

**ON THE HYPAETHRON OR
GREEK TEMPLES: A PAPER READ
BEFORE THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL
SOCIETY OF BERLIN**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649267828

On the Hypaethron Or Greek Temples: A Paper Read Before the Archaeological Society of Berlin by Edward Falkener

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

EDWARD FALKENER

**ON THE HYPAETHRON OR
GREEK TEMPLES: A PAPER READ
BEFORE THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL
SOCIETY OF BERLIN**

ON THE
HYPÆTHRON
OF
GREEK TEMPLES.

ON THE
HYPÆTHRON

OF
GREEK TEMPLES;

A PAPER READ BEFORE THE ARCHÆOLOGICAL SOCIETY OF BERLIN.

TOGETHER WITH

SOME OBSERVATIONS IN REPLY TO THE REVIEWERS

OF

“DÆDALUS.”

BY

EDWARD FALKENER.

LONDON:
LONGMAN, GREEN, LONGMAN, & ROBERTS.

1861.

~~173. h. 84.~~
173. h. 84.

LONDON :
COX AND WYMAN, PRINTERS, GREAT QUEEN STREET,
LINCOLN'S-INN FIELDS.



A R E P L Y,

4c.



THE Reviews of "Dædalus," with but one or two exceptions, have been written in so friendly a spirit, that it would ill become me not to express my gratitude to the various writers; the more so as it must necessarily be a delicate task to review a book written by one whose name was comparatively unknown, and in which the opinions of eminent living artists are sometimes controverted, and their works criticized. Whenever, therefore, under such circumstances, my Reviewers have agreed with me, I have felt indebted to them for that generous independence which has prompted them, despite of names, however celebrated, to adopt opinions which were likely to be contested by those who are justly regarded as the authorities of the day. These expressions of approval, coming from writers of experience, have had the effect of confirming me in my previous

judgment, and of leading me to conclude that I had not too rashly or too ignorantly expressed opinions on subjects which I should rather have left to be treated on by the professional writer. It cannot be expected however that the Reviewer should always agree with such opinions, nor indeed can it be expected that the Reviewer should be equally acquainted with every subject on which he is called upon to pronounce his verdict. Frequently it may happen that the author's meaning is not clearly understood, or that the author not being at hand to answer some question, the Reviewer is led to adopt an adverse theory, and this theory being delivered *ex cathedra* is looked upon as conclusive by a large mass of readers. It is possible that these objections and criticisms may be confined to one journal; and yet if the author answers any reviews he is expected to answer this, although the so doing may appear quite unnecessary to his other readers. It might be thought sufficient, in answer to such random objections, to refer the writer to contrary opinions expressed by other journals; but such a course is calculated rather to protect the reputation than to elicit truth, to shelter oneself behind the opinions of others rather than to produce the evidences of truth itself. I will therefore proceed to answer shortly some of the objections which have been incidentally raised by those who have reviewed my work.

As I could not expect all my readers to agree with me in my restoration of the Parthenon with a circular ceiling, especially when I put forward that restoration only as an hypothetical solution of the difficulty of placing a pedestal and statue fifty feet high inside of a temple which had only fifty-five feet, I have nothing to complain of when I find some objecting to it; on the contrary, I feel more than gratified in finding that there are others who accept the theory. One writer, however, remarks that the figures shown in my Restoration are too small. This criticism is not correct, and the reader may easily satisfy himself on the subject by remembering that the figure of Victory is six feet high, or the size of the human figure; and if after viewing this figure the reader looks down on the priests and singers below he will find that the scale of the building is scrupulously observed.

The first objection which is brought against me is that I seem to believe in Dædalus as a real personage. If I had passed by all the fables of Dædalus, because I had no facts to adduce, I should have had nothing to say about him, and my critic would then have censured me for calling my book by a name which I did not once refer to in the work itself. I felt it necessary, therefore, by reason of the title of my book, to omit no myth which had reference to the supposed father of sculpture.

One writer goes with me in my arguments about

the antiquity of the arch,* but when he finds that I imagine the ceiling of the Parthenon to have been of wood, he describes the reasoning as an anticlimax. The argument is, however, very simple. I contend that the ceilings of Greek temples were of wood, and not of stone, and therefore not imitative of the forms of trabeated masonry: I then show how I have been forced to employ a curved form from the necessities of the case; but anticipating the objection that the Greeks would not have employed a curved form of ceiling unless they were conversant with the arch, I go on to show that the Greeks were necessarily well acquainted with the arch, as it was extensively made use of by the Egyptians and Assyrians.

Another writer accuses me of presumption in putting forward a drawing designed by myself as a frontispiece to the work, but the critic should have considered that the object of this frontispiece

* Mr. Layard's evidence, proving the antiquity and use of the arch in Assyria, is confirmed by Mr. Loftus, who says, "That the Assyrians used the arch has been fully proved at Khorsabad, where magnificent arches of sun-dried bricks still rest on the massive backs of the colossal bulls which guard the great gateways leading into the city, and show that not only did the Assyrians understand the construction of an arch, but also its use as a decorative feature. Mr. Loftus then refers to other evidences showing that the Assyrian mode of vaulting was very similar to that still practised at Mosul."—W. Kennett Loftus, F.G.S., *Travels and Researches in Chaldea and Susiana*, 8vo., Lond., 1857, p. 182.