

in a similar way. Nor will many archaeologists feel at ease with the form of imaginative historical narrative which recounts that the Neolithic peoples of Thessaly were expelled, exterminated or absorbed by new peoples from Anatolia. It makes good reading, the reviewer is not competent to state whether or not it is good history, but it is not now good archaeology.

Professor Hammond's scholarly book is of great value to historians and pre-historians alike in its careful compilation of data and in its logical interpretations. But with his knowledge and his experience a rare opportunity has been missed, to consider the substance of the human record in Macedonia rather than the froth of the multitudinous variables of pre-history and history.

E. S. HIGGS

Bernard Ashmole, *Architect and Sculptor in Classical Greece*, Phaidon, London 1972, pp. 218 + Figs. 220.

In this volume Professor Bernard Ashmole has brought together six lectures «on the major Greek monuments of the fifth and fourth centuries B.C.», given at the New York Institute of Fine Arts upon the invitation of Mr & Mrs Charles Wrightsman.

As he himself observes at the beginning of his first lecture (which has become the first chapter of his book), it seems at first «impossible to say anything new on subjects which have already been so much and often so admirably discussed». Nevertheless he has at his disposal a long and intimate acquaintance with Greek plastic arts; the questions he asks are straightforward but soundly chosen —the fruit, I believe, of British Empiricism invigorated by the sap of logical positivism, a recent grafting on an ever-productive tree; in his lectures (and in the corresponding chapters of the book) he has combined these factors with sensitivity to achieve an admirably lucid account of the most relevant problems posed by the sculptures of three monuments, each of which marks a new stage in fifth- and fourth-century BC architecture.

The first three chapters have the general title, «The Temple of Zeus at Olympia»; of these, the first bears the subtitle, «The Project and its Fulfilment». In this first chapter the author poses a few simple questions that, very often, occur to all of us but which we do not regard as sufficiently important to warrant a fully worked out answer. Why, for example, did the Elians decide to build a temple to Zeus? (p. 2) Exactly what was it that they wanted to construct? From what materials would the temple be built? How much would it cost? Where would they find the money? Who would be the architect and how would he organize the job? What work-schedule would be followed? (He) proceeds along these lines to an account of these practical matters, a knowledge of which is pre-supposed as the secure basis of a correct evaluation of the work.

He discusses, for example, the problems of the cost of the stone and its transport, matters known only to the experts who, however, often forget to *discuss* them when discussing and confronting the work of art. In this way he reaches the conclusion that the artist who carved the sculptures must have worked for a lengthy period on Paros, where the marble blocks were quarried and given their first rough dressing. He concludes further on with a highly significant verdict: «I should guess that there was not a single man in the western Peloponnese who could carve a life-size statue in marble» (p. 20). Here he rejects the theory that attributed the pediment sculptures and the metopes to a local workshop as a means of getting around the difficulties provoked by their stylistic individuality. Many historians of

ancient Greek art will concur with his view, I think, even if they continue to disagree about attributing the sculptures to this or that particular workshop.

Although the idea that all the sculptures (pediment and metope) are related to Zeus and his offspring is basically correct, it is not an adequate explanation for the Battle of the Centaurs on the western pediment, where the mere presence of Apollo leaves little room for any substantial link with Zeus. It seems often that the relationships envisaged by the ancients, wherever they might have done so, escape us altogether when they are not as obvious as, for example, in the sculptures of the Parthenon. The chapter closes with some excellent observations concerning the colour of the sculptures and the impression that they would have made upon the person viewing them—and not so much a «sophisticated Athenian» as a «peasant from deepest Arcadia»: for these sculptures were not simply works of art, and *even* «that unhappy term work of art' with all its gruesome implications had not yet been invented».

The second chapter, subtitled «The Pediments: a Revolutionary Phase in Sculpture», contains an examination of the pedimental sculpture, which the author regards as revolutionary when compared with the architectural sculpture that preceded it. He believes that what the sculptor sought — and achieved — for the first time was to express in plastic form 1) the contrast between different ages, childhood, youth, maturity and old age; 2) the contrast between the substance and texture of the drapery with the nude, to set off the body; 3) the effects produced on the human body by movement; 4) the sense of the third dimension, and 5) the faces. To illustrate this he chooses certain characteristic figures from the eastern pediment: the child, the river-gods Cladeus and Alphaeus, the seer of Oenomaus and the horses of Oenomaus. The western pediment he examines almost in its entirety.

He advances towards his object describing the figures and their plastic details with sharp precision and discernment matched with restraint, his unaffected style recalling the unique descriptions of Beazley. Like his unforgettable friend, Professor Ashmole manages in his descriptions alone to bring out clearly all the values of a work, to indicate stylistic and chronological differences without resorting to tedious calculations. An admirable stroke in this section is the photograph of the resting swimmer (No. 31): she has exactly the same stance as that of the child on the eastern pediment.

Unexpected, but not implausible, is the view he expresses on pages 46-47, that the «Apollo Belvedere is a rationalization of the gesture of the Apollo of the West pediment». Professor Ashmole's judgement that «this was a genuinely experimental phase of sculpture... which might have led to something even more great and powerful» is undoubtedly correct and undeniably useful to students of ancient Greek art; but it is followed up with the observation that this might have happened «had not the concentration of Greek talent taken place so shortly afterwards at Athens in the building-schemes of Pericles, and produced through the overwhelming influence of Pheidias and his circle...a kind of classic conformity which has effected art ever since». This judgement sounds strange when uttered by Professor Ashmole, however much it might conform to contemporary criteria and taste and even though he excepts Pheidias himself from the condemnation and restricts it to «his followers». Personal taste is always unaccountable, to a greater or less extent, but the formulations of historians ought to be based on more objective grounds.

The author's stance becomes more understandable when the reader reaches page 59; with reference to the achievements attained in the sculptures at Olympia, he asks, «Were they not attempted before?» His reply is that they were «the result of a happy conjunction between genius and opportunity». Such an answer is insufficient, however, unless we understand by the term «opportunity» the entire complex of socio-historic conditions within which the artist lives; and these conditions were capable of leading only to the language of classical

art. From an historical point of view, this constituted a genuine revolution: it broke its bonds with the past and made advances in new directions. That classical art found its most complete expression in Athens is due neither to chance nor to Pericles' building-schemes and nothing more. Quite simply, the Greek city-state and the Greek spirit found their fulfilment in an Athens that had been capable of capitalizing upon her victory over the Persians to create the first Athenian hegemony-alliance. All her works of art are a consequence of this historical fact.

In the third chapter («The Metopes: New Aspects of Old Legends») he selects for examination three metopes from the Eastern face (The Augean Stables, Cerberus, and the Apples of the Hesperides), and three from the western (the Nemean Lion, the Stymphalian Birds, and the Cretan Bull). He opens his account with the assertion that «the series is conceived as a whole...and (that) the style is homogeneous, although certain differences can be detected which might well arise from two different mastersculptors having been at work». This view which finds reinforcement in the metopes themselves, effectively blocks those destructive but frequently-expounded theories that put many examples of architectural sculpture in danger of being regarded as conglomerations lumped together by a number of ill-matched artisans. His further opinion, that he might «call them more Cycladic, and should suppose that a closely-knit team of island sculptors worked upon them» is, as he himself characterizes it, «a guess», but one that is very much closer to the truth than so many other theories that have been advanced.

The fine perceptivity and discernment observed throughout the preceding chapter is equally manifest in his examination of the metopes. Indeed, it is his discernment and sound judgement that enables him to signal the stark and scarcely anticipated originality of the composition. Compared with the long pictorial tradition of the myth, the sculptor's representation of the exhausted Heracles with one foot upon the slain lion is a radical innovation. Just as ingenious —and felicitous— is the solution found in the scene with the Stymphalian Birds. The spirit of the eastern pediment, which captures the moment just before the event and not the event itself, inspires these two metopes where the hero is portrayed immediately after the performance of his feat. There is a very real temptation to compare the figure of Athena in the Stymphalian Birds scene with the Lemnia of Pheidias and with the Athena in Myron's group «Athena and Marseus», a comparison that could be considered persuasive were we to take it for a fact that Pheidias came to know the Olympian metope so soon and was delighted by the maidenly figure of the goddess; or perhaps there lies something else behind all three, a painting for example, that followed a new poetic interpretation of the goddess and portrayed her much more youthful and maidenly than we know her to have been up until then.

His subsequent analysis throws into relief the dynamic composition of the Cretan Bull metope and the skilful disposition of the figures in the metope of the Apples of the Hesperides. In dealing with the metope of the Augean Stables he reiterates the interpretation he proposed a few years ago, showing with keen perceptivity that Heracles holds not a pitchfork, as we have curiously accepted until now, but a crowbar for making a hole through which the river will run to clear away the dung. The chapter ends with two characteristic judgements: «One cannot want better sculpture than this» and «you can understand the claim of this moment, just before the Parthenon, to be the greatest in the history of Greek sculpture». Although alternative views are of course tenable, we cannot dispute the fact that Ashmole's opinion is based upon solid foundations.

Of the following two chapters, which are devoted to the Parthenon sculptures, the first (Ch. 4) has the sub-title, «The Metopes and Pediments: Problems Practical and Artistic». From the very outset the author notes that he will examine a number of different (but for

the most part practical) problems related to the construction, avoiding «a straightforward discussion of the style and subjects of all the surviving sculptures», because «this has been done so well several times already». Accordingly, he speaks to those attending his classes — and to the readers of his book — of the earlier Parthenon, the work-schedule and the order of execution of the sculptures (metopes, frieze, pediments, cult statue); after expressing the view that the foundations found south of the Parthenon belong to the workshop in which Pheidias constructed the chryselephantine statue, he proceeds to examine first the metopes and then the pediment sculptures.

It is his opinion that the decision to fill all the metopes and pediments was not such a particularly good idea, but he does not deny that this decision brought about the creation of «some of the greatest sculpture the world possesses». The space at his disposal for so many sculptures of such importance is quite limited, and for that reason he is restricted to very general and basic observations; he takes particular note of the qualitative differences between many of the metopes and the stylistic variation amongst the various figures of the pediments. For a general but brief and synoptic verdict he resorts like everyone else to the unique statement of Plutarch, who was able to express in a few, admirably succinct lines the essence of the artistic and spiritual values of the Parthenon sculptures.

The subject of the following chapter (The Frieze: Questions still Unanswered) is the Frieze. There is a discussion of the time needed and the procedure followed for its construction, and a synoptic survey of the theme and the figures; from these, and with the aid of illustrations, the hearer (and the reader) is able to form a total image of the grandest sculptural composition that Greek antiquity has left us. It would be superfluous to protract our report by going through all the points he makes, especially when they concern things that have been the subject of so much discussion and which do not present unsurmountable interpretative difficulties.

The eastern face, and in particular the central panel where the figures are located between the seated gods, is where the basic problem of interpretation lies. Professor Ashmole sets forth the received interpretation, and then gives an account of the recent theory of Miss Kardaras which, without conceding unreserved acceptance, he considers to be quite plausible and in any case well worth discussing. Miss Kardara explains the small boy as Erichthonius-Erechtheus, the man who takes the peplos as Kecrops, the woman as the goddess Earth and the two young girls with the chairs as daughters of Kecrops. Certainly, this interpretation can only be adopted if one also accepts the view that the entire frieze represents not an actual Panathenaic procession but the mythical original of the ceremony. I would object, however, that this discards the essential content of the Parthenon frieze which, in the most splendid possible manner, expresses in plastic form the elevation of the Athenian democracy to mythical status, just as Pericles' funeral oration expresses it within the historical framework of Thucydides' composition, and as the hymn of Sophocles to Athens sings it in poetry. If we fail to understand the deeply significant changes that had taken place in the spiritual stance of the men who made up the intellectual and artistic inner circle of Pericles, then the sculptures of the Parthenon (and not only these) will seem to amount to a useless and ultimately feeble philological survival of ancient myths that had ceased to have any active function.

With regard to Mr Ross Holloway's view, I can only agree with the author's comment that «I do not find this concept an easy one to digest». These attempts at interpretation fail to recognize the basic functions of an artistic work, and in his polite but firm and, I should say, tough-minded rejection of them Professor Ashmole lays them side by side with the criticism of a certain naval historian who detected four anachronisms in Turner's famous paint-

ing, The Battle of Trafalgar, as if the painter was supposed to have been a photo-reporter or a chronicler. One could add the words of Theotokopoulos (El Greco) on the re-location of the hospital of Don Juan Tavera in his famous «Toledo», which Seferis deemed worth appending to his «Sterna», to remind those who forget it that art «recreates the nature of things, it never copies anything».

The book closes with the sixth chapter, characteristically entitled, «The Tomb of Mausolus. Designers and Carvers». To say that it is the best chapter of all would be to forget unjustly the many substantial points made with such erudite precision in those that precede it. As I read it through, however, I am reminded of Beazley's words, «Nobody knows Greek fourth-century plastic art better than Ashmole». Learning, method, keen vision and fine judgment show up in the previous chapters, but this one is further inspired by a more personal warmth generated from immediacy of contact and the author's recent research, which has already brought us the discovery of yet another significant piece to complete the extreme right of panel 1015 (the one after 1014 with the famous semi-naked Amazon, comparable to the Maenad of Scopas). In a few pages Ashmole achieves a synoptic description of the Mausoleum and of its architectural problems (reconstructions etc.), together with a general outline of the problems posed by its sculpture and other remains. He notes characteristic sections of the frieze and discusses both the interpretative and stylistic problems that they present whilst at the same time managing to avoid getting caught up in the very difficult matter of attributing specific panels to the four known sculptors. His deep knowledge of the subject clearly makes him more cautious than other historians of art. Nevertheless, the distinction he makes between different figures allows the initiated reader to comprehend the trend of his thought, which every now and then becomes more revealing (e.g. p. 177, his remarks about the figure on plate 203). His brief exposition heightens the eagerness with which we look forward to his study of this basic fourth-century monument.

Bernard Asmole's book is yet another important contribution from this erudite historian of Greek sculpture above all to young people desirous of devoting themselves to research in classical art. It represents the best, most mature statement of the generation that could comprehend and analyse the plastic values of form and its language, affirming at the same time however that the terms of this attempt are now nearly spent and that reiteration of what the great teachers of the previous generation have taught us — Beazley and Buschor, for example, or Romaios and Karouzos for Greeks, — no longer has any meaning and cannot advance the understanding of classical art any further. New wine needs new skins.

MAN. ANDRONICOS

J. Mordaunt Crook, *The Greek revival, Neoclassical Attitudes in British Architecture 1760-1870*, London, W. J. Mackay Limited, Chatham 1972, pp. 204 + 250 plates.

It is always interesting to study problems concerning Neo-Classical Architecture and a happy chance that although with a two years delay from its first edition, we shall try to present here J. Mordaunt Crook's book: *The Greek revival*. The text divided into two parts, gives in the first one a general idea of the social rather background of the classicistic era in England and a detailed analysis of the work of the English travellers in the 18th and the early 19th century, among which with great admiration one can distinguish Lady Mary Montagu.

The author, having given with a romantic mood and discretion Elgin's matter, all the