names of many of the best-known artists are in the lists, and quotations from their works can be identified. Duris of Samos was a pupil of Theophrastus; he wrote of artists rather than of art: thus to the Peripatetics are to be traced many of the anecdotes preserved about early masters. Xenocrates was his contemporary: after these comes a gap—the same observed by Pliny in the history of art, after 300 B.C. Then came the Pergamene tradition, represented by Antigonus. To him and to Polemon are to be traced the inconsistent accounts often found in Pliny, Pausanias, and others.

Note I. on Cic. de Juvent. II. i. 1. a reference is detected to a Greek epigram on Zeuxis at Croton.

Note II. Hephaestus is to be struck out of the list of the works of Euphranor, who has been confused with Alcamenes.—E. A. G.


In this catalogue Mr. Robinson's aim is to combine "both a guide for general visitors and a useful handbook for students." These purposes are to a certain extent contradictory, and those who have tried can understand the difficulty of combining them: our concern is with the second purpose only. The account of the 252 Greek works, and 64 Roman, of which casts are exhibited in the Boston Museum, shows wide and accurate reading, independence of view, and a careful loving study of the works themselves for their own sake. Thorough acquaintance with the best that has been done in Germany is a special feature in this book. One may consult it with almost the certainty of finding the most important German ideas alluded to. Few references are permitted by the plan of the book, but several times in every page one observes in the turn of a phrase, or in words φωνῆαστα συνετῶσιν, proof that the writer had in his mind some recondite treatise on the subject in hand. But while the German training of the writer is obvious everywhere, he has not become a German: he retains his own standpoint, and a distinct individuality characterises almost every description of the more important works.

The descriptions, while by no means complete in detail (a complete description would require ten times the space), are well selected, and touch the points which are least obvious, e.g. no. 90 finds room to notice the mark of a spur on one foot and to add
the note that this is characteristic of the Amazon: the spectator, seeing that the right foot is a restoration, could not gather this for himself. The style of the descriptions is removed both from sculptor’s technicalities and from aesthetic twaddle. The brief summaries of characteristics in certain works are often admirable, and sometimes perfect in feeling and tone: take some of the tritest cases, the contrast between the Laocoon and the Dying Gaul, the concluding sentences on the Parthenon Frieze, and the three lines summing up the Hermes of Praxiteles. I quote the latter, chiefly because I have found myself always unable to agree with the last point in it: ‘the soft elastic texture of the skin, the infinite modulations of the surface, the exquisite outline of the figure from every point of view, and the extreme sensitiveness of the face’; but it would not be easy to analyze better in so few words the qualities of the surface.

In 16 we might have expected some slight indication of a difference in style between the two Aeginetan pediments, and I should have liked an acknowledgment of the skill shown in some details, e.g. the ears. That ‘Greek artists regarded the body not the face as the chief vehicle of expression’ is true, but the two lines which follow press it too hard.

In choosing a set of casts individual tastes are sure to differ. I should have thought that more specimens of the Olympian metopes might judiciously have been added: Mr. Robinson’s remarks too about them seem to me to miss the poetry which place some of them, in spite of their technical defects, among the most charming works of Greek art.

I observe the misprint ‘Melan’ on p. 23, and occasional inaccuracies of expression, where the words do not convey exactly the sense which the writer intended, e.g. no. 73 ‘found on its original site.’—W. M. R.


This little book is one of the Petite Bibliothèque d’Art et d’Archéologie, and contains two essays. The first, and shorter, is a suggestion somewhat sketchily worked out, of new names for two of the so-called “Fates” in the east pediment of the Parthenon.

M. Ronchaud starts from Pausanias x. 29, where describing the paintings of Polygnotus in the Lesché at Delphi he says: ἐκτίν ἄνακεκλιμένη Χλώρις ἐπὶ τοῖς Θνίας γόνασιν, a description which obviously applies to two of the figures. Pausanias does not give us