

1985

Review of *Les protomés féminines archaïques: Recherches sur les représentations du visage dans la plastique grecque de 500 à 480 av. J.-C.*, by Francis Crossant

Brunilde S. Ridgway
Bryn Mawr College, 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

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

Custom Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1985. Review of *Les protomés féminines archaïques: Recherches sur les représentations du visage dans la plastique grecque de 500 à 480 av. J.-C.*, by Francis Crossant. *American Journal of Archaeology* 89:703-704.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/14

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

Footnotes are gathered together at the end of the text, another cost-saving measure. A list of text figures, a museum index, a list of abbreviations (bibliography) and a general index conclude the book. The list of plates is given at the front of the volume of plates.

Hemelrijk has obviously involved himself closely with his subject matter. He has been meticulous and thorough in studying every important and not so important aspect of the vases. Sometimes, however, this involvement has led to overstatement; for example, his interpretation of the expression in eyes or faces (the boar on no. 10 is "struck dumb," the lion on no. 38 is shown "horribly scared"), or his characterization of the work of the Wind-Blown (Ivy) Painter as "hideous" and "trash."

Some minor points. Twice (pp. 120, 125) it is noted that gods only appear on Group A vases, yet Hermes clearly is seen on no. 21 (Group B). Stibbe (*Meded* n.s. 1 [1974] 19–37, esp. 24–25, 28–29) argued that "Nike" figures like that on no. 13 might instead be "Erotes," which in fact would suit the scene of Europa and the Bull on that vase. "Cowherds" may be a better term than "shepherds" or "cowboys" for the horsemen on no. 18. In Table F, nos. 6–8 are mistakenly placed in Group A. The text could have benefited from a final proofreading, especially for misreferences to figures and plates.

Caeretan Hydriae is a long needed, complete study of these fascinating vases. Hemelrijk has elucidated the intricacies of the hydriae themselves and established their position in the artistic tradition of East Greece. For this he must be highly commended.

GERALD P. SCHAUS

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS
WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY
WATERLOO, ONTARIO, CANADA N2L 3C5

LES PROTOMÉS FÉMININES ARCHAÏQUES. RECHERCHES SUR LES REPRÉSENTATIONS DU VISAGE DANS LA PLASTIQUE GRECQUE DE 500 À 480 AV. J.-C., by *Francis Croissant*. (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 250.) Vol. 1, text: pp. xv + 398; vol. 2: pp. xiv, pls. 144. Paris 1983.

An initial encounter with terracotta protomes during excavations on Thasos in 1965 led Croissant to years of intensive study of this well known but little appreciated form of coroplastic sculpture. The primary documentation was collected between 1969 and 1975 (and the early date of such efforts is still partly noticeable in the bibliographical citations of the footnotes). The total work was presented as a doctoral dissertation in 1981 and revised for publication by April 1982. The encyclopaedic knowledge of the protomes and of every possible related form of art revealed by this book fully accounts for the approximately 17 years that went into its genesis.

Croissant starts from the assumption that these unusual objects (for which the term *protome* may not correspond to ancient usage) are considerably more important than terracotta statuettes, since they allow much greater detailing of

the female face by virtue of their larger scale. He further assumes as a working hypothesis both the distinctiveness of regional styles within archaic sculpture and the stylistic unity of creations by a single center (p. 24). Although identity or even close resemblance between a given protome type and a specific marble kore (or kouros) is quite rare (p. 10), Croissant focuses on "l'air de famille" which links certain works despite their possible chronological distance, at times considerable. Thus style becomes a more influential factor than date, while technical considerations only allow for a general morphological division of the protomes into three groups: the masks (corresponding to the so-called Rhodian type, widely diffused although particularly at home in Asia Minor), the pinakes (an Attic tradition), and the busts (an Argive-Corinthian form). Yet these classifications receive relatively brief preliminary mention (16–21) and play no part in the extensive discussion of the actual protomes. Varying and unidentified clays, combined with the difficulties of possible export and reproduction of molds, make Croissant subordinate such technical evidence to the stylistic search for possible prototypes and their geographical milieu. Hence, the book is not a catalogue of extant protomes, but a selection of 251 representative masks or fragments exemplifying different regional groups and variants. They belong in general to the Aegean basin and Greece proper, with the exclusion of Magna Graecia, but the sad state of sporadic excavation and publication of finds is well brought out by the annotated list of protome-yielding areas and sites (13–16).

The text falls into four major sections. The lengthy Introduction on the protome form deals with origins (purely Greek, not Egyptian) and religious meaning (not votaries but divinities, and appropriate for several, not just the chthonian goddesses). It further considers the role of paint and the forms of jewels and decoration, and outlines methodological approaches and terminology. The first part treats the protomes created by continental and insular Ionia, and rates its own partial conclusions. The second part considers the two independent traditions of Athens and Corinth. The third part reviews the end of the archaic style in Central Greece, and the confluence of diverse styles producing imitations, adaptations and works under disparate influences. Within these three sections, the material is subdivided into 18 major groups (from A to U), each corresponding approximately to a geographical source—e.g., "Groupe A (Samos)," "Groupe M (Corinthe)"—although some defy classification beyond a general Ionic connection (groups H, J, and group K, which consists of isolated types), and the groups of section three can only be defined by affinities—e.g., "Groupe S (types corinthianisants)." Conclusions, a museum index for all protomes and comparanda cited, and a highly detailed Table of Contents close the book.

This apparently simple schema is, however, belied by the fractioning of each group within each section, according to facial types. For example, the "Chian" group, C, breaks into C 1a–c, C 2, C 3, C 4, C 5a–b, although each subdivision and variant need contain no more than one item (e.g., C 2, C 3, C 4). In the end, the Rhodio-Ionian *koiné* which is usually treated as a fairly homogeneous grouping is broken by Croissant into 48 face types distributed among 9 groups,

without counting group K, which is not a stylistic subdivision proper.

Yet even this meticulous apportioning of protomes could be acceptable, were the total picture of help in clarifying our understanding of regional styles and centers; but such is certainly not the case. Croissant is scrupulous in reiterating that his distributions are subject to revision according to new finds or evidence, that information on regional centers is scant or uncertain, that differences between types may be minimal and stylistic assessments subjective. I must admit I cannot always tell one group from another—let alone the various types within the group or the variations within the types—nor am I helped by the well laid-out plates with meaningful juxtapositions of comparable items. Perhaps only someone with Croissant's long familiarity based on constant handling of the protomes can distinguish them readily. The comparanda in monumental sculpture or other forms of art seem often equally elusive: either I cannot see the resemblances or I cannot subscribe to the regional attributions. To give but one example, the so-called Sleeping Head in the British Museum usually thought to belong to one of the Ephesian *columnae caelatae* is by Croissant labelled Milesian and used as a cog within his regional construction (p. 62); yet the recent study of all Ephesian material by C.A. Picón has convincingly shown that the London head belongs to the Artemision and is stylistically related to the other temple sculptures.

To be sure, Croissant describes vividly and at length, trying to make the reader see what he perceives as regional traits and distinctive features, but his very fluid language may hamper rather than increase comprehension. It is not that one does not understand, even share, Croissant's intuitive reading of facial expressions; it is just that it is hard to accept as objective comparisons based on, e.g., "la même franchise attentive, la même gaieté dynamique" (p. 146). The task is not made easier by the endless paragraphs, one of which can fill an entire page, and by the free associating of the thought-process, so wide ranging that virtually every major monument of the archaic and severe period is brought into the discussion—repeatedly, in different contexts and for different purposes, as the index and table of contents show.

Even the origin of Attic Red Figure is investigated in this scholarly cavalcade that is too rich in original thoughts and suggestions to assimilate at a single reading. I have only retained a few points, perhaps because closest to my concerns: that the Siphnian Karyatid and the so-called ex-Knidian head may, after all, belong to the same Treasury (p. 72 n. 1); that the Knidian Treasury may have had no karyatids at all (78 n. 4); that the heads from the Aigina temple are so varied as to represent deliberate eclecticism (369); and that the Piombino Apollo, although probably archaizing (216), can nonetheless be used to date comparable protomes around 480 (111). Croissant is so open to the various possibilities for interpretation and so conscious of the variables in each problem that the reader eventually cannot even find firm points for debate, whether in agreement or disagreement.

If the proof of the pudding is in the eating, the proof of a book should be in the reading. On such criteria, I can only state that this book has not passed the test: I have emerged from it with much vaguer notions than when I started it,

and this result is all the more regrettable in that so much effort and connoisseurship have clearly been expended on it. But in its present form I can only concur with Croissant that "loin de fournir des indications sur la chronologie, le style apparaît donc comme un facteur qui par définition en occulte les effets" (375) and that "la conclusion d'une telle enquête ne saurait être évidemment que provisoire" (373).

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND
NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

LA SCULTURA IN PIETRA DI SELINUNTE, by *Vincenzo Tusa*, with contributions by *G. Pugliese Carratelli, E. Paribeni, M. Carapezza et al.* Pp. 200, color pls. 16, black-and-white pls. 46, text figs. 16 + 303. Sel-lerio Ed., Palermo, 1983–1984.

Vincenzo Tusa, Archaeological Superintendent of western Sicily, has fulfilled one of the strongest *desiderata* in the field of Magna Graecian art history by providing this comprehensive, well illustrated and thoroughly documented publication of 301 items of stone sculpture from Selinous. These include all the well known metopal series and reliefs, but also as many as 242 unpublished pieces, some of them architectural, some freestanding and some of undefinable nature, both in marble and in local stone. Even items of presumed Selinuntine origin not in the Palermo Museum receive passing mention. The import of such extensive collection and publication is bound to be felt for many years to come.

In his prefatory comments Tusa stresses Selinous' originality in being "the only Greek city in Sicily to decorate its temples with stone sculptures" (15). The statement may seem rather sweeping in light of the pedimental remains once again recently attributed to Akragan and Himieran religious buildings (see, e.g., *Aparchai* [Festschrift P. Arias, 1982] *passim*), but it holds true for the archaic period, and especially for metopal decoration. (Note, however, that Tusa [125, no. 18 n. 6] would disclaim for Selinous the so-called Harpy metope in Copenhagen, which is generally considered to be from Sicily and would therefore imply metopal stone-carving elsewhere on the island.) Selinuntine workmanship is advocated for all pieces, including the marble parts from Temple E, although the analysis is sensitive to outside influences—from the mainland Greeks, the peoples of Asia Minor, the Phoenicians and local populations, as one would expect from a Phoenician expert of Tusa's caliber.

G. Pugliese Carratelli sketches the historical and religious background of Selinous, without however entering the thorny grounds of colonization dates. Helpful comments on Megara, both Hyblaia and Nysaia, underline the importance of a Malophoros cult in the Greek metropoleis, thus challenging the assumption that Selinous simply adopted Sicilian religious beliefs. Mycenaean and Cretan contacts are mentioned, as well as the difficult interrelationships of