The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

**Lermann's *Altgriechische Plastik* *Altgriethische Plastik*.
Dr. Von Wilhelm Lermann. München: C. H. Beck'sche
Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907. 4to. Pp. xiii + 231. Eighty
cuts in text, twenty coloured plates. Cloth, 25 m.**

P. Gardner

The Classical Review / Volume 21 / Issue 08 / December 1907, pp 235 - 237

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00180357, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00180357

How to cite this article:

P. Gardner (1907). The Classical Review, 21, pp 235-237 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00180357

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ARISTOPHANES, *FROGS* 1028.

As the Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society appeal only to a limited constituency, I venture to call attention to a restoration of the line Ar. *Frogs* 1028 which I published in the Proceedings for the Lent Term 1893, p. 5. Hitherto, so far as I am aware, it has been unnoticed, but I still believe

in it. Read instead of ἡνίκ' ἤκουσα περὶ Δαρείου τεθνεώτος, which is neither metre nor sense, ἡνίκ' ἐκόκυσαν περὶ Δ. τ. This describes the great sensational scene of the *Persae*, the invocation at Darius' tomb, and the appearance of his ghost. (vv. 658 foll.)

E. SEYMER THOMPSON.

REVIEWS

LERMANN'S *ALTGRIECHISCHE PLASTIK*.

Altgriechische Plastik. Von Dr. WILHELM LERMANN. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1907. 4to. Pp. xiii + 231. Eighty cuts in text, twenty coloured plates. Cloth, 25 m.

DR. LERMANN'S book is not a general or systematic account of early Greek sculpture but a series of chapters on particular parts or aspects of it.

It is more largely concerned with Athenian art than that of other schools. The question of the colouring of sculpture particularly interests him, and to this branch of the subject he devotes the whole of the twenty plates of his work, reproducing in them the patterns painted on the dresses of the Corae of Athens in the original size and colouring. The text however, and the cuts in it, deal with many sides of archaic art:—poros sculpture, the naked male figure, the draped female figure, the archaic smile, the treatment of hair, male and female figures in transitional art, works in relief, and the composition of pediments.

Dr. Lermann seldom discusses the meaning of statues or figures in relief; he gives few references to works of other archaeologists. His discussions bear upon art questions, lines

of development, points of style, and the like. In some places, especially in the chapter on the naked male form,¹ he founds himself largely upon Lange, whose genial and penetrating work has had much influence on writers on early Greek art. Very often however Dr. Lermann takes a line of his own, and much that he has to say is interesting, though discussions upon style without much regard to subject are apt to be unsatisfying.

The only way to give the reader a notion of this construction is to bring before him a few of the members or mouldings of it, which may be done pretty much at random, as the book is full of stylistic judgments, some better, some worse. We will begin at p. 142, where we find a discussion of the youth by Stephanos in the Albani Gallery. The original of this Dr. Lermann gives to the time immediately after the Persian wars. In 'the rounded forms and slight proportions we discern the work of an Attic artist,' yet he observes that it follows in type the canon of the Argive school of Hageladas. On the other hand the bronze Apollo of Herculaneum (usually classed with the last)¹ is declared to betray Peloponnesian work in the 'hard flat

¹ Here; and below I put my own remarks in brackets.

almost angular treatment of the body.' The similar Apollo of the Terme in Rome is of pure Attic character 'The nobility of its forms and the fine repose of the attitude, closely coinciding with the well-known krater of Orvieto, enable us to discern in it the work of an artist of the circle of Polygnotus; while it shows in the locks on the neck the form of the skull and the wonderful charm of expression some likeness to the Zeus of Olympia' (about the style of which, by the way, we know almost nothing).

On p. 150 begins a discussion of the bronze charioteer from Delphi, which Dr. Lermann values so highly as to place it in artistic value far above the Hermes of Praxiteles. After an elaborate analysis he comes to the conclusion that 'alike in general type and in certain peculiarities in the work of details it is about midway between the style of the Attic and that of the Argive school.' The well-known portrait of Pericles is regarded as so similar to the head of the charioteer that it is probably by a pupil of the man who made the bronze statue. Trying more precisely to determine the author of the charioteer, Dr. Lermann suggests Onatas as a member of 'the school, unfortunately at present lost to knowledge, of Aegina.' (To me *verschollen* seems a most extraordinary word to apply to the school of Aegina, which is surely better known to us than almost any archaic school.) It occurs however to Dr. Lermann that the style of the charioteer does not agree with that of the well-known Aeginetan pediments; but he bids us 'remember, how in this time full of swift change and rapid transitions in Athens contrasts meet.'

I will not proceed, for it is not entirely fair to compress Dr. Lermann's judgments thus: one loses the reasons and the links. And there is undoubtedly in the book, as I have already observed, a good deal of interesting observation and suggestion. I wished however to bring out clearly the dangers of a fashion of criticism which prevails far too widely in Greek archaeology. Brunn began by concentrating our observation on points of style in sculpture, and by his method he made many remarkable discoveries, such as the Eirene and Plutus

of Cephissodotus and the works of the Pergamene school, which certainly proved it to have efficacy. Professor Furtwängler's *Masterpieces* carried the method further; and in reviewing that extremely able work I pointed out to what dangerous ground such arguments led. In the result those fears have been justified.

After Furtwängler came Klein and Sauer and many other able archaeologists; until we have reached a stage when many writers of standing consider themselves in a position to assign works represented to us only by Roman copies not only to a particular school, but often to a particular artist, of whom we know little more than the name. The facts are in danger of being drowned in an ocean of theory and conjecture. Of course criticism of style has its uses and is necessary, but unless it is dominated by strong good sense, and determination to exaggerate nothing and overlook nothing, it may become an *ignis fatuus*.

We must make our way back to the land. For a really scientific history of Greek art we have in abundance data, the solidity of which cannot be denied. We have inscriptions, and coins, and dated buildings and monuments in abundance. We must more rigidly discern between facts which will bear a superstructure and theories which will not. We must build our views more exclusively on dated originals.

Dr. Lermann however, and that is a saving virtue in him, does deal mainly with originals. But even so, unless a certain breadth and sobriety of judgment is used, and subtle refinements are avoided, art criticism is dangerous. Dr. Lermann, for example, writes of the Athena of the West Pediment of Aegina that it is 'a figure of insipid and mechanical fabric, which certainly comes from an inconsiderable sculptor, or even from a workman.' In my opinion this is a great injustice to a charming and most delicately finished statue. But setting mere aesthetic judgment aside, is it at all probable that if the Athena had been made by a workman who was no artist, it would have been placed where it stood?

Nothing could better show the superiority of documents to art-judgments than the way

n which the Grenfell papyrus, containing lists of Olympic victors, has settled the dates of the activities of Myron and Polycleitus, and shown the erroneousness of recent theories on the subject, which have been based on intrustworthy data.

It is exceedingly difficult to follow much of the criticism of Dr. Lermann without reference to the originals, or at least to casts. He gives small engravings of some of the most important figures; but of course not of all. And such vague references as 'No. 56 des ath. nat. Mus.' and 'zwei in Cherchel aufgefundene weitere Repliken des Werkes' are trying to a man whose time is limited.

The task which Dr. Lermann has attempted in his plates of preserving for posterity the rapidly vanishing colouring of the archaic ladies of Athens is one of considerable importance; and for the attempt he cer-

tainly deserves our gratitude. His colours are somewhat harsh; how far they are faithful it would only be possible to judge in the Museum of the Acropolis. I have compared the plates with Pls. 18 and 39 of the *Antike Denkmäler* of the German Institute, and with the coloured cast published by Miss Ingrid Kjaer, who is now Dr. Lermann's wife; and found many differences, the colours blue and green in particular being frequently transposed. Dr. Lermann claims greater accuracy than his predecessors; and no doubt his plates embody the latest and most detailed examination.

It is in these plates, and in the very detailed examination of figures in the Athenian museums, that the value of Dr. Lermann's work mainly consists, rather than in his attempts to assign works to particular schools.

P. GARDNER.

THE DISCOVERIES IN CRETE.

The Discoveries in Crete and their bearing on the history of Ancient Civilization. By Prof. R. M. BURROWS. London: Murray. Pp. 244. 5s.

CAREFUL consideration of Prof. Burrows's book is calculated to deepen our impression of its value, not so much to the general reader (who would demand more illustrations) as to the general archaeologist. Prof. Burrows's book is an up-to-date critical discussion of the main problems of 'Mycenaeology' or 'Minöology' as they stand today, now that the lull in Cretan excavation enables us to look about us and see where we are. That such a commentary is of use to all archaeologists outside the circle of those actually engaged in these excavations (and even to them also as shewing them how their arguments present themselves to the minds of others) is indubitable. And the absence of illustrations will not be felt by archaeologists, who will know where to look for them.

Prof. Burrows plunges into the middle of things in his first chapter, which is occasion-

ally somewhat dithyrambic in tone. But with the third chapter our author becomes less picturesque, and settles down into a steady gait, broken only by occasional Wegg-like droppings into poetry in the course of his 'declining and falling off' the Minoan Empire (*e.g.* pp. 144, 206). These jerky little quotations from the poets, apt though they may be, are unrestful in effect.

The general position taken up by Prof. Burrows in regard to the Cretan discoveries is one of agreement with Dr. Evans's dating and arrangement, as confirmed from the Egyptian side, and therefore of disagreement with the novel and revolutionary proposals of Dr. Dörpfeld, which apparently do not take the Egyptian evidence into much consideration. It is probable that in Germany the orientalists do not come into such close contact with the Greek archaeologists as they do here, where constant interchange of opinion and consultation between the 'Mycenaeologues' and the Egyptologists has become the order of the day, and the archaeology of both Egypt and early Greece