

THE TEMPLE OF JUPITER PAN-HELLENIUS; ÆGINA.

THE full length of the temple on the lowest step is given as 98·635, which dimension divided by 2 gives 49·317 to compare with 49·592, the measured breadth. The plan of the temple on the lowest step therefore approaches a double square. To be exactly so it should have been ·590 longer, or ·275 less broad.

I entertain no doubt that the double square was the basis of the design, and that the difference is due to errors or to an adjustment; this view is confirmed when we find that the Naos also approaches on plan to a double square.

Length of Naos $42·875 \div 2 = 21·437$ to compare with 21·291, the measured breadth.

Thus the Æginetan temple furnished a precedent which was not disdained by the architect of the temple at Bassae, of making the plan of the Naos a similar figure to the general plan of the temple on the lowest step, in this case a double square; at Bassae, a double square and a-half.

The plan of the Naos of the Theseum is also a double square, but the general plan has a different proportion—a double square and a-half.

The temple has six columns on the front, and on flank twelve; the angle columns being included in either reckoning.

A double number of columns gives a double number of intercolumns, plus one, viz., 5 and 11; and hence, if this number of columns were arranged around a double square, the flank intercolumns must be diminished by one-eleventh of the intercolumn of the front, to make up the extra one required. In the present instance the application of such a rule would produce a difference between the columniations of front and flank equal to almost half a foot in favour of those in front.

The architect therefore deducted from his double square the dimension required on fronts and flanks for the projection of his steps, and the deduction from the fronts being relatively greater, the front columniations contract, and are brought nearer to the average of those of the flanks. Even thus the difference remains in favour of the front, as 8·541 to 8·334.

The conclusion from such circumstances, in the case of temples of later date, would be with confidence, that the arrangement adopted would be found to conciliate some other important rectangular proportions; we are not entitled to assume this in the present earlier instance, and it may not be easy to prove it. The solution of such a problem is to be sought for in the comparisons of the height of the columns with the spacing (and that does not help us here), or else in the altered proportions of metopes to triglyphs, resulting from the close spacing.