



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Professor Huelsen will present us with a complete topography, aus einem Gusse, whose maps and other accompaniments will be worthy of the words of him who more than any living man has advanced the knowledge of the topography of ancient Rome.

Rome, April, 1907.

JESSE BENEDICT CARTER.

Aegina. Das Heiligtum der Aphaia. Unter Mitwirkung von Ernst R. Fiechter und Hermann Thiersch herausgegeben von ADOLF FURTWÄNGLER, mit 130 Tafeln, 1 Karte, 6 Beilagen und 413 Abbildungen im Text. München, 1906. 2 vols. 4°. Pp. IX, 504.

Among recent archaeological publications this monumental work holds properly a high rank. The treatment of the subject is thorough, and the technical execution, both of text and plates, is excellent. Its appearance so soon after the conclusion of the excavations deserves much commendation and makes the reader lenient in criticism of the many misprints and errors of reference. The lack of an index is less easy to pardon. According to the division of labor among the authors, Fiechter contributes the chapter on architecture, Thiersch has charge of the pottery, bronzes and other smaller finds, while Furtwängler writes the important chapters on the name and sculpture of the sanctuary.

Since the announcements of discoveries, which were published from time to time in the course of the excavations, the name of Aphaia in connection with this temple has become familiar, but a full presentation of the question appears now for the first time. In regard to the deities formerly associated with the sanctuary, mention is made of the recovery of the forged inscription on which rested Cockerell's theory in favor of Zeus Panhellenios, who is thereupon dismissed; but the claims of Athena are discussed at considerable length. Since the time of Ross she has been regarded generally as the Goddess of the temple from the witness of several boundary stones with the inscription *ἄρος τεμένους Ἀθηναίας*, but Furtwängler shows that only one of these stones was found *in situ* far from the temple and close to the town, while the same inscription is cut in the living rock in a valley on the southern point of the island at the farthest possible distance from the temple. So he is undoubtedly right in declaring that these inscriptions can have no reference to any temple of Athena, but probably come from the time of the Peloponnesian war when the Athenians, after expelling the Aeginetans and settling their island, devoted certain portions of land to their Goddess.

But it is not justifiable to argue against Athena on the ground that as the patron of Athens she was the foe of Aegina. Such an

idea is wholly foreign to the polytheistic religion of the Greeks, who could afford to scorn no God, and in fact indulged in a practice just the opposite of that suggested. Cp. the famous instance in *Il.* VI 297 ff. The enmity between Athens and Aegina was not *primaeval*, but merely the result of mercantile rivalry beginning in the early sixth century. There is no *a priori* reason why the Aeginetans should not have worshipped Athena ages before that date. There is further not the slightest proof that they regarded her as a foe, but on the contrary we find her mentioned as their friend by Pindar, *N.* VII 143. The next point against Athena which rests on the silence of Pausanias is hardly more convincing if we remember that such omissions in Pausanias are not rare and that the temple was deserted in Roman times. But Pausanias does in fact mention a sanctuary of Aphaia which he locates on the way to the mountain of Zeus Panhellenios. This description does not fit the position of the present temple, and Furtwängler's suggestion that these two were the only sites worth seeing in the interior of the island and that one therefore was on the way to the other from the visitor's point of view is of course pure assumption. The next argument in favor of Aphaia is startling and shows that the author is willing to resort to extreme measures in order to support his case. In Herodotos III 59 where reference is made to the dedication of certain captured prows *ἐς τὸ ἱρὸν τῆς Ἀθηναίης ἐν Διγύνη* he believes that *Ἀφαιίης* should be substituted for *Ἀθηναίης* on no other ground apparently than that such a sanctuary of Athena in Aegina is irreconcilable with his theory. These arguments are unconvincing, and Aphaia would not be considered in the matter were it not for the testimony of the inscriptions. In all only eleven were found in the sanctuary, on two of which the name Aphaia is fully preserved, while two others give it in part. The most important is the great archaic inscription which reads: "In the priesthood of Kleoitais the house (*οἶκος*) and the altar were built for Aphaia, the ivory was added and the precinct constructed". This is strong evidence, and yet the arguments for Athena have not been silenced and no word has been said about the statues of Athena found in the precinct. The matter is not yet satisfactorily settled.

We come next to Fiechter's admirable chapter on the architecture of the sanctuary which discusses the measurements and proportions of the earlier buildings as well as those belonging to the fifth century. Particularly instructive are the comparative tables which show at a glance the relation of the present temple to various others of the Doric order in their architectural properties. In this way it is proved that the date of the temple falls between that of the Athenian treasury at Delphi (510-490) and that of the Zeus temple at Olympia (470-457), while the degree of relationship shows that it is nearer to the former than the latter, a view which is substantiated by the style of the sculpture.

Very ingenious is Fiechter's explanation of the fact that all the columns of the peristasis are monoliths with the exception of three on the north side. Here was the best approach for the conveyance of the massive architectural members, and therefore the great monoliths were placed on the stylobate, and the cella walls were raised to an equal height before the opening on the north was closed. As there was no longer room for handling monoliths the final columns were constructed of drums. Another interesting detail of the building is the presence of a door in the west cella wall connecting the temple hall proper with the opisthodomos, where there is a stone table which would indicate that the opisthodomos was also used for sacrificial purposes. On the cella floor were found marks of the basis of the cult statue, which show that it was a small and probably seated figure, but give no further clue toward its identification. As no piece of the metopes was found, it is reasonable to accept the view that they were constructed of wood.

The heart of the book is devoted to the treatment of the sculpture which was the primary cause which led to the present excavations whose most conspicuous success rests on the light thrown by the new fragments on the existing groups. Beside the pieces of sculpture a few blocks of the floor of the pediment were found, which show the marks where the plinths of the statues were placed and thus furnish important evidence for the new arrangement. Furtwängler begins the chapter with a brief sketch of the history of the marbles referring to his *Beschreibung der Glyptothek* in Munich (1900) for all details. They were discovered by Cockerell and von Haller in 1811, and through a misunderstanding on the part of the English, were purchased by Bavaria, and after restorations had been made by Thorwaldsen were deposited at Munich in 1828. The new reconstruction rests on the recent discoveries, on the original notes of Cockerell and von Haller, and on a close study of the weathering of the marble. Its most important element is the determination of the position of a group of combatants on either side of Athena instead of the group in the centre which has hitherto been assumed as fixed. The discovery under the south half of the west pediment of a right hand holding a stone which lies on a block is an indication of the presence of a fourth fallen man in that pediment. This is further supported by the marks in a block of the pedimental geison of the west front which show a compact group of three persons, two facing each other over a third between. And finally, the necessary four combatants are supplied by the observation that the head on a fallen figure in the Glyptothek has a helmet with an ancient cutting at the top in proof that it belonged to a figure standing under the right slope of the pediment roof and that it was turned to the left. The warrior preserved, who is rightly turned to the left, as the weathering shows, has his original head; and hence there were two combatants turned to the left who demand

two opponents. Thus this grouping is well attested for the west pediment and while, as Furtwängler says, a similar arrangement is probable for the east, there is slight evidence for it.

Of the other figures in the west pediment there is a shifting of position in the case of each pair. Those in the corners exchange places because immediately under the south corner a right lower leg was found and identified as the piece missing from the figure in the Glyptothek which has always been placed in the opposite end. The new position agrees with Cockerell's original drawing which was made at the time and based on the place of discovery. The position of the next figure is fixed on the north side since a piece of the left leg and the left arm were found under that end and it was thus placed by Cockerell. The upright combatant is moved from the right to the left side and the bowmen exchange places on the witness of Cockerell alone. In the case of the bowmen the weathering proves that they were headed toward the corners, while those in the east pediment are shown in the earliest sketches as facing the centre. Again on the testimony of Cockerell the corner men in the east have their feet toward the corner, and the so-called "Zugreifender" in each case occupies the third place from Athena.

Such in outline is the new reconstruction which is final as far as it is based on facts though it may be doubted if it is legitimate to lay so much weight on the position reported by Cockerell. The main difference between the pediments is that there are two distinct groups on either side of Athena in the west in contrast to the single group in the east. The arrangement in the west is well supported and fairly satisfactory but in the east it rests chiefly on theory and is not convincing in all details. In the general style and execution of the individual figures the west pediment is more archaic than the east, which leads Furtwängler to the belief that the sculptures are the work of two different artists.

In addition to these works the new excavations have brought out the remarkable fact that the sanctuary contained another series of sculptures showing the hand of several other artists. Thirty-eight fragments were found on the east terrace of the precinct which indicate that there were other warriors very similar to those in the pediments in style, size, plan and conception, which yet could not have been in the pediments. There were found also pieces belonging to a third Athena and fragments of a third akroterion. As there is no building to which they could belong Furtwängler maintains that they were made in competition with those finally accepted for the temple and later bought and dedicated in the sanctuary, where there are great foundations on either side of the altar. This is a startling idea and it is hardly a comfortable parallel to refer to the Amazon statues bought after competition by the fabulously wealthy sanctuary of the Ephesian Artemis. Beside a slight difference in style the fragments are too numerous to be assigned to the pedimental groups, but there

is no proof to support the theory suggested. Further it is clear that in the position he selects the author himself furnishes an argument against the Aphaia theory, for no self-respecting Goddess would allow a hostile Athena to stand directly over her altar.

On the interpretation of the sculpture and the meaning of the groups the traditional view has been largely followed. Apart from the central figure in each group, Athena, the only member that can be identified is Herakles in the east pediment, who, though without the lion's skin, wears its head on his helmet. The statement that this representation of Herakles and a similar figure on a metope of the Athenian treasury at Delphi are the only examples of such representation in the whole realm of ancient art is distinctly extravagant in view of the vase at Bonn and the other instances cited by Körte (*Arch. Jahrb.* VII, p. 68 and VIII *Arch. Anz.*, p. 199), which at least leave the question an open one. A new interpretation is given to the so-called "Zugreifender". The discovery of his original arm which held a helmet and was raised at a different angle to the body, together with an examination of the evidence literary and monumental, has led Furtwängler to the conclusion that these figures are not there to seize the fallen body but are squires (*ἰππηγῆται*), bearing the extra weapons of the master. But as the group arrangement of the east pediment is based only on theory any attempt to explain this puzzling figure seems futile. Athena, the dominating figure in each group, is declared by the author to have no relation to the temple but to be present only as the Goddess of battle (p. 310). This is surprising when taken in connection with the description of her as the foe of Aegina and inconsistent with the custom of representing the deity in the sculpture which was followed without exception in temples of the fifth century as far as our limited knowledge goes (see A. J. A. VIII, p. 18 ff.). If Furtwängler's arguments are sound, Athena is the most inappropriate deity that could have been placed in these pediments.

In his discussion of the position of the sculptures in the history of art our author is very successful, and we have interesting and instructive chapters on the development of pedimental sculpture in general, which our modern artists might study with much profit, the relation of the Aegina works to the vase paintings and their close connection with the Samian school of art. This last point is emphasized in an effort to prove that there was a school of marble sculpture in Aegina which was strongly influenced by the Samian artists. But it is remarkable that no word is said of the unmistakable signs of bronze influence on the statues themselves in view of the bronze tradition for which the island is famous.

The painting of the sculpture is treated at some length but without satisfactory result. From the few traces of color which remain Furtwängler argues that only two colors, red and blue, were used with perhaps the merest touch of gold for occasional contrast on a blue ground. As the works on the Akropolis show green and

yellow this does not seem very probable, but the theory is not as shocking as are the shades of red and blue which are selected. The whole matter is of course largely subjective and allowance must be made for the difficulty of reproducing on plates the colors of the models, but still the result is inconceivably harsh. Perhaps the most distressing detail is the Athena of the east pediment. Here Furtwängler in defiance of accepted theory and precedent paints the linen Ionian himation a single color, deep red, because there was found a small fragment of the lower edge of the back of the garment that was painted red. The author passes lightly over the aversion of the Greeks to paint completely large surfaces of their Parian marble and is little troubled by the fact that no Akropolis maiden shows any such himation, but rests his case on the parallel with the Apollo in Olympia whose mantle is painted red. This fact is mentioned several times, but it seems strange to compare the bit of color on the Apollo which was added only to break the glare of the marble with the great mass of Athena's garment. Further, there is too great a contrast between this figure and all the other female figures on the temple to whom are given garments painted like those of the Akropolis maidens in borders and rosettes. No one will disagree with Furtwängler in his declaration (p. 304) of the great need that is now felt for a satisfactory work on polychromy in Greek sculpture.

Among the briefer chapters, contributed by Thiersch, those on bronzes and on vases must be mentioned on account of their importance and the excellent way in which they are treated. Because of the division of labor it is inevitable that there should be some disagreement among the authors which makes some passages inconsistent with others. So, for example, we read in the last chapter (p. 490) that a view expressed by Fiechter in the early part of the work is false. Now Thiersch, agreeing with the common belief that there was a famous bronze school in Aegina, is surprised that no large bronzes and few small images even were found in the sanctuary. This fact leads him to the conclusion that it was an "ärmliches Landheiligtum", a view which is hard to reconcile with Furtwängler's description of a great national sanctuary in which captured prows would be dedicated and treasure stored, and which could buy numerous pedimental statues not needed for the temple. Most of the bronzes found are articles for personal use and adornment, such as rings, pins, mirrors, knives, nails, etc., and of these by far the largest group is that of the pins used for fastening garments. This has led Thiersch to give a sketch of the history of the use of these pins from the early type of the straight stick pin to its gradual development into the fibula. It is an important study, but there is one point which should be criticised. Thiersch advances the theory that these pins were not dedicated alone but together with the garments in which they were used. But Herodotos (V 88) says that Aeginetan women dedicated chiefly

clothing pins to a particular sanctuary after the Athenian women had stabbed to death the sole survivor of the Aeginetan expedition, and there is a verification of this in the inventory of the treasure of the temple of Mnia and Auzesia which mentions over three hundred pins and then states that a few (thirteen in all) were dedicated on the garments. There is no reason for assuming a greater proportion in the case of other sanctuaries.

The chapter on vases is little more than a catalogue, as Furtwängler reserves the material for his own use in reconstructing the history of the sanctuary. They begin with the late Mycenaean period, ca. 1200, and practically cease with the Attic ware. The large number of groups represented is proof of the great mercantile activity of the people of the island. One point that should be mentioned, on which there is again a difference of opinion between Furtwängler and Thiersch, is in regard to the home of the Proto-Corinthian class. Both of the authors reject Professor Hoppin's theory expressed in the Argive Heraeum and Thiersch thinks that Aegina itself as well as Sikyon may be suggested as the place. The claims of Aegina, however, are denied by Furtwängler in his concluding chapter, who believes with Dragendorff that the greatest evidence now is in favor of Sikyon. But cp. A. J. P. XXVI, p. 465.

The last chapter, the history of the sanctuary by Furtwängler, is to some extent a summary of what has preceded. Worship on the site was begun about 1200 B. C. but no building of any kind was erected until the second half of the seventh century. This temple was superseded by a larger one in the first third of the sixth century which was burned perhaps by the Persians, and the great new building was constructed between 490 and 480. The cult declined rapidly in the Hellenistic age and in Roman times the sanctuary was totally deserted. This is an interesting section and a notable illustration of the information that can be gleaned by the expert from a careful excavation and exact study of successive deposits of pottery, of innumerable dedications and of architectural remains.

The book is the complete final publication of an archaeological unit, and in spite of some points that are open to criticism, is a brilliant and inspiring work of the highest value not only to artists and archaeologists but to all students of classical antiquity.

T. L. SHEAR.