The Dates of the Vases Called 'Cyrenaic'

Author(s): J. P. Droop

Source: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 30 (1910), pp. 1-34

Published by: [Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/624259>

Accessed: 01-12-2015 10:21 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies and Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE DATES OF THE VASES CALLED 'CYRENAIC.'

THE literature dealing with the so-called 'Cyrenaic' vases is comparatively so huge that some excuse is needed for a fresh approach to the subject. That excuse is to be found in the new light shed on these vases through the recent excavations at Sparta by the British School at Athens, of which one result has been the discovery that Laconia was the home of the school which produced them.¹

At Sparta this distinctive Laconian style is presented in good chronological sequence, and its course can be traced from its rise in the early seventh century, through its development and decline in the sixth and fifth centuries, to its end in the latter part of the fourth.

It is true that the finds of pottery at the shrine of Artemis Orthia at Sparta consist of fragments of dedicated vases, the refuse, in fact, thrown out from time to time from the temple, so that what is presented by the stratification of the site is the chronological sequence not of the manufacture of the vases but of their destruction. Yet the development of the style as a whole, even when judged by the stratification, is so regular that it may be assumed that in most cases the order of destruction corresponded with that of manufacture. In any case the destruction of the older temple at the close of the seventh century gives at least one point where such correspondence is certain. Vases thrown out from the new temple must have been dedicated after the destruction of the older building. It has, thus, been possible to divide the style with much certainty into six chronological periods called, and approximately dated, as follows:—

Laconian I. (700–625), II. (625–600), III. (600–550), IV. (550–500), V. (500–425), VI. (425–350).²

The first two periods are clearly cut off from the later by the sand by which the level of the site was raised at the time of the building of the second temple. Subsequent to this the refuse from the shrine accumulated in three main deposits. The earliest of these contained a preponderating amount of Laconian III. and some Laconian IV., the next contained some

¹ *B.S.A.* xiv. p. 44.

² *B.S.A.* xiv. p. 47.

Laconian IV., and a preponderating amount of Laconian V., and the third contained some Laconian V. and a preponderating amount of Laconian VI. Above this last and partly mixed with it was some Hellenistic ware.

There is therefore clear evidence from stratification as to the relative dates of all these periods, though it may be that, as far as evidence from strata goes, no more than a good probability should be claimed for the position of Laconian IV. mixed as it was with both III. and V. That probability, however, becomes a certainty when the evidence of style is considered, which here rests on no mere *a priori* grounds but on the solid basis afforded by a comparison with the ware of Laconian II. and V., of which the relative positions are firmly fixed by the evidence of the spade. Laconian III. shows a close resemblance to, but clear development from, Laconian II., while in Laconian V. further changes due to development are to be observed. The vases of Laconian IV. are clearly rightly placed, for without abandoning all the characteristics of Laconian III. they show the developments of Laconian V. in an incipient stage.

It was to be expected, then, that the discovery of this pottery would have produced evidence that might assist in dating the exported³ vases of this style more accurately than has till now been possible.⁴ This hope has not been altogether disappointed, though it is not possible even now to be very definite in dating individual vases, for the periods marked by the evidence of stratification are rather too long. That a Laconian III. vase belongs to the first half and that a vase of Laconian IV. belongs to the second half of the sixth century we know, but to get nearer than this the characteristics of the vase must be weighed and a decision formed as to whether they most resemble those of the preceding or those of the following period. And this is as true of the vases found at Sparta as of the exported specimens.

The attempt is worth making, for the widely differing characteristics of the ware of the seventh and fifth centuries (Laconian II. and V.), which are new evidence, are now available as a guide.

The majority of the exported vases, it may be said at once, belong to the period covered by Laconian IV. This period, which is the beginning of the degeneration of the style, is marked by a growing tendency partially to abandon the use of the white slip characteristic of the style, which partial absence of slip is a marked feature of most of the exported vases.

Now during Laconian I. and II. the use of slip to cover the whole vase is almost without exception,⁵ and this practice is characteristic of the earlier part at least of Laconian III. On the other hand the use of slip has been entirely given up by the beginning of Laconian V. It is clear, then, that

³ By 'exported' vases I mean all those of this style known before the excavations at Sparta, none of which, so far as I know, were found in Laconia.

⁴ It is impossible in the light of the new evidence to accept M. Dugas' tentative classifi-

cation, *Rev. Arch.* 1907, Tom. IX. p. 403.

⁵ These exceptions (all in Laconian II.) are very few. The criterion still holds, because they are exceptions, but their existence weakens it a little.

the date of a vase of the intermediate period ought, other things being equal, to be earlier or later in direct proportion to the amount of slip used in the decoration. Also, as the evidence from Sparta points to a degeneration in the quality, that is the thickness and smoothness of the slip, concomitant with its partial abandonment, the state of the slip should also be taken into account.

The first criterion, then, to be applied is the quality and amount of the slip used.

The foot of the kylix, for the present purpose the most important, as it is among the exported vases the most frequent, shape, throughout Laconian II. and III. has a sharp thin edge. On the other hand in Laconian V. and VI. the edge is invariably thick and rounded. The shape, then, of the kylix foot is the second criterion.

Painted decoration (purple and black rings and tongues on a slipped ground) is characteristic of the stem of the kylix in Laconian II. and III., though the plain black variety is found all through. Channelled rings,⁶ on the other hand, go with the rounded edge to the foot and are characteristic of Laconian V. and VI.

Slip, then, and painted decoration on the stem of the kylix are a certain indication of an earlier, channelled rings of a later date.

No sure deduction, however, can apparently be made from the comparative height or shortness of the stem of the kylix. It is true that in the later periods the stem is usually short, but the evidence of excavation indicates that the early form of kylix, that was developed in the seventh century from a bowl without a foot, was also marked by a short stem. And with the evidence tending to prove that the high stem was not invariable at the period of full development, it is unsafe to go further than to say that, other things being equal, Laconian III. or the early part of Laconian IV. is the more probable period for the high stem, while a short stem might belong to any period.

Another indication that deserves consideration, although too much weight should not be given to it, is the style of the lotus pattern. It is probable that the few instances where a certain width and amplitude are given to the flower and bud are earlier than those in which these are cut down to narrower proportions. The use of purple also for parts of the design, for instance for the cross-bar of the lotus, or for the bough of the leaf pattern, is not found later than Laconian III., the palmette, in which a purple centre is regular until a quite late date, being the one exception to this rule. The degeneration of the style is also indicated in many patterns through the carelessness not so much of their execution, in which they are matched by some of the best period, as of their conception. The gradual loss in the leaf pattern of the twigs to the leaves, and then of the bough, is a good example of this.

The palmette also on either side of the handle in the kylix and

⁶ *J.H.S.* 1908, p. 179.

lakaina⁷ may afford some help, for one Spartan vase of the latter shape, which is dated definitely to the end of Laconian II., shows an example elaborate but without incisions (Fig. 1).⁸ Such may be thought to be early rather than late. On the other hand very sketchy palmettes without incisions cannot be taken as an indication of anything but slovenliness on the part of the painter, and hence cannot be used as evidence for date, except that *a priori* such carelessness is more likely than not to belong to the period of decline.

Another point that is remarkable in the above-mentioned vase and others of Laconian II. is the fresh red of the purple, and the thickness with which it is applied. This is not found later at Sparta, wherefore it seems

FIG. 1. (Scale 1 : 3.)

reasonable to look on vases that show a purple resembling this as approximating to the date of these vases, that is, as early rather than late.

Prior to Laconian III. the purple, I believe, was generally applied directly on to the slip, whereas afterwards there was a tendency to put it over black.

Yet these last three points will not bear much pressure, and are perhaps only strong when they are corroborative of other indications or of one another.

More reliable perhaps is the evidence borne by the thickness of the rim of the kylix, of which it may be said that a greater thickness than .004 m.

⁷ *B.S.A.* xiv. p. 31.

⁸ I have to thank the Committee of the

British School at Athens for permission to use this photograph.

is likely, other things being equal, to indicate a date not earlier than the middle of Laconian IV.

It remains to be said that evidence is not forthcoming from the excavations at Sparta as to the date at which mythological scenes are likely to have been in vogue. And the Laconian style seems after its early years to have been so much apart from outside influences that we are not justified in drawing any conclusions as to the date of certain vases from the scenes depicted on them.

These, then, are some of the considerations that must be borne in mind in an attempt to classify the exported Laconian vases. I have used the phrase 'other things being equal' several times, but there is no need to point out that other things never are equal, and the indications will often be found to be conflicting, so that in the nature of the case personal impressions have to supply the absence of definite evidence.⁹

Laconian I.

Cassel, *Königliches Museum* (Dugas 81).

Oxford, *Ashmolean Museum* (Dugas 65).

Munich, *Pinakothek* (Two or three fragments).

Florence, *Museo Etrusco* 3881.

London, *British Museum* Inv. No. 1907. 12-1, 731.

These pieces are certainly in the style of Laconian I., but that style, universal in the early seventh century, probably lasted on till its end contemporaneously with the developments of Laconian II., so that it is not possible to fix a more precise date than the seventh century for these pieces.

The Cassel sherd is one that came from Samos and is the base of a plate of a kind that is very frequent at Sparta. It shows the cross design with purple circles¹⁰ characteristic of Laconian I., and both slip and the black and purple pigment are early in quality.

The Oxford sherd found at Naucratis is a piece of rim perhaps of a typical early skyphos,¹¹ which has the square and dot pattern that went out of use, at least as a rim ornament, after Laconian II. The early date is corroborated by the purple line on the black ground of the inside, though this sometimes appears later.

In the Pinakothek at Munich are fragments of, I think, three bowls similar in style, which will be published in the forthcoming new catalogue, and should probably be grouped with Laconian I.

(In this museum there are also fragments of two or three bowls, which I believe to be Laconian, decorated with purple and white lines on a ground

⁹ Three papers (*B.C.H.* 1893, p. 226, n. 1; *Rev. Arch.* 1907, Tome IX., p. 377; *J.H.S.* 1908, p. 175) between them give the bibliography of these vases, which is completed by a reference to Prinz, *Funde aus Naukratis*, p. 66. An extremely useful feature of M. Dugas' paper

in the *Revue Archéologique* is the numbered catalogue, which shows at a glance the references for each vase. To this for brevity's sake I shall in all cases refer, thus (Dugas 1).

¹⁰ *B.S.A.* xiv. p. 32, Fig. 2, d.

¹¹ *B.S.A.* xiv. p. 31, Fig. 1.

of black paint.¹² This style is frequently employed at Sparta for the decoration of small vases during the first three Laconian periods but shows no changes that would fix a more definite date.)

The vase in Florence is a bowl with an offset rim decorated with the square and dot pattern; the shoulder is black, and broad rays rise from the base to a purple line that is applied directly to the slip. The two handles are horizontal. The foot of an Attic vase has unfortunately been joined to this bowl by way of restoration. The black inside shows three thin purple lines on the rim, three thin white lines lower down and nearer the centre other three thin purple lines. The inside, in fact, is decorated, as is frequent in this period, in the same style that is used for the whole vase in the fragments at Munich just mentioned. Nothing could be more typical of Laconian I. than this vase.

The rim of a similar vase with the square and dot pattern is to be seen at the British Museum among the pottery found by Mr. Hogarth at the temple of Artemis at Ephesus. Paint, clay, and slip alike show it to be early Laconian.¹³

Laconian II.

Paris, *Louvre*, E 674.

Berlin, *Antiquarium*, 1647.

Cassel, *Königliches Museum* (Dugas 71, 72, 73).

Rome, *Palazzo dei Conservatori*.

Both the Louvre (Fig. 2)¹⁴ and Berlin vases are small bowls (of much the same shape as the Florence vase), which might on a superficial view be

FIG. 2.

¹² *B.S.A.* xiii. p. 128; xiv. p. 32.

¹³ Inv. number 1907, 12-1, 731.

¹⁴ I am indebted to M. Pottier for leave to publish this photograph.

grouped with Laconian I. Each, however, shows an element which would be inconsistent with such grouping, namely the small foot, for which in Laconian I. there is no evidence. The line without slip on the inside of the rim of the Louvre example is an additional reason for placing this vase towards the end of the seventh century in Laconian II., the partial disuse of slip, though extremely rare so early as that, not being unknown. Later than this these vases cannot be.

The three vases from Dr. Böhlau's Samian necropolis are placed to this period by the figures, which would not be found earlier than Laconian II., and by the square and dot pattern, which would hardly be found later. The cross design on the base of the aryballos (Dugas 71) is an additional reason for not putting this vase later; and one of the other pieces (Dugas 72) is apparently part of a lakaina and shows the outward curve of the rim that is

FIG. 3. (Scale about 1 : 2.)

not found earlier than Laconian II. All these vases apparently were completely covered with slip.

My attention was called to the small lakaina (Fig. 3) in the Palazzo dei Conservatori by Dr. Zahn. Of its provenance I have no knowledge. Clay, slip, and black pigment are quite characteristic, so that there is no reason to doubt that the vase is Laconian in origin. The thick 'sigma' pattern, which is not found at Sparta in any period except Laconian II., the square and dot pattern on the rim, which is not found later than that period, and the outbent rim, and a pattern of thin rays on the belly, which are not found earlier, combine to place it at the end of the seventh century.

Two points, however, of which I have no explanation, are strange, the absence of purple, and the appearance given by the rays of having been

painted not from below, which was the usual practice, but from above, downwards.¹⁵

Laconian III., Early.

Vienna, *Oestreichisches Museum* (Dugas 21).

Paris, *Louvre* (Dugas 17, 26, 29).

Oxford, *Ashmolean Museum* (Dugas 39).

London, *British Museum* (Dugas 10).

The quality of the slip, the fresh redness of the purple, and the careful elaboration of the patterns (this in particular on the Louvre krater) are the signs that lead me to place these vases in the earlier years of Laconian III. All are completely covered with slip except the Vienna and Louvre kylikes (Dugas 21 and 26), which have each one thin line reserved in the natural clay (round the top of the stem, and on the inside of the lip). On the other hand both show the unincised elaborate variety of palmette (cf. Fig. 1), which, so far as can be judged from the traces left, was also present on the Oxford kylix. Whether this type of palmette carries weight enough to place these vases earlier than the British Museum kylix (Dugas 10) is a question. It exists on these three vases, which are certainly early, and on a vase (Fig. 1) at Sparta, which belongs to the period of the first temple, and cannot therefore be later than the end of Laconian II.¹⁶ Thus it is found in one case certainly earlier than any incised example, and to set against this there is only one later vase that shows it, namely that belonging to Mme. Mela in Athens, which probably falls early in Laconian IV. It is difficult to avoid arguing in a circle, but I certainly look on it as strengthening the early date of these two vases. The feet of the British Museum, the Oxford, and the Louvre kylikes are missing, but they doubtless had a sharp edge like that of the Vienna vase. The *deinos* (Dugas 17) might even belong to the end of Laconian II., but it is perhaps best to class it here with the krater (Dugas 29), which is shown by its very wealth of patterns to be not earlier than the full development of the style.

Laconian III.

Paris, *Bibliothèque Nationale* (Dugas 12).

Paris, *Louvre* (Dugas 35 and 32).

Brussels, *Musée du Cinquantenaire* (Dugas 19).

Cassel, *Königliches Museum* (Dugas 22, 74; 80; 82; 69; 75).

London, *British Museum* (Dugas, 24, 51, 54, 55, 61).

Oxford, *Ashmolean Museum* (Dugas 40).

Rome, *Castellani Collection* (Dugas 47).

Florence, *Museo Etrusco* (Dugas 45).

Athens, *Acropolis Sherds* No. 468.

Sherd found at Daphnai (Dugas 67).

¹⁵ My thanks are due to Comm. Castellani for permission to publish this vase, and to Mr. Yeames for procuring the photograph.

¹⁶ *B.S.A.* xiv. p. 34.

These nineteen vases fall probably rather later than those just discussed. The Arcesilas vase (Dugas 12) has been described so often that it does not require detailed discussion, falling easily into the latter part of Laconian III.; and its probable date (on the most reasonable assumption that Arcesilas II. is represented) and the presence of a sherd of the same period at Daphnai¹⁷ are two of the determining factors that place Laconian III. in the first half of the sixth century. The vase, in fact, is an elaborate but not very early work according to the standard set up by the finds at Sparta, for, though the whole vase is covered with slip, and the foot has a sharp edge, these marks do not do more than give it a place in Laconian III., and the incised palmette, which though elaborate, has no purple, makes it likely to be late in that period, while the white and purple lines round the stem cannot be held to fix a more precise date.

The kylix in the Louvre (Dugas 35) is rather a puzzle. I think it is of the good period and belongs here, for there is an elaboration about the ornament, especially about the palmette, that is hardly met with later. Moreover the lotus flowers are broad, which, for what it is worth, speaks for an early date. The work, however, does not seem very good, for the vase is thick, and the slip, which is applied all over,¹⁸ is of inferior quality. The added purple (where it is left) has been too much touched up to be taken into account, and it is possible also that accident may have affected the slip. The foot does not belong to the vase. It may of course be that the vase is a good specimen of a later date, but provisionally it seems best to class it with Laconian III.

The two hydriai¹⁹ (Dugas 24 and 32) both show elaborate ornamentation, in virtue of which, and of their complete covering of slip, they must be placed here, though the slip on the London vase is a little thin and washy, and that in the Louvre has suffered so much that the original state of its slip can hardly be ascertained. This vase and the krater both show purple additions to the lotus pattern.

The Brussels kylix in its outside decoration is an almost exact replica of the kylix found at Sparta in 1908,²⁰ even to the lotus flower that replaces the handle-palmette. There are, however, two reserved lines without slip on the inside of the rim, while the Sparta vase has but one, and there is no slip just between the branches of the handles. On the other hand the fresh redness and the thickness of the purple perhaps argue a slightly earlier date

¹⁷ *B.S.A.* xiv. p. 46.

¹⁸ I convinced myself, when examining this vase in the summer of 1908, that slip was used over the whole both inside and outside. Dr. Puchstein (*Arch. Zeit.* 1881, p. 218, No. 10, c) says that it has no slip, and M. Pottier (Dumont-Chaplain, *Céramique grecque*, vol. i. p. 299, 14) says '*pas de couverte blanche visible. Fond jaune sale.*' But M. Pottier, in publishing the vase fully (*B.C.H.* 1893, p. 238), says '*Terre rouge pâle... Décor intérieur. Il n'y a*

pas d'engobe visible... Décor extérieur. L'engobe blanc sali paraît ne couvrir que la zone d'animaux et la zone de lotus placée en dessous.' I submit that M. Pottier was right when he wrote '*fond jaune sale,*' and that this must be slip, as otherwise the light red clay would show.

¹⁹ There is, I think, no doubt that the London hydria belongs to the Laconian style, and is no mere imitation. Both clay and slip are to me conclusive on this point.

²⁰ *B.S.A.* xiv. Plate IV.

for the Brussels vase, for the Sparta kylix, which I judge rather late in Laconian III., shows it bluer and more washy.

The nymph kylix at Cassel (Dugas 22) may be compared with the Brussels vase for the technique of drawing nude women simply in outline on the white slip. It belongs to the best period of the style, and was, as Dr. Böhlau²¹ points out, a masterpiece. The wealth of patterns and the incised palmette place it later than the immature period, while on the other hand, the general style, the complete covering of slip, and especially the square and dot pattern near the inner rim, and the frieze of birds that follow one another (both legacies from Laconian II.) forbid a date later than the middle of Laconian III. This is, I think, confirmed by the purple bough to the leaf pattern and by the slipped stem with black and purple tongue pattern (Dugas 74), which probably belonged to this vase and is interesting as showing for the first time the channelled rings that were later to supplant completely the painted decoration of the kylix stem.

From the description given by Dr. Böhlau I think it very probable that the foot of a kylix and other fragments of kylikes (Dugas 80, 82) at Cassel also belong to this period.

No arguments are needed to support the position here of the oinochoe at Cassel (Dugas 69), for it is completely covered with slip, and compares excellently with the Sparta vases of this shape that belong to Laconian III.

And from Dr. Böhlau's description²² the other fragments of a jug (Dugas 75) probably have a similar date.

Little need be said as to the four kylikes in the British Museum. Only fragments are left of them, but enough to show that their position is here, for all four have a complete covering of slip on both sides. 51²³ is a careful piece of work, and 55 may even fall rather earlier than the rest of this group for the purple is very red, and the palmette, though incised, is rather elaborate, while 61 is part of a very fine vase, for the bars of the lotus are purple, which is a mark of the best style. The warrior on 54 compares well with that on a fragment found at Sparta also of this period. The fragment of a jug(?) in the Ashmolean Museum (Dugas 40) is careless work, but, I think, belongs to this period, for the covering of slip is complete. There are traces of a pattern of thin rays (not shown in M. Dugas' plate) that come down to meet the frieze.

Thanks to the kindness of Comm. Castellani I was able in 1909 to examine his Laconian krater (Dugas 47). The vase has a rectangular rim, which is black on top, but decorated on the side with chevrons alternately purple and black. Lower down on the neck is a rope-pattern, rather complicated, painted in purple and black on the white slip. Then on the shoulder below another row of chevrons is a pattern of black and purple tongues. On the belly is the pattern to which M. Dugas' note 'décoration florale' refers. It is a frieze, running right round the vase, of palmettes facing

²¹ Böhlau, *Aus ion. u. ital. Nekrop.* p. 128.

²³ Dugas' numbers.

²² Böhlau, *l.c.* p. 126.

alternately upwards and downwards. In each case it is the same palmette, save that the upper portion in each is made wider and the lower part narrower. The work is open in black and purple on the white ground, the only incisions being horizontal lines across the base of the main palmette. Beyond this base facing the other way is a small fan palmette. Below this frieze is a pattern of double rays in black, while the foot, which has a black edge, shows a purple and black tongue-pattern. Both purple and black have been touched up in places. The handles, flat and forking below into two before joining the shoulder, are decorated with a white rosette on each side, but owing to retouching I could not determine whether they were white on black or reserved on the slip. The complete covering of slip (in good condition though dirty), the unincised nature both of rope-pattern and palmette frieze, and the fact that the purple is always applied directly to the slip fix the date of the vase as not later than the middle of Laconian III. It is the largest known Laconian vase (ht. about .75 m.) that shows a decoration of patterns only.

The kylix at Florence (Dugas 45) is very much broken, but appears to be completely covered with slip, except for a thin reserved line on the inside of the rim. The purple used on the inside looks very fresh without the appearance of retouching. The exterior decoration much resembles that of the Brussels and Sparta kylikes, except that the rim is black and that there is nothing between the lotus flowers that do duty for palmettes. There is therefore no reason for placing this vase later.

The fragment found on the Acropolis at Athens²⁴ appears to belong here, for it is slipped all over and the drawing of the leaf-pattern is careful.

Laconian III., Late.

London, *British Museum* (Dugas 25, 49).

Oxford, *Ashmolean Museum* Inv. No. '09. 955.

The Gorgoneion kylix in the British Museum (Dugas 25) and a fragment of another kylix also in London (Dugas 49) should, I think, be placed on the dividing line between Laconian III. and IV. The former is, it is true, a careful piece of work, but the clay is rather thick, and the bowl rather shallow, and there is no slip on the raised ring at the top of the stem, or on a line reserved on the inside of the rim. The palmette is somewhat elaborate though incised, and the purple is comparatively fresh. The vase cannot be later than this, and may perhaps be earlier. No one of the indications of lateness would carry much weight if isolated, but combined they overcome the evidence of the purple, which is weak, and of the palmette, which on a vase so carefully painted as this is negligible. It is a difficult vase to judge, and such that judgment must rest largely on personal impression.

The fragment of a kylix has a band reserved without slip on the outside,

²⁴ B. Graef, *Vasen von der Akropolis zu Athen*, p. 50, Taf. 15.

but the work is careful, and the purple fresh and red, so that I hesitate to group it with Laconian IV.

The sherd shown in Fig. 4²⁵ was found at Naucratis and given to the Ashmolean Museum by Mr. C. C. Edgar in 1909. It probably formed part of a large vase of the *deinos* shape, for the curvature is very slight, and the inside is painted black, without which, indeed, it might well have come from the belly of an *oinochoe*. The period, I think, is Laconian III. late, for the workmanship is rather degenerate, yet the slip is not bad, and covers the whole surface, for what that is worth in the case of so small a sherd. It may, however, be Laconian IV. That is to say the date of this vase is probably not much earlier nor any later than the third quarter of the sixth century.

FIG. 4. Scale (1:1.)

The drawing clearly shows a return from hunting. To the left advances a figure of which little is preserved but the two hands, of which the left grasps a bow, and the right the fore-paws of a dead lion whose head hangs down. The object in the right upper corner is probably a stick carried on the shoulder of a second figure further to the right, from which are suspended the two birds that we see.

It is true that the string is not visible but just there the surface is defaced, and the birds are clearly hanging dead with limp feet. The lion has no purple, and that on the birds' upper wings above the incisions is dull, facts that point to the lateness of the vase.

Laconian IV., Early.

- Berlin, *Antiquarium* (Dugas 3).
- Bonn, *University Collection* (Dugas 43).
- Paris, *Bibliothèque Nationale* (Dugas 31).
- London, *British Museum* (Dugas 52, 53, 56).
- Athens, *Mme. Mela's Collection*.
- Rome, *Vatican, Museo Etrusco* (Dugas 11).

The beginning of Laconian IV. fits these eight vases. The absence of slip on the rim of the Berlin vase, and the slipless ring at the top of the stem, which suggests the slipless channelled rings of a late period, are enough to place it in Laconian IV., the more so as there are none of the marks that would indicate an early date. Yet the excellence of the drawing

²⁵ My thanks are due to Ashmole's keeper this fragment.
(Mr. D. G. Hogarth) for permission to publish

forbids, in the absence of any very striking proof of lateness, our placing the vase far on in the period of degeneration, and confirmation of this may be found in the sharp edge of the foot.

The kylix in the Bibliothèque Nationale is rather puzzling. In favour of a date in Laconian IV. are the parts reserved without slip, namely the rim on both sides, and two lines on the belly. In favour of an earlier date are the three lines of added purple on black and one of added white below the rim on the inside, the sharp edge of the foot, and the length of the handle-palmettes. These last, however, were probably lengthened because of the decision to place no ornament between them. The purple has been too much touched up to be any guide. I should be certain that this vase

FIG. 5. (Scale 1 : 3.)

was quite late, if it were not so carelessly worked, which is an inducement to discount the marks of lateness, and give perhaps more than their due weight to the few signs of early work. The early years of Laconian IV. probably suit it best.

Of the fragments of kylikes in the British Museum 53²⁶ and 56 show no clay without slip, but the slip is of bad quality, and the purple is thin and washy, so that, though there is no definite reason against placing them somewhat earlier, this position fits them best. 52, on the other hand, clearly belongs here, for it shows a line reserved without slip on the inside of the rim, and the bough of the leaf pattern, to which the leaves are not joined, is black.

The fragment at Bonn is not late work, but, I think, belongs to

²⁶ Dugas' numbers.

Laconian IV. in virtue of a line without slip above the frieze, and of the thinness of the purple and slip.

The kylix (Figs. 5 and 6) belonging to Mme. Mela (to whom is due my warmest gratitude for permission to publish the vase) is a piece of very careless work on the painter's part, but not, I think, very late, in spite of the thickness of the rim, which measures about .005 m. through.

The dimensions are: height, .115 m.; diameter, .197 m. x .193 m.; height of stem, .040 m.

The slip is good and is only abandoned on the inside of the rim, where two lines are reserved, on a raised ring at the top of the stem, and on one bare line reserved on the lower part of the bowl outside.

The amount and quality of slip, and the foot, which has quite a thin edge, argue a fairly early date in Laconian IV., which is confirmed by the elaborate unincised palmette. The type of lotus bud with a cross-bar joining

FIG. 6. (Scale 1 : 3.)

each pair of dots is, I think, new, and the confinement of the inside decoration to a floral design is unusual on Laconian kylikes.

The vase in the Vatican (Dugas 11) belongs here in virtue of the sharp edge of the foot, the high stem, the careful drawing, and the almost complete covering of slip inside, but can hardly be earlier owing to the absence of slip at the edge of the foot and at the level of the handles outside, and on the inside of the rim. The handle-palmettes, which have no ornament between them, are incised and careful but have very short stems. The purple being bluish, brown, and reddish in turn is no guide. The vase is a good piece of work but not of the best period.

Laconian IV.

It would perhaps be over tedious to examine in detail all the thirty-two vases that fall generally into Laconian IV. yet are not distinctive enough to be given a late or early date in the period. The absence of slip on portions of the vase is a feature so constant as to suggest that all these vases date from the time when the use of slip was gradually being abandoned. In

most cases, however, the foot has still a sharp edge. The purple for the most part is more blue than red, while the handle-palmettes are generally incised with purple centre. In general, that is, there is an equal absence of those elements that would suggest that the partial abandonment of slip is exceptionally early, or that would mark a vase as close on the time when the use of slip went out altogether.

These vases are :—

Munich, *Pinakothek*.

575 New Cat. (Dugas 42.) The foot is fairly sharp. No slip outside below rim. Three bare lines on the rim inside. Painted ornament, but no slip on stem. Careful work.

576 New Cat. (Dugas 37.) Very careless work. Palmettes very rude. Foot rather rounded. Slip over the whole inside, but outside no slip above the handles.

578 New Cat. (not mentioned by Dugas). No slip on either side of rim. Inside, a man attacking a boar, of which only half is shown. An eagle and palmette in field. Palmettes careless.

Würzburg, *University Collection*.

(Dugas 33.) No slip between the handles or on the rim inside.²⁷

Leipzig, *University Collection*.

(Dugas 6.) Outside no slip till below level of handles. No slip on the rim inside.

Berlin, *Antiquarium*.

(Dugas 86.) Outside no slip till below level of handles. Inside no slip on rim. Handle-palmettes very rude. Sharp edge to foot.

Paris, *Bibliothèque Nationale*.

(Dugas 16.) No slip outside till below level of handles. High stem with sharp edge to foot.

(Dugas 5.) The foot of the Polyphemus kylix has a comparatively sharp edge, and the clay is thin. The incisions on the scene are careful. There is, however, a band without slip between the handles, and the slip is yellow and thin, so thin indeed that on the inner rim it is only partially applied, and that apparently not with intention but through carelessness. The use of white is ambiguous. On the one hand the white lines between the purple on a black ground are characteristic of Laconian I., II., and III. periods, to which it is impossible to ascribe this vase. On the other hand the use of white in details of the scene is a feature that is very characteristic of Laconian V. and is hardly met with earlier, for it was not until the disuse of the white ground that white became really effective. Thus the white dots and lines on the

²⁷ Von Urlichs' illustration (Von Urlichs, *Beiträge zur Kunstgeschichte*, Pl. X.) wrongly gives the impression that the whole of the inside of the vase is covered with slip.

fish in the exergue are a late sign,²⁸ with which, I think, may be joined the white rays rising from the foot. In fact I think this vase an early example of the late return to favour of white paint.

Paris, *Louvre*.

(Dugas 34.) Band by handles and line below without slip. No slip inside rim. Purple thin. Stem with exceptional channellings but with sharp foot.

(Dugas 9.) Band by handles and line lower down without slip. Purple thin. Bevelled edge to foot.

(Dugas 15.) No slip by handles. Purple thin.

(Dugas 4.) No slip by handles, and near stem. No slip on rim inside.

(Dugas 28.) No slip on either side of rim. Good drawing. Slip rather white.

(Dugas 18.) No slip on either side of rim. No purple on palmettes. Leaf pattern with black bough.

(Dugas 1.) This kylix showing Zeus and his eagle has indeed a foot with a sharp edge, and purple that is fairly fresh, but the lip has no slip on either side, and the space between the handles on the outside is also bare. The most, therefore, that can be said is that the vase does not fall late in Laconian IV.

London, *British Museum*.

(Dugas 27.) No slip between handles or on inside of rim. No purple on handle palmettes.

(Dugas 8.) Sharp edge to foot. No slip between handles or on inside of rim. Rude tongue pattern all black.

(Dugas 30.) No slip between handles or on either side of rim, and band without slip at top of stem. Palmette rude and unincised. Sharp edge to foot.

(Dugas 36.) Sharp edge to foot. No slip on inside of rim, between handles, and next to stem.

(Dugas 48.) Lip of kylix. No slip. Careful drawing.

(Dugas 50.) No slip on the inside. Careful drawing.

(Dugas 57.) Lip of kylix. No slip on the inside.

(Dugas 58.) Foot of kylix. Bevelled edge without slip. Slip on inside of bowl.

Oxford, *Ashmolean Museum*.

(Dugas 20.) Slip on rim outside, and traces of slip inside. Badly cleaned.²⁹

²⁸ I hesitate, in the face of the statement in M. De Ridder's Catalogue and the illustration *Mon. d. I. i. Pl. VII.*, to speak definitely of the two rows of dots on the snake, but when I examined the vase I certainly thought that they

had been white also, not purple.

²⁹ It may be that this vase should be placed earlier, but there is hardly enough surface left for a sure judgment.

(Dugas 64.) Band without slip outside. Lotus pattern rather degenerate. Inside black.

Cassel, *Königliches Museum*.

(Dugas 70.) This vase has, indeed, painted rings round the stem, which might weigh in favour of an earlier date, if it were not for the large amount of surface without slip, which is found only on the lip and the under side of the bowl, and for the leaf-pattern with a black bough, to which the leaves are not joined, a piece of slovenliness that is the first step to the abandonment of the bough that is found later.

Florence, *Museo Etrusco*.

(Dugas 44.) High stem. Foot has bevelled edge bare without slip. Palmettes black unincised. No slip above handle level outside, and bare line on inner rim. Purple thin. Incisions careful.

Munich, *Glyptothek, Assyrian Room*. *Arndt Collection* (Temporary).³⁰

The clay of this vase is very thick, at the rim, I should think quite .006 m. Inside are two lines without slip, one near the rim edge, and one below the rim. In the centre is a goat well drawn, with incisions, and purple on the haunches. The outside is slipped all over, and the patterns are careful. Apart from the thickness of the clay the vase cannot be earlier than this, for it shows a pattern of crescents which did not come into general use until Laconian V. Indeed I should put this vase quite late in Laconian IV., if it were not for the careful drawing, and large amount of slip.

Vases that I think belong to this period, but of which the fragments are too small for a fair judgment, are Dugas 59, 60, and 62 in the *British Museum*.

The Tholos kylix from Samos (Dugas 14) in the *Königliches Museum* at Cassel also has been too much damaged to be fairly judged, but I am inclined to place it in Laconian IV.

Laconian IV., Late.

Munich, *Pinakothek*, New Cat. 579.

London, *British Museum* (Dugas 23).

Heidelberg, *University Collection* (Dugas 41).

Cassel, *Königliches Museum* (Dugas 2).

Athens, *National Museum*.³¹

Cambridge, *Fitzwilliam Museum*.³²

The kylix at Munich, which will, I believe, be published in the new catalogue, must be placed late, for there is no slip at all outside, and inside only at the centre of the bowl. Here the decoration consists of a rosette,

³⁰ Glyptothek, *Sammlung Arndt: Kurzer Führer*, p. 7.

H.S. VOL. XXX.

³¹ *J.H.S.* 1908, pp. 175 ff.

³² *J.H.S.* l.c.

which is, it is true, surrounded by the square and dot pattern, but in face of the large proportion of surface without slip this must be taken as a survival.

The vase from Naucratis in the British Museum, with a scene that has been interpreted erroneously, as I think,³³ as the nymph Cyrene holding the silphium plant, is an elaborate piece of work, but the patterns, especially the pomegranate on the inside of the rim, are of late form, the handle-palmettes have no purple, the rim inside is without slip, and there is no slip also outside till below the level of the handles, or on two raised bands at the top of the stem.

The kylix at Heidelberg is undoubtedly Laconian, for the slightly deeper colour of the clay only indicates the late date, to which the absence of slip on the outside, the row of single leaves without a branch between the handles, the channelled rings on the stem, the bad quality of the slip, and the thinness and brown colour of the purple all point.

In spite of the excellence of the interior the kylix at Cassel must be placed here on account of the presence of the crescent pattern, which became very popular in Laconian V., and of the channelled rings without slip on the stem. The foot, also, is thick and has a rounded edge, and there is no slip on the rim outside. The vase is a careful and good piece of work, but the foot, rings, and crescents are definite evidence for the late period to which it belongs.

Of the two vases published in this *Journal* (vol. xxviii), that in the National Museum at Athens (Dugas 87) in its exterior much resembles the Cassel kylix, and must belong to the same period, while that in the Fitzwilliam Museum is very careless work, and may even be later. Both show channelled rings and a rounded edge to the foot.

Laconian V.

Munich, *Pinakothek*, New Cat. 577.

Paris, *Louvre* (Dugas 13, 38).

Athens, *National Museum* (Petousi Collection).

Exported vases of a later date than Laconian IV. are few, but it is only natural that the degeneration of the style lessened the demand for Laconian vases.

The Munich kylix, which will be published in the new catalogue, has no slip at all, and the black paint has a metallic gleam that is found comparatively often in Laconian ware before and after the best period. The inside decoration shows nine fish with incisions and purple details. The outside ornament consists of lines and purple bands, and short careless rays. The palmettes are incised with purple centre. The work is careful, and the vase must be dated probably to the early years of the fifth century.

Of the Louvre kylikes 13³⁴ has no slip, and the foot has an unpainted

³³ *B.S.A.* xiv. p. 45.

³⁴ Dugas' numbers.

and bevelled edge, which is slightly bent upwards. The work, however, is careful, and there are three bands of purple on the exterior, and purple is also used for the centre of the palmette, so that the date is probably the same as that of the Munich kylix.

38 is a small kylix with a foot similar to that of 13, and is also without slip. The inside is black but for a bare line round the lip, and three circles reserved at the centre. The exterior shows a leaf pattern in which the bough is lacking, and there are no handle-palmettes.

FIG. 7. (Scale 1 : 2.)

The kylix which belonged to the collection of M. Petousi, and is now in the National Museum at Athens,³⁵ consists only of fragments, and has been still further damaged by a modern attempt to mend it with rivets. It is interesting as being a quite elaborate piece of work by a man who could not rise above the degeneracy of his time. Rim and foot are lost, but the parts remaining show no slip on either side. It is not easy to fit an interpretation to the scene depicted on the inside (Fig. 7). In front of, but not touching, a

³⁵ For permission to publish this vase I have to thank Dr. Stais, Ephor of the National Museum.

bearded figure on the left is a central figure in a bent and decrepit attitude whom the painter has been compelled by the desire of filling his space to make larger than the others. His left wrist is apparently grasped by the left hand of a figure to the right. This central figure is distinguished from the others by the long robe decorated in front with purple spots, and also by the peculiar fact that his hair is short behind. In places, indeed, the vase has been so carelessly painted that the black has washed to a very thin brown, and it may be that it washed so thin here that it has since worn off, as has happened to the raised left hand of the figure behind. I do not think so, however, for the incised line that would have been necessary to mark the edge of the shoulder, had the hair been long, is absent. The dress of the left-hand figure finds a parallel in the Hermes of the Cassel kylix (Dugas 2), and the round archaic eye on so late a vase is noticeable as an indication that such stylistic distinctions are of little value on these vases.

The outside decoration (Fig. 8) confirms the impression of late date left by the absence of slip and extreme carelessness of the inside. The lotus is careless, the palmette has no purple, and the crescent pattern, that first becomes frequent in Laconian V., takes the chief place in the lower decoration between two purple bands.

FIG. 8. (Scale 1 : 3.)

The diameter of the kylix without the rim is .195 m. and the depth of the bowl .050 m.

It is possible that the painter meant to represent on this vase the blind Teiresias, who practised divination with birds. The moment chosen would then be the departure of the seer led by the figure to the right from the presence of Oedipus, who lifts his hand in horror or anger at the message that he has just heard. In that case, however, we should expect Teiresias to have his staff, and flying eagles are too frequently used on Laconian vases merely as space-fillers to be allowed any weight in the explanation of a scene.

I do not propose to write a defence of the view that the 'Cyrenaic' pottery was made in Laconia. The view is not new, and its correctness is proved absolutely by the finds at Sparta. Yet I think it perhaps to the point to remark that bearded figures on these vases invariably have the upper lip shaven, and that the shaving of the moustache, though, of course, not unknown elsewhere, was a notorious Spartan custom.

The crescent pattern where it appears on these vases has up till now³⁶ been connected with the similar decorations on the so-called 'Fikellura' ware. I am very doubtful if such connexion exists. The date of the 'Fikellura' vases has been, indeed, a matter for doubt, some authorities³⁷ inclining to place them in the second half of the sixth century, while others³⁸

³⁶ Böhlau, *Arch. Anz.* 1898, p. 189; Droop, *J.H.S.* 1908, p. 176.

337.

³⁸ Böhlau, *Aus ion. u. ital. Nekrop.* p. 30.

³⁷ Walters, *History of Ancient Pottery*, p.

put them in the seventh. The pattern, however, at Sparta does not begin to appear till very late in the sixth century and flourishes most in the first half of the fifth, so that direct connexion, though not impossible, if we take the later date for the 'Fikellura' ware, does not seem very probable. Moreover there are differences to be observed. The Laconian pattern is in all cases shorter and less slender, and invariably is convex to the left, while the crescents face both ways on the 'Fikellura' ware with, I think, a decided tendency to be convex on the right.

I have tried in the above classification to date, at least comparatively, the exported Laconian vases, using the fabric of the vase, and not the style of draughtsmanship as my criterion, being led to this not only by the conviction that for such a system the finds at Sparta have given us definite data, but also because it appears from those finds that the painter's style is almost valueless as a criterion of date, for in Laconia the art of the vase painter never got beyond the archaic stage, so that careless work of the earlier periods may well be confused with the careful drawing of a later date. Degeneration in fact, overtaking the style at a stage when it was perhaps on the point of becoming free, prevented its natural development from following its course, and the style died down in the fifth century as archaic only more slovenly than in the best period. The Teiresias (?) vase in the National Museum at Athens is a good instance in support of this. Though it can hardly be earlier than the beginning of the fifth century, it shows the more archaic form of eye.

It may perhaps be thought that such a chronological arrangement as I have attempted presents an unwarrantable appearance of dogmatism, and in the case of any individual vase (when, however, it must be remembered that no more than probability is claimed for it) this may be so, yet the scheme, as a whole rests, I believe, on the firm basis provided by the stratification observed at Sparta.³⁹

It is perhaps in place here to point to another result of the excavations at Sparta. I have said above that from the end of Laconian IV. onwards it was characteristic of the stem of the kylix to show just below the junction with the bowl a reserved band decorated with channelled rings. This is not usual elsewhere, and seems to have been a Laconian speciality. Now there exists a group of Attic kylikes that also show this peculiarity, and these kylikes always approximate to the Laconian form, that is the late form

³⁹ M. Dugas catalogues eighty-seven pieces, two of which (22, 74) probably belong together, making eighty-six vases. Of these I have tried to classify seventy-four, with the addition of fourteen vases which M. Dugas did not know, making eighty-eight. Ten of M. Dugas' vases (Nos. 7, 46, 66, 68, 76, 77, 78, 79, 83, 84) I have not yet seen, and two (63, 85) M. Dugas has included in his catalogue by an error. My reasons for rejecting the Copenhagen vase (85) I will give later, but 63 (Ashmolean Museum,

No. 187 c) is catalogued by Prof. Gardner as Naucratic, and has a clay different from that of the Laconian fabric, of which it may be a local copy. Thus the total number of known exported Laconian vases is ninety-eight. This is exclusive of the Laconian I. fragments in the Pinakothek at Munich, about the number of which I am not quite certain, and also of the fragments found at the Heraeum of Argos (*The Argive Heraeum*. ii. p. 173).

a

b

c

d

Fig. 9. (Scale 1 : 3.)

with heavy rounded foot, and show an exterior decoration that always presents in greater or less degree Laconian characteristics. Others, again, possessing the characteristic form and patterns do not show the rings, but even so there is invariably an unpainted band in the right place. These vases, which may be dated with great probability to the latter part of the sixth century,

FIG. 10. (Scale about 1 : 3.)

must, I think, be Attic imitations of the Laconian pottery. It is clear that in the sixth century Laconia did a considerable export trade in vases, and therefore it is probable that it was with a view to competition with this trade that some Attic potters began to copy the Laconian style. The odd thing is, however, that the majority of these imitations are very unambitious. An ambitious effort was to have been expected by the men who intended

Fig. 11.

their wares to supplant the genuine Laconian style, but all are kylikes with no interior design other than circles reserved at the centre.

The vases known to me in this style are:—

Athens, *National Museum* :

12710 (Fig. 9, *a*); 12847 M (Fig. 9, *b*); 9711 (Fig. 9, *c*);
Petousi collection, No. 78 (Fig. 9, *d*).

Munich, *Pinakothek* :

2257, New Cat. (Fig. 10, *a*); 2259, New Cat. (Fig. 10, *b*);

Munich, *Glyptothek* :

Arndt Collection (Temporary) A, 903.

Würzburg, *University Collection* :

157 (Fig. 11, *a*); 158 (Fig. 11, *b*); 341 (Fig. 11, *c*); 342
(Fig. 11, *d*).

Berlin, *Antiquarium* :

2038 (Fig. 12, *b*); 2039 (Fig. 12, *c*).

Cassel, *Königliches Museum* :

Böhlau, *Aus ion. u. ital. Nekrop.* Taf. X, 2, p. 133.

Brussels, *Musée du Cinquantenaire* :

A 1580 bis (Fig. 12, *a*).

Gela, *Mon. Ant.* xvii. p. 646, Fig. 459.

These kylikes, I think, speak for themselves. The clay is Attic, and the absence of slip is only to be expected in the case of Attic vases, and is all the more natural in that by this time the use of slip was lessening in the Laconian fabric.

Some of the patterns are, as is only natural in an imitation, not Laconian, the palmette frieze, for instance (Fig. 10, *b*), and the palmette alternating with the lotus in the frieze (Fig. 9, *a*). The reserved zigzag line (Fig. 10, *b*, Fig. 11, *a*) is also foreign to the Laconian style, as is also the band of ivy leaf⁴⁰ (Fig. 12, *a*). This, however, is an easily intelligible adaptation of the common Laconian leaf-pattern. The lotus also regularly shows a slight divergence from the model, in the absence of the cross-bar and the thinness of the stems. The resemblances, however, far outweigh the differences. Many of the patterns are purely Laconian, and the alternation of bands with thin lines is a particularly characteristic feature of the Spartan style, inherited from the 'Geometric' period.⁴¹

As for the vase from Samos, which Dr. Böhlau publishes as probably of some Ionian origin akin to 'Cyrenaic,' it falls, I think, into our category.

⁴⁰ I know this pattern only on three Laconian sherds found at Sparta.

⁴¹ *B.S.A.* xiii. p. 120, Fig. 1, *e*.

FIG. 12. (Scale 1 : 4.)

The clay and technique, he admits, can be called Attic, and to compare with it he instances Berlin 2039, about which I think there is no doubt. He finds it strange, however, that an Attic imitation of Ionian ware should be imported into Samos, and would rather doubt the Attic origin of the Berlin vase. This difficulty vanishes when it is seen that it was really a Peloponnesian and not an Ionian ware that was imitated. In fact we have here an actual example of an Attic imitation competing with the Laconian fabric on soil foreign to both. Other examples are the Brussels vase found in Rhodes, and the two Berlin vases from Italy, while one vase in Athens (12710) comes from Rhodes, and one (12847 M) from Tanagra.⁴² The vase from Gela (which I have not seen) might from the illustration be a genuine Laconian vase from the IVth or Vth period, but for one point, namely the thinness of stem and absence of cross-bar in the lotus pattern, which therefore is not Laconian.

Four other kylikes in the *Pinakothek* at Munich (2256, 2258, 2261, 2262 New Cat.) (Fig. 13 *a, b, c, d*) and one in the *Museo Etrusco* at Florence (3885) are, I think, from the scheme of their decoration also imitations of Laconian ware. They much resemble the others, and there is no feature in their ornament that is definitely not Laconian. They are, however, to judge from the sharper edge to the foot, the higher stem, and the absence of channelled rings, somewhat earlier in date, contemporary perhaps with the earlier part of Laconian IV.⁴³

In a different class, inasmuch as it is a far closer copy, and not Attic in origin, is the vase at Copenhagen⁴⁴ (Dugas 85), which after close examination I was satisfied is not the genuine Laconian fabric, though I should not like to hazard a guess at its real home. The points, which to my mind exclude it from the class, are first the clay, which, though no bad imitation, yet differs from that found in the genuine specimens, and next the waved bough of the external leaf pattern (Fig. 14), a luxuriance of decoration from which the genuine style is free. The vase also shows a lotus pattern on the outside, which, if it be Laconian, is unique in its elaboration and fullness, resembling rather in shape those found on the hydriai of Caere than the Laconian forms, while the purple pupil found in the sphinxes' eyes (Fig. 15) would, if I remember rightly, be unique on a Laconian vase. These four points in themselves are I think sufficient to differentiate this vase from the Laconian style, but what is most striking is that with its absence of slip, and plentiful use of white, this kylix, if it be Laconian, cannot be earlier than Laconian V., yet is too good and elaborate to have been made at that date in Laconia, and shows a lotus pattern of proportions that are perhaps conceivable in the

⁴² An exact replica of this vase has been found by Prof. Burrows at Rhitsóna, No. 231, Grave 51 (*B.S.A.* xiv. p. 269, Fig. 14; Plate IX. *b*).

⁴³ For permission to publish these vases my grateful thanks are due to Dr. Stais, Ephor of the National Museum at Athens; to Dr. Sieve-

king, Konservator of the Vase Collection at Munich; to Dr. Bulle at Würzburg; to Dr. Zahn of the Antiquarium at Berlin; and to M. de Mot of the Musée du Cinquantenaire at Brussels.

⁴⁴ Copenhagen, Nat. Mus. Collection of Antiquities, No. 58.

FIG. 13. (Scale $a, c, d, 1 : 3$; $b, 2 : 5$.)

very beginning of Laconian III. but could hardly in Laconia be found later. The stem is very short but has a sharp edge, and shows no channelled rings; so that, considering its general excellence, I should be inclined to place this close imitation of the Laconian style not later than the latter part of the sixth century.

M. Dugas⁴⁵ has suggested a connexion between the 'Cyrenaic' ware and the work of the Attic potter Nicosthenes. In addition to the fact that the amphorae of this artist and the Laconian kylikes and oinochoai alike seem to point to metal originals (one such, a small bronze oinochoe, has actually been found at Sparta), there is one feature common to the six oinochoai which must be connected with Nicosthenes' name (*Louvre*, F 116, F 117,⁴⁶ F 118; Munich, *Pinakothek*, 1829 A, New Cat.;⁴⁷ *British Museum*

FIG. 14.

B 620, B 621⁴⁸) that confirms M. Dugas' conjecture. This is the presence of heads modelled in relief either at the lip or at the attachments of the handle. Now such heads, either human or leonine, are the rule on the Laconian oinochoai throughout the sixth century. These white slipped jugs of Nicosthenes and his school show in fact two features, slip and relief heads, that are both the rule in Laconia, and both innovations in Attica.

An amphora in the Louvre (E 705) is thought by M. Pottier to be Ionian in style.⁴⁹ We can to-day, I think, substitute the definite word

⁴⁵ *Rev. Arch.* 1907, Tom. X. p. 47.

⁴⁶ Pottier, *Catalogue des vases antiques au Musée du Louvre*, pp. 754, 757; *Wiener Vorleg.* 1890-91, Plate IV. 1, 2; Loeschke, *Arch. Zeit.* 1881, p. 36.

⁴⁷ Lau, Brunn und Krell, *Griech. Vasen*, Plate

XV. 1; Gerhard, *A.V.B.* lxxvii; Loeschke, *loc. cit.*

⁴⁸ *B. M. Cat. of Vases*, vol. ii. pp. 285, 286; Loeschke, *loc. cit.*; Walters, *Hist. of Ancient Pottery*, i. p. 385, Plate XXX.

⁴⁹ *B.C.H.* 1893, p. 432.

Laconian for the vague term Ionian. Apart from the vexed question of the extent of Ionian influence shown in the Laconian style, there is no one of the patterns on this vase but is common on Spartan vases of Laconian IV., though they appear here in degenerate form, and the two lower friezes show cocks, sirens, and animals, which, though also sketchily drawn, find their prototypes on many vases of the same style. Now M. Pottier calls this vase '*proto-nicosthénien*,' and looks on it as a link between the ware of the Ionian School and the Attic potter. There is, I think, no doubt that Nicosthenes knew and imitated the Laconian style.

FIG. 15.

I do not propose to solve the vexed question of the influences, Ionian or Peloponnesian, that went to make the style that we know now to have been Laconian.

An admirable summary of the arguments for both views is to be found in M. Dugas' paper.⁵⁰ The derivation of the white slip from Melos or Thera there suggested is perhaps possible, yet the white slip began to be used at Sparta at a very early date, probably in the ninth century, and needs no more explanation than is afforded by the desire to find a better background than the natural colour of the clay.

⁵⁰ *R.v. Arch.* 1907, Tom. X. p. 37.

This year further excavation at Sparta has shed more light on the nature of Laconian II., the style of the latter half of the seventh century. It is now clear that during this period, which saw the introduction of figures, friezes of following birds or animals were the rule, and that for the short period, probably about the middle of the century, before the use of incisions began, the reserved technique was used. By the end of the century the first of these 'Ionian' features had been almost, and the second completely, abandoned.

Whatever the origin of the style I think that the influence of the Greek cities of the Asia Minor coast has been overmuch pressed, for to-day it is no longer correct to say that the style is without the ram, the deer, and the boar,⁵¹ and that the lion is of rare occurrence. It savours, indeed, rather of special pleading to point to the friezes of following birds on the British Museum hydria (Dugas 24) and the nymph kylix from Samos (Dugas 22) as evidence of Ionian influence, while ignoring the friezes on those same vases in which the continuity is broken, and some of the figures face one another heraldically, a system which the excavations at Sparta have shown to have been much the more common at the date of those vases. To-day, at least, evidence for Ionian influence on the style cannot be argued on the same page from such friezes and from the floral nature of the decoration, for it was not until the adoption of the broken frieze had become general in the sixth century that the leaf-pattern and the lotus appeared. Earlier, except for the ray-pattern, presumably vegetable in origin, the scheme of decoration was almost geometric.

Again it is certain that the kylix was a favourite form with Ionian potters from the beginning of the sixth century, but the growth of the Laconian kylix from the low bowl without a foot⁵² can be traced in the latter part of the seventh century, and there is less reason to think that that growth was forced by Ionian influence in that no trace is to be found in the Laconian style of the favourite Ionian type of kylix with a low foot and no rim.

The satyr is unknown in the style, the bird-siren never has human arms, the winged figures are content with one pair of wings, and in the only centaur-scene known to me (Dugas 17) only two of the six centaurs have human fore-legs. And even less Ionian influence is shown in the human figure. I agree with Pernice⁵³ in thinking that when the Laconian potter drew figure scenes his motive had ceased to be purely decorative. And the figures themselves are entirely free from the use of white for details even in the short period at the beginning of Laconian II. before the introduction of the incised technique, while the habit of painting the flesh white belongs naturally only to the period of decadence (Laconian V.) (when with the disuse of slip the white could show against the light brown clay), and then is confined to female figures in the manner of the mainland. This

⁵¹ Böhlau, *Aus ion. u. ital. Nekrop.* p. 131.

⁵² *B.S.A.* xiv. p. 32, Fig. 2, *h.*

⁵³ *Jahrb.* 1901, p. 193.

distinction of sex is also to be seen in the two vases of Laconian III. (Dugas 19, 22), on which a woman is drawn in outline on the slip. And I do not think this outline drawing (whatever may be thought of the earlier examples of outline work at the beginning of Laconian II.) can be claimed to show Ionian influence, for it is clearly a device to utilise the white ground in order to show the sex distinction, which is not Ionian. And when white paint is used it is never applied to the clay directly, but always has a backing of black in the mainland manner.

The question of the eye is indecisive. On the one hand no distinction of sex is made, the Ionian oval eye being often the only type in use. On the other hand the mainland masculine type is often found.

I do not think, then, that the fully developed Laconian style (Laconian III., IV.) can be held to be closely connected with the Ionian style of vase painting, in spite of the floral nature of its decoration.

On the other hand the first appearance of figures in the seventh century (Laconian II.) is marked by two points that are admittedly characteristic of Ionian vases, the frieze of following birds or animals and the reserved technique and heads drawn in outline. We do not yet know exactly the point from which Oriental influence reached Laconia. Mr. Thompson⁵⁴ has suggested that early Laconian art owed much to Eastern sources by way probably of Cyprus through Phoenician traders. In this connexion we may remember that the shoes with turned-up toes seen on the Spartan hero-reliefs and on two Laconian vases (Dugas 12, 19) are found also in Cyprus,⁵⁵ Etruria, and on Hittite reliefs.⁵⁶

It is, of course, no new theory that the forms of some Laconian vases and the incised technique may have been imitated from Phoenician metal vases.⁵⁷ It may be, then, that Laconia and the Ionian schools of vase-painting were influenced from one common source, of which the hold on Ionia was lasting, while Laconia quickly altered the style, so that in later days its origin became barely perceptible. It is impossible, however, on such a theory to place the incised technique to the credit of Phoenician metal work, for that technique is one of the later changes of Sparta.

On such a theory it becomes unnecessary to strain the evidence to find more likeness between Ionian and Spartan vases than exists, and the isolation in which the Laconian style apparently developed makes it not

⁵⁴ *J.H.S.* xxix. p. 304. I see that Mr. Hogarth (*Ionia and the East*, p. 37) gives the Phoenicians credit for importing eastern influences to Laconia. How far the development of Laconian art at the end of the eighth century was also due to the revival of the artistic instincts of the older inhabitants of Aegaeon race (*op. cit.* p. 39) is not easy to say; but the geometric pottery which preceded that development shows no trace of even 'a partial derivation from some Aegaeon *Bauernstil*' (*op. cit.* p. 35), being quite free from any of the charac-

teristics that show the mixed origin of the Geometric ware of Crete.

⁵⁵ Cesnola, *Salamina*, Fig. 131, and Plate XII. Fig. 2; Perrot-Chipiez, iv. Fig. 286.

⁵⁶ Perrot-Chipiez, iv. Fig. 314, Plate VIII.

⁵⁷ Dugas, *op. cit.* p. 40. To the resemblances there noted I would add, for what it is worth, a comparison between the figures of horsemen on these vases (Perrot-Chipiez, iii. Figs. 544, 548) and those on three Laconian kylikes (Dugas 7, 8, 9).

surprising to find no close resemblance between it and Corinthian works, while such as do exist, the 'narrative' character of the scenes depicted, and the broken nature of the animal friezes, are easily explicable through the kinship of the peoples without the necessity of assuming close relations to have existed between them. Very few fragments of Corinthian pottery have been found at Sparta.

Classification of 'Cyrenaic' Vases.

VASES.	DUGAS' NUMBERS. ⁵⁸	LACONIAN PERIODS.	APPROXIMATE DATE.
Paris, <i>Louvre</i> , E 660	32	III.	Circ. 575 B.C.
" " " E 661	29	III. Early	" 585 "
" " " E 662	17	III. Early	" 585 "
" " " E 663	26	III. Early	" 585 "
" " " E 664	34	IV.	" 530 "
" " " E 665	9	IV.	" 530 "
" " " E 666	15	IV.	" 530 "
" " " E 667	35	III.	" 575 "
" " " E 668	1	IV.	" 530 "
" " " E 669	4	IV.	" 530 "
" " " E 670	13	V.	" 490 "
" " " E 671	28	IV.	" 530 "
" " " E 672	18	IV.	" 530 "
" " " E 673	38	V.	" 490 "
" " " E 674	88	II.	" 625 "
Paris, <i>Bibl. Nat.</i> 189	12	III.	" 570 "
" " " 190	5	IV.	" 530 "
" " " 191	31	IV. Early	" 545 "
" " " 192	16	IV.	" 530 "
London, <i>Brit. Mus.</i> B 1	8	IV.	" 530 "
" " " B 2	30	IV.	" 530 "
" " " B 3	36	IV.	" 530 "
" " " B 4	23	IV. Late	" 510 "
" " " B 5	25	III. Late	" 555 "
" " " B 6	10	III. Early	" 585 "
" " " B 7 (1)	27	IV.	" 530 "
" " " B 7 (2)	49	III. Late	" 555 "
" " " B 7 (3)	50	IV.	" 530 "
" " " B 7 (4)	52	IV. Early	" 545 "
" " " B 7 (4)	53	IV. Early	" 545 "
" " " B 7 (4)	54	III.	" 575 "
" " " B 7 (4)	55	III.	" 575 "
" " " B 7 (4)	56	IV. Early	" 545 "
" " " B 7 (4)	57	IV.	" 530 "
" " " B 7 (4)	58	IV.	" 530 "
" " " B 7 (4)	59	IV. ?	" ? "
" " " B 7 (4)	60	IV. ?	" ? "
" " " B 7 (4)	61	III.	" 575 "
" " " B 7 (4)	62	IV. ?	" ? "
" " " B 7 (5)	48	IV.	" 530 "
" " " B 7 (6)	51	III.	" 575 "
" " " B 58	24	III.	" 575 "
" " " Inv. No. 1907. 12-1. 731	89	I.	" 660 "
Oxford, <i>Ashmolean Museum</i> , 185	20	IV.	" 530 "
" " " "	64	IV.	" 530 "
" " " "	65	I.	" 660 "
" " " "	39	III. Early	" 585 "
" " " "	40	III.	" 575 "
" " " " Inv. No. 1909. 955	102	III. Late	" 555 "

⁵⁸ In this list I shall continue M. Dugas' sequence of numbers for those vases which are not in his catalogue.

VASES.	DUGAS' NUMBERS.	LACONIAN PERIODS.	APPROXIMATE DATE.
Cambridge, <i>Fitzwilliam Museum</i>	90	IV. Late	Circ. 510 B.C.
Munich, <i>Pinakothek</i> , 575	42	IV.	" 530 "
" " 576	37	IV.	" 530 "
" " 577	91	V.	" 490 "
" " 578	92	IV.	" 530 "
" " 579	93	IV. Late	" 510 "
" " Several fragments	94	I.	" 660 "
" " <i>Glyptothek</i> (Temporary)	95	IV.	" 520 "
Berlin, <i>Antiquarium</i> , 3404	3	IV. Early	" 545 "
" " 3185	86	IV.	" 530 "
Leipzig, <i>University Collection</i>	6	IV.	" 530 "
Bonn " "	43	IV. Early	" 545 "
Heidelberg " "	41	IV. Late	" 510 "
Würzburg " " 434	33	IV.	" 530 "
Cassel, <i>König. Mus.</i>	2	IV. Late	" 510 "
" " From Samos	81	I.	" 660 "
" " " "	71	II.	" 620 "
" " " "	72	II.	" 620 "
" " " "	73	II.	" 620 "
" " " "	22 }	III.	" 575 "
" " " "	74 }	III.	" 575 "
" " " "	80	III.	" 575 "
" " " "	82	III.	" 575 "
" " " "	69	III.	" 575 "
" " " "	75	III.	" 575 "
" " " "	70	IV.	" 530 "
" " " "	14	IV. ?	" ?
Vienna, <i>Oestreichisches Museum</i> , 140	21	III. Early	" 585 "
Brussels, <i>Musée du Cinquantenaire</i> , 401	19	III.	" 575 "
Rome, <i>Vatican, Museo Etrusco</i> , 1298	11	IV. Early	" 545 "
" <i>Castellani Collection</i>	47	III.	" 575 "
" <i>Palazzo dei Conservatori</i>	96	II.	" 620 "
Florence, <i>Museo Etrusco</i> , 3881	97	I.	" 660 "
" " " 3879	44	IV.	" 530 "
" " " 3882	45	III.	" 575 "
Athens, <i>Nat. Mus.</i>	98	IV. Late	" 510 "
" " " (Petousi Collection)	99	V.	" 490 "
" " " (Acropolis Sherds, No. 468)	100	III.	" 575 "
" <i>Collection of Mme. Mela</i>	101	IV. Early	" 545 "
" <i>Nat. Mus.</i> (Argive Heraeum)	103	?	" ?
Sherd found at Daphnai	67	III.	" 575 "

J. P. DROOP.