

were subject to legal restraint than is normally assumed, and that consequently the 'unwritten laws' had a more important part in regulating behaviour than is generally thought. This, however, remains to be established, requiring careful research to map out the fields of activity that were subject to legislation and those that were not. In the areas of archaic arbitration, law-giving and codification, H.'s own book will remain a necessary starting point for many years to come.

Gabriel Herman

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

L. Giuliani, *Bild und Mythos. Geschichte der Bilderzählung in der griechischen Kunst*. Munich: Beck, 2003. 367 pp. ISBN 3-406-50999-1.

Ever since Lessing's *Laokoon* of 1766, German scholars have pioneered discussion of the relationship between art and text. Carl Robert's *Bild und Lied* of 1881 established the terms of modern debate. Luca Giuliani's book echoes Robert's title and stands firmly on his foundation. In the face of a slew of works from the United States, in particular Mark Stansbury-O'Donnell's *Pictorial Narrative in Ancient Greek Art* (Cambridge, 1999) and Jocelyn Penny Small's *The Parallel Worlds of Classical Art and Text* (Cambridge, 2003), G. puts German scholarship back at the centre of the argument. All future study of the subject will have to begin from the pleasures of his text.

Three clear virtues set G.'s book apart. First, it sets the discussion of scenes related to myth in Greek art into the wider context of discussion of the relationship between art and text; that is, it goes back to Lessing's issues and not merely to Robert's, and it registers where recent art theory (e.g. the work of W.J.T. Mitchell) has left those issues. Second, it has both methodological and substantive theses to argue. G. insists that pictures may relate to stories as a whole, not illustrate the words of a particular textual instantiation of a story. And G. makes the case, already canvassed by him in a number of articles (in particular in *SCI* 20 [2001] 17-38), for a marked change from relating to stories to relating to texts occurring at the end of the fourth century. Third, G. takes seriously the importance of other images in shaping an artist's choice of presentation and, in the way that François Lissarrague, above all, has taught us to do, reads images in series.

G. writes for the general reader (and it is very much to be hoped that his work will be translated and made available to the anglophone general reader). In consequence the polemical edge of the book is buried (and takes some excavation, even from the book's footnotes). I detect two main targets for G.'s fire. G.'s chief enemy is the hyper-literalist, for whom the presence in an image related to some myth of details discrepant with a particular textual instantiation of that myth means that the image cannot be related to that text. G. delivers a powerful response here to Snodgrass's *Homer and the Artists. Text and Picture in Early Greek Art*, demolishing in advance Small's *Parallel Worlds* which appeared at the same time as his own book. But if G. is opposed to the minimalism which results from thinking that texts are merely the sum of the words that they use, he also has his sights on those who would impose a mythological identity on figures in a scene simply because those figures are compatible with a myth. G. both wants to insist that the use in an image of names different from those that appear in a text does not mean that the image has no relationship to that text, and to insist that where no names are given, particular names should not be too readily imposed (so G. takes a line on geometric figure scenes very different from that taken by G. Ahlberg-Cornell's *Myth and Epos in Early Greek Art. Representation and Interpretation* [Jonsered 1992], and a line on the identification of the figures involved when one heavily armed soldier carries a dead comrade off the battlefield which will surprise those who happily read Aias and Achilles there).

The six central chapters trace issues of the representation of myth from the eighth to the second century B.C. They are framed by preface, introductory chapter and conclusion. The preface

stresses that the book is an exercise in understanding pictures, and in understanding what they can't and don't do, in particular when it comes to representing stories, as a way of understanding what they can and do do. G. wants to sharpen the reader/viewer's visual acuity in the face of Lippmann's observation that people see in stereotypes.

The introduction sets out the problems as identified by Lessing. G. emphasises four points from Lessing's work around which subsequent discussion will focus: that pictures are a system of natural signs, where the sign resembles the signified; that language unfolds over time, pictures unfold at once; that artists can only show a single moment in pictures; and whether pictures can present plot and suspense.

G. begins his chapter on the eighth century by looking at the *Iliad*. He draws attention to the way in which the description of the Shield of Achilles in Book 18 operates in the imperfect, not the aorist tense, and to the absence of any plot or conclusion to the episodes described as represented on the Shield. G. suggests that these features show the poet's insight into the basic differences between text and picture, and are evidence that an eighth-century viewer expected pictures to describe rather than to tell stories. G. then goes on to insist on this point in his analyses of a series of scenes from geometric art. G. insists that one cannot have a story if one cannot name the participant; if it is open to the viewer to choose one of a number of possible identifications for the protagonists then a scene cannot be said to show a story. Even apparently peculiar scenes (as with the 'siamese twins' or the man eaten by lions) turn out to be descriptive of particular situations (facing up to lions as the ultimate test of manly virtue), not indications of particular stories. Geometric scenes are argued to show not a sequence of actions but parallel actions: no particular figure is emphasised above others and there is no possibility of suspense. G. is not attracted to see Odysseus in the man on the upturned ship on the Munich oinochoe, but he does admit that there the singular situation of one particular, central, figure does open up possibilities. This amounts to a very clear restatement of the sceptical position on story in Attic geometric art, and displays some very nice detailed touches. In two ways, however, G. disappoints. First, he shows very little interest in the context in which the vessels were either used or deposited. Some vessels were certainly made for use on graves, others for use at drinking parties; G. scarcely alludes to the possibilities which our knowing this opens up. Second, G. acknowledges the presence of the fantastic in these scenes only in his amusing discussion of the impossibility of lions being present in southern Greece in the eighth century. That there are geometric vessels showing Centaurs, certainly creatures who exist only in stories, is never admitted. Centaurs would hardly give G. a sleepless night, but they do present a limit case that needs exploring.

G.'s chapter on the seventh century concerns itself with the Mykonos pithos and the blinding of Polyphemos. With regard to the former, G. builds upon his treatment of geometric art: that is, he refuses to see any certain sequence to the metopes but acknowledges that there is clear allusion back and forward in time in the scene on the neck. Throughout the chapter G. emphasises that the artist finds visual ways of reproducing at least some of the effects of telling the story. He insists not only that all the seventh-century Polyphemos scenes are compatible with the *Odyssey* story, but that the allusions to Polyphemos' drunkenness point to dependence upon that version. There is some fine analysis here (and even a minimal acknowledgement of the archaeological context of the Mykonos pithos), but treatment of the Polyphemos scenes in isolation from other scenes on the same pots means that various very relevant tricks are left untaken.

The fourth chapter is concerned with writing on eighth, seventh, and sixth-century pots. Writing is important for G. in enabling the identification of protagonists vital to guaranteeing, or creating, a particular story, and raising questions about relationship to text. For G., names (or unique attributes) have to be added in order to be present: a warrior carrying off his dead comrade is only Aias if so named (even if the artist is otherwise Aias-obsessed). But G. also insists on identity of story even when there is variation of nomenclature (e.g. over the charioteer race on the François vase): this is no problem when we are dealing with not 'Literatur' but 'Oralitur' (p. 144).

G. wants also to insist that artists work within iconographic traditions, and that not all that they show has its origin in a text: G. persuasively connects the François vase's presentation of Theseus' encounter with Ariadne in the context of a dance with other images in which a man is shown charming a woman in a musical context.

Chapter 5 on the sixth and fifth centuries looks at further representations of Polyphemos and at the ransoming of Hector's corpse. The latter extremely effective discussion of a series of representations brings out the way in which different artists play out a variety of interpretative strategies through the manipulation of a small number of motifs. Once more G. is primarily interested in artists seeking to produce something equivalent to the effect of the text, including suspense, while going against the letter of the text. The chapter concludes with a discussion of suspense in scenes of Circe (discussion of the Erlangen lekythos in which Circe drops her potion cup when approached by Odysseus with sword might have benefited from juxtaposition with Menelaos dropping his sword when faced with the beauty of Helen, a scene discussed among the sack of Troy scenes) and discussion of the sack of Troy. The latter concentrates on the variety of ways in which artists convey the cruelty of the sack. G. stresses the descriptive aspects of the scenes of the sack, and the way that nameless characters draw attention to general plight: narrative and description are not bipolar but compatible (p. 221). Scenes of the sack of Troy are, for G., interested not in the narrative as such but in using it as a way of making visible the horror of it as an event (p. 230).

Chapter 6 traces how this relationship between picture and text changes between the fifth and fourth century and between Athenian and south Italian pot painting. Taking the embassy to Achilles and the pursuit of Orestes by the Furies at Delphi as examples, G. shows how Athenian fifth-century scenes violate the letter of the text in order to reproduce its effect (e.g. by having Achilles isolate himself from the embassy rather than welcome it), while south Italian fourth-century scenes illustrate the details of the text (and in the case of the *Eumenides* reflect what is described in the text rather than what was actually seen on stage). G. reinforces his points by comparison with Flaxman's illustrations of Homer and Aeschylus. In chapter 7 G. pursues textual illustration onto the hellenistic relief bowls with scenes from the *Odyssey* juxtaposed to (selective) quotations from the text, where several scenes all relate to a single 70-line passage of text. G. stresses what is lost as well as what is gained here.

The final chapter revisits the major issues with reference in particular to the exterior of Exekias' Munich cup, in which a soldier in armour lies dead under one handle, a naked corpse under the other. G. asks whether the scenes need a story or whether they describe what can occur in the world. (That the interior of the same cup shows a scene with a close relationship to the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysos*, or that the cup is by an artist whose other works explore related themes are aspects in which G., who throughout suppresses painters' identities, shows no interest). G.'s final summary of the argument in the book brings out the ways in which the various gambits which Greek artists employ respond to basic challenges laid down by the differences between pictures and texts. 'Illustration' is not where the relationship starts but is only a late and weak reaction after centuries in which pictorial artists had fruitfully quarried texts. So too this review is but a weak illustration of a text which, if hardly the final word on the topic, will surely be fruitfully quarried for years to come.