

Herbert Hoffmann

IN THE WAKE OF BEAZLEY

Prolegomena to an Anthropological Study of Greek Vase-Painting

I should like to begin this lecture ¹ by saying the obvious: that the thousands of figuratively decorated Greek vases that fill our archaeological museums are not really 'vases' in the modern sense of the word, meaning that they did not originally serve a primarily ornamental purpose (such as the display of flowers). Rather, they are offerings: their overwhelming numbers have been found for the most part in the excavation of tombs and sanctuaries; relatively few examples - and virtually none of the more important ones - have turned up in private dwellings, refuse heaps, and other secular contexts. As sacrificial offerings, their representations have a strictly defineable meaning in the offering context that does not differ essentially from the meaning generally assigned to the manifold terracotta figurines likewise found in Greek temples and tombs. The rich imagery represented on the painted vases, mythological, 'daily life' and other, is of a symbolic essence and is an integral part of the offering. It is, moreover, a primary source of information concerning Greek life and religious thought and, through the process of visualization (rather than verbalization), is more concrete and more direct than any literary text.

Yet if we look at the history of archaeological scholarships in the field of Greek vases we are surprised to find that in recent years - in fact for roughly the last century - it has been devoted almost exclusively to the pursuit of questions of style and chronology, to the virtual exclusion of inquiries concerned with the meaning, function and cultural relevance of these objects. Compilation and description have by and large replaced interpretation on both sides of the Atlantic. Of course there have been exceptions. The names of Carl Robert, Deubner and van Hoorn come to mind, and, more recently, the work of Charles Dugas and Karl Schefold and some of his pupils, as well as of Roland Hampe, Erika Simon and others. By and large, however, the study of style has held the field; and for most of this century painter attributions in particular have preoccupied classical archaeologists involved with Greek ceramics.

In order to shed light on this phenomenon, we must turn to the history of Greek vase collecting and, concomitantly, to the (still largely unwritten) history of the study of Greek vases ².

The history of the systematic collecting of Greek vases may be considered to begin with William - later Sir William - Hamilton ³, who as British envoy to the King of the Two Sicilies between the years 1764 and 1800 amassed an enormous number of Greek vases at his Neapolitan residence. Hamilton was a shrewd businessman as well as an able diplomat,

and in order to provide his vases with a suitable literary frame he engaged the Chevalier d'Hancarville, one of the leading literati of the day, to publish his collection. Hamilton had previously attempted to secure the services of J.J. Winckelmann, whose epoch-making *Geschichte der Kunst des Alterthums* had just appeared, but Winckelmann had declined. D'Hancarville's four-volume *Collection of Etruscan, Greek and Roman Antiquities from the Cabinet of the Honorable Wm. Hamilton*, issued in 1766 and 1767, is generally considered as the first important scholarly work on Greek ceramics.

Hamilton's speculation with scholarship shortly produced the desired result: the sale of his vases to the British Parliament for the then enormous sum of 8,400 pounds sterling. Spurred on by this initial triumph, Hamilton set about forming his second collection, which he this time had published by the celebrated artist Wilhelm Tischbein, a friend of Goethe's. In his drawings, Tischbein "improved" upon the Greek originals in such a manner as to render them more saleable, and Hamilton, posing as "disinterested collector", himself wrote the foreword to the next lavish four-volume catalogue, which appeared in print between the years 1791 and 1795. The results again more than amply rewarded the collector's investment: another substantial sale to the British Parliament, which had by this time appropriated funds for the construction of a special wing of the British Museum to house the collection, plus a peerage. This in spite of the fact that part of Hamilton's second collection was lost at sea when the HMS *Colossus* sank off the Scilly-Isles ⁴.

Other collectors followed suit. Sir John Coghill hired the classical scholar J.V. Millingen to publish his collection of vases, which subsequently also entered the British Museum ⁵. Early in this century Count Tyszkiewicz's vases were published by Fröhner and then sold off, largely to the British Museum and to the Museum of Fine Arts in Boston, Massachusetts ⁶.

In the years following the Napoleonic Wars, Bonaparte's slippery brother Lucien, who called himself Principe di Canino after the site of his Tuscan estates (which, as luck would have it, lay directly over the richest repository of Greek vases ever to have been uncovered, the cemetery of the Etruscan city of Vulci), amassed a vase collection that surpassed even that of Hamilton in numbers. During the single year 1828 no less than 3,000 painted vases were uncovered by the prince's "tombaroli", and in that same year his archaeological confidante, the able and erudite Ludwig Gerhard, who in 1830 became the first director of the Berlin museum, and in 1844 succeeded to the chair in classical archaeology, organized the "Istituto di Corrispondenza Archeologica" - the precursor of the present-day German Archaeological Institute in Rome - with its publications series *Bolletino*, *Annali* and *Monumenti Antichi* to deal with their speedy publication. It is interesting to note that among the sponsors of the "Istituto" appear the names of Millingen, the Duc de Luynes and the Duc de Blacas (both collectors), Count Metternich and the Crown Prince of Prussia ⁷. Greek vases were by now highly demanded in the drawingrooms of London, Paris and St. Petersburg. The market was a closely controlled one; and when it appeared as though it might be flooded, Bonaparte gave orders that the less important pieces unearthed be smashed in order that the quality (meaning the prices) be maintained. At Nola, an important vase source near Naples, the local landlords were leaving tombs unopened pending the market development.

At about this time collections of Greek vases and other classical antiquities were beginning to be formed also at the German royal residences. In 1841 King Ludwig I of Bavaria bought fifty of the finest pieces of Lucien Bonaparte's collection from his widow,

having previously already acquired an even larger number with the purchase of the Candelori collection; and in 1854 Otto Jahn published his *Beschreibung der Vasensammlung König Ludwigs* containing the more than 2,000 Greek vases that had found their way across the Alps to Munich. This publication is of great historical importance, for it set a new trend in the scholarly treatment of Greek vases - one which was to remain the model for generations.

During the first half of the nineteenth century - i.e. prior to Jahn - scholarly interest in Greek vases (aside from the material interest in making them more saleable) was largely interpretive and centred on the rich symbolism of their mythological representations. In fact, as early as 1723, E. Buonarotti in his speculative work *De Etruria Regali*⁸ observed how frequently the theme of Dionysos occurred on ancient painted vases and sought to connect the vase representations with the rites and mythology of the Bacchic mysteries.

Theodor Creuzer's astute *Symbolik und Mythologie der alten Völker, besonders der Griechen* appeared in the years 1810-1812. In 1829 was published Theodor Panofka's *Recherches sur les veritables noms de vases grecs*, a remarkable book nearly forgotten today (and referred to contemptuously if at all) in which he observes among other things (some brilliant, others nonsensical) that the Amasis Painter is particularly interested in representing subjects involving Negroes - and goes on to suggest that this may be because he may have been a black himself (a thesis recently taken up by John Boardman⁹). And in 1850 Panofka published a book on the so-called kalos-inscriptions on Greek Vases¹⁰, in which he boldly put forth the thesis that these inscriptions at times help interpret the scenes represented on the vases themselves (a thesis considered as quite plausible today). For all his intuitive leaps of imagination, Panofka was perhaps the first to attempt to understand Greek vase paintings in a systemic way - one is tempted to say as a semiological system.

Eduard Gerhard's manifold interpretive publications on Greek vase paintings date from the 20's to the late 60's of the last century; they still make good reading today. And in 1859 appeared a classic: J.J. Bachofen's *Versuch über die Gräbersymbolik der Alten*, in which the author of *Das Mutterrecht* (1861) produced interpretations of mythological scenes on the funerary vases of South Italy that anticipate the results of modern scholarship in this field¹¹ by more than a hundred years. Although this work was republished in 1958 in a modern edition accompanied by the critical commentaries of H. Meuli and K. Schefold, it continues to be virtually ignored by classical archaeologists. Why should this be so?

The answer can I think, be found by going back to Otto Jahn, the author of the trend-setting Munich vase catalogue and contemporary of Bachofen. Unlike Bachofen, Jahn was a devotee of the positivist philosophy of August Comte¹², which was just then sweeping intellectual Europe. French philosophical positivism, which wished to restrict all scholarly endeavor and research to the positive, the given, the actual - in other words to facts - declared all metaphysical questions to be theoretically impossible and therefore useless. All questions the answers to which cannot be verified by direct observation were termed "pseudo questions". In the field of Greek vase research, this of course included all questions as to meaning and significance. Otto Jahn, a good Comtian, denounced what he considered to be unfounded speculation, in particular the symbolic interpretation of subject matter. In his own work he restricted himself largely to the systematic classification of the material according to shape, date and workshop. One might say that he would have written the perfect fascicule of *Corpus Vasorum*! And Jahn was not alone: In England as in France the search for meaning in art ceased abruptly to be a respectable pursuit for scholarship; "objectivity" and "scientific approach" were the new catchwords of the day.

The years shortly after the middle of the nineteenth century witnessed a revival of theoretical interest among the otherwise positivistically oriented archaeological specialists engaged in the study of Greek vases. Their brief interest in theory was of a very particular orientation, involving, as it did, the search for "origins". The influence of Charles Darwin, whose *Origin of Species* appeared in 1859, was making itself felt in classical studies, and tracing the evolution of style now became a respectable approach to Greek ceramics¹³.

Other vase specialists were seduced by Lamarckian diffusionism¹⁴, which, translated into the context of archaeological scholarship, meant finding a theme and tracing its supposed cultural diffusion. Early in the present century, the trend - no longer fashionable - was to trace Greek decorative motifs to Egypt or to the Near East (the German Von Bissing and the Danish F. Poulsen being two prime exponents of this direction of scholarly interest)¹⁵.

Back to collecting: In the year 1859 A. Biliotti and A. Salzmann, the British and French consuls at Rhodes, exploited the island's ancient cemeteries encouraged by the archaeologist C. T. Newton. Good patriots, they sold their vases chiefly to the British museum and to the Louvre¹⁶. The free-booting Italian General Luigi Palma di Cesnola plundered ancient cemeteries of all periods in Cyprus in the early 1870's and watered the yield with clever forgeries¹⁷. He had his collection published in a six-volume atlas and then sold it to the Metropolitan Museum of New York, whose director he had become. Schliemann's campaigns in Troy during the 1870's and the subsequent sale of a substantial part of his collection to the Berlin museum can also be viewed in the economic context, rather than in the traditional romantic light.

Lest I give the impression that the nineteenth century scholarly interest in Greek vases was dictated solely by commercial interest plus misguided modish intellectualism, I hasten to add that there were other motives and interests as well. Foremost among these, perhaps, were the quest for personal and national prestige, the personal brilliantly analysed by the inimitable Thorstein Veblen in *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (1925)¹⁸, the national by Karl Marx and Walter Benjamin. This is the period of national chauvinism at its height, and with it of the construction of great theatre halls, great operas and great museums.

Since the greatest and most lavish museum is only as good as its greatest Masterwork (the criterion of "greatness" being generally determined by the museum's own experts), it follows naturally that during the next decades the major publications in the field of Greek ceramics should come from the pens of museum curators: viz. the scholarly vase catalogues by L. Stephani (St. Petersburg), F. Poulsen (Copenhagen), J. Sieveking (Munich), E. Pottier (Paris), A. Furtwängler (Berlin), followed by G. M. A. Richter (New York) and Caskey-Beazley (Boston). This tradition of the monumental and representative museum vase catalogue - whereby the splendour of the publication at times displaces the "chef d'œuvre" in relative importance - survives into the present day in the UNESCO-sponsored catalogue series *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*.

The decades straddling the turn of the century also saw the beginning of the close collaboration between the art dealer, the private collector and the public, or museum, archaeologist, a natural symbiosis, one might say, which has proven to be of undeniable mutual worth. I need but refer to Furtwängler's publication of the Somzée and Sabouroff collections in lavish privately circulated catalogues, followed by the dispersal of these

collections (the first by public, the second by private sale, the larger part to the Berlin museum of which Furtwängler was the director) as an early example of this institution of mutual advantage.

The cult of vase painter attributions, mentioned briefly earlier in this lecture, is also a child of the nineteenth century and can be said to have been inaugurated by Hartwig, Klein, Hauser¹⁹, and especially Furtwängler²⁰. In *Die griechischen Meisterschalen* (1893), Hartwig tried to find attributions for the major archaic drinking cups known in his day. Klein had already written his monograph on Euphronios (1886), and soon the three "E's" of Attic red-figure (Euphronios, Euthymides, Epictetos) emerged, to be followed by the corresponding "Masters" of black-figure (Exekias, Amasis, Nikosthenes) on the model of the "Masters" of Italian, Dutch and Flemish painting. The last-named of the black-figure trio achieved his status less through the quality of his drawing than from the fact that the potter Nikosthenes, after whom the vase painter who worked for him was named, was addicted to signing his name to vases²¹. This, in an age which held the "œuvre d'art signé" in far greater esteem than the unsigned work, is of obvious significance. Finally, it should be said that it was Furtwängler who in his position of director of the Berlin Antikensammlung first extended the concept "Meisterwerk" - originally applied in the field of classical art to sculpture only (meaning to the 'opus nobile') - to Greek vases. The reason is easy to understand: good ancient sculpture had become scarce by the turn of the century; good vases were still plentiful and now formed the gros of museum acquisitions.

The mania for attributing vases continued into modern times and culminated in the magnificent œuvre lists of Beazley. Sir John Beazley (1881-1970) can be said to have charted the map of Greek potters and painters. While he built on the foundations laid by Adolf Furtwängler - a debt which he himself acknowledged - he attributed more than 30,000 vases, as to Furtwängler's fifty-odd (only about one third of which proved to be correct). Beazley's lists comprise no less than 200 black-figure painters and nearly twice that many red-figure. The skill brought to bear by Beazley on the attribution of an individual vase to a particular painter has been likened to graphology, and not quite without reason; but it must be said in all esteem that Beazley's lists, books, catalogues and articles on individual painters have provided the frame work without which any future meaningful endeavor in the field of Greek imagery would be futile. Beazley, moreover, knew far more than he cared to commit to print. Behind the terse thematic labels and mythological indices of ABV and ARV lies hidden a profound and perhaps unsurpassed knowledge of ancient literature, history and religion. These subjects were not his professional concerns, however, and there was little communion, spiritual or other, between Beazley and such of his contemporaries as F. M. Cornford, Sir James Frazer or Jane Harrison. Beazley - whether consciously or unconsciously is immaterial - mirrored the philosophy of a Lord Russell or a Wittgenstein, both still quite alive at Oxford. Russell's "logical atomism", which insists that only individual and observable sense data are relevant and worth recording, in a sense provides the philosophical background for Beazley's volumes of painter attributions.

We have suggested that the history of the study of Greek vase painting was from its very beginning tied to the history of commerce in this field. What possible role did Beazley play in this connection? Surely no one who knew him personally will want to suggest that Sir John derived financial profit from the trade in Greek vases. There can be no question as to his scrupulous integrity; his household was modest, not to say austere, and

his personal collection of antiquities ²² contains no pieces of any great commercial value. And yet the influence of Beazley on the market in classical antiquities during his lifetime was profound, on a market, which it must be stressed, was responsible in the decades following World War II for a mass exodus of Greek vases from their lands of origin quite comparable to that of the days of Lucien Bonaparte. Hardly a vase was unearthed clandestinely of which he did not receive photographs for attribution; in fact, in Beazley's day a Greek vase without a Beazley attribution was virtually unsaleable, viz. the various antiquities auction catalogues of those years.

Since Beazley's death, neopositivism continues to dominate British archaeology in the field of Greek vase painting. Beazley's students and disciples, while beginning to revise some of his attributions, by and large have remained within their master's intellectual framework ²³.

The historical background submitted in this brief review I think explains the two historical phenomena described at the outset: the abrupt turn away from the quest for meanings at about the middle of the last century, and (coupled with it) the prevailing concern with painter attributions in the present century. As for the current situation: the search for meanings is not considered profitable, and this in the dual sense of the word. A scholar must "produce" if he wishes to survive, and it is easier to produce booklong lists, repertories and catalogues than it is to produce a single meaningful article. Furthermore: today's ever more specialized university education is directly counter-indicative to research in depth in the classics; for this implies an interdisciplinary approach; and specialists are in demand, not inter-disciplinarians.

The declared subject of this lecture is the anthropological study of Greek vase painting. Let me continue, therefore, by defining anthropology as I understand it and explaining how I propose that the definition might be applied in the context of future research in the field of Greek vase painting.

The most useful definition of "anthropology" that I have been able to find so far (or should I say the one best suited to my own particular temperament?) is the one coined by Claude Lévi-Strauss fifteen years ago with a quote from Tylor in the preface of his book on structural anthropology ²⁴. It is a very broad one: "the study of man, past and present, in all his aspects: physical, linguistic, cultural, conscious and unconscious".

This view comes very near the view of culture held by Bronislaw Malinowski (1884-1942), whose work I very much admire. "Culture", wrote Malinowski, "is an i n t e g r a l w h o l e consisting of implements and consumer goods, of constitutional charters for the various social groupings of human ideas and crafts, beliefs and customs" ²⁵. And elsewhere (in the introduction to his classic, *The Argonauts of the Western Pacific*): "All anthropological research must be based on painstaking study of concrete societies and their institutions - including the interrelation of those institutions with custom, belief and technology" ²⁶. Anthropology as the study of culture is seen as the most comprehensive human discipline, tantamount to a humanistic theory of culture. A large order indeed, for it implies an approach that can only be holistic and integrative, and hence interdisciplinary. It is the very antithesis of positivism.

"Utopia"? Perhaps. But the personal advantage of such an approach seems obvious: it implies no less than being able to close the gap between one's life and essence on the one hand and one's scholarship on the other. As a vase specialist in the narrower sense, meaning one devoted to the immanent study of Greek vases according to the pseudo-scientific

methodology currently in esteem, I am forced to give up my skills: namely my intuition and my imagination. I run the risk of atrophying into a highly specialized filing clerk of aesthetic cultural debris. As a holist, by contrast - one dedicated to the understanding of ancient society in its complex totality - I can bring the entire range of my skills and interests to bear on any given scholarly problem. In the words of Fritz Perls, the father of Gestalt psychology: "Particularism is to holism like freckles to a sun-tanned skin"²⁷.

Lévi-Strauss' view of anthropology is, finally, a very attractive one because it takes into account the whole range of human activity, including the activity of the unconscious mind and the unconscious nature of collective phenomena. Literature tends to have the character of conscious creation; with pictures, i.e. vase imagery, the case is different: the deeper "meaning" is enciphered and subliminal and awaits "decoding" in the historic and cultural context. In this respect the iconological study of vase painting resembles the study of language and of myth, and the Lévi-Straussian approach, which takes irrational content more seriously than the conscious rationale, promises a rich harvest of in-depth studies.

In terms of future research in the field of Greek vase painting, the view of anthropology here projected leads inevitably to the study of symbolic forms, in other words to that point in the history of ceramographic research where the thread was broken in the middle of the last century. Bachofen becomes interesting again²⁸, as do Usener²⁹ and Cassirer³⁰. With Lévi-Strauss (and, indeed the Warburg school before him) symbolic anthropology returns to the forefront of scholarly interest.

Symbolic anthropology³¹ views the elements of *s e n s e* - in this case the images, or thematic repertory - as forming a functional system that can be studied properly only within the context of the whole. Once we accept this notion of *s y s t e m* as a primary postulate³² (and the Greeks themselves were persuaded of it: viz. Chapter V of Plato's Republic), our object of research can no longer be the mere classification of factual data. Once accepted that the "reality" depicted on Greek vases is symbolic and socially constructed, to consider Greek vase paintings independent of the cultural reality that produced them becomes pointless and uninteresting.

There are many directions which a meaningful approach to Greek imagery might take, many avenues to be explored. One avenue which has always interested me personally involves animals. Animals on Greek vases have in the past most commonly been treated as the "attributes" of one divinity or another, or even been dismissed as "ornament" or meaningless decorative convention. The fact is that their occurrence on the vases can be demonstrated to represent a complex taxonomic system which in turn is constitutive of Greek social reality. The rules applied to human behaviour with respect to certain animal groups are homologous to the form of rules applied to behaviour towards the corresponding category of human beings. Greek literature from Homer on is replete with animal/human equations. With regard to the twin themes of pursuit and sacrifice, I have shown in a recent paper³³ that vase painting draws a homology between sacrificial pursuit and pursuit for sexual consummation, and elsewhere that the formal homology³⁴ of animal behaviour and of human behaviour is often used by Greek vase painters to convey a paradigm.

Another fruitful avenue for research involves the so-called Rites of Passage, the importance of which for Greek social history have been emphasized most recently by Pierre Vidal-Naquet³⁵. The theory, which was a favorite of Durkheim's and the subject of a now classic book by one of his brightest associates³⁶, is roughly as follows. Special rites -

the "rites of passage" - insure that the transition between social or metaphysical categories such as weddings (transition from virgin to matron), initiations (from child to man) or funerals (from living man to dead ancestor) shall proceed smoothly. Since the content of all transitions is essentially the same, having to do with dying in one state or status and being reborn in another, the rituals for weddings, initiations and funerals can be shown to be structurally closely related. The symbols, or imagery, of these rituals are likewise interrelated; in fact they are frequently identical: death/rebirth imagery for initiations, wedding and initiation imagery for funerals, and so forth. This is what puts the marriage of Bacchus and Ariadne onto Roman sarcophagi³⁷. And Greek vase painting teems with similar passage symbolism, the particular significance of which waits to be explored.

Yet another promising avenue involves semiology. Pierre Bourdieu³⁸ has shown that the space in and around the Berber house is symbolically organized with an incredible richness and complexity of meaning. The organization of space is demonstrated by him to constitute a symbolic system. This is, as I have mentioned above, very much in keeping with ancient Greek thinking, and in fact the system of signs, or semiotic system, on Greek vases seems to be organized in much the same manner. Jean-Louis Durand and François Lissarague deal with this aspect of Athenian vase imagery in a paper on the symbolism of bloody sacrifice.³⁹

The possibilities of anthropological research in the field of Greek vase painting are infinitely greater than suggested by these few examples, but they pose a great challenge, this being that without a thoroughgoing study of Greek religion, literature, custom, language and even history the anthropology of Greek vase painting (as I have here envisaged it) is not possible. For had Pierre Bourdieu not disposed over a wealth of information on Berber life, rites and even proverbs he would have missed the point entirely.

Should this dismay us? I think not; and my own recent encounters with colleagues in France and elsewhere suggests that there is some reason to be optimistic. Collaborative projects such as that currently in progress on Athenian sacrificial imagery at the Centre de Recherches Comparées sur les Sociétés Anciennes (10, Rue Monsieur le Prince, 75006 Paris) seem to be emerging as one fruitful direction that research in the field of Greek vase painting can take in the wake of Beazley.

The style specialists have held sway in the field of classical art and archaeology for the last half century and more and have envolved a set of rules of discourse which they consider to be alone appropriate. I think that the time has come to question their monopoly of academic esteem, and to open the doors again to a free-ranging discourse concerning the social and religious basis of Greek art. By implication this means taking down the fences that now separate the disciplines of art history, history, religion, philology and archaeology and to restate the problems now insoluble within the narrow limits of specialization with a deeper anthropological perspective.

In concluding - and lest I be taken to task as advocating a theoretical approach to Greek art divorced from the material basis - I should like here to emphasize the importance of initiating each inquiry with a concrete material documentation, a *corpus* as it were. This is where the Brommers, Bothmers and other compilers of data will prove invaluable to us. Their lists can serve as the field notes without which anthropology cannot live. In fact, we must continue the work of observing, documenting, compiling, but moving always from the particular to the general and back again. Like the good ethnographer we must feel our way into the culture that we are studying; we must learn to intuit the stereotypes,

or *topoi*, until we can recognize the variants in all their multifold manifestations. We must learn the particularly Greek way of thinking and feeling, corresponding to Greek institutions and traditions. Only then can we achieve interpretations in the deeper sense of the word. In this manner it should be possible eventually to see the design (as Lévi-Strauss would say) in our vase representations.

NOTES

- 1 This talk was given at the Collège de France on 7 November, 1978. I am most grateful to J.P. Vernant and M. Detienne for doing me the honour of inviting me.
- 2 The best account available is that given by R. M. Cook in *Greek Painted Pottery* (London 1960) in Ch. XV, from which I have here liberally borrowed. C. B. Stark, *Systematik und Geschichte der Archäologie der Kunst* (Leipzig 1880), largely ignores vase painting.
- 3 See *The Hamilton Collection: A Bicenary Exhibition 18 August to 29 October 1972* (British Museum).
- 4 Cf. Ann Birchall, *London Illustrated News*, September 1978, 71ff.
- 5 J.V. Millingen, *Peintures de vases antiques de la collection de Sir John Coghill* (Rome 1817).
- 6 W. Fröhner, *La Collection Tyszkiewicz* (Munich 1902). Tyszkiewicz's autobiography, *Souvenir d'un collectionneur*, to which Alain Schnapp has drawn my attention, makes fascinating reading.
- 7 For the early history of the German Archaeological Institute in Rome, cf. C. Weickert, *AA* 1955, 127ff.
- 8 On this figure see A. Momigliani, *Terzo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici e del Mondo Antico* (1966) II, 780.
- 9 In *Athenian Black Figured Vases* (London 1974), 54.
- 10 Th. Panofka, *Die griechischen Eigennamen mit KALOS in Zusammenhang mit dem Bilderschmuck auf bemalten Gefäßen* (Berlin 1850). For a list of Panofka's published writings see Beazley, *ARV*² 1989f.
- 11 Most recently W. Schmidt - A.D. Trendall - A. Cambitoglou, *Eine Gruppe apulischer Grabvasen in Basel* (Mainz 1976); H. R. W. Smith, *Funerary Symbolism in Apulian Vase-Painting* (Berkeley 1972).
- 12 For a good account, with bibliography, see P. Arbousse-Bastide, *Auguste Comte* (Paris 1968).
- 13 Viz. S. Birch, *History of Ancient Painted Pottery* (London 1858, 1873²). For the modern development of this concept in classical archaeology s. U. Hausmann, *Allgemeine Grundlagen der Archäologie* (Munich 1969), 173ff.
- 14 Jean Baptiste de Monet de Lamarck (1774-1829), *Philosophie zoologique* (1809, German ed. 1876); *Histoire matérielle des animaux sans vertèbres* (Paris 1815-22), with a clear account of "Lamarckianism" in the Preface. Neo-Lamarckianism - as in the field of classical archaeology - propagates the diffusion of characteristics acquired through adaptation to the (ecological or social) environment.
- 15 "Egyptian origins": e.g. the writings, in various journals, of F. W. Freiherr von Bissing; "Oriental origins": e.g. F. Poulsen, *Der Orient und die frühgriechische Kunst* (1912). R. M. Cook, *op. cit.*, 314, refers to Poulsen's "ingenious misuse of Oriental parallels".
- 16 Cf. A. Salzmann, *Nécropole de Camiros* (Paris 1875), a haphazard work. The remnants of Salzmann's and Biolotti's collection were sold at auction.
- 17 On Cesnola and the rôle of fakes in his collection see Vayson de Pradenne, *Les faux en archéologie* (Paris 1930), brought to my attention by A. Schnapp.
- 18 German translation by S. Heintz and P. von Haselberg as *Theorie der feinen Leute: eine ökonomische Untersuchung der Institutionen* (1971).
- 19 On these figures see the lively account given by Ludwig Curtius in *Deutsche und antike Welt* (Stuttgart 1950), s. name index.
- 20 *Ibidem*.
- 21 Cf. Beazley, *ABV* 216ff. (Nikosthenes, potter).
- 22 Select Exhibition of Sir John and Lady Beazley's Gifts to the Ashmolean Museum (Oxford 1967).
- 23 See M. Robertson, "Beazley and After", *Münchener Jahrbuch der Bildenden Kunst* 27 (1976), 29ff., figs. 1-17. - also the program for the symposium "Vasenforschung nach Beazley" 24-26 Nov. 1978 at the University of Tübingen: *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologen-Verbandes* 9, 2 (1978), 19f.

- 24 C. Lévi-Strauss, *Anthropologie structurale* (Paris 1958), transl. by C. Jacobsen and B.E. Schoepf as *Structural Anthropology* (Harmondsworth 1968), 18.
- 25 B. Malinowski, *A Scientific Theory of Culture* (U. of North Carolina 1944), 36.
- 26 Id., *The Argonauts of Western Pacific*, with a Preface by Sir James Frazer (New York 1922, 1961), 23.
- 27 F.S. Perls, *Ego, Hunger and Aggression* (New York 1947, 1969).
- 28 J.J. Bachofen, *Gesammelte Werke*, ed. by Karl Meuli (Basel and Stuttgart 1958), esp. vols. IV and VII.
- 29 H. Usener, *Götternamen, Versuch einer Lehre von der religiösen Begriffsbildung* (Leipsic 1896).
- 30 E. Cassirer, *Die Philosophie der Symbolischen Formen* (Hamburg 1925; Darmstadt 1953). Cf. esp. vol. II: *Das Mythische Denken*. Transl. by R. Manheim as *The Philosophy of Symbolic Forms* (New Haven and London 1975).
- 31 Some more recent titles of possible interest to students of symbolic anthropology: V. Turner, *The Forest of Symbols* (Cornell 1967). - M. Douglas, *Natural Symbols: Explorations in Cosmology* (Harmondsworth 1970). - E.R. Leach, "Magical Hair", in J. Middleton (ed.), *Myth and Cosmos* (New York 1967). - id., "The Structure of Symbolism", in J.S. La Fontaine (ed.), *The Interpretation of Ritual* (London 1972). - id., "Two Essays Concerning the Symbolic Representation of Time", in *Rethinking Anthropology* (London 1973). - R. Needham (ed.), *Right and Left: Essays on Dual Symbolic Classification* (Chicago 1973). - R. Firth, *Symbols Public and Private* (London 1973). - D. Sperber, *Rethinking Symbolism* (Cambridge Studies in Social Anthropology 1975). - M. Douglas, *Implicit Meanings* (London 1975). - I. Lewis (ed.), *Symbols and Sentiments: Cross-cultural studies in Symbolism* (London 1977). - J.L. Peacock, *Consciousness and Change. Symbolic Anthropology in Evolutionary Perspective* (London 1979). For a recent French structuralist approach cf. T. Todorov, *Symbolisme et Interpretation* (Paris 1978).
- 32 The "total social fact" of Emile Durkheim (1858-1917) and the authors of the *L'Année sociologique* comes close to reproducing this view. See E. Durkheim in one of his most important works: *Les Règles de la methode sociologique* (Paris 1895), translated by S.A. Solovay and J.H. Müller as *The Rules of Sociological Method* (New York 1966). Alain Schnapp calls my attention to the fact that "holism" in archaeological studies, as I have here articulated it, was in the year 1850 still considered self-evident and binding for German archaeologists. The "Archäologische Thesen" published in that year in the *Archäologischer Anzeiger* (pp. 204f.) stipulate among other things the following: "Aufgabe der Archäologie ist es, nicht nur eine Auswahl der Kunstdenkmälern, sondern die Gesamtheit des monumentalen Stoffes, an und für sich und in seinem Ergebnis für literarische, Religions- und Privatalterthümer, der Gesamtheit aller philologischen Forschung und der Gesamtanschauung des antiken Lebens zu überliefern".
- 33 *Sexual and Asexual Pursuit: a Structuralist Approach to Greek Vase Painting*, with a Foreword by Sir Edmund Leach (Occasional Papers of the Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland, no. 34, 1977).
- 34 *Révue Archéologique* n.s. 2, 1974, pp. 195ff., figs. 1-21 (on Greek cockfight symbolism).
- 35 M.M. Austin and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Economies et sociétés en Grèce ancienne* (Paris 1972), transl. by M.M. Austin as *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece* (London 1977), index, s.v. under "rite of passage" and "ephebes, krypteia".
- 36 A. Van Gennep, *Les Rites de Passage* (Paris 1908), transl. by M.B. Vizedom and G.L. Caffee as *The Rites of Passage* (London 1960).
- 37 Cf. R.O. Rubinstein, "a Bacchic Sarcophagus in the Renaissance", in *British Museum Yearbook I* (1976), 103 ff.
- 38 P. Bourdieu, "The Berber House, or the World Reversed", in *Mélanges Claude Lévi-Strauss* (Mouton 1971), excerpted in Mary Douglas (ed.), *Rules and Meanings* (Harmondsworth 1973). For German students: cf. P. Bourdieu, *Zur Soziologie der symbolischen Formen* (1970).
- 39 Cf. J.L. Durand/F. Lissarrague, *Les entrailles de la cité*, this journal 92-108.

Anschrift des Verfassers:

*Herbert Hoffmann
Archäologisches Institut
Arbeitsbereiche III/IV
Hartungstraße 5*

2000 Hamburg 13