

1971

Review of *Samothrace 3: The Hieron*, by Phyllis Williams Lehmann

Brunilde S. Ridgway
Bryn Mawr College, bridgway@brynmawr.edu

[Let us know how access to this document benefits you.](#)

Follow this and additional works at: http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs

 Part of the [Classical Archaeology and Art History Commons](#), and the [History of Art, Architecture, and Archaeology Commons](#)

Custom Citation

Ridgway, Brunilde S. 1971. Review of *Samothrace 3: The Hieron*, by Phyllis Williams Lehmann. *American Journal of Archaeology* 75:100-102.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/73

For more information, please contact repository@brynmawr.edu.

ing health of Professor Schweitzer forced him to cease writing in 1964. Research into the nature of geometric art has proceeded at an extremely fast pace since that time, and it is regrettable that more of the recent studies could not have been incorporated into this volume. However, an interpretation of the period as it was known in 1964 is not without value, although it can sometimes lead to embarrassing conclusions when published at this late date. For the Corinthian figure style, for example, Schweitzer bases much of his interpretation of the local fashion—which he regards as a reflection of the Doric stamp of the Corinthian people—on the decoration of the ship krater 919.5.18 from the Royal Ontario Museum in Toronto, now recognized as most probably Attic.

The most serious drawbacks to the book arise from an uneven treatment of the various subjects and from the fact that the author is often no better than his sources, which are sometimes out of date. Most present writers would consider the chronology to be about a generation too early (the Dipylon Master is placed immediately after 770 B.C.), but a few subjects, the architecture for example, are assigned dates that conform to the later chronology, which leads to problems in the interrelationship between styles.

Die geometrische Kunst Griechenlands would be most useful to the student or scholar who is already familiar with the geometric field, as the material can then be placed in its proper perspective. Since so few general books have been written on this period as a whole, a work like Schweitzer's can help fill a serious need. In spite of a few drawbacks, it would make a welcome addition to an archaeological library because it brings together material that is not readily available in summary form elsewhere, its footnotes and its clear format make it eminently usable, and its illustrations are especially excellent.

PHILIP P. BETANCOURT

TYLER SCHOOL OF ART
TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

SAMOTHRACE 3, THE HIERON, by *Phyllis Williams Lehmann*, with Contributions by *Martin R. Jones, Karl Lehmann, Gilbert Cass, Alec Daykin, Martha Leeb Hadzi, Elaine P. Loeffler, Iris C. Love* and *Philip Oliver-Smith*. Vol. 1, pp. xxxv + 387, figs. 344; Vol. 2, pp. xv + 304, figs. 345-447 and many line drawings and photographs of finds; Vol. 3, pls. 116. Bollingen Series LX.3, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 1969. \$45.00.

The Society of Architectural Historians has assigned to this book the Alice Davis Hitchcock Award for the most distinguished work of scholarship in the History of Architecture produced by a North American scholar in 1969. This fact alone would attest to the excellence of the publication, but even the forewarned reader will be impressed by the lucid exposi-

tion, the painstaking presentation of evidence and especially the elegant format of these three volumes. For such typographical quality it is perhaps a small price to pay that the book took several years in printing (the Preface is dated July 1965), although some recent publications could not therefore be taken into account. But the final appearance certainly does credit to the Bollingen Series and the Princeton University Press.

The author's task was formidable. When she undertook the study of the Hieron in 1948, the building had already been "excavated" by the French in 1866, the Austrians in 1873 and 1875, and again by a French-Czech expedition in 1923. Even during the definitive campaigns by the New York University Institute of Fine Arts, as so often in the past, the structure was severely damaged by local vandals. Old photographs and drawings, often erroneous, had to be correlated with the new excavational evidence, and fragments in Samothrace had to be "joined" and compared with others in Vienna and Prague. The challenge has been fully met and the results have finally clarified many incorrect theories on the Hieron which had found their way into the most authoritative handbooks.

These excavational vicissitudes are outlined in the Introduction. Chapter 1 describes and reconstructs the building from foundations to roof, reasoning out on paper every step of the reconstruction, so that the reader can evaluate for himself the strength of each theory. Through stylistic and structural correlations with other buildings, both in Samothrace and elsewhere, Chapter 2 tries to determine the date of the marble Hieron, and Chapter 3 discusses its Hellenistic architectural sculpture, from pronaos coffers to akroteria. In Vol. 2, chapter 4 (written by the late Karl Lehmann in 1959) offers a reconstruction of the ritual enacted within the Hieron based on literary sources and on the material evidence of the structure and its alterations. Chapter 5 then attempts a chronological description of the various phases of the Hieron down to Constantinian times. A short appendix on the modern restoration of the building *in situ* is followed by the catalogues of ceramics (by I. Love) and minor objects (E. P. Loeffler and M. L. Hadzi). Six excellent indices conclude the work.

Though basically a self-contained unit, each chapter derives inspiration and support from the material discussed in the others, so that some arguments seem somewhat circular but the general picture is clear. In outline it shows that the marble Hieron is the third on the site, preceded by a late 6th century structure and an Early Classical one of the same general plan and dimensions. From the beginning, the building was also called the Epopteion, and served for the second degree of initiation into the Samothracian mysteries. The third Hieron, built in the late 4th century, was left unfinished and completed, with modifications, only after 150 B.C. It was partly damaged and restored in the early Imperial period (earthquake of A.D. 17?). Extensive alterations, mostly dictated by changes in

the ritual, took place around A.D. 200, while further modifications occurred probably under Constantine. Within this complex framework individual bits of evidence may seem vague, but combine into fairly strong arguments for each proposal. It would be impossible here to discuss everything in detail, and I shall arbitrarily select a few points of interest or controversy.

Perhaps the most attractive feature of the marble Hieron is its wall system: smooth orthostats and string course between a recessed toichobate (here called stereobate) and blocks with drafted margins (two courses of stretchers followed by a single course of binders). This specific pattern is first found in the temple of Athena at Priene, but with smooth blocks; on the Hieron it makes its first appearance in combination with drafted margins, though the temple of Hemithea at Kastabos should now be taken into account as a possible rival in ornamental drafting. The interior wall decoration of the Hieron has been restored to repeat the outside pattern on the evidence of colored plaster and molded stucco fragments. The result strongly resembles the so-called Pompeian First Style and, more specifically, Macedonian funerary and domestic wall painting. The implications of this Samothracian example have already been discussed by V. Bruno in *AJA* 73 (1969) 314-316. Mrs. Lehmann visualizes the Hieron architect as a local man grafting his knowledge of contemporary practices in Asia Minor and Macedonia onto traditional local forms, thus skillfully correlating his building to surrounding structures. Architectural affinities between the Altar Court and the Hieron may suggest that both were donated by the Macedonian Arrhidaïos; his death in 316 B.C. may explain the interruption of work on the Hieron before the erection of pronaos and porch.

Chronology is perhaps the most controversial issue, since many structural and decorative features of the building are dictated by its predecessors, and ultimately by cultic requirements. The 4th century architect retained the cave-like apse of the previous structures, but inscribed it within a rectangular cella, perhaps for the first time in Greek architecture. Among the remote parallels (vol. 1, 156 n. 7) one should perhaps include the temple of the Athenians in Delos (though this contains a semicircular statue base and not a structural apse) because of the additional similarity of corner pilasters in the rear wall.

A late 4th century date for the marble Hieron is established by ceramic finds from the foundation deposits, architectural proportions and ornamental details of entablature and walls. Further evidence shows that the original plan (fig. 57) was left unfinished and that a revised porch and pronaos were added later (vol. 1, 84-93). But how much later? Since most of the extant sculptural decoration comes from this portion of the Hieron, chronology is important on several counts. In 1962 Mrs. Lehmann had anticipated in print her reconstruction of the sculptures, discussing them in isolation and promising full documentation of her assertions in the future. Reviewers therefore sus-

pending judgment on chronological matters, waiting for architectural confirmation (e.g., M. Bieber, *AJA* 67 [1963] 426-429.) This documentation has now appeared and is as complete and painstaking as any scholar could make it. Yet, in ultimate analysis, it is the style of the sculptures which dates the architecture rather than vice versa. Of the other criteria, the *nature* of the alterations in the plan implies a return to classicizing proportions, but the classicistic movement fluctuates within the 2nd century and cannot be pinned down, especially now that the date of Damophon of Messene has also been questioned; the *ceramic finds* from the pronaos fill are not safely datable, witness the cautious statements of the catalogue (vol. 2, 173-177) and Mrs. Lehmann's admission (vol. 1, 234 n. 229); finally, the *alteration* of decorative patterns on sima and antefixes has no relative chronological value except to suggest diversity of hands and methods, which is implicitly accepted.

Scholars may be disappointed by this conclusion, since the style of the Samothracian sculptures has been variously and subjectively assessed. I agree with Mrs. Lehmann that the pedimental figures, especially the striding woman in the center, should date shortly after the Pergamene Gigantomachy. The other extant statues and fragments make a less definite impression and look more classicistic, less aesthetically appealing. The boneless quality of arms and hands, even in the one clearly male figure, makes one wonder at the female classification of "disiecta membra." Is the "Harmonia" of the NE corner (fig. 240) really a little *girl*? Even the author comments on the unusually high number of women in one pediment. But her attributions of fragments to the various positions are most methodical, and, as with the architecture, the reader is given the benefit of following the mental process behind each theory. The "Nurturing of Aetion" may perhaps make a monotonous composition, and one wonders that Harmonia and Dardanos, so important for identification purposes, should be relegated to the corners, beyond geographical personifications; but the myth must have been familiar to Samothracian visitors and is a plausible choice for a pediment.

The original Nike akroterion seems later than the pedimental sculptures in general proportions; her elongation can be partly explained as an optical correction, but her thinness cannot be justified on the same grounds (contrast, e.g., the *thicker* corner columns of temples because they are not seen against an architectural background). The statue's pose also reminds me of the archaistic reliefs with Nike pouring a libation to Apollo, which may imply a date around 100 B.C. Finally the centaur of the coffer (theoretically the earliest of the sculptures because it was connected with the construction of the pronaos ceiling) looks impressionistic and pictorial, almost with terracotta overtones, and is therefore chronologically elusive though certainly post-Pergamene Gigantomachy.

Fragments of colossal torsos have prompted the theory that the rear pediment was filled at this time with

busts of the four Samothracian divinities, somewhat as they appear on the Tomb of the Haterii, but the evidence is scant. One fragment in particular, SP(S)1 (p. 319 and fig. 270) seems to retain traces of a gorgoneion, though it is not so described. If this impression is not entirely due to a photographic illusion, it should belong to a statue of Zeus or Athena, and therefore perhaps to an independent monument rather than to the south pediment. Similarly, the partial statue identified as Teiresias (figs. 371-374) and dated to 460-450 B.C., looks, at least in photograph, as if it might be Roman (see, e.g., the long locks and their point of origin on the nape). Unfortunately this bust constitutes a major element for attributing a pedimental Nekyia to the second Hieron and for dating that building to the Early Classical period. Since, however, I have no direct knowledge of the originals and photographs can be highly misleading, I feel bound to defer entirely to the excavator's opinion.

This review offers only a brief sample of the wealth of material included in this work. I can only add that Mrs. Lehmann has worked out for us one of the most interesting and complex buildings of antiquity and, in so doing, has set a pattern of thorough scholarship difficult to emulate.

BRUNILDE SISMONDO RIDGWAY

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

DIE ATHLETISCHEN LEIBESÜBUNGEN DER GRIECHEN, by Julius Jüthner, herausgegeben von Friedrich Brein. Vol. I, *Geschichte der Leibesübungen*. Pp. 209, figs. 12, map 1, pls. 24. Hermann Böhlau Nachf., Wien, 1965. Unb. Ö.S. 160. Vol. II, Part I, *Einzelne Sportarten, Lauf-, Sprung- und Wurf-bewerbe*. Pp. 368, figs. 75, pls. 100. Wien, 1968. Bound Ö.S. 280, unb. 260.

Julius Jüthner, who devoted a lifetime to the study of Greek athletics, left a manuscript, much of it in his own shorthand, for two out of the six originally planned volumes. It devolved upon the Austrian Academy of Science to prepare this material for publication, to bring it and the bibliography up to date and to complete and interpret so far as possible the author's purpose in presenting this to the scholarly public. The editor, Dr. Friedrich Brein, gives due credit to the original; his many additions and corrections are printed within brackets. The first of the two volumes under review was published twenty years after the author's death, the second volume, part I, came out three years after the appearance of the first. The second part of II is to appear later.

The author approaches each section of the book with consideration of its historical background. Beginning with mythology he proceeds to Homer, and here he holds the view that, in the matter of sport at any rate, Homer has extrapolated conditions prevailing in his own day, 8th century B.C., to the time of the Homeric heroes several centuries earlier. From the period of the epic the author proceeds to Bachyli-

des, Pindar, and the other writers of the 5th century, and so on down the line to Roman times. Against this literary background he examines the monuments from which he extracts whatever evidence is there, always mindful of inaccuracies and even wilful distortions introduced by the artist, whose aim was not always faithful portrayal of the scenes and movements he depicted. Jüthner's position is that products of art, be they sculpture, bronze, figurines, vases or minor objects, must reflect, if not always accurately portray, the activity of the athletes in an age when every citizen was intimately versed in the minutiae of athletic events. In some cases he seems to me to go too far in crediting a vase painter with specific, almost photographic information on movements which must have been difficult to distinguish in the *melée* and excitement of the Games.

The author's aim seems to have been to produce a complete work that would include all existing evidence, literary and monumental, for the history, development and practice of Greek sport and athletics. There is no English term that renders satisfactorily the German word "Leibes-Übungen," literally "body-exercises," here used to cover all phases of physical training, sport and athletics.

Such an ambitious undertaking was perhaps doomed from the beginning to remain unfinished. The editor's task of rescuing the author's prodigious work merits the highest praise. During more than two decades between the author's death and the publication of the two volumes, several books and numerous articles on the same and related subjects have appeared, and excavations have brought to light much new evidence unknown to Jüthner. All this additional evidence has been incorporated into the book in its proper context. It is fortunate and fitting that this exhaustive presentation of Greek athletics could be made available at a time when renewed interest in Greek athletics and athletic ideals has been engendered through the enlarged scope of the International Olympic Games and the formation of the Olympic Academy, which now holds annual sessions at Olympia with worldwide participation.

Jüthner's treatise is not intended for amateur scholars or week-end sport fans. It is addressed primarily to classicists, who with the author's expert guidance can form their own conclusions from his evidence. On the other hand the material is presented in such a form as to be of practical use to any serious-minded student of Greek sport, whether or not he can refer from the book directly to the ancient sources.

In his obvious endeavor to achieve completeness the author organized his material according to a very elaborate outline of contents. One has the impression that, instead of permitting the material at hand to determine the scheme of the treatise, he poured the information gained from his sources into a previously conceived form that made too little allowance for lack of uniformity and the disconnected and contradictory nature of the evidence. Such an arrangement leads inevitably to repetition. The same literary sources and