THE HOLKHAM HEAD.—A REPLY.

IN the last number of the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* (vol. xxxiv. p. 122) Mr. Guy Dickins begins his article on the Holkham Head and the Parthenon Pediment by saying that, before accepting my own arguments as contained in my article (*J.H.S.* vol. xxxiii. p. 276), 'we have the right to demand from him [myself] some evidence on the following points:—

(1) That there is reason to connect the head with Athens and the Acropolis,

(2) That the material is identical with the other pediment marbles,

(3) That the style is Pheidian, or at any rate fifth-century Attic, and

(4) That it is an architectural and not an independent piece of sculpture.'

I will not needlessly occupy space by repeating what I have already written fully in my article, and I will merely take Mr. Dickins's four objections *seriatim* and deal with them as concisely as possible; but I must ask my readers, after they have read Mr. Dickins's exposition of his views, again to read my article carefully in order to appreciate the relative value of the evidence furnished.

(1) The first objection, which he maintains 'is hardly considered by him [me] at all,' I hold is—to anyone conversant with the general facts—fully dealt with in my article. We must remember that there can only be very few fragments of the Parthenon extant anywhere in the world, even in Greece. Since the days of Lord Elgin, beyond the fragments left on the site itself or to be found in the basements of the British Museum, about three or four larger pieces have been identified, and one of these as is generally admitted by archaeologists, namely the Weber Head, certainly came from Venice. If it is difficult for Mr. Dickins to admit the possibility and even the probability that some of the few extant fragments may be found, of all places in Italy, such was not the opinion of the late Sir Charles Newton. When in 1878 I left for a tour in Italy and Greece he especially enjoined upon me the task of hunting for fragments of the Parthenon marbles in any one of the European countries, but especially in Italy. Knowing as he did, and as we all do, that Morosini and his associates attempted to lower parts of the pedimental figures—we know in one case with what disastrous results—it was not unlikely that such fragments would have found their way into Italy,

especially to Venice. About that time I communicated to him my belief that the large fragment of the lower part of a seated draped female figure in Venice, which he had noted in *Archäologische Zeitung* of 1860, might possibly be a fragment from the Western Pediment of the Parthenon. This fragment was published by me in the *Archäologische Zeitung* of 1880 (xxxviii. p. 71 *seq.*, taf. vii.) and has been reprinted in my *Essays on the Art of Pheidias* (pp. 120 *seq.*, Plate V.). Sir Charles Newton had the cast of this fragment placed in the Elgin Room of the British Museum for comparison with the Parthenon sculptures. That it certainly illustrates the Pheidian style of the Parthenon no fair-minded archaeologist will deny. Since those days, in 1882, I identified the head of a Lapith which came from Greece in the Museum of the Louvre (*J.H.S.* vol. iii. p. 228 *seq.*, *Essays etc.*, p. 98 *seq.*, Plate I.). About the same time I discovered two fragments of smaller reproductions of the Parthenon Frieze in terracotta, the one in the Louvre, the other in the Royal Museum at Copenhagen (*Essays etc.*, p. 231 *seq.*, Plate XI.); while Mr. A. H. Smith discovered another fragment of the same series in the Museo Kircheriano at Rome (*Essays etc.*, Note F, p. 232 *seq.*, Plate XIII.). Though the late Professor Furtwängler maintained the absolute genuineness of these fragments with emphatic dogmatism, as M. Salomon Reinach with the same vehemence maintained that they were forgeries, while I still withhold my final judgment on this point, the fact remains that I was right in considering them to represent the style of the Parthenon sculptures.

In 1889, after the Greek excavations on the Acropolis, a fragment of a female head in relief was found. In this case, as in the case of the Lapith head from the Metopes, I was enabled to furnish absolute proof that the fragment in question was the head of Iris from the Eastern Frieze of the Parthenon, and the cast of this fragment can now be seen immured in the continuous frieze in the Elgin Room at the British Museum.¹

This brief summary of the discovery of fragments from the Parthenon marbles in recent years is here given, not so much to establish for myself some claim in being capable of recognising the style of Pheidian art, but rather to show how we have reason and duty to hope that such fragments may be found in any part of the world, above all in Italy itself. Matthew Brettingham, who scoured all parts of Italy to purchase works of ancient art, would in the eighteenth century be as likely to secure such a fragment there as anywhere else in the world.

(2) Mr. Dickins is certainly right in agreeing with me that the question of the marble is of supreme importance for my contention, and I have done all in my power to settle this question. I might perhaps be allowed to suggest that before he ventured in a serious article to contradict all my statements on this important question as well, he might have seen fit to satisfy himself at least on this important point, and to have examined the marble at Holkham in its relation to the marbles in the British Museum,

¹ See *American Journal of Archaeology*, 1889, Pl. II.

though even then he would hardly be justified in expecting that his judgment would at once have over-ridden my own and that of my geological colleague, Professor McKenny Hughes. I paid three separate visits to Holkham to examine the original itself, from every point of view, and especially with regard to this important point of the nature of the marble. On the last occasion I had the great advantage of being accompanied by a specialist in geology and petrography. He had brought with him numerous specimens of the various marbles for confrontation with the head itself. Both he and I were not satisfied with the finality of our studies on the spot, and I did my best to persuade the owner to allow us to procure even the smallest chip from the back of the head, not visible to the spectator and in no way damaging to the work of art itself, in order that microscopic slides might be made for further more accurate and scientific examination of the marble. Mr. Dickins must forgive me if I remonstrate with him for seriously informing a specialist in geology of the difference in the nature of marble, even from the same quarry. This is of course known to all petrographers, and I myself have referred to this as a warning against hasty conclusions on several occasions. Nevertheless it cannot be denied that a great deal can be learnt as regards the classification of marbles from such microscopic examination; and the difference between, for instance, Pentelic and Parian, and Pentelic and nearly all the Italian marbles, is fairly recognisable. I could not prevail upon the owner of the head to give us this help towards the scientific solution of an important question. I could not even prevail upon him to allow me to have the head taken from the high niche and placed in a proper position and a proper light in order to have a really good photograph of the original made. I therefore had to remain content with a not very accurate photograph in its present unfavourable position, and for the rest had to rely upon photographs of the cast which, as regards the non-expert in such matters and even among archaeologists, are most misleading for the determination of delicate questions of style. If I failed in these attempts I need not say how impossible it was to get permission to bring the head itself to the British Museum for actual comparison on the spot with the Elgin marbles there for the light such a comparison might throw upon the question of the marble. But I must here emphatically point out the dogmatic and entirely inaccurate way in which archaeologists who compile catalogues of the various museums decide upon the question of the separate marbles. Should Mr. Dickins find it worth while to examine the original marble at Holkham, with a view to determining its relationship to the Parthenon marbles as regards material, I would warn him to remember that, not only this head at Holkham, but all the marbles in that house have, in comparatively recent years, been subject to a process of cleaning which has robbed them of their ancient *patina*, and that the appearance of the marble might therefore be very misleading to anyone applying his 'trained eye' to the determination of such delicate questions. I spent many years in the careful study of monuments in all the museums of Europe, and have seen many works issuing from the ground during excavations; but my

experience has certainly taught me one lesson: namely, extreme caution in expressing a decided opinion. As an archaeologist I shall always humbly defer to the final judgment of specialists in petrography, such as my friend and colleague, Professor McKenny Hughes.

3. That I should consider the style of this head Pheidian or fifth-century Attic, fills Mr. Dickins 'with amazement.' He goes on to say that, 'no doubt the sculptor of the pediment was not a first-class artist, but he did not at any rate commit the faults of the Holkham head.' I must confess that Mr. Dickins's opinion of the sculptor of the Parthenon pediments as a second-rate artist—or at all events not a first-class artist—will fill every archaeologist and artist with amazement. I need not repeat my reasons for assigning the Holkham head to the Attic style of the fifth century; but I must protest against all he says of the general inferiority in the modelling of this head with 'the heavy monotonous fleshy forehead, cheeks, and neck of the Holkham head,' and I would beg those interested in the question to examine the original, and not merely the cast of the head, to realise the quality of the modelling of these parts. As to the question of the lower eyelid, the edges of which are not as sharp as those of the upper lid, I could give him many instances of such differences in heads from the best period. Often (as I believe is the case in our instance) weathering or the restorer's hand in addition to this will account for such difference. It will, for instance be seen that in the well-known sepulchral relief, Hegeso wife of Proxenos (Collignon, *H.S.G.*, ii. Plate IV.), the seated female figure retains great sharpness in the cutting of the features, notably the eye-lids; while in the standing attendant female figure the features and the eye-lids have been much smoothed down in comparison. There is not a trace of the 'drilling out' of the lip corners (which he claims to see in the Holkham head) such as we find in later Roman work. He begins more definitely with the treatment of the hair, and maintains that 'the Parthenon sculptures and all the works certainly connected with the school of Pheidias show the use of thick curls of hair with a very pronounced wave.' There is no such unity in the general treatment of the hair of works belonging to the fifth century. A careful study, not only of the few heads extant in the Parthenon, but of the earlier Olympia pediments and the heads from the Argive Heraeum show a great diversity of arrangement in the treatment of the hair to conform to the several personalities presented. Some are treated in a broader manner, others with more minute variety and detail. We thus also find a very marked difference in the treatment of hair by the same artist, when Polycleitos, for instance, gives us the flat hair of the Doryphoros on a definite uniform system, and the strong variety of line and depth in the curls of the Diadumenos. To realise this variety I would ask the reader merely to turn to the second volume of Collignon's *Histoire de la Sculpture Grecque* (page 59, fig. 26) and to examine the treatment of hair of the three best preserved heads from the Frieze of the Parthenon (Poseidon, Dionysos, and Peitho) to realise the difference and the more meticulous treatment of hair strands and curls in one and the same work of the Pheidian period. Let

him turn also to the so-called Lemnian Athene from Bologna, which Furtwängler attributes to Pheidias, to realise what varied minuteness was given in this period to the treatment of hair if the artist desired to indicate this. Let him also note the difference in the treatment of the hair between the female figures on one and the same relief, namely, the well-known Eleusinian Relief (Collignon, *H.S.G.*, ii. page 141, fig. 68). If I am right in considering the Holkham head to represent Aphrodite—and though other divinities are occasionally represented with earrings the addition of such jewels strongly favours such an interpretation—the sculptor of a pedimental group would certainly give a more ornate treatment to the hair of this figure than to any of the others. In my article I chiefly compared the treatment of the hair of this head with that of the so-called Weber head especially on Fig. 16, page 288, where, in the profile view, the sharpness of the modelling has not been rubbed away as it is in front. To appreciate the difference in the earlier and later treatment of the hair, however, one need but compare the hair of the Holkham head with that of the colossal head from Turin, figured in his article, to realise the marked difference. Mr. Dickins does compare these two heads with one another, using the full face view from the original of the Turin head and the profile view from a painfully white cast of the Holkham head. I would demand that both marbles be examined in their front view, and that it be remembered that the upper part of the hair on the Holkham head is restoration.

Mr. Dickins adduces for comparison with the Holkham head works like the Hera Ludovisi (a highly contested work on the nature of which I cannot enter here now) and the restored head of the *Giunone che discende dall'Olimpo*² of the Villa Albani. But he considers the nearest analogy to the Holkham head to be the colossal head in Turin which he figures on page 124 of his paper, Fig. 1. Now I maintain in all sobriety and without violent dogmatism or arrogance, that one could hardly find among all ancient monuments two heads more suited to illustrate contrast between two styles rather than likeness than these two heads which he considers nearest to one another. The Holkham head gives the leading characteristics of a severer art of ancient Hellas—though the subject dealt with be that of Aphrodite and not of a Hera or a Demeter, and consequently one which would be more likely to anticipate the less severe treatment of the fifth century and early fourth century B.C. which would not be the case with other divinities. The Turin head, on the other hand, illustrates the great change that set in after Scopas, and even points to a period after Lysippos and the period of Alexander the Great as a striking specimen of Hellenistic art. In the head from Turin which, to my mind, is an offshoot of the artistic direction initiated by Scopas, and, passing through Lysippos to the schools of Pergamon, a late offshoot—how late I am not able to

² I have endeavoured to find reproductions of the head thus described by Mr. Dickins without further reference. I seem to remember

it as part of a relief; but without citation it is difficult to remember the many thousands of works in European museums.

determine—we have a distinct contrast in character and workmanship to the severer and earlier art of the fifth century, as illustrated in the Holkham head. I repeat: It would be difficult to find two heads so completely illustrating this contrast. The two heads are here (Fig. 1) placed side by side for comparison, the Holkham head no longer from a cast and in profile view. From the most general point of view, in attitude and expression there is a 'romanticism,' a sentiment, in the Turin head quite foreign to any heads I know which point back to the style of the fifth century B.C. The beginnings of such an expression and general artistic character we find in Scopasian

THE HOLKHAM HEAD.

HEAD IN TURIN.

FIG. 1.

heads and in the well-known head of Niobe in the Florentine statues preserved to us in a very inferior late Roman shop-copy. But, even in this late copy of the work which illustrates Scopasian character to us, we have a certain moderation and severity still noticeable in which the Turin head is entirely wanting. On the one hand, every feature in the whole modelling is coarsened down; and, on the other hand, there is a peculiar realism especially noticeable in the treatment of the hair. Though the hair is meant to represent the long hair of a female figure, not the longer or

shorter curls of a male figure as in the late portraits of Alexander the Great, or in the giants from the Pergamenean Altar, or the so-called Dying Alexander. The twists and twirls, the restless fluid character of these strands rising and falling on either side of the central parting, the more violent deeply cut and sharply rising ripples and waves, are most characteristic of this late sensational period. We come nearest to this style of hair in the two sea-centaurs in the Vatican,³ with which I beg the reader to compare the hair of the Turin head. The hair of these sea-centaurs is Hellenistic and, though later, may be led back to the Scopasian direction of art. Both Amelung and Löwy (*l.c.*) recognise this. It certainly is late in character, and is contrasted with the severer style of the fifth century B.C. and with that of the Holkham head. Moreover the work is most mechanical, and it is here that the drill has been freely used when we come to the long and deep groove cut into the mass of hair that covers the ear. Though the artist is here dealing probably with some divinity, if the diadem was genuine, he would put more restraint upon himself than he would in the case of a sea-centaur; but the character and the period remain the same as in the instances quoted, which mark a late development of the Greek schools of the end of the fourth century, turning through Pergamon and Rhodes back to Roman, or at all events, flowing into the later Roman period. The same late period is shown by the strong downward curve of the eyebrow and the deeply sunk eye, as well as by the open mouth and the expression which this treatment of such features gives. It is also accentuated by the hard and mechanical line coarsely cut into the cheek beside the nostril. This more mechanical treatment can also be seen in the rigid groove cut at the angle of the mouth.

We here have an illustration of the later developments of Greek art in the strongest contrast to the spirit of Greek art in the fifth century, and this contrast cannot be better illustrated than by a comparison between the *front* views of the original Holkham head and this colossal head from Turin. If this head is the one best suited in Mr. Dickins's words 'for the real comparison for the Holkham head,' then I have nothing more to say against Mr. Dickins's strictures on my own identification of ancient sculpture as based upon the study of style.

As to the divinity to which this head belonged, I can only repeat that, if in mind we add the earrings which were certainly there, and compare in mind the relationship which this decidedly earlier type bears to the Cnidian Aphrodite, the head is more likely to be that of an Aphrodite than of any other divinity.

Mr. Dickins dismisses my arguments which tend to show that the head formed part of a pediment as based upon perspective, by asserting that the deviations I referred to in my paper are signs of 'poor workmanship,' and

³ Helbig, *Führer*, etc., Nos. 185 and 179; Vatican Catalogue, ii. p. 418, n. 253, T. 46., *Kunst*, p. 86, T. 101. The best illustrations are Brunn-Bruckmann, *Denkmäler*, Nos. 137 and 258. and ii. p. 386, n. 228, T. 43; Löwy, *Griech.*

‘that all heads turned to the side are liable to produce asymmetry.’ I would ask the reader to examine again the heads from the Argive Heraeum as given on Figs. 17 and 18, pages 292–3, of my previous article,—still better if he would take the trouble to examine the more adequate renderings of these heads on Plates 31, 32 and 33 of Vol. I. of my *Argive Heraeum*. I would then ask the reader, whether or not the marked divergence from the straight central line of the centre of the helmet of Fig. 2 on Plate 33 and of Fig. 3 on Plate 31 is due to the gross incompetence on the part of the sculptor to fit these helmets in a straight and ordinary way (which is so easily done) and to the involuntary asymmetry which comes from the incompetence of a sculptor who could produce such excellent work as these heads undoubtedly manifest.

Finally, Mr. Dickins tells us that ‘when the modern restorations of the Holkham head are removed it will be seen that the original back of the head forms a regular flat surface’; that ‘the good condition of the head precludes the idea that it ever met with such damage’; and that ‘marble heads do not split in regular layers with smooth surfaces.’ The explanation therefore of the restorations is that ‘the Holkham head was never complete, but was originally made as a mask of the same kind as the Turin head.’ How can he predict what will be found when the restorations are removed; and is he aware that the restorer will generally smooth down parts which he joins together? But Mr. Dickins will allow me to be personal, and to say that I have been present on the sites of a great many excavations, besides those which I carried out myself, beginning with those at Olympia, and I can assure him that the evidence of innumerable fragments of statues and heads which I have there seen as they were dug up, having fallen from some height (namely, pediments, metopes, and friezes), shows that the marble itself split in large masses; and when it thus splits and has not fallen upon the face (but probably on the top of the head) the face may be in very good condition. The head of the Metope of Plate 30 of my *Argive Heraeum* is almost intact as regards the front of the face, while the back of the head was split off clean, but was fortunately found by us, so that we could bring the two parts together again. But more than this, I would ask him to cast even a superficial glance at Plate 17 of my article, taken from the original of the Holkham head, and he will see that the break, marking the point where the restoration of the top and back of the head was added, does not present a regular and straight line such as would have been the case had the head been presented as a mask. Moreover, the breakage at the right and the left of the neck, as well as in front, and the restorer’s work (who wished to make of it a symmetrical bust to be placed upon a small pedestal) are not of the nature of those masks with which we are all familiar.

Whether I am right or not in considering it probable that the head formed part of the Parthenon pediment, so much I do claim: that even if the Holkham head be a copy, it is one of the best Greek copies, not a

late Roman shop-copy, such as are some of the other heads which I reproduced in my previous article. Moreover, it would be a copy of a type earlier than the Aphrodite type of Praxiteles and would lead us back to the fifth century B.C., which finds its fullest expression in the art of Pheidias; and that this type stands in the strongest contrast to such later developments of Greek art represented by the colossal head from Turin, which Mr. Dickins considers the fittest specimen for comparison with the Holkham head.

CHARLES WALDSTEIN.