The Annual of the British School at Athens

<http://journals.cambridge.org/ATH>

Additional services for *The Annual of the British School at Athens*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The East Pediment Sculptures of the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina

Duncan Mackenzie

The Annual of the British School at Athens / Volume 15 / November 1909, pp 274 - 307

DOI: 10.1017/S0068245400017664, Published online: 18 October 2013

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0068245400017664

How to cite this article:

Duncan Mackenzie (1909). The East Pediment Sculptures of the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina. The Annual of the British School at Athens, 15, pp 274-307 doi:10.1017/S0068245400017664

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

FIG. 1.—THE RESTORATIONS IN THE E. PEDIMENT.

(Restorations indicated by dotted lines.)

THE EAST PEDIMENT SCULPTURES OF THE TEMPLE OF APHAIA AT AEGINA.

PLATE XIX.)

AT the Archaeological Congress¹ which met at Athens in 1905 one of the most interesting sittings was that at which Furtwängler gave a brilliant exposition of his reconstitution of the Pediment Sculptures of the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina, the result of his recent excavations in the island. Those who were present on that occasion were profoundly struck by an arrangement of the groups calculated to inspire the noble marbles with so much new and vivid life; in regard, however, to the grouping of the figures of the East Pediment there are said to have been not a few dissentient voices. This dissent related more especially to the disposal of the central groups right and left of the Athena and, in a particular way, to the falling pose given to the wounded hero on either side. The considerations that first awakened doubt at the Congress were, naturally enough in the circumstances, of a vague aesthetic character. In the case of life-size sculpture in the round, belonging still to the archaic period, it was instinctively felt that the pose was wrong; people were hardly prepared for so exaggerated a divergence from the position of stable equilibrium as that proposed by Furtwängler, and the object of my paper is to try to show that the doubts, then either felt or expressed, were justified in fact. My

¹ None who were present then could have foreseen that the work in Aegina was to be Furtwängler's last great achievement in archaeological science, and that many of the audience were then listening to him for the last time.

conclusions are embodied in the attempted reconstruction of the pediment shown in Pl. XIX. A.¹

Many then present may have reflected at the moment, or realized later, that the aesthetic considerations that had appealed to them then had their ample justification in the practice of the time. It is an undoubted historical fact that in Greek plastic art of the period, no true parallel can be instanced for this extreme exaggeration of unstable equilibrium in the pose of these figures. Furtwängler himself, it is true, admits this, but at the same time he cites examples of a similar pose from Attic black- and red-figured vase-painting which, in origin, may go back to the imitation of the monumental wall-painting of the period.² Considering, however, the significant lack of any parallel evidence from contemporary sculpture in the round, the analogy from painting should not have been quite so misleading as I venture to think it has proved in this case. It must be remembered that sculpture in the round was confronted by the necessity of finding a practical solution for an extremely difficult static problem which had absolutely no existence for painting in the flat. This practical difficulty may reasonably be regarded as in itself the explanation of the significant fact that vase-painting presents us so frequently with this particular falling pose, while it is entirely lacking in the sculpture of the same age. Not only so, but we find that in this respect, the practice of the great classic era of sculpture was in entire harmony with the tradition of an earlier time. It thus results that historical experience only tends to confirm the aesthetic considerations referred to, instead of showing them up as a mere subjective feeling with no justification in fact.

But now to the facts themselves that more concern us here. It had been my good fortune, in 1905 and again in 1906, to admire and study at Munich the finished outcome of Furtwängler's labours at Aegina. The sum total was there seen, embodied in the figurine groups which represent the reconstitution of the pediment sculptures as first rendered possible by these discoveries. These figurine groups are the originals of Plates 104, 105, 106 of the work on Aegina; Fig. 1, in which all the restored portions

¹ For the drawing of this reconstruction I have to thank the skill and artistic insight of Mr. Theodore Fyfe, who, at intervals, during more than three years, has devoted much self-sacrificing zeal to the working out of the design as it now stands. Some slight modifications, the result of later observations at Munich, were kindly inserted for me at Constantinople by Mr. Walter George.

² *Aegina*, 343-6; Figs. 272-7.

are marked by dotted lines, shows how much remains of the original figures in the East Pediment, and is here reproduced, by special permission of the Trustees of the British Museum, from the *Guide to the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities*. The falling figures of the East Pediment whose pose had awakened so much doubt at the Congress at Athens are D and H on Pl. XIX. B.¹

Thorwaldsen, as it happens, restored one of these figures, that to the left of the Athena, as already fallen and lying on his back on the ground. Let us now consider this pose. (Fig. 2.)

The possibility of the falling position proposed by Furtwängler probably did not occur to Thorwaldsen at all. If it did, we can be sure it was not, in the first place, for aesthetic reasons that it was not preferred. Rather it was because the torso afforded the sculptor indications as to its pose, which in such cases usually escape the notice of the archaeologist. Is there positive evidence that there actually were just such indications of pose as would naturally appeal to the practised eye of a sculptor and were likely to escape the attention of the archaeologist? If so, we shall not be far wrong in concluding that this was, in its nature, one of those special instances in which, for once, the artist was right and the archaeologist wrong. It is more than probable indeed, that the pose given by the restorer happened to be independent of any special archaeological knowledge regarding the traditions of plastic usage in the Archaic Period in Greece. In that case we shall only have the greater reason to trust the artist's special knowledge and judgment in favour of the recumbent position.

It is necessary to go somewhat into detail. In deciding as to the profile positions, right or left, of the statues in these pediments, Furtwängler has rightly attached special importance to the indications as to pose afforded by the weathering of the exposed parts of the figures. In doing so, there is, however, one thing, I think, which he has not appreciated with sufficient precision. This is the extraordinary difference between the kind of smooth weathering produced by north winds and the peculiar corrosion of the surface of the marble produced by the south wind alone.

¹ I have warmly to thank Prof. Paul Wolters for his kind mediation with the Munich Academy of Sciences, which has secured for me permission to reproduce this and other illustrations from *Aegina*. I am also indebted to Mr. Arthur H. Smith, Keeper of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, for kindly obtaining permission for the reproduction here of Fig. 1.

FIG. 2.—FIGURE OF A WARRIOR AS RESTORED BY THORWALDSEN

FIGS. 3, 4.—FRONT AND BACK VIEW OF THE UNRESTORED TORSO OF THE WARRIOR SHOWN IN FIG. 2.

Thus to come to our statue as shown in Fig. 2 (after *Aegina*, Pl. 95, 77): the corrosion on the left side of the body and extending towards the back, is perfectly natural here if the figure is conceived in agreement with Thorwaldsen's reconstruction. In that case the figure reclines horizontally on its back, and faces the south in such a way that the left side of the body would have been necessarily exposed to the full side-long force of the corrosive south wind. In this position too, the trickling down of the briny rain brought by the south wind, and the impregnation of the marble with the solutions of salt left behind through evaporation, would in itself account for the continuation of the corrosion towards the back. The horizontal position of the front of the body also afforded some protection against the full force of the south wind. It did not allow of the trickle of rain on the gently curving surfaces, and the corrosion here is accordingly much less marked than on the exposed left side. This peculiar intensification of the corrosion of the left side and the comparatively smooth weathering and good preservation of the front of the torso are, on the other hand, inexplicable with a falling pose of the figure in profile left, as proposed by Furtwängler.¹ This pose with the large shield held as it is in the model requires a considerable corrosion of the front of the body, which on this reconstruction would have been exposed to the full force of the south wind. There would have been no intensification of the corrosion towards the left side behind. Moreover the upper part of the left side protected by the shield should not have been corroded at all. As a matter of fact, however, there is considerable corrosion in the region extending from the left nipple to the shoulder. Furtwängler himself seems to have been conscious of this contradiction between the actual corrosion on the left side of the torso and the kind of corrosion which his reconstruction requires, but he gets over the difficulty by the suggestion that a considerable intensification of the weathering on the left side of the body towards the back occurred while the torso was in the earth.² But the peculiar intensification of the corrosion is best explained by the trickling down of the briny rain-water over the exposed side. The surface of the marble then became impregnated with the salt left behind in the process of evaporation; its solvent action on the surface was a process that went on under the influence of

¹ *Aegina*, Fig. 173, H; pp. 244-8; Figs. 198-202.

² 'An der linken Körperseite der Figur nach dem Rücken zu ist die Witterung nachträglich in der Erde erheblich verstärkt' (p. 248).

later weathering through wind and rain from other quarters, while the statue was still *in situ*. Any weathering that took place in the earth was really a continuation of the same process; that is to say, it was a disintegration, through damp, of surfaces impregnated with solutions of brine through exposure in position to the influence of the south winds and rains. The splashing of rain from the plinth is a further factor that has to be taken into account in the case of reclining figures.¹ In complete contrast to all this, it is rather significant to find that no parts of figures not having this special exposure show any trace of this particular kind of corrosion.

Furtwängler is farther puzzled by the fact that on the left breast of this figure there is 'eine wenig corrodirt Stelle.' This, in the natural course of things, would not have been the case were his reconstruction right, as this part would then have been exposed to the corroding influence of the south wind. He would account for the lack of corrosion by the interrogative suggestion: 'vielleicht war hier einmal ein Vogelnest das schützte?' Had the figure been reconstructed as reclining horizontally on the ground front up, there would have been no difficulty whatever in explaining the lack of corrosion. In such a position this part had more than a partial protection against the corrosive influence of the south wind, through its slope away and down towards the shoulder. This gave it a northern exposure instead of the southern one which it would have had on Furtwängler's reconstruction.

An extension of the corrosion of the left side may be taken for granted for the whole exposed part of the left shin. This particular instance of the probable effect of corrosion would, it is true, be applicable to Furtwängler's as well as to Thorwaldsen's pose, so far as the position of the missing part of the left leg from the knee down is concerned. But in the upward direction for which we have the real evidence, all agreement ends at the knee. Here the front of the thigh is much less corroded than it should have been in accordance with Furtwängler's exposed position of it; on the other hand it is quite as little corroded as was to be expected in the much more protected position presupposed by Thorwaldsen's restoration. In relation to the influence of the south wind the unprotected part of the thigh was the outside towards the back. This is borne out very clearly by the strongly marked corrosion at that part. The same

¹ Compare the statue in the north corner of the West Pediment.

tilt-up of the knee that brought the front of the thigh into shelter from the south wind exposed the outside, towards the back, to its full force. This double phenomenon is, on the other hand, quite inexplicable with a falling pose of the figure and a position of the thigh like that seen in Furtwängler's reconstruction. (H. Pl. XIX. B.)

It is a pity that we cannot safely assume that Thorwaldsen was aware of the bearing of this subtlety of weathering. Unfortunately, however, his mistake about the position of the Herakles, which has now been set right by Furtwängler, makes this seem doubtful. He placed the Herakles in the south wing of the pediment near the corner, in profile right, and so looking north. He did this notwithstanding a corrosion of the face that could only have been produced through its looking south. Even his artistic insight seems to have gone wrong here, for he has ignored the greater working out of details on the left side of the figure, which confirmed the evidence furnished by the strong corrosion of the face. The example of a statue which has been assigned its true place in the north wing of the pediment by Furtwängler is of special interest here. The weathering on the outside of the left thigh of this figure, which is intensified on the left or exposed outside of the knee, presents a complete analogy to that of the somewhat similarly placed thigh of Thorwaldsen's recumbent figure.

This corrosion of the thigh is only the prolongation of that of the left side already discussed. Both present a startling contrast to the smooth, unweathered, almost perfectly preserved surface of the protected under side towards the right, and away from the unprotected outer edge of the plinth, in the direction of the tympanum. This observation applies with special aptness to the back of the torso. Its excellent preservation and unweathered surface can hardly be accounted for unless by the exceptional protection afforded to it, in a recumbent position, through its juxtaposition to the plinth. It is a significant fact, not to be left out of account, that this special unweathered character of the surface is repeated in all parts of figures having the same recumbent pose and juxtaposition to the plinth and tympanum.¹

Here, however, we come to a fact about this torso which must have determined for Thorwaldsen, as a sculptor, the recumbent pose he gave to

¹ Compare the under side of the reclining warrior (Glypt. 85) in the same pediment and of all the reclining figures in the West Pediment.

the figure. This fact, curiously enough, seems to have escaped the vigilant eye of Furtwängler.

If we examine the torso closely either in the original, in Furtwängler's Fig. 199, or in our Figs. 3 and 4,¹ we cannot fail to notice a peculiar hitch-up, out of the horizontal line, of the left breast and shoulder. How are we to explain this? Only, I think, on the supposition that the left arm was supported from below. In other words, we have to suppose that the arm either rested at the elbow on the ground or, as is more likely, that it was supported in a resting position above the ground, by the help of the shield. This probably lay flat on the ground as in Thorwaldsen's reconstruction. Its position is fully warranted by the outward tendency of the biceps muscle shown by the part of the arm preserved (Fig. 3). It is, further, in harmony with the fact that, where the exigencies of combat do not interfere, the shield is usually not allowed to compromise the visibility of the figure. It is important likewise to note that at one point the transition to the arm from the torso is preserved, and this forms a rather abrupt curve outwards which agrees with the outward inclination of the biceps muscle. Thorwaldsen has rightly placed the lower part of this in a position to fit in with the corresponding outward inclination of the existing upper part. The transitions from the upper to the lower part of the muscle have been well observed; thus we find that the rather flat surfaces of the inner side of the lower part of the biceps muscle are kept in the same plane with those of the upper part. This is attached to the torso so that the outward inclination of the lower half necessarily results from the outward turn of the upper half of the muscle. The middle part is restored, but the lower part as far as the transition to the elbow is preserved. This shows a swell of the muscle and a strong turn outwards, which confirm the indications afforded by the upper part of the arm. The prominent vein which inclines so markedly outwards on the upper part of the muscle shows the same outward inclination on the lower part. This has been quite finely observed by Thorwaldsen in his restoration of the intermediate missing part.

In agreement with these indications let us once more return to the peculiar hitch-up of the left breast and shoulder already referred to. It is

¹ Fig. 3 is after a special photograph placed at my disposal through the great courtesy of Prof. Wolters; Fig. 4 is after *Aegina*, Fig. 199.

this hitch-up which produces the very pronounced asymmetry of the chest in front, and the prominent rounding of the left shoulder above. The whole is quite naturally and adequately explained if it belongs to a reclining figure leaning on the left elbow, which is below it. On the other hand, both are quite inexplicable, if, like Furtwängler, we conceive a figure falling backwards, and suppose a sinking position of the left arm from which the shield is just on the point of dropping. Such a position of the left arm is thus in clear contradiction with the hitch-up of the left breast and shoulder so characteristic of the torso.

Yet another circumstance. A glance at the back of the torso shows that the phenomenon noted in front is repeated behind. This indeed is very clearly observable in Fig. 4. The upper edge of the left shoulder-blade appears hitched up out of its normal position in relation to the right one, in a manner which admits of only one explanation: it could only be caused by the lean on the elbow of a figure lying on the ground. The prominence of the edge of the shoulder-blade next the spine, with the hitch towards the backbone as well as up in the direction of the neck, is equally convincing. It brings the angle of the blade here into sharp contrast with the corresponding more softly undulating contours of the right shoulder-blade. Again, the emphasis on the hollows in the middle region of the blade, to indicate compression, is a subtlety of plastic treatment which tells a story of its own. It can only be explained through the lean on the left arm of a body which, at the same time, was turned somewhat in the direction of its own left and towards the spectator.

There is one detail remarked on by Furtwängler, at the top of page 247, which is of paramount importance in deciding this question as to whether our statue was in a falling or in a recumbent position. The necessary suggestion underlying Furtwängler's reasoning is that the treatment of this detail is decisive for a falling pose, as such. No room at all is left for the alternative possibility that it is the recumbent pose of our statue that really conditions the treatment. And yet when we come to the real facts what do we find? Far from the treatment being decisive for a falling pose it presupposes a recumbent position. In such a position the hitch-up of the thighs with the right somewhat higher than the left, and the inclination of the body somewhat towards its own left side, are concomitant moments in the pose not to be left

out of account. And it was these which, for artists like those of the East Pediment, determined absolutely what, with such a pose, was the natural rendering of this organ. It is this complex pose that really explains the peculiar tilted disposition and leftward inclination of the 'Hoden' remarked upon by Furtwängler, but inadequately described by him as 'recht lose und etwas angezogen nicht schlaff hängend.' It is thus quite misleading to refer this latter peculiarity, as Furtwängler does, 'zu den allgemeinen Stilgewohnheiten der Epoche, die auch auf den attischen Vasen zu bemerken ist.' The characteristic tilt-up of the 'Hoden,' far from finding any adequate explanation in the general practice of the time, is a necessary deduction from the recumbent pose of a figure lying front upward and with upward inclination of the thighs. So much is this so, that it is entirely in harmony with the analogous and variant treatment of the organ in all the other reclining figures of these pediments. The slight but distinctly noticeable inclination to the left side is similarly to be explained: it follows partly from the greater hitch-up of the right thigh, partly from the slight turn of the recumbent figure towards its own left side. A detail in treatment, which has been apparently overlooked by Furtwängler but was observed by Thorwaldsen, brings out the cogency of this explanation in a still clearer light: the part of this organ next the torso is intact, and this shows on the under side a very noticeable bend up, and at the same time towards, the left side of the figure. This can only be explained respectively from the recumbent pose of the body front up, and the turn, already referred to, towards the left side. The detail, in itself a trifling one, is thus one more justification of Thorwaldsen's reconstruction.

Furtwängler, p. 247, as an argument in favour of his reconstruction, makes much of the dowel-hole noted and drawn by Haller, and visible on the back of the cast of the unrestored torso (Fig. 4) under the left shoulder-blade. On consideration, however, it turns out that such a dowel-hole is quite as conveniently available for the use to which Thorwaldsen put it as for that to which, on my view, Furtwängler has misapplied it. We must bear in mind that in the case of a recumbent figure, its visibility above the plinth, as looked at from the terrace of the temple, was a consideration sure to weigh with the sculptors. We can thus at once understand the motive for showing the body in a somewhat raised position, with no part of the torso touching the plinth. In such a position the extra

support afforded by a bar of bronze would be an advantage. On the other hand its concealment behind the left arm would prevent it from being visible to the spectator. In these circumstances we can well appeal to the support of aesthetic reasons in favour of a quite invisible, short support for the recumbent figure. There are equally strong aesthetic objections to the long and very noticeable bronze bar required by Furtwängler's reconstruction. The position of the dowel-hole, so much to one side under the left shoulder-blade, is adequately explained by a peculiarity in the pose already noted. In the recumbent position the figure was turned somewhat towards its own left side and to the spectator; but in a falling figure this particular inclination of the body towards the

FIG. 5.—LEFT FOOT OF WARRIOR G IN FURTWÄNGLER'S RESTORATION.

spectator does not exist, and thus the position of the dowel-hole, so far away from the centre of gravity, becomes inexplicable.

Granted now that the torso which we have been discussing belonged to a recumbent figure, the necessity at once arises for a new opponent to the warrior (in profile right, to the left hand of the Athena) who appears as Furtwängler's G.¹ This figure would represent the comrade and avenger of the fallen hero. To it would then belong the left foot (shown in Fig. 5, after *Aegina*, Fig. 200), and made up of fragments 78 and 79. In other

¹ Pl. XIX. B. This new opponent would in turn have a double, symmetrically corresponding to him in the south wing of the pediment. Thus reckoning the total of figures to be thirteen as in the West Pediment, Furtwängler's warrior G would be our H, and so on.

words, the foot in question does not belong to a falling figure at all, but to a figure having an inclination of the body forward as in deadly combat.¹

Here, however, an initial difficulty of a very serious character occurs in any reconstruction which assigns the left foot shown in Fig. 5 to our new combatant K. The foot requires that the left leg should be in the rear, and the assignment involves a pose which represents the combatant as striding forward with the right leg in advance. The arrangement would thus contradict a very common canon in archaic art which makes figures in combat usually appear with the *left* leg in advance. While, however, this is true in a general way, it would be unsafe to assume that the strictly canonical pose in combat admitted of no exceptions, since exceptions do occur in archaic art. Indeed the exceptions are often found to be caused by circumstances which justify them in one way or another.

The following consideration is of paramount importance. In an arrangement of combatants in pairs, the combatant in profile right, with left leg in advance, has the front of the body towards the spectator. On the other hand, the combatant in profile left, and also with left leg in the advance position, has his back turned towards the onlooker. Now, in archaic art there is no doubt that, other things being equal, the front view of the human figure was regarded as aesthetically preferable to the back view. Archaic art, indeed, down to the very mature period to which our pediment belongs, felt much more strongly about the matter than did the art of a later time which was less trammelled by profile positions. The desire to represent an action clearly was apt, in certain circumstances, to come into conflict with the canonical pose. This was particularly so in the profile pose to the left, which brought the back of the figure into view instead of the front. Thus it has come about that, while for figures in profile right, the left leg is usually advanced, this is not nearly so often true of figures in profile left. In this case we often see the right leg in the advance position instead of the left. The intention of the earlier

¹ Furtwängler, p. 245, says of this foot: 'die Stellung ist für einen Ausschreitenden unmöglich. But he thus seems to be instinctively warding off the possibility of an alternative which he is apprehensive may occur to the mind of his reader. He further says of the torso of our fallen hero in relation to his falling pose: 'Der Winkel in welchen das linke Knie gebogen war, ist hier glücklicherweise erhalten.' The suggestion, of course, is that there is a necessary connection between the left foot and the knee in question. But as the intervening leg-calf is missing the connection suggested is by no means established.

stages of archaic art was clearly to compromise the strict archaic canon for the sake of bringing the front of the body into greater visibility. If then the left foot belongs to a figure in profile left with the right leg in advance, we should here have an instance in point, surviving into the most mature archaic period. The circumstances of the case, indeed, make it difficult to urge objections to an exception to the rule based on considerations which are shown, by many examples, to have appealed strongly to the archaic artist. In the earlier stages of archaic artistic development, it is true, the contradictions that arose as an outcome of such compromises were manifold. In course of time, however, the contradictions tend to vanish, through the gradual artistic realization of special circumstances which justified exceptions to the rigid canonical rule. Besides, not only the artist, but every spectator could feel with the military expert of the time, that the rigid canon only corresponded to one of the many positions of the limbs possible in the heat of real combat.

The front view of the body was really preferred by archaic art to the back view. But granted all this, the artist realized in course of time how to eliminate inconsistencies by choosing an action which made the favourite front view also the natural one. It became so because it represented the satisfactory solution of an artistic problem which had long interested the vase-painter. We may safely assume that it also interested the contemporary wall-painter and the monumental sculptor in relief and in the round.

Here, however, it is convenient to point out that the pose given by Furtwängler to his falling figure involves, for the immediately preceding moment, an advance position of the right leg. In other words, before the falling warrior was wounded, his immediately preceding pose was one in which he is conceived as fighting with his *right* leg in advance. Therefore if we regard the foot shown in Fig. 5 as belonging, not to a falling figure, but to a warrior striding forward in the heat of combat, we have the same advance position of the right leg presupposed as a previous moment in the pose of Furtwängler's falling figure. Elsewhere, it is true, in these pediments Furtwängler has analogous figures of combatants in profile left with left leg in advance, and with a back view of the figure. These instances cannot, however, be urged against our reconstruction so far as the relative positions of the legs are concerned, since, as I have suggested, it is the position presupposed as

a previous moment in the pose Furtwängler gives to his falling warrior. This is proved by the very examples brought forward in *Aegina*, pages 343-5, Figs. 272-6, to justify the falling pose; but far from justifying it these examples serve to show that, in falling back, the wounded warrior on the vase, in his new position, keeps the same leg in the same advance position as while still attacking. This is so whether the leg in advance is the right one or the left. In other words, in the change from the attacking to the falling pose the relative position of the legs is not shifted. Thus it happens that the vase-pictures shown in Figs. 272 and 274, and brought forward by Furtwängler in support of the falling pose, afford much better evidence in favour of the profile position with right leg in advance. In the immediately preceding moment the warriors on the vases were hitting out with the right leg in advance, precisely like our warrior.

The kind of pose and attitude suggested is indeed well illustrated by one of the vase-paintings cited by Furtwängler himself, the kylix by Duris, *Aegina*, Fig. 273 (after *Wiener Vorlegeblätter*, vii. 3¹). The figure is on the left-hand side of the picture. It represents a combatant in profile left, and with the right leg in advance. The reason of the pose is best realized by looking at the picture as given in the *Vorlegeblätter*. We see that the warrior is fighting with a sword, and that this is swung back high up to the left of the helmeted head, so as to allow the face to be visible below the arm. The warrior is apparently on the point of hitting a stroke against his opponent obliquely down from left to right. Now, as a matter of fencing, this can only be done efficiently with the right leg in the advance position, and it will be found on trial that for a feat of this kind the left leg cannot be in advance. The reason is that this position does not give enough free scope for the initial leftward swing of the arm, and for the axial movement of the body and arm left and then right, required by this particular stroke.

What we find then is this. The profile-left pose with the right leg advanced is something traditional and of very frequent occurrence in archaic art. Given then the pose and the archaic preference for it, we find that in course of time the initial inconsistencies caused by the pose tend to disappear. By the period in vase-painting to which the Duris picture belongs, the pose with the front view of the body secured by means of it is justified and made entirely natural by the sword-stroke referred to. Indeed

¹ Furtwängler's vi. is a misprint.

at this stage in vase-painting, the profile-left pose with right leg in advance, front view of the torso and the sword-stroke from left down to right, is of such frequency that it may be regarded as a very favourite motive.¹

The net result of the inquiry so far is as follows:—(1) In harmony with Thorwaldsen's reconstruction, the warrior to the left hand of the Athena in this pediment is represented as having wounded one opponent who is lying on the ground. (2) At the moment represented, this same warrior is engaged in a hand-to-hand fight with a second opponent, the comrade of the fallen hero. (3) In the reconstruction of his falling figure Furtwängler has combined elements which do not properly belong together. Thus, as we have seen, the torso (Fig. 3) belongs to the statue of the fallen hero, while the foot (Fig. 5) is assigned by us to the new opponent K. Much less is therefore preserved of the figure representing this warrior K than Furtwängler claims for the figure of his falling warrior. On the other hand, it is probable that we shall ultimately be able partially to make up for this despoilment by assigning to him no less important a feature than the head shown in Fig. 6 which has been relegated by Furtwängler, quite wrongly, as I think, to a different figure in quite another part of the pediment. (Pl. XIX. A.)

From the views put forward very important consequences follow as to the meaning of the action of the camp-follower next to the right, who on our reconstruction figures as L. For if one combatant was really represented as wounded and in a recumbent position, while a second opponent has taken his place in the fight, it is clear that the interpretation of the action of the camp-follower must be modified accordingly. The action of this camp-follower in his dart forward is different according as we conceive him as trying to rescue the arms of a falling warrior, or those of one already fallen. And it is distinctly significant that, if this action is regarded dispassionately, the moment represented will be found to involve a perfectly simple act of attention, undividedly directed to an object in front, only slightly raised above the level of the ground. The forward movement of the body is, in this respect, in entire harmony with the downward inclination of the face and direction of the glance, and all afford perfectly precise indications as to the position to be presupposed for the object of attention. On the other hand,

¹ For other examples see Furtwängler-Reichold, *Serie I.* Tafel 26, 55, 58, 61; *Serie II.* Tafel 74; *ibid.* 75/76 is a sheer *tour de force*.

Furtwängler, by reconstructing the figure in front as a falling warrior, is compelled to assume that the object of attention for the camp-follower is at a much higher level than that indicated by the direction of its motion and glance. Thus there come to be two objectives of attention instead of one, and this curious result receives expression in a raised position of the right arm of the camp-follower, which is quite out of harmony with the action of the rest of the figure and especially with that of the left arm. Further, fragment 84 does not fit on to the shoulder of the torso, so that, in itself, the high position is not absolutely certain as against a somewhat lower one. The outside view of the arm, indeed, as seen in *Aegina*, Fig. 205 gives a much truer impression of its real position, and comes much nearer to Thorwaldsen's reconstruction of the right arm than to Furtwängler's.

It further appears, however, that the right shoulder of the torso has an inclination of the muscles which is in harmony with the lower position, and out of harmony with the higher one. The elongated curve of the right shoulder on the underside, and the continuation of it which still shows the beginning of the upper arm below, afford quite sufficient indications that the right arm, in relation to the axis of the shoulder, had its angle in the somewhat low position suggested by Thorwaldsen's reconstruction. The raised position adopted by Furtwängler has brought about a very marked discrepancy between the action of the right arm and that of the left, and this again is re-echoed in the singularly unaesthetic effect to the eye, so clearly seen in *Aegina*, Fig. 204. The true explanation of this effect is that the objective of attention at a higher level (the supposed falling figure), with which the right arm is put into relation by Furtwängler, is out of harmony with the evident intention of the figure, as revealed by the downward direction of the gaze and inclination of the face. The gaze and the direction of the missing left arm (as indicated by the lie of the left shoulder) are towards an object in front lying on the ground, and the corresponding disposition of the right shoulder makes it reasonable to conclude that the existing right hand and arm should be regarded as moving in the same, and not in a different direction. The whole figure glides forward stealthily, and a movement of both arms in harmony with the direction of the gaze and movement of the body is the natural one for a person whose whole attention seems to be concentrated on the object to which the gaze is directed. Furtwängler's reconstruction has destroyed this impression by making the gaze and

left hand attend to one thing: that towards which the figure moves; while the right hand attends to something else, the helmet of the falling figure. This, on the contrary, is seen at a glance to lie entirely outside the range of the figure's attention. The resulting incompatibility between the objectives of attention is as disagreeable aesthetically as it is unnatural physically. There is no disputing the fact that the attention of our figure, as indicated by the direction of the gaze, the glide forward, and at the same time the strong inclination downwards of the body, is towards an object much lower in position than the torso of Furtwängler's falling figure. Why, then, it may be asked, is the whole attention of the camp-follower directed to an object which, on Furtwängler's reconstruction, does not exist, while the right hand is made to grab at an object which, with the whole figure to which it is supposed to belong, lies entirely outside the range of the figure's attention? The possibility of such a question only exposes the improbability of the reconstruction. There is further, the important general consideration that the figure, as conceived by Furtwängler, is made to exemplify a dualism in the action and in the objective of attention, which is contradicted by every figure in either pediment. Each of these figures, in fact, is represented as either doing or suffering one simple thing, to the absolute exclusion of any other passion or objective of attention. What then shall we say of a secondary objective of attention, so subsidiary as to be reflected physically only, in the function attributed to the hand grasping at the helmet of the falling figure? Were it not indeed for the action attributed to the right hand, the person represented would seem to be absolutely unaware of the existence of the person to whom the helmet is supposed to belong. This is perhaps the best proof that the falling figure did not exist, and that the object to which attention is exclusively directed, is nothing else than the recumbent warrior of Thorwaldsen's reconstruction.

Consideration of the group as a whole shows that Furtwängler's reconstruction has entirely spoiled the point of a very typical situation in early Greek warfare. The situation is as follows:—The warrior on the left hand of the Athena has disposed of one opponent, represented as lying wounded on the ground. He is meanwhile engaged in deadly combat with a second opponent, the comrade of the first. At this critical point a camp-follower, noticing the bad case of the fallen hero, glides forward stealthily and quietly from the rear, in order to save the arms if not the person, of the

wounded warrior, from the enemy. This is all represented as happening at the 'psychological moment,' when the renewed combat is at its hottest, and in the deadly preoccupation of the fight the wounded hero is, for the time being, forgotten. The intention clearly is at the right moment to anticipate the rapacious designs of spoilers on the hostile side.

In order to realize to the full the improbability of Furtwängler's reconstruction we must conceive the situation not merely as a bold sculptural group but as a real episode in Hellenic combat. What then exactly is the situation which he presupposes? The warrior to the left of the Athena has just wounded his opponent, whose falling pose shows him to be placed *hors de combat*. At the same moment the unlucky camp-follower, all unarmed as he is, makes a fool-hardy dart forward to rescue the arms of his wounded chief just as the victorious enemy is striding up in the exultation of victory, before he is faced with a new opponent. We have only to realize the situation from this practical side to see that if the one was the right 'psychological moment' this, of all others, is the wrong one, for, on such a reconstruction, the conquering hero, as we can see at a glance, is bound to make short work of the unhappy camp-follower. All other objections apart, that consideration alone is sufficient to show the impossible character of a situation which runs so counter to all the probabilities of real combat.

Let us come now to the corresponding group in the south wing of the pediment. Furtwängler (p. 233) has assigned the two thighs shown in *Aegina*, Pl. 100, 54 to a falling figure, D, answering to the falling figure in the north wing. On our reconstruction these thighs must belong to a warrior, E, already fallen, corresponding to the fallen combatant in the north wing. The general character of these thighs, indeed, so visible on Pl. 100 makes it highly probable that, notwithstanding Furtwängler's opinion to the contrary, the restorers in Rome were right when, as Furtwängler himself, p. 233, has noted, they assigned these to a figure on its back, answering in the south wing, to the recumbent figure in the north wing already discussed. An impartial examination of the original makes it quite apparent that the static condition of rest of the muscles, taken in conjunction with the characteristic general set and disposition of the limbs, is in complete harmony with the pose of a fallen figure reclining in a wounded condition on the ground. The vigour of life is still in the body, but there is no longer any dynamic strain of a person in unstable

equilibrium endeavouring, though wounded, to recover balance; but on the other hand, there is as yet no rigidity of death in the limbs. The lack of tension, as the physical expression of a resting position of the limbs, is especially apparent in the disposition of the great muscles of the thighs on the under and inner side. This lack of strain is quite apparent to the eye, particularly in the case of the left thigh, as seen on Pl. 100.

A further phenomenon that is very characteristic in these thighs is the peculiar distribution of the corrosion on the exposed right sides, in complete analogy with that of the corrosion of the exposed left side of the corresponding figure (I) in the north wing of the pediment. In striking contrast with this corrosion is the smoothness of surface not merely of the left or protected surfaces, which were towards the tympanum, but of the surfaces below, towards the left. This smoothness below is accounted for by the protection from the weather afforded by the nearness of these under surfaces to the plinth.

On the other hand, it remains inexplicable, if we conceive this protection removed, and the figure in a more or less oblique position. Furtwängler himself, p. 233, cites the weathering on the outside as a reason for assigning the figure to which the thighs belong to the south wing of the pediment. Had he, however, in doing so, allowed a greater rôle to the corrosive influence of the south wind and to the lateral direction of its force, in relation to the orientation of the pediments, there can hardly be any doubt that he would have taken more account of the difference of effect of this sidelong corrosion. In that case he would have seen that the corrosion was likely to have had a different distribution according as any given figure is conceived as placed vertically, obliquely, or lying on the ground. I think that in his reconstruction he has failed to notice this peculiar sidelong influence of corrosion by the south wind. Accordingly he fails to take adequate account of a very important factor in the complex of phenomena which, under differing conditions, produces remarkably different effects. These differences of effect in certain cases, if carefully observed, determine the pose of figures with much greater precision than would be possible, had we to do with a mere general fact of exposure to the weather in which no wind played any peculiar rôle of its own.

To this fallen figure belongs also the left leg-calf with greave, shown in Furtwängler's Fig. 184 as fitting on to the left thigh. When, however,

the leg is seen in the profile view it does not look so straight as it appears in the front view. The fragment of left thigh shown on Pl. 100, 54 has the beginning of the transition to the calf under the knee, and that shows an angle which indicates that the leg was bent, and drawn up somewhat as it would have been in a reclining figure. As this figure was in the south wing of the pediment with the legs to the north, this somewhat raised position of the left leg was probably calculated to give as full a view as possible of the figure above the plinth. The figure, with the torso raised somewhat above the plinth, was probably also turned a little towards its own right side to bring the front into prominence.

There is, however, one point about this leg-calf which is of great importance. Furtwängler, p. 234, assigns both this calf and the calf of a right leg, also with a greave, shown in Fig. 183, to his falling figure D. Now, there is a very significant difference between the greave of the two fragments which Furtwängler himself has remarked. The difference is this:—the greave of fragment 55, 1 on Pl. 86, which is that of a right leg, shows the edges at the back in relief.¹ The greave of fragment 55, 2, on the same Plate (*i.e.* of the left leg which I assign to the fallen figure), does not show these edges at all.² Notwithstanding this marked difference Furtwängler assigns both greaved fragments to one figure, that of his falling warrior; and he explains the difference on the supposition that as, in that position (profile right, in the south wing of the pediment), the left leg was away from direct view and near the tympanum, details, such as the edges, could in this case be carried out in paint.³

Now, it can hardly, in the circumstances, be a mere coincidence that at the critical point in the proof, the necessary link of strict certainty in the evidence is lacking. If we look at Fig. 183 we shall not fail to observe that the connection between the right leg-calf with greave showing edges behind (Pl. 86, 55, 1) and the right thigh (Pl. 100, 54, 1) has not been established. There is an interval between both at the knee which, as shown in Fig. 183, has been filled up with plaster. On the other hand, the

¹ 'An dem rechten Schenkel sind hinten die Ränder der Beinschiene plastisch angegeben, der rechte Rand mit erhobenem Saum, der linke glatt' (p. 234).

² 'Am linken Schenkel ist die Trennung der Schiene hinten plastisch nicht angegeben, nur der Ansatz derselben oben ist angedeutet; wahrscheinlich war die Ausführung der Trennung hier der Malerei überlassen.' (*Ibid.*)

³ 'Da dann das linke Bein weiter zurückstand, wird jener Unterschied damit zusammenhängen.' (*Ibid.*)

calf of a left leg with greave not showing edges behind fits on to the left thigh (Pl. 100, 54, 2). Here then for the first time we come upon the true connecting link in the chain of evidence, and with it, for the first time, we have the real explanation of the discrepancy between the right and left greaves. This left calf fits on to the left thigh (Pl. 100, 54, 2), which, I think, belongs to a figure lying on the ground. To the corresponding right thigh (Pl. 100, 54, 1) the calf of a right leg (Pl. 86, 55, 1) showing the edges behind in relief does *not* belong. The real calf belonging to that thigh is missing, but if it existed we should be almost certain to find that its greave also showed no edge behind. As the figure to which the thighs belong was lying on the ground and presumably turned somewhat outwards towards its own right side, the backs of the greaves, right as well as left, in their low position immediately above the plinth, were quite invisible to the spectator, and so did not require to have their edges behind rendered in relief. The true explanation of the discrepancy in the greaves is as follows: the left calf (without greave-edges behind) fits on to the left thigh of a figure lying on the ground. The right calf (with greave-edges behind in relief) does not belong to a figure lying on the ground or even to Furtwängler's falling figure, but to a warrior in profile right, striding forward in combat. It is thus the erect position of the figure, involving the visibility of the calf behind, that explains the rendering of the greave-edges in relief. The corresponding calf of the left leg of this combatant is not in existence, but we have every justification for assuming that it also had such greave-edges in relief.

The result of this analysis, then, is to show that the right thigh and calf figured in *Aegina*, Fig. 183 as parts of one falling figure, do not belong together. Further, this thigh, and the thigh on Pl. 100, 54, 2, belong to a figure lying wounded on the ground, while the right calf, with foot attached to the plinth, fitting on to it, belongs to a warrior represented in the attitude of combat with the left leg in advance.

As regards the right leg which was in the rear-position, there is one important point which must not be left out of account. In the pose of combat it will be seen that this warrior has to be conceived as at a greater distance from his opponent than that given by Furtwängler to his falling figure. This point must be borne in mind while examining the fragment of right foot with a fragment of plinth attached, shown in *Aegina*, Fig. 185. This fits on to the right leg-calf of Fig. 183 already assigned to the fighting

warrior. It is important to note that the fragment of plinth having the foot in one piece with it, as shown in Fig. 186, fits in turn into a fragment of the geison-block to which the figure must belong, namely, No. 4 in Furtwängler's 'Beilage 4.' This fragment of geison, again, has part of the front edge preserved, so that the distance of the foot from the outer edge of the geison is fixed. On the other hand, as no other edge is preserved, it is clear that the fragment of geison can be shifted right or left along the line indicated by this edge, within the limits of the block to which it belongs, in a way which affords no guarantee whatever that the position which suits Furtwängler's reconstruction of his falling figure is the right one. Therefore as the absolute position of the foot, right or left, within the limits of the geison-block is not fixed, we are free to shift it to within a hair's breadth of the left edge to suit our reconstruction, and have an equally good chance of hitting the mark.

If, then, we consider the general situation presupposed, we have, as in the case of the corresponding figure in the north wing of the pediment, a warrior who is the comrade of the hero lying wounded at his feet, represented in our reconstruction as figure E. (Pl. XIX. A.) The action, with slight variations in detail, is thus a symmetrical repetition of the corresponding combat in the north wing. As, further, this renewed combat is still undecided, we must conceive a moment earlier than that at which a decisive blow has been struck either on one side or the other. Therefore the fitted fragments of a left arm with shield-strap slipped down out of position (*Aegina*, Fig. 187), assigned by Furtwängler to his falling figure D, cannot belong to our fighting warrior. The fragment can thus only be assigned to the figure of a fallen warrior to whom I also assign the two thighs shown in *Aegina*, Pl. 100, 54, 1 and 2, and the calf on Pl. 86, 55, 2. Furtwängler has allotted this fragment to his wounded and falling figure: even if it is assigned to the figure of a fallen warrior, we find that there is nothing essential in the disposition of the arm, in relation to the slipping down of the shield, which favours the earlier moment of falling, rather than the later one in which the warrior is shown as already fallen. There is nothing to show that something is happening rather than that it has just happened. The shield is still on the warrior's arm, but the hand, as in the other case, is no longer on the grip. The natural presumption, on our reconstruction, is that all this happened to a warrior not falling, but already fallen, and now succumbing to his fate. If this arm belongs to a figure of a wounded

warrior reclining front up in profile right, but inclined somewhat to his own right side, and the shield is further conceived as resting on its edge so as to show the inside with the arm, then we can easily assume a position for the arm in relation to the shield, which in no respect contradicts that presupposed by these fitted fragments. Indeed, with a different position of the body, this pose of the shield on its edge, showing the inside, and the arm with the strap slipped out of position and the hand no longer on the grip, is simply a variant of that shown by another recumbent figure, Glypt. 85 (also a wounded warrior succumbing to his fate), in the south corner of the same pediment. This coincidence is emphatically in favour of the function we assign to the fitted arm-fragments in relation to our fallen figure. When the shield could be made to stand on its edge with the inside and relaxing arm showing behind the figure, the motive was a favourite one. This condition is realized in the simplest form when the fallen figure, with front up, happens to be in profile to the right. This is the case of our fallen warrior E, where the shield then forms an expressive background, while the pathos of the figure, made visible to the eye by the relaxing arm and hand, is a plastic motive so inevitably true to nature that later art has never succeeded in improving on it.

Reverting to the phenomena of weathering, we find that, considered by themselves, they afford indications as to the real position of the arm which are entirely in harmony with the pose which we propose for the figure. The weathering on the arm is on the upper and inner side, that of the hand on the upper side.¹ This phenomenon, however, finds no adequate explanation in the falling pose given by Furtwängler to the figure. This peculiar distribution of the weathering on the upper side and, in the case of the arm, also on the inside, can only be accounted for on the supposition that the figure was lying on its back. In that position this upper side of the arm, in relation to the vertical pose of the shield, was adjusted axially into a lateral position of exposure, above the level of the torso, towards the full force of the south wind. The mechanism of the arm as observed by the sculptor, made this movement much less free towards the shoulder than at the wrist, and this accounts for the partial weathering of the arm also on the inner side. The freer movement of the hand conditioned for the sculptor its adjustment in a position which exposed

¹ Furtwängler says of the arm : 'die Witterung befindet sich auf der Ober- und Innenseite,' p. 236. 'Die Witterung befindet sich auf der Oberseite der Hand,' p. 237.

the inner side less, and the upper one more, to the effects of the weather, than the arm. It is this again which really accounts for the fact, observed also by Furtwängler, that the hand is weathered only on the upper side. Thus a mere glance at Furtwängler's falling figure will serve to convince us that, in that position, the body of the figure affords to the left arm a protection from the south wind which, added to its oblique position, leaves this particular distribution of the weathering entirely unaccounted for. Let us, on the other hand, conceive the figure as reclining more or less horizontally front up, but turned somewhat towards its own right side. Then we have relative positions of arm and shield, and an exposure of the arm to the south wind, which fully account for the existing peculiarities of weathering. The phenomenon further agrees with what we have already observed of the peculiar weathering of the thighs of the figure shown in *Aegina*, Pl. 100, 54, 1, 2.¹

After what has already been said about the corresponding figure in the north wing of the pediment it only now remains to say a few words about the camp-follower who completes this group. The criticisms to be made on Furtwängler's reconstitution of the figure are a mere repetition of those already made on his interpretation of the action represented in the north wing. The points to be emphasized are as follows:—(1) The camp-follower, on our reconstruction, is to be conceived as darting forward towards a wounded warrior lying on the ground, at the 'psychological moment' when the enemy is embroiled in a new combat with the comrade of this fallen warrior. If there is no comrade to the fallen warrior there is no 'psychological moment' for the camp-follower and the situation that results, even if conceivable in the form of a sculptural group, is unrealizable as an episode in actual warfare. (2) The action of the left arm and hand must be conceived as concerned with one and the same object. (3) This object is the wounded warrior lying on the ground in front of the two combatants.

There is one important point about this figure which is worthy of

¹ Furtwängler, p. 237, further assigns to the figure of his falling warrior the fragment of a right fore-arm on Pl. 87, 59, and the right hand on Pl. 89, 60. It might be tempting to claim both for the figure of our fallen warrior, were it not that there are hardly sufficient data to determine a pose of the arm, in relation to that of our figure, which could have brought about the weathering, or what seems more like the corrosion, on the inner side of the arm as well as on its upper side, while the hand is apparently only weathered on the outside. Do the hand and the arm belong together? They do not fit.

special remark. Furtwängler's description of the right leg is: 'rechtes Bein mit Verwitterung an der Aussen- und Vorderseite, also von einer nach rechts, aber etwas schräg aus dem Giebel herausbewegten Figur.' His own reconstruction, however, of the group gives no adequate explanation of this oblique movement of the figure; if, on the other hand, we conceive our wounded warrior as lying on the ground in front of the two combatants, we have a perfectly simple and self-evident motive for this movement of the camp-follower towards his own right. The figure of the camp-follower is represented as moving obliquely in the direction of the front of the pediment, because the object to which his attention is directed is lying in front of the main group of combatants, in the direction of the edge of the geison.

The pose of the warriors respectively right and left of the Athena is a point on which there can hardly be any reason for disagreeing with Furtwängler's conception. It is thus all the more tantalizing not to be quite certain about the position (left of the Athena), and the orientation facing north, of the statue (Glypt. 86) which in Furtwängler's reconstruction figures as G. (Pl. XIX. B) My doubts on this point were aroused at Munich in 1906 on noticing, to my own surprise, the corrosion of the torso in front, and the very emphatic accentuation of such corrosion in the region of the left breast. These doubts were not allayed when it further turned out that the fragment of right thigh (Pl. 86, 73), which has now been found to belong to the torso, shows the same corrosion of the front as the torso itself. Again, the torso and the fitted fragment of thigh show a smoothness of surface behind, in contrast with the front, which can only be reasonably regarded as due to weathering from the north. It is only natural to regard this weathering as due to the orientation north of the back of a figure in three-quarters profile south, and to the consequent protection afforded by the tympanum to the right side behind. The incrustation of the surface of the right hip and the corresponding part of the back cannot be easily taken as due to any sort of wind or rain weathering. Its cause is obscure.

If, then, the statue faced south, a necessary process of exclusion would make the torso belong to our F, that is, to the warrior next to the right of the Athena. As the figures right and left of the Athena correspond symmetrically the composition of the groups as a whole would not be affected by this transposition.¹

¹ Furtwängler assigns the heel of a right foot, Pls. 85 and 86, 74, to his G. On the other

Criticism has so far been confined to the central groups of the East Pediment on either side of the Athena. With Furtwängler's reconstruction of the other groups I am in agreement, with one exception: the assignment of the head (Fig. 6 *a*, *b*, *c*¹; *Aegina*, Pl. 97, 44) to the archer B, next but one to the south angle of the pediment. With this the strongly marked corrosion of the face is in contradiction. This corrosion is fairly uniform over the whole face and includes the right cheek as well as the left. It can thus only agree with a position of the head in profile to the left, that is, with a position which brings the face into full exposure to the south wind, the only wind that produces this particular kind of corrosion. On the other hand, in marked contrast with this corrosion of the face, the back of the helmeted head, as is clearly shown in Fig. 6 *a*, has a remarkably smooth surface, and this smoothness attains its maximum towards the right, behind. We can only conclude that this whole part was protected from the south wind by a profile position left and facing south, which made the back of the head face the other way, that is, towards the north. This position gives the back part of the head towards the right side, special protection through its juxtaposition to the tympanum.

There is one striking, and, at the same time, significant analogy for this particular distribution of the corrosion and weather-wear, the camp-follower, in profile left and facing south, in the north wing of the pediment. This position brings the face of the figure into full exposure to the south wind and this is what accounts for its uniform corrosion. Here again the best preserved part of the head is the back towards the right, which is next the tympanum and has the further protection of the gable-geison above. On the left side, on the other hand, the weather-wear increases gradually from the back of the head until it culminates in the corrosion of the left cheek. The corrosion, then, of both cheeks and the almost entire lack of weather-wear on the back of the head towards the right are the same in both instances. This parallelism may accordingly be taken as a sure indication that the head (Fig. 6) was in a position towards the south wind, and in relation to the tympanum, similar to that of the camp-

hand, he attributes the fragments of legs, Pl. 100, 61, Glypt. 125 and Pl. 86, 62 to his E. The question then is: may not all these fragments really belong to Glypt. 86? As regards the calf, Pl. 100, 63, Glypt. 124, also assigned by Furtwängler to his E, there is no intrinsic difficulty in assigning it to Glypt. 86, for, as Furtwängler remarks, the left leg of Glypt. 86 is lacking.

¹ Fig. 6 *a*, *b*, *c*, are after original photographs which I owe to the kindness of Prof. Wolters.

FIG. 6.—THREE VIEWS OF HEAD 44, SHOWING FACIAL ASYMMETRY.

FIG. 7.—THREE VIEWS OF HEAD OF DELPHI CHARIOTEER, SHOWING FACIAL ASYMMETRY.

follower L. We have a further analogous instance in the head of the Herakles which Furtwängler, with very good reason, has placed in profile left and facing south, in the north wing of the pediment next the reclining corner figure.

With this conclusion a circumstance agrees which, on the other hand, flatly contradicts the position given by Furtwängler to head 44. The helmet of this head, as is seen in Fig. 6 c, shows on the left side clear traces of a net-work decoration of dots. The dots appear slightly in relief as flat smooth discs, while the intervals between are weather-worn. This would seem to show that these dots were originally covered by some kind of paint-substance that protected them from the corrosive influence of the south-wind. Now, the position in profile right, given to the head by Furtwängler, necessitates the assumption that these traces of painting owe their preservation to the protection afforded by the tympanum, and to their position away from the influence of the south wind. This assumption, however, involves a serious difficulty when we consider that in such a position, the part of the helmet towards the tympanum, being invisible, was probably not decorated at all in detail. The part painted in detail was that which was visible to the spectator, that is, in this case, the whole left side of the helmet, and, of the right side, only the front above the brow. There is no trace at all on the unweathered right side behind of such ornament corresponding with that on the left side. This side shows behind a smooth bare weathered and polished surface which can hardly be due to any other influence than that of the fresh north winds and rain-storms, which, however, were not so destructive as to remove all traces of the net-work decoration.¹ On these grounds we must choose for the figure to which the helmet belongs a position in partial profile to the left, such as would bring the decorated left-hand side and right side in front, into view of the spectator. This position, again, brings the face to front south with an inclination at the same time towards its own left. With this position of the face accords the corrosion of both cheeks which, as in other instances from the same pediment, could only have been caused by direct exposure to the south wind.

But the disposition of the reticulate ornament on the helmet is not the only detail of execution which helps to indicate the true profile position of the head. There are also some peculiarities of execution in the working

¹ The left cheek next the ear came under the same smoothing influence.

out of the head in front, including the helmet, which seem to afford conclusive evidence as to this position. The head, as belonging to a pediment group, was ostensibly meant for a profile position, and we find that when viewed full in front the face shows certain asymmetrical characteristics. Closer scrutiny brings out at once the fact that the right side is carried out with somewhat less of a curve in the contours and with appreciably less prominence to the features, than the left. In the *en face* position of the head this asymmetry is most strongly marked in the outlining of the helmet in front; the arched curve is noticeably higher above the left brow than above the right. Correspondingly the right eyebrow is appreciably lower and straighter in its curve than the left.¹ But when the head, instead of being looked at *en face*, is placed in three-quarter profile left (as in Fig. 6 c), the asymmetry so apparent in the *en face* position disappears, and from the point of view of the spectator the head appears perfectly symmetrical. In the profile right view, however, the asymmetry becomes exaggerated, as is shown in Fig. 6 a.

The *raison d'être* of this peculiar device may be taken to be somewhat as follows.—A face meant for an incomplete profile position, if executed with all its features symmetrical, appears unsymmetrical in any profile position which allows the off side of the face to be visible to the spectator in one view with the near side. The reason of this is that the features on the side of the face next the spectator are seen more or less in full plan, and so the different contours have either their true curves, if seen in elevation, or a flatter curve, which may be anything short of or approaching a straight line, if seen strictly in plan. On the other hand, the features of the off side of the face bend away rapidly out of sight in a manner which tends to exaggerate all the curves and to make them appear shorter and at the same time higher than they are in reality. To correct this optical illusion and so make the face appear symmetrical to the spectator, all curves on the further side of the face in any profile position are correspondingly made somewhat longer and flatter than those on the nearer side.²

In agreement with this explanation we find that in this head, the right

¹ All this comes out quite clearly in the front view of the head shown in Fig. 6 b.

² It is interesting to find that the Herakles, which on Furtwängler's own reconstruction is in partial profile to the left, has the same asymmetry and the same slightly more arched curve of the left eyebrow in the *en face* view, and that the corresponding asymmetry of the face is annulled by the new position which Furtwängler rightly gives to it.

side of the face has its contours flatter, and its curves somewhat longer and less arched, than the left. The ridge of the nose, again, as observable on the original at Munich, does not go quite vertically down, as would be required for a full *en face* view, but inclines slightly towards the left cheek.¹

If by way of experiment we try different profile poses for our head it is striking to find that when the face is placed somewhat in three-quarter profile left, the features on the further side, owing to the rapid curve away of their contours, appear to the spectator to be of the same size as those of the nearer side. The slightly oblique inclination of the nose to the left counteracts the optical illusion which makes a nose, symmetrically placed, appear to run away at an exaggerated angle towards the side of the face turned away from the spectator, though still visible to him.

Coming now to the question whether the figure to which the head belonged looked right or left in the pediment, we are rather startled to find that on placing the head, as Furtwängler does, in three-quarter profile right, the asymmetry, which disappears when the face looks to the left, is at once greatly exaggerated. This curious result, as anybody can convince himself before the original, is particularly apparent in the treatment of a detail whose asymmetry is at once noticeable on the *en face* view, *i.e.* the higher arch of the helmet-edge above the left eyebrow.² The exaggeration of this asymmetry as the curves turn away on the off side of the face is further emphasized by contrast with the depression of the corresponding features on the side of the face next the spectator. The curves of this are seen either in their true proportions in elevation, or still further flattened in any view which comes short of a true elevation.

It thus turns out that the evidence afforded by the corrosion of the face is completely confirmed by the independent evidence of the peculiar plastic treatment. This secures to the spectator a symmetrical appearance of the face in all partial profile views right or left. The same technical device makes the face appear unsymmetrical in a front view, and exagger-

¹ The position of the mouth is correspondingly asymmetrical and is slightly towards the right. It thus appears symmetrically below the nose in the profile position. This may be noticed also in the camp-follower, the Herakles, and the recumbent figure at the north end of the pediment.

² This exaggeration is even apparent in the reproduction given in *Aegina*, Pl. 97, 44, 2 which shows a slight turn of the head to its own left. A strict *en face* view like that of Fig. 6 b brings out the real plastic asymmetry in its true proportions.

ates this asymmetry for any view in partial profile, except the one intended by the sculptor.

This peculiarity of treatment should not, however, be regarded as something invented once for all by the sculptors of the Aegina Pediments. It is rather the outcome of a long tradition, which is already seen fully established in the East Pediment of Aegina, and which, in later times, as a plastic principle of paramount importance, is seen to permeate all Greek composition in which profile positions played a rôle.

A notable example is the famous Charioteer of Delphi, which shows an asymmetry of the face, including the eyes, entirely analogous to that of our head. This comes out very clearly in Fig. 7 *a, b, c*.¹ If the statue is conceived in an elevated position, the three-quarter profile left position gives a view of the face, approaching that of Fig. 7 *c*, in which the calculated asymmetry of the *en face* view is entirely annulled. The inevitable conclusion is that the Charioteer of Delphi was meant to be viewed in three-quarter profile left, and that it was in this direction, to the left, that he was driving his chariot.

There is one fact still to be considered about the Aegina head. The head, as Furtwängler has argued from the strong curve of the neck behind, belonged to a figure with the upper part of the body inclined considerably forwards. This is the position in which Furtwängler, on the evidence of the part of a left leg shown on Pl. 99, 45, with good reason places his archer. Too much stress, however, must not be laid on this coincidence alone, when we recollect that our warrior K, on the evidence of the left foot shown in Fig. 5, must also be conceived as straining forward in combat. Our head does not fit on to a torso in either case, and it would be unsafe to affirm that the particular curve of the neck was, in itself, more in harmony with the particular inclination forward of the archer than of our warrior. When, on the other hand, we come to evidence like that of the distribution of the corrosion and weathering, which is more conclusive as to the orientation of the head, it can hardly be a mere coincidence that the reticulation of the left side of the helmet fits in with the other data as to this orientation. When I came to the conclusion, on these grounds, that the head must have been in profile left, and further, that it must have belonged to a figure in

¹ For these I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Sieveking who has courteously prepared for me photographs from the cast at Munich.

the north wing of the pediment, it was by an inevitable process of exclusion that I assigned it to our warrior K. And then, to my own surprise, it turned out that the inclination forward of this figure furnished an explanation of the neck-curve of the head which seemed to be supported by more than a mere coincidence. It fitted in with the other evidence instead of being contradicted by it, as in the case of Furtwängler's assignment of the head to the archer B in the south wing of the pediment.

The general results of this investigation into the grouping of the figures in the pediment may be summarized as follows:—

(1) In harmony with the formalistic spirit of the archaic period we have correspondence in the number of figures between the East and the West Pediment. This numerical correspondence is made probable in itself, by the fact that two main groups in either wing of either pediment correspond on general lines. The inherent probability of this correspondence is so great that any opposite view must bring forward strong positive evidence in favour of the theory that there are a smaller number of figures in one pediment than in the other.

(2) There is similarity on general lines in the manner of grouping the figures in either pediment, with divergencies in detail. Given this general similarity, there are such special difficulties in the way of supposing a less number of figures in the one pediment than in the other that without positive evidence on the point the supposition is a matter of great improbability.

(3) As the pediments are exactly the same size it is, in itself, unsafe for the archaic period, to suppose that they were not filled with an equal number of figures. Aesthetically considered, the East Pediment with only five figures on either side of the Athena, gives the feeling of something wanting to fill up the amount of space at our disposal. On the other hand, the thirteen figures in the West Pediment produce an impression of suitability which serves aesthetically to strengthen the conviction that there could not have been a less number of figures in the similar space of the East Pediment.

In the tendency *towards* the centre of the groups of the East Pediment and *away* from the centre of those of the West, is embodied a principle of pedimental composition which Furtwängler's reconstructions have helped to bring out in a new and striking light. As regards the East Pediment, however, the architectonic correspondence with the West

Pediment that should result, has been seriously compromised by the introduction of Furtwängler's falling figures.

The disappearance of those figures brings the composition of this pediment into complete harmony with that of the other. The only contrast that exists is the contrasted harmony of centripetal and centrifugal lines respectively.

And if there is one thing more than another that has been brought home to us by Furtwängler's investigations, it is that such harmonic contrasts in composition were the order of the day with the sculptors of Aegina.

DUNCAN MACKENZIE.

MUNICH, *March*, 1910.

A. SUGGESTED RESTORATION OF THE E. PEDIMENT.

B. FURTWÄNGLER'S RESTORATION OF THE E. PEDIMENT.

THE EAST PEDIMENT SCULPTURES OF THE TEMPLE OF APHAIA AT AEGINA.