

Bryn Mawr College
Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr
College

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology Faculty
Research and Scholarship

Classical and Near Eastern Archaeology

1981

Review of *The Propylaia to the Athenian Akropolis, Vol. 1: The Predecessors*, by William B. Dinsmoor, Jr.

James C. Wright

Bryn Mawr College, jwright@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

Wright, James C. 1981. Review of *The Propylaia to the Athenian Akropolis, Vol. 1: The Predecessors*, by William B. Dinsmoor, Jr. *American Journal of Archaeology* 85:347-349.

This paper is posted at Scholarship, Research, and Creative Work at Bryn Mawr College. http://repository.brynmawr.edu/arch_pubs/98

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

tended, eventually approximating a pedimental form. The reviewer accepts Hiller's evidence for an early use of the palmette finial and would derive the pedimental form from an architectural prototype. Contrary to what Neumann says, the palmette finial was never used for votive reliefs.

The sense of self-confidence instilled in the Athenians by the expulsion of the tyrants and their victory over the Persians is illustrated by the early classical reliefs. Worshippers and deity confront each other directly. Gods take on human characteristics and expressions of emotional states, while mere mortals assume positions heretofore reserved for their betters. These scenes suggest to the author that, in the Athenian mind, the distance between the human and divine realms has been reduced. It is, however, difficult to generalize for a period represented by only a handful of reliefs, each one of which poses problems of interpretation and date. The early classical reliefs that we can accept as votives, like their archaic predecessors, seem to be impressive versions of the more humble wooden and terracotta plaques.

Chapter III, "Classical and Late Classical Votive Reliefs," is a general discussion of the heyday of votive relief production. The surprising lack of dedications dated between 450 and 430 B. C. is explained by the construction of the Parthenon whose carved frieze served as an expression of civic piety for the entire polis. According to Neumann, not until after the devastating plague of 430 did the individual again express his personal devotion through private dedications. The recipients of votive reliefs in this period are indicative of a new religious spirit. They are protectors of the individual's health and happiness—Asklepios, Demeter and Kore, the Nymphs—rather than the patrons of the city's welfare. Toward the end of the fifth century, the reliefs began to be framed at the sides by antae and above by a horizontal sima with antefixes. Neumann interprets this framing as a reference to the stoa as the meeting place between god and man in the popular healing cults. We can add that the cave-shaped frames of fourth century Nymph reliefs have the same meaning.

Votive reliefs as a derivative art form are explored in ch. IV, "Problems of Prototypes and Questions of Style." Neumann's investigation of figural prototypes leads to a discussion of late fifth and fourth century sculpture in the round. Particularly convincing are his interpretation of the so-called Eleusis Demeter as Persephone and his identification of the Apollo Patroos on a fragmentary relief from the Acropolis.

Chapter V, "The Donors," reviews the development of votive reliefs as an economic indicator. Votive, as opposed to grave reliefs are expressions of the middle class, and an increase in the number of relief dedications indicates a corresponding rise in the economic importance of the poorer classes.

Although it is not explicitly stated, Neumann's

study evokes the impression that a real tradition of stone votive reliefs only began in the post-Parthenon era. Until that time the marble reliefs are translations of painted wooden or terracotta prototypes that essentially belong to a handicraft tradition. It is one of Neumann's valuable contributions that he places the monuments in this context rather than as a side light to the series of grave reliefs. The excellent photographs serve as a visual outline to the author's discussion and are particularly welcome since many of the monuments illustrated were known only from old and indistinct reproductions.

CHARLES M. EDWARDS

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL
STUDIES AT ATHENS
54 SOUIDIAS
ATHENS 140, GREECE

THE PROPYLEIA TO THE ATHENIAN AKROPOLIS, VOL. I. THE PREDECESSORS, by *William B. Dinsmoor, Jr.* Pp. xvi + 69, pls. 24, plan 1. American School of Classical Studies at Athens, J.J. Augustin, Glückstadt 1980, \$12.50.

The first volume of the publication of the Athenian Propylaea is concerned with the pre-Mnesiklean entrances, particularly the Old Propylon. Although the study is partly based on the notes and plans of W.B. Dinsmoor, Sr., it is essentially the result of the researches and interpretations of the author. In a detailed and authoritative manner Dinsmoor describes the remains and disentangles the many architectural phases preserved within and around the Propylaea. Because of the wealth of scholarship surrounding his subject, he has also taken care to unravel the course of discovery and interpretation as recorded since 1840. Clearly this respectful attention to previous authority is a consequence of checking each recorded detail against the preserved evidence. The results are a sober reassessment of the remains, convincing restorations and a multitude of corrections or explanations of the scholarship which has preceded this study.

Because the Old Propylon is one of the more intractable problems of Akropolis topography, Dinsmoor has taken care to frame his study. In the preface he weighs the value of his father's investigations, and in a separate section he divides a useful discussion of modern investigations into four parts (1840-1880, 1880-1902, 1902-1946, 1946-1977). In this manner the major areas of evidence and their discovery are placed in proper context, and the vicissitudes of reconstructing the Archaic Propylon are made clear and illustrated with a series of comparative plans (pl. 5). These can be easily compared with Dinsmoor's reconstruction (pl. 4) of which a synopsis is given before the main text. Finally, before proceeding with a discussion of the evidence, the author establishes the setting be-

fore the Archaic period. He briefly discusses the main theories on the Mycenaean entranceway (pl. 1) and proposes his own, a variant of Bundgaard's reconstructions of 1957 and 1976. The most significant element of this is the placement of the north arm of the Cyclopean wall (now totally missing) farther east than usual in order to make the plan of the gate conform more closely with the type sites of Tiryns and Mycenae. This reconstruction, which I believe is substantially correct, is of importance for the reconstruction of the Archaic Propylon because it establishes the position of its north gate wall.

This, of course, was the entrance arrangement which the builders of the Old Propylon altered, and its form may well have influenced the plan or concept of the first stage of that building—the Forecourt. Dinsmoor uses two new pieces of evidence to inform us of the forecourt. Because of H. Eiteljorg's researches in 1975, it is now proven that the metope revetment of the West Cyclopean wall (and presumably of the steps before it) continued farther north than had previously been known, thus establishing the pre-propylon stage of the forecourt. Second, Dinsmoor shows that the metopes bearing IG I²_{3,4} do not have the chamfered edge characteristic of those lining the forecourt. Hence they were probably not installed as a part of this lining. He also reconfirms the date of their inscription in 485/4, but for the forecourt argues a date of 489/8 to correspond with a conjectured building program after the victory at Marathon, the major element of which was the Older Parthenon. These arguments depend upon an acceptance of the elder Dinsmoor's theory that the "Hekatompedon" architecture and sculpture do not belong with the Old Athena Temple foundations. The author does consider some alternatives, but, as will most readers, dismisses them. Last he focuses attention on the "Tripod base" which he believes was for a perirrhanterion, whereas his father preferred a triple Hekate.

The next stage is the first of the Archaic Propylon: a krepidoma for the propylon west wall built, not perpendicularly to the forecourt as might be expected, but obliquely. This operation was aborted when a decision was made not to tear down the Cyclopean wall behind the krepis, leaving it as an awkward interlude in the Propylon's history. Although the author rejects the possibility that the krepis was not intended to be part of the Propylon, it is difficult to accept the hypothesis that the builders of this structure would have made such an awkward juncture between forecourt and steps without permission to dismantle part of the Mycenaean wall and the old gate. Further, although Dinsmoor rejects the suggestion that the krepis was conceived independently of the propylon project, perhaps to formalize the level before the existing (Mycenaean?) gate, this does not appear so improbable. The question partly hinges on one's understanding of Herodotus' (8. 52-53) references to τὰς πύλας and

τῶν πυλῶν (cf. pp. 4-5): Do they refer to the Mycenaean entrance or the Old Propylon?

The second stage constitutes the original scheme of the Propylon. Whether it was ever completed or not, we do not know; no elements of the superstructure have been identified, and according to the author it was burned at the time of the Persian sack (Hdt. 8. 52-53). Its reconstructed plan is clearly a predecessor to that of the Propylaia: wide tetrastyle-in-antis facades at east and west, an interior hall with two rows of three Doric columns each, a gate wall with five doors placed at the rise in levels, and a shallow eastern porch. The propylon was built mostly of marble, perhaps combined with some other materials.

As students of this building will recognize, this reconstruction was not easily achieved. To begin, Dinsmoor makes sense of the bedrock cuttings which define the position of the gate wall, the form of the floor (entirely paved) and the general dimensions of the building. He then determines the original form of the preserved south flank wall. This discussion would have been easier to follow if the description had been more closely keyed to illustrations. In addition some corrections are in order: the third block of the first course, p. 41, is illustrated in pl. 9, *not* pl. 3, and in pl. 4 c, d, *not* a, b. Although not cited, pls. 18 and 19 are necessary to understand these remains. The string course that crowns this southern wall of the propylon remains a mystery. Might it not have supported a mudbrick superstructure as did the similar string course in the Tholos in the Agora, or have replaced a wooden beam that was originally intended to carry a mudbrick superstructure?

Perhaps the most important of Dinsmoor's many perceptive contributions to our knowledge of this building is the recognition of the original form and dimensions of the anta and of its complementary trapezoidal marble filler block. More than any other elements these determine the form of the facade and colonnade and the quality of their materials and workmanship. In this regard, however, it might be pointed out that the extremely slender proportions of the columns are acceptable for this period only because this is a building in antis (cf. the Athenian Treasury) and the comparison to the Aphaia temple is of little value. Reconstructing the entablature was clearly problematic. Dinsmoor lays out the choices and chooses the best of all possible friezes—no wonder Pytheos disapproved of the Doric order!

The interior arrangement includes a paved hallway and bench. The author prefers high slender Doric interior columns comparable to the earlier ones postulated for the Stoa Basileios (cf. J.J. Coulton, *The Architectural Development of the Greek Stoa* [1976] 101). The gate wall is restored with four steps which bear little relation to the cuttings in the bedrock and whose placement contradicts the assertion, p. 41, that

the step cuttings would have been made with the actual blocks on hand.

The date of this principal stage depends primarily on the evidence of the calcined orthostate blocks of the flank wall and the inference from Herodotus that they were burned in 480 B.C. Other technical observations are marshalled to support these data, and post-Persian dates are rejected because (1) to our knowledge nothing was built in the 470s and (2) a date in the 460s-450s is too close to the Periklean program to have sensibly a second and a third stage, the latter dismantled for the Mnesiklean Propylaia. Consequently, the forecourt, the krepidoma and the second or main stage of the Propylon are uncomfortably crammed between 480 and 480 B.C.

The third and final stage is an uncanonical patchwork building. Blocks are cut away or replaced; others are reused from elsewhere, and the floor level is slightly lowered. The proportions are even more slender than in the predecessor (the anta is $6\frac{1}{3}$ lower widths high) because of the reutilization of the plan and narrower anta blocks. This reconstruction is not datable, but the author points out that whatever date can be demonstrated for the major portions of the North Akropolis wall will probably also be that of this last propylon, since the drafted lower margin characteristic of the interior circuit wall face appears in the blocks of the poros anta wall.

This publication sets high standards for research on the Akropolis. Whatever criticisms one might have are only possible because of the complete and logical detailing of the evidence and the honest assessment of its value. One must admire the painstaking attention to measured detail and the careful observation of technical variation. They are apparent in the plans which are for the most part legible and beautifully drawn—all the more pity then that the section on pl. 7 is upside down, that a printing error caused ink blotches on pl. 8, and that some of the photographic captions give wrong orientations (pl. 18 is looking south, and 19 a and b are looking east) while many of the photographs were poorly reproduced.

Finally, I would take note of the reasonable price of this publication, which is largely due to support from the National Endowment for the Humanities. The useful and well presented information of this monograph demonstrates the value of such support.

JAMES C. WRIGHT

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICAL AND
NEAR EASTERN ARCHAEOLOGY
BRYN MAWR COLLEGE
BRYN MAWR, PENNSYLVANIA 19010

GREEK AIMS IN FORTIFICATION, by *Arnold Walter Lawrence*. Pp. xviii + 483, pls. 97, text figs. 89. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1979. \$98.

The author of this book is well known to students of Greek art and architecture through his earlier substantial publications. This latest work has occupied the attention of the author intermittently for more than forty years, in which time he has visited a significant proportion of the great number of sites discussed. The stated purpose of the study is "to explain why so many fortifications, both great and small, were necessary, and why each took its particular form, with features shaped to meet specific needs." It is no encyclopedic list and discussion of Greek fortified places, but instead a refreshingly original examination of the subject, faithful to the theme, in which the reader is led through almost every fortified place known in the Greek world, and a number beyond.

The scope is ambitious and includes much information not collected and presented elsewhere. In Part I it is introduced through a consideration of preceding traditions in military architecture, specifically those which appear to have influenced early Greek patterns and modes of fortification. Here, credit is at last given to otherwise neglected ancient Near Eastern practices as they pertain to this area of Greek studies. In this introductory section the study of fortifications themselves is prefaced with an account of how sieges were carried out and how they were countered, and with a review of the development of siege machinery. Accounts of attack and defense as recorded in the ancient literature are presented in historical order of occurrence, rather than by author, by type of event, or other system. Translations are not given, but the passages included are summarized briefly. In Part II, on the other hand, the treatise of Philo of Byzantium on Hellenistic defenses is presented in translation, and although not complete, it is the first version of Philo's *Poliorketika* to appear in English. The omitted passages are summarized where they occur in order to maintain continuity. The translation is accompanied by a commentary on the text, arranged on facing pages.

It is in Parts III, IV and V that fortifications themselves are examined in detail. Rather than offering a broad discussion of walls and associated structures and describing masonry styles as has been done elsewhere, this section presents a thorough analysis of fortifications according to consideration of design, of structure and of components. In the first of these parts, Classes of Defensive Structures, where again the ancient sources are liberally used, the surviving monuments are examined according to such topics as "Perimeter Strongpoints" or "Temporary Fieldworks." Part IV, The Builder's Technique, considers the preparation of foundations, material, masonry, and the construction of walls, towers and gating systems. This approach makes it possible to discuss the variety and complexity of these problems apart from planning, which is the subject of Part V: Components of a Fortification.