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Abstract

This article presents a synthesis of the developments in the field of Greek vase painting during the last 15 years. I first place various types of publications and fields of inquiry into a historical context and then consider the current state of research in the various subareas. I close with comments on emerging practices and trends in the field and some of the major problems that need to be addressed.*

INTRODUCTION

The study of Greek vase painting has long held an important position in the field of classical archaeology, with serious studies of Greek painted ceramics beginning in earnest during the 18th century.¹ The term itself, Greek vase painting, is interpreted slightly differently by different scholars; some, for example, include painted vases from the Greek Bronze Age, while others do not. Most include Protogeometric, Geometric, and Hellenistic painted vases, but the essential core, to which the bulk of the scholarship is devoted, is the figured vases from the Archaic and Classical periods (700–323 B.C.E.). It is this core that this article primarily considers, although much of what is said is relevant to the study of the other painted vases.

The primary focus of the study of Greek vase painting has changed during the centuries, as has the degree of emphasis on various aspects such as interpretation of subject, collecting, typology, cataloguing, chronology, and attribution. Although scholarship continues today in all these areas, more emphasis is being placed on context, trade, shape, the technical aspects of production, the history of collecting, and theoretical approaches in interpreting the images—especially the so-called “genre” or “everyday life” images—than previously.

Each year, hundreds of publications on Greek vase painting appear, almost all of which are collected and briefly summarized every two years in the Bulletin Archéologique: Céramique of the Revue des Études Grecques. This important scholarly resource was initiated in 1960 by Henri Metzger and is now continued by a group of successors under the leadership of Maffre. The most recent issue is the joint product of six experts: Bellelli, Dupont, Fontannaz, Frère, Maffre, and Siebert.² Since this article reflects the current state of the field, I limit myself primarily, and admittedly arbitrarily, to including works with a publication date of 1996 or later—that is, the last 15 years—and focus on those I consider to be good representatives of the observations I make.³

EXCAVATION POTTERY

The majority (by far) of publications featuring Greek figured ceramics are excavation reports, ranging from

* I must first apologize to anybody I may have offended either by not including their contribution(s) to scholarship or not sufficiently stressing its importance when I have. I can only plead for forgiveness in that the bibliography is immense, the space to review limited, and my own knowledge sometimes wanting. I have done my best to try to present a balanced overview, choosing representative books and articles, but as is the case with all humans, I am sure that some of my prejudices show and that there are good arguments for choosing different representative books or articles than I have. I am particularly grateful to the following colleagues who have read and critiqued all or part of the manuscript or who have provided useful information: Serge Alexandre, Robert Crome, Martine Denoyelle, Sherry Fox, Bilga Hürmüzlü, Bettina Kreuzer, Kathleen Lynch, Claire Lyons, Jean-Jacques Maffre, Ian McPhee, Eleni Nodarou, Ewdoksia Papuci-Wladyka, Garry Schaus, Udo Schlotzhauer, Alan Shapiro, and Athena Tsingarda. For help with the illustrations, I also want to thank Sabine Albersmeier, John Camp, William A.P. Childs, Stacey Gannon-Wright, Jasper Gaunt, Martin Guzelev, Joachim Heiden, Klaus Junker, Nikolaos Kalsas, Donna C. Kurtz, Adrienne Lezzi-Hafter, Jean-Luc Martinez, Dimitar Nedev, Michael Padgett, Maria Pili, Maria Saflioti, Ann Sinfield, Irma Wehgartner, and Maria Viglaki. Finally, special thanks are due to Editor-in-Chief Naomi Norman, who solicited this review, and to the anonymous reviewers for the AJA, all of whom helped make this a much better contribution. Needless to say, only I am responsible for the opinions expressed in this article.


² Maffre et al. 2008. Occasionally the article has appeared late.

³ The proceedings of a round table in Bern (Association Suisse d’Archéologie Classique 1996), which focused on the current state and future of vase painting studies in 1996, provides a useful backdrop for this review.
a mere mention of new finds made at a specific site to fully detailed publications of entire complexes or sites. Classical archaeologists publishing figured pottery from large sites excavated over many years have traditionally devoted single volumes to one or occasionally more than one type of pottery. This format continues: Moore’s magnificent volume on the Attic red-figure and white-ground pottery from the Athenian Agora is a good example (fig. 1). Scholars producing these volumes often have to include pottery from old excavations whose exact findspot and context are no longer known. Such is the case with Kreuzer’s fine study of the Attic black-figure pottery from the Heraion on Samos, which also analyzed the vases according to their function (fig. 2). One of the advantages of the excavation report is that it allows a quick overview of one type of pottery at a site, which is all the more interesting if it is an import, such as the Attic black-figure found on Samos. It likewise assists in bettering our understanding of individual painters and potters and for discerning the emphasis on particular subjects or shapes found at particular sites. Sometimes the preparation of this type of volume can lead to a new overall study of the type of pottery featured in it, as is the case with Zaphiropoulou’s recent study of the so-called Melian Ware found on Delos. Other volumes, such as Olymische Forschungen 28, study all the imported pottery from one time period, in this case the archaic, thereby providing an overall picture of the imported pottery at one time and a clearer picture of trade patterns.

The major disadvantage to this approach, however, is that the vases have often not been published with the other material found with them, so their depositional context is not evident or considered. The current trend, therefore, is to publish the vases within their archaeological contexts, as is the case with two recent volumes from the Kerameikos excavations: Kunze-Götte’s study of archaic and classical graves and Knigge’s publication of Bau Z. Inclusion of the archaeological context enables us to pose different questions and to ascertain how the pottery was used in a variety of circumstances, including cult, ritual, and domestic use, and in a variety of transactions, including trade, and in a variety of venues, including the sanctuary, the graveyard, the marketplace, and the household. Our knowledge of dining and burial practices, among other social activities, is enhanced by increased information about both the vases used in these practices and the archaeological context in which these vessels were found. In addition, these kinds of publications clarify the chronological relationship of various types of pottery and artifacts to one another, as well as the chronological relationships of different parts of the archaeological site.

Unfortunately, there is much excavated pottery that has either never been published or only rudimentarily mentioned or illustrated, and full counts of the pottery found at one site or in large deposits are often not given. Recent scholarship has made us all much more aware of the destruction brought to archaeological sites by looters looking for antiquities to supply the art market and how the vases surfacing from these illegal activities have lost much of their scientific value because their archaeological context is not known. It is time for archaeologists to bring to task excavators who do not publish their finds. Not only do the contexts of the ceramics that they have excavated remain unknown, but so, too, do the ceramics themselves since they often reside in storage and are inaccessible to scholars—a double loss. The Archaeological Institute of America’s Code of Professional Standards and the Register of Professional Archaeologists’ Code of Conduct stipulate that archaeologists make public their research in a timely fashion, but many excavators are not living up to these standards.

Another complication is the dearth of scholars under the age of 55 in the United States, Germany, Russia, and Switzerland who are trained in publishing...
Greek excavation pottery. I attribute this to the low esteem in which the study of Greek ceramics is held in some of these countries. In Germany, for example, the study of Roman art, especially Roman sculpture, has been preeminent the last few decades. Although there is a new generation of German professors who are interested in “Vasenforschung,” they are unfortunately often not interested in excavation pottery. And to a good number of American scholars, those who study pottery—as opposed to those who excavate it—are not considered archaeologists. Yet pottery is by far the most common artifact found in most excavations, and excavators need pottery experts to date and publish these finds. If excavators are to publish this material properly, more pottery experts need to be trained and their contributions properly recognized and valued.

Catalogues

The importance of cataloguing is obvious, for it makes known and available to scholars (and the public) pottery found in excavations or housed in collections; catalogues both enlarge the corpus of known vases and increase our overall knowledge of Greek art and archaeology. They are an important first step in a research process that allows others to approach the material in different ways. The publication of more catalogues with excellent illustrations and profile drawings is needed, especially of small, less accessible collections; unfortunately, in the United States and other countries, this basic research is often not as well funded or valued as other types of research in Greek archaeology. For example, the National Endowment for the Arts used to support the production of volumes of the *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum* (see below) but no longer does so.

Catalogues are part of a long and continuous tradition in the study of Greek figured pottery, inspired chiefly by the publication in 1766–1776 of Sir William Hamilton’s collection of Greek vases.11 This publication has been called the “first great work on Greek pottery.”12 By the middle of the 19th century, the museum catalogue had been introduced, a form of publication that continues today. The last 15 years have seen a continuous stream of museum catalogues of Greek vases. Some, such as the catalogue for the collection of the University of Melbourne, are broad-based ceramic publications;13 others, such as the catalogue for the Theodor Collection of Attic black-figured vases, are more narrowly focused.14 Unfortunately, the
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11Hugues d’Hancarville 1766–1776.
12Cook 1972, 278.
13Connor and Jackson 2000.
14Heesen 1996.
Theodor Collection catalogue (and some others) served as a precursor to an auction catalogue and so contributed to the market for Greek artifacts. Catalogues of private collections, therefore, are falling out of favor because of abuses in the art market, and auction and sales catalogues, including those of Sotheby’s and Christie’s, include fewer and fewer vases, many of which were known before 1970, the year the UNESCO resolution uses as the cutoff for what archaeologists consider legal antiquities.

Museum catalogues normally publish either an entire collection of pottery or a specific part of it, usually defined by fabric—so, for example, all the Attic figured vases, or all the South Italian vases. In other cases, when all or part of the museum’s ancient art collection is published, only part of it is vases. Some individual articles are also catalogues of part or all of a collection. Catalogue-like in format but not true catalogues are the now popular, glossy guides to the highlights of a particular collection. Often they feature some vases, and occasionally there is a guide for only the most important vases in a collection.

The Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum

A special type of catalogue designed primarily for ancient vases is the Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum (CVA). This long-term project functions under the aegis of the Union Académique Internationale and is its oldest research project. The CVA was conceived in 1919 by Edmond Pottier, who published the first volume of the series in 1923. Originally, the goal was to publish illustrations and basic descriptions of all ancient vases dating from prehistoric to Roman times. Today, the project continues to flourish. Many of the fascicles now focus primarily on Greek painted pottery, particularly those decorated in the black-figure and the red-figure techniques, although there are volumes dedicated to other types of figured ceramics, including Corinthian, East Greek, Geometric, and Etruscan pottery of various types. Other primarily nonfigured fabrics, such as Cypriot, Mycenaean, and Attic black-gloss, are also sometimes included.

To date, more than 325 fascicles of the CVA have been published from 27 different countries. The Germans, whose contribution is supported by the Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaft, have produced the most: 84 fascicles (plus three from the former Deutsche Demokratische Republik) and three Beihefte. The latter are new and publish papers from conferences held under the aegis of the Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaft. The first Beiheft contains papers on a variety of subjects connected with the study of painted vases, including ancient repairs, preliminary drawings, chronology, and the history of collections. The second volume focuses on conservation and restoration, and the third on Attic vases in Etruscan contexts. A fourth on hermeneutics is in preparation. The French have started a similar series, Cahiers du Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum France, the initial volume of which features papers from a conference on the purchasers of Greek vases.

In addition to the countries that have historically produced CVA volumes, other countries have recently become involved in the project. Most notable are the 16 Russian volumes from the State Hermitage Museum and Pushkin Museum. Other countries that have emerged during the last decade are Ireland, Finland, Australia, and Serbia and Montenegro. The first volume from Turkey is being planned at this point. Denmark, which had not produced a volume since 1963, has begun to do so once again, as has Hungary after a long hiatus; Austria, and perhaps Belgium, will shortly do the same. Others, such as Greece, have notably increased their production recently. The Poles, meanwhile, are redoing their first three (pre–World War II) volumes with better illustrations and an up-to-date commentary. The United States continues steadily to produce volumes, seven since 1996, four of which are from the J. Paul Getty Museum. Several new, exciting trends are noticeable. Good profile drawings (often using new techniques) in CVA publications are now a standard. Two recent volumes from Amsterdam, for example, used for the first time computerized tomography (CT) scans to create the
The major advantage of this technique is that the interior profile of closed shapes is visible, which aids in identifying potters and workshops. The major disadvantage is that the exterior profiles are often blurry and the fine details of potting used in identifying potters are not clearly discernable.

Also helpful is the listing of the capacity of each vase that is included in some volumes. Furthermore, fragments are sometimes reproduced at 1:1 to facilitate the finding of joins with fragments in other collections. Fascicles with color plates are becoming more common, and most countries no longer produce volumes with loose plates but employ bound plates printed on both sides. This makes the volumes cheaper to produce and prevents the plates from becoming separated from the text. Controversial is the fascicle of the Marathon Museum because it is written in modern Greek, rather than in one of the four traditional languages for the CVA: English, French, German, and Italian. Unfortunately, the practice in the British series is to sometimes use photographs that are too small to reveal all the details. This is not the case with the volume publishing the fragmentary vases from the excavations of the HMS Galloos, the ship that was wrecked carrying part of Hamilton’s second collection of Greek vases to England. Normally vases found in excavations are not published in CVA volumes, per the original goals of the project and because their archaeological context would not be included, but these fragments were acquired by the British Museum and are now part of their collection.

Some 250 out-of-print volumes of the CVA are now available online via the Beazley Archive in Oxford. Not only can these volumes be searched by country and collection but also by fabric, shape, and technique. An even wider range of fields is available for Attic black- and red-figure vases, including subject, artist, and findspot.

The Beazley Archive at Oxford continues to thrive (fig. 3). Begun in 1970 with the notes, photographs, and drawings of Sir John Davidson Beazley, former Lincoln Professor of Classical Archaeology at Oxford, the archive has steadily grown over the years to include more than a quarter of a million photographs, the vast majority of which are of Greek vases, particularly Athenian vases. Its pottery database was started in 1979 and went online in 1998, making available to scholars an easily searchable database of Attic figured vases. This is an invaluable tool for all. Indeed, some scholars now include the Beazley Archive number for vases referenced in their scholarship.

A similar archive for South Italian figured vases, the Trendall Archive, is housed at La Trobe University in Melbourne, Australia. The archive contains both the approximately 40,000 photographs collected by the late Arthur Dale Trendall and his library. A text database has been produced for virtually all the South Italian red-figure fabrics, except Apulian, but the database is only available for consultation at La Trobe. There are plans to add Apulian and to attach digitized images to the text.

Several museums have put images and text about the vases in their collections online (e.g., Ian Potter Museum of Art, The University of Melbourne vase collection); others offer only a selection of their vases (e.g., Winchester College, England; Krannert Art Museum, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign). This practice was popular in the 1990s but has declined noticeably, very likely in part because of copyright concerns that affect the reuse of images placed on the Internet. Nevertheless, there are many images of Greek vases available online. The Perseus Digital
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32 E.g., CVA Bochum 1–3 (Germany 79, 81–82).
33 This has become standard in the volumes from the J. Paul Getty Museum.
34 CVA Marathon Museum 1 (Greece 7); Hemelrijk 2004.
35 E.g., CVA Glasgow 1 (Great Britain 18); CVA Winchester College 1 (Great Britain 19).
36 CVA British Museum 10 (Great Britain 20).
38 http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk.
41 http://www.winchestercollege.co.uk/UserFiles/File/A%20selection%20of%20Greek%20vases%20in%20Winchester%20College.pdf.
EXHIBITIONS

Greek painted pottery is a standard element in many exhibitions about the Greek and Etruscan world. Some recent major exhibits in which Greek pottery has played a key role include (1) several in response to the 2004 Olympic Games in Athens, such as Agon at the National Museum in Athens;45 (2) several dealing with daily life, such as the exhibition at Dartmouth College about Greek children and childhood and that at Mariemont about perfume;46 (3) those dealing with myth, such as the exhibition in Munich on Herakles;47 (4) the monumental exhibition in Berlin exploring the idea of the Greek classical;48 and (5) the exhibition in Rome of stolen antiquities that have been returned to Italy.49 Both myth and everyday life are featured on the pottery exhibited in Worshipping Women: Ritual and Reality in Classical Athens, the latest in a run of important exhibitions organized by the Onassis Cultural Center in New York.50

As more and more people realize the importance of archaeological context, exhibitions of material in private collections (esp. pieces without known findspots and a known history) are becoming a thing of the past: the Martin von Wagner Museum’s Mythen und Menschen and the beautiful exhibition The Centaur’s Smile and its catalogue are exceptions.51 Exhibitions featuring material from particular archaeological excavations, by contrast, are becoming more frequent. Noteworthy here was the exhibition and catalogue of recent finds from the excavations for the Metro at Athens, The City Beneath the City.52

As a whole, exhibitions dedicated only to Greek painted pottery are not nearly as common as those with only some Greek vases, but three recent ones are of particular note for their outstanding catalogues. Ta Attika: Veder greco a Gela featured the Greek figured vases found at Gela; the illustrated catalogue for the exhibition includes all the attributed vases from the site.53 Strikingly beautiful is the catalogue for The Colors of Clay: Special Techniques in Athenian Vases, which featured Attic vases of special production and decorated with techniques other than black-figure or red-figure (e.g., coral-red, white-ground, Six’s technique).54 Le vase grec et ses destins, the third, follows the often long and diverse life of Greek painted pottery from its production to its use and afterlife in museums and as a source of artistic inspiration.55 Earlier this year, the National Museum in Athens finished installing the long-inaccessible and very important Vlastos Collection of Greek vases in a new permanent exhibition.

CONFERENCES, COLLOQUIA, AND WORKSHOPS

Papers on Greek vase painting have been presented frequently at conferences for many years, but conferences devoted to Greek ceramics are very much a recent phenomenon, starting in earnest in 1984 with the University of Amsterdam’s ground-breaking “Ancient Greek and Related Pottery.”56 Today, these vase conferences are normally large, international affairs. Some, such as that in Kiel in 2001 on Greek ceramics in cultural context, were broad in scope and included papers on both figured and nonfigured pottery.57 The subject of others is much more narrowly defined. These include a symposium on Panathenaic amphoras (fig. 4) in Rauischholzhauen in 1998, a colloquium on fourth-century Attic ceramics in the western Mediterranean in Arles, published in 2000, and another at the National Museum of Naukratis and East Greek pottery.58 “Athenian Potters and Painters” was the theme of two international conferences held appropriately in Athens where the vases were made, while a roundtable was held in Naples in 2000 to discuss the future of the study of Apulian red-figure after the death of Trendall, the leading figure in the study of South Italian vase painting.59 The published proceedings of the special conference held in connection with the exhibition The Colors of Clay: Special Techniques in Athenian Vases further enlightens our understanding of these special products.60 Other conferences of note include the roving one held...
in 2001 in Sicily (Catania, Caltanissetta, Gela, Camarina, Vittoria, and Syracuse), with the theme "Greeks, Barbarians, and Attic Ceramics," and the four noted above that were organized by the Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaft and published as Beihefte to the German CVA series. Among those whose proceedings have not yet appeared but are being prepared for publication are a symposium on interpreting images held in Bern in 2007 and another in Brussels in 2006 on the shape and uses of Greek vases.

ATTRIBUTION AND PAINTERS

The 19th century saw the first attempts to attribute vases to individual artistic hands. At first scholars used primarily the signed vases as their starting point, but the work of Sir John Davidson Beazley changed that. He devoted his life to attributing thousands of unsigned Athenian vases to individual hands on the basis of the style of drawing, thereby creating a much better understanding of how Attic black-figure and red-figure developed, which is still a basis for dating Attic figured pottery. It is the Attic figured pottery found in deposits that is often one of the most important elements used for dating those deposits and that, in turn, is used to date the other objects found in them. The chronology of Attic black-gloss, for example, is highly dependent on the black- and red-figure pottery found in the deposits used to create its chronology.

Beazley’s methodology has often been misunderstood. Scholars have thought that it was directly derived from that of the art historian Giovanni Morelli (1816–1891), who attributed unsigned paintings to individual hands on the basis of the idiosyncratic manner in which various details were drawn. Beazley, who never mentioned Morelli in his work, does seem to have derived his approach from German scholars, such as Hartwig. Indeed, a comparison of the language and drawings of Beazley’s earliest article on a painter that he christened the Kleophrades Painter and Hartwig’s Die griechischen Meisterschalen makes clear this
influence. Beazley himself acknowledged Hartwig in this article, as well as Hauser and Furtwängler. We do best, then, not to connect Beazley’s approach directly with Morelli but with Hartwig, who, along with other German scholars, followed a long tradition starting in the late 1840s of making attributions to add to the lists of signed vases.

There is a tendency by some scholars not trained in attribution to trivialize Beazley’s methodology, reducing it to something as simple as comparing anatomical details. This is partially because Beazley never wrote a specific study focused solely on his methodology. Rather, one must consult his early articles focusing on individual vase painters, particularly those on the Berlin Painter, the Achilles Painter, and the Antimenes Painter, for a clear picture of how he worked.

These articles show both that Beazley looked for systems of rendering forms consisting of many details, not just one or two, in order to assign vases to an artist, and that the way drapery and realia-antiquaria were drawn was just as important as the anatomical details. Attribution is hard work and requires close examination and good visual recall, so it is not something that all can do well and not something done quickly and easily by those untrained. Not only does attribution bring life to the pottery industry by revealing artistic personalities, but it also is an “enabling tool” that enhances the study of production and pottery production. It can, for example, help determine trade patterns by indicating where different pottery workshops sent their wares or allow us to determine if the pottery in one deposit was the work of one artist and therefore likely a set of pottery bought at one point in time.

Beazley’s lists of thousands of vases attributed to various painters, classes, and groups is one of the great achievements of classical archaeology, a fact appreciated even by his detractors. In the late 1980s and the 1990s, the value of attribution and continuing work in Beazley’s legacy were debated. The criticisms of, for example, Whitley and Turner were rebutted by Williams, me, and several others. This is not the place to repeat all the arguments and assertions, but suffice it to say that the critiques have not kept scholars, both young and old, from continuing to produce very useful scholarship of this nature.

Indeed, recent scholarship demonstrates this to be the case, for the study of individual artists continues. Monographs on the Attic Sabouroff Painter, Achilles Painter (fig. 5), Sotades Painter, Epiktetos, Makron, and the Boeotian red-figure artist, the Argos Painter, have appeared, in addition to two monographs on the Meleager Painter, a red-figure artist, and two on the Theseus Painter, a black-figure artist. Studies of the Codrus Painter, Syriskos, and Skythes are in progress, among others. These kinds of monographs have all developed from simple lists of vases and discussions of an artist’s style to broader studies that can, among other things, attempt to reconstruct the workshop in which the artist worked or reflect on how the images produced by the artist relate to the culture of the time in which they were produced and the audience(s) the painters wished to address.

Both major and minor Laconian black-figure artists are reconsidered in Stibbe’s supplement to his Latakische Vasenmaler des sechsten Jahrhunderts v. Chr., as are a group of Attic red-figure painters in Mannack’s The Late Mannerists in Athenian Vase-Painting. Kluiver analyzes a group of Attic black-figure painters in his The Tyrrhenian Group of Black-Figure Vases. The painters of Etrusco-Corinthian figured vases are the focus of Szilágyi’s magnum opus. Individual artists are the subjects of major articles, such as Neeft’s on the Corinthian Painter of Vatican 73 or Denoyelle’s on the Proto-Attic Analatos Painter. Other articles focus on a particularly important vase (or vases) by a vase painter. McPhee’s study of a bell krater by the Telos Painter with Herakles and Bousiris illustrates this type well. New painters continue to be discovered, and new attributions are made, most notably Güdiche’s rich book on Attic ceramics in Magna Graecia from the second half of the fifth century B.C.E. Sadly, however, Kerameus, a series devoted to studies of the individual
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artists, has come to an end with Kunisch’s *Makron* and Mommsen’s *Exekias*. It is noteworthy that many scholars writing monographic studies of vase painters are young Greek excavators who know how important an understanding of Greek painted pottery is to dating and understanding what they have excavated.

**SHAPE, ORNAMENT, AND WORKSHOPS**

The study of individual shapes has a long tradition in classical archaeology, and it continues unabated today. Brijder’s third volume of his career-long study of the Siana cups (fig. 6) is a sterling example, as is Bentz’s volume on Panathenaic amphoras (see fig. 4). Brijder analyzes both the development of the shape and many other aspects of the Siana cups, including ornament, iconography, and painters. Bentz’s volume concerns itself primarily with the relationship of the vases with the Panathenaic games and the archaeological contexts of these amphoras. There has been a recent spate of interest in epinetra (ceramic coverings to protect the knee and lower thigh when working wool), three books within a three-year span, all of which concern themselves with the relationship between the shape and the decoration. This kind of inquiry between shape and decoration has become popular, ever since Scheibler’s ground-breaking article about the pictures on amphoras, as Kreuzer’s analysis of the Horse-Head amphoras and Schmidt’s recent study of the pictures on white lekythoi, pyxides, choes, and hydriai illustrate. Other studies reflect on the relationship of a shape in one fabric to that in another. Broader in scope is Papanastasiou’s book on the relationship between Attic red-figure and black-gloss vessels in the fourth century B.C.E., in which she compares 14 different shapes.

It was Bloesch’s ground-breaking study of the individual potters of Attic black- and red-figure cups that led to detailed studies of individual shapes, their potters, and workshops. His methodology involved placing lead wire against the vase to capture the profile, which he then traced onto paper. After comparing the fine details of potting, he attributed the vases to individual potter’s hands. His student, Lezzi-Hafter, carried on his tradition by using his methodology to identify the potters of the workshops of the Schuvalov Painter and the Eretria Painter. Lezzi-Hafter pushed the methodology of attribution further by attributing the ornament on many of the vases from these workshops (fig. 7) to individual hands, different from those of the figure painters. This combined approach has its fullest expression in Kunze-Gôte’s reconstruction of the Kleophrades Painter’s black-figure workshop, which she calls the Atalanta Workshop. Ornament is the subject of several studies, such as Kunze-Gôte’s on myrtle and Kunisch’s on the leafy zigzag pattern.

Other scholars, meanwhile, focused their study of profile drawings on a single shape, as did Philippaki in her monograph on the Attic stamnos. Other examples include Becker’s analysis of Attic pelikai from the last quarter of the sixth century to ca. 480 B.C.E.
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and Roberts’ study of the Attic pyxis. Nor was this approach limited to Attic pottery. The study of individual potters continues, as illustrated by Mommsen’s work on the potter Amasis, Kluiver’s on the Tyrrhenian Group, and Tosto’s on Nikosthenes.

Complementing these studies of shape are those that focus on the functions of individual forms. An important conference was held in Brussels in 2006 on this subject, the proceedings of which are now being prepared for publication. Important topics explored at the conference included the study of capacity and what it can tell us about the use of a vase and its users, and what archaeological context can tell us about the users of a particular shape, notably their gender, age, and social status. The conference was sponsored by the Archaeological Research Center (CReA) of the Free University of Brussels (ULB), which has recently been an important center of activity in the study of pottery. Its Web site has a handy calculator for determining capacity.

Important advances in the field include the publication of a greater number of profile drawings, which are necessary for studying shape and identifying potters. New techniques for making these drawings are being introduced, including the use of a CT scanner.

Detailed studies of shape, as of painters, allow us to develop an even more closely knit and dependable chronology in addition to helping us reconstruct ancient pottery workshops. Meanwhile, several volumes of the Lexicon Vasorum Graecorum (LVG), the standard reference work for the Greek names of the forms of Greek vases, have appeared since 1992. Volume 5, which ends with the entry for Epheperion, is the most recent product of the philological project. Typically, the entry for each Greek name includes variations of the name, the form and function of the vase, materials from which the vase is made, geographical area in which the vase was used, the Latin name for it, citations of the name in ancient texts, and bibliography.

CHRONOLOGY AND CLASSIFICATION SYSTEMS

In the 1980s, a series of studies by Vickers and Francis attempted to change dramatically the chronology for Greek archaic art—including pottery—that was first established by Langlotz in 1920. Although their proposed down-dating of about 50 years found little support, they performed the extremely useful function of forcing scholars to reexamine the evidence. This was done by several scholars but perhaps most notably by Shear, whose thorough, excellent examination of all the deposits in the Agora connected with the Persian sack of Athens in 480 B.C.E. verified the old chronology and put the extreme views of Vickers and Francis to rest.

Fig. 6. Black-figure Siana cup by the Griffin-Bird Painter. Greek, 545 B.C.E., earthenware with slip and painted decoration, (with handles) 11.1 x 25.4 cm (4 3/8 x 10 in.). Madison, Chazen Museum of Art, University of Wisconsin–Madison, inv. no. 1985.96 (courtesy Chazen Museum of Art, University of Wisconsin–Madison; Gift of Mr. and Mrs. Arthur J. Frank).
This is not to say, however, that some scholars were not convinced that some alterations to the old scheme were needed, most notably Tölle-Kastenbein, who altered slightly (ranging from five to 15 years) the stylistic dates of objects from the Late Archaic and Early Classical periods. Suggestions for slight alterations to the old chronology continue to be made. Rotroff, for example, argues that the beginning of Attic red-figure should be down-dated from 530–525 B.C.E. by 10 years because it does not show up in Agora deposits until then. There are also the minor adjustments for the dating of individual vases that continue to emerge from the study of individual painters or potters.

New discoveries of East Greek pottery, most notably at Miletus, have changed our understanding of various fabrics. For example, several vases, the so-called bilinguals (fig. 8), have been discovered at Miletus and are decorated partly in the Wild Goat Style and partly in Fikellura. This hybrid decoration indicates that we are dealing with one fabric that exhibits a continuum between two styles of decoration, not two fabrics as previously thought. This discovery and others have led Kerschner and Schlotzhauer, for example, to propose a new and more flexible classification system for East Greek pottery that is based both on the place and region of production and on chronological periods and phases. Two articles about the earliest Klazomenian sarcophagi will be published shortly by Hürmüzlü, who demonstrates by the use of excavated examples that the production of these painted containers began 100 years earlier than previously thought. We know of at least one vase painter, the Borelli Painter, who decorated Klazomenian sarcophagi, and most likely others did as well.

INSCRIPTIONS

Originally, Greek figured vases were thought to be Etruscan, but in the mid 18th century, scholars recognized that the inscriptions on many of them were in Greek (see fig. 2), which indicated that they originated in Greece and Greek colonies in Italy. Ever since then, the inscriptions have been of interest to scholars, and a number of new important studies have been published during the last 15 years. Most notable are Wachtter’s monograph on inscriptions on non-Attic vases before 400 B.C.E. and Johnston’s addenda to his monumental Trademarks on Greek Vases. The latter updates what is the only comprehensive source for the various graffiti and *dipinti* found on painted Greek vases, often on the bottom of their foot (fig. 9) and so normally not visible. Johnston’s study of these marks adds much to our understanding of Greek commerce, for he notes that certain trademarks are associated primarily or solely with vases by certain artists or with certain sites. Wachtter’s book also provides a corpus and commentary that updates the non-Attic examples in Kretschmer’s standard work on vase inscriptions, which is now more than a century old. Immerwahr’s *Attic Script* provides a good survey of Attic inscriptions, and a PDF version of his preliminary Corpus of Attic Vase Inscriptions (CAVI) is available online. Wachtter is now preparing a definitive corpus for publication (Attic Vase Inscriptions) that is based on
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Immerwahr’s work. A complete study is still needed of the inscriptions on South Italian figured vases.

Also useful is Maggiani’s corpus of Attic vases with inscriptions to Etruscan deities, which suggests that there was interplay in many cases between the scene depicted on the vase and the specific cult to which it was dedicated. Work on ostraka continues, as does work on the prosopography of Attic vase painters and potters. Many inscriptions on Greek vases appear in various reference works, including Threatte’s magnum opus on the grammar of Attic inscriptions. New vase inscriptions of importance are published in the Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (SEG).

A host of articles have been written on individual inscriptions or groups of them, and an entire issue of the journal Métis is devoted to the subject. Some articles simply report new finds with inscriptions, such as the amazing collection from Pistoia, which features both Greek and Thracian names; others feature a wide range of approaches, from the purely philological to those suggesting various levels for the interpretation of inscriptions and the figured scenes they accompany: in other words, they discuss how figures and words work together in unison to create a nuanced image. Even the use of nonsense inscriptions is analyzed with respect to the scenes in which they are found.
and painters’ names and kalos inscriptions still remain popular subjects, and new evidence about the ancient prices for vases continues to be discovered and discussed. In general, since the 1990s, we have seen a major renaissance in the study of vase inscriptions.

TECHNICAL STUDIES

Technical studies of painted pottery began in earnest in the 1920s with the publication of early experiments attempting to reproduce Athenian black-gloss. Richter, moreover, put to use her training as a potter and combined it with literary and archaeological evidence to reconstruct as thoroughly as possible the ancient Athenian art of making pottery. The following decades saw a growing number of publications presenting scientific analysis of both black-gloss and intentional red glosses, and in 1965 the first edition of Noble’s The Techniques of Painted Attic Pottery was published; it became the standard study for decades on how an Athenian painted vase was made.

Important recent work includes that of another potter, Schreiber, whose book substantially enlarged our understanding of the step-by-step process of potting the various shapes used in ancient Athenian vase painting. Important also is Papadopoulos’ Hesperia supplement, which looks at the debris from Early Iron Age (and later) Athenian pottery workshops in the Agora and analyzes what this debris tells us about pottery production in ancient Athens. Preliminary drawings, clay analysis, pigment analysis, ancient repairs, drawing tools, and kiln firings are some aspects of the manufacturing process that have drawn attention recently. Among the many scientific techniques used are (1) analysis of the chemical composition of clay and other materials by a scanning electron microscope with an energy dispersive X-ray attached (SEM-EDX); (2) micromorphological analysis employing a transmission electron microscope (TEM); (3) inductively coupled plasma emission spectroscopy; (4) X-ray diffraction (XRD) analysis of pigments and clays; and (5) experimental archaeology. Some studies allow us to better define the locations of workshops and the products made in them. Great progress has been made with decorated pottery from East Greece in particular, where, for example, neutron activation analysis (NAA) of recent finds from the Sanctuary of Apollo at Ermik has revealed a previously unknown East Dorian Fikellura Ware. Fakes are still being unmasked by the use of thermoluminescence testing.

The catalogue of the exhibition The Colors of Clay: Special Techniques in Athenian Vases and the papers published from the symposium connected with it present new information about the technical processes involved in making Athenian pottery. Color has now become an important subject for research in classical archaeology. Koch’s book on early Greek painting is very useful, and Koch-Brinkmann’s monograph has made a substantial contribution to our understanding of the colors used on Attic white-ground lekythoi
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and their relationship to lost monumental Greek wall paintings. Some vase paintings have long been recognized as reflections of lost wall and panel paintings, but we are now learning that some of the actual materials used in the white-ground technique, such as those for the individual colors, are actually the same as used in wall paintings. In general, scientific archaeology is increasingly playing a critical role in the study of ancient ceramics, including Greek figured vases. One impediment to this kind of research, however, is the cost of many scientific procedures. The reluctance of many authorities in charge of antiquities to allow sampling, sometimes because of the rarity of the type of vase involved, also has a dampening effect on this research. Therefore, in some cases, it is not currently known if these scientific results are statistically valid and the results truly indicative of the entire picture. In other cases, however, such as when comparing samples of one type of pottery with a database, a small number of samples is not such a problem.

**Trade and Economy**

Because pottery is nearly indestructible, it is the single most common object preserved and thereby extremely important for the study of ancient trade. Cook’s stimulating yet sobering article about the role and value of Greek painted pottery in the study of ancient trade and economy resulted in a growing interest in this area of research. Questions of how and where the vases were produced, distributed, and used and how they were perceived and valued by their local clients have headed the list recently. Indicative of the increased interest in these problems was the publication in 1999 of the international colloquium “Céramique et peinture grecques: Modes d’emploi.” Sections of other major publications also point to this interest: the congress at Kiel in 2003, “Griechische Keramik in trade and economy resulted in a growing interest in this area of research. Questions of how and where the vases were produced, distributed, and used and how they were perceived and valued by their local clients have headed the list recently. Indicative of the increased interest in these problems was the publication in 1999 of the international colloquium “Céramique et peinture grecques: Modes d’emploi.” Sections of other major publications also point to this interest: the congress at Kiel in 2003, “Griechische Keramik in trade and economy resulted in a growing interest in this area of research. Questions of how and where the vases were produced, distributed, and used and how they were perceived and valued by their local clients have headed the list recently. Indicative of the increased interest in these problems was the publication in 1999 of the international colloquium “Céramique et peinture grecques: Modes d’emploi.” Sections of other major publications also point to this interest: the congress at Kiel in 2003, “Griechische Keramik in trade and economy resulted in a growing interest in this area of research. Questions of how and where the vases were produced, distributed, and used and how they were perceived and valued by their local clients have headed the list recently. Indicative of the increased interest in these problems was the publication in 1999 of the international colloquium “Céramique et peinture grecques: Modes d’emploi.”

**A particularly fine and extremely important study that uses context to help understand trade is Reusser’s Vasen für Etrurien.** He analyzes the various archaeological contexts for the use of Attic pottery in sixth- and fifth-century B.C.E. Etruria and draws a number of important conclusions, including: (1) only a very low percentage of the pottery found in household deposits is Attic and, to judge from their shapes, was used primarily for banqueting; (2) Attic pottery found in sanctuaries was used as offerings, cultic ware, and for sacred banquets and was present at all types of sanctuaries—both inland and coastal; (3) Attic pottery was not restricted to the elites; and (4) the shape of the vase, not the subject matter depicted on it, was of primary importance to the Etruscan customer.

Several broad overviews of the nature of the pottery trade and the trading value of pottery have appeared in the last 15 years that have countered the arguments of Gill, who would see figured pottery as nothing more than ship ballast. Most are now agreed that although the trade in figured pottery was not always a major element of commerce, it was nonetheless profitable.

A current subject of hot debate is whether Athenian vase painters decorated their products with their purchasers—primarily the Etruscans—in mind, or if they painted primarily for an Athenian audience. Two articles with the same title but with different viewpoints on the subject appear in the same collection of essays: Greek Vases: Images, Contexts and Controversies. There, Marconi argues that many a popular scene is generic.
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in nature so as to appeal to different audiences, while Osborne maintains that they were made primarily with Athenian audiences in mind.\textsuperscript{148} Lewis, however, argues that many of the vases were made with the Etruscan market in mind.\textsuperscript{149} The truth probably lies somewhere between the two extremes, namely that although many painters did not draw scenes with the Italian market in mind, some certainly did, the Perizoma Group being the best example (fig. 11).\textsuperscript{150} That Attic potters made vases for a specific foreign market is evidenced by the figured wares they potted employing foreign shapes: these include Cypro-jugs, Nikosthenic amphoras, and kyathoi based on Etruscan bucchero models, as well as Apulian-style nestorides and Thracian-style mugs (fig. 12) and beakers.\textsuperscript{151} Surprisingly, although there are numerous studies about the distribution and meaning of Attic painted pottery in many areas of the Mediterranean, Greece itself has been largely ignored.\textsuperscript{152} Several other studies have focused more on the actual process of distribution in specific areas, such as Pape’s exemplary study of the role the Etruscans and the Massiliotes played in the commerce of Greek products (most notably ceramics) in the central east zone north of the Alps.\textsuperscript{153} Shipwrecks with Greek pottery add to this picture.\textsuperscript{154} Still other studies offer new examples of imported vases made specifically for sanctuary use. For example, Pipili, in her publication of the Laconian pottery from the Artemis sanctuary on Samos, presents the first Laconian black-figure two-handled mugs known from anywhere (fig. 13), in addition to several rare black-figure chalices.\textsuperscript{155} Also important are the analyses of imported Greek painted pottery (in one fabric or many) at a particular site or region; good examples of this kind of study include Tuna-Nörling’s thorough analysis of the trade in Attic black-figure to the East, Posamentir’s overview of East Greek pottery found at Berezan, and Fless’ study of fourth-century Attic red-figure imported around the Mediterranean and Black seas.\textsuperscript{156} Also noteworthy are inquiries that focus on the distribution of the products from a single workshop. Jubier-Galinier, for example, demonstrates how widely dispersed around the Mediterranean the products of the workshop of the Diosphos and Haimon painters were.\textsuperscript{157}

\textbf{IMAGES}

Already in the 18th century, the pictures on the vases were what attracted the primary attention of scholars and collectors, and describing and interpreting these images were their primary goals. Literary sources normally served as the basis for their conclusions, but often they over- or misinterpreted the images. Their tendency was to view the vase paintings as illustrations of Greek texts. This approach—despite its long history in vase painting scholarship—has now for the most part abated.

Much of the late 19th and the 20th centuries were devoted to the study of iconography and iconology. This combined approach consists normally of first collecting all the known depictions of a particular subject and analyzing how its composition changed over time and in various parts of the Mediterranean world (iconography), followed by an attempt to explain the historical, cultural, symbolic, social, political, or artistic reasons for these changes—that is, the deeper significance of the scene (iconology). Simon, Boardman, and their students, as well as Shapiro, are some of the leading practitioners of this traditional approach. They injected new life into this kind of
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study by integrating iconography, history, and politics with archaeology. The numerous studies sparked by the approach taken in Boardman’s seminal 1972 article, in which he first argued that the tyrant Peisistratos identified himself with the hero Herakles, is a good example.\(^{158}\)

Traditional studies continue in full force and still dominate the field. Gebauer’s book on animal sacrifices, Kefalidou’s study of victorious athletes (fig. 14), Moraw’s monograph on maenads, Schäfer’s analysis of symposium scenes, and Schultz’s study of depictions of the Athenian apobates race are all excellent recent examples of this kind of work.\(^{159}\) Two monographs discuss the same subject—workshop scenes.\(^{160}\) Other studies focus on specific iconographic elements on Greek vases, such as snakes or depictions of statues (there are also two monographs on the latter);\(^{161}\) and still others identify for the first time various types of realia-antiquaria such as the depiction of an ichneumon or previously undocumented events such as a picture of a man striking coins.\(^{162}\) Several articles present new depictions of subjects already known, such as the Trojan Horse.\(^{163}\) Others present radically new interpretations of well-known images such as Mayor’s intriguing suggestion that an ancient fossil was the source of inspiration for the depiction of the monster threatening Heisone on a Corinthian krater in Boston.\(^{164}\) Clearly, the images themselves are still fruitful ground for research.

Of tremendous value in studying the images in vase paintings is the publication of the *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (LIMC), an approximately 30-year project to document the iconography of ancient Greek, Etruscan, and Roman art, including painted Greek vases. This is without a doubt the single most important and influential project of its generation in classical archaeology, resulting not only in eight massive double volumes plus indices but also numerous dissertations and other publications. A supplementary volume has just appeared.

Political, social, and cultural institutions and events are credited by other authors with influencing the choice of subject and the way it is depicted. Bundrick’s monograph on classical images of musicians (fig. 15), for example, connects the new interest in depicting musical performance with developments in fifth-century music,\(^{165}\) while Neer looks at the manner in which contemporary political and social discourse
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influenced Late Archaic and Early Classical Athenian vase painting.  

The publication of La Cité des images ushered in the so-called Paris-Lausanne School, which took a new and innovative approach to interpreting vase paintings, one based on anthropology and structural linguistics that compared the basic elements of Greek culture with those of primitive cultures. They see the language of imagery as a system of communication that tells us what Athenians valued, as expressed through their visual culture. Leaders of this school include Lissarrague, Bérard, Frontisi-Ducroux, and Schnapp. After a burst of publications by them and their followers, the last 10 years have seen a decrease in these publications. The school seems to be less active and not to have produced a young following in France and Switzerland, although some German scholars are adopting this approach in some of their work. Still, the founders continue to make important contributions, and one might point out here Schnapp’s book on the hunt, Frontisi-Ducroux’s monograph on metamorphosing figures, and Lissarrague’s glossy book on Greek vases, as well as a number of very useful articles, such as Lissarrague’s recent study of shield devices.

Perhaps the most enduring contribution of the Paris-Lausanne School was to inspire other scholars to investigate vase paintings using a variety of theoretical approaches. Cohen’s excellent collection of essays on “Otherness” is a good example. Other scholars draw on a number of theoretical approaches, many of them derived from literary studies, to explain certain types of scenes or elements that would have been difficult to understand fully otherwise. Thus, Steiner uses narratology, information theory, semiotics, and structural linguistics to explain how repetition conveys meaning, and Stansbury-O’Donnell deploys structural analysis, Lacanian psychoanalytic theory, gender theory, and ritual theory to explain spectator figures. One avenue that is emerging and seems particularly fruitful is the study of metaphors and similes, both how a particular scene can serve as a metaphor or simile for another scene and how the same metaphors and similes are used in vase painting as in literature. A good example is Barringer’s study of hunting scenes, in which she convincingly demonstrates how in both literature and vase painting, hunting serves as a metaphor for sexual pursuit, taking note of the motifs lifted from hunting scenes and placed in vase paintings of sexual pursuit (fig. 16).

More and more scholars are now turning to the study of genre or everyday life scenes, particularly those involving women, rather than of mythological
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scenes. Many of these genre scenes have formerly been interpreted as illustrating the oppressed nature of a woman’s life in ancient Athens, but some scholars are now putting a more positive spin on these pictures and interpreting them as idealizations of the female contributions to the household. Basic questions, such as “are all female nudes hetairai?” are being debated anew, and sex and gender in the vase paintings continue to be popular subjects for research. In general, an increasing number of scholars no longer see the images merely as illustrations of ancient life but as cultural constructs that have their own language that needs to be decoded so as to understand the social and cultural values and beliefs that they reflect. Sourvinou-Inwood, who sadly died prematurely, was one of the leaders of this concept, her work much influenced by French structuralism and semiotics. Scenes of myth, although receiving less attention, are still the subject of some studies, such as Hedreen’s insightful Capturing Troy, which investigates the narrative function of landscape in scenes of the Trojan War (fig. 17), Isler-Kerényi’s important book on Dionysos in archaic imagery, and Carpenter’s Dionysian Imagery in Fifth-Century Athens.

Fig. 15. Seated man playing a barbiton. Attic red-figure skyphos by the Eucharides Painter. Mainz, Mainz University, inv. no. 113 (courtesy K. Junker).

Tragedy and its relationship to images on Greek pottery continue to be a popular field of inquiry (fig. 18). The exact nature of the relationship between the two has long been debated, ranging from those who see a direct influence of Attic tragedy on the images to those who see virtually none. Taplin’s beautifully illustrated Pots and Plays suggests a logical middle-of-the-road approach that interprets the pictures as informed by the plays. Also useful is Todisco’s La ceramic figurata a soggetto tragico in Magna Grecia e in Sicilia, although it is very expensive. Comedy and Greek vase paintings have also been the subjects of a number of inquiries, including Rothwell’s study of animal choruses. Other scholars have taken different approaches. For example, the relationship of subject to the shape it decorates is featured in several studies. Söldner explores the iconography of the early workshops of Lucanian red-figure vase painting, thereby focusing on the iconographical relationships of different artists. The representation of emotion is the subject of a good article by Tsingarida. Humor in Greek vase painting is considered in two recent books; the art of imitation in another. Muth looks at depictions of violence in her Gewalt im Bild, the first volume in the new series
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Image and Context. Future volumes featuring primarily vase paintings include one on depictions of monsters and another on ancient laughter. More traditional subjects include narration and the analysis of a single important figured pot, such as the articles about the Pella hydria and the Chigi vase, and the monographs on the Niobid krater and the François vase.

HISTORIOGRAPHY AND RECEPTION

The last 15 years have seen a burst of interest in historiography and reception, with some scholars clearly specializing in one or the other. The interest in the historiography of Greek vases is connected to the growing attention devoted to the history of archaeology and how public and private collections were formed, the latter spurred on by the problem of the market in illicit antiquities. This interest in studying the history of the field dovetails with similar trends in classical studies, highlighted by the founding of the International Journal of the Classical Tradition in 1994. Similarly among art historians, the 1980s saw new interest in studying the history of collecting that resulted in the establishment of the Journal of the History of Collections in 1989.

The histories of several vase collections, including some in Berlin and in German universities, have been published; there are also publications on the history of early collections that no longer exist, including the collection of the Duke of Noia. In some cases, the collections from an entire region are evaluated, as in De Paoli’s article on Venetian collections. Also important are publications discussing the dispersal of old collections, such as the part of the Campana Collection that went to French museums and the vases acquired by the Louvre from the Canino Collection. Probably the most significant recent work in this area is Norskov’s book, sections of which trace post–World War II trends in collecting and the art market, with a special focus on both the buyers and the sellers. Jenkins, Lyons, Masci, and Denoyelle have also been leaders in this subfield. Masci has published one important monograph on the letters concerning collecting sent to the antiquarian Anton Francesco Gori and another on the Vatican collection and Giovanni Battista Passeri (the author of the three-volume Picturæ Etruscorum in vasculis: Nunc primum in unum collectae, explicationibus et dissertationibus illustratae, one of the earliest “picture books” of Greek vase paintings). Denoyelle, Benedetto Benedetti, and Masci are currently organizing an international group of scholars to form the Lasimos Project, whose aim is to create an interactive database for the history of Greek vases, particularly collections that hold Greek vases. A program on the history of the restoration of Greek vases connected with the Lasimos Project is planned under the aegis of Brigitte Bourgeois.

Investigations into 19th-century archives are producing important studies that allow us in some cases to put vases back into their contexts. In the case of Sarti’s study of the Campana Collection, it is into their original museum setting; this is also the case with the recent exhibition in Atlanta and Paris that has reunit ed the collection of Empress Josephine. Montanaro has been able to reestablish the archaeological contexts for some of the vases from Ruvo, including entire tomb groups containing Attic and South Italian painted pottery.
Fig. 17. Briseis led away. Attic red-figure skyphos by Makron. Paris, Musée du Louvre, inv. no. G 146 (courtesy J.-L. Martinez).
The history of research on Greek vase painting has likewise interested scholars. Rouet has been a leader in this subfield. His monograph comparing the conflicting approaches of the French scholar Edmond Pottier and the Englishman John Beazley is a very significant contribution to our understanding of the intellectual history of the study of Greek painted pottery.197

The catalogue for the exhibition *Le vase grec et ses destins* is a valuable source of information about the reception of Greek vase painting.198 Interest in this area results from the fact that Greek vases were highly sought after in the 18th and 19th centuries (the time when the major cemeteries in Campania, Apulia, and Etruria were opened), and vase paintings greatly influenced neoclassical design and the decorative arts. Articles about the reception of Greek vases cover a range of objects, including wall painting, panel painting, pottery, and mosaics. For example, Kulke demonstrates how the publication of the collections of Sir William Hamilton influenced the interior decoration of the Cabinet Étrusque in the Stadtschloss in Potsdam, and Picard-Cajun shows the influence of Greek vases on the work of the French painter Jean-Auguste-Dominique Ingres.200 Indispensable for an understanding of Hamilton and his collections is the landmark exhibition catalogue *Vases and Volcanoes.* Broader subjects include Bonova’s contribution on the influence of Greek vases on Spanish art of the 18th and 19th centuries.201 Interesting studies appearing elsewhere include Hillert’s examination of the manufacture of modern Greek imitations of ancient Greek vases and Lindner’s synopsis of the painted Greek vases found in the paintings of Lawrence Alma Tadema, a Dutch-born English painter (1836–1912).202 Of particular note is Arnold’s study of the amazing paintings and mosaics in the early 20th-century French Riviera Villa Kérylos that are primarily inspired by Greek vase paintings.203

**OTHER PUBLICATIONS**

Painted Greek vases are the primary subject of other types of publications. Festschriften honoring vase painting specialists, such as Dietrich von Bothmer, or
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volumes in honor of colleagues who are no longer with us, including Eleni Hatziavassiou, are one type;\textsuperscript{204} textbooks, handbooks, and collected essays are others. Prominent among these are Sparks’ collection of essays, \textit{The Red and the Black}, the second edition of Coldstream’s \textit{Greek Geometric Pottery}, Cook and Dupont’s \textit{East Greek Pottery}, and Boardman’s \textit{Early Greek Vase Painting}.\textsuperscript{205} The last is the final handbook in Boardman’s extremely useful series on Greek vase painting, which is now further complimented by his textbook overview, \textit{The History of Greek Vases}.\textsuperscript{206} A particularly lovely and learned general book is Tiverios’ volume for the Greek publisher Ekdotoike Athenon’s series on Greek Art, \textit{Αρχαία Αγγεία}; and for those students interested primarily in iconography, Woodford’s general introduction to reading pictures, \textit{Images of Myth in Classical Antiquity}, is a must.\textsuperscript{207} Very informative is von Bothmer’s article on forgeries of Greek vases.\textsuperscript{208} For South Italian vase painting, Schauenburg’s recently completed series is a mine of information.\textsuperscript{209} Finally, mention should be made of useful overviews of the Greek pottery found in one particular region, such as Dominguez and Sánchez’s book on Greek pottery from the Iberian Peninsula during the Archaic and Classical periods and Mannack’s recent \textit{Addenda} to Haspels’ monumental work on Attic black-figure lekythoi.\textsuperscript{210}

\section*{Conclusion}

As we have seen, much is happening in the field of Greek vase painting, and there is a rich variety of discourse. The number of publications about Greek figured vases increases nearly every year, and the vast majority continues to reflect the more traditional forms of publications and of interpretation. These include excavation reports, catalogues, conference proceedings, exhibition catalogues, handbooks, Fest-schriften, and studies on individual vase painters or subjects. Nevertheless, some changes are being made in the format of these traditional forms of publications, such as the increased use of profile drawings in catalogues; and new theoretical models based on literary and anthropological theory are employed ever more frequently in the study and interpretation of the images on the vases.

In the last 15 years, there has been a substantial increase of interest in several areas, including the inscriptions found on vases, trade, economy, shape, and the use of context. Other areas, such as chronology and attribution, remain static. Areas in which an interest has developed rapidly and appears likely to develop even more rapidly in the future are the history of collections, the intellectual history of the discipline, the reception of Greek figured vases, and scientific analyses. The use of science has recently revealed much about East Greek pottery, and more and more testing will be done on painted Greek pottery in the foreseeable future to determine, among other things, both how and where the vases were made.

Symposia on Greek ceramics have also become very popular and are often large international undertakings. The publication of the papers from them has provided substantial and timely new information. Important Internet-based information, such as that supplied by the Beazley Archive, has become extremely rich and helpful. Unfortunately, interest among authorities in charge of individual collections to provide on the Internet illustrations of the vases in the collections under their care appears to be waning. This reluctance, coupled with the need for thorough publication of these collections with full descriptions and profile drawings by experts in Greek pottery, are obvious reasons why the \textit{CVA} project needs to continue.

In short, the field of Greek vase painting remains a very healthy and diverse one, but there still remains much to do. For example, more Internet-based material needs to be developed and catalogues of small, less accessible collections need to be published. There also needs to be more scientific analyses of different fabrics and their constituent materials. There is a great need for additional research on the history of collecting and the reception of Greek vases; such research offers excellent opportunities for interdisciplinary work. Too many excavators do not publish their finds or make them available to other scholars, and that problem needs to be redressed. This is exacerbated by the fact that in some countries, the study of excavation pottery is not encouraged or financially supported. Nevertheless, all in all, research on Greek vase painting remains one of the cornerstones of the study of Greek art and archaeology, and it presents numerous old, new, different, and interesting research opportunities for all, from graduate students to well-established scholars.
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