



The Argive Hera of Polycleitus

Author(s): Charles Waldstein

Source: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 21 (1901), pp. 30-44

Published by: [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/623863>

Accessed: 16/12/2014 10:24

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE ARGIVE HERA OF POLYCLEITUS.

[PLATES II., III.]

OF all the renderings of the goddess Hera, the gold and ivory statue by Polycleitus in the Heraeum near Argos was the most famous, and was considered by the ancients one of the most beautiful works of Greek art. It certainly held its place beside the masterpieces of Phidias, and is even called by Strabo the most beautiful of all.¹

As in the case of the Zeus and Athene of Phidias, and the Cnidian Aphrodite of Praxiteles, it is most natural that numerous attempts were made in the past to identify this Polycleitan Hera with some extant monument. And, as the most beautiful Aphrodite extant, the Melian Aphrodite in the Louvre, was at once singled out as representing the most famous statue of which there is record in ancient authors, so the famous colossal mask of Hera, known as the Juno Ludovisi, was the first to be identified with the great Polycleitan statue. This identification has been abandoned.² Then followed the so-called Farnese Hera,³ the claims of which were powerfully upheld by Brunn. But though the head in question manifests some Polycleitan characteristics, its identification with the famous Hera by the Argive artist may be said to have been abandoned. In fact it may fairly be said that at the present no extant work of *statuary* is recognised, even as a hypothesis, as representing the famous Argive statue.⁴

¹ Strabo, viii. p. 372. ἐν ᾧ (Heraion) τὰ Πολυκλείτου ξάνα τῆ μὲν τέχνη κάλλιστα τῶν πάντων, πολυτελέα δὲ καὶ μεγέθει τῶν Φειδίου λειπόμενα. What the plural here means I am unable to say. It may have included the Hebe by Naucydes placed beside her. We must of course not lay too much stress upon the testimony of Strabo, who does not show himself the most discriminating art-critic.

² Overbeck, *Kunstmythol.* iii. pp. 50 and 83. *Atlas*, Taf. IX. 7 and 8. The Ludovisi is considered by some to be more of the type established by Praxiteles. To me the so-called Hera Pontini possesses more of the characteristics of that artist. Others see in the Ludovisi head features of Lysippian art. This may be so; but there are to my mind survivals of Polycleitan art which might well make this a modification belonging to the Lysippian period

in which traits of the Polycleitan type have survived.

³ Brunn, *Bullet. dell' Inst. Arch. Rome*, 1846 p. 124 seq. *Annali*, 1864 p. 298 seq. Overbeck, *Gr. Kunstmythologie* iii. p. 50 seq., *Atlas*, Taf. IX. 142. Furtwängler, *Meisterwerke* pp. 557 and 76 seq.

⁴ The most recent commentators of Pausanias (Blümner-Hitzig, ii. note p. 566) say: 'Es ist noch nicht gelungen eine statuarische Replik derselben nachzuweisen.' Overbeck, *Gr. Kunstmythologie*, iii. p. 51, 'dass wir nach dem gegenwärtigen Stand unseres Wissens nicht zu sagen vermögen, weder dass Polyklet das kanonische Heraideal geschaffen habe, noch welches die von ihm festgestellten massgebenden Züge dieses Ideales, namentlich was den Typus des Kopfes anlangt gewesen seien.'

I have had the good fortune to come upon a well-preserved and beautiful marble head in the British Museum, formerly known as Apollo, now as Bacchus,¹ which I believe will be admitted to be a reproduction of the famous Hera by Polycleitus (Pl. II., III. 4). The manner in which many archaeologists to whom I have shown the discovery have unanimously accepted my arguments and demonstration, leads me to hope that the identification will be universally admitted.

When we consider how great and widespread was the influence of Polycleitus on the later generations of artists, so that we can even perceive the survival of the types established by him in extant works of Graeco-Roman art, we must be the more astonished not to find numerous reproductions of his most famous statue, the Hera, especially as such famous representations of the leading divinities can generally be traced in sculptured copies or in works of minor art.

Overbeck is only partly right when he maintains (l.c.) that Polycleitus did not create the ideal type of Hera as Phidias did that of Zeus, and that therefore the Polycleitan type did not survive. The series of Argive coins (to which I shall refer below) and those derived from them show the survival of the Polycleitan Hera type through many generations. On the other hand the fact remains that the type in statuary seems to have developed away from that established by Polycleitus in the fourth century B.C. This is to be accounted for by the mythical significance of the personality of Hera as she was affected by the general current of evolution in the types of Greek gods in the progress of the fifth to the fourth and later centuries before our era. It is not possible for me to enter fully into this interesting and important question of Greek mythology here, and I must defer the treatment of this subject to another occasion. Suffice it to say that the general tendency towards 'rejuvenescence' in the types of gods, which marks the difference between the fifth and fourth centuries of Greek art, only failed in effect when there were definite causes pressing in another direction which did not allow that general tendency to become effective. On the other hand the artistic desire (an expression of the whole complex spirit of the age) for youthful and sensuously beautiful forms was so strong as to lead to the transformation

¹ Greek and Roman Antiquities in the Brit. Museum, 1880, No. 140, p. 62; Museum Marbles, xi. Pl. V.; Specimens of Anc. Sculpt. i. Pl. 23. Mansell's Photogr. No. 1279.

Restored: the neck, the whole nose, excepting top of bridge and half of left nostril; end of foremost curl on her left side as well as same on right side. Band and hair above in front within line of ear. We must ask the question why this piece is *broken out* in that manner. May it not have been a higher portion of stephane with decorated work which was broken or cut away? Moreover the working of the hair behind this and on the crown of the

head is so rough that it points to some more elaborate work from the front having surmounted it originally.

Dimensions:—

Height from chin to top of head ...	28 mt.
Greatest width taken across centre of the eyes... ..	225 ,,
Depth from back to front	225 ,,
From middle of forehead to end of chin	17 ,,
From end of cheek-bone to cheek-bone	143 ,,
Width between inner angles of eyes...	036 ,,
Width of bridge of nose on level of top of eye-lid...	022 ,,
Width of mouth	048 ,,

of most types into more youthful renderings, wherever their essential nature admitted of such a transformation (*c.g.*, Apollo, Hermes, Dionysos, Aphrodite, Artemis, Athene). But where the personality of the divinity was, from one reason or another, too strong to submit to such a change—as notably is the case with Zeus—the type established in the earlier century (by a Phidias) was likely to survive in spite of the artistic idiosyncrasies of a Scopas and Praxiteles and the taste of the times they represented artistically.

Now Hera was originally simply a female divinity who presided over the life and fate of the Argive people. She thus was representative of the female type in general and comprised in her nature all womanly characteristics from the virgin¹ to the matron,² from the queen³ to the housewife.⁴ The more the Olympian cycle became organised and the several figures became specialised and individualised in their personalities and functions, the more did Hera respond to that side which represented the spouse of Zeus and matronly queen; while the more youthful and human side was transferred to her daughter and attendant Hebe. Thus, by a singular contrast to the general course of development, with Scopas, Praxiteles and the later artists Hera and Juno are represented as maturer and older, the womanly side, the queenly spouse, being accentuated; while the more youthful and sensuously attractive side, fully and specifically represented by other female divinities, is repressed. Now with Polycleitus the older Argive conception still survived to some degree, and he could therefore include the simpler and more youthful aspects of that female divinity in the artistic type which he established. But it is owing to these complex circumstances that the type of Hera as established by the great Argive artist did not survive in its direct form in the later ages, and that striking modifications were no doubt introduced by Praxiteles and later artists; though some definite features and characteristics as established by Polycleitus survived amid the changes of later times.

I shall now enumerate what material we have had before us concerning the Argive Hera of Polycleitus; what new data for the understanding of the type have recently been furnished, especially by the American excavations of the Argive Heraeum; and I shall then endeavour to show how we may now claim to possess at least one copy of the head in an extant marble bust.

The statue, considered by ancient writers the masterpiece of the great Argive sculptor, was evidently the work of his full maturity.⁵ The temple

¹ *παρθενία*, Paus. viii. 22, 2; Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 6, 149; Steph. Byz. v. 'Ερμιών.

² *τελεία*, Paus. i. 1, 4; viii. 9, 1; ix. 2, 5; viii. 22, 2 (*ἐς τὴν Στύμφαλον ὠνόμασεν ὁ Τήμενος χήραν*); Aristoph. *Thesm.* 973.

³ *βασίλεια*, Phoron. ap. Clem. Str. i. p. 418; Aesch. *Suppl.* 291; Sen. *Agam.* 349; Appul. *M.* 6, 4; Kaibel, *Epigr.* 822.

⁴ Preller, *Gr. Myth.* *Εἰλειθία*, i. 4 p. 171;

ζυγία, p. 170; suckling, p. 171.

⁵ In an extremely ingenious and interesting paper (*Hermes*, xxxv. 1900, pp. 141 seq.)—with some of the conclusions of which I cannot however agree—Prof. C. Robert draws most instructive inferences concerning the works and the dates of some Greek sculptors—notably of Polycleitus—from a thorough investigation of the list of Olympian victors recently found and

must have been built, and the statue made for it, shortly after the old temple had been destroyed by fire in 423 B.C.¹

From Pausanias,² we learn that 'the image of Hera is seated, and is of colossal size: it is made of gold and ivory and is a work of Polycleitus.' Based on the computations made by the architect (Mr. Tilton) on the ground of the height of the *ναός* for the estimate of which our excavations of the Heraeum furnished the material, the total height of the image, including the base and the top of the throne, would be about 8 metres, the seated figure of the goddess herself about 5·50 metres. It is probable that the face, neck, arms and feet were of ivory, while the rest of the figure was draped in gold.

Like the Olympian Zeus of Phidias Hera was seated on an elaborately decorated throne, holding in her left hand the sceptre surmounted in her case by the cuckoo (as that of Zeus had an eagle), and in her right, instead of an elaborate figure of Victory (such as the Athene Parthenos and the Olympian Zeus held) simply a pomegranate. The explanation of the pomegranate Pausanias 'omits as it is of a somewhat mystic nature,' and I am inclined to do the same; though it probably was symbolical of prolific power. Nor need we enter into his hesitating reasons for the choice of the cuckoo. The crown was adorned with figures of Graces and the Seasons. To this point I shall have to refer below.

'It is said that beside the image of Hera there once stood an image of Hebe of ivory and gold, a work of Naucydes.'³ This Naucydes was evidently closely related to Polycleitus, but considerable uncertainty exists as to what exactly his relationship to the older and younger Polycleitus was. Nor does the passage in Pausanias referring to the Hebe clear this uncertainty in any way. For Pausanias himself is evidently in doubt and introduces his mention of the Hebe by the phrase *λέγεται*, only giving it as a report. In the translation above I have adopted Mr. Frazer's rendering: but the passage admits of a different interpretation given by Messrs. Blümner and Hitzig.⁴ According to them the doubt implied by *λέγεται* does not refer to the presence of the statue in the time of Pausanias (contradicted by her presence on later coins) but to the merely traditional ascription of the work to Naucydes. I may add that the doubt may also refer to the identification with Hebe or the Hebe of

published by Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt in the Oxyrhynchos Papyri. He thus gives us the striking new information that the early work of Polycleitus (the Kyniskos) dates back to the year 460 B.C. (p. 188), that he was born about 477 and that he had thus already passed the sixties (?) when he fashioned the Argive Hera. (*Und als er die Hera schuf, war er, wie wir jetzt sehen, mindestens ein Sechziger*, p. 186.)

¹ Thucyd. iv. 133, cf. Waldstein, *Excavations of the Am. Sch. at the Heraeum of Argos*, No. 1. London 1892, p. 3.

² The passage referring to the statue of Hera, ii. 17, 4 reads as follows: Τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα τῆς Ἥρας ἐπὶ θρόνου κάθηται μεγέθει μέγα, χρυσοῦ

μὲν καὶ ἐλέφαντος, Πολυκλείτου δὲ ἔργον· ἔπεισι δὲ οἱ στέφανος Χάριτας ἔχων καὶ Ὠρας ἐπειρασμένας, καὶ τῶν χειρῶν τῇ μὲν καρπὸν φέρει, τῇ δὲ σκῆπτρον κόκκυγα δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ σκῆπτρῳ καθῆσθαι φασί, Λέγεται δὲ παρεστηκέναι τῇ Ἥρᾳ τέχνη Ναυκύδου ἄγαλμα Ἥβης, ἐλέφαντος καὶ τοῦτο καὶ χρυσοῦ.

³ For the literature on this subject see Frazer, *Pausanias*, Notes to vi. 6, 2; ii. 22, 7; vi. 17, 5. Robert (*Hermes*, xxxv. (1900) p. 190 seq.) makes Naucydes the brother of the elder Polycleitus.

⁴ *Pausaniae Graeciae Descriptio*, i. 2nd Part, p. 567 (Note to p. 423, 18).

Naucydes. It is certain that some hesitation existed in the mind of Pausanias or his informant.¹

This description of the statue, however imperfect, gives a fair idea of the general composition and arrangement of the famous statue. We are much helped in forming such an idea by ancient coins. Foremost among these is the Roman Imperial coin of Antoninus Pius² (Pl. III. No. 9), which shows us Hera seated on the throne in the attitude described by Pausanias, as well as Hebe by her side and a peacock between the two. The same figure is rendered on a slightly larger scale (the Hebe and peacock being omitted) on similar coins³ of about the same date (Pl. III. Nos. 8, 10). Attitude, attributes and drapery become clear to us, though we must of course always remember that renderings of colossal statues on such coins can only give an idea of the general composition and broad details, while they are generally quite inadequate for the rendering of the artistic character of a great work. I shall refer to the peculiar 'turreted' crown on these coins below.

But it must be admitted that we approach comparatively near to some idea of the artistic character and style of the head in the fine specimens of autonomous Argive coins⁴ (Pl. III. Nos. 1, 5-7) dating from about the same period as the erection of the great statue by Polycleitus. Here the head merely is given and on a comparatively large scale. Most authorities have long been agreed that in this coin we have a direct relation to the statue,⁵ while Furtwängler⁶ considers the coin to be a direct copy. We can further-

¹ I have consulted on this point my colleague Sir Richard Jebb, who has kindly sent me the following note on the passage, which, I am happy to find, confirms what I had myself suspected.

'The words could mean:

(1) 'An agalma, which stands by the Hera, is said to be one of Hebe, the work of Naucydes.'

In this case, the doubt implied would refer to the subject, as well as the author, of the agalma.

Or: (2) 'An agalma of Hebe etc. . . . is said to be the work of Naucydes.'

The doubt would then refer to the authorship only.

If Pausanias meant: 'It is said that an agalma of Hebe, the work of Naucydes, once stood by the Hera,' he ought to have written (1) *παραστήναι ποτε*, or (2), if he meant *παρεστηκέναι* to be the inf. of the *πλυσιπρ.*, *παρεστηκέναι ποτέ* (or some similar adverb).

As the text stands, *λέγεται παρεστηκέναι* would naturally mean 'is said to stand.' From the words, *ἐλέφαντος καὶ τοῦτο καὶ χρυσοῦ*, I should rather infer that Pausanias had the agalma before his eyes; but this point cannot be pressed.

παρὰ δ' αὐτήν. Does this refer to (1) the

'*Ἡρα*, or (2) the '*Ἡβη* whose agalma has just been mentioned? The latter would be the more natural.'

² Imhoof-Gardner, *Numism. Comment.* etc. (*Journal of Hellen. Stud.* 1885) Pl. LIV. (I.) No. xv; Berlin *Münzcat.* i. No. xii., xiii., xv.; Frazer, *Paus.* iii. p. 185, Fig. 30; Blümner-Hitzig, *Paus.* i. 2nd Part Taf. xvi., No. 20. Overbeck, *Kunstmyth.* iii. Münztafel iii. No. 1.

³ Imhoof-Gardner, *ibid.* No. xii. xiii., *Brit. Mus. Catal. of Gr. Coins*, Pelop. Argos, No. 156; Head, *Historia Numor.* p. 367; Frazer, *ibid.* p. 184; Blümner-Hitzig, *ibid.* No. 18. Overbeck, *Kunstmyth.* iii. Münztafel iii., Nos. 2 and 3.

⁴ *Brit. Mus.* Argos, Nos. 33, 34, 37, 35 and 40, 41; Imhoof-Gardner, *ibid.* No. xiv.; Overbeck, *ibid.* Münztafel, ii. No. 6; Percy Gardner, *Types of Gr. Coins*, Pl. VIII. No. 13; Blümner-Hitzig, *ibid.* No. 23.

⁵ Blümner-Hitzig, *ibid.* p. 566. '*Dafür ist fast allgemein angenommen dass der schöne autonome Kopf argeischer Didrachmen, die eben aus jener Zeit stammen, uns eine gute, wenn auch nicht absolut treue Vorstellung von dem Typus der polykletischen Hera geben.*' But cf. Overbeck, *l.c.*, p. 44.

⁶ *Meisterwerke*, p. 413.

more trace this type, with slight artistic modifications in detail, on Argive coins (e.g. Pl. III. No. 2) for more than a century, and for a still longer period throughout the whole of the ancient world,¹ in Elis (Fig. 3, p. 44), Himera, Cnossos (Pl. III. No. 3); and this shows that Overbeck's statement as to the failure of Polycleitus to fix the type (see *supra*) needs modification at least as regards coins. We shall have to consider this coin more in detail as we proceed. (See note, p. 44.)

In spite of our good fortune in possessing, as regards the Hera type of Polycleitus, so fair a description in Pausanias and coins of such exceptional beauty and clearness in the rendering of the head, we should still be far removed from an adequate idea of the artistic style and character of the great statue and even of the head alone with only these materials before us. To attain this we require the evidence of the individual style of that artist as manifested in some work or works of sculpture on a larger scale or in adequate copies of these made in the Classical period. Our idea would be still more adequate if we could identify any extant statue or bust with the Argive original. Yet, as I have always maintained in similar cases, we are most likely to attain this latter consummation, if we succeed in making ourselves fully cognisant of the Polycleitan style in all the other works identified with that master, and widen the field of our enquiry from this the safest point of departure.

Now since Friederichs' beautiful identification,² we have with Polycleitus an exceptionally clear case, in that the statues of the Doryphoros and Diadumenos have long been identified with comparative certainty as illustrating all the definite characteristics of Polycleitan style which ancient authors³ have handed down to us. The number of replicas of these statues is continually increasing; and, especially as regards the heads, we have now so large a series⁴ that their chief characteristics are easily recognisable by even the apprentice in archaeological study. Some of the heads in the several statues of the Ephesian Amazon,⁵ though they show deviations among each other, reproduce the leading characteristics which we recognise in the Doryphoros and Diadumenos. But it is the merit of Professor Furtwängler to have recognised in the head of the Doryphoros-type the earlier, and in that of the Diadumenos-type, the later style of the same artist, Polycleitus.⁶

But our data for such an archaeological induction have become more

¹ Overbeck, *l.c.* Münztafel, ii.

² K. Friederichs, *Der Doryphoros des Polyklet*, Berlin, 1865; see for criticism of this, O. Rayet, *Monuments de l'Art Antique*, i., on Pl. 29.

³ Cf. Overbeck, *Die Antiken Schriftquellen*, etc. p. 170, Nos. 952-964; p. 173, Nos. 967-977.

⁴ See the chapter on Polycleitus in Furtwängler's *Meisterwerke*, etc. (*Masterpieces*, etc. translated by Eugénie Sellers).

⁵ Michaelis, 'Die sogenannten Ephesischen Amazonenstatuen,' *Jahrbuch d. Kaiserl. Deut-*

schon Arch. Institut. Berlin 1887, i. pp. 14, *seq.* Robert, *op. cit.* p. 190, considers the various types probably all to be Polycleitan, and thinks the 'Berlin' type to have been made between 450 and 440, the 'Capitoline' between 430-420 B.C.

⁶ *Masterpieces*, etc. p. 243. It is in no sense to diminish the merit of his discovery and his full claims to it, but to confirm it, if I say that I had independently come to the same conclusion about the earlier and later style of Polycleitus in the Doryphoros and Diadumenos.

than doubly increased and made doubly secure, by the discovery of numerous and important fragments of the sculptured metopes from the Argive Heraeum in the excavations of the American Archaeological Institute and School, over which I presided from 1892 to 1895. Among these are at least nine well preserved heads, one of which might be called a replica of the Doryphoros head, while all of them illustrate and exemplify in the fullest manner the characteristics of Polycleitan heads as we have hitherto recognised them. These sculptures, moreover, in every respect bear the same relation to the great Argive master of the Hera, that the Parthenon marbles bear to the great Attic sculptor of the Athene. Yet, while in the case of Phidias we have no Doryphoros or Diadumenos to give us such well supported material for the appreciation of his peculiar style with which we could confront the Parthenon marbles, the sculptures from the Heraeum verify and supplement the information which the Polycleitan works hitherto identified have yielded. And yet the archaeologist who now would wish to disprove the Phidias character of the Parthenon marbles, to which every circumstance points *a priori*, would find himself confronted with a very difficult task.

It was an unwarrantable assertion of Professor Furtwängler to deny the relation of these Argive sculptures to Polycleitus,¹ even before he had seen them and before some of them had been discovered, and I hardly believe that the grounds, both positive and negative, upon which he based his denial will bear serious consideration. In the future our study of Polycleitan style will have to take its start from the Doryphoros and Diadumenos in conjunction with the marbles which we found at the Argive Heraeum. Moreover it was only in taking this stand, and on the ground of the wider knowledge of Polycleitan characteristics thus acquired, that I was led to the present identification of the Polycleitan Hera.

As regards Polycleitan heads we find that, in spite of the differences which obtain between the Doryphoros and Diadumenos, and still more among the varied subjects, male and female, of our Argive metope-heads, certain broad and distinctive characteristics remain common to them all. These are:—

(1) The general outline and composition of these heads is quite distinctive. The character of the *quadrata signa*, as we knew it in the massive types of the Doryphoros and Diadumenos, is markedly maintained in the whole build of the head, naturally, in the simplest and most pronounced form, in the earlier Doryphoros head with its short closely fitting hair, in no

¹ First (in 1893) in the *Archaeolog. Studien H. Brunn dargebracht*, repeated *Masterpieces*, p. 223. I have dealt exhaustively with this question in the forthcoming official publication. How any trained archaeologist could have considered the small marble head which Furtwängler compares with the marble head of 'Hera' from the Heraeum, which I first published in 1892, and find any resemblance is to me incomprehensible. The only point of contact

is a superficial similarity in the curious braid on the top of the head which Furtwängler's head has in common with the Heraeum head as well as with the 'Karyatides' from the Erechtheum (and it is probably upon this that he and some others have seen an Attic character in the Heraeum head). His original attribution of his small head (now unwisely discarded by him) to the style of the Olympian pedimental figures, is much nearer the mark.

wise interfering with the general structure of the head. This squareness of outline is so marked that we might almost say that each one of these heads would fit into a square with the slightest possible amount of interval between this square and the points where the modelling of the features required the cutting away of the marble; and it is so distinctive that it can readily be contrasted with the more oblong, triangular or pear-shaped, or round ball-like outlines¹ which characterise the heads of some other schools. If this is the case in the front view seen in full face, it is also, even more markedly, so in the profile view. The whole of this characteristic, borne out and accentuated in other phases of this artist's work the more we follow them, seems to point not to a mechanical procedure, but to an extreme desire for succinctness and accuracy—if I may say so—the very reverse of the vague and sketchy methods and tendencies of the impressionists. We thus also find that, with the several parts of the face, the broader phases of structure are emphasised in their distinctness in masses, such as the upper part of the face above and below the eyes, from the beginning of the hair at the sides upwards to the top, and again the line from cheekbone to chin on either side. Within these again the brow and forehead in their relation to the hair; the intermediary straight section of the region of the eye, between the upper part and the lower part—and so again each subdivision.

(2) The general impression which this outline structure of the heads gives, is still further impressed by the effect of the *ensemble* of all the features. It carries on the general impression in the rendering of the bodies of these *τετράγωνοι* athletes; it is that of weightiness if not of heaviness. There are none of those softer, rounder lines in the female heads, such as we find in Attic contemporary work, *e.g.*, the Karyatides from the Erechtheum—structure is never hidden to produce the effect of rounded softness. And the features carry this still further in the impression of solidity, verging upon the stolid and the pouting, even in the most advanced types of the Diadumenos, and the exquisite beauty of line and form of some of the female heads. This expression is no doubt due to some extent to the massive and firm treatment of cheek and chin; but it is especially conveyed by the characteristic rendering of the nose and the mouth.

The nose in the profile view does not follow the line of the forehead in a simple sweep, but shows a gradual advance at a very obtuse angle, while the tip extends far down and comes slightly lower than the level of the edge of the nostril. In the front view the nose appears short in relation to its breadth. Throughout its whole length it retains a comparatively great breadth from bridge to tip. There is a slight increase of breadth about the middle part, so that it appears slightly narrower at the bridge and immediately above the tip. The tip again, well rounded, is as broad as the widest part in the middle of the nose. Compared with this uniform breadth along the bridge to the tip the nostrils do not extend widely on

¹ See my article on 'A Head of Polycleitan Style etc.' in *American Journal of Arch.* ix. (1894) p. 334.

either side—which fact again tends to accentuate the breadth of the nose itself.

Perhaps the most characteristic feature of all, and one to which the peculiar expression of these heads is chiefly due, is the mouth. This is never firmly closed, in some of them slightly opened. The lower lip protrudes slightly, and seems tilted over with a marked curve below where it joins the chin, presenting a comparatively thick and compact mass. In addition to this protruding lower lip the upper lip is exceptionally short (most noticeable in the profile view) and what represents the red portion of the lip is widened out on either side, preserving this width to a certain degree even at the corners. The total effect is that of heaviness, almost a pout.

The eyes are treated in a simple manner, the brow extending in one broad sweep from the bridge of the nose to the temple, which line, together with the breadth of the bridge, gives the eyes themselves a broad setting. The well marked upper lid runs almost parallel to the brow; while the lower lid, though firmly chiselled, is not accentuated by a soft hollowing out below it—which in many heads of the fourth century adds so much sentiment and softness to the expression. The orb itself is widely oval, gently curved and slightly slanting inwards in a downward direction. I have dealt exhaustively with the treatment of the hair and the general modelling of texture in the forthcoming official publication of the excavations at the Argive Heraeum, and as this does not concern the definite question before us, I need not enter into it here.

When arranging the casts in the Fitzwilliam Museum of Archaeology here at Cambridge, I naturally desired to bring the works of the same school and period together as far as possible. In the case of unidentified works I endeavoured to place them among the classified works to which they bore the closest relationship of style. It is thus many years ago that I recognised in the head of 'Bacchus,' formerly 'Apollo,' in the British Museum (Pl. II., III. 4) characteristics of Polycleitan art; for it was among these heads that the so-called Bacchus found his place. This conviction grew more firm and definite when, in preparing the final publication of the marbles from the Argive Heraeum I had to study the characteristics of that art with greater minuteness, and, among other comparisons, confronted the head from the British Museum with the casts of the Heraeum heads which I had brought from Argos. This was especially the case when the life-size 'Hera' head from the Argive pediment was compared with the British Museum head in the profile view. I felt more and more convinced that the 'Bacchus' was Polycleitan, and at the same time I began to doubt whether it really was a male head.¹ In spite of the restoration of the nose (the restorer has followed the

¹ The mistake as regards the sex of the head—especially with the restored neck which the 'Bacchus' had—is not a grave one and is easily incurred by any archaeologist, when an antique head (especially with such short hair) is severed from the body. In such cases doubts

must often be felt. I need merely remind the reader that the beautiful head at Bologna which Furtwängler has so ingeniously restored to the Athene at Dresden and which he with much probability identifies with the Lemnian Athene of Phidias, was held by several authori-

extant indications of the broad bridge in a very skilful manner) and of slighter restorations of the hair on the top of the head, the characteristics of Polycleitan art which I have just endeavoured to enumerate were well illustrated in this head.

Hitherto I chiefly studied this beautiful bust from the front view. When now I began more carefully to examine the profile view I felt convinced that there existed some other work with which I had been familiar to which this bore the closest analogy. What made it difficult to recall this analogous case was that it was not a work of sculpture in the round, a bust on a large scale, or even a sculptured marble relief. One day, however—a common trick in the action of memory—the instance I had looked for suddenly occurred to me; and, upon examining the coins, I found that it was in truth the autonomous tetradrachm of Argos reproducing the head of the famous Hera of Polycleitus.

If we bear in mind the reduced size of such a coin as compared not only with the colossal original, but even with a life-size marble head, and place the two side by side, the marble in its profile view (as is here done on Pl. III.). it at once becomes evident that both are reproductions of a common type. From this type the marble head no doubt shows some modifications and deviations, such as the reduction of the diadem to a narrow band without ornament. Such modifications were also necessarily introduced into the rendering of the coin, however marvellous this may be in the retention of some of the grand qualities of the famous original from which it was copied.

What makes the marble head in the British Museum appear so singular and unique is, in the first place, the treatment of the hair. This, together with the wrongly restored neck, was no doubt the chief reason why the head has hitherto been mistaken for that of a male divinity. This peculiar, almost unique treatment of the hair, in longish curls, though far from the length usual in ancient female figures, which only occurs to me in a few early instances (none to my knowledge later than the fifth century B.C.), we find again in the head of Hera on the contemporary Argive coin. It is moreover interesting to note how on the later modifications of the same coin (Pl. III. No. 2) the antiquated fashion of this short hair is replaced by a longer braided hair of the ordinary female *coiffure*.¹ The only instances of female hair similar in length which I can recall are the case of the Demeter on the famous Eleusinian relief² and of the Sterope from the eastern pediment of the temple of Zeus at

ties to be a male head. I also take this opportunity of stating that the authorities of the British Museum (who gave me every assistance in my research) could not be expected to discover the nature and attribution of the head. In the reproduction given here the female character of the head is made more obvious by the fact that the modern (male) neck has been omitted. We can as little expect that the officials of Museums should make all the dis-

coveries concerning the objects in their care as that librarians should anticipate all the discoveries made by students in the manuscripts and books in their library.

¹ See Overbeck, *ibid.* Münztafel, and Percy Gardner, *Types of Gr. Coins, l.c.*

² The best illustration in Brunn *Denkm. Gr. und Röm. Sculpt.* Pl. VII. See also Collignon, *Hist. de la Sculpt. Grecque*, ii. p. 141, Fig. 68.

Olympia.¹ Also one of the so-called Dancing Maidens from Herculaneum in the Museum of Naples.²

But though these heads have hair similar in length, the analogy in the arrangement is much more striking and complete in the case of the Argive coin. In the coin as well as in the marble head the hair runs over the forehead to the temple in three well defined waves³ (more minutely subdivided by further modelling in the larger marble head); while on the side, from the temple to the back of the head, there are again four well defined curl-like subdivisions in larger masses which are again subdivided by smaller wavy modelling. Though thus there naturally is more indication of detail in the rendering of these curls in the large marble head than on the coin, the die-sinker appears to me on the whole a greater artist—a better sculptor—than the copyist in marble, especially in the manner in which he has been able to transfer into his reproduction the character of the metal work, which is to a greater extent lost in the coarser marble technique. To appreciate the close analogy in this unique rendering of the hair in these two heads it is well to recall that the end of the side curl nearest the temple is broken away in the marble.

The line of forehead and brow, the treatment of the eye (always allowing for the difference of technique and size) are the same. Though the nose is restored in the marble, its profile direction is prescribed by the extant portion of the bridge, and the relation of its outline to that of the forehead is thus in both cases the same. Evidently the restorer has not given sufficient prominence to the tip of the nose (and for this some of our Heraeum heads with perfectly preserved noses will serve as models). But the mouth, with the short upper lip and the projecting lower lip, is the same. Still more marked is the characteristic square outline of both heads taken as a whole when viewed in profile.

The most noticeable discrepancy in appearance is caused by the different treatment of the diadem in these two cases. The marble copyist evidently shrank from the attempt of rendering the diadem decorated with the Graces and the Seasons in the original, and thus merely furnished his head with a plain band, which, being thus unornamented, he was forced to reduce in size. The die-sinker was somewhat more ambitious. Instead of the full decoration with Graces and Seasons he kept the diadem broader and decorated it with a delicate honeysuckle pattern, the anthemion. Percy Gardner⁴ has put forward the hypothesis that 'the flowers with which the stephane of Hera is adorned are an abridged symbol of the horae and charites, which figures were introduced in the same place by Polycleitus.' It seems to me more likely that the gold and ivory Hera had this very anthemion pattern on the band portion of her crown. And, by analogy with Phidias's statue of the Olympian Zeus (in which these Graces and Seasons placed at the upper end

¹ See Olympia, Treu, *die Sculpturen*, Tafelband iii. Pls. X. and XI.; also Collignon, *op. cit.* i. Pls. VII.–VIII.

² Rayet, *Monum. de l'Art Gr.* i. Pl. 39;

Brunn, *Denkm. Gr. und Röm. Sculpt.* No. 294 first from our left, No. 295 first from our left.

³ See note, p. 44.

⁴ *The Coins of Elis*, p. 19.

at the back of the throne appeared to wind round the head of Zeus) these same figures would on the crown of Hera form the upper summit and completion. Now if we examine the copper coins representing the whole figure of Hera on her throne with all her attributes, we find that she wore what looks like a 'turreted' crown (Pl. III. Nos. 8-10). This may of course be a modification introduced by the later die-sinker. But as he appears to be so accurate in all the other details, such an act on his part must seem strange to us. I do not believe that the mural crown occurs as early as the fifth century B.C. Now if we examine the Argive coins with Hera we must realise that the upright points which make the crown look 'turreted' are not at all distinct.¹ The question may therefore be fairly asked, whether these points do not represent upright figures worked in the round or in high relief on the top of the diadem.² In this case the Graces and Seasons would have projected above the band of the diadem in the round or in bold relief; and the die-sinker of the earlier autonomous coin, in whose rendering of the head the details were on a more elaborate scale, had to omit the rendering of such minute figures (indistinctly given by the points of the later Roman die-sinker) and remained content with the rendering of the ornamented band only.³ The following seem to me the possible arrangements of the Graces and Seasons on the stephane of the Argive Hera. (1) Either the Graces and Seasons were worked above the gold band *in the round*, and then the upright masses would have been the die-sinker's indication of these; or (2) they were worked *in high-relief* on upright projections which are rendered in the late coins without the reliefs; or (3) they projected between the flowers of the anthemion in high relief (as the winged horses on the coins with Juno Lacinia of Pandosia and Croton)⁴ on a very broad gold band, the stephane. At all events it does not seem to me likely that the die-sinker would have represented the battlements of the mural crown by the high projections on these coins with Hera. It is also interesting to note (a fact to which my friend Mr. Cecil Smith has drawn my attention) that Hera is distinguished, on a beautiful red-figured vase of the fifth century, B.C.⁵ from Athene and Aphrodite in the Judgment of Paris, by an elaborate stephane ornamented with flowers on the top of which a winged horse projects in the round,⁶ while, on an elaborate high head-dress from a terracotta figure from Cyprus, above the flower band, are sphinxes in high relief.⁷

¹ Mr. G. F. Hill has drawn my attention to the fact that the prototype of these points is to be found in the points which are visible with the lens, if not with the naked eye, on all the early autonomous tetradrachms of Argos; in Pl. III., they are to be discovered, three in number, standing out from the top edge of the crown.

² If this was so the words *ἔπεισι* and *ἐπειγαομέναις* used by Pausanias would be the appropriate words for a diadem so ornamented.

³ Dr. Dressel of the Coin Department of the

Berlin Museum informs me that Dr. Imhoof-Blumer considers the crown on these coins to be the mural 'turreted' crown.

⁴ *B.M. Cat. Italy, Croton, No. 88; Pandosia, No. 2.*

⁵ C. Smith, *Cat. Gr. and Etr. Vases, Brit. Mus.* iii. p. 195, E. 257 (a).

⁶ See also the Hera on a vase quoted by Mr. Smith, from the *Elite Ceramogr.* i. Pl. 29.

⁷ Terracotta in the Brit. Mus., No. C. 102.

The whole question of the distinctive crown of Hera and Juno ought to be dealt with more exhaustively than I can here do, and would make an interesting monograph. What appears to me clear, however, is that the coins we are discussing have not mere representations of the late mural crowns; but have some reference to the decoration of Hera's diadem as described by Pausanias. But to return to the anthemion ornament.

It is certainly more than a mere coincidence that the pattern as here given is to be found in nearest approximation on the ornaments of the very temple in which the great statue stood—namely, the Argive Heraeum which we have excavated (Fig. 1).¹ This, by the way, confirms our belief in the close relationship between the sculptured work of the temple and the statue it contained: i.e., the common patterns and styles of the one Polykleitan workshop. If we study the natural history of this pattern throughout Greek art² we find that the delicate low relief with the wavy, horizontal lines is to be found first in the Parthenon, and then in these most beautiful specimens from the Argive Heraeum; that this is followed by its rendering in the Erechtheum of Athens (which shows a close relationship to the Argive



FIG. 1.—FRAGMENT OF MARBLE SIMA FROM THE ARGIVE HERAEUM.

pattern in that, in one instance,³ it even reproduces the bird, but which, being at least ten years later, marks a further step in conventionalisation in that the flowers are more upright and closer together). Next we may mention the Tholos of Epidauros with deeper undercutting and bolder relief, fuller in line—in short more ‘Barocco;’ then the temple of Artemis at Ephesus, then the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, etc., etc.⁴

Nay, the analogy may perhaps be much closer still. On the specimen of the Argive tetradrachm here reproduced (Pl. III. No. 1), there is, above the volute of the pattern, a small projection rising obliquely upwards, which is not sufficiently distinct to show any drawing. This may be simply the result of a flaw in the die.⁵ But the other specimens of the coin have some peculiar

¹ Cf. Waldstein, *Excavations*, etc. Pl. VII.

² One of the students of our Cambridge School will shortly publish a more elaborate treatment of the development of this pattern in the successive stages of Greek art, especially in the Simae of Greek temples. According to Furtwängler the acanthus was first introduced

into Attica in the Erechtheum.

³ Penrose, *Principles of Athen. Archit.* 2nd edit. ch. x.; Yorke, ‘Balustr. of Athena Nike,’ *Journ. Hellen. Stud.* xiii. (1892, 3), note to p. 273.

⁴ See note, p. 44.

⁵ Dr. Imhoof-Blumer considers it such.

form of rise or thickening at this same point—so Nos. 5 and 6, in the same Plate. May this originally have been a bird, such as constitutes so distinctive a feature in the anthemion on the Sima of the Heraeum? Or may it not mark the point where the die-sinker originally worked his die to fashion the bird as in the other Argive pattern, and finding he could not render it adequately on so small a scale, gave it up, a hollow however here remaining in the die, of which subsequent attempts at repair could not remove all traces? The recurrence of unevennesses at this point in several specimens distinctly points to this. This detail in no way affects the main argument as to the similarity of the anthemion pattern as a whole; but as a possibility, in view of the curious protuberance on a set of coins from one die, it had to be mentioned here.

At all events this close approximation in subject and style of ornament between the gold and ivory statue of Polycleitus and the carved decoration of the temple is very interesting and may be important as not only confirming the directness of relation which existed between the marble-workers of the Heraeum (*a fortiori* the sculptors of the Metopes) and the master of Hera, Polycleitus; but also in its bearing upon the general relation between the architectural sculptures of a temple and the great statues which they contained.¹

If now we turn from the profile to the full-face view of our marble Hera, the simple, broad and noble character of this head bears out the principles of Polycleitan art and style to which I referred. We have the square outline of the whole, the distinctness and articulation of the different sections of the face, and the peculiarities in the simple features, in spite of the restoration of the nose and some damage to portions of the lips.

There remains one striking feature which gives a distinctive character to this head, namely, the way the hair from the temples downwards is, as it were, lifted away from the face, as if it were made of separate and different material.² This accentuates the difference of texture between face and hair and, in spite of the broad, firm modelling of the face, gives its surface a touch of softness—as of ivory framed by gold. The head may give us some faint notion of the effect of the chryselephantine technique. In other respects also, in the firm, broad modelling and the sharp lines (note the firmly cut edge



FIG. 2.—TERRACOTTA HEAD FROM THE ARGIVE HERAEUM.

¹ In a paper which I have just sent to press, presenting the discovery of some reproductions of pedimental figures from the Parthenon, I am dealing more fully with this question.

² Cf. the head published by Eugénie Sellers, *Journal Hellen. Stud.* xiv. (1894) pp. 198 seq. Pl. V.

of the upper eyelid), we believe we can recognise the art of a master in *caelatura*.

I would finally draw attention to a very important piece of evidence bearing upon this question. Among the few terracottas dating as late as the fifth century B.C., which we found in our Argive excavations (few in comparison with the many hundreds of an earlier date) there is one head, only half of which is extant, the largest terracotta head we there found (Fig. 2). It is evidently a work of the fifth century and bears more marks of being copied from a great work than any of the others. The extant features of the face distinctly show the Polycleitan characteristics, especially in mouth and nose, though we must take into account the inferiority of the coroplast and the limitations enjoined by the material and the customary degree of finish given to such figurines. This of course applies also to the modelling of the hair. But with this reservation and in spite of the rough sketchy modelling of the hair, the principle of its arrangement and treatment is the same as in our marble head from the British Museum. The band of the diadem can be seen above the hair on the side; while the hair below it falls down in wavy masses like curls and is in the same characteristic manner set off and 'undercut' from the face. I venture to hold that this terracotta head is an attempt at a direct copy of the famous Argive Hera by Polycleitus.

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.



FIG. 3.

NOTE.

I have compared the marble head only with the Argive coin to avoid confusion; but I should like, as an appendix, to draw attention also to the coins of Elis (Fig. 3) which Prof. Percy Gardner places between the years 420 and 400 B.C., and which he rightly maintains convey some idea of the Polycleitan Hera. In some respects these coins, with the large and heavy features, reproduce the characteristics of Polycleitan style even more markedly than those of Argos; though I do not believe that their execution is finer. The hair is the same in the treatment over the forehead, while the method of rendering the 'curls' over the neck varies in distinctness,—it is certainly not the usual long braided hair. This modification does, however, take place in the next century (Gardner, *ibid.* Pl. XIV. 2a, 1, 3, 2b) when the later *coiffure* is adopted. The diadem in the best of these Elean coins is ornamented with the same pattern and is to be found even in specimens of the fourth century. But the freedom of the die-sinker is shown in the way he has introduced modifications, in some even substituting for the scroll between the flowers letters reading Ἡρα .



THE HERA OF POLYCLEITUS

Héliog. Dujardin



THE HERA OF POLYCLEITUS.