Diskussion bedürfen. Den Herausgebern kommt das große Verdienst zu, sowohl Grundlage als auch Anstoß zu dieser Diskussion geliefert zu haben.

post-war period, and to compare this with the availability of such material on the antiquities market. In addition, those museums’ acquisitions and display criteria are examined, a short history of vase-collecting forms a preface, and there are appendices on source material, especially interviews with relevant museum curators. While the thesis has been revised, references to «this century» throughout were not; cf «could be opened in 1999» re galleries in the Metropolitan Museum (162).

The choice of museums is restricted but tolerably representative, British Museum, Copenhagen National Museum and Ny Carlsburg, Basel, Metropolitan, Ashmolean, Kiel, Duke University. Despite the shortness of the list N. at times explains that she has not had the opportunity to study the relevant material in toto.

Objectivity of approach is generally maintained, and this is a wise decision. One value judgment to escape the net is p. 260 «there is a clear improvement in the situation in the last ten years» – re the decrease in number of ‘fresh’ vases on the market. Perhaps also some judgment is made in what would appear to be a rather naive remark on p. 315, where it is noted, re the work of Gill and Chippendale, that the ‘ideal’ of objects coming on to the market with a proper provenance is unlikely to be reached; but does/did anybody actually believe in that possible outcome? It is in the Appendix with edited interviews with curators that some of the tensions and ethical choices are more apparent, and they are an essential part of the volume, as well as being entertaining in themselves, with their glimpses of odium academicum.

Naturally it is not easy to present a factual account of material passing through the market. N. does her best to isolate vases shuttling their way from Basel to London to New York and back, and comments on the increasing frequency of such commuting. But she also notes, perhaps not strongly enough, that the ‘unseen market’ must also be taken into account – pieces going straight from the clandestine front-men to an individual or corporate buyer. In this context her remark that «little attention has been paid to Italian collectors (who must, of course, exist)» seems either naive, as a glance at any Trendall index would demonstrate, or politically motivated. Lack of access to Ede catalogues (254) is difficult to accept (and it was Charles, not James, Ede with whom Trendall was wont to stay in London – 266).

The chapter on the history of collections is largely blameless and secondary. 28, the lack of Greek vases as ‘heirlooms’ at Pompeii could have been set against the presence of metal equivalents. 46, I have always found the stress put on the ‘ghost’ of d’Hancarville echoing down the years inconvinving, but it is a subjective matter. 48, N. did not see Tischbein V in the British Museum Department. 78, n. 174 wrong date for J. M. Cook’s pioneering Protoattic article, and on p. 79, it is technically wrong to say, though often said, that Payne was Beazley’s student (similarly von Bothmer, 149); it was the case that in modern parlance he had none, but in Oxford of the time that was not unusual. 102, «Koroibos mount of Olympia» is not a suitable rendering of Koroiboshügel (and the volume number, I, is omitted), while the mathematics of the partage of the Pergamon finds outlined on 103 defy logic. The chapter ends with a balanced, if brief account of the problems of looting and non-publication; it is ironic, at least, that the vases bought by the National Museum in Athens from the Hirschmann collection, the subject of two lavish volumes, as N. says, were labelled «unpublished, no photographs» when put on display. A few words on the
role of the media as a major promoter of the «treasure-mentality» might have been usefully added, as well as a little more on tax-breaks in the USA.

The core chapter on case studies of individual museums, where I concentrate my remarks on the British Museum, requires careful scrutiny, and not just simple reading of the attractive box graphs; information on what is or is not included in them is often hiding somewhat in the text (e.g. 244, Duke University’s «large collection of fragments», full stop). The Colossus sherds were not mentioned by Brian Cook (Keeper, not «Chief Curator») in his reports of new acquisitions (125), but they were excavated long before the Museum officially acquired them in 1981. N. might have pondered how the inclusion of such fragmentary material in the charts would have affected the overall conclusions. There is no mention in the main text, just in the Appendix, that many objects that had long been in the BM were only catalogued post-war, nor that some objects were given back-dated accession numbers (e.g. BSA 73, 1978, 106–7). The role of the Trustees, explained by Williams and Burn in Appendix A (326) is also not accurately reflected in the main text. The book was completed a little too early for the effects of the opening of the Great Court to be taken into account, i.e. the long term closure of several ‘reserve’ rooms (annulling the difference with the Ashmolean, 219).

133, Edinburgh may have had a ‘Royal’ Museum, but it scarcely had its roots in any royal collection; far from it. 135, «Painter of B76», presumably ‘London’. 137, not «tomb 172 tonst court», at Vulci, but T172 in the Hercle excavations; N. has some other odd topographic remarks («vases from Dipylon, Athens» (205), and «fikellura» passion). 154, re the Euphronios krater, in the Appendix von Bothmer recognises that the Metropolitan made an error in selling coins in order to buy it, but it is puzzling that those involved had to change their version of the earlier history of the piece during the enquiries by the Observer, and that news of a piece which at one point was alleged to have long been in a hatbox in Beirut would not have reached Beazley. 176, a «recent» thermoluminescence date does not prove a piece a fake. Publication references to vases in Basel are thin; even a ‘still unpublished’ would have helped here and there; one such krater appeared in the Sotheby catalogue of December 1994 (lot 130) to which N. says she had no access; another was «exhibited in the exhibition….. Pandora [in 1996]», without any reference to the published catalogue, in which it does not seem to appear. The statement that the Antikenmuseum «was the result of co-operation between archaeologists, collectors and dealers» is another infuriatingly accurate generalisation (199). 208, the ARV reference (p. 9) to the lekythos in n. 282 would not have caused much of a problem, and on 218 it is not noted that the plan of the Ashmolean galleries is of the first floor.

The chapter ‘A look at the market’ is by definition surely incomplete, but a reasonable overview of what is known, consisting largely of an introduction to the cast and summaries of pots put on sale during the post-war period, in a reasonably representative series of catalogues.

The conclusions contain much that could be strongly debated, e.g. is the Ashmolean a more «archaeological» collection than the rest (300)? Has smuggling been stopped in Greece (306, n. 24)? Perhaps the change in the general approach of museums is not from «Temples of Learning» to «Temples of Leisure», but to «User-friendly heritage-imparting areas» (157). The Kerameikos Museum is perhaps not the best – or fullest – example of display of contextual materials (118) – surely Syracuse would have been a better choice? Rather late in the book (258), N. says she uses the word «provenance» in the art-dealing sense = «has been known to be in a collection earlier», rather than using a discrete word, or even symbol, for that dubious category, without any archaeological provenance. This enables the anodyne conclusion, immediately after such a use of ‘provenance’, that «the
price list [of the hundred most expensive pots] clearly showed that the more expensive vases virtually all came with documentation of former ownership. Also there is a confusing use of the word ‘register’, to mean both entering as a museum acquisition and, simply, ‘noting’.

The conclusion that individual curators are the key in explaining acquisition patterns, which have little direct correlation to market availability is acceptable, and perhaps not unsurprising – sponsors do not readily jump at guaranteeing an unknown auction price. Other conclusions reached are more tentative and sometimes near contradictions appear elsewhere in the volume, e.g. high interest in archaic and earlier material in the ’50s and ’60s is contrasted with strong emphasis on the influence of Beazley on acquisition policy, but balanced out as both being «major influences» on p. 299. The comparative dearth of South Italian material at that time seems underplayed. Fuzziness too in the remark on 124 that the BM is the earliest example of ‘multi-media’ display of material, while on 140 the National Museum in Copenhagen and on 158 the Metropolitan are stated to have used that form of exhibition earlier.

More generally, N does make clear the insistence in some museums of divorcing ‘Art’ from ‘information’ (which surely is of no help to a proper study or appreciation of the past), and this is certainly a worthwhile result of her endeavours. While she is honest in saying that she has not discovered the full facts about some aspects, one feels that in most cases it would not have taken much effort to fill the gaps, another sign of a thesis put to bed too early. And since much of the illustrative effort is put into pretty bar charts in colour, there is a danger that the incompleteness of some of them, noted in the text, will be overlooked when the results of the investigation are quoted elsewhere.

In sum, a useful volume, but one to be used carefully, and one that perhaps should have seen more revision before being published in such a format. London

Alan Johnston
