Greek Sculpture

ANOTHER beautiful book on Greek sculpture! Nothing is lacking on the publishers' part. To say nothing of the excellent paper and printing, the illustrations surpass anything that we have had in this line, both in quantity and quality. There are thirty-one full-page plates interspersed in the text, and at the end of the volume are forty more plates, containing one hundred and thirty illustrations in smaller form, only three of which are not from photographic reproductions.

The title of the book reveals that it is in no sense an ordinary handbook or history of Greek sculpture. It does not claim to do somewhat better what has been so often done and well done in English, French and German. It is rather a discussion of principles which underlie Greek sculpture. The first part, of 101 pages, about one-third of the book, is by no means easy reading, but is in some respects the most interesting and important part. A good example of the author's close reasoning may be seen on page 24. He has gone deeply into the philosophy of sculpture, and in particular of Greek sculpture. His judgments may sometimes be disputed, but no one can deny that he has profoundly thought.

The description of the technic of the Parthenon frieze, in which so many planes are produced in the total small depth, is clear and incisive. The distinction between the dreamy pathos of Praxiteles and the fiery energy of Skopas is well set forth. He calls the former's Hermes "Hermes the Dreamer" (p. 273) and rejects the idea that he is in any sense part of a group. The child Dionysos does not interest Hermes in the slightest. The restoration of him dangling a bunch of grapes before the child he thinks a profanation.

* GREEK SCULPTURE: ITS SPIRIT AND PRINCIPLES. *By Edmund von Mach.* Boston: Ginn & Co. 1903. $4.00.

Pergamon Altar (Reconstructed). From Von Mach's "Greek Sculpture." Ginn & Co., Publishers

The author exercises independent judgment, and does not overcrowd his book with references; he has, however, neglected none of the authorities and worshiped none. His explanation of some features on the ground of technical reasons seems sometimes more ingenious than plausible—*e.g.*, the contention (p. 113) that the hair of the "Apollo" of Tenea "hung down the neck long and loose" because it was not "possible that the thin column of the neck could hold up the heavy weight of the head." Did not the early Greeks *wear* the hair long? The broadening of certain copies of Polykleitos's Doryphoros head at the back is explained as "a labor-saving device of the Roman stone-cutter, who did not care to carve the ears standing out from the head. The skull is therefore broadened and the ears are not undercut" (p. 255). But does not the bronze bust at Naples show the same broadening of the head as the marbles?

The chapter entitled "The Human Body," in which is described the art of Polykleitos, whose limitations make him schematic and dull compared with Myron, so full of force, and especially with Lysippos, who is his beau ideal, may be singled out for especial praise.

Lysippos is extolled as follows: "This Apoxyomenos is, if one is permitted to stretch the term, the first real statue in the round." Earlier (p. 114), it is said: "The Strangford 'Apollo' is really the first statue in the round deserving the name, even in its most modest application."

The claims set up for Naxian, Chian, Samian, Parian and Dorian schools, which have caused much wrangling among the authorities, are disallowed.

The author is a master of felicitous phrases. In speaking of the advance in technic in the Acropolis figures, he says (p. 152): "The earlier sculptor conceived his task to be the carving of a human figure which happened to be draped, the later endeavored to show the drapery which happened to be worn by a woman." In speaking of Polykleitos (p. 251), he says "his Doryphoros was not to be a man, but the body of a man. To-day we are not much interested in a mere body—we want the man." Of the same sculptor, he says (p. 260): "He began with the 'head' and neglected the 'heart,' he paid more attention to things as they are than as they appear to be," which latter is, of course, the duty of the artist. His phrase, "Autumn Days," for the period after Lysippos, is felicitous, suggesting the glorious fruits, the Apollo Belvidere, the Venus of Milo, the Nike of Samothrace and the Pergamon sculptures.

One may, of course, challenge some of the positions of the book. The statement (p. 145): "Not even Roman copies of this period (viz., of the Acropolis maidens) are extant, for Roman taste did not appreciate the earliest attempts of the Greeks." But certain Romans are said to have had a sort of pre-Raphaelite liking for works of Bupalos and Athenis, which belong to the very period referred to.

The author couples (p. 151) two heads as closely related, Plate ix, Fig. 4, and Plate p. 144. These two heads were long ago so associated by Winter, but Lechat and others then pointed out that the relation between them was mere contrast. The former is in line with the long series of which she is the best in execution, and has the "archaic smile" toned down, but that she still belongs to the series is shown by the eyes, not set in deep sockets, but protruding, and hardly held in by the thin eyelids; while the latter has eyes set deep back in the skull and inclosed by thick fleshy eyelids. Her mouth shows a feature, unique among all the Acropolis maidens, of a distinct pout like that on the mouth of the yellow-haired youth in the room next to her, called *le frère de la petite boudeuse*. One statue stands deep in the old tradition, while the other is in open revolt from it.

In the description of the west gable of the Parthenon, the author appears to ignore Sauer's careful examination of the horizontal cornice, on which he found beddings for figures enough to include nearly all the Olympian gods. In his hope that the central figures of the east gable "may some day turn up again, perhaps in a museum, where they have passed unnoticed," the author probably stands alone.

A few errata may be noticed. "Agelaadas" is probably designedly used, instead of Agelaïdas, since its use is constant.

Page 238, second line from bottom, read *pediment* for "frieze." Page 217, first line, read Pl. x, Fig. 1, for Pl. x, Fig. 2. Page 347, third line from bottom second column, *Pl. xxix*, for "Pl. xix."

What is meant by the statement (p. 336) that Polykleitos is seen by the Oxyrhynchos papyrus "to have been active as a sculptor as early as the fifth decade before Christ, and perhaps even earlier," is difficult to see, for if we change "decade" to "century" we have the possibility of Polykleitos working in the sixth century, which can hardly be meant.

In the list of authorities the "given" names or their initials are usually added. Why Murray, Frazer and others should be excepted one does not readily see. The rule of greater notoriety will not hold, for Perry lacks the addition, while Brunn, Collignon, Furtwängler and Michaelis have it. F. Sellars should be E. Sellars.