The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Euthymides and his Fellows *Euthymides and his Fellows*. By Joseph Clark Hoppin. Octavo. Pp. xvi + 186, with 48 plates and 36 illustrations in the text. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917. \ \$4.00.

W. Lamb

The Classical Review / Volume 33 / Issue 3-4 / May 1919, pp 73 - 74

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00012579, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00012579

How to cite this article:

W. Lamb (1919). The Classical Review, 33, pp 73-74 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00012579

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

p. 175, Asclepias for Asclepius; p. 188, *Εκτορα*, no accent or breathing; p. 217, 'legitimate,' misspelled; p. 307, last

two lines, final letters wrong; p. 437, Marcu for Marcus.

G. W. BUTTERWORTH.

EUTHYMIDES AND HIS FELLOWS.

Euthymides and his Fellows. By JOSEPH CLARK HOPPIN. Octavo. Pp. xvi+186, with 48 plates and 36 illustrations in the text. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1917. \$4.00.

THE group of vase painters here described consists of Euthymides, the central figure, of Phintias, and 'Kleophrades,' in all probability his partner and pupil, and of Hypsis, whose relation is less easy to determine. To the student, usually condemned to search for the material he desires among numerous periodicals and repertories, the book will be indeed welcome; not only is it the first of its size to be sufficiently illustrated, but it contains also condensed and valuable information on most of the questions involved. To the expert it will afford pleasant matter for controversy; some thirty unsigned vases are attributed to the several painters, and various problems of the early R.F. period considered.

Dr. Hoppins' method is to discuss each artist in three sections: the signed vases are first given a description equivalent to that of a catalogue; the evidence they afford is then summed up and the individual peculiarities of drawing minutely analysed; thereby the reader is taken into the author's confidence, and can watch how the evidence is applied in the final section which deals with the attributed vases.

Euthymides is treated somewhat more fully than in the earlier monograph. Emphasis is laid on his consistent use of the proportion 1:7 for head and body, and the comments he inscribed on his own pots are pleasantly characterised as an ancient attempt at advertisement. Ten vases and fragments are assigned to him in addition to the original ten; these include the Vienna pelike with the murder of Aegisthos (after Furtwängler) and three small kylikes, attributed by Hartwig to Phintias, one at Athens bearing the signature *Φυρτίας*.

ἐποίησεν. If the hand that painted it was really that of Euthymides, not only would his partnership with Phintias be attested by inscriptional evidence, but he would appear in a new light as one of the more skilful of cup painters. Was he capable of a pose so free from awkwardness and a composition so ingenious? Unfortunately the Bocchi plate, which might have guided us, survives only in fragments.

Phintias is considered to be 'inferior in technical skill,' but 'possessing the elements of a bigger style.' It would appear that his development was arrested by the good fortune that placed him at the head of an atelier. The fact that his drawing became stereotyped, though regrettable from an artistic point of view, makes reconstruction of his work on the lines of this book most satisfactory. With Hypsis it is otherwise. His work is, on the whole, individual, and his people like demure children with big heads and feet, but its details are more elusive. Therefore the attribution of the Amphora B.M. E. 253, on the strength of its details and without regard to the general impression, is unconvincing. From the productions of the Kleophrades painter are selected six, illustrating Euthymides' influence.

The author does not purpose to speak much of the relation between Euthymides' circle and its contemporaries, apart from the rivalry with Euphronios and a suggested connexion between it and the "Andokides" group. This connexion is cited in favour of the theory that the four painted in B.F. technique: nevertheless, except in the case of Phintias' early kylix, their style shows too great an advance on that of Andokides to allow any resemblance to be used as proof. With reference to Andokides, is not the heterogeneous nature of his wares too much emphasised?

In the preface is mentioned the

impossibility of discussing the work of Euthymides apart from that of his colleagues. This is not only because they are allied in style, but because several of the unsigned vases are believed to be by two painters. Collaboration of this kind has been advocated by various scholars, but one has the impression that it is too often appealed to, and that the appeal is the outcome of insisting too strictly on uniformity of drawing. That the back or shoulder of a vase should be left to a subordinate is quite probable, in the case of an equal the process would have little to recommend itself, and neither a kylix of the 'Kleinmeister' type nor the British Museum Pamphaios kylix amounts to evidence.

One cannot be too grateful for the various tables and résumés the book contains. The analyses of composition by a scheme of essential lines are an interesting experiment, though naturally they neglect what is an equally good criterion, the spaces. Apart from the value of the illustrations in relation to the text, they are illuminating as a collection of works entirely of one period.

For a long time the science of vases has needed more books to come between the monograph on the one hand and the monumental folio on the other. Just such a book is *Euthymides and his Fellows*: it would be well if other painters could be chronicled in the same way.

W. LAMB.

A HISTORY OF GREEK ECONOMIC THOUGHT.

A History of Greek Economic Thought.
By ALBERT AUGUSTUS TREVER. One vol. 9½" x 6½". Pp. 162. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois, 1916. 3s. 6d. net.

THIS book is a dissertation submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Chicago University. It is planned as a history of the theoretical views entertained by those of the Greeks—philosophers for the most part—who have attempted a scientific investigation of economic subjects. It excludes, therefore, the history of Greek economic conditions, even where these may be regarded as the expression of a settled conviction. Three-fifths of the book are properly devoted to Plato and Aristotle, the only considerable authorities for whose beliefs information in sufficient detail is forthcoming. The remainder, apart from the introductory and concluding chapters, discusses pre-Platonic thought, Xenophon, the Orators, and the minor Socratics and post-Aristotelians—the two last being somewhat inconveniently grouped together under the description of 'Minor Philosophers.' It is, I think, unfortunate that, in the case of Xenophon, no attempt has been made to distinguish the views of Xenophon himself, chiefly contained

in the minor treatise on *Ways and Means* (πρόποι), from the opinions of Socrates, for which, in this sphere at any rate, Xenophon is our main source. The consequence is that, though there are many references to the Socratic point of view, what Socrates himself maintained is nowhere explicitly set forth. Some estimate of Socrates' contribution should have been formed; and, if the Cynic and Cyrenaic outgrowths had been examined in the same connexion, a clearer light would have been thrown on Plato's own development.

The chapters devoted to Plato and Aristotle are written clearly and carefully, and provide a useful compendium of the economic principles which are discussed or adopted by these writers.¹ Several of the passages which Mr. Trever examines have been vigorously debated by previous critics, and, even though his conclusions may not be accepted in every case, his arguments are presented with fairness and moderation.

The exposition of the thought of the earliest and latest periods is less satisfactory, and seems to have been written

¹ An error on p. 38 arises from the omission of *ἐνεκα* in the quotation from *Rep.* 371 B; and on p. 39, *Laws* 918 B is very imperfectly cited.