The Classical Review

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

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Classical Architecture *The Architecture of Greece and Rome*. By W. J. Anderson and R. Phené Spiers. Batsford, 1907.

W. R. Lethaby

The Classical Review / Volume 23 / Issue 02 / March 1909, pp 46 - 48
DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00002687, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00002687

How to cite this article:

W. R. Lethaby (1909). The Classical Review, 23, pp 46-48 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00002687

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

constructed of reeds, he got the inhabitants to send him their dogs; to [the tails of] these dogs he attached naphtha and fire; the dogs, running to their homes, caused a general conflagration. Feats of this sort so alarmed the great tribe of Hamdân, that they abandoned their fortresses and betook themselves to the Byzantine empire. By the command of Basil however they had to return and settle in Aleppo, till they were dispersed and perished. [The German translation omits this last sentence].—Hamdân was not a tribe, but a dynasty: the historical facts perverted in this statement are to be found in Freytag's *Geschichte der Hamdaniden* (Z.D.M.G. x. 493-495).

Stephanos continues:—Ibn Khosrow not only let the Christians celebrate their feasts fearlessly, but himself on the day of the Coming of the Redeemer into the Temple, which is called Candlemas, organized illuminations with brilliant torches, wax-candles, and a quantity of flax. [The German translation is: *ja er selbst feierte das Kommen des Erlösers, welches Advent genannt wird, in dem Tempel mit hellem Lichterglanz*. The German translators seem a little weak here in Christian antiquities.] Further, he illuminated the wings of the doves with naphtha and fire, and sent them skywards. He also put on a crown and styled himself king of kings, which was not the Arab custom. Finally he tried to debase the coinage, and when his coins were not taken, he stamped potsherds and scraps of leather, and compelled the tradesmen to take them in exchange for goods.

A good deal of this appears to be historically sound. The title 'king of kings'

(*shâhanshâ*) and the wearing of a crown 'against the custom of the Arabs' by 'Aḍud al-daulah, are the subject of allusions by his court-poet Mutanabbi (ed. Dieterici, pp. 762, 763). He had a Christian vizier, and the story of his keeping Candlemas has no inherent improbability. His debasing of the coinage is not expressly mentioned by Ibn al-Athîr in his obituary notice, but agrees very well with what is stated there.

The above extract not only gives an idea of the historical value of Stephanos, but shows that the translators have not taken their task too seriously. Their Armenian scholarship seems to be on the whole trustworthy, but is occasionally slipshod. In iii. 22 we are told that the emperor Basil, being asked to send his sister to wed with a Bulgarian prince, sent *das Weib eines seiner Diener*: the Armenian (*kin mi i dsarayits iorots*) surely means 'one of his slave women,' which is somewhat different. At the beginning of iii. 23 the author is made to repeat himself: *nach diesem zog der Kaiser Wasil selbst mit einem Heere nach dem Lande der Bulgaren. Und er zog mit einer starken Armee aus*. In the original the first sentence says that he prepared troops to go out. Slips of this sort seem to occur very rarely, and since Russian is scarcely better known than Armenian in Western Europe, they deserve thanks for rendering this chronicle generally accessible. In these days of relentless industry it is refreshing to find some scholars who do not take too many pains.

D. S. MARGOLIOUTH.

88 Woodstock Road, Oxford.

CLASSICAL ARCHITECTURE.

The Architecture of Greece and Rome. By W. J. ANDERSON and R. PHÉNÉ SPIERS. Batsford, 1907.

THE systematic study of Greek architecture was undertaken first by English students. For about two generations, however, this phase of classical archaeology was almost

completely neglected, and except for the fine work of the late Mr. Penrose—the last fruit of the old tradition, which seemed indeed to appear out of season—English architects contributed little of value to European scholarship during this time. Fergusson, however, in working over the materials gathered by others, formed another link

between the past and the present, and his general history of architecture has been a very useful compendium, although it is hardly scientific enough, being in many cases concerned rather with the author's aesthetic opinions than with external facts. Nor must we, in this relation, neglect to mention the records of excavations undertaken by the British Museum at Ephesus, Priene, and Halicarnassus.

With the establishment of the Hellenic Society and the British Schools in Athens and Rome, a new era in the appreciation of classical architecture seems to have opened. The volume of Messrs. Anderson and Spiers, of which Mr. Batsford has just issued a second edition, is eminently qualified to maintain and enlarge this interest, for it is just the kind of book which was required, being at once learned and readable; giving a wide survey and adequate summary of what is known in regard to both Greek and Roman art in one volume of moderate size. I have just happened to see a review by S. Reinach of the German edition of this book, and wish to echo his praise of the excellent bibliography included, which, he says, is the best that is known to him. The volume consists of 339 pp. and full index, together with 253 illustrations, many occupying the whole page, a valuable chronology of Greek temples, a good glossary of terms, and a list of books, the last covering 6 pp. It opens with a chapter on Mycenaean architecture brought well up to date, and including an excellent restoration by Mr. Spiers of the gate of the 'Treasury of Atreus.' This is followed by chapters on the archaic period in Europe and Asia Minor, on the age of maturity in two chapters, another on the Alexandrian period is followed by a chapter on 'Secular Buildings.' These form the first section of the work, and an account of Etruscan and Roman architecture fills eight more chapters. The illustrations are admirably selected, fresh, and from the best sources, and include several drawings by the authors. A most valuable feature is the large number of plans of temples given in the work. It is a book to read, as well as a book of reference, convenient in size and pleasant. I hope that the present edition

of this most useful volume will be speedily exhausted, so that from time to time still more may be added, for it seems to me the best groundwork for a history of classical architecture that we are likely to obtain.

With still more material the arrangement might doubtless be further improved; at present the Treasury of Cnidos at Delphi and the Great Altar at Pergamos come close together in a chapter on the 'Culmination in the Peloponnesos.' I note the following small points—some as to doubts of my own, and some as to small slips of the pen or the memory on the part of the authors. Is there any record that Phidias worked on the Parthenon without pay? It is suggested (p. 77) that the metopes of the Parthenon might have been carved when in position on the building. It is my impression that Mr. Ebersole's inspection of those on the west front showed that they did not all perfectly fit, and must have been carved before they were put in place. That the centre of 'west' pediment was missing in 1674 (p. 78) should read 'east.' The architect of the Erechtheum is properly said to be unknown, but Furtwaengler has suggested Kallimachos. The North Portico, shown on figure 63, is now entirely restored. The Temple of Athene at Priene, begun about 340 B.C., is spoken of on p. 108 as the earliest of the Hellenistic temples of Asia Minor, but this hardly agrees with the chronological list, and Ephesus, begun c. 356 B.C. at latest, seems to be the type from which it derived. The Temple of Apollo near Miletus is spoken of as the greatest of temples (p. 113). Strabo is, I believe, the authority for this, but in the recent French work on Miletus it is stated that Samos was still bigger. On the same page Paeonios is called the architect of this Temple of Apollo as well as of the Artemision, and this he may have been at some stage, but the Apollo Temple is generally much later in style than the other, and I think that a date much too early is given to it. On page 114 it is pointed out that square plinth blocks under bases are not found in the purer Greek works. This may be true of Athens, but the Croesus Temple at Ephesus had them. It is, I think, going outside the record to say that the Mausoleum ranked as one of the

Seven Wonders 'owing to its sculptures' (p. 119). An angle capital, not only a volute, of this building is in the British Museum.

One of the many points which have specially interested me in this work is mentioned on page 114. What could Vitruvius have meant by attributing the invention of the Pseudodipteral formation of temples to Hermogenes, the architect of the Temple of Dionysos at Teos? I have often felt that the putting of the peristyle at a wider distance than ordinary from the cella can hardly have constituted a remarkable departure. The portico columns of most temples, including the Parthenon and Theseum, are at a distance from the inner row as great as the beams would allow. At Selinus the whole peristyle stands at a distance of two columniations from the cella walls, and this temple

happens to be given as *the* example of the Pseudodipteral arrangement in the recently issued American Dictionary of Architecture. The early Ionic temple at Locri had, I believe, a very wide peristyle, so also had some of the Doric temples of Paestum. Mr. Spiers himself gives the plan of the temple at Messa, on the island of Lesbos, and speaks of it as pseudodipteral, while in his chronology he places it early in the Fourth Century, and before any of the other Hellenistic temples, including Ephesus.

Of the Roman part of the book I have not space to speak. I can only say that it is fully equal in every respect to the Greek section, and even more indispensable, for there is no other book of any authority in English upon this subject.

W. R. LETHABY.

DIELS'S PRESOCRATICS.

Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker. Griechisch und Deutsch. Von HERMANN DIELS. 2^{te} Auflage, Band II. 1. Berlin: Weidmann, 1907. Pp. viii + 469-864. 10 m.

THE appearance of this volume marks the further progress of the second edition, so that it is now complete with the exception of the Index Verborum. It is good news to hear that arrangements have been made for the preparation of a full verbal index 'with special reference to terminology,' and that its publication may shortly be expected. The present instalment contains the text of the Cosmologists and Sophists, with short notes at the foot of each page, the notes to the texts printed in the first volume, and a register of authors and names. The whole of the text, that is to say, the biographical and doxographical extracts as well as the actual fragments, is now printed uniformly in the larger type; and it is to be hoped that, when the book reaches its next edition, another improvement will be made by the transference of the notes to the Philosophers from the end of the second part to their

proper place below the pages to which they refer. There cannot be any practical difficulty in making this change, which has already been carried out to the great advantage of readers in respect of the less important writers printed in the present volume.

Prof. Diels has spared no pains in remedying the minor defects of the first edition: as illustrating the care with which the work of revision has been carried out, it may be mentioned that almost all the particulars to which exception was taken in this *Review* (xviii. 217 ff.) have now been modified. The principal additions to or alterations of the text in the second part are as follows. The chapter on Orpheus contains two new extracts (15^a and 22); but a passage in the former (p. 478, 28-30) is quite unintelligible as printed here. In the case of Epimenides, frs. 6, 7 and 17 of the old edition have been separated and rearranged, with certain additions, as belonging to a work bearing the title *Κρητικά*. A new chapter among the astronomers is now given to the fragments of the *Ἀστρονομίη* of Hesiod: this work,