

1976

Review of *Asymmetrie griechischer Köpfe vom 5. Jh. bis zum Hellenismus*, by Lambert A. Schneider

Brunilde S. Ridgway  
Bryn Mawr College, [bridgway@brynmawr.edu](mailto:bridgway@brynmawr.edu)

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs)

 Part of the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

---

#### Custom Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1976. Review of *Asymmetrie griechischer Köpfe vom 5. Jh. bis zum Hellenismus*, by Lambert A. Schneider. *American Journal of Archaeology* 80:93-94.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. [http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch\\_pubs/19](http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/19)

For more information, please contact [repository@brynmawr.edu](mailto:repository@brynmawr.edu).

has wisely followed in the steps of Ch. Graux and H. Diels-E. Schramm; his own suggestions are only three in number, all reasonable (p. 294, Philo, 82.4; p. 313, Philo, 94.47; p. 325, Philo, 103.5). The text and translation are of course primarily the occasion for detailed archaeological commentary. Because of his own concerns, this reviewer has been most interested in "Book V, Part A" (on fortifications), and has learned much from G.'s discussions. Perhaps the Asia Minor monuments might be more prominent; and while the reviewer acknowledges the linguistic difficulties in Diels-Schramm's and his own interpretations of Philo's "double trace," G.'s suggestion seems both vague (what exactly is "a parapet of double thickness"? double what?) and without any parallel among the monuments. Yet here again criticisms are minor, and perhaps as often as not unfounded. The simple fact is that G.'s volume is a superb piece of scholarship, which will be indispensable to all who deal with the military history of the classical and early Hellenistic periods.

F.E. WINTER

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO

ASYMMETRIE GRIECHISCHER KÖPFE VOM 5. JH. BIS ZUM HELLENISMUS, by *Lambert A. Schneider*. Pp. 170, pls. 16. Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden, 1973. DM 76.

Detailed measurements, statistics and elaborate charts of symbols in art books make difficult reading for non-mathematical minds, and much of this study on Greek heads is well over my very own. But Schneider has a real contribution to make, and his discussion of selected pieces is enough to convince me without recourse to his complex tables. He takes nine well known originals of the fifth century B.C. and shows that their heads are built asymmetrically in such a systematic way as to suggest definite guiding principles for their distortion. He demonstrates conclusively that the wider or narrower half of each face does not always coincide with the spectator's viewpoint, but rather with the direction of the head movement and the position of the total figure. Finally, he notes that the displacement of individual traits takes place along a convex line curving away from both the horizontal and the vertical axis of each head, so that not only the facial but also various cranial features, specifically the hair, reflect this deviation. Single features deviate abruptly, step-wise, so that the curve described is not continuous, but the total effect is that each head has been divided into two halves of unequal width by means of a curving line.

Such asymmetry prevails whether the head belongs to a free standing or a pedimental statue, or to a high relief (when both sides of a face are rendered). Yet the rule applies only to heads which turn or tilt with respect to their torso. Though asymmetries exist in straight and level heads, no specific pattern can be distinguished behind their occurrence. Nor does the

amount of distortion in a head depend on the degree of its movement, since even strongly turned faces may display minimal asymmetry. Though conclusions are based on exact measurements, meaningful distortions should also be apparent to the naked eye, and minor discrepancies cannot be considered intentional. The formula: the features of a fifth century head in motion (either turned or tilted) are displaced roughly along a curve whose ends point in the same direction as the movement (therefore toward the rear of the body) while its greatest projection is directed away from it (i.e. toward the chest). Thus a head turned to proper left shows chin and hairpart displaced to the left of its central axis, while its nose tilts outwards (to proper right); the proper left half of such a face is narrower than the proper right, and its right eye lies higher than its left.

In historical context this guiding principle finds its first application in the early fifth century B.C. (Athenian Treasury metopes, Aegina pediments). Sixth century heads, though often asymmetrical, cannot be reduced to a system. In the Severe period patterns can still fluctuate, but greater conformity sets in with the 450's and then becomes virtually a rule, regardless of geographical origin. The fourth century at first continues the same tradition but later introduces new patterns of distortion: the continuous curve and the parallelogram. Yet an increasing number of heads show no significant asymmetry despite their position. In the Hellenistic period all previous patterns can be found but the continuous curve predominates. Broken curvature is used on heads which echo classical sculpture (e.g. Pergamon Altar). However, the overall trend is toward increasing regularity of features, despite the new general interest in portraiture and characterization. Whenever asymmetries occur, their relationship to the head position is no longer so strict and a new system begins, based on the spectator's viewpoint. New forms of distortion are created through the plasticity of the facial surface and the hair movement, and are therefore no longer measurable in exact terms. Regional differences may distinguish Rhodio/Koan workshops from those of Pergamon and of Damophon of Messene. In overall view, the average of distortion is much greater in the fifth than in all following centuries and tends to diminish within the Hellenistic period itself.

This is the factual part of the book, amply supported by a catalogue of 319 heads (pp. 89-147), whose asymmetry is analyzed in the various charts. The theoretical discussion is confined to ch. 7, where previous explanations for sculptural distortion are debated and a new solution is suggested. Noting the chronological correspondence between the introduction of ponderation and that of facial asymmetry, Schneider assumes that movement within the head serves the same general purpose as within the body, not as depiction of actual motion but as expression of general liveliness. I agree with him that optical corrections and depiction of physiognomic distortion as it occurs in living creatures are theories made untenable by his findings, but I am not sure that his own answer is more convincing.

Some objections may be raised. How can Schneider determine chronological trends when several of the heads considered are, as he points out, only imperfectly dated? Or when the range of evidence is limited? Within the fourth century chart, 23 heads belong to single statues (ranging from the Demeter of Knidos to a panther in Munich!); but of the remaining 89 entries, 20 are taken from the Alexander Sarcophagus and 15 from that of the Mourning Women; 50 are Attic gravestones. The Hellenistic material is listed in two consecutive groups by two different criteria: regional schools and division by century. Both are obviously open to question.

Though I feel some reservation about the latter part of the study, I am excited and convinced by Schneider's conclusions for the fifth century. A byproduct of his observations is that asymmetry can now help in reconstructing the original position of isolated heads. Could another be to distinguish between true copies of fifth century originals and classicizing creations? One hopes that in a future work Schneider will check out his findings against the vast field of Roman copies.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

CORPUS VASORUM ANTIQUORUM, Italy fasc. LIV, Gela, Museo Archeologico III, by *Filippo Giudice*, pp. 25, pls. 44. "L'Erma" di Bretschneider, Rome, 1974.

The publication of the Navarra Collection of the National Archaeological Museum of Gela apparently continues on a schedule of one fascicule a year. The two previous publications, appearing in 1972 and 1973, dealt with Corinthian and other mainland wares as well as some East Greek vases and have been recently reviewed in this journal by J.L. Benson (*AJA* 79 [1975] 163). Fascicule III presents, chronologically arranged, Attic *rf.* pottery and what the author considers the most significant *bf.* examples. Some 60 vases are published under the correct rubrics III h and III i; those in white ground technique are classed under III I, rather than being given their own rubric III J. All are attributed, 12 previously by Haspels and 25 by Beazley. A number of the minor examples are published for the first time; most of the vases are completely illustrated for the first time.

The 22 *bf.* vases are all lekythoi, including 3 *bf.* pots with a white ground. Ajax attacking Cassandra, Herakles at the tree of the Hesperides by the Edinburgh Painter (pls. 17, 18, 19), and an interesting scene of two "Ethiopians" with the body of Memnon by the Emporion Painter (pl. 23) are the most noteworthy of the mythological scenes portrayed. Most of the *rf.* vases are also lekythoi (30, 6 in white ground technique) and include good examples by the Brygos Painter (pls. 24, 25) and the Providence Painter (pls. 29-31). Also published are 2 column kraters, 3 pelikai, including one by the Pig Painter with Theseus and

the Minotaur, 2 Nolan amphorae and one white ground alabastron.

The illustrations for this fascicule are generally adequate and the photographic record of each pot is more or less complete. Several views are given of each example, sometimes extending over three plates, which are happily printed on only one side. Details such as shoulder designs on lekythoi are generally given, yet only one example has its entire figured scene shown in a single illustration (pl. 19). Two plates are slightly blurred (pls. 9, 10). Close views of individual figures or scenes are often given but occasionally the student is disappointed. For instance, the illustrations of the lekythos attributed to the Edinburgh Painter with Herakles at the tree of the Hesperides (pls. 17, 18) are well photographed except for the Hermes (pl. 17.3) who is shown only in an overall side view of the pot and is so dark that practically all details are lost. Since the figure of Hermes is singled out in the text for comment, this is particularly discouraging.

The text is straightforward, although dates occasionally tend to be specific without benefit of any discussion. The descriptions of each example are thorough with enough attention given to details such as incision, added colors, etc. Two measurements are usually given, height and width of mouth. No scales are provided, nor are there profiles; other measurements would have aided study. Dipinti and graffiti are given in facsimile drawings by the author. The author accepts almost all of the attributions previously made, and his own seem quite obvious and correct. One *rf.* lekythos with a scene of a running woman, pls. 27, 24 (inv. 117/B) is attributed to the Tithonos Painter rather than to the "Manner of the Berlin Painter" as had Beazley, *ARV*<sup>2</sup>, 216, no. 20. From the one photo given of the scene, this reviewer would have to prefer the earlier attribution although the choice is a rather narrow one.

The text suffers from an all too common fault for some *CVA* fascicules, poor proofreading. The reader will be irritated and exasperated by the number of bad references, inverted numbers, etc. Most of these are minor, Beazley *ARV*<sup>2</sup> numbers off by one digit, etc., and are not vital. A few others are major enough to cause the reader more trouble than should be necessary, and two of the most obvious are corrected here.

Pl. 13, lekythos, inv. 40: the missing *AA* reference should be 1954. Pl. 27, lekythos by the Tithonos Painter, inv. 68: the bibliography for this vase has become muddled with the next entry, lekythos 117/B. Following the first reference, the two entries are identical. The entry for inv. 68 should be as follows (given in the form adopted by the author): Benndorf, in *Bull. dell'Inst.* (1867) p. 233, XXII; Benndorf, *Griech. u. Sicil. Vasenbild.*, taf. 47,2; Beazley, *ATT.* V., p. 129, n. 10; Beazley, *ARV* I, P. 207, n. 12; Beazley, *ARV.* 2, P. 309, n. 13. The bibliography for the following inv. 117/B is correct except for the *JHS* reference which should be omitted as an error.

WILLIAM R. BIERS

UNIVERSITY OF MISSOURI-COLUMBIA