

UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

Date: 4 February 2005

I, Alexandra L. Lesk,
hereby submit this work as part of the requirements for the degree of:
Doctor of Philosophy

in:

Classics

It is entitled:

A Diachronic Examination of the Erechtheion and Its Reception

This work and its defense approved by:

Chair: Charles Brian Rose
Jack L. Davis
Kathleen M. Lynch
J. James Coulton

**A DIACHRONIC EXAMINATION OF THE
ERECHTHEION AND ITS RECEPTION**

Alexandra L. Lesk, B.A., M.St. (*Oxon.*), M.A.

Presented to McMicken College of Arts and Sciences and the Department of Classics of
the University of Cincinnati in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

2004

Committee:

C. Brian Rose (Chair)

Jack L. Davis

Kathleen M. Lynch

J. James Coulton

ABSTRACT

“A Diachronic Examination of the Erechtheion and Its Reception” examines the social life of the Ionic temple on the Athenian Akropolis, which was built in the late 5th century B.C. to house Athens’ most sacred cults and relics. Using a contextualized diachronic approach, this study examines both the changes to the Erechtheion between its construction and the middle of the 19th century A.D., as well as the impact the temple had on the architecture and art of these successive periods. This approach allows the evidence to shed light on new areas of interest such as the Post-Antique phases of the building, in addition to affording a better understanding of problems that have plagued the study of the Erechtheion during the past two centuries.

This study begins with a re-examination of all the pertinent archaeological, epigraphical, and literary evidence, and proposes a wholly new reconstruction of how the Erechtheion worked physically and ritually in ancient times. After accounting for the immediate influence of the Erechtheion on subsequent buildings of the Ionic order, an argument for a Hellenistic rather than Augustan date for the major repairs to the temple is presented. These repairs are then placed among the significant building projects carried out in Athens by the Hellenistic kings. While Rome ruled its empire, the Erechtheion continued to exert its own influence. Copies of both the Erechtheion’s special Ionic order and the maidens of the South Porch were incorporated into several Roman monuments in Greece, Italy, and Spain. This study examines the significance of these quotations, and probes the Roman reception of the Erechtheion in the light of Vitruvius’ opening statements in *De Architectura*, where the Roman architect calls female architectural supports “caryatids.”

The surviving architectural evidence, in conjunction with the accounts and depictions of the Erechtheion by the early travelers to Athens, provide the bases for reconstructing the different phases of the Erechtheion. After it served as a pagan temple, the Erechtheion was transformed into a pillared hall in Late Antiquity, a basilica church in the Byzantine period, an elaborate residence in the Frankish period, and finally into a house for an Ottoman official. During the Venetian bombardment of the Akropolis in 1687, the Erechtheion was severely damaged. After this event, the building served as a gunpowder magazine, and as a ruin to be admired for its antiquity. From the 18th century onward, the Erechtheion also served as a model for Neoclassical buildings all over Europe. By gauging the aesthetic reception of the Erechtheion by early travelers to Athens, this study attempts to appreciate the temple's timeless appeal and its role in the creation of the nascent Greek state's national identity.

Copyright 2004 by
Alexandra L. Lesk

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

My interest in the Erechtheion was sparked in 1998 by Harriet Boyd Hawes' daughter, (the late) Mary Allsebrook, who asked me if I would be interested in seeing if any of her mother's ideas contained in an unpublished manuscript titled "The Riddle of the Erechtheion" were still of any interest today. Vasso Fotou helped me acquire a copy of this manuscript, and the rest, as they say, is history.

I am deeply indebted to the University of Cincinnati Classics Department and the Semple Fund for their unwavering and flexible support of my graduate studies. I would like to express my humblest gratitude to the members of my dissertation committee, Brian Rose (supervisor), Jack Davis, Jim Coulton and Kathleen Lynch, for their patience and perseverance with the drafts of this document. Other University of Cincinnati faculty members, namely Diane Harris-Cline, Getzel Cohen, and John Hancock (DAAP), also provided welcome advice and support.

I am very grateful to the Samuel Kress Foundation for funding my travel around Europe to visit museums and research institutions in 2001-2002, and to the University of Cincinnati University Research Council for supporting me while I conducted research in Athens in 2001. While living and researching in Athens in 2000-2002, several people generously inspired, guided, and challenged me. I would like to thank Judith Binder, Richard Anderson, Michael Djordjevitch, Peter Schultz, Bob Bridges, Tasos Tanoulas, Gloria Pinney, and Bill Murray. Other members of the American School of Classical Studies and the British School at Athens also provided assistance and support, including Natalia Vogeikoff-Brogan, Amalia Kassis, Samantha Martin, and Heinrich Hall. I would also like to thank Bronwen Wickkiser for encouraging me to start writing.

I am grateful to the Museum of the City of Athens, the Benaki Museum, the National Historical Museum, the Center for Modern Greek Studies, and the 1st Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities for their assistance with and permission to conduct research on the Erechtheion.

I would also like to acknowledge Marianne Hillenmeyer, the historian at the Nashville Parthenon, who kindly searched out and provided me with images of a symmetrical version of the Erechtheion built for the Tennessee Centennial Exposition in 1897 for an AIA talk. Ian Jenkins assisted me in locating and consulting several images of the Erechtheion in the British Museum, while Susan Palmer and Stephen Astley went out of their way to help me find wonderful documents pertaining to the Erechtheion in Sir John Soane's Museum. I would like to thank the library staff of Burnham Library for their kind and generous help, and in particular, fellow student Jennifer Sacher, for her assistance in finding obscure references for me while I was abroad.

I owe a great deal to Dorothy King whom I met in Athens in 2001. She shared her corpus of female architectural supports with me and lent me her sofa in London when I needed to use the city's libraries and museums. I would also like to thank Jeff and Laura Kursman for allowing me to stay in their guestroom in Cincinnati for long periods of time; my only regret is that we were like ships passing in the night and barely had time to visit.

Most importantly, I would like to acknowledge the constant support of my husband, Paul Blomerus, and my parents, Earl Lesk and Donna Love. Without them, I would never have made it through this experience.

While I appreciate the patience and expertise of the members of my dissertation committee for their input and diligent corrections, all the remaining mistakes are my own.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Acknowledgements	vi
Table of Contents	ix
List of Tables	xiii
List of Figures	xiv
Chapter I – Introduction	1
Philosophical Background to Methodology	4
Terminology	12
Spelling, Capitalization and Measurements	17
Grids	18
Anatomy of the Erechtheion	19
Outline of the Study	21
Chapter II – The Erechtheion in the 5th Century B.C.	26
Introduction	26
Before the Ionic Temple	29
Bronze Age Predecessors	29
Archaic and Early Classical Period	33
General Trends in the Scholarship: Looking at the Erechtheion as a Whole	39
The Canonical Interpretation of the Classical Erechtheion: Paton et al.	39
Alternative Locations for the Cults of Athena Polias and Erechtheus: Travlos, Jeppesen, Mansfield, Robertson and Ferrari	42
Original Plan: Dörpfeld, Dinsmoor, Elderkin and Hawes	50
Recent and New Thoughts on the Architecture and Sculpture of the Classical Erechtheion	64
Date	64
Architect	71
Reconstruction of the Interior of the Main Building	71
Function of the Maiden Porch and the Identity of the Maidens	102
Design note on the West Anta of the Maiden Porch	108
North Porch as the Entrance to the Temple of Athena Polias	110
Stevens’ Reconstruction of the Terrace North of the Erechtheion	112
New Architectural Fragments	115
The “Stoa” Mentioned in the Inscriptions	116
Sculptured Frieze from the Erechtheion	117
Base for the Cult Statue of Athena Polias?	129
Placing the Cults on the Blank Canvas: Recent and New Thoughts on the Cults and Objects in the Erechtheion	129
Lamp of Kallimachos and the Niche	130
Peplos of Athena	138
Statue of Athena Polias and the Table in Front	141
A Series of Special Ritual Vessels	143
Votive Stelai around the Erechtheion	144
Votives in the Erechtheion	145
Indoor Altars	152
Conclusion: A New Restoration of the Erechtheion in the Classical Period	154
Chapter III – Late Classical and Hellenistic Periods (399-31 B.C.)	165
Introduction	165
History of Athens during the Hellenistic Period	167
History of Fires in the Erechtheion	195

Stylistic Dating of the Repaired Moldings.....	201
Changes to the Erechtheion during the Hellenistic Period.....	207
The Reception of the Erechtheion in the Late Classical and Hellenistic Period.....	231
Conclusion.....	242
Chapter IV- The Roman Period (31 B.C. –A.D. 330).....	243
Introduction.....	243
Historical Context and Changes to the Erechtheion during the Roman Period.....	245
Graffiti.....	261
Roman Reception of the Erechtheion.....	262
The Reception of Vitruvius and the Conflation of “Caryatid” and the Erechtheion Maidens.....	262
Pausanias and the Reception of the Akropolis in the 2 nd Century A.D.....	280
The Reception of the Erechtheion Ionic Order in the Roman Period.....	286
Conclusion.....	301
Chapter V – The Late Antique and Byzantine Periods (330-1204).....	303
Introduction.....	303
Historical Overview.....	304
Changes to the Erechtheion in the Late Antique and Byzantine Periods.....	314
Archaeological Overview.....	316
State of the Scholarship and the Problem of Dating Early Christian Architecture.....	318
The Erechtheion as a Pillared Hall.....	320
The Erechtheion as a Basilica Church.....	322
Phase I of the Basilica.....	322
Phase II of the Basilica.....	342
Christianization of Pagan Monuments.....	350
Graffiti.....	352
Dedication.....	352
Crosses.....	353
Ships.....	355
Reception in the Byzantine Period.....	362
Conclusion.....	363
Chapter VI – The Frankish Period (1204 – 1458).....	365
Introduction.....	365
Historical Background.....	365
Archaeological Overview.....	372
Changes to the Erechtheion during the First Frankish Period.....	374
Changes to the Erechtheion during the Second Frankish Period.....	394
Reception of the Erechtheion in the Frankish Period.....	400
Conclusion.....	402
Chapter VII – The Ottoman Period (1458-1833).....	404
Introduction.....	404
Archaeological Overview.....	408
Historical Background.....	409
Travelers’ Accounts and Depictions.....	425
The Earliest Travelers to Athens.....	426
The Earliest Travelers to Describe the Erechtheion.....	434
The Venetians.....	445
Venetian Reception.....	451
The 18 th Century and the First Artists to Draw the Erechtheion.....	452
The Dawn of a New Age: the 19 th Century.....	507
Prelude to the War of Independence.....	564
Travelers during the War of Independence.....	586
Synthesis of Travelers’ Reception of the Erechtheion.....	594

Modus Operandi	595
The Development of Scholarship.....	597
‘Caryatid’ and the Renaissance.....	598
Trends in Aesthetic Reactions.....	600
Motivations for Travel.....	601
Philhellenism	602
Attitudes toward Lord Elgin’s Activities	603
Robert Adam and Sir John Soane	604
Changes to the Erechtheion during the Ottoman Period (1458-1821).....	610
Changes to the Erechtheion during the First Ottoman Period.....	611
The Venetians (1687-1688)	617
Changes to the Erechtheion during the Second Ottoman Period (1688-1821).....	624
Graffiti on the Erechtheion during the Ottoman Period.....	642
Changes to the Erechtheion during the War of Independence (1821-1833).....	645
Conclusion.....	649
Chapter VIII – Period of Greek Independence.....	653
Introduction	653
Scholarship Review	654
The Erechtheion between 1833 and 1853.....	656
Reception of the Erechtheion in Athens	677
Graffiti	679
Conclusion.....	684
Chapter IX – Conclusion	688
Bibliography.....	696
Appendix A: Literary and Epigraphic Evidence pertaining to the Erechtheion	750
Appendix B – Travelers’ Accounts Mentioned in the Text relating to Athens and the Erechtheion	774
Appendix C – Erechtheion Maidens and Moldings.....	904
Appendix D – Figures.....	908
Depictions of the Erechtheion by early modern Travelers.....	908
Cited Depictions of Athens and the Akropolis	991
The Erechtheion.....	999
Plan and Terminology.....	999
Basic Views of the Erechtheion	1000
East Porch	1007
South Wall	1045
Maiden Porch.....	1078
West Façade.....	1126
Pandroseion and Kekropeion	1160
Westward Projection of the North Porch	1174
North Porch.....	1190
North Wall	1310
North Terrace.....	1330
Interior	1334
South Aisle.....	1356
Byzantine Features.....	1358
Other	1371
Early Photographs.....	1376
Early Excavations Notes.....	1378
Reconstructions	1379
Keys to Grids.....	1386
Papanikolaou Drawings on Display on the Akropolis	1393

Diachronic Models.....	1395
Archaeological Comparanda.....	1413
By Location.....	1413
By Feature.....	1469
Miscellaneous	1482
Other	1486
Erechtheion Related.....	1499
Appendix E – Graffiti on the Erechtheion	1511

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Summary of Korres' Observations Concerning the North Face of the Foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias.	36
Table 2. Monuments which Feature an Anthemion Molding with Features Comparable to the Replaced Lintel of the North Door of the Erechtheion.	206
Table 3. Summary of Features of the Maidens from Tivoli and the Forum of Augustus, Compared to the Erechtheion Maidens.	272
Table 4. Predecessors and Successors of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus.	291
Table 5. Location and Description of Crosses Carved on the Erechtheion.	354
Table 6. The Different Allocation of Cults between the 1758 and 1770 Edition of Le Roy's Plan of the Akropolis.	476
Table 7. Allocation of the Cults in the Erechtheion According to the 1821 and 1841 Versions of Leake's texts.	538
Table 8. The Differences Between the Plans in Leake's 1821 and 1841 Publications.	538
Table 9. Description of the Blocks Inwood Sold to the British Museum.	582
Table 10. Arrangement of the Colored Glass Beads in the Guilloche of the Columns of the North Porch, According to Donaldson.	584
Table 11. Casts of Parts of the Erechtheion in Sir John Soane's Collection.	606
Table 12. Architectural and Sculptural Elements from the Erechtheion Removed by Elgin and Now in the British Museum (BM).	637

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Verneda, <i>Pianta del Castello d'Acropolis e Città d'Athene. Tavola delle cose più nottabili conteute [sic] nella Pianta del Castello</i> , 1687.....	908
Figure 2. Verneda, <i>Athens During the Explosion in the Parthenon on September 23, 1687</i> , 1687.....	908
Figure 3. Verneda, <i>Veduta del Borgo e del castello di Athene al momento del esplosione di Partenone da una bomba</i> , 26 September 1687. Detail.....	909
Figure 4. Verneda, <i>Bombardment of the Akropolis by General Morosini in 1687</i> , 1687.....	909
Figure 5. Fanelli, <i>Plan of the Akropolis after Verneda</i> , 1687.....	910
Figure 6. Fanelli, <i>Veduta del cast: d'Acropolis dalla parte di tramontana</i> , 1687.....	910
Figure 7. San Felice, <i>Plan de la ville d'Athènes</i> , 1687. Note the apsidal North Porch.....	911
Figure 8. Coronelli, <i>Acropolis Cittadella d'Atene (Blackmer 409)</i> , 1687.....	911
Figure 9. M. Fourmont, <i>The Erechtheum</i> , 1729. Cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.....	912
Figure 10. C.-L. Fourmont, <i>The Erechtheum</i> , 1729. Cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.....	912
Figure 11. M. Fourmont, <i>Sketches for the drawing of the Erechtheion</i> , 1729. Cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.....	913
Figure 12. Pococke, <i>The Temple of Erectheus at Athens, restored</i> , 1745.....	913
Figure 13. Dalton, <i>Le Temple d'Erichtheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast</i> , 1749.....	914
Figure 14. Dalton, <i>Le Temple d'Erichtheus a Athènes: View from the West</i> , 1749.....	914
Figure 15. Stuart, <i>Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum</i> , 1751. RIBA.....	915
Figure 16. Stuart, <i>One of the Caryatids Viewed in Front and in Profile</i> , 1751.....	915
Figure 17. Le Roy, <i>Vüe du Temple d'Erechthée à Athenes</i> , 1755.....	916
Figure 18. Le Roy, <i>Plan de la Citadelle d'Athènes</i> , 1755. From Sayer 1759, pl. 1.....	917
Figure 19. Le Roy, <i>East Elevation</i> , 1755 and Le Roy, <i>Restitution du Temple d'Erechthée</i> , 1755. From Sayer 1759, pl. 21.....	918
Figure 20. Le Roy, <i>Ordre caryatide</i> , 1755 and Plan of the Erechtheion. From Sayer 1759, pl. 22.....	919
Figure 21. Le Roy, <i>Ordre ionique</i> , 1755. From Sayer 1759, pl. 23.....	920
Figure 22. Pars, <i>The Erechtheum from the Northeast</i> , 1765. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	921
Figure 23. Barthélemy, <i>Plan d'Athènes Pour le Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis</i> , 1799.....	921
Figure 24. Barthélemy, <i>Vue perspective du Parthénon</i> , 1799.....	922
Figure 25. Cassas, <i>The Erechtheion from the Southwest</i> , 1786-1787. Courtesy of the Benaki Museum.....	922
Figure 26. Fauvel, <i>Rough Plan of the Acropolis</i> , 1787. Cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.....	923
Figure 27. Fauvel, <i>Measured drawings of the Porch of the Maidens</i> , 1789. Cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.....	923
Figure 28. Fauvel, <i>Sketch plan of the Erechtheion</i> , Undated. Cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.....	924
Figure 29. Fauvel, <i>Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion</i> , Undated (ca. 1789). Cliché Bibliothèque nationale de France, Paris.....	924
Figure 30. Hope, <i>Plan of the Acropolis</i> , ca. 1795.....	925
Figure 31. Préaux, <i>Temple of Erectheus at Athens; East Porch of the Erechtheion</i> , 1799-1801.....	926
Figure 32. Gell, <i>Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis</i> , 1801. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	927
Figure 33. Gell, <i>Inside the East Portico</i> , 1800. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	928
Figure 34. Gell, <i>Interior of the Porch of the Maidens</i> , 1800. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	929
Figure 35. Gell, <i>Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis</i> , 1801. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	930
Figure 36. Gell, <i>Temple of Erectheus</i> , 1800. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	930
Figure 37. Gell, <i>Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis</i> , 1800. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	931
Figure 38. Atkins, <i>The Erechtheion from the Southwest</i> , 1801. Courtesy of the Benaki Museum.....	931
Figure 39. Wilkins, <i>Restoration of the Erechtheion from the Southwest</i> , 1802.....	932
Figure 40. Smirke, <i>The Erechtheum from the Northwest</i> , ca. 1803. RIBA Library Drawings Collection.....	932
Figure 41. Detail of Dodwell, <i>The West Front of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion, from the Propylaea</i> , 1805.....	933
Figure 42. Dodwell, <i>South-West View of the Erechtheion</i> , 1805.....	933

Figure 43. Pomardi, <i>Erechtheion</i> , 1804-1805. From the west.....	934
Figure 44. Pomardi, <i>West End of the Pandrosion</i> , 1804-1805.....	935
Figure 45. Hobhouse, <i>The Akropolis viewed from the Propylaea</i> , 1809-1810. Detail.....	936
Figure 46. Haygarth, <i>Erechtheum from the North</i> , 1810-1811. Courtesy of the Gennadeion.....	936
Figure 47. Cockerell, <i>The Loft in the North Portico</i> , 1811-1814. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	937
Figure 48. Williams, <i>View of the Erechtheum</i> , 1817.....	937
Figure 49. Williams, <i>View of the Propylaea</i> , 1817.....	938
Figure 50. Williams, <i>Temple of Pandrosus</i> , 1817.....	938
Figure 51. Basevi, <i>Parthenon viewed from the Inside looking North</i> , 1818. Courtesy of Sir John Soane's Museum.....	939
Figure 52. Basevi, <i>The Interior of the Erechtheion from the Northwest</i> , 1818. Courtesy of Sir John Soane's Museum.....	940
Figure 53. Basevi, <i>Erechtheion from the North</i> , 1818. Courtesy of Sir John Soane's Museum.....	941
Figure 54. Basevi, <i>West Façade of the Erechtheion</i> , 1818. Courtesy of Sir John Soane's Museum.....	942
Figure 55. Page, <i>The Erechtheum from the Southwest</i> , 1818. Courtesy of the Gennadeion.....	942
Figure 56. Taylor, <i>The Erechtheum from the Northwest</i> , 1818.....	943
Figure 57. Eastlake, <i>The Erechtheum</i> , 1818-1820.....	943
Figure 58. Inwood, <i>The Erechtheion from the West</i> , 1819.....	944
Figure 59. Inwood, <i>An Ideal Restoration of the Temple; North-west View</i> , 1819.....	944
Figure 60. Inwood, <i>Restored Plan of the Interior of the Erechtheion</i> , 1819.....	945
Figure 61. Thürmer, <i>The Erechtheum from the Northeast</i> , 1819. Courtesy of the Gennadeion.....	945
Figure 62. Artist Unknown, <i>View of the Erechtheion</i> , ca. 1818. Courtesy of the Museum of the City of Athens.....	946
Figure 63. Donaldson, <i>Disposition of the coloured glass beads in the interlacing ornament in the capitals of the tetrastyle portico</i> , 1820. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	946
Figure 64. Wordsworth, <i>The Pandroseum</i> , pre-1821.....	947
Figure 65. Wordsworth, <i>The Parthenon and the Erechtheum</i> , 1832-1833.....	948
Figure 66. Cole, <i>The Erechtheum from the Southeast</i> , 1833. Courtesy of the Gennadeion.....	948
Figure 67. Arundale, <i>View of the Temple of Erechtheus at Athens</i> , 1834. Courtesy of the British Museum.	949
Figure 68. Arundale, <i>View of the Temples of the Parthenon and the Erechtheum</i> , 1834. Detail. Courtesy of the British Museum.....	949
Figure 69. Lange, <i>Early Excavations on the Athenian Plateau</i> , 1834. Detail.....	950
Figure 70. Hansen, <i>Inside the North Portico of the Erechtheion</i> , 1835-1836. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.....	950
Figure 71. Hansen, <i>Interior of the Maiden Porch from the East</i> , 1835-1836. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.....	951
Figure 72. Hansen, <i>The Maiden Porch from the Southeast</i> , 1835-1836. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.....	951
Figure 73. Rørbye, <i>Parti af Erechtheion</i> , 1836.....	952
Figure 74. S. Bracebridge, <i>The Erechtheion and the Parthenon from the East</i> , 1837.....	953
Figure 75. S. Bracebridge, <i>The Erechtheion and the Parthenon from the West</i> , 1837.....	953
Figure 76. Zahn, <i>Erechtheum</i> , ca. 1837. Courtesy of the Gennadeion.....	954
Figure 77. Marilhat, <i>The Erechtheum, Athens</i> , 1837-1841.....	954
Figure 78. Müller, <i>Parthenon and Erechtheion from the West</i> , 1837-1844. Courtesy of the Benaki Museum.....	955
Figure 79. Müller, <i>Parthenon, Erechtheion and Propylaea from the East</i> , 1837-1844. Courtesy of the Benaki Museum.....	956
Figure 80. de Chacaton, <i>View of the Parthenon with the Mosque</i> , 1838-1839. Courtesy of the Benaki Museum.....	956
Figure 81. Skene, <i>The Erechtheum from the Southwest</i> , 1839.....	957
Figure 82. Skene, <i>The North Portico from the Northwest</i> , February 27, 1839.....	957
Figure 83. Flandin, <i>The Erechtheum and the Parthenon from the West</i> , November 15, 1839.....	958
Figure 84. Leake, <i>Plan of the Akropolis</i> , 1841.....	959
Figure 85. Skene, <i>Temple of Minerva Polias and Erechtheus</i> , January 8, 1841.....	960
Figure 86. Skene, <i>The Interior of the Erechtheum</i> , May 25, 1841.....	960

Figure 87. Skene, <i>Akropolis</i> , March 1843. Courtesy of the British Museum.	961
Figure 88. Caffi, <i>The Parthenon and the Erechtheion from the West</i> , 1843. Used with permission from the Bridgeman Art Library.	962
Figure 89. Caffi, <i>The Parthenon and the Erechtheum from the East</i> , 1843.	963
Figure 90. Frey, <i>View of the Erechtheion and the Parthenon</i> , September 3, 1843. Courtesy of the Museum of the City of Athens.	963
Figure 91. Rey, <i>The North Portico from the East</i> , 1843.	964
Figure 92. Rey, <i>Temple of Erechtheus from the Southwest</i> , 1843.	964
Figure 93. Chenavard, <i>Vue meridionale de l'Erechtheion à Athènes</i> , 1844.	965
Figure 94. Chenavard, <i>Vue orientale de l'Erechtheion à Athènes</i> , 1844.	965
Figure 95. Hansen, <i>The Erechtheion from the Southwest</i> , 1844. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.	966
Figure 96. Ricardo, <i>The Erechtheum from the Northeast</i> , December 1845. Courtesy of the British Museum.	966
Figure 97. Penrose, <i>Portico of Minerva Polias</i> , April 5, 1847. Courtesy of the British School at Athens.	967
Figure 98. Tétaz, <i>Acropolis d'Athènes. Ruines de l'Érechtheion, état actuel</i> , 1848.	968
Figure 99. Cook, <i>The Erechtheion</i> , ca. 1846. Courtesy of the Museum of the City of Athens.	970
Figure 100. Martineau, <i>Athens, Acropolis, The Erechtheum</i> , January 4, 1850. RIBA Library Drawings Collection.	970
Figure 101. Murray, <i>The Erechtheum, Athens</i> , ca. 1850. RIBA Library Drawings Collection.	971
Figure 102. Winstrup, <i>The Erechtheion from the East</i> , 1850-1851. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.	971
Figure 103. Winstrup, <i>The Erechtheion from the South</i> , 1851. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.	972
Figure 104. Winstrup, <i>The Erechtheion from the West</i> , 1851. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.	973
Figure 105. Winstrup, <i>The Interior of the North Wall of the Erechtheion</i> , January 1851. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.	973
Figure 106. Elevations of the Erechtheion, <i>Elevations of the Erechtheion</i> , 1852. West Exterior.	974
Figure 107. Stilling, <i>The Erechtheion from the Southeast</i> , 1853. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.	977
Figure 108. Stilling, <i>Erechtheion from the West</i> , 1853. Courtesy of the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts.	978
Figure 109. Beulé 1853-1854.	978
Figure 110. Anonymous, <i>The Erectheum in 1855, seen from the West</i> , 1855.	979
Figure 111. Anonymous, <i>The Erectheum in 1855, seen from the East</i> , 1855.	979
Figure 112. Breton, <i>Portique orientale de l'Érechthéion</i> , ca. 1855.	980
Figure 113. Breton, <i>Portique des caryatides</i> , ca. 1855.	980
Figure 114. Breton, <i>Porte septentrionale de l'Érechthéion</i> , ca. 1855.	981
Figure 115. Breton, <i>Façade occidentale de l'Érechthéion</i> , ca. 1855.	982
Figure 116. Breton, <i>Plan de l'Érechthéion</i> , ca. 1855.	982
Figure 117. Newton, <i>View of the Acropolis and the Parthenon</i> , 1865. Courtesy of the Benaki Museum.	983
Figure 118. Spiers, <i>The Erechtheion from the Southeast</i> , ca. 1866.	983
Figure 119. Spiers, <i>The Erechtheion from the Northeast</i> , ca. 1866.	984
Figure 120. Spiers, <i>The North Porch of the Erechtheion from the East</i> , 1866. RIBA Library Drawings Collection.	985
Figure 121. Werner, <i>View of the Porch of the Caryatids on the Erechtheion</i> , 1877. Courtesy of the Benaki Museum.	986
Figure 122. Gifford, <i>Ruins of the Parthenon</i> , 1880.	986
Figure 123. Polenov (1844-1927), <i>Portico with Caryatids</i> , 1882. Used with permission from the Bridgeman Art Library.	987
Figure 124. Skovgaard, <i>Porch of the Maidens from the East</i> , 1884.	988
Figure 125. Ellis, <i>View of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion</i> , 1890. Courtesy of the Museum of the City of Athens.	988
Figure 126. Giallina, <i>Portico of the Caryatids with Terracotta Cast</i> , 1891.	989
Figure 127. Hone the Younger, <i>The Caryatids</i> , 1891/1892.	990

Figure 128. de Bruges, <i>Athènes</i> , 1453, in de Courcy, <i>Chronique de la Bouquechadière</i>	991
Figure 129. Schedel, <i>Athene oder Minerva</i> , 1493.	992
Figure 130. Anonymous, <i>Castelo di Atene come si ritrova nel presente ano 1670</i> , 1670.....	992
Figure 131. Anonymous, <i>Castelo di Atene come si ritrova nel presente ano 1670</i> , 1670.....	993
Figure 132. Anonymous, <i>Castelo di Atene come si ritrova nel presente ano 1670</i> , 1670.....	993
Figure 133. Anonymous, <i>Plan d'Athènes</i> , ca. 1670. Courtesy of the Benaki Museum.	994
Figure 134. Babin, <i>Vüe d'Athenes dont une partie est cachée derriere la colline</i> , 1674.	994
Figure 135. Anonymous, <i>Akropolis from the Northeast</i> , 1674.....	995
Figure 136. Carrey, <i>The Acropolis</i> , 1674.	995
Figure 137. Carrey, <i>The Acropolis and the City of Athens from the Northeast</i> , 1674. Detail.....	996
Figure 138. Spon, <i>Bird's Eye View of Athens</i> , 1676.	996
Figure 139. Wheler, <i>Bird's Eye View of Athens</i> , 1675-1682.....	997
Figure 140. Hope, <i>East Frieze of the Parthenon on the ground</i> , ca. 1795.	997
Figure 141. Dupré, <i>Louis Fauvel in His House Overlooking the Akropolis</i> , 1819. Courtesy of the Gennadeion.	998
Figure 142. Plan of the Erechtheion.	999
Figure 143. Terminology used in this study for various parts of the Erechtheion.....	1000
Figure 144. The Erechtheion from the east.	1000
Figure 145. The Erechtheion from the southeast.	1001
Figure 146. The Erechtheion from the south.	1001
Figure 147. The Erechtheion from the southwest.....	1002
Figure 148. The Erechtheion from the west.	1002
Figure 149. The North Porch of the Erechtheion from the north.....	1003
Figure 150. The Erechtheion from the northeast.	1003
Figure 151. The interior of the West Façade.	1004
Figure 152. The bedrock inside the Erechtheion, from the east.	1005
Figure 153. The Erechtheion from the Agora.....	1006
Figure 154. East Façade of the Erechtheion.	1007
Figure 155. Sound end of the East Porch, from the southeast.	1008
Figure 156. Entablature of south part of the East Porch.	1009
Figure 157. EE.BB.03-04 with iron dowels still in situ.....	1009
Figure 158. North part of the East Porch, from the southeast.....	1010
Figure 159. South part of the East Porch, from the northeast.....	1011
Figure 160. Curvature of the krepidoma of the East Porch, from the south.	1012
Figure 161. South anta of East Porch.	1013
Figure 162. Cuttings in the stylobate between the south anta of the East Porch and EE.C1, from the north.	1016
Figure 163. Stylobate of the East Porch and toichobate for the East Wall, from the east.	1018
Figure 164. Stylobate between EE.C1 and C2. From the east.	1018
Figure 165. Stylobate between EE.C2 and C3.....	1019
Figure 166. Cutting for a lintel in the south side of EE.C3.	1020
Figure 167. Drum displacement of EE.C3.....	1021
Figure 168. Cutting for a lintel in the east side of EE.C4.....	1022
Figure 169. Cuttings in the north side of the base of EE.C3.	1022
Figure 170. Cuttings in the south side of the base of EE.C4.....	1023
Figure 171. Cuttings on the southeast side of the base of EE.C5.....	1024
Figure 172. Frankish cuttings on the east side of the base of EE.C5.....	1025
Figure 173. EE.C6. In the British Museum.	1026
Figure 174. Graffiti of crosses in the flutes of EE.C6.	1028
Figure 175. Bedding lines for the northeast corner of the stylobate of the East Porch.....	1031
Figure 176. Toichobate for the north part of the East Wall.....	1031
Figure 177. Northeast anta of the East Porch, NN.01.17. In the British Museum.....	1032
Figure 178. North krepidoma of the East Porch, from above.	1034
Figure 179. Northeast anta base of the East Porch from the east.....	1034
Figure 180. Northeast anta of the East Porch from the northeast.	1035
Figure 181. Northernmost architrave of the East Porch, EE.AA.05. In the British Museum.	1036

Figure 182. Capital of EE.C1.	1036
Figure 183. Capital of EE.C2.	1037
Figure 184. Capital of EE.C3.	1037
Figure 185. Capital of EE.C4.	1038
Figure 186. Corner fragment of an anta, probably from the East Porch. In the Metropolitan Museum of Art, no. 24.62.	1038
Figure 187. Interior of the East Porch and North Wall from above.....	1039
Figure 188. Interior of East Foundations and East Wall, from the south.....	1040
Figure 189. Interior of the East Porch frieze, from the southwest.	1041
Figure 190. Notch in situ in the east foundations, from the northwest.	1042
Figure 191. Interior of the east foundations, from the north.....	1043
Figure 192. Void in the east foundations, from the north and above.....	1044
Figure 193. The Erechtheion from the southeast.....	1045
Figure 194. Top of the South Wall, from the east.	1046
Figure 195. South Wall above the roof of the Maiden Porch.....	1047
Figure 196. Weathered anthemion epikranitis block, SS.0.06.....	1049
Figure 197. Byzantine cuttings in SS.09.08-11, from the south.....	1050
Figure 198. Ottoman cuttings in the South Wall near the Maiden Porch.....	1052
Figure 199. Impact of a gun shot on SS.08.06.....	1053
Figure 200. Cutting in bottom right corner of SS.08.06.....	1053
Figure 201. Ottoman cuttings in SS.06.05.....	1054
Figure 202. Ottoman cuttings in SS.04-05.06-07.....	1054
Figure 203. Slit window in SS.12.04.....	1055
Figure 204. Slit window in SS.12.07.....	1056
Figure 205. Slit window in SS.12.12.....	1057
Figure 206. Krepidoma of the South Façade, from the east.....	1059
Figure 207. Interior of the South Wall, panorama. East part.....	1060
Figure 208. South Door to Maiden Porch.....	1064
Figure 209. Interior of the South Wall, west part.....	1065
Figure 210. Interior of South Wall, east part.....	1066
Figure 211. Lower marble courses of South Wall, east part.....	1067
Figure 212. Cutting for the shelf of the Niche. Small holes in the large cutting.....	1067
Figure 213. SS.18.02.i. Bottom of the recut pilaster of the South Door to the Maiden Porch.....	1069
Figure 214. SS.20-21.01.i, from the northwest.....	1070
Figure 215. Void under the Maiden Porch, from the northwest.....	1071
Figure 216. Junction of the interior of the South Wall and the West Cross-Wall.....	1072
Figure 217. Long rough cutting in SS.18.5.i, from the northwest.....	1074
Figure 218. Southeast interior (unfinished) corner.....	1075
Figure 219. Maiden Porch from the southwest.....	1078
Figure 220. Podium of Maiden Porch, from the south.....	1079
Figure 221. Krepidoma of the Maiden Porch.....	1080
Figure 222. Maiden Porch from the west.....	1083
Figure 223. Top of the terrace of the Archaic Temple of Athena, Maiden Porch and Kekropeion area.....	1085
Figure 224. Interaction of the Maiden Porch and the foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena from the southwest.....	1086
Figure 225. Maiden Porch from the southeast.....	1086
Figure 226. Maiden Porch from the east.....	1087
Figure 227. Graffiti on ME.04.02.....	1088
Figure 228. East Door of the Maiden Porch.....	1089
Figure 229. Threshold of the East Door of the Maiden Porch. From above and the east.....	1090
Figure 230. Threshold of the South Door (north door of the Maiden Porch) from the interior of the main building.....	1090
Figure 231. MS.01.04 from above.....	1091
Figure 232. Rough treatment of the east side of MS.02.03.....	1091
Figure 233. East Pilaster of the Maiden Porch, ME.PE.01.....	1092
Figure 234. Junction between the krepidoma of the South Wall and that of the Maiden Porch.....	1093

Figure 235. Junction between east architrave of Maiden Porch, ME.02.02, and the South Wall.....	1094
Figure 236. Junction of the roof of the Maiden Porch and South Wall.....	1094
Figure 237. Roof of the Maiden Porch from northeast.....	1095
Figure 238. Interior of the Maiden Porch from the northeast.....	1095
Figure 239. Ceiling of the Maiden Porch, from the east.....	1096
Figure 240. Ceiling and back wall of the Maiden Porch, from the east and below.....	1097
Figure 241. Northeast corner of the ceiling of the Maiden Porch.....	1098
Figure 242. Cuttings in the top of the lintel, SS.11.01.....	1098
Figure 243. West Doric pilaster on SS.13.01.....	1099
Figure 244. East Doric pilaster on SS.12.02.....	1099
Figure 245. Steps from east door of Maiden Porch.....	1100
Figure 246. Interior of west side of the podium.....	1100
Figure 247. Southeast interior corner of the podium.....	1101
Figure 248. Southwest interior corner of the podium.....	1101
Figure 249. Northwest interior corner of podium.....	1103
Figure 250. Top of east half of the podium.....	1104
Figure 251. Maidens #1, #2, #4, and #5 in the Akropolis Museum.....	1105
Figure 252. Graffiti on the thigh of Maiden #2, Akropolis Museum.....	1106
Figure 253. Maiden #3, in the British Museum.....	1107
Figure 254. Maiden #3 from the back. Upper.....	1108
Figure 255. Head of Maiden #3 from the back.....	1110
Figure 256. Echinus and abacus of Maiden #3 from the back.....	1111
Figure 257. Maiden #3 from the back, upper.....	1112
Figure 258. Upper part of the face of Maiden #3.....	1113
Figure 259. Left side of the head of Maiden #3.....	1114
Figure 260. Right breast of Maiden #3.....	1116
Figure 261. Left breast of Maiden #3, with graffiti.....	1117
Figure 262. Upwards view of the overfold of the peplos of Maiden #3.....	1119
Figure 263. Left hip of Maiden #3.....	1120
Figure 264. Lower left side of Maiden #3.....	1121
Figure 265. Back of the right leg of Maiden #3.....	1122
Figure 266. Foot of Maiden #3 with missing toe.....	1123
Figure 267. Foot of Maiden #4 with pin.....	1123
Figure 268. Abacus and echinus of Maiden #4. Courtesy of the ASCSA Photo Archive.....	1124
Figure 269. Swastika on the cheek of the artificial stone cast of Maiden #3. Photo Hege 1558, 1930-1940. Courtesy of the <i>DAI Athen</i>	1125
Figure 270. West Façade of the Erechtheion from the west-southwest.....	1126
Figure 271. Erechtheion from the Propylaia, from the west-southwest.....	1126
Figure 272. Northernmost intercolumniation of the West Façade.....	1127
Figure 273. North anta capital of the West Façade, WW.01.02.....	1129
Figure 274. Entablature of the north end of the West Façade, detail. WW.AA-CC.....	1130
Figure 275. Northernmost column capital of the West Façade with iron pin. WW.C1.01.....	1131
Figure 276. Northernmost intercolumniation of the West Façade, from above.....	1132
Figure 277. Southern three column capitals of the West Façade from above, WW.C2-C4.....	1133
Figure 278. West Façade from the north.....	1134
Figure 279. North part of lower West Façade.....	1135
Figure 280. South part of the lower West Façade (Greek Wall).....	1136
Figure 281. Stairs below the West Façade to the Pandroseion, exiting passageway from the North Porch.	1137
Figure 282. Lower West Façade from the northeast.....	1138
Figure 283. Upper West Façade and Westward Projection of the North Porch.....	1138
Figure 284. Upper West Façade.....	1140
Figure 285. West Façade from the south-southwest.....	1141
Figure 286. Column bases and lower West Façade from the south-southwest.....	1142
Figure 287. West Façade from below.....	1142
Figure 288. South anta of the West Façade.....	1143

Figure 289. West Door of the West Façade, exterior.	1144
Figure 290. Junction between the West Façade and the Westward Projection of the North Porch, from below.....	1147
Figure 291. Detail of cuttings in the north anta of the West Façade.....	1148
Figure 292. WW.AA.01 with Arabic inscription, carved in 1805.....	1149
Figure 293. Cornice Block from the West Façade, in the British Museum.....	1149
Figure 294. View of the interior from the east.....	1150
Figure 295. Upper West Façade interior, north part.....	1150
Figure 296. Interior view of the west frieze composed of reused statue bases with footprints for bronze statues.....	1151
Figure 297. Lower West Façade interior, north part.....	1153
Figure 298. West Door interior.....	1154
Figure 299. Southern intercolumniation, interior.....	1157
Figure 300. Molding on top of “Greek Wall” of the interior of the West Façade.....	1158
Figure 301. Bench along the interior of the West Façade, from the North Door.....	1158
Figure 302. Bench along interior of West Wall, from the south.....	1159
Figure 303. Kekropeion from the northwest.....	1160
Figure 304. Kekropeion. View of foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena under the Maiden Porch, from the west.....	1162
Figure 305. Cutting back of the lower West Façade for Kekropeion.....	1163
Figure 306. Interaction between the step blocks of the Maiden Porch and the foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena, from the northwest.....	1164
Figure 307. Pandroseion from above.....	1165
Figure 308. Threshold of the passageway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion, from the north.....	1166
Figure 309. Detail of the threshold of the passageway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion.....	1167
Figure 310. Pavement of the Pandroseion from the southwest.....	1168
Figure 311. Recent excavations in the Pandroseion, from the south.....	1169
Figure 312. Recent excavations in the Pandroseion from the southwest.....	1170
Figure 313. Recent excavations in the Pandroseion from the northwest.....	1171
Figure 314. New anastylosis of the Pandroseion, 2003, from the west.....	1173
Figure 315. Roots of olive tree planted 22 February 1917.....	1173
Figure 316. Westward Projection of the North Porch, from the south.....	1174
Figure 317. Westward Projection from below.....	1177
Figure 318. Junction between the West Façade and the Westward Projection of the North Porch.....	1177
Figure 319. Cuttings above the passageway from the North Porch to the Pandroseion, from the south.....	1178
Figure 320. Graffiti of crosses in the Westward Projection, from the southwest and below.....	1178
Figure 321. Westward Projection from the west-southwest.....	1179
Figure 322. Lower part of the Westward Projection, from the west-southwest.....	1180
Figure 323. Passageway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion, from the southwest.....	1181
Figure 324. Lower part of the oblique anta of passageway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion, from the south.....	1182
Figure 325. Upper part of the oblique anta of passageway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion, from the south.....	1183
Figure 326. West anta of the North Porch, from the west.....	1184
Figure 327. Capital and entablature above the west anta of the North Porch, from the west.....	1185
Figure 328. Capital of the west anta of the North Porch, from the southeast. AK 39, courtesy of the ASCSA Photo Archive.....	1185
Figure 329. Cuttings for a roof in courses 15 and 16 of the west anta of the North Porch, from the southwest. Chi-Rho cross graffiti.....	1186
Figure 330. Courses 17 and 18 of the west anta of the North Porch, from the southwest. Cross graffiti.....	1187
Figure 331. Base of the west anta of the North Porch, from the west.....	1188
Figure 332. Cuttings for a roof in the west side of the west anta of the North Porch, from the west.....	1188
Figure 333. Cannonball impact on the west anta of the North Porch, from the northwest.....	1189
Figure 334. North Porch from the north.....	1190
Figure 335. North Porch from the east.....	1191

Figure 336. PP.C5 from below.....	1193
Figure 337. North Porch and North Wall, from the northwest.....	1194
Figure 338. North Porch from the northwest.....	1195
Figure 339. Junction of North Porch and North Façade, from the east.....	1196
Figure 340. East frieze of the North Porch.....	1196
Figure 341. Entablature of the west side of the North Porch.....	1197
Figure 342. Damage due to gunfire on the west architrave of the North Porch.....	1197
Figure 343. West part of the North Porch.....	1198
Figure 344. North Door from the north, and PP.C3 and C4.....	1199
Figure 345. West part of the North Porch.....	1200
Figure 346. Views of the ceiling of the North Porch, from the southwest.....	1201
Figure 347. Upper North Porch, the west anta to PP.C1.....	1204
Figure 348. Upper North Porch, PP.C1-C2.....	1204
Figure 349. North Door from the north.....	1205
Figure 350. North Door from above and the northeast.....	1206
Figure 351. Lintel of the North Door, from above and the northeast.....	1207
Figure 352. Lintel of the North Door, from below.....	1208
Figure 353. Lintel of the North Door, details of molding. East part.....	1208
Figure 354. East console of the North Porch, from the north.....	1210
Figure 355. Upper part of the east jamb of the North Door. Byzantine door lining at right.....	1212
Figure 356. Detail of juxtaposition of the 5 th century and the repaired leaf molding on the North Door.....	1213
Figure 357. Upper part of the interior of the east jamb of the North Door.....	1214
Figure 358. Lower part of the interior of the east jamb of the North Door with cuttings, from the northwest.....	1215
Figure 359. Detail of the east jamb of the North Door, cutting for a lintel.....	1216
Figure 360. Threshold and east jamb of the North Door, from the northwest.....	1217
Figure 361. East Byzantine jamb, from above.....	1218
Figure 362. Interior of the (Byzantine) west jamb of the North Door.....	1219
Figure 363. West jamb of the North Door, from above and the northeast.....	1220
Figure 364. Threshold and west jamb of the North Door, from the northeast.....	1222
Figure 365. Detail of west jamb of the North Door with graffiti.....	1223
Figure 366. Graffiti on east jamb of the North Door.....	1224
Figure 367. Graffiti on the west jamb of the North Door.....	1224
Figure 368. East anta capital of the North Porch, NN.05.07.....	1225
Figure 369. East anta and epikranitis of the North Porch, NN.05.06-07.....	1225
Figure 370. East part of NN.05.06.....	1226
Figure 371. Middle part of NN.05.06.....	1227
Figure 372. NN.05.05-06, Gap and ancient repairs.....	1227
Figure 373. NN.05.05.....	1228
Figure 374. East part of NN.05.04.....	1228
Figure 375. Middle part of NN.05.04.....	1229
Figure 376. West part of NN.05.04.....	1229
Figure 377. NN.05.04-05.....	1230
Figure 378. Upper west part of North Wall within the North Porch, from above.....	1231
Figure 379. Upper east part of North Wall within the North Porch, from below.....	1232
Figure 380. NN.06.03 - NN.07.03-04.....	1232
Figure 381. NN.06.04 - NN.07.04.....	1233
Figure 382. NN.06.05 – NN.7.05-06.....	1233
Figure 383. NN.06.04-05 – NN.07.05.....	1234
Figure 384. NN.06.05-06.....	1234
Figure 385. NN.06.06 – NN.07.06-07.....	1235
Figure 386. Early photograph of upper part of the North Wall in the North Porch. AK 33, courtesy of the ASCSA Photo Archive.....	1235
Figure 387. Southeast corner of the upper part of the North Porch. AK 34, courtesy of the ASCSA Photo Archive.....	1236
Figure 388. AK 36. Courtesy of the ASCSA Photo Archive.....	1236

Figure 389. Example of graffiti in the North Porch. Southeast corner, from the north.	1237
Figure 390. NN.07.07, Chenavard, Rey and Dalgabio graffiti.	1238
Figure 391. NN.07.07.	1239
Figure 392. Ceiling of the North Porch, from below.	1240
Figure 393. Ceiling of the North Porch, from east to west.	1242
Figure 394. PE.AA.01. Graffiti of two boats, from the northwest.	1245
Figure 395. Middle Fascia of PE.AA.01. Graffiti detail.	1245
Figure 396. PE.AA.01. Detail of boat graffiti.	1246
Figure 397. North end of PE.AA.01.	1247
Figure 398. Graffiti: Eliza Claire Fabreguette 1834.	1247
Figure 399. PE.AA.01-02. Graffiti of a single boat.	1248
Figure 400. Middle fascia of the south end of PE.AA.01.	1249
Figure 401. PE.AA.01 from northwest.	1249
Figure 402. PE.AA.01-02.	1250
Figure 403. South end of PE.AA.02.	1250
Figure 404. Middle of PE.AA.02.	1251
Figure 405. North end of PE.AA.02.	1251
Figure 406. PE.02.01 from south to north.	1252
Figure 407. PS.AA.03, from east to west.	1256
Figure 408. PS.AA.02, east part.	1258
Figure 409. Coffers blocks with painted meander preserved.	1259
Figure 410. Coffers of the North Porch.	1260
Figure 411. Detail of one coffer.	1261
Figure 412. Coffers block PP.CF.18, in the British Museum.	1262
Figure 413. Northeast corner of the North Porch, from the southwest.	1264
Figure 414. PN.AA.02-03 from the south.	1264
Figure 415. PN.AA.03 from east to west.	1265
Figure 416. PN.02.04, graffiti.	1267
Figure 417. Access to and support for roof of the North Porch PS.RR.01 and PW.RR.01, from below and the north.	1268
Figure 418. Roof support from above (PE.RR.01, PS.RR.01, PW.RR.01), from the north. PN.RR.01 is a replacement block. Notice also the replacement block for PP.CF.18 in the foreground.	1269
Figure 419. Roof of North Porch from the north.	1269
Figure 420. Roof with pediment blocks, from the southeast.	1270
Figure 421. West edge of the roof from the south.	1271
Figure 422. East edge of the roof from the south.	1272
Figure 423. Roof of the North Porch with titanium reinforcements, from the northeast.	1273
Figure 424. Southwest corner of the roof of the North Porch, from the northeast.	1273
Figure 425. PP.C1 from the east.	1274
Figure 426. Capital of PP.C1 from the east.	1275
Figure 427. Base of PP.C1.	1276
Figure 428. PP.C2 from the southeast.	1277
Figure 429. Capital of PP.C2 from the southeast.	1278
Figure 430. Capital of PP.C2 from the west.	1279
Figure 431. Recently discovered column fragments of PP.C2. Courtesy of the <i>DAI Athen</i>	1280
Figure 432. Base of PP.C2 from the north.	1281
Figure 433. Capital of PP.C3 from the southeast.	1282
Figure 434. Base of PP.C3 from the north.	1282
Figure 435. Drums of PP.C4 showing cutting for sill of Frankish windows, from the northwest.	1283
Figure 436. Capital of PP.C4 from the south.	1284
Figure 437. Capital of PP.C4 from the northwest.	1285
Figure 438. Base of PP.C4, from the northeast.	1285
Figure 439. Capital of PP.C5 from the southwest.	1286
Figure 440. Base of PP.C5.	1287
Figure 441. Capital of PP.C6 from the west.	1288
Figure 442. Base of PP.C6.	1288

Figure 443. Capital of the east anta of the North Porch, from the northeast.	1289
Figure 444. Base of the east anta of the North Porch, from the northeast.	1289
Figure 445. Base of the west anta of the North Porch, from the northwest.	1291
Figure 446. Stylobate from above and the east.	1292
Figure 447. Stylobate between PP.C1 and C2, from the east.	1293
Figure 448. North part of stylobate between PP.C1 and C2, from the south.	1293
Figure 449. South part of stylobate between PP.C1 and C2, from the north.	1294
Figure 450. Stylobate between PP.C4 and C5, from above and the east.	1295
Figure 451. East part of the stylobate, PP.C5 and C6, from the south.	1296
Figure 452. Stylobate between PP.C6 and the east anta of the North Porch, from above and the west.	1297
Figure 453. Stylobate of the North Porch in the rain showing drainage, from the southeast.	1298
Figure 454. Brick-lined access to cistern in the North Porch, from the northeast.	1298
Figure 455. West krepidoma and cuttings in the stereobate of the North Porch, from the south.	1299
Figure 456. Missing stylobate blocks of the North Porch, from the west.	1300
Figure 457. Depressed block from the north.	1301
Figure 458. Depressed block from the west.	1302
Figure 459. Hole "E" in the depressed block, from above.	1303
Figure 460. Hole "E" in depressed block, from below.	1303
Figure 461. Void created by excavation of cistern east of the North Porch, from the west.	1304
Figure 462. Underground passageway under the North Wall, from the northwest.	1304
Figure 463. View through the underground passageway into the interior of the main building, from the north.	1305
Figure 464. Iron bar set in lead in reinforcing the opening under the North Wall.	1305
Figure 465. Opening of the underground passageway from the interior of the main building, from the southeast.	1306
Figure 466. Graffiti in the Underground Passage.	1307
Figure 467. North Wall and North Porch from the northeast.	1310
Figure 468. North Wall from the west-northwest.	1311
Figure 469. Junction between the entablature of the North Porch and the North Wall, from the northeast.	1312
Figure 470. Detail of slit window and Frankish cuttings in the North Wall east of the North Porch, from the northeast.	1313
Figure 471. North side of the north anta of the East Porch and the North Wall.	1314
Figure 472. Podium of the East Porch and the lower part of the North Wall, from the northwest.	1316
Figure 473. Gameboard inscribed into the krepidoma of the North Wall, from above.	1317
Figure 474. Architrave from the North Wall of the Erechtheion, in the British Museum, no. 414.	1318
Figure 475. Two epikranitis blocks, probably from the North Wall, in the British Museum, no. 409.	1318
Figure 476. Epikranitis block probably from the North Wall, in the British Museum, no. 409.	1318
Figure 477. Panorama of the interior of the North Wall.	1319
Figure 478. Interior of the North Wall, west part, from the northwest.	1325
Figure 479. Interior of North Wall, middle part.	1325
Figure 480. Interior of the lower part of North Wall, east of the East Pilaster.	1326
Figure 481. Interior of orthostates, NN.18.11-13.	1327
Figure 482. Ancient block with commemoration of Pittakis' repair in 1838, now upside-down in the North Wall.	1327
Figure 483. Junction between North Wall and West Façade, lower part, from below.	1328
Figure 484. Foundations of the North Wall, with notch.	1329
Figure 485. South face of the north Akropolis wall, north of the North Wall of the Erechtheion.	1330
Figure 486. Krepidoma of the North Wall and paving of the terrace, from the northeast.	1332
Figure 487. Marble euthynteria/paving of the terrace at the northeast corner of the North Porch, from the north.	1333
Figure 488. Aerial view of the interior, from the northwest.	1334
Figure 489. Aerial view of the interior from the north.	1335
Figure 490. Aerial view of the interior of the North and East Façades.	1336
Figure 491. Interior of the Erechtheion, from the west.	1337
Figure 492. Detail of the South Wall at the junction with the West Cross-Wall.	1338

Figure 493. Detail of the North Wall at the junction with the West Cross-Wall.....	1339
Figure 494. West threshold of the north aisle, from the south.....	1340
Figure 495. West threshold of the nave from the south.....	1342
Figure 496. West threshold of south aisle, from the north.....	1343
Figure 497. Aerial view of the West Corridor, from the north.....	1344
Figure 498. West side of the foundations of the West Cross-Wall, standing in the cistern under the West Corridor, from the northwest.....	1345
Figure 499. Foundations of the West Façade, standing in the cistern under the West Corridor. Shows remnants of the Turkish vault, from the northeast.....	1345
Figure 500. Southwest corner of the West Corridor. Cutting for access to cistern, from the north.....	1346
Figure 501. Foundations of the North Wall below the North Door, standing in the cistern under the West Corridor, from the south.....	1347
Figure 502. Northwest corner of the West Corridor with modern foundations inserted, from the east.....	1347
Figure 503. West side of foundations of West Cross-Wall, from the south.....	1348
Figure 504. The north aisle separator (foundations for the internal colonnade of the basilica), from the west. Reused architrave blocks on the top course in the foreground and background. Note the dowels with pour channels.....	1349
Figure 505. Blocks from the east foundations reused in the foundations for the northern interior colonnade, from the northeast. Note the notch in the bottom left corner of the block in the middleground.....	1350
Figure 506. Westernmost concrete foundation for pillared hall and the access to the underground passage, from the southwest.....	1351
Figure 507. North aisle from the southwest. East threshold of Phase II of the basilica overlying the easternmost concrete foundation of the pillared hall.....	1353
Figure 508. East threshold across the north aisle, from the south.....	1354
Figure 509. North aisle from the east. East threshold and concrete foundation for pillared hall.....	1355
Figure 510. Deep dip in bedrock in the south aisle, from the west.....	1356
Figure 511. East threshold, <i>templon</i> slab, and nave from the northeast.....	1357
Figure 512. Bedrock in the nave, from the southeast.....	1357
Figure 513. View of east end of basilica from above and the southeast.....	1358
Figure 514. Southern apse extension, from the north.....	1358
Figure 515. Gray marble pavement at the east end of the south aisle, from the east.....	1359
Figure 516. Brick paving at the east end of the nave, from the south.....	1359
Figure 517. <i>Templon</i> . Front, from the west.....	1360
Figure 518. Monolithic columns of <i>verde antico</i> lying in the nave.....	1362
Figure 519. Small and large Ionic column bases for the monolithic columns.....	1363
Figure 520. Column fragment of purple and cream marble.....	1364
Figure 521. Base of the north pilaster for the north aisle (uninscribed).....	1364
Figure 522. Base of the north pilaster for the south aisle: <i>IG I.31 A</i> . In the Epigraphical Museum, Athens.	1365
Figure 523. Base of the south pilaster of the south aisle: <i>IG I.31 B</i> . In the Epigraphical Museum, Athens.	1366
Figure 524. Base of one of the pilasters for the opening to the nave.....	1367
Figure 525. Fragment of a Byzantine anthemion molding in the Erechtheion.....	1368
Figure 526. Reused sarcophagus panel currently lying on top of the foundations of the north interior colonnade, from the north.....	1368
Figure 527. Byzantine fragments in the void in the east foundations where the apse used to be, from the northwest.....	1369
Figure 528. Cut-back of bench block behind the North Door. Experiment with compass to show that the cutting back of the bench must have occurred after the Byzantine doors (and jambs) were installed. After Stevens, pl. 2.....	1370
Figure 529. Chandler Stele in the British Museum.....	1371
Figure 530. Fragment of molding in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, no. 12.19.....	1372
Figure 531. Roman sima with lionshead and rampant antefix from the Erechtheion. From Dinsmoor 1932, p. 171.....	1373
Figure 532. Roman antefixes from the Erechtheion, from Züchner 1936, pp. 321-322.....	1373
Figure 533. New Eleusinian blocks prepared for installation, with clamp cuttings.....	1374

Figure 534. Inscribed thrones of the priests of Boutes and Hephaistos, currently located among the foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena, from the east	1374
Figure 535. Large scale peculiarities of the Erechtheion.....	1375
Figure 536. Leveling block for the orthostates of the Erechtheion. Courtesy of the <i>DAI Athen</i>	1375
Figure 537. Early excavation of North Terrace, from above and the southwest. Courtesy of the ASCSA Photo Archive.	1376
Figure 538. Early excavations (1880s) of the northeast corner of the Erechtheion. Courtesy of the <i>DAI Athen</i>	1377
Figure 539. Early excavation (1880s) east of the Erechtheion, from the northeast. Mycenaean wall in the left foreground. Cistern in the left background. Column from the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus in the right foreground. Courtesy of the <i>DAI Athen</i>	1377
Figure 540. Sketch of the excavation of a cistern east of the Erechtheion, after Bundgaard 1974, pl. 87.	1378
Figure 541. Transcription of Carl Blegen's 1914 notes on the excavation of the south aisle of the Erechtheion. Notebook in the ASCSA Archives.	1378
Figure 542. New reconstruction of the interior of the Erechtheion.	1379
Figure 543. New reconstruction of the East Wall with the narrower door.	1379
Figure 544. Fergusson 1880. Reconstruction of the Erechtheion which incorporates the slit windows in the North and South Walls.	1380
Figure 545. Original Plan according to Hawes. Courtesy of Mary Allsebrook and Sandy Hawes.	1381
Figure 546. Original north elevation according to Hawes. Courtesy of Mary Allsebrook and Sandy Hawes.	1382
Figure 547. Original east and west Elevations according to Hawes. Courtesy of Mary Allsebrook and Sandy Hawes.	1382
Figure 548. Original south elevation according to Hawes with a comparison to the Maiden Porch as built. Courtesy of Mary Allsebrook and Sandy Hawes.	1383
Figure 549. Section looking east through the originally planned Erechtheion according to Hawes. Courtesy of Mary Allsebrook and Sandy Hawes.	1383
Figure 550. Reconstruction of the ceiling of the Erechtheion as built over the West Corridor and central chamber according to Hawes. Courtesy of Mary Allsebrook and Sandy Hawes.	1384
Figure 551. Frames of the coffered ceiling, according to Hawes.	1385
Figure 552. Plan of Ferrari's reconstruction of the east cella of the Archaic Temple of Athena, after Paton et al., pl. 1.	1385
Figure 553. Key to east exterior elevation. After Paton et al. 1927, pl. 3.	1386
Figure 554. Key to south exterior elevation. After Platon et al. 1977, fig. 9a.	1387
Figure 555. Key to south interior elevation. After Platon et al. 1977, fig. 9b.	1387
Figure 556. Key to Maiden Porch. After Platon et al. 1977, fig. 11.	1388
Figure 557. Key to west exterior elevation. After Platon et al. 1977, fig. 10 a.	1389
Figure 558. Key to west interior elevation. After Platon et al. 1977, fig. 10b.	1389
Figure 559. Key to north exterior elevation. After Platon et al. 1977, fig. 12a.	1390
Figure 560. Key to north interior elevation. After Platon et al. 1977, fig. 12b.	1390
Figure 561. Key to the North Porch. After Paton et al. 1927, pl. 5.	1391
Figure 562. Key to the ceiling of the North Porch.	1392
Figure 563. Key to Blocks in Plan. After Paton et al. 1927, pl. 2.	1392
Figure 564. West elevation.	1393
Figure 565. South elevation.	1393
Figure 566. North elevation.	1394
Figure 567. Northeast perspective. Shaded blocks are plaster casts from the British Museum.	1394
Figure 568. The area around the Erechtheion in the Archaic period. Model created in consultation with Tanoulas, Korres and Papanikolaou. In the Akropolis Study Center.	1395
Figure 569. The Erechtheion in the Early Classical period. Sketch prepared by Papanikolaou, on display in the Akropolis Study Center.	1395
Figure 570. The Erechtheion in the Classical period.	1396
Figure 571. Interior of the Erechtheion in the Hellenistic period from the northeast with the North Wall cut away. Roof support in South Wall not reconstructed.	1397
Figure 572. Reconstruction of the West Corridor in the Hellenistic period.	1398
Figure 573. The Erechtheion in the Late Antique period. Section looking north.	1399

Figure 574. The Erechtheion in the Byzantine period. Sections and plans.....	1400
Figure 575. The Erechtheion in the Frankish period. Plans. First Frankish period.....	1402
Figure 576. The Erechtheion from the southeast during the Second Frankish period.....	1403
Figure 577. The Erechtheion in the Ottoman period. Plans.....	1404
Figure 578. The Erechtheion in 1749, from the southeast.....	1405
Figure 579. The Erechtheion in 1765, from the southeast.....	1405
Figure 580. The Erechtheion in 1789, from the southeast.....	1406
Figure 581. The Erechtheion in 1801, from the southeast.....	1406
Figure 582. The Erechtheion in 1803, from the southeast.....	1407
Figure 583. The Erechtheion in 1819, from the southeast.....	1407
Figure 584. The Erechtheion in 1833, from the southeast.....	1408
Figure 585. The Erechtheion in 1839, from the southeast.....	1408
Figure 586. The Erechtheion in 1853, from the southeast.....	1409
Figure 587. The Erechtheion in 2003, from the southeast.....	1409
Figure 588. Blocks in place in 2003, from the northeast.....	1410
Figure 589. Rendered view upwards of the North Porch, from the northwest.....	1410
Figure 590. Reconstruction of the major fire and the temporary roof after the fire. From Burden 1999, p. 316.....	1411
Figure 591. Blocks most affected by the major fire that ravaged the Erechtheion.....	1411
Figure 592. Typology of Post-Antique cutting styles. Door cuttings.....	1412
Figure 593. Key to the Propylaia.....	1413
Figure 594. Byzantine cuttings in the south wall of the south wing of the Propylaia.....	1414
Figure 595. Byzantine cuttings in the west wall of the north wing of the Propylaia.....	1414
Figure 596. Stylobate between DN2-DN3 of the Propylaia showing Frankish cuttings, from the north.....	1415
Figure 597. Frankish cuttings in the east porch of the Propylaia, from the north.....	1415
Figure 598. Ottoman cuttings in the south passage of the Propylaia, from the northwest.....	1416
Figure 599. Drains in the Propylaia.....	1416
Figure 600. Gameboards on the stylobate of the Propylaia.....	1417
Figure 601. Phialai carriers from the Parthenon frieze from the Choiseul-Gouffier Collection in the Louvre.	1418
Figure 602. Oinochoai carriers from the Parthenon frieze from the Elgin Collection, in the British Museum.	1418
Figure 603. Frieze from the east façade of the Temple of Athena Nike, in the Akropolis Museum.....	1419
Figure 604. Aerial view from north of the east chamber. Bronze Age column base in left middle- foreground.....	1420
Figure 605. Aerial view of the west chamber (Opisthodomos), from the northeast.....	1420
Figure 606. Foundations from the north.....	1421
Figure 607. North Akropolis wall containing architectural members of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias. Capitals with abacus oriented outwards towards the city.....	1421
Figure 608. Doric capitals from the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias scattered around the Akropolis.....	1422
Figure 609. Inscribed architrave of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus, from the east.....	1424
Figure 610. Top part of a column from the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus.....	1425
Figure 611. Details of the capitals of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus.....	1426
Figure 612. Kymation moldings from the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus.....	1428
Figure 613. Necking band of Monopteros of Rome and Augustus, in the British Museum no. 420.....	1429
Figure 614. Foundations east of the Parthenon on which the remains of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus currently stand.....	1429
Figure 615. Greek Imperial coin showing the Akropolis from the north. Cast kindly provided courtesy of the British Museum.....	1430
Figure 616. Statue bases of Eleusinian limestone for standing bronzes.....	1431
Figure 617. Rock cut inscription for the statue of Ge Karpophoros north of the Parthenon.....	1432
Figure 618. Photo of field wall composed of Byzantine material probably from the Akropolis, on display in the Byzantine Museum.....	1433
Figure 619. 6 th century A.D. <i>templon</i> slab, probably from the Akropolis.....	1433
Figure 620. Olive Tree Pediment, in the Akropolis Museum.....	1434

Figure 621. Weathered seated Archaic statue of Athena, attributed to Endois, in the Akropolis Museum.	1435
Figure 622. Archaic Ionic capital fragment identified by Korres as belonging to the Archaic sema of the Kekropeion.....	1436
Figure 623. North Akropolis wall containing architectural members of the pre-Parthenon, directly north of the Erechtheion.	1437
Figure 624. Bottom course of a Mycenaean terrace wall east of the Erechtheion. Photo courtesy of Ellen Guerrettaz.....	1437
Figure 625. Rock-cut steps of the northwest ascent to the Akropolis.....	1438
Figure 626. Enclosure of the Bronze Age northeast ascent.	1438
Figure 627. Mycenaean well from below.	1439
Figure 628. Detail of the blocks added to the Eponymous Heroes Monument in the Agora. Courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations.....	1440
Figure 629. Slit window in the Stoa of Attalos II. Courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations.....	1440
Figure 630. Pi-clamps and pour channels in the base of the Donor's Monument in front of the Stoa of Attalos II. Courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations.	1441
Figure 631. Temple and altar of Aphrodite Ouranos.	1441
Figure 632. Ionic column shaft with anthemion necking band in the Agora, A 4643.	1442
Figure 633. Ionic base found near the Temple of Aphrodite Ouranos, from the southeast.	1443
Figure 634. Torso of the statue of Hadrian in the Athenian Agora.	1444
Figure 635. Westernmost triton from the 2 nd century A.D. façade of the Odeion in the Agora. Courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations.	1445
Figure 636. Interior of the Hephaisteion with vault and a block from the cult statue base, from the east.	1446
Figure 637. Cult statue base of Eleusinian limestone with cuttings for dowels. Courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations.	1446
Figure 638. Preparation for the east (pronaos) wall of the Hephaisteion, from the southeast.	1447
Figure 639. Frankish cuttings for single leafed door in one of the intercolumniations of the Hephaisteion.	1448
Figure 640. Graves in the cella of the Hephaisteion. Courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations.....	1448
Figure 641. Pedimental sculpture from Temple F at Eleusis, 2 nd century A.D. National Museum Nos. 200, 201 and 202.....	1449
Figure 642. Chancel screen in the katholikon in the monastery at Kaiseriani. With detail of the <i>templon</i> slab.....	1449
Figure 643. Ionic column from Delphi with anthemion necking band, near the Stoa of the Athenians.	1450
Figure 644. Ionic column capital from Delphi with anthemion necking band. Below the Altar of Apollo, from the east.....	1452
Figure 645. Copy of an Erechtheion maiden from Roman Forum at Corinth.	1453
Figure 646. Persian captive from the Captive's Façade at Corinth.	1457
Figure 647. Lechaion basilica, 5 th century A.D. Ionic base with traces of parapet.....	1458
Figure 648. Nea Anchialos. Column bases show traces of parapets.....	1459
Figure 649. Late Roman sarcophagus reused as a fountain in Preveza.	1459
Figure 650. Late Roman sarcophagus in the Nikopolis Museum.	1460
Figure 651. Back of a Late Roman sarcophagus in the Ioannina Museum.....	1460
Figure 652. Model of the Forum of Augustus, in the Markets of Trajan, Rome.	1461
Figure 653. Torso of one of the maidens from the Forum of Augustus.	1462
Figure 654. A recently excavated Dacian prisoner from the Forum of Trajan.	1463
Figure 655. Sculpture from the attic story of the Municipal Forum at Mérida, ca. A.D. 50.....	1463
Figure 656. Clipeus with head of Zeus Ammon from the Municipal Forum at Mérida.	1464
Figure 657. Clipeus with the head of Medusa from the Municipal Forum at Mérida.	1465
Figure 658. Relief depicting an olive tree, snake and birds from the Municipal Forum at Mérida.	1466
Figure 659. Maiden from the Municipal Forum at Mérida. With detail of a maiden's jug.	1467
Figure 660. Roman temple outside the Agora at Seleukia near Side (probably ancient Lyrbe).	1468
Figure 661. Anthemion molding from the Temple of Apollo Smintheus at Chyrse. 150-125 B.C. From Rumscheid 1994, pl. 31.14.....	1469

Figure 662. Egg-and-dart molding from a column, from the Bouleuterion at Miletus, 175-164 B.C. From Rumscheid 1994, pl. 100.	1469
Figure 663. Anthemion molding from the stoa of the Sanctuary of Athena at Pergamon, 197-159 B.C. From Rumscheid 1994, pl. 188.34.	1470
Figure 664. Anthemion moldings from the Great Altar at Pergamon, 175-150 B.C. From Rumscheid 1994, pl. 124.	1470
Figure 665. Anthemion from the Temple of Dionysos at Miletus, 276 B.C. From Rumscheid 1994, pl. 149.5-6.	1471
Figure 666. Anthemion from the Forum of Trajan, before A.D. 112.	1471
Figure 667. 2nd century A.D. molding with ring voids from the Greater Propylon at Eleusis.	1472
Figure 668. Anthemion molding from the Arch of Septimius Severus in Rome, A.D. 203.	1472
Figure 669. Maiden from the Tomb of Perikles at Limyra. Courtesy of D. King.	1473
Figure 670. Sveshtari Tomb in Bulgaria, ca. 300 B.C. Courtesy of D. King.	1473
Figure 671. Sketch of a circular tomb on Rhodes, Hellenistic. Courtesy of D. King.	1474
Figure 672. Vanity chest from Cumae, Hellenistic. Courtesy of D. King.	1474
Figure 673. Renaissance drawing of a copy of an Erechtheion maiden in the Berlin Codex. Courtesy of D. King.	1475
Figure 674. "La salle des caryatides" Louvre, Paris, A.D. 1550.	1475
Figure 675. Cast of Erechtheion Maiden #3 in Copenhagen, no. KG 392.	1476
Figure 676. Byron's signature at Sounion.	1477
Figure 677. Byron's signature from Harrow Chapel, in Newstead Abbey, Nottinghamshire.	1477
Figure 678. Byron's signature from a letter on display at Newstead Abbey, Nottinghamshire.	1478
Figure 679. Gameboards from the Basilica Julia in the Forum Romanum at Rome.	1479
Figure 680. Gameboard on the stylobate of the Temple of Apollo at Didyma.	1480
Figure 681. Gameboards in the Hephaisteion. Probably Byzantine.	1481
Figure 682. Roman relief in the Louvre showing garlands hanging between columns of a temple's porch.	1482
Figure 683. Coin depicting the planned circular Temple of Mars Ultor decreed in 20 B.C.	1482
Figure 684. Ancient ship graffiti from Delos. Ship graffito in situ in the House of Dionysos.	1483
Figure 685. Roof of the church in Thame, Oxfordshire.	1484
Figure 686. Bedrock protruding above ground level at the War Memorial in Edinburgh Castle.	1485
Figure 687. Table by Thomas Hope with Classical Motifs.	1486
Figure 688. Master's Lodge at Downing College, Cambridge, by William Wilkins 1807-1812. From Downing College's website.	1486
Figure 689. St. Pancras Church, London, by William and Henry Inwood, 1819-1822.	1487
Figure 690. Façade of Sir John Soane's Museum, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London.	1488
Figure 691. Bank of England Dividend Office by Sir John Soane, 1790, demolished in the 1950s.	1489
Figure 692. Ward, <i>Posthumous Portrait of Fanny, Soane's 'favourite dog'</i> , 1822. Courtesy of Sir John Soane's Museum.	1489
Figure 693. Slotskirke in Copenhagen by Christian Hansen, ca. 1850.	1490
Figure 694. The History Building at the Tennessee Centennial Exposition in Nashville, 1897, based on the Erechtheion. Courtesy of the Historian at the Nashville Parthenon.	1491
Figure 695. Academy of Athens (1859-1887) by Th. Hansen.	1492
Figure 696. Reading room of the National Library at Athens.	1494
Figure 697. National Archaeological Museum at Athens (completed 1889) by Lange.	1495
Figure 698. Gennadius Library at Athens (completed 1926) by Van Pelt and Thompson.	1497
Figure 699. Union poster from the University of Cape Town, February 2003.	1498
Figure 700. Cockerell, <i>Lord Elgin's Museum at Park Lane</i> , 1808. Courtesy of the British Museum.	1499
Figure 701. Cannon ball west of the Maiden Porch.	1500
Figure 702. Pilaster in the Arundel Collection in the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford.	1501
Figure 703. Logistical calculations for the Lamp of Kallimachos.	1505
Figure 704. Unpruned olive tree in a restaurant on the outskirts of Preveza.	1506
Figure 705. Legendary olive tree at Kavousi. Photos by Yuki Furuya.	1507
Figure 706. Oinochoai with <i>mastoi</i> from the North Slope of the Akropolis. Courtesy of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens: Agora Excavations.	1508

CHAPTER I – INTRODUCTION

The Erechtheion on the Akropolis at Athens, one of the most beautiful and enigmatic buildings ever built by the ancient Greeks, once housed Athens' most important cult, that of Athena Polias, Protectress of the City. Besides the altars of Poseidon/Erechtheus, Hephaistos and Boutes, the Erechtheion also incorporated, in one complex, the tokens of the foundation of the city of Athens, namely the salt-sea of Poseidon and the olive tree of Athena. The date, the architect, the reconstruction of the interior of the Erechtheion, and the organization of the various cults within it, are still subjects of heated debate. The ancient literary, epigraphical, and archaeological evidence is plentiful, but almost every bit of it is ambiguous. Part of this study has been to re-examine this evidence and to approach the monument with a fresh perspective, without any preconceived topographical agenda into which the Erechtheion must fit. This wholesale reassessment of the primary evidence is necessary to combat the incremental nature of the scholarship on the topography of the Akropolis. The result is a radically different reconstruction of the Classical Erechtheion that is nonetheless sympathetic to the surrounding topography (Figure 143 and Figure 542).

The re-analysis of the building in the Classical period was essential for laying the foundations for the primary focus of this study, namely the alterations to the temple over time, between the 4th century B.C. and the mid-19th century A.D. The earliest of these alterations was the result of a series of fires not long after the Erechtheion was built. A devastating fire, which has been redated in this study to the 3rd century B.C., was followed by a major repair, probably funded by one of the Hellenistic kings in the 2nd

century B.C. Further renovations were probably carried out in the late 2nd century A.D. in preparation for the installation of the imperial cult of Julia Domna.

After ceasing to function as the home of Athena Polias' cult, the Erechtheion experienced three construction phases during the Late Roman and Byzantine periods: the first of these can be assigned tentatively to the 4th century A.D., and constituted the transformation of the temple into a pillared hall, probably with a groin vaulted roof (Figure 573); the second to the late 6th or 7th century, which converted the pillared hall into a basilica church (Figure 574); and the third to the 12th century, which consisted of some minor renovations in order to update the basilica to conform to contemporary liturgical requirements (Figure 574).

After the Franks took over the Akropolis in 1204, the Erechtheion was transformed into an impressive residence, probably for the Catholic bishop (Figure 575). The Catalans likely allowed the residence to fall into disrepair in the 14th century, but when the Florentine Acciajuoli family regained control of the Akropolis, the residence was renovated (Figure 575 and Figure 576).

When the Ottomans took over the Akropolis in 1458, the Erechtheion was used, with few alterations, by an Ottoman officer as a house (Figure 577). It appears that the Venetians built the vault in the North Porch for a gunpowder magazine during their occupation of the Akropolis in 1687-1688. The Erechtheion and its accumulated accretions had been damaged during the Venetian siege, and so, when the Ottomans reoccupied the Akropolis, the Erechtheion was no longer fit to house a family, and there was no impetus to repair the domestic structures. Instead, the North Porch continued to

function as a gunpowder magazine, and the rest of the Erechtheion slowly disintegrated into a ruin (Figure 577).

In 1803, Lord Elgin removed Maiden #3 from the South Porch, the northernmost column of the East Porch, and several other architectural blocks (Figure 582). Other visitors to the Akropolis took away smaller fragments of architecture and sculpture. Luckily, many travelers recorded what they saw, and so it is possible to reconstruct a picture of the gradual, often year-by-year, dismantlement of the Erechtheion. The evidence to chart these changes comes primarily from the depictions (Figure 1 – Figure 127) and descriptions (Appendix B) of early travelers to Athens; the cuttings on the blocks themselves; and the reuse of materials from various parts of the building.

The North Porch, West Façade, and Maiden Porch were bombed, and largely destroyed, during the Greek War of Independence (1821-1833). During the 19th and 20th centuries, the Erechtheion underwent four major anastylosis campaigns, the last of which ended in 1986, leaving us with the building we see today. Important measures for consolidating the rapidly disintegrating marble blocks continue at the time of writing.

The second major component of this study concentrates on the reception of the Erechtheion, that is, how people reacted to it aesthetically and culturally. Each chapter contains a section on the reception of the temple's architecture and sculpture according to the time-period under discussion.¹ For example, part of Chapter IV examines the reasons why the Romans included the maidens of the South Porch extensively in their monuments, as well as how they were interpreted in Roman contexts. And when early modern travelers began visiting the Erechtheion regularly during the 18th century, they drew and painted the temple, and often wrote accounts of their visits. This study gauges

¹ See below “Outline of the Study” for an explanation of the chronological organization of the study.

their reactions to the temple. For example, some travelers found this Ionic temple the epitome of elegance, while others found the columns spindly and the assembly of the porches unpleasantly awkward. Their reactions to the sculptural quality of the maidens are equally bipolar. Besides these personal reactions, this study also examines the methods of transmission of features of the Erechtheion to Western Europe, which in turn served as inspiration for many Neoclassical buildings.²

The following sections of this introductory chapter describe the methodology, the definitions of the essential terminology employed in this study, a general description of the Erechtheion, and an outline of the subsequent chapters.

PHILOSOPHICAL BACKGROUND TO METHODOLOGY

The fields of anthropology, philosophy of science, and literary criticism often lend theoretical models to other fields such as art history and architecture. The unique combination of holistic diachronic and reception-based approaches used in this study have enabled the evidence to be interpreted in new ways, and for the social life of this monument to be better appreciated. This section lays out the history, value, and application of this study's approach.

The study of aesthetics is almost as old as, if not older than the Erechtheion itself. Plato and Aristotle described art/poetry as the mimesis of nature. Mimesis is an elusive term usually translated (poorly) as “imitation.” A comparison of a work of art with nature, namely its relative approximation to the real thing, has periodically been the standard by which art historians from Pliny onward have rated artistic quality. This measure, of course, became meaningless in Gothic and Byzantine art, and in particular, at

² See Appendix C for a partial list of the monuments inspired in some way by the Erechtheion.

the dawn of the modern era – with the advent of Impressionism – precisely when Walter Pater began examining the theory of aesthetics.³

Writing in the 1860s, Pater offered a new form of aesthetic criticism wherein the individual's subjective reaction was considered paramount, and the relativism inherent in his interpretation of the subject, relevant.⁴ For the purposes of this study, Pater's approach is applied to the analysis of the aesthetic reaction of those who interacted with the Erechtheion, from uninformed interpretations of the casual traveler, to those of scholars and architects.

The theoretical emphasis on interpretation, as absolute and fundamental to every experience in life (i.e., radical hermeneutics), belongs to Heidegger: people live socially, always with others, and they live historically – their experiences of the world change in time.⁵ Every new interaction results in a new interpretation of the situation, object, or experience, and is colored by every previous cultural and independent engagement, and affects every future interaction. This study examines the experience of those who encountered the Erechtheion or its elements during different chronological, political, social, intellectual, and religious periods, and considers the tools the individual had at his disposal, be it a local guide, a copy of Pausanias, or a military strategy.

Furthermore, Heidegger uses the example of a Greek temple to illustrate the special place art has in what he calls the world/earth strife:

The building holds its ground against the storm raging above it and so first makes the storm itself manifest in its violence. The luster and gleam of the stone brings to radiance the light of the day, the breadth of the sky, the darkness of the night. The temple's firm

³ On Pater, see Iser 1987.

⁴ See Holub 1984 on the development of aesthetics and reception theory. Viewable in hindsight as a transition to modernism, Pater's aesthetic approach is still applied to art today.

⁵ Heidegger 1962.

towering makes visible the invisible space of air. Its own repose brings out the raging of the sea.⁶

Hans-Georg Gadamer used Heidegger’s work on hermeneutics as a springboard to develop the concept of “play” or *spiel* in relation to the experience of art. Art (and architecture) is transcendental to time and culture, and this art has a “mode of being.”⁷ Also, because a work of art is always the same work of art, it is also in the Present for every person who has interacted with it since its construction.⁸ In the way that the celebration of a festival is a repetition of an earlier custom, so is the architectural backdrop: “for the festival to be contemporaneous is for it to claim the participants and to confront them with their own identity.”⁹ This applies well to both the ancient participants in the Panathenaia as well as the travelers on the Grand Tour.

The following words of Gadamer resonate surprisingly well with this study’s approach to the Erechtheion:

A work of architecture extends beyond itself in two ways. It is as much determined by the aim it is to serve as by the place it is to take up in a total spatial context... We call a successful building a “happy solution,” and mean by this both that it perfectly fulfils its purpose and that its construction has added something new to the spatial dimensions of a town or landscape. Through this dual ordering the building presents a true increase of being: it is a work of art.

A building is not a work of art if it stands just anywhere, as a blot on the landscape, but only if it represents the solution of an ‘architectural problem.’ Aesthetics acknowledges only those works of art that are in some way worth thinking about and calls them ‘architectural monuments.’ If a building is a work of art, then it is not only the artistic solution to a building problem posed by the contexts of purpose and life to which it originally belongs, but somehow preserves them, so that they are visibly present even from its original purpose. Something in it points back to the original.¹⁰

⁶ Collins and Selina 1999, p. 136, quoting Heidegger 1950, p. 27.

⁷ Gadamer 1994, p. 101.

⁸ Gadamer 1994, p. 123.

⁹ Johnson 2000, p. 23.

¹⁰ Gadamer 1994, p. 156.

Reader-response criticism came to the fore of literary criticism (and film theory) in the late 1960s as a way of investigating the mechanisms by which authors addressed their audiences, and how these audiences reacted within their discrete social environments. This type of criticism can also be used to analyze how audiences reacted to and perceived art (sculpture) and architecture (monuments). Hans Robert Jauss' definition of reception theory may be “to wrest works of art from the past by means of new interpretations, to translate them into a new present, to make the experiences preserved in past art accessible again,”¹¹ but it may also be used as a tool to investigate the interpretation of a monument through the eyes of those who lived during different cultural horizons.¹² When a monument such as the Erechtheion stands for two and a half millennia, to add a new interpretation from this generation is to add little of value to the discussion. What is required is a diachronic assessment using hermeneutics to examine how people from both Athens and abroad interpreted the building, that is, how people received, interpreted and reacted to the building over time. The value of this diachronic use of reception theory is summarized by John E. Hancock:

Hermeneutics (interpretation) shows us that all encounters of any kind rely on this background-foreground relationship. Every new thing, of any kind, is interpreted as what it is because of its simultaneous similarity and difference from that *in relation to which* it is considered. And every thing that can ever be considered is *already in* such a network of relations.¹³

Therefore, why the Erechtheion? This diachronic hermeneutic study is not appropriate for any and every ancient building. This example of Classical architecture has evoked a wide range of reactions from all echelons of society, from locals to

¹¹ Jauss 1969, pp. 54-55.

¹² “Cultural horizon” means the period of time between the transitions of dominating tides of influence during which the political, social, and religious situations are relatively constant.

¹³ Hancock 1997, p. 1.

foreigners, from architects to scholars. To them, the Erechtheion is “lopsided,” “the epitome of elegance,” “weighty,” “transverse,” and “preposterous”. Each of these aesthetic reactions is as important as the next. It is not the purpose of this study to decide whose interpretation is right or wrong, but to examine the intellectual or cultural phenomenon behind what inspired the reactions. Aesthetic appreciation is not the only interpretative aspect of interest. The overt symbolism of the Maiden Porch must be assessed diachronically as it had different meanings during different cultural horizons.

The Erechtheion’s original purpose was to house the most sacred items of one of the most culturally influential city-states of all time. Its architectural design and sculptural elaboration resonated throughout Antiquity, and again with the rediscovery of Greece by Western European travelers in the 18th century. The building was never completely abandoned, although it did fall into disrepair at various points in its existence. Its use as a church in the Byzantine period and subsequent use as a house and gun-powder magazine during the Ottoman occupation resulted in architectural amendments that have not been examined in detail since the early 20th century, and have never been interpreted through the lens of reception theory.

According to leading architectural theorist, Kenneth Frampton: “Architecture is neither science nor art, nor is it either of these disciplines in their applied forms. Passing attempts at rationalization or aestheticization notwithstanding, architecture is a craft-based practice closely tied to the lifeworld.”¹⁴ Although a pluralistic approach to any topic is ideal, one that is at least focused on contextuality, interactivity, and temporality will reveal new relationships and new conclusions about a building that has influenced, and been influenced by, the “lifeworld.” Diachronicity is therefore essential for such an

¹⁴ Frampton 1993.

approach in order to tease out the meaning of such a long-lived member of the lifeworld during pagan, Christian, and Muslim times, and finally to the relatively secular historicized present where the Erechtheion has become a symbol of Greek nationalism, a link to Greece's glorious past and a promise for the future.¹⁵ Furthermore, the holistic diachronicity of the approach (i.e., 5th century B.C. – 19th century A.D.) is essential on an archaeological level, namely for filtering through and organizing the wide range of Post-Antique cuttings extant on the Erechtheion in order to reconstruct the alterations and additions to the temple. For example, it would have been impossible to discern the form of the Frankish residence without looking at the evidence for the Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine, and Ottoman phases as well.

There is now a name for an approach which uses reception theory when applied to artifacts. This is an “Object Biography,” an idea introduced in the 1980s by Igor Kopytoff.¹⁶ Other scholars are using this kind of approach to good effect as well. For example, Susan Langdon has used this approach in a study of the biography of two Late Geometric pots.¹⁷ Such an object biography addresses the economics of the pots' manufacture, purchase, use, social value, religious significance with their ritual deposition in graves, archaeological importance upon their (re-)discovery, and ultimate meaning as they sit today in a museum case. Similarly, an object biography has great potential in its application to a building which has stood in one place, in full view, for two and a half millennia, and interacted with many societies.

¹⁵ Hancock 1995.

¹⁶ Kopytoff 1986, pp. 64-91.

¹⁷ Langdon 2001.

An important aspect of object biography is the Object's changing and increasing value to the owner in his or her society – its accumulative pedigree, so to speak.¹⁸ In the case of the Erechtheion (as the Object), on a basic level, Athens increased her prestige by building the beautiful Object. While on display, the Object continued to amplify Athens' glory the longer it stood on the Akropolis as the center of important civic cults. Jumping ahead in history, anyone who came to own a piece of the Object, such as Lord Elgin, garnered a fraction of its additive glory, especially with the renaissance in the appreciation for the Object which the purloiners stimulated in their homelands.

Similarly, anyone who took the time to view, draw, describe, or paint the Object acquired for himself a small portion of its greatness.¹⁹ This transcendental greatness increases the viewer's status. Society considers someone who is well-traveled of higher status than someone else who has never left his or her hometown. Any of the aforementioned acts of recording, and hence *interpreting*, the Object is an act of ownership. The owner's own biography is affected, as is the Object's, whose state and importance was passively chronicled and augmented.

The next degree of ownership, which also affects the Object's biography and is an extension of that discussed above, is the quotation of the Object in a new context. To copy an element and incorporate it into one's own design as designer, or life as patron, is to associate oneself more closely with the Object copied, and to increase the pedigree of the Object by means of the cliché: "Imitation is the sincerest form of flattery." To be

¹⁸ For example, the sale of John F. Kennedy's golf clubs or humidior, or a gift from the popular President, demands exponentially more at auction than the same items, in the same condition, and from the same era, which belonged to John Doe.

¹⁹ Modern photography offers a quick fix for the tourist bent on recording his travels to prove he has been to a monument in order to increase his status in his society. It is only those who spend the time in contemplation of the complex details of the Object who truly come to own a bit of it and become part of its history. On the prolonged gaze, see Csikszentmihalyi 1990.

identified as the origin of good taste, as was the case for the Erechtheion in late 18th and early 19th century Europe, was the highest status an Object can possibly achieve. It is also an achievement for the Object to do so at such a great distance. Many architects and patrons who engaged the Object for inspiration never viewed it in person. Thus, the method of transmission of the Object's allure, especially in the era before commercial photography, requires reflection upon another aspect of the Object's existence. Casts, scale models, and technical drawings of the Object allowed architects and their patrons to pick and choose architectural features from what was deemed to be the epitome of taste in the "Greek Style".

Although Langdon warns against naming specific time parameters when compiling an Object's biography, in the larger scope of this study, the cultural horizons defined below in this chapter suffice to describe who owned the Erechtheion, both literally (by occupying the structure itself), or figuratively (by absorbing it through words or art, or by quoting its elements). Unlike the pots which ended up in the local museum, and although denuded of its accumulative context by irredentist excavation of its immediate environs, the Erechtheion is relatively unmovable. Therefore, as an Object, the Erechtheion may continue to acquire new meanings and allow scholars to probe it for a deeper understanding of its secrets.

Therefore, the dual approach of the reception of the Object (i.e., its use and perception by society) plus holistic contextualized diachronicity results in an object biography and a line of questioning that goes beyond assessing influence of architectural or artistic technique and form. This study seeks to tell the Erechtheion's story, as well as the story of those who interacted with it.

TERMINOLOGY

The study of the topography of the Akropolis is plagued with problems of terminology. Terms from ancient documents are variously applied to buildings and features, and as interpretations of these documents and buildings change, the terminology changes with them. For clarity and consistency's sake, the following sections define the most problematic terminology used in this study, and explain why certain, less-than-ideal, terms have sometimes been chosen.

“ERECHTHEION”

What to call the subject of this study poses a major dilemma. The name by which the marble Ionic Temple on the north side of the Akropolis was generally known in the Classical period is uncertain. The generic and cumbersome label used in the building accounts, “the temple in which the ancient image is,” is unusable for general reference in this study.²⁰ “Temple of Athena Polias” and “*archaios neos*” are also unacceptable because of the polemic surrounding this terminology.²¹ Similarly, “Erechtheion” cannot be used without major qualification, as there is no consensus on whether the cult of Erechtheus was located within the Ionic temple.²² Apparently neutral would be the “Ionic Temple”; however, there is another Ionic Temple on the Akropolis, that of Athena Nike.²³ By default, then, the appellation “Erechtheion” is used to refer to the late 5th century marble Ionic temple as a whole because this is the most common name used to refer to the building, and it provides the least distraction to the reader. That many cults

²⁰ This identification has been challenged as recently as 2002: Ferrari 2002.

²¹ See below note 26.

²² See Chapter II; Jeppesen 1987; Robertson 1996.

²³ The Temple of Athena Nike is admittedly on a bastion jutting out from the west end of the Akropolis. Nonetheless, confusion may arise with the constant unqualified use of the term “Ionic Temple” to refer to the subject of this study. Therefore, specific mention will be made of Athena Nike when referring to her Ionic temple on the bastion.

shared this temple (as will be discussed in full below) is to be understood. Under certain circumstances, however, such as when a neutrality of cult reference is required, the term “Ionic temple” will be used. This should be understood to refer to the Ionic temple on the north side of the Akropolis unless otherwise specified.

“ARCHAIC TEMPLE OF ATHENA”

The Archaic temple whose polygonal foundations lie between the Erechtheion and the Parthenon is referred to as the “Archaic Temple of Athena Polias” in this study. Called the “Hekatompedon” by most early 20th century scholars, including the authors of *The Erechtheum*, this temple was excavated by Wilhem Dörpfeld in the late 19th century, and was interpreted by him as the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias.²⁴ Most recently re-examined by Gloria Ferrari, the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias is still at the heart of the controversy over the contentious term, “*archaios neos*.” During the Archaic period, this temple housed the olive wood cult statue of Athena Polias and was referred to as the “*archaios neos*.”²⁵ After the construction of the new Ionic temple, the term appears to have been transferred with the ancient cult statue when it was moved to the Erechtheion. William Bell Dinsmoor, Sr. investigated the transference of the term “*archaios neos*” from the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias to the Ionic Temple.²⁶ He concluded that the term followed the ancient statue, that is, the *raison d’être* for the building that housed it.²⁷

²⁴ Paton et al. 1927, p. 428. Most scholars, led by Manolis Korres, agree that the area referred to as the Hekatompedon by Archaic inscriptions and literary evidence belongs in the vicinity of the Parthenon: Korres 1994c. Noel Robertson disagrees and maintains that the temple foundations excavated by Dörpfeld belong to the Hekatompedon: Robertson 1996. The topographical terminology of the treasury inscriptions is discussed in Chapter II.

²⁵ For a detailed summary of the various theories on the allocation of the Archaic architectural sculpture to various buildings on the Akropolis, see Hurwit 1999, pp. 106-116.

²⁶ Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 308-309. On the treasury inscriptions relating to the *archaios neos*, see Harris 1995, pp. 201-222. Harris concurs that the term *archaios neos* was transferred to the Ionic temple with the olive wood statue of Athena, but she follows Paton et al. in placing Athena in the east chamber at the upper level:

The strange terminology used in the header of the Chandler Stele to describe the temple, “the temple in which the ancient image is” probably reflects a liminal moment for the name for the building. Before the transference of the title “*archaios neos*” from the Archaic Temple of Athena was complete (and the statue itself moved – the grammar of the inscriptions is, in fact, unclear on this point),²⁸ the name of the temple which housed for the first time under one roof, indeed in one room, *both* the cults of Athena and Erechtheus-Poseidon, was up in the air. By the 4th century, the term “*archaios neos*” was consistently applied to the Erechtheion.

“OPISTHODOMOS”

The Opisthodomos with a capital “O” is the west half of the Archaic Temple of Athena which survived the Persian Wars relatively intact. Diane Harris-Cline has most recently assessed the nomenclature of the spaces referred to in the treasury inscriptions. Following Dinsmoor and Dörpfeld, she argued that the term “Opisthodomos” refers to the west half of the Archaic Temple of Athena.²⁹

see Chapter II on the reconstruction of the interior of the temple and a discussion of the placement of the cults and relics within it. It is important to note that the treasury inscriptions do not denote items being stored in the shrine of Erechtheus as a separate location from the “*archaios neos*.” Furthermore, before the construction of the Ionic temple, no treasures were stored in the “*archaios neos*.” In the 5th century, all items were stored in the Pronaos, Hekatompedon, Parthenon and Opisthodomos, the first three terms referring to parts of the Parthenon, from east to west. In the 4th century, the Pronaos went out of use for storage, and the “*archaios neos*” was used: Harris 1995, p. 2. This makes sense topographically according to the scheme espoused in this study because the temporarily restored shelter in the Archaic Temple of Athena was only fit for housing the goddess, and not her treasures, prior to her installation in her new home, the new “*archaios neos*” in the Ionic temple.

²⁷ There are several ancient and modern parallels for this type of transference.

²⁸ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 298-299.

²⁹ Dörpfeld 1887; Dörpfeld 1890; Dörpfeld 1897; Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 309-311; Harris 1995, pp. 4-5, 40-41. Manolis Korres (1994c) concurs with the identification of the Opisthodomos as the west half of the Archaic Temple of Athena.

“MAIDEN PORCH” AND “CARYATID”

There are many ways by which scholars refer to the porch whose roof is supported by six female statues at the west end of the South Wall of the Erechtheion: from “Caryatid Porch” to “Porch of the Maidens” to the “South Porch”. The terms “Maiden Porch” and “South Porch” will be used interchangeably in this study. The very specific and problematic term, “caryatid” will receive its own discussion in Chapter IV.

“ORIGINAL”

The word “original” is used arbitrarily in previous scholarship to mean two very different things. Sometimes “original” is used to describe something that belongs to the Classical phase versus, for instance, the Byzantine phase of the building, as in the case of the date for the creation of the West Door. On the other hand, “original” is also used to describe something that belongs to a hypothetical or unexecuted plan of the Erechtheion. In this study, every effort has been made to reserve the use of “original” for the latter purpose.³⁰

“COPY” AND “QUOTATION”

The language used for describing the copying of ancient sculpture is specific. The terminology used by Brunilde Ridgway will be employed in this study.³¹ This study acknowledges the term “copy” in the following manner:

If the term *copy* is the mechanical and exact duplication of a piece of sculpture in all its details and exact dimensions, then very few items...qualify for this title. If, however, what is meant is the reproduction of a work to such an extent that its similarity to the prototype is easily recognizable and, at least in the intention of the maker, the two pieces can be considered the same, then the Greeks

³⁰ On the original plan of the Erechtheion, see Chapter II.

³¹ Ridgway 1984, pp. 1-3.

themselves ‘copied’ from the very beginnings of stone carving, in the sixth century B.C.³²

The term “quotation,” as used by Ridgway, refers to the allusion of earlier monuments by copying one or more of its elements reasonably accurately. In the case of the Erechtheion, therefore, the building is being quoted in the Forum of Augustus through the employment of recognizable, though not completely accurate, copies of the maidens of the South Porch.

How can one tell that a building design was inspired by the Erechtheion? The most quotable feature that an architect, ancient or modern, could include to refer to the Erechtheion is a maiden from the South Porch. Whether the Maiden Porch is copied as a whole, abbreviated to a distyle aedicula, or the maidens are repeated many times as a decorative element, the significance is clear to the architect’s audience: “This is a reference to the Ionic temple on the Athenian Akropolis, home of Athena Polias, Protectress of Athens, and all the meanings associated with it.”³³

The next most quotable feature is the distinctive and elaborate column with necking band (technically known as the *hypotrachelia*) decorated with an anthemion molding. And finally, the remarkable layout of the building is arguably a quotable element of the building. Whether viewed as part of the development of the Roman transverse temple, as by Vitruvius, or by a modern architect, the asymmetrical and unusual layout (barring the reasons for it) is a source for inspiration. The hexastyle façade of the East Porch, the tetrastyle *in antis* façade of the West Porch with the

³² Ridgway 1984, p. 6.

³³ Hence Vitruvius’ admonition that architects must be versed in history in order to be able to explain why they have incorporated female architectural supports in their compositions (1.2-4). On the dissociation of the Erechtheion from this passage, see Chapter IV.

intercolumniations pierced by windows, and the exquisitely decorated columns of the North Porch served as inspiration for both ancient and modern buildings.

SPELLING, CAPITALIZATION AND MEASUREMENTS

Transliteration of Greek words will be on the German/Greek rather than English/Latin model, e.g. *Erechtheion* rather than *Erechtheum*, *Pandroseion* rather than *Pandroseum*, etc. The Latinized versions of these terms are avoided unless they are contained in a quotation or bibliographic reference. Similarly, the transliteration of *kappa* as “k” is used, as in Akropolis, unless it is overly distracting, as it would be in Thoukydides rather than Thucydides. *Erechtheion* is often spelled *Erectheion*, especially by the early travelers, as are its related words, such as *Erectheus* or *Erictheus*. Such alternate spellings are retained in quotations and bibliographic references. The original, often inconsistent, spellings have been retained, some with “[sic]” added in order to indicate that what appears to be a misspelling is not just a typographical error. The spelling and accentuation errors in foreign titles and prose have also been retained.

Parts of the *Erechtheion* such as the South Wall, the West Cross-Wall, the North Porch, the Niche, and the West Façade are capitalized in an effort to make navigating around this complex building feasible in both the text and the mind of the reader, as well as to ensure consistency of terminology (Figure 143). The only case where two terms refer to the same part of the building is in the case of the Maiden Porch. Sometimes it is grammatically necessary to refer to it as the South Porch when discussing the maidens as a separate entity from their architectural surroundings.

When giving absolute measurements on a particular feature or cutting on the *Erechtheion*, the metric system is used. However, when describing the size of the

building blocks of the Erechtheion, such as the regular ashlar blocks, or the widths of the doors, Attic feet will be used because this was the system of measurement used in the building accounts. This also renders discussions containing comparisons of measurements more meaningful. Any mention of feet can be presumed to be Attic feet. The Imperial system of measurement is never employed in this study except in the context of the measurements of the early travelers.

GRIDS

The plates prepared by Gorham P. Stevens for *The Erechtheum* (1927) still comprise the mainstay of our scientific record of the temple. These have yet to be replaced by a set of detailed elevations and plans of the temple as it stands now, as reconstructed by Alexander Papanikolaou and his team between 1979 and 1986. In preparation for this most recent anastylosis, Papanikolaou created a series of highly detailed and technical architectural blueprints of the building as it stood before his team interfered with Nikolaos Balanos' restoration.³⁴ These blueprints, which are accessible in Athens at some of the foreign schools at Athens, correct some of the subtle mistakes and oversights of Stevens' plates, such as the omission of various subtle yet important cuttings on the interior of the North Wall at the junction with the West Cross-Wall. A new set of plans and elevations is eagerly anticipated, but its publication has unfortunately been delayed by the death of Papanikolaou in May 2000. It is not the purpose of this study to replicate this detailed work in anticipation of this publication. Instead, this study includes hundreds of detailed colored photographs taken with the kind permission of the 1st Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities.

³⁴ Platon et al. 1977.

Owing to the detailed analysis in this study of the individual blocks that make up the Erechtheion, each block has been assigned a unique label that corresponds to the grid and key provided. These labels are based on a numbering system laid out by Papanikolaou and his team in the 1970s, which in turn are based on Stevens' elevations which accompany Paton et al. 1927.³⁵ In certain cases, labels were assigned to undesignated blocks, but these follow the same logic as the rest of the building.

The labels for the blocks are in the form of XX.00.00.x. For example SS.05.09 belongs to the South Wall (SS), course 5, block 9. Under certain circumstances, it was necessary to denote further a certain aspect of a block by a suffix such as “s” for “step,” “o” for exterior, or “i” for interior. References to individual blocks are made on this model throughout this study. The full key and grids are in Appendix D: (Figure 553 to Figure 563).

ANATOMY OF THE ERECHTHEION

There are very few “facts” that can be stated about the building commonly referred to as the Erechtheion. Those few are set out here in a general description of the main features of the temple. The main building is rectangular and measures, at the lowest step of the krepidoma, 24.078 m from east to west and 13.004 m from north to south. At the east end is a hexastyle Ionic porch: the East Porch. At the west end is a plain wall pierced by an off-axis door and surmounted by four half-columns between antae: the West Façade. The main building is abutted on the north by a tetrastyle Ionic porch with a column on each return, measuring 12.033 m wide and 7.11 m deep at the lowest marble step of the krepidoma. This “North Porch” projects past the main rectangle to the west by

³⁵ Platon et al. 1977.

3.714 m.³⁶ A 2.427 m wide by 4.882 m tall door provides access from the North Porch to the west end of the main building. A 1.318 m wide second door in the North Wall, located in the Westward Projection of the North Porch, provides access to the area west of the Erechtheion. In the southeast corner of the North Porch is an opening in the stylobate which provides access to an underground passage into the central area of the main building. Above this opening in the stylobate, a ceiling coffer was deliberately omitted. The stylobate of the North Porch is 3.24 m lower than the stylobate of the East Porch.³⁷ The columns of the East Porch are 6.586 m tall compared to the columns of the North Porch at 7.635 m.

Attached to the southwest corner of the main building is a podium 2.504 m high on which stand six over life-size female statues, four in the front, and one on each return. Each stands *contraposto* with her weight on the outside leg. These female architectural elements support a slightly sloping roof with an Ionic architrave whose fascia are decorated with discs and a cornice with dentils. The eastern block of the podium is 5 Attic feet wide, while the other three on the front are only 4 Attic feet wide. The Maiden Porch has an opening in its northeast corner that leads to a stairway which descends and turns right. The steps descend through a door 1.264 m wide, which opens onto the West Corridor of the main building.

The southwest corner of the main building and northwest corner of the Maiden Porch lack foundations and several of the lowest courses of marble blocks. The blocks at the south end of the lower West Façade end in an irregular, truncated manner. Very large

³⁶ This constitutes the “Westward Projection of the North Porch” (Figure 143). All measurements are from Paton et al. 1927 unless otherwise cited.

³⁷ This figure refers to the difference in elevation between the lowest steps of the respective porches.

blocks, up to 4.43 m long, were used to span the void below, and measures were taken to reduce the load on the marble blocks above this area on the interior of the South Wall.

The Ionic order of the Erechtheion is highly elaborated. An epikranitis decorated with an anthemion (lotus and palmette) pattern encircled the rectangular block of the main building. The columns of the East, West and North Porches of the Erechtheion have necking bands decorated with an anthemion molding. Almost unique in all Ionic architecture is the anthemion molding of the North Porch; it has an additional floral tendril between the lotus and palmette, which is referred to in this study as the “interfloral element.”

The frieze of the main building and the North Porch was made of dark Eleusinian limestone. Separately carved figures in Parian marble were attached to the dark background with metal dowels. The three pediments of the temple (above the East, West and North Porches) were devoid of sculpture.

OUTLINE OF THE STUDY

Using a holistic contextualized diachronic approach, this study investigates the physical and functional changes made to the Erechtheion between its erection in the late 5th century B.C. through the middle of the 19th century A.D., as well as its reception both locally and abroad. It is divided into chapters according to the main cultural horizons of Athenian history.

Chapter II, “The Classical Period,” re-examines the archaeological, epigraphical, and literary evidence pertaining to the late 5th century marble Ionic temple; summarizes and assesses the contributions to the study of the Erechtheion by scholars since the

publication of the seminal work *The Erechtheum* by Paton et al. (1927); and proposes a new reconstruction of how the temple worked physically and ritually.

Chapter III, “The Late Classical and Hellenistic Periods,” challenges the Roman date typically assigned to the major repairs necessitated by the fire that ravaged the Erechtheion’s interior. This study argues for a Hellenistic rather than Augustan date for these major repairs and places this restoration project amongst the significant building projects that the Hellenistic kings carried out in Athens. The immediate reception of the Erechtheion and its impact on Late Classical and Hellenistic architecture are also considered in this chapter.

Chapter IV, “The Roman Period,” analyzes the historical circumstances surrounding the installation of the imperial cult of the Severan empress, Julia Domna, next to Athena Polias in the Erechtheion; a reappraisal of topographical issues relating to the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus; a reconsideration of Pausanias’ tour of the Akropolis; and a critical assessment of the reception of Vitruvius’ *De Architectura* with respect to the interpretation of the Erechtheion maidens as “caryatids.”

The corpus of evidence for Byzantine churches in Greece has increased immensely since the publication of *The Erechtheum*.³⁸ Using these additional comparanda, Chapter V, “The Late Antique and Byzantine Periods,” discerns three distinct phases for the conversion of the Erechtheion into a church. An alternative reconstruction for the building in this period is proposed which also takes into account the cuttings on the exterior as well as the interior of the building. Chapter V also introduces the first of a series of unpublished graffiti on the Erechtheion in the form of three ships in the upper reaches of the North Porch.

³⁸ Paton et al. 1927.

From Chapter VI, “The Frankish Period,” onward, it becomes possible to mine the information available in the illustrations of the Erechtheion by the early modern travelers. The evidence from these depictions, in conjunction with the cuttings in the fabric of the temple itself, permits the reconstruction of two phases for the Erechtheion as a residence, probably for the Catholic bishop, during the Frankish period.

Chapter VII, “The Ottoman Period,” continues to exploit the aforementioned visual evidence as well as the accounts of the early travelers in order to understand the continued use of the Erechtheion as an Ottoman house, and follows its gradual ruin and conversion into a gunpowder magazine. Textual analysis of the travelers’ accounts also reveals their aesthetic reaction to the building. The publications of the moldings and special features of the Erechtheion by Le Roy (1755), Stuart (1789) and Inwood (1819) comprise the primary method of transmission of these features to Western Europe, and enable an appraisal of the impact the Erechtheion on Neoclassical architecture.

Chapter VIII, “Period of Greek Independence,” summarizes in brief what happened to the Erechtheion after the War of Independence through 1853 when commercial photography was developing rapidly. This chapter presents the illustrations and accounts of the Erechtheion that were not known to the authors of *The Erechtheum*. It also documents the 19th century graffiti on the Erechtheion as an additional source of testimonia for travelers’ interaction with the building.

Chapter IX, “Conclusion,” summarizes the main contributions of this study to the biography of the Erechtheion.

The second half of this study is comprised of several appendices. Appendix A is a list of the ancient literary and epigraphic evidence pertinent to the Erechtheion and is

organized by content, then by date. Appendix B contains the testimonia about the Erechtheion by the travelers to Athens beginning in the 3rd century B.C. Appendix C is a partial list of buildings inspired by the Erechtheion through the quotation of its most recognizable feature, i.e., the maidens, and/or through the incorporation of the Erechtheion's special Ionic elements.

Appendix D comprises the visual evidence for this study beginning with the depictions of the Erechtheion by the early modern travelers, followed by the documentation of almost every aspect of the architecture of the Erechtheion in color photographs. This assemblage of photographs, both general and detailed, is organized as a logical visual description of the temple rather than by the order of their reference in the text. Unless specified, all these photos were taken by the author. The photographs from early excavations were provided by the *Deutsches Archäologisches Institut* at Athens, and early photographs of special features of the Erechtheion were provided by the American School of Classical Studies Photo Archive. Keyed grids which label each individual block of the Erechtheion follow.³⁹

Appendix D continues with a series of models of the Erechtheion during each major cultural horizon: as a pagan temple, basilica church, Frankish residence, and Ottoman house. Then, to accompany Chapters VII and VIII, a computer model shows the gradual, block-by-block destruction of the Erechtheion over time from its relatively intact state in 1749 through its nadir during the War of Independence. The state of the Erechtheion between each of the four major *anastyloses* is also illustrated. Appendix D concludes with images of relevant archaeological comparanda cited in the course of this study.

³⁹ See above “Grids.”

And finally, Appendix E contains a table documenting the graffiti found on the Erechtheion.

CHAPTER II – THE ERECHTHEION IN THE 5TH CENTURY B.C.

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this study is the reception of, and changes to, the Erechtheion subsequent to its initial construction. In the light of the problems with previous interpretations of the building as a pagan temple, it is necessary to re-evaluate the existing evidence for its purpose and construction. As the Classical building is the foundation for all the subsequent phases, this chapter presents the conclusions arrived at by autopsy and consideration of the scholarship since 1927.¹ To review each and every argument for this reconstruction in full would be another doctoral study in and of itself. Therefore, only a brief review of the main contributions to the study of the Erechtheion and the new reconstruction are presented here.² The two most important results of this re-evaluation to affect the Post-Antique transformation and use of the building are:

1. There was never an East Cross-Wall.
2. There was no floor at the level of the East Porch in the east half of the main building.

This chapter begins with a brief overview of the area beneath and surrounding the Classical Erechtheion during the Bronze Age, Archaic, and Early Classical periods in order to set the topographical scene for the rest of the chapter. In order to review the wide range of scholarship that has appeared since Paton et al.'s 1927 holistic examination, this study divides the scholarship into its main themes and assesses its contribution.

¹ Paton et al. 1927.

² The full argument including a review and assessment of the modern scholarship, using Paton et al. 1927 as a point of departure, will appear elsewhere in print in the near future.

To begin, three major trends in the scholarship on the Erechtheion are considered:

1. The temple's general physical reconstruction;
2. The location of the cults inside and around the Erechtheion; and,
3. The temple's original symmetrical plan.

The first of these topics also serves to acquaint the reader with the basic features of the building and its canonical interpretation.³ The second and third represent the two major trends in the scholarship over the past seventy-five years. The most recent trend (2) is to argue for different arrangements of the cults of the Erechtheion. These theories are reviewed, critiqued, and compared against the primary evidence.⁴ The earlier trend (3) was to search for the temple's original, symmetrical plan. These older ideas are assessed, and their relevance and value to an up-to-date discussion of the Erechtheion are ascertained.

Much of the post-1927 scholarship on the Erechtheion deals with limited, specific aspects of the Classical temple and its cults, such as the Maiden Porch, or the technique of carving the anthemion moldings. These contributions will be considered in the context of the discussion of the architectural reconstruction, sculptural interpretation, or cult placement, as is relevant.

These discussions lead to a new, overall interpretation of the architectural, archaeological, literary and epigraphic evidence, and a new reconstruction of what the temple looked like and how it functioned in the Classical period. In an attempt to improve upon previous treatments of the Erechtheion, this study approaches the new reconstruction in a new way. First, the architectural evidence is analyzed with special

³ Please refer to the end of Chapter I for a brief physical description of the temple as it stood at the end of the 5th century B.C.

⁴ The relevant literary and epigraphical evidence is presented in Appendix A.

attention to its problematic subtleties and with reference to the epigraphical and literary evidence relevant to the structural composition of the building. The re-evaluated architectural evidence serves as a blank canvas onto which the cults may be placed and reconciled with all the other literary, epigraphical and archaeological evidence relating to the Erechtheion.⁵ This reconstruction is then tested against the sole extant ancient narrative description of the building: an excerpt from Pausanias' *Description of Greece* (1.26.6-1.27.3).

Paton et al. described every detail of the Erechtheion in its early 20th century state, during and after its restoration by Balanos.⁶ This American team was in the privileged position of being able to examine the inner workings of the blocks.⁷ As the most thoroughly and convincingly argued reconstruction of the Classical building, their interpretation has become the standard. The breadth and depth of this publication might leave one with the impression that there is little left to say on this subject.

Since the publication of *The Erechtheum* in 1927, however, the building has changed dramatically. Between 1979 and 1986, the Erechtheion was dismantled and restored according to internationally accredited principles. Recently discovered blocks from the Erechtheion were incorporated into the new restoration and the incorrect placement of other blocks was rectified. The structure, as it stands today, is therefore a significantly better approximation of the ancient building, and serves as a more accurate

⁵ Owing to the nature of the evidence, however, it is not always possible to present the arguments for the architecture without reference to the overall hypothesis on the location of the cults. Every effort has been made to ensure that the arguments are not circular. See Appendix A for the literary and epigraphical evidence organized by topic.

⁶ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 3-180.

⁷ Their measurements and drawings are very accurate except in a few places upon which will be commented below.

basis for a reconstruction of what the temple looked like and how it functioned in Antiquity.⁸

BEFORE THE IONIC TEMPLE

The chronological scope of this study is the late 5th century B.C. to A.D. 1853. The next two sections set the topographical scene for the discussion of the Classical temple by describing the area beneath and surrounding the Erechtheion during the Bronze Age, Archaic, and Early Classical periods. It is necessary to have an understanding of the pre-existing structures in the vicinity in order to appreciate the special measures taken by the builders of the Classical Erechtheion to accommodate them.

BRONZE AGE PREDECESSORS

L. B. Holland provides the most in-depth analysis of the Bronze Age remains in the area of the Erechtheion at the time closest to their excavation.⁹ Paton et al., and scholars such as Harriet Boyd Hawes, based their arguments on his interpretation of the Bronze Age evidence. Holland interpreted the Bronze Age remains beneath the Erechtheion as part of the Bronze Age palace: court, forehall and shrine.

Holland's interpretation has since been challenged. The remains of these Late Bronze Age palace walls within the Erechtheion have since been downgraded functionally to terracing structures that supported the scanty remains of the building

⁸ Besides the discovery of new fragments of the building accounts, there have also been major contributions to important topographical issues elsewhere on the Akropolis that influence the interpretation of the area surrounding the Erechtheion from the Archaic through Roman periods. How these developments affect the Erechtheion has not yet been dealt with holistically, at least in print. Papanikolaou led the most recent restoration of the Erechtheion and was the scholar most intimately familiar with all the issues surrounding the Erechtheion. Unfortunately he passed away (the very month this study was embarked upon) without having published his final analysis of the temple. Papanikolaou's notes and sketches are currently being edited by his former students. It is not yet clear when these will be published.

⁹ Holland 1924, pp. 1-23, 141-169.

preserved within the foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena. Spyridon Iakovides and Jens Bundgaard most recently assessed the evidence for the Bronze Age Akropolis, and their conclusions have met with mixed reviews.¹⁰

Iakovides identified the remains of several Bronze Age houses in the vicinity of the Erechtheion.¹¹ Habitation on the Middle Bronze Age citadel may have clustered in the area of the Erechtheion (despite the absence of domestic architecture), as evidenced by children's graves found on the citadel's north (near the Erechtheion) and west edges.¹²

A few LHI potsherds and scraps of a wall belonging to a room with a packed white-clay floor north of the Classical Erechtheion attest to habitation in the Late Bronze Age. This evidence comprises the first non-funerary architecture on the Akropolis, but there is no reason to identify it as a palatial structure, despite the proximity in time and space to the area associated with King Kekrops.¹³ These structures are modest for the Shaft Grave period. There is no architectural evidence dating to the LHII-LHIIIA on the Athenian Akropolis.

In LHIIIB, a cluster of five terraces 2-3 m high were constructed on the north side of the Akropolis to support a major structure in the center of the plateau (Figure 539 and Figure 624).¹⁴ Two of these parallel terraces run under the Classical Erechtheion and are

¹⁰ Iakovides 1962; Bundgaard 1976. For an overview of the Bronze Age Akropolis, see Hurwit 1999, pp. 67-84.

¹¹ Iakovides 1962, pp. 47-96.

¹² Hurwit 1999, p. 71. Infants and young children were often buried within the confines of Bronze Age houses.

¹³ The Parian Marble, I, dates the reign of Kekrops to 1581/0 BC; the Kekropeion, or Tomb of Kekrops is commonly recognized as the feature at the southwest corner of the Erechtheion.

¹⁴ For plans of this area in the Bronze Age, see Hurwit 1999, p. 69, fig. 48; Iakovides 1962, p. 75. Plato mentions the dwellings of the warriors as being located in the north part of the Akropolis (*Crit.* 112b): "And its outer parts, under its slopes, were inhabited by the craftsmen and by such of the husbandmen as had their farms close by; but on the topmost part only the military class by itself had its dwellings round about the temple of Athene and Hephaistos, surrounding themselves with a single ring-fence, which formed, as it were, the enclosure of a single dwelling. On the northward side of it they had established their

the remnants of the walls that Holland, and those who followed him in the early 20th century, interpreted as the court, forehall and shrine of the Bronze Age Palace.¹⁵ Among the foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena are the scanty remains taken to be palatial structures: a limestone column base (Figure 604) and steps for a monumental stairway leading up to the main terrace and to a megaron facing west.¹⁶

Based on the analogy of a similar complex at Mycenae and not on archaeological remains, Hurwit suggests that there may have been a cult center with altars and a shrine for an armed goddess, *a-ta-na-po-ti-ni-ja*, a priest's house, and a processional way.¹⁷ Moreover, Homer (*Od.* 7.79-81) implies that Athena resided in the “Hall of Erechtheus” (i.e., the Bronze Age palace) on the Akropolis. She may well have already been in the form of the olive wood statue that would become the focus of Athenian cult and the recipient of the sacred peplos presented at the Panathenaic Festival.

The dates of two rock-cut staircases on the north slope of the Akropolis, one at the northeast (Figure 626) and one at the northwest (Figure 625), are controversial, but most scholars see them as providing access to the Bronze Age citadel, in the vicinity of the Erechtheion. The northeast ascent was blocked off when the Cyclopean circuit wall was built late in LHIII B.¹⁸ The main access to the Akropolis was now, as later, at the gently sloping west end.¹⁹

public dwellings and winter mess-rooms, and all the arrangements in the way of buildings which were required for the community life,” (Trans. Fowler).

¹⁵ Holland 1924; Paton et al. 1927; Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*; Hawes 1936; Elderkin 1912; Elderkin 1941; Dörpfeld and Schleich 1942.

¹⁶ Hurwit 1999, pp. 72-74.

¹⁷ Hurwit 1999, p. 74.

¹⁸ That is, after the main walls at Tiryns and Mycenae were built, but around the same time that the walls of these other major citadels were extended.

¹⁹ On the early phases of the Propylaia, see Dinsmoor Jr. 1980; and Dinsmoor and Dinsmoor Jr. 2004.

Also important to any up-to-date discussion of the Erechtheion is the Mycenaean (late LHIIIB) well on the northwest slope of the Akropolis (Figure 627) because it features prominently in one of the theories about the location of the cult of Erechtheus that will be discussed below.²⁰ As at Mycenae, provisions were made to ensure access to drinking water from within the citadel in order to defend against siege. This natural, 30 m deep cleft in the rock has cuttings in its sides which supported wooden planks to form a stairway for the first two of eight flights of stairs, and schist slabs for the lower six flights.²¹ From the lowest flight, water vessels were lowered into a shaft at least 8 m deep which filled naturally with water seeping out of the limestone. For all its ingenuity, the well was not a success. Access to its watery depths lasted no longer than a generation according to the pottery found below the level of the collapsed staircase that put the well out of use. During LHIIIC, the well was used as a rubbish dump.

Although short-lived, the palace-complex on the Akropolis, complete with Cyclopean walls, bastion, hidden well and terraces could well have been “remembered in the Homeric tradition as the ‘strong-built house of Erechtheus.’”²² Erechtheus was the King of Athens who fought Eumolpos of Eleusis during the mythical past of the Athenians, and was already the stuff of legend for Homer when Menestheus was king of Athens and sent fifty ships to Troy.

According to Thucydides (1.12), it was less than a century after the fall of Troy that the Dorians attacked the Peloponnese. Athenian myth boasts that their citadel was

²⁰ On the discovery of the well, see Broneer 1939. On the well’s potential significance in the Archaic through Roman periods, see Jeppesen 1987. Plato refers to a spring which was destroyed during the earthquakes of that time (*Crit.* 112c-d): “And near the place of the present Akropolis there was one spring-- which was choked up by the earthquakes so that but small tricklings of it are now left round about; but to the men of that time it afforded a plentiful stream for them all, being well tempered both for winter and summer,” (Trans. Fowler).

²¹ Broneer 1939.

²² Hurwit 1999, p. 79.

never destroyed by invaders, and moreover that the inhabitants of Pylos took refuge at Athens after their palace fell. Athens, nonetheless, could not survive the collapse of Mycenaean society on its own, and so the citadel eventually declined as well. Tombs reappeared inside the Akropolis for the first time in LHIIIC since the Middle Helladic period.²³

In sum, in the vicinity of the Erechtheion, there is evidence for domestic habitation in the Middle Bronze Age, and for sophisticated terracing to support a structure, likely the palace, located on the site of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias, during the Late Bronze Age.

ARCHAIC AND EARLY CLASSICAL PERIOD

The archaeology of the area under the Classical Erechtheion is poorly understood for the Archaic and Early Classical periods. By carefully sifting through the evidence, Holland discerned what features were in place before others were added.²⁴ He also examined the “negatives” of the blocks of the Classical Erechtheion in order to reconstruct the structures that predated it.

Vastly different reconstructions for the area around the Erechtheion have been proposed based on the very limited available evidence for the Archaic period. These reconstructions are usually without reference to the extremely problematic period between the Persian Wars and the construction of the Classical Erechtheion at the end of the 5th century.²⁵ Orlandos, for example, reconstructed an obliquely oriented hexastyle amphiprostyle temple which encompasses the “trident marks” of Poseidon in its pronaos

²³ Hurwit 1999, p. 84.

²⁴ Holland 1924, pp. 1-23, 402-425.

²⁵ This evidence is very disjointed and elusive. For the fullest description, see Holland 1927, pp. 402-425.

for the Archaic period.²⁶ Other scholars restore a series of temene loosely aligned with the Archaic Temple of Athena. For example, the reconstruction in the Akropolis Study Center includes an enclosure facing east (in the east half of the later temple) with an open plaza to the north (Figure 568).²⁷ To the west of this enclosure are two small west-facing buildings side-by-side, in front of which stands a huge Ionic column. There is little to no tangible evidence to support this reconstruction.²⁸ Other scholars extrapolate freely on the evidence for the simple, low eastern temenos and reconstruct a full-fledged tetrastyle naiskos for Athena Polias.²⁹ Nonetheless, subsequent scholars build on this theory and propose that the Archaic pediments such as Herakles' introduction to Olympos and the Olive Tree Pediment belong to these structures (Figure 620).³⁰

The area to the south of the Classical Erechtheion was the location of an important temple, probably from the early 6th century. Referred to by Paton et al. as the Hekatompedon, and often neutrally referred to as the Dörpfeld Foundations Temple, this temple is now generally accepted to be the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias.³¹

The Archaic temple of Athena Polias was a hexastyle, peripteral, distyle *in antis* temple with chambers facing east and west. The smaller east chamber had an internal

²⁶ Orlandos 1977, p. 4.

²⁷ The preliminary results of Papanikolaou's study are on display in the Akropolis Study Center. His reconstruction follows Holland's 1924 reconstruction of the enclosure preserved in the east foundations of the Classical Erechtheion. Holland is also loosely followed in the three-dimensional models of the area around the Erechtheion in the Archaic period created in consultation with Korres and Tasos Tanoulas (Figure 568).

²⁸ Backward extrapolation from the commonly reproduced restoration of the interior by Paton et al. 1927, pl. 1, appears to be the sole justification for this arrangement. See below "Reconstruction of the Interior of the Main Building" for the argument against this restoration for the Classical temple interior.

²⁹ For what should be a low, open temenos but is elaborated into a naiskos for Athena Polias, see Hurwit 1999, p. 145. See below "Interpreting Diploun... Oikema" for a discussion of the pre-Ionic temple structures under the east half of the Classical Erechtheion.

³⁰ Robertson 1996, pp. 35-36.

³¹ This is the *archaios neos* of the Archaic period. This term accompanied the olive wood statue of Athena when she was moved to the main chamber of the Ionic temple in the late 5th century. On this problematic term, see Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 308-312, and Chapter I.

colonnade of three Doric columns on either side of the central space, and almost certainly housed the olive wood cult statue of Athena Polias during the Archaic period. The larger, western part of the temple was composed of three rooms behind a distyle *in antis* back porch: an ante-room leading into two rooms, side-by-side. This west, or back, part of the Archaic temple almost certainly survived the Persian destruction and continued to house the treasures of Athena and the “Other Gods” under the rubric of “Opisthodomos.”³²

The construction phases of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias are of lesser concern here than the relationship between this temple and the area of the Erechtheion.³³ One such relationship is that between the foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias (essentially a terrace wall as it now stands) and the cults below and to the north (Figure 606). Korres reinvestigated the varied treatment of the north face of the foundations and asked: “To what extent were the foundations visible in Antiquity?”³⁴ He assumed that treated surfaces would be visible, that the untreated surfaces were concealed in some way, and that any treatment would have been concurrent with the assembly of the terrace. Table 1 summarizes Korres’ observations, beginning from the east end of the foundations:

³² The survival and use of the Opisthodomos will be discussed in detail later in this chapter and Chapter IV. In general on this topic, see Harris 1995, and most recently on the survival of the Opisthodomos into the Roman times, see Ferrari 2002. On the survival of the Opisthodomos, Korres agrees with Dörpfeld that the Opisthodomos, was “preserved for decades, or even centuries, despite the fact that it stood at a very short distance from the Caryatids”: Korres 1994c, pp. 146-147.

³³ Dörpfeld and Theodor Wiegand believed that the core of the temple was built in the early 6th century, that is, before the peripteros was added by Peisistratos: Dörpfeld 1897 and Wiegand 1904. Dinsmoor dismissed this view and argued for a holistic execution of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias while transferring the label “Hekatompedon” (and the associated Bluebeard and Herakles pediments) to the site of the Parthenon: Dinsmoor 1950, pp. 71-72. Plommer, on the other hand, assigned the whole temple to the early 6th century, and attributed to the Peisistratids the substitution of the marble pedimental sculpture of the Gigantomachy: Plommer 1960, pp. 127-159. Hurwit summarizes the evidence and theories: Hurwit 1999, pp. 106-112.

³⁴ Korres 1997, p. 101.

Table 1. Summary of Korres' Observations Concerning the North Face of the Foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias.

Segment ³⁵	Location	Description
1-2	South of the east part of the Erechtheion	The blocks are roughly hewn and untreated. This section is covered up by the poros section of the South Wall of the Erechtheion.
2-3	South of the middle part of the Erechtheion	The blocks have been trimmed because of the structural separation of the corresponding part of the Erechtheion. The cuttings must precede the construction of the Erechtheion because the direction of the cutting is parallel neither to the Archaic Temple nor the Classical Erechtheion. ³⁶
5	Under the sixth column from the east of the Archaic Temple (Figure 303 and Figure 304)	The foundations are recessed and vertical. Two blocks have been dressed with a pointed chisel. These blocks are among the most finely tooled of Archaic Temple's terrace wall aside from section 2-3 and the northwest corner.
4, 6-7	4 is visible under the Maiden Porch (Figure 303 and Figure 304); 6-7 are visible just west of the Kekropeion (Figure 606)	The foundations widen as they descend, except for the lowest course which is set back. The stones have large gaps between them except for the stereobate (and now missing stylobate). This suggests that for this section of the terrace wall, a foundation trench was dug that narrowed slightly toward the bottom, and then the foundations were laid. The untrimmed north face of this section terrace wall was never intended for display.
7-11	West third of the foundations of the Archaic Temple	The three bottom courses, and up to courses four and five, are built of smaller, irregular blocks. Korres characterizes this phenomenon as being "directly related to a systematic irregularity in the thickness of the foundations: being narrow at the bottom, it widens steadily" ³⁷ toward the middle, and becomes narrow again toward the top. Korres explains that the lower half of the foundations was originally built into a trench dug into hard soil "in which the blocks of each course completely fill the entire trench." ³⁸

What does this mean for the reconstruction of this area, at least in the Archaic period? The degree to which the foundations of the Archaic Temple were exposed

³⁵ For the key to the segments, see Korres 1997, p. 101, fig. 10.

³⁶ Korres concurs with Dörpfeld and Schleif 1942, p. 27; Holland 1924, p. 15; and Bundgaard 1976, p. 85, note 212.

³⁷ Korres 1997, p. 102.

³⁸ Korres 1997, p. 102. Michael Djordjevitch, however, disagrees, and doubts the foundations of the Archaic Temple were ever exposed, even the top few courses, because there are spaces between the joints of all the blocks except for the top course of the foundations, or *euthyneria*: Djordjevitch (pers. comm.).

impacted on the ground levels and reconstruction of the Pandroseion and the Kekropeion immediately west of the Classical Erechtheion.

It appears that the foundations of the west half of the Archaic Temple were sunk into deep soil, down to the bedrock. This soil was not removed until at least after the Persian War and the construction of the L-shaped Ionic stoa of the early-Classical Pandroseion.

The goal of Korres' re-examination of the terrace wall of the Archaic Temple was to argue for the placement of a columnar monument to mark the Kekropeion. There are cuttings in the bedrock about a meter west of the void under the Maiden Porch and in alignment with the Archaic Temple. Korres conjectures that after the Archaic Temple was built, a monument on a strong square foundation of about 2 m x 2 m was constructed. On this tall base, he places a huge Ionic column surmounted by a sphinx adjacent to the mound representing Kekrops' tomb (later largely under the Maiden Porch).³⁹ Korres has identified two fragments of a huge Archaic Ionic capital, one fragment of which is now lying just east of the Erechtheion (Figure 622). The other fragment is known only from early photographs and has since been lost.⁴⁰ Korres argues that this Ionic column was destroyed by the Persians in 480 B.C. and subsequently ritually disposed of along with other destroyed monuments and statuary.⁴¹ According to Herodotos (8.55), the sacred

³⁹ This arrangement of Archaic temple and columnar sphinx monument is paralleled at Delphi. The Naxian sphinx was also placed on an Ionic column half way along the long, north side of the Archaic Temple of Apollo, and at a lower level. The function of the Naxian sphinx monument is debatable, but likely funerary: *École française d'Athènes* 1991, pp. 144-146.

⁴⁰ Korres 1997, p. 99.

⁴¹ Korres 1997, p. 104. Korres argues that, at some point in time between the Persian destruction and the construction of the Erechtheion at the end of the 5th century, a replacement monument was erected on top of the mound, restored by him as a tall stele, based on contemporary funerary monuments. The replacement of this monument is necessary, he argues, in order to explain the bosses left on the west side of the south anta of the West Façade. As argued below in "Function of the Maiden Porch and the Identity of the

olive tree of Athena was burned at this time, although recovery was swift as it grew a new shoot a cubit long overnight.⁴² Herodotos also records that the precinct in which the olive tree was located (that of Erechtheus in the Archaic period) was also destroyed by the Persians.⁴³ It is important to note that this account implies that Athena's ancient (and therefore huge) olive tree was not completely burned down by this event. Its foliage and several smaller branches may have been burned away, but its massive trunk and major branches would have survived the conflagration.

In the Early Classical period, the area under the late 5th century Erechtheion included a low temenos (perhaps originally of Archaic date, repaired after the Persian destruction, and later incorporated into the east foundations at course 18 and preserved in the Classical temple: Figure 568); a wall under the North Wall and the paving of the North Terrace.⁴⁴ Herodotos (8.55), visiting Athens in the mid 5th century, says the olive tree and *thalassa* of Poseidon were in the *neos* of Erechtheus. As argued below, the *thalassa* was probably enclosed in this low temenos and the precinct of Erechtheus was in its immediate vicinity.⁴⁵ The olive tree was located to the west of this precinct.

Maidens,” this uneven treatment of the south anta is better explained by the presence of the sacred olive tree of Athena.

⁴² Other ancient sources follow Herodotos' anecdote about the burning and recovery of the olive tree, such as Pausanias 1.27.2.

⁴³ On the olive tree in the precinct of Erechtheus, see below the discussion of Robertson's allocation of cults in “Alternative Locations for the Cults of Athena Polias and Erechtheus.”

⁴⁴ The function of this temenos is debatable. See below “Interpreting Diploun... Oikema” and “Conclusion: A New Restoration of the Erechtheion in the Classical Period” for the argument that this temenos enclosed the salt-sea of Poseidon. There appear to have been some obliquely oriented structures from both the Bronze Age and/or the Archaic period under the middle and west parts of the main building (Figure 484). For the anomalies in the east foundations, see Holland 1924 and Paton et al. 1927, pp. 5-15. The wall under the North Wall was incorporated into the Classical Erechtheion. This wall and the temenos are the structures that appear to have been in the closest alignment with the Classical temple. The reason for the strange orientation of the Classical temple (it does not align with the Archaic Temple of Athena, the Parthenon or the Propylaia) has never been resolved. Perhaps these structures are the best clues for future discussions on this topic.

⁴⁵ See below “Conclusion: A New Restoration of the Erechtheion in the Classical Period.”

To the north was a paved terrace, probably with a seating area. The Pandroseion was paved with marble and defined architecturally by a small L-shaped stoa (Figure 569 and Figure 313). The Pandroseion was built on an oblique angle to the Archaic Temple of Athena (and the later Classical Erechtheion). The Kekropeion was perhaps enclosed by a simple temenos wall as well.⁴⁶ Between the end of the Persian War and the completion of the roof of the Classical Erechtheion, the cult statue of Athena Polias probably resided in a temporarily refurbished shelter in the east cella of the Archaic Temple of Athena.⁴⁷

The above summary of the state of the environs of the Erechtheion before the late 5th century is only tentative because of the dearth of evidence. Further research is necessary, especially into the changing orientation of the successive phases prior to the construction of the Classical Erechtheion. Prior to the construction of the Classical Erechtheion, there appears to be evidence for an L-shaped stoa for the Pandroseion at the west, a temenos formed by a low wall in to the east, a large monument marking Kekrops' tomb, and an olive tree in the middle.

GENERAL TRENDS IN THE SCHOLARSHIP: LOOKING AT THE ERECHTHEION AS A WHOLE

THE CANONICAL INTERPRETATION OF THE CLASSICAL ERECHTHEION: PATON ET AL.

There is no such thing as a general description, interpretation and reconstruction of the Erechtheion. “The facts” as outlined at the end of Chapter I are the only general

⁴⁶ On the reconstruction of the pre-existing Kekropeion temenos when the Classical Erechtheion was built, see Stevens 1946, pp. 93-97. See below “Function of the Maiden Porch and the Identity of the Maidens” for an argument that attributes a significant portion of the markings on the West Façade instead to the olive tree of Athena.

⁴⁷ Korres 1994c.

statements that can safely be made with respect to this building, and these leave any student of ancient architecture and/or religion distinctly unsatisfied. Most scholars, especially English-speaking ones, who include a discussion of the Erechtheion as a part of their work base their interpretation on Paton et al. 1927 with a few minor modifications.

The canonical interpretation is that the Ionic temple north of the Parthenon is the Erechtheion. Construction began during the Peace of Nikias in 421 and finished, after interruptions, in 406/5 B.C. The architect was Mnesikles, designer of the Propylaea. The temple was divided into several parts: the east chamber was the cella of Athena and sits 3 m higher than the floor level in the western chambers. The west half of the temple was, in turn, divided into three further chambers, in imitation of the Opisthodomos of the Archaic Temple of Athena.⁴⁸ Poseidon-Erechtheus, Hephaistos and Boutes had their altars in the two central chambers and the “well” of Poseidon was located in the southwest corner of the main building.⁴⁹ The hole in the ceiling of the North Porch preserved the route traveled by Zeus’ thunderbolt. The thunder strike is commemorated by the indentations in the bedrock left exposed almost directly below.⁵⁰

The area to the west of the Erechtheion was the Pandroseion, within which were the olive tree of Athena and the altar of Zeus Herkeios. The tomb of Kekrops was a mound of earth at and below the south corner of the West Façade. Several bosses were

⁴⁸ The foundations south of the Erechtheion were considered to be the Hekatompedon by Paton et al. but are now generally acknowledged to be the Archaic Temple of Athena, following Dörpfeld’s extensive scholarship on the subject. The Hekatompedon is now generally considered to be an antecedent of the Parthenon. On this terminology, see Korres 1994c.

⁴⁹ Paton et al. 1927, pl. 1.

⁵⁰ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 490-491. Most descriptions of the Erechtheion refer to the curiosities in the North Porch mentioned above, but most neglect the Altar of Thyechoos which stood above the marks in the bedrock (described in detail in the building inscriptions), but which went unmentioned by Pausanias. Provisions for the various animals (snake and doves) in residence in the Erechtheion are usually overlooked.

left on the south anta of the West Façade because some monument related to the Kekropeion prevented the masons from removing them.

There is no canonical interpretation of the Maiden Porch. Paton et al., in their summary of the purpose of the Erechtheion, do not assign a function to the Maiden Porch.⁵¹ The maidens themselves were not well understood in 1927 because it was unknown at that time that they held phialai.⁵² It is important to distinguish between the identity and significance of the maidens and the function of the porch itself. Since 1927, many interpretations have been set forth and these will be examined below.

Much has been written on various aspects of the Erechtheion since 1927, but few of these ideas have made it into the mainstream scholarship. Jeff Hurwit, author of *The Athenian Acropolis*, the standard text for students of Classical archaeology, acknowledges these new ideas, but he returns to the “canonical” interpretation in the end because it remains the best argued and most often reproduced.⁵³

Several issues rarely discussed in the general scholarship are introduced here to create a context for the reader before the problems surrounding them are discussed in detail in the following sections. The Erechtheion not only has a strange layout, but it also contains many strange features. These oddities include the Niche in the southwest corner of the main building and the underground passageway from the North Porch into the central chamber.⁵⁴ Other peculiarities include the evidence for a change in plan, such as the eastward transposition of the West Façade which created the Westward Projection of the North Porch; the blocks of different sizes in the podium of the Maiden Porch; the

⁵¹ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 456-459.

⁵² The Tivoli maidens holding *phialai* were only discovered in 1952. See Chapter IV.

⁵³ Hurwit 1999, pp. 200-209.

⁵⁴ For a description of the Niche, see Paton et al. 1927, pp. 171-175. On the underground passage, see Paton et al. 1927, pp. 104-110; Holland and McAllister 1958.

asymmetrical axes of the North, South and West Doors; and the plurality of phases of the West Cross-Wall. When the strangeness of the Erechtheion is noted, scholars usually attribute “its irregularities in plan” to “pre-existing cult-monuments and ritual areas which were incorporated into the later building”⁵⁵ rather than interpreting these peculiarities as changes to the plan during the course of construction as part of a negotiated process of preserving the pre-existing relics.

ALTERNATIVE LOCATIONS FOR THE CULTS OF ATHENA POLIAS AND ERECHTHEUS: TRAVLOS, JEPPESEN, MANSFIELD, ROBERTSON AND FERRARI

Paton et al.’s interpretation of the Erechtheion stood unchallenged in print until John Travlos reconsidered the evidence and suggested an alternative organization of the cults and reconstruction of the interior. Other scholars soon followed Travlos in trying to debunk the “canonical” interpretation, with varying degrees of acceptance within the scholarly community. While none of their theories is entirely satisfying, their reassessment of the evidence and introduction of additional, potentially relevant evidence is thought-provoking and inspiring of new ways of looking at the problem surrounding the Classical Ionic temple.⁵⁶ The main contributors on the location of the cults of Athena and Erechtheus, besides Travlos, are Kristian Jeppesen, John Mansfield, Noel Robertson and Gloria Ferrari. Their theories are summarized and assessed below.

Travlos argued that the olive wood statue of Athena Polias was located in the western half of the Ionic temple and the altars of Poseidon-Erechtheus, Hephaistos and

⁵⁵ Mansfield 1985, p. 200.

⁵⁶ The more neutral term “Ionic temple” is substituted for “Erechtheion” in this section for clarity’s sake because of the controversy surrounding the location of the cults of Athena and Erechtheus.

Boutes were in the east half.⁵⁷ This reconstruction is based primarily on Pausanias' route, the monumentality of the North Porch being best associated with Athena Polias, and Philochoros' story of the dog jumping from the temple of Athena Polias into the Pandroseion.⁵⁸ For Travlos, Pausanias' διπλοῦν...οἴκημα for the Erechtheion is the division of the building into two halves, east and west, rather than two rooms side-by-side in the west chamber, as concluded by Paton et al. Where there are strange markings on the walls in the western chamber, i.e., for the West Cross-Wall, Travlos reconstructed an adyton for the tomb of Erechtheus to be closed off by two of the double-leafed stone doors mentioned in the building accounts. He placed the cult statue of Athena Polias in another adyton backing onto the so-called East Cross-Wall.

One problem with Travlos' theory is that he places the "well" of Poseidon in the west, thus separating it from his altar.⁵⁹ Secondly, the markings on the interior of the North Wall do not correspond in any way to the adyton he reconstructed over the underground passage. Also, there is no evidence for an East Cross-Wall (see below) and Athena must have faced east according to evidence derived from Dio Cassius (54.7.1-4). Travlos also omits the West Cross-Wall for which there is substantial evidence in the form of massive foundations. As Overbeck pointed out, Travlos does not present a holistic assessment of all facets of the building such as the anomalies or cite any new literary or archaeological evidence.⁶⁰ Otherwise, Travlos' general allocation of Erechtheus to the east chamber and Athena to the west chamber (owing to the monumentality and orientation of the North Porch and Pausanias) is appealing.

⁵⁷ Travlos 1971.

⁵⁸ Travlos 1971, p. 83. See Appendix A for the literary evidence.

⁵⁹ For a point-by-point rebuttal of Travlos' theory, see Overbeck 1972. Overbeck defended Paton et al.'s reconstruction of the Erechtheion.

⁶⁰ Overbeck 1972, p. 127.

Kristian Jeppesen is the first scholar to attempt a wholesale re-examination of the location of the cults of Erechtheus and Athena Polias since 1927.⁶¹ Jeppesen argues that the altars of Poseidon-Erechtheus, Hephaistos and Boutes were located in the so-called House of the Arrhephoroi northwest of the Ionic temple and the “well” of Poseidon was the Mycenaean well excavated by Broneer in the 1930s.⁶² He allocates the entire Ionic temple to Athena Polias.

While the prospect of associating the Mycenaean well with the trident mark of Poseidon is appealing, Jeppesen’s theory denies the close topographical association of the cults of Athena and Erechtheus.⁶³ It also requires Pausanias to take a very convoluted route, namely to progress from the south side of the Parthenon to the Mycenaean well on the north side of the Akropolis, and then back to the Ionic temple.

Jeppesen highlights some valuable evidence to correct the common conflation of Erechtheus and Erichthonios, namely, a late 5th century Attic red-figured krater in Schloss Fasanerie attributed to the Kekrops painter.⁶⁴ The obverse of this vase appears to illustrate the topography of the Akropolis and the foundation myths of the Pandroseion, Kekropeion, and the “Erichthoneion.” Three maidens, Pandrosos, Herse and Aglauros are depicted in the top left. Kekrops holds a phiale and a tiny lamb to sacrifice to the infant Erichthonios hidden in the basket in the middle of the scene. Above the basket is

⁶¹ Jeppesen 1987. See also the preliminary publication of his theory: Jeppesen 1979.

⁶² On the Mycenaean well, see Broneer 1939.

⁶³ Jeppesen insists that φρέαρ, the term Pausanias uses to describe the water source, “would *a priori* exclude that an isolated cistern in the form of a natural cavity in the surface of the rock could have been meant”: Jeppesen 1987, pp. 12-13. This is incorrect since the common use of φρέαρ refers not to a natural well or spring, but to an artificial well, cistern, reservoir or tank: *LSJ*, 1996, s.v. φρέαρ. Herodotos (8.55) calls it a θάλασσα or “salt-sea”. Again, this is different from a well or spring. Also, Jeppesen has no explanation for how the “building is double.” He ignores this phrase because of the preceding lacuna in the earliest manuscript of Pausanias.

⁶⁴ *CVA*, Deutschland 11 [1956], pls. 46-48. Jeppesen 1987, pp. 46-47. Most recently on the difference between Erechtheus and Erichthonios, see J. Shear 2001, pp. 55-60. Also important on this topic is Kron 1976, pp. 37-39.

the olive tree. Athena Polias is at the right with her hand extended with a phiale.⁶⁵

Hephaistos reclines (with his lame foot hidden). Hermes tells him the news of his son's birth and a winged figure crowns him as Erichthonios' father. Erechtheus and Poseidon are seated at the bottom and receive the news of the marvelous birth of Erichthonios.⁶⁶

This is excellent evidence that Erechtheus and Erichthonios are different characters with different cults and mythological associations.⁶⁷

In 1996, Noel Robertson contributed a chapter on Athena's shrines and festivals to Jenifer Neils' thought-provoking volume *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia & Parthenon*.⁶⁸ Robertson's scenario for the location of cults on the Akropolis is as follows: the Ionic temple was the location of the Temple of Athena Polias from the earliest times; the Dörpfeld Foundations (Archaic Temple of Athena Polias in this study) was the Hekatompedon; and the shrine of Erechtheus was in the southeast corner of the Akropolis in "Building IV", the area traditionally associated with the Heroön of Pandion.⁶⁹

In order to rationalize his scenario, Robertson argues for the existence of two olive trees of Athena (one in the Pandroseion west of the Ionic temple and one in the precinct of Erechtheus) because Herodotos mentions the olive as being in the shrine of Erechtheus and all other (later) sources place it in the Pandroseion.⁷⁰ Robertson's lack of diachronic approach fails to appreciate the change in topography of the Akropolis in the

⁶⁵ Behind her is another Athena: Athena Nike.

⁶⁶ That Erichthonios' birth precedes the reign of Erechtheus is not a problem for the vase painter who is trying to depict the topography of the Akropolis' cults.

⁶⁷ The reverse of the vase is a looser composition with Apollo with a laurel tree, a seated Athena holding a small, egg-shaped object, and a large winged female leaning on Athena's shield. Herakles is about to hit a bull with his club, and a Nike figure about to crown Herakles. An elegant matron stands at the left.

⁶⁸ Neils 1996.

⁶⁹ Robertson 1996.

⁷⁰ Robertson 1996, pp. 42-44.

period between the Persian War and the construction of the Ionic temple. Herodotos is almost certainly referring to the state of the Akropolis in the middle of the 5th century, that is, before the Ionic temple was built.⁷¹ He explains Pausanias' description of the Erechtheion as being “double” by reconstructing an open air temenos and an indoor shrine despite the fact that the term διπλοῦν is never used in this way.⁷²

Despite certain flaws in this theory, Robertson makes several interesting suggestions. First, he reminds us of the important rites that took place in the Ionic temple, namely the cleansing and omen-taking ceremonies that focused on the cult statue of Athena Polias. Second, he suggests that the small, Archaic sculptured pediments now in the Akropolis Museum may belong to the buildings under the Erechtheion whose foundations have since been removed (and perhaps reused).⁷³ He also offers a new interpretation of “Thyechoos” as “the watcher of the burnt offering,”⁷⁴ and associates the strangely shaped oinochoai with molded breasts made in 410 B.C., disposed of around

⁷¹ At this point in time, the shrine of Erechtheus was north of the Archaic Temple of Athena, down at a low level, to the east of the Pandroseion. In the middle of the 5th century, the olive tree would have stood between the two sanctuaries, and Herodotos mentioned the more famous and important of the two when he described the location of the olive tree. After the Ionic temple was built and the altars of Erechtheus et al. enclosed within the east half of the building, the olive tree was in closer proximity to the Pandroseion, located as it was, west of the West Façade. On the background for this arrangement, see above “Archaic and Early Classical Period” and below “Conclusion: A New Restoration of the Erechtheion in the Classical Period.”

⁷² Robertson 1996, pp. 38-39.

⁷³ Robertson 1996, pp. 34-36. These sculptures and architectural members are usually assigned to treasuries tentatively placed by most scholars in the area west of the Parthenon: see Hurwit 1999, pp. 111-116, fig. 83. Furthermore, the sculptural programs of these pediments are appropriate to this area, particularly the olive-tree pediment (Figure 620). The high degree of reconstruction of this pediment as displayed is acknowledged, but the basic elements of the composition, namely a kore with an upraised arm and head-cushion (a *hydriaphoros* or *diphrophoros*), a building (temple?), and the olive tree, are undeniable. Others have seen this scene as the Achilles' ambush of Troilos at the fountain house. On the olive-tree pediment, see Hurwit 1999, pp. 113-115. According to Robertson, this scene depicts the cleansing festival. See above “Archaic and Early Classical Period.”

⁷⁴ Robertson 1996, pp. 32-33.

200 B.C., and found near the Klepsydra with the inauguration of the temple and celebration of the cleansing festival.⁷⁵

Mansfield follows Jeppesen and Robertson in believing that the cults of Erechtheus resided in a different building and that the Ionic temple only housed the cult of Athena Polias.⁷⁶ Mansfield, however, suggests that the Erechtheion was in the area traditionally identified with the sanctuary of Zeus Polieus and interprets the cuttings for posts (there are about fifty) as the marks of Poseidon's trident.⁷⁷

Ferrari took a different tack altogether with her allocation of cults in her 2002 *AJA* article, "The Ancient Temple on the Acropolis at Athens."⁷⁸ While she helpfully reviews the evidence for the long survival of the Opisthodomos, she also reasserts Dörpfeld's suggestion that the east half of the Archaic Temple of Athena continued to stand as part of a "choreography of ruins" in commemoration of the Persian destruction.⁷⁹ In order to do so, Ferrari asserts that the contexts of the findspots of the superstructure of the Archaic Temple are all late, many of them dating to the Late Antique period.⁸⁰

Ferrari argues that the whole Ionic temple belonged to the cults of Erechtheus-Poseidon, Hephaistos and Boutes (without being specific about their arrangement within it), and that the cult of Athena Polias remained where it had always been in the east chamber of the Archaic Temple of Athena. This theory requires both the survival of the majority of the Archaic temple (including the peripteros) and the interpretation of the phrase in the heading of the Chandler Stele, "the temple in which the ancient statue is," as

⁷⁵ Robertson 1996, p. 34. On these oinochoai, see below "A Series of Special Ritual Vessels."

⁷⁶ Mansfield 1985, p. 198.

⁷⁷ Mansfield 1985, pp. 245-246.

⁷⁸ Ferrari 2002.

⁷⁹ On Dörpfeld's discovery of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias, see Dörpfeld 1897 and Travlos 1971, pp. 143-147, with bibliography.

⁸⁰ Ferrari 2002, pp. 22-24.

referring not to the ancient statue of Athena Polias, but to some unknown statue of Erechtheus.⁸¹ She also reassigns the second half of this inscription to repairs to the Archaic Temple of Athena.⁸²

There are several problems with her theory:⁸³

1. It assumes that the Oath of Plataia would have been broken if the Ionic temple had been built for Athena Polias, and the Oath was not broken because the 4th century orators were able to refer to it as if it were still intact.⁸⁴
2. The theory does not account for the significant volume of material (including column drums, cut in half with the flat, rectangular side oriented outward and the entablature and capitals oriented with their abacus toward the north) in the North Akropolis wall that once belonged to the Archaic Temple of Athena (Figure 607). This material was placed in the wall by Themistokles.⁸⁵
3. The phrase in the Chandler Stele to the “temple in which the ancient image is” must refer to the statue of Athena Polias, the only statue on the Akropolis which needed no further description. There are no ancient references to a statue of Erechtheus in the Erechtheion.

⁸¹ Ferrari 2002, pp. 17-18, 21. The Chandler Stele is now in the British Museum and records the report by the commissioners on the state of the Ionic temple in 409/8 (Figure 529). A full transcription of the Chandler Stele (Inscr. I-VII, the largest fragment being Inscr. II) is in Paton et al. 1927, pp. 280-321.

⁸² This would have patently violated the Oath of Plataia which she argues elsewhere was upheld so that the 4th century orators could refer to it as an example of Athens' integrity: Ferrari 2002, p. 14.

⁸³ A point-by-point rebuttal of Ferrari's argument was composed by Kevin Glowacki and Judith Binder: Glowacki and Binder Unpublished. J. Binder kindly provided me with a copy of this document. Many of these observations are, however, the author's own.

⁸⁴ Ferrari 2002, p. 14. The existence and validity of the Oath of Plataia is a separate controversy. The construction of the new Ionic temple was not technically a “rebuilding” of the old temple as it was located elsewhere. That this oath was indeed sworn and abided by is well argued by T. L. Shear 1966.

⁸⁵ Korres 2002b.

4. It is argued that the contexts for the dispersed elements of the Archaic Temple are later than the 5th century, but almost all of the reused architectural fragments of the Archaic Temple can be comfortably dated to 5th century B.C. contexts.
5. The bronze lamp inscribed to Athena found near the West Cross-Wall in the Erechtheion is overlooked.⁸⁶
6. Vitruvius' (4.8.4) identification of the Ionic temple as the Temple of Athena is also overlooked.⁸⁷
7. Ferrari's scenario (helpfully illustrated with models) almost completely blocks off all view of the Maiden Porch except for a window of appearance between the backs of the Opisthodomos and the restored east cella of the Archaic Temple of Athena.⁸⁸
8. The east cella of the Archaic Temple as restored by Ferrari in the text (but not in plan) would have been impossibly shallow (Figure 552).

In sum, Ferrari's theory that Athena always resided in the east cella of the Archaic Temple is not feasible. While the surviving portion of the east cella of the Archaic Temple of Athena was probably reused temporarily to house the statue of Athena Polias after her return from Salamis after the end of the Persian Wars, she was more likely housed in the Ionic temple from the late 5th century onward.⁸⁹

⁸⁶ Paton et al. 1927, p. 572: *IG I³ 549*.

⁸⁷ See below "North Porch as the Entrance to the Temple of Athena Polias."

⁸⁸ While this would, if true, explain why Pausanias does not mention the Maiden Porch, architecturally, it is an unlikely situation.

⁸⁹ The removal of the statue of Athena Polias to Salamis is inferred from the episode recounted in Plutarch, *Them.* 10.

The attempts by the aforementioned scholars to relocate the cults of Erechtheus and Athena Polias are important contributions to the study of the Ionic temple because they demonstrate both the multi-valence of, and the gaps in, the existing evidence, while also encouraging its re-evaluation. This author’s allocation of cults is set out below in the conclusion of this chapter.

ORIGINAL PLAN: DÖRPFELD, DINSMOOR, ELDERKIN AND HAWES

The study of the Erechtheion in the early 20th century tended to focus on the search for the temple’s original, symmetrical plan. While Paton et al. acknowledged changes to the plan of the Erechtheion, they did not propose a holistic theory that reconstructed a hypothetical original plan.⁹⁰ The most ambitious scenario for an original plan was proposed by Dörpfeld.⁹¹ William Dinsmoor Sr., George Elderkin, and Harriet Boyd Hawes also put their minds to the task and proposed highly complex scenarios to explain how the building ended up looking as it does.⁹² Although the question of an “original plan” for the building relates to issues of the development of the Ionic order, and Greek design principles and processes, it is generally avoided in recent scholarship. Historiographically, this search for a symmetrical, original plan may be attributable to the early presumption that the acutely rational Greeks could never have designed a building like the Erechtheion on purpose; however, there is modern relevance in the question of an original plan.

⁹⁰ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 167-169.

⁹¹ Dörpfeld’s final publication on the original plan was posthumous: Dörpfeld and Schleif 1942. Preliminary publications include: Dörpfeld 1903; Dörpfeld 1904; Dörpfeld 1921. Dörpfeld demonstrated a veritable obsession with finding a symmetrical original plan over the course of his four decades. First formulated before the turn of the last century, his vision was realized in full scale in Nashville for the Tennessee Centennial Exhibition of 1897, as the fair’s History Building – with a few minor logistical modifications such as enclosed porches – and situated in similar accordance to the Nashville Parthenon as the Erechtheion stands on the Akropolis, although rotated 90 degrees (Figure 694).

⁹² Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 314-326; Elderkin 1912, pp. 53-58; Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*.

Any real interpretation of the Erechtheion must take into account not only the large-scale peculiarities, such as the Westward Projection of the North Porch, the Niche, and the off-axis doorways, but also the more subtle irregularities in the design and treatment of the foundations, walls, and porches. This section will review the main theories for the original plan of the Erechtheion and point out the main factors that must be taken into consideration when trying to reconstruct the circumstances under which the Erechtheion was built.⁹³

In Dörpfeld's version of the original plan, the existing east wing is duplicated on the west, resulting in a building that would have measured over 120 Attic feet and covered a vast amount of uneven terrain. In doing so, the originally planned temple would have incorporated an assortment of ancient shrines and tokens, and required the creation of high podia at both ends. Instead of walls on either side of the West Corridor that connect the two porches, a series of pillars were to have formed a low portico within a hypethral central space.⁹⁴

The impetus for Dörpfeld's search for an original plan for the Erechtheion may lie in his (supposed) discovery of Mnesikles' original plan for the Propylaea. Similar principles could be applied, he postulated: first, detect the unfinished features of the building, and then extrapolate. Despite the criticism he received from his contemporaries for his elaborate original plan, Dörpfeld stuck by the essence of his theories for the next forty years when they were finally published in full, posthumously, in 1942.⁹⁵

⁹³ The author's own scenario is laid out below in "Date."

⁹⁴ Dörpfeld and Schleif 1942.

⁹⁵ Weller 1921; Rodenwaldt 1921; Hill, *Review of Dörpfeld's Erechtheion*. Hill wrote a long diatribe attacking Dörpfeld's theory point-by-point, but it was never published. The manuscript is located in the ASCSA Archives: Bert Hodge Hill Papers, Subseries IV.2: Erechtheum, Box 19, fol. 2.

To another leading scholar of Akropolis topography, William Bell Dinsmoor Sr., it seemed “clear that this irregular scheme was not that which any architect could have desired, and that behind it must have been a much more logical plan. The awkward treatments of the north and south porches overlapping the west wall show a lack of study which would have been incredible in a finished design.”⁹⁶

Dinsmoor’s scheme for an original plan contrasts drastically with Dörpfeld’s proposal. He believed that the original scheme was simply a translation into marble of the inner building of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias, which the Erechtheion was intended to replace.⁹⁷ The site for the new marble temple moved directly to the north when it was decided that the west rooms of the Archaic Temple of Athena, i.e., the Opisthodomos, would continue serving as a treasury. The discrepancy in ground level by over 3 m of the new site, Dinsmoor argued, required the eastern colonnade to be shrunk in proportion and augmented in number to six columns, and the portico at the west enlarged in proportion and given two more columns behind the front four. This new plan would have obliterated the Kekropeion and the sacred olive tree of Athena.⁹⁸

Religious objection to such disregard for the ancient tokens, Dinsmoor suggested, resulted in the west porch being transferred to the north – echoing Vitruvius (4.8.4) on transverse temples – and the west wall moved 2 feet to the east. The Maiden Porch, which had not been a part of either of the two original designs, was added to balance the North Porch. Finally, a colonnade of four engaged columns was added to the West Façade at the same elevation as those at the east end.⁹⁹

⁹⁶ Dinsmoor 1950, p. 190.

⁹⁷ Dinsmoor 1932, p. 317.

⁹⁸ Dinsmoor 1932, p. 320.

⁹⁹ Dinsmoor 1932, p. 321.

Other published theories include Elderkin’s proposal which picks up on Dörpfeld’s scheme and postulates that the west wall “is the original west façade compressed into one plane and placed at the line up to which the architect was permitted to build.”¹⁰⁰ The central room was to be hypaethral for the salt sea and the olive tree, and the interior pilasters were designed to carry heavy cross-beams.¹⁰¹

At the same time that Dörpfeld, Dinsmoor and Elderkin were formulating and publishing their respective and widely differing theories concerning the original plan for the Erechtheion, Hawes devised an innovative approach to the problem by using the building accounts as the basis for her theory.¹⁰² For Hawes, the Erechtheion on the Athenian Akropolis was a building of “exquisite detail and preposterous plan.” “The Riddle of the Erechtheum,” as she titled her unpublished article, was a project she returned to for over thirty years where she argued for a symmetrical original plan for the Ionic Temple on the Akropolis.

Hawes was motivated to diminish the uncertainty concerning the various peculiar features of the Erechtheion “by discovering the original plan of the building and tracing its modifications, as they are revealed in the building itself and by the inscriptions.” Her approach was first to lay out her observations on the peculiarities in the plan of the

¹⁰⁰ Elderkin 1912, p. 56.

¹⁰¹ Elderkin 1912, pp. 52-58.

¹⁰² Better known as the first American archaeologist (not to mention the first woman) to excavate on Crete and for her ground-breaking work at Kavousi and Gournia, Hawes also made forays into problems of Classical antiquity. She sought solutions for what she considered to be the five riddles of Greek archaeology, namely the poros sculptures from the Akropolis, the “Ludovisi Throne”, the Parthenon pediments, the so-called “Theseion” and lastly, the Erechtheion. This last riddle was the most complex and the one she spent the most time on, but she never submitted it for publication. Hawes worked on her idea for an original plan for decades. The manuscript in the Smith College Archives dates to 1935 and contains many later alterations in Hawes’ hand. She edited this manuscript up until a few months before her death in 1945. Her daughter, Mary Allsebrook, kindly offered me her mother’s manuscript in 1998 and the opportunity to research the validity of Hawes’ ideas both in the context of early 20th century scholarship and today. I intend to publish an article placing Hawes’ arguments in their historiographic context of the other prevailing theories of the day and highlight the significant contribution she can still make to the study of the Erechtheion. Some of these other contributions are presented elsewhere in this chapter.

Erechtheion; second, to formulate a hypothesis which explained each of these peculiarities; and last, to test her hypothesis with the architectural and inscriptional evidence. Hawes, like Dörpfeld, concluded the Erechtheion was planned and begun as a double, symmetrical building, but her approach led to a very different result.

A cursory examination of the Erechtheion reveals several obvious architectural peculiarities – the very same which Dörpfeld and Dinsmoor focused on explaining away (Figure 535):

1. The North Porch projects westward past the West Façade;
2. The West Door is off the central axis;
3. The southward extension of the North Porch ends obliquely;
4. The roofs of the North Porch and West Façade abut awkwardly;
5. The North and South Doors are on axis with each other, but not with the West Corridor and the Maiden Porch;
6. The West Façade is so close to the North Door that the western leaf could barely be opened; and,
7. The interior South Wall was cut back to create a Niche.

There are also several subtler peculiarities that reveal a change in the architect's intention after the building was begun, and point to the existence of a symmetrical original plan:

1. The foundations of the corridor walls are of different widths – the narrower foundation supports the whole (exterior) West Façade, and the wider, only the interior West Cross-Wall;

2. Wide blocks run under the West Façade and protrude on either side;¹⁰³
3. The blocks of the Maiden Porch podium are of different sizes;
4. The South Wall was cut back and clamps destroyed to accommodate the roof of the Maiden Porch;
5. Maidens #4 and #6 have a different method of clamping their headgear from the others (Figure 268);
6. Projections on the interior of the North and South Walls created by armpit blocks were subsequently chiseled off at the east edge of the foundations for the West Cross-Wall;
7. The south doorway was raised by 1 ½ Attic feet;
8. The columns of the East Porch are proportionally closer together than the columns of the North Porch;¹⁰⁴ and,
9. There was an unusual combination of a shorter frieze on the taller wall of the main building next to the taller frieze on the shorter North Porch.¹⁰⁵

Hawes' chronological scheme for the Erechtheion has three parts, beginning with a new double shrine of Pentelic marble on a single level on the site just to the north of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias (Figure 545). According to Hawes, this symmetrical temple was planned by Perikles as part of his scheme to beautify the Akropolis. She believed that beginning around 435 B.C., all the material for the execution of this original plan with two wings on both sides of a colonnaded passage and the two porches was

¹⁰³ Paton et al. 1927, p. 163, .fig. 104.

¹⁰⁴ Hawes and others were concerned that the East Porch columns lacked entasis. As argued in Chapter III, the lack of entasis on these columns may be due to their recarving after the major fire in the Erechtheion.

¹⁰⁵ The height of the frieze usually relates to the height of the columns, not the height of the wall: Coulton (pers. comm.).

assembled. The north elevation shows how the roofs and friezes of the North Porch and main building were all to be at the same levels (Figure 546).

According to Hawes' scenario for the original plan, looking west through the grille of the original engaged colonnade of the east façade, one could have seen the sanctuary of Athena Polias (Figure 547). Through the windows of the proposed original west façade, one would have looked into Poseidon's shrine, and farther on, into the interior colonnaded passage. This internal colonnaded passage was planned, according to Hawes, to have a frieze above the columns of white Pentelic sculptures attached to dark Eleusinian stone, a combination which would have stood out in the semi-darkness of the interior space (Figure 549). From the floor of this colonnaded passage, two steps would have led to the stylobate of the wings. This plan of placing an interior colonnade on the raised stylobate surmounted by a decorated frieze is similar to the arrangement at Bassai. Hawes went so far as to suggest that Iktinos was the architect of the Erechtheion based on such similarities that when "thwarted in Athens, he sought in distant Arcadia an opportunity to build his inner colonnade and frieze."¹⁰⁶

The floor of Hawes' original interior colonnaded passage was to be one step below the sill of the North Door and two steps below the sill of the South Door. The stylobate on either side of the interior colonnade was to be cut in two low steps each $\frac{3}{4}$ of a foot high, ranging with the North and South Doors, respectively (Figure 545).

The level of the second step was to continue as the floor of Athena's shrine. This would have concealed the troubling discrepancy between the bottom of the orthostates in the North and South walls.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰⁶ Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*.

¹⁰⁷ On this discrepancy, see below "West Chamber."

Before the first change in plan, Hawes suggested following was built:

1. The North Porch up to the tops of the columns;
2. Six courses of the North and four courses of the South Walls above the orthostates, including the interior pilasters which were comprised of armpit (i.e., L-shaped) blocks, later chiseled away;
3. The east side of the Maiden Porch;
4. Four foot wide foundations of Aeginetan limestone had been laid for the stylobate of the eastern interior colonnade to connect the two porches;
5. The western stylobate had been prepared but not yet put in place; and,
6. The columns for the interior colonnade had been carved but not placed.

According to Hawes, the symmetrical design was abandoned at this point in construction. The west shrine of Poseidon was scratched and the materials were used to create an additional chamber behind the original east shrine. Four courses were added to the temple walls both to accommodate the difference in levels of the East and North Porches and to maintain an even roof line. The sacred features such as the Kekropeion were also accommodated by converting the colonnaded passage into a corridor and moving the West Façade two feet east of its axial location.

Hawes proposed that work continued along this revised plan during a second building period, beginning, according to Hawes, around 425 or 421. Although the west wing had been scratched, the already prepared west stylobate was placed on top of the 2-foot wide Aeginetan limestone foundations and under the West Façade. These stylobate blocks were rotated 180 degrees from their intended orientation, and protruded on either

side of the west wall, thus creating the bench-like structure on the inside and step-like projection on the outside.¹⁰⁸

Moving the West Façade eastward necessitated the curtailment of the Maiden Porch, which resulted in its inaxiality and overall asymmetry. As planned, the Maiden Porch would have been 21 feet wide, each of the four blocks of the podium measuring 5 ¼ feet (Figure 548). When the Maiden Porch was reduced in size, the single already-prepared 5 ¼ foot block was retained at the east, and 1 foot was removed from each of the other three remaining blocks. “To preserve the fitting proportions of the shorter porch, the two Maidens already finished, as figures wearing baskets, were shortened by cutting out the baskets, leaving a weak joint between the cushion and echinus.”¹⁰⁹ This adaptation, Hawes argued, accounts for the differences in how the maidens’ capitals were attached. Maidens #4 and #6 have a “weak joint” in that their capitals are attached between their heads and the echinus (Figure 268).¹¹⁰ The other maidens have a stronger joint between the abacus and echinus.

Hawes believed that the materials for the abandoned interior colonnades were used elsewhere. She proposed that the stylobate of the east interior colonnade was used in the krepidoma of the East Porch, and that the six columns carved for the inner colonnades but never erected were used instead to create the East Portico. She believed that the columns’ lack of entasis strongly suggested that they were originally designed to decorate an interior space where optical refinements were unnecessary at close quarters.

Furthermore, according to the original plan for the interior colonnades, the proportions

¹⁰⁸ Paton et al. 1927, fig. 104, p. 163.

¹⁰⁹ Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*.

¹¹⁰ Hawes was unaware that Maiden #6 was a replacement. See Chapter III on the effects of the fire and recarving on the maidens.

and spacing of these columns are identical to those of the North Porch. As they stand in the East Porch, the columns are proportionally closer together than in the North Porch.¹¹¹

With the elimination of the interior colonnaded passage, a low barrier which Hawes characterized as a “marble sill” was constructed over the center line of the 4 foot wide Aeginetan foundations to separate the corridor from the shrine. This is not to be confused with the later, taller cross-wall. Hawes believed that the original pilasters that were to have framed the colonnade were chiseled off (Figure 493).

Hawes reassigned more of the building materials: the engaged colonnade, which was to have ended the double shrine on the east, was instead set upon a low wall to form the West Façade. Consequently, the façade designed for the west was employed as the East Wall and pierced with a door, four feet, not eight feet wide, as Hawes corrects Stevens (Figure 543). This not only allows the “console at the east” dictated in the building accounts to be placed on the East Door frame, but also allows one of two sets of stone door leaves (also described in the building accounts) to be placed in the East Doorway, and the other set in the South Doorway. This is a far better alternative than in the “light screen wall” as restored by Paton et al. where the existence of such heavy doors is highly unlikely.

Hawes creatively, though almost certainly incorrectly, equated the “stoa” mentioned in the inscriptions with the interior colonnades of the originally planned temple.¹¹² The items listed in the Inventory and Accounts as being “from the Stoa” are a

¹¹¹ Hawes was apparently not aware that entasis was added with the final fluting of the columns, which did not occur until 408/7 according to the building accounts. This does not affect the main thrust of her argument, however.

¹¹² I. Shear pointed out that this was impossible because the fluting of the column (and hence the entasis) was only added after they were erected in the East Porch, and that Hawes’ “stoa” contradicts the usual definition (pers. comm.). On the definition of “stoa” see Coulton 1976. The “stoa” mentioned in the

hundred feet of cornice blocks, blocks for two pediments, and blocks of Pentelic marble and Aeginetan limestone. The Aeginetan limestone, originally destined for the foundations of the interior colonnades, instead served as backers for the Eleusinian frieze inside the east chamber between the wooden roof beams. The Pentelic blocks lined the East Porch on the north and south. The 96 feet of frieze blocks not used in the stoa, together with an additional 129 feet of decorated frieze mentioned elsewhere in the building inscriptions (and interpreted by Hawes as newly acquired), were used all the way around the exterior of the building and above the East Porch wall.¹¹³

In Hawes' view, the omission of the west wing released an already prepared stock of building material including a number of 4 foot long ashlar blocks. Because of the raised elevation of the East Porch, Hawes argued that four courses, each 1 ½ feet high, were added to all four walls of the main building to create an even roof, thus bringing the height of the temple from 23 feet to 29 feet. These adaptations to the plan explain how the shorter decorated frieze now appears above the highly decorated epistyle blocks, and looks slightly out of proportion above the higher temple wall when compared to the

inscriptions is instead almost certainly the stoa in the Pandroseion. See below “The ‘Stoa’ Mentioned in the Inscriptions.” Although Hawes' argument about the material literally coming from the stoa is appealing in its tidiness, her general arguments are not intrinsically damaged by this idea.

¹¹³ This scenario has its problems. According to Hawes' description and elevations, there is a 2 foot high frieze around the originally planned building measuring 228 linear Attic feet, including the North Porch. Since there is admittedly room to play with the height of the epistyle in the interior colonnade, then the height of the frieze above it may well have measured 2 ¼ feet. Therefore, after the first change in plan when the idea of the interior colonnade was scratched, and the walls of the temple were increased in height by four courses with the material from the similarly scratched west wing, the 2 ¼ foot frieze blocks were reallocated to the North Porch where building had stopped at the level of the top of the columns. The North Porch, measuring just over 72 linear feet at the frieze course, was in need of as much height as possible, juxtaposed as it was to the now taller North Wall. Essentially, if all the building materials really had been accumulated before the start of construction as Hawes postulated at the beginning of her hypothesis, then she need not have supposed that an additional 129 feet of 2 foot high frieze blocks having one end and the back trimmed (Inscription II, col. II, lines 8-24) came from an outside source at a later date. Indeed, Hawes explicitly and graciously says, “I am sure that I cannot escape making mistakes and I shall be most grateful for correction, only hoping that a distinction will be made in the reader's mind between major and minor faults and that my argument as a whole will not be rejected because of flaws which may mar but not materially weaken it. If my argument fails to convince, I hope it may yet help toward a correct solution”: Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*.

grandeur of the taller frieze of the shorter North Porch. The extra two feet of Aeginetan limestone left unused for the foundations of the west colonnade show up in the building accounts as backers for the frieze in the East Portico. These elements, including the decorated frieze, can all be reconciled quite nicely with items in Hawes' originally planned interior colonnade by means of a series of simple calculations based on the inscriptions and architectural remains.

The building inscriptions and the detailed evidence of the building itself are the bases of Hawes' arguments. Unlike Dinsmoor and Dörpfeld who base their arguments for the original plan mainly on the large scale peculiarities, Hawes has convincing epigraphic evidence to support her statements, only a few of which have been presented here. Volumetrically, Hawes' arguments are very compelling. Her approach is quantifiable and scientific. Despite some problems with her arguments, her scenario for the original plan of the Erechtheion is nonetheless the most convincing, and probably constitutes the closest approximation to what actually happened.

So, why do scholars today no longer ask the question, "Was there an original plan for the Erechtheion? And if so, what was it?" These were important questions to the early 20th century scholars, although they are rarely considered now. The answers suggested by Dinsmoor and Dörpfeld do not feature in recent treatments of the building. For example, Hurwit's 1999 synthesis on the Athenian Akropolis contains no reference to an unrealized original plan for the Erechtheion, but it does mention alternative locations for the cult of Erechtheus. Modern opinions on why the Erechtheion departs so radically from the canons of ancient architecture vary, and fall short of satisfactory explanations; and like Dörpfeld's and Dinsmoor's, are based almost solely on the general

circumstances of the topography of the Akropolis. For example, Korres believes “that the plan of the Erechtheion was designed to be asymmetrical and irregular from the beginning because of the great importance of the older sanctuaries and buildings that had to be preserved.”¹¹⁴ Robertson’s explanation is that, “In other cities, other Archaic and Classical temples were straightened out as Greek architecture formed its canons. But the Athenians, so innovative in some respects, were in others unshakably attached to the past.”¹¹⁵ Others see the Erechtheion as an unsuccessful, inorganic agglomeration of rooms to house ancient cults.

Admittedly Hawes, Dinsmoor and Dörpfeld may have had an agenda in their attempt to discern a symmetrical plan. Their underlying conviction that the ancient Athenians were too rational a civilization to have produced a building as complex and radical as the Erechtheion was rooted in a general propensity to view Classical Athens as the birthplace of democracy, a sentiment embodied in the highly symmetrical Neoclassical architecture of contemporary public buildings. This explains in part why the original plan was such a burning issue at that time. Today, scholars seem much more willing to accept this strange building at face value; on the one hand, perhaps because (post-)modern architecture can be so asymmetrical, and on the other hand, because the complexity in the Erechtheion’s design and the subtleness in the clues to its building history present such a formidable challenge.

So, was there an original plan? As J.J. Coulton has pointed out, the assumption that there would have been a “finished plan” for the Erechtheion prior to the start of

¹¹⁴ Korres 1994c, p. 146.

¹¹⁵ Robertson 1996, p. 31.

construction went unquestioned in the late 19th through mid 20th century.¹¹⁶ This is no longer necessarily true, as the evidence for ongoing planning carved into the cella walls of the Temple of Apollo at Didyma attest.¹¹⁷ However, the phases of Hawes' scheme of planning and construction nonetheless intuitively reflect the fluid nature of ancient plans. Hawes' assumption that the volume of material was fixed because all the marble was ordered early on in the planning stages is logical, and is supported by references to the storage of these materials in the building accounts.¹¹⁸ During construction, there was clearly a sequence of major changes in plan that resulted in the unusual projections and floor levels evident in the final product. It seems reasonable that a symmetrical temple with a plan similar to that proposed by Hawes (with or without the interior colonnade) was intended to sit north of the temple it was to replace. This means that the altars of Erechtheus, Hephaistos and Boutes, and the well/cistern of Poseidon were not originally supposed to have been enclosed within the Classical temple. When it was deemed unfeasible (for whatever reason) to build the west wing over the Kekropeion and Pandroseion, the architects might have decided to extend the east wing eastward and enclose the relics and features that would make the building so famous later in Antiquity.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁶ Coulton (pers. comm.); Coulton 1985. The strength of convention in Neoclassical architectural traditions in Western Europe and North America would have also played a part.

¹¹⁷ Fontenrose 1988.

¹¹⁸ See note 139.

¹¹⁹ See below "Interpreting Diploun... Oikema" and "Conclusion: A New Restoration of the Erechtheion in the Classical Period."

RECENT AND NEW THOUGHTS ON THE ARCHITECTURE AND SCULPTURE OF THE CLASSICAL ERECHTHEION

DATE

Despite having the incomparable evidence of the building accounts from 409-404 B.C., the evidence for the inauguration of construction of the Erechtheion is highly problematic. Was there indeed a hiatus of construction as assumed by most scholars apart from Vickers and Ferrari?¹²⁰ Part of the difficulty is that Plutarch does not include the Erechtheion among the monuments of the Periklean building program which include the Odeion next to the Theatre of Dionysos, the Parthenon, the Propylaia, Temple of Athena Nike and the Eleusinion.¹²¹ Was the Erechtheion not included because Perikles died before construction began?

There is no primary evidence that refers directly to the start of construction. The two dates usually offered for the start of the Erechtheion are the late 430s according to Dörpfeld,¹²² and, 421, during the Peace of Nikias according to Michaelis.¹²³ The more popular of the two, the Peace of Nikias, is when Athens and Sparta agreed on a fifty-year alliance – an indication that the Athenians thought that the war with Sparta was over. Paton et al. follow Michaelis' suggestion because it seems like a convenient time to begin a new architectural project to honor the patron goddess of Athens.¹²⁴ The Peace of Nikias, however, cannot be relied upon as the underlying logic for the beginning of

¹²⁰ Vickers 1985, pp. 17-25; Vickers forthcoming; Ferrari 2002, pp. 16-19.

¹²¹ Plutarch, *Per.*

¹²² Dörpfeld 1904, pp. 101-107.

¹²³ Michaelis 1889, pp. 362-363.

¹²⁴ Paton et al. 1927, p. 454.

construction, nor the subsequent Spartan takeover of Dekelea and/or the Sicilian disaster of 413 as the cause of a hiatus in construction.¹²⁵

The generalization that there were no building projects during times of war needs to be questioned. Both those who want to date the Erechtheion's inception to the 430s and those who want to date it to the Peace of Nikias use this argument.¹²⁶ A great deal of building was underway, both on the Akropolis and elsewhere in Greece, during the Peloponnesian War. Most of Temple of Athena Nike was built during the first half of this conflict.¹²⁷ Therefore, temples could be and were built during times of extreme economic strain.¹²⁸ The initiation of construction did not depend on the polis being at peace, and so the argument that the Peace of Nikias was the date of the inception of the Erechtheion is invalid. Also, the workforces necessary to build a temple were relatively small compared to the size of the military forces on land and sea.¹²⁹ The building inscriptions (Inscrs. VIII-XXVIII) indicate that only a few dozen craftsmen were involved in the construction of the temple once the materials had been quarried and delivered to the Akropolis, and of this workforce, only a third of them were Athenian citizens. This diversion of manpower, furthermore, could easily be justified in the name of pleasing the protectress of the city.

¹²⁵ The latter is assumed owing to the nature of the statements in the Chandler Stele which, through its summation of work completed and still to be accomplished on the temple, implies that work had come to a stand-still and required a full accounting before further construction could proceed: Paton et al. 1927, pp. 453-454.

¹²⁶ Dörpfeld dated the start of construction to 431 B.C. on these grounds, Dörpfeld 1921, pp. 101-107; Michaelis argued similarly for a date of 421 B.C., Michaelis 1889, pp. 362-363, followed by Judeich 1931, p. 272; Dinsmoor 1950, p. 188; and Travlos 1971, p. 213.

¹²⁷ The exact dates of construction are debatable, but all theories fall between 427 and 418: Mark 1993. See below note 141. Schultz has most recently argued convincingly that the impetus for the construction of the Nike Temple was the victory over the Spartans at Sphacteria in 425, and that construction was underway by 424: Schultz 2003.

¹²⁸ The Propylaia, although not a temple, was a major building project executed during the first phase of the Peloponnesian War. The Argive Heraion is another temple built during this war.

¹²⁹ J.J. Coulton (pers. comm.).

In recent scholarship, it has become more common to look to the 430s as a date for the conception of the Erechtheion.¹³⁰ Hurwit allows that the mid-430s is a possibility.¹³¹ It also appears that the temple of Erechtheus is alluded to topographically in Euripides' *Erechtheus* fr. 65, lines 90-94 (Austin) produced between 423 to 421 B.C.¹³² However, as Vickers admits, the play does not clarify whether construction had already begun or was imminent. Those who prefer to see the Erechtheion as a part of Perikles' grand scheme tend to credit him with the plan to honor Athena with a new marble temple, but to what extent he was actually involved in its design can never be known.¹³³

Alternatively, Vickers argues for a very late date for the inception of the Erechtheion, 412 B.C., based on possible allusions to construction in Euripides' *Erechtheus* and Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*. He argues that construction was financed from 1000 talents put aside for a rainy day by the board of *probouloi*; according to Thucydides (2.24.1), they were commissioned to reduce public spending at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War in 431 B.C.¹³⁴ These funds, Vickers believes, were released after the Sicilian disaster and the Dekelean defeat, and Athena received her customary cut.¹³⁵ Furthermore, he argues that the summary nature of the Chandler Stele does not imply that there was a hiatus in construction, rather that construction began in 412 and continued at

¹³⁰ By "conception" is meant that the idea that a new temple for Athena Polias was approved, and that there were preliminary discussions about its form, probably with proposed elevations, on which to base the order for the necessary building materials.

¹³¹ Hurwit 1999, pp. 316, 322.

¹³² Citations are from Palagia 1984, p. 519; Austin 1968, pp. 22, 31; Calder 1969, pp. 154-156; Calder 1971, pp. 492-495; Clairmont 1971, pp. 486-488; Treu 1971, pp. 115-131, who thinks the date of the play is 423 B.C. Hurwit 1999, p. 202, also highlights the strong associations between the cult of Poseidon-Erechtheus and Athena Polias in this play. Kathleen Lynch rightly points out that that it is possible that Euripides is alluding to an earlier shrine of Erechtheus (pers. comm.).

¹³³ See note 130.

¹³⁴ Vickers 1985, p. 25.

¹³⁵ Vickers 1985, pp. 21-22.

full steam until 406 B.C. But why would such a full accounting be made unless it was necessary? A new board of overseers of the project was necessary, and it was this same board who oversaw the subsequent years' construction, albeit with a different composition, including the overseeing “architect.”¹³⁶

To support his argument, Vickers cites Aristophanes' possible (and very obtuse) reference to the (Lakonian, he assumes) maidens standing about waiting for incorporation into the South Porch in *Lysistrata*, first performed in 411 B.C.¹³⁷ Whether the maidens were still standing around waiting for their final position, or not, is hardly a reason to down-date the start of construction of the Erechtheion to 412 B.C. In the light of the recent events mentioned above, not to mention the treaties signed and sealed with libations by Athens' traditional enemies, Sparta and Persia, Vickers argues that the Erechtheion maidens can be read as Vitruvian “caryatids” or symbols of humiliation and submission.¹³⁸

In sum, it is possible to credit the initial planning of the Erechtheion to Perikles owing to his (presumed) vision of completely revamping the Akropolis. The Erechtheion was probably part of Perikles' conception of the new Akropolis, but construction had not begun before his untimely death due to plague in 429. The building materials were probably ordered and began to be supplied before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War

¹³⁶ Admittedly, there are other possibilities that may have required the full accounting and change of personnel: e.g., a financial scandal leading to an administrative change, or the death of the original architect: Coulton (pers. comm.).

¹³⁷ Aristophanes, *Lys.* 78.

¹³⁸ Furthermore, Vickers sees the roof of the Maiden Porch as heavy and burdensome as opposed to I. Shear's interpretation that it is light and not conducive to a Vitruvian interpretation: I. Shear 1999. Perhaps the lesson to be learned here is that a diachronic approach to the interpretation of the maidens of the Erechtheion is necessary. On the Roman reception of the Erechtheion maidens and the legacy of Vitruvius' story about the “caryatids”, see Chapter IV.

in 431 B.C.¹³⁹ The beginning of the actual construction of the Erechtheion probably dates to shortly after two catastrophic events: the earthquakes of 427/6 mentioned by Thucydides (3.87.4) as rocking Athens, Euboeia and Boiotia, and the plagues of 429 and 427/6 (2.47-55). Could it be that the earthquakes and plagues jolted the Athenians into paying attention to the shrines of Poseidon, the earth-shaker, and Athena, the Protectress?¹⁴⁰ After over half a century of neglecting the ruined Archaic Temple of Athena, the plan conceived of by Perikles and his architect might have been put into action using the money put aside for a rainy day.¹⁴¹ In the same way that the construction of the Parthenon did not violate the Oath of Plataia, nor did the construction of the Erechtheion: no ancient temple was rebuilt. The pre-Parthenon had never been consecrated and construction of the new Temple of Athena was relocated to a site north of the Archaic Temple of Athena. The new construction incorporated the ancient relics and altars of Poseidon, Kekrops, Erechtheus, Hephaistos and Boutes, but no architectural structures were actually rebuilt.

Euripides' *Erechtheus* may have been written when the Erechtheion was under construction. In the play, Athena orders the widowed Praxithea to build a shrine for her heroized husband. The play not only associates the cults of Athena Polias and Poseidon-

¹³⁹ The building accounts for the Erechtheion suggest that in 409, all of the as yet unused building materials were being stored in and around the Erechtheion. This means that all the building materials had been ordered and supplied at some point before this. As regards to regular practice, on the contrary, building inscriptions from Delphi and Epidauros do not suggest that all the supplies were assembled before construction began: Coulton 1977; Burford 1969.

¹⁴⁰ Bronwen Wickkiser has recently convincingly argued that the importation of the cult of Asklepios from Epidauros in 420 has nothing to do with an attempt to lift the plagues of 429 and 426/7: Wickkiser 2003.

¹⁴¹ See below "Architect." The Nike Temple was probably also under construction by the mid 420s and benefited from the money put aside for peaceful endeavors. Travlos 1971 gives the date of 427-424 for the Nike Temple. Ira Mark dates its construction to 424/3-418: Mark 1993. See also Schultz 2001 for a recent review of the date of the Nike Temple. The argument that the Kallias decree (434/3) (which restored financial order to the Akropolis and left the Propylaia unfinished) did not mention or allow for the construction the Erechtheion is moot since the Nike Temple was also under construction during the 420s. Alternative dates for the Kallias Decree are 424/4, 422/1 or 418/17: Fornara 1995, pp. 134-136. On the relevance of the Kallias Decree to the date of the Erechtheion, see Hurwit 1999, p. 206.

Erechtheus but it also refers to the violent tremors produced by Poseidon that caused the city “to dance” and the roofs of houses to collapse.¹⁴² This earthquake was severe enough to dislodge the perfectly fitted columns of the Parthenon by 0.02 m.¹⁴³ This also means construction on the Erechtheion could not possibly have progressed very far above the level of the foundations, otherwise the unstabilized, roofless walls would have fallen down.

Religious conflicts, similar to those presumed to have been encountered by Mnesikles for the Propylaia with the priestess of Athena Nike, probably resulted in a few changes from an original, likely symmetrical, plan and caused various delays in construction.¹⁴⁴ Construction probably stopped in 413 with the Sicilian disaster, one of the lowest points of the war for Athens. There might have been a hiatus in construction until 409 when a new commission was set up to assess the progress on the temple and oversee its completion.¹⁴⁵ Most of the temple had been built at this time, although the final layers (or protective skins) of marble had not yet been chiseled off in most places. Only the blocks of the South Wall above the Maiden Porch had not yet been put in place,

¹⁴² On the relatively recently discovered fragments of Euripides’ *Erechtheus*, and the implications for the start date of the Erechtheion in the 420s, see Austin 1968; Calder 1969; Clairmont 1971.

¹⁴³ Korres 1994d, p. 138.

¹⁴⁴ On the changes in plan to the Propylaia, see above “Original Plan” and Dinsmoor 1950, p. 205. Contemporary epigraphical evidence (421/0) attesting to priestly objections to the construction of the Asklepieion can be found in *IG II² 4960*, *IG II² 4961*, and *IG I³ 78*, lines 54-59; Camp 2001, pp. 122-124. The religious conflict concerning the construction of the Erechtheion might have had to do with the preservation of certain ancient relics. Perhaps the original architect expected the olive tree to be pruned to accommodate the new building and this was not acceptable. A documented parallel for religious conflict interrupting construction is the building of the cathedral at Gaza in A.D. 402-407: Mark the Deacon, *Vita Porphyrii*; Mango 1974, p. 27.

¹⁴⁵ But see note 136. On the building accounts in general, see Paton et al. 1927, pp. 277-422. There have been many new discoveries and contributions on the building accounts. Dinsmoor’s contributions are summarized in Dinsmoor 1932. See also Jeppesen 1983. On the Erechtheion workforce described in the inscriptions, see for example: Burford 1969; Morgan 2002. *Contra* a hiatus of construction prior to 409, see Vickers 1985, pp. 17-25.

as well as some of the rafters of the North Porch.¹⁴⁶ Most of the finishing touches such as the carving of the moldings, painting of the ceilings, and carving of the frieze were still unexecuted. The painting and frieze were finished by 406/5 when construction of the Erechtheion ceased. Many moldings were never finished and layers of marble and bosses were never chiseled off.

Why, therefore, was the most important cult building in Athens never finished? Keeping in mind that the entirety of the Erechtheion was built during the Peloponnesian War, the last building accounts date to 405/4B.C.¹⁴⁷ What happened after 405/4? It is possible that the reign of the Thirty Tyrants (404-403) distracted the city, and the new regime had no interest in completing what the democracy had begun. There are innumerable examples of unfinished buildings dotted around the world, but the examples at Rome from all periods are especially edifying. For instance, churches sponsored by one papal family went unfinished when a new pope came to power. These may lack an entire façade, and yet they still stand and function as churches.¹⁴⁸ The same thing may have occurred with the Erechtheion. As soon as there was a roof to protect the olive wood statue of Athena Polias, the temple could begin to function. Once the project finally lost steam, probably owing more to the turn-around in political climate than financial problems related to the lingering war, there was little motivation or necessity to finish the project. The Erechtheion was essentially complete and already functioning.

¹⁴⁶ Paton et al. 1927, p. 545.

¹⁴⁷ Fragment no. XXVI; Paton et al. 1927, p. 278. On the dating of the latest fragments of the building accounts, see Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 146-154.

¹⁴⁸ The church of Sant' Ignazio at Rome is one example. It was begun by Cardinal Ludovisi in 1626, but the exterior was never finished: Hager 1999, pp. 36-41.

Cult furniture was in place, set against unfinished walls and propped up against unfinished corners. This was no barrier to the functioning of the cult.¹⁴⁹

ARCHITECT

While we know the name of the architect-overseers, Philokles and Archilochos, who worked on the project after 409 B.C., the identity of the original architect of the Erechtheion is unknown. Dörpfeld argued for Mnesikles owing to the similarities in the challenge of dealing with multiple ground levels in the Propylaia.¹⁵⁰ Ione Shear argued for Kallikrates and against Mnesikles by pointing out the difference between the treatments of various levels within the buildings, a feature emphasized in the Propylaia, but played down in the Erechtheion.¹⁵¹ As presented above, Hawes argued for Iktinos, the architect who may have gone to Bassai to experiment with this interior colonnade surmounted by a figured frieze when his plans were abandoned.¹⁵² Or was it some other unknown architect? The answer to this important question remains unanswered as the Erechtheion, as it now stands, is unique in its design.

RECONSTRUCTION OF THE INTERIOR OF THE MAIN BUILDING

Paton et al.'s reconstruction of the interior temple has troubled many scholars including Travlos, Hawes and Dörpfeld. As part of this study's argument for a reversed organization of cults in the Erechtheion (i.e., Erechtheus in the east and Athena in the west), a fresh interpretation of the architectural remains and the building accounts, in the light of subsequent scholarship and autopsy, leads to a new reconstruction of the interior

¹⁴⁹ The cult in the Olympieion at Athens, begun by Peisistratos in the 6th century B.C. and finished by Hadrian in the 2nd century A.D., was active throughout the lulls in construction and during it.

¹⁵⁰ Dörpfeld 1911, p. 39.

¹⁵¹ I. Shear 1999, pp. 408-424.

¹⁵² Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*.

of the main building. The following sections argue that the main building was divided formally into only two spaces by a West Cross-Wall that was solid (with an off center door) at the bottom and colonnaded at the top.¹⁵³ The West Cross-Wall defined the West Corridor and a large open chamber that extended to the foundations of the East Porch. The East Wall was pierced by two windows and a small (4 Attic feet wide) door. Pilasters that reached neither the roof nor the ground at the point where the East Cross-Wall is normally restored divided this large space. From the top of these pilasters sprang the cambered beams that supported the great transverse beam. A coffered ceiling covered the West Corridor and west half of the main chamber, but probably not the east half. The floor level of the whole main building was all at one level, that of the North Porch. Thus, the East Porch served as a viewing platform for the contents of the large chamber.

WEST CHAMBER

The restoration of the west chamber with two rooms side by side, as in the west half of the Archaic Temple of Athena (or Opisthodomos), is the most commonly presented plan.¹⁵⁴ When a scholar such as Travlos tried to offer a different solution for the interior arrangement of the Erechtheion,¹⁵⁵ the new suggestion met with great resistance.¹⁵⁶ While Travlos' restoration of the interior of the Erechtheion is not without its problems, his attempt to debunk the accepted interpretation is admirable. Why must the interior plan of the west chamber imitate the Opisthodomos of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias? After all, those who place Athena in the east part of the Erechtheion do not suggest that it had an interior colonnade like the cella of the Archaic Temple of

¹⁵³ The colonnade was either composed of pilasters or columns.

¹⁵⁴ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 156-159.

¹⁵⁵ Travlos 1971, pp. 213-214; Roueché 1989.

¹⁵⁶ Overbeck defended Paton et al.'s interpretation point by point: Overbeck 1972, pp. 127-129.

Athena. It must be emphasized that the Erechtheion and the Archaic Temple of Athena were entirely different conceptions:

1. They occupy different sites;
2. The west chambers of each respective building served different purposes;
3. They are in different architectural orders;
4. The Archaic temple is peripteral and the Erechtheion is not;
5. They were built over a century apart; and,
6. The Classical temple was designed to accommodate more than one cult.

The evidence for the commonly restored plan of the existing west chamber is shaky at best, yet these are the bases for Dinsmoor, Dörpfeld and Paton's original plan.

The archaeological basis for Paton et al.'s restoration of a longitudinal cross-wall to create two chambers east of the West Corridor is based on the following facts:

1. The orthostates of the North Wall are 0.976 m tall, but only 0.897 m in the South Wall (i.e., a difference of 0.079 m). This results in the southern orthostates standing at an elevation higher at the bottom and lower at the top than the northern orthostates.
2. Four stone doors (leaves) 8 ¼ feet long and 2 ½ feet wide are mentioned in the building accounts of 409/8 B.C.¹⁵⁷

First, a circular argument is created anew each time someone draws a conclusion as to the function of the west chamber and location of the various cults in the Erechtheion. It is important to remember that the west, double-chambered half of the

¹⁵⁷ Inscr. II, col. II, line 87-89. Paton et al. 1927, p. 297.

Archaic Temple of Athena is the basis of the reconstruction for the west chamber of the Erechtheion. To argue that this portion of the Erechtheion must therefore have housed certain cults, be they Athena Polias or the Poseidon/Erechtheus, Hephaistos and Boutes triad, creates a circular argument. Other evidence may very well point to this conclusion, but it is the similarity of plans which is quoted as the most obvious cultic link in recent general descriptions of the Erechtheion.¹⁵⁸

Second, these two archaeological “facts” can be discounted as evidence for a longitudinal cross-wall. According to Paton et al., the difference in floor level (resulting from the placement of the floor at the bottom of the orthostate) required concealment because “if the central portion of the temple formed a single room with the floor at the same level throughout, this floor must have stood in very different relations to the orthostates in these two walls, - an unusual irregularity in a Greek building.”¹⁵⁹ This is simply not true, especially in cases where there is extensive evidence for changes in plan.¹⁶⁰ In a building as complex as the Erechtheion, adaptations were common.¹⁶¹ Therefore, the minor difference between the heights of the orthostates in the west half of the building is not a major issue, and certainly not valid as a reason for reconstructing a

¹⁵⁸ Also, since this study places the cult of Athena Polias in the west half of the temple and the triad of altars in the east, the correspondence in plan of the Opisthodomos of the Archaic Temple of Athena and the Erechtheion is irrelevant. Similarly, even with altars of Poseidon/Erechtheus, Hephaistos and Boutes in the west chamber as argued by Paton et al. there is no cultic reason for making the correlation beyond the creation of three spaces.

¹⁵⁹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 156.

¹⁶⁰ For example, the Propylaea and the Parthenon. The heights of all the blocks may all fit together perfectly, but they are not all consistent all over these structures: J. Binder (pers. comm.). For the Parthenon: Orlandos 1977, vol. 2, pp. 264-271. The variation is in the length of the orthostates in the north and south walls, but this seems to have to do with the curvature of the stylobate.

¹⁶¹ Such a discussion is outside the scope of this study. Coulton 1985 and Coulton 1977 especially, pp. 53-73. On the fluidity of architectural planning, see above “Original Plan: Dörpfeld, Dinsmoor, Elderkin and Hawes” and “Date.”

longitudinal cross-wall.¹⁶² Another possibility is that the floor level was designed to slope gently toward the north, that is toward the underground passageway, for drainage.¹⁶³ Not only was the interior of the Erechtheion essentially open to the elements, but indoor sacrifices in front of Athena Polias were conducted, and the floor would have needed to be washed down periodically.¹⁶⁴

Next, the 8 ¼ foot tall stone doors mentioned in the inscriptions were probably not destined for the half-height West Cross-Wall. Doors of this magnitude in mass and height would have been highly inappropriate in this location. These doors were most likely destined instead for any two of the following: the West Door, the South Door, or the East Door, and the Passageway from the North Porch to the Pandroseion. Each of these openings measures about 8 by 5 Attic feet.¹⁶⁵

It is clear from the cuttings in the passageway from the North Porch to the Pandroseion that it did not have a door in Antiquity (Figure 308).¹⁶⁶ This leaves us with the East, South and West Doorways.¹⁶⁷ The material of the doors in the inscriptions suggests that they served on the exterior. Therefore, the West Door that opens onto the Pandroseion is a prime candidate, although Hawes presents a plausible argument for the

¹⁶² Mansfield 1985, p. 212, agrees that there is no justification for the longitudinal cross-wall. An internal parallel for differing heights of blocks can be found in the East Wall of the Erechtheion: see Paton et al. 1927, p. 33.

¹⁶³ Blomerus (pers. comm.).

¹⁶⁴ *Agora XVI 75*, the Law and Amendment Concerning the Small Panathenaia, mentions sacrifices “in the archaios neos.” See below “Indoor Altars.”

¹⁶⁵ On the East Door, see below “East Wall.”

¹⁶⁶ For the passageway to the Pandroseion, see Paton et al. 1927, p. 97: “Its dimensions agree very closely with those of the west door,” but in spite of the three extant sets of pivot holes, “there are no indications of a door or gate here in Greek times.”

¹⁶⁷ For discussions on the problems of reading the markings for the pivots, see Paton et al. 1927, pp. 58-59 for the West Door where all traces of the Classical Greek doorway opening have disappeared. The difference in the size of the opening between the phases is negligible: see pls. 4 (state elevations) and 15 (restored elevation). See Paton et al. 1927, p. 119, for the South Door, “to the later alterations belong the sinkings in the sill for the pivots of a door.” For the later cuttings, see Chapters V, VI and VII.

East and South Doors.¹⁶⁸ As a matching set in the openings for the West and South Doors (though still uninstalled and in need of their black stone cross-pieces in 409/8 B.C.), both would have been visible simultaneously from within the West Corridor. This is not to say that the leaves of the East Door were dissimilar, only that perhaps they were already in place, even if the consoles were still lacking.¹⁶⁹ The upper southwest corner of the Erechtheion was still unbuilt in 409/8 B.C. It is therefore not surprising that the doors had not yet been installed in the openings of the West and South Doors. Alternatively, the South Door may indeed have already been finished because the interior of the Maiden Porch was one of the only parts of the building that had actually received its final smoothing. As this discussion shows, the exact allocation of the four stone door leaves cannot be made with certainty.

However, with respect to the reconstruction of the interior of the Erechtheion, it is completely unnecessary to invent two new doorways when there are four already extant doorways of correct size on the building. This is not to deny, however, that there was a doorway in the half-height West Cross-Wall to provide access the central chamber. Assuming the repaired West Cross-Wall followed the same basic layout on the ground as the repaired version, then the opening (without a door) was on axis with the West Door, as discussed in the next section.

Furthermore, the correct general acceptance that the dual-chambered Opisthodomos of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias continued to stand and function

¹⁶⁸ Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*. The West Door was essentially an exterior door in spite of the mediation of the enclosed courtyard of the Pandroseion because there was no restriction of access in the Passageway from the North Porch.

¹⁶⁹ Inscr. II, col. II, line 93 refers to an uninstalled, incompletely worked console for the East Door. As discussed below in the section titled “East Wall,” the four stone door-leaves mentioned in line 87 are referred to just before the console for the East Door.

after the Erechtheion was conceived and erected undermines any arguments for the imitation of the plan in the west half of the Erechtheion, because one would not have needed two similarly standing and functioning structures. This applies whether one places the altars of Erechtheus/Poseidon, Hephaistos and Boutes in the west half of the Erechtheion, or the statue of Athena Polias. In the first scenario, the “imitation of the Opisthodomos” would have no cultic meaning because these altars predated the construction of the Classical Erechtheion; in the second, Athena Polias, who was accustomed to a single, full-width chamber of her own in the Archaic Temple of Athena, would have found relegation to such a small compartment unacceptable.

The whole main building of the Erechtheion can, then, best be seen as a replacement for the east cella of the Archaic Temple of Athena. This is easy to see in plan, especially if one accepts Hawes’ scenario for the original plan, i.e., the east part of the main chamber represents an eastward extension of the original plan to incorporate extra cult features. In plan, one can see that the whole main building is due north of the east cella of the Archaic Temple. The cult statue of Athena Polias was therefore translated (perhaps via the symbolic bridge of the Maiden Porch) to a new building north of her old home. The Opisthodomos, which continued to function as a treasury, was not duplicated because this was not necessary functionally or for cult purposes.

WEST CROSS-WALL

The story of the West Cross-Wall is a mind-teaser of epic proportions.¹⁷⁰ After a good rain, the shadow of where the wall once stood is visible on the interior of the North Wall (Figure 478). There are at least four theories that attempt to account for the amazing array of cuttings that tell the messy story of the West Cross-Wall. The evidence is contained in the blocks themselves.¹⁷¹ Figure 493 and Figure 492 are essential for the following discussion. Stevens' plates (pls. 11 and 12) are less helpful because they only contain a selection of the subtle markings on the walls, and the upper portions of the South Wall have since been dismantled and reassembled. The four theories are summarized here, the last of which is the author's interpretation of the architectural evidence.

Theory 1: Paton et al. argue that when the Erechtheion was originally planned, the roof beams and West Cross-Wall would have been in alignment; however, when the West Façade was moved eastward for religious reasons, the West Cross-Wall was moved east as well in order to restore the width of the narrowed West Corridor.¹⁷² Therefore, the east face of the first West Cross-Wall that was actually constructed was aligned with the east edge of the extant foundations, in line with the east wall of the Maiden Porch.¹⁷³ The builders were not concerned that the ceiling blocks, whose organization was dictated by

¹⁷⁰ Among the blocks of the Erechtheion that have never moved, there are a few errors in Stevens' drawings, particularly in the North Wall at the junction with the West Cross-Wall: pl. 11. For a better visual description of this problematic area, see Figure 493. It is not the place of this study to create a new set of detailed drawings: the Erechtheion as it now stands has already been surveyed and drawn by the now unfortunately late director of the restoration project, Alexandros Papanikolaou. These, however, are still in draft form at the writing of this study, and are being prepared for publication by Papanikolaou's students.

¹⁷¹ A verbal description of the markings is almost impossible without adding interpretation. Theory 4 contains this author's description and reading of the cuttings.

¹⁷² Paton et al. 1927, pp. 151-156.

¹⁷³ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 167-169. See Paton et al. 1927, pls. 25-26 for a visual summary of the misalignment of the West Cross-Wall and support for the ceiling beam, as built.

the voids for the insertion of corbels and the “great transverse beam”, were not in alignment with the West Cross-Wall.¹⁷⁴ When the West Cross-Wall was repaired, however, it was moved westward into alignment with the ceiling and roof beams, as indicated by the second set of drafted margins and cuttings to key in the West Cross-Wall toward the west.

Theory 2: Harriet Boyd Hawes proposed another theory which has three rather than the two stages proposed by Paton et al. First, the original plan of the West Cross-Wall (for Hawes, this was actually just a stylobate for the east interior colonnade with pilasters on the North and South Walls) was to be aligned with the Maiden Porch, that is, at the east edge of the in situ foundations. Second, when there was a change in plan for “religious reasons,” the armpit blocks that formed the inward protrusions were cut off and the Cross-Wall was moved toward the west in alignment with the more shallow drafted margins, and the corbel for the transverse beam was relocated accordingly. This was done in order to *narrow* the West Corridor for visual reasons so that the lack of symmetry on either side of the North and South Doors would be reduced. Third, the wall was replaced on the same, western line during the repair. It was at this time that the rough (and, in her opinion, very unclassical Greek) cuttings were created for the keying in of blocks (Figure 216 and Figure 478).¹⁷⁵

Theory 3: Bundgaard is the most recent scholar to have made any conscientious attempt at analyzing the West Cross-Wall in detail. He is adamant that there was never

¹⁷⁴ Only the bottom two courses of the foundations are Greek : Paton et al. 1927, pp. 151-156. The ceiling was a contentious issue for the authors of *The Erechtheum*. Alternative theories were published by Paton et al. 1927, pp. 154, 647-648. Bundgaard argues that only the bottommost course of the foundation of the West Cross-Wall is in fact Greek owing to the presence of later sherds and Akropolis chips in the gaps.

¹⁷⁵ Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*.

any wall in the Greek period because of the lack of clamps in the armpit blocks, and that instead the West Corridor and West Chamber made one long cella of Athena Polias.¹⁷⁶

Theory 4: The blocks of the North and South Walls between their respective doors and the West Cross-Wall had to be specially pre-ordered owing to the unique shape of each one. The original location of the West Cross-Wall was in line with the east pilaster and podium of the Maiden Porch as evidenced by the carefully drafted margins visible in NN.13.06 (Figure 493). When the West Façade had to be moved eastward for “religious reasons,” this location was abandoned and the hallway was narrowed in order to reduce the asymmetry of the walls on either side of the North and South Doors (as in Theory 2, but in this case, in the Classical period). The pre-ordered armpit blocks at these locations were shaved off and the wall was built, in the late 5th century, slightly to the west, and fitted into the cuttings (strangely rough, but paralleled in the Hephaisteion) in NN.17.05-06 and NN.15.05-06. Another set of lighter drafted margins is in evidence on this alignment in NN.14.05, NN.13.05-06, NN.12.05, and NN.11.05-06.

The West Cross-Wall must have been damaged in the major fire that ravaged the Erechtheion and required wholesale rebuilding on the present alignment owing to the complete replacement of the wall down through the lowest marble course and the foundations.¹⁷⁷ This replacement marble base-course is still in situ and secured with the pi-clamps characteristic of the repair.¹⁷⁸ The area where the North and South Walls interfaced with the West Cross-Wall did not suffer extensively from the devastating

¹⁷⁶ Bundgaard 1976, pp. 160-161. See also Travlos’ interpretation of the location of the cults in the Erechtheion: Travlos 1971. See above “Alternative Locations for the Cults of Athena Polias and Erechtheus: Travlos, Jeppesen, Mansfield, Robertson and Ferrari.”

¹⁷⁷ On the history of fires in the Erechtheion, see Chapter III. That there was a wall here and not a colonnade is certain because there are pry marks and clamps visible in the top of the blocks.

¹⁷⁸ On the date of the major repair and use of pi-clamps, see Chapter III.

conflagration that necessitated the wholesale replacement and the recutting of seriously damaged blocks elsewhere in the temple. Furthermore, the tell-tale signs that the building was left unfinished, i.e., the protective “skins” of the blocks, except at the angles where a wall was supposed to turn a corner, are still visible; these are features that would have been obliterated if the chisels of the repairers had indeed been at work in these areas. Therefore, the puzzle of markings on the interior of the South and North Walls can only date to the initial planning and final execution of the building. After the major fire that gutted the Erechtheion (in the Hellenistic period according to this study), the West Cross-Wall was rebuilt on the same alignment as the wall that stood there in the Classical period.

Incidentally, the top of the solid West Cross-Wall as reconstructed for the Classical period (Figure 477) corresponds to the level of the series of small holes in the top of course 9 (NN.09.06-08) that are thought to have secured a tarpaulin over the central chamber when the temple was rendered roofless by fire.¹⁷⁹ Above this level (course 8) was presumably a colonnade either of piers (as in the Temple of Athena Nike between the antae or in the Temple of the Athenians at Delos) or columns (along the same spacing and proportions as those of the West Façade), framed by engaged pilasters. These columns supported an architrave which in turn supported the roof beams. The “bent beams” restored here by Paton et al. belong to the roof system of the main chamber.¹⁸⁰

¹⁷⁹ On this temporary roof between the fire and the repair, see Chapter III.

¹⁸⁰ See below “Ceiling and Roof of the Main Building.”

LOCATION OF THE DOOR IN THE WEST CROSS-WALL

The marble blocks in situ at the West Cross-Wall belong to the major repair (redated in Chapter III to the Hellenistic period), fitted as they are with pi-clamps rather than the double-T clamps used in the Classical construction. After the major repair, the West Cross-Wall had an opening on axis with the West Door as evidenced by the absence of pi-clamps, dowels and pry marks at this location on the marble course in situ (Figure 494, Figure 495 and Figure 496).¹⁸¹ In the spirit of conservatism and the general disinterest in symmetry in the Classical temple as built, the original access to the central chamber was probably at this same location.

INTERPRETING *DIPLOUN*... *OIKEMA*

Pausanias calls the Erechtheion a διπλοῦν ... οἶκημα. *Diploun* is like the word “duplex,” which has many meanings.¹⁸² Here, it will be argued that it means “two-storied” or “double height”, that is, with the second story as a basement, not an upper story or two rooms side by side¹⁸³ (as in the case of the Opisthodomos, or the treasury, which is also sometimes described as διπλοῦν.)¹⁸⁴ The term οἶκημα implies that this was not a temple, or *neos*, the term Pausanias uses to describe the Temple of Athena

¹⁸¹ See Chapter III.

¹⁸² For example, in Vancouver, “duplex” means a semi-detached house with two separate, usually symmetrical entrances. In Chicago, “duplex” means a two-story apartment. In Montreal, a “duplex” is a house divided into two separate floors with two entrances.

¹⁸³ Pausanias (3.15.10) says explicitly that the Temple of Aphrodite at Sparta is the only temple that has an upper story.

¹⁸⁴ The source is an unreliable scholiast on Aristophanes, *Pl.* 1183: F. Dübner, *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*. Paris: Didot, 1877 (repr. Hildesheim: Olms, 1969): 323-387. The scholiast was Petrus Victorious, a 16th century scholar. He had access to the first printed edition of Ploutos and several other collected books including Hesychius, etc. It is clear that this source for the double treasury on the Akropolis cannot be trusted. I am grateful for Holt Parker’s assistance in this matter.

Polias and other sanctuaries.¹⁸⁵ The following section investigates how this term can be reconciled with the architectural and archaeological evidence.

In their introduction to the Erechtheion, Paton et al. state unequivocally that the floor of the East chamber was at the level of the East Porch while the floor of the western half of the building was at the level of the North Porch.¹⁸⁶ Also, since 1927, the reconstruction of a solid cross-wall to form the back wall of the east chamber has gone unchallenged except by a few scholars.¹⁸⁷ These two issues (namely there being no East Cross-Wall and no east cella floor at the level of the East Porch) are intimately associated. The following reanalysis of the state of the lower portions of the interior North Wall shows that there was no interior floor at the level of the East Porch and that there is no solid foundation, both literally and figuratively, for the reconstruction of the so-called “East Cross-Wall.”

Several early scholars argued for a second, basement story for the east chamber.¹⁸⁸ These scholars had the opportunity to examine the blocks closely for themselves. While taking their theories into account, Paton et al. tried to put the matter to

¹⁸⁵ While authors before the construction of the Classical Ionic temple call the area sacred to Erechtheus a *neos* (Homer, *Il.* 2.549 and Herodotos 8.55), Homer (*Od.* 7.81) and Aeschylus (*Eu.* 516: δόμος δίκας) also characterize it as a *domos*. After the construction of the temple, Euripides, Dionysios and Himerios all refer to the precinct of Erechtheus as either a *sekos* or *tememos*: Jeppesen 1987, p. 41. See Appendix A for the references and Greek text.

¹⁸⁶ Paton et al. 1927, p. 4.

¹⁸⁷ Boyadjief 1977; Platon et al. 1977, pp. 231-234, 419.

¹⁸⁸ Tétaz 1847-1848: Tétaz, *Acropolis d'Athènes. Ruines de l'Érechtheion, état actuel*, 1848 (Figure 98); Fergusson 1876, facing p. 148; and Julius 1878. Some inspiration may be found in the early scholars' reconstructions. They were at liberty to scramble around in the interior of the Erechtheion when it was first excavated; nonetheless, they added stairways to link spaces of different elevations without the justification of markings on the walls: e.g., Inwood 1827. Many scholars also used the aisles of the basilica church as foundations for creative interior columnar arrangements before these were known to have an early Christian terminus post quem: Julius 1878. Fergusson's bi-level reconstruction is creative: Fergusson 1876. It takes into account the slit side windows of the North and South Walls to illuminate small, enclosed spaces. Jahn and Michaelis are two of the first to fill in the east chamber in order to conceal the troublesome treatment of the walls. Their authoritative work influenced most subsequent reconstructions: Jahn and Michaelis 1901, p. 26.

rest by concluding that Pausanias' use of διπλοῦν must refer to the arrangement in the west chamber in imitation of the Opisthodomos of the Archaic Temple of Athena and not to a two-storied east chamber.¹⁸⁹

However, several important factors indicate that the floor level of the east half of the Erechtheion was at the same level as the west half and that there was no East Cross-Wall. First, the archaeological evidence:

1. The interior of the orthostate blocks at the base of the North Wall on either side of the East Pilasters are dressed to the same extent, namely, almost to a smooth finish (Figure 480).¹⁹⁰ This is the first indicator that the space to the south of these blocks may have been intended for use and not simply to receive an earthen fill.
2. The course below the orthostates (NN.20.08, which forms the molding above the krepidoma on the North Façade) immediately east of the East Pilaster has anathyrosis on the inside as if to receive a paving slab at exactly the same level as the pavement of the west chamber (Figure 480).
3. Below the elevation of the East Porch (Figure 477 and Figure 480), a pattern of unfinishedness “ascends” from the lower stylobate at NN.20.09 to NN.18.13 to NN.17.14, and increases as one moves from west to east, with the eastern blocks still sporting their lifting bosses.¹⁹¹

¹⁸⁹ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 486-487.

¹⁹⁰ East Pilasters is the term used in this study instead of “East Cross-Wall.” The two orthostate blocks immediately east of the East Pilasters (NN.18.11-12.) are finished except for the last layer of “skin,” while the next four blocks (extending to the east foundations) still have an additional layer of skin (NN.18.13-16).

¹⁹¹ Penrose believed that there was a staircase descending along the interior of the North Wall to access the earlier, conserved precinct at the lower level: Penrose 1888, pp. 92-93.

This suggests that there may have been a staircase against the interior of the North Wall linking the level of the East Porch and the floor level of the temple.

4. There is a thin course of poros blocks set on edge against course 21 and only dowelled to the projecting foundation course below and not bonded otherwise with the North Wall. This feature ran all the way from the eastern corner of the building, as seen in Stevens' pl.11, to the lintel of the underground passageway.¹⁹² This forms a "lip" which likely served as a support for the pavement of the west half of the temple (Figure 484). This feature continued east of the East Pilasters and served the same purpose in the east half.
5. The two orthostate blocks on the North and South Walls (NN.18.10 and SS.18.05.i), where the so-called East Cross-Wall was supposed to have interfaced, are not treated to receive the first marble course of the cross-wall (Figure 480 and Figure 207). There is neither a protruding block like the L-shaped blocks above, nor a recess cut in the orthostate to receive a perpendicular block, as can be found in the orthostates at the cross-walls in the Hephaisteion above the Agora (Figure 638).
6. There are no foundations, nor cuttings for foundations, in line with the so-called East Cross-Wall (Figure 512).

¹⁹² Paton et al. 1927, p. 6.

7. There is no anathyrosis on the blocks of the North Wall in course 14 to meet a floor at the upper level in the east half of the temple.¹⁹³
8. Furthermore, if the east chamber had a floor at the level of the East Porch, then the North and South Walls would both have orthostates, on the inner side, even if only half the width of the wall. In fact, the opposite case is true. The North and South Walls do not have orthostates at the upper level. Great pains were taken to make the interior of the orthostate level of the South Wall (course 12) out of regular 4 foot x 2 foot ashlar blocks, (though they were half-thickness).
9. Something important existed in course 18. The east foundations were carefully cut back to accommodate a pre-existing structure at this low level in order to incorporate these features within the Classical building (Figure 190).¹⁹⁴

Another reason for reconstructing the east half of the temple at the lower level is the behavior of the later Athenians who converted the Erechtheion into a pillared hall, and then into a basilica church.¹⁹⁵ It is highly unlikely that whoever transformed the Erechtheion into a pillared hall would have bothered to dig out the earthen fill down to the bedrock in order to sink the concrete foundations for the pillars.¹⁹⁶

Similarly, there is the troublesome question of what happened to the material that made up the supposed East Cross-Wall. Not only are there no extant foundations like the

¹⁹³ Although these blocks have suffered some fire damage, there is enough of the Classical surface remaining to show that they did not receive anathyrosis or any other indicative of contact with a floor at this level.

¹⁹⁴ On the notches, see above “Original Plan: Dörpfeld, Dinsmoor, Elderkin and Hawes,” and below, p. 88.

¹⁹⁵ On the pillared hall and basilica church, see Chapter V.

¹⁹⁶ If the space under the east chamber had indeed been filled with earth, subsequent users of the Erechtheion would have been far more likely to have filled in the west chamber, as had happened naturally by the 18th century, and to have used the windows of the West Façade as the points of access.

substantial foundations for the half-height West Cross-Wall; neither are there cuttings in the bedrock to receive the foundations necessary for a 9 m plus high marble cross-wall, as reconstructed since 1927. The builders of the basilica church removed the foundations of the East Wall, thereby creating room for an apse at its eastern end, and reused the material for the foundations for the interior colonnades of the church. There is no sign of what happened to the great volume of material that would have comprised an East Cross-Wall (approximately 150 blocks each 4 x 2 x 1 ½ Attic feet) that would have required removal by the transformers of the temple. Nor was there any fathomable reason to remove the foundations of the wall, had there been any, as they would have been lying below the level of the nave and aisles. Indeed no block of this so-called East Cross-Wall has yet been found, reused elsewhere in the Erechtheion or scattered around the Akropolis.

The third point is a matter of topography. Contrary to popular opinion, the East Porch is not 3 m higher than the west half of the temple on account of the topography of the Akropolis.¹⁹⁷ The usual explanation for the bizarre shape and layout of the Erechtheion is summed up by Brouskari's recent general description: "...the unevenness of the terrain. The site on which the temple was built is not flat: the rock falls away at the north and west, obliging the architect to find some way of accommodating greatly differing levels in his structure."¹⁹⁸ Photographs from the late 19th century excavations in the DAI at Athens clearly show that the East Porch of the Erechtheion stands on foundations that travel down to the bedrock, at the same level as the rest of the North

¹⁹⁷ The slope of the bedrock from the highest point in the southeast corner to the lowest point in the northwest corner is only about 10.5%, a total of 1.20 m to the deepest hole in the crypt under the North Porch: Paton et al. 1927, p. 5, note 1.

¹⁹⁸ Brouskari 1997, p. 174.

Wall (Figure 537 and Figure 538).¹⁹⁹ These foundations stretch as far south as the South Wall and abut the massive terrace of the Archaic Temple of Athena. On the interior, the bedrock does not rise above the level of the lower stylobate in either the east or the west extremes of the temple.²⁰⁰ This raising of the East Porch suggests a deliberate envelopment, or at least accommodation, for whatever may have occupied a lower level in the temple.²⁰¹ The motivation for placing the East Porch at this level (thus requiring a major filling operation) may have been to extend the processional area at the level of the altar of Athena and the Archaic Temple of Athena toward the north Akropolis wall. This in turn created more seating for the theatral area surrounding the terrace north of the Erechtheion.²⁰²

This leads to the final point: the mysterious notches in the foundations of the East Wall. Following the careful work of Elderkin and Hill, Leicester Holland noted a notch in a foundation block in course 18 (his course 4) behind the second column from the south (Figure 190).²⁰³ He searched for similar blocks in the environs of the Erechtheion, and found six of the eight from this course in the foundations for the aisles of the church

¹⁹⁹ Photograph Akropolis no. 11 and 12, dating to 1888.

²⁰⁰ The bedrock falls off by about 1m over 15 m – hardly the primary reason to create the East Porch at the upper level.

²⁰¹ Consideration of the Altar of Dione (mother of Aphrodite in Homer and consort of Zeus) must be taken into account. Judith Binder places this altar just east of the southernmost column of the East Porch based on Inscr. XIV, col. I, line 4: “For stonework, for channeling the columns at the east end, those opposite the altar; the one next to the altar of Dione (I), Laossos of Alopeke, 10 dr....The next column (II)...”: Paton et al. 1927, p. 383. Since the altar was probably immovable or at least in situ during the channeling of the East Porch columns, it was probably located on the terrace east of the Archaic Temple of Athena. As Zeus’ consort, Dione was strongly associated with the Oracle of Zeus at Dodona who became increasingly important during the first phase of the Peloponnesian War when Athens’ access to Delphi was cut off: J. Binder (pers. comm.). The association with Zeus is interesting because of this study’s placement of the altars of Erechtheus et al. in the east half of the temple. Pausanias sees an altar of Zeus Hypatos (the Highest) “in front of the entrance to the Erechtheion.” Perhaps these two altars were in close proximity to one another at the northeast corner of the Archaic Temple of Athena and at the southeast corner of the Erechtheion.

²⁰² On the reconstruction of the terrace north of the Erechtheion, see below “Stevens’ Reconstruction of the Terrace North of the Erechtheion.” On the state of the area of the east chamber before the Erechtheion was built, see above “Before the Ionic Temple.”

²⁰³ Holland 1924.

(Figure 505).²⁰⁴ He interprets the notches to mean that there was a pre-late 5th century structure of relatively light construction between 24 and 32 feet long from north to south against which the east foundations of the Erechtheion were built. The foundations blocks below the notch were placed against earth and the foundations above the notch were built around the earlier structure because there was some necessity to preserve it. There is compelling evidence for such a scenario still in situ in the Pandroseion, namely a thin paving slab supported by a euthynteria block and a foundation block of similar dimensions and arrangement (Figure 310 and Figure 313).²⁰⁵

The ramifications of these seemingly innocent notches are manifold. What Holland characterized as a “temenos,” in other words, a paved open space with a low parapet, must have been preserved in the late 5th century temple (Figure 542 and Figure 570).²⁰⁶ Access to this “temenos” presumably continued in the Classical through Roman periods, and was only dismantled when the temple was transformed into the basilica church.²⁰⁷ At this point, the foundation blocks that encased the earlier structure found new homes in the foundations for the colonnades of the nave when they were removed to

²⁰⁴ Holland 1924, p. 19. These blocks were moved from their ancient position in the east foundations in order to build the apse of the church and were reused in the foundations of the interior colonnades on either side of the nave. Five blocks were found in the north colonnade foundation, and one was found in the south. Two of those in the north nave have notches like the one in situ while the other one is unique having only a corner of the block cut away.

²⁰⁵ Holland 1924, p. 9.

²⁰⁶ Schultz has recently investigated the term δρύφακτος in the context of Temple of Athena Nike’s parapet as it appears in *IG I³ 64a*: Schultz 2003. He concludes that this term must refer to a low wall that one could jump over, made of either wood or stone (cf. Aristophanes, *Eq.* 674-675; Polybius. 1.22.6 and 10; Josephus, *BJ* 5.193-194). The term δρύφακτος may be appropriate to describe the architectural arrangement that fit into the notches in the east foundations of the Erechtheion.

²⁰⁷ Because of references in the accounts to the statue in the new Ionic temple, some scholars, however, assume that there must have been a naiskos, to protect the statue. The careful enumeration of the evidence by Holland precludes a structure as substantial as a naiskos. The structure accommodated by the east foundations was probably little more than a simple temenos.

make room for the apse. Therefore, there was a basement story at least in the north half of the east chamber.

As Paton et al. admit, Pausanias' use of διπλοῦν does not preclude a basement chamber.²⁰⁸ In fact, Lysias (1.9) even combines *diploun* with the diminutive word for house (οἰκίδιον ἔστι μοι διπλοῦν), and is clearly referring to a two-story structure.²⁰⁹ One may therefore conclude that there was a lower story which contained, and probably preserved access to, an important, earlier sacred space in the southern half of the basement chamber whose floor was at the level of course 20.²¹⁰ Holland suggested that this area was built directly over Mycenaean walls of significant size.²¹¹ The notch, however, accommodated the pre-late 5th century, perhaps marble, enclosure. As will be argued below, the salt-sea of Poseidon may have been located in this enclosure.

Access to this basement story remains uncertain. The interior of the South Wall at this lower level is composed of poros blocks, some with exposed anathyrosis, indicating that they come from older constructions.²¹² The stepped transition between the poros foundations and marble blocks of the South Wall has led some scholars to restore a staircase there. Penrose's aforementioned idea that there was a wooden staircase along the east end of the interior of the North Wall is likely; however, this stairway cannot have

²⁰⁸ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 486-487. Pausanias is specific about the Temple of Aphrodite-Morpho at Sparta being unique for its upper story (3.15.10): προελθοῦσι δὲ οὐ πολὺ λόφος ἐστὶν οὐ μέγας, ἐπὶ δὲ αὐτῷ ναὸς ἀρχαῖος καὶ Ἀφροδίτης ξόανον ὠπλισμένης. ναῶν δὲ ὧν οἶδα μόνῳ τούτῳ καὶ ὑπερῶν ἄλλο ἐπιχωδοῦνται Μορφοῦς ἱερόν.

²⁰⁹ *LSJ*, 1996, s.v. διπλός.

²¹⁰ For a parallel arrangement, one must only look to the sanctuary of Athena Nike where early sacred spaces and altars are preserved in the bowels of the bastion on which the Periklean temple was built.

²¹¹ Holland 1924, p. 417, fig. 4.

²¹² Paton et al. 1927, p. 10. Indeed, the block in course 19 below the notched block in situ appears to be made of a type of stone different to the blocks below and above it. Its pinkish hue suggests that it is Kara limestone, the material that makes up the stylobate of the Archaic Temple of Athena.

been for public use.²¹³ There is not enough room on the foundations of the East Wall to support anything more than a narrow gangway from the (4 foot wide) East Door along the inside of the East Wall. This arrangement means that the East Door can only have been a portal for viewing the relics and altars from above, and corresponds well to Pausanias' account of the Erechtheion and Temple of Athena Polias.²¹⁴ Fred Cooper makes the east door of the Temple of Apollo at Bassai similarly inaccessible. He does so, however, to let light in more than to allow viewing.²¹⁵

Extrapolations based on the notches in the east foundations discussed above have led several scholars to reconstruct a post-Persian tetrastyle naiskos in the southeast corner of the Erechtheion to house Athena Polias during the construction of the Erechtheion. Hurwit reproduces such a plan without an explanation of the evidence for the reconstruction.²¹⁶ For example, when work was conducted in the vicinity of the “image” in the building accounts, scholars assume she must have been protected by a structure: “These references [in the building accounts] imply that a small naiskos, perhaps of mud-brick, housed the cult statue, constructed on or near the site of the Porch of the Karyatids. As the new temple was being built, the statue continued to stand there. This would account for the irregular orthostates and wall-joints that have been observed on the western part of the inner face of the south wall.”²¹⁷

One problem is a confusion about the whereabouts of the statue of Athena Polias between the end of the Persian War and the completion of the ceiling of the Erechtheion.

²¹³ The evidence for this staircase is laid out above on p. 84.

²¹⁴ For the reconstruction of the east half of the Erechtheion, see Figure 542.

²¹⁵ Cooper 1996, pp. 218-228.

²¹⁶ Hurwit 1999, p. 145, fig. 115. The origin of this frequently reproduced plan is in the Akropolis Study Center.

²¹⁷ Harris 1995, p. 403, citing Holland 1924, pp. 16-23, 407-421. See also Paton et al. 1927, pp. 44-146; Dinsmoor 1947, p. 109, note 4; Hill 1969, p. 176.

Plutarch (*Them.* 10) implies that the statue was taken to Salamis when most of the Athenians evacuated. Where was it housed when it returned? Korres has convincingly argued that “the cella, or at least part of the cella, of the temple of Athena Polias was repaired and maintained for worship.”²¹⁸ This would mean that the header of Inscr. II, col. II, line 1, which refers to the Erechtheion in 409/8 B.C. as the “temple on the Akropolis in which the ancient image is,” was proleptic.²¹⁹ In 409/8 B.C., the coffered ceiling and roof beams were still not in place, but all these were in place by the end of the first year of resumed construction. Perhaps the cult statue was moved from the east cella of the Archaic Temple to the west half of the Erechtheion in a special procession through the Maiden Porch which acted as a permanent bridge between her old and new homes.²²⁰ After 408, none of the activities going on in the vicinity of the statue would have affected it. When the painting was going on above it, or the smoothing of moldings behind it, simple measures could be taken to ensure its safety.

A structure of the statue’s own in the form of a naiskos was not necessary, nor is there any evidence – literary, epigraphical, or archaeological – to prove it. There was no taboo about moving a cult statue around to accommodate the logistics of renovations, or, especially, for its physical protection.

In sum, the phrase “διπλοῦν γάρ ἐστι τὸ οἶκημα” appears to refer to a two-storied space, namely the undivided interior of the Erechtheion. Pausanias most likely described this space from the vantage point of the East Porch as he looked down from the

²¹⁸ Korres 1994c, p. 42. For another possible location of the Athena Polias statue after the Persian War, see Raubitschek and Jeffery 1949, pp. 359-364.

²¹⁹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 298.

²²⁰ See below “Function of the Maiden Porch and the Identity of the Maidens.”

East Door onto a precinct that preserved pre-Classical altars and a temenos for the salt-sea of Poseidon at the level of the North Porch.

MOLDINGS

Since Jeppesen read ΠΡΟΣΤΟΙΟΝ where earlier editors had read ΠΡΟΣΤΟΜΙΑΙΟΝ, the implications of Inscription II, col. I, lines 69-76 require reinterpretation.²²¹ These lines state the following:

1. On the wall within (το τοίχο το ἔντος): 8 tetrapodies of molded stone are in need of smoothing.
2. On the wall in the *prostoion*: 12 tetrapodies of molded stone are in need of smoothing.
3. The *parastas*: 7? tetrapodies of molded stone are in need of smoothing.
4. On the wall toward (or by) the image (το πρὸς το ἀγάλματος): 6? tetrapodies of molded stone are in need of smoothing.

In the light of the hypothesis put forward in this study that Athena Polias resided in the west portion of the temple,²²² the following interpretation, based on the assumption that each designation represents a molding along a different wall or feature, can be constructed:

1. The wall “within” must be the interior of the North Wall of the temple.

The distance from the West Cross-Wall to the beginning of the

²²¹ Jeppesen 1983. A *prostoion* is the common architectural term for an ante-chamber, like the *pastas* of a Greek house, as in Plato’s description of Kallias’ residence in *Protagoras*. For the importance of this reinterpretation, see below “Moldings.”

²²² For a summary of this hypothesis, see below “Conclusion: A New Restoration of the Erechtheion in the Classical Period.”

presumed staircase at the east end is 32 Attic feet, that is, exactly 8 tetrapodies.²²³

2. Jeppesen has proven that the *prostoion* is the West Corridor. 12 tetrapodies implies that 48 linear (Attic) feet required smoothing. The temple is 30 feet wide and the West Corridor has two long walls of that length, making 60 feet. It is not clear whether this was a molding along the floor (like a wall foot molding as in the Hephaisteion) or at a higher level. If the molding is along the ground (i.e., along the benches on either side of the West Corridor),²²⁴ it would be possible to subtract the width of the doors (5+5=10 Attic feet) and the blocks missing in the vicinity of the Kekropeion (about 2 feet) and arrive at 48 Attic feet for the amount of bench in need of smoothing.
3. *Parastas*, meaning “anything that stands beside” can be translated variously as doorpost, pilaster, vestibule or entrance.²²⁵ In the Erechtheion, the term seems to refer to the molded jambs of the North Door. The same term is used in both the building accounts and the treasury inscriptions. In the latter, *parastas* appears to refer to objects hanging or leaning against the “doorpost,” a term always used in the singular in both sources of evidence.²²⁶ The inner lining of the North Door was made of wood, an appropriate material to which to attach

²²³ On the continuation of the marble floor level east of the East Pilaster (or so-called East Cross-Wall) see above “Interpreting Diploun... Oikema.”

²²⁴ WW.20.02-07, and the complementary bench restored by Paton et al. at the base of the West Cross-Wall: Paton et al. 1927, pl. 1.

²²⁵ *LSJ*, 1996, s.v. παραστάς.

²²⁶ Harris 1995, pp. 201-222.

dedications.²²⁷ In the case of the moldings in need of smoothing, this probably refers to the marble moldings on the exterior of the North Door. The North Door has about 40 Attic feet of marble moldings. The restored footage in the inscription is 7 x 4 Attic feet = 28 Attic feet. Perhaps some of the moldings had already been carved, or the restoration of 7 tetrapodies is inaccurate.²²⁸

4. And lastly, there is the wall “toward” or “by the image.” This must be the east side of the West Cross-Wall, the same wall on which the painting of Erichthonios hung, “behind the image” and the same image above which the coffers were painted.²²⁹ The restored length of the molding in need of smoothing is 6 tetrapodies, or 24 Attic feet. Assuming this was a wall-base molding, this amount corresponds well to the length of the wall (30 feet) minus the width of the opening in the wall (approximately 5 feet plus the width of its moldings).

CEILING AND ROOF OF THE MAIN BUILDING

The reconstruction of the coffered ceiling and roof of the main building of the Erechtheion should be based on the detailed information available in the building accounts. Inscription XIII, col. I, lines 4-5, refers to the placement of “the bent (or cambered) beam”: τὸν καμπύλεν σελίδα.²³⁰ This beam is usually restored above the half-height West Cross-Wall because of the assumption of the existence of the East

²²⁷ The stone to which the wooden interior jambs were attached suffered extensive damage during the major fire (Figure 477).

²²⁸ Further autopsy of the inscription is required.

²²⁹ Inscr. XI, col. III, lines 43-46.

²³⁰ For the inscription, see Paton et al. 1927, p. 380.

Cross-Wall that reached the ceiling and so required no transverse beam. However, examination of the junctions of the West Cross-Wall with the North and South Walls suggest that the cambered beam system does not belong here. Instead, an anta probably framed a colonnade above the West Cross-Wall with an architrave above, similar in arrangement to the West Façade (Figure 572).²³¹ The massiveness of the foundations supporting the West Cross-Wall (which are more substantial than those supporting the whole West Façade) suggests that this wall, and its colonnade, supported the roof.

In contrast, there is no evidence for a solid East Cross-Wall supporting the ceiling and roof. Therefore, the cambered beam should instead be assigned to support the great transverse beam at the East Pilasters on the North and South Walls.²³² At this junction on the North and South Walls, the blocks are only half thickness from course 6 and above (Figure 477 and Figure 207). This suggests strongly that there was a vertical, probably wooden beam inserted here. The cambered beam would have acted as a brace between the vertical and horizontal roof elements. The support for the ceiling here should be restored in an arrangement similar to the cambered brace support for the roofs of English churches, such as Thame's parish church (Figure 685).

As these beams were not in place in 409 B.C., it is impossible that the ceiling and roof over the East Chamber were in place. As there is no mention anywhere of the carving of this ceiling in the building accounts, it is fairly safe to assume that there was no ceiling over the east chamber.

²³¹ This is similar to Papanikolaou's perspective drawing in the Akropolis Study Center, labeled "ΣΧ. 48," and as published in Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, p. 98, as an illustration for Palagia's theory that the Lamp of Kallimachos stood in the Niche: Palagia 1984. On the Lamp and the Niche, see below "Lamp of Kallimachos and the Niche."

²³² The absence of an East Cross-Wall is argued above in "Interpreting Diploun... Oikema."

The building accounts offer tantalizing clues about the layout of the coffered ceiling of the main building, including the total amount paid to the artisans for carving it and the topographical indicator that coffers “above the image” were painted. Paton et al., who thought the image (of Athena Polias) was located in the east chamber, found the task so contentious that they published more than one reconstruction for the arrangement of the ceiling.

Hawes constructed an ingenious argument for the arrangement of the ceiling of the west half of the main building based on the building inscriptions (Figure 550). Her reconstruction and explanation also confirm the location of Athena Polias in the west half of the building.²³³ Inscription XI, col. III, lines 6-13, states that four men were paid 20 drachmas each for carving four “smaller frame squares,” that is, the inner two levels of the coffers.²³⁴ Each coffer had 3 frames: the largest was 2 ½ feet to a side (10 feet all the way around), the middle 1 ½ feet (6 feet), and the smallest, 1 foot (4 feet) (Figure 551). The cost of carving the large frame was the same as the cost of carving the two, smaller, inner frames. Hawes calculated that each man was paid ½ a drachma per carved foot of coffer. Therefore, each coffer required 20 feet of carving and cost 10 drachmas. The total expenditure on the carving of the ceiling was 1100 drachmas (line 15). Therefore, 110 coffers of the same size were carved.²³⁵

There were two coffers carved into each wooden “ladder,” or series of coffers. Over the west chamber 6 such ladders were in turn placed between wooden beams 1 ½

²³³ Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*.

²³⁴ These are among the same coffers other men were paid to paint “above the image [of Athena Polias]” (lines 43-46 of the same inscription). For the inscriptions, see Paton et al. 1927, pp. 338-341. Paton et al. attempt to work out the arrangement of this ceiling to be placed over the east chamber because this is where they imagined statue of Athena Polias to have been located.

²³⁵ The 50 coffers in the corridor received painted floral ornaments like the North Porch, and the 60 coffers in the central chamber received painted bosses.

feet wide running north-south and resting on top of the epikranitis (Figure 550).

Therefore, between each beam were 12 coffers, to make a total of 60 coffers. With the 5 sets of frames 2 ½ feet wide and 4 beams each 1 ½ feet wide, the total width of this portion of the ceiling was 18 ½ feet. The 6 double ladders were each 5 feet long, and total 30 feet, the width of the main building.

Over the West Corridor, 4 east-west beams 1 ¼ feet wide supported 5 double ladders arranged north-south. Therefore, between each beam were 10 coffers, to make a total of 50 coffers. With 5 sets of frames 5 feet wide (25 feet) and 4 beams 1 ¼ feet (5 feet) wide, the total width of the ceiling is 30 feet, which corresponds to the width of the main building. The width of the West Corridor is, in turn, 12 ½ feet wide.

At 10 drachmas per coffer, and (50+60) coffers carved, the total expenditure is 1100 drachmas, as in the inscription. These same carved coffers were subsequently painted. The painters were paid for coffers “above the image,” that is, the olive wood cult statue of Athena. This places Athena in the west part of the temple. Since the West Corridor is essentially the pronaos of the temple, we must imagine Athena east of the West Cross-Wall and assume that these are the 14 coffers indicated as being painted above her.²³⁶

Based on these calculations and the absence of further expenditure for carving a coffered ceiling in subsequent inscriptions, there appears to have been no coffered ceiling above the eastern chamber of the main building.²³⁷ This potential absence of a ceiling above the east part of the temple, i.e., east of the cambered beam, may be appropriate if

²³⁶ See above “Moldings.”

²³⁷ The other possibility is that the coffered ceiling over the east chamber was already in place before the commissioners’ report of 409, but as discussed above, the cambered beam to support the roof over the main chamber had not yet been placed. See above “Moldings.”

indeed it housed altars of Poseidon-Erechtheus, Hephaistos and Boutes, on which sacrifices were burned.

EAST WALL

Stevens reconstructed the East Doorway in the East Wall to be almost 9 Attic feet (2.60 m) wide. This reconstruction is based on a complex, logical, but not exclusive interpretation of the evidence.²³⁸ There must also be two windows in the East Wall because of the duplication of the moldings among the surviving fragments.²³⁹

In Stevens' reconstruction, the location of the window in the wall is set by Block "F" which has cuttings for the lintel of a window. Similarly, Block "G" has cuttings for the sill of a window. Paton et al. place these blocks in courses 4 and 9 respectively. The width of the East Door is based on the survival of a single wall block, "E", which was rabbeted to receive the lining for a jamb in some other material. Early in the 20th century, Hawes convincingly argued in her unpublished article that the door should be much smaller, only 4 Attic feet wide, in order to accommodate the consoles still to be placed as mentioned in the building inscriptions. She rightly complained on aesthetic grounds that, "In the restoration of the East Façade by Mr. Stevens there is too little space between windows and door for good appearance, [and] no room at all for door consoles."²⁴⁰

During the interventions of the 1970s and 1980s, Papanikolaou identified additional fragments of the door frame and windows of the East Wall. Casanaki and Mallouchou published a collage of Papanikolaou's conclusions and Stevens'

²³⁸ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 32-45, and pl. 17.

²³⁹ Paton et al. 1927 pp. 38-45, graphically demonstrated on p. 43.

²⁴⁰ Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*: Inscr. II, col. II, lines 93-94; Paton et al. 1927, pp. 296-297. She also postulated that two of the 8 ¼ x 2 ½' door leaves mentioned in the building accounts of 409/8 B.C. just prior to the console for the east door belong here. This is a sound conclusion. The other doors belong to the West Door or Maiden Porch. The Classical lintels on both have been since cut away by later alterations; but the width of these openings matches. See above "West Chamber."

reconstruction of the East Wall. This diagram shows how the few additional fragments can be arranged around the windows and the lintel of the door.²⁴¹

It is possible to create a more aesthetically pleasing reconstruction of the East Wall, which both takes into account the surviving blocks and parallels contemporary buildings on the Akropolis (Figure 543). This is a two step procedure. First, the windows should be moved up one course; Block “F” can be moved to serve as the top right corner of the south window (Figure 543).²⁴² Second, the East Door should be narrowed: the extant rabbeted wall block “E” can be placed one course higher, in course 10, which, with the standard arrangement of the ashlar masonry, makes the door 2 feet narrower on each side, and results in an opening of 5 Attic feet. This allows one set of the heavy and decorated doors (2 ½ Attic feet wide by 8 ¼ feet tall each) mentioned in the building accounts to be used for the East Door, rather than the hypothetical openings in the light-weight West Cross-Wall.²⁴³ This also allows for the logical inclusion of the next item mentioned on the inscription to be used in the same part of the building (two of the door-leaves, at least): “the console for the lintel at the east end, incompletely worked.”²⁴⁴ How to restore these consoles created a real problem for Paton et al. and

²⁴¹ Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, pp. 92, 97; Paton et al. 1927, pl. 17. Papanikolaou’s detailed reconstruction of one of the openings is displayed on the wall in the Acropolis Study Center in Makriyianni and is published in Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985 (with no scale), p. 98; and Brouskari 1997 (with a scale), pp. 176-177. The caption in Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985 for fig. IX.2 reads as follows: “Reconstructed drawing of the southern window in the eastern door wall”: Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, p. 95. Brouskari’s publication introduces some confusion, however, in that the caption for fig. 120 on p. 177 reads “Drawn reconstruction of the east entrance to the Erechtheion (after Papanikolaou).” The width of this aperture measures 0.72 m, or 2 Attic feet according to the scale. It appears that there was a problem in the translation from Greek to English in Brouskari’s work. For further discussion of the four small doorways of the temple, see page 71.

²⁴² Block “G” can be moved up one course and northward in order to serve as the bottom left corner of the north window.

²⁴³ Inscr. II, col. II, lines 87-92. On the allocation of the doors mentioned in inscriptions, see above “West Chamber.” On the correct reconstruction of the West Cross-Wall, see above “West Cross-Wall.”

²⁴⁴ Inscr. II, col. II, lines 93-95. Paton et al. 1927, p. 297.

Stevens omits them from his reconstruction altogether.²⁴⁵ As Hawes pointed out, there is no room for a console on the East Door as reconstructed by Stevens, but with the reduction in the size of the door, there is adequate space. Furthermore, the fragments of the East Door lintel identified by Papanikolaos are proportionally much too small for the 8 foot doorway (using the North Door as a model for an 8 foot wide door) conceived by Stevens and onto which Papanikolaou restored the fragments.²⁴⁶

Stevens restored the doorway with a width of 9 feet because Paton et al. believed this was the entrance to the shrine of Athena Polias. As the most important shrine of the Athenians, she required a grand entrance. With Athena now relocated to the west half of the temple and the East Porch acting as a viewing platform for the altars and relics at a lower level in the interior, the East Door need not be nearly as grand.²⁴⁷

Windows in cella walls are rare in Greek temple architecture. The existence of the windows in the East Wall of the Erechtheion surprised Paton et al. as there were no known parallels in 1927. The windows in northwest wing of the Propylaia were known, but this was not a temple. Since 1927, evidence for windows in the Parthenon and the Temple of the Athenians at Delos has also been discovered²⁴⁸ The engaged pilasters on the back of the hexastyle amphiprostyle Temple of the Athenians are unusual in Greek

²⁴⁵ Paton et al. 1927, pl. 17.

²⁴⁶ Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, pp. 92, 95, 97, figs. 1.3, 1.4.

²⁴⁷ A tall threshold to impede access to the interior (and to increase safety) has also been restored (Figure 543). See Cooper 1996, pp. 219-221, on the east entrance of the Temple of Apollo at Bassai. Cooper has also restored a high threshold (0.648 m above the pteroma) to impede access based on solid evidence of extant blocks. There was also a grille set into cuttings in the pteroma: Cooper 1996, p. 223. Unfortunately, the stylobate of the East Porch of the Erechtheion is not preserved, but a similar restoration may be appropriate. Another, even taller “threshold” can be found at Didyma whose doorway was again not for entry.

²⁴⁸ I. Shear 1963, p. 408. The Delian temple, incidentally, has four pilasters *in antis*, like the two in the Temple of Athena Nike which is believed by some, including I. Shear, to have been designed by Kallikrates. I. Shear argued that Kallikrates was the designer of the Erechtheion, and the Erechtheion also probably had pilasters on the interior of the half-columns of the West Façade.

architecture of this period, namely, 425-420 B.C.²⁴⁹ Korres discovered fragments of the windows of the East Wall of the Parthenon during his tenure as head architect of the restoration of the Parthenon.²⁵⁰ The windows in the Parthenon are the best chronologically- and topographically-comparable example.²⁵¹ Light was especially important for illuminating the paintings and tapestries housed in the Erechtheion. The windows in the Parthenon are less elongated in shape than the windows in the Erechtheion. This is not surprising as such elongation is sympathetic to the Ionic order of the Erechtheion (Figure 543).

FUNCTION OF THE MAIDEN PORCH AND THE IDENTITY OF THE MAIDENS

Many scholars have contributed to the interpretation of the function of the Maiden Porch and the identity of the maidens since 1927. Art historians have re-examined the date of the porch and authorship of the maidens.²⁵² While Ephor of the Akropolis, Maria Brouskari identified several new fragments of the maidens, such as the left lower arm of Maiden #5 and the head of Maiden #6.²⁵³ These and other contributions to the scholarship on the Maiden Porch are summarized in this section.

There are several theories about the function and significance of the Maiden Porch. Kontoleon insightfully argued that the Maiden Porch served as a monopteral heroön to mark the Tomb of Kekrops.²⁵⁴ Scholl supports Kontoleon's theory in a series of long articles on the Maiden Porch where he argues that the maidens are mourners for

²⁴⁹ Bruneau and Ducat 1983, pp. 129-130.

²⁵⁰ See Korres 1984. These windows are also illustrated in Korres 1994b, p. 85.

²⁵¹ Andron A at Labraunda is another example. See Hellström 1989; *Labraunda* I.2, pp. 40-48.

²⁵² Scholl 1995; Scholl 1998.

²⁵³ Brouskari 1984, p. 61. This arm fragment has a triple bracelet similar to the copies of the Erechtheion maidens from the Villa of Hadrian at Tivoli. On the head, see Brouskari 1963.

²⁵⁴ Kontoleon 1949. This interpretation has found wide acceptance, including Marszal 1988, pp. 205; Palagia (pers. comm.).

Kekrops because of the association of “caryatids” with tombs.²⁵⁵ If the Maiden Porch is a heroön for Kekrops, then Korres is probably not correct that a stele marked the tomb of Kekrops in the Classical period and prevented the masons from finishing the south anta of the West Façade. Otherwise, the Kekropeion would have had had two markers. The simpler of these two markers would hardly have been reason to truncate the Maiden Porch and push it off axis, thus resulting in it not fully covering the mound of the tomb.²⁵⁶ The Maiden Porch was probably originally designed to encapsulate fully the Kekropeion, and so serve as its marker, as evidenced by the 3-foot reduction in width.²⁵⁷ The reason why the Maiden Porch was truncated on the west and the bosses were left on the West Façade is more likely due to the impediment of the giant olive tree of Athena rather than Korres’ hypothetical pillar *sema*.²⁵⁸

I. Shear, however, maintains that the Maiden Porch does not commemorate the Tomb of Kekrops because it does not follow the pattern used for the other religious tokens.²⁵⁹ Kontoleon and Scholl ignore the association of architectural maidens with treasuries, e.g., the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi. The substitution of maidens for columns in the South Porch does not appear to denote its function as a treasury although the Erechtheion as a whole, as the *archaios neos*, certainly housed many valuable objects which were listed in the treasury inscriptions. But then this is the function of most

²⁵⁵ Scholl 1995; Scholl 1998. On the association of “real” Vitruvian-defined caryatids with tombs, see King 1998 and Chapter IV. Although it is later than the Erechtheion, the quotation of the Maiden Porch by Perikles in his 4th century funeral monument at Limyra is the strongest support for Kontoleon’s interpretation. See Chapter III on the Heroön of Perikles at Limyra.

²⁵⁶ The stele, Korres argues, replaced a huge Archaic Ionic column monument surmounted by a sphinx which was destroyed by the Persians: Korres 1997. See above “Archaic and Early Classical Period.”

²⁵⁷ See above “Original Plan” and Figure 548.

²⁵⁸ See below “Conclusion: A New Restoration of the Erechtheion in the Classical Period.”

²⁵⁹ I. Shear 1999, p. 84, note 65.

temples, and so the idea that the Maiden Porch somehow indicated a treasury is not a compelling argument.

In actuality, with its truncation, the Maiden Porch ended up serving primarily as a (narrow and twisted) physical bridge between the old cult place of Athena Polias and her new home in the western portion of the Erechtheion. Never fully considered in this light are the significance of the east entrance to the South Porch, the marble staircase, and the alignment of the east cella of the Archaic Temple of Athena with the western chamber of the Erechtheion where the olive wood statue of Athena Polias stood with her back to the West Cross-Wall. Whether the procession of her statue was played out only once or several times, the routes of ritual access between the two cult places is undeniable. Unlike the old theories that reconstruct the west half of the Erechtheion in imitation of the Opisthodomos, we should look toward the east cella of the Archaic Temple of Athena for inspiration instead.²⁶⁰

What are the origins of the female architectural supports? The female form had been used to support *perirrhanteria* and as mirror handles since the early Archaic period.²⁶¹ Most recently, I. Shear proposed an attractive theory that the maidens of the South Porch are part of the miniaturization of the Ionic order from Asia Minor.²⁶² In essence, she postulates that the huge Archaic Ionic temples of Asia Minor, such as the Temple of Artemis at Ephesus, were adapted for use on the Greek mainland by miniaturizing the various elements. This miniaturization is first manifested in the earliest Ionic marble building on the Greek mainland, namely the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi,

²⁶⁰ On the imitation of the Opisthodomos in the west part of the Erechtheion, see above “West Chamber.”

²⁶¹ On the origins of “caryatid” see Homolle 1917; Picard 1935; Plommer 1979.

²⁶² I. Shear 1999.

traditionally dated to 525 B.C., well before the Persian War.²⁶³ For I. Shear, the female architectural supports from this treasury derive from the reliefs of female figures that decorated the bases of the columns of the Temple of Artemis at Ephesos.²⁶⁴

Nor were female architectural supports necessarily a new feature on the Athenian Akropolis in the Classical period. Ridgway, followed by Marszal, has argued that the Lyons kore (550-540 B.C.) was part of an architectural context because the top of her polos was treated to receive another block, and because of her hefty proportions and the unusual direction of her himation. This garment falls in the opposite direction from almost all other korai, that is from left shoulder to right hip, suggesting that she was one

²⁶³ Vickers 1985 attempted to redate the Siphnian Treasury to after the Persian Wars in order to argue in favor of Vitruvius' etiology of "caryatid" applying to these female architectural supports thereby removing the problem that they were "invented" before the event that was supposed to have inspired their creation. In spite of the strong associations between the maidens of the South Porch and the maidens on the east frieze of the Parthenon, and as descendants of the pre-Persian maidens from Delphi and perhaps also the Lyons kore on the Akropolis, Vickers has constructed an insightful argument which harbingers the Vitruvian definition of "caryatid" and the subsequent conflation of the term with the Erechtheion. Although his arguments for down-dating the Siphnian Treasury to after the Persian Wars to allow for a Vitruvian reading of term "caryatid" are untenable, Vickers points out that a passage in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*, produced in 411 B.C., perhaps refers to the maidens of the Erechtheion in a mocking way. The maidens of the South Porch "will surely have given Aristophanes the idea for a play whose central theme is the occupation by women of the Acropolis; Before they were raised into position, the Erechtheum Caryatids will have stood around on the Acropolis in public view and will doubtless have been the objects of precisely the kind of crude remark addressed to the Spartan, Corinthian and Theban women early in Aristophanes' play: 'and here's our lovely Spartan, Hello, Lampito dear. Why darling, you're simply ravishing! Such blemishless complexion – so clean, so out-of-doors! And will you look at that figure – the pink of perfection' – and 'what unbelievably beautiful bosoms....'": Vickers 1985, p. 19; Aristophanes, *Lysistrata*, 78 (Trans. Parker). In light of his reading of Aristophanes, Vickers suggests that the maidens of the South Porch are the burdened and humiliated Lakonian matrons and the occasion for including them in the Erechtheion was the peace treaty between Sparta and Persia in 412. (Vickers argues for a late date for the start of construction and no hiatus in work on the Erechtheion.) The maidens' inclusion under these circumstances would not only have highlighted the despised cozy relationship with an old, universal foe, but also acted as a reminder that the Spartans did not come to the aid of the Athenians and Plataians in 490 at Marathon. If Vickers is correct in associating the comments of the Athenian women with the foreignness of the Erechtheion maidens, then there would be a case for a Vitruvian reading, but there are no iconographical markers to do so.

²⁶⁴ Owing to I. Shear's focus on the origin of the female figural supports, she does not take into account the more normal sized Ionic architecture in the Cyclades which seems to be the origin of most Attic Ionic buildings: Coulton (pers. comm.).

of a symmetrical pair like the extant Siphnian maiden.²⁶⁵ If so (though probably not), as Hurwit points out, the maidens in the South Porch of the Erechtheion “must now be considered Classical expressions of an architectural tradition that had already been established there in the Archaic Period.”²⁶⁶ This is not to say that these female sculptures all represented the same female persona. Their attributes differ: the Lyons kore holds a dove in her right hand, and her (very muscular) arm is bent across her torso; the Siphnian and ex-Knidian maidens from Delphi have elaborately decorated poloi; and the Erechtheion maidens almost certainly held phialai. There is, however, a marked similarity in the hairstyles of the architectural females from the Akropolis in that both the Lyons kore and the Erechtheion maidens have coiled tresses descending over their shoulders. This leads to the issue of the identity of the maidens.

In the building accounts, they are simply referred to as *korai*, or maidens.²⁶⁷ Paton et al. were unaware that they held phialai. The copies from Tivoli, which include phialai, were only discovered in 1952.²⁶⁸ They also wore snake-headed bracelets, but these were standard forms of jewelry in Antiquity.²⁶⁹ Some scholars believe the echinus may have once been a basket that was subsequently cut down during the change in plan, which would make the women “carriers of unmentionable things” or the Arrhephoroi; however, the architectural nature of the echinus suggests that this was never a basket like

²⁶⁵ Akropolis Museum no. 269 and Lyons Museum (head): Ridgway 1993, pp. 147-148; Marszal 1988. Coulton disagrees that the Lyon kore was an architectural support because there are other *korai* with reversed drapery that are definitely not architectural (e.g., Akropolis Museum no. 672), and because the top of her polos slopes: Coulton (pers. comm.).

²⁶⁶ Hurwit 1999, p. 115.

²⁶⁷ Inscr. II, col. I, line 86. Most free-standing *korai* were votives or served a funerary function.

²⁶⁸ The more recently discovered 4th century B.C. copies of the Erechtheion maidens at Limyra (see Chapter III) also held phialai.

²⁶⁹ Brouskari identified the left lower arm of Maiden #5 which has a bracelet similar to the Tivoli maidens: Brouskari 1984, p. 61. On the conservation of iconography in ancient jewelry, see Higgins 1980.

those carried by the Eleusis maidens of the Lesser Propylon.²⁷⁰ Olga Palagia points to the single braid starting at the center of the maidens' foreheads as a distinguishing feature. She conjectures that these signify young girls of aristocratic birth, the daughters of Athenian citizens who participated in the Panathenaic procession, as shown on the Parthenon East Frieze (Figure 601).²⁷¹ They would have dedicated their braids as part of a coming of age ritual. Based on their physiognomy (developed breasts and substantial hips), she estimates their age at about sixteen years.²⁷² Vickers uses the same hairstyle to identify them as Lakonian matrons, but he does not cite any iconographic parallels. Therefore, unfortunately the hairstyle is not a particularly useful indicator until a study of regional and age-related hairstyles has been conducted.

There is also a small possibility that the Erechtheion maidens held oinochoai because the loose copies of the Erechtheion maidens from the municipal forum at Augusta Emerita (modern Mérida, Spain) held vessels (Figure 659), and oinochoe- and phiale- bearers are intermingled on the Parthenon frieze (Figure 602).²⁷³ The oinochoai carried by the maidens in the Parthenon frieze (and perhaps by those on the Erechtheion) may be further related to those found on the North Slope of the Akropolis and used in the cleansing ceremony as hypothesized by Robertson.²⁷⁴

The maidens of the South Porch probably represented the officially-sanctioned replacements for the plethora of Archaic *korai* destroyed by the Persians and ritually

²⁷⁰ On the Eleusis maidens, see Palagia 1997, pp. 83-87, with bibliography.

²⁷¹ On the maidens carrying phialai on the Parthenon frieze, see Neils 2001, pp. 154-158. None of the heads of the phialai carriers on the Parthenon frieze is well enough preserved to tell if they too had braids in the center of their heads.

²⁷² Palagia (pers. comm.); Rehak (pers. comm.).

²⁷³ Early 19th century scholar, William Wilkins, suggested (insightfully perhaps, but without evidence) that the maidens may have carried hydria.

²⁷⁴ Robertson 1996, p. 34. On these oinochoai, see Green 1962; See below “A Series of Special Ritual Vessels.”

buried in the only definitely closed *Perserschutt* deposit on the Akropolis northwest of the Erechtheion.²⁷⁵ Further support for this theory lies in the fact that the Erechtheion maidens have coiled tresses of hair hanging over the front of their shoulders, a regular feature of the Archaic *korai*, but fairly uncommon among statues of women in the 5th century. This archaism is not a feature of the maidens on the Parthenon frieze with whom the Erechtheion maidens are most often equated.²⁷⁶

If the maidens of the South Porch are replacements for the Archaic *korai*, then they cannot all be representations of Athena. While they are highly idealized, they are all deliberately different in subtle ways and so do not represent a single person or deity. Had uniformity been desirable, it could have been achieved within the context of sculpting this part of the monument. The maidens of the South Porch are therefore probably the official replacements for the *korai* destroyed by the Persians. In this capacity, they represent the honored teenage servants of Athena who perpetually stand ready to make libations to the olive wood cult statue's former home in the east cella of Archaic Temple of Athena, also destroyed by the Persians (Figure 146).

DESIGN NOTE ON THE WEST ANTA OF THE MAIDEN PORCH

Edward Dodwell correctly complained that James Stuart misrepresented the west side of MP.PW.01 as being decorated.²⁷⁷ Although the south face of the pilaster capital was originally carved with anthemion, the west face was not, as depicted in Dodwell, *South-West View of the Erechtheion*, 1805 (Figure 42), Pomardi, *West End of the*

²⁷⁵ Hurwit 1999, p. 206; Kavvadias and Kawerau 1906, p. 23.

²⁷⁶ Neils' E2-E6, E60-E61: Neils 2001, pp. 154-158. Conversely, Archaic *korai* do not have their hair gathered at the back like the Erechtheion maidens. This gathering of the hair may have been done to augment the slender silhouette of the maidens' neck and to counter their architectonic appearance.

²⁷⁷ Dodwell 1819, p. 349. See also Chapter IV "Dodwell and Pomardi" and T 43 in Appendix B.

Pandrosion, 1804-1805 (Figure 44), Pomardi, *Erechtheion*, 1804-1805 (Figure 43), Williams, *Temple of Pandrosus*, 1817 (Figure 50), Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819 (Figure 58), and Page, *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*, 1818 (Figure 55).

Gell is the only dissenter, but his southwest view is rife with other problems which indicate that he finished the drawing at another location. Majority certainly rule here.

Paton et al. copied Stuart's mistake.²⁷⁸ MP.PW.01 was shattered during the War of Independence and the west half of it was rebuilt without any carved detail on its west or south sides.²⁷⁹

Because the Maiden Porch was finished to a higher degree than the rest of the building according to the Chandler Stele (except, of course, for the rosettes on the architrave), one must ask whether this blank band on the West Pilaster was a deliberate decision in order to make the West Façade a more pleasing and balanced composition; another case of impeded access owing to the branches of the olive tree; or, just unfinished carving. Achieving a balanced composition for the West Façade was a tall order. There was an anthemion band at the top of the antae and columns of the West Façade, and on the anta and columns of the North Porch. Perhaps the architect/overseer thought it would have looked odd if there was another, much smaller, anthemion band visible on the anta of the Maiden Porch. If this were the case, the west side of MP.PW.01 was left blank on purpose.

Alternatively, this is the area of the Kekropeion and the olive tree and we must recall that many of the lifting bosses were left on the west face of the West Porch's south

²⁷⁸ Paton et al. 1927, pl. 13.

²⁷⁹ On the damage to the Maiden Porch during the War of Independence, see Chapter VII.

anta.²⁸⁰ Perhaps, therefore, this area was inaccessible or unnecessary to finish because of the impediment in the form of branches of the gigantic, crooked olive tree.²⁸¹

NORTH PORCH AS THE ENTRANCE TO THE TEMPLE OF ATHENA POLIAS

Vitruvius identified the North Porch as the entrance to the Temple of Athena Polias. In *De Architectura* 4.8.4, two temples in Attica have “all that we regularly find on the fronts of others is in these transferred to the sides” and are comparable to examples at Rome. One of these would seem to be the Temple of Athena Polias, i.e., the Erechtheion. Scholars who resist the identification of the Erechtheion as the Temple of Athena Polias or relegate her to the east chamber dismiss this evidence.

In his description of the various types of temples, Vitruvius states:

There are also other kinds of temples, constructed in the same symmetrical proportions and yet with a different kind of plan: for example, the temple of Castor in the district of the Circus Flaminius, that of Vejovis between the two groves, and still more ingeniously the temple of Nemi Diana in her sacred grove, with columns added on the right and left at the flanks of the pronaos. Temples of this kind, like that of Castor in the Circus, were first built in Athens on the Acropolis, and in Attica at Sunium to Pallas Minerva. The proportions of them are not different, but the same as usual. For the length of their cellae is twice the width as in other temples, but all that we regularly find on the fronts of others is in these transferred to the sides.²⁸²

In other words, Vitruvius considered the building known as the Erechtheion to be the Temple of Pallas Minerva (a cella with a porch or colonnade on its side): it is the position of the North and South Porches that defines it as such. Also, since the East

²⁸⁰ WW.05.01 and WW.07.01 still have their lifting bosses, but the anta block adjacent to the pilaster capital, WW.06.01, does not.

²⁸¹ Another break in the anthemion band is where it does not go around the corner onto east face of NN.05.00 in the Westward Projection of the North Porch (Figure 328). This is where it meets the south side of a plain interbeam block. Again, it is difficult to tell whether this was left unfinished because it would never have been seen, or if it is a conscious design decision to allow for a more pleasing flow into the simpler surfaces. In any event, the west surface of MP.PW.01 was never given an anthemion band. On the size of the olive tree, see note 387.

²⁸² Vitruvius 4.8.4. See Appendix A for the Latin text.

Porch was simply a viewing platform as argued above, the North Door must be the main entrance to the temple which Vitruvius identifies by description as belonging to Athena. Antonio Corso, in his article about whether Vitruvius ever visited Athens and Attica and in his recent edition of Vitruvius' *De Architectura*, has no qualms about attributing the Erechtheion to Athena based on this passage.²⁸³ Moreover, he cites Vitruvius' identification of the Erechtheion as the Temple of Athena with its pronaos (North Porch) and cella (central chamber) at right angles as support for scholars who locate the temple of Athena in the western part of the Erechtheion.²⁸⁴

Scholars who place Athena in the east half of the Erechtheion find this passage of Vitruvius highly inconvenient because it appears to identify the western portion and North Porch with the Temple of Athena Polias. They cite the lack of explicit reference to the Temple of Athena on the Akropolis as grounds to dismiss the evidence. Such negative arguments never offer an alternative transverse temple on the Akropolis to be associated with Vitruvius' passage. Vitruvius, as Corso points out, is both economical and explicitly specific with his references to comparanda. He would only fail to make an explicit reference if it were clear from the context to which cult or building or person he was referring. In fact, Vitruvius himself emphasizes the importance of using as few words as possible in his address to the emperor in the introduction to Book 5. Among all the evidence, epigraphical, literary, and otherwise, Vitruvius' identification of the transverse temple as belonging to Athena is the most concrete evidence for the cult of Athena Polias in the Ionic Temple rather than in the Archaic Temple of Athena or solely in the east part of the Erechtheion.

²⁸³ Corso 1997; Corso and Romano 1997, pp. 14-17, 69-73.

²⁸⁴ Corso 1997, p. 386; Notably Roueché 1989; Palagia 1984; Wycherley 1978; Travlos 1971; Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*; and J. Binder (pers. comm.).

STEVENS' RECONSTRUCTION OF THE TERRACE NORTH OF THE ERECHTHEION

After the publication of *The Erechtheum*, Stevens continued to work on problematic issues that, in his opinion, had not been completely resolved. In an *AJA* article of 1946, he re-examined the evidence for the reconstruction of the paved area north of the Erechtheion and east of the North Porch.²⁸⁵ His arguments are reviewed here as they are the basis for the reconstruction of the terrace north of the Erechtheion in Figure 570.

Paton et al. laid out the evidence for this area in *The Erechtheum*.²⁸⁶ There are poros foundations for large Pentelic paving blocks extending just north of the northernmost edge of the stereobate/euthynteria of the North Porch. The Pentelic paving overlaid this area; evidence for its northern extent is preserved in situ: the marble block on the east side of the North Porch at the level of the euthynteria (Figure 487). This block only has anathyrosis on one of its two exposed sides. This indicates that it would have received another marble block to its east and not to its north.

The southern extent of the pavement runs under the lowest step of the northern krepidoma “the usual amount.”²⁸⁷ What is interesting about the pavement at this point is that it appears to cut into the foundations, which may belong to an earlier phase of the area, or were at least put in place before the pavement was laid. Furthermore, one of the blocks along the south edge of the pavement lacks anathyrosis on its north face and

²⁸⁵ Stevens 1946, p. 102. The reconstruction in the Akropolis Study Center appears to be based largely on Stevens' assessment, although Casanaki and Mallouchou report additional new research: Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, pp. 91, 98.

²⁸⁶ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 15-18.

²⁸⁷ Stevens 1946, p. 97. Paton et al. 1927, fig. 1.

extends farther north than the other blocks (Figure 486). An altar has been restored there by Papanikolaou.²⁸⁸

On the north face of the podium supporting the East Porch is evidence for a twelve-step staircase rising from the level of the paved area to the upper level of the East Porch (Figure 472).²⁸⁹ This staircase extended at least as far as the end of the northern extant poros foundations, but this leaves unresolved what the space between the Akropolis wall and the poros foundations looked like.

The southern face of the north Akropolis wall was studied by Paton et al. and reanalyzed by Stevens in order to propose a reconstruction for the area between the north edge of the poros foundations and the Akropolis wall, thus uniting the whole precinct north of the Erechtheion.²⁹⁰ Today, the unfinished drums of the pre-Parthenon are clearly visible to the visitor (Figure 485). These are the drums whose north sides have been visible to the Athenians from the city since their incorporation in the Themistoklean period, that is immediately subsequent to the Persian Wars (Figure 623).²⁹¹ Stevens suggested that these drums were hidden on the interior by a staircase that turned the corner at the point where the poros foundations end.

The evidence of the north Akropolis wall is as follows: The wall today is the same height as it was in the Classical period because there is no evidence for a course lying above the extant blocks (Figure 485). The southern faces of the top four courses are fully

²⁸⁸ Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, p. 98.

²⁸⁹ The rise of the step is half a course high. Each step is indicated by the progressively longer recess on the corresponding (half) course on the north face of the podium of the East Porch. See Paton et al. 1927, pl. 5.

²⁹⁰ Stevens 1946, pp. 97-100.

²⁹¹ Korres reviews the evidence for the date of the north Akropolis wall and concludes that it must be Themistoklean, not Kimonian or Periklean: Korres 2002b.

dressed. There are two small windows in the third course from the top.²⁹² The courses below the dressed blocks extend farther south and are not dressed for public view. There is a “Greek” cutting in the fifth course from the top at Stevens’ “E”, that is, below the western window in the fifth course from the top of the wall which Stevens deemed to have great significance for several reasons.²⁹³ First, its height is equal to one of the steps of the staircase (measurable on the podium of the East Porch).²⁹⁴ Second, it lines up with the eighth riser of the east steps by a contrivance that the top of the fifth course of the Akropolis wall had to be cut back. Third, the northern face of the cutting is parallel to the Erechtheion, and not to the Akropolis wall (although the west edge of the cutting is). Therefore, whatever slotted into the cutting, ties in with the whole area as it relates to the Erechtheion.²⁹⁵ This allows for a reconstruction of eight steps perpendicular to the staircase at the east and parallel to the Erechtheion itself, ending, however, perpendicular to the drum-laden portion of the North Akropolis wall. Furthermore, the horizontal cutting in Stevens’ drum “D” corresponds to the levels of the steps, a cutting therefore which would have received appropriately sized foundation blocks. The portions of the pre-Parthenon drums below ground level of the paved area were left rough, as are seen today, with their lifting bosses still in place.

The result is a two-sided theatral area, extending north from the podium of the East Porch, turning west at the point aligned with the north edge of the North Porch. This north section had four fewer steps than the eastern staircase because it leveled out into a

²⁹² See Chapter III on the uniqueness of the slit windows if one is to date them to the 5th century.

²⁹³ Stevens 1946, p. 99, fig. 16.

²⁹⁴ See Figure 472 and Paton et al. 1927, pl. 5.

²⁹⁵ Stevens 1946, pp. 99-100.

platform which left the four upper courses of the Akropolis wall exposed (Figure 570).²⁹⁶

The top four steps of the eastern staircase extended all the way to the Akropolis wall.

The third and fourth sides of the precinct are formed by the krepidoma of the Erechtheion itself. Some monument or altar contributed to the strange size and treatment of one of the blocks along the south side of the pavement (Figure 486).²⁹⁷

NEW ARCHITECTURAL FRAGMENTS

As research continues on the Akropolis, additional blocks have been associated with the Erechtheion since 1927. This section presents these additions to the corpus. Several new molded architectural fragments of the Erechtheion have been identified recently and published by Korres.²⁹⁸ These include the following:

1. Composite fragments of one of the necking bands from a column of the North Porch;²⁹⁹
2. An architrave fragment with lesbian kymation;³⁰⁰
3. The corner of one of the windows from the North Porch;³⁰¹

²⁹⁶ Stevens and Paton et al. suggested restoring the marble thrones inscribed with the priesthoods of Hephaistos and Boutes (Figure 534) to the “eastern side of the flagged area, near the pavement in the traditional Greek manner. It is equally likely, if not more likely, that the thrones were placed on the northern side of the area [on the upper platform next to the north Akropolis wall], for there is some evidence of fairly early date for a special architectural treatment of the steps”: Stevens 1946, p. 102; Paton et al. 1927, pp. 484-485. Two of these thrones have been found: one “in the vicinity of the Erechtheion” and the other one has been sitting among the foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena for over a century (Figure 534). The treatment of their undersides is rough, as if they were designed to sit on earth. They are inscribed $\text{IEP}\Omega\text{Σ BOYTOY}$ and $\text{IEPO}\Omega\text{Σ HΦAICTOY}$. The inscriptions date to the 4th century B.C. (perhaps to the time of Lykourgos, who was an Eteoboutadai and priest of Erechtheus: see Chapter III). They do not belong to the Theatre of Dionysos where the thrones of these priests also survive. On these thrones, see Paton et al. 1927, pp. 484-485. Paton et al. alternatively suggest that the thrones were located in the east chamber: Paton et al. 1927, p. 71.

²⁹⁷ The influence of the relatively recently excavated theatral areas of the Cretan palaces was readily acknowledged in a footnote by Paton et al., pp. 18, 427; Stevens 1946, p. 102; Elderkin 1941, pp. 113-125.

²⁹⁸ Korres 2002a, pp. 382-386.

²⁹⁹ Akropolis Inv. nos. 6355 and 3434.

³⁰⁰ Akropolis Inv. nos. 3430 and 3411.

³⁰¹ Akropolis Inv. no. 6372. This fragment was known to Paton et al. and is illustrated in their fig. 25, but seems to have been re-published by Korres.

4. A fragment published by Papanikolaos in 1983;³⁰²
5. A geison block now located outside the Erechtheion;³⁰³

A block that was never actually incorporated into the Erechtheion, but was an important part of its construction, has also been identified recently.³⁰⁴ This block is for testing the flatness of the orthostate blocks of the Erechtheion (Figure 536).³⁰⁵ Its area matches the orthostate blocks of the Erechtheion exactly and its extremely flat, smooth surface would have been covered in a pigment (probably red). Then this block would have been lowered onto the block being carved, and then lifted again. Any bumps left on the surface would have received the transfer of pigment and these areas would then have been chiseled or polished down.³⁰⁶

THE ‘STOA’ MENTIONED IN THE INSCRIPTIONS

In the building inscriptions for the Erechtheion, many blocks of the entablature were being stored in “the stoa” during the accounting of building materials in 409/8 B.C.³⁰⁷ Several suggestions have been made for the location of this “stoa”.³⁰⁸ Scholars have argued that the mysterious “stoa” mentioned numerous times in the building inscriptions is one of the following structures: somewhere near the so-called House of the Arrhephoroi; a surviving colonnade of the Archaic Temple of Athena;³⁰⁹ the North Porch

³⁰² Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, p. 97.

³⁰³ Akropolis Inv. no. 14000.

³⁰⁴ On the Inscr. XIII, see Korres 2002a, pp. 382-384.

³⁰⁵ Akropolis Inv. nos. 14288 and 16758. Korres dates this block to 435 B.C.: Korres 2002a, p. 386. It measures 0.65 m in length, 0.29 m in width and 0.051 m in thickness.

³⁰⁶ This method was described by Korres during a Summer Session lecture on the Akropolis in 2000 while describing a similar block found for the Parthenon, once thought to be a ritual table because of the red pigment.

³⁰⁷ Inscr. II, col. II, line 49.

³⁰⁸ For a summary of the scholarly opinions, see Paton et al. 1927, p. 317.

³⁰⁹ Dörpfeld and Schleif 1942.

of the Erechtheion; or, even the interior double colonnade which may have been planned to connect the North and South Porches, but was never built.³¹⁰

A recent re-examination of the evidence for the elusive Pandroseion located west of the Erechtheion has identified a series of small Ionic capitals that probably belonged to an L-shaped stoa whose foundations can be found on pl. 2 of Paton et al. 1927.³¹¹

Perhaps, therefore, this unresolved reference is instead to the stoa of the Pandroseion.

This small stoa would have been a convenient (and pre-existing) place to store building materials. This logical conclusion accommodates the wording of both “in the stoa” and “from the stoa” in the accounts, located, as it is, directly adjacent if not contiguous to the half built temple.³¹²

SCULPTURED FRIEZE FROM THE ERECHTHEION

Individually carved Parian marble figures were attached by means of iron dowels to the dark Eleusinian limestone frieze that surrounded the main building and the North Porch of the Erechtheion.³¹³ The frieze, and consequently the height of the figures, varies

³¹⁰ Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*. More recently, Coulton has suggested that this “stoa” was a builders’ shed: Coulton 1976, p. 2 note 1.

³¹¹ See Hurwit 1999, p. 145; Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, p. 92. Vasso Manidaki has recently conducted a study on this and plans are currently underway to rebuild the Pandroseion. Work has stopped owing to problems with the reconstruction and the materials (Figure 314): Korres (pers. comm.).

³¹² The oblique angle created at the southwest angle of the North Porch is where the Pandroseion and the Ionic temple came into contact. Jeppesen tentatively makes the connection between the stoa in the Pandroseion and the stoa mentioned in the Chandler Stele (Inscription II, Col. II, line 49) in the key to his reconstruction of the Erechtheion in the so-called House of the Arrhephoroi and the Temple of Athena Polias (Ionic Temple): Jeppesen 1987, p. 69.

³¹³ The type of marble was characterized as “white” by Fowler in Paton et al. 1927 p. 239. Boulter 1970, called it “Pentelic,” and Palagia recently called it “Parian”: Palagia 2000, p. 55. Kevin Glowacki confirms this latest assignment of “Parian” to the Erechtheion sculptures: “When I wrote my article [Glowacki 1995], I said ‘Pentelic’ since that is what Boulter and many others have said, and it seemed to agree with what I was observing on the fragment I was publishing. Since then, however, I have learned quite a bit more about the various ‘grades’ of Parian marble: very fine (almost like Pentelic but without the micaceous schist), medium-grained (what most people identify immediately as Parian), and even big-grained (very close to what we traditionally call Naxian). I learned about this from one of the conservators in the Acropolis Museum. He told me (and showed me) that the Erechtheion fragments (including my helmet) are

between those that decorated the North Porch and the main walls, but only by 0.066 m. Otherwise the only figural sculptures on the building were the maidens of the South Porch.³¹⁴ Although the frieze can be dated exactly to 408/7 B.C. thanks to the building accounts, its subject remains largely a mystery. This section summarizes the research conducted on the Erechtheion's frieze since 1927.

Fowler ascribes the whole frieze to the work of one artist as a designer, but it is clear from the building inscriptions that the figures were actually executed by several sculptors. In the 1960s, Patricia Boulter restudied the surviving fragments of the frieze and discerned the hands of seven master sculptors of the Erechtheion frieze.³¹⁵

The technique of attaching the Parian marble figures to the Eleusinian limestone may have been conceived as a shortcut because only small pieces of marble were necessary and the dark background would have required no maintenance.³¹⁶ Boulter argued, however, that time and effort would not have been saved because the frieze would have been more complicated to assemble.³¹⁷

Alternatively, the dullness of the dark background may have graced the temple with an air of antiquity since it was, after all, the *archaios neos*. Compare the Parthenon's faded blue background by the late 4th century B.C. It was this faded hue that

"fine" Parian. I can see that now, but could not then. When I have the opportunity to discuss the fragment again, I will certainly include a footnote with the correction. Parian": Glowacki (pers. comm.).

³¹⁴ The Maiden Porch probably did not receive the same frieze treatment because there would have been too much visual competition between the maidens and the frieze. On the other hand, there is the highly decorated Siphnian Treasury at Delphi whose maidens are surmounted by a sculpted frieze and pedimental sculpture. This top-heavy arrangement can be explained by the initial miniaturization process of the Ionic order from Asia Minor when it was first used on the Greek mainland: see I. Shear 1999.

³¹⁵ Boulter 1970.

³¹⁶ The first to associate the sculpted fragments of the frieze with the dowel holes in the Eleusinian blocks was Inwood in 1819: see Chapter VII. Susan Walker, who has considered how the Portland Vase inspired the jasperware designs of Josiah Wedgwood (invented in 1775), has also queried the influence of the Erechtheion on the potter: Walker (pers. comm.). The late date of the association of the Pentelic frieze fragments with Erechtheion precludes the possibility that the Erechtheion frieze inspired Wedgwood.

³¹⁷ Boulter 1970, p. 20.

was imitated in the Macedonian tomb at Lefkadia of about 300 B.C. onto which were copied eight metopes of the centauromachy from the Parthenon.³¹⁸

In any case, the designer's efforts at low maintenance was shattered, for it is clear that some of the sculptured elements of the frieze, perhaps from the West Façade, had been damaged, probably by the major fire and required restoration. According to Paton et al., the frieze of the West Façade was never replaced because there are no cuttings for dowels in the west faces (actually bottoms) of the reused statue bases currently in the position of the frieze.³¹⁹ Clearly, some of the damaged frieze figures from somewhere on the building were replaced, as in the case of the omphalos-holder (*Erechtheum* no. 85; Akropolis Museum no. 1293) and the female figure seated on a rock (No. B, Akropolis Museum no. 1263), as demonstrated by Boulter.³²⁰

Although it is commonly acknowledged that the technique of the frieze is unique among all temples in the Greek world – attempted only once and on the Erechtheion – this is not entirely accurate.³²¹ It is used in the metopes designed by Skopas of the later 4th century Temple of Athena Alea at Tegea, and was probably derived from the technique employed by Pheidias and his disciples for decorating cult statue bases, such as Zeus at Olympia and Athena Parthenos.³²² Although the appliqués to the cult statue bases were usually made of precious metals, the background, at least of the Zeus statue's base, was made of Eleusinian limestone, like the frieze of the Erechtheion. This would

³¹⁸ Bruno 1981.

³¹⁹ See Chapter III and VII for why the modern reconstruction of the West Façade's frieze is incorrect.

³²⁰ Boulter 1970, pp. 18-23.

³²¹ Hurwit 1999, p. 207.

³²² Harrison 1977; Palagia 2000.

have required significant transport to Olympia in the western Peloponnesos.³²³

Eleusinian limestone was also used for the base of the cult statue group in the Hephaisteion.³²⁴ One block from this base was found reused in a Byzantine wall inside the temple, and its original function was identified by Dinsmoor (Figure 636 and Figure 637).³²⁵ One side of the block has five dowel holes for attaching separately carved figures in the identical manner of the Erechtheion, although the slightly later cuttings in the Erechtheion frieze blocks appear to be more carefully rendered. Palagia has suggested that the attached sculptures for the Hephaisteion base were made of Pentelic marble (perhaps gilded) rather than of metal (as inferred from literary descriptions of the Zeus at Olympia and Athena Parthenos) because of the similarities of the cuttings of the Erechtheion frieze blocks and the sensible assumption that (hollow) metal appliques would have required little more than pins for attachment.³²⁶

Of the total number of 112 fragments of figures of the Erechtheion frieze known to Fowler, those that can be distinguished as having once decorated the taller frieze of the North Porch are 56, to be distributed among the 70 or so dowel holes in the Eleusinian limestone blocks (Figure 334).³²⁷ At one dowel per figure, this means 80% of the figures of the North Porch frieze are preserved. That leaves 56 fragments of figures (corresponding to about 46 different individual figures plus a team of horses) that can be assigned to the frieze of the main building. Of these, Fowler asserted that the figures that survive must come from the frieze blocks that remained longest on the building, namely

³²³ Palagia 2000, p. 54: “Pausanias (5.11.8) explicitly states that the figures on Zeus’ base were golden. The base itself was made of Eleusinian limestone as attested by fragments of the blocks inside the cella.”

³²⁴ Boulter 1970, p. 20.

³²⁵ Dinsmoor 1941, p. 108, cited by Palagia 2000, p. 55.

³²⁶ Palagia 2000, p. 57.

³²⁷ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 239-246. Fowler wrote the sculpture chapter for *The Erechtheum*.

those along the east ends of the North and South Walls and the East Façade, which were still extant in the 18th century.³²⁸ The distribution of the surviving fragments along the longest extant portions of the frieze blocks allows for approximately the same spacing of the figures as on the North Porch.³²⁹ Unfortunately, none of Fowler or Pallat's attempts to fit the cuttings for dowels in the back of the figures with the location of the dowel holes on the frieze blocks led to any meaningful arrangement of the sculptures. This is mainly due to the large margin of uncertainty owing to the comparatively large size of the dowel holes in the frieze blocks (to receive the iron dowel and lead) versus the small size of the dowel hole in the back of the marble figures.³³⁰ Fowler reminds us that any further attempt to discern the arrangement of the sculptures must take into account the weathering marks on the architrave and the holes on its upper surface which may have secured metal attachments to the frieze or spikes to discourage birds from perching.

It is not known when the figures of the frieze fell down. The earliest paintings of the Erechtheion from the 18th century do not show any of the figures surviving in situ. Furthermore, most of the known fragments are chance finds, often pocketed by early modern travelers.³³¹ Broneer reported finding fragments of the frieze on the North Slope “on or near the surface, or built into a modern house wall. The majority were recovered from what were described as ‘late’ or ‘modern’ or ‘mixed’ fills, which were sometimes specifically identified as containing soil dumped from the early excavations on the Akropolis. One was found in a ‘late’ pit, possibly of the Ottoman period. None of the

³²⁸ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 240-241. On the state of the Erechtheion in the 18th century, see Chapter VII.

³²⁹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 242. The placement of the dowels indicates a wider spacing of figures than on the Parthenon: Paton et al. 1927, p. 245.

³³⁰ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 242-243; Pallat 1912.

³³¹ For example, Sir John Soane, architect and vocal protester against the spoliation of the Akropolis by the likes of Lord Elgin, ended up with a fragment of the Erechtheion frieze among his collection of casts. Of course, he was aware that he owned an Egyptian sarcophagus and other original pieces: *A New Description of Sir John Soane's Museum* 2001.

fragments came from undisturbed ancient Greek, Roman or Byzantine contexts.”³³²

Rangabé reported finding several fragments of the frieze during the dismantlement of the vault in the North Porch.³³³

Fowler’s assertion about the survival of the fragments corresponding to the longest-surviving in situ frieze blocks may be true of the figures found during the dismantling of the vault in the North Porch; however, it is more likely that the figures that remained on the Erechtheion the longest were also more accessible to the travelers. The travelers’ treasures have since been all but lost in their collections, such as the fragment only relatively recently identified in Sir John Soane’s collection.³³⁴ The surviving fragments whose findspots are unknown more likely came from the deeper layers of debris, having fallen from the temple long ago and having remained hidden from the sticky fingers of the travelers.

To the corpus of fragments of the frieze described and illustrated by Fowler 1927 in *The Erechtheum* must be added ten fragments published by Broneer, namely the face of a woman, a seated female, a draped figure, two left feet, two fragments of drapery, an arm, and two fragments of a horse;³³⁵ six more draped figures published by Boulter;³³⁶ and a Corinthian helmet published by Glowacki.³³⁷

In spite of our having detailed building accounts for the carving of part of the frieze, the theme of the Erechtheion frieze is still unclear since the accounts simply describe each figure in neutral terms such as “woman with little girl leaning against

³³² Glowacki 1995, p. 326.

³³³ Rangabé 1845, p. 323; also Paton et al. 1927, p. 240, note 2. As argued in Chapter VII, the vault in the North Porch was built by the Venetians in 1687-1688.

³³⁴ On Soane, see Chapter VII.

³³⁵ Broneer 1933, pp. 349-350, figs. 20, 21; Broneer 1935, pp. 138-140, figs. 24-29.

³³⁶ Boulter 1970, pp. 23-24.

³³⁷ Glowacki 1995.

her.”³³⁸ The majority of the figures are female, and most are also stationary, as was common in friezes and sculptured statue bases of this period. Their interpretation by the ancient viewer depended on written labels as seen in the equally inactive scenes in contemporary vase painting.³³⁹ Fowler suggests that the stationary figures are probably deities. Many sit on chairs, as in the Parthenon frieze, others sit on rocks, denoting an outdoor or perhaps mountainous environment.

Attempts have been made to discern the subjects of the individual friezes, but all the theories remain hypothetical.³⁴⁰ According to Pallat, the North Porch had a chariot race with a four-horse chariot on the west side, Athena catching the daughters of Kekrops opening the basket containing Erichthonios on the north side, and the birth of Erichthonios on the east. The figures from the main building include 17 standing figures, 8 moving figures, 11 seated figures, and 5 in various positions. Two thirds of these figures are female, and there are very few iconographic markers to aid in their identification.

Many of the draped females look very similar to the maidens of the South Porch with respect to the arrangement of their drapery (peplos with the heavy overfold). Fragment 83 (Fowler’s numbering), a seated draped figure of indistinguishable sex, holds an omphalos. Ironically, this single iconographically-defined figure is a replacement from the period of the repair.³⁴¹ The obvious identification would be Apollo, but Pallat

³³⁸ Paton et al. 1927, p. 406.

³³⁹ Palagia 2000, p. 54. Labels (names) were carved on the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi to help viewers identify individual figures.

³⁴⁰ Pallat 1912; Pallat 1935; Pallat 1937.

³⁴¹ Akropolis Museum no. 1293. Boulter 1970, pp. 18-19; Brouskari 1974, p. 156. This also argues against statements in Paton et al. 1927, p. 240: Fowler’s conclusion that the West Façade never received a new Pentelic frieze when it was rebuilt after the major fire in antiquity (see Chapter III) is shaken, although it is possible that this fragment could have replaced a fallen or damaged figure elsewhere on the building.

believed it represented Ge or Themis.³⁴² Boulter compares the post of the figure to Athena on the Nike parapet although she does not identify her certainly as female.³⁴³ Hurwit, however, identifies it as Apollo.³⁴⁴ If Glowacki is correct to associate with this figure the Corinthian helmet found in the excavation of the North Slope of the Akropolis by Oscar Broneer in the 1930s (AS196), then we might alternatively have a seated Athena.³⁴⁵

Although the building accounts, which identify the individual sculptors paid to execute the various figures, have been studied by epigraphers and sculpture historians, there have been only a few assessments of the frieze's theme or themes other than Pallat's 1935 study. Carl Robert also tried to use the building inscriptions and the fragments themselves to discern the theme of the frieze. He concluded that part of it showed the departure of Erechtheus for his battle with Eumolpos, and part of it had an oracular scene.³⁴⁶ Other scholars interpret the fragments as showing scenes from the story of Ion.³⁴⁷ Hurwit believes that the Erechtheus story told by Euripides, namely the sacrifice of Erechtheus' daughters to save Athens, was featured on the North Porch of the Erechtheion, not on the Parthenon as argued by Joan Connelly.³⁴⁸

³⁴² Pallat 1912, p. 186.

³⁴³ Boulter 1970, pp. 18-19.

³⁴⁴ Hurwit 1999, p. 207.

³⁴⁵ The grouping of a seated Athena with her helmet on the ground is quite common in Greek art. Glowacki provides two illustrative parallels in his pl. 66: National Museum no. 2983, late 5th century Attic relief; and Akropolis Museum no. 1330, early 4th century relief atop the proxeny decree (*IG II² 49*). It must be pointed out, however, that these examples would be mirror images of the Erechtheion composition in which the helmet "faces" right rather than left.

³⁴⁶ Robert 1890.

³⁴⁷ Brouskari 1974, pp. 152-153.

³⁴⁸ Hurwit 1999, p. 208, *contra* Connelly 1996.

Holtzmann most recently reassessed the subject of Akropolis Museum no. 1073: the group with the standing man with the kneeling man in front.³⁴⁹ He revisited Robert's oracular theory and discredited it by offering two new pieces of evidence. Holtzmann argued that the front figure is kneeling to write something on the ground, not on a tablet as proposed by Robert. The man behind bends over his shoulder slightly to read it. He offers no conclusion, however, on the overall themes of the frieze. Akropolis Museum no. 1073 is one of the few fragments that can probably be safely correlated with the building inscriptions, namely a fragment of an inscription found by Dow in the Epigraphical Museum, which he and Merritt joined up to the Erechtheion building account stelai.³⁵⁰ The sculptor was paid 100 drachmai for a double figure. Since 60 drachmai was the going rate for each figure, it is reasonable to suppose that the extra 40 drachmai implies something like the overlapping kneeling figure.

Perhaps some of the same principles might be applied to the sculptural program of the Erechtheion used in Peter Schultz's recent reassessment of the sculptural theme of the Temple of Athena Nike.³⁵¹ Particularly ground-breaking is Schultz's reinterpretation of the standing gods and goddesses frieze which adorned the east façade, erected only a few years before the Erechtheion. Schultz concluded that this scene, which has baffled scholars for years, depicts the birth of Athena (Figure 603). The gods and goddess attend the birth which is shown in the center of the frieze: Hephaistos, with his lame leg hidden behind Zeus's throne, cracks open Zeus' head with an axe (damaged) to release Athena, fully grown and armed, standing to his right. Identifying the deities is notoriously

³⁴⁹ Holtzmann 2000.

³⁵⁰ Merritt 1934, pp. 69-70.

³⁵¹ Schultz 2003.

difficult. Their attributes are generally absent or obscure.³⁵² Nonetheless, the Nike frieze belongs to a contemporary tradition of birth scenes:

1. Pandora: On the base of Athena Parthenos on the Akropolis, third quarter of 5th century B.C. (by Pheidias) (Pausanias I. 24.7).³⁵³
2. Aphrodite: On the base of the chryselephantine Zeus at Olympia, third or last quarter of the 5th century B.C. (by Pheidias).
3. Erichthonios: On the base of the cult statues of his “parents,” Athena and Hephaistos, in the Hephaisteion, probably last quarter of the 5th century B.C.³⁵⁴
4. Helen: On base of the statue of Nemesis in her temple at Rhamnous (430-420 B.C.).³⁵⁵
5. Athena: On the east pediment of the Parthenon.

All six scenes belong to the same Attic tradition: the divine Pantheon stands in anticipation of the incipient birth. The birth scenes on the bases, incidentally, all have chthonic associations: Erichthonios, Pandora, Aphrodite and even Helen.³⁵⁶

The question remains then, what is the subject of the frieze of the main building? The elevated position of the frieze of the Erechtheion, as opposed to the base of the cult

³⁵² In similarly stationary scenes on vases from this period, the characters were labeled: Palagia 2000, p. 54.

³⁵³ On these statue bases, see Palagia 2000.

³⁵⁴ Harrison 1977, pp. 138-139. Harrison conflates Erechtheus and Erichthonios. For a succinct discussion on the difference between Erechtheus and Erichthonios, see J. Shear 2001, pp. 55-60. They were not one and the same as is often suggested in the scholarship. Jeppesen 1987 also outlines the different traditions and identities of Erechtheus and Erichthonios.

³⁵⁵ Helen is also Nemesis' daughter by Zeus according to the *Kypria* (*Kypria* fr. 7 [=Athen. 8.334b]). Helen's mother is usually Leda, but Attic vase-paintings depict Nemesis as Helen's mother as well. Pausanias 1.33.7-8 says the base shows Leda leading Helen to Nemesis (Leda being Helen's nurse, not mother). For reconstruction of statue base from the 293 fragments, see Petrakos 1981. See also Lapatin 1992.

³⁵⁶ Schultz (pers. comm.).

statue, perhaps precludes the usual themes mentioned above.³⁵⁷ Characterized by Boulter as the last great sculptural effort by Attic sculptors of the high Classical period, the theme of the sculptures must be considered within this framework.

With the repetition of Athena's birth on the Parthenon and the Nike Temple, there is no reason to exclude this theme from the pool of candidates. If anything, it must be the first hypothesis to be tested: Women – some with children lounging against them– and a few men are standing and sitting still (in spite of the flowing drapery). Those moving to the left and to the right are perhaps still in the process of arriving at the central scene of the birth.

If not Athena, then which of the most prominent deities and heroes would be most likely? The obvious choice is Erichthonios, inventor of the chariot, born of Hephaistos and Athena *via* Ge. After all, at least part of the Erechtheion can be associated with the eponymous hero-king and his sister Pandrosos. There are many vase-paintings from the late 5th century which depict the birth of Erichthonios, and the basic elements of female domination, standing and seated in natural surroundings.³⁵⁸ As discussed above, it is possible his birth was depicted in the frieze of the North Porch.

Who else remains? Poseidon is crucial to Athenian mythology, appearing in the Parthenon pediment and possessing tokens preserved on the Akropolis in the

³⁵⁷ If there was a decorated statue base of Athena Polias in the Erechtheion, there are several appropriate chthonic births that may have been depicted: Erechtheus is most likely, but also Erichthonios, Kekrops or Poseidon. See the next section for a proposed fragment of the statue base of Athena Polias.

³⁵⁸ For example, red-figure squat lekythos attributed to the Meidias Painter, ca. 420-410 B.C. in the Cleveland Museum of Art no. 1982.142: Neils 2001, p. 179 and *CVA* Cleveland Museum of Art 2, [USA 35-37], fig. 5, pls. 1818-1820: 72.1-4, 73.1-2, 74.1-2; a red-figure kalix krater in the Richmond, VA, Museum of Fine Arts, no. 81.70 (Beazley Archive no. 10158); a red-figure stamnos in the Munich, Antikensammlungen, no. J345: *ARV*² 495.1, no. 1656; a red-figure hydria in the British Museum, no. E182: *ARV*² 580.2, no. 1615; a red-figure kylix in the Antikensammlung, Berlin no. F2537: *ARV*² 1268.2, no. 1689; and especially, a red-figure kalix krater mentioned above in Schloss Fasanerie, Adolphseck, no. 77: *ARV*² 1346.1. Images of these vases can be found in the Beazley Archive database.

Erechtheion. Since the sculptural program often has nothing to do with the deity housed within, Theseus and Herakles also become candidates. The various activities of Herakles had been depicted in the pediments of the Archaic buildings of the Akropolis, big and small. As mentioned above, Robertson argued that some of the small Archaic pediments, such as “Herakles’ introduction to Olympos” pediment, belonged to the pre-Persians shrines “under” the Erechtheion.³⁵⁹ If this is true, it would make sense to repeat that theme on the frieze of the new temple, that is, if Herakles’ iconography were not too closely associated with the Peisistratids, who were responsible for so many of the Archaic monuments on the Akropolis.³⁶⁰ Besides the birth scenes, the chariot groups can be worked in and may be interpreted as Herakles’ introduction to Olympus. This scene appears time after time on the other side of pots that depict the birth of Athena.³⁶¹

It is also worthwhile considering the sixteen red-figure oinochoai with *mastoi* (breasts) of a special shape, made at one time by a single potter, and dated to about 410 B.C.³⁶² These vases are decorated with scenes of chariots, charioteers and Athena, and were perhaps created to celebrate the dedication of the new Ionic temple to Athena. The chariot scenes and Athena correspond well to the fragments of the frieze of the Erechtheion.

The themes of the friezes of the Erechtheion are an avenue for further study. If the themes can be discerned, then their significance for the temple that housed Athens’

³⁵⁹ Robertson 1996, pp. 35-36.

³⁶⁰ See various articles by Boardman which argue for the close association between Herakles iconography and Peisistratos: Boardman 1972; Boardman 1975; Boardman 1984. Many scholars disagree with Boardman’s blanket interpretation of anything that is Athenian, involves Herakles, and is Archaic, must be related to Peisistratos. In his own defense, see Boardman 1989.

³⁶¹ For example, Beazley Archive: BS496.

³⁶² Green 1962. The *mastoi* are a regular feature on Geometric oinochoai, but otherwise unknown on later decorated pottery: Green 1962, p. 93. See below “A Series of Special Ritual Vessels.”

most important relics can be considered in the light of the temple's foremost importance in Athenian religious life.

BASE FOR THE CULT STATUE OF ATHENA POLIAS?

A fragment of a relief, with a preserved height 0.30 m, was found between the Parthenon and the Erechtheion in 1960.³⁶³ This female figure, wearing a peplos that clings to her body as if she were running swiftly and showing a wing, identified her as a Nike. Her head and most of the limbs are missing. The size of the figure precludes it being from the Erechtheion frieze.³⁶⁴ Gulaki follows Brouskari's opinion that it resembles the Nike parapet in style and suggests that it belonged to the base of the statue of Athena Polias in the Erechtheion. If so, it was created anew for the olive wood statue's installation in the Erechtheion when she was transferred from the Archaic Temple of Athena. There seems, however, little reason to associate this isolated fragment, which could apparently have been part of the Erechtheion except for its size, with the base of the cult state of Athena Polias.³⁶⁵

PLACING THE CULTS ON THE BLANK CANVAS: RECENT AND NEW THOUGHTS ON THE CULTS AND OBJECTS IN THE ERECHTHEION

The previous sections presented the arguments for the reconstruction of the interior and interpretation of the exterior of the Erechtheion. The following sections argue for the placement of the cults, the relics from the contest for the patronage of Athens, and the cult equipment and furniture in and around the Erechtheion. It has

³⁶³ Brouskari 1974, p. 118; Gulaki 1981, pp. 55-58. *Non vidi*, and no photo or drawing of the image has been published.

³⁶⁴ Gulaki 1981, p. 57.

³⁶⁵ There are no published images of this fragment and I have not yet arranged to see it in the Akropolis Museum storerooms.

already been shown that the olive wood statue of Athena Polias stood in the west part of the single main chamber, faced east, and had her back to the West Cross-Wall. It will be suggested that the salt-sea of Poseidon was located in the pre-Classical temenos slotted into the carefully cut notches of the east foundations.³⁶⁶ The altars of Erechtheus, Boutes and Hephaistos were located in the east half of the main chamber. Hanging between these two areas was, perhaps, the giant peplos of Athena dedicated at the Greater Panathenaia. The lamp of Kallimachos described in detail by Pausanias stood on the ground near the ancient statue of Athena Polias.

LAMP OF KALLIMACHOS AND THE NICHE

Few scholars have discussed the purpose of the Niche created by cutting back the blocks of the South Wall on the interior next to the southwest anta. After Paton et al. proposed that the Niche only reduced the weight over the Kekropeion and the shelf diverted rainwater from the well below,³⁶⁷ Dell suggested in 1934 that the Niche was a perch for Athena's sacred owl.³⁶⁸ In 1977, Bundgaard suggested that the Niche formed part of an elaborate envelope and support system for the ancient, gnarled behemoth of a sacred olive tree.³⁶⁹ Hawes proposed that the shelf of the Niche was meant to shield the well of Poseidon below from the droppings of the sacred doves.³⁷⁰ Most people, however, will agree that the southern intercolumniation of the West façade was left open, that is, without grilles, for some special cultic reason. Most recently, Palagia postulated that the famous golden lamp was perched in the Niche in the southwest corner of the west

³⁶⁶ See above "Interpreting Diploun... Oikema."

³⁶⁷ Paton et al. 1927, p. 172.

³⁶⁸ Dell 1934, p. 25.

³⁶⁹ Bundgaard 1976, p. 85-102. *Contra* Bundgaard is Thompson 1978, p. 258.

³⁷⁰ Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*, manuscript p. 40.

chamber on the shelf, next to the open intercolumniation, and that it was placed there to let the smoke out and so that its flame could be seen by those entering the Akropolis (Figure 212).³⁷¹ At first glance, this is an attractive theory if one is inclined to accept the identification of the west chamber as belonging to Athena Polias.

There are problems with this theory, and it is only because it is the most recent that it is addressed here as a starting point for the discussion of the lamp and the Niche.

The objections are:

1. The shelf on which the lamp is supposed to have stood is slanted downward toward the west, a fact that is omitted in Palagia's article.³⁷²
2. It would not be sensible to put a heavy bronze and gold lamp full of a year's supply of oil exactly where drastic measures had to be taken to reduce weight lest that whole corner of the temple collapse:³⁷³ the gaps between the blocks in the back of the Niche reveal anathyrosis. This demonstrates that the back wall of the Niche was cut back *after* the erection of the building including the architectural feature of the Niche, in order to alleviate the strain on the monolithic blocks that span the void over the Kekropeion (SS.11.01, SS.18.01, and WW.13.01; Figure 208 and Figure 223).
3. Placing the Lamp of Kallimachos in the Niche would have exposed it to the powerful winds that howled through this gap in the West Façade.

³⁷¹ Palagia 1984. The Niche was approximately 4.2 m tall by 1.7 m wide. Stevens restored an engaged pilaster to define the eastern edge of the Niche: Paton et al. 1927, pl. 15.

³⁷² Paton et al. 1927, pp. 171-172.

³⁷³ See the discussion below on the size and weight of the Lamp of Kallimachos.

This location would have been precarious, not only for the lamp itself, but also for the all-important eternal flame.³⁷⁴

In light of the problems with Palagia's reconstruction, a re-examination of the primary evidence for the lamp is necessary. After Pausanias mentions the origins of the statue of Athena Polias as having fallen from heaven, he says,

I shall not enter on the question whether this is so or not; but Callimachus made a golden lamp for the goddess. They fill the lamp with oil and then wait until the same day of the following year; and that supply of oil suffices during the entire interval for the lamp, although it burns perpetually by day and by night. The wick is of Carpasian flax, which is the only kind of flax that does not catch fire. A bronze palm tree above the lamp, reaching to the ceiling, draws off the fumes. Callimachus, who made the lamp, though falling behind the leaders in art itself, in dexterity is so far the best of all, that he first used a borer on marble, and gave himself the name of "extreme refiner of art," or when others gave it to him, he appropriated it to himself. Then there is in the temple of Athena Polias a wooden Hermes...³⁷⁵

An important clue as to the appearance of the Lamp of Kallimachos is a pilaster of Roman (probably 2nd century A.D.) date decorated in relief in the Arundel Collection in the Ashmolean Museum at Oxford that may be a representation of the Lamp of Kallimachos (Figure 702).³⁷⁶ This relief matches Pausanias' description very closely. Above the large base, which could suffice for a year's supply of oil, there are openings between the leaves to provide oxygen for a flame and a tall palm tree, which could serve

³⁷⁴ High winds on the Akropolis are well known: in 1852 a storm blew down the remnants of the West Façade. See Chapter VIII.

³⁷⁵ 1.26.6-7. Translation by Paton et al. 1927, p. 481. See Appendix A for the Greek text.

³⁷⁶ The provenance of the pilaster (one of a pair) is unknown, but is thought to be from Syria. Its architectural function is ambiguous as well. All that can be said from a preliminary examination of the block in the Ashmolean Museum is that something vertical, either wooden or stone, was attached to its side toward the rear. The other relief in the pair depicts another, different lamp, thus suggesting that specific, perhaps famous, lamps were depicted.

as a chimney to “draw off the fumes.”³⁷⁷ At the top, there is also a cup-shaped element that must represent the part that met with the coffered ceiling.³⁷⁸

With this relief in mind, it is possible to consider the logistics for a receptacle large enough to hold enough oil to keep the lamp going for a whole year. First, it is important to dispel the suspicion that Pausanias is using a literary motif when he describes the lamp as filled annually. Nowhere else in his *Description of Greece* does Pausanias say that he saw another lamp that was only filled once per year. Indeed, he is full and specific in his description: ἐμπλήσαντες δὲ ἐλαίου τὸν λύχνον τὴν αὐτὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος ἔτους ἀναμένουσιν ἡμέραν, ἔλαιον δὲ ἐκεῖνο τὸν μεταξὺ ἐπαρκεῖ χρόνον τῷ λύχνῳ κατὰ τὰ αὐτὰ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ καὶ νυκτὶ φαίνονται. Furthermore, Pausanias is careful to separate fact from fiction in this section of his text, contrasting the legend, which he doubts, i.e., that the olive wood statue fell from heaven, with the facts (contrasted by the use of δε) about Kallimachos’ lamp, which he can see with his own eyes.

Experiments by D. M. Bailey showed that one fluid ounce of olive oil used with a linen wick 1 mm² in cross-section in a “normal” terracotta lamp burns for about three hours.³⁷⁹ The Lamp of Kallimachos had a special wick of Karpasian flax and presumably produced a substantial flame. This wick may have been about 10 mm² in cross-section, and therefore drew (and burned) approximately 10 times the amount of oil per hour. Therefore, to fuel one lamp with one large wick for a year would require the following amount of oil: 10 ounces of oil per 3 hours, or 80 ounces per 24 hour-day, which equals

³⁷⁷ Palagia discounts the Ashmolean relief as a source of visual evidence for the appearance of Kallimachos’ lamp because she deems the (upper part of the) object a lamp-stand rather than a chimney: Palagia 1984, p. 520.

³⁷⁸ I am indebted to Michael Djordjevitch for pointing this out to me (pers. comm.).

³⁷⁹ Bailey 1972, p. 10.

29200 fluid ounces per 365-day year. 29200 fluid ounces is equivalent to 182 ½ Imperial gallons, or 900 liters, which has a metric volume of 0.9 m³. Thus, the lamp must have had a receptacle to hold at least this great a volume. So, if we take the proportions of the lamp depicted in the pilaster in the Ashmolean Museum, even just as a general guide, the scale of the lamp must have been huge (Figure 703).³⁸⁰

If one takes the radius to height ratio of the “tank” on the pilaster to be approximately 1 to 6, and then calculate the radius of the tank based on the volume of a cylinder ($\pi r^2 \times h$), and the known minimum volume needed to keep the lamp lit for a year, the radius of the tank comes out to be 0.36 m, and its height 2.16 m.

If 10% is added to the volume of oil needed to bring the total number of liters to 1000, since the lamp was probably not designed to hold the bare minimum amount to get the eternal flame through the year, then the radius of the tank comes out to 0.38 m. To get the overall exterior proportions of the lamp, one must add the thickness of the walls of the tank. The walls of the tank of a large lamp may have been about 0.02 m thick, so the radius rises to 0.40 m, and the height to 2.4 m. This results in a lamp, based on the proportions of the pilaster, of at least 8.00 m in height (Figure 703).

No matter how approximate the above calculations might be, a lamp on a scale necessary to hold a year’s worth of oil - that is to have a tank of approximately 1000 liters in volume - would never have fit in the 3 m tall Niche, especially with its thin, sloping shelf. Nor would it have likely fit (depending on the *actual* proportions of the lamp) in

³⁸⁰ The author acknowledges that the proportions of the pilaster govern the proportions of the lamp; however, the subject of a lamp was probably chosen for the relief for the very reason that it had appropriate proportions to fit the pilaster. The same reasoning serves the other pilaster depicting a lamp in the pair. See above note 376.

the 6 m tall east chamber, as reconstructed by most scholars as the location of the cult of Athena Polias.³⁸¹

The most likely location for the Lamp of Kallimachos, therefore, was on the floor of the west chamber, in the vicinity of the cult statue of Athena Polias. The height of the main chamber, from floor to ceiling, is approximately 9.2 m, only about a metre greater than our rough calculation for the height of the lamp based on the Roman pilaster.

It is almost impossible to be any more specific about the original location of the Lamp of Kallimachos, but Palagia cites Nonnos' *Dionysiaca* (33.124) who refers to the famous lamp in the Erechtheion as “the lamp of Kekrops.” It is reasonable, therefore, to locate the lamp in the vicinity of his tomb in the southwest corner of the temple.

No matter where the Lamp of Kallimachos is placed in the west half of the temple, it extended to the ceiling and must have met with it via a cup-like structure like the one depicted in the Ashmolean relief, perhaps through a hole in the center of, or in lieu of, one of the coffers. Comparanda for the unusual treatment of certain coffers may be found within the same building, namely the hole in the roof of the North Porch.³⁸²

Furthermore, the Lamp of Kallimachos must have been of a scale to warrant its widely recognized fame and specific mention by Pausanias, among many older and important relics. In any case, a 9 m tall floor-to-ceiling bronze lamp with a chimney is not as wild an idea as it might seem. Comparandum of close date may be found in the Hephaisteion. Evelyn Harrison reconstructed a massive “bronze floral column”³⁸³ that stretched from the floor to the ceiling, between the cult statues of Athena Ergane and

³⁸¹ On the east half of the temple having no floor at the level of the East Porch, see above “Interpreting Diploun... Oikema.”

³⁸² On the significance of the hole in the ceiling of the North Porch, see below “Conclusion: A New Restoration of the Erechtheion in the Classical Period.”

³⁸³ Harrison 1977, p. 161.

Hephaistos, based on enormous requirements of tin recorded in the building accounts for an “anthemon” in the Hephaisteion. This idea that has been accepted by other scholars with some modifications, including Palagia.³⁸⁴

In conclusion, if one is willing to accept the premises set out above about the appearance, size, and location of the famous Lamp of Kallimachos, then a new piece of evidence has been created that assists in the identification of the location of Athens’ most important cult, that of Athena Polias. Her statue, therefore, probably resided on the same, low level as the lamp, most probably in the west half of the Erechtheion.

Since the above argument has removed the Lamp of Kallimachos from the Niche, what was the function of this strange feature? The best explanation for the Niche and the equally strange treatment of certain blocks in its vicinity, following Bundgaard, is that it accommodated branches of the gigantic, crooked (παγκυῖφος) olive tree of Athena. The shelf probably did not support the branch, *per se*, but accommodated it by framing it as it meandered in and out of the temple via the southernmost intercolumniation of the West Façade.³⁸⁵ Several bosses were not removed from both the interior and exterior of the south anta of the West Façade. Most scholars, most recently Korres, argue that part of a monument on top of the mound of the Kekropeion must have prevented the masons from removing the bosses.³⁸⁶ Some of the bosses on the anta, however, were successfully removed. The strange pattern of the blocks with bosses (the exterior of WW.05.01 and

³⁸⁴ Harrison 1977.

³⁸⁵ The structural problems created by accommodating the Kekropeion and the olive tree had almost certainly manifested themselves before the resumption of building in 409: the west end of the South Wall was incomplete as the builders considered how to reduce the weight over the lintels which spanned the missing foundations. To be clear, the Niche was executed as part of the final construction of the Erechtheion. It is defined architecturally by pilasters and the shelf. After construction was completed, the Niche was cut back further to reduce the weight as evidenced by the spaces in the between the middle of the blocks, which reveals the gap created by the anathyrosis (Figure 212).

³⁸⁶ Korres 1997.

WW.07.01 [Figure 270], and the interior of WW.04.01 [Figure 294 and Figure 299]) suggests that crooked (παγκύφος) branches of the inviolable olive tree impeded the masons.³⁸⁷

Bundgaard argued that virtually all of the unusual markings and characteristics on the Erechtheion can be attributed to accommodating the gigantic olive tree, including the void under the southwest corner as well as the holes in the upper and lower parts of the North Porch.³⁸⁸ Bundgaard is probably correct in essence, but he took his theory too far. The Niche and some of the bosses on the West Façade can probably best be attributed to the olive tree. Unpruned olive trees can grow very tall, much taller than the Erechtheion. For example, there is a relatively young (small trunk diameter) unpruned olive tree in the middle of an outdoor restaurant in Preveza that is at least 18 m tall (Figure 704). In support of Bundgaard's theory of the roots invading the foundations of the Erechtheion is the evidence of the root system of the olive tree that was planted on February 22, 1917 west of the Erechtheion. The roots have already traveled several meters toward the foundations of the West Façade in the shallow soil of the Akropolis (Figure 315).

It is difficult to imagine that the olive tree was not affected by the major fire that ravaged the interior of the Erechtheion.³⁸⁹ After the fire, the Niche went out of use. The evidence for this is the removal of the sloping shelf and the insertion in its bed for the metal attachments to secure the temporary tarpaulin that protected the west half of the Erechtheion before the major repair. At this time, certain branches near the West Façade

³⁸⁷ The olive tree of Athena is described as Παγκύφος in Aristophanes. *Fr.* 727. Regarding the size of the olive tree in the late 5th century: Herodotos and Pausanias recount that the Persians burned the sacred olive tree of Athena. When olive trees burn in forest fires, they do not burn down to the ground. The trunk and most of the branches remain, and so the size of the ancient olive tree (already very ancient in the late 5th century) would have remained immense.

³⁸⁸ Bundgaard 1976, pp. 85-102.

³⁸⁹ See Chapter III on dating the major fire to the Hellenistic period.

may have perished; therefore, the Niche probably went out of use, and its corresponding open intercolumniation was filled in when the West Façade was rebuilt from course 11 upward.

In conclusion, the Niche mostly likely accommodated a wayward branch of the sacred olive tree of Athena. The tree also prevented the masons removing certain bosses from the exterior and interior of the south anta of the West Façade. Therefore, it was not the hypothetical monument on top of the Kekropeion that impeded access to the south anta as restored by Korres, but the branches of the olive tree, which would have effected a more irregular result. In consequence, the Maiden Porch was probably designed as a funerary marker for Kekrops since there is no longer any reason to reconstruct a replacement for the Ionic column surmounted by a sphinx that was destroyed by the Persians.³⁹⁰

PEPLOS OF ATHENA

The peplos offered to Athena at the Great Panathenaia was no small affair. It was used as a sail on a ship beginning in the Classical period and was decorated with the Gigantomachy. John Mansfield estimates it was approximately 4-8 m to a side.³⁹¹ Athena and Zeus figured prominently according to several literary sources, including Plutarch *Demetrios* 12.3 and a scholiast on Euripides' *Hecuba* 469. Mansfield argued that Zeus and Athena were the only two gods locked in mortal combat against the sons of Earth, a.k.a. the Giants.³⁹² That Athena rode a chariot on the peplos is attested in

³⁹⁰ See above “Function of the Maiden Porch and the Identity of the Maidens.”

³⁹¹ That is, 16 to 64 m² in area: Mansfield 1985, p. 58. For the most recent assessment of the peplos, see J. Shear 2001, pp. 173-186.

³⁹² Mansfield 1985, p. 61.

Euripides' *Hecuba* (446-473). He also describes it as being crocus-colored.³⁹³ Other sources mention the peplos as being the colors of saffron and hyacinth.³⁹⁴ Scholia on Aelius Aristides (1.404 Lenz & Bar) mention the chariot as well. The theme was standard, and the design probably did not change very often, although the design did require the approval of the Boule.³⁹⁵ These features are relevant to the discussion of the theme of the sculpture of the frieze of the Erechtheion, and the significance of the oinochoai found on the north slope of the Akropolis.

In his work on the Tyrannicides, Thomas Carpenter has demonstrated how influential the peplos of Athena was on the iconography in Athens, and even further afield.³⁹⁶ No one, however, has suggested a reasonable location for the display of the great peplos of Athena – and it had to be on display in order to influence the decorative arts.³⁹⁷ Mansfield only says that after the peplos sail was removed from the ship in the City Eleusinion, it was “‘conveyed in the procession’ ...or ‘dedicated’ to Athena at the Great Panathenaia, [and] presumably displayed in one of the temples on the Akropolis after the festival”³⁹⁸ “such as the Parthenon or the Temple of Athena Polias.”³⁹⁹

³⁹³ J. Shear 2001, p. 179.

³⁹⁴ Strattis *fr.* 73 (*PCG*); scholiast on Euripides, *Hec.* 468; that is, “with figures outlined in purplish-blue or violet against an orange-yellow background,” Mansfield 1985, pp. 64-65.

³⁹⁵ Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 49.3. See J. Shear 2001, p. 180 for discussion. Demetrios Poliorketes and Antigonos Monophthalmos were honored by having their images woven into the peplos in 307 B.C. This Greater Panathenaia was ill-omened: a strong wind tore the peplos during the Panathenaic procession through the Kerameikos in 302/1 B.C. according to Plutarch, *Demetr.* 12.3.

³⁹⁶ Carpenter 1994.

³⁹⁷ Hurwit suggests that the peplos was displayed outdoors “on the otherwise strikingly blank south wall of the Erechtheion”: Hurwit 2004, p. 275, note 11. Not only is there no physical evidence for the attachment of such an object to the South Wall in the form of cuttings for clips or a curtain rod-type apparatus, but the sacred peplos of Athena would not have been left exposed to the elements.

³⁹⁸ Mansfield 1985, pp. 77-78.

³⁹⁹ Mansfield 1985, p. 55. In the 19th century, Fergusson placed the peplos of Athena as a ceiling hanging above Athena Parthenos, based on a reference in Euripides' *Ion* (1141-1158) to figured awnings called peploi. See Mansfield 1985 *contra* David Lewis' suggestion that Athena Parthenos wore the Panathenaic peplos. See Shear 2001, pp. 101-102 on the late date of introduction of the smaller peplos that was dedicated at the Smaller Panathenaia. It was probably not draped on the olive wood statue of Athena.

The armpit blocks of the East Pilaster indicate some delineation of space even though there was no wall here.⁴⁰⁰ Perhaps the most recent peplos of Athena was hung from a pole between these pilasters, thus dividing the precinct of Erechtheus, Poseidon and Boutes from that of Athena Polias.⁴⁰¹ The peplos would therefore have been highly visible yet protected from the public, who would have been confined to the platform of the East Porch, as well as from the elements. The peplos would have been lit from both sides from the windows and doors of the East and West Façades.

The collected, valuable and sacred peploi from years past were not mentioned in the treasury inscriptions (Treasurers of Athena and the Other Gods), but reference is made to a *peplotheke* with regard to the transfer of certain metal items, such as a bronze bit (*chalinos*) to the Chalcotheke (*IG II/III*² 1462, lines 11-15, ca. 329/8-322/1 B.C.)⁴⁰² Nagy concluded that the *peplotheke* was either a separate building on the Akropolis or inside the Chalkotheke, but Mansfield is probably correct in refuting the latter's claim.⁴⁰³ A cupboard somewhere in the Erechtheion or in the Opisthodomos would be an appropriate place for the storage of such materials.⁴⁰⁴ The *chalinoi* may be the fixtures by which the top of the peplos was fastened to the yardarm of the Panathenaic ship-car, and then subsequently to a pole below the cambered beam between the East Pilasters in the Erechtheion, from which the peplos was hung for long-term display.⁴⁰⁵

⁴⁰⁰ See above "Ceiling and Roof of the Main Building."

⁴⁰¹ On the hanging of the peplos for display, or *parapetasma*, see Mansfield 1985, p. 42.

⁴⁰² The Chalkotheke was used as a warehouse for naval gear: Mansfield 1985, pp. 106-107.

⁴⁰³ Nagy 1984, pp. 227-232; Mansfield 1985, pp. 44-45.

⁴⁰⁴ By the end of the 4th century B.C., about 45 peploi would have required storage: Mansfield 1985, p. 56. An 8 x 8 m peplos would have needed about 0.25 m² of storage, so the accumulated peploi would have required a large cupboard.

⁴⁰⁵ Mansfield 1985, pp. 71-73. *LSJ*, 1996, s.v. χαλινός III for ship tackle. Bronze horse bits were also common dedications.

Mansfield cited several examples of imagery where Zeus and Athena fight Giants, such as in the pediment of the Archaic Temple of Athena, the east metopes of the Parthenon, on the shield of Athena Parthenos, and in the Great Altar at Pergamon.⁴⁰⁶ He does not mention, however, of one of the most recognizable images of Athena from the Akropolis and closely associated with the Panathenaia: the Athena Promachos (not to be confused with the Bronze Athena made from the spoils at Marathon by Pheidias, often misnamed “Promachos”). She can be found on vessels intimately associated with the festival, namely the Panathenaic amphora and the special class of oinochoai from the North Slope where she appears on the neck in the Promachos pose (Figure 706).⁴⁰⁷ Perhaps the peplos, and not a statue of Athena, is the source of Athena in this pose – Athena fighting or celebrating, having defeated the Giants. This is an image that reaches back at least as early as the Peisistratid reorganization of the festival, when the prize amphoras first appear.⁴⁰⁸

In sum, the peplos of Athena Polias from the Greater Panathenaia may have hung between the East Pilasters from bronze bits, *chalinoi*. The peplos depicted Athena fighting the Giants in a pose that is perhaps imitated on the Panathenaic amphora and the sacred vessels found on the North Slope.

STATUE OF ATHENA POLIAS AND THE TABLE IN FRONT

Kroll most recently reanalyzed all the evidence for the appearance of the olive wood cult statue of Athena Polias. He concluded that she stood upright, and held a

⁴⁰⁶ Mansfield 1985, pp. 65-67.

⁴⁰⁷ Green 1962 and Moore 1997. On the oinochoai, see below “A Series of Special Ritual Vessels.”

⁴⁰⁸ Ferrari made a very interesting argument for the Athena Promachos on the Panathenaic amphoras as Athena doing the victory dance after having defeated the Giants: Pinney 1988. This theory does not conflict with the above suggestion.

golden owl in her left hand at shoulder level and a phiale in her outstretched right hand. She was adorned with the gold accoutrements enumerated in the treasury lists: “A gold circlet, which the goddess has; earrings which the goddess has; a band which she has on her neck; five necklaces, a gold owl, a gold aegis, a gold gorgoneion, a gold phiale that she holds in her hand.”⁴⁰⁹ She probably also had a bronze helmet which was not enumerated because it was made with less valuable material. While she may have started out as a shapeless piece of wood, she was probably modeled slightly and given her golden accoutrements by Endoios in the late 6th century B.C.⁴¹⁰

There is still no consensus on the issue, as Ridgway more recently argued for a seated-type.⁴¹¹ As argued above, the statue of Athena Polias stood (or sat) with her back to the West Cross-Wall, perhaps on a sculpted base.⁴¹²

According to Deinarchos, *Or.* 3.2, there was a table in front of the statue of Athena.⁴¹³ He wrote in 323 B.C.: “And he dared to take bribes against you all, against your country and your wives and children; he has broken the oath which he swore between the statue of Athena and the table; and he proposed a decree against himself imposing the death penalty on him if he had accepted any of the money which Harpalus brought into the country.” Besides serving as a location for oath-taking and for general offerings, this table may have played a part during the indoor sacrifice to Athena Polias during the Panathenaic festival, as described in *Agora XVI 75*.⁴¹⁴

⁴⁰⁹ Harris 1995, p. 209. These items show up in a series of the treasury inscriptions from 375/4 to 314/3 B.C.)

⁴¹⁰ For the evidence, see Kroll 1982.

⁴¹¹ Ridgway 1992, pp. 120-127.

⁴¹² See above “Moldings” and “Base for the Cult Statue of Athena Polias?”

⁴¹³ That the statue is that of Athena Polias is, admittedly, not specified by Deinarchos.

⁴¹⁴ For more information on this indoor sacrifice, see below “Indoor Altars.” Blood offerings were probably not made on the *trapeza*.

A SERIES OF SPECIAL RITUAL VESSELS

Green has suggested that a special class of vessel, an attenuated oinochoe, was created in association with the consecration of the Erechtheion around 410 B.C. These vessels were used (or stored) for about two centuries before being dumped where they were found in a 3rd century context 7 m east of the Klepsydra Spring on the North Slope of the Akropolis.⁴¹⁵ “That they had some ceremonial use is plain...The fact that they appeared along with pottery and coins of the late 3rd century B.C. has suggested that they might have been thrown down from the Acropolis during the process of clearing some storage space in connection with the military occupation of the citadel at that period.”⁴¹⁶ It is more likely that they were disposed of during the clearing of the damage to the temple caused by the major fire dated in this study to the 3rd century.⁴¹⁷

These vessels, all similar enough to have been made by the same potter, are finely decorated with several different scenes, including Athena striding (Promachos pose), or Athena mounting her chariot. Some show charioteers, and one features dolphins below a chariot, which Green and Moore interpret as Poseidon and Amphitrite in a chariot, although only the bottom of a feminine cloak – just like those of Athena – is visible (Figure 706).

That these vessels were intended for ritual is without doubt: they had small modeled breasts opposite the handle, a very complex rim, and details such as the reins of the chariot and other details were picked out with gilt. The gilding is reminiscent of the metal attachments on architectural sculpture; this brings to mind the chariots in the North

⁴¹⁵ Green 1962, p. 82. Such disposal of broken (ritual) vessels is paralleled elsewhere along the North Slope.

⁴¹⁶ Green 1962, p. 93.

⁴¹⁷ See Chapter III.

Porch frieze. Robertson sees the vases as being used during the Plynteria, or cleansing ceremony of the Polias statue, performed on Thargelion 25.⁴¹⁸ Green connects these vessels with the Panathenaic procession – Athena, in her panoply, attends her own festival.⁴¹⁹ Could these special oinochoai, created around the time of the dedication of the newly built temple, reflect its sculptural program and the giant peplos of Athena displayed inside it?⁴²⁰ This is an avenue for further research.

VOTIVE STELAI AROUND THE ERECHTHEION

Cuttings for votive *stelai* in the euthynteria on the west side of the North Porch are comparable to those found in the flight of “steps” west of the Parthenon, and they probably functioned similarly (Figure 455).⁴²¹ The location of the display was important, as dedications tended to line the main routes through the sanctuary. By the same token, these *stelai*, restored in their cuttings, would have blocked access to the west side of the North Porch, suggesting that access to the Erechtheion was generally from its north and east sides. Recalling the back wall of the stoa of the Pandroseion, this area would have been ideal for the display of such dedications.

Similarly, Keesling implies that there are cuttings in the stylobate of the Old Athena Temple for statue bases in the Archaic period.⁴²² Only a few blocks of the actual stylobate survive in situ. Indeed, the stylobate blocks in the vicinity of the Maiden Porch were removed even before the porch was built over the foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena. The euthynteria survived only in a few places as well. In Kissas’

⁴¹⁸ Robertson 1996, p. 34.

⁴¹⁹ Green 1962, p. 93.

⁴²⁰ See above “Sculptured Frieze from the Erechtheion” and “Peplos of Athena.”

⁴²¹ For the most recent comments on the votives on the Akropolis, see Keesling 2003.

⁴²² Keesling 2003, p. 14, cites Kissas 2000, p. 36.

discussion of the foundations of the Archaic temple, he shows, in his fig. 1, an east-west rectangular cutting in the euthynteria and a north-south rectangular cutting in the one surviving stylobate block in situ (Figure 223).⁴²³ These cuttings must post-date the destruction of the peripteros, because in the Archaic period, when the temple was intact, the first cutting would have been covered by a stylobate block, and the second cutting, by one of the Doric columns. Therefore, these cuttings may be roughly contemporary with those in the west euthynteria of the North Porch, also implying access to them on the terrace above the Pandroseion.

VOTIVES IN THE ERECHTHEION

Keesling argues that most sculptural votives made by members of the public were meant for outdoor display.⁴²⁴ Smaller, movable items of precious metals were, on the other hand, kept indoors.⁴²⁵ The non-cult objects Pausanias mentions that are on view in the Ionic temple are generally very important relics, spoils from the most important wars (namely the Persian Wars) and genealogical paintings of priestly families – in other words, not dedications by the public.

Diane Harris-Cline has most recently analyzed the treasury inscriptions of the *archaios neos* in their entirety.⁴²⁶ The following items were stored in the Erechtheion during the 4th century B.C. Sometimes where they are located is indicated in the inscriptions and these indicators will be highlighted below with italics.

⁴²³ Kissas 2000, pp. 35-36.

⁴²⁴ Keesling 2003, p. 14.

⁴²⁵ On the precious votives, see Harris 1995.

⁴²⁶ Harris 1995, pp. 201-222.

1. Two little silver shields, two silver miniature helmets, and a silver spear.⁴²⁷
2. Two little silver shields.
3. *Against the φάτνη*,⁴²⁸ little silver shields.
4. *Against the parastas*, twelve little gold shields.⁴²⁹
5. A little gold shield, dedicated by Phylarche.
6. A gilt shield, which Iphikrates dedicated.
7. A little gold shield *hanging from the parastas*.
8. Small silver spears ... cross-laced around the nail.
9. Small silver helmets.
10. A small helmet *from the base*, having gold cheekpieces and an ivory plume.⁴³⁰
11. One gilt helmet, not in good condition.
12. A cavalry knife, ivory.
13. An ivory sacrificial knife, which [...]s dedicated, uninscribed.
14. A bronze saber, *against the parastas*.
15. Two swords, against the parastas.
16. Three bronze sabers.
17. Silver figurine, *against the parastas*, which B[...] dedicated.

⁴²⁷ The numbering system matches Harris', which reflects her own grouping of the objects by type. Please note that this numbering does not reflect the order of the objects as listed in the treasury inscriptions. On the order of the objects' appearance in the original treasury lists, see below page 150.

⁴²⁸ Harris translates ΦΑΤΝΗ as cupboard. *LSJ* translates φάτνη as manger or coffer. Paton et al. suggests it denotes a piece of temple furniture, perhaps a table with a high border or frame around the top: Paton et al. 1927, pp. 468-469. Perhaps this is the table in front of Athena.

⁴²⁹ Harris translates *parastadi* as "door-posts": Harris 1995, p. 207. On the use of *parastas* in the building accounts, see above "Moldings."

⁴³⁰ This may be from the base of the cult statue: Harris 1995, p. 221. See also above "Base for the Cult Statue of Athena Polias?"

18. A silver owl on a small (box-wood) column; an object having five gold pieces which the Priestess Phanostrate, daughter of Anak[...], dedicated
19. A little Palladion on a silver column, full of resin, not complete.
20. A gold circlet, which the goddess has; earrings which the goddess has; a band which she has on her neck; five necklaces, a gold owl, a gold aegis, a gold gorgoneion, a gold phiale that she holds in her hand.
21. A small snake
22. [A statue] holds [...] in the right hand, and in the left hand it holds a bronze box.
23. A gold ring, unweighed, which Archedike dedicated.
24. A silver [object], *against the parastas*.
25. A large silver [object] which the diaitetai in the archonship of Apollodoros (319/18) dedicated.
26. A gold [object] *against the parastas*.
27. In the *archaios neos*, of the gold in a ceramic pot (chytra...)
28. An unfired gold nugget, which Philto dedicated, unweighed.
29. A gold lustral basin (aporrhanterion), unweighed, which the male statue holds.
30. A silver brazier on which is inscribed ... dedicated; Nikokrates of Kolonos made it; weight: 500+ dr.
31. *Against the lintel*, a silver kylix.⁴³¹

⁴³¹ ΥΠΕΡΤΟΝΑΙΩ is the term translated as “lintel.”

32. A silver oinochoe, marked ..., on which is inscribed “Sacred to Athena”; weight ... dr. A silver wine-jug, on which is inscribed “Sacred to Athena”; weight ... dr. 2 silver wine-jugs, on which is inscribed “Sacred to Athena”...
33. A wood phiale with gold.
34. A silver phiale, unweighed, which the wife of Glaukon dedicated.
35. A silver phiale, unweighed, in a case, which Demo, wife of Akoumenos, dedicated.
36. A silver phiale, unweighed, in a case, which Eukoline dedicated.
37. A silver phiale, which Aristoboule dedicated.
38. A silver embossed phiale, which Ionike dedicated.
39. A small silver phiale...which Nikylla [wife of] Presbias dedicated.
40. A small silver phiale...which Nikagora, wife of Philistides of Paiania, dedicated.
41. A silver phiale.
42. *In the φάτνη*, 1+ silver phialai; other silver phialai right opposite from the ... sacred objects.
43. A small silver phiale *against the lintel*; another small phiale *against the parastas on the left as you enter. Against the parastas on the right as you enter* is a silver phiale with gold overlay, which the judges dedicated.
44. Phialai behind the door...as you enter on the right.⁴³²

⁴³² ΘΥΡΑ is translated as “door.”

45. A silver phiale in an oblong box.
46. A silver phiale inscribed “To Athena Polias”; Phryniskos of Thessaly dedicated it.
47. Another silver phiale, on which is inscribed “Sacred to Athena Polias”; the priestess [...]strate ... dedicated it.
48. A small silver phiale, on which are inscribed archaic letters.
49. A smooth silver phiale.
50. A smooth silver phiale.
51. A small silver phiale, *against the parastas*.
52. A silver phiale, which ... dedicated.
53. A silver phiale, which Nikophon of Themakos dedicated.
54. A gold incense-burner (thymaterion) has been fitted into the floor, inscribed with its weight: 19+ dr.⁴³³
55. Two wreaths of overlaid wood.
56. A gold wreath, which the treasurers dedicated in the archonship of Euboulides (394/3); unweighed.
57. A gold wreath, unweighed, which the treasurers dedicated in the archonship of Demostratos (390/89).
58. A gold wreath, unweighed, which the ambassadors dedicated, those who served with Dion L...
59. A gold wreath, which Konon dedicated; unweighed.
60. A gold wreath, unweighed, which Timagoras dedicated.

⁴³³ This item may have been added in 314/3: Harris 1995, p. 215.

61. A gold wreath, unweighed, which the *boule* in the archonship of Kalleas (377/6) dedicated.
62. A gold wreath, which the *boule* in the archonship of Charisandros (376/5) dedicated.
63. A gold wreath, which the *boule* in the archonship of Hippodamas (375/4) dedicated.
64. In the archonship of Sokratides (374/3): a gold wreath which Timotheos dedicated.
65. A gold wreath, which Philippos dedicated.
66. A gold wreath, which Kallikleia dedicated, the wife of Thoukydides.⁴³⁴

Harris states her assumption that the order of the objects on the treasury lists relates to their relative position in the temple. Therefore, near the statue of Athena, implied by the enumeration of her ornaments, (#20, mentioned in *IG II*² 1456, lines 20-22, 314/3 B.C.) there was a gold incense-burner actually set into the floor (#54, *IG II*² 1456, lines 16-18). Only a phiale intervenes in the list.⁴³⁵ Also near her was the *andrias*, the male statue which held a gold lustral basin (#29). Both the ornaments and the statue are mentioned next to each other in *IG II*² 1414; 1424a; 1425; and 1429. Harris is eager to associate the items in the inventory lists with the items mentioned by Pausanias. She associates this male statue with that of Hermes, obscured by the myrtle boughs which were used for ritual sprinkling.⁴³⁶ The treasury lists are similar to the building accounts in

⁴³⁴ Harris 1995, pp. 206-217.

⁴³⁵ Harris 1995, p. 218.

⁴³⁶ Harris 1995, pp. 218-219. This connection is not as far fetched as it sounds. Pausanias only mentions the items in the Temple of Athena Polias of great historical interest or antiquity. Very early statues holding torches, for example, are recorded in Homer (*Od.* 98-102) and Pausanias says the statue of Hermes was

that they employ extremely neutral, though descriptive, terminology to the items they record. As the building accounts would record the figures of the frieze as “woman with kneeling boy,” Mardonios’ gold dagger mentioned by Pausanias may well be one of the many golden daggers mentioned in the Parthenon lists.⁴³⁷

It is also important to note that the treasury inscriptions do not mention the bronze lamp in the shape of a ship inscribed to Athena Polias that was actually found on the east side of the West Cross-Wall. This is because bronze items were not valuable enough to warrant explicit mention in the treasury lists, which represented the items for which the *tamiai* were accountable.

As discussed above in the context of the walls with moldings in need of smoothing, the term “parastas” probably means “door-post,” its most common translation. The items attached to the presumably interior, wooden door-posts are: many little gold shields (#4, #7), bronze saber (#14) and two swords (#15), a silver figurine (#17) and other silver and gold objects (#24, #26), and a silver phialai (#51). Certain door-posts are specifically indicated, i.e., the *parastas* on your right or left as you enter (#43). This could either refer to the North Door or the door in the West Cross-Wall “as you enter” Athena’s chamber. Phialai were also stored “behind the door” (#44), “as you enter on the right.” This may refer either to the very cramped space on the bench behind the North Door, which prevented the west leaf from opening fully, or again to the

dedicated by Kekrops, the earliest king of Athens. Therefore, this lustral basin held by a male may well be the statue Pausanias mentions.

⁴³⁷ See Harris 1995, p. 217, on the rationalization between the items mentioned by Pausanias and the treasury lists. Harris suggests that “some spurious relics may have entered the temple” at a later date and tales woven around them.

southwest corner of the main chamber.⁴³⁸ The term “against the lintel” also appears with reference to the attachment of a silver kylix (#31) and a phiale (#43).

The term *phatne* is more problematic. Harris translates this as “cupboard” and infers it to mean “shelving” but its most common meaning is “manger.”⁴³⁹ Petersen suggested that this could be a table with high sides.⁴⁴⁰ Alternatively, it could be box on a stand.⁴⁴¹ Stored in relation to the *phatne* are little silver shields against it (#3) and silver phialai in or on it (#42).

Other venues for display would have been the benches on either side of the West Corridor. As pointed out by Harris, the *archaios neos* was not filled to the brim with the range of dedications found in the Hekatompedon, Parthenon and Opisthodomos. The items in the *archaios neos* are mainly quite functional in the rites of Athena Polias such as the Panathenaia: ritual vessels (jugs and phialai especially, as in the Parthenon frieze and the Maiden Porch), sacrificial knives, etc. Other items such as the little gold shields would have decorated the doorposts to which they were attached.

INDOOR ALTARS

One of the first things students of Greek religion are taught is that the main rituals of pagan cult was conducted out of doors, and that the temple was little more than the shelter for the cult statue.⁴⁴² As with the architecture of the Erechtheion, the cults contained in it were anything but typical.

⁴³⁸ The bench in the West Corridor prevented the west leaf of the North Door from opening fully. Contrary to general understanding, the bench behind the western leaf of the North Door was not cut back until the Byzantine period, see Chapter V.

⁴³⁹ Harris 1995, p.1.

⁴⁴⁰ Cited without footnote in Paton et al. 1927, p. 469.

⁴⁴¹ Coulton (pers. comm.).

⁴⁴² Burkert 1985, pp. 84-92.

Pausanias describes altars of Poseidon/Erechtheus, Boutes and Hephaistos specifically as being inside the Erechtheion.⁴⁴³ This arrangement is neither unique nor common. For example, Poseidon also has an altar in the Temple of Apollo at Delphi. This does not appear to be a case of chthonic/Olympian duality like Asklepios because Hephaistos and Poseidon are solely Olympians.

As part of his attempt to dissociate these cults from the Ionic Temple on the north side of the Akropolis, Jeppesen pointed out that the three altars of Poseidon/Erechtheus, Boutes and Hephaistos seen by Pausanias inside the Erechtheion are not mentioned in the building accounts of the “Temple in which is the Ancient Statue.” However, these altars, unlike that of Thyechoos, were certainly already in place and in use, because they had already existed there. Therefore, by the time the accounts of 409/8 were written up, they required no further mention.⁴⁴⁴ It is impossible to tell whether these altars were raised temporarily and replaced on the new marble flooring when the Erechtheion was built, or whether the new floor approached, but did not impinge on the ancient altars.⁴⁴⁵

One of the many reasons Paton et al. argue for the placement of the three altars in the west chamber is that the low wall and spacious intercolumniations of the West Façade would have provided good ventilation for the smoke from the altars. However, the door and two windows in the East Wall would similarly have provided adequate ventilation for the sacrifice at the altars. These windows would also have provided good lighting for the paintings of the Boutadai that Pausanias saw.

⁴⁴³ Pausanias 1.26.5.

⁴⁴⁴ See above “Interpreting Diploun... Oikema.”

⁴⁴⁵ Figure 686 shows a modern example of the transition between bedrock (on which an altar to the unknown soldier stands) and the surrounding pavement.

Agora XVI 75, the Law and Amendment Concerning the Small Panathenaia, mentions sacrifices “in the *archaios neos*” whereby *prytaneis*, the nine archons, the *tamiai*, the *hieropoioi*, the *strategoï*, the *taxiarchoi*, the marshals and the *kanephoroi* all received portions of the sacrifice “ἐν τῷ ἀρ[χάσι νεῶι].”⁴⁴⁶ This appears to have been a smaller sacrifice than the hekatomb on the Great Altar that took place outdoors. As we do not hear of an altar to Athena inside the temple, these sacrifices may have taken place at the three known indoor altars discussed above.⁴⁴⁷

CONCLUSION: A NEW RESTORATION OF THE ERECHTHEION IN THE CLASSICAL PERIOD

The purpose of this chapter was to present and assess the major contributions to the scholarship on the Erechtheion since 1927, as well as to discuss new ideas and interpretations of the evidence in order to lay the ground-work for a new reconstruction of the temple and its cults. What is imperative for the reader to take away in order to understand the subsequent chapters is that there was no East Cross-Wall, and that the floor level of the whole temple was the same as that of the North Porch.

This section presents that new reconstruction, which was conceived (without a topographical agenda) after having examined of all the available archaeological (architectural, pottery and small finds), epigraphic and literary evidence. The scenario will be presented as a working hypothesis and then tested against Pausanias’ account of the temple to show that the reconstruction is plausible.

⁴⁴⁶ For an in-depth and insightful analysis of *Agora XVI 75*, see J. Shear 2001, pp. 73-87. Rosivach identified the sacrifice “in the *archaios neos*” with the Panathenaic hekatomb and argued that this sacrifice must have taken place on the Great Altar, despite the specific terminology used in the *Agora XVI 75* with respect to the composition and location of the sacrifices: Rosivach 1991, pp. 439-442.

⁴⁴⁷ Pierre Brulé has recently suggested that this sacrifice was offered not only to Athena Polias, but also to Erechtheus, Boutes and Hephaistos: Brulé 1996, pp. 44-46.

The Ionic temple commonly known as the Erechtheion housed the cults of Athena Polias and Erechtheus et al.⁴⁴⁸ The temple was likely conceived as part of the Periklean building program to re-house the cults on the Akropolis in accordance with the constraints imposed by the Oath of Plataia.⁴⁴⁹ The initial plan was probably symmetrical.⁴⁵⁰ Construction began soon after the earthquake of 427/6 B.C. but was probably stopped at intervals because of religious conflicts over certain immovable features of religious significance.⁴⁵¹ These conflicts necessitated changes in design. Construction likely ceased between 413 and 409, probably for financial reasons as a result of military commitments. When work on the temple ceased for good in 405/4, it was not fully finished and never would be.⁴⁵²

The temple was entered from the north via the North Porch. Access to the North Porch from the east was via a staircase descending from the level of the East Porch to the terrace north of the North Wall. From the west, one had to pass by the Bronze Athena by Pheidias, the terrace of the Archaic Temple of Athena, and the back of the sanctuary of Pandrosos.⁴⁵³

The main entrance to the temple was through the North Door.⁴⁵⁴ This led to a *prostoion*, or ante-room to the main chamber of the central building.⁴⁵⁵ The West Cross-

⁴⁴⁸ That Athena and Erechtheus-Poseidon shared a precinct is evident from all the evidence, including Homer, *Il.* 2.546-551; Herodotos 5.82 and 8.55; Euripides, *Ere.* 90-94; and Himerios, *Or.* 5.30; Scholia (Sopater) on Aristeides, *Panath.* (13), 43, III, p. 62.3, 9 Dindorf.

⁴⁴⁹ On the Oath of Plataia not being violated by the construction of the Parthenon or the Erechtheion, see above “Original Plan” and “Date.”

⁴⁵⁰ See above “Original Plan.” The altars of Erechtheus, Boutes and Hephaistos may not have been intended to be enclosed within the Classical temple.

⁴⁵¹ See above “Original Plan” and “Date.”

⁴⁵² Even during ancient repairs necessitated by fires in the vicinity of unfinished areas, the bosses on the West Façade and the North Door were never removed. Other moldings were never finished and protective skins were left on the wall blocks.

⁴⁵³ From the Propylaia, i.e., the west, only the upper, colonnaded part of the West Façade and North Porch were visible above the terrace of the Archaic Temple of Athena and the back wall of the L-shaped stoa of the Pandroseion.

⁴⁵⁴ See above “North Porch as the Entrance to the Temple of Athena Polias.”

Wall was the only divider of space in the main building and it was pierced by an opening on axis with the West Door.⁴⁵⁶ A colonnade above the lower solid part of the West Cross-Wall supported an architrave, which in turn supported the ceiling and roof.⁴⁵⁷ Contrary to most previous reconstructions of the Erechtheion, there was no East Cross-Wall. Pilasters where the East Cross-Wall is traditionally placed further demarcated the space of the main chamber (“East Pilasters”). In line with the East Pilasters, the vertical support of a cambered beam system was inserted into course 6 and above, where the blocks are only half thickness in the North and South Walls.⁴⁵⁸ West of the cambered beam, the ceiling was coffered.⁴⁵⁹ There may have been no ceiling to the east of the cambered beam.

The main chamber was an open hall with the floor level all at the same (low) elevation.⁴⁶⁰ A marble floor extended along the North Wall from the West Façade to at least NN.20.08, if not all the way to the East foundations. This marble floor also extended to the western extent of the poros foundations on the South Wall. The east foundations were built around a pre-existing enclosure.⁴⁶¹ The remainder of the floor area (exclusively in the eastern half of the main chamber) was of beaten earth.⁴⁶²

⁴⁵⁵ See Jeppesen 1983 for the important re-reading of the Chandler Stele and explanation of this term. See also above “Moldings.”

⁴⁵⁶ This door was probably in the same place as restored after the major fire dated by this study to the Hellenistic period. For the location of this door in the Hellenistic through Roman periods, see Chapter III. See also above “Location of the Door in the West Cross-Wall.”

⁴⁵⁷ See above “Ceiling and Roof of the Main Building.”

⁴⁵⁸ See above “Moldings.”

⁴⁵⁹ Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum* calculated the arrangement on the coffers in the west half of the building “above the image” based on the building inscriptions. See above “Ceiling and Roof of the Main Building.”

⁴⁶⁰ See above “Interpreting Diploun... Oikema.”

⁴⁶¹ For a detailed description of the evidence of this enclosure, see Holland 1924, pp. 402-425. Also see above “Interpreting Diploun... Oikema.”

⁴⁶² See above “Indoor Altars.”

The East Pilasters perhaps framed the peplos of Athena from the Greater Panathenaia. The giant peplos would have hung from a rod, maybe by means of bronze bits mentioned in conjunction with the peplotheke in the treasury inscriptions. This rod would have been suspended beneath the cambered beam between the East Pilasters on the North and South Walls.⁴⁶³ The tapestry would have been illuminated from both east and west, by the windows and openings in the East Wall and West Façade.

The East Porch was a viewing platform from which the peplos, secondary cults, and contents of the interior could be viewed. The East Wall had two elaborately carved windows and a door five (not nine) feet wide.⁴⁶⁴ One could not normally enter the temple from the East Porch as there was no floor at the level of this porch. There may, however, have been a narrow walkway that extended to the North Wall toward a narrow set of wooden steps that descended to the lower level.⁴⁶⁵

The West Corridor had a bench along the interior of the West Façade. The southwest corner of the temple lacked foundations because it was built over the east part of the mound of earth representing the tomb of Kekrops.⁴⁶⁶ The Kekropeion was enclosed by a wall extending westward from the West Façade and was accessible by a staircase from the terrace of the Archaic Temple of Athena west of the Maiden Porch.⁴⁶⁷

⁴⁶³ See above “Peplos of Athena.”

⁴⁶⁴ See above “Interpreting Diploun... Oikema.”

⁴⁶⁵ See above “Interpreting Diploun... Oikema.”

⁴⁶⁶ It is physically impossible for the “salt-sea” or “cistern” of Poseidon to have been here, as reconstructed by Paton et al. because it would have overlapped the mound of earth of the Kekropeion.

⁴⁶⁷ On the reconstruction of the Kekropeion and how it interacted with the West Façade of the Erechtheion, see Stevens 1946, pp. 93-97. Stevens interpreted the unfinished blocks on the West Façade to show that the floor of the Kekropeion was at the bottom of the third course from the top of the door in the West Façade (WW.18.01). Somehow, the massive trunk and crooked branches of the ancient olive tree had to share this space. See above “Archaic and Early Classical Period” and “Function of the Maiden Porch and the Identity of the Maidens.”

Also in the southwest corner of the West Corridor, above the void in the foundations, there was a Niche in the South Wall with a sloping shelf connected to the one grill-less opening in the West Façade.⁴⁶⁸ The Niche and shelf served several structural functions. First and foremost, the Niche reduced the thickness of the wall (and hence the mass) over the void of the Kekropeion. The sloping shelf probably served as a perch for the doves (and owl) in residence; accommodated a branch of the huge, “crooked” (παγκῦφος) sacred olive tree; and protected a portion of the Kekropeion from eroding inside the temple.⁴⁶⁹

The oblique angle at the edge of the westward projection of the North Porch accommodated the Early Classical L-shaped stoa and paving of the Pandroseion to the west of the temple.⁴⁷⁰ The olive tree stood in the Pandroseion next to the altar of Zeus Herkeios (“of the courtyard”).⁴⁷¹

The Maiden Porch, whose foundations are shaped to fit against those of the Archaic Temple of Athena (Figure 306), acted as a physical and ritual bridge between Athena’s old and new homes as well as a marker for Kekrops’ tomb.⁴⁷² Because of the truncation of the Maiden Porch, and hence only partial covering of the earthen mound of the tomb, the primary function of the porch was as a passageway. There is no evidence for any altar or ritual taking place there. The east door of the Maiden Porch, the marble stairway and the South Door together suggest that a perhaps a procession of a few, but important, personages paraded through this structure. The stately, slightly individualized

⁴⁶⁸ On the disassociation of the Lamp of Kallimachos with the Niche, see above “Lamp of Kallimachos and the Niche.”

⁴⁶⁹ See above “Lamp of Kallimachos and the Niche.”

⁴⁷⁰ On the westward projection of the North Porch, see above “Original Plan.”

⁴⁷¹ On the olive tree in the Pandroseion: Philochoros, *Fr.* 146. Apollodoros 3.14.1. On Herodotos and the olive tree in the Erechtheion, see above note 71.

⁴⁷² See above “Function of the Maiden Porch and the Identity of the Maidens.”

maidens are servants of Athena: the phialai carriers of the Parthenon frieze. They stand in perpetual readiness to offer libations to Athena’s former home in the east cella of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias, a home desecrated by the Persians. It is not the Opisthodomos of the Archaic Temple (still standing in the Classical period) that was recreated in the Ionic Temple as restored by Paton et al., but the east cella. These two spaces are identical in size. An examination of the rituals involving the cult statue of Athena Polias may hold clues to a procession between her new home in the Ionic temple, through the Maiden Porch, and the cella of the Archaic Temple.⁴⁷³

Now that the basic architectural structure has been addressed, the cults mentioned by the sources may be placed in and around the temple. The olive-wood statue of Athena Polias resided in the west part of the central chamber and faced east.⁴⁷⁴ That the temple (particularly the west part?) was associated with Athena can be inferred from the reference by the atthidographer Philochoros’ story about the dog which went directly “from the Temple of the Polias to the Pandroseion.”⁴⁷⁵ That Athena probably resided in the west chamber is supported by the find-spot of the bronze lamp shaped as a ship inscribed to Athena on the east side of the West Cross-Wall.⁴⁷⁶ According to the new

⁴⁷³ The Plynteria and Kallynteria celebrated Thargelion 25-27 are candidates. These festival involved the public undressing and washing of the cult statue and Athena Polias’ adornments: Robertson 1996, pp. 48-49. Robertson suggests this ritual occurred in the North Porch of the Erechtheion; however, it is possible that this important ritual took place in the ruins of the east cella of the Archaic Temple of Athena, the statue having been brought out of the temple via the Maiden Porch.

⁴⁷⁴ Cassius Dio (54.7.1-4) implies she faced east because she turned around to face west to spit blood (toward Rome). See Chapter IV on the political rather than topographical significance of this event.

⁴⁷⁵ Philochoros, Fr. 146 : κύων εἰς τὸν τῆς Πολιάδος νεῶν εἰσελθοῦσα καὶ δῦσα εἰς τὸ Πανδρόσειον, ἐπὶ τὸν Βωμὸν ἀναβᾶσα τοῦ Ἐρκείου Διὸς τὸν ὑπὸ τῆι ἐλαίᾳ κατέκειτο.

⁴⁷⁶ *IG I³ 549 bis*. This lamp was discovered in the 1860s by Bötticher while he was excavating under the Byzantine pavement of the nave of the basilica. It was found “in the central chamber in or close to the west transverse wall”: Paton et al. 1927, p. 572.

reconstruction of the ceiling, the coffers painted “above the image” must be above the west chamber.⁴⁷⁷

Circumstantial evidence for Athena in the west part of the main building includes the placement, monumentality and high degree of decoration of the North Porch as the entrance to the city’s most important cult (Figure 153).⁴⁷⁸ Finally, a negative argument that Athena Polias could not have stood in an east chamber at the upper level as reconstructed by Paton et al. is possibly shown by the calculations for the size of the Lamp of Kallimachos, at least 8 m in height, which stood near her.⁴⁷⁹

According to Deinarchos (3.2), an offering table stood in front of the cult statue of Athena Polias. Behind her, on the West Cross-Wall, hung a painting of Erichthonios, with the chariot he is supposed to have invented according to a scholiast on Aristeides.⁴⁸⁰ The treasury inscriptions record a golden incense burner set into the floor and a male statue holding a golden lustral basin in the vicinity of the cult statue.⁴⁸¹

On the other side of the peplos which hung between the East Pilasters (that is, under the ceiling-less portion of the temple) were the altars of Erechtheus-Poseidon, Boutes, and Hephaistos, perhaps set on a floor of beaten earth. The 4th century triple thrones for the priests were perhaps also located in the vicinity, placed on the earthen

⁴⁷⁷ See above “Ceiling and Roof of the Main Building.”

⁴⁷⁸ The association of the temple with Athena is implied by Vitruvius 4.8.4. See above “North Porch as the Entrance to the Temple of Athena Polias.”

⁴⁷⁹ Strabo 9.1.16; Plutarch, *Sull.* 13.3; See above “Lamp of Kallimachos and the Niche.” Pausanias’ route is discussed below. It is difficult to use his testimony as direct evidence since the passage on the Erechtheion and Temple of Athena Polias has been used to support all the theories for the allocation of cults. Nonetheless, Pausanias is our only narrative description of the temple, and so it must be taken into account, even if it cannot be the basis for the reconstruction.

⁴⁸⁰ Scholiast (Sopater) on Aristeides, *Panath.* (13), 43, III, p. 62.3, 9 Dindorf, says this is Erechtheus, but Mansfield 1985, pp. 210, 232-233, suggests this could also be Erichthonios, the inventor of the quadriga according to the *Marmor Parium* A, lines 17-18, ep. 10, *FGH* IIB 239, p. 994.8 Jacoby: “Erichthonios yoked a chariot at the first celebration of the Panathenaia.”

⁴⁸¹ This statue with the lustral basin may be the wooden Hermes described by Pausanias. See above “Votives in the Erechtheion.” The incense burner may have only been added in the early Hellenistic period.

floor.⁴⁸² The walls were decorated with paintings of the Boutadai which were well lit by the openings in the East Wall. The “salt-sea” of Poseidon was located in the temenos nestled against the east foundations.⁴⁸³

The literary evidence does not necessitate the proximity of the “salt-sea” to the trident marks of Poseidon.⁴⁸⁴ The best candidate for the trident marks is still the three indentations in the bedrock beneath in the North Porch, preserved for display by the hole in the stylobate.⁴⁸⁵ The path of the trident was commemorated by the deliberately missing coffer in the ceiling of the North Porch.⁴⁸⁶ The hollow Altar of Thyechoos stood over the marks.⁴⁸⁷ The crypt below this altar led into the main chamber of the temple, not far

⁴⁸² Admittedly, this would have made the space extremely cramped. For alternative locations for the thrones, see above note 296.

⁴⁸³ The slit windows cut in the North and South Walls (during the Hellenistic period: see Chapter III) allowed drafts to circulate and cause the “sound of waves” phenomenon commented on by Pausanias in the 2nd century A.D. One should not expect to find an actual salt-spring, as often suggested in the scholarship. The words used to describe Poseidon’s watery token are *phrear* (Pausanias), which means artificial well, tank, cistern or reservoir, or *thalassa* (Herodotos). Herodotos would have seen the “sea” before the construction of the east foundations of the Erechtheion, that is, when it was simply framed by a low temenos.

⁴⁸⁴ In fact, Pausanias describes them as being “on the rock”, that is, exposed in the bedrock. If the trident marks had been underwater in the salt-sea, he would not have been able to see them.

⁴⁸⁵ On the commemoration of ancient tokens in antiquity, see Boardman 2002.

⁴⁸⁶ Paton et al. concluded that the arrangement in the North Porch must commemorate Zeus’ thunderbolt and not Poseidon’s trident: Paton et al. 1927 p. 490. To do so, the altar of Thyechoos must be mistaken as the altar of Zeus Hypatos by Pausanias. Boardman has recently stated his support for the marks in the North Porch as being the marks of Poseidon’s trident rather than Zeus’ thunderbolt: Boardman 2002, p. 109. Elderkin fancifully combined the two possibilities by suggesting that the marks began as being thought to have been caused by Poseidon’s trident, but later became acknowledged as Zeus’ thunderbolt. This idea is based on Hyginus (*Fabulae* 46), who conflates the stories by reporting that Zeus, at the request of Poseidon, smote Erechtheus with a thunderbolt: Elderkin 1941, p. 113. Furthermore, the altar of Thyechoos has several provisions (including its name according to some etymologies) for libations, and libations and fire sacrifice were explicitly forbidden features of the rites of Zeus Hypatos. Poseidon threw his trident a second time, to murder Erechtheus for having killed his son, Eumolpos of Eleusis. Erechtheus’ tomb is supposed to be in the location of this trident strike, and Euripides tells in *Ion* that the tomb is located by the Long Rocks on the Akropolis North Slope, just east of the Klepsydra. This must not be confused with Poseidon and Athena’s battle for the patronage of the city. Jeppesen makes this conflation: Jeppesen 1987, p. 13. The reconciliation between Poseidon and Erechtheus is illustrated by the oracle’s order that Erechtheus also be honored at Poseidon’s altar (Pausanias 1.26.5).

⁴⁸⁷ This altar is very problematic. Various etymological explanations have been suggested, but the most probable is that the priest is the “pourer of offerings”: Paton et al. 1927. Alternatively, Hawes interpreted Thyechoos to mean the “cake-eating snake”: Hawes, *The Riddle of the Erechtheum*; and Robertson breaks it down to mean “the watcher of the burnt offering”: Robertson 1996, pp. 32-33. The priest of the Thyechoos had a throne in the Theatre of Dionysos, but is otherwise unknown. Pausanias does not confuse

from where the statue of Athena Polias stood.⁴⁸⁸ This must be the lair of the snake in residence in the temple.⁴⁸⁹ The depressed block in the North Porch with the semi-circular hole may have been where the honey cakes were placed for the snake.⁴⁹⁰ Libations could be made to Athena Polias at the Altar of Thyechoos, which was connected to her cella by the passageway under the North Wall.

A good comparison for the exposed bedrock in the North Porch is the sanctuary of Ge Olympia in the sanctuary of Zeus Olympios at Athens. An opening in the floor in her shrine was about two feet wide and was thought to be that through which the Deukalian flood drained. According to Pausanias (1.18.7), cakes of wheat-meal and honey were offered there every year. This parallel resonates particularly well with the situation in the North Porch since some accounts of Poseidon's gift to Athens ended with the flooding of Attica when he did not win over the local residents with his gift.⁴⁹¹ It is possible to imagine that the flood dissipated through the crypt as the rain water does today.

Despite its late date and inherent problems, Pausanias' account of the Akropolis is usually the starting place for any discussion of the Erechtheion because it remains the only relatively complete narrative description of the building as a whole. While Pausanias is the source of the information about many of the features of the Erechtheion, up until now, the organization of the temple and the location of the cults have been based

this altar with that of Zeus Hypatos which must have been east of the Erechtheion. Instead, Pausanias mentions what was being commemorated, namely, the trident marks of Poseidon.

⁴⁸⁸ The transition from the crypt to the floor level of the temple is unclear. Hawes swears to have seen traces of steps running upward from the crypt along the lower North Wall, which is, admittedly, made of marble rather than the poros of the foundations. These traces no longer exist.

⁴⁸⁹ The snake of Athena (Philostratos, *Imag.* 2.17) appears to have had the run of the temple. Hesychios, (s.v. οἰκουρὸν ὄφις) associates the snake with the *hieron* of Erechtheus (although Jeppesen 1987, p. 45 argues that this should be Erichthonios). Eustathios, *Odys.* 1.357 refers to the guardian serpent as living in the temple of the Polias, which may mean the building as a whole.

⁴⁹⁰ Herodotos 8.41. This supports Hawes' "cake-eating snake" etymology for the altar of Thyechoos.

⁴⁹¹ Apollodoros 3.14.1.

on architectural, epigraphical and other literary evidence. The theory argued here will now be tested against Pausanias' account of the building called the Erechtheion and the Temple of Athena Polias.

After Pausanias visited the Parthenon, he made his way to the building called the Erechtheion. At this point, he is standing in front of the East Porch. The altar of Zeus Hypatos (on which πέμματα, or cakes, were placed, but no wine) is in front of the East Porch, probably near the Altar of Dione mentioned as being east of the southernmost column of the East Porch in the building accounts. Pausanias calls the Erechtheion a διπλοῦν ... οἶκημα. Here, he is likely describing a two-storied or double-height building, that is, with the second story as a basement, not an upper story or two rooms side by side.⁴⁹² The term οἶκημα implies that this was not a temple, or *neos*, but simply a building: the Erechtheion is an annex to the Temple of Athena Polias, an area enclosed as an afterthought when the original, symmetrical plan was not executed. Indeed, it is at the back of her temple, since there was no direct access to the altars from the East Porch. Nonetheless, Pausanias saw the οἶκημα called the Erechtheion first, through the opening in the East Door, and describes the *phrear* of Poseidon and the altars of Poseidon-Erechtheus, Hephaistos, and Boutes there. The phenomenon of hearing the waves when the south wind blows can be explained by the draft caused by the slit windows in the North and South Walls, one of which is located directly above the enclosure with the *phrear* nestled into the east foundations.⁴⁹³

After describing the altars, *phrear* and paintings of the Boutadai, Pausanias leaves the East Porch, descends the steps north of the Erechtheion to the North Terrace and

⁴⁹² See above “Interpreting Diploun... Oikema.”

⁴⁹³ See note 483.

stands in the North Porch. Here he points out the trident marks in the rock (below the altar). As he enters the temple through the North Door, he gives a transitional paragraph explaining Athena's importance. Once inside, he describes the prime features of the temple, namely the olive wood statue of Athena and the Lamp of Kallimachos. He finally tells us the obvious, that he is inside the *naos* of Athena, where he proceeds to tell about the wooden statue of Hermes (perhaps the *andrias* of the treasury inscriptions) and other important historical relics.

Pausanias then leaves by the West Door and enters the Pandroseion in which is the olive tree, once burned by the Persians. He exits the temple complex via the door in the Westward Projection of the North Porch and proceeds toward the House of the Arrhephoroi.⁴⁹⁴

This reconstruction is based on a straight-forward reading of the documentary and archaeological evidence and does not require any “explaining away” of inconvenient evidence, as required by other reconstructions and allocation of cults to the Erechtheion. This reconstruction is also the basis for the arguments laid out in the following chapters regarding the later phases of the Erechtheion.

⁴⁹⁴ On Pausanias' the omission of the Maiden Porch and Kekropeion, see Chapter III.

CHAPTER III – LATE CLASSICAL AND HELLENISTIC PERIODS (399-31 B.C.)

INTRODUCTION

This study is divided into chapters according to successive cultural horizons rather than historical periods.¹ Most ancient art historians would extend the Classical period to Alexander's death in 323 B.C. Politically, however, Athens never regained her former dominance of the Aegean after the Peloponnesian War. This development, as well as the coming of Macedon, affected the religion and society of the city-state far more than did the death of Alexander. The previous chapter ended with the cessation of the Erechtheion's construction in the twilight of the 5th century. This chapter starts by setting the scene for the historical circumstances of the first fires that damaged the building in the following decades.

Indeed, it may be said that the destruction of the Erechtheion began before it was finished. Xenophon records a fire in the *palaios neos of Athena* in the same year as an eclipse of the moon.² This fire is dated by Paton et al. to 406 B.C., according to the archon.³ Dinsmoor challenged the foundations of the argument for this date and redated the fire to 377-376 B.C.⁴ Whichever date one agrees with, the Erechtheion was not finished when the first fire took hold.⁵ For instance, bosses and protective layers of marble were left on many parts of the exterior and interior of the walls, and many moldings remained unfinished.

¹ On the definition and importance of “cultural horizons” to this study, see Chapter I.

² Xenophon, *HG* 1.6.1: παλαιὸς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεῶς.

³ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 459-463.

⁴ Dinsmoor 1932.

⁵ See below “History of Fires in the Erechtheion.”

The most recent scholarly treatment of the second, more severe fire which damaged the Erechtheion is Jeffrey Burden's 1999 doctoral thesis, "Athens Remade in the Age of Augustus." Burden assembled most of the references to changes undergone by the Erechtheion as a result of the major fire from Paton et al. 1927. He accepts Paton's conclusion that the major repair dates to the Augustan period without reassessing it in the context of modern scholarship on Hellenistic and Roman Athens.

This chapter, therefore, has three aims: first, to review the status of the cult of Athena Polias in the turbulent centuries between the Erechtheion's construction and Sulla's unwelcome visit in 86 B.C.; second, to re-analyze the so-called Roman repairs (Figure 591) and reconsider their date in the context of the building projects of the Hellenistic kings; and third, to survey the immediate impact of the Erechtheion on subsequent Ionic buildings in the Greek world. Before achieving these goals, however, it is necessary to investigate the history of Athens and the welfare of the cult of Athena Polias from the 4th through the early 1st centuries B.C. in order to gauge its impact on the historical evolution of the Erechtheion.

Jon Mikalson's approach toward Athenian religion in the Hellenistic period is sound and logical: "Religious and political patterns tend to be waves on the same frequency, because dislocations in both were caused largely by foreign influences and restorations in both tended to occur when the Athenians, however briefly, could manage their government and lives as they pleased."⁶ The following section will follow these oscillations in Athenian fortunes, and reflect on the impact of individuals and historical events on the cult of Athena Polias and her temple.

⁶ Mikalson 1998, p. 7.

HISTORY OF ATHENS DURING THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

By the end of the 5th century, the Erechtheion stood complete but unfinished, and possibly ravaged by the first of many fires. The Athenians had lost the Peloponnesian War, and briefly their democracy. The Athenian general Konon exacted a certain amount of revenge on the Spartans when, in 394 B.C., he scuttled the Spartan fleet off Knidos. The early 4th century saw the Athenians' desperate attempts to rekindle the despised Athenian Empire and to find their city's place in the world of political alliances and leagues in which Athens was no longer the strongest force. The historical events concerning Athens in the early 4th century are complicated and involved many shifting and surprising alliances.⁷

With rumblings in Macedon and the lure and fear of Philip II's growing power, pro- and anti-Macedonian factions surfaced in Athens. Orators and statesmen such as Aeschines, Demosthenes and Lykourgos dominated political life in Athens. At the same time, Athens was the cradle for the rise of leading philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle, as well as the schools they established. The philosophers were notoriously cynical toward the established state and popular religious practices. In the realm of drama, Menander wrote situation comedies rather than the sharply witty self-critiques in the style of Old Comedy.

EARLY 4TH CENTURY B.C.

The history of the Akropolis in the first part of the 4th century included a few surprises. Between 385/4 and 353, a banking scandal centered on the treasurers of Athena (and probably the Other Gods as well) resulted in the burning of the

⁷ These events can be consulted in history books such as Green 1993; Sealey 1976; Lewis et al. 1994; Buckley 1996; and Hammond 1986.

Opisthodomos to cover their embezzlement of Athena's treasure.⁸ Although depleted during the Peloponnesian War, the sanctuary of Athena on the Akropolis enjoyed a quick recovery. The goddess received many private dedications of precious metals and other materials, all carefully recorded in the treasury inscriptions.⁹ There are some famous names in these inscriptions, such as Lysimache, the long-serving priestess of Athena Polias, who was probably the inspiration of Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*. Later, Roxane, Alexander the Great's wife, was recorded as having dedicated a gold necklace and rhyton.¹⁰

The Akropolis remained a center of elite display in the 4th century. Hundreds of sculptures, both single and in groups, were set up as state and private dedications. For example, Konon was commemorated for his military leadership and successes north of the Parthenon, as was Lysimache.¹¹ If the Roman copies of a statue of an old woman in London, Rome and Basel are accurate reflections of the bronze original of Lysimache by Demetrios of Alopeke, then this sculptor lived up to his reputation for employing a heavy dose of verism. Her toil and long service to her goddess are depicted in the lines and wrinkles of her grandmotherly face.

Other famous sculptors received commissions for sculptures on the Akropolis. Praxiteles, for example, made a statue of Artemis for the Brauroneion and a Diadoumenos as a private dedication for an athletic victor. Leochares, who had worked on the Mausoleum and made the chryselephantine statues of Philip II, Olympias and

⁸ Demosthenes, *Tim.* 24.136. On the banking scandal, see Cohen 1992. See below "History of Fires in the Erechtheion."

⁹ Harris 1995.

¹⁰ Hurwit 1999, p. 250.

¹¹ Pausanias 1.24.3. On the location and reconstruction of these monuments, see Stevens 1946, pp. 4-10.

Alexander for the Philippeion at Olympia, probably also made the portrait of Alexander the Great found beside the Erechtheion.¹²

LYKOURGOS (338-322 B.C.)

On the religious and civic fronts, Lykourgos was the 4th century's answer to Perikles. Brilliant financier, religious and cultural restorer, Lykourgos directed the first major building and restoration project in almost a century. Lykourgos was of the *genos* of the Eteoboutadaï and priest of Poseidon-Erechtheus. As a male with the closest possible ties to the cult of Athena Polias, he would have been intimately involved in any changes to the Erechtheion and its cults. And yet we hear of nothing significant in the ancient record to this end. There exists, however, a highly illustrative decree on the Smaller Panathenaia (*Agora XVI 75*) which describes the healthy revenues and members of the procession, as well as prescribes the recipients of the sacrifices which took place “in the *archaios neos*” to Athena Polias (and perhaps Erechtheus, Boutes and Hephaistos).¹³

According to a *Res Gestae* of sorts preserved in a decree proposed by Stratokles in 307-6 B.C., Lykourgos was honored for having built the first substantial version of the Theatre of Dionysos, repaired the Long Walls, finished the stadium and ship sheds, and filled the Chalkotheke with armor.¹⁴ In *Against Leokrates* (330 B.C.), Lykourgos implored private citizens to donate money for the rebuilding of walls, as well as the construction and maintenance of triremes, rather than spending it on festival liturgies. In

¹² Hurwit 1999, p. 252; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, p. 281: This head (AM 1331) was found in 1886 by Kavvadias.

¹³ Shear 2001, pp. 73-91; Brulé 1996, pp. 44-46. On the topographical implications of the term “*archaios neos*,” see Chapter II.

¹⁴ That is, some seventeen years after Lykourgos' death.

his role as treasurer of the general revenues, he also raised an immense amount of private funds for Athena's treasury. He also recycled her broken and damaged dedications, thereby creating new ritual vessels, decorations for the goddess and her servants (including enough jewellery for one hundred *kanephoroi*), and replacing the golden Nikai.¹⁵ During the nadir of the Peloponnesian war in 407/6, all but one of the statues of Nike were melted down for coinage. The treasury inscriptions of 371/0 and 369/8 note that seven bases for Nikai existed but the statues themselves were missing. Lykourgos remade seven such statues in gold or gilded bronze.¹⁶ He also devised a new system for inventorying Athena's treasures.¹⁷

Mikalson observes that “we see here the beginnings of a planned and systematic new manner of the use of the resources of the rich for the benefit of the community in religious affairs,”¹⁸ that would culminate in gifts of whole buildings by Hellenistic kings. Mikalson also detects a subtle shift away from the Akropolis cults of Athena Polias and Poseidon-Erechtheus in the 4th century to cults in the Agora and the Piraeus, not to mention the quickly growing cult of Asklepios on the south slope of the Akropolis.¹⁹ With the polis' acquisition of Oropos, and the healing sanctuary of Amphiaraos there in the aftermath of Chaironeia, the health of Athenians was well attended to, as the dedications proclaim: “[Amphiaraos] takes good care of the Athenians and the others who come to his sanctuary for the health and safety of all those in the land.”²⁰

¹⁵ Lykourgos' deeds are recorded in a decree proposed by Stratokles in 307/6 B.C., preserved in fragments *IG II² 457* and *IG II² 513*, in Plutarch and Pausanias.

¹⁶ Mikalson 1998, p. 28, says they were made of gold, two talents each. Hurwit 1999, p. 256, says they were gilded bronze. The Stratokles decree says gold specifically.

¹⁷ Harris 1995, pp. 33-35.

¹⁸ Mikalson 1998, p. 27.

¹⁹ Mikalson 1998, p. 43.

²⁰ *IG VII 4252*. Also see Lesk 1995.

In the Agora, Lykourgos built (or at least paid out for) a new temple of Apollo Patroos to replace the 6th century version that had been destroyed by the Persians. In front of it, he built an altar covered in gold to fulfill a vow in accordance with an oracle of Apollo.²¹ Usually restored as tetrastyle *in antis*,²² this little Ionic temple could also have been hexastyle with almost identical proportions to the East Façade of the Erechtheion.²³ The column capitals with the anthemion necking band associated by T. Leslie Shear, Jr. with the Augustan temple of Aphrodite Ouranos west of the Stoa Poikile are better attributed to the late 4th century Temple of Apollo Patroos.²⁴ Lykourgos also built the extant Eponymous Heroes monument in the Agora, a monument that would undergo a great deal of alteration through Athens' desire to honor and dishonor foreign potentates in the following centuries.²⁵

Lykourgos was no friend of the Macedonian cause. Alexander demanded that he and Demosthenes be given up when Athens fell under his charge after destroying Thebes in 335. But the Athenians would not betray their champions, sending instead an embassy to Alexander to beg for leniency for the trouble-makers. Alexander acquiesced and only the offending general was executed. Demosthenes survived as well, and both he and Lykourgos were alive eleven years later to make jibes at the suggestion that the Athenians worship Alexander as a god. Lykourgos, first and foremost the defender of

²¹ Pseudo-Plutarch, *Vit. Dec. Or.* 843F.

²² Camp 1990, pp. 74-77.

²³ Anderson, *The BE-BZ Roman Temple in the Athenian Agora: An Alternative Restoration Incorporating an Additional Step*.

²⁴ T.L. Shear Jr. 1997, pp. 495-507; Anderson, *The BE-BZ Roman Temple in the Athenian Agora: An Alternative Restoration Incorporating an Additional Step*; and Michael Djordjevitch (pers. comm.). See below "The Reception of the Erechtheion in the Late Classical and Hellenistic Period" for further discussion on the significance of Lykourgos choosing the Erechtheion's Ionic order for this temple.

²⁵ See Hurwit 1999, pp. 255-259, and Mikalson 1998, pp. 11-45, for Lykourgos' other building and religious activities.

ancient ritual, dryly responded: “What kind of god would he be, when [worshippers] will have to purify themselves on leaving the sanctuary?”²⁶

There was not a great deal Lykourgos could do about Alexander the Great’s well-known religious and political gestures occurring center stage on the Akropolis.²⁷

Nonetheless, Lykourgos did restore much of Athens’ pre-Peloponnesian War financial health, even if not her political clout. Paradoxically, with all Lykourgos’ anti-Macedonian fervor, it was Greece’s defeat at Chaironeia which released so much of the funding needed to carry out his reforms, which had been tied up in military concerns.

Lykourgos was no one-man show; he had help from other elder, wealthy statesmen. Their personal interests manifested themselves in different ways in their regeneration of Athens, in the same way that Lykourgos paid special attention to the cult of Athena Polias because of his ancestry.²⁸

Lykourgos’ sons followed in his footsteps as priests of Poseidon-Erechtheus, as implied by the wooden statues of all three of them in the Erechtheion. Habron dedicated a panel by Ismenias of Chalkis which depicted all the Boutadae members who had served as priests of Poseidon-Erechtheus, and with Habron passing the trident over to his brother Lycophron.²⁹

DEMETRIOS OF PHALERON (319-307/6 B.C.)

After Alexander and his general, Antipater, died in 319, Antipater’s son Kassander took the reigns of power in Greece and installed a local Athenian, Demetrios

²⁶ Pseudo-Plutarch, *Vit. Dec. Or.* 842D.

²⁷ Alexander dedicated 300 Persian panoplies from the Battle of Granikos in the Parthenon and attached fourteen shields to its east architrave, thus making the Parthenon into his own victory monument over the Persians.

²⁸ Mikalson 1998, pp. 34-36.

²⁹ Pseudo-Plutarch, *Vit. Dec. Or.* 843 E.

of Phaleron, as the governor of Athens. Demetrios embarked on a pseudo-Lykourgan crusade to limit ostentation at funerals and weddings.

Most scholars, following Fergusson's *Hellenistic Athens*, believe the statements of philosophers resident in Athens, that Athenian religion was in decline.³⁰ It is worth noting the reason for much of the hostility toward popular and state religion in Athens, as voiced by the philosophers of the various schools of the late 4th century: Aristotle, Theophrastus, Xenokrates and Theodoros were all foreigners. Mikalson points out that as foreigners they were excluded from the majority of Athenian religious festivals.³¹ Therefore, their commentary does not accurately represent the state of cults. In fact, religion continued to experience a great deal of growth and prosperity throughout the Hellenistic period.³²

DEMETRIOS POLIORKETES (307/6-287/6 B.C.)

Demetrios of Phaleron was not such a terrible ruler, but no freedom-loving Athenian could bear the garrison at Mounichia. Therefore, when Antigonos I Monophthalmos declared at Tyre in 314 that all the Greek poleis should be free, self-ruling and ungarrisoned. The Athenians were delighted, and seven years later welcomed him and his son Demetrios (soon to be Poliorketes, the "Besieger") with open arms when they arrived to help them defeat Kassander, Demetrios of Phaleron and the garrison at Mounichia.³³ The blossoming relationship was further sweetened by Antigonos' donation of a large consignment of ship timbers and grain.³⁴

³⁰ Ferguson 1911. See Mikalson 1998, pp. 68-69.

³¹ Mikalson 1998, p. 71.

³² Mikalson 1998, p. 71.

³³ Plutarch, *Demetr.* 8.4-9.1.

³⁴ Mikalson 1998, p. 75.

All started well, and Antigonos and Demetrios were voted with the highest imaginable honors in the land:

1. Antigonos and Demetrios were added to the Eponymous Heroes monument, and the number of tribes was augmented from ten to twelve. This was the first change to the late 6th century Kleisthenic tribal system.³⁵
2. Statues of Antigonos and Demetrios were erected next to the two sets of Tyrannicides in the Agora. This is the first time that another statue group had infringed upon this most protected of real estate. They were the new saviors, or *soteres*, of Athens, and were put on the same level as those who had ended Peisistratid rule.
3. Antigonos and Demetrios were woven into the Gigantomachy alongside Athena and Zeus in the Panathenaic *peplos* (another first).³⁶
4. Large crowns were awarded to them, and an altar “of the Saviors” was erected.³⁷

Athens had previously promoted humans to divine status, such as in the case of Alexander, but this is the first time anyone living in Athens had ever been worshipped as a god. The pro-Demetrios faction led by Stratokles proposed the decrees granting these

³⁵ When the monument was altered, pi-clamps were used to attach the new blocks (Figure 628). This is important for the discussion below on the redating of the major repair to the Erechtheion because it demonstrates that pi-clamps were in use at Athens as early as the late 4th century, and need not date to the Augustan period. Demetrias and Antionis were the names of the new tribes.

³⁶ See J. Shear 2001 for the most recent analysis of the Panathenaic *peplos* and the inclusion of Demetrios and Antigonos. See also Mansfield 1985.

³⁷ Diodoros 20.46.1-4. The genitive plural is used here. See Mikalson 1998, pp. 79-81 for an analysis of these honors.

honors.³⁸ These conferrals were not out of the ordinary, and were part of the Athenian system for honoring benefactors. Formerly, the gods provided the grain and the autonomy. Now Athens was dependent on a Macedonian king for its prosperity.³⁹

Demetrios left Athens in 307 to attend to other problems, at which time Athens found itself at war once with Kassander. Demetrios came to the rescue, and by 304/3 had saved Athens once again, recovering not only the forts of Phyle and Panakton, but also the sanctuary of Amphiaraos at Oropos.⁴⁰ This second stint in Athens was more autocratic, and his supporters more oligarchic.

The honeymoon between Athens and Demetrios was over quickly, and the relationship soured. Demetrios began to act like a god and conscientiously emulated Dionysos.⁴¹ Plutarch (who liked to collect examples of ill-omens for historical events) recorded that the *peplos*, while acting as a sail for the Panathenaic ship-car and into which the portraits of Demetrios and Antigonos had been woven, was torn by a gust of wind during the Great Panathenaia procession of 302/1 B.C. Plutarch also reported that when Demetrios was in Athens in 304 he took up residence, along with his entourage of mistresses, in the opisthodomos of the Parthenon.⁴² This was probably the four pillared west room of the Parthenon (“Parthenon” in the treasury inscriptions) rather than the open, drafty west porch of the Parthenon, or the Opisthodomos, that is the remainder of the Archaic Athena Temple. As an incarnation of Dionysos, Demetrios was the younger brother of Athena, and his behavior was not that of a “very orderly guest,” or befitting “of

³⁸ Habicht 1997, pp. 68, 71. This same Stratokles proposed the decree honoring Lykourgos discussed above.

³⁹ Mikalson 1998, p. 83.

⁴⁰ Habicht 1997, pp. 74-77.

⁴¹ Plutarch, *Demetr.* 2.3. Demetrios chose Dionysos because he considered the god of wine the most terrifying during times of war and the most jovial during times of peace.

⁴² On *Demetrios'* mistresses, see Habicht 1997, pp. 78-79.

a virgin” hostess.⁴³ In fact, his debauchery and impiety were wholly loathsome to the Athenian populace, which must have realized that they had brought this on themselves by their decrees which had made Demetrios into a god.⁴⁴

Demetrios’ demands grew steadily. He insisted upon full initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries all at once, a ritual process that usually took a year’s cycle of festivals. Demetrios’ wish was granted. His actions inspired many witty epigrams such as that by Philpides, a comic poet, who wrote that Demetrios was “the man who compressed the year into one month,” and “the man who took the Acropolis as a hotel and introduced courtesans to the virgin.”⁴⁵

In 301, Demetrios and Antigonos (who was then very old) were defeated by an alliance of other Diadochoi (Seleukos, Kassander and Lysimachos) at Ipsos, thereby leaving Athens without a Macedonian master. Athens was forced to exercise caution around these now dominant Macedonian forces, and managed to sustain good relationships with them and the Ptolemies by being politically neutral. During this period of neutrality, however, Athena suffered even more gross indignities when Kassander placed the Athenian demagogue Lachares in power. Pausanias gives the fullest account of Lachares’ transgressions in the context of his description of the Parthenon (1.25.7):

Kassander had a terrible hatred of Athens; this time he took over Lachares, the leader of the people, and talked him into planning a dictatorship. Of all the dictators we know anything about, he was the most ruthless against men and uninhibited against gods. Demetrios son of Antigonos had a difference with the people of Athens, but all the same he brought down the dictatorship of Lachares. When the walls were taken, Lachares ran away to Boiotia. He had some golden shields from the Akropolis and had stripped the statue of Athene herself of valuable ornaments,

⁴³ Plutarch, *Demetr.* 23.3, 24.1.

⁴⁴ Mikalson 1998, p. 87.

⁴⁵ Plutarch, *Demetr.* 26.

so that the people suspected he was very wealthy; and at Koroneia they murdered him.⁴⁶

Combining Pausanias's account with the other evidence about Lachares, it seems quite clear that he melted down all the gold and silver on the Akropolis (the treasury lists had ceased by this time), including the gold drapery panels of Pheidias' Athena Parthenos statue.⁴⁷ Demetrios reasserted his claim to Athens in 296 and besieged the city that had once hailed him as savior. In 295/4, he installed garrisons at Piraeus and on the Hill of the Muses southwest of the Akropolis. Athens resisted and fought against the garrisons in 288/7, but never managed to oust them from Mounichia, Piraeus, Eleusis, Phyle, Salamis, Sounion and Rhamnous. Demetrios' hubris did not stop. When access to Delphi was cut off by the Aetolian occupation in 290/89, Demetrios, as a medium for the oracle of Apollo, hosted the Pythian Games at Athens. He had his oligarchic supporters vote him more honors, such as changing the name of the month Mounichion to "Demetrian", and the thirtieth of every month to "Demetrias" in honor of his birthday. Appropriately, Mounichion/Demetrian is the month into which Demetrios had compressed the year of festivals for his initiation into the Eleusinian Mysteries mentioned above. The City Dionysia, with which Demetrios had long associated himself, was renamed the Demetrieia.⁴⁸

⁴⁶ Translation by Levi 1971. τυράννων would be better translated as "tyrant" than "dictator." Κάσσανδρος δὲ--δεινὸν γὰρ τι ὑπῆν οἱ μῖσος ἐς τοὺς Ἀθηναίους--, ὁ δὲ αὖθις Λαχάρην προεστηκότα ἐς ἐκεῖνο τοῦ δήμου, τοῦτον τὸν ἄνδρα οἰκειωσάμενος τυραννίδα ἔπεισε βουλεῦσαι, τυράννων ὧν ἴσμεν τὰ τε ἐς ἀνθρώπους μάλιστα ἀνήμερον καὶ ἐς τὸ θεῖον ἀφειδέστατον. Δημητρίῳ δὲ τῷ Ἀντιγόνου διαφορὰ μὲν ἦν ἐς τὸν δῆμον ἤδη τῶν Ἀθηναίων, καθεῖλε δὲ ὅμως καὶ τὴν Λαχάρους τυραννίδα· ἀλικομένου δὲ τοῦ τείχους ἐκδιδράσκει Λαχάρης ἐς Βοιωτούς, ἅτε δὲ ἀσπίδας ἐξ ἀκροπόλεως καθελὼν χρυσᾶς καὶ αὐτὸ τῆς Ἀθηναῖς τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸν περιαιρετὸν ἀποδύσας κόσμον ὑπωπτεύετο εὐπορεῖν μεγάλως χρημάτων. Λαχάρην μὲν οὖν τούτων ἕνεκα κτείνουσι ἄνδρες Κορωναῖοι.

⁴⁷ The treasury inscriptions cease during Demetrios' residence in the Parthenon. He probably dined off Athena's plates, drank from her phialai, and absconded with many of them, an embarrassment the *tamiai* did not wish to highlight in their accounts: Hurwit 1999, pp. 261-262.

⁴⁸ Plutarch, *Demetr.* 12.1.

Athens revolted again in 287 and Olympiodoros successfully ousted Demetrios' garrison on the Hill of the Muses. On this occasion Athens enlisted the aid of Pyrrhos, the king of Epiros, who arrived after Demetrios had been ousted. Plutarch says that he spent only one day in Athens, and during that visit he sacrificed to Athena Polias, a fitting conclusion for Demetrios' rule on the Akropolis.⁴⁹ Between the ousting of Demetrios Poliorketes in 287/6 and the Chremonidean War in 267/6, the Athenians set about "de-Demetriotizing" the city's cults and changing the names of the months and days back to their traditional monikers. Only the tribes, Demetrias and Antigonis, remained. Demetrios had only lost the city of Athens, and continued to control most of the rest of Attica.

TURMOIL AND RECOVERY (287/6-200 B.C.)

Athens' fortunes plummeted during the 3rd century and Athena Polias lost much of her wealth and prestige. It is perhaps during this period of turmoil (287-250 B.C.) that an unrecorded fire damaged the Erechtheion. This would be the fire that necessitated the major repair redated in this study to the 2nd century B.C. This section outlines the historical and economic circumstances that reveal a nadir in the status of her cult, and consequently, the condition of her home in the Erechtheion.

The impact of Lachares' pillage of Athena Polias' wealth and Demetrios' insult to her prestige was enormous. Her treasuries had been violated twice in a decade and she did nothing to stop it. A major indication of how severely her cult was disrupted is that the Great Panathenaic festival was cancelled in either or both 286 and 282 B.C.⁵⁰

⁴⁹ Mikalson 1998, p. 104.

⁵⁰ Lysimachos sent a new mast and yard-arm for the Panathenaic ship-car in 299/8 B.C. according to *IG II²* 657. These items were probably damaged during the windstorm that ripped the *peplos* bearing Antigonos

Nonetheless, as mentioned above, religion in Hellenistic Athens continued to thrive, as implied by the plethora of private and state dedications, especially the new cults in the Piraeus – with the exception of that of Athena Polias.⁵¹

Athena Polias lost her epithet for several centuries because she failed in her role as “Protectress.” Instead, she was worshipped as Archegetis, or “Leader/Founder,” and invited to take care of industry and craft concerns.⁵² In other cases, Athena appears in inscriptions without epithet.⁵³ This is the case for the 2nd century B.C. reference to “Honors for Sosandros of Sypalettos [who] shall be inscribed on the stele by the men appointed for the reconstruction of the temple of Athena.”⁵⁴

The philosophical schools were blossoming in the first half of the 3rd century, but the matters for discussion were less about religion and more about the nature of things, ethics and rhetoric. When philosophers did address religion, it was almost without fail with great skepticism; however, at the end of their lives, be it on their deathbeds or in their wills, they invariably reverted to the funerary rites of their ancestors.⁵⁵

In contrast are the atthidographers who enthusiastically documented the history and cultural events of Athens and Attica. The most famous and reliable of these is Philochoros. He wrote in the late 4th and early 3rd centuries about contemporary events, including an account of the arrival of Demetrios Poliorketes in Athens during the archonship of Anaxikrates (307/6 B.C.), and the resulting departure of many Athenians.

and Demetrios in 302/1. The evidence for the missing festival(s) lies in the wording of the decree that honored Kallias of Sphettos (*SEG* 28.60.64-66). Kallias also arranged for Ptolemy to send “equipment” (probably ropes) for the rigging of the *peplos*.

⁵¹ Mikalson 1998, p. 92.

⁵² Mikalson 1998, pp. 109-112.

⁵³ Between the outbreak of the Chremonidean War in 267/6 and 250 B.C., there is no documentation of the use of the epithet “Polias.”

⁵⁴ *IG* II² 1023. Sypalettos is a deme in Attica. See: “History of Fires in the Erechtheion” below for the significance of this evidence to the re-dating of the repairs to the Erechtheion.

⁵⁵ Mikalson 1998, p. 127.

He adds the occurrence of several portents, one relating to the Erechtheion: A dog went into the temple of Polias (Πολιάδος νεών) and then into the Pandroseion, and jumped up onto the altar of Zeus Herkeios under the olive tree and lay down.⁵⁶ Philochoros was an Athenian, knew his cults, and participated in the state religion.

Ptolemy II supported the coalition of Greek cities and leagues, including Elis, the Achaean League, Tegea, Mantinea and Orchomenos, in their fight for freedom from Macedon. Piraeus was the only part of Attica currently under Macedonian control. The resulting Chremonidean War (named after Chremonides who proposed the treaty) was disastrous for Athens. Antigonos, the victor, was merciless in his re-garrisoning and razing of the city and territory. The year 262 marked the end of Athenian independence, according to A. W. Gomme.⁵⁷ Life in Athens went downhill sharply. The Athenians stooped to bribing people not to attack them, such as Alexander, the governor of Corinth. This tactic worked, and in 229 they bribed Diogenes, Antigonos III Doseon's governor of Athens, with 150 talents to leave.⁵⁸ Athens was free at last for the first time in a century.

Inventories on the Akropolis resumed in the 250s B.C. according to Pollux (10.126), and a decree honoring Athena Polias survives from the archonship of Alkibiades. The cult appears to have revived and the priestess reportedly conducted the sacrifice successfully “for the health and safety of the Boule and Demos, children and women, and of King Antigonos, his queen, and his descendants.”⁵⁹ These coincidental events suggest that there was a renewed interest in the cults on the Akropolis.⁶⁰

⁵⁶ Philochoros, *fr.* 146. See Appendix A for the full text.

⁵⁷ Gomme 1937, pp. 204-248.

⁵⁸ Mikalson 1998, p. 138.

⁵⁹ *IG II²* 776, lines 5-10.

⁶⁰ Mikalson 1998, p. 164.

Perhaps, during this period of neglect, war and deprivation (287-250 B.C.), a major, though unrecorded, fire occurred in the Erechtheion which caused the roof and ceiling to collapse, and damaged all the openings of the main building.⁶¹ Traces on the North and South Walls attest to a substantial though temporary roof that protected at least the west half of the Erechtheion. This roof would have provided a certain degree of protection for the relics inside before repairs could be made.⁶² This may have been the situation when the cult of Athena Polias received attention once again.

In fact, Herakleides of Crete failed to mention the Erechtheion as one of the most beautiful buildings in Athens when he described his travels to Athens in the second half of the 3rd century B.C. (T 1)⁶³ This omission may be a further indication that the temple was in bad condition at this time.⁶⁴ In fact, Herakleides calls the Parthenon “Athena’s temple,” as if the Erechtheion, her actual temple, was not functioning.⁶⁵ Perhaps, during the Erechtheion’s nadir right after the fire, the main cult items were temporarily transferred somewhere safe and sheltered. The Lamp of Kallimachos, for example, would have needed to be housed in a room whose ceiling was at least 9 m high.⁶⁶ For this, the Parthenon would have sufficed.

After Athens regained her freedom from Macedonian control in 229 B.C., the Athenians were poor and struggled to feed themselves. Herakleides’ account suggests

⁶¹ This must have occurred after Philochoros’ account. Owing to his interest in portents, he probably would have mentioned the devastating fire if it had already occurred.

⁶² On the evidence for the reconstruction of this roof, see below “Changes to the Erechtheion during the Hellenistic Period.”

⁶³ He mentioned the Parthenon, Theater of Dionysos and even the unfinished Olympieion, but not the Erechtheion. Testimonia (T) can be found in Appendix B.

⁶⁴ Incidentally, it is remarkable how similar Herakleides’ account is to those of the early modern travelers (see Chapters VII and VIII). Herakleides complains about the roads, the dryness and the “Atticans” while marveling at the glorious monuments. By quoting a poem by Lysippos, he enjoins travelers to appreciate Athens lest he be considered an uneducated fool.

⁶⁵ The Parthenon was never really a temple proper with its own cult, but instead served as a treasury. See a summary of this problem in Camp 2001, pp. 74-82.

⁶⁶ On the logistics of the Lamp of Kallimachos, see Chapter II.

that the “bread and circuses” approach through the celebration of many festivals kept the population relatively happy and fed.⁶⁷ This further suggests that there was no extra money, state or private, to pay for the restoration of the Erechtheion.

Eurykleides of Kephissia and his brother Mikion (II) took over Athenian affairs and attempted to bring about a post-Chaironeia, Lykourgan-style revival. Their aim was to remain neutral among the continuously rivalrous Macedonian kingdoms. For funds, they turned to the Ptolemies of Egypt. In return, the Athenians rewarded Ptolemy III Euergetes by adding his statue to the Eponymous Heroes monument and the tribe of Ptolemais to the tribal structure of Attica in 224. Athens managed to avoid the Social War of 220-217, and the first Macedonian War between the Romans (and Aetolians) and Philip V.

Athens first started courting Pergamene support and broke its neutrality in the aftermath of a sacrilege that occurred at Eleusis. Livy, whose source was Polybios, recounts how two Acarnanian youths accidentally sauntered into the sanctuary of Demeter uninitiated and were executed for their mistake. The Acarnanians went to Philip seeking retribution, and together they attacked Athens with devastating results. At this point, Athens turned to Rhodes and Pergamon (with Rome as an ally) for support, and the Second Macedonian War was declared in 200. Philip took out his hatred of the Athenians in a rampage around Attica, during which time he razed the countryside and its sanctuaries to the ground.⁶⁸

It is important to note that Livy implies that Philip was never able to breach the walls of Athens, and so one should expect no evidence for destruction inside the city or

⁶⁷ On Herakleides of Crete’s account, see T 1; Pfister 1951; Mikalson 1998, pp. 168-169.

⁶⁸ Livy 31.26.9-13.

on the Akropolis because of him at this time. Indeed, Livy comments that “had the Romans not come to help, [Athens] would have suffered the same mutilation. For Philip would have sought with the same wickedness the gods who tended the city and Athena who presided over the citadel as he did the temple of Demeter at Eleusis and Zeus and Athena in Piraeus.”⁶⁹

Philip was finally defeated at Kynoskephalae in 197, and the Roman proconsul, Flamininus, claimed the victory and proclaimed the Greek states free once again. Philip’s scorched earth policy left the Athenians in more desperate straits than ever. They had lost not only their fields, but also the deities who had once protected them. The rural sanctuaries must have ceased to function, as there is no evidence for cult activities (documentary or votive) for a long period after 200 B.C. In religious and civic retaliation, and out of hatred for Philip, the Athenians finally eliminated the tribes of Antigonis and Demetrias, two of Philip’s ancestors. A full *damnatio memoriae* of Philip’s family followed: all decrees and monuments referring to Antigonos Doson, Antigonos Gonatas, Demetrios Poliorketes and Antigonos Monophthalmos were erased – their names were chiseled away or their statues destroyed, if they had not been already.⁷⁰

Athens enjoyed relative peace for the next thirty years (200-170 B.C.) and avoided most of the opportunities for war. In contrast to the turmoil and neglect of the previous century, Athens enjoyed a renaissance of monumental building at the hands of

⁶⁹ Livy 31.30, from Mikalson 1998, p. 191. This distinction of where an aggressor toward the Athenians did and did not pillage is of similar importance when analyzing Plutarch’s account of Sulla’s sack of Athens. Both Livy and Plutarch make it quite clear that the Akropolis was not sacked and burned at these particular times.

⁷⁰ The many statues of Demetrios Poliorketes had already been destroyed. One was found in a well in the Agora: see Camp 2001, p. 170. On the abolition of the Macedonian tribes and the destruction of statues and decrees, see Habicht 1997, p. 197 with bibliography; and Habicht 1970. For a bibliography of pre-Roman *damnatio memoriae*, see Sevinç et al. 2001, note 50.

enamored foreign powers, such as the Attalids, Seleucids, and Ptolemies, as the city started to exploit its historical and cultural appeal.

THE 2ND CENTURY B.C.

Athens' fortunes improved in the 2nd century under the patronage of the Hellenistic kings. This section investigates the historical events and topographical development of the Akropolis in order to evaluate the possibility that one of the Hellenistic kingdoms sponsored the 2nd century repair to the Erechtheion. The leading candidates are the Attalids and the Ptolemies.

After Athens resumed independence in 229, her citizens began to manipulate their history and promoted their diplomatic goal of ingratiating the city with the Hellenistic kings through the system of granting honors and citizenship in return for building projects that benefited Athens' civic and religious life.⁷¹ Ptolemy II Philadelphos had donated the new "equipment" for the Panathenaic ship-car in 282 B.C., before the nadir in Athena's cult.⁷² And after the nadir, Ptolemy III, living up to his epithet, Euergetes, donated a gymnasium around 224 not far from the Roman Agora. This became one of the important venues for philosophical discourse in the following centuries with its lecture halls and library.⁷³ This gymnasium was the first major building project in a century, and it is worth noting that it was undertaken by a foreigner and not by a private Athenian citizen or the state. This would become the norm for almost all future building projects

⁷¹ Mikalson 1998, p. 171; Habicht 1997, pp. 220-225.

⁷² On the decree mentioning this donation (*SEG XXVIII* 60.66-69) and the use of this equipment (ropes) for the conveyance of the peplos, see J. Shear 2001, pp. 146-147.

⁷³ Philip was able to burn the Academy and Lyceum in 200-197 because they lay outside the city walls of Athens.

in Athens until the late 1st century B.C., when the Athenians built the Monopteros to honor Rome and Augustus.

Ptolemy III (whose family already had a tribe named after it) was honored with a festival, the Ptolemaia, which continued to be celebrated into the 1st century B.C.⁷⁴ And finally, Ptolemy VI Philometor, winner of a horse race in the Panathenaia of 166,⁷⁵ was perhaps the person honored with an equestrian statue next to the temple of Athena Polias in gratitude for some unknown act of euergetism: “παρὰ τὸν]// [νε]ῶ τὸν ἀρχαῖον τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τ[ῆς Πολιάδος].”⁷⁶ Perhaps this equestrian statue was placed next to the Temple of Athena Polias, i.e., the Erechtheion, because he donated some of the money toward its repair.⁷⁷

Attalos I was warmly received in Athens in 200 B.C. when he arrived to meet with the Roman ambassadors who shared the anti-Philip cause. Athens honored him for his support during the Second Macedonian War. The welcome he received (described by Polybios 16.25) and the honor of becoming an eponymous hero (the tribal count returned to twelve at this point) must have had a profound impact on Attalos I: upon his return to Pergamon, he did everything in his power to recreate parts of Athens in his own kingdom.

⁷⁴ Mikalson 1998, p. 179. Ferguson suggested that diplomatic ties between Athens and Egypt had broken down in the second half of the 2nd century. Several pieces of evidence, such as the inscription that refers to the Ptolemaia celebrated in 117/6, have come to light since Ferguson’s seminal publication that contradict this suggestion. For a summary of the other evidence, see Habicht 1992, pp. 83-85; and Habicht 1997, pp. 221-222.

⁷⁵ *IG II²* 2316, lines 44-47. J. Shear dates the inscription attesting to Ptolemy’s victory to 158/7 B.C.: J. Shear 2001, pp. 1068-1070, with bibliography. On the Ptolemaic victors, see Habicht 1992, pp. 78-79.

⁷⁶ *IG II²* 983.2-6: “[to proclaim this] crow[n both] at the ne[w competition] of [tra]gedies [of the City Dionysia and] at the [gymnastic games of the Panathenaia and Eleusini]a and Ptolemaia; [the demos is] also [to set up] a bronze [st]atu[e] of him on [horse-back by the] archaios [ne]os of Athena [Polias].” This letter cutting was active from 169/8 to 135/4 B.C.: J. Shear 2001, p. 1027, with bibliography.

⁷⁷ For the argument for the date of the repair, see below “Stylistic Dating of the Repaired Moldings.”

When Attalos wanted to commemorate his defeat of the Gauls who had threatened his kingdom in 233, and again in the 220s, he not only erected a monument in the sanctuary of Athena at Pergamon, he also set up a similar, smaller version in Athens south of the Parthenon, probably on or before the occasion of his visit in 200 B.C.⁷⁸ Attalos viewed his victory over the Gauls as a parallel to Athens' victory over the Persians, but unlike Alexander's gestures which usurped Athens' glory, Attalos I sought to emulate and honor it. His monument was composed of the foes of the Greeks, both mythical and historical: Amazons, Giants, Persians and Gauls.⁷⁹ According to one reconstruction, one could walk among the sculptures, and the viewer assumed the vantage point of the victor over these mythological and historical barbarians.⁸⁰

The Attalid kings were very active in Athens, both on the Akropolis and in the city. Hellenistic kings and family members participated in the Great Panathenaia in the first third of the 2nd century. All four of Attalos I's sons competed in the equestrian events in one particular festival, and all four won. In commemoration, brothers Eumenes II (king from 197-159), and the future king, Attalos II (159-139), built two pillar monuments on the Akropolis. Eumenes II erected his just west of the Pinakothekē of the Propylaia. The pillar was composed of 15 courses of pseudo-isodomic masonry, and was surmounted by a quadriga with Eumenes inside it, flanked by youths or charioteers.⁸¹

⁷⁸ For a summary of the chronological debate, see Pollitt 1986, pp. 90-95 and Stewart 1990, p. 347 with bibliography. Some scholars think the monument in Athens is Attalos II's attempt to associate his victory over the Gauls with that of Attalos I; however, Pausanias and other historical probabilities suggest Attalos I was the donor and this occurred during his visit of 200 B.C.: Pollitt 1986, p. 91; Habicht 1990, pp. 562-563. Hurwit 1999, p. 270, argues that the monument was already in place in 200, because he was honored as a long-standing benefactor when he arrived: Polybios 16.25.

⁷⁹ There is a collection of copies of these three-quarter life-size sculptures in the Capitoline Museum in Rome, Naples and in Venice. See Palma 1981 for catalogue of the evidence.

⁸⁰ See Stewart 2004.

⁸¹ Habicht 1997, p. 364; Korres 1994c, pp. 47-48; Travlos 1971, p. 483. This monument would honor Antony for a short time and then be dedicated to Agrippa thereafter.

Attalos II's monument was on the same model, and was located on well-executed rock cuttings with pour-channels at the northeast corner of the Parthenon.⁸² The monument as reconstructed by Korres would have crowded the area between the Parthenon and the precinct of Zeus Polieus to the northeast, as well as obscured the metopes and pedimental sculpture of the northeast corner of the Parthenon. Real estate on the Akropolis was at a premium, and Hellenistic monuments maximized the vertical aspect of the spaces they occupied.⁸³ In the case of this pillar monument, Attalos II was literally attaching himself to the victorious associations embodied by the Parthenon.

While the Attalids erected wholly new monuments on the Akropolis, perhaps some of the Hellenistic repairs to the Parthenon can also be attributed to their benefactions. King has identified press-folds in the drapery of the Athena from the west pediment.⁸⁴ Press-folds did not appear in 5th century sculptures, and they seem to be a Hellenistic affectation primarily found on honorific statues of individuals; they convey the sense that the individuals honored could afford freshly laundered and pressed clothing. The Athena may have been damaged as early as the earthquake of 427/6 B.C. (Thuc. 3.87, 3.89), which rocked the temple and even shifted some of the column drums off their vertical axis.⁸⁵ One might expect that the Attalid kings would have wanted to ensure that the monument they emulated, and with which they identified, should form as intact a backdrop as possible for their honorific dynastic displays.

⁸² Stevens 1946, pp. 17-21, argues that this monument was a quadriga on a low krepidoma dedicated by Pronapes soon after the foundations of the Periklean Parthenon were laid. He had to explain away the pour-channels preserved in the rock cutting, which he admits usually date to the 2nd century B.C. or later. Korres' theory, summarized in the annual notes of *BCH* 110 (Korres 1986), is now taken as gospel in all subsequent treatments of this area. Korres suggests that Augustus was later honored on this pillar monument.

⁸³ Rose 1997, pp. 4-7.

⁸⁴ King 2004.

⁸⁵ Korres 1994d, p. 138.

Eumenes II and Attalos II also built stoas for the people of Athens. As Athens had become the Oxford of the ancient world, Attalos II came to Athens for part of his education (much like Rhodes Scholars from the former British ex-colonies do today). As one of Athens' most generous alumni, he donated the stoa which framed the east side of the Agora. At 115 m long, Attalos II's stoa had three-stories with shops at the back on the top two levels. The rear wall has slit windows that are wider in the interior to provide both ventilation and security for the shops (Figure 629). These are similar to the slit windows the North and South Walls of the Erechtheion. The building methods include pseudo-isodomic masonry, pi-clamps, pour channels, and holes for double lewisies.⁸⁶

Attalos II erected another pillar monument with a quadriga directly in front of and on axis with his stoa. Hundreds of blocks from the superstructure have been identified in the Post-Herulian Wall, and can be restored with pseudo-isodomic masonry. This monument contains pour-channels and pi-clamps as well (Figure 630).

There was a general renewal of interest in the Akropolis cults in the 2nd century B.C., and in particular that of Athena Polias, as suggested by the rise in a new form of monument: statues of *arrhephoroi* (earlier: *errhephoroi*) set up by family members in commemoration of their daughters' service to Athena Polias.⁸⁷ Parker is troubled by this abrupt upsurge in such monuments. Had Demetrios of Phaleron also forbidden elaborate dedications to the goddess? But was this prohibition, for some reason, not included in the

⁸⁶ These construction techniques show up in the repair to the Erechtheion and so are important for the following arguments. Recent research suggests that many of the Pergamene monuments, such as the Stoa of Eumenes on the south slope of the Akropolis and the pillar monument west of the Propylaia, were not only designed in Pergamon, but the stone used was quarried around Pergamon, and the labor force was Pergamene. The characteristic grey and cream marble used in these monuments comes from Pergamon: ASCSA lecture, January 22, 2002, by Merle Langdon.

⁸⁷ Mikalson (1998, p. 199, note 86) cites twelve examples: *IG II²* 3461, 3465, 3466, 3470, 3471, 3472, 3473, 3482, 3486, 3488, 3496, and 3497. Dedicators include parents, brothers, uncles and grandfathers.

ancient sources?⁸⁸ Sculptural dedications had indeed been made on the Akropolis in the 4th century, although not statues of *arrhephoroi*. These dedications had only tailed off during the chaotic years of political upheaval and military involvement at the foot of the Akropolis during the 3rd century.

So what is the significance of this upsurge in the cult of Athena Polias? Was this renewed interest in her cult catalyzed by an extensive repair to the Erechtheion which provided a desirable context for commemoration?⁸⁹ In the last third of the 2nd century, Diogenes' granddaughter made a dedication that succinctly reflects the current status of the cult of Athena Polias:⁹⁰

Near your temple, Pallas, Archegetis of the Erechtheidai,
this statue of your priestess Philtera was erected.
She is from the bloodline of the Eteoboutadai. Her father
was Pausimachos, five times a general of the army.
Her ancestors flourished among the Aegeidai: Lykourgos
and the Diogenes held in honor in the Attic land.
Lykourgos delighted in oratory, but by Diogenes' deeds
our fatherland achieved its ancient freedom.⁹¹

Athena Polias is still Archegetis, and Diogenes is now seen as a bringer of freedom rather than a Macedonian enemy. Athena's temple has been restored, as has the reputation and respect for the goddess and her priestly family.

Another change was the introduction of a smaller, annual peplos to Athena Polias at the Smaller Panathenaia at some point between 142/1 and 108/7 B.C.⁹² This addition to the procession occurred at the same time as the upsurge in statues of *arrhephoroi*.

⁸⁸ Parker 1997, p. 271.

⁸⁹ Since there must have been a fire that necessitated the repair which can be independently dated to the 2nd century on stylistic grounds, then the chaotic times of the early 3rd century must be the period in which an unrecorded fire gutted the Erechtheion, see above "Turmoil and Recovery (287/6-200 B.C.)" and below "History of Fires in the Erechtheion."

⁹⁰ Diogenes was the Macedonian commandant who allowed himself to be bribed in 229 to leave Athens and remove the garrison. He received Athenian citizenship and married into the Eteoboutadai family.

⁹¹ *IG II²* 3474, after Mikalson 1998, pp. 171-172.

⁹² J. Shear 2001, pp. 101-102.

Together, this rise in dedications and the elaboration of the annual festival strongly suggest that the Erechtheion has been repaired.

The Attalids may have been motivated to repair the Parthenon and perhaps the Erechtheion because it was to serve as the backdrop for their new monuments. The repair to the Parthenon (and Erechtheion) would have been on such a small scale compared to their other own monuments that these lesser activities would hardly have received a specific mention in the literary record. Epigraphical evidence for repairs to monuments on the Akropolis in the 2nd century, however, exists, and these decrees honor those who organized the execution of the repairs.⁹³ The money itself may well have come from the Attalids, or from other Hellenistic kings who dabbled in construction in Athens, such as the Ptolemies, one of whom may have been honored with an equestrian statue next to the Erechtheion for unspecified reasons. The placement of Ptolemy's statue, evidently in similar juxtaposition to Attalos II's and the Parthenon, may indicate these kings' involvement with their respective repair projects, that is that the Attalids repaired the Parthenon and Ptolemies repaired the Erechtheion.⁹⁴

By the end of the 2nd century, judging from the epigraphical evidence and the elaboration of the Panathenaic festival with the new annual dedication of a *peplos*, the cult of Athena Polias was in excellent shape again, probably buoyed by the refurbishment of the Erechtheion. Priestesses after Diogenes' granddaughter Philtera continued to dedicate statues to commemorate their service to Athena Polias. New servants of Athena

⁹³ For an enumeration of this epigraphical evidence, see below "History of Fires in the Erechtheion."

⁹⁴ It is clear from *IG II² 983* that the Athenians ("the demos") set up the statue of a Ptolemy (perhaps VI). As for the Attalid monument next to the Parthenon, the distinctive Pergamene design of the pillar monument would imply that the king himself sponsored the monument. The prominent and arguably inconvenient location of Attalos II's monument would have required some negotiation: perhaps the repair to the Parthenon was part of the benefaction which released this prime real estate for vertical development.

were instituted. For example, the weavers (*ergastinai*) of the annual peplos were introduced only in 108 B.C., according to J. Shear's recent reanalysis of the evidence.⁹⁵ But by the end of the century, Athens fell on hard times again, and was under the sway of demagogue philosophers who led the city down the path to destruction.⁹⁶ The gymnasia were abandoned, the theater cancelled, the Pnyx and courts shut down, the philosophical schools closed, and even the Eleusinian Mysteries were suspended. Civic life ceased and the cults suffered.

MITHRIDATES AND SULLA

As a reward for their cooperation in the Macedonian Wars, Rome gave Athens Delos in 166 B.C. Soon after, Athens reciprocated in the only way they were able: the personification of Rome, Roma, was honored with a cult, and prayers were said in Athens for the health and safety of the Roman people.⁹⁷ In addition, a new festival, the *Romaia*, was celebrated.⁹⁸ Although the razing of Corinth by Mummius in 146 served to underscore Rome's role as Greece's overlord, the Athenian government remained nominally autonomous.

Relations between Rome and Athens were good (although Athens' fortunes had soured) until the anti-Roman Peripatetic philosopher-turned-tyrant, Athenion, convinced the Ekklesia in 88 B.C. to support Mithridates of Pontus in his revolt against Rome.

Athenion returned from a visit to Mithridates as the new Dionysos (shades of Demetrios Poliorketes), and sent another Peripatetic philosopher, Apellikon, off for Delos to collect

⁹⁵ J. Shear 2001, pp. 97-103.

⁹⁶ The reasons for this slip in fortunes is not entirely clear: Mikalson 1998, p. 280.

⁹⁷ Mellor 1975; Spawforth 1997.

⁹⁸ The *Romaia* is mentioned in only one inscription: *IG II² 1938*. Another inscription honoring the Roman *demos* is *Agora XV 180*. See Ferguson 1911, pp. 296, 366-367; Habicht 1997, pp. 273-274; Hurwit 1999, p. 263.

Apollo's treasures, according to a hostile source, Poseidonios. While there, they were attacked by the Romans and over 600 Athenians were slaughtered. Mithridates avenged his new Athenian allies by slaughtering 20,000 people on Delos, mostly Italians.⁹⁹

Having turned away from Rome, Athens raised the ire of Sulla, who saw Athens and Attica as a place worth pillaging despite Philip's recent sack a century before. Athenion and Apellikon fled Athens and Delos, and the power vacuum was filled by another tyrannical philosopher named Aristion, this time from the Epikourean school. With Mithridatic and Delian financial support, Aristion prepared to withstand Sulla's impending siege. In a defensive act, Aristion burned down the Odeion of Perikles to prevent the huge timbers of its construction from being used by Sulla's military machine.

Plutarch is our main source for Aristion's depravity and Sulla's activities in Athens in 87-86 B.C.:

Sulla had a terrible and inexorable passion to capture Athens, either because in some kind of jealousy he was shadowboxing against the city's ancient glory or because he was angry at the jokes and obscenities with which the tyrant Aristion, dancing and ridiculing, used to provoke him and Metella from the walls. Aristion had a soul made up of licentiousness and savagery, and had taken up the worst of the diseases and passions of Mithridates. In these last times he imposed the fatal blow on a city that had escaped countless wars and many tyrannies and civil wars. Wheat was selling for 1000 drachmas a bushel in the city, and men were eating the fever-few that grew around the Akropolis and were boiling their shoes and leather flasks for food. But Aristion himself was constantly having midday drinking parties and revels, was dancing in armor and telling jokes on the enemy. He paid no attention when the sacred lamp went out for lack of oil, and when the priestess asked for a quart of wheat he sent pepper. When members of the Boule and priests begged him to pity the city and settle with Sulla, Aristion scattered them with a volley of arrows. Late and reluctantly Aristion sent out two or three of his drinking companions to negotiate for peace. They asked for nothing that could bring safety but spoke solemnly about Theseus, Eumolpos, and the Persian Wars. Sulla replied, "Go away, gentlemen, and

⁹⁹ Appian, *Mith.* 22-23, 28, 58, 62.

take with you these speeches. I was sent by the Romans to Athens not to learn history but to put down rebels....” Sulla broke down and leveled the section of the wall between the Piraeic and Sacred Gates, and he entered the city about midnight. He was terrifying because of the many trumpets and bugles, the cries and shouts of the army that was let loose to pillage and murder and was rushing through the narrow streets with drawn swords. No count could be made of those who were killed, but the number is still now measured by the area covered by the flowing blood. For, apart from those killed in the rest of the city, blood and gore in the Agora covered all the Kerameikos inside the Dipylon, and many say it washed through the gate and over the area outside. So many died in this way, but no fewer committed suicide in pity and longing for their country which they thought would be destroyed. This made the best men despair and even fear survival because they expected no humaneness or moderation from Sulla.... After the city was taken the tyrant Aristion fled to the Akropolis and was besieged there by Curio to whom the task was assigned. Aristion held out for some time but finally, oppressed by thirst, he gave himself up. And straight away the divine gave a sign. For at the same hour of the same day that Curio was bringing Aristion down, clouds formed in a clear sky and filled the Akropolis with water. Soon thereafter Sulla took also the Piraeus and burned most of it.¹⁰⁰

Appian (6.39) tells us also that Sulla relieved the Akropolis of forty pounds of gold and six hundred pounds of silver “somewhat later.” This was part of his general policy to strip almost every sanctuary of its valuables in order to pay and feed his army on his return from quashing Mithridates in 84 B.C. In the end, Sulla paid the price for his sacrileges, not least his dragging Aristion off the Akropolis whence he claimed asylum: the Roman general came down with fatal bowel problems.¹⁰¹

As mentioned above in the case of Philip V’s rampage, the literary sources tend to distinguish quite clearly what the aggressors did and did not pillage.¹⁰² Philip did not pillage Athens, and Sulla did not sack the Akropolis. The worst thing that happened to

¹⁰⁰ Plutarch, *Sull.* 14.3-7, after Mikalson 1998, pp. 285-286.

¹⁰¹ Pausanias 1.20.7 and Plutarch, *Sull.* 36.

¹⁰² See above note 69.

the Erechtheion during the Sullan episode was that the lamp was allowed to go out, not directly because of Sulla, but due to Aristion's neglect.¹⁰³

A fragment of the Erechtheion building accounts was found in a closed deposit in of the Klepsydra spring on the North Slope of the Akropolis. Citing Arthur Parsons, Homer Thompson associates the fragment with the Sullan destruction of the Akropolis.¹⁰⁴ In other words, the Erechtheion accounts, which were presumably displayed in the vicinity of the Erechtheion, were thrown down over the side of the North Akropolis Wall as part of what he assumes was the major catastrophe that necessitated the Augustan repairs to the Erechtheion. Because these repairs can now be redated to the Hellenistic period, this scenario needs to be re-examined. If the building accounts were indeed thrown down during the Sullan siege, this means that there was some, perhaps minor, disruption to the status quo on the Akropolis. But because the precious relics survived in the Erechtheion, and Plutarch mentions only that the lamp of Kallimachos went out owing to lack of oil, this means that the temple itself did not suffer structurally.¹⁰⁵

Athens soon recovered and rested on her laurels once again. The philosophical schools continued to attract leading Romans such as Cicero, Varro and Horace. Other Romans made grandiose dedications, such as the Lesser Propylon at Eleusis by consul Appius Claudius Pulcher in 54 B.C., a monument which included female architectural supports with raised arms.¹⁰⁶ Athens proper saw redevelopment and restoration at the

¹⁰³ Plutarch, *Sull.* 13.

¹⁰⁴ Parsons 1943, pp. 240-244.

¹⁰⁵ Hoff 1997, pp. 41-42 cites Lewis 1975, pp. 183-184. They believe Sulla sacked the Akropolis primarily based on the date of the presumed Augustan repair to the Erechtheion and the fragment of the Erechtheion account found in the Klepsydra deposit.

¹⁰⁶ On Roman involvement at Eleusis, see Clinton 1989 and Clinton 1997. The Lesser Propylon at Eleusis contains a mixture of architectural traditions: Hörmann 1932. Not only are the maidens colossal (incorrectly characterized as inspired by the Erechtheion by Palagia 1997), the Corinthian capitals have the front parts of griffins (compare the pegasi of the Forum of Augustus in Rome a few decades later), and a

behest of Ariobarzanes II of Cappadocia, who funded the rebuilding of the Odeion of Perikles.¹⁰⁷

Athens continued to be a source of fine art for voracious art collectors. Cicero says Verres, one of Dolabella's renegade legates, looted gold from "the temple of Minerva."¹⁰⁸ This was most likely the Erechtheion for Cicero, who had spent many happy years in Athens as a student.¹⁰⁹ Rome would maintain a curious relationship with Athens in the later 1st century. This will be investigated in Chapter IV.

HISTORY OF FIRES IN THE ERECHTHEION

More than one fire ravaged the Erechtheion during its long history. While the evidence for their dates is problematic, physical evidence for intense burning is readily visible in the misshapen blocks on the interior of its North and South Walls. We only have direct literary and epigraphic evidence for one fire and repair campaign which occurred in the late 5th or early 4th century. The surviving archaeological evidence points to another fire and repair which does not emerge at first glance in the ancient documentary record. Most scholars attribute the subsequent fire to Sulla's siege and destruction of Athens. There is, however, no direct archaeological or literary evidence for any serious damage to the Akropolis as a result of the activities of Sulla and his army, despite the destruction they wrought on the city below. Therefore, a new scenario for the

Doric frieze embellished with the iconography of the Eleusinian Mysteries is superimposed on an Ionic frieze. Even the inscription is unusual: it is one of the few Latin (bilingual) inscriptions in Attica (*CIL* 547). Corinth, which was refounded as a Roman colony after Mummius razed it in 146 B.C., had many more Latin inscriptions. This is a common feature of the distribution of Latin inscriptions in the Roman East. For example, Roman colonies, such as Cremna in Pisidia, have the only Latin inscriptions in the whole region. Incidentally, the maidens are "caryatids" in the Vitruvian sense (see Chapter IV and King 1998) and are part of the Hellenistic phenomenon Vitruvius would soon describe.

¹⁰⁷ Vitruvius 5.9.1 and an inscription on a statue base: *IG* II² 3426.

¹⁰⁸ Cicero, *Ver.* 2.1.44-5; 2.4.71; Habicht 1997, p. 331.

¹⁰⁹ Vitruvius (4.8.4) will refer the Erechtheion as the temple of Minerva without the epithet of Polias/Poliades.

fire and repair must be found that fits in with the freshly interpreted archaeological and epigraphical evidence.

Xenophon refers to the first of these fires, reporting that, “in the following year in which there was an eclipse of the moon and the ancient [παλαιός] temple of Athena in Athens was set on fire.”¹¹⁰ This fire is traditionally dated to 406 B.C., but Dinsmoor argued that this eclipse and fire could equally have occurred soon after 377 B.C.¹¹¹

An inscription from Karpathos appears to refer to the donation of a large cypress trunk for the roof repairs of the Temple of Athena necessitated by that first fire:¹¹²

...The Eteokarpathians at the instance of a certain Hegesarchus contributed a cypress, cut in the sanctuary of Apollo, ἐπὶ τὸν νεῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας τῆς Ἀθηνῶν μεδούσης, and the Athenians were so appreciative of the gift of the cypress trunk cut in the precinct of Apollo at Karpathos and destined for the temple of Athena the Guardian at Athens, that they recorded Hegasarchus, his sons, and the Eteokarpathians as benefactors, and also recognized the autonomy of the community.¹¹³

This inscription is usually dated to 393 B.C., which implies a fire in 406, but Dinsmoor down-dates this inscription to shortly after 377 as well.¹¹⁴

Demosthenes mentions that a fire was lit in the Opisthodomos by the arsonist treasurers.¹¹⁵ Dörpfeld’s discovery of the Archaic Temple of Athena allowed for the correct association of the term “Opisthodomos” with the west half of this temple. Dörpfeld argued that since Demosthenes did not provide a date for the fire in the

¹¹⁰ Xenophon, *Hell.* 1.6.1.

¹¹¹ Dinsmoor 1932.

¹¹² Paton et al. 1927, pp. 461-462: *IG* XII, 1, 977 = *SIG*³ 129. Mansfield 1985, p. 202, dates this inscription to 394-390 BC. For a summary of the scholarship leading to the conclusion that the Karpathos inscription dates to this period, see Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 155-158.

¹¹³ Paton et al. 1927 p. 461.

¹¹⁴ Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 155-157. Immediately before the final printing of this study, Keith Dix brought to my attention Jameson and Lewis’ the recent redating of this inscription to 445-430 B.C., and based on this, has argued that the donation of the cypress can be instead dated to the original construction of the Erechtheion: Dix and Anderson 2004.

¹¹⁵ See above “Early 4th Century B.C.”

Opisthodomos that had been lit to hide the embezzlement of Athena's treasure by her *tamiai*, and since the Opisthodomos is next to the Erechtheion, then both must have burned at the same time, that is, in 406 B.C.¹¹⁶ Dinsmoor argues, probably rightly, that these two incidents did not occur in 406.¹¹⁷ The Opisthodomos fire must have occurred between 386/5 and 353 B.C. owing to the terminology used by Demosthenes for the different boards of treasurers and other epigraphic and historical indicators.¹¹⁸ The fire in the Opisthodomos had to have occurred after 385 when the boards of the *tamiai* were separated into the Treasurers of Athena and the Treasurers of the Other Gods. The terminus ante quem is 376 B.C. according to Dinsmoor because the Treasurers of that year do not mention their predecessors in their accounts; he supposes this is because they were the shamed, fraudulent group who embezzled Athena's funds and tried to cover it up with the fire. Since the dates of the fire in the "Old Temple" and the fire in the "Opisthodomos" can both be dated to 377/6, and the Karpathos inscription to just thereafter, then it makes sense that the fire which started in the Opisthodomos spread to the Erechtheion and seriously affected the roof in this year.

The fire and repair not long after construction ceased on the Erechtheion probably only affected the wooden parts of the main building, namely the ceiling and roof beams of the main building, as there is no evidence that the marble blocks required or received repairs at this time. Perhaps some of the antefixes and simas were, however, replaced in the contemporary style.¹¹⁹ The later of the two dates (377/6) for the fire seems most

¹¹⁶ Dörpfeld 1887, pp. 44-45, 207.

¹¹⁷ See Dinsmoor 1932, p. 160 for a review of the scholars who opposed Dörpfeld.

¹¹⁸ Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 160-172. In general, see Harris 1995. Demosthenes, *Tim.* 13.14; Schol. R.Y., Demosthenes, 24.136; Schol. A.D.T.V., Demosthenes, 24.136. See Appendix A under "Opisthodomos" for the text of these sources. On the banking fraud, see Cohen 1992, pp. 221-224.

¹¹⁹ For an argument as to why the [actually late] Roman antefixes and sima do not imitate the 5th century ones, see Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 171-172.

reasonable since the building inscriptions for the Erechtheion continue through 405/4 B.C. without any concrete reference to repairs due to fire.¹²⁰ Therefore, this first fire and repair cannot be associated with the major repairs that resulted in the rebuilding of the West Façade and the replacement of the lintels and window frames with very different building and carving techniques that will be described and examined in detail below.

Historical and archaeological circumstances for another, much more damaging fire (Figure 591) must be sought which necessitated the later, major repairs to the Erechtheion. Traditionally, this fire has been assigned to the Sullan siege of Athens; however, as argued above in “Mithridates and Sulla,” it is quite clear that the Akropolis suffered little to no physical damage because Aristion gave it up after a siege, but without a fight. It is in the context of this siege that the Lamp of Kallimachos was supposed to have gone out owing to the lack of oil.¹²¹ Had Sulla sacked the Akropolis and burned the Erechtheion (or if Aristion had somehow set fire to it, as suggested by Burden), neither the 5th century B.C. Lamp of Kallimachos nor the olive wood cult statue would have survived to be seen by Pausanias in the 2nd century A.D.¹²² Therefore, the fire (and the related repair) must be earlier than the 1st century B.C.

It will be shown below that the so-called “Roman repairs” can be re-dated securely to the Hellenistic period. The extent of the repairs shows that a fire must have ravaged the interior of the Erechtheion and damaged, in particular, the windows and

¹²⁰ A date later than 404 B.C. for the fragments (XXVII-XXVIII) of the Erechtheion building accounts that refer to the burning and repair of the Erechtheion are fully argued by Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 146-155. This interpretation differs from Paton et al. Pieces of the inscription were lost and then found again, which allowed for the discovery of new joins.

¹²¹ Plutarch, *Sull.* 13.

¹²² Burden 1999, p. 14.

doors. It is likely that this major fire occurred after Lykourgos¹²³ but before the end of the Hellenistic period, because the repairs themselves (the new moldings, clamps, lewises, and pour channels, etc.) are best assigned to this period stylistically.¹²⁴ As discussed above, the period between 287-250 B.C. would in general be plausible for the major fire: Athens was in turmoil, and Athena Polias' reputation and her cult were suffering.¹²⁵

There are three possible pieces of epigraphic evidence that may point toward the later 2nd century B.C. for the repairs:

1. *IG II² 968* records honors from the State to Miltiades, son of Zoilos, who, as *agonothetes* of the Panathenaia in or after 144/3 B.C. Miltiades, raised money for these games and repaired “the things needing work” on the Akropolis.¹²⁶ His own daughter was a *kanephoros* in the procession he organized.
2. *IG II² 1023*: “Honors for Sosandros of Sypalettos shall be inscribed on the stele by the men appointed for the reconstruction of the temple of

¹²³ Otherwise, one might have expected Lykourgos to have repaired the Erechtheion during his religious renovation campaign, being, as he was, a priest of Poseidon-Erechtheus and of the *genos* of the Eteoboutadai.

¹²⁴ The inclusion of a cornice block from the West Façade of the 5th century Erechtheion in the foundations east of the Parthenon can be disassociated from the Monopteros, whose construction date of 27 – 20/19 B.C. formerly provided the immediate terminus ante quem for the repair to the Erechtheion (see Chapter IV). This rather weak argument for associating the two building activities (repair to the Erechtheion and the Monopteros) is dismantled in Chapter IV. There are several very good reasons for why this circular building stood elsewhere in ancient times. Similarly, the statue base of Glaphyra, dating to the early 1st century A.D., is supposedly a reused Eleusinian limestone block from the Classical Erechtheion. That these blocks were lying around the Akropolis and recycled at that time is no reason to assume that the blocks suddenly became available: Kokkinos 1987. The range of 27 B.C. – 19 B.C. is given by the employment of “Augustus” rather than “Octavian” as a title on the inscription, an honor decreed by the Senate in 27 BC, and by the date of the archon, “Areios,” also given in the inscription, who could have served no later than 20/19 B.C.: Binder 1969, p. 4.

¹²⁵ See above “Turmoil and Recovery (287/6-200 B.C.).”

¹²⁶ Mikalson 1998, p. 258.

Athena.”¹²⁷ Dinsmoor cites epigraphical indicators to date this inscription to the late 2nd century B.C., and suggests this must refer to a different event (from the fire in 406/377 B.C.), “possibly a fire in the Parthenon of which there are traces of ancient repairs.”¹²⁸ However, it could equally apply to the Erechtheion, although the adjective *archaios*, which would clearly designate it as referring to the Erechtheion, is not present in the inscription.¹²⁹

3. *IG II² 983*: “[to proclaim this] crow[n both] at the ne[w competition] of [tra]gedies [of the City Dionysia and] at the [gymnastic games of the Panathenaia and Eleusini]a and Ptolemaia; [the demos is] also [to set up] a bronze [st]atu[e] of him on [horse-back by the] archaios [ne]os of Athena [Polias].”¹³⁰ This honors a Ptolemy (perhaps VI Philometor), who may have given some of the money for a repair in the mid 2nd century. This would explain why he was honored by the Athenians with a statue next to the Erechtheion.

The funds Miltiades raised for “things needing work” on the Akropolis came from many sources, including his own pocket. It would also have probably come from foreigners such as the Ptolemies and Attalids as well, both of whom were so well

¹²⁷ Sypalettos is an Attic deme of the tribe Kekropis.

¹²⁸ Dinsmoor 1932, p. 160, note 8.

¹²⁹ Mikalson 1998, pp. 108-112, argues that the term Polias was used less often in the third and second centuries because the goddess had failed in her protective role in light of contemporary events (see above). Also, the Parthenon was known as the Parthenon at this time, as seen in the account of the ancient traveler Herakleides of Crete (T 1). See above “Turmoil and Recovery (287/6-200 B.C.).”

¹³⁰ “παρὰ τὸν]//[νε]ῶ τὸν ἀρχαῖον τῆς Ἀθηναῖς τ[ῆς Πολιάδος]”: *IG II² 983.2-6*. This letter cutter was active from 169/8 to 135/4 B.C.: Shear 2001, p. 1027; Tracy 1990.

disposed and generous toward Athens, and had a vested interest in glorifying Athena and her monuments, as discussed above.¹³¹

In sum, the historical circumstances discussed above point to the second quarter of the 3rd century B.C. for the date of the second fire in the Erechtheion as this period corresponds to the nadir in the cult of Athena Polias. The epigraphical references to general repairs on the Akropolis; to the reconstruction of the temple of Athena; to the rise in dedications of statues of *arrhephoroi*; to the introduction of the annual peplos to the Panathenaic festival; and to the erection of an honorific statue of a Ptolemy (perhaps VI) as benefactor next to the Erechtheion, together suggest that the repair took place around the middle of the 2nd century B.C.¹³² The following sections contain the archaeological argument for the dating of the repair of the Erechtheion to the 2nd century B.C. This argument begins with a comparative analysis of the repaired moldings, especially the lintel of the North Door. This is followed by an examination of the construction and design techniques employed for the repair on other parts of the building, in particular the West Façade.

STYLISTIC DATING OF THE REPAIRED MOLDINGS

Using the terminology for describing the various elements of the anthemion pattern and the methodology set out in “Dating by Means of Architectural Decoration: Possibilities and Limits” by Vandeput, this study argues for a 2nd century B.C. date for

¹³¹ Furthermore, the ritual vessels (oinochoai) made around 410 B.C. perhaps in conjunction with the inauguration of the Erechtheion as the new home of Athena Polias were discarded near the Klepsydra around 200 B.C. Perhaps this was part of the clean-up operation prior to the restoration of the temple. On these oinochoai, see Chapter II; Green 1962; and Robertson 1996, p. 34.

¹³² On the rise in dedications and the introduction of the annual peplos, see above “The 2nd Century B.C.”

the carving of one of the best preserved repaired elements of the Erechtheion: the replaced lintel of the North Door.¹³³

Vandeput states that:

Any attempt to date monuments by means of architectural decoration must begin with the floral and geometrical patterns...These motives are purely decorative and have no structural value....Architectural ornamentation is especially valuable when the ‘normal’ methods of dating...are missing... Reliable dates result from a comparison of the motives on each building with those on other, preferably well-dated buildings in the other cities in the same region. It may be assumed that the decoration of public monuments in Antiquity was subjected to changing ‘fashions’ affecting the architecture of all cities, if not always in the same way or at the same rate.¹³⁴

The lintel blocks of the North Door were completely replaced as part of the major repair of the Erechtheion. The upper block comprises a long, unique, anthemion molding and provides the best opportunity for the stylistic dating of the repair through a comparative analysis with other well-dated monuments (Figure 353).

Traditionally, the repairs are dated to the Augustan period by linking the style of carving with the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus built in 27-19 B.C. Almost every treatment of the Monopteros or the repair to the Erechtheion implies that both monuments were built around the same time, and perhaps by the same team of workmen.¹³⁵ Even a cursory comparison of the repair molding from the Erechtheion (Figure 353) and the Augustan period molding from the Monopteros (Figure 613) reveals that this cannot be the case.¹³⁶ The Monopteros’ anthemion is very doughy and flat

¹³³ Vandeput 1997, p. 30, 129-133.

¹³⁴ Vandeput 1997, p. 129.

¹³⁵ Paton et al. 1927; Burden 1999. See also Schmalz 1994, p. 14, and Hurwit 1999, pp. 279-280. Gros 1976, p. 236 is less convinced that the capitals of the Monopteros are so similar.

¹³⁶ Paton et al. simply refer to any “inferior,” non-5th century carving as being of Roman (Augustan) date. Furthermore, the connection among the workmen on the Monopteros, the Erechtheion and the monuments in Rome which quote the Erechtheion is faulty. As discussed in Chapter IV, the Monopteros was built and dedicated by the Athenians. There is no evidence that Augustus donated any money to repair the

compared to both the crispness and vivacity of the 5th century anthemion of the Erechtheion (with which it shares general design features), and to the shallow, spindliness of the repaired lintel of the North Porch (from which it differs in layout, design and overall technique). Nor do the repaired anthemion moldings on the Erechtheion resemble those on other Augustan monuments.¹³⁷

The anthemion pattern of the North Porch (on the epikranitis, necking-bands of the columns, the lintel of the North Door) differs from that on the rest of the building.¹³⁸ That of the North Porch has an almost unique additional “interfloral element” between outward-curving lotuses and palmettes, while that on the rest of the building does not. While the anthemion of the replaced lintel also has the inter-floral element, the shape of the flower is completely different from that on the epikranitis and the necking bands on the columns of the North Porch.

The anthemion of the repair lintel and that of the 5th century epikranitis of the North Porch differ in more subtle ways, namely in the style of the carving and the shape of the discrete elements of the pattern itself (Figure 353 vs. Figure 368 to Figure 377). The main palmettes are outward curving like the rest of the building, and the small palmettes on either side of the lotus are inward curving. From the Hellenistic period onward, most examples of palmettes are inward curving, rather than outward curving.¹³⁹ It would seem that the repairers’ desire to imitate the 5th century anthemion as closely as

Erechtheion (unlike his donation to help complete the Roman Agora), or that Roman architects were involved in any way. Also as discussed in Chapter IV, casts of the Erechtheion maidens were almost certainly not taken to Rome (by Roman agents) as models for the figures in the attic story in the Forum of Augustus.

¹³⁷ See Rumscheid 1994; Alzinger 1974; and Vandeput 1997 for well-dated Augustan moldings.

¹³⁸ Schädler 1990 identifies the many different hands at work on the anthemion of the epikranitis, but they are all clearly characteristic of the late 5th century.

¹³⁹ At the Gate of Mazaeus and Mithridates at Ephesos, the closed palmettes alternate curving inward and outward between the open palmettes: Rumscheid 1994, pl. 38.

possible led them to use the out-dated, outward-curving form for the main palmettes, but they used the established contemporary norm of inward-curving palmettes in the additional element of the smaller flanking palmettes.¹⁴⁰

In general, the carving of the repair lintel is very shallow and delicate. The lotuses are very spindly, their leaves rising vertically very high before splaying outward. The lotuses rise out of an unusual calyx, which has a circular element in the middle of it. A rather more subtle difference between the repair and 5th century anthemion is that in section, the leaves of the repair palmettes are convex in cross-section, while those of the 5th century are concave with sharply defined edges.

Many of the unusual characteristics of the repair anthemion can be compared with other anthemion moldings from well-dated buildings. The later Empire initially appeared to be attractive period for the carving of the repaired lintel block for historical reasons. Some repairs were almost certainly carried out in the late 2nd century A.D. in preparation for the installation of Julia Domna's statue next to that of Athena Polias (see Chapter IV). There are several Attic examples of anthemion from this period whose radically different form and style have been collated and analyzed by Susan Walker.¹⁴¹ The 2nd century A.D. examples have deeply drilled, chunky leaves and are highly stylized. The Outer Propylon at Eleusis is a prime example of this (Figure 667). Anthemion moldings from the Bath on the Lechaion Road at Corinth are even more different. The carving is shallower: the leaves are flat and highly stylized.¹⁴² Examples of anthemia from further afield corroborate these conclusions – the Serapeion at Ephesos is a good example from

¹⁴⁰ Therefore, the curvature, be it inward or outward, can not be used as evidence to date the carving. Similarly, comparison of the interfloral elements is not a fruitful approach, because this element is almost unique to the anthemion of the North Porch of the Erechtheion.

¹⁴¹ Walker 1979. See also Giraud 1989 for ring voids at the late 2nd century Greater Propylon at Eleusis.

¹⁴² Biers 1985, pp. 11-12, pls. 20, 21, 25, 26.

the Hadrianic period, and the Arch of Septimius Severus from the early 3rd century (Figure 668).¹⁴³ The closest comparison to the repair lintel of the Erechtheion comes from the Forum of Trajan in Rome. The high “vertical rise before splaying” of the lotus is very similar to that of the repair to the Erechtheion (Figure 666). They also share the convexity and narrowness of the leaves. Unfortunately, there is no other corroborating evidence – epigraphical, historical, or otherwise – that would support a Trajanic date for the repair.¹⁴⁴

Having dismissed a 2nd century A.D. date for the carving of the repair lintel of the North Door, we may now consider the 1st century A.D. and B.C. In general, anthemion moldings from this period – from Rome to Asia Minor – are carved in much deeper relief than that found on the repair block of the Erechtheion.¹⁴⁵ The most commonly cited comparison for the Erechtheion repair comes from the Augustan period and is its neighbor: the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus. The Monopteros anthemion actually imitates the 5th century anthemion of the East Porch very closely. As noted above, it is clear from the comparison of the repair lintel of the Erechtheion described above and anthemion on the Monopteros that these could not have been carved at the same time.¹⁴⁶ Therefore, the repair lintel does not date to the same period as the construction of the Monopteros (27-19 B.C.). In pursuit of the date of the repair to the Erechtheion, we must go further back in time to the Hellenistic period. As argued in the section above, there

¹⁴³ Vandeput 1997, pl. 89. The high “vertical rise before splaying” of the “open” palmette from the Forum of Trajan at Rome is very similar to that of the repair to the Erechtheion (Figure 666). They are also similar in the convexity and narrowness of the leaves.

¹⁴⁴ Shear 2001, p. 639.

¹⁴⁵ Late 1st century A.D.: Ephesos Pollio Nymphaion, see Vandeput 1997, pl. 84. For Augustan examples from Ephesos, see Alzinger 1974.

¹⁴⁶ The palmettes of the Monopteros, for example, are concave, like those on the 5th century moldings of the Erechtheion and most other examples. Also, the anthemion of the Monopteros is typical of the Augustan period: see various well-dated examples in Alzinger 1974; Rumscheid 1994; and Vandeput 1997.

are indications that there was a fire and repair in the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C., respectively.

The best-dated buildings with anthemion moldings come not from Hellenistic Greece, but from the Ionic buildings of the west coast of Asia Minor. After examining the characteristics of dozens of relatively well-dated moldings from the 3rd through 1st centuries B.C., the best parallels for different features found in the repaired lintel of the Erechtheion come from the 2nd century, as summarized in Table 2.¹⁴⁷

Table 2. Monuments which Feature an Anthemion Molding with Features Comparable to the Replaced Lintel of the North Door of the Erechtheion.

Monument	Date	Shallow carving	Convex leaves	High “vertical rise before splaying” of lotus	Figure
Chryse, Temple of Apollo Smintheus	150-125 B.C.	Yes	Yes		Figure 661
Pergamon, Sanctuary of Athena	197-159 B.C.	Yes		Yes	Figure 663
Pergamon, Great Altar	197-159 B.C.	Yes			Figure 664

Interestingly, the example of the anthemion from the Great Altar at Pergamon also has the interfloral element which is almost unique to the North Porch of the Erechtheion. The flower, in fact, more closely resembles the repair interfloral element (a mini-lotus) rather than the poppy/rosette of the 5th century interfloral element. Since the Great Altar at Pergamon takes many cues from design features of the Athenian Akropolis, the inclusion of the interfloral element in the anthemion may be a deliberate allusion to the North Porch of the Erechtheion. In turn, this may imply that the repair to

¹⁴⁷ Rumscheid 1994.

the Erechtheion occurred either before or concurrently with the construction of the Great Altar. Unfortunately, the date of the Great Altar at Pergamon is contentious and can only be narrowed to the first half of the 2nd century B.C.¹⁴⁸

For further evidence of an early to mid 2nd century date for the repair, we can look at the beautifully carved egg-and-dart molding on the lower of the two lintel blocks. A close parallel may be found in the Miletus Bouleuterion which dates to 175-164 B.C. (Figure 662).¹⁴⁹ The shape of the egg and the sharpness and shape of the dart match closely.¹⁵⁰

In sum, the result of this stylistic comparison of moldings on the repair lintel blocks of the North Door of the Erechtheion suggests that the best date for the major repair of the Erechtheion is the first half of the 2nd century B.C., which is contemporary with, or shortly later than, the Attalid sculptural dedications on the south side of the Akropolis and the dedication of the statue of a Ptolemy next to the Erechtheion.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD

This section summarizes and re-examines the changes to the Erechtheion during Hellenistic period in the light of the new epigraphical, historical and stylistic evidence presented above. Paton et al. 1927 found evidence of the major repair, characterized by

¹⁴⁸ See Lawall 2002 and Smith 1991, p. 158 for a discussion of the date of the Great Altar at Pergamon.

¹⁴⁹ This comparison is based on the distinctive shape of the egg, which changes over time. In the Classical period, the top quarter or so of the egg is truncated. By the Hadrianic period, the whole egg is visible, and is almost detached from the top of the molding (cf. the Hadrianic Pantheon). This is not a perfect, linear progression, but the shape of the egg both frontally and in profile can be used for relative dating purposes.

¹⁵⁰ Rumscheid 1994, pl. 100. On the replaced east console of the North Door: It is very different from the anthemion of the upper lintel. It matches examples from the 3rd and early 2nd century, and is finished to a much higher degree with a flat chisel and abrasive polish (Figure 354). Decent parallels for the carving of the east console can be found at the Temple of Dionysos at Miletus (276 B.C.): Rumscheid 1994, no. 139.4-6 (Figure 665). Since the insertion of the new, repair blocks into the North Wall was presumably simultaneous with the east console and lintel, then perhaps the master craftsman undertook the console while a less skilled, perhaps younger hand carved the upper lintel.

pi-clamps, pour channels and replaced moldings, in the West, South and North Porches, and the top of the North and South Walls. Further areas that were damaged by the fire and repaired are the figured frieze and the South Porch (Figure 591). This fire and major repair are traditionally dated to the Augustan period because of Paton's 1927 analysis of the evidence.

If the arguments above are accepted, we should substitute the term "Hellenistic" for almost every instance Paton et al. (and subsequently Burden 1999) use the term "Roman" or "Augustan" in their discussion of the major repairs to the Erechtheion. These changes involved the cutting back of blocks to remove fire damage and the subsequent attachment of new portions to complete the building. They also involved the wholesale replacement of completely damaged blocks.¹⁵¹ The construction methods employed included pi-clamps and dowels with pour channels. Double lewises were also employed for lifting. All these construction techniques were commonly used in the Hellenistic period.¹⁵²

In the 5th century Erechtheion, the clamps used to hold the blocks together are in the shape of an "H" or "double-T." For Paton, the primary indicator of the so-called "Augustan" repair were pi-clamps. Pi-clamps are not, however, exclusive to the Augustan period. In fact, they appear in Greek buildings as early as the 4th and 3rd

¹⁵¹ The overall aim of the repair campaign seems to have been to restore the Erechtheion to its Classical state as best as possible. Each of the damaged blocks would have been evaluated for their structural integrity and aesthetic merit. Pragmatism would have resulted in as many blocks as possible being repaired and reused in situ, with salvageable blocks reused in their original location or some modified manner. Despite all the effort to recreate the Classical temple, it was probably impossible and unnecessary to revert to earlier construction techniques. For example, new cuttings in old blocks were made to receive the pi-clamps that were in current usage rather than the Classical double-T clamp. Modern doweling for securing blocks vertically and double lewises for lifting them were widely used in the repair. The sculptors matched the moldings with a certain degree of success, though many of the repaired moldings stick out even to the untrained eye of modern visitors. In general, however, such details were far away from most ancient viewers, and so would never have looked out of place.

¹⁵² Certain repairs to elements of the roof can be dated to the 2nd century A.D. (Figure 531 and Figure 532). See Chapter IV and Orlandos 1966.

centuries, in Athens and abroad, such as at Samothrace.¹⁵³ In Athens, pi-clamps can be found in the Stoa of Attalos and the Middle Stoa in the Agora, both of which date to the 2nd century B.C.¹⁵⁴ Pour channels, another indicator to Paton et al. of the “Roman” repair, also occur in Athens in the Hellenistic period, such as, again, in the Stoa of Attalos. This construction technique, however, only come into regular use in the 2nd century, thus ruling out the 4th (and 3rd century) for the date of the repair.

Between the major fire and repair, a temporary roof was erected over the west half of the Erechtheion. On the interior of the North Wall, two rows of small, carefully-drilled holes 0.02 m in diameter and about 0.08 m in depth slope downward away from the line of the West Cross-Wall. These holes also appear on both antae (north face of SS.09.01 [Figure 278] and south face of WW.02.08 [Figure 291]), and show that the upper portion of the West Façade was not in existence when these holes were being used.¹⁵⁵ There is a complementary set of holes for the west set on the interior of the South Wall. These run through the cutting for the Niche and the north side of the south anta of the West Façade, indicating that not only was the West Façade not in place, but the shelf of the Niche had also been destroyed (Figure 212 and detail of Figure 278). Most scholars, including Burden, take these holes to be the attachments for a temporary roof over the western sections of the temple, made either of “hide or metal” (Figure 590).¹⁵⁶ Burden admits his reconstruction would drain any rainwater hitting the temporary roof into the middle of the temple, but supposes that water may have somehow

¹⁵³ Frazer 1990; Lehmann and Spittle 1982. For 4th through 2nd century monuments at Athens that employ pi-clamps, see above “Demetrios Poliorketes (307/6-287/6 B.C.)” and “The 2nd Century B.C.”

¹⁵⁴ The Middle Stoa is clamped only at the corners for reinforcement.

¹⁵⁵ Because of this “structural stratigraphy,” these holes cannot be Post-Antique. The West Façade continued to stand until the Greek War of Independence: see Chapter VII.

¹⁵⁶ Burden 1999, p. 316.

been guided through some damaged portion of the North Wall.¹⁵⁷ One of the problems with Burden's reconstruction is that it does not take into account the devastating effect the fire would have had on the rest of the roof over the south and east half of the temple, which eventually required the replacement of the backs of the epistyle and epikranitis blocks along the tops of the North and South Walls. It is quite possible that the entire main building was covered by temporary roof structures of some kind, the evidence for which has since been obliterated by the repairs themselves.

Between the fire and the installation of the temporary roof, and then later, during the repair itself, the cult objects may have been transferred to another building for safe-keeping, probably the Parthenon, as argued above.

WEST FAÇADE

The greatest overhaul of the Erechtheion caused by the fire and subsequent repair was to its West Façade. Almost everything above course 11 between the north and south antae of the West Façade was replaced as part of the major repair. While the rest of the repair imitated the 5th century building very closely, the repaired West Façade was somewhat different from the Classical design.¹⁵⁸ Instead of wooden grilles above low walls in the intercolumniations, the intercolumniations were completely filled in and pierced by three windows in the central three intercolumniations which narrow slightly toward the top. The southern intercolumniation, which had lacked a grill in the Classical period, was probably filled in completely.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ Burden 1999, pp. 36-37.

¹⁵⁸ For a summary of the Classical Greek wall, see Paton et al. 1927, pp. 63-66.

¹⁵⁹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 69.

Not only are the intercolumnar windows themselves an unusual feature in an ancient building, but the arrangement of the intercolumnar walls is unusual as well. Of particular interest is the very narrow course, WP.06. In the northernmost intercolumniation, this narrow block corresponds to the sills of the windows and was inserted during Balanos' restoration of the West Façade, which had been completely toppled after a storm in 1852. Paton et al. express discomfort with this restoration because this course does not appear in Dalton's West Elevation of 1749 (Figure 14) and the block itself does not survive.¹⁶⁰ Close inspection of this area of the temple in Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819 (Figure 58) and Gell, *Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 32) demonstrates that this narrow block did indeed exist in the repaired wall.

Therefore, the pattern of the intercolumnar wall, working upward, is one long block, two half blocks, and a long narrow block. This "quasi-pseudo-isodomic" masonry is similar to the pseudo-isodomic masonry used all over the Greek world in the Hellenistic period. Furthermore, Pergamene-sponsored monuments in Athens, such as the pillar monuments on the Akropolis, the Stoa of Attalos, the Donor's Monument in front of it, and the Stoa of Eumenes on the South Slope, all have this style of masonry. The Tower of the Winds has courses of varying heights.¹⁶¹ The masonry style of the West Façade provides an additional piece of circumstantial evidence for assigning the repairs to the Hellenistic period.

¹⁶⁰ Paton et al. 1927, p. 69.

¹⁶¹ Kienast is probably correct in his attribution of the date and patronage of the Tower of the Winds to a Hellenistic king at the end of the 2nd century B.C.: Kienast 1997, pp. 60-61. This theory is contrary Palagia's, which dates the Tower to the time Mark Antony spent in Athens in the 30s B.C. (Lecture October 2001 at the Institute for Classical Studies, London and at the DAI at Athens). This is impossible since Varro (37 BC) and Vitruvius describe the monument.

There are very few parallels for the large windows similar to those in the intercolumniations of the West Façade that date before the Late Imperial period. The early modern European travelers remarked upon this when they saw it for the first time, and little has changed since. To begin with, there are few buildings in Greece well enough preserved to offer comparanda.¹⁶² It is necessary to cross the Aegean to find even distant parallels.¹⁶³ The few buildings that do preserve proportionally large windows include the towers for the Hellenistic Gate at Perge, whose windows are between shallow Doric pilasters.¹⁶⁴ The other examples are in Androns A and B at Labraunda, which date to the middle of the 4th century B.C. These are not in intercolumniations, nor do they have jambs and lintels like the Erechtheion.¹⁶⁵ And so we are not much further along in our attempt to understand the architectural design of the West Façade than were the early modern European travelers 200 years ago.¹⁶⁶

The anthemion necking bands of the replacement columns of the West Façade are in very poor condition. The palmettes conform very closely to the shape and style of the 5th century anthemion pattern, which are preserved around the whole epikranitis of the

¹⁶² The second story of the Arsinoëion at Samothrace had thin slabs between pilasters on the exterior with columns on the inside: McCredie et al. 1992. A rustic example of such windows with inclined jambs may be found at the fortified farmhouse “Pyrgos Agias Triadas” on Amorgos dating to the second quarter of the 4th century B.C. Korres studied this complex in the 1970s and recently presented his findings at the colloquium in honor of J.J. Coulton at Lincoln College Oxford, 17 April 2004: see also below note 204.

¹⁶³ The Doric Neorion at Samothrace and the Stoa of Philip V on Delos both had windows whose openings were lined with pillars: Wescoat 2004.

¹⁶⁴ Schmalz 1994, p. 14, incorrectly cites the Odeion of Agrippa as a parallel for the contemporary arrangement of the windows of the repaired West Façade. There is no physical evidence for the narrow strip at the bottom of the windows as restored in the elevation and model reproduced in Camp 1990, p. 121. In fact, this restoration is itself inspired by the West Façade, making the argument completely circular.

¹⁶⁵ *Labraunda* II.1, p. 48, fig. 33.

¹⁶⁶ Later examples of windows between engaged pilasters (not engaged columns as in the Erechtheion) include the upper story of the Colosseum at Rome. Alessandro Viscogliosi’s reconstruction of the interior of the Temple of Apollo Sosianus in Circo at Rome includes windows between Corinthian columns in the second level of the interior colonnade: Viscogliosi 1996. The so-called “Temple of Rediculus” between the *via Appia* and the *via Latina* has three windows with consoles above a narrow strip of darker brick between engaged Corinthian pilasters. This funerary monument dates to the middle of the 2nd century A. D. and may have belonged to the Herodes Atticus and Regilla, benefactors of Athens at this time: see Lanciani 1892, pp. 291-292.

main building and in the columns of the East Porch. The carving is, however, much shallower in depth, and in spite of its condition still belongs well within the Hellenistic tradition (Figure 277).

The four blocks currently making up the frieze of the West Façade (Figure 272 and Figure 296) consist of three reused statue bases of Eleusinian limestone and one additional block of a different veined stone (possibly Hymettian marble). The footprints for the now absent bronze statues are visible on the interior.¹⁶⁷ The following discussion challenges both the validity of the use of the statue bases in Nikolaos Balanos' 1902-1909 restoration (as well as in Papanikolaou's current restoration) and suggests that the replacement frieze of the West Façade also had figural decoration.

Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the West*, 1749, the earliest extant depiction of the West Façade in 1749 (Figure 14), clearly shows one short and two long frieze blocks extending from the north edge of the west façade to almost halfway to the second southern intercolumniation.¹⁶⁸ The divisions of the blocks are not clear in reproductions of this image, and so the original engraving must be consulted.¹⁶⁹ In later drawings, namely Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 35), these lengthy frieze blocks are visible on the ground to the west of the temple, having fallen from their place above the entablature. After about 1805, the blocks no longer appear in the drawings, likely having been

¹⁶⁷ Several similar inscribed bases line the modern path that leads from the Propylaea to the top of the Akropolis plateau (Figure 616). See Kokkinos 1987 for an inscribed statue base which he postulates originally came from the Erechtheion. See also Kosmopoulou 1996 and Kosmopoulou 2002.

¹⁶⁸ This is a fairly accurate rendering. See Chapter VII, section on Dalton.

¹⁶⁹ Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751 (Figure 15), executed two years after Dalton's drawing, shows the frieze course in a greater state of completion. In Stuart's depiction, the frieze extends almost all the way across the West Façade, leaving room, it would seem, only for the first frieze block of the South Wall. In any case, the additional block(s) of the frieze course (which lack delineation in Stuart's painting) does not support the argument that the reused statue bases belong at the southern end.

removed and reused, because the ground level did not change significantly between the time when the frieze blocks are depicted on the ground and their subsequent absence.¹⁷⁰

The placement of the cuttings for dowels on the top of the architrave blocks confirms the length of the blocks in Dalton's depiction.¹⁷¹

Therefore, it is clear that the blocks currently in place do not belong in this location and should have been removed during the most recent anastylosis of the building according to the guidelines set out by the Akropolis Restoration Committee.¹⁷² These guidelines (namely the removal of blocks from other buildings and the addition of new blocks where, and only where, it was necessary to support another ancient block above it) were followed closely for the rest of the building.¹⁷³

Even back in the early 20th century, Paton et al. acknowledged that the reused statue bases did not belong where Balanos placed them and where they still stand today.¹⁷⁴ They argue instead that these blocks belong at the south end of the West Façade.¹⁷⁵ In order to evaluate whether the reused statue bases really belong at the south end, it is necessary to examine the question of whether the figured frieze was replaced during the major repair.

¹⁷⁰ Dodwell, *South-West View of the Erechtheion*, 1805 (Figure 42) shows just one of these frieze blocks still on the ground.

¹⁷¹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 72.

¹⁷² Papanikolaou 1994, pp. 143-147. See also Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985 and Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, esp. pp. 213-217.

¹⁷³ The addition of the casts of the column #6 of the East Porch and the associated entablature removed by Elgin was as much for aesthetic as for structural purposes. These decisions regarding the replacement casts were debated and approved by the committee. It is strange that the West Façade in general did not receive the same careful analysis. See Papanikolaou 1994 and Paton et al. 1977.

¹⁷⁴ Balanos apparently placed them there because he had fragments of the north end of the cornice of the West Façade which needed support: Balanos 1938, p. 29.

¹⁷⁵ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 73-74. It is also curious that Paton et al. did not mention whether the statue bases placed in the west frieze have inscriptions on their faces (which are oriented toward the ground as restored). I anticipate that the publication of Papanikolaou's report on the most recent anastylosis will address this potentially revealing issue.

Paton et al. 1927 state that the figured frieze was not replaced during the major repair because there are no cuttings in the exterior face of the frieze blocks currently on the building (Figure 272 and Figure 296).¹⁷⁶ The first piece of evidence that the figured frieze was indeed replaced on the West Façade during the major repair comes from Dodwell's 1805 description: "The frieze of the western front of the Erechtheion has also been anciently ornamented; but apparently less so than that toward to east: some holes are seen in the marble."¹⁷⁷ As mentioned above, at least one of these "marble" blocks can be seen lying on the ground where they had fallen since 1789 in Dodwell, *South-West View of the Erechtheion*, 1805 (Figure 42).

Patricia Boulter has since identified two fragments of the figured frieze that belong to the repair.¹⁷⁸ It is ironic that the first of these replacement figures is the sole fragment with an identifiable attribute. Akropolis Museum no. 1293 (Boulter's no. 83) is a seated figure facing right with an omphalos on its lap:

The drapery between the legs is sketchily rendered by a series of harsh broad folds.... The drapery folds which hang between the seat and the ankle are broken, but in the valleys are clear traces of a very coarse rasp used at right angles to the drapery folds...Tool marks of this type do not appear on any other pieces of the frieze, although occasionally they can be found at this period [Classical] well hidden in the drapery folds. They can, of course, be easily paralleled on Roman work. The deeply cut grooves on the thigh and the channels of drapery on the lap, as well as the overall "hard" appearance of the modelling, can all be paralleled on the Eleusis statuettes, Roman copies on a smaller scale of pedimental figures of the Parthenon. The marble of this figure is a chalky white; both its color and texture seem to set it apart from other pieces of the frieze.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁶ These are the reused statue bases discussed above.

¹⁷⁷ Dodwell 1819, p. 349. Dodwell's comments on the spacing of the dowels suggest that perhaps the arrangement of the repaired frieze was less complex or densely figured. The function of the clamps on the Eleusinian frieze blocks was known by the turn of the 19th century. See Chapter VII.

¹⁷⁸ Boulter 1970, pp. 18-19.

¹⁷⁹ Boulter 1970, pp. 18-19. Substitute "Hellenistic" for "Roman" in this text.

Although it is impossible to prove for certain whether these two replacement fragments came from the West Façade, the combination of Dodwell's testimony of the holes and the fact that some of the figured frieze was replaced during the major repair strongly suggests that the West Façade received a new decorated frieze. There are several practical reasons for this, namely:

1. The West Façade is highly visible from the main points of view of the sanctuary, such as from the east of the Propylaea, as one entered the Akropolis;
2. A great deal of money, effort and care was spent on the repair to restore the Erechtheion to its Classical state. This was achieved (with some lavish modification) in the rest of the building;
3. It is highly unlikely that irregular, re-used statue bases would have been employed in this highly visible location for structural reasons (irregular depth toward the interior would have interfered with the roofing of the corridor); and,
4. More importantly, because nowhere else in the repair were (reused) blocks from other structures used.

It is therefore highly likely that if figures were replaced during the repair, the figured frieze was replaced on the West Façade. The smooth exterior faces of the frieze blocks currently on the West Façade means that they do not belong to the West Façade. This inevitable conclusion significantly alters our understanding of the major repair of the Erechtheion. The re-used statue bases in the West Façade are an unwelcome intrusion into the restored building.

Where do the blocks currently on the building come from? The fact that these four blocks suddenly “seem to have come to light again”¹⁸⁰ and are employed in the early 20th century restoration of the building is suspicious. It is well known that Balanos “proceeded to rebuild large parts of the buildings using the available ancient material without going to the trouble of finding out where each block belonged. He also pieced together architectural blocks (column capitals and ceiling coffers in particular) by joining ancient fragments of uncertain provenance; he did not even hesitate to cut down the broken fragments in order to obtain flat surfaces for the forcible joins.”¹⁸¹ These four blocks, with their mason’s marks and corresponding clamps, probably do belong together, but to an altogether different monument. The differing depths of the blocks would better suit a monument on the ground, where the uneven rear edges could be filled with earth or other small stones.

Just to the west of the Kekropeion and north of the terrace wall of the Archaic Temple of Athena are several modern replacement frieze blocks made of Hymettian marble complete with their double-T-clamps and dowel cuttings (Figure 533). Instead of the reused statue bases, modern blocks such as these should have been employed to support the surviving horizontal and raking cornice fragments at the north end of the West Façade.

One last point on the repair of the West Façade: Paton et al. neglected to mention the one extant bronze pin in the northernmost engaged column of the West Façade.¹⁸² It is located in the angle of the north volute (Figure 275). One can assume that the 5th century capitals of the West Façade also had bronze pins in the volutes like their

¹⁸⁰ Paton et al. 1927, p. 73.

¹⁸¹ Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, p. 236.

¹⁸² Paton et al. 1927, pp. 66-68.

neighbors in the North Porch (Figure 426 and Figure 433), which were probably used for hanging garlands and other decorations, as seen in a Roman frieze from the Louvre (Figure 682). Not only is this conscientious imitation of the Classical feature a nice example of the continuity of logistical detail for festival practices maintained by the repairers, but the inclusion of the bronze pins in the replacement capitals also lends weight to the argument above that it is unlikely that the Hellenistic patron would have cut corners by reusing old statue bases and neglecting to recreate the attached frieze, since they took the time to restore little details such as the bronze pins.¹⁸³

NORTH PORCH

Several blocks of the cornice on the north side of the North Porch had to be removed in order to access the porch's fire-damaged ceiling. When these cornice blocks were replaced after the ceiling was repaired, PN.CC.08 and PN.CC.09 were switched. In 1903, Balanos returned the cornice blocks to their Classical positions according to the cuttings for the double-T-clamps. Some of the other cornice blocks must be replacements, because two un-reused Classical North Porch cornice blocks have been found on the Akropolis.¹⁸⁴ These had been reused elsewhere because they contain pi-clamps and lewis holes.¹⁸⁵ The repairers did an especially fine job on the cornice because it is impossible to tell from the ground which blocks are replacements.¹⁸⁶

Like many of the cornice blocks, the two extant tympanum blocks have been secured with pi-clamps while retaining the 5th century cuttings for double-T-clamps. This

¹⁸³ Another example is the degree of completion, including encaustic painting and metal attachments, of the replaced coffer blocks in the North Porch: see below "North Porch."

¹⁸⁴ Paton et al. 1927, p. 92.

¹⁸⁵ See Paton et al. 1927, p. 93, fig. 60 for drawings of these blocks. Their current whereabouts are unclear.

¹⁸⁶ Paton et al. 1927, p. 92.

indicates that the blocks were removed and replaced during the repair.¹⁸⁷ The dismantling of the cornice and tympanum allowed for access to the ceiling of the North Porch. For the repair of the roof, Burden suggests that the replacement tiles for the North Porch may have been made of terracotta rather than marble because not a single marble roof tile that can be associated with the North Porch of the Erechtheion has ever been found on the Akropolis. He also suggests that the roof tiles could have been periodically white-washed to give the illusion of marble from afar.¹⁸⁸

Flames must have spread through the North Door because the lintel of the North Door and the ceiling of the North Porch were damaged. This necessitated the replacement of the central beam (PN.02.03b) which was installed without dismantling the North Wall above it. As a consequence, the replacement beam is not dowelled into the epistyle. The interbeam west of this new beam is also a replacement – the egg-and-dart molding is not symmetrical as it turns the corner, like on the 5th century interbeams.¹⁸⁹ Some of the coffer blocks have indications of repair as well.¹⁹⁰ Their upper surfaces are more roughly picked than those of the 5th century coffer blocks (Figure 419). The replacement blocks did, however, receive the same finish on the underside as the 5th century blocks: encaustic painting with meander and egg-and-dart, as well as a metal rosette attached to holes in the center of the coffers (Figure 393 – center).

As mentioned above, the flames damaged the lintel of the North Door and necessitated its complete replacement. This was no small feat considering it was well integrated into the North Wall of the main building. The well-cut holes in NN.07.03-04

¹⁸⁷ Paton et al. 1927, p. 94.

¹⁸⁸ Burden 1999, p. 57.

¹⁸⁹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 87.

¹⁹⁰ See Paton et al. 1927, p. 89, pl. 8.4 for a summary of the so-called Roman repairs to the ceiling of the North Porch.

that run through the full thickness of the wall were probably cut to fit beams intended to support the wall while the new lintel block was gently shimmied into place (Figure 351).¹⁹¹

The lintel is strangely composed of two separate blocks, one on top of the other (Figure 351).¹⁹² The lower of the two blocks continues the moldings of the 5th century jambs which were not repaired, in spite of having been extensively damaged by fire (Figure 355).¹⁹³ The leaf-and-dart is a fairly unusual molding and approximates the 5th century molding very convincingly.¹⁹⁴ The rosettes were also continued, but their centers were not hollowed out for the attachment of metal ornaments as on the 5th century vertical jambs.¹⁹⁵ The east console and adjoining block that run through the wall were also replaced. The west console was doveled onto the face of the Classical block, and has long since disappeared. The craftsmanship on the east console is of the highest quality (Figure 354).

EAST PORCH

The fire appears to have been particularly violent in the East Porch because almost all the surviving fragments of its ceiling were reworked during the repair or were replaced with new blocks.¹⁹⁶ The openings in the East Wall were severely burned as

¹⁹¹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 101; Burden 1999, pp. 42-43.

¹⁹² For the lintel's importance to the discussion of the date of the major repairs, see above "Stylistic Dating of the Repaired Moldings."

¹⁹³ The vertical jambs were not damaged at a later date, as one might suppose, because the lintel is in excellent condition. The difference in their condition can be seen at the transition from the vertical to horizontal moldings (Figure 355).

¹⁹⁴ Burden 1999, p. 44, introduces the controversial issue of the use of the drill in Augustan times, well before its predominance characterizes later Imperial sculpture. There is virtually no difference in the technique and treatment of the leaf-and-dart molding of the Classical vs. the repaired sections, which are juxtaposed directly in Figure 355.

¹⁹⁵ Inwood 1831, p. 15 and pl. 20, while clearing away rubbish from the east console to make a cast, found a small bronze disk close to the North Door. This may have been the center of the rosette decoration.

¹⁹⁶ Paton et al. 1927, p. 30.

well, and therefore the sills and jambs of the windows required recarving.¹⁹⁷ The high placement of the windows in the East Wall would have accelerated the destruction of the ceiling of the East Porch by providing two additional routes for the oxygen-seeking flames (see Chapter II).

The East Porch of the Erechtheion is very curious because its columns do not have any entasis. This has troubled students of ancient architecture for over a century.¹⁹⁸ Optical refinements were not reserved for the Doric Parthenon: the krepidoma of the East Porch has curvature (Figure 160), the walls have inclination, and all the other columns of the Erechtheion have entasis. For some reason, however, the columns of the East Porch do not.

In the Spring of 2003, Richard Anderson and I received permission from the Akropolis Ephoreia to use a reflectorless-EDM (r-EDM) to double-check the results achieved by earlier measuring techniques and confirmed that the East Porch columns do indeed lack entasis. Anderson is currently formulating a theory that would explain this lack of entasis, namely, that in the Hellenistic period columns were often reworked to hide damage due to fire or just wear and tear. In the process, as in the case of the Erechtheion, the entasis was removed and the columns appear much slenderer in proportion than originally designed.

This would make sense considering the pattern of burning in the Erechtheion that necessitated the repairs. The stone windows of the East Wall and the Porch ceiling suffered immensely and the flames must have affected the columns as well. The pattern

¹⁹⁷ Paton et al. 1927, p. 42.

¹⁹⁸ The other feature of the Erechtheion that has trouble students of architecture are the pilasters used on the interior of the West Façade. One need only look to the Temple of Athena Nike for precursors of both: this temple's columns not only lack entasis, but the architectural supports *in antis* are rectangular pillars.

of damage and repair holds for the other two colonnades as well. The North Porch columns do have entasis, but it is very slight. They would not have been as severely affected by the flames because of their greater distance from the fire in the main building. In turn, they have much less entasis than the columns of the newly-replaced West Façade, which received the normal amount of entasis.

Relatively simple analyses, comparing the columns' lower and upper diameters, fillet width, flute depth, and diameter of the base at the largest part of the lower torus, suggest the following scenario: The West Façade columns, which are a wholesale replacement, have 0.0132 m maximum entasis (distance from the straight taper) because they were new, and copies of the originals. The shape of the flutes of the North and East Porches is much less than the full semi-circle which is common in Classical buildings and reproduced in the West Façade. Also the flare of the apophyge is quite prominent in the North and East Porch columns, both compared to the West Façade and other Classical buildings, suggesting that some of the material was carved away. The columns of the North Porch were slightly damaged and so the flutes were recarved, and some of the original material which made up the entasis was removed in this process (now only 0.0059 m maximum entasis over twice the height of the West Façade columns).¹⁹⁹ The columns of the East Porch were much more severely damaged and required the greater removal of burned material, and so these columns lost their entasis completely. This is a working theory and an avenue of further research.

¹⁹⁹ The figures for the entasis are derived from Paton et al. 1927, pp. 67 and 81. Our r-EDM results compared very closely with Stevens' calculations.

NORTH AND SOUTH WALLS

EPISTYLE AND EPIKRANITIS

Although the epistyle blocks of the North and South Walls are no longer on the building, it is quite clear that they, like the epikranitis blocks of the course below, were cut back on their inner sides to remove the damaged part of the block. New interior slabs were fitted and attached with pi-clamps.²⁰⁰

SLIT WINDOWS IN THE NORTH AND SOUTH WALLS

There are three windows in each of the South and North Walls of the Erechtheion, five of which are ancient and are contained in blocks that have never been moved. The sixth has been reconstructed entirely in new material. All the openings are 0.37 m high and 0.08 m wide on the exterior, widening to 0.44 m except for the window in the North Porch (NN.12.06), which is only 0.31 m on the interior. All the windows are located in the same course (12), although those in the North Wall are 0.16 m higher than those in the South Wall. The standard elevation means that in the North Wall, the windows are far above eye level if one is standing in the paved area north of the Erechtheion. In the South Wall, the windows are irregularly placed, but are contained entirely within the external orthostate blocks: SS.12.04.x (Figure 203), SS.12.07.x (Figure 204), and SS.12.12.x (Figure 205). The orthostates on the South Wall are only half the thickness of the wall, and the interior blocks have all disappeared. Those on the interior were replaced during the most recent *anastylosis* with new blocks, which extrapolate the angle of the slit window (Figure 203). The bottoms of the windows would have coincided with the bottoms of the corresponding interior blocks in course 12. The windows in the North

²⁰⁰ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 52-53. For the importance of these repairs regarding the reconstruction of the temporary roof proposed by Burden, see “Changes to the Erechtheion during the Hellenistic Period.”

Wall are located equally irregularly in blocks NN.12.06 and NN.12.08. The bottoms of each window correspond to the bottoms of the blocks. The slit window in NN.12.14 is made of entirely new material and has been placed directly across from the window in SS.12.12. It is important to note that there is no primary evidence for this window.

Paton et al. considered these windows to be a feature of the Byzantine phase, which contributed significantly to the down-dating of the basilica church to the 8th from the 9th century.²⁰¹ One of the reasons Paton et al. did not consider the windows to be original to the building is that there were no parallels for such windows from the Classical period; nor were there parallels in early Christian basilicas. However, when Papanikolaou conducted his investigations into the Erechtheion in the 1970s and 1980s, he published an article arguing that that these windows (i.e., narrow rectangles on the exterior that widened at various angles toward the interior) indeed belonged to the initial construction of the temple.²⁰²

None of the slit windows in situ is directly across from another. The opening in NN.12.06 is unique in that its west “reveal” is perpendicular to the face of the block and coincides with the west end of the block itself. The perpendicular edge of this window indicates the presence of the West Cross-Wall.

Papanikolaou argued that the windows must be Classical because they were designed so that the clamps or dowels were not exposed by the openings. However, when the major repairs were being carried out on the temple, the builders, who would have been well acquainted with the 5th century placement of clamps and dowels, would

²⁰¹ See Chapter V for the Erechtheion as a basilica church.

²⁰² Papanikolaou 1978. *Contra*: these windows are not mentioned in the building accounts.

have had no problem avoiding revealing them. In any case, the dowels in the North Porch slit window (NN.12.06) are, in fact, exposed.²⁰³

Since there are no 5th century examples of slit windows, Papanikolaou's arguments are far from convincing. Instead, it is entirely possible, if not more likely, that these slit windows were added during the repairs of the Hellenistic period. Slit windows are a common feature of defensive towers starting in the 4th century.²⁰⁴ Unfortunately, very few ancient civic or religious buildings have survived to a height where the windows are preserved. The Stoa of Attalos is one such building, and there are slit windows of very similar design in the back of each room/shop on the ground floor (Figure 629).²⁰⁵

Other buildings are known to have had slit windows, but like the Stoa of Attalos, these are secular. In the building inscription for the Arsenal of Philo at Piraeos, Item 66 states that “there shall be joints left open for ventilation between the ashlar at the direction of the architect.”²⁰⁶ These are best restored as slit windows.²⁰⁷

In an article subsequent to the publication of *The Erechtheum*, Stevens remarked upon two windows in the North Akropolis Wall as part of his analysis for a reconstruction of the theatral area north of the Erechtheion (Figure 485).²⁰⁸ These windows are Classical, he argued, because the jambs are well dressed through the entire

²⁰³ Papanikolaou 1978, p. 194.

²⁰⁴ Lawrence 1979, p. 399. External widths of slit windows in Greek fortifications range between 0.05 m in the most exposed positions to 0.30 m, where it would be unlikely for an enemy missile to enter the defensive tower. “The back of the embrasure is always several times as wide, even though the wall be comparatively thin. Excellent examples can be found in Lokris, at Side and Perge, to name just a few.” Another excellent example can be found at Pyrgos Agias Triadas in the fortified farm house with tower on Amorgos dating to the second quarter of the 4th century B.C. There are larger windows with inclined sides (like the upper West Façade) in the second story: see above note 162. Well-preserved late 5th century fortifications, such as at Rhamnous, do not contain slit windows.

²⁰⁵ These windows have been closed up for security reasons. It has not been possible to examine them in person to see if they also have anathyrosis.

²⁰⁶ *IG II-III*² 1668.92-94; Lorenzen 1964, p. 6.

²⁰⁷ Lorenzen restores these as slit windows: Lorenzen 1964, p. 28; Jeppesen (1958) restores larger windows: figs. 58-59, 64-67.

²⁰⁸ Stevens 1946, p. 99.

thickness of the wall. Unlike those in the Erechtheion, these windows have parallel sides and do not widen from north to south. The slit windows in the North Wall of the Erechtheion are indeed also ancient, but not “original” or “Classical.”

This part of the north Akropolis wall (i.e., north of the Erechtheion) has drafted margins along the bottoms of the blocks of the upper three courses, the lowest of which contains the slit windows. The single drafted margin is a typical feature of (finished) Hellenistic ashlar masonry, and so the windows integral to these blocks can (probably) best be dated to the Hellenistic period as well, when slit windows were very common in fortifications walls.²⁰⁹

Therefore, what was the significance of these windows to the ancient temple? Papanikolaou’s article does not offer an explanation, nor any ancient parallels for such windows.²¹⁰ Early investigators of the Erechtheion such as James Fergusson drew up creative reconstructions which took these windows into account (Figure 544).²¹¹ No matter how radical one’s reconstruction may be for the cults and interior of the pagan Erechtheion, the windows’ placement and form must be considered. The problem is that

²⁰⁹ Djordjevitich (pers. comm.). I await the results of the examination of the Akropolis walls by J. Binder and Tanoulas. Unfortunately, Korres’ recent article on the North Akropolis wall does not examine this portion of it at all: Korres 2002b. I discussed this section of the wall with Korres in Oxford in April 2004 and he assured me that this portion was also Classical (and Themistoklean), but this seems to me to be impossible. If this were so, then these slit windows ante-date the first slit windows anywhere in the ancient world by a century. This matter remains open to further research, but it seems very unlikely that the Themistoklean portion of this carefully crafted wall (Korres 2002b) would have blocks with drafted margins.

²¹⁰ Papanikolaou wrote in his unpublished dissertation that the slits in the north Akropolis wall were related to those in the North Wall of the Erechtheion for cult purposes. He suggested they served as portals of communication during midnight rites inside the temple: participants would use torches to communicate the news of the successful completion of the rites to others standing in the theatral area north of the Erechtheion. These people would then, in turn, flash torches through the slits in the Akropolis wall so that the eagerly waiting populace in the lower town could see them: J. Binder (pers. comm.). Whether this scenario is true or not (as these slit windows certainly belong to the ancient building) their distribution around the building and their interior angles must also be considered in the context of the cult placement inside the temple.

²¹¹ Fergusson 1876; Fergusson 1880, p. 19, pl. 4.

there are no parallels at all for slit windows in other ancient temples, and so their function must remain, at the moment, unsolved. Perhaps they were added in order to increase the ventilation for the indoor altars, and/or to augment the light entering the temple because the repairers were partially blocking up the West Façade. And perhaps coincidentally, drafts were created that allowed the south wind to blow over the “Well of Poseidon” and create the sound of the sea that Pausanias remarks upon.²¹² Such acoustic machinations are not unusual, especially in Hellenistic temples such as at Klaros and Didyma.²¹³

WEST CROSS-WALL

The West Cross-Wall appears to have been completely replaced during the major repair. The marble sills in situ along the top of the foundation of the West Cross-Wall belong to the major repair because the blocks are linked to each other and the side walls by pi-clamps (Figure 494). The ancient dowels and pry holes can be discerned along the upper surface of all of the marble sills. The other cuttings are either Byzantine or Frankish, and will be discussed in Chapters V and VI, respectively. The spacing of the pry holes indicates that a course of ashlar stretchers rested on top of the marble sills. The course was laid from north to south starting with a full block against the North Wall. This was the first course of the wall which was keyed into the North Wall in courses 15 and 17. The West Cross-Wall was pierced by a door approximately on the axis of the (off-central-axis) West Door (Figure 495 and Figure 496). This is the location of the access to the main chamber of the Erechtheion. The wall continued south of the door,

²¹² This sound may have been a remarkable side effect of the slit windows. See Chapter II on the location of the “salt sea” of Poseidon within the temenos that fitted into the notches of the East Foundations (Figure 542).

²¹³ On Klaros, see Várhelyi 2001. On Didyma, see Fontenrose 1988. The mechanical contrivances for producing “miracles” are common in ancient temples. The Christian apologists are a good source for the exposure of these practices: see MacMullen 1997. On *deus ex machina* in ancient Greek plays, see Spira 1960.

and was laid from south to north starting with a half block against the South Wall. The wall was also keyed into the South Wall in courses 15 and 17.

Above this otherwise solid wall, there was probably a row of columns or pilasters (like the interior of the West Façade) which supported the roof beam.²¹⁴ Papanikolaou believed some of the Classical West Façade columns were reused in this context.²¹⁵ The north anta of this colonnade was keyed into the North Wall in courses 4 and 7. Remnants of the anta blocks are extant, having been broken off. The south anta was keyed into the South Wall in courses 7, 8 and possibly higher. We can only assume that the repaired roof for the main building generally followed the same system as the 5th century roof.²¹⁶

MAIDEN PORCH

Hans Lauter has made an important contribution to our understanding of the major repair phase of the Maiden Porch.²¹⁷ He showed that Maiden #6 (his Maiden F), which now only exists in fragments, is a replacement. The style and carving technique of the drapery, the hair and the method of attachment of the maiden (dowels in the capital) are different from the rest. The hair falling down her back is distinctly curlier, the drapery and egg-and-dart more deeply drilled.²¹⁸

A quick survey of the backs of the other five maidens shows a wide variation in treatment of the drapery. Compare the depth of the maidens' drapery at the front and back.²¹⁹ It is clear that the drapery on the back of Maidens #1, #2, #4 and #5 is flatter –

²¹⁴ This is in contrast to the cambered (“bent”) beam roofing system proposed by Paton et al. On the arrangement of the Classical roofing system, see Chapter II.

²¹⁵ Burden 1999, p. 54.

²¹⁶ Burden 1999, pp. 56-57.

²¹⁷ Lauter 1976, pp. 30-31.

²¹⁸ Lauter assumes the replaced maiden is Augustan because he was influenced by Paton et al.'s scholarship, not for independent reasons.

²¹⁹ Use the plates from Lauter 1976 for reference.

the drapery of #4 being the flattest. Maria Brouskari argues that the back of Maiden #4 was recarved by Italian sculptor Andreoli during the restoration of the Maiden Porch during the 1840s in order to match the back of the other three remaining maidens (#1, #2 and #5).²²⁰ Maiden #3, removed by Lusieri for Elgin in 1803, shows the continuity of fine drapery from the front around the back. Maiden #3 was taken in 1803 because she was the best preserved.

The question is, then, when were the backs of Maidens #1, #2 and #5 recarved? Was it after one of the fires?²²¹ If we extrapolate Burden's reconstruction of the fire which necessitated the major repair (Figure 590), and allow flames to come through the South Door to the Maiden Porch (as they must have done because the fire damage to the South Door was also chiseled away),²²² then we can imagine the flames shooting east- and westward along the shortest path to the atmosphere. The staircase in the Maiden Porch may have funneled the flames toward Maiden #6 in particular and damaged her beyond repair. The backs of Maidens #1, #2, and #5 were also significantly damaged while Maidens #3 and #4 escaped relatively unharmed. Maiden #6 was replaced in its entirety, on the model of its Classical rear drapery, and Maidens #1, #2 and #5 had their fire-damage removed which resulted in the shallow carving of the drapery on the rear. The major repair removed as little material as possible from the architectonic maidens.²²³

Therefore, when Lusieri selected the best preserved maiden for Elgin in 1803, his choice was between Maiden #3 and #4, whose backs still showed the fullness of High Classical drapery. He chose Maiden #3. Then, when Andreoli began the task of

²²⁰ Brouskari 1984, pp. 55-57. See Chapter VIII.

²²¹ Brouskari believes this is Xenophon's fire of 406. See: "History of Fires in the Erechtheion."

²²² See below in this section.

²²³ I have consulted an expert on Hellenistic sculpture, D. King, who assures me that the style of the recarved backs is not an impediment to a Hellenistic date (pers. comm.).

resurrecting the sculptural aspects of the remaining maidens (beginning immediately after the War of Independence and then under the auspices of the French team led by Paccard in the 1840s),²²⁴ he not only carved the missing parts of Maiden #6, he also re-carved the back of Maiden #4 to approximate the treatment of the back of the other three extant maidens on the building. Andreoli's treatment of the drapery is extremely shallow, and the re-carving encompasses the entirety of her back. It is clear that this is a recent intervention because its folds and ridges are almost undamaged, where as those of the other three maidens are in poor condition, and broken off at the edges, thus indicating that they were re-carved at a much earlier time.

The left arm of Maiden #5 was replaced in Antiquity: the cutting for the replacement arm is visible at her shoulder. Brouskari found this braceleted arm in the Akropolis storerooms. She also found a right arm which she associates with this maiden as well.²²⁵ Brouskari believes these repairs belong to the "Roman" (i.e., major) repair phase.²²⁶

Changes to the South Door (leading into the back of the Maiden Porch) probably occurred during the major repair. The jambs-cum-pilasters were cut back and the capitals (which used to extend through the opening and around the north side of the South Wall) on the inside of the temple were removed and replaced with new ones inserted into sockets just below the huge lintel. Each new pilasters was 0.25 m wide, that is, about 0.07 m narrower than the width of the Classical Greek pilaster. This evidence is preserved at the bottom of the orthostate directly east of the doorway (Figure 213). These

²²⁴ See Chapters VII and VIII.

²²⁵ Brouskari 1984, pp. 59-61.

²²⁶ Brouskari 1984, p. 60.

changes were attributed by Paton et al. to the major repair because of the similarity of the chiseling to other repairs within the building.²²⁷

The cuttings in the threshold probably accompany the cutting of the new jambs. These L-shaped cuttings are composed of three small squares, the corner squares being deeper, and are located just north of the axis of the South Wall (Figure 230). These are not pivot holes for doors. Instead, the door-leaves probably hung from hinges attached to the jambs.²²⁸ The shape of the cuttings for the jambs suggests that this new door would have opened toward the interior of the temple. There are two small rectangular cuttings north (inside) the line of the door (bolt cups), probably to receive vertical bolts, suggesting that this door could be locked from inside the temple. Lastly, there is a square cutting midway between the jambs on the south side of the door. Whether all of these cuttings were used simultaneously cannot be known, but it is clear the the door had some form of security mechanism.

THE RECEPTION OF THE ERECHTHEION IN THE LATE CLASSICAL AND HELLENISTIC PERIOD

APOLLO PATROOS

Lykourgos is associated with the building of the Temple of Apollo Patroos in the Athenian Agora.²²⁹ Although this temple is often restored with four columns *in antis*, John Camp, however, asserts it more likely had “six columns in a prostyle arrangement.”²³⁰ According to Agora architect Richard Anderson, this temple ought to

²²⁷ Paton et al. 1927 p. 119.

²²⁸ I was not able to examine the underside of the lintel and look for cuttings because there is a modern wooden door in place at present.

²²⁹ See above “Lykourgos (338-322 B.C.)”.

²³⁰ Camp 2001, p. 156. The temple is usually restored as tetrastyle *in antis*, for example in Camp 1990, p. 76.

be restored with the proportions and column type of the East Façade of the Erechtheion.²³¹ The evidence for the column type is A 4643 which was found north of Odos Adrianou (Figure 632).²³² While T. L. Shear associates this column with the Augustan phase of the temple of Aphrodite Ouranos,²³³ it clearly does not date from the Augustan period because of the treatment of the anthemion pattern. The closest parallels for this anthemion pattern come from examples of late 4th century to early 3rd century buildings from Asia Minor to the Levant. Ralf Stucky has found fragments of almost identical columns in the Eshmun sanctuary at a Greek outpost in Phoenicia, which flourished in the early to mid 4th century at Sidon.²³⁴ His analysis suggests that they are made of Pentelic marble, implying some trade in finished architectural members in the late Classical period. Anthemion moldings from the Belevi tomb (290-270 B.C.),²³⁵ the Temple of Athena Polias at Priene (350-323 B.C.),²³⁶ and the naiskos at Didyma (300 B.C.)²³⁷ are also very good parallels. There are also two Ionic capitals with anthemion necking bands from Delphic pillar monuments (Figure 643 and Figure 644).²³⁸ These examples also belong to the later 4th and 3rd centuries.

It makes sense that the Temple of Apollo Patroos, whose front elevation is only marginally smaller than the East Façade of the Erechtheion, would sport Erechtheion-inspired columns considering the sponsor: Lykourgos.²³⁹ Lykourgos was, of course, the priest of Erechtheus-Poseidon and of the family of the Eteoboutadai. It was natural for

²³¹ Anderson, *The BE-BZ Roman Temple in the Athenian Agora: An Alternative Restoration Incorporating an Additional Step*.

²³² T.L. Shear Jr. 1997.

²³³ See Chapter IV.

²³⁴ Stucky 1988, pp. 28-29, fig. 3.

²³⁵ Rumscheid 1994, pls. 15-16.

²³⁶ Rumscheid 1994, pl. 158.

²³⁷ Rumscheid 1994, pls. 29-33.

²³⁸ See below “Other Reception of the Erechtheion.”

²³⁹ Lykourgos, at least, held “the purse strings” for this and other religious projects: Mikalson 1998, p. 29.

him to choose to associate a temple, in whose design he was involved, with the Erechtheion.²⁴⁰ The cult was closely related to the organization of the phratries, as Apollo the Father was their patron. The phratries were an important mechanism of fostering the tightly woven fabric of Athenian citizenry, whom Athena Polias protected. If is fitting, therefore, that Lykourgos, as the leading statesman, one of the Eteoboutadaí and regenerator of his time, would have concerned himself with this important aspect of civic religion. Perhaps the quotation of the architecture of the Erechtheion was meant to evoke the ancestral (Patroos) aspect of Erechtheus, as the resident of the east half (and hexastyle) of the Ionic Temple.

Djordjevitch asserts that the impact of the East Façade of the Erechtheion on subsequent building was profound.²⁴¹ The East Façade served as a new canon for the proportions of Ionic hexastyle-prostyle temples as soon as it was erected (and through the Hellenistic period), whether or not they used columns with anthemion necking bands, or were even Ionic. Examples include the second Temple of Athena Pronoia at Delphi (Doric) and the (Ionic) Propylon at Samothrace.²⁴² The early 3rd century B.C. Propylon at Epidauros has similar proportions as well.²⁴³

HEROÏN OF PERIKLES AT LIMYRA

Outside Athens, the Erechtheion also had an almost immediate impact on at least one ruler in the Aegean. This can be clearly seen in the Heroön of Perikles at Limyra, in modern day western Turkey. In the early 4th century (370-350 B.C.) Perikles (from Lykia

²⁴⁰ There is a small room opening off the north side of the cella which resembles the placement of the North Porch.

²⁴¹ Djordjevitch (pers. comm.).

²⁴² On the Temple of Athena: *Delphes* II, xiii. The propylon at Samothrace dedicated by Ptolemy II Philadelphus had a hexastyle Ionic portico on the East (outside the sanctuary) and Corinthian on the west (inside the sanctuary). See Frazer 1990.

²⁴³ Roux 1961.

not Athens) built a tomb which quotes the Erechtheion. It is the earliest, and only, example of a quotation of the Maiden Porch from the Classical period.²⁴⁴ The tomb has eight female architectural supports which are carved in a very “provincial” style and are in a tetrastyle-amphiprostyle arrangement (Figure 669). Above them is an architrave with two fasciae, the upper one having discs inscribed with a smaller circle in the middle. Above the fasciae is a dentillated cornice and a pediment with akroteria depicting Perseus and Medusa, and Stheno (or Euyale).²⁴⁵ Along the sides of the tomb chamber are processional friezes.

Like the Erechtheion maidens, the Limyra maidens are stocky, have two tresses of hair over their shoulders, wear bracelets and carry phialai in one hand while clutching their drapery in the other.²⁴⁶ Jürgen Borchhardt has reconstructed all four maidens on the north side of the tomb as holding phialai in their right hands, and all four on the south side in their left hands, rather than the symmetrical composition of the Maiden Porch of the Erechtheion.²⁴⁷

The main differences between the Erechtheion and Limyra maidens are in the arrangement of the drapery. The Limyran maidens have a visible belt and an undecorated head-piece, not to mention a lack of elegance in their execution. Whereas the Erechtheion maidens have bare arms, the Limyra maidens’ garments cover theirs substantially. This is true of the akroterial figure as well. Perhaps this has something to do with the higher sensibility toward nudity in Lykia in the 4th century B.C.

²⁴⁴ See Borchhardt 1976; Schmidt-Colinet 1977 Catalog W 6, pp. 20, 69, 89, 109-10, 132, 218; and King 1998, p. 278, note 10.

²⁴⁵ Borchhardt 1976, pp. 85-87; Borchhardt 1990; Borchhardt 1993.

²⁴⁶ This evidence corroborates the reconstruction of the Erechtheion maidens with phialai, first realized with the 1952 discovery of the Tivoli maidens. The Limyra examples are several centuries earlier and so provide better evidence.

²⁴⁷ Borschhardt 1999, pl. 16.

While the Limyran maidens' style may disassociate them from the Erechtheion at first glance, the architrave with discs on the upper fascia is similar to the Maiden Porch.²⁴⁸ This evidence points to the deliberate quotation of the Erechtheion. The pediments above the maidens and the tetrastyle-amphiprostyle arrangement of the maidens themselves may allude to two temples in Athens: the Athena Nike and the Ilissos temples. Perikles of Limyra designed his heroön to be an amalgamation of some of the most appealing Ionic monuments in Athens, and so he was doing what the Attalids would later do at Pergamon when they tried to recreate parts of Athens. The Heroön demonstrates that the Erechtheion had already acquired a certain status as a symbol of Greek cultural achievement by the early 4th century, even on the international stage. Furthermore, the tomb of Perikles at Limyra is the best support for the funerary association of the Erechtheion's Maiden Porch proposed by Kontoleon (see Chapter II).²⁴⁹ The question remains, however, whether Perikles of Limyra simply adopted the iconography and structure of the Erechtheion and perhaps the Nike Temple because it appealed to him (and shared an affinity for the Akropolis monuments with his statesman namesake), or because he was trying to emulate the function and significance of the Maiden Porch as a tomb and heroön.

MAUSOLEUM AT DOUGGA

Besides the Heroön of Perikles at Limyra, which was based overtly on Athenian models, other temple tombs were inspired by the construction of the Mausoleum at Halikarnassos. Such tombs can be found all over from Asia Minor to North Africa, from

²⁴⁸ Many scholars might place them instead simply in the tradition of female architectural supports which include the Siphnian and ex-Knidian maidens from Delphi.

²⁴⁹ Kontoleon 1949.

the late Classical to Roman times.²⁵⁰ One such example is at Dougga in Tunisia, which dates to the Hellenistic period. Its square bottom story of pseudo-isodomic masonry rests on a five-step krepidoma. The corners are embellished with engaged Aeolic pilasters. Three more steps lead up to the second story, which has four engaged Ionic columns with necking bands. Between the columns, the wall is pseudo-isodomic. Above the columns are an architrave and frieze which transition to an upper, narrower story. Each side is decorated with a quadriga. This is topped off by a four-sided pyramid with akroteria.

The second story is highly reminiscent of the repaired West Façade of the Erechtheion, with its fully enclosed intercolumnar walls of pseudo-isodomic masonry and Ionic capitals with necking bands. This monument is an excellent example of the Egypto-Greek syncretism as translated by the Carthaginian elite.²⁵¹ The bilingual Libyan-Punic inscription records that the tomb was built for a prince named Ateban by a Carthaginian who led a team of Numidian workmen. This tomb has been dated to the late 3rd or early 2nd century by Serge Lancel, and tentatively to the 2nd century by Mark Wilson Jones.²⁵²

OTHER RECEPTION OF THE ERECHTHEION

Aside from the overt quotation of the Erechtheion maidens in a very limited number of late Classical monuments and other almost unique design features discussed in the previous sections, the impact the Erechtheion had on other monuments can be difficult to gauge. For example, how much influence did the Erechtheion have on the use of anthemion patterns, especially in the Ionic buildings of Asia Minor, and how much

²⁵⁰ Cormack 1992.

²⁵¹ Lancel 1995, p. 308.

²⁵² Wilson Jones 2000, pp. 70-71.

desire was there to emulate a temple on the Akropolis at Athens? It is important not to underestimate the appeal of the Erechtheion, especially in places like Pergamon which forged such close ties with Athens. This section describes monuments which were inspired in some way by the Erechtheion, either by its proportions or decoration, during the late Classical and Hellenistic periods. Special attention is paid to the conscious emulation of Athens by the Attalid kings of Pergamon.

Athens may have become a political backwater by the late 3rd century when the Attalids started to take an interest in her welfare, but the city remained famous for its philosophical schools, and the Athenians were quite happy to trade on the city's historical prestige in exchange for benefactions. It is in the 2nd century that the Attalid kings of Pergamon began to honor all things Athenian in their attempt to become the new Athens of Asia. These Pergamene kings, starting in the 3rd century with Philetairos, emulated Athens in many ways. The result was an amalgam of elements from the Athenian Akropolis. A copy of Pheidias' Bronze Athena may have been placed on the circular base in the middle of the precinct and Athena was honored with a festival modeled on the Greater Panathenaia.²⁵³ The Attalids also created a library which attempted to rival that at Alexandria. In it stood a simplified marble version of the Athena Parthenos. The library was part of a stoa complex which defined the sanctuary of Athena Nikephoros; these stoas contained anthemion moldings similar to those on the Erechtheion.

Last but not least is the Great Altar at Pergamon, which featured Athena and Zeus prominently among other deities fighting the Giants. Various elements of this sculptural masterpiece were clearly inspired by the sculptures from the Parthenon, from both the

²⁵³ Hurwit 1999, p. 265. Radt 1984, p. 47, suggested that a Prima Porta-type statue of Augustus stood on the circular base. Schober reconstructs the Large Gauls on it: Smith 1991, p. 113.

pediments and the metopes. These images (themes and positions), in turn, may have been lifted originally from the Panathenaic peplos which probably hung in the Erechtheion.²⁵⁴ Certain architectural elements of the Great Altar derive from the Erechtheion, namely the otherwise unique anthemion pattern from the North Porch with the additional interfloral ornament.

The Temple of Athena Polias at Priene (by Pythios, the architect of the Mausoleum, dated 350-323 B.C.) also has an anthemion molding, in this case with alternating inward and outward curving palmettes that look very similar to those on the Erechtheion. The dedication of the temple and the choice of ornament are probably not accidental. Priene, an independent Classical city-state, consciously emulated the success of Athens in the time of Demosthenes, Aeschines and Isokrates, even though Athens was in the growing shadow of Philip of Macedon. In fact, Joseph Carter goes so far as to suggest that “a case has been made... for Athenian participation in the refounding [of Priene]. The Athenian influence has been seen in many aspects of the life of the new city, and it has been thought that this may reflect the renewed interest of Athens in the Ionian cities around the middle of the 4th century B.C.”²⁵⁵ Priene sent a delegation to the Panathenaia and, on occasion, gave Athenians Prienian citizenship.²⁵⁶

In some instances, the influence of the Erechtheion is less explicit. While the Lykian Perikles may quote the obvious elements of the Erechtheion, (i.e., the maidens), in order to demonstrate his cultural affinity with Athens, the Belevi Mausoleum includes a very close approximation of the North Door.²⁵⁷ The spiky leaf-and-dart molding

²⁵⁴ See Chapter II. On the peplos as the source of imagery for Athenian art, see Carpenter 1994.

²⁵⁵ Carter 1983, p. 28.

²⁵⁶ Carter 1983, p. 28.

²⁵⁷ Rumscheid 1994, pp. 70-76, pls. 14-15. Rumscheid dates the Belevi temple tomb to 290-270 B.C.

between the bead-and-reel below (and inside) the rosettes of the Erechtheion's North Door is highly unusual (Figure 355). This molding can be found in the anta capitals of the Ptolemaion on Samothrace (285-246 B.C.), sandwiched between egg-and-dart and rosettes, as on the Erechtheion.²⁵⁸ Alfred Frazer calls this molding an ovolo, a term that usually refers to the egg-and-dart molding. The location of the rosettes is similar to those on the Nereid Monument at Xanthos. Although Frazer makes no connection with the Erechtheion, he goes into great detail on the influence of the Samothracian anthemion.²⁵⁹

The influence of the Erechtheion in the centuries immediately after its construction is also recognizable in the general vocabulary of Greek architecture. Following is a summary of the subtler features of this phenomenon, according to Dinsmoor (1950):

1. The unusual combination of the cyma recta profile of Erechtheion on the sima influenced Ionic temples in Asia Minor.²⁶⁰
2. The entablature of the Lysikrates monument (335 B.C.) "repeats the moldings (including the dentils) of the Caryatid portico of the Erechtheum, but has in addition a sculptured frieze."²⁶¹
3. The Nereid Monument at Xanthos: "Though the columns have Asiatic Ionic bases (without plinths), the capitals with their intermediate fillets in the volutes are obviously inspired by the Erechtheum (though

²⁵⁸ Rumscheid 1994, pl. 202.6; Frazer 1990, pp. 84-86.

²⁵⁹ Frazer 1990.

²⁶⁰ Dinsmoor 1950, p. 221.

²⁶¹ Dinsmoor 1950, p. 238.

omitting the anthemion necking on account of the small scale), so they must be contemporary or slightly later [410-400 B.C.].”²⁶²

4. The Mausoleum at Halicarnassos has similar architrave crowns and anta capitals as the Temple of Athena Nike and the Erechtheion (ca. 353-345 B.C.).²⁶³ This is not surprising considering the similarities between the Temple of Athena Polias at Priene described above, which was also designed by Pythios.
5. Temple of Aphrodite at Messa on Lesbos (ca. 280 B.C.): “The use of red stone for the frieze, contrasting with the white of the rest of the structure, may even be a conscious attempt to imitate the Erechtheum at Athens.”²⁶⁴
6. Temple of Artemis Leukophryene at Magnesia on the Meander (175-125 B.C.): “For ease of construction, exactly as in the north porch of the Erechtheum, the base joint was placed below the upper torus (which varied with the column diameter) so that the lower parts of the bases and the plinths could be identical throughout.”²⁶⁵
7. Temple of Hekate at Lagina, a later Hellenistic Corinthian temple, by Hermogenes (2nd half of the 2nd century B.C.): “Both the outer and the inner columns have the upper torus of the base worked on the bottom drum of the shaft, as at Magnesia (and in the North Porch of the

²⁶² Dinsmoor 1950, pp. 256-257. The Nereid monument is now dated to around 370 B.C.

²⁶³ Dinsmoor 1950, p. 260.

²⁶⁴ Dinsmoor 1950, p. 272. The date assigned to this temple varies from the 4th through 2nd centuries B.C. Dinsmoor’s date is given here.

²⁶⁵ Dinsmoor 1950, pp. 274-275.

Erechtheum), and probably for the same reason, enlargement of the angle column diameter.”²⁶⁶

8. Bouleuterion of Miletus (175-164 B.C.): “The external treatment recalls the west wall of the Erechtheum, translated into Doric terms: a basement of pseudo-isodomic masonry, rising to the level of the topmost seat, carries a colonnade of twelve semi-detached Doric columns on the fronts, eight on the flanks, besides pilasters at the corners, all with corresponding pilasters on the inner face and in some cases with windows between.”²⁶⁷
9. Bicolunar monuments in the tradition of Ptolemy II and Arsinoë at Olympia (284-246 B.C.):²⁶⁸ There are ten bicolunar monuments at Delphi where each pair of Ionic columns shares a single podium and are connected at the top by an entablature in the form “of a conventional representation of an architectural order... The capitals in one case imitated the elaborate Erechtheum examples,”²⁶⁹ There are actually at least two examples from different monuments with anthemion necking bands (ca. 4th century, Figure 643 and Figure 644). One of these even has the bronze pins in the volutes and holes for attachments over the eyes like those of the North Porch of the Erechtheion.

²⁶⁶ Dinsmoor 1950, p. 282.

²⁶⁷ Dinsmoor 1950, p. 297.

²⁶⁸ On the significance of the columnar monuments at Olympia, see Rose 1997, pp. 6-7 with notes.

²⁶⁹ Dinsmoor 1950, pp. 326-327.

CONCLUSION

The fire that gutted the Erechtheion's interior and damaged the external porches probably dates to the first half of the 3rd century, during the tumultuous times brought on by civil and international strife. The major repair to the Erechtheion after this fire probably took place in the first half of the 2nd century, perhaps with some financial support from the Pergamene and/or Ptolemaic kings. Recent research on various aspects of the architecture and sculpture of the Erechtheion has enabled a reassessment, which has resulted in the addition of several important considerations with respect to the repairs, especially concerning the West Façade, Maiden Porch, and the slit windows in the North and South Walls.²⁷⁰

Although the Erechtheion would have a profound influence on the architecture of the Romans, there are only a few examples in the late Classical and Hellenistic periods where the Erechtheion was deliberately imitated, namely in the Tombs of Perikles at Limyra, and of a Prince Ateban at Dougga, as well as perhaps in the Temple of Apollo Patroos in Athens. Other, subtler, features of the Erechtheion that scholars have remarked upon in later buildings can often be attributed to the development of the Ionic order; however, one revealing example (among others at Pergamon) is the imitation of the unique anthemion pattern of the replacement lintel of the North Door of the Erechtheion in the Great Altar at Pergamon.

²⁷⁰ The redating of the repair of the Erechtheion to the Hellenistic period also has an impact on many post-Classical monuments in Athens, for example, the date of the replacement base for the Bronze Athena statue. Stevens' (and Burden's subsequent) attribution of the colossal egg-and-dart molding to the Roman period is based exclusively on its similarity to the repairs in the Erechtheion: Burden 1999, pp. 69-75; Raubitschek and Stevens 1946, pp. 107-114. This shows how many monuments on the Akropolis and in the city below require a fresh examination in the light of the redating of the repair of the Erechtheion. To do so is beyond the scope of this project.

CHAPTER IV- THE ROMAN PERIOD (31 B.C. –A.D. 330)

INTRODUCTION

Ever since *The Erechtheum* was published in 1927, an Augustan date for the major repair of the Erechtheion has been taken as fact.¹ Both major and minor treatments of the Erechtheion, and buildings related to it such as the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus, use this “fact” as a touchstone for their arguments.² As argued in Chapter III, the major repair to the Erechtheion should be dated to the Hellenistic period instead. With this new date in mind, the role of the Erechtheion during the Augustan period, in both Athenian life and as a quotable feature in Roman monuments, requires a fresh investigation.

For the purposes of this study, the Roman period begins with Antony’s defeat by Octavian at Actium in northwest Greece in 31 B.C. and ends in A.D. 267 with the Herulian invasion of Athens.³ This chapter begins with an historical overview of events which affected the Erechtheion and its cults during the Roman period. The evidence for what happened to the Erechtheion during the Roman period is presented within this historical discussion. Only one construction phase can be detected. The historical overview allows this largely cosmetic refurbishment to be placed in the late 2nd century A.D., and interpreted as preparation for the installation of Julia Domna’s cult next to that of Athena Polias in the Erechtheion.

¹ Paton et al. 1927.

² Schmalz 1994; Hoff and Rotroff 1997; Burden 1999.

³ At first glance, perhaps Justinian’s closure of the philosophical schools in A.D. 529 is the most obvious date for the change in cultural horizons between the Roman and the Byzantine periods; however, the decline of paganism and the effect this had on the Erechtheion is better discussed in the context of the rise of Christianity. This transition will be discussed in Chapter V – the Late Antique and Byzantine periods. This chapter’s time frame also allows the discussion of the reception of the Erechtheion to remain focused on the Roman, pagan, interpretation.

Although the Erechtheion did not experience radical alterations (i.e., the major repair) during the early Roman Imperial period as previously implied in the scholarship, its influence nonetheless resonated deeply across the Empire. Monuments from Rome to Spain quoted the Erechtheion by incorporating the temple's most quotable feature: the maidens from the South Porch. Through an examination of the context of the Erechtheion maidens in Roman monuments, this chapter approaches the famous opening passages of Vitruvius' *De Architectura* (1.1.5) concerning the origin of the term "caryatid" from a new perspective.

This discussion of Vitruvius 1.1.5 seeks to go beyond the usual debate on the reliability of his etiology for "caryatid" by first acknowledging the recent work which has defined what Vitruvius probably meant by the term. Following that is an analysis of the contexts, both architectural and literary, where human architectural supports appeared from the early Principate onward. This diachronic examination of the reception of the Erechtheion maidens in Roman monuments leads to the conclusion that they were considered caryatids in the Vitruvian, i.e., humiliated, sense from the late 1st century B.C., rather than since the 18th century A.D.

Next is a discussion of Pausanias' visit to the Akropolis. Pausanias' tour of the Akropolis and, more specifically, his description of the Erechtheion and the Temple of Athena Polias, are notoriously problematic. Nonetheless, every topographical argument must take his description into account. Pausanias' contribution to the reconstruction of the Classical Erechtheion is discussed in full in Chapter II. In this chapter, several questions are addressed that lend new insights into Pausanias' experience on the Akropolis, as well as into some problematic issues regarding the monuments he omits.

For example, why does Pausanias fail to mention the Maiden Porch or the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus? What other buildings were still standing on the Akropolis plateau? Was Pausanias' view impeded by some of them? Where was Pausanias' attention directed at different stages of his tour? The answers to these questions lead to an explanation for Pausanias' omission of the Maiden Porch.

The earlier conclusions that the major repair of the temple dates to the Hellenistic period shed doubt on the assumption that there were Augustan architects or sculptors crawling over the Erechtheion during the temple's repair.⁴ The notion that casts were made of the Erechtheion maidens for monuments in Rome is therefore challenged. The Erechtheion's elaborate Ionic order was employed in monuments in both Rome and in Athens. The Monopteros of Rome and Augustus on the Akropolis is the most prominent example. The circumstances of its erection, choice of quotation of the Erechtheion, and its role as an Athenian monument are considered in the light of the reception of the Erechtheion in the Roman period.

HISTORICAL CONTEXT AND CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE ROMAN PERIOD

During the second half of the 1st century B.C., future leaders of Rome and her petty kingdoms came to Athens to learn rhetoric and philosophy from the leading minds of the day. Athens was mostly a cross-roads on the political stage. Sulla's army had traversed Greece and visited Athens on its way to and from fighting in the East, with dire consequences for the city.⁵ Starting with the poor decisions made under Aristion examined in the previous chapter, Athens invariably chose the wrong side in the conflicts

⁴ This is contrary to explicit statements by scholars such as Schmalz 1994, pp. 7-19; and Hurwit 1999, p. 266.

⁵ See Chapter III: "Mithridates and Sulla."

between Rome's biggest personalities. Astoundingly, the Athenians managed not to alienate the winners in each of these conflicts which played out on the city's doorstep. The health of the cult of Athena, housed as it was in the Erechtheion, rose and fell with the city's fortunes under Roman domination.

Athens thanked Pompey for his contribution of fifty talents for rebuilding the city by supporting him in his fight against Caesar. Then Caesar defeated Pompey at Pharsalos in 48 B.C. and gave Athens fifty talents to build a new Agora east of the "old" one. Despite this generous donation, Athens celebrated Caesar's murderers, Brutus and Cassius, as Tyrannicides. The demos commissioned portrait statues and placed them next to the Archaic and early Classical versions of Harmodius and Aristogeiton (statues of Demetrios and Antigonos, the previous Tyrannicides, had long since been removed). Antony and Octavian avenged Caesar's murder by defeating Brutus and Cassius at Philippi in 44 B.C. The portrait statues were promptly taken down. When Antony and Octavian fell out with each other, Athens again found itself on the losing side.

After taking over the eastern half of Rome's territory, Antony made Athens his headquarters for a short time in the 30s B.C. The Athenians hailed Antony as the new Dionysos and supported him in his efforts against Octavian, which ended in disaster for Antony and Cleopatra at Actium in 31 B.C.⁶ This would be Athens' last infelicitous major political decision until the 2nd century A.D.

Long before this pivotal sea battle, the last Pergamene king, Attalos III, had left his kingdom to Rome in his will when he died in 133 B.C. Therefore, when the Athenians wished to honor their new masters, they had little compunction about rededicating their

⁶ The new Dionysos: *IG II/III*² 1043 lines 22-23 dated to 39/8 B.C. and Plutarch, *Ant.* 60.4.

pillar monuments on the Akropolis.⁷ When the Athenians flirted with the Dionysian Antony, they changed the inscription on the pillar monument west of the Propylaea. Antony and his popular wife, Octavia (sister to Octavian), were honored as gods in the Agora according to an inscribed statue base.⁸ Taking a cue from Demetrios Poliorketes before him, Antony as Dionysos “married” Athena Polias who was identified with Octavia.⁹ Athena/Octavia’s city provided her with a thousand talent dowry, and games were celebrated in Antony’s honor.¹⁰ And when Antony left Athens to fight the Parthians in 36 B.C., he took a garland of Athena’s olive tree and water from the Klepsydra spring with him as tokens of good luck and superiority of the West over the East.¹¹ Despite these tokens, Antony was unsuccessful against the Parthians.

Antony’s marriage to Octavia-Athena was short-lived. Antony put her aside for an eastern queen, the infamous and former lover of Caesar, Cleopatra VII.¹² Plutarch reports that during the night before the Battle of Actium, the statue of Dionysos (assimilated to Antony) in the Gigantomachy (of the Smaller Attalid monument) and several other statues of Attalid kings that had been re-inscribed to Antony (e.g., next to the Propylaea), were thrown down into the Theatre of Dionysos by a storm.¹³

⁷ Because the independent Pergamene kingdom had ceased to exist, and although the city of Pergamon continued to flourish under Roman dominion, the rededication of the pillar monuments in Athens was a sensible and altogether non-offensive way of recycling monuments which had finished serving their purpose. This was not a *damnatio memoriae* because the Attalid line had died out, and their major civic monuments such as the stoas continued to bear their names.

⁸ *Agora I* 3071: Raubitschek 1946, p. 149, pl. 1.

⁹ See Mansfield 1985, pp. 226-227; Seneca, *Suasoriae* 1.67-7; Cassius Dio 48.39.2.

¹⁰ Schmalz 1994, pp. 7-8.

¹¹ Plutarch, *Ant.* 34.

¹² Seneca, *Suasoriae* 1.6 refers to graffiti on one of the Athenian statues dedicated to Antony which urges Athena to divorce Antony.

¹³ Plutarch, *Ant.* 60.2-3. Topographical problems are raised when Dio 50.15.2 is compared. For a rationalization of the evidence, see Habicht 1990, p. 572; and Hölscher 1985, pp. 126-127.

Caesar had warned Athens that it would not be able to rest on its laurels forever.¹⁴ The city could not depend on its former glory to protect it when it made repeated political mistakes. After defeating Antony, Octavian did not favor Athens at first. The city had sided against his adoptive father, Caesar, and with his nemesis, Antony. Octavian and Agrippa visited Athens with their armies on several occasions, first in 31 B.C. after the Battle of Actium, then in 22/21 B.C. and 20/19 B.C.; and Agrippa came on his own in 15 B.C. Before their initial visit after Actium, Cassius Dio (54.7.1-4) tells the story that the statue of Athena turned around to face west (in other words, toward Rome) and spat blood. Most scholars believe this is the olive wood statue of Athena Polias, housed in the Erechtheion. This has political overtones as well as incidental topographical implications, the latter of which were taken into consideration in Chapter II.¹⁵ The political subtext is that Athena was angry about the arrival of Rome. Augustus was again displeased. As a punishment, he rescinded Athens' jurisdiction over Eretria and Aigina, and stopped the Athenians from selling citizenship to wealthy foreign would-be benefactors.¹⁶

After the incident with the blood-spitting Athena, the Athenians went out of their way to flatter Augustus by building the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus.¹⁷ The emperor may have also been honored on the other pillar monument on the Akropolis, that

¹⁴ Appian, *BC* 2.368.

¹⁵ In sum, this passage indicates that the statue of Athena must have normally faced east.

¹⁶ Hurwit 1999, p. 264; Stoneman 2004, p. 132. See Arafat 1996, pp. 122-123 for a recent discussion of Plutarch, *Mor.* 207F and the date of Augustus' withdrawal to Aigina to show his displeasure toward Athens.

¹⁷ Camp points out that the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus was not a temple, as characterized by Schmalz and others, who compare it to the Capitoline Temple of Mars Ultor which was to receive the newly recovered Parthian standards: Camp 2001, p. 187. For a detailed analysis of the Monopteros, see below "The Monopteros of Rome and Augustus." The Monopteros is not labeled as a temple in the dedicatory inscription, nor is it large enough to be one.

is, the one at the northeast corner of the Parthenon.¹⁸ Augustus softened, and in reconciliation he sent grain to the province of Achaia.¹⁹ They entreated him for more money to finish the new Agora and he gave the city the additional funding needed.²⁰ This new commercial space commandeered the name “Agora” thenceforth. When Pausanias uses the term “Agora” he is clearly referring to the Roman Agora. He uses the term “Kerameikos” to refer to the older, “Greek” Agora.

After Antony lost at Actium, Eumenes’ pillar monument next to the Propylaia was rededicated once again, this time to Agrippa.²¹ Agrippa visited the city several times and took a genuine interest in its post-Sulla recovery. He donated an Odeion which occupied the central space of the now “old” or “Greek” Agora.²²

The Roman emperors tended to leave the Akropolis plateau alone. Any changes that were carried out were done by the Athenians themselves. After the Monopteros, no

¹⁸ On the rededication of the pillar monument northeast of the Parthenon, see Korres 1986, p. 676. Schmalz 1994, p. 214 presents *IG II² 3272* as the rededication of Attalos II’s monument to Claudius after A.D. 42: “The People [of Athens dedicate this monument to Tiberius Claudius Caes]ar//[Augustus Germanicus, pont]ifex maximus, [with tribunician power, impera]tor, twice consul//[and pater patriae, as savior and bene]fac[tor].” Admittedly, there is room to interpret the titles as referring to either emperor. J. Shear raises the excellent point that Augustus was consul for the second time in 33 B.C., that is, before Actium, when Antony was favored in Athens. Therefore, this inscription is better related to Claudius who revamped the approach to the Propylaia rather than the other candidate, Tiberius, who did little for Athens: J. Shear 2001, pp. 911-912 and see below.

¹⁹ Athens received a share of this *alimentum*: Schmalz 1994, pp. 9-10.

²⁰ *IG II² 3175* is the dedication of the Market of Athena Archegetis, dated to between 10/9 B.C. and A.D. 2: “The People [of Athens] out of the donations bestowed [on them] by the deified Gaius [Julius] Caesar and the emperor Augustus, the son of the deified Caesar, [dedicate this] to Athena Archegetis during the hoplite generalship of Eukles [from the deme] of Marathon, when he assumed the office of epimelete on behalf of his father Herodes and served as ambassador; in the archonship of Nikias, the son of Serapion, [from the deme] of Athmonia.” See Chapter III on the relationship between Athena’s epithets: Polias and Archegetis during the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. A new propylon in the Asklepion was dedicated during the reign of Augustus: *IG II² 3120*. Palagia associates repairs to the pediments of the Parthenon to Augustus: Palagia 1993. On the Hellenistic repairs to the Parthenon, see Chapter III. Another of Attalos II’s monuments was also rededicated to an Emperor. His donor’s monument in the Agora in front of the Stoa of Attalos was reinscribed to Tiberius: “The Boule of the Areopagus, the Demos, and the Boule of the Six Hundred [dedicate this monument] to Tiberius Caesar, the Theos Sebastos and benefactor of the city,” *IG II² 4209*: Schmalz 1994, pp. 212-214.

²¹ *IG II² 4122*, 16-12 B.C.

²² For the development of the Agora in the Roman period, see Camp 1986, pp. 181-214; Walker 1997; Schmalz 1994 and Burden 1999.

new buildings were added: the Akropolis had already achieved heritage status. This is not to say that the Akropolis ceased to be the venue for display and dedications. The Athenians dedicated a portrait group of Augustus, Tiberius, Drusus and Germanicus west of the Parthenon in A.D. 4 on the occasion of Augustus' adoption of Tiberius as his successor.²³ Other statues of Tiberius gave him the epithet of “Benefactor” in anticipation of future patronage, but Tiberius did nothing. Around the same time, in A.D. 1 or 4, a frieze block from the Classical Erechtheion may have been reused as an inscribed base for a prominent honorific statue of Glaphyra, wife of Augustus' ally Juba II of Mauretania.²⁴

Claudius not only returned the seven statues Caligula had stolen from the Akropolis, but he also replaced the (unfinished, straight) ramp leading up to the Propylaia with a (straight) staircase.²⁵ This project probably also extended to the paving of the Panathenaic way whose marble blocks can still be seen near the City Eleusinion. Claudius was probably thanked by the Athenians for this lavish embellishment to the city's processional way with the rededication of the pillar monument northeast of the Parthenon.²⁶ His benefaction was also commemorated on 2nd and 3rd century Athenian bronze coins which will be important for the discussion below about the location of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus.

²³ Hurwit 1999, p. 279.

²⁴ Kokkinos 1987; Hurwit 1999, p. 279. Eleusinian stone was used for statue bases throughout antiquity on the Akropolis. It is unlikely this block necessarily came from the Erechtheion as it is only 0.22 m in height. Even if it did, the chronological implications of a frieze block from the 5th century Erechtheion being reused in the early 1st century A.D. is minor. There was probably a pile of discarded, reusable stones on the Akropolis at all times.

²⁵ *IG* II² 5173-5179; Graindor 1931, pp. 160-163; Hoff 1994, p. 116; Spawforth 1997, pp. 190, 198, note 50; Hurwit 1999, p. 274. Caligula was even honored as benefactor despite his pillage. Also, according to *IG* II/III² 3532, 3533 and 3534, three Vestal Virgins visited Athens between A.D. 25 and 50, probably in connection with the lamp of Kallimachos. See Mansfield 1985, p. 230.

²⁶ See note 18 on why Korres' attribution of *IG* II² 3272 to Augustus is incorrect; J. Shear 2001, p. 911.

Nero's henchmen also indulged in some sculpture-scavenging. The Athenians tried to appease him by adding a bronze inscription to the architrave on the front of the Parthenon in A.D. 61-62. The holes for attaching the inscription are still clearly visible. The inscription is thus restored:

The Council of the Areopagus, the Council of the Six Hundred, and the Demos of the Athenians [honor with this inscription] the very great emperor Nero Caesar Claudius Augustus Germanicus, son of the deified [Claudius], [decreed] when Tib. Claudius Novius, son of Philinus, was hoplite general for the eighth time, epimelete, and nomothete; [carried out] while Paullina, the daughter of Capito, was the priestess [of Athena Polias].²⁷

This inscription marks Athens' support of Nero's campaigns against the new Persian foes, Armenia and Parthia, and serves as an additional layer on top of the Augustan and Alexandrian statements of the long legacy of the struggle with and victory over the East.²⁸ Nero never visited Athens, and so he never saw the Parthenon rededicated to him. The inscription only appeared on the building for a few years, until Nero suffered *damnatio memoriae*.

The rest of the 1st century was relatively uneventful. The philosophical schools continued to attract foreign benefactors. A local Athenian named Pantainos dedicated a library in the southeast corner of the Agora to the Emperor Trajan and to Athena Polias between 98 and 102 A.D. The dedication of the library to Athena Polias indicates that her cult was alive and well at the end of the 1st century A.D.

²⁷ *IG II² 3277*: Schmalz 1994, p. 215. The inscription was deciphered by Kevin Carroll: Carroll 1982.

²⁸ This theme may be the subtext of Vitruvius' story about the origin of the term "caryatid" as will be discussed below in: "The Reception of Vitruvius and the Conflation of "Caryatid" and the Erechtheion Maidens."

Athens experienced a renaissance in the 2nd century, with assistance from Hadrian and Herodes Atticus.²⁹ The Akropolis, including the Erechtheion, was, however, generally ignored. Famous for his philhellenism, the Emperor Hadrian finally finished the Temple of Zeus Olympieion and made the sanctuary the center for his worship. All the cities in Achaia and beyond erected statues of Hadrian within the walled precinct. Ninety-five altars to Hadrian (and counting) have been found in Athens.³⁰ Pausanias says the workmanship of Hadrian's cult statue of Zeus was good considering its size (only the colossi at Rome and Rhodes were larger).³¹

In the "Greek" Agora, Hadrian incorporated into his new basilica the Julio-Claudian Northeast Stoa which contained elements of the Erechtheion's Ionic order.³² This is the first such basilica in Athens. It functioned in the same way as the stoas which lined the Agora, namely to house courts and other civic business. This structure, however, was wholly Roman in form.

Hadrian visited Athens in A.D. 124/5, 128/9 and 131/2, thus spending more time here than in any other city besides Rome.³³ On his first visit, the Athenians paid him the ultimate compliment by adding a thirteenth eponymous tribe, "Hadrianis," and his portrait statue to the Eponymous Heroes Monument.³⁴ The torso of Hadrian from the Agora is emblematic of his reign and relationship to Athens (Figure 634). It depicts Athena being crowned by Nikai as she stands on the back of the wolf who nurses

²⁹ The Athenians dedicated many more statues on the Akropolis, including the statue of Gaia Karpophoros after a drought. See below "Pausanias and the Reception of the Akropolis in the 2nd Century A.D." for the importance of this sculpture to our understanding of Pausanias' description of the Erechtheion.

³⁰ Boatwright 2000, p. 145.

³¹ Pausanias 1.18.6.

³² For the use of the Erechtheion's Ionic order in this Julio-Claudian building, see below "Temple of Aphrodite Ouranos in the Athenian Agora."

³³ Boatwright 2000, p. 144.

³⁴ Camp 1990, pp. 69-72.

Romulus and Remus. Athena is flanked by her owl and snake (Erichthonios). Hadrian's benefactions were rewarded with an honor even greater than becoming an eponymous hero: he became the first mortal to have a bronze portrait statue dedicated in the Parthenon.³⁵

Hadrian and his successor Antoninus Pius actively ameliorated the sacred way to, and the sanctuary at, Eleusis.³⁶ At Eleusis, Temple F was built during the 2nd century next to the Telesterion. Some of its preserved pedimental sculpture closely imitates the reclining figures of the west pediment of the Parthenon at two thirds original size.³⁷ The other two figures, a seated woman and a kourotrophos (seated woman with a youth in her lap, Figure 641), are highly reminiscent of the frieze of the Erechtheion, especially (Fowler's) figures 18 and 85, respectively.³⁸ Furthermore, the Greater Propylon imitated the central building of the Propylaia in both form and detail, and was probably erected by Antoninus Pius.³⁹ There had been virtually no building of new monuments on the Akropolis by foreign benefactors for three centuries because it had become something of a heritage site; therefore, the Akropolis was recreated anew at Eleusis. This was all a part of an extensive classicizing phenomenon occurring at Eleusis at this time.⁴⁰

Prosperity continued into the later 2nd century under the beneficence of Herodes Atticus of Marathon. As both a Roman citizen and Athenian philosopher, Herodes funded projects – from private villas to monumental nymphaia – all over Greece and

³⁵ Pausanias 1.24.7.

³⁶ Hadrian dedicated a bridge over the Kephissos on the sacred way to Eleusis: Clinton 1989.

³⁷ Camp 2001, pp. 212-213. Ironically, these are the figures Spon and Wheeler misidentify as Hadrian and Sabina on the Parthenon.

³⁸ See Paton et al. 1927, pls. 41 and 44 for images of these sculptures.

³⁹ Clinton 1989.

⁴⁰ Camp 2001, p. 213. Marcus Aurelius is usually credited with the restoration of the Telesterion whose repair was necessitated by the mid 2nd century raid of the Kostoboks. Pausanias (10.34.2) is the only source to mention the Kostoboks in Greece. Originating in Russia or Poland, they raided the Roman Empire between A.D. 166 and 180.

Italy.⁴¹ Herodes' villas, for instance at Loukou and on the via Appia, incorporated female architectural supports. At Loukou, they resemble the maidens of the South Porch of the Erechtheion quite closely.⁴² This probably simply reflects Herodes' heartfelt attachment to Athens as his home and seat of his intellectual inspiration. He was deeply affected by his wife Regilla's death and many of his monuments were dedicated to her memory, including the Odeion on the south slope of the Akropolis.

With Herodes' new Odeion now hosting large musical spectacles south of the Akropolis, Agrippa's Odeion in the Agora was converted into a much smaller lecture hall after the roof collapsed. This Odeion also received a new façade composed of over life-size giants and tritons on tall pedestals.⁴³ Both the sculptures in the round and the reliefs on the pedestals alluded to the Akropolis, and specifically the iconography associated with the Erechtheion. The torso of the giants imitated the Poseidon of the Parthenon's west pediment, and all the pedestals were decorated with the olive tree of Athena entwined with her snake, both emblems being key symbols associated with the Erechtheion (Figure 635).

Besides contributing the new Odeion, Herodes also refurbished Lykourgos' stadium completely in white marble. It could now hold 50,000 people for the newly overhauled Panathenaic games.⁴⁴ Herodes donated a new ship-car for the festival. This new ship-car was probably housed on the long conglomerate foundations on the hill northeast of the stadium. Philostratos described the inaugural festival:

In accordance with this promise [Herodes] completed within four years the stadium on the other side of the Ilissos, and thus

⁴¹ On Herodes Atticus' wide range of projects, see Tobin 1997.

⁴² King 1998, p. 278, note 8. The Loukou maidens have not yet been published.

⁴³ Bruno 1976.

⁴⁴ See Shear 2001 for the status of the Panathenaia in the 2nd century A.D.

constructed a monument that is beyond all other marvels, for there is no theater that can rival it. Moreover, I have been told the following facts concerning the Panathenaic festival. The robe of Athena that was hung on the ship was more beautiful than any painting, with folds that swelled before the breeze; and the ship, as it took its course, was not hauled by animals but slid forward by means of underground machinery.⁴⁵

It was during Herodes' building campaign that Pausanias visited Athens and witnessed the peak of the city's urban development.⁴⁶ In the late 2nd century, the first significant changes in over 300 years were made to the Erechtheion. The impetus for this renovation may have stemmed from the grudge Septimius Severus held against Athens due to some (unspecified) insult he suffered there before he became emperor.⁴⁷ Septimius Severus probably even denied Athens the right to strike coinage.⁴⁸ The Athenians pulled out all the stops to make amends, but they did this indirectly by honoring Julia Domna with the most extravagant honors ever conceived.⁴⁹ According to *IG III² 1076*, between A.D. 195 and 197, the Athenians “dedicated the An[cient Te]mple to Iulia Domna [as the Polias],” set up a golden statue of her in the Parthenon, and instituted various rites in honor of the empress.⁵⁰ Besides Hadrian, Julia Domna was the only other mortal honored with a statue in the Parthenon.⁵¹

⁴⁵ Philostratos, *VS* 550: Camp 2001, p. 214; Shear 2001, pp. 154-155.

⁴⁶ See below “Pausanias and the Reception of the Akropolis in the 2nd Century A.D.” for a discussion of the Akropolis in the middle of the 2nd century A.D.

⁴⁷ SHA, Septimius Severus 3.7: Post hoc Athenas petit studiorum sacrorumque causa et operum ac vetustatum. Ubi cum iniurias quasdam ab Atheniensibus pertulisset, inimicus his factus minuendo eorum privilegia iam imperator se ultus est.

⁴⁸ Walker 1980, p. 263.

⁴⁹ Julia Domna, an admirer of the Athenian philosophical tradition, probably persuaded the emperor to be lenient toward Athens: Hurwit 1999, p. 279. Whether her assimilation to Athena Polias was in acknowledgement or in propitiation of this appeasement is unclear. Julia Domna is generally acknowledged to have been the first empress since Livia to wield any significant imperial power: Kleiner 1992, p. 326.

⁵⁰ Mansfield 1985, pp. 203-204. See Mansfield 1985, p. 226 for the bibliography of this inscription. The rites and Julia Domna's titles are also referred to in an inscription from the Agora: Oliver 1941, pp. 84-85.

⁵¹ There are also portraits of Caracalla, Julia Domna and Geta in the Akropolis Museum storerooms.

There are fragments of antefixes and lion heads from the sima that belong to the Erechtheion, but they are distinctly different in style from any other element on the building (Figure 531 and Figure 532). Dinsmoor dated the lion's head and the single known antefix to the 4th century B.C. repair.⁵² Paton et al. allocate them to the Roman period, but not specifically to the major repair they believe occurred in the Augustan period.⁵³ They are correct to suspect a different date. The deep drilling of the palmette leaves, scrolls and flowers, and schematic treatment of the acanthus point to a late 2nd century A.D. date.⁵⁴ Züchner went through the marble piles on the Akropolis in the 1930s and assembled further examples of similar antefixes.⁵⁵ Antefix specialist, Gerhild Hübner, concurs with a 2nd century A.D. date.⁵⁶

The question is, what might have occasioned the repairs to the roof of the Erechtheion? The previous repairs to the Erechtheion had occurred several centuries earlier. The most fragile parts of a building are the roof elements, especially the decorative features. They are prone to damage from windstorms, lightning and vandalism. Therefore, it is likely that in preparation for the installation of a cult statue of Julia Domna in the Erechtheion and her assimilation to Athena Polias, the antefixes and simas were repaired in the current style.⁵⁷ These activities, and perhaps some other minor cosmetic measures such as a deep clean, may have accompanied the late 2nd century preparations to receive the new mistress of Athens.

⁵² Dinsmoor 1932, p. 171.

⁵³ Paton et al. 1927, p. 79. See Chapter III.

⁵⁴ The acanthus of the antefixes does not have the ring-voids described as being typical of the Hadrianic period by Walker 1979.

⁵⁵ Züchner 1936, pp. 322-327.

⁵⁶ J. Binder (pers. comm.).

⁵⁷ On the term "assimilation", see Mikocki 1995, pp. 7-8 and Lundgreen 2004, p. 71. Lundgreen suggests that Julia Domna's assimilation to Athena Polias should be seen more as a reference to her being "first lady" of the empire as Athena Polias was the "first lady of Athens" than Julia Domna's status as *mater castrorum* as being related to Athena's military aspects: Lundgreen 2004, p. 89.

There is no direct evidence to suggest what form Julia Domna's statue took in the Erechtheion. The empress was often portrayed (in sculpture and on coinage, for example) in the guise of goddesses or personifications, such as Ceres, Abundance, Cybele, Venus, Juno and Diana, but only occasionally as Minerva/Athena.⁵⁸ The "Athena-Medici" statue type, such as the example in the Thessaloniki Archaeological Museum (no. 877), has been viewed as a portrait assimilation of Julia Domna with Athena.⁵⁹ It is remarkable that this statue was conceived as acrolithic, with the head being made of marble, and the body probably made of wood.⁶⁰ Perhaps this is the very statue type used in the Erechtheion; it would have been appropriate considering the nature of the ancient xoanon of Athena Polias next to which the new statue of Julia Domna was placed. In fact, Giorgos Despinis has suggested that the Thessaloniki head was actually made in Athens owing to its high quality.⁶¹ The date of her installation in the Erechtheion (A.D. 195-197) suggests that her first portrait type was probably used. Perhaps the Thessaloniki example, possibly set up in the city's agora, was inspired by the model dedicated in the Erechtheion.⁶²

It was around the time of Julia Domna's installation next to Athena Polias that the Christian apologist Tertullian called the ancient xoanon "a rough stake and shapeless

⁵⁸ Scrinari 1953-1955, pp. 122-123; Bieber 1977. Livia was the last empress to be assimilated to Athena on a large scale before the Severan period: Lundgreen 2004, pp. 69, 72. For a summary of the numismatic evidence for Julia Domna as Athena, see Lundgreen 2004, pp. 81-83.

⁵⁹ Lundgreen 2004, p. 70. With the addition of hair in the attachment holes, the characteristic "helmet head" of Julia Domna emerges.

⁶⁰ Lundgreen 2004, pp. 72-73.

⁶¹ Despinis 1975; While Despinis believes the Thessaloniki head was originally carved as Athena and then altered, Lundgreen argues that the facial features are distinctive enough to have belonged to an original, assimilated conception of the goddess and the empress: Lundgreen 2004, pp. 74-78.

⁶² Kleiner 1992; The Thessaloniki example has been associated with the so-called Leptis type, named after her Severan arch at Leptis Magna dated ca. A.D. 205/6 to 208/9: Lundgreen 2004, pp. 79, 85, fig. 14.

piece of wood.”⁶³ The olive wood statue may have been in an advanced state of disintegration by the end of the 2nd century: Julia Domna was now the living incarnation of Athena Polias, protectress of the city. She was probably installed next to the olive wood statue in the central chamber of the Erechtheion. Like the olive wood statue of Athena, Julia Domna would have faced east and had her back to the West Cross-Wall.⁶⁴

The podia of the giants and tritons in the façade of the 2nd century Odeion in the Agora were not the only depictions of Athena’s snakes and olive trees in the Roman period: AM 2444 is apparently a sculptural fragment of the Altar of Athena Polias.⁶⁵ The fragment includes not only a large snake, and olive tree, but also an owl perched on the stylized palmette. This outward-curving palmette has plump concave leaves. Above this ensemble is a lesbian kymation. A reasonable date for this fragment is the late 2nd or early 3rd century A.D.⁶⁶ Just before World War II, Stevens identified cuttings in the bedrock 15 m east of the Archaic Temple of Athena as the Great Altar of Athena Polias.⁶⁷ The 15 x 8.5 m monumental altar was probably established between 450 and 425 B.C. and underwent many alterations over the centuries.⁶⁸ AM 2444 may constitute a fragment of the altar’s Roman incarnation, and perhaps constitutes a complementary restoration of the altar at the same time as the refurbishment of the Erechtheion for the installation of Julia Domna’s cult statue.

⁶³ Tertullian, *Ad Nat.* 1.12.3; see also Mansfield 1985, pp. 137-138.

⁶⁴ On the location of the olive wood cult statue of Athena Polias, see Chapter II.

⁶⁵ Brouskari 1997, p. 169; Brouskari 1974, fig. 7. Other publications, such as Schädler 1990, p. 372, do not consider the fragment to belong to the Altar of Athena.

⁶⁶ Rose (pers. comm.).

⁶⁷ Stevens 1940, p. 86; Stevens points out that Pausanias does not mention the Great Altar of Athena “this is strange, for on his way to the Erechtheum he must have passed near it”: Stevens 1946, pp. 3, 16.

⁶⁸ Hurwit 1999, pp. 314-315.

The city experienced its first invasion by “barbarians” from the north in A.D. 267 when the Herulians swooped down, destroying everything in their path.⁶⁹ They wreaked havoc in the lower city before they were finally driven off by 2000 Athenians led by the archon Herennios Dexippos, who wrote an account of the invasion.⁷⁰ In the aftermath of this devastation, the Themistoklean circuit wall was abandoned and the city shrank: a new “post-Herulian” circuit wall was built using the material from the buildings destroyed by the Herulians. To reinforce the Akropolis, Nikias’s choregic monument from near the Asklepieion was dismantled and incorporated into the new “Beulé Gate” below the Propylaia. Coins found in the mortar of the Beulé Gate date to the reign of Probus (A.D. 276-282), thus indicating that the project of the post-Herulian wall was probably well-planned and not a rush job in the face of impending danger.⁷¹

As with the Sullan attack of 86 B.C., there remains the problem of what effect the Herulian invasion had on the Akropolis. The scholars are split on this issue.⁷² What can be said for certain is that the Parthenon was destroyed and rebuilt as a pagan temple between the 3rd and 5th centuries A.D. Was the damage done by the Herulians in 267 or by the Visigoths in 396? This is important to this study because the same sequence of damage and repair will apply to the conversion of the Erechtheion into a pillared hall in the Late Antique period.⁷³

The two main theories regarding the Late Roman destruction of the Akropolis are:

⁶⁹ The Herulians were originally a Germanic tribe which had been displaced from Scandinavia by the Danes, and were lately from the Black Sea.

⁷⁰ Camp 2001, p. 223. Stratigraphy shows the extent of the destruction of the Agora: the Dipylon Gate, the Metroon, the Stoa of Attalos, the Temple of Ares, the Library of Hadrian, the Stoa of Eumenes, and many private houses were devastated. On the Herulian invasion, see Wilson 1971.

⁷¹ That is, in contrast to the Themistoklean Wall.

⁷² According to Wilson 1971, p. 116, the Herulians did not breach the Akropolis walls which had recently been refortified under Valerian. Gallienus visited in A.D. 264/5, and the coinage minted in Athens at this time emphasizes the new Akropolis walls.

⁷³ See Chapter V.

1. The Parthenon was destroyed by the Herulians in A.D. 267, and was rebuilt by Julian the Apostate in A.D. 361-363 during his revival of paganism.
2. The Parthenon was destroyed by the Visigoths in A.D. 396, and was probably rebuilt by Herculius, prefect of Illyria between 408 and 412, who was honored with statues on the Akropolis next to the Bronze Athena and in the Library of Hadrian.⁷⁴

The first theory requires the Parthenon to lie in ruin for a century, during which time the Panathenaia continued to be celebrated with full honors; the second does not allow enough time to pass before the closure of the Parthenon as a temple, and for its new east door to scrape deep, arced grooves into the new threshold and stylobate.⁷⁵ Korres supports the Julian date for the repair of the Parthenon, and suggests that an unrecorded earthquake resulted in the fire that destroyed the entire interior of the Parthenon in the early 4th century.⁷⁶ This rationalization is appealing, because not only does it allow for the continued celebration of the Panathenaia into the early 5th century with the intact backdrop of the Parthenon, but it also allows the same unrecorded earthquake to both destroy the Erechtheion and require the removal or cessation of its cults.⁷⁷ As will be discussed in Chapter V, in the 4th and 5th centuries, the cult of Athena seems to be

⁷⁴ Herulians and Julian: Travlos 1973; Visigoths and Herculius: Frantz 1979. Herculius was probably a Christian, so it does not make sense that he would be involved in the repair of a pagan temple: Hurwit 1999, p. 286. Furthermore, the Panathenaic festival ceased in the early 5th century, right around the time Herculius would have finished spending vast sums restoring this pagan temple.

⁷⁵ Korres 1994d, p. 141.

⁷⁶ Korres 1994d, p. 143. Hurwit 1999, p. 286 supports the Visigoths-Herculius theory.

⁷⁷ For the further ramifications of this issue with respect to the Erechtheion, see Chapter V.

focused on the Athena Parthenos statue, and there are no further references to the cult of Athena Polias or her olive wood cult effigy.⁷⁸

In sum, during the Roman period, Athena Polias' cult enjoyed a high level interest and influx of wealth. Her festival, the Panathenaia, attracted interest from both local and international patrons, and her house, the Erechtheion, was refurbished in the late 2nd century, probably on the occasion of the installation of the cult of the empress, Julia Domna, as the new Athena and protectress of the Athens.

GRAFFITI

There are a hundreds of examples of graffiti on the Erechtheion, but only a few can be dated to Antiquity. Graffiti are defined in this study as markings (either carving or with added pigment [*dipinti*]) of a nature unrelated to the original purpose of the building. One example from the Erechtheion is a gameboard carved into one of the steps of the north krepidoma (Figure 473). Game-boards such as these have been found in and on many temples and other buildings.⁷⁹ Excellent nearby examples are game boards of a similar type on the steps of the Propylaia (Figure 600).⁸⁰ Circular-type game-boards can also be found littering the pronaos of the Temple of Apollo at Didyma (Figure 680) and the Bouleuterion at Stratonikea in Turkey. Game-boards of different types can also be found on the steps of the Basilica Julia at Rome (Figure 679) and on the steps and stylobate of the Hephaisteion. Such game-boards are as ubiquitous as they are difficult to date, mostly because the games themselves are so ancient. The game-boards composed of dots from the Hephaisteion illustrated here probably date to the Byzantine period,

⁷⁸ Mansfield 1985, p. 203.

⁷⁹ On ancient gameboards and games in general, see Kurke 1999; and Rothaus 1992.

⁸⁰ On the rectangular quadrisectioned gameboards, see Rothaus 1992, pp. 366-367.

because such a game-board appears on a threshold of a doorway cut through the wall of the Pinakothek in the Propylaea during the middle Byzantine period. The game-board on the Erechtheion was probably carved in the Roman period.

ROMAN RECEPTION OF THE ERECHTHEION

THE RECEPTION OF VITRUVIUS AND THE CONFLATION OF “CARYATID” AND THE ERECHTHEION MAIDENS

The maidens of the South Porch are the Erechtheion’s most quotable feature and have been copied since their erection in the late 5th century B.C.⁸¹ These maidens have been the subject of close scrutiny by scholars, particularly concerning the use of “caryatid,” a term derived from the opening passage of Vitruvius’ *De Architectura* (1.1.5).⁸² Despite this attention, confusion about how to reconcile Vitruvius and the maidens of the Erechtheion remains. Using the contextualized diachronic approach employed throughout this study, the following question can be addressed: Why are the maidens of the Erechtheion almost always called “caryatids”?

The contemporary building accounts indicate that the Erechtheion maidens were called “*korai*” or “maidens” in the 5th century B.C.⁸³ Not once in the ancient sources are the Erechtheion maidens on the Akropolis referred to directly as “caryatids.” But rather than simply dismissing every post-Antique reference to the Erechtheion maidens as

⁸¹ See Chapter III for a discussion of the earliest monument to copy the Erechtheion maidens: Heroön of Perikles at Limyra.

⁸² The early seminal works on the origins of the caryatids are: Lessing (no date); Kinnard 1825; Blomfeld 1826; and Homolle 1917. Paton et al. 1927, pp. 232-238 deals with the origins of the Erechtheion maidens specifically. More recently are: Schmidt-Colinet 1977; Plommer 1979; Vickers 1985; and King 1998; The identity of the Erechtheion maidens and the function of the Maiden Porch is a separate topic: see Chapter II. The Erechtheion maidens and their Roman copies provide an excellent opportunity to assess the intentions of the Roman copyist and also the desires of the Roman patron. Contrary to the spelling conventions in the rest of this study, “caryatid” and not “karyatid” is used in this discussion because the first instance of the word comes from Vitruvius, a Latin source.

⁸³ Inscr. II, col. 1, line. 86 in Paton et al. 1927 (*IG I² 372.86=IG I³ 474.8*).

“caryatids” as a mistake, the origins of this conflation of terms are examined using hermeneutics. By following the manifestation of this conflation backward through time, this article’s hypothesis that its origins lie in the late 1st century B.C. can be confirmed.

To illustrate his assertion that an architect’s knowledge be well-rounded, Vitruvius wrote in the early 20s B.C.:⁸⁴

A wide knowledge of history is necessary because architects often incorporate many ornamental features in the designs of their works, for which they must be able to give a reasoned account when asked why they added them. For example, if anyone erects marble statues of robed women, which are called Caryatids, instead of columns on his building, and places mutules and crowning members above them, this is how he will explain them to enquirers: Caryae, a city in the Peloponnese, allied herself with the Persian enemy against Greece. Later the Greeks were rid of their war by a glorious victory and made common cause and declared war on the Caryates. And so the town was captured, the males were killed and the Caryan state publicly humiliated. The victors led the matrons away into captivity, but did not allow them to lay aside their robes or matronly ornaments. Their intention was not to lead them on one occasion in a triumph, but to ensure that they exhibited a permanent picture of slavery, and that in the heavy mockery they suffered they should be seen to pay the penalty for their city. So the architects of those times designed images of them for public buildings specially placed to uphold a load, so that a well-known punishment of the Caryates’ wrongdoing might be handed down to posterity.⁸⁵

⁸⁴ The treatise was written around 28-23 B.C., based on experience from earlier in life, in the 50s-40s B.C.: Wilson Jones 2000, p. 34. The actual date of Vitruvius’ work is controversial. See also Corso and Romano 1997.

⁸⁵ Vitruvius 1.1.5: (Morgan, trans. 1960):

Historias autem plures novisse oportet, quod multa ornamenta saepe in operibus architecti designant, de quibus argumenti rationem, cur fecerint, quaerentibus reddere debent. quem admodum si quis statuas marmoreas muliebres stolatas, quae caryatides dicuntur, pro columnis in opere statuerit et insuper mutulos et coronas conlocaverit, percontantibus ita reddet rationem. Caryae, civitas Peloponnensis, cum Persis hostibus contra Graeciam consensit. postea Graeci per victoriam gloriose bello liberati communi consilio Caryatibus bellum indixerunt. itaque oppido capto, viris interfectis, civitate deflagrata matronas eorum in servitutem abduxerunt, nec sunt passi stolas neque ornatus matronales deponere, non uti una triumpho ducerentur, sed aeterna, servitutis exemplo gravi contumelia pressae poenas pendere viderentur pro civitate. ideo qui tunc architecti fuerunt aedificiis publicis designaverunt earum imagines oneri ferendo conlocatas, ut etiam posteris poena peccati Caryatium memoriae traderetur.

Virgil used similar language to describe how he led away the Muses from Helikon in his own, poetic triumph at the beginning of *Georgics* 3 (line 11): *Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas*. I am grateful to Anton Powell for bringing this to my attention.

Because of this passage and the prominence of the maidens of the Erechtheion, scholars have searched for a way to reconcile the term “caryatid” with the origin of female architectural supports. Scholars usually come to one of three main conclusions on this topic:

1. The Erechtheion maidens are indeed caryatids in the Vitruvian, i.e., post-Persian punished, sense;⁸⁶
2. The Erechtheion maidens have nothing whatsoever to do with this medizing etiology and are instead descended from the pre-Persian female architectural supports from Delphi (e.g., Siphnian maidens); and,⁸⁷
3. The term “caryatid” refers to the dancers at the shrine of Artemis Karyatis who were commemorated in stone at Delphi.⁸⁸

⁸⁶ In the 1980s, Michael Vickers attempted to re-date the Treasuries of the Athenians and Siphnians at Delphi to after the Persian War based on the iconography of the monuments as a whole and, specifically, the relief decoration on the polos of the maidens from the Siphnian Treasury: Francis and Vickers 1983. These polos, he argues, adopt a specifically Persian language of victory: Vickers 1985. Regardless of his massaging of dates, which allows a Vitruvian reading of the meaning of the Erechtheion maidens as “Caryatids” and as descendants of the Delphi maidens, one must also consider the precursors of female architectural supports, namely the women who hold up the even earlier Archaic perirrhanteria. The idea that these, as well as the later female architectural supports, are temple servants has gained overall currency, both in interpreting the Erechtheion maidens as Arrhephoroi or kanephoroi, replacements for the Archaic korai, or as libation bearers for Athena’s ruined temple next door. For example, see Dinsmoor 1950, p. 193. Vickers concludes that there are two kinds of architectural maidens, “caryatids” and temple servants, because he is unable to interpret the late Republican architectural maidens from Eleusis (50 B.C.) politically as Caryatids owing to the visual signifiers of the *cista mystica* on their heads. The maidens from Eleusis are “Republican” because they were paid for by Appius Claudius Pulcher when he was consul of Rome in 54 B.C. He vowed them to Demeter and Kore for unknown reasons. Cicero (*Att.* 6.1.26; 6.2) indicates that the building was begun before February, 50 B.C. It was finished after Pulcher’s death in 48 B.C. by his nephews according to the dedicatory inscription: Palagia 1997, p. 83.

⁸⁷ Plommer 1979, p. 102.

⁸⁸ Pliny, *NH* 36.23 mentions a group of sculptures of dancers by Praxiteles. These dancers were called Caryatids or Thyades, the Delphic name for the female followers (maenads) of Dionysos. See Brouskari 1997, pp. 185-186. On the “dancers column” see *Delphes* II, ix, pp. 60-67; *École française d’Athènes* 1991, pp. 84-90.

These approaches focus on whether Vitruvius' account is trustworthy. His veracity is doubted because he offers many other appealing stories to explain, for example, the origins of the Doric and Corinthian orders; stories which are now generally regarded as having been invented by Vitruvius.⁸⁹ It was the 18th century German antiquarian, G.E. Lessing, who first suggested that Vitruvius' account of the origin of the term "caryatid" was a fabrication.⁹⁰ Most scholars now summarily debunk Vitruvius' story of post-Persian punishment by referring to the female architectural supports from before the Persian War, such as those from the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi which date to ca. 525 B.C. There are also historical problems with Vitruvius' account, namely that Karyae was not destroyed until after the Battle of Leuktra in 371 B.C.; in other words, about a hundred years later than Vitruvius insinuated.

Scholars have also perceived Vitruvius' coupling of the term "caryatid" with the Doric entablature (the order implied by his reference to "mutules") as a way to disassociate the term from the Erechtheion maidens; maidens, that is to say, who support a most unusual abbreviated entablature.⁹¹ This entablature consists of a dentilled cornice and three fasciae decorated with what were eventually to have become rosettes, but have always remained flat discs because the temple was never finished (Figure 219).

⁸⁹ On the origins of the Doric order, see Wilson Jones 2002; Coulton 1977, p. 128. On the origins of the Corinthian order, see Pedersen 1989. On the origins of the architectural orders in general, see Onians 1988; Barletta 2001.

⁹⁰ Lessing (no date), pp. 385-386. Lessing's suspicions were aroused long before the discovery of the Delphi architectural maidens. His argument for rejecting Vitruvius' story is based on Winckelmann's identification of a male statue with a Corinthian capital on his head in the courtyard of the Palazzo Farnese as one of the caryatids of Agrippa's Pantheon mentioned by Pliny (see below): Winckelmann 1764, p. 387. Lessing bought into Winckelmann's contemporary argument; therefore, since the "caryatid" was male, then Vitruvius' story must be a fabrication. On the historiography of this problem, see Vickers forthcoming.

⁹¹ Plommer 1979, p. 98.

It is unfortunate that by not using a contextualized diachronic approach, scholars often make unfounded assumptions which lead to conflated interpretations such as the following:

1. “Attempts to de-emphasize the weight carried by the maidens combined with their position which isolates them from the rest of the building and obscures their architectural function would not have been introduced if these figures depicted enslaved women carrying heavy burdens, as Vitruvius would have us understand.”⁹²
2. “The Roman architect Vitruvius states that the Erechtheion statues depicted the women of the Lakonian city of Karyes, which sided with the Persians during the Persian Wars”⁹³

And what is wrong with these interpretations? First, both interpretations incorrectly assume Vitruvius was talking about the Erechtheion when he gives his definition of “caryatid.” Nowhere in Vitruvius 1.1.5 does he say he is talking about the South Porch of the building known as the Erechtheion. Both scholars also ignore the fact that Vitruvius’ story requires the women to be matrons, and not maidens as they are specifically characterized in the ancient building accounts; and both ignore the fact that Vitruvius places a Doric, and not an Ionic, architrave above them.⁹⁴ These citations serve to demonstrate the importance of the contextualized diachronic approach in assessing the relationship between Vitruvius and the Erechtheion maidens.

⁹² Shear 1999, p. 84.

⁹³ Brouskari 1997, pp. 185-186.

⁹⁴ Some scholars have argued that the building accounts would not have used the artistic or interpretive name for the figures considering the neutral terms used to describe the sculptured frieze: King 1998, p. 278 note 8. Nonetheless, the fact that the inscriptions describe them as *korai* and not *gynai* (or matrons, as for the female figures of the frieze, for example Inscr. XVII, col. I, line 20: see Paton et al. 1927, pp. 388-389) remains a significant distinction.

The initial conflation of the Vitruvian term “caryatid” and the Erechtheion maidens has generally, although incorrectly, been attributed to Stuart and Revett, the intrepid traveler-architects who visited Greece in the 1750s, and to Winckelmann, who never visited Greece.⁹⁵ In fact, it was an Italian named Cornelio Magni who, in 1674, was the first early modern European traveler to call the Erechtheion maidens “caryatids.”⁹⁶ In any case, their mistake might be perceived as a natural one, that is, in missing the significance of that singular term *mutulos* which denotes that a Doric cornice belongs above the caryatids.

Before these earliest travelers to Greece, that is during the Middle Ages and the early Renaissance, it is possible though difficult, to identify the equation of Erechtheion maiden and “caryatid.” On the one hand, there exist Renaissance drawings of copies of the Erechtheion maidens in collections scattered around Italy, such as a drawing in a codex in Berlin (Figure 673), but such examples are not labeled as “caryatids.”⁹⁷ On the other hand, we have renditions of “caryatids” that illustrate early modern editions of the opening passages of Vitruvius, such as the examples from the 1511 edition of Vitruvius by Fra Giacondo and the 1556 edition by Palladio and della Porta in Barbaro.⁹⁸

There is, however, monumental evidence for the Erechtheion maidens being “caryatids” in the eyes of Renaissance viewers in the Louvre. Jean Goujon, who studied with Michaelangelo, placed four Erechtheion-inspired maidens in his tribune which holds

⁹⁵ Stuart and Revett 1762-1816; Winckelmann 1760, p.185: Credited as the source of the conflation by Plommer 1979, p. 101 and King 1998, p. 276.

⁹⁶ On Magni see T 9, on Stuart and Revett see T 25. On Magni, Winckelmann, and Stuart and Revett, see Chapter VII.

⁹⁷ See Appendix C for a list of Post-Antique copies of Erechtheion maidens. See also Schmidt 1973 for the basic collection of Renaissance drawings and copies of Erechtheion maidens. For additional drawings of copies of Erechtheion maidens in Italy, see Harprath 1983.

⁹⁸ See D'Evelyn 1988-1999 for the Fra Giacondo and Barbaro caryatids, as well as other illustrations of caryatids from other Renaissance editions of Vitruvius.

up the musicians' gallery in a room called in the building accounts of 1550 (and periodically thereafter) “*la salle des caryatides*” (Figure 674).⁹⁹ Although these are not exact copies, they capture the essence of the Erechtheion maidens fairly well. Despite the fact that there was no method of transmission of images from the original source on the Athenian Akropolis to the French and Italian workshops because there was no tourism to Greece to speak of in the 16th century, the term “caryatid” was nonetheless intrinsically linked to the maidens of the Erechtheion through the ancient copies extant in western Europe at this time. These examples demonstrate that the Erechtheion maidens and the Vitruvian term “caryatid” were linked at least two centuries before the early modern travelers to Greece beheld these Athenian maidens in person, and made what seemed at that point in time a sensible and logical connection.

But can the explicit association of “caryatid” and the Erechtheion be pushed back even earlier? It is possible to argue that in the early Augustan period the significance of the term *mutulos* to designate the associated Doric order was already overlooked by almost every architect from the Roman through modern periods. Before examining the evidence for this, it is essential to discern what Vitruvius was actually referring to when he told his story about the humiliated Karyan women. Recent work on what Vitruvius probably had in mind when he proffered his etiology for the term “caryatid” has been argued persuasively by Dorothy King. She defines a caryatid as a female architectural support with one or both arms raised, wearing a *polos* on her head, and surmounted by an almost invariably Doric entablature. These figures are to be associated with the Persian Stoa at Sparta described by Vitruvius immediately after his explanation of “caryatid.”¹⁰⁰

⁹⁹ “*La salle des caryatides*” was called “*la salle des antiques*” between 1692-1793.

¹⁰⁰ King 1998, pp. 275-289.

Examples of such true “caryatids” come almost exclusively from funerary or private contexts of the Hellenistic period, and are perhaps derived from a lost “Caryatid monument” at Sparta.¹⁰¹

For example, inside both the Sveshtari Tomb in Bulgaria (Figure 670) and a rock-cut circular tomb at Agia Triada on Rhodes (Figure 671), there are reliefs of women with one or both hands raised, wearing long robes, a polos on their heads and a Doric frieze above.¹⁰² These Hellenistic Vitruvian “caryatids” appear to have been adapted to portray mourners and appear almost exclusively in funerary contexts.¹⁰³ The other context in which Vitruvian caryatids appear is on a small scale in the private sphere of the elite. A good example – also found in a tomb – is a late Republican cosmetics chest from Cumae into which little ivory “King-defined” Vitruvian “caryatids” with one or both arms up were inlaid (Figure 672).¹⁰⁴

Therefore, with the question of what Vitruvius was referring to by the term “caryatid” no longer dismissed as sentimental or fantasy, it is now possible to examine the legacy of Vitruvius’ opening statements and see if the conflation of the term “caryatid” and the Erechtheion maidens can be pushed back to the Augustan period. To do this, it is crucial to remember that Vitruvius, in his definition of a caryatid, was

¹⁰¹ Picard 1935; Schneider 1986.

¹⁰² The Sveshtari tomb dates to soon after 300 B.C.: Valeva 1993, pp. 121-123, figs. 8 and 9. The tomb in Rhodes is late Hellenistic: Lauter 1986, pp. 221, 251, fig. 73b. See also King 1998, p. 280.

¹⁰³ King 1998, p. 285. Compare the mid 4th century B.C. sarcophagus of the Mourning Women from Sidon (Inv. no. 368 in the Istanbul Museum) and the throne from the so-called Tomb of Eurydike (Philip II’s mother) at Vergina whose “spindles” below the armrests and seat-back are also Vitruvian “caryatids”. Both examples are surrounded by Ionic architectural features. A throne similar to that in Eurydike’s tomb can be found on the Persae vase. The funerary association of the female architectural support continues into the Roman period. They are often found at the corners of 2nd - 3rd century A.D. sarcophagi such as in the Amazon sarcophagus from Thessaloniki in the Louvre and the Velletri sarcophagus, A.D. 150. The late 2nd century A.D. reference in Athenaeus to the parasite Eukrates who remarks, “When one dines here, one has to use one’s left hand, as Caryatids do, to hold up the roof,” (Athen. 241d: Plommer 1979, p. 99), can be considered just another deliberately erudite and obscure allusion that peppers his works.

¹⁰⁴ This box is on display in the Museo Nazionale in Naples.

describing a phenomenon of the Hellenistic period that was limited almost entirely to the private and sepulchral spheres of the elite, and therefore not familiar to the general public. As with Stuart and Revett, the very specific definition of “caryatid” with a mutule molding above was lost immediately on the following generations of architects who used *De Architectura* as a guide. Therefore, when a post-Vitruvian architect wanted to include female architectural supports in his design, what came to mind were not the reliefs in tombs and on cosmetic boxes, but the maidens of the South Porch of the Erechtheion. This phenomenon can be witnessed by examining the following series of monuments in Rome: the Agrippan Pantheon, the Forum of Augustus, the Forum of Trajan and the Arch of Constantine.

Shortly after Vitruvius wrote his treatise and dedicated it to “Imperator Caesar”, major building projects were inaugurated by Agrippa and Augustus, namely the Pantheon and the Forum of Augustus respectively. Both monuments incorporated female architectural supports on the Erechtheion model. It is important to remember that Augustus had recently won the Battle of Actium with Agrippa’s assistance, and afterward both men spent some time in Athens.

Agrippa dedicated the Pantheon in the Campus Martius in 27 B.C., perhaps as the main victory monument in Rome that commemorated the Battle of Actium.¹⁰⁵ The pre-

¹⁰⁵ Schmalz 1994, p. 15 cites a date of 25 B.C. based on Dio 53.27.2. The inscription on the Hadrianic building preserves the original inscription and records that the original Pantheon was dedicated during Agrippa’s third consulship. Agrippa completed his third consulship either in 27 or 25 B.C. The Agrippan Pantheon was once a part of a large complex which included the Basilica of Neptune. The land and sea imagery that is so pervasive in Augustan monuments and commemorative of his victory at Actium is in evidence here as well. This may have been the main Actium monument in Rome: Augustus and Agrippa stood in niches on the exterior because Augustus duly refused to have what might have been perceived as a cult statue of himself indoors: Wilson Jones 2000, pp. 179-180.

Hadrianic phases of the Pantheon were also circular, and according to Pliny (*HN* 36.11) were decorated with caryatids:¹⁰⁶

The Pantheon of Agrippa was embellished by Diogenes of Athens; and among the supporting members of this temple there are Caryatids that are almost in a class of their own, and the same is true of the figures on the angles of the pediment, which are, however, not so well known because of their lofty position.¹⁰⁷

Pieter Broucke believes the caryatids in the Agrippan Pantheon were quotations of the Erechtheion maidens,¹⁰⁸ and has demonstrated convincingly that the four copies of Erechtheion maidens discovered in the Canopus at Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli in 1952 were probably rescued from the remains of the Agrippan and Domitianic Pantheons, most likely when the Pantheon was rebuilt on the same spot by Hadrian.¹⁰⁹

Broucke's argument is as follows: The four Tivoli maidens can be divided into two types, Type A and Type B.¹¹⁰ Types A and B differ in significant ways, namely in their height, the number of coiled tresses over the shoulder, the treatment of footwear, the attachment of the capital and treatment of the drapery, the egg-and-dart molding, and the bead-and-reel, all of which together point to their production at different times by different workshops. Table 3 summarizes the features of the two types of Tivoli Maidens including Broucke's conclusions regarding the dates of the copies:

¹⁰⁶ Wilson Jones 2000, pp. 180-182.

¹⁰⁷ Loeb translation of "Agrippae Pantheum decoravit Diogenes Atheniensis; in columnis templi eius Caryatides probantur inter pauca operum, sicut in fastigio posita signa, sed propter altitudinem loci minus celebrata."

¹⁰⁸ Winckelmann 1760 was the first to assume that there were copies of Erechtheion maidens in the Pantheon based on Pliny's description. This assumption has been challenged by many scholars. Broucke's arguments, however, add archaeological evidence to what was admittedly a prime example of the conflation of the term "caryatid" and the Erechtheion maidens.

¹⁰⁹ Broucke 1998. The Pantheon burned down in A.D. 80 and was rebuilt by Domitian in A.D. 81. On the discovery of the maidens at Tivoli, see Aurigemma 1996.

¹¹⁰ For photographs of the Tivoli maidens, consult Schmidt 1973, pls. 6-32. Unfortunately I do not have my own images to illustrate these arguments.

Table 3. Summary of Features of the Maidens from Tivoli and the Forum of Augustus, Compared to the Erechtheion Maidens.

Maiden	Tivoli 1	Tivoli 2	Erechtheion	Tivoli 3	Tivoli 4	Augustan Forum
Type	B	B	Original	A	A	A
Date	Flavian	Flavian	Classical	Augustan	Augustan	Augustan
Accuracy of drapery at front	Accurate	Accurate	Flat drapery at front	Not accurate Twisted drapery at front	Same as Tivoli 3	Same as Tivoli 3&4
No. of tresses	2	2	2	3	3	3
Back		Similar to Erechtheion maidens M3 & M4 with original treatment preserved	M3 and M4 have original drapery, M1, M2, M5 have recarved drapery ¹¹¹	Flattened, but protruding segments of drapery ¹¹²	Same as Tivoli 3	Same as Tivoli 3&4
Shoe style	Plain sole, no straps	Plain sole, no straps	Plain sole, top of all feet too damaged	Triple layered sole, sculpted straps	Same as Tivoli 3	Notched sole at big toe ¹¹³
Tivoli Museum No.	2236	2239		2233	2238	

Type A, however, is very similar to the maidens from the Forum of Augustus, especially with respect to the arrangement of the drapery in the vicinity of their stomachs. The match with the torso found in the Forum of Augustus is truly remarkable (Figure 653). Therefore, it appears that Type A dates to the Augustan period. If Broucke's theory is correct and the Tivoli Type A maidens belong to the Pantheon, then they date to a few years before the Forum of Augustus, thus serving as the model for the highly repeated Erechtheion maidens that appear in the Forum's attic story.

¹¹¹ On the recarving of the backs of M1, M2 and M5, see Chapter III. M6 is an ancient replacement, probably Hellenistic.

¹¹² The treatment of the backs of these maidens suggests that their backs would not be seen in their original contexts in the Pantheon and Forum of Augustus.

¹¹³ Francis 2001 suggests this sole type dates to the 2nd century B.C., based on the typology laid out by Katherine Morrow in Morrow 1985.

Type A may have been inspired by the Erechtheion maidens, but as the information summarized in Table 3 indicates, it is by no means an accurate quotation. We must remember that Pliny attributes the Pantheon “caryatids” to Diogenes of Athens. Diogenes, as a sculptor and native of Athens, would have been highly familiar with the Erechtheion maidens and confident enough to recreate them within an acceptable degree of accuracy from memory.¹¹⁴ These Type A maidens are the very sculptures Pliny must have seen when he denotes them as being in “a class of their own” in the mid 1st century A.D.

Type B, on the other hand, is a much more faithful quotation of the Erechtheion maidens. The arrangement of the drapery is almost identical, but the carving in general is not as well executed. The closest parallels for the drapery style are Flavian.¹¹⁵ Broucke characterizes the drapery as having “deep linear cuts” which “terminate abruptly,” having been drilled for accentuation.¹¹⁶

Furthermore, the chronology of the Tivoli maidens corresponds well to the known phases of the pre-Hadrianic Pantheon, namely the Augustan and Domitianic periods.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁴ Diogenes’ purpose may not have been to copy the maidens exactly, nor need he have gone back to his hometown to make a study for the versions in the Pantheon. Diogenes was undoubtedly familiar with the form and function of the Erechtheion maidens. When commissioned to create copies for the Pantheon, he did not return to Athens to make a mold. He carved them from memory or perhaps a sketch in the contemporary classicizing style (including Roman-style footwear: see Francis 2001). He created his own version for the Pantheon which was sufficiently reminiscent of the Erechtheion maidens to be identify them with the home of Athena Polias in Athens.

¹¹⁵ Compare the statue of Titus from Herculaneum. That the Type B Tivoli maidens date to the Domitianic period and replicate more faithfully the form of the originals in Athens begs the question of how the sculptors became so closely acquainted with the original form since there were already so many inaccurate Augustan copies visible in Rome. Because of the accuracy of these copies, coupled with the well-known fact that Domitian was obsessed with Athena as observed in the Forum Transitorium dedicated to her, it is conceivable that casts (or at least a detailed study) were made from the original maidens on the Athenian Akropolis during Domitian’s reign. The historical overview above, however, indicated that there was little imperial activity on the Athenian Akropolis during the Flavian period.

¹¹⁶ Broucke 1998.

¹¹⁷ The frieze inscription still on the building attests to the initiation of building in 27 B.C. Cassius Dio 53.27.2 reports that the Pantheon and Basilica of Neptune were completed by 25 B.C. and Pliny reports that “caryatids” were incorporated by Diogenes of Athens. Dio (66.24.2) is also the source for the fire in the

So, if Broucke is correct in his identification of the elusive caryatids of the 1st century B.C. and A.D. phases of the Pantheon as the copies of the Erechtheion maidens found at Tivoli, and Pliny used the term “caryatid” in the second half of the 1st century A.D. to refer to these very sculptures, then the implication for the interpretation of Vitruvius’ legacy is highly meaningful: Pliny, one of the best educated and lettered men of his time, called the maidens of the Erechtheion “caryatids” by virtue of copies in the Pantheon. This connection supports the argument that when writers or architects after Vitruvius envisioned caryatids, they made the visual connection with the famous maidens from the Classical Erechtheion.

Having established the impact of Vitruvius on the interpretation of the Erechtheion maidens, we can now turn to the contexts in which these human architectural supports are found. Augustus’ vow on the eve of the Battle of Philippi in 42 B.C. to build a temple to Mars Ultor was long overdue by the time he defeated Antony and Cleopatra at the Battle of Actium, and so he ensured that progress was being made on the temple and his Forum by the mid 20s B.C.¹¹⁸ The design of the Forum included an attic

Campus Martius which damaged the Pantheon under Titus. The *MHG* 9.146 and Hieronymos, *Ab Abr.* 2105 attest to the restoration of the Pantheon under Domitian, (and there are Domitianic brick-stamps). Lightning struck under Trajan according to Oros 7.12.5 and Hieronymos, *Ab Abr.* 2127; and Hadrian rebuilt the Pantheon wholesale after 126, at which time he “carted off” (Broucke 1998) the four remaining maidens to Tivoli where his villa was still under construction but already in use (*SHA, Hadrian* 19.10). See Ziolkowski 1999.

¹¹⁸ The date of the dedication of the Forum of Augustus, 2 B.C., was the year Lucius Caesar assumed the *toga virilis* and received the title of *princeps iuventutis* and other honors. Augustus finally accepted the title of *pater patriae*, and Gaius Caesar set out for Parthia armed with proconsular imperium at the tender age of eighteen: Rich 2002. The peace with Parthia negotiated by Augustus and Tiberius in 20 B.C. did not last. See Rose forthcoming, for the most recent discussion of Rome and the Parthians. Gaius would leave for his campaign from the newly dedicated forum. From then on, the Forum of Augustus became the formal departure point for all military campaigns. John Rich and Martin Spannagel argue that the actual inception (i.e., start of construction) of the Forum of Augustus was 17 B.C. This was the year of Augustus’ adoption of Gaius and Lucius as his sons and heirs. The design and impetus for the forum not only represents Augustus’ desire to set an example for building civic and religious structures *ex manubiis*, but also projects the emperors’ high hopes for Gaius and Lucius’ futures: Rich 2002; Spannagel 1999, pp. 79-85. This inception date of 17 B.C. is about a decade after the dedication of the Pantheon of Agrippa. C. Vibius Rufus, who signed his name on one of the copies of the maidens in the Forum of Augustus, got his model

story above the colonnades with Erechtheion maidens alternating with clipei, or shields, adorned with heads (Figure 652). Only two types of these heads survive, those of Zeus Ammon and a Gaul. These heads represent the proud nations conquered by Augustus, and the emperor's hegemony in both East and West. This interpretation is underscored by the inscribed lists of conquered people on display in the forum.¹¹⁹ The Forum of Augustus, as a whole, sent out a message of the new emperor's wide-ranging control over the growing Empire, by means of its sculptural program and use of multicolored marbles from Egypt to Asia Minor.¹²⁰

The copies of the Erechtheion maidens are usually interpreted as being references to the glory of Classical Athens – as a parallel to the golden age of Rome inaugurated by Augustus – because modern scholars wish to deny Vitruvius' story.¹²¹ While the

for the Erechtheion maidens from the Pantheon. In the Forum of Augustus, the maidens stand between clipei with the heads of conquered nations such as Egypt (as Zeus Ammon) and a Gaul: Schmidt 1973, p. 11, figs. 4 and 5. Margarete Bieber characterizes the sculpture by the Italian Vibius as “in a style similar to the heads and hair on the Ara Pacis,” (Bieber 1977, p. 30).

¹¹⁹ For similar lists of conquered tribes, see Augustus' victory monument at La Turbie. Personifications of conquered nations were carved in the round and labeled at Aphrodisias. For the inscriptions, see Velleius Paterculus 2.39.2; Nicolet 1991, pp. 42-45. Rose (forthcoming) reports that only two types of *clipeus* masks have been recovered in the Forum of Augustus, and suggests these were the only types used in this context. At Augusta Emerita (see below), the Jupiter Ammon/Egypt type is found with a Medusa type (Figure 656 and Figure 657): Trillmich 1990. This subtle modification of iconography is paralleled in the alteration to the copies of the Erechtheion maidens which flanked the clipei (Figure 655 and Figure 659). Fragments of two clipei bearing the heads of Jupiter Ammon and one with a Medusa were discovered in the Provincial Forum at Tarraco, modern Tarragona, in Spain: Aquilué et al. 1991, pp. 63-66. The clipei at Tarragona have the same motifs as the clipei from the Forum at Mérida. Since we only have the Jupiter Ammon and the Gaul from the Augustan Forum, perhaps we can add Medusa to the suite of *clipei* in Rome. We might therefore expect further excavation to reveal Erechtheion-inspired maidens to accompany these *clipei*. I am indebted to Eva M. Steinby for bringing the Tarragona *clipei* to my attention.

¹²⁰ Agrippa and Augustus were inundated with design decisions as monuments under their patronage were being erected in Rome and abroad. The aesthetic appeal of the Erechtheion maidens made them a natural symbolic substitute for the glory of Greece, but the symbolism behind them must not be overlooked. While on the one hand, they might have thought, “Athens has six of these lovely maidens, we'll use sixty;” on the other, the developing iconography and visual language of victory was carefully contrived and always served a propagandistic agenda. On Augustan iconography and propaganda, see Zanker 1988.

¹²¹ Kleiner 1992, pp. 100-101; Kellum 1997, p. 167. Taylor interprets the inclusion of the maidens as Rome being better than Greece and distinctly anti-Mark Antony: Taylor 1949. For Taylor, the Erechtheion maidens were something beautiful that could be imported from an otherwise debased culture. Karl Galinsky recognizes the shameful overtones of the maidens in the Forum of Augustus, but does so out of a straightforward reading of Vitruvius: Galinsky 1996, p. 203.

equation with Periklean Athens may have been intended on one level, the maidens must be considered in their symbolic juxtaposition to the alternating shields of conquered nations. Alongside the fact that Athens had sided yet again with the losing party in the Battle of Actium, and had to grovel for forgiveness in the aftermath of the civil war, these maidens of Classical Athens had become symbols of submission, true caryatids in the eyes of the visitor to the Augustan Forum. It is also worth remembering that Augustus had never been well-disposed toward Athens.¹²² Therefore, the Erechtheion maidens would have been an appropriate signifier of Athens' (and Greece's) subjection to Roman rule.

Further evidence for interpreting the copies of the Erechtheion maidens in the Forum of Augustus with Vitruvian overtones derives from two later and related monuments: the Forum of Trajan and the Arch of Constantine. Statues of bound Dacian prisoners carved in purple-veined marble occupied the identical position in the Forum of Trajan as did the copies of the Erechtheion maidens did in the Forum of Augustus (Figure 654). This highly visible architectural parallel between the two monuments leaves no doubt that the two were equated as symbols of victory over conquered peoples.

Moreover, that icon of *spolia*, the Arch of Constantine, recycles eight of the very same Dacian prisoners from the Forum of Trajan.¹²³ Again, they are set up in the attic story and frame recycled and re-carved relief panels of the lost arch of Marcus Aurelius which bear scenes of successful army activities; they serve as constant reminders of the fate and circumstances of a conquered people. In fact, beginning in the Renaissance, these Dacian captives were actually considered to be quotations from the Persian Stoa at

¹²² See above note 16.

¹²³ The Forum of Trajan was still standing when the Arch of Constantine was erected. The Dacians (and other *spolia* employed in the monument) may have come from marble yards: see Alchermes 1994.

Sparta described by Vitruvius and illustrated in the masculine counterpart to the “caryatids” of the Palladian edition.¹²⁴

In sum, using a contextualized diachronic approach to analyze the problem of Vitruvius’ definition of the term “caryatid,” and how this relates to the Erechtheion maidens, we have observed that upon the publication of *De Architectura*, the Erechtheion maidens became a part of the Roman iconographic vocabulary of triumph. Therefore, from the early Augustan period through the 4th century A.D., the maidens from the Erechtheion at Athens represented for the viewer “caryatids” in the Vitruvian sense: symbols of submission and humiliation.

Examples of copies of Erechtheion maidens in contexts of submission can also be found in Roman Greece after the 2nd century A.D. In the Roman Forum at Corinth, for example, the Captives Façade embellished one side while another monument sharing the same space incorporated copies of Erechtheion maidens (Figure 645 and Figure 646).¹²⁵ Although the original context of the maidens at Corinth is not known – and so their significance and meaning when they were originally erected in the Julio-Claudian period cannot be discerned – their meaning in the 2nd century is obvious: Their contraposition to the Captive’s Façade in the Roman Forum at Corinth makes the maidens symbols of subjection even more directly than the aforementioned architectural parallel between the Augustan and Trajanic Fora in Rome.

¹²⁴ Palladio and della Porta’s illustration of D. Barbaro’s edition of Vitruvius, *I dieci libri*, 1556; Schneider 1986.

¹²⁵ On the copy of the Erechtheion maiden at Corinth, see Williams and Fisher 1975, pp. 22-23. The excavators date the maidens to the Julio-Claudian period. Their original context is unknown, but the treatment of their backs indicates that they were not free-standing. Williams identified the best preserved maiden (S-74-26) as an exact copy of Maiden #6. The drapery around the back is deep compared to the flat treatment of the rears of Maidens #1, #2 and #5 (see Chapter III). Erechtheion Maiden #6 is an ancient replacement.

At Emerita Augusta (modern Mérida, Spain, and Roman capital of Lusitania), a forum based on that of Augustus at Rome was erected in the middle of the 1st century A.D. The design included loose copies of the Erechtheion maidens and clipei with heads, in this instance, of Medusa and Jupiter Ammon (Figure 655, Figure 656 and Figure 657).¹²⁶ The maidens from Mérida were not carved in the round as at Rome, and they hold jugs in either their right or left upraised hands rather than phialai/paterae of the Tivoli examples (Figure 659). Despite the major differences between the maidens from Athens and Mérida, they are nonetheless directly related because of the general architectural parallels between the fora at Rome and Mérida. This raises the question of what this sculptural decoration would have meant to the inhabitants of a colony composed of veterans of the V and X legions from Augustus' wars and their descendants.¹²⁷ Would these veterans have understood the maidens as quotations direct from Athens, and/or as symbols of subjugation?

¹²⁶ Emerita Augusta was founded as a colony between 25 and 19 B.C.: Alvarez Martínez, de la Barrera Antón, and Jiménez 1900a, p. 4. On the “municipal” forum, see Alvarez Martínez, de la Barrera Antón, and Jiménez 1900a, pp. 49-50; Trillmich 1990; Alvarez Martínez 1982; Alvarez Martínez 1989. For an annotated bibliography of scholarship on Mérida up to 1992, see Jimenez 1992. Scholl considers the copies from Mérida in his analysis of the Maiden Porch of the Erechtheion: Scholl 1998, pp. 64-65. See note 119 for a discussion of the clipei from the fora at Rome, Mérida, and Tarragona.

¹²⁷ It is very difficult to prove that a certain soldier who fought in the legion V or X necessarily both visited Athens with Augustus and Agrippa and was a colonist of Emerita Augusta. The history of legions V and X is complex and it is difficult to follow individuals' membership in them. Sometimes legions were reorganized for logistical reasons, such as to increase numbers in legions where many soldiers had died, and sometimes for political reasons: Pompey and Caesar each had Legions numbered I-X, and the triumvirates also had their own legions. Legions V and X were originally created by Julius Caesar: Legion V Alaudae (A.K.A. the Larks) was created illegally and Legion X Equestris (A.K.A. Gemina) won fame in the Gallic and Civil Wars. Pompey also had a set of legions numbered I-X. Caesar's Legion V ceased to exist after it sank in the Adriatic on its way to Greece to join Caesar's efforts against Pompey in 49 B.C. After Pharsalus in 48 B.C. when Caesar defeated Pompey, Caesar took over Pompey's forces including his Legion V. Caesar then had multiples of the same legions I-X. Caesar retired many of the veterans, who remained loyal to their legion “number.” After Caesar was assassinated in 44 B.C., Mark Antony took over most of his legions, including Caesar's V Alaudae and X Equestris. Octavian raised legions among the veterans Caesar had recently settled and they marched under their old legionary numbers and they fought in the Battle of Mutina. After the second triumvirate fell apart, there were triple repetitions of legionary numbers. In 35-34 B.C., Octavian took over the legions of the deposed Lepidus. By the time of the Battle of Actium, these legions had been combined to even out the numbers, and Octavian met Antony

Unfortunately, there is no literary evidence for which legions accompanied Augustus and Agrippa on their visits to Athens at which time these future colonists may have come into direct contact with the Erechtheion. Nonetheless, it is important to remember that the veterans from these campaigns understood the language of triumph and subjugation since they themselves were the subjugators, and would have seen the iconography of imperial triumph not only at Rome but all over the Empire by the middle of the 1st century A.D. There is one small piece of evidence which links the forum at Mérida to Athena of Athens: a 1st century A.D. relief (perhaps from a balustrade?) which depicts an olive tree, a snake and birds (doves?) (Figure 658).¹²⁸ In light of the loose interpretation of the Erechtheion maidens at Mérida, it is only safe to say that their inclusion appears to be simply a part of the quotation of the Forum of Augustus as a whole, rather than harkening all the way back to the original source at Athens. The impetus to copy the Forum of Augustus probably springs from the colony's desire to recreate a little piece of Rome in far-flung western Hispania.¹²⁹ The original veteran-soldier-colonists probably chose to quote the Forum of Augustus in particular because they were Augustus' clients. Augustus was their imperator, patron, and commander-in-chief, and they showed their enthusiasm and loyalty by imitating the emperor's architectural programme and thereby espousing the Imperial ideals.

and Cleopatra with about sixty-five legions. After Actium, Octavian went overland to Egypt and visited Athens on the way with several legions, but it is unclear which ones. The other legions were dismissed to other quarters. Octavian left three legions in Egypt to control the new province. Octavian retired over half of his legions, leaving twenty-eight renumbered legions. When he retired some of the soldiers of the V and X to the colony of Emerita Augusta six or so years later, it is not clear which V and X. The only way to deduce where an individual fought is if this information was recorded on his tombstone. The habit of recording such information did not begin at Emerita Augusta until the 2nd century A.D. Therefore, it is impossible to say for certain that the soldiers who retired to Emerita Augusta had seen the Erechtheion. On the history of the legions, see Keppie 1998.

¹²⁸ These are the trademarks of Athena's cult in Athens, see Chapter II.

¹²⁹ Fred Drogula (pers. comm.).

And finally, why did Vitruvius choose the story of the Karyan women as the prime example of how to explain the architect's design choices to his patron for the opening passages of his treatise? The war with Persia was still playing itself out for the Romans. Sulla and Pompey's victories in the East were overshadowed by the loss of the military standards by Crassus in 53 B.C. to Parthia. Perhaps Vitruvius' inclusion of the anti-Persian story is his reaction (as a military engineer under Julius Caesar) to the smarting memory of this humiliation, a story which would have pleased the "Imperator Caesar" to whom the treaty was addressed. Its subtext also served as a warning to those cities, mostly in Greece and Asia Minor, whose monuments Vitruvius held up as key examples of the architectural phenomena he was describing: Do not consider medizing like the Karyans did during the Persian War, or else Rome will punish you!

In conclusion, the Roman reception of the Erechtheion illustrates how this building and its sculpture played an important role in the psyche of the people of the Roman Empire. The new way of looking at Vitruvius presented here serves to clarify some of the previous misconceptions about his text's relationship with the Erechtheion. It demonstrates how, almost from the moment his definition of "caryatid" was written down, every generation until now has interpreted the term in almost exactly the same way, namely as referring to the constantly visible maidens of the South Porch of the Erechtheion, and as eternal symbols of submission and humiliation.

PAUSANIAS AND THE RECEPTION OF THE AKROPOLIS IN THE 2ND CENTURY A.D.

Pausanias' *Periegesis Hellados* or *Description of Greece* forms the basis for every discussion of the topography of the Akropolis, and more certainly of the Erechtheion.

His description constitutes the only continuous narrative of the temple and its environs. All the other literary and documentary evidence pertaining to the Erechtheion is piecemeal and circumstantial. For example, on the one hand, the *archaios neos* may be mentioned in a treasury list, on the other, the priest of Erechtheus is mentioned in an honorary decree. Pausanias' account is therefore our only ancient narrative description of the Erechtheion, and its place on the Akropolis, as it functioned in ancient times.

This section will demonstrate the importance of examining Pausanias' tour of the whole Akropolis (1.22.4-1.28.3) in order to understand not only his detailed description of the Erechtheion and Temple of Athena Polias (1.26.5-1.27.3), but also his omission of one of the most important sculptural features of the building, the Maiden Porch.¹³⁰ In order to address this problem, the following questions are posited: Which buildings were still standing on the plateau in the mid 2nd century A.D.? Did some of these structures, mentioned and unmentioned, impede Pausanias' view of certain parts of the Erechtheion? Where was Pausanias' attention directed at different stages of his tour?

That Pausanias was not interested in architecture is the reason usually given as to why he failed to note the Maiden Porch of the Erechtheion.¹³¹ But Pausanias certainly

¹³⁰ See Chapter II for the incorporation of Pausanias' testimony into the reconstruction of the Classical Erechtheion. The problem of Pausanias' omission of the Maiden Porch troubled traveler-scholars as early as Stuart and Revett in 1751. Previous travelers conflated the maidens with the Graces by Sokrates whom Pausanias mentions much earlier in his account of the Akropolis: 1.22.8.

¹³¹ For recent discussions of Pausanias' methods, see Hutton 1995; Habicht 1998; and Alcock, Cherry, and Elsner 2001. Pausanias' tours of sanctuaries and towns were generally erratic, especially in Athens, the first city on his panhellenic tour. In Athens, he had not yet sorted out a consistent pace at which to visit sites (he complains, for example, about his own digressions immediately prior to his discussion of "the building called the Erechtheion," 1.26.5), nor a trusty way to record what he had learned from his local guides. Notorious is the problem in Pausanias' tour of the Agora, where for many years it was thought that the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios was the same building as the Royal Stoa because Pausanias does not employ his usual words to indicate that he is moving on to the next building. To compound these syntactical problems, Pausanias visits the Akropolis even before he visits the Agora. As a result, his method is even more opaque. It seems as if he, as the early modern travelers who would follow in his footsteps, could not remember exactly the monuments he had seen - or the order he had seen them in - when he sat down to write out his travel narrative replete with additional historical and artistic commentary. While Pausanias

was interested in sculpture, especially Classical sculpture. He describes all manner of sculpture in his narrative of the Akropolis, including those in marble, bronze, and even wood. The maidens in the South Porch of the Erechtheion were some of the finest examples of standing sculpture carved in the round in all of Greece. Therefore, the question remains, why did Pausanias, who expended a great deal of effort on the items in the interior of the temple, ignore the sculpture on the South Porch? It is probable that he neglected to mention the maidens because he never saw them (i.e., his attention was never drawn to them). He missed his first chance when he initially beheld the Erechtheion from the Propylaea because there was a structure blocking his view, and he missed his second chance when he passed by the Erechtheion on its south, because his attention was directed to the north terrace of the Parthenon. And after his visit to the Parthenon and the sculptures in the vicinity of its east entrance, Pausanias hurries himself onward to the Erechtheion lest he never complete his *Description of Greece*.¹³²

The structure blocking the view of the Maiden Porch must have been the remains of the Opisthodomos of the Archaic Temple on the Athena.¹³³ It is here that

does mention the main themes of the pedimental sculpture of the Parthenon (1.24.5), he does generally ignore sculptures high up on buildings. For instance, later in his *Description of Greece* (10.11.1), Pausanias mentions no sculptural detail whatsoever of the highly decorated and earliest of all marble Ionic buildings on the Greek mainland: the Siphnian Treasury. By this point, Pausanias' style has developed from its nascent stages when he described Athens to when he described the Panhellenic sanctuary at Delphi. The frieze and maidens of the Siphnian Treasury may have been obvious features, but they were neither cult statues nor dedications whose pedigrees needed explaining. Pausanias was not writing a reference book to be consulted in a library, but a guide to be read by the traveler in front of the monument: see Rutherford 2001.

¹³² Pausanias 1.26.5.

¹³³ Ferrari 2002, pp. 14-15 most recently reargues the case for the survival of the Opisthodomos into Late Antiquity. Her arguments are based entirely on Dörpfeld 1919, p. 39, and his earlier publications: Dörpfeld 1887; Dörpfeld 1890; and Dörpfeld 1897. While her (and Dörpfeld's) arguments regarding the survival of the entire cella (and peristyle as well, according to Ferrari) of the Archaic Temple of Athena is untenable based on the volume and nature of materials contained in the North Akropolis Wall as well as other 5th century contexts on the Akropolis, it is generally accepted that the Opisthodomos continued to stand after the Erechtheion was "finished": see Harris 1995, pp. 40-41. On the identification of the Opisthodomos as the remainder of the Archaic Temple of Athena as opposed to the west room of the Parthenon (correctly termed "Parthenon"), see Dinsmoor 1932, pp. 309-311 and Harris 1995, p. 4. That the Opisthodomos was

Pausanias' lack of interest in mundane buildings, especially ones whose function has probably ceased, comes into play. Pausanias' path up to the point where he mentions the building called the Erechtheion is well-enough established. After passing through the Propylaia, "the only entrance to the Akropolis,"¹³⁴ he observes the Temple of Athena Nike,¹³⁵ and the place where Aigeus threw himself off the bastion upon seeing the black sails of Theseus' returning ship.¹³⁶ He then returns to the Propylaia to describe more sculptural monuments.¹³⁷ Pausanias proceeds up and along the crest of the Akropolis, stops to look at the Brauroneion on his right. This whole time, the southwest view of the Erechtheion is almost completely blocked by the terrace of the Archaic Temple of Athena and the Pheidias' Bronze Athena. The Maiden Porch would have been blocked entirely by the Opisthodomos. After visiting the Brauroneion, Pausanias then passes between the Parthenon and the ruins of the Archaic Temple of Athena, and notes in particular the monuments on the terrace of the north side of the Parthenon such as the statue of Ge beseeching Zeus for rain.¹³⁸ The cutting for the statue's base is still visible in the bedrock. Next to the cutting is the rock-cut inscription, ΓΗΣ ΚΑΡ/ΠΟΦΟΡΟΥ/ ΚΑΤΑ ΜΑΝ/ΤΕΙΑΝ or "[Image] of Earth, Bearer of Fruit, according to the oracle." This

dismantled after the cessation of the Treasury Lists in the late 4th century B.C. is an unfounded assumption. The treasury lists which mentioned the Opisthodomos ceased at this time owing to irregularities in the use and storage of the goddess' treasure (see Chapter III). The structure itself did not cease to exist. There is no evidence for the removal of the Opisthodomos. Its materials were not reused elsewhere on the Akropolis in contexts after the 4th century B.C. On the longevity of the Opisthodomos after the cessation of the treasury lists, see Korres 1994c, p. 47, who allows for its continued existence "even [for] centuries." Also on the term "Opisthodomos" see Hollingshead 1999, pp. 210-214.

¹³⁴ Pausanias 1.22.4.

¹³⁵ Pausanias 1.22.4.

¹³⁶ Pausanias 1.22.5.

¹³⁷ Pausanias 1.22.8.

¹³⁸ For a general discussion of these monuments, see Stevens 1946, pp. 1-13. See also Korres 1994a; Korres 1986, p. 675; and Schmalz 1994, p. 202. Pausanias, 1.24.3, describes this statue of Ge as embodying artistic workmanship rather than mere antiquity. She is an image of Earth beseeching Zeus to rain upon her, and he speculates that maybe the Athenians needed rain or all the Greeks had been plagued with drought. Stevens 1946, p. 4 suggests she dates to the Hadrianic period.

monument is in line with the seventh column from the west of the Parthenon (Figure 617), and so we know exactly where Pausanias' attention was directed at this point in his tour: he is facing south, that is away from the Maiden Porch, as he crosses the Akropolis, and so misses his first opportunity to view the maidens since the Opisthodomos had previously been blocking his view of them.¹³⁹ As Pausanias proceeds eastward, his attention is drawn to the Altar of Zeus Polieus, probably located to the northeast of the Parthenon. He describes the unusual ritual at the altar where the priest kills the bull who has partaken of the sacred grain on the altar with an axe, runs away, and his peers try the axe as if they did not know who killed the bull.¹⁴⁰ Stevens claims to have identified cuttings for the pen where the bull was kept prior to sacrifice to the northeast of the Parthenon.¹⁴¹ The next monument Pausanias describes is the Parthenon¹⁴² and the statue of Athena Parthenos within.¹⁴³ After describing a bronze statue of Apollo opposite the entrance to the Parthenon which he attributes to Pheidias, he proceeds to the south wall and describes the Attalid monument with the Giants, Amazons, Persians and Gauls.¹⁴⁴ After catching himself for rambling on in a digression, he realizes that he must move on if he is to describe all of Greece.

¹³⁹ On first glance of this section of Pausanias' text, he appears to have changed modes of description and started detailing one of his categories (as he does, for example, with the altars at Olympia), namely a series of sculptures; however, the order of these sculptures bears out "on the ground," so to speak, along the north side of the Parthenon. After Ge, Pausanias lists Timotheos and his father Konon, Prokne and Itys and Athena with Poseidon and their respective gifts to Athens: see Stevens 1946, pp. 1-12. It is unusual that Pausanias would list the son before the father as a matter of course, but this is in fact how he came across the sculptures. The inscribed base (*IG II² 3774*) for this statue group was found a yard from the rock-cut inscription of Ge, Timotheos was on the right, and Konon on the left, if their backs were to the Parthenon: Habicht 1998, p. 63; Stevens 1946, pp. 1-4.

¹⁴⁰ Pausanias 1.24.4.

¹⁴¹ Stevens 1946, pp. 12-15.

¹⁴² Pausanias 1.24.5.

¹⁴³ Pausanias 1.25.7. Erichthonios (not conflated with Erechtheus) is the snake nestled in her shield. He mentions Hadrian's portrait as the only (mortal) portrait statue in proximity to Athena Parthenos.

¹⁴⁴ Pausanias 1.25.2.

After his visit to the south wall of the Akropolis and a short description of a venerable statue of Athena by Endoios,¹⁴⁵ Pausanias launches into his description of the οἶκημα Ἐρεχθειον καλούμενον, or “the building called the Erechtheion.”¹⁴⁶ As argued in Chapter II, Pausanias is standing in the East Porch and looking down when he describes the altars and well of Poseidon in the οἶκημα διπλοῦν or two-story building/house/dwelling place.¹⁴⁷ And why did he not mention the Maiden Porch at this point? Perhaps it is because the east view of the Maiden Porch would have been easy to overlook considering the many statues and monuments that littered the area.¹⁴⁸

We return to where we started. First, did Pausanias actually neglect to mention the maidens? Dinsmoor suggests Pausanias alludes to them after his description of the Temple of Athena Polias when he mentions the “arrhephoroi” as the “maidens who bear on their heads what the priestess of Athena gives them to carry.”¹⁴⁹ If so, this would give us the best clue as to the maidens’ significance. But this theory (including the connection between Pausanias and the maidens) has not gained many adherents because Pausanias appears to have moved onto a new topic by this point in his narrative. We must conclude, therefore, that on his whirlwind tour of the Akropolis, Pausanias may very well

¹⁴⁵ Many scholars such as Olga Palagia and Maria Brouskari consider Akropolis Museum no. 625 to be the statue of Athena by Endoios that Pausanias mentions: see Brouskari 1997, p. 240; Hurwit 1999, p. 125. For the opposing view, see Ridgway 1992, pp. 138-139. See also Kroll 1982, p. 67, who suggests that Endoios’ reworked of the cult statue of Athena Polias in the late 6th century B.C.

¹⁴⁶ Pausanias’ omission of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus has often been noted and this has generally been put down to Pausanias’ habit of not dwelling on imperial monuments unless the sculpture is remarkable (see Arafat 1996, p. 123), as in the case of Ge Karpophoros.

¹⁴⁷ See Chapter II for the remainder of Pausanias’ tour of the Erechtheion.

¹⁴⁸ It is admittedly conceivable that Pausanias did see the Maiden Porch at this point in his tour, but did not consider it sufficiently noteworthy enough to mention because they were so ubiquitous at Rome: Rose (pers. comm.).

¹⁴⁹ Dinsmoor 1950, p. 193. The maidens cannot be the arrhephoroi who were young girls of seven to eleven years of age because these maidens (like the Archaic korai) have full busts and hips. The Erechtheion maidens carried phialai (although Dinsmoor would not have known this because the Tivoli copies were only discovered in 1952, see above “The Reception of Vitruvius and the Conflation of “Caryatid” and the Erechtheion Maidens.”) See Chapter II for a discussion of the identity of the maidens of the South Porch.

not have noticed the Maiden Porch. As one who regularly took note of artistic marvels, of which the Maiden Porch certainly was, having been copied extensively throughout the Roman Empire, it seems inevitable to conclude that Pausanias' view of it was obscured by the Opisthodomos of the Archaic Temple of Athena when he entered the Akropolis and proceeded past the Brauroneion.¹⁵⁰ And at his first opportunity to view the Maiden Porch head-on from the south, his attention was diverted to the remarkable sculpture of Ge beseeching Zeus for rain. Because of the continued existence of the Opisthodomos, Pausanias was deprived of beholding one of the most popular and famous views of the Erechtheion from the southwest, the view most often depicted by the early travelers to the Athens who sketched the Erechtheion.¹⁵¹

THE RECEPTION OF THE ERECHTHEION IONIC ORDER IN THE ROMAN PERIOD

By the 1st century B.C., the Corinthian order had become the most commonly used order for Roman building. It was useful especially in unusually shaped buildings such as tholoi and monopteroi because of its three-dimensional qualities. Nonetheless, the Ionic order, and specifically the Erechtheion Ionic, was employed in several buildings in the Roman Empire. The “emerging influence of the Erechtheum's architecture” on Roman building has been attributed many times to the restoration of the temple during the 20s B.C.¹⁵²

¹⁵⁰ One may argue that the Maiden Porch was commonplace owing to the ubiquity of human architectural supports in the Roman Empire by the 2nd century; however, the Erechtheion was remarkable for being the source of so many of the Roman copies that Pausanias would surely have been impressed at seeing the original inspiration for the motif.

¹⁵¹ See Chapter VII for an analysis of these depictions of the Erechtheion.

¹⁵² Schmalz 1994, p. 14. See also Snijder 1924 and Wesenburg 1984. In fact, this concept pervades Schmalz's otherwise thoughtful and carefully researched doctoral thesis on Augustan and Julio-Claudian building in Athens so much that in almost every sentence of the first chapter, reference is made to Augustus' repair of the Erechtheion: Schmalz 1994, pp. 7-42.

Particularly revealing is the role Vitruvius (who preferred Hellenistic to Classical monuments) saw the Erechtheion as playing in the development of architecture. For example, the Erechtheion was far more important than the Parthenon because Vitruvius was not only more interested in the baroque and in orientalism, but also “because the [Erechtheion] is considered closer to the great flowering of Ionic architecture in Asia Minor, from Pytheos to Hermogenes.”¹⁵³ While Vitruvius did most of his traveling in Asia Minor under Caesar and his writings reflect a penchant for the monumental temples of the area, during the next generation under Augustus and after the publication of *De Architectura*, “the triumph of neo-Atticism imposed a different point of view; the Attic tradition of the fifth century was considered superior to that of the middle Hellenistic times inspired by the taste of Asia Minor and the Parthenon was appreciated much more than the temples of Hermogenes: the latter architect is never mentioned in written sources after Vitruvius.”¹⁵⁴

As the conclusions of Chapter III demonstrate, namely that the so-called Augustan repair actually took place in the Hellenistic period, a re-examination of the reasons for the widespread use of the Erechtheion Ionic is required. Since there is no longer a reason for Augustan architects to have been clambering on the Erechtheion, what were the means of transmission and the reasons for quoting the specific Ionic order of the Erechtheion in monuments in Athens and Rome during the early Empire? In order to investigate this problem, the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus, the Temple of Aphrodite Ouranos (both at Athens), and a copy of an Ionic column from the Erechtheion found in the vicinity of the Imperial Fora at Rome will be considered.

¹⁵³ Corso 1997, p. 400.

¹⁵⁴ Corso 1997 p. 400.

THE MONOPTEROS OF ROME AND AUGUSTUS

The Monopteros of Rome and Augustus is the earliest monument of Augustan Athens and the only known structure on mainland Greece built especially for the cult of Roma and Augustus.¹⁵⁵ Its plan consists of nine Ionic columns which imitate the East Porch of the Erechtheion and are laid out in a circle on a stylobate with a diameter of 7.36 m. It had a conical roof and a three step krepidoma (Figure 609, Figure 610, Figure 611, and Figure 612).¹⁵⁶ There is a general consensus that this building was designed by the same architect as the restorer of the Erechtheion, not only because the columns of the Monopteros imitate the necking band with an anthemion pattern, but also because a fragment of the original west cornice of the Erechtheion was found in what has come to be known as the foundations of the Monopteros.¹⁵⁷

The traditional argument for the Augustan date of the repairs to the Erechtheion relies mainly on the discovery of this cornice block from the 5th century Erechtheion in the rectangular foundations east of the Parthenon; circumstantial historical factors; and subjective comments about poor Roman workmanship, rather than on any comparison of datable moldings.¹⁵⁸ This section will endeavor to sever the triangular relationship between the Monopteros, the repair to the Erechtheion, and the foundations east of the Parthenon. After doing so, the correct chronological and topographical relationship among these monuments can be established. This study attempts to prove that the major repair to the Erechtheion took place in the Hellenistic period; the Monopteros should be

¹⁵⁵ Schmalz 1994, p. 12.

¹⁵⁶ Dinsmoor 1950 p. 284. Most examples of Augustan anthemion have inward curving palmettes, as in the Gate of Mazeus and Mithridates at Ephesos (4/3 B.C.).

¹⁵⁷ Dörpfeld believed there was a single architect for both projects: Dörpfeld 1903, p. 466. See also Schmidt-Colinet 1977, pp. 23-24. That Diogenes of Athens could have possibly supervised the design and construction of the Monopteros, the Pantheon and the Forum of Augustus is unlikely. Dörpfeld adds the repair of the Erechtheion to Diogenes' *curriculum vitae*, but as argued in Chapter III, this was impossible.

¹⁵⁸ See Chapter III.

located east of the Erechtheion; and the foundations east of the Parthenon supported some other monument, perhaps a colossal bronze of Apollo.

First, it is important to recognize that the association between the Monopteros and the rectangular foundations east of the Parthenon is an artifact of convenience. An examination of the history of the excavation of the Akropolis demonstrates that these foundations (where the substantial remains of the Monopteros are currently located) turn out to have been little more than a convenient place to collect the fragments as they were found.¹⁵⁹ The first piece of the Monopteros' superstructure was found by Ludwig Ross in 1833, built into the Byzantine church of the Parthenon. At this point, the flat area east of the Parthenon became a convenient place to collect the scattered fragments of the Monopteros as they emerged.¹⁶⁰ In 1851 Penrose reported seeing "some fragments of the materials of a circular building of later architecture...There is no evidence to show precisely where it stood or what it was."¹⁶¹ In Beulé's 1853 plan of the Akropolis (Figure 109), the Monopteros is located in the unexcavated region of the sanctuary of Zeus Polieus.¹⁶² This suggests that the location of the Monopteros was not yet fixed in the

¹⁵⁹ W. Binder 1969 first argued that the Monopteros belonged east of the Erechtheion. His theory was widely accepted only in German circles: Trummer 1980, p. 56; Hänlein-Schäfer 1985, pp. 157-158; and Kockel 1991, p. 284. Scholars of other nationalities cite W. Binder as a seminal work, but disagree with his relocation of the Monopteros because of the foundations' interrelationship with the repair of the Erechtheion. Camp, however, implies that the traditional location of the Monopteros is rightly disputed: Camp 2001, pp. 187-188. The independent redating of the repairs of the Erechtheion to the Hellenistic period (Chapter III) removes impediments scholars find to moving the Monopteros.

¹⁶⁰ The (inscribed) architrave block of the Monopteros can be seen in the middle ground of Lange, *Early Excavations on the Athenian Plateau*, 1834 (Figure 69). The south side of the foundations are exposed in the 1874 photograph by Sébah: Yiakoumis 2000, p. 127.

¹⁶¹ Penrose 1888, p. 3.

¹⁶² Beulé 1853-1854, II, pl. I. See also Beulé 1853-1854, p. 206:

Il faut dire cependant que l'on n'a retrouvé que trois morceaux d'Architrave....Les fragments sont séparés, et celui qui porte l'inscription est beaucoup plus près du Parthénon. Il se trouve à côté: d'une substruction rectangulaire en pierres qui ne peut évidemment manquer la place du temple, car elle a trop peu d'étendue et correspond trop exactement à l'entrecolonnement du milieu et à la porte du Parthénon, qui ne pouvaient être masqués. (Là je crois, s'élevait l'autel

middle of the 19th century, as it was generally known that the fragments came from all over the Akropolis, including the vicinity of the Erechtheion.¹⁶³ Kawerau and Kavvadias' notes and final publications label the area as belonging to the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus, although they report that all the remains in the vicinity were exclusively Ottoman.¹⁶⁴

Secondly, besides the suspicious means by which the superstructure accumulated at this spot, there is also the problem of placing a round structure on a rectangular foundation, a combination completely unparalleled in ancient architecture. Table 4 summarizes the shape of the foundations for round buildings before and after the construction of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus:

de Minerve.) Mais au Nord-est de la substruction on remarque un assez grand de rocher aplani, que pouvait occuper le temple de Rome et d'Auguste. Cependant il n'y a aucune trace sur le rocher.

Ernest Breton also places the Monopteros to the northeast of the Parthenon: Breton 1868, p. 147, pl. I. Leake 1841, pp. 353-4:

Among the monuments of the Acropolis not noticed by Pausanias, may be mentioned as the most remarkable: - 1. A brazen ram of colossal dimensions. 2. The temple of Rome and Augustus, [inscription noted in footnote] situated about ninety feet in front of the eastern face of the Parthenon. From a portion of its architrave still in existence, we may infer that it was circular, twenty three feet in diameter, of the Ionic or Corinthian order, and about fifty feet in height, exclusive of a basement, upon which undoubtedly it was raised.

Although Leake visited the Athens in 1802-1805, his account reflects updated knowledge of the post-Independence excavations. His plan also shows that the foundations have been exposed by 1841. On Pausanias not noticing the Monopteros, see Arafat 1996, pp. 121-126.

¹⁶³ W. Binder 1969, p. 133, summarizes the known findspots of the dispersed fragments of the Monopteros and illustrates its location according to various published theories.

¹⁶⁴ Bundgaard 1974, 102; Kavvadias and Kawerau 1906. Apparently Kavvadias excavated more of the foundations (Kawerau 1888, pls. 25 and 26 with text) and directed Kawerau to assemble the rest of the blocks from the Monopteros there: Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, p. 281; J. Binder (pers. comm.). She conducted the research for this part of Papageorgiou-Venetas' book. See also Burden 1999, p. 63 on the nature of the foundations east of the Parthenon.

Table 4. Predecessors and Successors of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus.

MONUMENT	DATE	SHAPE OF FOUNDATION
Tholos in the Athenian Agora	465 B.C.	Round
Thymele at Epidauros	360-320 B.C.	Round
Tholos at Delphi	Early 4 th century B.C.	Round
Temple of Aphrodite Euploia at Knidos	360 B.C.	Round
Philippeion at Olympia	338 B.C.	Round
Lysikrates Monument	334 B.C.	Tall square podium
Arsinoeion at Samothrace	289-281 B.C.	Round
Round Temple by the Tiber at Rome	ca. 100 B.C.	Round
Delphinion at Miletus	1 st century B.C.	Round
Small tholos at Palestrina	1 st century B.C.	Round
Temple B in the Largo Argentina at Rome	1 st century B.C.	Round
Temple of Fortuna at Tivoli	1 st century B.C.	Round
Well-house at Pompeii	1 st century B.C.	Round
Harbor Monument at Miletus	After 31 B.C.	Round
MONOPTEROS OF ROME AND AUGUSTUS	27-19 B.C.	?
La Turbie, France	5 B.C.	Round foundations within a tall square podium
Grave monument at St. Remy, France	Late 1 st century A.D.	Tall square podium
Grave monument at Aquileia	Early 1 st century A.D.	Tall square podium
Grave monument at Pompeii	1 st century A.D.	Tall square podium
Babbius Monument at Corinth	1 st century A.D.	Medium rectangular podium
Monopteros in the Agora	2 nd century A.D.	Round
Temple of Tyche at Side	2 nd century A.D.	Round
Hadrianic Palaimonion at Isthmia	A.D. 120-138	Low square podium
Antonine Palaimonion at Isthmia	A.D. 161-180	Low square podium
Temple of Vesta at Rome	ca. A.D. 195	Round

Table 4 shows that all round buildings in the Graeco-Roman world (except for those on tall, square podia) have complementary, round foundations.¹⁶⁵ The closest parallel for the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus is another monopteros, in the Athenian Agora near the Stoa of Attalos, which dates to the 2nd century A.D. It has a circular base about 8 m in diameter and a ring of eight Corinthian columns which once supported one of the earliest brick domes in Greece.¹⁶⁶ It is possible to extrapolate backward from this later monopteros (which clearly emulated that on the Akropolis, including the similarity of their diameters) and assume that the building that inspired it also stood on a circular base.¹⁶⁷

The only exception to the general rule that all ancient round buildings had round foundations unless they stood on a tall square foundation is the Babbus Monument at Corinth which dates to the Tiberian period. Its base is rectangular but still fairly high at 2.3-2.4 m above the forum floor. Therefore, it is in close proximity in time and space to the new, important monument on the Akropolis at Athens, and so could have possibly been influenced by it, if it were located on the rectangular foundation east of the Parthenon. This raises the question of whether the Monopteros on the Akropolis could have stood on a 2+ m rectangular podium. The Augustan Monopteros in Athens, however, could not have been on a (rectangular) podium of any height in this position because it would have blocked the entrance of the Parthenon to an even greater extent than it does as traditionally reconstructed. Furthermore, the Monopteros has a three step

¹⁶⁵ See Seiler 1986; Wilson Jones 2000, pp. 74-79, esp. p. 75 for the plans of other free-standing round buildings in or near Rome.

¹⁶⁶ Camp 1990, pp. 123-125.

¹⁶⁷ On the Monopteros in the Agora, see Schmalz 1994, p. 200; and Dinsmoor Jr. 1974.

krepidoma and none of the round monuments on tall square podia have krepidomata.¹⁶⁸

Another reason the foundations east of the Parthenon are not the home of the Monopteros is that they are much larger than its diameter.¹⁶⁹

Therefore, where was the Monopteros of Augustus and Rome located? Intriguing numismatic evidence places the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus just east of the Erechtheion. The only ancient depictions of the Erechtheion and its environs is a series of imperial bronze coins which show the north and south sides of the Akropolis.¹⁷⁰ Unique among the north slope series is one coin type which depicts, from right to left, the Propylaia, Pheidias' colossal Bronze Athena, the Erechtheion, and to the left of the Erechtheion, a small, round, conical-roofed building (Figure 615).¹⁷¹ This can only be the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus.¹⁷² Therefore, the best location for the Monopteros is a few meters east of the Erechtheion – in symbolic, ritual and architectural juxtaposition to the temple from which it draws its inspiration.¹⁷³ Like the altar of

¹⁶⁸ The Hadrianic and Antonine Palaimonia at Isthmia are the only two examples of monopteroi on low square bases that I have been able to find, but the shape of the foundations themselves within the structures is unclear.

¹⁶⁹ See W. Binder 1969 for a publication of many of these arguments. The foundations themselves are difficult to date. The poros stone is in poor condition and the blocks contain no clamps (Figure 614). J. Binder awaits permission to excavate the foundations themselves in search of chronological and stratigraphic evidence (pers. comm.).

¹⁷⁰ This coin series dates to the Hadrianic through mid-3rd century A.D. according to Walker 1980, pp. 194-203. Walker 1980, p. 183, notes that “no other Greek Imperial coinage so completely ignores the contemporary world in which it circulated. On the average city coinage the obverse portrait of a Roman emperor or empress immediately made the user aware of the date of issue and of the real ruler of the city's destiny.” On p. 187, Walker notes that the victories depicted belong to the 5th century, not to the Roman emperors: “This denial of the contemporary reality must have been a conscious choice and there must be a reason behind it.” The imperial coinage demonstrates how Athens looked back at her past glories, as did the orators and historians, in contrast to the attitudes of the 5th century Greeks who, following the Persian War, wanted everything to be shiny and new again: (J. Binder, pers. comm.).

¹⁷¹ British Museum CM 1922.3-17.82. I am indebted to Dr. Jonathan Williams for his assistance in the Department of Coins and Medals at the British Museum and for sending me a cast of this coin.

¹⁷² I am grateful to J. Binder for alerting me to this issue.

¹⁷³ W. Binder 1969, p. 47, for a reconstruction of the “correct” placement of the Monopteros.

Athena, no foundations for this structure survive, having long been robbed for construction elsewhere.¹⁷⁴

Importantly, the relocation of the Monopteros removes the tenuous chronological and stratigraphic association of the 5th century cornice from the Erechtheion in the foundations east of the Parthenon and the date of the major repair to the Erechtheion.¹⁷⁵ As mentioned in Chapter III, the major repair to the Erechtheion is traditionally dated to the Augustan period. This traditional view implies that the presence of this cornice block in the foundations for the Monopteros means that work on the Monopteros began soon after the repairs to the Erechtheum were initiated.

The disassociation of the foundations east of the Parthenon and the superstructure of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus disturbs the standard view that the major repair to the Erechtheion occurred during the Roman period. As a result, the date for the cornice block's incorporation into these foundations no longer has a *terminus ante quem* of 27 B.C.-19 B.C. It is now possible to look toward the Hellenistic period for the purpose of the foundations east of the Parthenon.

So, what stood on the rectangular foundations east of the Parthenon? The relocation of the Monopteros and the redating of the major repair to the Erechtheion

¹⁷⁴ W. Binder 1969, p. 132, fig. 1 shows the wide distribution of the findspots of the fragments of the Monopteros. That we have not found any of the related foundations can be attributed to the same phenomenon of dismantlement and reuse, as well as to the 19th century policy of selling off any non-sculptural poros blocks that were not in situ for building material: Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, p. 227 and note 122. The foundations for the equestrian statue of a Ptolemy (perhaps VI) “παρὰ τὸν/[νε]ῶ τὸν ἀρχαῖον τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος” (next to the *archaios neos* of Athena Polias, i.e., the Erechtheion, see Chapter III) have also not been located and so have probably disappeared as well: *IG II² 983.2-6*.

¹⁷⁵ Dörpfeld 1903, p. 466, believed the cornice block came from the West Façade since this façade was replaced in its entirety during the major repair. Paton et al. 1927, p. 75) conclude that it belonged to the North Porch. The block itself has been misplaced and was probably used in the North Porch during Balanos' anastylosis according to Paton et al.

allow these foundations to belong to any period from the 3rd century B.C. onward.¹⁷⁶

Does Pausanias mention any monument that can be associated with these foundations?

In the 19th century, the alternative function of these foundations was to support the Altar of Athena, but Pausanias neglects to mention this as well.¹⁷⁷ After Pausanias visits the Parthenon, the first monument he mentions is a bronze Apollo (I.24.8):

τοῦ ναοῦ δέ ἐστὶ πέραν Ἀπόλλων χαλκοῦς, καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα λέγουσι

Φειδίαν ποιῆσαι: “Opposite the temple is a bronze Apollo, and they say Pheidias made

the statue. They call it Parnopios [The Locust God], because when locusts were once

ravaging their land the god said he would drive them away.”¹⁷⁸ Pausanias uses his usual

textual construction to express his doubt about his guide’s attribution of the sculpture to

Pheidias, but his specific use of πέραν with respect to the Parthenon is potentially highly

indicative. If Pheidias is not the sculptor, the statue may be the work instead of a later,

though no less skilled, artist. It would seem that the statue would be large, as in the style

of Pheidias, and so perhaps may have stood on a base on foundations east of the

Parthenon.¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁶ This date is based on the likely date of the fire which ravaged the Erechtheion and necessitated the major repair as well as the inclusion of the cornice block from the 5th century Erechtheion: see Chapter III.

¹⁷⁷ See Beulé 1853-1854.

¹⁷⁸ Trans. Hurwit 1999, p. 307.

¹⁷⁹ The foundations are bigger than those of the Pheidias’ bronze Athena; therefore, if Apollo was standing on them, he was probably in the middle of a large paved area. Further research about this sculpture needs to be done before any solid attribution of the foundations can be forged. An alternative theory is that the foundations east of the Parthenon date to the Classical period based on the similarity between these foundations and those of the terrace north of the Erechtheion and the paving of the Klepsydra (460s B.C.): (Blomerus, pers. comm.). The cornice block found in the foundations has been misplaced since its discovery and Paton et al. suggest that Balanos reused it in his reconstruction of the North Porch: Paton et al. 1927, p. 75. Perhaps this cornice block was never used on the Classical Erechtheion, but was discarded because of some fault, and so was lying around the Akropolis. This pushes the terminus post quem back to the 5th century. By the same token, this damaged cornice block could have been used to patch the foundations any time after the Erechtheion’s damage in the 3rd century. Where exactly it was found amongst the foundations is unclear since Kawerau reports only “ein vom Erechtheion stammender Geisonblock”: see Paton et al. 1927, p. 75 note 2. Since the block was removed from the foundations, it was probably found near the edge. This would allow Pheidias to be the artist of the Apollo, the Locust

What is the significance of the quotation of the Erechtheion in the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus? One might also ask, why was the Monopteros not given Corinthian capitals as might be expected for the time, especially on a circular building? Part of the answer may lie in the fact that there had not yet been any monuments with the Corinthian order on the exterior on the Akropolis.¹⁸⁰ A Monopteros in the Corinthian order would have stuck out even further as an *arriviste* interloper in the relatively static setting of the Akropolis in the 1st century. The choice to employ the Erechtheion Ionic was careful and conscious. In its correct location east of the Erechtheion, the Monopteros makes so much more sense for the layout of the whole Akropolis. The buildings fit together ritually, architecturally, and politically.

Firstly, it is imperative to recall that this is an Athenian monument erected to honor Augustus, whatever the date and occasion of its erection.¹⁸¹ The civic and religious bodies behind the monument are described in the inscription, *IG II² 3173* (Figure 609):

The people to the goddess Roma and Caesar Augustus. Pammenes, the son of Zenon, of Marathon, being hoplite general and priest of the goddess Roma and Augustus Savior on the Akropolis, when Megiste, daughter of Askelpiades, of Halai, was priestess of Athena Polias. In the archonship of Areos, son of Dorion of Paiania.¹⁸²

What stands out in the inscription is the inclusion of the (lifelong) priestess of Athena, Megiste of Halai. Her presence in the dedication is a “pseudo-eponym” and acts to acknowledge her authority over the cults on the Akropolis.¹⁸³ She is also the priestess

God. The poetic mathematics of the relationship between the siting of the foundations and the Parthenon described by Schmalz (Schmalz 1994, p. 18, fig. 2) still holds for whatever monument was inserted into the “victory text” of the Akropolis. My post-doctoral project will investigate this line of reasoning.

¹⁸⁰ The Corinthian order may have been used (and invented) for the west room of the Parthenon and/or the column which supported Athena Parthenos’ right hand: see Pedersen 1989.

¹⁸¹ See below, this section.

¹⁸² See Schmalz 1994, pp. 19-32 for a recent analysis of the inscription.

¹⁸³ Schmalz 1994, p. 21.

of Athena Polias' cult, which resided in the temple whose architecture is quoted by the Monopteros. The cultic link between the two temples would have been strong, not least because the ever popular Octavia, Augustus' sister, had not long ago been assimilated to Athena Polias. This quotation of Athena/Octavia's temple in the new monument for Augustus and Rome may constitute an additional means of flattering the Emperor's family.

The bibliography on the Monopteros is growing steadily.¹⁸⁴ The latest research on the Monopteros suggests that it was erected in 19 B.C. to house temporarily the Parthian standards whose triumphant return Tiberius diplomatically negotiated when Augustus and his army stopped in Athens on their way back to Rome.¹⁸⁵ The choice of the circular plan for the monument has been associated with the intention to build a circular temple to Mars Ultor on the Capitoline in Rome. A *senatus consultum* to this effect was voted in 20 B.C. and the planned circular temple was commemorated on coins which circulated throughout the empire (Figure 683).¹⁸⁶ In the end, the circular Capitoline temple may never have been built¹⁸⁷ – Augustus built a much larger peripteral *sine postico* temple for Mars Ultor in his forum between 17 and 2 B.C.¹⁸⁸

¹⁸⁴ Rose forthcoming; Burden 1999; Schäfer 1998; Baldassarri 1998, pp. 45-63 and Baldassarri 1995; Spawforth 1997, pp. 184-185; Hoff 1996, pp. 185-194; Schmalz 1994; and Hänlein-Schäfer 1985.

¹⁸⁵ Camp 2001, pp. 187-188, is the only dissenter to this interpretation. He continues to believe the Monopteros was built soon after Actium.

¹⁸⁶ Rose forthcoming cites two Pergamene coin types which displayed a monopteral type.

¹⁸⁷ Rose forthcoming *contra* Rich 2002, pp. 82-87. Rose cites Dio (54.8.3) as proof that the circular temple on the Capitoline was actually built.

¹⁸⁸ See note 118. For the possible interior decoration of this temple, see the most recent and thoughtful discussion by Brian Rose: Rose forthcoming. This is a huge topic that extends well beyond the scope of this study. Further comments about the reception of the Erechtheion with respect to the Monopteros will be reserved for a later project.

TEMPLE OF APHRODITE OURANOS IN THE ATHENIAN AGORA

There are foundations for a Roman temple, just to the west of the Stoa Poikile in the Agora, that have been identified as the Temple of Aphrodite Ouranos by the former and current directors of the excavations, T. L. Shear and Camp. The temple is Roman in style with frontal emphasis, is in axial alignment with its Archaic altar, and has a deep, wide porch (Figure 631). The upper part of an Ionic shaft with a necking band of anthemion (Agora no. A 4643) was found reused in a Byzantine wall 10 m away (Figure 632). An Attic Ionic base was also found reused in a late antique columnar monument a few meters south of the Temple of Aphrodite (Figure 633). Its size, T. L. Shear argues, matches the above mentioned shaft and the profile of the Erechtheion bases.¹⁸⁹

T. L. Shear has reconstructed the temple as tetrastyle-prostyle with proportions resembling the North Porch of the Erechtheion.¹⁹⁰ The temple façade, he argues, is a three quarter scale imitation of the North Porch.¹⁹¹ There are several problems with T. L. Shear's interpretation of the archaeological evidence. First, the capital should not be interpreted as an imitation of the Ionic order of the North Porch. The anthemion of the A 4643 lacks the interfloral element which makes the North Porch anthemion different from (and more highly decorated than) the anthemion on the rest of the Erechtheion. This

¹⁸⁹ T.L. Shear Jr. 1997, p. 502.

¹⁹⁰ T.L. Shear Jr. 1997.

¹⁹¹ If the Aphrodite temple really did quote the North Portico of the Erechtheion, then according to this study's identification of the west chamber of the Erechtheion as belonging to Athena Polias, the following argument can be made: The temple of Aphrodite Ouranos, the Greek Venus and the progenitor of the Julian clan, commemorates Augustus lineage through Julius Caesar. Using architecture as a signifier, the designers of this temple made a connection to the most important cult of the city of Athens, Athena Polias, through the quotation of columns from the Erechtheion. This architectural quotation appropriates the cult of Athena Polias and assimilates her to Aphrodite, mother of Aeneas, the mythical founder of the Romans and of the Julian clan through his son, Iulus. The propaganda of this monument would not be lost on the local population despite the apparent subtlety of the quotation. The Athenians would most likely have recognized that their patron goddess was being equated with Venus Genetrix in this manner. That the columns do not belong to this temple demonstrates the flexibility of reception studies and the pit-falls of reading too much significance into architectural quotations.

damages T. L. Shear's argument that the Temple of Aphrodite Ouranos is a recreation of the architecture and proportions of the North Porch. Instead, A 4643 better imitates the columns of the East Façade and dates not to the Augustan period, but to the 4th century B.C.¹⁹²

Second, in an unpublished article, Richard Anderson, the architect for the Athenian Agora, demonstrates that an additional step must be added to the existing platform. Doing so negates the possibility that the temple's proportions correspond to the North Porch of the Erechtheion.¹⁹³ Anderson also points out some deliberately rusticated masonry which may indicate instead a Claudian date for the first phase of the temple.

And finally, the Ionic column base is also better dated to the late Classical or early Hellenistic period because of the setting marks still preserved on the top of the base (Detail of Figure 633).¹⁹⁴ Therefore, a new original context for A 4643 must be found. As argued in Chapter III, this is the Temple of Apollo Patroos. This temple was rebuilt in the late 4th century by Lykougos and was still standing when the Temple of Aphrodite Ouranos was erected in the Julio-Claudian period. In the light of this very compelling reanalysis of the Aphrodite temple foundations by Anderson, the redating of the anthemion shaft, and the new correlation drawn between the shaft and the East Porch, it is therefore difficult to endorse the reconstruction proposed by T. L. Shear. Whatever conclusions one draws from the evidence of the column shaft with the anthemion pattern (A 4643), it is doubtful that this highly recognizable column type would have been

¹⁹² See Chapter III for a discussion of A 4643 and its use in the Temple of Apollo Patroos. T.L. Shear Jr. 1997, p. 506, points out that the quotation is not slavish: A 4643 has seven petals on the lotus while the Erechtheion has five; A 4643 has blossoms of nine palmette leaves while the Erechtheion has seven. For the very similar shaft from 4th century Sidon, see Stucky 1988, pp. 28-29, fig. 3.

¹⁹³ Anderson, *The BE-BZ Roman Temple in the Athenian Agora: An Alternative Restoration Incorporating an Additional Step*.

¹⁹⁴ Djordjevitch (pers. comm.).

employed without the purpose of making some significant reference to the building which inspired it, especially when the source was always visible from the shaft's original context in the heart of the lower city.¹⁹⁵

IMPERIAL FORA AT ROME

There is a fragment of an Ionic capital from the Forum of Augustus that is a copy of a capital from the North Porch of the Erechtheion. Only the right volute of this distinctive capital-type survives, but it appears to be a full scale version.¹⁹⁶ Its original location in the Forum of Augustus is disputed as it does not fit in with any of the other excavated structures of this complex. The Temple of Mars Ultor and porticoes were all decorated with Corinthian columns with Attic bases. Alternatively, the Erechtheion capital may instead belong to the Forum of Domitian/Nerva.¹⁹⁷

Assigning this quotation of the Erechtheion to the Forum of Domitian conceivably has important implications. Should the copy of the Erechtheion-type Ionic column derive from the Forum of Domitian, and should Broucke's theory outlined above regarding the date and origin of the two more "accurate" Tivoli maidens be accepted,¹⁹⁸ then a case could be made for cast-making at the Erechtheion in the Domitianic period. This would explain how accurate copies of elements of the Erechtheion were suddenly

¹⁹⁵ A more solid candidate than the Temple of Aphrodite Ouranos for the reception of the Erechtheion Ionic in the Roman period is the Northeast Stoa in the Agora. The rest of this large public building has not been excavated and lies under Odos Adrianou: Camp 1990, pp. 98-100. The architectural fragments found in the destruction debris of the stoa include several fragments of diminutive Ionic volutes and a few anthemion moldings of varying size: Anthemion: Agora A1674a&b, A1681. Volute: A1669, A1670, A1672a&b, and A1673. This building has been dated to the 1st century A.D. and was later incorporated into the Hadrianic basilica to its east.

¹⁹⁶ Gantz 1993, p. 76; Kockel 1991.

¹⁹⁷ Michael Djordjevitch (pers. comm.). He cites Domitian's fascination with Athena and the weaving iconography of the Forum of Domitian's frieze as possible reasons for the emperor's desire to connect his forum architecturally with the Temple of Athena Polias at Athens, the inspiration for all the other peplos festivals in the empire; D'Ambra 1993.

¹⁹⁸ See above "The Reception of Vitruvius and the Conflation of "Caryatid" and the Erechtheion Maidens."

available in Rome, despite the many less-accurate versions of the Erechtheion maidens that have been visible in Rome since the Augustan period.

This cast-making activity does not necessitate Domitian's presence in Athens. In fact, Domitian seems never to have visited Athens himself: no inscriptions that preserve his name have been found, nor are there any benefactions that can be associated with him.¹⁹⁹ He probably did, however, traverse northern Greece on his way to Sarmatia with his army to enact revenge for massacring a legion and its commander in A.D. 70.²⁰⁰ His interests in Greece were nonetheless recorded farther south. Domitian paid for some repairs to the Temple of Apollo at Delphi.²⁰¹ Another inscription commemorates his donation of some monument at Megalopolis in Arkadia. Therefore, it appears that agents, artists and architects affiliated with the emperor were active in Greece at this time and carrying out projects at the emperor's behest. Perhaps the acquisition of good copies of the Erechtheion maidens and its capitals was part of their assignment.

CONCLUSION

The ritual importance of Athena's cults on the Akropolis continued from strength to strength in the Roman period. The Panathenaia persisted on a grand scale through the early 5th century A.D. In times of political and economic trouble, the Athenians often bartered with Athena's status to assuage Imperial displeasure. Augustus was honored with a monument which copied the columns of the Erechtheion, and Julia Domna was assimilated to Athena Polias. As argued in Chapter III, the Erechtheion was not repaired

¹⁹⁹ *Damnatio memoriae* may account for much of his disappearance from Greece. Signs of Domitian resonate nonetheless at Philippi where an honorific statue base of a colonist named Lucius Tatinius Cnosus "preserves" the erasure of Domitian's name: Mee and Spawforth 2001, p. 416.

²⁰⁰ Suetonius, *Domitian* 6.

²⁰¹ École française d'Athènes 1991, p. 181. A large dedicatory inscription in the museum attests to Domitian's repair.

under Augustus when the Monopteros was built east of the Erechtheion. The temple was, however, probably spruced up in the late 2nd century A.D. in preparation for the installation of Julia Domna next to Athena Polias.

The impact of the Erechtheion on the architecture and iconography of the Roman Empire was significant. Both the maidens and the Ionic order of the Erechtheion were copied and incorporated into Imperial, private and “local” building programmes from Greece to Spain. Soon after the publication of Vitruvius’ *De Architectura*, the maidens of the Erechtheion entered into the Roman visual vocabulary as symbols of triumph and humiliation.

CHAPTER V – THE LATE ANTIQUE AND BYZANTINE PERIODS (330-1204)

INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses what happened to the Erechtheion between the 3rd century A.D. and the early 13th century A.D.¹ As described in the previous chapter, the Erechtheion and the Parthenon suffered a major destruction at some point in the 3rd or 4th century A.D. Whether this destruction is attributable to the Herulians who sacked Athens in A.D. 267, the Visigoths in A.D. 396, or some natural catastrophe such as an earthquake is unclear, but it is highly likely that Julian the Apostate was responsible for the rebuilding of the Parthenon as a pagan temple between A.D. 361 and 363. In the 4th and 5th centuries, only a single cult of Athena is attested on the Akropolis and worship took place at the Parthenon.² The Erechtheion, as the home of the olive wood statue, appears to have been abandoned.

The former home of Athena Polias' cult experienced three construction phases during the Late Antique and Byzantine periods, the first of which can be assigned tentatively to the 4th century, the second to the late 6th or 7th century, and the third to the 12th century.³ The first phase transformed the Erechtheion into a pillared hall, probably with a vaulted roof. The second phase converted the pillared hall into a basilica church,

¹ I would like to express my gratitude to Bill Caraher, a fellow Associate Member at the ASCSA in 2001-2002, for his guidance on early Christian architecture. We plan to co-author an article on the Erechtheion as a Byzantine church. This chapter will only briefly summarize the main elements of our future arguments. The Late Antique period extends to A.D. 529 with Justinian's closure of the philosophical schools, a watershed in the economic, religious and political history of Athens. The Byzantine period is defined in this study as A.D. 529 – 1204.

² Mansfield 1985, p. 203.

³ See Caraher 2003 on the difficulty of assigning firm dates, even centuries, to early Christian churches in Greece. In this chapter, the phases of the Erechtheion are assigned dates based on published, (often only relatively-) dated comparanda, with the understanding that the chronology of Byzantine architecture is very problematic: see Sanders 1999, pp. 474-475; Sanders 2004; Slane and Sanders forthcoming.

and the third phase included some relatively minor, but significant, renovations in order to update the basilica to contemporary liturgical requirements. Not long before the Frankish acquisition of the Akropolis, a series of ships were carved into the interior of the east architrave of the North Porch. These ships, and other Christian graffiti, will be analyzed in this chapter.

This chapter will present a short overview of the history of the Erechtheion during the 4th through early 13th centuries A.D. and a summary of the results of recent research on the Erechtheion as a pillared hall and basilica church.

HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

If a natural catastrophe such as an earthquake led to the fiery demise of the Parthenon in the early 4th century A.D., as is currently professed by Korres, the Erechtheion almost certainly experienced a similar fate, (if not to the same degree). After the conflagration, the Parthenon was rebuilt, probably by Julian the Apostate, in the middle of the 4th century.⁴ From this point onward, it is possible that, until the second half of the 5th century A.D., there was only one temple of Athena on the Akropolis, and this was the Parthenon.⁵ An Athena (not the original chryselephantine Parthenos statue, but some smaller, perhaps reused, Athena), installed on a smaller base in the cella, was the only object of cult. References to the olive wood statue of Athena Polias ceased. The translation of the cult must therefore have occurred after the mid 4th century repair of the

⁴ See Chapter IV for the different arguments about the destruction of the buildings on the Akropolis in the Late Roman period. Korres' argument for a 4th century disaster and rebuilding by Julian the Apostate appears to be the most likely scenario: Korres 1994d, p. 143. His opinion on this issue will be followed in this study.

⁵ Libanius, *Or.* 1.14-25, (A.D. 336-340); Julian, *Ep.* 275 A-D, (A.D. 361); Zosimos, *Historia Nea* 4.18; Marinos, *Procl.* 30. Libanius studied in Athens in the 4th century. This is the first time the Parthenon has ever truly been a temple which housed a cult of Athena. Mansfield does, however, point out that Himerios, *Or.* 5.30 (Colonna) refers to “the temple of the Polias and the nearby precinct of Poseidon” in the middle of the 4th century A.D.: Mansfield 1985, p. 228.

Parthenon. The olive wood statue had probably disintegrated, and the Erechtheion was probably reduced to a subsidiary, if not empty shrine in this period.⁶ The Lamp of Kallimachos may have been removed from the Erechtheion at the same time.⁷ This may indicate that the Erechtheion, which once housed the most important cults and relics of pagan Athens, had already been “neutralized” or secularized by its conversion into a pillared hall when Julian the Apostate repaired the Parthenon and reopened the temples.⁸

Was Athens again destroyed in the late 4th century during the Visigoth attack of 396? Zosimos recounts that Athena and Achilles appeared and frightened off Alaric, leaving Athens intact. Philostorgios, Claudian, and St. Jerome, on the other hand, record that the city was taken and destroyed. The Visigoth’s presence can certainly be seen outside the post-Herulian walls, especially in the Agora, where the buildings that

⁶ Mansfield 1985, p. 203. Christian apologist, Tertullian, described the statue of Athena Polias as a rough stake in the late 2nd century. His comments are, of course, tainted with a disdain toward idolatry in general, and so he may have emphasized the cult statue’s formlessness. Since the wooden statue was already very old when Pausanias saw it only a few decades earlier, it is not surprising that it might have finally disintegrated or perished in the Herulian attack or earthquake destruction.

⁷ In the Parthenon during the Byzantine period, there appears to have been an ever-burning lamp which used to belong to Athena: See Mansfield 1985, p. 231. In his first speech as Archbishop of Athens in A.D. 1182, Michael Choniates (*Eisbaterios* 32-33; Lampros p. 104) described the Theotokos Atheniotissa (Parthenon) as “this light-receiving and ever radiant place, where an unquenched hearth-fire used to be tended, a sort of bright torch, one might say, of impiety...a lantern (devised by Satan) which was the guide of darkness...But later the sun of righteousness rose up from the ever-virgin maiden, extinguished that deceiving and gloomy fire, just as the light of glow-worms is dimmed by its bright ray...and this citadel has been freed from the tyranny of the false virgin Athena and the never-sleeping fire on her altar is no longer nourished, and the ever-shining torch of the eternal virgin and mother of God, as from heaven, rises from this height and shines not only throughout the city and the lands which border upon Attica, but also throughout all the earth which the sun traverses.” Benjamin of Tudela also reported in 1102 that there was a lamp that burned without ever running out of oil in the Church of the Blessed Virgin Mary: d’Avezac 1839, pp. 817-854; van der Vin 1980, p. 510. There were many such legends around medieval Greece; however, the continued reference to such a long-burning lamp in the Parthenon may imply that the Lamp of Kallimachos survived the end of Antiquity and was transferred to the Parthenon, thus remaining one of the treasures of the Akropolis.

⁸ Most temples in Athens probably did not require reopening as they had never closed, despite the edicts calling for their closure. Those which had suffered damage, however, were probably not restored to their pagan state, such as was the case for the Erechtheion. Pagan temples, especially important ones, probably lay empty, or fallow, for a certain period before they were converted for other uses by the Christians: see Frantz 1965 and Frantz 1988. It is not clear whether the pillared hall had a religious (pagan or Christian) or secular function. Although the pillared hall resembles examples of churches in this form in the 4th century, it is unlikely that the Erechtheion had been converted into a church at this early date. Therefore, it seems reasonable that the main building of the Erechtheion was used for some secular or civic function.

survived the Herulians were finally destroyed. These include the Tholos, Stoa of Zeus, and the Temple of Apollo Patroos. This late 4th century A.D. destruction of the Temple of Apollo Patroos, which probably contained the Erechtheion Ionic order, made available the columns for reuse in a Byzantine building near the Temple of Aphrodite Ouranos.⁹

In spite of the destructive attacks from the late 3rd century A.D. onward, the city continued to flourish thanks to the reputation of the philosophical schools. Villas sprang up on the slopes of the Akropolis and were adorned with rich marble revetment, earlier sculptures, and elaborate mosaics. These were the homes of the rich philosophers who, since the 2nd century A.D., had charged fees for their tutorials, according to Eunapios. There was a great deal of Oxbridge-type “town vs. gown” tension between the growing Christian population and the pagan intellectual elite: the tension forced the philosophers to take refuge in their grand homes, fearful, as they were, to “go down into the city and discourse in public.”¹⁰ Constantine’s recognition of Christianity as the Roman Empire’s official religion fell on deaf ears in one of the last bastions of paganism. Athens remained pagan until the very end, and scholars such as Frantz believe the temples of Athens continued to serve as homes for pagan cult statues.¹¹

Sixteen imperial decrees denounced paganism between A.D. 345 and 435; these called for the cessation of sacrifice, the closure of temples, the destruction of temples, and the extinction of pagan adherents. Edicts mandating the destruction of temples were issued repeatedly, implying that the Imperial command was largely being ignored at the

⁹ T.L. Shear Jr. 1997, p. 502. On the Erechtheion-inspired Ionic columns in the Temple of Apollo Patroos, see Chapter III.

¹⁰ Eunapios, *VS* 483.

¹¹ Frantz 1965. On the survival of paganism in Christian Greece, see Gregory 1986.

local level.¹² Also, consistency among these edicts is absent. Whereas one emperor decreed that “temples in the country districts...shall be torn down,”¹³ other emperors urged that temples should not be torn down, but instead be converted into spaces for public use.¹⁴ Indeed, less than a quarter century later, the first intimations of a desire to preserve temples may be found in a slightly later decree of Leo and Majorian, which called for “the preservation and protection against cannibalization of ‘all the buildings that have been founded by the ancients as temples and as other monuments.’”¹⁵

Similarly, despite the edict calling for all cult images to be removed from temples, Gratian, Valentinian II, and Theodosios I together decreed that in A.D. 382, “the temple shall continually be open...in which images are reported to have been placed which must be measured by the value of their art rather than by their divinity.”¹⁶ The usual festivals and processions were allowed to continue in this transparent environment, although no sacrifices were allowed. Frantz asserts that Athens, among other cities, would have been quick to exploit the loophole in the laws.¹⁷

Athena’s cults were finally eradicated from the Akropolis in the later 5th century. The Bronze Athena was removed to Constantinople between A.D. 450 and 500.¹⁸ She was seen in the Forum of Constantine by 9th-13th century travelers, and described as standing on a column of porphyry and marble.¹⁹ This colossal bronze was finally torn

¹² Frantz has argued persuasively that the 4th and 5th century edicts had little effect on the masterpieces of temple architecture in Athens: see Frantz 1965.

¹³ *Cod. Theod.* XVI.10.16.

¹⁴ *Cod. Theod.* XVI.10.3 (A.D. 346); XVI.10.15 (A.D. 399); XVI.10.18 (A.D. 399); XVI.10.19 (A.D. 408 or 407).

¹⁵ *Novels of Marjorian* IV.1: Frantz 1988, p. 70.

¹⁶ *Cod. Theod.* XVI.10.8.

¹⁷ Frantz 1988, p. 70.

¹⁸ The Bronze Athena was definitely still in place in 410 because a statue of Herculus was dedicated next to it. Hurwit suggests that it was removed from the Akropolis between 465 and 470: Hurwit 1999, p. 286.

¹⁹ It was also illustrated in an 11th century illuminated manuscript: Stevens 1936, p. 495.

down in 1203 by drunken rioters who thought that her outstretched arm was beckoning the Crusaders into the city.²⁰ Athena Parthenos was destroyed between A.D. 451 and 485 by the Christians, according to the biography of Proklos, the Lykian head of the Neoplatonic School at Athens.²¹ Proklos left Athens for a year in 450 to avoid the pressure of the anti-pagan sentiments of the growing Christian population. Between the date of his return in 451 and his death in 485, Proklos had a dream after “the statue of the goddess which had been set in the Parthenon had been removed by those people who move what should not be moved” (i.e., the Christians).²² A beautiful woman appeared to him “who told him to prepare for a divine guest who wished to dwell with him – *kyria Athenais*.”²³ Soon after Proklos’ death, Justinian closed the philosophical schools in A.D. 529. Athens’ economic and intellectual lifeline had been severed, and civic paganism declined once and for all.

The closure of the philosophical schools also cut Athens off from the rest of the world. Denuded of the Bronze Athena, symbol of knowledge and paganism, the Athenian Akropolis became the ecclesiastical center for Byzantine Athens in the following centuries, and its fortified situation continued to play the role it had since Bronze Age times. But Athens was no longer the capital of anything, the regional seat of government being located at Thebes during the Byzantine period. The transition from university city to provincial town seems, however, to have been gradual.²⁴ The city was

²⁰ Byzantine historian Niketas Choniatas (1140-1213) described the statue and its destruction. On the biography of the Bronze Athena, see Stevens 1936, p. 495.

²¹ Proklos had a villa south of the Asklepieion, the foundations of which are now marked out in the cement of the pedestrian walkway on Odos Dionysiou.

²² Marinos, *Procl.* 29.

²³ Hurwit 1999, p. 287. See also Frantz 1988, p. 72 on Proklos.

²⁴ Paton 1951, p. 4.

certainly not deserted in the Byzantine period, as excavations in the Athenian Agora, Makryianni, and Plaka demonstrate.²⁵

The Vandals raided Athens in the second half of the 5th century according to a single line in Prokopios (*Bell. [Vand]* 3.5.23). Corroborating evidence comes from a hoard of 500 bronze coins, of which the latest date to the reign of Leo I (A.D. 457-474), and a layer of ash and debris which covers the west side of the Agora.²⁶ Athens was also attacked by Slavs in A.D. 582/3. The Erechtheion, as a pillared hall, was perhaps damaged, if not destroyed, in one of these attacks.²⁷

The history of the rise of Christianity in Athens played out against the backdrop of the imperial dedications and “barbarian” invasions. The “Good News” was first brought to Athens by Paul in A.D. 53. A small community of Christians, with Dionysios the Areopagite as the first bishop or *episkopos*, left little mark on the topography of the city. The first material remains that are obviously Christian date to the mid 4th and early 5th centuries, namely gravestones with crosses, and lamps with Christian symbols.²⁸ Early Christian worship in pagan Athens (i.e., pre- A.D. 529) probably took place in private houses until the later 4th century because even the forceful decrees, preserved in the Theodosian Code, were largely ignored in this city of the great, pagan philosophical schools.²⁹ The Asklepieion, for example, continued to treat the ill through the 5th

²⁵ Frantz 1988.

²⁶ Camp 2001, pp. 235-236.

²⁷ Only the roof was probably destroyed at this time: the walls and porches of the Erechtheion were not discernibly damaged.

²⁸ Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 197.

²⁹ Frantz 1988, p. 72. *Cod. Theod.* XVI.10.25 is the Edict of Theodosios II of A.D. 435 which called for the destruction of all temples.

century,³⁰ and the Panathenaic procession continued to be held through the end of the 4th century A.D.³¹

Structures for the new religion may be divided into two categories: wholly new constructions (usually in basilica form) and ancient structures, often temples, which were converted into churches. It is the latter of these two categories that is of interest to this study, although the *de novo* constructions must be taken into account as a point of reference for how an “ideal” church, without the restrictions of ancient walls, would have been organized. According to Frantz, converted ancient monuments tend to be later in date than the wholly new constructions.³²

The earliest of the wholly new churches is probably the tetraconch church inside the colonnaded court of the Library of Hadrian.³³ The mosaics date the church to the second quarter of the 5th century. The impressive quatrefoil shape of the building was soon replaced after a serious fire by a (possibly 7th century) three-aisle basilica. This church, and not the Parthenon, was the first cathedral in Athens according to tradition,³⁴ and may be associated with the benefactions of Empress Eudokia.³⁵

³⁰ Marinus (*Procl.* 29) records Asklepios’ healing of Asklepiegeneia through the prayers of his mentor, Proklos, in the 5th century in the Asklepieion, a sanctuary which suffered greatly during the Herulian invasion of A.D. 267. The sanctuary’s reconstruction after this destruction attests to its importance for the people of Athens. Frantz’s analysis of this passage, in the light of decrees calling for the closure of pagan temples in the Byzantine empire, suggests that such activities were performed inconspicuously so as not to arouse the ire of the Christians in the vicinity, and that the sanctuaries themselves remained accessible: Frantz 1988, pp. 70-71. The Asklepieion was, however, soon converted into an early Christian basilica, and dedicated to the Agioi Anargyroi, the doctor saints: Travlos 1971, p. 128.

³¹ Shear 2001, p. 659.

³² Frantz 1988, p. 72. The first basilica church (the form into which the Erechtheion would later be transformed) was built on the banks of the Ilissos in the 5th century. The conversion of temples into churches did not occur in Athens, as in Rome, until the 6th and 7th centuries.

³³ The nature of this building has been much debated. Travlos argued that the tetraconch building was indeed a religious structure from its beginning because the narthex is the carefully bonded into the masonry of the main building, Travlos 1986, pp. 343-347; cited by Frantz 1988, p. 72.

³⁴ Frantz 1988, p. 73.

³⁵ Karivieri 1994, pp. 111-113; Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 200.

Justinian is credited by scholars, such as Tasos Tanoulas, as having lavished a great deal of attention on Athens and the Akropolis during his reign (A.D. 527-565), despite Prokopios's statements in his *Secret History* that he did nothing at all for the city.³⁶ Many of the changes, including infrastructure, may be associated with Justinian's activities. Under the threat of the Slavs and other attackers, the Akropolis served as a refuge, and cisterns near the Propylaia, Parthenon, and Erechtheion were built.³⁷ The Slavs and Avars caused major destruction of the churches in the city in 582.³⁸

Athens only figures intermittently in the historical sources between the 7th century and its takeover by Franks in 1204. Constant II visited the city with his court and army on his way to Italy in A.D. 662-663. The later Archbishop of Canterbury, Theodoros of Tarsos, studied in Athens in the 7th century. Empress Irene was born in Athens around A.D. 800, and the city was home to her family during its banishment.³⁹ Basil II held a victory feast on the Akropolis in 1018-19 in celebration of his defeat of the Bulgarians.⁴⁰ In doing so, he exploited, intentionally or not, the Akropolis' connotations of victory which stretched back a millennium and a half.

Most scholars imagine that Athens ceased to prosper in the early Byzantine period;⁴¹ however, the careful and artful conversion of many of the pagan temples into churches, including the Erechtheion, suggests that religious matters were taken seriously, and pious members of the community donated their time, money, and skills to beautify

³⁶ Prokopios, *Arc.* 26.35: Bouras 2003, p. 236.

³⁷ Bouras 2003, pp. 234, 236.

³⁸ Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 200, suggests that the Tetraconch church and the many early basilicas outside the walls of Athens were destroyed at this time.

³⁹ Irene's niece, Theophano, also married a Byzantine emperor. That Athens was home to empresses indicates that there was a significant local aristocracy despite the general impression that Athens was a backwater in the early Byzantine period: Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 204.

⁴⁰ van der Vin 1980, p. 198; Tanoulas 1997, vol.1, pp. 18-19 ; vol. 2, p. 284.

⁴¹ Mango 1974, p. 161.

and conserve their places of worship.⁴² The effects of the Slav invasions of Attica may not have affected the state of Athens and her churches in the long-term, as suggested by recent archaeological excavations in Athens and Corinth.⁴³ Indeed, the Akropolis itself was never captured, and the empress Irene may well have paid attention to her birth-place, and ensured her hometown received some of the bounty enjoyed by Constantinople in the 9th century.

The religious importance of Athens rose during the 9th and 10th centuries. Athens was promoted to an archbishopric between 819 and 841, and to a metropolis with jurisdiction of the whole Peloponnese between 975 and 981, according to the title mentioned in the graffiti on the Parthenon.⁴⁴ Although the date of the conversion of the Parthenon into a church is equally as problematic as the conversion of the Erechtheion, by the 10th century, at the latest, the Parthenon had become an important place of pilgrimage. It is mentioned as such in the *Life of St. Luke Steiriotes*. There is otherwise little archaeological evidence for changes to buildings on the Akropolis during the 9th and 10th centuries.⁴⁵

In the 10th century, Athens likely felt the threat of the Arab pirates based at Khandak (Candia/Heraklion) in Crete. They left their mark in Athens, literally, through inscriptions in Kufic script: on the Akropolis, in the Agora, in the Asklepieion, and on the

⁴² See Caraher 2003.

⁴³ Sanders 1999, pp. 474-475; Sanders 2004; Slane and Sanders forthcoming. Handbooks on Byzantine art and architecture, old and new, insist that no great feats of architecture could possibly date to the 7th and 8th centuries because of religious, social, and historical upheavals, such as the Slavic invasions and Iconoclasm. Also on the Slavs in Greece, see Curta 2001.

⁴⁴ Korres enumerates the graffiti on the Parthenon and summarizes its importance: Korres 1994d, p. 148, with bibliography. The capital of the deme of Hellas, created in the 7th century at Thebes, probably moved to Athens in the middle of the 9th century. On the graffiti on the Parthenon, see Orlandos 1973, and below note 158.

⁴⁵ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 1, p. 19.

Hephaisteion.⁴⁶ A chrysobull of Alexios I (1082) gave the Venetians free trading rights with Athens. This suggests that Athens enjoyed an international economy, and imported foreign goods in exchange for its local agrarian produce of oil, grain, retsina, and honey.⁴⁷ Athens probably escaped the Norman invasion in 1146, precisely because it did not have much to offer up as booty compared to Thebes and Corinth.

The mid 12th century Arab geographer Edrisi described Athens as populous and “surrounded by gardens and farmland.”⁴⁸ Things seemed to have changed, however, by the time Archbishop Michael Choniates arrived from Constantinople. This last of the Byzantine metropolitans most probably resided on the Akropolis, in the Propylaia.⁴⁹ His letters provide a great deal of information about the life and times of Athens in the late 12th century, just prior to the Frankish takeover. For example, he mourned that the town bore no relation to the splendid ancient city, having lost “all semblance of a city and the very form and condition of a city,” largely owing to the crushingly oppressive taxation and misbehavior of the Byzantine bureaucrats.⁵⁰

Choniates tried to mediate between the Athenians and the bureaucrats, and used the glorious past of Athens to invigorate the down-trodden city when he addressed it in his inaugural speech in 1182. This type of rhetoric was probably lost on the local population who was trying to eke a living out of the arid environment. The Archbishop’s good deeds toward Athens ended soon after he had thwarted Leo Sgouros’ (ruler of Naupolion) attempt to attack Athens. Choniates gathered the Athenians into the Akropolis and mounted a successful defense, only to yield to Boniface of Montferrat, one

⁴⁶ van der Vin 1980, p. 416; Setton 1975, pp. 314-316.

⁴⁷ Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 212.

⁴⁸ Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 213.

⁴⁹ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, p. 284.

⁵⁰ Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 213.

of Frankish nobles of the Fourth Crusade, without resistance in 1204. This brought an end to Byzantine rule in Athens. The effects of the Frankish takeover are examined in Chapter VI.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION IN THE LATE ANTIQUE AND BYZANTINE PERIODS

In order to figure out how the Erechtheion was transformed in the Post-Antique period, it is necessary to examine the wide variety of cuttings for doors and other accretions, such as roof beams, preserved in the marble blocks of the temple. It is notoriously difficult to date these cuttings; however, using a contextualized diachronic approach, a significant degree of clarity can be achieved, and conclusions drawn, from the jumble of markings on the building. Before this can be done, though, one must state certain assumptions:

1. Cuttings for doors in the same style and technique date to the same building phase;
2. Cutting styles will vary over time; and,
3. If more than one set of cuttings occupies the same space, they must date to different construction phases.

After examining all the cuttings on the Erechtheion together, and working through the possibilities logically, certain patterns emerge: Byzantine door cuttings in the Erechtheion tend to be carefully cut, deep, approximately 0.08 m pivot holes for double-leaved doors. This pattern is comparable to the cuttings for doors in the Propylaia, dated

by Tanoulas to between A.D. 700 and 1200, and in the Hephaisteion.⁵¹ Characteristics of cuttings from later periods will be addressed in later chapters (Figure 592).

The round, carefully carved, “Byzantine” type of cutting can be found in the threshold of the North Door, directly behind the new marble jambs that were added during the Byzantine period (Figure 350). This type of cutting is also found behind (interior) rectangular areas roughened to receive substantial, probably masonry, vertical jambs between PP.C1 and PP.C2 (Figure 447), and PP.C4 and PP.C5 (Figure 450).

There are two sets of pivot marks in the intercolumniations of the North Porch: one directly behind, and one slightly inside the cuttings for the jambs. These represent two phases of doors, both probably belonging to the Byzantine period. Similar cuttings for Byzantine doors may be found in the Propylaia. Tanoulas dates single pivot holes that do not have locking mechanisms in the middle, nor cuttings for jambs, to the Byzantine period.⁵²

There are cuttings that date to the Byzantine period in the walls of the Erechtheion: *viz.*, well-cut, square, or rectangular cuttings of relatively consistent, though shallow, depth for the insertion of large beams. As will be discussed below, the Byzantine cuttings in the area of the Pandroseion can be interpreted as sockets for beams that supported a gallery along the West Façade at the level of the windows.⁵³

⁵¹ Tanoulas 1997, especially vol. 2, drawings 9, 17, 36.

⁵² Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, drawings 36 and 53.

⁵³ There are also isolated cuttings whose purpose remains mysterious: e.g., the 0.28 m square cutting in the west side of the podium that supports the East Porch (below EE.15.07). This in situ cutting is unfortunately unintelligible on its own, but it does suggest that there was some building activity in this area north of the Erechtheion during the Byzantine period (Figure 592).

ARCHAEOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

The interior of the Erechtheion was probably converted into a pillared hall at some point in the 4th century, perhaps after a period of abandonment. Three pairs of concrete foundations were built along the inside of the North and South Walls to support pillars which, in turn, probably supported a groin-vaulted roof over the main building (Figure 506 and Figure 507).⁵⁴

In the late 6th or 7th century, the Erechtheion was converted into a three-aisled basilica church with the West Corridor serving as the narthex (Figure 488 and Figure 489).⁵⁵ The central portion of the east foundations was removed to make room for a curved apse. The removed blocks were reused to make the foundations for the aisles (Figure 505). Three columns of *verde antico* separated each aisle from the nave (Figure 518). Thin slabs were placed vertically between the columns at the outer edge of the foundation in order to define the central nave further. The nave was paved with marble and the aisles were of beaten earth. The foundations of the West Cross-Wall supported a wall pierced by three openings (Figure 494, Figure 495 and Figure 496). These openings were framed by pilasters whose molded bases preclude the insertion of doors (Figure 521, Figure 522, Figure 523 and Figure 524). At the east end of the nave, a chancel screen connected the two aisles (Figure 517).

⁵⁴ Contrary to popular opinion (based on Paton et al. 1927), the east half of the Erechtheion did not need to be excavated prior to the construction of the pillared hall: see Chapter II. The floor of the main building of the ancient temple had always been at the same, low level as the stylobate of the North Porch.

⁵⁵ The study of Byzantine architecture has come a long way since 1927, the last time this phase of the Erechtheion was treated in any detail. There is now a conscious effort to use non-anachronistic, neutral terminology when referring to specific parts of early Christian basilicas. The term “early Christian” is preferred to “early Byzantine” because the former acknowledges the overlap of pagan and Christian cultures. For example, “iconostasis” is an anachronistic term for the early Christian period. Instead, “chancel screen” is used: see Orlandos 1952. Terms such as “diaconicum” and “prothesis”, used by Paton et al., are also anachronistic for early Christian Greek architecture and are avoided in this study. “Aisle” refers to the space between the colonnade and the outer wall. The line of the colonnade is the “aisle separator” or “interior colonnade,” and the low walls between the columns are “parapets.”

The North Door was reduced in size by the insertion of a new, beautifully carved, marble lining (Figure 349). Walls were built between the columns of the North Porch and two doors, one between PP.C1 and PP.C2 (Figure 447), and one between PP.C4 and PP.C5. Traces of the door jambs and pivots are preserved in the stylobate (Figure 450). The intercolumnar walls were probably only slightly taller than the doors, similar to those reconstructed by Korres between the columns of the peristyle of the Parthenon.⁵⁶ The intercolumniations of the East Porch were probably filled with low walls as well.

The lintel of the West Door received some attached decoration, probably made of wood (Figure 289). At some point in the Byzantine period, perhaps associated with Justinian's augmentation of the Akropolis' water supply, cisterns were built in the external angle of the North Porch and the North Wall, as well as east of the Erechtheion (Figure 537 and Figure 540).

In the 12th century, the basilica was renovated. The round apse was enlarged, incorporating EE.C3 and EE.C4, and was given straight sides on the exterior. The chancel screen was extended to the North and South Walls (Figure 508 and Figure 515). As part of this renovation process, the vertical slabs separating the aisles from the nave were probably removed because of a change in the liturgical requirements. It is perhaps at this time that a gallery was added to the exterior of the West Façade of the Erechtheion, just below the bottom of the windows. If the size of the congregation had grown, perhaps more room was required for men inside the church. The gallery would, therefore, probably have been constructed for the female worshippers. This gallery was likely accessed from the terrace of the Archaic Temple of Athena, or through the Maiden

⁵⁶ Korres 1994d, p. 147.

Porch. The stoa in the Pandroseion probably continued to frame the courtyard west of the temple and to provide shelter for congregants.

STATE OF THE SCHOLARSHIP AND THE PROBLEM OF DATING EARLY CHRISTIAN ARCHITECTURE

There is still no published stylistic chronology for early Christian architecture and decoration. In the 1940s, Ernst Kitzinger began to establish a chronology of early Christian churches in Greece based on the development of their floor mosaics.⁵⁷ His chronology is still the basis for dating early Christian churches in Greece. It is not, however, helpful for dating the conversion of the Erechtheion because the temple probably never contained any mosaics. Other chronologies are difficult to establish because of the conservative nature of other types of decoration, such as the *templon* (the decorated slab of the chancel screen). The *templon* in the Erechtheion, for example, has much the same layout, style of carving, and decorative motifs as the 20th century iconostasis in the 11th century church of Agioi Theodoroi kai Kapnikarea on Odos Ermou in Athens.

In the light of these modern chronological problems, it is imperative to revisit the bases for Paton et al.'s dating of the conversion of the basilica. Unfortunately, most of Paton et al.'s chronological reasoning must be discarded because they believed that there was only one phase in the transformation of the Erechtheion into a church, and that the slit windows in the North and South Walls belonged to this transformation.⁵⁸ The discovery of many more early Christian basilicas in Greece since the publication of *The*

⁵⁷ Kitzinger 1946, pp. 134-140, pls. 170-185.

⁵⁸ Papanikolaou has proven that the windows are ancient: Papanikolaou 1978. See also Chapter III on the date and significance of the slit windows.

Erechtheum in 1927 allows for a better (though far from perfect) understanding of the development of Byzantine architecture.

The date arrived at by the authors of *The Erechtheum* for the conversion of the Erechtheion into a church was influenced heavily by their consideration of the slit windows as part of the Byzantine conversion, a feature for which they could find parallels only in the much later churches of Italy. While the majority of the stylistic evidence in the Erechtheion pointed to the 6th or early 7th centuries, Paton et al. were compelled to date the conversion to the 8th century.⁵⁹ Now that Papanikolaos has proven that the windows were in fact part of the ancient construction of the Erechtheion, this chronological dilemma can be eliminated. Very few Classical or Byzantine scholars have approached the problem of the date of the Erechtheion since Paton et al., as most focus on the date of the Parthenon.⁶⁰ If the Erechtheion is mentioned in works on Byzantine Athens, it is only in passing and without any fresh contemplation of the evidence. Travlos is one scholar who did reanalyze the evidence from the Erechtheion, and he concluded that the Erechtheion was converted into a church in the 7th century. His conclusions are followed by most scholars including Frantz, Tanoulas, and Hurwit.⁶¹ But like Paton et al., Travlos recognized only a single phase for the basilica.

A major problem nonetheless remains: all the dates offered by scholars are a matter of scholarly exercise. As Caraher's dissertation shows, it is nearly impossible to date accurately any construction phase of early Christian churches.⁶² In the same vein, associating the construction of a church or a conversion of a temple into a church with an

⁵⁹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 515.

⁶⁰ See Travlos 1960; Orlandos 1952; Korres 1994d; and Bouras 2003.

⁶¹ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 1, p. 20, based on Sotiriou 1927, pp. 43-44 and Travlos 1971, p. 214; Hurwit 1999, p. 325.

⁶² Caraher 2003.

historical figure is also a perilous endeavor. Political figures may have put up some funds, but churches were often constructed piecemeal, through small donations of time, materials, labor, and/or money from members of the community, as indicated by inscriptions recording individuals' contributions, and the piecemeal character of conversions, as seen in the Erechtheion.⁶³

THE ERECHTHEION AS A PILLARED HALL

Between the pagan temple and the basilica church phases of the Erechtheion is a phase that is largely ignored in the scholarship: the Erechtheion as a pillared hall. Paton et al. did not quite know what to do with the large concrete pillars that lined the interior of the North and South Walls, and that were stratigraphically earlier than the basilica church. The concrete foundations for the pillars lie beneath the floors of the aisles and the eastern thresholds of the basilica (Figure 506 and Figure 509).⁶⁴ Since the publication of *The Erechtheum*, a cemetery church was discovered at Zapanti (Megali Chora), west of Agrinion in Aetolia, which has three large pillars in the nave, and an apse with a diameter of 5.70 m and three windows.⁶⁵ The masonry of its pillars contains irregular hammered stones and bricks inserted horizontally at intervals, just as in the pillars of the Erechtheion. Despite this more recent discovery, this type of “basilica” (as Pallas calls it) remains rare. Other examples include the basilica at Geraki in the Peloponnese, and at Paramythia and Vouthroton in Epiros.⁶⁶

⁶³ Bowden 2003.

⁶⁴ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 516-517.

⁶⁵ Pallas 1977, pp. 28-29; Orlandos 1961, pp. 43-49.

⁶⁶ Pallas 1977, p. 29. On pillar churches in general, see Orlandos 1952, p. 340. On Geraki, see Xyngopoulos 1937, p. 109; on Paramythia, see Sotiriou 1929, p. 204; on Vouthroton, see Ugolini 1937, pp. 165, 172; Orlandos 1952, p. 172.

The 4th century edicts from the Theodosian Code that concern the conversion of temples for public use are particularly intriguing in light of this stratified evidence. It is impossible to discern whether the pillared hall had a religious function, but it may have served as the first phase of the de-paganization of the space that had once housed the most important relics of pagan Athens. What does seem quite clear is that this pillared hall did not have an apse – at least not one in the same location as the later apse. The material removed to create the apse for the basilica was used in the foundations of the basilica's interior colonnade, a feature absent in the pillared hall.

As discussed above, the Athena Parthenos statue was removed from the Parthenon in the second half of the 5th century. It was allowed to remain according to the edict of A.D. 382 which allowed cult statues with artistic value to be left in situ. The olive wood statue of Athena Polias probably did not fall into this protected category, if it even had survived to this period. With Athena's house vacated, the Erechtheion was probably now free for conversion to other, perhaps public, use according to the edicts preserved in the Theodosian Code.

An engaged pillar structure – with arches reinforcing the side walls and the pillar foundations supporting arches for a vaulted roof – was a late Roman building technique.⁶⁷ This type of construction can be found in pagan temples as early as the 2nd century A.D., often with the pillars and arches in ashlar (e.g., at Seleukia near Side in southern Turkey

⁶⁷ The half-height West Cross-Wall probably served as a support for one of the arches since it is located exactly where the next concrete pillar would have been placed had the strong structure not already been in place. For a proposed reconstruction of the roof of the pillared hall, see Figure 573.

[Figure 660]).⁶⁸ A pillared hall structure need not be associated with Christianity. The same is true for the basilica.⁶⁹

THE ERECHTHEION AS A BASILICA CHURCH

PHASE I OF THE BASILICA

There is a substantial amount of architectural evidence for a reconstruction of the Erechtheion as a basilica church. Where the evidence is lacking or unclear, the restoration proposed in this study is based on the most common solution appropriate to the contemporary period and location.⁷⁰ It is not to the imposing, dramatic churches of Thessaloniki or Constantinople/Istanbul, but to the small and ubiquitous basilica churches of Greece to which we must turn in order to understand the transformation of the Erechtheion into a church. Krautheimer characterizes the typical early Christian basilica in Greece as having the following features: an atrium (external courtyard); an exonarthex; a nave flanked by two aisles; colonnades on raised stylobates; intercolumniations closed by parapets; chancel screens projecting into the eastern bay of the nave; an apse, semi-circular on both its interior and exterior; a *synthronon* in the hemicycle of the apse; colonnades surmounted by arches resting on impost blocks; an esonarthex communicating with the nave through a triple arch, or *tribelon*; and one or two rooms jutting out from the short ends of the narthex, one for receiving offerings of the

⁶⁸ Inan 1998, pp. 69-72, 128-129.

⁶⁹ See Mango 1974, pp. 66-70, on the adaptability of the basilica form. The basilica had long been used to house civic and political activities. The Hadrianic basilica in the northwest corner of the Agora was the first basilica in Athens. The earliest Christian basilica was that on the Ilissos. Orlandos reconstructed the 4th century pillared church hall at Zapanti with a pitched roof: see Pallas 1977, p. 28.

⁷⁰ For example, Italian basilica churches tended not to have galleries, but clerestories in their place to light the nave. Although a clerestory may be the simplest solution for the simple church into which the Erechtheion was transformed, the architectural comparanda from Greece would suggest galleries instead. This evidence needs to be weighed against the archaeological evidence of the cuttings, or lack thereof, on the interior walls of the Erechtheion. Galleries featured in the Parthenon, where the two-storied interior colonnade was used as the skeleton, and cuttings on the interior of the cella walls served to secure beams to support the floor: Korres 1994d, p. 147.

congregation, and one for the baptistery.⁷¹ Although these are features of churches which were built *de novo*, there is good archaeological evidence for almost every one of them in the Erechtheion.

With respect to the date, the plans of early Christian basilicas remain standard far into the 6th century. But by the later 5th century, such simple forms were overshadowed by much larger, more lavish churches of increasing complexity.⁷² Perhaps this is the reason that the ancient temples, now devoid of their former pagan gods, became attractive frameworks in which to build. The walls did not need faux marble revetment because they *were* made of solid marble. And in the Erechtheion, at least, there were already additional, unusually-shaped rooms for the baptistery and sacristy (for storage of cult implements).

EXTERIOR

NORTH PORCH AND NORTH DOOR

The North Door probably continued to serve as the main entrance to the Erechtheion after it was converted into a church. The intercolumniations of the North Porch were filled in to create a semi-sheltered ante-chamber to the basilica. These walls probably rose to a level slightly higher than the top of the doors that pierced the walls between PP.C1 and PP.C2, and PP.C4 and PP.C5. The intercolumniations of the Propylaia, the Parthenon, and the Hephaisteion were also partially filled during the Byzantine period.⁷³

⁷¹ Krautheimer 1965, p. 92.

⁷² Krautheimer 1965, p. 93.

⁷³ See Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, drawing 52, for the state of the Propylaea in 700 A.D. For the Parthenon, see Korres 1994d, pp. 147-151.

The North Door was reduced in size by the insertion of new marble jambs (Figure 349).⁷⁴ This beautifully carved lining composed of seven unequal blocks reduced the size of the opening significantly, and appears to have been produced specifically for the North Door even if the blocks themselves are *spolia*. On the sides of the jambs are several incised crosses (Figure 366).⁷⁵ The long east-west cutting in the north side of the threshold of the North Door creates an intermediate step and probably belongs to the Byzantine period as well (Figure 360). Korres dates similar cuttings at the west end of the Parthenon to the Byzantine period.⁷⁶ The new vertical jambs were set into rectangular beds cut about 0.01 m deep in the threshold of the North Door (Figure 361).

There are several sets of carefully rendered cuttings on the jambs, some of which appear to relate to the Byzantine phase.⁷⁷ The first set is for a bar to secure the new door, ca. 1.48 m above the threshold of the North Door.⁷⁸ The butt of the bar would have been lodged in the west jamb (Figure 365), and the other end slid downward along an increasingly deep cutting in the east jamb (Figure 358). This bar would probably have secured the Byzantine doors from the outside with a lock when the church was empty.⁷⁹

In the threshold of the North Door are two large, well-cut pivot holes directly behind the new marble jambs that belong to the Byzantine phase of the door (Figure 350).

While there was a bar to secure the church from the outside, the church could also be

⁷⁴ Paton et al. 1927, p. 103.

⁷⁵ On the crosses, see below “Crosses.”

⁷⁶ Korres 1994d, pp. 150-151. Alternatively, this step may have been cut during the Frankish period because its width is the same the Frankish doorway: see Chapter VI. Conversely, however, the Frankish doorway may have been designed to match the step.

⁷⁷ The other two sets of cuttings will be discussed on the following chapter.

⁷⁸ The bottom of the west cutting is 1.45 m above the stylobate level, and measures 0.08 m in width and 0.09 m in height; the bottom of the east cutting is 1.47 m above the stylobate and is 0.36 m high, increasing in depth as it descends.

⁷⁹ The chronology of this pair of cuttings is problematic. It seems strange that there would be cuttings for a bar *outside* the basilica.

secured from the inside by inserting a bolt into the cuttings on the threshold in line with the pivot holes.

The North Door and the two doors of the North Porch functioned differently. Like the Classical North Door, the leaves of the smaller, Byzantine North Door swung inward. In the doors in the intercolumniations of the North Porch, on the other hand, the pivots holes are located just inside the large stippled cuttings for the jambs, suggesting that these doors opened outward and the leaves rested flush against the jambs.

It has always been assumed that the bench along the interior of the West Façade was cut back in Classical times to allow the North Door to open.⁸⁰ This cannot be the case because the southern extent of the cut-back is not sufficient to allow the original North Door to open past the edge of the bench (Figure 350). Instead, this cut-back corresponds exactly to the width of the leaves of the Byzantine door.⁸¹

Other cuttings that may be associated with the Byzantine phase include the two stippled squares and other clustered cuttings just west of the door, between PP.C1 and PP.C2 (Figure 448). Perhaps these cuttings were intended to secure some kind of stand either for donations or ablutions, as can be found outside Greek Orthodox churches today. The circular cutting with the pour channel on the middle step, below the square stippled areas, matches the securely dated Byzantine cuttings in the intercolumniations of the aisles that would have secured the screen blocks.

⁸⁰ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 165-166. This problem arose because the West Façade was moved to the east according to a change in the original plan (see Chapter II).

⁸¹ A simple experiment with a compass and plan of the area (e.g., Paton et al. 1927, pl. 2) proves this hypothesis: Place the point of the compass in the pivots of the Classical and Byzantine doors and the pointer/pencil exactly half way along the threshold (in line with the edge of the blocks below the threshold). For a graphic illustration of this experiment, see Figure 528.

In sum, the cuttings in the North Porch suggest that the intercolumniations were filled in to a level just above two closable doors, one on the west and one on the north. This enclosure formed the exonarthex of the basilica.

DOOR TO THE PANDROSEION

Among the three sets of cuttings in the threshold between the North Porch and the Pandroseion, the northernmost set, a pair of simple pivot holes for a double-leaf door, fits the pattern for Byzantine cuttings (Figure 309). Although there are no cuttings on the underside of the ancient marble lintel, on the east reveal, the uppermost block is cut back as if to receive a wooden lintel into which the upper door pivots would have been cut. This closeable door would have led to the enclosed area of the Pandroseion.

WEST DOOR

That the West Door was not cut through the West Façade in the Byzantine period as an access to the narthex of the church has long been established, and Paton et al. discuss the evidence leading to this conclusion.⁸² Stevens concludes, however, that owing to the rough treatment of the reveals (Figure 289), the door was enlarged a total of 0.11 m (0.055 m on either side) in Byzantine times.⁸³

The threshold of the door was also cut down by 0.03 m. Two deep pivot holes, in line with the inner edge of the West Wall, and rough beds for jambs were then carved into the threshold (Figure 298). These are in the same style – deep and round – and lie directly behind the rough cuttings for jambs, as in the Byzantine North Door. The cuttings on the west and east faces of the lintel suggest that a decorative wooden plaque

⁸² Paton et al. 1927, p. 59.

⁸³ Stevens 1946, p. 95.

was mounted above this doorway in the Byzantine period, when the door would have given access to the (eso)narthex of the church.⁸⁴

The question then arises, where was the main entrance to the church? Although the small, wood-lined West Door was definitely functioning during the Byzantine period and granted access to the narthex of the church, the beauty of, and effort expended on, the new marble jambs of the North Door suggest that this was still the main entrance the building. The partially-enclosed North Porch courtyard mediated between the secular and the profane spaces. Water would also have been necessary for ablutions prior to entering the church. The cistern next to the North Porch would have provided an ample supply.⁸⁵

Our understanding of how the area west of the Erechtheion functioned depends on the state of preservation during the Byzantine period of the south and east facing L-shaped stoa comprising the ancient Pandroseion. In ancient times, the Pandroseion was accessible from the outside only through the door in the North Porch just described.⁸⁶

Assuming that the stoa of the Pandroseion was still intact, the area west of the Erechtheion was probably used as an open-air courtyard accessible from the outside via the small door in the North Porch. The stoa in the Pandroseion would have continued to function as it always had: as a shelter and enclosure west of the Erechtheion.

⁸⁴ There are also rough cuttings in the southern reveal at the level of the joint between the blocks, as well as in the middle, exactly where one would expect to find a metal clamp. These cuttings are not for bars to lock the door as in the jambs of the North Door, but are the tell-tale signs of a desperate search for metal during Frankish and Ottoman times.

⁸⁵ See below “Cisterns.”

⁸⁶ The survival of the L-shaped stoa in the Pandroseion is uncertain. A new study by Vasso Manidaki, one of the architects on the Akropolis, is currently investigating the evidence. There is an unpublished plan of the Pandroseion in the Akropolis Study Center which Hurwit reproduced: Hurwit 1999, p. 145.

CISTERNS

Three large cisterns were installed in and around the Erechtheion during the Post-Antique period: one was under the West Corridor, probably installed in the Ottoman period and roofed over by a brick vault; a cement-lined cistern east of the East Porch; and another cistern to the east of the North Porch. The latter two cisterns concern us here. Paton et al. did not commit to a date for the creation of any of these cisterns (and completely overlooked the cistern east of the East Porch), arguing only that their construction method was either Frankish or Ottoman.

A diachronic examination of constructions around the Erechtheion and a careful reading of the archaeological evidence can provide a better chronology for the cisterns.

The cistern east of the North Porch required the removal of several of its foundation and pavement blocks adjacent to where the Altar of Thyechoos once stood (Figure 456). One can at least be certain that this cistern *under* the North Addition preceded the North Addition's construction in the Frankish period.⁸⁷ Otherwise this cistern could more easily have been built elsewhere.

In his reconstruction of the Byzantine church in the Erechtheion, Travlos includes the cistern east of the North Porch.⁸⁸ In light of the drastic measures required to create the cistern, namely the removal of foundation blocks of the southeast corner of the North Porch, he is probably correct in dating its construction to the Byzantine period. The scale of this undertaking is paralleled in the Post-Antique Erechtheion only in the removal of the foundation blocks from the East Porch for the construction of the apse.⁸⁹

⁸⁷ See Chapter VI.

⁸⁸ Travlos 1960, p. 137.

⁸⁹ See below "Apse."

This cistern was accessible from within the North Porch, in a place where the stylobate blocks are missing (Figure 454). The space beneath the Altar of Thyechoos had always been empty, and the bedrock exposed, because this area once served as the underground passage into the temple.⁹⁰ Several blocks of the foundation of the North Porch were removed to connect the cistern's head in the North Porch to the new cistern to the east (Figure 461). Paton et al. considered the extant shaft to be Ottoman; however, a 1947 investigation by Leicester Holland revealed three sherds that the Athena Agora staff believed were Byzantine.⁹¹

The cistern itself, almost 3 m east to west and 4 m north to south, was made of mortared masonry and lined with well-cut, ashlar blocks (not made of marble, and probably not from the Erechtheion). The cistern is visible in photographs from the early excavations (Figure 537), but is now concealed beneath the present ground level. The size and treatment of the blocks, as discernable from photographs and drawings, show a remarkable similarity to the construction of the cistern northeast of the Propylaia.⁹² The roofing method of this cistern is unknown – it is unlikely that the brick vault visible in the 18th and 19th century paintings dates to the Byzantine period. The paintings probably instead depict the vault built over the cistern in the Frankish period.⁹³

⁹⁰ Although there is no proof, perhaps the (hollow) Altar of Thyechoos served as a puteal.

⁹¹ Holland and McAllister 1958, p. 161. This is likely the basis of Travlos' date of the cistern: see above note 88.

⁹² Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, fig. 288, and drawing 50.

⁹³ On the North Addition that was built over this cistern in the Frankish period, see Chapter VI. The most detailed view of the vault over this cistern is a view by an unknown German diarist, perhaps Adolf Schöll: Anonymous, *The Erechtheion from the North*, 1838-1844. This pencil sketch shows a vault made of blocks of about the same size as the those used for the walls (cf. the excavation photographs mentioned above), and running north-south. There may also have had an internal supporting pillar according to this drawing. I am grateful to Astrid Lindenlauf for bringing this, and the accompanying suite of drawings of the Erechtheion from all angles, to my attention in late November 2004, just prior to the final printing of this study. I mention this suite of drawings in this context because the only new information to be gleaned about the state of preservation of the building relates to the vault over this cistern (previously hidden by the remnants of the North Addition). See also Skene, *The North Portico from the Northwest*, February 27, 1839.

There is a long cutting, approximately 0.10 m wide, running diagonally across the North Porch (Figure 446). This cutting served as a drain, although it is not entirely clear which direction the drain flows. In fact, it appears to flow both west, toward the edge of the steps between PP.C1 and PP.C2, and east, toward the mouth of the Post-Antique cistern, its main purpose being to remove water as efficiently as possible from the stylobate. As Korres points out for the Parthenon, “Conversion of the pteromas into open spaces [during conversion into a Christian church] made it necessary to hew grooves in the floor to collect and lead off rain-water – most of which came from the roof.”⁹⁴ The coffered ceiling offers little protection from downpours without its tiled roof.

The date of the drain is uncertain, but it must have been created before the ground level rose above the level of the stylobate of the North Porch. This event probably occurred at some point during the Byzantine period, in conjunction with, or after the construction of, the cistern which it helped to fill.⁹⁵ Paton et al. mentioned the drain only in passing, and considered it to have been cut to carry off any liquid spilled during the process of drawing water from the well, which had been installed sometime after the Erechtheion was converted into a house.⁹⁶ The drain’s terminus post quem is the removal of the Altar of Thyechoos because its vertical blocks would have blocked the roughly cut

⁹⁴ Korres 1994d, p. 145. While the Parthenon’s pteroma was unroofed, and so exposed to the sky, water was still a problem in the roofed North Porch. Having witnessed a heavy downpour in the North Porch in March 2003 (Figure 453), it is evident that even with a relatively intact ceiling (the rain has always come through the omitted coffers above the Altar of Thyechoos and the intercolumniations, and more recently through the holes in the center of the coffers into which the bronze rosettes used to be attached), the North Porch required drainage.

⁹⁵ See Travlos 1971, p. 216, for a state plan for the Christian church which also includes the cistern and drain.

⁹⁶ Paton et al. 1927, p. 105.

drain, and the terminus ante quem must be the installation of the vault in the North Porch.⁹⁷

Such roughly hewn drains are visible not only in the Erechtheion and Parthenon, but also in the Propylaia (Figure 599) and the Hephaisteion. It is also worth noting that the drain runs diagonally northwest across the stylobate of the North Porch and exits in the intercolumniation where one of two doors of the Byzantine period has been restored in the North Porch.⁹⁸

The cistern east of the East Porch has never before been discussed in print. It appears only in Georg Kawerau's hand-written field-notes, and in the far left-hand corner of two photographs of the Akropolis excavations in the 1880s (Figure 539 and Figure 540).⁹⁹ According to the plan in the field notes, the west wall of this cistern was 0.50 m thick, and the east wall was 0.70 m thick. The width of the south wall is not indicated specifically on the plan but is depicted as being narrower than the west wall of 0.50 m. The northern extent of the cistern is not indicated. The photographs suggest it was lined with cement and was approximately 2 m deep.¹⁰⁰

Based on a similar cistern just west of the Parthenon,¹⁰¹ the cistern east of the Erechtheion was cement-lined and probably vaulted with one or two raised (square) heads for access to the water. How this cistern was filled is not clear. Unlike in the North Porch, there are no indications of drainage channels that would have led into this cistern.

⁹⁷ See Chapter VII concerning the late 17th century date of the vault in the North Porch.

⁹⁸ See above "North Porch and North Door."

⁹⁹ These notes were published by Bundgaard 1974. Pl. 87 is the sketch of the southeast corner of the Erechtheion.

¹⁰⁰ The extant top of the cistern is approximately level with the top of the euthynteria of the East Porch. The bottom of the cistern is aligned with the middle of course 20 of the east foundations of the Erechtheion: Courses 16, 17 and 18 = 1.36 m; Course 19 is 0.46 m high, and a third of the lower course is about 0.15 m. Therefore, 1.36 m + 0.46 m + ~0.15 = 1.97 m.

¹⁰¹ Korres has made a reconstruction of this cistern: Korres 1994d, p. 150.

Perhaps it was fed from some other building in the vicinity, or by some above-ground shunt from the roofs of the basilica and apse in the Erechtheion.¹⁰² The exact date of this cistern cannot be known owing to the lack of archaeological information. It is not clear whether the north end of it was destroyed during subsequent periods or only during the early excavations. The photographs and drawings simply show the state of the cistern as it was being destroyed as an unwanted, medieval accretion during the clearance of Post-Antique remains in the 19th century.¹⁰³

The cistern northeast of the Propylaia must be Byzantine, in any case, because it precedes stratigraphically the Catholic chapel of St. Bartholomew. In the case of the Erechtheion, it is not difficult to imagine the role water would play in Christian ritual: holy water was required in significant quantities for the baptistery and for the fonts of holy water at the entrances to the church.

Cisterns were added all over the Akropolis during the Byzantine period. Tanoulas associates most of these with Justinian, who refortified Athens and the Akropolis and paid particular attention to its water supply.¹⁰⁴ These cisterns ensured an adequate supply for religious and domestic life, as well as for drinking during troubled times.

EAST PORCH

The East Porch was largely filled by the apse of the basilica. Nevertheless, there are Byzantine-looking cuttings between EE.C2 and EE.C3. These include a pair of carefully-cut pivot holes 0.05 m in diameter, and 0.46 m west of the edge of the top step

¹⁰² For a methodology of how to estimate the capacity of a cistern and to fill it, see Connelly and Wilson 2002. Further analysis of how the cistern east of the Erechtheion was filled is required.

¹⁰³ On the clearance of Post-Antique accretions, see Chapter VIII.

¹⁰⁴ Tanoulas 1997.

(Figure 165). These cuttings probably belong, therefore, to the early Byzantine phase of the church, when the apse was small and rounded.

The intercolumniations of the East Porch were almost certainly filled in to above head-height, as Korres believes was the case for the Parthenon. Since in the early Christian period the apse would have had fairly large windows at an unusually low level owing to the low floor level of the interior, these intercolumnar walls would have protected the windows.¹⁰⁵

INTERIOR

Beginning with the apse in the east and moving westward, the following sections present, in brief, the evidence for the first phase of the basilica, and suggest a tentative reconstruction for the Erechtheion as a church.

APSE

The reconstruction of the apse at the east end of the Erechtheion is not as clear cut as that of the Parthenon because the ground level of the basilica was approximately 3 m below the level of the East Porch (as in the two levels of the ancient temple). The foundations below the East Wall were pried out and reused for the foundations of the interior colonnade of the basilica. The apse was inserted into the niche created by the removal of the foundations of the East Porch (Figure 192). Evidence for the curvature of the apse is provided by the roughly cut curve on the west side of blocks EE.13.03 and EE.13.04 (Figure 488). Further evidence for the shape of the apse derives from the plan drawn by Tétaz in 1848 in which several stones are arranged in an arc which extends

¹⁰⁵ On the apse and large windows, see the next section below.

northwestward from the curved cutting in the stylobate (Figure 98).¹⁰⁶ A semi-circular *synthronon* (seats for the priests and bishop) would have been built into the interior of the apse.¹⁰⁷

CHANCEL SCREEN

One slab of the chancel screen, or *templon*, survives and has been replaced in its correct location on the threshold, which ran across the nave of the church (Figure 517). This screen separated the nave from the apse. Its main decorative features include a large lozenge with a transenna pattern in the center.¹⁰⁸ In the corners are pomegranates arranged around plain triangles. The sculptor made no attempt to model (i.e., soften the edges of) the motifs.

Unfortunately, no typological study of early Christian *templon* slabs has been published, partly because it is very difficult to date even those which are still in situ, and partly because of their overwhelming conservatism.¹⁰⁹ The closest parallel for the pattern on the slab derives from the chancel screen at the Kaiseriani Monastery in the foothills of Mount Hymettos (Figure 642). The origin of the Kaiseriani *templon* slabs is known: the slabs are made of Prokonnesian marble and were shipped in their finished state in the 6th century.¹¹⁰ An inscribed stele was reused to make the *templon* in the Erechtheion.¹¹¹ The

¹⁰⁶ Tétaz, *Acropolis d'Athènes. Ruines de l'Érechtheion, état actuel*, 1848. It is important to note that the wall between EP.C2 and EP.C5 in courses 15 through 19 of the foundations is modern, and much of the evidence for the apse is now either hidden or has been removed. One of the few depictions of the interior of the East Façade before the modern wall was erected is the work of the Greek architect, P. Kalkos, in the plates of the Greek Commissioners Report of 1852 (published in 1855): Archaeological Society of Athens 1853.

¹⁰⁷ An excellent example can be found in the church of St. Irene in Istanbul: Mango 1974, p. 157.

¹⁰⁸ The transenna pattern is derived from the decorative windows and screens common in late antiquity and early Byzantine buildings.

¹⁰⁹ The lozenge motif can even be found in Late Roman contexts, such as 3rd to 4th century A.D. sarcophagi. There is an example in the Ioannina Museum (Figure 651).

¹¹⁰ Paton et al. 1927, p. 511. The Prokonnesian examples were reused in the 11th century Katholikon (Figure 642).

similarity in the design, the lower quality of the carving, and the reuse of a stele suggest that a slightly later, local sculptor executed the *templon* in the Erechtheion.

There are other parallels for the various features of the *templon* in the Erechtheion. In the Byzantine Museum at Athens is a *templon* (stylistically) dated to the 6th century which was reused in the (probably Second) Frankish period as a threshold, and subsequently built into the Akropolis wall (Figure 619).¹¹² This *templon* contains pomegranates dispersed around a curvilinear scroll pattern.

The first phase of the chancel screen only ran across the nave of the church. Two sizes (and colors) of monolithic columns were used in the Byzantine period. The smaller (purple and cream) columns (Figure 520) fit nicely into the cuttings in the threshold that separates the nave from the apse (Figure 513), and would have stood on the inside of each of the *templon* slabs (Figure 574). Orlandos has shown that in early Christian basilicas, there would have been no screens above the decorated stone *templon* slabs to block the view of the apse, as restored by Paton et al.¹¹³

In the same reconstruction, Paton et al. restore another identical *templon* for the south side of the nave. This desire for a symmetrical design is probably misplaced. In most churches, the *templon* slabs are not found in matching pairs: the designs may be complementary, but they are rarely identical.¹¹⁴ Hundreds of fragments of *templon* slabs from the Akropolis were assembled and built into a wall during the excavation of the plateau. Early photographs of this (now dismantled) wall show several fragments that

¹¹¹ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 508-509.

¹¹² The characteristic cutting for a Frankish door is in evidence (Figure 592). See Chapter VI. The back of the same slab is visible in early photographs of this wall (Figure 618).

¹¹³ Paton et al. 1927, pl. 32.

¹¹⁴ The only true “pair” of chancel screens I have seen are in Moni Petraki in Kolonaki, but these are very recent and of simple design.

share features with the screen in the Erechtheion, such as the rectilinear lozenges (Figure 618). One of these may have been the mate to the slab in the Erechtheion.

AISLES

The aisles were never paved and remained beaten earth, while the nave, as illustrated by Tétaz (Figure 98), was paved with marble slabs. These slabs have all since disappeared, although some of the brick foundations for them remain in the area in front of the apse (Figure 516). Graves were sunk into the south aisle.¹¹⁵

As mentioned above, the foundations for the colonnades that separated the aisles from the nave were created from the foundations blocks of the East Porch, which had been removed to make space for the apse. The colonnades of *verde antico* stood on a platform about 0.40 m above ground level (Figure 518). The upper course of the foundation of the northern interior colonnade (threshold) is composed of architrave blocks from the East Wall which had been partly dismantled in order to accommodate the apse.¹¹⁶ The top course of the foundation for the south interior colonnade was made of poros limestone blocks from the east foundations.

Based on the pattern and location of pour channels in the tops of the blocks, Paton et al. correctly reconstructed low parapets between the columns that separated the aisles from the nave.¹¹⁷ Such aisle separators were a common feature in early Christian basilicas. The nave of the basilica was reserved for the procession and the officiants, and the congregation stood in the aisles. Tradition dictated that the men and women stood in

¹¹⁵ Carl Blegen and Dinsmoor excavated a grave at the east end of the south aisle in 1914. Other than the publication of one of the inscriptions they found (Merritt 1927), no report was ever published. See Figure 541 for a transcription of Blegen's notes and sketches.

¹¹⁶ Paton et al. 1927, p. 517, note 1.

¹¹⁷ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 504-507. The location of the pour channels indicate that the parapets were not placed in the middle of the block, but toward the North and South Walls, thus forming a bench along the sides of the nave.

separate sections of the church.¹¹⁸ In some Greek churches, women still stand in the north aisle and the men in the south aisle.¹¹⁹ Other early Christian churches with parapets between the columns of the aisles include Basilica A at Nea Anchialos (ca. A.D. 470, Figure 648), the Lechaion near Corinth (Figure 647), the basilica at Nemea, and the basilica at Nikopolis ad Istrum in Bulgaria.¹²⁰

The blocks of the parapet are now missing. In the Middle Byzantine period, the parapets were no longer a feature in new churches. Therefore, they were probably removed from the Erechtheion during the alterations of the 12th century (see below) to meet the demands of Middle Byzantine liturgy and taste.

The colonnade of monolithic *verde antico* columns, perhaps reused from a Late Roman building, supported a lintel (most likely arcuated), above which rose either a solid wall or a second story of columns, as restored by Travlos.¹²¹ The second story, if there was one, did not hold galleries because there are no cuttings to support them in the North and South Walls.¹²²

WEST CROSS-WALL

The repaired (Hellenistic) West Cross-Wall had probably supported one of the arches in the pillared hall.¹²³ This wall was now dismantled down to the bottom course

¹¹⁸ Usually, the women stood in the galleries and the men in the aisles. In the Erechtheion, there were no galleries in the first phase of the basilica; therefore, according to later practice and modern ethnographic parallels, the men probably stood in the south aisle and the women in the north. On gender separation in the early church, see Holtzinger 1889, pp. 175-177.

¹¹⁹ Langdon 1990, p. 84.

¹²⁰ On Nea Anchialos, see Krautheimer 1965, p. 94; on the Lechaion at Corinth, see Krautheimer 1965, pp. 99-100; on Nemea, see Langdon 1990, p. 84; and on Nikopolis ad Istrum, see Poulter 1995.

¹²¹ There are many columns of *verde antico* still in the Erechtheion, and many more were taken by early travelers and residents of Athens, such as Fauvel. See Chapter VII for a description of the removal of the columns from the Akropolis in the 18th and 19th centuries.

¹²² There are cuttings in the north and south walls of the Parthenon for the galleries in the second story.

¹²³ This wall only rose to course 9. Above this height was probably a colonnade. See Chapters II and III on the complicated history of the West Cross-Wall.

of marble above the ancient foundations, that is, to the level of the ancient threshold. This marble course then served as the thresholds for the aisles and nave of the basilica. New molded bases for antae/pilasters, mostly made from reused inscribed stelai, framed the openings for the aisles (Figure 521, Figure 522, Figure 523 and Figure 524).¹²⁴

Above the openings to the aisles and naves (the molded bases preclude the existence of doors), the lintels were probably arcuated. The opening to the nave also would have had a *tribelon* (the traditional triple-arched opening) above it.¹²⁵

The new West Cross-Wall probably extended up to the ceiling if there was one, or supported the roof directly. The second story of the new West Cross-Wall was probably a columnar screen, as it had probably been in Antiquity (as reconstructed by Travlos), but perhaps with the columns lining up with those on the West Façade.¹²⁶

WEST CORRIDOR

The West Corridor naturally served as the narthex for the basilica. Access to it could be gained from the North or West Doors. It also gave access to the Maiden Porch, which may have served as a baptistery. The ceiling/roof of the West Corridor was probably at the same height as the rest of the basilica, that is, at the level of the epikranitis. Paton et al. reconstruct a sloping roof from the West Cross-Wall to the level of the window sills of the West Façade, partly because they believe the west end of the South Wall had already fallen down.¹²⁷ This is almost certainly incorrect, especially if a

¹²⁴ The term “doorway” is avoided when no door leaves can be restored owing to the molded bases. Instead, the neutral term “opening” is used.

¹²⁵ Cloth curtains, if anything, physically separated the narthex from the aisles and nave. Curtains are still used in this manner in Greek Orthodox churches today.

¹²⁶ Travlos 1960, p. 137.

¹²⁷ See Paton et al. 1927, pl. 32.

gallery is to be restored on the exterior of the West Façade in the second phase of the basilica. This leads us to the problematic reconstruction of the roof of the basilica.

ROOF

The reconstruction of the roof of the Erechtheion is a problem, even for the 5th century building.¹²⁸ It is likely that the first phase of the basilica in the Erechtheion had a timber roof. In a remarkable freak of preservation, or thanks to constant care and favorable environmental conditions, a timber roof of the 6th century survives in the Monastery of St. Catherine on Mount Sinai.¹²⁹ This is perhaps the best evidence upon which to reconstruct a timber truss roof for the Erechtheion.

The roof of the basilica in the Erechtheion probably extended from the South to the North Wall at the same level, and ran from the line of the East Wall to the West Cross-Wall, as restored by Travlos. Above the interior colonnade and the West Cross-Wall was probably a second arcuated colonnade, which in turn supported the roof. The roof over the West Corridor/narthex is problematic because the timber roof probably could not span the entire width of the temple in the absence of the interior colonnade in the West Corridor. Paton et al.'s solution of a roof sloping downward from the West Cross-Wall to the West Façade is a good one, but it should be at a higher level. Instead, the sloping roof should begin at the top of the West Cross-Wall and slope downward toward the entablature of the West Façade (Figure 574).

Wood was a valuable commodity both in Antiquity and the Middle Ages, so the choice to roof the Erechtheion in wood would have been an expensive one. All that can

¹²⁸ Paton et al. 1927 published two different restorations for the Classical roof of the Erechtheion. See Chapter II for this study's reconstruction.

¹²⁹ Mango 1974, pp. 21-22, fig. 21; Forsyth 1968, pp. 8-9, fig. 21. There are also timber roofs in other early Christian basilicas such as Agios Demetrios in Thessaloniki, but these are not the original roofs.

be said is that the basilica church must have had a roof of some kind, and that it was not the original roof of the temple. There are no cuttings in the top of the epikranitis for a timbered roof, although the beams may have rested behind the half-thickness blocks of the epikranitis (Figure 194).

The roof of the Parthenon, which extended only between the cella walls in the Byzantine period, was also pitched and tiled. Along each of the sides, frieze blocks were removed and dormer windows were installed to provide light for the galleries and nave (Figure 130).¹³⁰ A similar scenario may be proposed for the Erechtheion, but this is not necessary. As discussed in the next section, ample light would have entered the basilica through other openings.

LIGHTING

The North and South Walls of the Erechtheion had only the ancient slit windows, and the roof structure almost certainly did not allow for the clerestory lighting employed in most early Christian basilicas.¹³¹ Adequate light would not have been a problem, however, because the ancient structure would have allowed a great deal of light into the basilica according to the reconstruction of the basilica proposed in this study. Light would have come in through the windows of the West Façade and the large windows in the smoothly-curved apse.

Early Christian basilicas often had three or more large windows in the apse to illuminate the sanctuary.¹³² Three or more windows at a high level in the apse of the

¹³⁰ Korres 1994d, p. 147, figs. 12 and 145.

¹³¹ Paton et al. were convinced that the slit windows in the North and South Walls were carved in the Byzantine period. This belief led them to date the basilica to the 8th century although most of the other features could be dated to the 6th century: Paton et al. 1927, pp. 514-516.

¹³² One example is the Basilica of St. John of Studius at Constantinople, (ca. A.D. 450): Mango 1974, pp. 61-63. See also the basilica at Trier (A.D. 305-312).

Erechtheion would have provided adequate light and a view of the columns of the East Porch. As mentioned above, the intercolumnar walls of the East Porch restricted access to the apse windows.¹³³

MAIDEN PORCH

Many early Christian basilicas had baptisteries for initiating new converts. Although there is no concrete proof of this, it is highly likely that the Maiden Porch was used as a baptistery. The porch's location as a southern protrusion from the main body of the basilica places it exactly where most baptisteries were located in early Christian basilicas.¹³⁴ At some point in the Byzantine period, a ceiling was built at the level of the top of the podium of the Maiden Porch, approximately where the temporary, modern roof is located. Carved at the top of block SS.11.01, slightly inside the line of the Doric pilasters of the South Door, are two large square cuttings for beams (Figure 242). These are exactly level with the top of the podium of the Maiden Porch and probably supported a ceiling that covered at least the west and south portion of the hollow podium. This new ceiling in the Maiden Porch was high enough (1.8 m) for people to stand comfortably on the ancient floor level, and the space was large enough for a small number of people to

¹³³ All the surviving large basilicas with clerestory lighting have quite generous openings for light. The small, narrow windows in Paton et al.'s reconstruction (pl. 32) are a feature of Middle Byzantine church architecture, and have no place in an early Christian basilica. The small arches for the clerestory windows in their reconstruction are probably a conflation of the mis-dated slit windows in the North and South Walls and the windows in much later Byzantine churches. The earliest examples of small, narrow, arched windows in Greece are in the Church of the Panagia at Skripou, which dates to A.D. 873/4 according to an inscription. This type of window appears elsewhere in the Byzantine Empire around the same time: in the early and late 9th century at Zadar (Zara) and Ohrid, respectively (Krautheimer 1965, pls. 122 and 124), and in the early 10th at Nessebar in the Church of St. John the Baptist on the coast of the Black Sea (Krautheimer 1965, pl. 129). These narrow windows became a defining feature of churches from the Middle Byzantine period onward, an excellent example being Agios Soter on the North Slope of the Akropolis, within view of the Erechtheion. Windows with rows of circular glass set in stone became common by the 11th century, excellent surviving examples being those at Daphni. This style of window has remained popular in Greek churches ever since, and is still used in modern repairs and new structures.

¹³⁴ Sometimes the baptisteries are located at the north end of the narthex.

assemble to participate in the sacrament of baptism. The East Door was blocked by the new ceiling and the opening was probably filled in while the Maiden Porch was being used as a baptistery.

SUMMARY OF PHASE I

The conversion of the Erechtheion into a basilica church included all the main features of a basilica built *de novo*. The Pandroseion served as the atrium, the North Porch as the exonarthex, the West Corridor as the esonarthex, the Maiden Porch perhaps as a baptistery, the main chamber of the Erechtheion as the nave and aisles of the church, and the East Porch contained the apse. Based on the published dates of the closest comparisons for the features extant in the Erechtheion and the history of the other monuments on the Akropolis, the conversion of the Erechtheion into a basilica church dates to the late 6th or early 7th century.

PHASE II OF THE BASILICA

Paton et al. and Travlos assumed that there was only one phase to the Erechtheion as a basilica church when they proffered their reconstructions. Advances in the study of Byzantine architecture and a close examination of the remains of the basilica, indicate that there were, in fact, two phases. The first phase transformed the pillared hall into a basilica with a small, smoothly-curved apse and a timber roof in the late 6th or early 7th century, as described above. At a later point in time, probably in the 12th century, the church was updated and given many of the features of contemporary middle Byzantine basilicas. There are many possible reasons for this. Krautheimer suggests that the reason for the changes in the form of basilicas between the early Christian and middle Byzantine periods is that there was a:

...Growing emphasis on the Great Mystery – the Mass in which the invisible and undepictable God reveals Himself through the action of the priesthood – assigned an increasingly predominant role to the clergy and to their movements about the altar. The space given over to the officiating priest grew larger and became the very focus of the church.¹³⁵

This religious demand needed to be realized in the Erechtheion whose walls could not change, but whose internal plan was somewhat malleable. The renovation of the Erechtheion can potentially be attributed to several additional factors, including a change in the liturgy, a rise in the size of the congregation, and a general desire to update the basilica as a whole.

APSE

In the second phase of the basilica, the apse was updated and enlarged. Its new, straight, exterior sides incorporated EP.C3 and EP.C4, and its interior was pushed back to create a larger area for the *synthronon*. There are several cuttings in the East Porch that may be associated with the enlargement of the apse. The cuttings between EP.C3 and EP.C4 – the bases of the columns are cut back and irregular holes sunk into the tori – anchored the expanded apse around the columns (Figure 169 and Figure 170). In addition, the southwest portion of the base of EE.C3 has been roughly hacked away at the point where the south side of the apse would have begun its return. There are otherwise no indicative cuttings or wear marks on the stylobate to show where the apse once stood. The absence of wear marks is not entirely surprising because this enlarged apse would have stood for less than a century.

The low floor level of the basilica in the Erechtheion meant that the entablature of the East Porch did not need to be dismantled to accommodate the half-dome of the apse,

¹³⁵ Krautheimer 1965, pp. 199-200.

as was the case in the Parthenon where the architrave above the apse in the pronaos (specifically the central slabs of the east frieze) had to be removed.¹³⁶ The dome of the apse of the Erechtheion probably would not have risen up very high above the East stylobate, perhaps just high enough to include narrow, double-arched windows to allow some light to enter. As a result, the East Façade of the Erechtheion did not change substantially.

EXTENSION OF THE CHANCEL SCREEN

The chancel screen was extended across the north and south aisles in the second phase of the basilica.¹³⁷ The thresholds were (and are) not integrated with the central chancel screen or the side walls in any way, and so appear to have been added later, likely to satisfy liturgical requirements for greater privacy for the mystery of transubstantiation occurring in the area around the altar (Figure 508).¹³⁸ The cuttings in the thresholds included settings for decorated *templon* slabs, and dowels with pour channels for pilasters to frame the curtained opening.¹³⁹ A screen was probably added to the top of the full extent of the chancel screen, in order to shield the apse from view further:

After Iconoclasm the *templon* [i.e., the chancel screen] was extended to the *Pastophoria*. Like the screen of the *bema*, these screens consisted of slabs set between colonnettes and carrying an

¹³⁶ Korres 1994d, p. 147.

¹³⁷ Orlandos has shown that in the early Christian period, the chancel screen only cordoned off the east end of the central portion of the nave, which contained the altar and the *synthronon*: Orlandos 1952. Orlandos' reconstruction of the early Christian chancel barrier as confined to the nave can be found in most books on Byzantine architecture (e.g., Mango 1974, p. 70). In other words, early Byzantine churches, of which the Erechtheion is an example, did not have a *pastophoria*, i.e., closed rooms to the north and south of the sanctuary. Other early Christian churches without a *pastophoria* are St. John of Studius in Constantinople (Mango 1974, p. 62); the Episcopal church at Stobi (Kitzinger 1946); the Acheiropoietos basilica in Thessaloniki (Mango 1974, p. 66); the Aphantelli basilica on Lesbos (Mango 1974, p. 70; Orlandos 1952); Basilica C at Philippi (Pallas 1977, pp. 106-107); and the basilica at Sikyon (Pallas 1977, p. 173).

¹³⁸ The south aisle threshold is currently concealed by timbers stored in the Erechtheion (Figure 515).

¹³⁹ On the use of the term "opening" rather than "doorway" see above note 124.

epistyle; all such forms, nonetheless, were generally slighter than those of the time of Justinian I. According to M. Chatzidakis (15 CEB [Athens 1976] 3:165) toward the end of the 11th C. the transformation of the medieval *templon* was completed with the appearance of *Proskynetaria* and icons set in the intercolumnar openings.¹⁴⁰

The extension of the chancel screen across the entirety of the east end of the basilica is exactly what appears to have happened in the Erechtheion. Therefore, the *terminus post quem* for Phase II in the Erechtheion is the mid-9th century A.D., that is, the end of Iconoclasm.

REMOVAL OF THE PARAPETS

The parapets between the columns of the interior colonnade were probably removed, as there is no trace of the blocks anywhere in the vicinity of the Erechtheion. Middle and Late Byzantine churches did not have such barriers. If they had not been deliberately removed, then one would expect at least one of the parapet blocks to have endured considering the survival of the *templon* slab and many fragments of the interior colonnade.

GALLERY ON THE WEST FAÇADE

The rise in the size of the congregation may have resulted in the construction of a gallery on the exterior of the West Façade, the evidence for which is presented below. The separation of men and women was still required by custom, and the Erechtheion did not have galleries for women above the aisles as in most basilicas, including the Parthenon. Perhaps the congregation had grown to such an extent that, with the removal of the aisle barriers, the men filled both the north and the south aisles. At this point, a

¹⁴⁰ *ODB*, s.v. *templon* (Kazhdan 1991). It is after the 11th century that we can begin to talk about an iconostasis without running into the problem of using anachronistic terminology.

place for the women was required. Perhaps this necessitated the construction of the gallery on the exterior of the West Façade. The floor level would have been just below the level of the large windows. The female congregants would have been able to see what was going on in the nave through the three windows in the West Façade and the columnar screen above the West Cross-Wall as reconstructed by Travlos.¹⁴¹

Among the plethora of markings on the walls facing the Pandroseion, besides those described for the West Door, at least three are in a similar style and can be assigned to the Byzantine period.¹⁴² The first is on block WW.15.05 and is about 0.14 m to a side (Figure 279); the second is on block NN.08.01.o and descends slightly into NN.09.01.o, about 0.20 m to a side (Figure 316); and the third is on block WW.08.01, and is about 0.20 m in width and about 0.12 m in height (Figure 270).

All three of these cuttings are isolated and in situ. A substantial beam may be reconstructed as protruding out of each cutting. The first of these cuttings, in WW.015.05, is probably related to the passageway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion, the beam extending from it perhaps supporting an extension of the ancient marble roof.¹⁴³

The second and third cuttings are probably related because they are both at the same elevation as the bottom of the windows in the West Façade. The cutting in course 8 of the westward projection of the North Porch would have received a beam running north to south. The beam protruding from the cutting in the south anta of the West Façade

¹⁴¹ Travlos 1960, p. 137. The lines of sight from the gallery attached to the exterior of the West Façade would have been blocked in Travlos' reconstruction. Perhaps the colonnade above the West Cross-Wall had the same spacing as the West Façade.

¹⁴² I.e., the West Façade and the (south face of the) westward projection of the North Porch.

¹⁴³ The bottom of the extended lintel of the door to the Pandroseion is flush with the top of the cutting for the beam.

extended westward. A vertical post where these two aforementioned beams would have crossed probably supported some sort of platform. This platform would not only have provided some shelter in the area of the Pandroseion, but it would also have served as a gallery.¹⁴⁴ Because of the high ground level west of the Maiden Porch, in the Kekropeion and on the terrace of the Archaic Temple of Athena, a simple wooden staircase would have sufficed for access to the gallery, but there is also a possibility that the gallery could be reached via the Maiden Porch (which had a floor at the same level as the top of the podium).¹⁴⁵

There are other similar cuttings in the upper West Façade especially between WC.01 and the north anta; however, owing to its complete destruction in the middle of the 19th century and restoration in the early 20th century, it is very difficult to base any arguments for a restoration on these, particularly since the early reconstructions sometimes filled in cuttings with new marble pieces.¹⁴⁶ Two potentially significant cuttings that are perhaps relevant to the gallery and likely Byzantine are a neat square cutting, about 0.19 m to a side, in the south end of WP.02.05, and a careful rectangular cutting about 0.38 m wide and 0.01 m high in the upper left (north) part of WP.04.01 (Figure 272). These two cuttings are very high on the West Façade as it now stands, and it is probable that the blocks into which they were cut are not in situ.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁴ Paton et al. were deeply concerned about the lack of evidence for galleries over the aisles of the church: Paton et al. 1927, pp. 492-523.

¹⁴⁵ See above “Maiden Porch.”

¹⁴⁶ The restoration of the 1970-1980s discerned carefully between intentional cuttings and damage to the blocks. Restorers did not fill cuttings made to support beams or rough hackings made in search of metal clamps, but did fill in areas where blocks had otherwise been damaged.

¹⁴⁷ The Balanos reconstruction of the West Façade was not materially altered during the most recent anastylosis.

NORTH DOOR

For some unknown reason, the North Door was reduced in size in the second phase of the church. There is a cutting for a lintel approximately 4.40 m above the level of the threshold, just below the marble jamb (Figure 362 and Figure 357).¹⁴⁸ This lintel could not have been inserted in the Frankish or Ottoman phases because the West Corridor in these periods had a second story at a lower elevation and its floor would have cut off a door at this height.

ROOF

In its second phase, it is likely that the basilica in the Erechtheion was roofed with a triple barrel vault (Figure 574). The vaults over the aisles seem to have survived into the Frankish period, and a remnant of the vault can be seen in one of the earliest paintings of the Erechtheion, a watercolor by William Pars (1765), springing from the South Wall over the south aisle (Figure 22).

Geographically, the closest parallel for a vaulted roof in a converted temple is the Hephaisteion (Figure 636). The date of this roof has been hotly debated and placed anywhere between the 9th and 13th centuries.¹⁴⁹ The vault in the Hephaisteion springs from the top of the side walls. The interior half of the uppermost wall blocks has been removed in order to key in the vault.¹⁵⁰

Course 1 of the Erechtheion displays a strikingly similar arrangement. When the temple underwent its major repair (in the Hellenistic period according to this study), the backs of both the architrave and epikranitis blocks were replaced due to fire damage

¹⁴⁸ This top set of cuttings was inaccessible, but the bottom of the cuttings correspond with the top of the middle block of the jamb which is 4.40 m (east) and 4.55 m (west) above the stylobate.

¹⁴⁹ For a summary of the debate, see Frantz 1965, pp. 204-205.

¹⁵⁰ This can be seen clearly in section in Travlos 1960, p. 143.

(Figure 194).¹⁵¹ The replaced backers of the epikranitis had probably already been removed in the early Byzantine period (several were used as the top course of the foundations of the north colonnade in the first phase of the basilica). Their removal created the same kind of keyed platform for the vaults as found in the Hephaisteion.

CUTTINGS IN SS.09.08-11

There is a series of fourteen small, closely-spaced, roughly-carved cuttings in blocks SS.09.08-11, on the exterior of the South Wall (Figure 197). The cuttings must have received beams for the roof of a lean-to, similar to that which has been reconstructed in Chapter VII for the cuttings just east of the Maiden Porch. These appear to date to the Byzantine period not because of their style of carving, but because of their elevation on the building. By the Ottoman period, the ground level covered the orthostates of the South Wall and so the cuttings in SS.09.08-11 could not have supported a ceiling of sufficient height. The Byzantine cuttings for roofs in the Propylaia are more carefully cut and supported lean-to roofs well above human height (Figure 594 and Figure 595). The best explanation for these cuttings is that some individual or group independently (and probably unofficially) attached a lean-to to the exterior of the South Wall of the Erechtheion in the Byzantine period.

SARCOPHAGUS SLAB

There is a thin slab of marble lying on the foundations of the north colonnade, east of the east threshold of the chancel screen (Figure 526).¹⁵² Its sculptural decoration is heavily battered, as if to create a more even surface for reuse. This slab was originally

¹⁵¹ On dating the repair to the Hellenistic period, see Chapter III.

¹⁵² This block is not in situ and the story of its discovery and association with the Erechtheion is unknown. This study assigns its use to the Byzantine period because the reuse of ancient materials was especially high at that time and because it is currently associated with the aisles of the basilica.

decorated with cupids, and once formed one side of a Late Roman sarcophagus, similar to an example reused as a fountain in Preveza (Figure 649), and to another on display in the Ioannina Museum (Figure 650). It is almost certainly not in situ.¹⁵³

SUMMARY OF PHASE II

Korres dates the two construction phases of the Parthenon apse to the 6th century and the 12th century.¹⁵⁴ The basilica in the Erechtheion was probably renovated around the same time as the renovation of the Parthenon in the 12th century. The apse was enlarged and given straight sides on the exterior; the chancel barrier was extended to the North and South Walls; the parapets between the aisle colonnade were removed; a gallery was added to the West Façade; and the lintel of the North Door was lowered slightly (Figure 574). A small, low lean-to may have been added to the exterior of the South Wall.

CHRISTIANIZATION OF PAGAN MONUMENTS

Frantz argued that the transformation of a temple into a church took place in three phases:

1. The desacralization of the pagan temple by removing the cult statue;
2. A period of fallow where the building would not have undergone any structural changes;

¹⁵³ There appear to be no published references to this slab.

¹⁵⁴ Korres 1994d, p. 145. A graffito on the Parthenon records that Archbishop Nikolaos Ayiotheodoritis (1166-1175) enlarged the apse: Korres 1994d, p. 148.

3. The actual architectural transformation in accordance with liturgical requirements.¹⁵⁵

Decree XVI.10.25 of the *Codex Theodosianus*, dating to A.D. 435, declares, among other things, that all temples be destroyed and purified with a Christian sign: “praecepto magistratum destrui collocacioneque venerandae christianae religionis signi expiari praecipimus.” That sign would be the cross, and although the Erechtheion was not destroyed, crosses are evident in many places on the temple and speak to its conscientious purification and conversion into a place of Christian worship.

Another method of Christianization of pagan temples was the burial of Christian corpses within the ancient precinct. Christian burials in close proximity to, and within, pagan temples were quite common, as in the Hephaisteion and the Parthenon, to name but a few examples in Athens alone.¹⁵⁶ There were also several burials in the south aisle of the Erechtheion and in the Pandroseion, according to the 1853 Report of the Greek Commission.¹⁵⁷

The marble blocks of the converted pagan temples became a canvas for the artistic expression of devout Christians.¹⁵⁸ While there is no surviving evidence for wall-

¹⁵⁵ Frantz 1965, p. 201; Ward-Perkins 1999, pp. 237-238; Reagan Baydoun (pers. comm.) pointed out that Proklos’ death in 485 is only a terminus post quem for the conversion of the Parthenon (and perhaps the Erechtheion by association). On the Christianization of temples in Greece, see Spieser 1986 and Spieser 1976.

¹⁵⁶ There were graves in the opisthodomos of the Parthenon, in the northwest angle of its pteroma, and in the south side of the krepidoma. The last of these contained coins of Justinian, Justin II and Tiberius II, dating to A.D. 527-582: Norre 1966, pp. 34-35. These graves provide a terminus ante quem for the cessation of pagan cult and represent an important, datable part of the Christianization process on the Akropolis. For the graves in the Hephaisteion, see Dinsmoor 1941 and Figure 640.

¹⁵⁷ Archaeological Society of Athens 1853, section 35. The early Christian burials on the Akropolis are the first burials since the Sub-Mycenaean period.

¹⁵⁸ On the Parthenon, there are 232 legible graffiti, 60 of which can be dated precisely, and these are spread evenly over the whole period when the Parthenon functioned as a place of Christian worship, that is from the 5th century A.D. through the end of the Frankish period. Orlandos recorded the Christian graffiti and dipinti in the Parthenon: Orlandos 1973. Tanoulas has documented the graffiti in the Propylaea: e.g., Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, figs. 286 and 287. The majority of the graffiti on the Parthenon are invocations to

paintings in the Erechtheion like those in the Parthenon, the presence of many crosses and ships speaks to the Christian religiosity of the people who used the elegant structure for their worship.¹⁵⁹

GRAFFITI

Three categories of graffiti datable to the early Christian and Byzantine periods will be discussed in the following sections:

1. Evidence for dedications of the Erechtheion as a church;
2. Crosses inscribed at various locations around the Erechtheion, probably as part of the Christianization process;
3. A series of ships carved into the interior of the east architrave of the North Porch, probably near the end of the Byzantine period.

The dedications were recorded in the 19th century and have since disappeared; the crosses have never been recorded systematically and considered together; and the ships have never been noted, published, nor analyzed.

DEDICATION

The name of the Erechtheion as a church is attested by three graffiti. In 1859 Pittakis read an invocation to the Virgin on the back wall of the North Porch, east of the North Door. This graffiti is now completely faded, but once read: Θεοδόχε Δέσποινα πιστῶν τὸ κέρασ σῶζε καὶ φύλαττε τὸν σὸν ἱκέτην] Δ[ι]ονύσι[ον] Ἰωάννην τα

Christ or the Virgin Mary, and commemorations of deaths. This “chronicle in stone” records the names of dozens of bishops, archbishops, and other clergy: Korres 1994d, p. 148.

¹⁵⁹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 493. Rangabé reported having seen faint traces of wall paintings in the Erechtheion, but he is a lone witness: Rangabé 1882, p. 263. On wall-paintings in the Parthenon, see Korres 1994d. The wall-paintings in the Parthenon were applied directly to the marble surface. Owing to the poor state of preservation of the interior of the walls of the Erechtheion, it is not surprising that no paintings have been found.

πεινὸν καὶ ψάλτην καθολικῆς ἐκκλησίας Ἀθηνῶν. Ἀμήν.¹⁶⁰ In 1924, Paton et al. found two more graffiti relating to the dedication of the church: “both...rudely scratched on the first block west of the east anta of the portico, in the course above the orthostates,”¹⁶¹ that is, on blocks NN.17.06 or 07. The first reads: μηρ θυ meaning Μητῆρ Θεοῦ. The second reads θεωτ κ δεσπινα | Βοηθη τω σο δουλο θεωσσο . . . του αμην, meaning Θεοτόκε καὶ Δέσποινα βοήθει τοῦ σοῦ δούλου Θεοσσω . . . του αμην. The Erechtheion, therefore, appears to have been dedicated to the Theotokos (Mary, Mother of God) when it served as a basilica church.

CROSSES

Many crosses were carved onto the marble blocks on the exterior the Erechtheion, sometimes at a great height. This was part of the non-architectural Christianization process that included Christian burials within and around the previously pagan temple. The crosses engraved on the Erechtheion have never before been documented systematically. Table 5 describes them and their locations:

¹⁶⁰ Pittakis 1859, pp. 1809-1810, no. 3647; Mommsen 1868, p. 40, no. 37; Petit de Julleville 1868, p. 477.

¹⁶¹ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 518-519.

Table 5. Location and Description of Crosses Carved on the Erechtheion.

Cross No.	Block ID	Location on block	Characteristics	Figure
1	NN.12.04	West face of east jamb of the North Door	Large serifs (flanges are well delineated) ¹⁶²	Figure 366
2	NN.12.03	East face of west jamb of the North Door	Large V-shaped serifs, perhaps related to NN.12.04	Figure 367
3	NN.11.01	South face of the Westward Projection of the North Porch, east of Cross no. 4	Small, carved with a pointed chisel? Horizontal and vertical elements about equal length on the eastern cross	Figure 320
4	NN.11.01	South face of the Westward Projection of the North Porch, west of Cross no. 3	Small, carved with a pointed chisel? Taller vertical element, horizontal element cuts vertical in half	Figure 320
5	NN.16.01	South face of southwest anta of North Porch	A Chi-Rho, but the rho is made in the bottom right quadrant instead of the usual top right quadrant.	Figure 329
6	EE.C6.06	Front flute	A series of crosses, some of them interconnected Chi-Rho symbols, run down the front flute of EE.C6, now in the British Museum. ¹⁶³	Figure 174
7	MP.M3	Upper left thigh	A horizontal cross	
8	MP.M3	Left side, lower drapery	A horizontal cross	

The crosses on either side of the Byzantine jambs of the North Door (Cross Nos. 1 and 2) probably belong to the same, probably early, Christianization process. They are at approximately the same height and are of about the same size. The extensive patterned Chi-Rho symbols running up the flutes of the East Porch column(s) are an interesting and obvious attempt to “Christianize” the pagan temple.

¹⁶² Compare the style of the serif on the cross on the south side of the eastern anta of the North Wing portico of the Propylaia: see Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, fig. 186.

¹⁶³ The other columns of the East Porch may also have had crosses on them, but these have since weathered and are no longer visible. Crosses are visible on other flutes of the same drum as well.

Niccolò da Martoni, who visited Athens in 1395, reacted to the presence of such crosses on the Parthenon:

Among the columns there is one column with a mark on it. St. Dionysius was standing close to it at the time of the Passion of Christ, and when all the buildings in the world trembled because of an earthquake, St. Dionysius spoke the following words: ‘Either the whole world is being destroyed, or the Son of God must be undergoing suffering,’ and on the column he drew with his hand the sign of the cross. And that cross is still on the pillar.¹⁶⁴

Unfortunately, Niccolò did not visit the Erechtheion; by his time, it had been turned into a residence, probably for the Catholic bishop.¹⁶⁵ Nonetheless, his interpretation of the crosses on the Parthenon shows us how important the Christian symbols engraved on the monuments of the Akropolis were to visitors, and suggests that there were legends about these markings.

It is, of course, very difficult to date the crosses on the Erechtheion and the Parthenon; neither is it possible to discount completely Niccolò da Martoni’s account since Dionysios the Areopagite may very well have been up on the Akropolis in the 1st century A.D. and have carved a cross on the pagan Parthenon. The locations of the crosses on the Erechtheion do, however, suggest a Post-Antique date.

SHIPS

There are three undocumented, engraved depictions of ships on the inside face of the east architraves of the North Porch of the Erechtheion (Figure 399 and Figure 396).¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁴ van der Vin 1980, p. 616. For the rest of da Martoni’s account, see Chapter VII and T 4.

¹⁶⁵ See Chapter VI.

¹⁶⁶ Aside from the many crosses on the monuments of the Akropolis, the Christian inhabitants also drew other Christian symbols. *Ciboria* (vessels for storing the Eucharist), ships with crosses, and birds are among the other symbols. Nor are the Akropolis monuments unique. The church of Ayia Triada in the Argolid is covered with graffiti of ships, as are large fragments of frescoes now in the museum on Delos. Regarding the phenomenon of carving ships on churches, Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, p. 321, write: “After a long gap, in which a small and perhaps only seasonal population survived, we see in the ship graffiti on the walls of the inland church of Ayia Triadha (E81, established in 1244 A.D.) the nautical tastes

The date of these ships is intriguing for many reasons, not least because of their inaccessible location on the building. Comparably placed engraved depictions of ships have been found by Tanoulas in the Propylaia on the “exterior” of the south wall, that is, just outside the Byzantine chapel (A.D. 700-1388) in the south wing.¹⁶⁷ Not only are the examples from the Propylaia in the same high and inaccessible location, as well as in close proximity to a Christian church, but they also have a probable *terminus ante quem* of A.D. 1400 when the so-called Frankish (actually Florentine) Tower was erected within the south wing, thus changing the purpose of the area. The only thing that is not comparable between the Erechtheion and the Propylaia is the nature of the ships depicted. Those on the Propylaia are very primitive while the examples on the Erechtheion are quite complex in composition, with rigging and depictions of dry land. There are also examples of ship graffiti in the Parthenon.¹⁶⁸

The ships in the North Porch of the Erechtheion are located on the inside of block PE.AA.01. Ship 1, that is, the one including what is best interpreted as dry land, is on the north end of the block (Figure 399), while Ships 2 and 3 are just south of the middle of the block (Figure 396).

SHIP 1

The entire composition of Ship 1 covers the middle and lower fascia of the architrave block of PE.AA.01, the ship itself remaining fairly isolated in the middle fascia, while the moorings transcend the lower fascia and are fixed to what appears to be dry land (Figure 394 and Figure 399). The bow is at the right (south) and the stern at the

of some of the inhabitants between the thirteenth and sixteenth centuries. They would have served both on the larger Venetian ships and on the smaller craft depicted.”

¹⁶⁷ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, fig. 286 shows a boat with a cross, and fig. 287 shows a *ciborium* with cross on a boat.

¹⁶⁸ See Orlandos 1973, pp. 39, 93, 95 (same as p. 39).

left (north). The ship appears to have three masts with triangular sails or rigging, extending from the top of the mast to form a triangle, the right-most perhaps being a double sail. In addition, the forestay is depicted.

A 6th century mosaic from Sant' Apollinare Nuovo at Ravenna has three ships that share many of the same features as the graffito in the North Porch of the Erechtheion.¹⁶⁹ The Ravenna mosaic probably depicts the type of merchant ship represented by the 7th century Yassi Ada shipwreck. The shape of the stern is very similar, although no rudder mechanism is depicted in the graffito unless the “mooring lines” at the stern are actually the rudder, poorly rendered. The horizontal lines on the hull in both the mosaic and the graffito underscore the similarities. The single-masted 3rd century A.D. Roman merchantman has a similarly shaped body with a “forward-leaning forepost and a high stern where the stern-post is bent inwards and often has the shape of a swan’s neck.”¹⁷⁰ The Roman merchantman could well be the predecessor of the Ravenna ship.

The shapes of the hull, bow, and stern are, however, even closer to those of a fishing boat (without sails) from an 11th century lectionary of the Church of Giorgi dei Greci, Venice, in that both the stem and stern “both curve inboard sharply” and the strake “projects beyond the sternpost.”¹⁷¹ A parallel can be found for the whole ship in a 14th to 15th century graffito from the Church of ΤΗΣ ΒΟΥΛΓΑΡΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΩΝ ΣΚΟΤΙΩΝ.¹⁷²

As the preceding discussion illustrates, parallels for features of this ship can be found over nine centuries. The closest parallel, however, is as undatable as that on the

¹⁶⁹ See Bass 1974, fig. 18, p. 154.

¹⁷⁰ Landström 1961, pp. 49-51.

¹⁷¹ Folio 98: see Martin 2001, p. 62, fig. 36.

¹⁷² Ovcharov 1993, p. 31, no. 6. Furthermore, Greek manuscripts now in Paris and Moscow, reproduced by Landström, show the same upward curving bow and sterns: Landström 1961, p. 81.

Erechtheion: Graffito no. 112 on column 26, drum 2 of the Parthenon shows a triple-masted ship with a similar arrangement of stays and moorings, not to mention a similarly shaped hull.¹⁷³ The example from the Parthenon is of similar ilk and placement to a very simple graffito of a ship with a carefully carved cross on column 22, drum 1 of the Parthenon, and is dated by Kaufmann and Orlandos only generally to the early Christian period.¹⁷⁴

SHIPS 2 AND 3

The second composition includes more than one ship (Figure 396). The right-hand ship (Ship 2) is the better preserved. It appears to be a lateen-rigged ship, traveling from right to left, the bow being at the left, and the stern at the right. During the Middle Ages, the lateen sail was peculiar to the Mediterranean and was so called by the North Europeans because of its “Latin” connection.¹⁷⁵

Comparanda for what could be classified as a riverine cargo vessel may be found in the fresco of St. George and the Princess by A. Pisano, originally in the Pellegrini Chapel of the Church of San Anastasia at Verona, and dated to ca. 1430.¹⁷⁶ The shape of the vessel and sail, however, is very simple, and so cannot be pinned down to a type or date with any real certainty. Indeed, the *tartane*, or Greek *sacoleva* and *trekandini*, is another type of small trading vessel common in the Mediterranean in the 18th century which loosely resembles the single-sailed, simply-hulled Ship 2.

On the other hand, if the scale of the ship depicted is much larger than the riverine cargo vessels described above, then the shape of the bow and stern and the elongated hull

¹⁷³ Orlandos 1973, p. 95.

¹⁷⁴ Kaufmann 1922, p. 297; Orlandos 1973, p. 93.

¹⁷⁵ Landström 1961, p. 80.

¹⁷⁶ Martin 2001, pp. 99-100, fig. 84.

strongly resembles the Mediterranean warships of the 12th century. Depictions of such warships in manuscripts, such as one in the Bibliothèque nationale de Paris (BnP) dating to 1154-1235, do not always show the oars and the lateen sail. The example of the bow in the BnP manuscript has a downward curving ram, and the stern has the one detail that is common to all warships: a pair of upward curving wings. This type of ship is derived from the biremes of the eastern Roman Empire and was called a *dromon*, meaning “runner.”¹⁷⁷ The graffito on the Erechtheion also has a vertical line at the stern (far right) which may represent a flag-staff, as seen on other depictions of warships, such as those in the Catalan Atlas of 1370.¹⁷⁸

To the left of the lateen-rigged vessel is another, less well-preserved graffito of a ship. Ship 3 either has two sails and a yard across the mast (creating a cross) or what could just be an independent cross like the ship graffito in the Propylaia.¹⁷⁹ Despite the poor state of preservation of Ship 3, many of the most important features that characterize a ship are visible. The two lateen sails and the comparatively (to Ship 1) low bow strongly resemble those of the Venetian ships that were carrying crusaders around the Mediterranean. The Venetian ships were 84 ½ feet long according the records of the ships made for Louis IX in 1268 for the Seventh Crusade.¹⁸⁰ Similarly, the merchantmen of the medieval Mediterranean shared many of the same features as the Venetian and Genoese transport vessels (i.e., the double lateen sail), but they are smaller.¹⁸¹ In this

¹⁷⁷ Landström 1961, pp. 84-85.

¹⁷⁸ Landström 1961, p. 91, figs. 244 and 245.

¹⁷⁹ See note 167.

¹⁸⁰ Landström 1961, pp. 82-83, fig. 214, is based on the contemporary portrayals of Venetian ships in the mosaics of San Marco, other 12th century mosaics, and a 13th century Spanish miniature.

¹⁸¹ Such cargo vessels could carry 1000 pilgrims or 100 horses, crusaders, and their attendants: Unger 1980, p. 123.

context, it is obviously very difficult to tell the scale of the ship.¹⁸² Furthermore, with the conversion of the Erechtheion from a church into a house for the Bishop in the Frankish period (13th century),¹⁸³ the so-called third “mast” is more likely to be an independent cross rather than the mast of a square sail because the square sail was only reintroduced into the Mediterranean in the early 14th century.¹⁸⁴

When shown these ship graffiti, experts Katerina Delouka and Kostas Daminidis suggested that the scene composed of Ships 2 and 3 may represent a naval battle; in the light of the potential martial overtones of the two vessels, such an interpretation is certainly possible.¹⁸⁵ We know that ships of these types would have come into contact in the Mediterranean. Richard the Lionhearted was probably carried in a double lateen-sailed Venetian-type ship when he encountered and battled what was described as a very large *dromon* in 1191, during the Third Crusade.¹⁸⁶

DISCUSSION

The following discussion addresses the who, how, why, and when of the carving of the ships inside the North Porch of the Erechtheion. Why were the ships carved, and by whom? Drawing ships on churches was a common, and in no way a new, practice in the Byzantine period.¹⁸⁷ The best ancient examples of ship graffiti come from Delos,

¹⁸² See Landström 1961, pp. 86-87.

¹⁸³ And so access to the upper reaches of the North Porch would have been restricted, see Chapter VI.

¹⁸⁴ Landström concedes that the square sail may not have completely disappeared from Mediterranean ships in the Middle Ages, but the lateen sail completely dominated imagery for a thousand years (Late Antiquity to 1400): Landström 1961, p. 90.

¹⁸⁵ Delouka and Daminidis (pers. comm.).

¹⁸⁶ See Landström 1961, p. 84.

¹⁸⁷ One must be careful, however, not to confuse reused ancient blocks with ancient ship graffiti with the phenomenon under examination, although the sentiments and impetus behind their creation were probably similar: Delouka 1991. Delouka’s article illustrates how ancient blocks with ancient graffiti were reused in the Byzantine church of Agios Theodoros called “Ομορφη Εκκλησία” on Aigina.

scratched into plaster walls, such as in the House of Dionysos (Figure 684).¹⁸⁸ The impetus to carve an image of a ship was probably very similar in both ancient and Byzantine times. Sailors carved their ships into temples and churches in search of protection for their vessels, lives, and cargo.¹⁸⁹

How were the ships carved? At first glance, it would appear that the vault in the North Porch had to have been in place in order for the ship-engravers to have made their mark on the inside of the architraves. However, using the location of the ship graffiti in Propylaia as a comparison, it is very possible that the ships could have been carved inside the architrave of the North Porch using a ladder.¹⁹⁰

And finally, when were the ships carved? If the ship graffiti in the Erechtheion are part of the Byzantine phenomenon of carving ships on churches, then they must date to after the conversion of the temple into a church in the early Byzantine period, and to before the conversion of the basilica into a grand residence, probably for the Frankish bishop, which, as will be discussed in the next chapter, occurred after A.D. 1204.

¹⁸⁸ Bruneau and Ducat 1983, pp. 253-255: “Les graffites des murs de maisons. Le stuc des murs des maisons déliennes porte souvent des graffites. Il s’agit soit de textes plus ou moins lisibles et intelligibles, soit de dessins, labyrinthe, oiseaux et surtout bateaux, de loin les plus nombreux. Aucune des explications proposées de ces graffites navals n’est vraiment convaincante et, en particulier, il serait aventureux, comme on l’a avancé, de les attribuer tous aux marins de Triarius.”

¹⁸⁹ What were the carvers of the ship graffiti doing up in the North Porch? Might they have had an ulterior motive? Perhaps they also took the opportunity to remove the bronze rosettes that were once attached to the inside of the coffers.

¹⁹⁰ Tanoulas actually uses the high location of the ship graffiti on the Propylaia as evidence for the rise in ground level. Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, drawing 54, shows the reconstruction of the south side of the Propylaia around A.D. 700. The caption reads: “By this time the ground level had risen so high that the man in the drawing was able to carve his graffiti of ships, horseman etc. on the top courses of the South Wing south wall.” This assumption, that the graffiti must have been created by a person standing on the ground, is probably invalid. Unknown to Tanoulas, the ship graffiti in the Erechtheion is equally highly placed on the building, in an area where the ground was certainly not high enough for a person to stand on it carve the images. A ladder or scaffolding must have been employed.

RECEPTION IN THE BYZANTINE PERIOD

The Erechtheion probably had more people inside it on an average day during the Byzantine period than it did in Antiquity.¹⁹¹ This building played an important part in the life of the congregation that used the converted temple as a church. Much has been made of the appropriateness of the conversion of the Parthenon (house of the Virgin) into the Church of Our Lady of Athens.¹⁹² The same principle applies to the Erechtheion, which was also dedicated to the Mary, Mother of God.¹⁹³ The protective aspect of Athena Polias lived on through Mary. The phenomenon of carving ships in the North Porch perhaps attests to this.

And what did the maidens of the South Porch mean to the congregation and the ecclesiasts in charge? Unlike much other pagan sculpture in Athens, the maidens were not destroyed in their entirety.¹⁹⁴ Perhaps the maidens of the Erechtheion were spared for similar reasons as the northwest metope on the north side of Parthenon, which was interpretable by the early Christians as the Annunciation (Angel Gabriel and the Virgin Mary). The sculptures probably embodied for the early Christians the virtues of maidenhood and the associations of purity, desirable concepts in Christianity.

There was no reception of the Erechtheion abroad during the Byzantine period because there was little direct contact between Western Europe and Attica. According to documentary, archaeological, and numismatic evidence, up until the 11th century there were two main economic spheres in Europe: the Mediterranean basin and northwest

¹⁹¹ See Hurwit 1999, pp. 48-54, concerning the Akropolis on an “average day” in Antiquity.

¹⁹² Archbishop Michael Choniates even comments upon it. See above note 7.

¹⁹³ See above “Dedication.”

¹⁹⁴ Perhaps the objects they held in their hands, the phialai, were removed. Phialai, however, continued to be an important cult implement in Christian ritual, in the hands, however, of men. The removal of the phialai would have neutralized their pagan connotations, and would thus represent very selective iconoclasm.

Europe.¹⁹⁵ There was no iron curtain between them, however. Elite objects of Byzantine manufacture have been found in France and England in contexts of 11th century date and later, implying that there was at least a trade in luxury items between the East and West.

The Byzantine world tended not to seek out contact with the West, which it considered barbaric. Trade was mostly in the hands of Jews and “Syrians,” the by-word for anyone from the East who was not Greek.¹⁹⁶ Although many large harbors in the Mediterranean were under the control of the Byzantine emperors, Athens was not among them. And because pilgrims (i.e., those who were traveling for non-economic reasons) usually used the traders’ routes and means of transport, be they on land or sea, Athens did not figure in their itineraries in spite of the sanctity of some of the places then associated with great characters from the Bible, such as St. Paul. As a result, there were few opportunities for bringing back ideas and images of Classical architecture from Athens. Neither was there a mode of transmission to the West other than by direct observation, because the printing press had not yet been invented. Travel in Greece, furthermore, was dangerous and uncomfortable. The Balkans were almost impassable by land, and sea voyage did not offer a particularly pleasant alternative owing to the threat of pirates and high seas. There was no system of hostels or tourist facilities as had sprung up along pilgrimage routes, hence the dearth of travelers’ descriptions of Athens in the Byzantine period.

CONCLUSION

The Late Antique and Byzantine periods saw major changes to the Erechtheion. In the Late Antique period, the Erechtheion was transformed into a groin-vaulted, pillared

¹⁹⁵ van der Vin 1980, p. 4.

¹⁹⁶ van der Vin 1980, p. 4.

hall. In the 6th or early 7th century, the Erechtheion was converted into a basilica church with the removal of much of the foundations of the East Porch for the creation of an apse; the construction of an interior colonnade which divided the space into a nave and two aisles; the partial enclosure of the North Porch; and the installation of several cisterns. This study identified a second phase of the basilica, datable to the 12th century. This renovation included the enlargement of the apse; the extension of the chancel screen across the full width of the building; the removal of the parapet blocks between the columns of the internal colonnade; and the addition of a gallery on the exterior of the West Façade.

This chapter also examined several previously undocumented examples of graffiti which can be ascribed to the Byzantine period. The inscribed crosses scattered around the temple probably attest to the early Christianization of the pagan temple, and the graffiti of ships in the North Porch to the hopes that the Theotokos, to whom the Erechtheion was dedicated, would protect the lives and cargo of the sailors who carved them.

CHAPTER VI – THE FRANKISH PERIOD (1204 – 1458)

INTRODUCTION

The Frankish period can be divided into two main building phases on the Akropolis. The First Frankish period falls under the patronage of the Burgundian de la Roche family who lived on the Akropolis between 1204 and 1311. There is a seventy-seven year interlude, between 1311 and 1388, when very little building occurred under the mercenary Catalans. The Second Frankish period flourished under the rather kinder auspices of the Florentine Acciajuoli family between 1388 and 1458. The Erechtheion as a Byzantine church was deconsecrated at this time and converted into a grand residence. While scholars such as Kenneth Setton, Korres and Tanoulas have deduced that the occupant during the Frankish period was most likely the Catholic bishop, little research has been carried out on the architectural conversion of the Erechtheion in the Frankish period.

This chapter examines the evidence for the conversion of the Erechtheion from the church into a grand residence. Based on the information derived from the early depictions of the temple by the early modern travelers and the range of cuttings on the blocks of the temple itself, this study discerns two building phases of the residence and proposes reconstructions for each phase (Figure 575). A brief look at the earliest of the travelers to visit Athens concludes this chapter.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The participants in the Fourth Crusade seized, looted and massacred Orthodox Christian Constantinople in April of 1204, and the Catholic Baldwin of Flanders became

the first Latin Emperor.¹ In the short period between the fall of Constantinople and the establishment of Frankish rule at Athens, Leo Sgouros, the Lord of Corinth, Argos and Nauplia, attempted to enlarge his territory. Michael Choniates, the Archbishop of Athens, appealed for the solidarity of the Greek kingdoms. In reply, Leo sacked Athens and besieged the Akropolis. Although Leo did not succeed in taking the Akropolis, he made a favorable marriage to Eudoxia, the daughter of the exiled Byzantine emperor.²

Like the Diadochoi of a millennium and a half before, the Franks proceeded to carve up their new Empire in order to reward and pacify the participants of the “holy endeavor.” And again like the Diadochoi, power struggles and invasions of each other’s territory followed.

The Byzantine period at Athens ended with Athens giving in to Bonifatius (Boniface) of Montferrat, one of the Frankish nobles of the Fourth Crusade, without resistance in 1204. Archbishop Choniates, recognizing that resistance was futile and would only cause unnecessary suffering, left his palace in the Propylaia and fled to Kea.

As part of the attempt by the Frankish noblemen to recreate the feudal system in Greece, Boniface granted Athens to Otto de la Roche of Burgundy for services rendered during this most recent crusade. Thus Otto became the *Dominus Athenarum*. Guy I succeeded Otto de la Roche as Duke of Athens in 1259, a title conferred by Louis IX of France.³ The Duchy of Athens included Attica, Boeotia, and the Megarid, the rest of the Peloponnese falling under the principality of Achaia and ruled by the Villehardouin

¹ Woodhouse 1984, pp. 79-80. The terms “Latin,” “Catholic,” and “Frankish” are generally interchangeable for the purposes of this study.

² King 2004 forthcoming.

³ The legend on Guy I’s coinage changed from DNS ATHEN (*Dominus Athenarum*) to GUI DUX ATHENES (Guy, Duke of Athens).

family.⁴ Guy I managed to maintain his Athenian duchy during a resurgence of the Byzantines in 1261 when they recaptured Constantinople. Guy I was succeeded by his sons Jean (1263-1280) and Guillaume (1280-1287), and then by the Guillaume's son Guy II (1287-1308).

The Frankish dukes initiated an ambitious building program on the Akropolis, beginning with the strengthening the fortification of the “Castel de Setines” as it was known at this time.⁵ For the first time, the Akropolis was no longer the domain of the local citizenry, and served primarily only the needs of the Frankish occupiers. In 1206, the Parthenon was converted into the Latin archiepiscopal Cathedral of Our Lady or *Notre Dame d’Athènes*,⁶ the de la Roche family installed itself in the Propylaia which Otto had converted into his palace. Otto effected many changes to this building including the addition of a second story to its north wing and a series of cross-vaults in the Pinakothek whose lower room was illuminated by the cutting of loophole windows.⁷ The new Roman Catholic bishop was probably the honored resident of the Erechtheion, which had been recently transformed for domestic use from the Byzantine Orthodox

⁴ Woodhouse 1984, p. 81; Tanoulas 1997, vol. 1, p. 21; vol. 2. p. 284.

⁵ Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 216. The new fortifications included the patching of the Akropolis north wall, and the buttressing of its south wall. The Franks also added the crenulations around the entire Akropolis wall, as well as the new Rizokastron wall below the Akropolis which incorporated the Odeion of Herodes Atticus, the Stoa of Eumenes, and the Theatre of Dionysos: see Tanoulas 1987, p. 439. Athens became *Satines*, a contraction and corruption of the Demotic Greek εις Αθήνας. In official documents from 1278 onward, the city of Athens was called *Sethines* or *Setines*. In slightly later Latin documents, the city was referred to as *Athenae*. Under the Catalan domination and the suzerainty of the house of Aragon, the town was called *Cetines* and the Duchy *Attene*. Thereafter in Latin documents, the town was called the *civitas Cetinarum*, but the Akropolis remained *Castrum Athenarum*: Setton 1975, p. 245. Piraeus became Porto Leone in honor of the colossal lion overlooking the port. This lion was later removed by Morosini and taken to Venice in the 17th century.

⁶ By Papal Bull of November 27, 1206: see Korres 1994d, p. 148. In this bull and other letters, Pope Innocent III praised the “ancient glory of Athens,” and celebrated the fact that Mary was now worshipped in “Pallas’ renowned citadel.” According to him, it was only by the grace of God that the glory of ancient Athens had not been forgotten: Setton 1975, p. 92. Partly in order to assist the Athenian economy, Guy II arranged that visitors to the Parthenon benefit from a papal indulgence for the expiation of all sins.

⁷ Tanoulas 1997, vol.2, p. 309.

basilica church.⁸ Besides the Parthenon, there was accommodation for private Catholic worship on the Akropolis as well: Catalan documents mention the existence of a chapel of St. Bartholomew in the palace. Tanoulas has identified the remains of this chapel north of the central hall of the Propylaia, on top of the remains of the Justinian cistern. The earlier, Byzantine chapel in the south wing seems to have gone out of use when this new chapel was built after 1204 by the de la Roche family.⁹

In 1311, the Catalan Grand Company, often characterized as pirates, defeated the de La Roche family at the bloody Battle of Lake Copais (Boeotia), took over the Duchy, and subjected the inhabitants of Athens to harsh rule.¹⁰ The Catalans, who were called the Almughavars in Byzantine sources, commanded their holdings from the Akropolis from 1311 to 1388.¹¹ Acknowledging that they were weak in the art of government, the approximately 7000 mutually mistrustful mercenaries managed their power under the suzerainty of the kings of Aragon, except for a brief period when a group of Navarrese soldiers occupied Boeotia and Lokris from 1378-1381.¹² The capital of the Duchy moved to Thebes, Catalan became one of the official languages alongside Latin, and the

⁸ The first Archbishop of Athens was Bérard. It is not clear, however, whether he was the first person to take up residence in the Erechtheion: see Setton 1975, p. 92. Bérard and his priests were reluctant expatriots, however, as there is evidence that the Pope had to issue orders for them to go to Athens.

⁹ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, pp. 300-301, fig. 288, drawings 55 and 60.

¹⁰ Guy II died in 1308 and he was buried at Daphne among his family. Without an heir, he was succeeded by his cousin Gaultier, Count of Brienne, who became Gaultier I, Duke of Athens. He may have been known as a “Defender of the Faith,” but he was not successful in his defence of Athens. Gaultier was in charge when the citadel fell to the Catalan Grand Company. The members of the Catalan Grand Company were primarily Catalan mercenaries. Byzantine Emperor Andronicus II employed them to fight against the Ottomans, but they had a falling out. After razing Thrace in revenge, the Catalan Grand Company traveled westward in search of more plunder and food. When they reached Athens, Gaultier hired them to help him fend off would-be rulers of Athens. The Catalans kept their end of the bargain and asked for permission to settle in the Duchy because they were weary of their nomadic life. Gaultier refused: see Mackenzie 1992, p. 5. The Battle of Lake Copais near Thebes ensued. Kazanaki-Lappa calls the fight between the Catalans and the Franks the Battle of Almyros: Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 216. King calls it the Battle of Kephissos: King 2004.

¹¹ The Catalans called the Akropolis “*Castell*”. The term Akropolis was not used in the Frankish period until Cyriac of Ancona re-introduced the ancient toponym.

¹² Setton 1975. See also King 2004 for a summary of the power struggle among the Pope, the house of Aragon, the Burgundian de la Roche family, and the often excommunicated Catalans.

legislation was based on the law of Barcelona.¹³ On May 20, 1380, the Catalans composed a document known as the *Els Capítols d'Atenes*, addressed to King Pedro IV of Aragon, asking him for protection. In the document wherein Pedro appointed twelve men for the “Acrópolis de Atenas,” we also find the first comments in over a millennium regarding the aesthetic importance of the monuments on the Akropolis – a general aversion to damaging the property of the Pope in the name of military installations. There is little intervention attributable to the Catalan period of 1311-1388 with respect to the monuments on the Akropolis other than neglect, although Catalan documents preserved in Barcelona do refer to maintenance on the citadel’s walls.¹⁴ The ancient monuments such as the Parthenon continued during this period to serve the needs of the Catholic church and was called the *Seu de Santa Maria de Cetinas*. Athens was under the control of the Catalan *vicarius*, at least one of whom, Don Alfonso Fadrique of Aragon (1317-1330), lived in the Propylaia.¹⁵ Setton suggests that the Catalan Archbishop of Athens, Antonio Ballester (1370-1387), along with his cathedral staff of twelve priests and canons, lived in the Erechtheion.¹⁶

Such neglect and even abuse is apparent in the comments of Ludolf von Sudheim, a German parish priest from Westfalen. He records contemporary political history and the pillage of Athens for sculpture and monuments as early as 1336:

¹³ Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 216.

¹⁴ Setton 1975, p. 241.

¹⁵ Setton 1975, p. 28.

¹⁶ The Catalans gradually eliminated the Burgundian clergy and replaced them with Spaniards: Cheetham 1981, p. 150. This means that when the French bishop and his staff was ousted, it was probably from the Erechtheion. It is not clear if the Catalan clergy moved straight in, or made some repairs (which would have been out of character since the only improvements on the Akropolis appear to have been made to the fortifications). Whatever the case, something (perhaps just time and changing tastes) necessitated the wholesale renovations of the Erechtheion as a luxurious residence, assigned in this study to the Second Frankish period.

And it should be said that that the former country of Achaia is now called the Morea. The Catalans took this area from the Greeks by force. In that country there is a beautiful city called Patras, where the holy apostle St. Andrew was martyred. St. Anthony and other saints lived there at one time, and originated from that place. Not far from Patras is Athens, where at one time Greek studies flourished. This city was formerly very important, but is now practically deserted. For in the city of Genoa there is not a single marble column or other piece of stone work that was not taken there from Athens, just as Venice was built with stone from Troy.¹⁷ In this same country of Achaia is the beautiful and very strong city of Corinth; it stands on top of a mountain, and its equal in strength would be hard to find....St. Paul wrote several letters to this city.¹⁸

The Akropolis was the only prize the Acciajuoli of Florence did not win when Nerio Acciajuoli took over the Duchy in 1386 with the help of Navarrese mercenaries.¹⁹ Two years later, however, this jewel in the crown of Attica was his. The Acciajuoli were the builders of the misnamed “Frankish Tower” (which should actually be called the “Florentine Tower”) built over the south wing of the Propylaea. When Nerio died in 1394, he was buried in the Parthenon. In his will, he placed the whole city of Athens under the protection of the Venetians, who proceeded to occupy the Akropolis. In 1397, however, Nerio’s Greek-born son, Antonio Acciajuoli, laid claim to his inheritance and in 1402, besieged the Akropolis. The Venetians received reinforcements and repaired the Akropolis walls in 1401. The Venetians held out for fifteen months, after which time the Akropolis returned to the Acciajuoli family and a new era with relative freedom for the Greeks began: the official language was Greek – even the Florentine nobles spoke it and official documents were written in it – and the Greek Orthodox bishopric of Athens was restored although the Parthenon continued to celebrate Latin rites. Catholics and

¹⁷ Venice, incidentally, was not built of the stones from Troy, but of the stones from Constantinople and Alexandria Troas according to Brian Rose, excavator of Troy (pers. comm.). See also Brown New Haven.

¹⁸ Neumann 1882, cited by van der Vin 1980, pp. 579-582. An appreciation of the Akropolis’ unique importance was expressed by Pedro IV in 1380: “The Acropolis is the earth’s richest jewel, and of such worth that not a king in Christendom could create its equal.”

¹⁹ The Acciajuoli were the bankers to the popes at Avignon.

Orthodox Christians were allowed to marry, and a few Greeks were even granted citizenship. This group would soon rise to some degree of importance as a Greek middle-class under the Ottomans.²⁰

Antonio Acciajuoli elaborated his palace in the Propylaia when he reclaimed the Acropolis for the Acciajuoli from the Venetians.²¹ The residence expanded into the Central Building which had hitherto been left open. He walled-in the west colonnade, and inserted loophole windows for defense. Family problems soon ensued. When Antonio died without an heir, his widow, Maria Melissini, tried to rule the Duchy until Antonio's cousin Nerio II drove her out "by craft."²² This Nerio, however, was sickly and soon ceded the Duchy to his more energetic brother, Antonio II, so that he could return home to Florence. Antonio, however, died young and Nerio took the reigns again until his death in 1451. He had been married to the aforementioned Maria Melissini, but after her death, married Chiara, the daughter of the Baron of Karystos, Euboeia. She bore him a son whom they named Francesco. Francesco was only a young boy when his father died and his mother married an adventuring Venetian named Contarini after having poisoned his inconvenient first wife in Venice. The Athenians smarted at this exploiter's harsh rule and complained to the Sultan who was now nominally overseeing activities in Greece. When the Sultan summoned Contarini to explain himself, Contarini asked that his step-son Francesco be acknowledged as Duke. When the Sultan heard of Contarini's behavior toward his first wife, he installed Francesco's rival, cousin, and favorite in the Sultan's court, Franco, as Duke of Athens.²³

²⁰ Mackenzie 1992, p. 6.

²¹ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 1, p. 24; see also Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, drawings 60 and 61.

²² Sicilianos 1960, p. 81.

²³ Sicilianos 1960, p. 86.

As soon as Franco was settled in the Propylaia, he murdered Chiara, who was at the same time his aunt on one side and his father's brother's wife on the other. The Sultan disapproved of his behavior as well and so sent Omar, the son of his General Turakhan, to seize Athens and oust the Acciajuoli for good.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

The Erechtheion underwent extensive changes during the Frankish period (1204-1458), namely its conversion from a Byzantine church into a grand residence, probably for the Catholic bishops of Athens who held mass in the Latin Cathedral of Our Lady in the Parthenon. This conversion into a residence – second only in luxury to that of the Burgundian dukes installed in the Propylaia – can be charted with a certain degree of certainty with the aid of a selection of 18th and 19th century paintings, in conjunction with the archaeological evidence of cuttings on the walls, lintels, thresholds, jambs, architraves, frieze, and stylobate of the temple itself.

As discussed in the previous chapter, it is difficult but not impossible to date cuttings for doors and the like. Through detailed analysis and the consideration of chronological issues, certain patterns emerge. Compared to the bold circular cuttings of the Byzantine period (see Chapter V), Frankish door cuttings appear to be characterized by smaller, approximately 0.05 m diameter, pivot holes with rectangular cuttings adjacent (in front) for receiving the vertical wooden jamb that formed the exterior of the doorframe. Such cuttings are usually for double-leafed doors, but some are single-leafed, for example between the south anta and EE.C1 (Figure 162). These cuttings cannot be related to the period of the church owing to their prevalence in the East Porch (almost completely occupied by the apse of the church), and in the Byzantine thresholds on the

West Cross-Wall where simple pilasters with molded bases and not doors were used to divide the space between the West Corridor and the aisles.

In many places on the building, such as in the thresholds on the West Cross-Wall and on the stylobate of the East Porch, there are two sets of Frankish-shaped cuttings for the same opening (Figure 162). Therefore, although the cuttings are of similar shape, their different carving technique suggests that they belong to separate building phases.²⁴ One set is much more deeply and clearly cut than the other. It is possible to infer that the deeper, clearer pivot and rectangular jamb cuttings are earlier than the shallower, more stippled version. In almost every case, the deeper set defines a wider opening than the shallower, and doorways tend to be narrowed rather than widened (Figure 494). The two building phases implied by the two sequential types of cuttings correspond to the Frankish (First Frankish period) and Florentine (Second Frankish period) historical occupations of the Akropolis. That neither building phase corresponds to the Catalan period is admittedly an assumption, but a logical one.²⁵

In the First Frankish period, the biggest change to the Erechtheion was the construction of the North Addition. This completely new structure was almost as deep as the North Porch, and stretched from its east side at least to the line of the East Wall. Two large, pointed-arched windows and a door, which communicated with the North Addition, pierced the completely filled intercolumniations of the North Porch. A smaller door was inserted into the opening of the North Door, and the interior was reorganized to create spaces both enclosed and open to the sky. The apse in the East Porch was probably dismantled and a single-leafed door was installed between the southeast anta

²⁴ See the assumptions regarding the typology of cuttings set out in Chapter V.

²⁵ See above note 16.

and EE.C1. The other intercolumniations of the East Porch were filled to a higher level than they had been previously. The Maiden Porch probably served as a primary entrance to the main building.

In the Second Frankish period, the North Addition was extended eastward with the construction of a possibly uncovered antechamber to the east at the level of the East Porch. This structure incorporated EE.C4 and EE.C5, and also extended eastward from EE.C5 with a door. A double-leafed door replaced the single-leafed one between the southeast anta and EE.C1, while a second (reused?) single-leaf door was added between EE.C2 and EE.C3. The doors in the interior of the temple were also replaced.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE FIRST FRANKISH PERIOD

NORTH PORCH

Evidence in the form of cuttings in the stylobate, columns, and antae, in conjunction with 18th and 19th century depictions of the Erechtheion, point to the alterations to the North Porch in the Frankish period. The North Porch was fully enclosed in the Frankish period, new doors were inserted into the opening of the North Door and the passage to the Pandroseion. Two of the intercolumniations were pierced by pointed-arched windows, and one with a doorway to the North Addition.

FILLING OF THE INTERCOLUMNIATIONS

All of the earliest “actual state” drawings of the Erechtheion show the intercolumniations of the North Porch as having been filled in, Dalton’s west view from 1749 being the earliest elevation (Figure 14). Over sixty years earlier, Verneda’s 1687 plan of the Akropolis (Figure 1) shows the North Porch with lines between the dots for

the columns. Paton et al. give 1676 as the terminus ante quem for the filling in of the intercolumniations of the North Porch because this is the state in which Spon and Wheler found it in that year. However, consideration of the filled-in pointed arches shown in Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800 (Figure 36), suggests that some of the intercolumniations were embellished with windows, and that these features were filled in with rubble after their period of use, thus pushing the complete filling of the intercolumniations back to the Frankish period.

CUTTINGS FOR WINDOWS OF THE NORTH PORCH

Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800 (Figure 36), a view of the Erechtheion from the north, shows the remains of two pointed-arched openings in the central and western intercolumniations.²⁶ Their ogee shape is strongly reminiscent of the Gothic architecture of the Middle Ages in Western Europe and of crusader architecture in the East.²⁷ It would not be surprising to find an arch of this shape in a building used by one of the Frankish rulers because the Gothic style was prevalent in France and Italy during the 11th to 13th centuries.

The bottom of these pointed-arched windows corresponds to rough but regular concave cuttings for window ledge beams at the lower edges of PP.C2.05, PP.C3.05, and PP.C4.05 (Figure 435). The bottom ledges of these windows would have been slightly higher than head height, thus allowing for a great deal of light and air circulation while at the same time preserving the inhabitants' privacy. There is a similar cutting on the east

²⁶ These openings were probably filled in with squared stones early in the Ottoman period: see Chapter VII. See also Basevi, *Erechtheion from the North*, 1818. The peaked arches are faintly visible in the central and western intercolumniation. The ground level rose significantly between Gell's drawing of 1800 and Basevi's of 1819.

²⁷ Boas 1999.

side of the southeast anta of block, NN.16.06, but no corresponding cutting in PP.C6.05 (Figure 335). A reasonable interpretation is that the cutting in the anta received one end of a lintel for an opening (there are no cuttings in the stylobate or anta for door hardware) that communicated with the lower rooms of the North Addition (above the cistern); the other end of the lintel was wedged against the south side of PP.C6.

On the second floor of the Acropolis Study Center, there is a model of the Akropolis as it would have appeared in the mid 15th century according to Tanoulas and modelled by P. Dimitriadis in 1985.²⁸ In the photo of the model published by Tanoulas, the North Porch has Gothic arches in all of the west and north intercolumniations.²⁹ There are three too many arched openings in this model. First of all, there is no evidence for a window between the southwest anta and PP.C1 of the North Porch – none at least that matches the clear pattern for the windows between PP.C2-C4. Furthermore, there is neither pictorial nor archaeological evidence for the doors in the form of Gothic arches. The cuttings for doors between PP.C1 and PP.C2, and PP.C4 and PP.C5 belong to the two phases of the Byzantine period, as argued in the previous chapter. There were no doors in these spaces in the Frankish period. This means that there was no direct access from the krepidoma of the North Porch unless the Byzantine doors were retained without renovations that affected the marble, but this is unlikely considering the otherwise complete reorganization and refurbishment of the building. Instead, the main entrance to the residence was most likely via the Maiden Porch, making the enclosed North Porch the main reception room.

²⁸ I have seen this model in the Akropolis Study Center but was not permitted to photograph it.

²⁹ Tanoulas 1987, p. 439, fig. 28.

NORTH DOOR

“On the late jamb linings [of the North Door] there are cuttings for doors or gratings of uncertain date, but which may well be mediaeval or Turkish.”³⁰ This is all Paton et al. have to say about the cuttings in the North Door.

A third and fourth set of cuttings in the Post-Antique jambs of the North Door (after the two sets described in Chapter V relating to the Byzantine phase) are comprised of a series of four small, shallow cuttings on each jamb, probably for a grill or fence (Figure 358 and Figure 364). These cuttings are in line with cuttings for a lintel corresponding to course 14, that is, 2.75 m above the level of the stylobate (Figure 359 and Figure 362).³¹ The cuttings in the east jamb are deeper and larger, with an even deeper section at the bottom, while those on the west are uniformly shallow. The cuttings, however, are not at the same heights in both jambs; the uppermost one on each side cuts into the lowest of the cuttings for the bars across the Byzantine door.³²

These cuttings are in alignment with, and in a similar carving technique (i.e., careful and deep) to, a set of cuttings comprised of pivot holes with rectangular cuttings in the threshold of the North Door. How these cuttings functioned together, if they did at all, is unclear, but the cuttings in the jambs are definitely related to each other despite their different heights. If a grille spanned the Byzantine jambs of the North Door, it would most likely have been slotted first into the east jamb, into the deeper set of cuttings, and then shifted westward into place, in the shallower, cuttings of the west

³⁰ Paton et al. 1927, p. 110.

³¹ The bottom of the west cutting is 2.74 m above the stylobate level and measures 0.20 m in width and 0.09 m in height; the bottom of the east cutting is 2.71 m above the stylobate, is about 0.20 m in width and 0.43 m in height, increasing in depth as it descends. Its depth could not be measured owing to its inaccessibility.

³² On the east, the cuttings are 0.30 m, 0.76 m, 1.12 m and 1.54 m above the level of the threshold of the North Door, and 0.28 m, 0.94 m, 1.20 m, and 1.49 m on the west.

jamb.³³ This would mean that the pivot cuttings belonged to a separate phase.³⁴

Alternatively, these holes served to secure the means by which the North Door was further reduced in size: the pivot holes had a vertical jamb, probably of wood, into which whatever fit into the Byzantine jambs also fit into the new, smaller doorframe. This smaller doorframe would have reduced the size of the Byzantine North Door significantly. There are cuttings for a lintel, first inserted into the west jamb, and then shunted onto the horizontal plane of the cuttings in the east jamb.³⁵

Also, the cutting back of the north side of the North Door threshold, which created a more easily negotiable step, is identical in width to the spacing of the cuttings for the Frankish door. While this cutting back probably dates to the Byzantine period, it is possible that the width of the Frankish door was to some degree dependent on it (Figure 350).

It is worth noting that the location of the cuttings for the vertical jambs is south of the pivot holes. Cuttings for the jambs is a feature which usually shows up on the exterior of a door in order to protect and hide the door pivot, as is visible in the similarly dated cuttings in the East Porch.³⁶ This indicates that the North Porch, with its filled intercolumniations, was considered an interior space, and that the West Corridor functioned as a more public passageway leading up to it.

³³ The present, interior-most, jambs of the North Door date to the Byzantine period (See Chapter V).

³⁴ There is only one set of deep, (i.e., First Frankish period) pivot and jamb cuttings in the threshold of the North Door.

³⁵ The Frankish lintel cannot have been in the highest set of cuttings (course 11) because of the height of the ceiling/floor in the West Corridor (lower down in course 13): see below “Internal Organization of the Bishop’s Residence.”

³⁶ See below “East Porch.”

PASSAGE BETWEEN THE NORTH PORCH AND THE PANDROSEION AND THE AREA WEST OF THE ERECHTHEION

Among the three sets of cuttings in the threshold of the passageway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion, the southernmost set appears to be Frankish. This set has distinctive deep pivot and rectangular jamb cuttings for double leaves with a small square cutting in the middle for securing a bolt (Figure 308). If the jamb cuttings are again taken as an indication of the “direction” of the door, then the space inside this door was even more private than the enclosed North Porch. The cuttings indicate that the North Porch was the more “exterior” space since the jamb cuttings are on the north of the pivots and the square cutting for the bolt is slightly south of (and hence inside) the line of the door. A reasonable explanation is that the structure in the Pandroseion (see next section), was a secured area, perhaps a treasury of sorts, which could be locked from within the North Porch, a logical arrangement of rooms for a wealthy ecclesiast.

A wide range of markings on the southwest anta of the North Porch (Figure 322), the south side of the Westward Projection of the North Porch (Figure 319) and on the northern portion of the lower West Wall (Figure 322) indicates that the area of the ancient Pandroseion was built up and used in several ways over the centuries. As described above, the area of the Pandroseion was an interior space as denoted by the orientation of the cuttings for a doorway in the passage between the North Porch and the area west of the Erechtheion. A series of markings can be read together in the region of the westward projection of the North Porch to indicate that there were structures attached to the west side of the temple.³⁷

³⁷ These structures must not be confused with the masonry structure seen in many of the 18th and 19th century illustrations of the Erechtheion. That buttressed mass of masonry does not correspond to the cuttings in this area, having instead been built against the Erechtheion without being keyed-in in any way.

The evidence for the structures probably belonging to the Frankish period is a series of rough, horizontal, sloping cuttings for various roofs extending westward from the building.³⁸ These cuttings are very similar to those on the orthostates of the interior of the South and North Walls of the main building discussed below.³⁹ A fairly steep roof may be restored as slotting into the downward sloping cuttings above the marble lintel to the Pandroseion, in blocks WW.13.06, WW.14.06, and WW.14.05 of the West Façade, and the horizontal cutting in the south side of the overhang in blocks NN.13.01-02, which corresponds to the left and highest elevation of the slope.

A second, more gently sloping roof may be restored as fitting into the cuttings on the west side of NN.15.01 and the west and south sides of NN.16.01. These cuttings must be related (due to cutting style) to two horizontal cuttings below, on the west side of passage to the Pandroseion door, at the lower edges of blocks NN.16.01 and NN.17.01, and to a shorter (the southern part of the block is made of new material), horizontal cutting at the bottom of NN.15.01. The west corner of the west side of the passage to the Pandroseion door was roughly hacked off at a later date.

Several early photographs show the difference in color of the west side of the southwest anta of the North Porch, above and below the sloping line for the roof, indicating that this area was protected from the elements for a very long time.⁴⁰ In sum, there is a sloping-roofed structure extending westward from the lower West Wall of the

³⁸ These cuttings preclude the continued existence of the ancient stoa of the Pandroseion which had probably continued to stand during the Byzantine period and formed a courtyard outside the basilica church: see Chapter V.

³⁹ See: “Internal Organization of the Bishop’s Residence.”

⁴⁰ Anonymous, *Erechtheion*, ca. 1880; Athanasiou, *The Erechtheion and the Parthenon*, ca. 1880; and Margarites, *The Erechtheion from the West*, ca. 1855.

Erechtheion and the southwest anta of the North Porch, which was probably only accessible from the North Porch, and may have served as a safe-room for valuables.

EAST PORCH

CUTTINGS FOR DOORS

The terminus post quem for the cuttings on the stylobate of the East Porch between the columns is the beginning of the Frankish period, when the apse was removed during the conversion of the basilica into a residence (otherwise the apse would be in the way of the doors).⁴¹ The terminus ante quem is the rising ground level, which most likely only occurred sometime in the later Ottoman period, as shown in several of the early paintings such as in Dalton's 1749 view (Figure 13). This is further evidence for the Frankish date of the pivot with rectangular jamb cuttings for doors in the East Porch discussed earlier.

There are cuttings for doors in two of the intercolumniations of the East Porch: between the south anta and EE.C1 (Figure 162), and between EE.C2 and EE.C3 (Figure 165). There are two sets of cuttings between the south anta and C1, the deeper and clearer set belonging to the First Frankish period and consisting of a single pivot hole 0.05 m in diameter with a rectangular jamb cutting (0.08 x 0.03 m) directly in front of it near C1, and a second, rectangular cutting of the same size and depth 0.64 m to the west, thus creating an opening of that width. The cuttings for a door between EE.C2 and EE.C3 belong to the Second Frankish period.⁴²

⁴¹ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, drawing 62 is a plan of the Akropolis around A.D. 1300. It incorrectly shows the apse still in place in the Frankish period.

⁴² See below "Second Frankish Period; East Porch."

The deeper set of cuttings for the single-leafed door belongs to a large door. This door provided the access to the East Porch and interior of the Erechtheion in the First Frankish period. The intercolumniations were filled in to form a screen wall which the abovementioned doors pierced. Evidence for the height of this infill is provided by cuttings in the south anta in course 4 and 5, making the wall approximately 4 m high (Figure 161). The cuttings probably indicate the position of the coping for the top of the wall; the lower, more southerly one, corresponding best with the First Frankish period door cuttings. A parallel for the several phases of the increasingly higher intercolumnar screen walls can be found in the Parthenon⁴³ and in the Hephaisteion.⁴⁴

There is a pair of cuttings 0.21 m deep and 0.08 m in height, and between 2.16 and 2.22 m above the stylobate, in the west side of EE.C2.04 and EE.C3.04 (Figure 166). The stippled carving of these slots is very similar to that found in the south anta of the East Porch mentioned above, and in NN.16.07, which served as a lintel for an opening. There are otherwise no First Frankish period-type cuttings in this EE.C2-C3 intercolumniation, nor are the column cuttings in line with any of the other (Byzantine and Second Frankish period-type) cuttings; therefore, it is probably fairly safe to attribute these cuttings to the First Frankish period. Because of their height, they probably served as fixing points for a window ledge. There is also a large east-west 0.13 x 0.67 m cutting in the stylobate between EE.C2 and EE.C3 with a rough-hewn style similar to those

⁴³ Korres 1994d, p. 147; Setton 1944, p. 200.

⁴⁴ The frequency of the doors in the intercolumniations in the Hephaisteion is curious. Almost every single intercolumniation has cuttings for a door, most of which are in the same style and arrangement (Figure 639). The difference between the Erechtheion and these other monuments is that the latter served as churches through the Frankish period, and the Erechtheion had been converted into a semi-private, domestic structure.

above. This may have received some sort of buttress to prop up or secure the intercolumnar screen wall with the window.

THE NORTH ADDITION

There are several sources of information for the reconstruction and date of the structure attached to the north side of the North Wall of the Erechtheion, called in this study the “North Addition.” Cuttings in the North Wall of the temple (Figure 467, Figure 468, and Figure 470), in the west face of the podium of the East Porch (Figure 472), and in the northern krepidoma of the East Porch (Figure 178) can be associated with this structure that we find, already in a dilapidated state, in the most important depiction of the North Addition, (*viz.*, Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765 [Figure 22]).⁴⁵ Pars’ careful rendition of this ruin is even more helpful than if a photograph had been taken of the structure intact because it shows the interior detail. Three other depictions show various angles of the North Addition in ruins. These are:

1. Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800 (Figure 36);
2. Smirke, *The Erechtheum from the Northwest*, ca. 1803 (Figure 40); and,
3. Basevi, *Erechtheion from the North*, 1818 (Figure 53).

Other images may depict the North Addition earlier than 1765, and before its partial demolition during the 1687 Venetian bombardment of the Akropolis, the most likely being, Fanelli, *Veduta del cast: d’Acropolis dalla parte di tramontana*, 1687 (Figure 6). If Fanelli’s engraver is to be trusted, the Erechtheion could be cautiously interpreted as the large building to the right of the Parthenon. If this is indeed the Erechtheion, then the engraver must have used some licence in his rendering of the East

⁴⁵ Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765.

Façade by including a chimney and pediment. This engraving shows the North Addition with a sloping roof extending as far east as the east wall and having windows on the east and north sides. The problem with identifying this sloped roofed structure with the Erechtheion is, firstly, the obvious lack of specific depiction by Fanelli, and secondly, that Pars' very detailed drawing portrays the North Addition as being three-storied, and taller than the temple itself, when fully extant. Fanelli's rendition of the Akropolis would then be the only depiction we might have of the intact North Addition, which was probably damaged by the Venetian canons, as indicated in Verneda, *Athens During the Explosion in the Parthenon on September 23, 1687*, 1687 (Figure 2) and Verneda, *Veduta del Borgo e del castello di Athene al momento dell'esplosione di Partenone da una bomba*, 26 September 1687 (Figure 3).

The other, earlier 17th century images of the Akropolis from the north that should include the Erechtheion appear not to, primarily because these travelers were unaware of the building's existence when they toured the Propylaia and Parthenon, and so did not include an accurate rendition of the structure when they were filling in the space between these other more visible ancient monuments.⁴⁶ The only other meaningful visual reference to the North Addition is Fauvel's rough plan of the Akropolis which indicates its outline a hundred years after its destruction (Figure 26).⁴⁷

The cuttings on the temple that can be associated with the North Addition are as follows:

⁴⁶ On the omission of the Erechtheion from early traveler's accounts, see Chapter VII.

⁴⁷ Fauvel, *Rough Plan of the Acropolis*, 1787. The North Addition appears to extend eastward beyond the line of the East Porch because this is the structure's fullest extent in Second Frankish period: see: "Incorporation of the East Porch and the Extension of the North Addition."

1. The series of at eight squarish cuttings in NN.10.06-NN.10.10, two per block, gradually deepening from top to bottom, but preserving the original clean edges of the adjacent blocks (Figure 468 and Figure 470).⁴⁸
2. A rectangular cutting in the center top of NN.13.11 (Figure 468).
3. A small, rectangular cutting on the east side of the southeast anta of the North Porch (NN.10.06), about 0.20 m wide and 0.10 m high (Figure 470).
4. A larger, carefully cut, rectangular cutting on the east and north side of the southeast anta of the North Porch (NN.12.06) (Figure 470).
5. A wide gash with a flat bottom (cf. cuttings in the back of EE.C2-C3.03) in the east side of PP.C6.03 (Figure 467). This corresponds well with the cuttings described in (1) and (3).
6. A squarish cutting, about 0.28 m to a side in NN.11.16, also deepening from top to bottom and preserving the edge below (Figure 471).⁴⁹
7. A long horizontal cutting in NN.02.08, similar to the long cuttings in the area of the Pandroseion (Figure 469).⁵⁰
8. Also in block NN.02.08, a squarish cutting west of similar carving technique as (1) of the horizontal cutting for a beam (Figure 469).

⁴⁸ One of these cuttings was filled in during an early repair: NN.10.09. The next block to the east is a completely new replacement, so there might have been more cuttings. This is unlikely, however, owing to where the perpendicular wall appears on the Pars drawing and to the additional cuttings below the easternmost cutting for beams for keying into the North Wall. I could not get exact dimensions for these cuttings because they are out of reach. According to Stevens' elevations (in Paton et al. 1927), they are about 0.19 m to a side.

⁴⁹ This block appears on Paton et al. 1927, pl. 5, at coordinate NN.16.14, and is shaded to indicate that it has never been moved.

⁵⁰ On those in the Pandroseion, see above "Passage between the North Porch and the Pandroseion and the Area West of the Erechtheion."

9. Another long horizontal cutting along the bottom of the grey Eleusinian limestone frieze, PE.BB.01 to partway through PE.BB.04 (Figure 339). The north end of this cutting corresponds exactly to the extent of the cistern east of the North Porch.
10. A large, carefully cut, square cutting about 0.05 m deep on the west face of the (unfinished) podium of the East Porch, adjacent and perpendicular to NN.16.16 (Figure 472).
11. Two deep, rectangular cuttings in the top of the western extent of EE.15.07.s, north of the northeast anta (Figure 178).

In addition, although it is not technically a cutting, there is a circular hole that cuts through the robbed out foundations of the North Terrace, east of the Byzantine cistern enclosed within the North Addition. This “feature” is visible in photographs from the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Figure 537). Such pits, or *bothroi*, are commonly found in Byzantine through Ottoman levels in the Athenian Agora. According to the photographs, it does not appear to have been lined to hold foodstuffs or water.

Pars’ 1765 painting provides an essential additional dimension to the evidence for the North Addition (Figure 22). His painting shows the North Addition in ruin, an almost perfect cut-away perspective from which to observe the inner workings and arrangement of this structure. Overall, the North Addition extended almost as far north as the southern volute of PP.C5 of the North Porch, which corresponds with the end of the cutting along the bottom edge of the frieze (9) and the northern extension of the Byzantine cistern.⁵¹ This makes the North Addition approximately 5.5 m deep. There was a cross-wall perpendicular to where the cuttings in NN.10 end (1). The North Addition extended at

⁵¹ See Paton et al. 1927, pl. 2.

least as far as the line of the East Wall, though in the Second Frankish period it may have been extended farther, that is, past the line of the columns of the East Façade.

Pars' depiction of the cross-wall shows the various floor levels clearly. On the bottom level is a door with a slit window to its south and a larger window above it and slightly to the north. These "windows" did not let in any direct sunlight, since the spaces on both sides would have been fully enclosed.⁵² Above are two rows of holes for beams which line up with the krepidoma of the East Porch. Paton et al. (correctly) suggest that these two sets of beams were not used at the same time.⁵³ The lower set is more evenly arranged and probably dates to the original construction of the North Addition in the First Frankish period. The haphazardness of the upper set suggests possible Ottoman workmanship (see Chapter VII) or, less likely, alterations during the Second Frankish period.

Above the ground floor is a second story with what looks like a "picture-rail" molding, and then east-west slats for a ceiling and another floor above. Taking perspective into account, this level corresponds approximately to the cuttings at the lower edge of the frieze of the North Porch, giving the room a ceiling height of approximately 3 m. Above this is a third story, again with a "picture-rail" molding near the top of the wall. The additional blocks added to the remaining tympanum blocks of the North Porch (best seen in Gell, *Temple of Eretheus*, 1800, Figure 36), formed a kind of parapet around the roof of the North Porch. The third story of the North Addition corresponds approximately to the top of the North Porch with this parapet of masonry. This arrangement would have allowed for a ceiling about 2 m high. Perhaps the roof of the

⁵² The slit windows in the fabric of the North Wall are ancient, and would have worked in a similar manner to circulate air and to allow in a small amount of light.

⁵³ Paton et al. 1927, p. 526.

North Porch served as a kind of sun terrace accessible via the third story room nearest the North Porch – a place for drying produce or laundry, as is the case with flat roofs of many Mediterranean homes today.

The room supported by the floor whose beams were inserted into the long series of square cuttings in the North Wall (1), west of the North Addition's cross-wall, was probably quite important. Basevi's 1818 drawing of the west side of the cross-wall (Figure 53) shows that there was a pointed-arched niche, flanked by two windows with (probably wooden) horizontal lintels and ledges. Since the Erechtheion most likely served as the bishop's residence, this relatively isolated room perhaps was his private chapel. A niche at the east end supports such an hypothesis.

In the Byzantine period, a cistern was constructed at the external corner of the North Porch and the main building, as described in Chapter V. This cistern was then enclosed within the North Addition upon its construction, and perhaps re-covered with a brick vault at this time. Access to this cistern may have continued to be via the well-head in the North Porch, where the circular, brick-lined shaft still survives at the entrance to the underground passage into the interior of the Erechtheion (Figure 454). As described above,⁵⁴ access to the room above the cistern was through an opening with a lintel at the level of the bottom of course 16. This room above the cistern also communicated with the room on the other side of the North Addition cross-wall by means of the doorway mentioned above, and as visible in Pars' drawing.

The carefully-carved square cuttings (6) and (10) at the east end of the North Wall probably received beams which supported the second story of the North Addition. The cuttings in the krepidoma in this area (11) may have received some kind of major door

⁵⁴ See above "North Porch."

jamb for the entrance to the east end of the North Addition in the First Frankish period. How to interpret these cuttings is difficult as they may relate to the eastward extension of the North Addition, which was definitely altered, if not expanded, in the Second Frankish period. It appears that the stairs between the upper and lower terraces north of the Erechtheion were mined for their stone, either for the construction of the Akropolis walls or the construction of the North Addition, or both.⁵⁵ These builder-scavengers went so far as to remove several blocks of the foundations below the northeast corner of the Erechtheion. This was soon shored up, however, with the ancient materials such as the Ionic column shaft (from the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus), large ashlar blocks and contemporary masonry (bricks, small stones and mortar) visible in the early excavation photographs (Figure 538).⁵⁶

In sum, the North Addition in the First Frankish period appears to have been composed of six rooms on three levels. Unfortunately there is not enough physical or documentary evidence to show how the different floor levels communicated with one another, but it is fairly clear that the floor levels of the two halves of the North Addition were not at the same height. The east half's second story floor was at the level of the krepidoma of the East Porch, and in the west half, higher up in course 10. Other than the doors on the bottom level mentioned above, there does not appear to be any communication between the rooms on the second floor. The lowest level, with its access to both halves of the North Addition, as well as to the cistern and bothros/underground storage, may have been used for food preparation and storage. This lower level also had access to the grander, more public space of the North Porch, which perhaps served as a

⁵⁵ Or for some other project.

⁵⁶ On the incorporation of the shaft from the Monopteros, see Binder 1969.

dining area. But before arguing for other purposes for the North Addition, it is imperative to examine how the interior of the Erechtheion was used during the Frankish period.

The date of the construction of the North Addition was unclear prior to this study. Paton et al. did not have the benefit of all the cuttings in a row for the North Addition in 1927, but deduced the number of cuttings to expect in the North Wall from Pars' 1765 watercolor and the misplaced blocks. Nor did they offer a date for the construction of the North Addition. This study's argument for a Frankish period date is largely circumstantial, and at the same time, logical. Firstly, the closest comparison for the shape and style of the cuttings on the North Wall (1) can be found in the Frankish cuttings of the palace in the Propylaia, dated by Tanoulas (Figure 597).⁵⁷ These are characterized as being relatively large, rectangular, carefully-cut, and respectful of edges of the blocks around them, as opposed to the smaller, rounder, and less carefully-carved beam cuttings characteristic of the Byzantine and Ottoman periods.⁵⁸

INTERNAL ORGANIZATION OF THE BISHOP'S RESIDENCE

The internal organization of the bishop's residence maintained the tripartite division of space of the basilica church and most likely reused the columns of the aisles in situ and the West Cross-Wall. The Byzantine thresholds in the West Cross-Wall certainly continued to be used in the Frankish period. It is important to recall that the specially molded bases (re-carved ancient stelai with inscriptions), employed on either side of these thresholds, precluded leaved doors in the Byzantine period. There are

⁵⁷ Tanoulas 1997.

⁵⁸ See Figure 598 for the Ottoman cuttings and Figure 594 and Figure 595 for the Byzantine cuttings in the Propylaia.

several sets of cuttings on these thresholds. Only one set, on the northern threshold, conforms to what has been defined as cuttings belonging to the First Frankish period (Figure 494). Just off-center of this deeper set for a double-leafed door is a small rectangular cutting, which probably received the vertical element of the locking mechanism.

On the interior of the North Wall are the remains of at least seven regular, approximately 0.20 m square, cuttings in the lower half of blocks NN.08.05-08 (Figure 478).⁵⁹ The cuttings are for ceiling/floor beams, and are very similar in shape and style to those found in the Propylaia (e.g., the north wall of its eastern portico, which supported a Florentine floor [Figure 597],⁶⁰ and on the exterior of the North Wall [Figure 467]). Taken in conjunction with the Frankish cuttings on the northern threshold at the West Cross-Wall, it is possible to reconstruct a high-ceilinged room, with a lockable door, as wide as the northern aisle, with a terrace or additional room above. These ceiling/floor beams probably slotted into the back of the architraves (or the flat preserved parts), above the monolithic Byzantine columns of the aisles. There was also a second story whose roof lined up approximately with the top of the North Addition. The intercolumniations between the Byzantine monolithic columns of the North Aisle were likely to have been partially filled up in order to define the ground floor room. Light was probably allowed to enter at the top, through the remaining demi-lunes of the arcuated lintels postulated for the Byzantine church. As in the Pinakothek, there was no communication between the rooms on either side of the North Wall.

⁵⁹ The restoration of the 1970s and 1980s replaced more blocks to the east of those known in 1927, but none of these additional blocks are well enough preserved to indicate the continuation of such cuttings. These cuttings were considered Ottoman by Paton et al. 1927, p. 525.

⁶⁰ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, fig. 148.

The interior of the North Wall, just east of the West Cross-Wall, received special treatment. Patches of a cement encrustation, perhaps the remnants of plaster or even wall painting, survive (Figure 478). The date of this encrustation is unknown, but it can probably be associated either with the Byzantine or Frankish periods, as a way of smoothing, if not decorating, the interior walls, much of the surface of which was badly damaged by fires in ancient times. The encrustation does not appear to overlap with the line of the West Cross-Wall, but the area of the surviving encrustation covers a portion of the walls which was never severely damaged by fire. If the plaster did once cover the wall farther to the east, it has not survived. But if the plaster were Frankish, then it would have probably only extended as far east as the end of the beam cuttings (NN.08.09).

The West Corridor most likely continued to exist in its Antique/Byzantine state (i.e., thin, marble, paving slabs), serving as a *pastas*, of sorts, to the interior spaces of the North Porch and aisle rooms, and entered from the Maiden Porch, or less likely, the West Door. It is improbable that the cistern under the West Corridor existed in the Frankish period because the vault that covered it rose above the level of the threshold of the North Door, and this threshold has Frankish cuttings for a door opening toward the North Porch.⁶¹

The West Corridor was probably roofed at this time. Four large, rectangular cuttings in course 13 (in blocks WW.13-14.02-03 [C], WW.13.03 [M], WW.13.05, and WW.13.06 [C]),⁶² probably belong to the Frankish period (Figure 151).⁶³ There is no

⁶¹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 169, consider the cistern under the West Corridor to be medieval (i.e., Frankish) or Ottoman.

⁶² These cuttings are now generally filled in with new material, either marble (M) or cement (C). The general “rules” of the anastylosis of the Erechtheion advise against the filling in of cuttings made by human agency. This was followed closely in the restoration of the North and South Walls; however, very little of the West Façade was reassessed in the later 20th century restoration (see Chapter III).

matching cutting in the southern corner of the building near the door to the Maiden Porch. This is probably the point of access to the second story of the West Corridor, which would have been well-lit by the open windows, and by the main entrance to the main building through the Maiden Porch. Whether and how this second story above the West Corridor was roofed are unclear. There are no cuttings for roof beams on the interior of the West Wall; however, the ledges created by the missing half-thickness blocks that backed the beams and interbeams of the ceiling of the North Porch at the bottom of course 3 on the interior of the North Wall, and the ledges created by the missing half-thickness blocks of the South Wall's interior (which once hid the ends of the roof blocks of the Maiden Porch at the bottom of course 4), together may have supported a ceiling just above the tops of the windows of the West Façade.

The extent to which the roof of the basilica church survived is not clear. In any case, the internal organization of the space would work quite nicely whether roofed or not, since so much of daily and public life in the Mediterranean took place in enclosed courtyards, under the open sky.⁶⁴

It would appear from the cuttings in the East and North Porches, which can best be associated with the Frankish house, that the interior could be accessed on two levels, differing in elevation by over 3 m. For the most part, however, the half-enclosed East Porch not only supplied a certain degree of privacy from prying eyes from the east; but the narrow north-south passage along the East Porch, accessed via the door between the

⁶³ Paton et al. 1927, p. 525. The Byzantine gallery tentatively suggested by Paton et al. at this level would have interfered with the elaborate and newly refurbished North Door. Instead a gallery should be reconstructed on the exterior of the West Façade for the Byzantine period, at the level of the window ledges (see Chapter V).

⁶⁴ The remnants of this vaulted roof for the church (cf. the Hephaisteion [Figure 636]) may be visible in Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765, springing from the top of the South Wall.

southeast anta and EE.C1, also provided access to the North Addition's second story at the northeast corner of the temple.

There was probably also some communication by means of staircases between the East Porch and the lower level of the interior. The easternmost part of the interior of the main building may have been partially filled in at this time, perhaps owing to the collapse of the apse and the roof, thus providing a platform of sorts extending westward from the East Porch. Perhaps the mysterious horizontal cuttings in NN.18.10-12.i and SS.18.05, so similar to those in the area of the Pandroseion discussed above, are related to the construction of these stairways as a method of anchoring them to the side walls (Figure 217 and Figure 480).

In summation, the entrance to the residence was probably gained through the Maiden Porch or the West Door. The West Corridor had a floor/ceiling at course 12, and provided access to the enclosed North Porch and to a room built into the west half of the north aisle of the basilica. The West Corridor also provided access to the central space of the main building which may have been open to the sky. The West Corridor and the room in the north aisle each had a second story. The East Porch was probably used as an ante-chamber to the second story of the North Addition.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE SECOND FRANKISH PERIOD

After the Catalan occupation ended, the new proprietors of Athens, the Florentine Acciajuoli, made significant changes to various monuments on the Akropolis, including the central building of the Propylaia. Assuming the Catalans did not do anything constructive to the Erechtheion, the Florentine Catholics would have needed to renovate

the Erechtheion in order to make it fit for habitation after over seventy years of foreign occupation. This section traces the changes made to the Erechtheion between 1388 and 1458. The cuttings for doors are similar in shape and size to those of the First Frankish period, but the nature of the carving is much shallower, resulting in a rougher surface.

New doors were inserted in the East Porch and the intercolumnar wall rose in height; the North Addition was extended eastward, and an annex was added to the north end of the East Porch as an antechamber; new doors were installed in the West Cross-Wall; and the height of the rooms in the aisles was halved.

EAST PORCH

In the Second Frankish period, a new set of double doors replaced the single-leafed door of the First Frankish period in the space between the southeast anta and EE.C1 (Figure 162). There is also evidence for the further raising of the height of the intercolumnar walls from course 5 to course 4, namely the cutting for coping (to protect the top of a mudbrick wall) in course 4 on the northern side of the southeast anta (Figure 161). The shallower set of door cuttings is also located farther north than the earlier, deeper cuttings of the First Frankish period. The location of the two cuttings for the coping in the anta corresponds to this shift in door placement. This door may have been secured by a horizontal bar whose butt end fitted into the 0.09 x 0.045 m cutting in course 11 of the south anta in either or both Frankish periods, but the cutting is quite far north of the line of the door, and so may have served some other, unknown purpose (Figure 161).

A second, double-leafed door was inserted between EE.C2 and EE.C3, where there are shallow pivot and jamb cuttings in the stylobate (Figure 165). If the cistern

immediately east of the Erechtheion was still in use in the Frankish period, this doorway would have given direct access to this source of water.

INCORPORATION OF THE EAST PORCH AND THE EXTENSION OF THE NORTH ADDITION

The northeast portion of the lower torus of the base of EE.C5 was cut back to accommodate a typical Second Frankish period door cutting: an approximately 0.05 m diameter, shallowly cut, pivot hole with a rectangular cutting adjacent for a wooden vertical jamb that formed the exterior of the door frame (Figure 172). Its orientation, perpendicular to the East Porch, is unusual, but it is by no means unique among the monuments of the Akropolis. There is another, unusually-oriented, Frankish-looking pivot and jamb cutting on the second from the top step northwest of DW5.⁶⁵ Tanoulas dates this typical Frankish-looking cutting to A.D. 700, and reconstructs it as part of the southwestern extension of the north wing of the Propylaia.⁶⁶ The cutting on the Erechtheion, which should be dated to the Second Frankish period, indicates that there was a door perpendicular to the East Porch belonging to a structure contiguous with the North Addition. A corresponding cutting on the east side of EE.C5.04 could receive the lintel (Figure 158). In addition, there is an identical cutting on the next column to the south, EE.C4.04, at exactly the same height (Figure 158 and Figure 168). The only cutting on the stylobate between EE.C4 and EE.C5 is a ragged cutting in the east-southeast edge of the torus of EE.C5 (Figure 171).

⁶⁵ See Figure 593 for a key to the parts of the Propylaia.

⁶⁶ See Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, drawings 17 and 52, and fig. 159 for a photo of the cutting. This particular cutting is deeper and better defined than the perpendicular example in the Erechtheion, and so probably dates to the First Frankish period.

The arrangement of the cuttings in the East Porch suggests the following reconstruction: access to the interior of the Erechtheion was possible through either of two sets of double doors; one between the south anta and EE.C1, and the other between EE.C2 and EE.C3. The intercolumniations were otherwise filled by a 4 m high screen wall. Further north, the cuttings on the east sides of the columns, at both the level of the stylobate and above head-height, suggest that there was a beam, or more likely a lean-to, extending between EE.C4 and EE.C5, and anchored at the corner by the object set into the ragged cutting in the east-southeast quadrant of the torus. This lean-to structure would have served as a covered entrance to the door perpendicular to the northeast quadrant of EE.C5. The east jamb of this door lay to the east of the krepidoma of the Erechtheion. This wall turned northward on the other side of the door, thus creating an (uncovered?) antechamber to the east of the North Addition. The northernmost extent of this structure extended slightly farther than the existing North Addition, as suggested (through the examination of the shadows) by Pars' 1765 drawing discussed in detail above (see Figure 22).⁶⁷

INTERIOR

In the Second Frankish period, the double doors in the threshold of the northern aisle on the West Cross-Wall were replaced with narrower doors set into a new group of shallower cuttings. The south aisle received a matching set of double doors for the first time, and the central threshold also received a double door. The space between the original jambs of the nave of the church were filled in to create a frame for the door, as well as a separation of space between the West Corridor and the central space, the latter

⁶⁷ This antechamber was probably about the same shape and size as reconstructed for the Propylaia by Tanoulas: Tanoulas 1997, drawing 52.

of which was probably open to the sky. There is no clear evidence for a ceiling anchored into the South Wall, comparable to the square cuttings in course 8 on the North Wall. It is possible, however, that a ledge was cut into, or created by, the removal of the half thickness ashlar blocks backing the orthostates of the South Wall in SS.12-13.03-07.i. This ceiling would have been considerably lower than the First Frankish period ceiling in the north aisle. In fact, there is a rough horizontal cutting along the bottom of NN.13.06-09 (similar in style to the orthostate cuttings mentioned with respect to the proposed stairs) that corresponds in height and location with the proposed ceiling for the South Wall in the Second Frankish period.⁶⁸ Furthermore, this lower ceiling in the north aisle extends exactly as far as does the evidence for the higher ceiling in the First Frankish period. This lowering of the ceilings, from the substantial height of course 8 to the rather more flimsy ceiling in course 13, indicates the extent of the neglect and need for renovation of the interior of the residence.

The cuttings in all three thresholds are located toward the western edges of the blocks. That all three thresholds remained in use through the two Frankish and probably First Ottoman periods suggests that the tripartite organization of the basilica was preserved on a fundamental level. The monolithic columns of the aisles of the basilica were almost certainly retained and reused in situ, most of them surviving to be found in the interior of the temple by travelers in the 18th century. These intercolumniations were probably partially filled in to define rooms within what probably became an open courtyard in the former central nave. This courtyard was also separated from the West Corridor by a doorway in the Second Frankish period.

⁶⁸ See Paton et al., pl. 9. It is possible but difficult to detect this cutting in photographs, see Figure 478.

MAIDEN PORCH

In the threshold of the east door of the Maiden Porch, there are cuttings for a set of doors that are unlike any others in the Erechtheion (or the Propylaea). There are two circular cuttings about 0.05 m in diameter about 0.15 m apart, just north of the center of the block, near the eastern edge (Figure 229). Near the edges of the opening, and a few centimeters farther east, are two shallow rectangular cuttings. The south one is easier to make out than the north one. There is no pivot hole behind either of them.⁶⁹

There is a problematic cutting on the east side of MS.01.04 at its north end, above the eastern pilaster of the Maiden Porch. This relatively neat cutting – at least when viewed from above – is approximately 0.35 m wide and 0.08 m deep with a slightly deeper indentation at its south end (Figure 231). This deeper section is in exact alignment with the circular pivot holes in the threshold below, and suggests that it secured some kind of vertical element, such as a dividing jamb between two leaves of a door. The rectangular cuttings toward the edges of the threshold (in the shallow, Second Frankish period-style) received the vertical, probably wooden, front of the door-jamb. There are, of course, other double-leafed doors in the Erechtheion, namely in the East Porch (see above), but in those instances, the leaves meet in the middle when the door is closed. The best explanation for these unique cuttings is that there was a set of double-leafed doors that, when opened fully, became a vertical post. The deep central cutting in MS.01.04 appears to have been widened toward the north at a later date, perhaps to receive a tall vertical plank in order to constrict the access at the east door of the Maiden Porch.

⁶⁹ Running in a relatively straight line west of these cuttings is a narrow groove. It is difficult to tell whether this last feature is a fault in the marble or deliberately cut because it is filled with dirt. Its irregularity suggests, however, that it is a natural occurrence and so it will be disregarded in this discussion.

The Frankish period is also a good candidate for the in-filling of the spaces between the maidens. Not only were the intercolumniations of the East Porch filled in partially, and those of the North Porch filled in completely during the Frankish period, it is also unlikely that the Maiden Porch was enclosed during the Byzantine period for reasons of circulation as described in the previous chapter. By the Ottoman period, the Maidens had been immured, the east door to the Maiden Porch had been filled with masonry, and the walls between them were in the process of falling down. Furthermore, the arrangement of the east door described above required the filling-in of the northeasternmost space in order to secure the jambs and other hardware.

Thus, the enclosed Maiden Porch may have served as the main entrance to the bishop's residence. Not only was this entrance very grand, but its orientation toward the Catholic cathedral of the converted Parthenon was appropriate to his position as its overseer. The staircase led down to the South Door and into the West Corridor, which in turn, opened onto all the different enclosed spaces housed by the ancient temple.

RECEPTION OF THE ERECHTHEION IN THE FRANKISH PERIOD

Western European travelers to Athens were rare until the later 17th century, and those who did visit the Akropolis tended not to mention the Erechtheion (see Chapter VII). This oversight is not surprising for this period because the Erechtheion was so built-up and covered by accretions: the North Addition was taller than the North Wall; the North Porch was completely filled in, including most of the column shafts, and the capitals themselves were barely visible. The blank South Wall was probably visible, but the maidens were walled in.

One of the earliest travelers to record his experiences while on pilgrimage during the Frankish period was the Italian Niccolò da Martoni, from Campania.⁷⁰ He was a notary, which made him a man of some education. His profession influenced his reports, in that they are highly detailed and organized. Niccolò set out on his travels in 1395, and arrived in Attica in January 1396 (see Chapter VII).⁷¹ His long account of his visit to the Akropolis does not include any mention whatsoever of the Erechtheion.

Cyriac of Ancona, a naïve Italian merchant, embarked on a tour of classical remains and arrived in the medieval village of Athens on April 7, 1436, after having visited Yugoslavia, Albania, Patras, Delphi, Boeotia, and Euboia. He visited the overlord of Athens, the Florentine Nerio Acciajuoli, Duke of Athens and Thebes, with his letter of introduction.⁷²

Cyriac was probably lodged on the Akropolis, perhaps even in the Erechtheion.⁷³

Bodnar argues that,

During this time [Cyriac of Ancona] seems to have been living in the house of a certain Antonello Balduino on the Akropolis, for he records next a first century A.D. inscribed base in honour of Tiberius Claudius Novius which, now at least, is north of the Erechtheum by the Acropolis wall, and he says he saw it ‘in domo Antonelli Balduini hop. n.’⁷⁴

Despite his drawings of the Parthenon and Olympieion, and his documentation of inscriptions, Cyriac ignored the Erechtheion. Cyriac, as will be discussed in the following chapter, was only interested in the overtly classical remains and

⁷⁰ The Arab geographer, Aboulfeda, from Damascus describes Athens in general terms before 1321, the year his book was published: Reinaud 1848. His description does not suggest autopsy. Another would-be visitor to Athens in the early 14th century is the German nobleman and monk, Wilhelm von Boldensele: van der Vin 1980, p. 574.

⁷¹ van der Vin 1980, p. 37.

⁷² The original document might be in Sangallo’s copy of Cyriac’s travels: see Bodnar 1960.

⁷³ Bodnar 1970, pp. 97, 100.

⁷⁴ Bodnar 1960, p. 40.

conscientiously ignored anything Post-Antique.⁷⁵ By the same token, the early travelers were notoriously unskilled at detecting the difference between ancient and more modern accretions. Cyriac's oversight of the Erechtheion may be attributed to the possibility that he spent the night in the temple.⁷⁶ The radical alterations masked the Erechtheion's original grandeur and beauty.

In conclusion, the Frankish period was the first time the Akropolis was no longer in the hands of the local population, but instead in those of the first of many occupying forces. The conversion of the Parthenon into the Catholic cathedral of the Duchy more than accommodated the public religious needs of the small Frankish population, who also built their own chapels within their domestic spheres. Thus, lack of access to the Byzantine church in the Erechtheion by the local Greeks, coupled with lack of necessity for another Catholic church, meant that the Orthodox church could be deconsecrated and converted into a residence, albeit probably for a personage of relatively high ecclesiastical standing.

CONCLUSION

This chapter proposed a reconstruction of the Erechtheion during the Frankish period when the basilica church was converted into a residence, most likely for the Catholic bishop (Figure 575 and Figure 576). Two phases of this residence were discerned based on the two types of similar cuttings for doorways (Figure 592). These two phases were assigned to the early 13th century, and to the period following the Catalan occupation of the Akropolis in the late 14th century.

⁷⁵ Chapter VII addresses the possible reasons for the rise of interest in the classical remains amongst travelers such as Cyriac.

⁷⁶ There is no other information about Signor Balduino. It is not known if he was a bishop, but it would not be unheard of for a traveler such as Cyriac to lodge with a high ranking ecclesiast.

During the initial transformation, the intercolumniations of the North Porch were completely filled, and pierced by two large, pointed-arched windows. A “strong-room” was added to the Westward Projection of the North Porch, and was only accessible from the North Porch. A three-story addition, with rooms of varying sizes and grandeur, was built along the full length of the exterior of the North Wall. The North Addition was accessible from the semi-enclosed East Porch and from the North Porch. The tri-partite division of the basilica was maintained on the interior, but the aisles were transformed into closed rooms, and the West Corridor into two stories. The Maiden Porch probably served as the main entrance to the residence.

During the second phase of the Erechtheion as a Frankish residence, the North Addition was extended eastward (Figure 576), and additional doors were added to the East Porch. An additional floor level was added to each of the aisles, thus halving the ceiling height of the ground-floor rooms.

It was during the later Frankish period that travelers, mostly Italians, began to visit Athens and record the city’s visible ancient monuments. The Erechtheion does not figure in any of their accounts because of the many accretions that obscured the original building.

CHAPTER VII – THE OTTOMAN PERIOD (1458-1833)

INTRODUCTION

In general, the archaeology of the Ottoman Empire is an unpopular area of research. According to Baram and Carroll,

...[this] stems largely from the perception that its growth marked a deleterious period in world history. This view is propagated both by Western scholars and by people living in the regions once ruled by the Ottomans.... It is not coincidental that these images of decline and decay fit nicely into the concepts of progress and Western triumph which characterize much of modern Western thought and scholarship, including archaeology.¹

Both prejudices apply to Greece; however, the archaeology of the Akropolis during the Ottoman period has finally become an area of focus for modern scholarship. The Parthenon and Propylaea have been studied in this regard most recently by Korres and Tanoulas, respectively.² The afterlife of the Erechtheion, however, has been largely neglected.³ When books do refer to the afterlife of the Erechtheion, it is almost invariably with an overtone of scandal for having served as a harem.⁴

In the early 19th century, the remnants of the Ottoman (and even the medieval) presence were scorned and considered a pollution of the ancient tradition. Orders were issued to strip the Frankish and Ottoman accretions from the Akropolis.⁵ This chapter attempts to redress the balance of scholarship.

¹ Baram and Carroll 2000, p. 5.

² For the Parthenon, see Korres 1994d, with references. Anastasia Norre wrote a study similar to Korres' for the Parthenon in the 1960s: Norre 1966; Propylaea: Tanoulas 1987 and Tanoulas 1997.

³ Paton et al. devoted two sections of a chapter on the general history of the Erechtheion as a "Turkish house" and as a "ruin": Paton et al. 1927, pp. 523-581. Platon et al. considered the rise in ground level during the Ottoman period and later, but their work remains a technical and preparatory study for the restoration of the building in the 1970s and 1980s: Platon et al. 1977.

⁴ E.g., Tsigakou 1981, p. 123.

⁵ Some did voice complaints, but usually motivated by disagreements about what was truly ancient. For example, Peter Forschhammer believed that the cistern under the West Corridor belonged to the Classical

The Ottoman period (1458-1833) is divided into two phases, called in this study the First and Second Ottoman periods, and refers respectively to the periods before and after the Venetian siege, bombardment and occupation of the Akropolis in 1687-1688. The main purpose of this chapter is to follow the disintegration of the Erechtheion and its accretions, from its continued use as a residence in the First Ottoman period, to its nadir as a ruin during the War of Independence; to understand the processes at work which led to its disintegration; and to assess the impact the Erechtheion had on the early modern travelers (dilettantes on scientific expeditions, travelers on the Grand Tour, artists, and architects) who came into contact with it, as well as on Neoclassical architecture in Western Europe.

The disintegration of the Erechtheion can be characterized as a “punctuated equilibrium.” Most of the major changes can be attributed to certain historical events. During the 15th through 19th centuries, the Greek-speaking world was ruled by various empires, most notably the Ottomans, the Venetians, and the Genoese. This chapter begins with an historical account of Athens under Ottoman rule and focuses on the events that affected the monuments on the Akropolis during this period. Within the historical framework of the 15th through 17th centuries, it is possible to attribute several major changes to the Erechtheion before there is specific documentary evidence to attest to its state of preservation.

By the middle of the 16th century, diplomatic and commercial relationships between the Ottoman Porte and the French opened the first direct channels to Greece.⁶

construction of the Erechtheion: Forchhammer 1887. See Chapter VIII on the clearance of the post-Antique modifications to the Akropolis.

⁶ Augustinos 1994, p. 49; Shaw 2003, p. 14. These agreements (or capitulations) were soon extended to the Venetians, the Dutch, and the British as well.

Consulates and missions were set up in Athens. A Jesuit mission in 1641 was soon succeeded by the Capuchine monastery, which incorporated the Lysikrates Monument (then also known as the Lantern of Demosthenes) in 1658.⁷ The French were among the first to establish a consulate, and the king sent diplomats, such as the Marquis de Nointel (1670-1679), Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier (1782-1785) – and their entourages – to represent French interests, both political and antiquarian. Citizens from other European countries soon followed. At the turn of the 19th century, Greece became the new destination *par excellence* on the Grand Tour, owing to the disruption of travel to Italy caused by the Napoleonic Wars.⁸ Travelers, be they the adventurers who documented the even more exotic East, government officials on their way to posts, or young aristocrats on the Grand Tour, almost always made Athens one of their main stops. Consequently, there is a sudden rise in the amount of Western European documentation from 1800 to the beginning of the Greek War of Independence in 1821. The journals and sketches, paintings and publications by the travelers form an invaluable resource for assessing the state of preservation and reception of the Erechtheion during this golden age of travel to Athens under the Ottomans. The War of Independence of 1821-1833 is a watershed in the history of Greece and the monuments on the Akropolis, especially the Erechtheion, which suffered severely from gunshots and cannon fire. These events and their effect on the Erechtheion are discussed in this chapter, while the changes to the Erechtheion after the liberation of the Greeks from Ottoman rule are treated separately in Chapter VIII.

⁷ See Guillet 1675, pp. 222-225, for the story about the acquisition of the monument for use by the Capuchin monks: Augustinos 1994, p. 298. These monks taught the children of the English (and Dutch, and formerly French) consul Giraud. The neighborhood was already called “Plaka” at this time: Sicilianos 1960, p. 169.

⁸ Constantine 1984.

Overlooked by the earliest modern travelers to Greece, the Erechtheion began to appear in their accounts of the Akropolis starting in the late 17th century. This chapter analyzes their testimonia and depictions of the Erechtheion in order to discern the state of preservation of the Erechtheion;⁹ to follow the development of understanding about its various features; to gauge the aesthetic response to the ornament and building as a whole; and to estimate the impact of its ornament on the Neoclassical architecture in Western Europe. The textual analysis of the accounts also includes comments on the travelers' tourist experience as it relates directly to the temple, as well as highlights the nationalistic associations they assigned to the temples' various features and the activities going on around it.

Besides writing down descriptions and their personal reactions to the Erechtheion, many early travelers also created illustrations of the temple in various media. These depictions have been collected and reproduced in color (when possible) in Appendix D. Each depiction was analyzed by processing them on data sheets. Each block was assigned a unique label (Figure 553 – Figure 563). Notation was made as to whether each block was absent or present; whether the blocks had sustained damage; and whether there were any accretions to the building such as lean-tos or walls in the intercolumniations. After processing these depictions, the information was entered into a database which contains a field for each individually-labeled block in the Erechtheion. This database drove the computer model which generated the diachronic models presented in this study (Figure 578 – Figure 587). This examination not only revealed

⁹ Their testimonia (T) are contained in Appendix B. The depictions of the Erechtheion are in Appendix D, Figures 1-127. Leonora Navari's catalog numbers for the Blackmer and Atabey Collections for specific editions of a selection of books by early travelers are in the bibliography: Navari 1989 and Navari 1998. See also Navari 2004.

both major and subtle changes to the building, but also inaccuracies in several of the depictions where the artist restored blocks he thinks he knows should be there, or added imaginary details to improve upon the overall composition.

After analyzing this documentary evidence, this chapter examines the reception of the Erechtheion by dwelling on important themes that surfaced in the previous sections, including how the early travelers set about describing and understanding the Erechtheion; the development of the scholarship pertaining to the Erechtheion; the interpretation of the maidens of the South Porch as “caryatids”; trends in the aesthetic reaction to the temple; the motivation of the travelers to visit and document the temple; Philhellenism and the symbolism of the Erechtheion; travelers’ attitudes to Lord Elgin’s activities; the methods of transmission of the Erechtheion’s ornament using Sir Robert Adam and Sir John Soane as case studies; the fictionalization of the Akropolis by Jean-Jacques Barthélemy; and the legacy of the father of Art History, Johann Winckelmann, who never visited Greece.

The last part of this chapter focuses on the physical changes to the Erechtheion during the First and Second Ottoman periods, during the Venetian siege, bombardment and occupation of the Akropolis in 1687-1688, and during the War of Independence of 1821-1833. Depending on the quality and quantity of the documentary evidence, the disintegration of the temple can be followed, at certain times, decade-by-decade, if not year-by-year, especially in the late 18th and early 19th centuries.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL OVERVIEW

Evidence for the state of the Erechtheion early in the First Ottoman period (1458-1687) is very scanty. The temple had most recently been used as a residence, probably by the Catholic bishops who ministered in the Parthenon, as discussed in the previous

chapter. The Erechtheion probably continued to serve as a dwelling, this time for one of the important members of the Ottoman garrison. Very few additions or changes can be attributed to this phase aside from structures added to the South Wall near the Maiden Porch and the cistern under the West Corridor (Figure 577).

The Venetian bombardment of 1687, most infamous for blowing up the Parthenon, resulted in severe damage to the Erechtheion as well, including the destruction of Maiden #6 and much of the interior of the main building. The Erechtheion ceased to serve its domestic function after this time. The building then became a strategic military target with the installation of a gunpowder magazine in the North Porch. This involved the construction of a vault in the North Porch, the lining of the passageway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion with a well-built arched doorway, and a buttressed masonry structure to conceal its entrance (Figure 577). The construction of the vault resulted in the blocking up of the North Door and the creation of a loft between the vault and the coffered ceiling of the North Porch.

The rest of the building slowly sank into a ruinous state in the 18th and early 19th centuries, pillaged for its High Classical sculpture, building materials, and metal clamps. Cannon fire during War of Independence caused severe destruction to the Erechtheion including the collapse of the west half of the North Porch, most of the West Façade, and part of the Maiden Porch.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

The Ottomans conquered Byzantine Constantinople in 1453. Three years later, the Athenians surrendered to General Omar, who was sent to Athens to punish Franco Acciajuoli for murdering his predecessor's mother. After locking himself in the

Akropolis for two more years, the Duke finally surrendered in exchange for Boeotia. Thus, the Ottomans seized the Akropolis in 1458. The Parthenon briefly returned to being, at least officially, an Orthodox church, but as the Akropolis was a garrison-post at this time, it is unclear whether it was actually able to serve the local Orthodox community.¹⁰ The Parthenon was soon converted into a mosque, probably at the time of the (second) visit of the Sultan Mehmet II in 1460. The mosque is mentioned for the first time by a Venetian called the Vienna Anonymous (c. 1460) and by Urbano Bolzanio. The Sultan granted Athens many rather paradoxical privileges. These included the logistical honor of not being the capital of a Sandjak to protect it from the crippling taxation of the provincial governors; tax exemption for the Kaisariani Monastery, whose abbot had handed over the keys to the city to the Ottomans because the Metropolitan of Athens, Isidore, had already fled his post; and the addition of many of the city's women and children to the Imperial harem.¹¹ As Athens was neither on the trade nor pilgrimage route and the Aegean was infested with pirates, the city was rarely visited by Westerners.

Sultan Mehmet decreed that Athens be governed by a *subaşı* (under the Pasha of Chalkis) and a *dizdar* or military commander. The *subaşı*'s *konak* was in the Library of Hadrian and the *dizdar* installed himself in the former ducal palace in the Propylaia.¹² The Erechtheion appears to have been used in a similar, domestic manner by an important member of the Ottoman army, but not as a harem for the *dizdar* as commonly stated in modern books.¹³

¹⁰ Korres 1994d, p. 15.

¹¹ Sicilianos 1960, p. 95.

¹² de Courmenin 1624. Courmenin traveled to Athens in 1621 and mentions that Athens is under a "Shumbashi."

¹³ See below "Spon and Wheler."

Other than the aforementioned advantages, the population generally suffered under the Ottomans. The Athenians endured several bouts of plague and, like non-Muslim communities all over the Ottoman Empire, many were forced to give up their eldest male child to serve as Janissaries and be raised as Muslims in Istanbul.¹⁴ In 1645, Athens' status in the Ottoman Empire changed when it became part of the Sultan's harem. This meant that the Governor of the harem, or *Kislar Ağa*, appointed a *voivode* (of whom we hear a great deal from the early travelers) as a tax collector and governor in Athens. He paid a large sum of money for his post and for the privilege of extorting as much money as he could from the local population.¹⁵ The chief benefit of this political situation for the Athenians was the right of appeal to the Chief Eunuch should the tax collectors abuse their positions.¹⁶

The siege of 1687 was not Venice's first attempt to conquer Athens. In 1466, Venice sent Admiral Vittorio Capello to expand Venice's sphere of influence in the Aegean.¹⁷ He looted the lower town of Athens, but the strong walls of Akropolis

¹⁴ The short chronicle of 1606 records six collections of boys by the *Turnacibaşı*, usually an Ethiopian slave: Sicilianos 1960, p. 99. Although Babin and Spon compliment the healthy climate of Athens, seven epidemics are recorded in the 1606 chronicle for the period between 1480 and 1553: Sicilianos 1960, p. 100. Babin reports having read an inscription on the Hephaisteion (Theseion to him) that "a vile death came in 1553 and thousands died": Babin 1674 (cited by Mackenzie 1992, p. 60).

¹⁵ Darling 1996; Farah 1993. The Ottoman system of tax-farming is similar to that employed during the Late Roman Republic for tax collection in the Greek East and Asia Minor. Rome would auction off the privilege to collect taxes in the provinces to fill the state coffers in advance, and also to cut down on the bureaucracy of tax collection. Abuse of these positions was very common. On Roman tax-farming, see Aubert 1994, pp. 325-346; Badian 1972.

¹⁶ Sicilianos 1960, p. 104-105. The Athenians took this privilege seriously and complained regularly to the Sublime Porte about the *voivode*'s abuse, e.g., in 1671: Sicilianos 1960, pp. 106-107. Abuse was common, and embassies were sent to Istanbul. Sometimes Greeks and Ottomans banded together against a particularly harsh governor, as in 1754 when the governor retreated into the Akropolis and was besieged. The revolt lost steam and a huge fine was imposed by the governor on both populations: Mackenzie 1992, p. 32.

¹⁷ Sicilianos 1960, p. 96. Mackenzie says this event occurred in 1464: Mackenzie 1992, p. 17.

deterred him and he sailed off to conquer Patras.¹⁸ In 1640, disaster struck the Propylaia. A lightning bolt hit the central building, which housed the gunpowder magazine. In 1645, the Jesuits established themselves in Athens and one of their priests, Babin, published one of the first detailed descriptions of Athens (but did not mention the Erechtheion).¹⁹

Two centuries after their first attack, the Venetian fleet returned. They were accompanied by a mercenary army composed of an international force including Swedish, French, Germans and Italians, and were supported by the Pope. The Venetians entered the Piraeos on September 21, 1687, and besieged the Ottomans who fled to the Akropolis for refuge, taking with them a few Greek nobles as hostages.²⁰ The Ottoman soldiers reinforced the walls of the Akropolis, dismantled the Nike Temple, and used the material to build a gun emplacement lest the Venetians attack from the Hill of the Muses.²¹ The Greeks, who decided to ally themselves with the Venetians because they appeared as the imminent victors owing to their recent successes in the Peloponnese, met the Venetian General Francesco Morosini and Swedish Count Otto Königsmark at Piraeos and welcomed them and their fellow Christian soldiers.

The Venetian siege of the Akropolis was a turning point for the Erechtheion. The systematic bombardment of the Akropolis began on September 24, 1687. Although the greatest destruction wrought by the Venetians was the bombardment of the Parthenon on

¹⁸ Sicilianos 1960, p. 96. This Venetian presence may have occasioned the description of Athens now known as the Vienna Anonymus, and which will be discussed below. Sicilianos implies that this manuscript was written during this Venetian presence in Athens: Sicilianos 1960, p. 97.

¹⁹ Babin 1674.

²⁰ Königsmark was the Swedish commander of the land forces at the siege and bombardment of the Akropolis. For the accounts of the bombardment, see Laborde 1854, vol. 2, pp. 134-157. His wife's lady-in-waiting, Anna Åkerhjelm, gave an account of the bombings: Andrews 1979, pp. 105-106; Laborde 1854, appendix. Francesco Morosini (elected the Doge of Venice in 1688 while still in Greece) commanded the allied armies of the Holy League.

²¹ Sicilianos 1960, p. 111.

September 26, 1687, the formerly grand residence which incorporated the Erechtheion also experienced an irreversible change.²² Verneda and Fanelli's drawings of the trajectories of the cannon fire (Figure 2, Figure 5, and Figure 6) indicate that the North Addition suffered from bombardment from the north, and the Maiden Porch from the east.²³ Much of the Post-Antique alterations to the interior were also destroyed.

The Ottomans surrendered the Akropolis on September 29, 1687 having lost their commander, most of their ammunition, and many of their families. The Ottomans were granted five days to leave Athens and to take with them as many of their belongings as they could manage (except for the horses, weapons, and slaves). Unfortunately, Morosini was unable to control his mercenary soldiers. They attacked the 400 defeated Ottoman soldiers and their families, and abducted many of the young women.²⁴

After their victory and installation on the Akropolis, the Venetians settled into power.²⁵ Athens was Christian once again. Athenian churches that had been converted into mosques were restored to Catholic worship. Arrangements were made to accommodate the Lutheran Swiss and German mercenaries as well.²⁶

²² Laborde 1854, vol. 2, p. 138. The personal details of the bombing of the Parthenon are intriguing. According to Sicilianos, "the bomb had been fired without reason, and without orders, by the Italian Count de San Felice, whose Hanoverian colleague Bülow says that he was a fool, and had no idea of the art of artillery": Sicilianos 1960, p. 112. See also Schwencke 1854, ch. 10. Laborde describes Schwencke's account as a "diatribe violente et injuste contre Morosini": Laborde 1854, vol. 2, p. 140.

²³ Verneda, *Athens During the Explosion in the Parthenon on September 23, 1687*, 1687; Fanelli, *Plan of the Akropolis after Verneda*, 1687; Fanelli, *Veduta del cast: d'Acropolis dalla parte di tramontana*, 1687.

²⁴ Mackenzie 1992, pp. 19-20. Sicilianos (following Laborde 1854, vol. 2, p. 156) says 500 soldiers, and 2,500 men, women and children: Sicilianos 1960, p. 112.

²⁵ Cristofor Ivanovich, a poet who served in the Venetian army, gives a full account of the attack and occupation of Athens: Paton 1940, pp. 9-18. On p. 14, Ivanovich (born in Dalmatia) names the famous monuments described by Pausanias: the Temple of Athena Nike, the Arsenal of Lykourgos, the Doric Temple of Minerva, the Lantern of Demosthenes, the octagonal Tower of the Winds and the Areopagos, but not the "building called the Erechtheion." From this omission, it would appear that the Venetians were not aware that they were hitting the Erechtheion. The building, however, is labeled as the Temple of Erechtheus and Temple of Minerva Polias on Fanelli and Verneda's post-siege 1687 plans.

²⁶ Mackenzie 1992, p. 20.

The Venetians gave up the Akropolis on April 8, 1688, a mere six and a half months after bombing the Parthenon and the Erechtheion. Plague had broken out the previous summer in the Morea (Peloponnese), and by winter, Athens was surrounded by affected cities to the north and south. Morosini realized that he would not be able to hold Athens any longer without reinforcements, but plague kept his army in Athens for the winter.²⁷ Plague finally hit Athens in the spring of 1688: the number of deaths in a single day outnumbered the deaths in the whole of the previous month. The Athenians fled to Salamis, Nauplion, and Aigina; and Morosini did his best to institute measures to control the transmission of the disease.²⁸ Before he left, however, Morosini fancied relieving the Parthenon of some of its sculpture for a victory monument in Venice.²⁹ This endeavor ended in the destruction of marbles from the western pediment of the Parthenon when they fell to the ground and broke. In his own (translated) words, “Mais à peine eut-on commence à enlever le dessus de la grande corniche que tout se précipita en bas de cette hauteur extraordinaire, et c’est merveille qu’il ne soit arrive aucun malheur aux ouvriers.”³⁰ He did manage to transport three marble lions from the Akropolis, the Hephaisteion (Theseion in their terms), and the Piraeos (at that time called Porto Leone because of the sculptured lions that once stood sentry there).³¹ The army marched to Piraeos on April 4, 1688 and embarked for Poros four days later.³² This was an ignominious end to a short-lived and destructive occupation.

²⁷ Paton 1940, pp. 37-42.

²⁸ His worries and measures are outlined in his many letters to the *Inquisitori di Stato*: see Paton 1940.

²⁹ The porphyry sculptures of the Tetrarchs were successfully transported to Venice from Constantinople and built into St. Mark’s Cathedral in a similar act of conquest. On the removal and incorporation of ancient sculpture into buildings as an act of victory, see Shaw 2003, pp. 35-44.

³⁰ Laborde 1854, vol. 2, pp. 224-225.

³¹ Laborde 1854, vol. 2, pp. 241-247. These lions still stand outside the naval station in Venice.

³² Paton 1940, pp. 43-44.

The Ottomans, having been betrayed by the Athenians, reconquered and burned the city. The few die-hard Athenians, who had taken refuge within the Akropolis walls, fled.³³ For three years, Athens lay forsaken. The Ottomans invited the Athenians to return to Athens under amnesty and promised restitution of property, primarily because the Porte did not want Attica to remain uncultivated, and hence continue not to pay tribute.³⁴ Those who remained on Salamis suffered attacks by the Ottomans. Eventually, these citizens also returned under the amnesty, but as late as 1699, the town was still ruined and deserted. The Akropolis fortifications were in a terrible state and lacked cannons entirely.³⁵

Before the Venetian hiatus, a quarter of the population had been Ottoman.³⁶ The 300 Ottoman families that had returned to Athens made up only one tenth of the population – a proportion that was maintained until the end of the Ottoman period. Therefore, there was little impetus to ameliorate the conditions of the meager Ottoman population, which generally kept to itself on the Akropolis. The greatest effort was

³³ The parallels to the Persian Wars with the evacuation to Salamis and refuge of conscientious objectors in the Akropolis were commented on by Pittakis: see Sicilianos 1960, p. 116.

³⁴ Sicilianos 1960, p. 117.

³⁵ Paton 1951, pp. 155-172. The source of this information was an officer on one of the Comte de Ferriol's ships: Tanoulas 1987, p. 441.

³⁶ George Wheler, who visited Athens before the Venetian attack, describes the living conditions on the Akropolis:

About a hundred Turks of the Country who reside there with their Families. Their houses overlook the City, Plain and Gulf, but the situation is as airy as pleasant, and attended with so many Inconveniences that those who are able and have the Option, prefer living below when not on duty ... the Rock is destitute of Water fit for drinking, and Supplies are daily carried up in earthen Jars, on Horses and Asses. The Garrison is also on its guard for fear of Pirats who... do a great deal of Mischief, wherefore all Night a Part of them by turns go the Rounds of the Walls, making a great Halooing and Noise to signify their Watchfulness and that if Pirats or other Enemies come, they are ready to receive them: (Wheler 1682).

expended on the construction of a new mosque inside the eastern half of the Parthenon. Marble from the recently destroyed Parthenon was used in this mosque's construction.³⁷

Modern historians are wont to say that the Turks made great efforts to strengthen the defenses on the Akropolis, and quote Chandler to this effect, that it was “patched with pieces of columns and with marble taken from the ruins.”³⁸ However, the question is: did Chandler mistake the drums visible in the walls of the Akropolis as representing Ottoman building activity, dating to after the bombing of the Parthenon? Did he not realize that these are the remains of the pre-Parthenon destroyed by the Persians and incorporated into the Akropolis wall by Kimon and Themistokles?³⁹ The buttressed south Akropolis wall was clearly in place during the First Ottoman period according to the anonymous drawings from 1670.⁴⁰ The earliest (relatively accurate) views of the Akropolis from the north show similar buttressing in existence by this time as well.⁴¹ It is clear from a cursory examination of the paintings and the walls themselves that the fortification walls were certainly patched during the later periods, albeit with small stones and mortar, and not with the drums mentioned by Chandler.⁴² A new wall around the lower Akropolis called the *Hypapanti* was erected, and part of the Propylaia was dismantled in order to

³⁷ This mosque appears in many of the drawings of the early travelers: e.g., Arundale, *View of the Temples of the Parthenon and the Erectheum*, 1834; Lange, *Early Excavations on the Athenian Plateau*, 1834; and Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811.

³⁸ Chandler 1817; Mackenzie 1992, p. 24; Sicilianos 1960, p. 119.

³⁹ Sicilianos does not realize Chandler's mistake: Sicilianos 1960, p. 119. Mackenzie also quotes Chandler on this: Mackenzie 1992, p. 24.

⁴⁰ Three of these drawings are most recently published by Beschi 2002: see Figure 130, Figure 131, and Figure 132. These buttressed walls are part of the Frankish reinforcement of the Akropolis: see Chapter VI.

⁴¹ Carrey, *The Acropolis*, 1674 (Figure 136); Carrey, *The Acropolis and the City of Athens from the Northeast*, 1674 (Figure 137). These crenulated walls belong to the Frankish period.

⁴² A new book on the chronology of the Akropolis walls by J. Binder and T. Tanoulas is keenly awaited.

build a third battery to dominate the western slope some time between 1699 and 1738, when the Earl of Sandwich visited and described the state of affairs.⁴³

The walls aside, comparison of the plans by Verneda (1687, Figure 5) and Le Roy (1755, Figure 18) shows that the gun emplacements were embellished. Verneda's plan shows twelve emplacements on the north, east, and south sides (not counting the heavily armed Propylaia, which underwent many changes in this period). Le Roy's plan (similar to Fauvel's of 1785) shows more than twelve emplacements along the straight section of the wall northwest of the Erechtheion. It is not clear, however, whether Verneda abbreviated his plans.⁴⁴ In any case, by the 19th century, the fortifications had deteriorated, and most of the cannons were out of commission. Those that were in working order were used to announce the Muslim holy days.

Although the Athenians' first hopes of liberation from the Ottomans by Peter the Great had been dashed when the Russo-Ottoman war ended in 1718, conditions in Athens improved somewhat under the younger and more enlightened Sultan Ahmed III and his successor.⁴⁵ Unfortunately, conditions in Athens went downhill: in 1754, the Ottoman inhabitants and Christian Greeks, together, mounted an insurrection against the rapacious and violent *voivode*, Sari Muselimi. Travelers James Stuart and Julien-David Le Roy recorded this event.⁴⁶ The agricultural economy and trade now began to flourish. In 1760, Athens' special status as part of the Imperial harem under the auspices of the Chief

⁴³ Tanoulas 1987, p. 442.

⁴⁴ A diachronic examination of the travelers' descriptions of the Akropolis wall may shed further light on this topic.

⁴⁵ Mackenzie 1992, p. 37. As a fellow Orthodox Christian, Peter the Great launched his own crusade to reunite members of the Church under common dominion.

⁴⁶ Sicilianos 1960, pp. 122-123.

Eunuch ended, and the city became part of the Imperial estates as a *malikane*.⁴⁷ The Athenians were exposed to increasingly avaricious governors, who had to pay more for their posts as the Porte continued to require more money. The *voivodes* abused and extorted the population unchecked. Infamous was Hatzi Ali Haseki, who ruled Athens from 1775-1795 as *voivode*. He survived the intercessions of the Grand Vizier and imprisoned the greater portion of the population who could not pay the taxes he demanded. Haseki's reign of terror made the later 18th century a time of deprivation and imprisonment for both Ottomans and Greeks.⁴⁸ After having been expelled from Athens, Haseki managed to get his position back in 1777, at which time he famously presented the Athenians with a huge bill for his expenses while in exile. He showed his leadership skills, however, in 1778 when he defended Athens during a raid by 600 Albanians. After this incident, he built around the lower town what is now referred to as the Haseki Wall, using any and all building materials, including those from visible monuments.⁴⁹ This wall both kept invaders out, and trapped the Athenians and all their property inside the city, as each of the gates was guarded. Haseki was finally banished to Thessaloniki for insubordinate behavior, and then to Chios for plotting to take over the Sultan's Bodyguard. After a final attempt to extort a vast sum from the Athenians, and to poison the abbot of Moni Petraki (in modern day Kolonaki) while in Istanbul, Haseki was finally banished to Kos and beheaded.

⁴⁷ The administrative structure in Athens at this time consisted of the *mufti* (religious leader), the *kadi* (judge according to sacred law), the *dizdar ağa* (military governor of the Akropolis), the *serdar* (military governor of the city), and the *voivode* (collector of most taxes): Sicilianos 1960, p. 135.

⁴⁸ In his journal, John Venizelos said of the year 1789: "Everyone was in prison that Easter." See Sicilianos 1960 (pp. 141-143) for Panayis Skouzes' account of Haseki's prisons.

⁴⁹ Tanoulas 1987, p. 454; Sicilianos 1960, p. 137. The Ionic temple on the Ilissos drawn by Stuart and Revett was completely dismantled to provide material for Haseki's Wall: St. Clair 1997, p. 62.

A second Russo-Ottoman war broke out in 1768, and mistrust and paranoia flourished between the Greeks and Ottomans. John Venizelos records the climax of this war as it affected Athens:

In May, 1770, the war between the Turks and the Muscovites was at its height. We Greeks slept up in the Castro for the greater security of the Turks. At the beginning of June, Captain Alexander Palikoutzas came from the Russian fleet...to Piraeus....The Turks were so scared that none slept in the city, but all went up to the Castro.⁵⁰

The Greeks were supposed to rise in revolt when the Russian fleet appeared. But again, nothing came of this war for the Athenians.⁵¹

The second half of the 18th and first quarter of the 19th centuries are more infamous for the removal of ancient sculpture and architecture from the Akropolis than they are for the plague that decimated the population.⁵² The Ottoman policy toward the removal of antiquities is generally misunderstood as being blasé; however, it is clear that without express permission from the Porte, this was a punishable offence. For example, in 1759, the Athenian Ottoman governor Tzistarakis “blew up a column in the Temple of Olympian Zeus as he wished to incorporate it into the mosque he was building in Monastiraki Square.⁵³ He was heavily fined and dismissed from his post....”⁵⁴ But Istanbul was far away, and well-intentioned travelers, while on the one hand finding the destruction of the Parthenon abhorrent, on the other arranged, by whatever means

⁵⁰ The full text of this incident is reproduced in Sicilianos 1960, pp. 127-128. Palikoutzas met with his friend Monsieur Caïrac, husband of Spyridon Logothetis’ sister, that night and encouraged them to raise a revolt of the Greeks against the Ottomans. His friend begged him not to, lest he “bring total destruction on the unhappy Greeks of Athens.” The Russians were kept at bay; nonetheless, the Ottomans threw Logothetis into prison. In 1771, when the Russians returned and set up a raiding camp on Salamis (Koulouris), causing further unrest among the Turks, Albanians, and Greeks.

⁵¹ The Russians succeeded in taking most of the Morea (although only for a short time) and held the Cyclades for several years: Lord Kinross 1977, pp. 400-401.

⁵² 1200 Greeks and 500 Ottomans died of plague in 1789.

⁵³ This mosque, next to the Library of Hadrian, is now the Folk Art Museum.

⁵⁴ Mackenzie 1992, p. 28.

possible, to remove sculptures for their own collections.⁵⁵ Chandler's acquisition of the "Chandler Stele," namely the first and most important inscription containing the building accounts of the Erechtheion, is proudly recorded in his *Travels* (T 29).⁵⁶

Official arrangements could, of course, be made if one were the Ambassador. In 1780, when French influence was at its zenith at the Porte, the passionate collector and French nobleman, the Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, obtained official permission as French Ambassador to draw and make casts of sculptures on the Akropolis. He set up his assistant, Fauvel, in Athens, and wrote telling him (unofficially) to "Enlevez tout ce que vous pourrez...Ne négligez aucune occasion de piller dans Athènes et dans son territoire tout ce qu'il y a de pillable."⁵⁷ Fauvel (who was a gracious host to many early travelers and a nemesis to Lord Elgin) was able to send a great deal of sculpture to France, mostly fragments which had fallen from buildings, and were lying about on the ground. The majority of this sculpture were sent to the Louvre (where his collection remains today) when the Comte was exiled to Russia during the French Revolution. Fauvel continued to collect sculptures in Athens, forming his own collection, while at the same time, protecting Choiseul's on behalf of the new French Republic. With the Ottoman officials in the palm of his hand, he made it difficult for other travelers to acquire antiquities.

To avenge Napoleon's conquest of Egypt, the Ottoman Empire declared war on France in 1798, and ordered every Frenchman arrested. Fauvel found himself imprisoned

⁵⁵ On the Ottoman attitude to collecting and *spolia*, see Shaw 2003, pp. 35-44. Shaw concentrates mostly on the development of museums and antiquity law in late Ottoman times (19th to early 20th century). At this time in Istanbul, precious items were kept out of sight. This concealment of objects added to their mystique and power. The objects' inaccessibility was considered antithetical to the Romantic notion of the prolonged gaze, and yet, augmented the impression of power of the keeper, namely the Ottoman government: Shaw 2003, pp. 32-35.

⁵⁶ Chandler 1776, pp. 57-58.

⁵⁷ Legrand 1897, p. 57.

in Istanbul.⁵⁸ It was England's turn to rise to a place of influence and power with the Porte. Lord Elgin, like Choiseul-Gouffier before him, acquired a *firman* from the Sultan to draw and take casts of the sculptures on the Akropolis. The story of Elgin's activities on the Akropolis are well known and compellingly recounted by St. Clair.⁵⁹ The long-standing controversy over the marbles is addressed most recently by King.⁶⁰ Elgin's motivations and exploits as they affected the Erechtheion are discussed later in this chapter.

Diplomatic relations between Britain and the Sublime Porte were severed temporarily in 1806, and Leake, who had fought for the Turks against the French in Egypt, was put in jail in Thessaloniki. The British ambassador had demanded a renewal of alliances and the dismissal of the French ambassador. A short war (1807-1809) ensued between England and the Ottoman Empire, and Admiral Duckworth took the British fleet to Istanbul with a threat to destroy the city and the Ottoman fleet if the Porte did not acquiesce. Secret plans were also afoot at this time between France and Russia to dismember and claim the Ottoman Empire. France was to take over Albania, Greece, Crete, and the other islands.⁶¹ John Cam Hobhouse (Lord Byron's companion in Greece) reports this war resulted in the destruction of the South Wall of the Erechtheion, perhaps as a result of the search for lead and iron for ammunition and weapons (T 47).⁶²

⁵⁸ Fauvel met Pouqueville in Istanbul and they visited the Erechtheion together after Pouqueville was appointed the French Consul to Ali Pasha in Ioannina. "We visited the temple of Erectheus, the Pandroseion, the Caryatides, the remains of the chapel of Minerva Polias [with Fauvel]": Pouqueville 1822, p. 89.

⁵⁹ St. Clair 1997.

⁶⁰ King 2004.

⁶¹ Lord Kinross 1977, pp. 437-438.

⁶² It is not clear whether this metal would have been exported to the front lines or used in Athens. The theatre of war was Istanbul and the Dardanelles: Lord Kinross 1977, pp. 429-430. See below "Byron, Hobhouse and Galt" and "1807-1809" for further discussion of Hobhouse's account and the search for metal to make ammunition.

All the diplomatic work Elgin had done in Istanbul was rendered useless when Napoleon persuaded the Porte to side with him against Britain and Russia. Elgin's main agent in Athens, Lusieri, left when he heard about the war; and Fauvel, who had returned to Athens in 1803, not only claimed Lusieri's collections, but also the one-and-only large cart in Athens that Lusieri had previously commandeered.⁶³ With many of Elgin's marbles still in Athens, their transfer to Britain became a military affair. Despite many attempts to arrange for their transport, every scheme fell flat. When peace was restored in 1809, Elgin frantically tried to get the marbles out of Athens. It was at this time that the Ottomans "declared that Lord Elgin never had permission to remove any marbles in the first place," and the activities of Lusieri and Elgin's other agents had "been illegal from the start."⁶⁴ The saga continued as the marbles became the pawn for the Ottomans to play between British and the French.⁶⁵ Elgin did, of course, manage to get the marbles to London, but then had to face a skeptical and unsympathetic Parliament on the issue of their purchase by the state.⁶⁶

Lord Byron made his first trip to Greece in 1809 as a young man of twenty-two. He never "described" the Erechtheion as such in his writings, but his impact on Greek history and the Akropolis is nonetheless profound for this study. His lampooning of Lord Elgin, while he was trying to sell his marbles to the British Museum and to defend their removal in front of Parliament in London, put into eloquent words the outraged sentiments of most, but not all, visitors to Athens. Unlike the other visitors, however, Byron was more interested in the modern Greeks, whom most travelers and foreign

⁶³ St. Clair 1997, pp. 151-152.

⁶⁴ St. Clair 1997, p. 155.

⁶⁵ St. Clair 1997, p. 156.

⁶⁶ For the transportation of the fragments from the Erechtheion, see below "Lord Elgin, Lusieri, Hunt and Lady Elgin."

residents in Athens, like Fauvel, dismissed as being “degenerate.” His position as a nobleman also compelled the four main great powers, England, France, Prussia, and Russia, to support the liberation of the Greeks from Ottoman rule.⁶⁷

The Society of the Friends of the Muses was founded in Odessa in 1813 by three well-educated Athenians in order to promote the education of the Greek people, publications, archaeological discoveries, and the return of Greece’s glorious past. By 1815, Britain had taken over the Ionian Islands, and this seems to have had an effect on European interest in Greek nationalism and support for its independence.⁶⁸ Along with Lord Byron, the Society was a key player in the rise of Philhellenism and the Romantic notion of the restoration of a free Greece.

The opportunity arose when the infamous Ali Pasha of Ioannina rebelled against the sultan, whose Empire was rapidly crumbling. In 1820, Sultan Mahmud II decided to curb the renegade Pasha who had set up his own empire in Epiros. This ignited a civil war that provided the opportunity for the *Philiki Etairia* (Friendly Society) and its leader, Alexandros Ipsilantis, to launch a Greek uprising. The lead-up to the Greek War of Independence is as complex as it is relevant to the reception of the Erechtheion. Athens was only a small and relatively unimportant, though symbolic, theatre of the war during the struggle for independence. Nonetheless, the Athenian Akropolis was caught in the cross-fire.⁶⁹

⁶⁷ Clogg 1992, pp. 35-38; Eliot 1968; Spencer 1974; Woodhouse 1984, p. 143.

⁶⁸ Gallant 2001. Woodhouse 1984, p. 136; Woodhouse 1969.

⁶⁹ For more background on the Greek War of Independence, see Brewer 2001; Dakin 1973; Dakin 1972; Shaw and Shaw 1977; Woodhouse 1984; and Woodhouse 1969. While the philosophical background for the war is of direct interest to this study, most of the events themselves outside of Athens are far outside its scope.

Greek liberators entered Athens in April 1821 shouting “Christos anesti” – Christ is risen! “The Turks retired to the Acropolis, whither they had already withdrawn their families; and the city of Athens became once more the city of the Athenians.”⁷⁰ 450 Ottoman families were besieged while the Greeks refused to parley. Ottoman reinforcements came in the form of Omar Vryoni and a well-organized army. The siege was temporarily lifted on July 20, 1821.⁷¹ The Akropolis fell to the Greeks again on September 28, 1821 when Vryoni withdrew. The Greeks continued to starve out the Ottomans, and on November 13, 1821, attacked the wells where the Ottomans obtained their water near the Odeion of Herodes Atticus (the Serpentze). After a long battle, the Greeks seized these wells and two of the gates approaching the Propylaia. On December 20, 1821, the Greeks tried to take the third gate, but the Ottomans held the citadel and sixty-five Greeks were killed.⁷² French and German Philhellenes organized the bombardment of the Akropolis from the Areopagos. The Ottomans finally surrendered the Akropolis on June 9, 1822. On June 10, 1822, the Greeks raised their flag on the Akropolis for the first time, an act that symbolized their defiance and victory over occupiers, and one that would be repeated several times in the next century and a half.

This sweet victory was short-lived. On June 28, 1826, Redshid Pasha suddenly appeared on the horizon leading the Ottoman army. He had re-occupied the lower town of Athens by August 14, 1826, and drove the Greek defenders into the Akropolis where they were besieged for almost a year.⁷³ Of all the attacks on the Akropolis over the ages,

⁷⁰ Waddington 1825, p. 47.

⁷¹ Sicilianos 1960, p. 159.

⁷² Sicilianos 1960, p. 160.

⁷³ June 5, 1827: Paton et al. 1927, p. 557. On the events of 1827, see Captain Thomas Douglas Whitcombe’s account in Eliot 1992. On Redshid Pasha: see Eliot 1992, p. 60; on the siege, p. 67; on the surrender of the Akropolis, pp. 158-159. According to Whitcombe, there were several Philhellenes fighting (and dying) with the Greeks on the Akropolis: Eliot 1992, p. 105.

the Ottoman siege of 1826-1827 did the most damage to the Erechtheion. On May 24, 1827, the Akropolis was surrendered to the Ottomans once again, soon after a terrible massacre of 800 Greeks in Phaleron.⁷⁴ The Athenians fled to Aigina, Salamis, Poros, and the Peloponnese.⁷⁵ Conditions in Athens were appalling from 1828-1829.⁷⁶

Although Greece had established herself as free in 1828, political problems slowed the establishment of a stable government and its first capital at Nauplion. The Ottoman garrison only left the Akropolis on April 1, 1833. Eventually in 1834, King Otto of Bavaria was welcomed into the new capital of Athens as the King of Greece.

TRAVELERS' ACCOUNTS AND DEPICTIONS

The following sections analyze the accounts and depictions of the Erechtheion by the early travelers to Athens between the 17th century and 1833. The development of the understanding of the ancient form and function of the Erechtheion is traced, as are the travelers' comments on its contemporary use, state of preservation, and symbolic significance.

The accounts and depictions are considered chronologically according to the travelers' date of interaction with the building. Travelers who visited Athens in the same year as part of the same expedition are grouped together because they encountered the Erechtheion in the same state of preservation, and interacted with one another, exchanging ideas on aesthetics, art, and architecture. The nationality, socio-economic background, and profession of each traveler are considered insofar as to assess how these

⁷⁴ April 25, 1827. Eliot 1992, pp. 152-153.

⁷⁵ Sicilianos 1960, p. 161.

⁷⁶ The abandoned mud-brick houses disintegrated: Sicilianos 1960, p. 161. The rise in ground level around the Erechtheion attests to this.

factors affect his reception of the building, as well as to understand his motivation to describe the building in words.

THE EARLIEST TRAVELERS TO ATHENS

There are very few travelers whose descriptions of Athens have survived from before the Ottoman period, largely because Greece was not on the pilgrim or merchant route to Constantinople.⁷⁷ Athens had a reputation for being little more than a pile of ruins and it was believed to have been wiped off the face of the earth because of piracy and brigandage.⁷⁸ For example, Guillet said in 1675, “Je m’étonnay d’avoir lû, et d’avoir ouï dire mille fois qu’Athenes estoit un desert.”⁷⁹

Niccolò da Martoni is one of the first to give an eyewitness, detailed description of what he saw on the Acropolis, in 1395 (T 4).⁸⁰ Neither he, nor Cyriac of Ancona who followed him in 1436, clearly mentions the Erechtheion.⁸¹ Their contrasting interests show in their accounts: Christian history and relics for the pilgrim notary Niccolò da Martoni, and the works of Pheidias for Cyriac of Ancona. Cyriac’s account is further

⁷⁷ See sections on reception in Chapters V and VI.

⁷⁸ See below note 103.

⁷⁹ Guillet 1675, p. 151.

⁸⁰ van der Vin 1980, pp. 615-617. Paton points out that da Martoni saw Athens just before the Acciajuoli took over: Paton 1951, p. 173. Da Martoni arrived in Athens on Ash Wednesday February 24, 1395. His account of Athens is an interesting combination of personal observations, guides’ stories, and classical references, and which was all written down in “rather barbarous Latin” when he returned home. Paton says that he is the first western visitor to Athens (ignoring the visit of the Anglo-Saxon pilgrim Saewulf in 1102 [T 3] whom Paton mentions on p. 5).

⁸¹ For Cyriac of Ancona, the great recorder of inscriptions which would otherwise be totally lost, the Pnyx was “the most ancient walls of Athens, built of huge stones,” the Olympieion was the Palace of Hadrian, the Theseum was Temple of Mars, and the Tower of the Winds was a temple. Although his other identifications were flawed, Cyriac was correct in identifying the Propylaia as the palace of the Florentine Duke, Nerio Acciajuoli II. There are a few manuscripts containing Cyriac’s travels, including the *Codex Hamilton* in the German National Library, Berlin; the *Codex Vaticanus Barberinus Latinus* in the Vatican Library, Rome. On Cyriac in Athens, see Bodnar 1960. On Cyriac’s possible interaction with the Erechtheion, see Chapter VI.

notable because he uses the term “Akropolis” for the first time in a thousand years. It was otherwise referred to as the *Castrum*.⁸²

For seventy years before the Ottoman conquest of Athens, the Acciajuoli ruled the Duchy from the Akropolis (1388-1458) under the protection of Venice.⁸³ Attitudes toward the local Greek population also changed under the Acciajuoli. Nerio Acciajuoli was friendly toward the Greeks; Greek returned as the official language of the Dukedom; and the Greek Metropolitan was allowed to return to Athens after two hundred years.⁸⁴ After Antonio Acciajuoli added Athens to his inheritance in 1394 and installed himself in the Propylaia, travelers began assigning classical names and references (although very often fanciful and inaccurate) to most of the buildings in Athens.⁸⁵ A renewed interest in the remains of Athens may have started at this time because the Florentine court was flourishing with the Renaissance.⁸⁶

The first possible reference to the Erechtheion occurs in the account of the Vienna Anonymous. He probably visited the Athens prior to the Ottoman takeover, and wrote down his impressions soon after his visit. This chronology is suggested by his use of the past tense when referring to the Dukes of Athens, and the lack any Ottoman details (T 5).⁸⁷ The possible reference to the Erechtheion appears in the section called “Theatres

⁸² Setton 1975, p. 234. The evidence that the Akropolis was called “kastro” in the Middle Ages comes from an 11th to 12th century “register of the properties belonging to an ecclesiastical institution in Athens, probably a big monastery”: Kazanaki-Lappa 2003, p. 208.

⁸³ Paton 1951, p. 8.

⁸⁴ Paton 1951, p. 7.

⁸⁵ Paton 1951, p. 174.

⁸⁶ Zintzen 2000.

⁸⁷ Laborde 1854, vol. 1, p. 16. The account of the Vienna Anonymous is a topographical description of Athens, transcribed in the 15th century, and reunited with different theological pieces in one manuscript volume; it is now in the Imperial Library of Vienna (*Codex theolog. Gr.*, 252, fol. 29-32). A facsimile of the manuscript can be found at the beginning of Laborde 1854, vol. 1. The author is alternatively thought to be a Greek by Mackenzie 1992, p. 11), and a Venetian by Sicilianos 1960, p. 97).

and Schools,”⁸⁸ after references to the Nike Temple⁸⁹ and the Propylaia,⁹⁰ and before the Parthenon.⁹¹

South of this building was a stoa with various decorations, gilded all around and outside, and embellished with precious gems. This is the portico from which the Stoic philosophers take their name, and who came there to be instructed. Across from this portico flourished the Epicurean school.

Other than the mistake in orientation, this description corresponds to the North Porch of the Erechtheion quite closely, especially the reference to the embellishment with precious gems: these are likely the glass beads that remained attached to the recesses of the guilloche of the columns until the early 19th century when travelers took them home as souvenirs.⁹²

⁸⁸ For the original Greek and an argument against considering this passage in the Vienna Anonymous as referring to the Erechtheion, see Paton et al. 1927, pp. 520-522. Sicilianos implies that because he was a Venetian, he would not have been able to visit the Akropolis: Sicilianos 1960, p. 97. Depending on how one interprets and translates the opening comment “upon entering...the Akropolis,” we can in fact easily imagine that the Vienna Anonymous is describing what he sees as Schools from a position outside the kastro. A Venetian would have been able to visit the Akropolis before the Ottoman takeover because Venice was nominally in charge of the Akropolis owing to Acciajuoli’s request for their protection. Also, the Venetians looted the lower town in 1466.

⁸⁹ “Upon entering, then, the Akropolis, we find a small school, which belonged to the musicians and was founded by Pythagoras of Samos.”

⁹⁰ “In front of it is a very large palace, and below it are found very numerous...[probably columns] and enriched with marbles with the ceiling and murals. To the north..., the chancellery was totally constructed in marble and decorated with white columns.”

⁹¹ “Then at the Temple of the Mother of God, which Apollo and Eulogius built at the invocation of the *Unknown God*, this is how it is: It is a very vast and spacious temple. Its walls are white marble, and have the shape of a tetragon; they are built without mortar and without lime, clamped only by iron and lead. Outside these walls, the temple is enriched with very large columns, which encircle the cella. Between the columns, it envelopes an oblique space, and next to the beautiful door is the main altar, one there and the other to the south west... contains the placement of these columns, rising considerably in height. The capitals of the columns were sculpted by the size of the chisel in the shape of a palm tree;...”

⁹² This type of mistake in orientation when referring to the Erechtheion in particular is pervasive, even in modern scholarship. For example, the hoard of coins found with the Archaic *korai* on the Akropolis is indicated on the display boards in the Numismatic Museum (and in their leaflet) as having been found southwest of the Erechtheion, rather than northwest. Self-orientation on the Athenian Akropolis is counter-intuitive partly because one sees the back, or west end of the Parthenon, upon entering, and partly because the Erechtheion does not conform to a regular plan! The glass beads are a Classical feature of the Erechtheion: Paton et al. 1927, pp. 85-86. Tétaz, who visited Athens in 1847 and 1848, appears to be the last to have seen any of the glass beads in situ: “Deux [petits cylindres d’email] sont encore en place, l’un bleu, l’autre vert,” Tétaz 1847-1848, p. 53. The examples Donaldson brought to London and presented to R.I.B.A. in 1842 have long since been lost. See Chapter II on the North Porch and below “Donaldson”.

Some evidence is also as spurious as it is misleading. J.-P. Fallmerayer reported that, according to fragments of manuscripts available to him but never published, the Maiden Porch (Pandroseion to him) was once filled with gunpowder and exploded in 1500.⁹³ Laborde and Paton et al. rightly discount this report because not only can Fallmerayer's sources not be verified (the suspect manuscripts have never been published and have not otherwise been identified), but the relatively intact state of the Maiden Porch in the 19th century precludes it.⁹⁴ Other questionable sources include André Thevet, who claims to have visited Athens in 1550 (like Guillet after him), but his account is that of a “grand menteur.”⁹⁵

Some “sources” offer imaginary renditions of Athens. Athens appears as a Flemish town in the Chronicle of Jean de Courcy from 1416-1422 (Figure 128), and in 1493, as a German town in a woodcut from Hartmann Schedels' *Nürnberg zusammengestellter Weltchronik* (Figure 129).⁹⁶ The Akropolis, as such, does not figure in any of these fantasy illustrations. The reason for this dearth of information is that travelers and pilgrims did not often go to Athens. They went instead to the commercial centers of Corinth and Megara. If their ships did dock at Piraeos, they stayed aboard, ignorant of the treasures to see in Athens.⁹⁷

⁹³ Fallmerayer 1965, p. 437: “Laut Angaben handschriftlicher Fragmente, das mit Pulver gefüllte Pandrosion daselbst bereits im Jahre 1500 aufgefliegen war.” The Maiden Porch appears, however, to have been seriously damaged during the siege of 1687, by a hit on its east side, but probably not earlier.

⁹⁴ Laborde 1854, vol. 1, p. 45; Paton et al. 1927, p. 523, note 1.

⁹⁵ Laborde 1854, vol. 1, p. 49.

⁹⁶ De Courcy's artist was Louis de Bruges, Lord of Gruthuyse, amateur of “beaux manuscrits, meilleur connaisseur [sic] en miniatures et certes un homme for instruit, se contente d'un représentation de la ville de Minerve transformée plaisamment en ville gothique de la Flandre”: Laborde 1854, vol. 1. Hartmann Schedel's *Weltchronik*, or *Chronicle of the World* (better known today as the *Nuremberg Chronicle*, after the German city in which it was created), was a groundbreaking encyclopedic work and, at the time, the most lavishly illustrated book ever printed in Europe.

⁹⁷ Laborde 1854, vol. 1, p. 47.

In the late 16th century, Martin Kraus, or Crusius of Tübingen, was the first to concern himself with contemporary Greece. Compelled by the absence of other travelers' accounts, he corresponded with two native Greeks in order to obtain first-hand information on Athens.⁹⁸ The information about Athens from this period is conflicting, and summarized by Lowe, but the overarching conclusion is that access to the Akropolis was absolutely forbidden to Westerners.⁹⁹ In fact, one of Crusius' contemporaries and countrymen, the apothecary and adventurer, Reinhold Lubenau of Königsberg, was warned by his guides during his visit on October 4, 1588 not even to sketch the Akropolis.¹⁰⁰ Lubenau was temporarily taken hostage by Janissaries and his notes and drawings of Athens were not returned to him.¹⁰¹

The accounts of the first three quarters of the 17th century are also unhelpful owing to the a trend toward writing fictionalized travelogues, especially in Germany and France. Lithgow's description (1608) is vague and does not show any intimate knowledge of Athens (T 6).¹⁰² The French geographer, Antoine de Pinet, turned his nose up at Athens describing it as "a little castle and a village which was not even safe from wolves, foxes and other wild animals."¹⁰³ Accusations among these intrepid armchair travelers flew: While George Wheler charged Pinet with viewing Athens only "from the

⁹⁸ Or, according to Sicilianos, one Greek official in Istanbul: Sicilianos 1960, p. 97. "Our German historians write that Athens is completely destroyed and has been replaced by a few fisherman's huts. Is this true?": Crusius 1584, pp. 410-83; See also Mackenzie 1992, p. 11. See below note 103.

⁹⁹ Lowe 1936, pp. 233-242.

¹⁰⁰ Lubenau was Rudolf II's (the Holy Roman Emperor) ambassador to the Porte: Mackenzie 1992, p. 11. When he was prevented from leaving his post after eighteen months, the British Ambassador, Sir Edward Barton, gave him false papers and helped him onto an Ottoman galley, by means of which he came to visit Athens.

¹⁰¹ Lowe 1936, p. 242.

¹⁰² Lithgow 1814, pp. 62-64.

¹⁰³ Andrews 1979, p. 15. Such contemporary sources (i.e., the early travelers) appear to indicate that Athens was a relatively insignificant two in the early Ottoman period. This status has become proverbial and pervades modern scholarship on this period of Athenian history. Machiel Kiel has demonstrated, however, through his analysis of contemporary Ottoman documents, that Athens was one of the four largest and most important towns in the Balkans: Kiel 1999, p. 196.

Sea through the wrong End of their Perspective Glass,”¹⁰⁴ Spon accused Guillet de Saint-Georges of never having gone to Athens, and of writing his accounts based on the information sent to him by the Capuchin monks (see below).¹⁰⁵ These Capuchins, incidentally, had only a “mediocre knowledge of archaeology.”¹⁰⁶

Access to the Akropolis continued to be limited. When the monk, Robert de Dreux, part of the entourage of de la Haye-Vantelet, the French Ambassador to the Porte, tried to arrange a visit to see the temple of the Unknown God [Parthenon] in 1668, he was refused entry because the *dizdar ağa* thought he was a spy who had been looking for weaknesses in the Akropolis walls the day before.¹⁰⁷ A gift of an ivory ring the next day greased the diplomatic passage. De Dreux described the Parthenon, but as usual, the Erechtheion remained in obscurity.

Although many 17th century travelers complained about their difficulties in accessing the citadel, there was no such impediment to Evliya Çelebi, the seasoned Turkish traveler who wrote *Seyahatname*, a ten-volume work describing his travels all over the Ottoman Empire and beyond.¹⁰⁸ Evliya visited Athens in 1667, admired the mosque inside the Parthenon at great length (T 7), and described the Propylaia as “a building with strangeness [or unexpected things].”¹⁰⁹ Despite his ease of access to the castle, he does not interact with the Erechtheion.¹¹⁰ For the purposes of this project,

¹⁰⁴ Wheler 1682.

¹⁰⁵ On the conflict between Spon and Guillet, see note 117.

¹⁰⁶ Sicilianos 1960, p. 169.

¹⁰⁷ Omont 1901, p. 280. Omont published Robert de Dreux’s account.

¹⁰⁸ On Evliya as an Ottoman traveler, see Dankoff 2004.

¹⁰⁹ Biris 1959, pp. 42-23; Tanoulas 1997, vol.1, pp. 45-46: “Γιὰ τὸ κτίριο μὲ τὰ παράδοξα.”

¹¹⁰ See Andrews 1979, pp. 68-77, for the only English translation of the Evliya’s trip to Athens.

Evliya's frequent references to the water supply on the Akropolis are revealing and speak to the recent installation of cisterns in the houses within the walls.¹¹¹

Even after Spon and Wheler – who managed to use Pausanias to greater success with respect to the Erechtheion than did Guillet – the Erechtheion is absent from many descriptions of Athens and the Akropolis, including an anonymous account from 1699 which mentions all the other buildings on the Akropolis.¹¹² Similarly, even in Babin's account of Athens and his ground-breaking engraving of the Akropolis from the southwest, the Erechtheion is ignored (Figure 134).¹¹³ Babin's description of Athens may have been written in preparation for the Marquis de Nointel's visit, discussed below.¹¹⁴ A rather more accurate set of drawings, all made in 1670, show the Akropolis again from the southwest, a perspective from which the Erechtheion is easily blocked by the Parthenon and the soldiers' houses on the plateau (Figure 130, Figure 131, and Figure 132). This southern perspective is dominant among the views of the Akropolis from this period, including another anonymous colored view, Anonymous, *Plan d'Athènes*, ca. 1670 (Figure 133).

The question remains: Why did those who had access to the Akropolis fail to mention the Erechtheion time and time again? Like Pausanias, there are no references to the Maiden Porch (discounting Fallmerayer's claims to the contrary). As the descriptions

¹¹¹ “In the time of the infidel this castle had drinkable water from an aqueduct, but now every house collects its own rainwater in a cistern, which keeps it very cold even in July. The need for rain-water is great. Many carry their rainwater up on donkey-back from freshwater springs in the suburbs of the town”: Andrews 1979, p. 70. Evliya also describes how the rainwater was collected off the roof of the Parthenon through the guttering system and into a large cistern. The water “is clean and cold and from it the multitude quench their thirst”: cited by Andrews 1979, p. 72.

¹¹² This anonymous traveler is referred to as “L'Assuré”: Paton 1951, p. 165; Tanoulas 1997, vol. 1, pp. 65-66.

¹¹³ Babin 1674.

¹¹⁴ Miller 1972, p. 8. Babin sent a description of Athens to a canon in Lyons, who passed it on to Jacob Spon, who published it in 1674: Sicilianos 1960, p. 168.

and depictions indicate, the Akropolis was filled, cheek-by-jowl, with the houses of soldiers and their families. A prime example of the omission of the Erechtheion may be seen in two of the few views of the Akropolis from the north. The first is a rough, anonymous sketch in the Bibliothèque nationale de France, and dates to 1674 (Figure 135). The second is a pair of large oil paintings made for Nointel (Figure 136 and Figure 137), one now in the National Gallery (in Athens) on loan from the Chartres Museum.¹¹⁵ These, and the series from 1670 mentioned above, are some of the very few “realistic” views of the Parthenon before the Venetian attack of 1687: only the Parthenon, the crenulated Propylaia, and “Frankish Tower” are identifiable. There is a very large building to the west of where the Erechtheion should be that also appears in Fanelli’s view of the bombardment of the Akropolis.¹¹⁶ The rest of the Akropolis, including the area where the Erechtheion is located, is filled with small buildings with raking roofs. Therefore, if the Erechtheion could no longer be seen from the city below owing to its accretions and surrounding structures, any view of the Erechtheion would also have been obscured from all the main vantage points of the visitors viewing the Propylaia, the Temple of Athena Nike, and the Parthenon.

¹¹⁵ Anonymous, *Akropolis from the Northeast*, 1674; Carrey, *The Acropolis and the City of Athens from the Northeast*, 1674. The other painting, Carrey, *The Acropolis*, 1674, is the clearer of the two with respect to the Erechtheion. These were first published by Homolle: Homolle 1894. The more general depiction of Athens has figures in the foreground. These include Nointel in the center, standing in front of Giraud (English Consul at Athens), Chastegenier (French Consul at Athens), Cornelio Magni (see below “Magni”), Père Sogé (Jesuit), Père Galand (Capuchin), Nointel’s chaplain, and various other people in Athens at the time: Sicilianos 1960, p. 177. Also crucial to this first period are the famous drawings created by Jacques Carrey in 1674 of the Parthenon sculptures still in situ before the explosion of the Parthenon, and the activities of Elgin and his contemporaries. Carrey was also a member of the Marquis de Nointel’s entourage, who was sent by Louis XIV to collect manuscripts, medallions, and sculpture. I consulted the original folio which contains the drawings of the Parthenon sculptures in the Louvre with the hope of finding a complementary set of drawings of the Erechtheion. Unfortunately, there were no drawings of the Erechtheion, although Carrey did make drawings of a few other monuments in Athens, such as the Tower of the Winds.

¹¹⁶ Fanelli, *Veduta del cast: d'Acropolis dalla parte di tramontana*, 1687.

THE EARLIEST TRAVELERS TO DESCRIBE THE ERECHTHEION

GUILLET

In his account of 1669, Guillet claims to have seen the famous well [of Poseidon] fifty feet from the Parthenon (T 8).¹¹⁷ Guillet is obsessed with the well – conjecturing the existence of secret channels to the sea that work on hydraulic principles – but relates it in no way to the Erechtheion, which he does not seem to have been able to find even though he looked for it with Pausanias as his guide. He says he cannot be expected to find the olive tree of Athena, the Opisthodomos, or the long-burning Lamp of Kallimachos, which he relates to the miraculous lamps in the mosque in the Parthenon.¹¹⁸ Here we find a traveler bringing Pausanias into the historical present. Historical perspective tells us Guillet did not see the well he calls “celebre [sic]”, although he is the very first traveler to mention it in print (three years before Spon’s 1678 publication), having visited the Akropolis seven years before Spon and Wheler. Putting aside the remote possibility that Poseidon’s well was destroyed between Guillet/Guilletière’s and Spon and Wheler’s visit, and in the light of accusations that Guillet never actually went to Athens, it is almost certain that neither Guillet nor his fictitious brother saw *the* well. He/his source might have seen *a* well, and perhaps his guide tricked him by somehow adding salt to his sample of the water. Guillet complains that because there is no living tradition of the original names of the monuments among the Greeks, and since the so-called Janissaries

¹¹⁷ Guillet 1675, p. 198 (misprinted as p. 298); Spon’s accusation is true. Guillet admitted he had never traveled to Athens, but defended his work saying that his brother, Sieur de la Guilletière, had visited Athens in 1669, and brought back material with him. This brother is probably imaginary, and Guillet plagiarized a Capuchin monk. Strangely, despite the very public controversy with Spon and Wheler and their unsullied scholarly reputation, E.D. Clarke quotes Guillet at length and as an authority on the well: Clarke 1814. Clarke could not find it, and believes that Guillet was successful. See below “Clarke and Préaux.” For the full story of the altercation between Spon and Guillet, see Laborde 1854, vol. 2, pp. 31-35; Guillet 1675, p. 198 (misprinted as p. 298).

¹¹⁸ Guillet 1676, pp. 188-195.

who live on the Akropolis have built houses among the monuments, it is impossible to discern which buildings are the Temples of Jupiter, Minerva the Protectress, Neptune, Pandrosos and Victory.¹¹⁹

Guillet's account is fraught with controversy. In a later debate with Spon and Wheler (see below) Guillet conceded that he did not in fact visit Athens in person and had therefore to resort to the claim that his account was based on descriptions provided by his brother, de la Guilletière.¹²⁰

MAGNI

Cornelio Magni was part of the Marquis de Nointel's entourage. He achieves several firsts in his account of the Erechtheion (T 9). Unlike Guillet, he does not appear to have been armed with Pausanias when he visited in 1674, but he was the first traveler to notice the Maiden Porch (something Pausanias failed to do in the 2nd century A.D.¹²¹), and, most importantly, he was the first traveler (ever) to refer to the Erechtheion maidens directly as "caryatids." Interestingly, Magni says that architects call these female architectural supports "*Cariati*," a turn of phrase startlingly similar to Vitruvius' famous passage on Caryatids discussed in Chapter IV. It would be tempting to assume that Magni had read Vitruvius, and like so many others before and after him, instantly associated the maidens of the South Porch with Vitruvian caryatids. However, we cannot be sure of Magni's educational background since he did not use Pausanias. Nevertheless, even without the benefit of Vitruvius, Magni could have picked up the term for female architectural supports in Italy where we know that Erechtheion-type maidens were called

¹¹⁹ Guillet 1676, p. 194.

¹²⁰ See also note 117.

¹²¹ On Pausanias' tour of the Akropolis and interpretation of the Erechtheion, see Chapter IV.

caryatids.¹²² This Italian also considers the maidens perfect, and delicately draped. This constitutes a very positive, first aesthetic reaction to them, and shows that there were warmly received in the last quarter of the 17th century.

Magni does not, however, recognize the building as either the Temple of Erechtheus or Athena Polias. To him, the rest of the structure is “un’altra fabbrica con qualche Colonna, e muraglie, che mostra essere stata un Tempio, benche angusto”.¹²³ an irregular hodgepodge, impossible to make out clearly. Nointel’s entourage proceeded from west to east across the spine of the Akropolis; therefore the columns he refers to probably belong to the East Porch.¹²⁴

VERNON

Letters comprise one of the other categories of documentary evidence about the Erechtheion. These tend to be less self-consciously written as they were not usually intended for publication. The earliest private letter that refers to the Erechtheion was written by Sir Francis Vernon in Smyrna to a Mr. Oldenburg (T 10).¹²⁵ He describes the temple as being of the “*Conique*” (meaning Ionic) order, the first to do so, and admires the fine workmanship and the accurately carved moldings (also the first to do so). It is not clear whether he has Pausanias in hand, although he suspects that the temple belonged to Pandrosos. He gives the dimensions of the building as 67 feet by 38 feet, which does not correspond to the dimensions of either the main building or the North Porch. Even if one allows for flexibility in his definition of the foot, a comparison of the proportion is no more helpful. The ratio of Vernon’s measurements is 1.76 (67 feet

¹²² See below “‘Caryatid’ and the Renaissance.”

¹²³ Magni 1688, p. 57.

¹²⁴ Sicilianos says he consulted with Spon: Sicilianos 1960, p. 178.

¹²⁵ Ray 1693, vol. 2, pp. 19-25.

divided 38 feet) which is almost exactly between the ratio of the length and side of the North Porch (1.7) and the main building (1.84).

SPON AND WHELER

French physician Jacob Spon and Englishman Sir George Wheler visited Athens near the end of the First Ottoman period, in 1676.¹²⁶ This pair was the first to describe the Erechtheion in any detail, as well as the first to identify the building by explicitly using Pausanias.¹²⁷ This approach marks a significant change. Before Spon and Wheler, travelers such as Cyriac of Ancona and the Vienna Anonymous faithfully recorded the identification of the buildings according to local lore, rather than according to any explicit ancient evidence. An appreciation and awareness of the classical sources, and a questioning of tales told by the local guides, is a symptom of the Enlightenment in Western Europe that marks the change from “the spiritualized landscapes of medieval travel accounts.”¹²⁸

The circumstances of Spon and Wheler’s interaction with the Erechtheion are very important to the interpretation of their accounts of the Erechtheion. Despite spending a whole month in Athens, Spon and Wheler were only able to visit the Akropolis on a single occasion, encountering, as they did, severe mistrust from the *dizdar ağa*. Furthermore, they were forbidden to make sketches or take notes during their visit lest their scribblings be useful to the enemies of the Ottomans. This means that both of

¹²⁶ Wheler (1650-1723) was born in Holland, his parents having fled as Royalists during the Civil War. He met Spon in Venice in 1675, after which they traveled together throughout eastern Europe and Western Asia. They spent six months in Greece in 1676. Wheler gave his collection of inscriptions, coins, and manuscripts to the University of Oxford, became a priest in 1677, and published his travels in 1682. Spon was born in Lyon in 1647: Sicilianos 1960, pp. 175-176.

¹²⁷ Spon had recently published Babin’s work at Lyons: Rankin 1978, p. 8.

¹²⁸ Augustinos 1994, p. 52.

their accounts were written up from memory of this single day on the Akropolis.¹²⁹ Nonetheless, their accounts of the monuments of Athens in general are remarkable considering “that they were making their observations in a near vacuum of knowledge about Greek architecture.”¹³⁰

Spon published his account first, in 1678, and truly set the pattern for all travelers’ accounts for the next century (T 11). Using Pausanias as a guide, he identified the Erechtheion based on Pausanias’ interpretation of it as a double building, and based on the rumor that it contained the salt well. For Spon, the double building was composed, based on his measurements, of the main building and the North Porch. The quest for the salt well remained unrealized. They imagined it to have been located within the temple (at that time serving a domestic function, and hence off limits to foreigners); the (unnamed) guides assuaged their frustration by telling them that it was almost dry.

It is this pair to whom we can credit the report of the Erechtheion as having been used as a harem.¹³¹ Wheler (T 12) says, “We could not have permission to go into the Temple, to see it; because the *Turk* that lives in it, hath made it his *Seraglio* for his Women; and was then abroad.”¹³² When the use of the Erechtheion as a harem (as it is usually modernly termed) is mentioned, most textbooks and scholarship assume the

¹²⁹ These security measures had an impact on the earliest sketches of the Erechtheion as well, including on those of the abbé, Michel Fourmont, in the mid 18th century. He clearly remembered the main elements of the temple, but had difficulty recalling how they all fit together. Of course, Fourmont, as a Frenchman, did not have the benefit of the previously rendered Venetian plans of the Akropolis to remind him of the arrangements of the façades he attempted to pull together so creatively. See below “Fourmont.”

¹³⁰ Rankin 1978, p. 16.

¹³¹ Chandler, visiting Athens in the 1760s, described the houses as “secured with high walls and the windows turned from the street and latticed or boarded up so as to preclude all intercourse even of the eyes. The apartments set aside for Turkish women are not only impenetrable but must not be regarded even on the outside with any degree of attention.” William Pars, in his endeavor to make drawings on the Akropolis, upset the Turks because he appeared to be peering into their houses, “obliging them to confine or remove the women, to prevent their being seen”: Chandler 1776 (cited by Mackenzie 1992, pp. 61-62). The remnants of such boarding up of openings may be seen in Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819.

¹³² Author’s emphasis. Wheler 1682, pp. 364-365.

harem belonged to the *dizdar* of the Akropolis. There is no other evidence for its use as a harem aside from the accounts of Spon and Wheler, who say only that “*the Turk that lives in it...was then abroad.*” This cannot be the *dizdar*, who lived in the Propylaia with his own harem. Indeed, in Spon’s account – and also in Giraud’s – we hear of the terrible tragedy of the demise of the then *dizdar* and his family, except for one of his daughters “who was spending the night in the lower town,”¹³³ when the Propylaia exploded.¹³⁴ Also, earlier in his account, Wheler even discusses the difficulty in getting access to the Akropolis from the *dizdar* for that one day; therefore, the *dizdar* is clearly in residence and not abroad:

It was with great difficulty, we obtain'd the Favour of seeing the Castle of the Haga; who being newly come thither, and scarce well settled in his Place, knew not whether he might safely gratify us. But an old Souldier of the Castle, his Friend and Confident, for three Oka's of Coffee, two to the Governour, and one to himself, perswaded him at last to give way, assuring him, it was never refused to such Strangers, as it appear'd that we were.¹³⁵

Paton et al. remind us that there was more than one important person living on the Akropolis in some degree of splendor among the ruins of the monuments, and that, at least before the Venetian siege, this seraglio belonged to one such important, though unnamed, person.

Other important indications provided by Spon and Wheler as to the state of the Erechtheion in 1676 are also very problematic. At first reading, it appears that the spaces between the maidens of the South Porch are filled in - Spon describes them as “enclavées

¹³³ Paton et al. 1927, p. 528.

¹³⁴ Spon and Giraud did not agree on the date of the explosion of the Propylaia (1656 vs. 1640, respectively). Collignon 1913, p. 14) vouches for Giraud, who was a longer-term resident at Athens, and from whom Spon received most of his information.

¹³⁵ Wheler 1682, pp. 357-358. Wheler’s (and all other travelers’) unconventional spelling has been retained. An *oka* (or *okka*) weighed approximately 1.28 kg. This was a great deal of coffee to give as a “gift” for access to the Akropolis.

dans un mur,” and that there are old hovels, “masures anciennes,” next to the Maiden Porch (T 11). Paton et al., however, believe this whole paragraph (in both travelers’ accounts) does not refer to the Maiden Porch of the Erechtheion at all, because the reference is to an area *south* of the Temple of Minerva¹³⁶ (the Parthenon in Paton et al.’s estimation), and that there are *Three* Graces¹³⁷ and not four or more maidens as would have been visible in the Erechtheion.¹³⁸ Paton et al. believe Spon and Wheler are referring to “some ruins in which were three draped female statues” “south of the Parthenon”.¹³⁹ New evidence and a reanalysis of the texts would, however, suggest that Spon and Wheler were referring to the Maiden Porch for the following reasons:

¹³⁶ Most early travelers opted for the Latinized names for the gods and goddesses in their accounts. Zeus is Jupiter, Dionysos is Bacchus, and Athena Polias is Minerva Poliade. This was typical of travelers after Spon and Wheler as well. This is probably because they are coming from Rome and are accustomed to the names there, as well as because they were reading Latin sources. Rome’s grandeur also held precedence over Athens’, and thus perhaps do the Latin names for the deities: “As to the eminent Monuments of Antiquity, yet remaining in Athens, I dare prefer them before any Place in the World, Rome only excepted”: Wheler 1682, p. 357. Pausanias was only available in Latin and Greek at this time (as opposed to modern languages). The earliest editions of Pausanias date to the early 16th century (Pausanias 1516). The first traveler to use Pausanias in his account of the Erechtheion was Guillet, a Frenchman, in 1669. He was followed soon after by his compatriot and nemesis, Jacob Spon, who was the first to identify and interpret the Erechtheion explicitly by referring to Pausanias. The first French translation of Pausanias appeared in 1731 (Pausanias 1731), which means that these early Frenchmen were using the earlier Latin translations which date back to 1516 (Pausanias 1516). This analysis is based on a survey of the holdings in the Bibliothèque nationale de France and the British Library.

¹³⁷ The travelers’ source for the Three Graces derives from a reference in Pausanias much earlier in his account of the Akropolis, that is, even before the description of the Parthenon, right after he entered the Akropolis: “At the very entrance to the Akropolis there is a statue of Hermes, which they call Propylaios. And the Graces, they say, were made by Socrates, son of Sophroniskos, to whose statue as ‘the wisest of men’ the Pythia was witness...” (1.22.8, trans. Hurwit 1999, p. 306). This account would make the sculptor *the* famous Socrates, a possibility according to some modern scholars. This is a discussion, however, far outside the scope of this examination. Interesting also is the lengths to which Spon and Wheler go to relate the ancient text with monuments visible above the ground, and the gullibility of those who followed them without realizing that these statues must have been located directly next to the east side of the Propylaia. The origins of the disapproval of the nudity contained in the travelers’ references to the Three Graces are unclear, and are not present in Pausanias’ account.

¹³⁸ Paton et al. 1927, p. 531.

¹³⁹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 532. In 1795, Thomas Hope drew the central slabs of the east frieze of the Parthenon as built into a wall (Figure 140). It appears that Hymettos is in the background, suggesting therefore that these slabs are south of the Parthenon. It would be difficult, however, to mistake these figures as the Three Graces.

1. Paton et al. did not have the benefit of assessing the blocks with cuttings east of the Maiden Porch in their correct places. Therefore, they could not make the connection between Spon and Wheler's texts and one of the two series of cuttings for the ceiling/roof beams in the Ottoman style (Figure 592) in blocks SS.05.05-07, SS.06.05-06, and/or SS.09.08-11 (Figure 198);¹⁴⁰
2. Spon's description of the features as being "De l'autre côté du Temple de Minerve, ou à son Midy" immediately after the description of the Erechtheion (and long after that of the Parthenon) implies that they are attached to the former structure (the Erechtheion, i.e., *the Temple of Minerva*). This interpretation of the Erechtheion as a Temple of Minerva is in accordance to a straightforward reading of Pausanias, and is repeated by the Venetians a decade later in their plans and descriptions of 1687 (see below);¹⁴¹
3. The travelers' vague reference to "quelques" (Spon) and "some" (Wheler) statues of women built into a wall – a sign that perhaps they were trying to rationalize for themselves how four women could represent the Three Graces, or that the accretions to the building may have obscured the maidens in such a way that only three remained plainly visible;

¹⁴⁰ See below "Hovels' on the South Wall."

¹⁴¹ Wheler cannot, however, figure out where to put the temple of "Minerva Poliades" among the ruins. On the problems Wheler has translating Spon's text, see below.

4. The indication that Wheler does not agree with Spon's interpretation of the maidens as Graces, since he gives him full credit for the idea, thus distancing it from his own, perhaps unformed, opinion.

Furthermore, the last sentence in Wheler's account of the Erechtheion even more clearly illustrates the source of the confusion surrounding these accounts, namely Wheler's sometimes careless translation of Spon and his misunderstanding of the cults of the Akropolis. Wheler's account states "'Tis like also, here was the Temple of *Minerva Poliades*; that is, Protectrice of the City; and the Temple of the Nymph *Pandrosa*; but no Remains of them are now to be seen."¹⁴² Wheler is clearly confused by Spon's reference to two different temples of Minerva. His lack of understanding of the topography and of Pausanias influences both this passage and his translation of portions of Spon's description of the Erechtheion.

Wheler's publication is not, however, as some would characterize it, a wholesale translation into English of Spon's book. His account of the "Temple of Erictheus" puts the information in a different order, and his descriptions imply an examination of the building independent of that of Spon. When he gives the measurements he says, "The less one, by which the Entrance is to the other..." referring to the North Porch. Not only do Spon and Wheler appear to have taken independent measurements (Spon gives the width of the main building as half a foot wider), Wheler seems to imply that the North Door is still functioning, and more importantly, that the East Porch is almost entirely blocked up. The state of the North Door is important with regard to the date of the

¹⁴² Wheler 1682, p. 365. Spon (T 11) wrote: "Ce pouvoit être là le Temple de Minerve Poliade, c'est-à-dire protectrice de la Ville, et de la Nymphé Pandrose."

installation of the vault in the North Porch, which would necessitate it being blocked, as was reported by later travelers.¹⁴³

Wheler makes a curious observation about the “chapters” (or capitals) of the Erechtheion: “Its roof is sustained by *Ionick* Pillars, channelled but the Chapters are something different from any I have seen of the Order; and seem to be a kind of mixture between it, and the *Dorick* order.” To which of the three sets of visible Ionic capitals Wheler is referring is unclear, but it seems, by the context, to be either the East or West colonnades as the comments follow the measurements for the “bigger” temple; however, only the North Porch would still have had its roof. In any case, what can Wheler mean? He seems quite informed about the distinct types of fluting of Ionic and Doric columns. The Ionic order of the Erechtheion is quite unique, but the Doric element that he notes cannot have been the distinctive anthemion necking band. Perhaps Wheler sees the guilloche below the canal as a sort of echinus. Earlier in his account, Wheler says that the Temple of Athena Nike Apteros is Doric and serves as a powder magazine. Therefore, either Wheler confused the Nike Temple with the Doric part of the Propylaia, or Wheler is confused by the distinctive versions of the classical orders contained in the monuments on the Akropolis.¹⁴⁴

Spon and Wheler illustrated a selection of the Athenian monuments, including the Parthenon, Tower of the Winds, and the Lysikrates Monument. Unfortunately, like Cyriac and Babin before them, neither Spon nor Wheler chose to feature the Erechtheion among their drawings. Spon and Wheler’s expedition would have benefited greatly from

¹⁴³ It is also important to recall that the vault over the cistern in the West Corridor rose above the level of the threshold of the North Door, and so the North Door had been further reduced in size since the Frankish doors had been installed. On the date of the vault in the North Porch, see below: “Vault in the North Porch.”

¹⁴⁴ On the Temple of Athena Nike: Wheler 1682, p. 358.

the services of a professional artist and draftsman, in the way that Jacques Carrey was enlisted for Nointel's expedition. Their drawings, though charming, are schematic and out of proportion.

Similarly to their textual accounts, the illustrations also differ between Spon and Wheler's publications, the Erechtheion being indicated for the first time in Wheler's view of Athens labeled "2. T. Ericthei" (Figure 139).¹⁴⁵ The number "2" is situated at the eastern end of the Akropolis, at the left hand side of a long row of north-facing, gabled houses with little windows and doors; these are rendered in a childlike manner. The Parthenon is the only recognizable structure on the Akropolis. It is difficult to tell whether the Erechtheion was just too complicated a structure for him to attempt to depict, or whether the building, including the North Addition, was truly hidden behind such a long row of houses.

In the years immediately following the publication of *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce, et du Levant*, as mentioned above, a vicious spat played out in print between Spon and Guillet because Guillet accused Spon of never having gone to Greece. Spon counter-attacked with the same allegation, that Guillet and his pretend brother never visited Athens, and had plagiarized a Capuchin monk (T 13).¹⁴⁶ In his own defense, Spon replied that no one could say that *he* did not go to Greece because he has proof in his passport in the form of consular stamps from the consuls of France at the Porte, Zante, Morea, Athens, and Smyrna.¹⁴⁷ Spon also pointed out each of Guillet's mistakes, including once concerning the Janissaries: "Les soldats du Chasteau ne se sont point

¹⁴⁵ Spon's view of the Akropolis is from the South, as are most of the early views (see Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, figs. 1-4, 6), and so the Erechtheion could not be included.

¹⁴⁶ Spon 1679, p. 16.

¹⁴⁷ Spon 1679, p. 17.

nommer Janissaires, mais Neferides, c'est-à-dire gens de la garnison, ou Isarlides gens du Chasteau en langue Turque: on les appelle aussi en Grec Castriani.”¹⁴⁸ Surprisingly, Spon does not mention Guillet’s apparent obsession with the well of Poseidon, perhaps out of jealousy that Guillet’s source (probably the monk) had been able to see it, and he had not.

Between Spon and Wheler’s visit in 1676 and the Venetian takeover of the Akropolis in 1687, there are no explicit references to the Erechtheion.

THE VENETIANS

The Venetians besieged and occupied the Akropolis, and had access to the monuments for a mere six and a half months between September 1687 and April 1688. Several members of the Venetian Army, from engineers to *bombistas*, were compelled or commissioned to create the first descriptive plans and drawings of the Akropolis of both the siege and its contemporary state for military and documentary purposes.¹⁴⁹ This cluster of information in 1687-1688 demonstrates the variety of influences and information from the late 17th century, and the already far-flung fame and importance of Spon and Wheler’s publications.

VERNEDA AND FANELLI

The most important of the Venetian drawings were made by one of General Morosini’s engineers, Giacomo Milhau Verneda (Figure 1, Figure 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4).¹⁵⁰ Verneda seems to have relied chiefly on his own observations (T 14), unlike

¹⁴⁸ Spon 1679, p. 309.

¹⁴⁹ On Verneda and other Venetian engineers, see Dokos and Panagopoulos 1993.

¹⁵⁰ Verneda appears to have been an important officer who served Morosini for several years. He died on September 2, 1688. For further biographical information see Paton et al. 1927, p. 602, note 1.

Fanelli, who, as will be discussed below, tended to gather information at random from various sources. Fanelli's drawings consequently resulted in a rather confused and inaccurate picture of the Akropolis. Verneda produced several renditions of the siege of the Akropolis, both engravings and colored drawings, but none shows the Erechtheion clearly except for Figure 4, which shows the North Porch clearly peaking over the North Akropolis Wall.¹⁵¹ His plan demonstrates a basic understanding of the Erechtheion and provides significant information about it:¹⁵² The main building is depicted as rectangle closed by the six columns of the East Porch without any further detail of the interior or the West Façade; the North Porch is fully enclosed by a red wall, with five columns (three in front, two on the return) picked out in gold ink (there is another rectangle inside the red one with what looks like an architectural symbol for a vault – an hourglass inscribed in a rectangle); and the Maiden Porch is also fully enclosed by a wall, denoted in red, with three dots across the front and an “X” inscribed within the rectangle, probably to denote the roof.¹⁵³ The North Porch is marked “R”, and the Maiden Porch “S” in accordance with the key (T 14): “R. Tempio d’Ericteus,” and “S. Altro Tempio di Minerva Poliades, cioè Protettrice della Città, e della ninfa Pandrosa, le mura del quale sono sostenute dà quatro Statue di marmo, quali rapresentono le Gratie, che Socrate fece far vestite, per burlarsi di quelli che le hanno rappresentate nude.”¹⁵⁴ Verneda has clearly read Spon and/or Wheler and is trying to reconcile the building with their descriptions.

¹⁵¹ Verneda, *Bombardment of the Akropolis by General Morosini in 1687*, 1687; Verneda, *Athens During the Explosion in the Parthenon on September 23, 1687*, 1687; Verneda, *Veduta del Borgo e del castello di Athene al momento del esplosione di Partenone da una bomba*, 26 September 1687.

¹⁵² Verneda, *Pianta del Castello d'Acropolis e Città d'Athene. Tavola delle cose più nottabili conteute [sic] nella Pianta del Castello*, 1687.

¹⁵³ Paton et al. 1927, p. 602. *Non vidi*.

¹⁵⁴ See T 14: the discrepancies between the plan and key will be further discussed below.

The “N” (“Gran deposito di polvere”) in the key does not appear to correspond to any label “N” on the plan.¹⁵⁵

Verneda also offers new information about the surroundings of the Erechtheion: “à fronte di detta Corte o scala si vedono ancora altre sei Colonne simili alle sudette.” Not only is he the first to mention the six columns of the East Porch, but he also makes reference to a stairway that links the ground level of the North Porch with the higher level of the East Porch.¹⁵⁶

Fanelli’s plans and drawings are primarily based on Verneda’s more accurate versions (Figure 5 and Figure 6); however, Fanelli incorporates other sources that lead him astray – mostly because he never went to Athens, and because he published his book in 1707, twenty years after the Venetians had conquered and lost control of the city. For example, Fanelli published one plan by Mutoni, Conte di San Felice, which represents the North Porch as a huge apsidal colonnade; places only four columns in the East Porch; eliminates the Maiden Porch entirely; and places the entire structure much too close to the Parthenon (Figure 7).¹⁵⁷ He identifies the main building as the “Tempio di Minerva Poliados” and the apsidal North Porch as the “Tempio di Nettuno.”

In his textual account (T 15), Fanelli also draws on various sources with curious and confusing results. Although his Venetian sources had access to the temple, Fanelli

¹⁵⁵ On the omission of the “N” in Fanelli’s version: Fanelli, *Plan of the Akropolis after Verneda*, 1687, see Paton et al. 1927, p. 602, and below “Vault in the North Porch.”

¹⁵⁶ Fanelli, in copying this, wrote “corte e scala.” These stairs are probably not the krepidoma of the North Porch, which are almost certainly below the ground line, and the text links the North and East Porches via a “scala.” The North Addition would have obliterated most of the ancient staircase between the two terraces. There is a slim possibility that Verneda is either referring to the remnants of the ancient staircase near the Akropolis Wall, or to a staircase inside the temple, which rose from the level of the West Corridor to that of the East Porch (see Chapter VI).

¹⁵⁷ San Felice, *Plan de la ville d’Athènes*, 1687. According to Locatelli, San Felice commanded the mortar batteries under Königsmark and was extremely incompetent. According to his fellow officers, he did more harm to his own side than to the enemy: Locatelli 1691, p. 211; Laborde 1854, vol. 2, pp. 141-148.

still copied Wheler with respect to the well of Poseidon, saying that “alcuni Nazionali” maintain that the source of the water was much diminished, as well as repeating Wheler’s remarks about the Doric character to the Erechtheion’s capitals. On the other hand, he includes up-to-date information regarding the temple’s present use as a gunpowder magazine.¹⁵⁸ He also paraphrases Verneda regarding the huge beams that support the roof of the North Porch.¹⁵⁹

For all of Fanelli’s faults, he is the first to mention (although not depict in plan) two of the three windows in the West Façade, opposite the six columns of the East Façade, which he describes as “*di un solo pezzo*”. In relation to the windows, Fanelli also mentions “*gelosie di Marmo di un solo pezzo lavorate da scalpello arifitiosamente esquisito*” - possibly a reference to “*transennae*,” fragments of which Ross said were found near the Erechtheion.¹⁶⁰ He also is the first to describe the Maiden Porch as being attached or “*contiguo*” to the main building, although he gets its orientation wrong.

DE LA RUE

As did Spon and Wheler, Fanelli also admits, at the end of his account, the difficulty in trying to identify the locations of the cults of “Minerva Poliade” and the “Ninfa Pandrosa”; this is in spite of his assertion that there was universal agreement on the issue. De la Rue describes most of theories about the original organization and purpose of the building in his description¹⁶¹ (T 16): The main building housed the cult of “Minerva Poliados” according to some, or it was the palace of “Eristeo” [Erechtheus].

¹⁵⁸ Fanelli 1707, p. 321, information available on Verneda’s key (T 14).

¹⁵⁹ Verneda’s admiration of the ceiling beams and the fine carving of the North Door reveals that he had access to the interior of this strategic structure, not surprising since he was a key member of Morosini’s staff. De la Rue, a *bombista*, comments on these as well (T 16): see below “de la Rue.”

¹⁶⁰ Ross 1855, p. 125, note 6; Paton et al. 1927, p. 534, note 4. These appear to have been found in the 1837 excavations but I am unaware of their current whereabouts.

¹⁶¹ Duhn 1878, pp. 59-60.

And some say the North Porch was dedicated to Neptune while others want it to belong to Pandrosa. In other words, there was really *no* universal agreement. The only part of the building that de la Rue is certain about is the Maiden Porch. For him, these are the daughters of Erechtheus: Procris, Cerusa, Ectonia and Oritia; this is the first time that this theory appears in print.¹⁶² De la Rue does not appear to have consulted Pausanias directly. He is evidently getting his information from somewhere other than Spon and Wheler, and certainly from a source other than Verneda and Fanelli. De la Rue's account is completely devoid of any mention of the current use or state of the building, other than its lack of a roof over the main building; he is only interested in the ancient significance of the building as a pagan temple.

LOCATELLI

Locatelli's posthumous account (T 17) reflects an acquaintance with de la Rue's sources, albeit with even more creative spelling. He is the first to remark upon the amazing survival of this special building, considering what it had been through in the previous centuries: "non scorgendosi nel detto Castello quasi tutto distrutto da vicendevoli Dominii di varie Nationi altre rimarcabili antichità."¹⁶³ Unlike all the previous commentators, Locatelli finds the Maiden Porch the most remarkable feature of the Erechtheion, and begins, rather than ends, his description with an interpretation of its significance, agreeing in this regard with de la Rue. Furthermore, Locatelli is the first to mention the glass beads in the guilloche of the capitals of the North Porch (at least the

¹⁶² The usual spelling of these names of the daughters of Erechtheus is: Procris, Kreousa, Chthonia and Oreithuia: Gantz 1993, p. 242. These names come from Apollodoros, who marries them all off, leaving none of the named daughters to have been sacrificed to save Athens, as in Euripides' *Erechtheus*.

¹⁶³ Locatelli 1691, pp. 33-34.

first since the tenuous reference by the Vienna Anonymous [T 5]), which he mistakes for semi-precious lapis lazuli and carnelian.

CORONELLI

The final description by a Venetian of the Erechtheion to be discussed in this study is Vincenzo Coronelli's plan of the Akropolis (Figure 8).¹⁶⁴ Its usefulness is limited owing to some general inaccuracies. The Erechtheion is far too close to the Parthenon, and the North Porch has five columns across the front, one on the eastern return and two on the western return. The East Porch is more accurate, with six columns, but the East Wall has been restored (with a door) and the West Cross-Wall has been given four columns which are in false alignment with the east edges of the North and Maiden Porches. As in San Felice, Locatelli and de la Rue's plans, the North Porch is labeled "Tempio di Nettuno" and the Maiden Porch, following Verneda, Locatelli, and Fanelli, is labeled the "Tempio di Minerva Poliados." Interestingly, in his textual description of the city (T 18), Coronelli mentions first among its antiquities "the Temple of Victory of the *Ionick* Order; which the *Turks* make now their Magazin of Powder" but makes no mention of either of the temples labeled on his plan of the Erechtheion.¹⁶⁵ He appears to be using an old source of information from before the dismantlement of the Temple of Athena Nike, that is, before the Venetian siege, because the only gunpowder magazine on the Akropolis after 1687 is located in the North Porch of the Erechtheion, that in the Parthenon having been ignited.

¹⁶⁴ Coronelli, *Acropolis Cittadella d'Atene (Blackmer 409)*, 1687. Coronelli also made another plan: Coronelli, *Plan of Athens, dedicated to Girolamo Duodo*, 1687. It imitates Verneda, San Felice, and a lost third source. The small scale of Akropolis forces letters to be used for monuments on the Akropolis as opposed to labels as in the lower town. M is "Tempio di Ericeus": Paton et al. 1927, p. 603.

¹⁶⁵ Coronelli 1685, p. 199.

VENETIAN RECEPTION

Spon and Wheler had a profound influence on the Venetian interpretation of the building as many of the Venetian sources also considered the maidens to be Graces – Verneda and Fanelli even reduced their number on their plans of the Akropolis to three, the latter offering a lengthy mythological background for them. Although Fanelli states that there is a universal opinion that the Maiden Porch is the Temple of Minerva Polias and of the nymph Pandrosos, *bombista* de la Rue, on the other hand, disagreed. He confidently interprets the maidens of the South Porch as representing the *four* daughters of Erechtheus.

If the maidens had not already been immured when Spon and Wheler saw them¹⁶⁶ there were certainly walls between them in 1687 according to Verneda’s plan. In the original color version, which Paton et al. consulted in Venice, there are red lines between the columns of the North Porch (in spaces that were certainly filled in 1687) and between the three dots representing the maidens on the South Porch.¹⁶⁷ Despite the three maidens on both of Verneda and Fanelli’s plans, both mention in the keys that there are four statues of women. In Fanelli’s account, he glosses over the confusion caused by identifying the maidens with the Three Graces and the fact that four maidens were visible by noting simply that there are “*alcuni nicchi con Statue.*”

The question is: why were only three maidens depicted on these Venetian plans? Incidentally, only three columns are depicted along the front of the North Porch as well. At least five maidens were in place in 1687, Maiden #6 almost certainly having been

¹⁶⁶ See controversy about whether Spon and Wheler describe the Maiden Porch (above on p. 437).

¹⁶⁷ Paton et al. 1927, p. 602. On Verneda’s original colored plan in Venice, the columns of the North Porch are in gold.

destroyed in the recent siege.¹⁶⁸ If the maidens were immured, the rear pair (Maiden #1 at least) would have been almost invisible; in other words, only the lower four fifths of the statue, mainly drapery, would have been visible, and her form would, therefore, have been difficult to discern. Also, as there was a lean-to directly to the east of the Maiden Porch before the siege and probably (rebuilt) after, Maiden #6 would not have been visible. Fanelli describes the maidens as being in “alcuni” niches, so only a few maidens would have been visible. De la Rue, however, saw and accounted for all four visible maidens, calling them the daughters of Erechtheus.¹⁶⁹

Similarly, some of the North Porch columns were almost completely hidden by the intercolumnar wall in several depictions, and only suggestions of the capitals are visible. The effectiveness with which the North Porch was walled in may have led to the incorrect number of columns in the North Porch being depicted among the Venetian plans.

The Venetian sources never refer to or depict the accretions on the Erechtheion. Their presence is discernible, however, because they impede an overall understanding of the structure. For the Venetians, the Erechtheion was not a single temple at all, but a series of separate, physically-detached units.

THE 18TH CENTURY AND THE FIRST ARTISTS TO DRAW THE ERECHTHEION

Many travelers continued to avoid Athens owing to the hazardous and uncomfortable conditions of the roadways of Greece in the 18th century. Plague, brigands, bad roads, and uncomfortable accommodations all contributed to the adverse

¹⁶⁸ See below “Damage Due to the Siege of 1687.”

¹⁶⁹ de la Rue 1878, p. 60; Locatelli 1691 (T 17).

reputation that resulted in none but the most enthusiastic and persevering traveler visiting Athens.

POTTER

At the end of the 17th century, Athens lay practically deserted. It was at this time that John Potter, Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury, made his way there in 1697. His description of the Erechtheion imitates Wheler's account closely, but adds some new information (T 19). He was evidently a man learned in classical scholarship because he introduces evidence not contained in Pausanias: e.g., Athena's owl placed before her olive wood statue and the "ὄικχοι ὄφεις" (which he translates as "Dragons") in Athena's temple. Furthermore, he introduces for the first time information drawn from the scholiast to Aristophanes' *Plutus*, with regards to the *Opisthodomos* as the "publick Treasury."¹⁷⁰ This scholiast was, however, writing less than a century before Potter, and could not have been any better informed about the actual topography of the Akropolis than previous travelers.¹⁷¹ As a classical scholar, Potter was more interested in how the ancient temple had functioned rather than in the details or state of the building.

M. FOURMONT AND C.-L. FOURMONT

Over thirty years passed before other travelers, this time an uncle and nephew, left a record of the Erechtheion. Their documentation is important because they illustrate the

¹⁷⁰ See Chapters I, II, and IV on the *Opisthodomos* as a separate building, almost certainly the surviving western chambers of the Archaic Temple of Athena.

¹⁷¹ This scholiast on Aristophanes' *Plutus* was Petrus Victorius, a 16th century scholar, who owned a copy of the first printed edition of *Plutus* and several other collected books including Hesychius. The late date of this source suggests strongly that it must not be trusted. I am grateful to Holt Parker for showing me how to investigate the origins and date of such scholiasts. This evidence is almost always cited in modern discussions concerning the *Opisthodomos*, but should henceforth be discredited.

Erechtheion for the first time.¹⁷² Michel Fourmont was on a literary mission to consult the libraries in the Ottoman Empire in 1727. He and young Claude-Louis Fourmont, his nephew, came to Athens in 1729 with a *firman* from the Sultan to collect inscriptions. They were well-received by the Ottomans (i.e., they were given free access to the Akropolis after giving the *dizdar* a present of coffee and pepper, and paying the captain of the guard), and were shown inscriptions as they surfaced when the Ottomans were hunting for building materials. Nonetheless, it is evident that neither Fourmont spent a great deal of time on the Akropolis. Their writings include brief notices on the monuments of Athens, but none on the Akropolis, and only three inscriptions were recorded as having come from the Akropolis. Perhaps most revealing is that four pages were left blank in C.-L. Fourmont's notebook for his observations on the Akropolis and were never filled.¹⁷³

Nonetheless, a series of almost identical drawings of the Erechtheion are preserved in the Bibliothèque nationale de France (Figure 9 and Figure 10).¹⁷⁴ All are equally unsuccessful. M. Fourmont was obviously enamored with the temple: “Ce temple est de la dernière elegance. Le pronaon [sic] est soutenu par cinq figures qui sont de la dernière beauté” (T 20).

The process of making this first depiction of the Erechtheion can be followed by examining the preparatory sketches. Their *modus operandi* appears to have been as follows: to make sketches on the spot for the final product; to take their notes and

¹⁷² That is, on its own, in relative isolation from the other monuments on the Akropolis, and as the main feature of the composition.

¹⁷³ Bibliothèque nationale de France, Nouv. acq. fr. 1892, fols. 142, 143. There is no mention of the Erechtheion in Fourmont, *Voyage fait en Grèce par les ordres du Roy en mil sept cent vingt neuf*.

¹⁷⁴ Fourmont, *Temple d'Erechthée à Athènes*, 1729; Fourmont, *The Erechtheum*, 1729; Fourmont, *The Erechtheum*, 1729; and Fourmont, *The Erechtheum*, 1729.

sketches back to France; and then, to produce a finished drawing and neat copies.¹⁷⁵ One such sketch shows the Erechtheion from the southwest, with Maidens #1-#4 all facing south (Figure 11).¹⁷⁶ The four columns of the West Façade are clearly delineated, as is the Westward Projection of the North Porch. The lower parts of the Westward Projection and WW.C1-C2 are not depicted owing to an accretion in the angle of the building not illustrated until 1751 by Stuart (Figure 15). M. Fourmont also tried to make a measured drawing, but this too was unsuccessful.¹⁷⁷ Despite their enthusiasm, their memories failed them, and their notes were not sufficient to create an accurate depiction of the Erechtheion. The temple's unconventional shape was too much for their artistic talent.

M. Fourmont's original (final) drawing of the Erechtheion from 1729 is terribly damaged, but is rendered in a fine hand (Figure 9).¹⁷⁸ C.-L. Fourmont was the draftsman of the expedition and he made several, rather clumsier (but better preserved), attempts at copying his uncle's drawing (Figure 10).¹⁷⁹ At the right, Maidens #1-#5 are depicted unencumbered by any masonry between them, and standing on a simple pedestal of small ashlar blocks without moldings. Maiden #1 faces outward, toward the left, as she does in Pococke's reconstruction of the Erechtheion a decade later (see below, Figure 12), despite having been depicted correctly in the preparatory sketch (Figure 11).¹⁸⁰ Adjacent and to the left of the Maiden Porch is a hexastyle Ionic façade with wavy lines in a reserved necking band below the capitals. To the left of this is one column on the return. The intercolumniations are filled in with ashlar blocks. This depiction appears to be a

¹⁷⁵ Paton et al. 1927, p. 605.

¹⁷⁶ Fourmont, *Sketches for the drawing of the Erechtheion*, 1729.

¹⁷⁷ Fourmont, *Temple d'Erechthée à Athènes*, 1729. There is also a detailed sketch of the moldings of the entablature of the West Façade in pencil.

¹⁷⁸ Fourmont, *The Erechtheum*, 1729.

¹⁷⁹ Fourmont, *The Erechtheum*, 1729.

¹⁸⁰ Fourmont, *Sketches for the drawing of the Erechtheion*, 1729; and Pococke, *The Temple of Erectheus at Athens, restored*, 1745.

conflation of the East and North Porches. Dozens of architectural blocks and statue bases litter the foreground of the composition. This document is obviously of limited usefulness for understanding the state of the temple in the early 18th century. Its importance is that it is the first illustration of the Erechtheion, and the problems encountered by the artists illuminate the difficult process of creating a final drawing of this complicated building from on-site sketches.

LORD SANDWICH

In 1738, Lord Sandwich (John Montagu, Earl of Sandwich) was one of the first young travelers on the Grand Tour to break away from the usual itinerary and venture as far as Greece. His observations were published posthumously in 1799.¹⁸¹ He traveled with a party including his tutor, friends such as William Ponsonby, the future Earl of Bessborough, and the artist, J.-E. Liotard. Liotard was to “draw the dresses of every country they should go into; to take prospects of all the remarkable places which had made a figure in history; and to preserve in their memories, by the help of painting, those noble remains of antiquity which they went in quest of.”¹⁸² Although he is more famous for his gambling, a habit which apparently led to the invention of the “sandwich” to nourish him during long hours at the gaming table,¹⁸³ his is the first long narrative on the Erechtheion during which he introduces several new pieces of ancient evidence. His descriptions betray a classical education, begun at Eton and continued at Cambridge, although he left university without a degree. Paton et al. suggest that his “journal” was

¹⁸¹ Montagu 1799.

¹⁸² Montagu 1799, p. iii. None of Liotard’s depictions of monuments survive: Paton et al. 1927, p. 606, note 1.

¹⁸³ Rodger 1994.

probably more the work of his tutor than himself.¹⁸⁴ His description (T 21) is very detailed and methodical, but cadenced with the lilt of first hand observation and candid comparisons to other ancient monuments he encountered on his tour. It is helpful to note that, although his description was published sixty years after his travels, it does not reveal any familiarity with the works of Le Roy or Stuart and Revett, which were published and proved highly influential in the interval. Instead, his description reads like a transcription of notes made as a young man.

At the outset, Lord Sandwich identified the temple by recourse to Pausanias' account. The entrance to the main temple of Minerva Polias, from his perspective, was the West Façade. He is perplexed by the windows "unusual among the ancient temples,"¹⁸⁵ and the walls built between the columns. He comments that the walls of the main building are "standing entire," wanting only a roof. He is impressed by the workmanship, "the nicest I ever saw; the flutings of the pillars, the volutes, the cornices, and all the other ornaments, being as neatly finished as if they were done in ivory."¹⁸⁶ Sandwich runs into problems when trying to describe the North Porch: "On the north side of this is the small temple of the nymph Pandrosa, joined to it on one side, and on the three others adorned with ten columns of the same order and proportions."¹⁸⁷ On the other hand, he reports clearly, for the first time, that the Maiden Porch has five maidens, "the sixth being wanting."

Lord Sandwich, probably inadvertently, revives de la Rue's earlier hypothesis that the North Porch should be associated with Pandrosos. Later, the general consensus

¹⁸⁴ Paton et al. 1927, p. 606.

¹⁸⁵ Montagu 1799, pp. 64-66.

¹⁸⁶ Montagu 1799, pp. 64-66.

¹⁸⁷ Locatelli makes a similar conflation of the columnar façades: Locatelli 1691, pp. 33-34 (T 17).

among the travelers will be that Pandrosos' cult resided in the Maiden Porch. Instead, Sandwich suggests that the Maiden Porch functioned as the home of the *kanephoroi*, “bearers of baskets,” whose annual ritual he describes in full.¹⁸⁸

POCOCKE

Two years after Lord Sandwich's visit, Oxford-educated cleric Richard Pococke (1704-1765) visited Athens in 1740, and published the first restoration of the Erechtheion (Figure 12), accompanied by a detailed description of the temple in its current state (T 22).¹⁸⁹ For Pococke, half of Pausanias' double temple was missing: this was a logical explanation for the asymmetrical state of the building. His hypothesis is a harbinger of expectations that there should have been a symmetrical original plan, a notion postulated by several scholars in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.¹⁹⁰ Pococke is the first to recognize the special qualities of the Erechtheion's Ionic order, namely, “a very beautiful Ionic order fluted within eight inches of the capital, which space is carved with bass reliefs of flowers,” and the egg-and-dart pattern on the echinus of the maidens. He also notices the horizontal fluting on the column bases. The only column bases visible in 1740 were probably those of the West and East Façade: the ground level, less than a decade later, covered the bases of the columns of the North Porch.¹⁹¹

Pococke specifically mentions the krepidoma of the East Porch. He also describes the stubs of the East Wall and draws them on the plan he provides alongside his

¹⁸⁸ Paton et al. refer to Sandwich's *kanephoroi* as *arrhephoroi*: Paton et al. 1927, pp. 537, 606, despite the accurate transcription of his publication: pp. 588-589.

¹⁸⁹ Pococke, *The Temple of Erectheus at Athens, restored*, 1745; Pococke 1745, vol.2, part 2, pp. 163-164. A letter to his mother pinpoints the date of his visit to the Akropolis to October 11 and 12, 1740, British Museum, MSS, Add. 22.998, fol. 192, letter XLVIII. This is now in the British Library.

¹⁹⁰ On the original plan of the Erechtheion, see Chapter II.

¹⁹¹ As seen in Dalton, *Le Temple d'Eretheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast*, 1749; and Dalton, *Le Temple d'Eretheus a Athènes: View from the West*, 1749.

restoration. Indeed, he is the first to depict the cross-walls of the interior relatively accurately, now a possibility since the eviction of the household that lived in the Erechtheion before the Venetian siege. Furthermore, his plan, the first of its kind (measured and relatively accurate), shows the North Door, a feature that does not appear on any of the Venetian plans.

Pococke's attention to detail is ground-breaking, and demonstrates his background as a scholar. On the one hand, his appreciation of the maidens anticipates Winckelmann's aesthetics by fifteen years;¹⁹² on the other, he mentions that the door in the South Wall to the Maiden Porch is "now almost buried under ground,"¹⁹³ showing his understanding that the actual Erechtheion is an integrated whole. In his belief that half of the ancient temple was missing at the west, he postulated that there may have been six more maidens on the other half, and so, in total, these may be the nine Muses and the three Graces. At the end of his account of the Erechtheion, Pococke returns to Pausanias and makes a brief reference to the well that is supposed to have been in the temple. In sum, Pococke's description of the Erechtheion is succinct and insightful, and curiously clear – and would stand up well against many other modern descriptions of this most complicated of structures.

Pococke is proficient in recognizing what is ancient and what is Post-Antique. His restoration removes the walls between the columns of the North Porch and between the maidens. As in the Fourmont drawings, Pococke turns Maiden #1 outward to face west. Pococke does not restore Maiden #6, which has been missing since 1687, although he notes it should be there in his text. The absence of Maiden #6 may go some way to

¹⁹² See below "Barthélemy and Winckelmann."

¹⁹³ The east door to the Maiden Porch was not acknowledged until late in the 18th century with Fauvel and Lusieri's successive "discoveries" (see below "Choiseul-Gouffier, Cassas and Fauvel").

explain his westward orientation of Maiden #1. In spite of his evident powers of observation, he ignores the window in the second intercolumniation from the south on the West Façade, and depicts walls in three of the five intercolumniations. Pococke overemphasized the West Door and places it farther north than it should be. The passageway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion is not delineated at all because it was blocked, as will be seen in the first of the depictions of the Erechtheion with all its accretions by Stuart in 1751 (Figure 15).¹⁹⁴ Lastly, Pococke does not presume to restore the pediments over the West Façade and North Porch.

PERRY

In contrast to Pococke's independent and erudite analysis is Charles Perry's nearly contemporaneous account (T 23).¹⁹⁵ He has "conductors" as his guides, but makes major mistakes in the descriptions of the monuments he saw, more from carelessness and forgetfulness than because he received incorrect information his guides. than from misinformation received from his guides. For example, there is no way of adding up the columns to get a total count of 14, unless he failed to notice two columns on the return of the North Porch; these, however, never appear to have been fully obscured. Perry appears to have consulted Wheler after his visit since he includes curious details that seem to be drawn from it: e.g., the supposed mix of the Doric and Ionic orders and the presence of only three maidens.

¹⁹⁴ Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751.

¹⁹⁵ Perry 1743, p. 504.

LORD CHARLEMONT AND DALTON

An Irish Lord Charlemont (James Caulfeild, fourth Viscount Charlemont) began his Grand Tour at the tender age of eighteen and met Richard Dalton in Catania, Sicily, in 1749. Dalton agreed to become Charlemont's draftsman to record the sights he saw on his travels, but the two men eventually had a falling out before the end of the voyage (as had Charlemont with Piranesi previously in Rome). As a result, Dalton published his pictures of the Erechtheion independently in 1752.¹⁹⁶

Charlemont's account of his travels was published only twenty years ago, and is based on his manuscript preserved in the Royal Irish Academy (T 24).¹⁹⁷ Unfortunately, the entire text was not reproduced and the editors omitted the section where Lord Charlemont may have mentioned the Erechtheion. The only published reference is not even in the within the section on the Akropolis: "Encompassed as I [was]...by the venerable ruins of the most illustrious of all cities – the awful antiquity of the Temple of Theseus, the massive magnificence and towering majesty of the Parthenon, and the other wonders of the Acropolis, the ornamented purity, and graceful elegance of the Fane of Erectheus, the rich and elegant singularity of the Choragic Monument,...."¹⁹⁸ He was evidently deeply impressed by these monuments. Waxing poetically, he continued: "with such objects in my view, and with a mind overflowing with the reflection of ages long since past, and of events through all succeeding generations consecrated to fame, - the business of the former world! – how is it possible that I should refrain? Without further

¹⁹⁶ Dalton 1752.

¹⁹⁷ Stanford and Finopoulos 1984.

¹⁹⁸ Stanford and Finopoulos 1984, p. 108.

apology then let me proceed....” But the editors do not allow him the liberty of proceeding.¹⁹⁹

Charlemont and Dalton reached Piraeos November 23, 1749, and report having trouble getting permission to use measuring equipment on the Parthenon. The *dizdar* was right to be apprehensive since Charlemont tried to separate some of the blocks of the Parthenon to figure out how they were joined so perfectly together.²⁰⁰

Dalton created a set of the first draftsmanly drawings of the Erechtheion, which are dated April 12, 1749 (Figure 13 and Figure 14).²⁰¹ They are not aesthetically pleasing, but they seem to match his attitude. According to Hardy, “It has been stated to me, that as an artist he was miserable, but exact and faithful.”²⁰² On the one hand, they show the state of the building itself clearly for the first time, but on the other hand, Dalton has omitted the accretions and surrounding structures, isolating the Erechtheion in a blank landscape. The accretions on the South Wall that are depicted for the first time by Fauvel in plan in 1789 and by Gell in perspective in 1800 are noticeably absent. A closer examination of the image reveals that below course 5, Dalton ceases to indicate the cracks in damaged ashlar wall blocks. Furthermore he neglects to depict the orthostates of course 12(-13). These are both indicators that his view of these parts of the building was obscured. No information about the state of the main building is lost, however, because the walls were still standing to their full height at this time. The ground levels seem otherwise accurately depicted and Dalton has not indulged in any obvious restoration.

¹⁹⁹ Stanford and Finopoulos 1984, p. 108.

²⁰⁰ Stanford and Finopoulos 1984, p. 130.

²⁰¹ Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast*, 1749; and Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the West*, 1749.

²⁰² Hardy 1812, vol. 1, p. 20.

Dalton's west and southeast views of the Erechtheion serve as a benchmark for the state of preservation the building (as the first almost 360 degree record) and so will be described in some detail here, starting with the East Façade (Figure 13).²⁰³ Please refer to the model of the Erechtheion for 1749 for a visual summary of the following information (Figure 578). The horizontal cornice is preserved from the south to a point over EE.C4 (EE.BB.01-05) with some note made of damage to the northernmost cornice block (the raking cornice at the southeast corner now on the Erechtheion is not drawn).²⁰⁴ The entire frieze is present, as is the rest of the East Façade below this level. The ground line is half way up drum 5 of the columns (i.e., the lower part of course 12 of the walls) and rises toward the North. The drums themselves are not delineated and so the columns look monolithic. The east wall is absent; the ragged stubs are shown protruding northward from the south anta, as they do at present (2004).

On the South Wall, the cornice block of the East Façade wraps around the corner; its western end is damaged, as is the next and only other horizontal cornice block in this wall, SS.CC.01-02. Frieze blocks SS.BB.01-02 are depicted with a line separating them (not visible in most reproductions of this image). Below this, the long SS.AA.01 is the only extant fascia block on this wall. The anthemion patterned epikranitis course is partly extant. SS.01.02-07 are missing as are SS.01.12-13. The rest of the South Wall is standing except for SS.02.03,²⁰⁵ and, as mentioned above, damage is only depicted on the upper courses of the wall because the lower wall was obscured by later (omitted)

²⁰³ Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast*, 1749. If a block is illustrated, it is assumed to be present on the building at the time of the depiction's execution unless there are reasons, which will be explicitly stated, to believe otherwise.

²⁰⁴ This fragment of the raking cornice had already fallen off the building in Dalton's time, but was found and replaced by Balanos.

²⁰⁵ Paton et al. suggest that Dalton enlarged this gap to show the top of WW.C4: Paton et al. 1927, p. 539. Compare Fauvel, *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*, Undated (ca. 1789).

structures. The ground level rises from course 12 at the East Façade to course 11 near the east side of the Maiden Porch and falls again toward the west end of the Maiden Porch. The podium of the Maiden Porch is filled in, Maiden #6 is missing, as is the shaft of the east pilaster, ME.PE.02, both having been hit by a Ottoman cannon in 1687 that was firing from the East. The top of the podium does not extend behind Maiden #5, indicating that ME.03.02 is also absent.²⁰⁶ The roof of the Maiden Porch has grass growing on top of it and the correct number of discs (nine) is depicted on its eastern architrave.

The North Wall peeks through the East colonnade. The visible part (a zone about two fifths of the North Wall) is illustrated as being fully extant from course 12 to course 2, while NN.01.17 of course 1 completes the northeast anta. This is surmounted by one fascia block, NN.AA.01. The inside of the building is filled up (with rubbish according to later accounts) even higher than the stylobate of the east colonnade, and several large architectural blocks, probably belonging to the top of the North Wall, are scattered about. Paton et al. suggest that the fully extant North Wall may have been restored by Dalton in order to hide the unsightly remains of the North Addition,²⁰⁷ however, Dalton was quite content to omit accretions and happily “restored” sky and clouds to areas where fortification walls and other surrounding structures would have appeared. By the same token, the authors of *The Erechtheum* admit that Lord Sandwich did describe the walls in 1740 as fully extant in words (T 21) and we have no grounds on which to discount his account.

²⁰⁶ The damage to the top half of ME.04.02, as indicated by its replacement by Alexis Paccard, had probably also occurred by this time, most likely in conjunction with destruction of Maiden #6. This area was built into a wall (omitted by Dalton), which supported the roof in the absence of Maiden #6.

²⁰⁷ Paton et al. 1927, p. 539.

Although some elements of the West Façade are visible in the southeast view, more information can be gleaned from the West elevation (Figure 14).²⁰⁸ The west view is an accurate rendition of the Maiden Porch, with nine discs on the fascia and Maiden #1 correctly oriented southwards, in contrast to Fourmont and Pococke's illustrations (Figure 9 and Figure 12). The blocks of the podium show accurately rendered cracks.²⁰⁹ The Maiden Porch appears to be empty, and the coffers are rendered. The maidens had lost most of their arms by this point and appear to be accurately depicted.

Dalton's representation of the entablature of the West Façade is crucial for critiquing the current reconstruction of the Erechtheion. In 1749, starting with the entablature, WW.CC.01-03 were in situ but without delineation of the blocks. On the other hand, WW.BB.01-03 are illustrated including the lines between the blocks. The northernmost frieze block is damaged at its north end, and extends only to the middle of the northernmost intercolumniation. The next two blocks are much longer; the first extending to WW.C2, the next to the intercolumniation between WW.C3 and C4. Dalton's west view shows a very different state of affairs from the current reconstruction which includes reused statue bases.²¹⁰ The whole fascia course, WW.AA is present, and lacks only the southern half of WW.AP.02.

The colonnade is fully extant, complete with three windows enclosed by damaged ashlar blocks in their correct pattern. The window frames also show signs of damage. The filling-in of the northernmost intercolumniation is slightly inaccurate because it

²⁰⁸ Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the West*, 1749. Paton et al. point out a minor discrepancy in the depiction of the moldings of the architrave block in the southwest corner: Paton et al. 1927, p. 539.

²⁰⁹ The damage depicted by Dalton matches the pattern of the blocks' repair.

²¹⁰ See discussion in Chapter III about the repair and modern reconstruction of the West Façade. Papanikolaou did not alter Balanos' reconstruction of the West Façade.

omits the narrow course (block WP.06.04) clearly depicted by Inwood and Gell.²¹¹ The southern intercolumniation is empty except for two blocks, WP.09.01-02. While Dalton depicted the damage to the north and south sides of the anta carefully, he omits the prominent lifting bosses on the west face of the anta.

The lower West Wall is also less than perfectly depicted. The large lintel over the West Door is rendered as consisting of relatively regular ashlar blocks. Some restoration was necessary on Dalton's part owing to his omission of the mound of masonry south of the Westward Projection of the North Porch, a feature which is first visible in Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751. As a result, he omits the door to the Pandroseion.

Dalton depicts the North Porch for the first time. Its intercolumniations of the colonnade are filled in, but Dalton seems to have deliberately left the flutes of the columns exposed when they probably were not, as seen in several later depictions such as Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751 (Figure 15). Dalton appears to have been attempting to show more of the columns than were actually visible, by using information extrapolated from the North Façade of the North Porch.²¹²

The horizontal cornice, frieze and fascia courses of the North Porch are all in place. Dalton pays attention to the details of the columns: he makes a good attempt at a guilloche pattern on the upper cushion of the capitals though the volutes themselves are

²¹¹ Paton et al. note that Balanos' restoration was based on Inwood's elevation despite the lack of physical evidence for that narrow course: Paton et al. 1927, p. 69. WP.07.07-08 and WP.05.11-12 are of equal and "normal" size for their placement in the wall. In any case, narrow block WP.06.04, was probably reused in some other building as a threshold or lintel owing to its appropriate shape and size. Paton et al. criticize Inwood's evidence and Balanos' reconstruction, and are apparently unaware that this narrow block appears in at least one other painting, namely Gell, *Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 32). For the importance of this narrow course, see Chapter III.

²¹² In contrast, Gell's drawings illustrate the actual degree of obscurity of the column shafts: his view from the west (Figure 35) shows the column drums completely concealed in by the intercolumnar wall, while from the north (Figure 36), the column shafts are visible.

mildly crooked. His anthemion pattern for the anta is convincing. Also accurate is his depiction of the upper south face of the Westward Projection of the North Porch, with the narrow back of the fascia block and the large squarish back ends of the first beam and interbeam. Paton et al. complain that the tympanum of the North Porch is not rendered as it is in slightly later depictions;²¹³ however, from the artist's perspective on the ground, the tympanum would have been invisible.

The ground line covers half of the podium blocks of the Maiden Porch and descends toward the north, concealing the terrace wall of the Old Temple of Athena. The first course and a half of the West Door are visible. The North Porch is buried up to the top of NN.C1-C2.07. Last, but not least, two courses of frieze backers on the East Porch entablature appear to be in place below the cornice.

Dalton also produced a detailed study of one corner of the Maiden Porch.²¹⁴ It appears to be a depiction of the west corner; however, the maiden behind the anterior one and the pilaster below the capital were both missing, as is the case for the east side of the porch, and not the west, at this point in time. It appears that the engraver took a short cut and did not bother to convert the drawing to its reverse before creating the engraving.

STUART AND REVETT

James Stuart (1713-1788) and Nicholas Revett (1720-1804), intrepid architect-travelers, probably had the most profound impact on the dissemination of motifs based on the Erechtheion throughout Western Europe. Their mission from the Society of Dilettanti

²¹³ Le Roy, *Vüe du Temple d'Erechthée à Athenes*, 1755; and Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765. These paintings show three blocks composing the one central block of the tympanum. Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800, is the most faithful.

²¹⁴ Dalton, *One End of the Building Contiguous to the Temple of Erectheus*, 1749.

was historic: to travel, record, measure and draw the monuments of Greece.²¹⁵ Their four volume work *The Antiquities of Athens*, published between 1762 and 1816, was a “must-have” for every architect in Europe in the later 18th and 19th centuries, and is always to be found among his library holdings.²¹⁶ It is not possible to underestimate the importance and power of Stuart and Revett’s sketches of the moldings of the Erechtheion, nor can the assertion that these pages represent the first real mode of transmission of High Classical Greek moldings and design to Western Europe be overstated.²¹⁷

The first volume of *The Antiquities of Athens* concerned the monuments of the lower town; the second volume, those on the Akropolis. Stuart’s description (T 25) and depiction of the Erechtheion,²¹⁸ especially the plates based on Stuart’s *Sketching the Erechtheion* (Figure 15) and Pars’ indispensable 1765 view from the northeast (Figure 22), are ground-breaking for their inclusion of the Post-Antique accretions.²¹⁹ Though Stuart and Revett were the first to set out on this type of mission, they were not the first to publish. Stuart’s sudden death in 1788 delayed the publication of Volume II, and so they were beaten to the press by Le Roy (see below) who traveled to Athens a few years after them in 1755.²²⁰

²¹⁵ The Society of Dilettanti was founded in about 1732 as a social club for wealthy young aristocrats to celebrate “Grecian taste and Roman spirit”: St. Clair 1997, p. 170. Its interest and expertise in antiquity derived from its members’ travels to Italy as part of the Grand Tour and their purchase of ancient artifacts, mostly sculpture and vases. On the history of the Society of Dilettanti, see Cust and Colvin 1898.

²¹⁶ Stuart and Revett 1762-1816. Several editions of *The Antiquities of Athens* were published, in the 19th century: Kinnard 1825; Stuart and Revett 1898.

²¹⁷ Le Roy’s earlier but less accurate publication is the other main mode of transmission in the 18th century: see below “Le Roy.”

²¹⁸ Stuart appears to have written the text, Paton et al. 1927, p. 607.

²¹⁹ Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751; Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765.

²²⁰ Watkin 1982. Stuart and Revett parted company after the publication of the first volume. The plates for the Erechtheion were engraved in 1787. Stuart died in 1788, after which time William Newton took over the task. The section on the Erechtheion was published in 1789 in Volume II of the series: Stuart and Revett 1789.

For the first time, a traveler’s description resembles an original, scholarly description of the temple, rather than simply a translation of Pausanias. Stuart and Revett’s interpretation of the Erechtheion incorporates evidence gathered from Herodotus, Apollodoros, a scholiast to Demosthenes, Hesychios, Dionysios of Halicarnassos, Homer, and Vitruvius, as well as various inscriptions.²²¹ Furthermore, Stuart and Revett seem to have done some minor excavation of their own, and report finding the throne of the Priest of the Boutes near the Erechtheion. Not only do they illustrate their discovery, they also mention and illustrate the terrace wall of the Archaic Temple of Athena in the notes to their plan of the Erechtheion.²²² They also indicate the dowels in the frieze in the reconstruction of the East elevation even though there is no indication in the text that they understand their function.²²³ And, believing the South Porch to be the Pandroseion, they, following Chandler, make the charming suggestion that the “crooked” olive tree of Athena grew within it, an idea that would catch the imagination of many subsequent travelers.²²⁴

Stuart is duly perplexed that Pausanias neglected to mention the maidens of the South Porch: “Pausanias has not mentioned them, though they are certainly more ancient than the time in which he wrote.”²²⁵ Stuart is also the first to conflate explicitly the Erechtheion maidens and Vitruvius’ term “caryatid” derived from the introductory

²²¹ The information about Athens being called “Cecropia” before the battle between Athena and Poseidon is cited by many of the earliest travelers (e.g., Babin 1674) and probably reflects a familiarity with Apollodoros: Simpson 1976, p. 1.

²²² Stuart and Revett 1789, vol. 2, Ch. 2; Kinnard 1825, p. 71, pl. 20.

²²³ Stuart and Revett 1789, vol. 2, Ch 2, Kinnard 1825, pl. 21.

²²⁴ See below “Chandler and Pars.”

²²⁵ Stuart and Revett 1789, vol. 2, p. 17. Stuart appears to be following Le Roy’s cue on this issue; his words are an almost direct translation of the Frenchman’s text.

passage of *De Architectura*.²²⁶ Stuart also provides a frontal and profile view of one of the maidens, either Maiden #4 or #5 (Figure 16), which is an improvement on both Dalton and Le Roy's attempts.

Between Stuart and Revett's visit and their publication, Chandler – who traveled with Revett and Pars in 1765-1766 – had acquired and published the stele (see account of this acquisition below, T 29) with the Erechtheion building accounts.²²⁷ A short analysis of this inscription was incorporated into Stuart and Revett's text, in which they express their frustration with the unique architectural terminology in it. They found the text difficult to reconcile with their own identification of the Pandroseion and the Kekropeion. This tendency to try to establish a one-to-one relationship between the terms from Pausanias (and other literary sources) and the visible extant structures is a forgivable mistake, and one made by many subsequent travelers.²²⁸ Furthermore, Stuart attributes the Erechtheion to the Periklean building program, despite its conspicuous absence from Plutarch's account, a text that would have been accessible to Classical scholars of this period, even though Stuart does not mention it explicitly. Finally, Stuart helpfully gives equivalencies for the value of the *mina* for an intended general audience unfamiliar with ancient monetary denominations.

Stuart and Revett were the first to describe carefully the subdivisions within the Erechtheion and to assign cults to its various sections. They describe the temple as being in “a very ruinous condition” and interpret the stubs protruding from the North and South

²²⁶ Although Magni called the Erechtheion maidens “Cariatid” in 1674, he did not cite Vitruvius as the source of this information. See Chapter IV on the conflation of the term “caryatid” and the Erechtheion maidens in the Roman period. See below “‘Caryatid’ and the Renaissance.”

²²⁷ Chandler 1774, no. 1.

²²⁸ For example, because the Pandroseion west of the Erechtheion and mentioned by Pausanias and the Chandler Stele was not visible, travelers correlated the term with the parts of the temple instead.

Walls as the dividing walls of the temple, although of the walls themselves, “hardly any traces of them remain.” The east chamber is assigned to Erechtheus, the west chamber and the North Porch to Minerva, and the South Porch to Pandrosos. As depicted in Dalton’s southeast view, “the pavements are so encumbered with large blocks of marble and variety of rubbish, as to render the inside almost impassable,” and “is filled up to a great height in the same manner.”²²⁹ As foreigners, they were unable to enter the “walled-up” North Porch which was still serving as “a magazine of military stores.”²³⁰

The depiction of the actual state of the temple demonstrates Stuart and Revett’s priorities. Unlike Dalton’s depictions, Stuart and Pars embrace the accretions on the Erechtheion and depict them in detail; therefore, their renditions represent the first illustrations of the Erechtheion in its actual state. On the one hand, the accretions are shown and the moldings and proportions are meticulously measured and rendered in a series of plates; on the other hand, there are careless errors in depicting how the building was actually put together, such as how the wall blocks relate to the South Porch and the North Porch.²³¹

The features Stuart and Revett failed to indicate in their restored elevations represent what they considered to be Post-Antique. For example, although they restored Maiden #6 in the east elevation (pl. 21), they did not recognize the east entrance to the Maiden Porch, which at the time was filled in, nor the northern part of the podium as damaged. They also omit the door in the West Façade.²³² The ruinous state of the

²²⁹ Stuart and Revett 1789, vol. 2, p. 18.

²³⁰ Stuart and Revett 1789, vol. 2, p. 18.

²³¹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 607.

²³² Stuart deletes this door in his painting of the Erechtheion from the southwest as well: Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751 (Figure 15). The ground level as depicted in this painting would have obscured it.

building likely also resulted in their overlooking the anthemion on the top of the East Wall.

From Stuart's 1751 depiction, what new information can be gleaned about the actual state of the Erechtheion?²³³ Stuart includes a helpful explanation of his painting which describes the colorful and important figures in the foreground. These figures include the *dizdar* and his son-in-law, who frequently visited them to check that they were not stealing anything (T 25). The *dizdar*'s agents perch on the podium of the Maiden Porch, and oversee the three workmen hired by Stuart and Revett to excavate it. The *dizdar*'s grand-daughter is shown with her fattened lamb. The contemporary figures in the painting helps to remind us that these ancient monuments were the backdrop to the daily the lives of the inhabitants on the Akropolis.²³⁴ Lastly, Stuart includes himself as the artist in the painting, a common motif in this period.²³⁵ This self-reference underscores the historicity of the painting, i.e., that this is the Erechtheion, here and now in 1751, with all its accretions and personalities surrounding it.

Despite the historicity implied by the composition, Stuart indulged in some reconstruction of the West Façade at the level of the frieze and the cornice. He extrapolated both of them further to the south (and without delineation of the blocks) than Dalton's more accurate rendition of 1749.

In contrast, although Dalton depicted the intercolumniations of the North Porch as being filled in, he omitted the masonry accretion in the angle of the Westward Projection

²³³ *The Antiquities of Athens* reproduced Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751 as an engraving. The original watercolor is now in the Royal Institute of British Architects. An engraved version of Pars 1765 watercolor also illustrates Stuart and Revett's text: Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765. For the analysis of Pars' painting, see below "Chandler and Pars."

²³⁴ For the Ottoman attitude toward ancient monuments, see Shaw 2003.

²³⁵ See, for example, the 17th century painting, *Las Meninas*, by Diego Velázquez.

of the North Porch. Stuart represents this mass of masonry for the first time. It is buttressed on its west and south sides, and rises to a level just above the base of WW.C1. It has a flat top that slopes slightly downward from north to south.²³⁶ According to Woods (T 58), Laurent (T 59), and Inwood (T 61), it served as the point of access to the gunpowder magazine in the North Porch, and had to be dismantled and bricked-up every time ammunitions were added or removed. Stuart also depicts the stub of the raking cornice on the south side of the North Porch (part of the same block as PW.CC.01). This feature is unique to this painting (and exaggerated in the engraved version), and is present on the building today.

The South Wall, almost totally obscured owing to the perspective of the painting, is visible between the maidens, and appears to be fully extant, that is, to the same degree as depicted in 1749 by Dalton. And like Dalton, Stuart seems to have omitted the South Building (visible in Figure 32, Figure 37, and Figure 38) that would have blocked the South Wall.²³⁷

Stuart also provides the first glimpse at the surroundings of the Erechtheion, including the Akropolis wall topped with parapets. A stairway is shown to the northwest of the North Porch and a wall due south of the Erechtheion. The structure northwest of the Erechtheion must be the gun emplacement with eight guns, as seen in Le Roy's 1755 plan of the Akropolis (Figure 18). To the east, beyond the Erechtheion and the horseback rider, Stuart depicts a two-story house behind a low wall with windows, a chimney, and a

²³⁶ The top of this structure is significantly higher than the cuttings for the roofs discussed in Chapter VII. This structure changes slightly over time, as represented in other paintings, thus demonstrating it had to be dismantled and rebuilt each time access to the gunpowder magazine was necessary.

²³⁷ Paton et al. point out that Stuart does not provide a south elevation among his plates, probably because the full extent of that wall was so obscured: Paton et al. 1927, p. 541. Stuart's choice of perspective was likely determined by his desire to omit the South Building.

terracotta tiled roof. The ground level west of the Erechtheion appears to have risen in the two years following Dalton's 1749 west elevation; the top corner of the West Door is missing, and more courses of the southwest anta of the North Porch are hidden from view.²³⁸

The ground level on the south side has also changed, owing to Stuart and Revett's excavations around the podium of the Maiden Porch. There is a pyramid of earth on top of the Maiden Porch. This was a typical precaution against cannon fire. Stuart and Revett must have done some excavation around the bases of the columns of the North Porch because Revett depicts the bases with the guilloche pattern on the upper torus. Further to the state of the North Porch, only the capitals are visible as they protrude from the walls between the columns.

The engraved version of *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum* includes some subtle changes. Where the detail of the blocks is lacking in the watercolor, the engraver has added lines indiscriminately, e.g., to the blocks of the upper West Façade. The engraver also overemphasizes the stub of the raking cornice on the Westward Projection of the North Porch. Conversely, the painted version has a simpler composition (there are fewer workmen) and changes of a subtler nature, such as the direction the girl's dog is facing.

LE ROY

Son of the clockmaker to the King of France, architect and traveler Julien-David Le Roy (1724-1803) was a *pensionnaire* in the French Academy at Rome.²³⁹ Having won first and second prizes in Architecture at the Royal Academy in Paris, he arrived in

²³⁸ Alternatively, concern about the antiquity of the West Door may have motivated Stuart to manipulate the ground-lines in order to conceal the area in question. See also note 232.

²³⁹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 608. A *pensionnaire* is a student of the French Academy at Rome.

Athens in 1754 and witnessed the rebellion against Sari Muselimi.²⁴⁰ Upon his return to France in 1758, Le Roy published his drawings and an account of his travels in *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce*.²⁴¹ Le Roy may have beaten Stuart and Revett to the first scientific publication (description and illustration) of the Erechtheion, but the results are of lower quality (T 26).²⁴² His depictions are not very accurate, nor detail-oriented, which is surprising for a *pensionnaire* who likely had excellent drafting skills. Instead, Le Roy concentrates on expressing a sense of the wild, romantic neglect (Figure 17). Despite its faults, when Le Roy's book was published it caused a sensation. A pirated version by Sayer came out the following year for the British audience. Its plates combined several unrelated monuments into one composition (T 28).²⁴³ A German version soon followed. Le Roy registered his contempt by publishing his comments in *Observations sur les édifices des anciens peuples*.²⁴⁴ Le Roy published a second edition in 1770.²⁴⁵

Le Roy's observations of the Erechtheion are his own, although he refers to Spon and Wheler on points where he disagrees, e.g., in the nature of the duality of the temple. At first, he considered the double aspect of the temple to refer to its two levels:

...au lieu je pense que des deux Temples dont parle l'Auteur
ancien, l'un étoit au-dessus de l'autre : ce qui se remarque

²⁴⁰ Le Roy describes this rebellion, as referred to by Sicilianos: Sicilianos 1960, pp. 122-123. According to Paton et al., Le Roy arrived in Athens in February 1755 and stayed in Greece for only three months: Paton et al. 1927, p. 608.

²⁴¹ Le Roy 1758.

²⁴² A minor tussle between Stuart and Le Roy ensued, the former believing that the latter gazumped him. After criticizing Le Roy in vol. I of *Antiquities of Athens*, Stuart decided to let the feud go: Paton et al. 1927, p. 608.

²⁴³ Sayer 1759. Indeed, I was only able to acquire Le Roy's images of the Erechtheion from Sayer 1759. Le Roy's plans, elevations and perspectives reproduced in this study are from the compiled and reduced views of this cribbed, English source. The text is a translation of Le Roy. The plates of the details of moldings and features of the Erechtheion are condensed onto fewer pages. An Italian version appeared in 1799: Cipriani 1799, p. vii.

²⁴⁴ Le Roy 1767, p. 2.

²⁴⁵ Le Roy 1770.

facilement par la grande différence du pavé des deux vestibules qui conduisoient, l'un par le côté dans le Temple inférieur, l'autre par la face dans le Temple supérieur.²⁴⁶

In other words, one temple was at the higher level of the East Porch; the other at the lower level of the North Porch. In the 1770 edition, he changed his mind, and suggested that the Erechtheion mentioned by Pausanias must be south of the Parthenon because of the preceding subject, namely, the monuments on the south Akropolis wall; the Ionic temple housed the cult of Athena Polias in the main building; and the North Porch was the home of Pandrosos. This change of interpretation is not superficial; it resonated in the key to his plan of the Akropolis. Table 6 summarizes the differences between the cult allocations of the 1758 and 1770 editions of Le Roy's plan of the Akropolis (Figure 18):²⁴⁷

Table 6. The Different Allocation of Cults between the 1758 and 1770 Edition of Le Roy's Plan of the Akropolis.

	1758 Edition ²⁴⁸	1770 Edition
Main building	Temple d'Érechthée, qui étoit double	Temple d'Érechthée, ou plus vraisemblant de Minerve Poliade
East Porch	Vestibule par lequel on entroit dans le Temple supérieur	Vestibule par lequel on entroit dans le Temple
North Porch	Vestibule par lequel on entroit dans le Temple inférieur	Temple de Pandrose
Maiden Porch	Espèce de Vestibule soutenu par des Cariatides et appuyé contre le corps du Temple	Petit monument construit contre le Temple de Minerve Poliade, et dont l'entablement est soutenu par des Canéphores ou des Caryatides.

Le Roy placed the well of Poseidon in the West Chamber, though he had no more success in finding it than did Spon and Wheler, but for a different reason. While Spon and Wheler had been prevented from going inside the temple because it was a private

²⁴⁶ Le Roy 1770, p. 11.

²⁴⁷ Table 6 is based on Paton et al. 1927, p. 609.

²⁴⁸ Le Roy, *Plan de la Citadelle d'Athènes*, 1755.

home in 1676, Le Roy's success was impeded by the marble blocks littering the interior.²⁴⁹

Le Roy placed the Erechtheion in the period between the Persian invasion of 480 B.C. and Hadrian (A.D. 117-138) in his attempt to date the temple stylistically based on characteristics of the Ionic order. His other deductions are equally unrefined, largely because he did not have the benefit of the Chandler Stele to assist him.

Le Roy was also troubled by Pausanias' omission of the Maiden Porch: "il est assez extraordinaire que Pausanias ne nous apprenne pas son usage, qu'il garde le silence sur les six caryatides qui l'ornoient, dont il reste encore cinq assez bien conservées, & d'une très-grande beauté. Ce monument seroit-il postérieur au voyage de cet Auteur? ou seroit-ce par negligence qu'il auroit omis d'en parler?"²⁵⁰

Le Roy's description of the temple is little more than an annotation to his less than perfect view of the Erechtheion from the northwest (Figure 17). His aesthetic reaction, on the other hand, is enthusiastic:

...il est un des plus précieux restes de l'Antiquité par la beauté des ordres Ioniques qui l'ornoient, par la perfection, la richesse, & la singularité de leurs chapiteaux, dont nous n'avons aucune connoissance, & par l'entablement qui couronne les caryatides, qui est aussi très-beau, & nous étoit également inconnu.²⁵¹

Le Roy created a series of engravings which included the aforementioned view of the Erechtheion from the northwest in its current state (Figure 17); a study of the "caryatid order" (Figure 20); the Ionic order of the North Porch (Figure 21); a reconstruction of the West Façade; a plan and a restored east elevation of the Erechtheion

²⁴⁹ By 1770, Le Roy was very skeptical about the existence of this well because it had not been found in the interim by other travelers either.

²⁵⁰ Le Roy 1770, p. 11. Stuart echoed Le Roy's concern on this matter.

²⁵¹ Le Roy 1770, p. 10.

(Figure 19); and a plan of the Akropolis which shows structures in the immediate vicinity to the Erechtheion (Figure 18).

The eight-gun bastion on the plan of the Akropolis has already been referred to and described (Figure 18).²⁵² The bastion appears in Stuart and Le Roy's other views, and is in a rather poor state of repair. Le Roy's plan is especially valuable because it indicates the main roads around the Akropolis. From the piazza northwest of the Parthenon, a curving road leads eastward to the Erechtheion. The Erechtheion is surrounded by a wide, light-colored band, indicating that no other structures infringed on the temple.

Le Roy also attempts a plan of the Erechtheion and gets the main elements correct. The South Building continues to obscure the South Wall and so impedes Le Roy's understanding of the krepidoma. As a result, the krepidoma of the South Wall ends in the same place as it does at the north end of the East Porch (Figure 20).²⁵³ He does not appear to have studied the inside of the temple because none of the interior details (such as the stubs of "cross-walls" and the door to the Maiden Porch) are recorded on his plan.

Le Roy's restoration of the West Façade is significantly more ambitious, though proportionally less accurate (Figure 19).²⁵⁴ The columns of the North Porch are too widely spaced and there are far too many courses of masonry in the upper West Wall. The maidens are too far apart, as in the study of the caryatid order.²⁵⁵ This reconstruction

²⁵² Le Roy, *Plan de la Citadelle d'Athenes*, 1755. See above "Stuart and Revett."

²⁵³ Le Roy, *East Elevation*, 1755. There was no way for Le Roy to know about the windows, or the size of the door. Otherwise the restoration is reasonable except for the missing anthemion at the top of the East Wall.

²⁵⁴ Le Roy, *Restitution du Temple d'Erechthee*, 1755.

²⁵⁵ Le Roy, *Ordre caryatide*, 1755.

does not show dowel holes for the frieze on the North Porch as depicted in Le Roy, *Vüe du Temple d'Erechthée à Athenes*, 1755 (Figure 17). This probably indicates that he considered the dowel holes to be Post-Antique. The lower part of the West Wall is not visible because Le Roy thought it was concealed in Antiquity and served as the container for the well of Poseidon in the West Corridor. By the same token, Le Roy ignores the West Door (which is misplaced in Le Roy, *Vüe du Temple d'Erechthée à Athenes*, 1755). Because Le Roy did not have access to the North Porch, and the podium of the Maiden Porch was filled in, he (and other travelers as well) may not have realized how the North and South Doors descended to the lower elevation.

Le Roy's detailed drawings of the Ionic and Caryatid orders represent the first published details of the Erechtheion in Western Europe. His Ionic capital, from the North Porch, is exquisitely rendered and annotated with basic measurements (Figure 21).²⁵⁶ The Caryatid order, on the other hand, leaves much to be desired (Figure 20).²⁵⁷ Le Roy places the maidens too far apart and adds several additional discs to the upper fascia.²⁵⁸

According to Le Roy's 1755 view of the actual state of the Erechtheion (Figure 17), the building appears to have sustained some damage since Dalton and Stuart visited half a decade earlier.²⁵⁹ His depiction shows the North Façade for the first time. This northwest perspective is almost unique among the angles chosen by the early travelers.²⁶⁰ Le Roy artificially creates a large area around the Erechtheion by pushing the Parthenon and the wall visible behind Stuart in *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum* (1751) far into the

²⁵⁶ Le Roy, *Ordre ionique*, 1755.

²⁵⁷ Le Roy, *Ordre caryatide*, 1755.

²⁵⁸ Dalton's version is more useful, even if it is in reverse: see above note 214.

²⁵⁹ Le Roy, *Vüe du Temple d'Erechthée à Athenes*, 1755.

²⁶⁰ Taylor, *The Erechtheum from the Northwest*, 1818; and Smirke, *The Erechtheum from the Northwest*, ca. 1803, are two others.

background. As mentioned above, the gun emplacement is in the left foreground and another large ashlar ruin features as a backdrop for some human figures in the right foreground. The latter feature is probably a figment of Le Roy's imagination. The artist embellished the ruins with foliage. It emerges from the cracks between the blocks, and especially of the later masonry.

Le Roy indulged in a bit of enforced and creative neglect, and depicts PW.CC.03-04 as having fallen off the North Porch.²⁶¹ The blocks, with their (exaggeratedly) large egg-and-dart molding are lying on the ground to the west of the North Porch. Le Roy depicts the column drums, delineates their damaged edges, and like Dalton, reveals the fluting on the west side.²⁶² The coursing of the southwest anta of the North Porch is less successful than Dalton's. The masonry of the walls between the columns of the North Porch is lightly delineated, although little information about the intercolumnar walls can be gleaned. Le Roy depicts the dowel holes in the frieze, and the state of the tympanum of the North Façade is visible for the first time: PN.PP.02-03 are present, as is the stub of the raking cornice: PN.RC.01. Below this, the entablature of the north face of the North Porch is intact. Most of columns PP.CC.03-05 are blocked by the gun emplacement. The northeast corner of the Erechtheion peeks out above it, showing that EE.C6 is present, as well as at least the first block of the full entablature: NN.AA.01, NN.BB.01 and NN.CC.01.

Accuracy begins to decline in the rendering of the West Façade, although Le Roy does not appear to have indulged in the restoration of the entablature as did Stuart.

Instead, Le Roy shows the entablature to be in the same state as it was in Dalton's time,

²⁶¹ The cornice appears intact in all subsequent depictions until the War of Independence.

²⁶² See above "Lord Charlemont and Dalton." In Stuart's and Gell's views of the west side of the North Porch, the column shafts are hidden by the intercolumnar masonry.

but with the *addition* of WW.CC.04. Details of the column drums of the West Façade are somewhat delineated, but the blocks in the intercolumniations are not, hence the immensely inaccurate restoration of the West Façade among the other plates. Le Roy indicates that the two blocks (WP.09.01-02) in the southern, otherwise empty intercolumniation, are now missing.²⁶³ The coursing of the southern anta is incorrect and the bosses are absent. The ground level rises very high up the lower West Wall, and Le Roy, for some unknown reason, transposes the West Door southward. He also eliminates the topographical impact of the Old Temple of Athena terrace wall. Instead, the ground level gently descends to the west. Disaster really strikes with the Maiden Porch. Both Maidens #1 and #2 face west and the podium is rendered without attention to detail.²⁶⁴

BARTHÉLEMY AND WINCKELMANN

At the same time as Stuart and Le Roy were creating the first scientific examinations of the Erechtheion and other monuments in Athens, Jean-Jacques Barthélemy, a French abbot (1716-1795), wrote a fictional account of a young traveler, the first historical novel to be set in Ancient Greece: “Imagine a Scythian, named Anacharsis, to arrive in Greece, some years before the birth of Alexander; and that from Athens, the usual place of his residence, he makes several excursions into the neighbouring provinces; every where observing....”²⁶⁵ This book, essentially a translation of Pausanias,²⁶⁶ was very popular, and several editions were published during the 18th and

²⁶³ They reappear in later drawings, so this is probably a mistake.

²⁶⁴ Compare Pococke, *The Temple of Erechtheus at Athens, restored*, 1745, and Fourmont, *The Erechtheum*, 1729.

²⁶⁵ Barthélemy 1784, preface.

²⁶⁶ Barthélemy includes other sources such as Aristophanes’ *Plutus* regarding the Opisthodomos.

19th centuries. Such a novel may have satisfied the armchair travelers, but it does not purport in any way to identify extant buildings specifically (T 27).

To accompany Barthélemy's prose, Barbié de Bocage created a fine plan of Athens' ancient monuments, both actual and fictional (Figure 23),²⁶⁷ as well as a restoration of the Parthenon (Figure 24).²⁶⁸ This restoration also includes the Erechtheion; however, the engraver chose not to reverse the drawing during the engraving process. As a result, the Erechtheion is backward: the Maiden Porch is at the right rather than left end of the building. Since Barthélemy never refers to the specific elements of the Erechtheion in his text, and the Parthenon effectively looks the same from either perspective, there was no pressing need for the engraver to reverse the image on the copper plate in order for the reader to understand the novel.

Also writing at this time was Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768). Winckelmann extolled the pre-eminence of Ancient Greece over Rome from his armchair (he never visited Greece). He waxed poetical about the Apollo Belvedere and the Laocoön in thinly veiled homoerotic terms and developed the West's aesthetics in his various publications in the 1750s and 1760s. His scholarship culminated in the *History of Ancient Art* in 1763, while at the same time Stuart, Revett, and Le Roy were making their first forays into the source of this art and architecture.²⁶⁹

²⁶⁷ Barthélemy 1799; Barthélemy, *Plan d'Athènes Pour le Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis*, 1799. There are at least two different versions of this plan. One is reproduced in Yiakoumis 2000, p. 80; the other, in Barthélemy 1799.

²⁶⁸ Barthélemy, *Vue perspective du Parthénon*, 1799.

²⁶⁹ While Pococke seems to anticipate Winckelmann's style a decade and a half before the publication of Winckelmann 1764, many of the travelers also echo his enthusiasm and effusiveness in their descriptions of the Erechtheion. Watkins (1792) even compares the Erechtheion to the Apollo Belvedere, one of Winckelmann's favourite *objets d'art*. See below "Scrofani" for more comparisons with Winckelmann.

CHANDLER AND PARS

Epigraphist and traveler Richard Chandler (1738-1810), Nicholas Revett and painter William Pars (1742-1782) visited Athens on their way home from their expedition to Turkey in 1765-1766 at the bidding of the Society of Dilettanti. During this time in Athens, Chandler procured the eponymous stele with the report of the Commission of 409 B.C. regarding the construction of the Erechtheion.

Chandler published an account of the team's travels in 1776 (T 29). Several smaller editions quickly followed, as well as a French translation by Servois and Barbié de Bocage, with additional notes provided by Fauvel (see below) in 1806.²⁷⁰ Nicholas Revett disagreed with several aspects of the text with respect to the Erechtheion and annotated his edition of Chandler's book, which is now in the British Library.²⁷¹ These annotations (or corrections) were used to create an updated edition in 1825. The footnotes to T 29 reflect these annotations.

For Chandler,

...the building was double, a partition-wall dividing it into two temples, which fronted different ways. One was the temple of Neptune Erechtheus, the other of Minerva Polias. The latter was entered by a square portico connected with a marble skreen [sic], which fronts towards the propyléa [sic]. The door of the cell was on the left hand, and at the farther end of the passage was a door leading down into the Pandroséum, which was contiguous.²⁷²

In other words, the entrance to the temple of Athena Polias was via the North Porch, the West Corridor connected the North Porch to the Maiden Porch, and the cult area itself was in the central chamber to the east. For some reason, Chandler thought the

²⁷⁰ Paton et al. 1927, p. 543, note 1.

²⁷¹ Paton et al. say this is in the British Museum (Paton et al. 1927, p. 543, note 1), but most such manuscripts and books have been moved to the British Library. Revett's copy of Chandler 1775 is in the British Library, Shelfmark 1782.b.17 and 148.b.1.

²⁷² Chandler 1776, p. 52.

South Door led downward rather than upward.²⁷³ After these comments on the whereabouts of the cults, Chandler returns to non-specific identifications using Pausanias' prose. The Pandroseion is in the Maiden Porch, which also housed the "stunted olive-tree" and the altar of Zeus Hercéus.²⁷⁴ Chandler's interpretations, especially with respect to the eponymous stele, are influential (including on Stuart) until Wilkins' important 1816 publication on the Erechtheion.²⁷⁵

Chandler offers some new information about the cults and later history of the building, heretofore unseen in print. For example, he is the first to mention Plutarch's account of the extinguishment of the Lamp of Kallimachos during the Sullan siege.²⁷⁶ He is also sensitive to the current state of the Erechtheion as a ruin, "An edifice revered by antient [sic] Attica, as holy in the highest degree, was in 1676 the dwelling of a Turkish family; and is now deserted and neglected; but many ponderous stones and much rubbish must be removed, before the well and trident would appear."²⁷⁷ As a member of the Society of Dilettanti, it is no surprise that he was familiar with Spon and Wheler's travels, as suggested by his familiarity with the story that the Erechtheion was formerly used for domestic purposes.

Chandler managed to obtain permission to dig around the exterior of the North Porch. The only discoveries reported, however, are that "the door-way of the vestibule is walled up, and the soil risen nearly to the top of the door-way of the Pandroséum."²⁷⁸ He finds the Maiden Porch difficult to describe. Chandler falls back on Vitruvius' etiology

²⁷³ Revett does not correct him on this point.

²⁷⁴ This information is copied by Stuart. See above "Stuart and Revett." The source for the stunted olive tree is Hesychios, see Appendix A.

²⁷⁵ Wilkins 1816. See below "Wilkins."

²⁷⁶ Plutarch, *Sull.* 13.

²⁷⁷ Chandler 1776, p. 54.

²⁷⁸ Chandler 1776, pp. 54-55.

for the phenomenon of female architectural supports, and compounds the conflation with “one hand uplifted to it, and the other hanging down by her side,”²⁷⁹ part of the definition of a “real” caryatid.²⁸⁰ Chandler is recalling the early editions of Vitruvius which usually portray female architectural supports (“caryatids”) in this way. Owing to the mutilated state of the maidens, it is possible to suppose that one of their arms might have been raised.²⁸¹ He then mentions that the maidens, once six in number, are mutilated and their faces “besmeared with paint.”²⁸² As it was in Stuart’s time, the podium is still filled with earth.

Chandler candidly recounts the acquisition of the stele that bears his name:

Another marble, which has been engraved at the expense of the society of DILETTANTI, was discovered at a house not far from the temple of Minerva Polias, placed, with the inscribed face exposed, in the stairs. The owner, who was branded for some unfair dealing with the appellative *Jefüt*, or *the Jew*, prefixed to his name, seeing me bestow so much labour in taking a copy, became fearful of parting with the original under its value. When the bargain was at length concluded, we obtained the connivance of the Disdar, his brother, under an injunction of privacy, as otherwise the removal of the stone might endanger his head, it being the property of the Grand Seignior. Mustapha delivered a ring, which he commonly wore, to be shown to a female black slave, who was left in the house alone, as a token; and our Swiss, with assistants and two horses, one reputed the strongest in Athens, arrived at the hour appointed, and brought down the two marbles, for which he was sent, unobserved; the Turks being at their devotions in the mosque, except the guard at the gate, who was in the secret. The large slab was afterwards rendered more portable by a mason.²⁸³

²⁷⁹ Chandler 1776, p. 55.

²⁸⁰ See Chapter IV and King 1998.

²⁸¹ It is important to remember that the pose of the maidens and their attributes were only recently identified upon the discovery of the Roman “copies.”

²⁸² Chandler 1776, p. 55.

²⁸³ Chandler 1776, pp. 57-58. For the alteration to the stele, see Paton et al. 1927, p. 281.

This account gives a startling insight into the nocturnal and clandestine activities of many of the travelers who participated in removing antiquities from Athens, usually with the complicity of the Turkish officials.²⁸⁴

Chandler's partner in the expedition, William Pars, was mainly occupied by the execution of a series of sketches of the Parthenon frieze. He drew them from the level of the architrave of the colonnade rather than from the ground, the perspective whence Carrey was compelled to create his sketches for Nointel:

The marquis de Nointel, ambassador from France to the Porte in the year 1672, employed a painter to delineate the freeze [sic]; but his sketches, the labour of a couple of months, must have been imperfect, being made from beneath, without scaffolding, his eyes straining upwards. Mr. Pars devoted a much longer time to this work, which he executed with diligence, fidelity, and courage. His post was generally on the architrave of the colonnade, many feet from the ground, where he was exposed to gusts of wind, and to accidents in passing to and fro. Several of the Turks murmured, and some threatened, because he overlooked their houses; obliging them to confine or remove the women, to prevent their being seen from that exalted station. Besides views and other sculptures, he designed one hundred ninety six feet of bass-relief in the acropolis.²⁸⁵

Pars also found the time to create an important view of the Erechtheion, the first of its kind from the northeast, and the first depiction of the ruined state of the North Addition (Figure 22).²⁸⁶ An engraving of this painting, the original of which is in the Department of Prints and Drawings at the British Museum, was published in Stuart and Revett's *The Antiquities of Athens* as a replacement for a missing drawing from the same perspective apparently prepared by Stuart.²⁸⁷ This perspective will remain a rare one

²⁸⁴ See various passages in St. Clair 1997 for accounts of a range of stealthy thefts of antiquities from the Akropolis.

²⁸⁵ Chandler 1776, p. 51.

²⁸⁶ Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765.

²⁸⁷ Stuart and Revett 1789, p. 8. There are a few differences between the original and the engraving, mainly the details of the figures: There is no AΘE inscription on the architrave block and the turbaned figure in the central foreground is carving an inscription on a reused column in Arabic text. A young girl

among artists who, understandably, time and time again, select the best-preserved parts of the monument as their subject matter. The most important features of Pars' painting are the North Addition, the first view of the east side of the North Porch, the recently demolished North Wall, and the masonry at the top of the South Wall.

The North Addition's derelict condition affords a better opportunity for analysis than if the structure were in perfect condition (see Chapter VI for an interpretation of this painting with respect to the North Addition). The painting shows that only the interior cross-wall of the North Addition is still standing to approximately its full, original height, namely the same height as the North Wall. Its north wall has fallen down on either side of the interior cross-wall, although it rises again toward the North Porch where it interacts with the intercolumnar wall just south of NN.C5. The dark patch above the door on the lowest level of the interior wall may indicate that the plaster has fallen off the wall in this area. The (probably plaster) lining of the south wall of the North Addition is visible east of the interior cross-wall. The east end of the North Addition is not at all clear and must be discerned from the cuttings on the building. The destruction of the North Addition observable in this painting was almost certainly wrought by the Venetians during the siege of 1687.

The North Porch is clearly still enclosed on the east side, seen here for the first time. The masonry of the north face of the North Porch is not as carefully delineated as it is on its east side. As in Le Roy's view, tympanum blocks PN.PP.02-03 are clearly present. To the east of these blocks is another block, more clearly depicted in Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800 (Figure 36), which creates a kind of parapet around the roof of

plays a drum in this scene. The figure at far right holds a staff with a piece of material hanging from the end (perhaps a flag).

the North Porch. There are additional masonry structures on the roof of North Porch, and light foliage grows out of them. As the North Addition's third story was higher than the roof of the North Porch, perhaps the roof once served as a kind of open-air domestic space or roof garden.²⁸⁸

Since 1749, the remaining cornice blocks (EE.CC.01-05) on the East Façade have fallen off or have been removed from the building. Pars carefully delineates the clamp cuttings. The northeast anta is clearly visible for the first time. This painting also reveals the severely demolished state of the North Wall since 1749, when it had been fully extant up through course 2, and NN.01.17 completed the anta. Pars' drawing indicates that the following blocks have fallen off the building: NN.02.09-16,²⁸⁹ NN.03.08-15, NN.04.08-14,²⁹⁰ NN.05.11-15, NN.06.09-14, NN.07.11-14, and NN.08.11-13.²⁹¹ Only NN.AA.01 remains of the entablature of the North Wall.²⁹² The wall in the foreground blocks the lower part of the East Façade and the east part of the North Wall. The West Façade appears to be in the same condition it was when it was last depicted in 1755.

Last but not least, the most revealing feature (besides the North Addition) of Pars' painting is the brownish entity depicted at the top of the South Wall. This may be a remnant of the vaulted roof over the main building, probably dating to the second phase

²⁸⁸ There are additional notes made in the sky of the painting in the British Museum:

Inscription in sky in upper right-hand quadrant:

Temples in [the?] Acropolis

Y ² Portico	{of Erechtheus	_____	1
	{of Min. Polias	_____	2
	{leading into Min.		
	[the?] Pandrosus	_____	3
	Temple of Min. Parthenos		4

There is a sketch of a temple (Parthenon?) to the right of the inscription: 40' W. of N Temple of [D?] and also a sketch in pencil of Ionic capital above northernmost column of the East Porch.

²⁸⁹ Plus most of NN.02.08.

²⁹⁰ Plus half of NN.04.15.

²⁹¹ Plus half of NN.08.10.

²⁹² Compare Fauvel, *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*, Undated (ca. 1789) (Figure 29) in order to estimate the blocks obscured by the interior cross-wall of the North Addition.

of the Erechtheion as a basilica church during the middle Byzantine period.²⁹³ These vaults continued to shelter the aisles during the Frankish period when the Erechtheion was first transformed into a residence.²⁹⁴ For a reconstruction of the Erechtheion in 1765, see Figure 579.

Pars' depiction is almost as interesting for the surrounding structures as it is for the Erechtheion itself. In the foreground are the remains of an east-west wall made of masonry and *spolia*: the top of a column shaft with egg-and-dart and bead-and-reel below, a broken volute from an Ionic capital, and what looks like a fragment of a marble window frame. There was a narrow passage between this wall and the Erechtheion, as indicated by the shaft of light between them illuminating the debris north of the temple. A green bush peeks above the wall, perhaps out of a dome.

The activities of the figures in the foreground are described in Stuart's text (T 25); however, this description bears little resemblance to the scene.²⁹⁵ Whatever their activities, they are assembled on the walkway behind the crenulated north Akropolis wall which runs westward and encompasses the gun emplacement north of the Erechtheion

²⁹³ See Chapter V.

²⁹⁴ See Chapter VI.

²⁹⁵ Figures in foreground, left to right:

1. The male figure with the turban is leaning into a pillar composed of an architrave with the inscription: AΘE, topped by a rectangular blue object, and a cushion-shaped object. There is a small red object on top. The elderly figure holds a pointed object in his right hand, wears a turban and red waistcoat, and has a white beard. His left hand is visible and hugs the cushion-shaped object.
2. The boy faces right, stands at lower level than the parapet walkway, and leans on the leg of the third figure. He wears a red fez.
3. A black-bearded male barefoot figure sits cross-legged and wears blue trousers and an orange hat. His red shoes are on the parapet walk. He plays a stringed instrument.
4. A standing, mustached man wears a blue long coat over a blue and white striped, red-belted calf-length garment. He holds a pipe and wears a blue hat over his turban.
5. A veiled young girl kneels with her arms resting on a brown barrel. She wears a light blue frock.
6. A turbaned, mustached, standing man wears white baggy trousers, a blue coat, and a white shirt. Tucked into his red belt are several weapons, one of which is a long curved sword. He wears red shoes and is smoking a long pipe.

seen in Stuart and Le Roy's depictions (Figure 15 and Figure 17). North of the North Addition is a pile of debris in front of which stands a small brown goat. To the right of the goat is an arched masonry vault with a chimney-like extension coming out of the top. This may be a kiln, perhaps for making lime out of the manageably-sized marble fragments in this area of the Akropolis. Ottoman houses are visible in the background along the walkway inside the north Akropolis wall. At the far left of the painting, the Parthenon is visible.

CHOISEUL-GOUFFIER, CASSAS AND FAUVEL

Just over a century after the French aristocrat and diplomat Marquis de Nointel visited Athens, the Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier arrived in 1776. Choiseul-Gouffier published *Voyage pittoresque de la Grèce* in 1782, but it did not discuss Athens.²⁹⁶ He returned in 1785 as Ambassador of France to the Ottoman Porte with the painter Louis-François Cassas.²⁹⁷ Cassas created many views on and of the Akropolis, many of which are in the Royal Archives of the Louvre²⁹⁸ and on display in the Benaki Museum in Athens.

In 1785 Cassas executed a very picturesque, but not terribly useful, view of the Erechtheion from the southwest (Figure 25).²⁹⁹ This colored engraving, along with a wide range of others made for Choiseul-Gouffier, was reproduced by Landon in his massive volume, *Grandes vues pittoresques des principaux sites et monuments de la Grèce et de la Sicile et des sept collines de Rome, dessinés et gravés à l'eau-forte, au*

²⁹⁶ Jean-Baptiste Lechevalier accompanied Choiseul-Gouffier in Athens in 1784, and published a third edition of *Lechevalier 1802*, vol. 1, which mentions the Erechtheion briefly on pp. 155-156. Guillaume Martin was in Athens with Choiseul in August 1784 and wrote a brief account in *Martin 1819*, pp. 32-33.

²⁹⁷ On Cassas, see Gilet 1994 and Schmidt-Colinet 1994, pp. 207-222.

²⁹⁸ *Non vidi*: These were under restoration when I visited the Royal Archives in the Louvre in August 2002. Also *non vidi*: Cassas 1799.

²⁹⁹ Cassas, *The Erechtheion from the Southwest*, 1786-1787.

trait, par MM. Cassas et Bence (1813).³⁰⁰ Charles-Paul Landon (1760-1826) was a French painter himself, and offered a succinct description of the painting: (T 31). Paraphrasing Landon’s description, the east half of the temple is the Erechtheion and contains the salt well; Minerva Poliade is in the west half; and the Maiden Porch is unequivocally the Pandroseion, in which was the crooked olive tree, under the roof supported by caryatids. The brevity of Landon’s account is due to the vast scope of his tome.

Cassas’ painting is unhelpful for our understanding of the contemporary state of preservation of the Erechtheion because he has taken liberties and restored parts of the building that logic told him must be there: e.g., the epikranitis of the South Wall and its entablature. On the other hand, Cassas does illustrate the remnants of the walls that formerly enclosed the Maiden Porch mentioned by Spon and Wheler in 1676, and were otherwise omitted in the previously discussed depictions. The roof of the Maiden Porch is piled high with ashlar blocks. The perspective allows for a glimpse of the coffers and the moldings at the back of the Maiden Porch. The artist again omits the structure standing in front of the South Wall – and again, the orthostate blocks are rendered as ashlar blocks.

The excavations taking place in the foreground, probably on Choiseul-Gouffier’s firman of 1784, reveal the lower moldings of the podium of the Maiden Porch for the first time and disclose the *raison-d’être* of his patron’s interest in the Akropolis, namely to “pillage anything that is pillageable.”³⁰¹ Interestingly, the assemblage of the figures in the

³⁰⁰ Landon 1813.

³⁰¹ As quoted by Legrand 1897, p. 57. For full quote in French, see note 57. Choiseul-Gouffier managed to get a *firman* in 1784, and with Fauvel’s help, removed Parthenon sculptures, inscriptions, reliefs and other objects to the Louvre where his collection remains to this day. One of these slabs from the Parthenon frieze

foreground is highly reminiscent of Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751.³⁰²

Cassas' purpose appears to have been to produce a picturesque view of the Erechtheion for Choiseul-Gouffier which would have shown a relatively complete version of the temple, thus approximating how it would have looked in Antiquity.

One trick used by painters to create a picturesque view and evoke the notion of ruin, was to add foliage sprouting from the crevices of the building, especially among the remnants of later masonry.³⁰³ Trees were also carefully placed to balance a composition. Cassas appears to have been selective about which surrounding structures to include, omitting for example the wall east of the Erechtheion, as depicted in the meticulous painting by Pars (Figure 22). At the far right of Cassas' depiction is an ashlar wall which runs approximately parallel to the South Wall of the Erechtheion.³⁰⁴ In the background, single and multi-storied structures line the inside of the Akropolis wall northeast of the Erechtheion.³⁰⁵ Mount Lykavitos is visible in the distance.

Cassas traveled all over the Mediterranean and collected plaster models of ancient monuments, some of which he purchased in Rome from the famous model maker,

includes the maidens carrying the phialai, the closest iconographic comparison for the Erechtheion maidens (Figure 601).

³⁰² At bottom left are two men with pickaxes. The man at the left walks with a pickaxe on his shoulder, wears gray baggy trousers, a gold-embroidered blue waistcoat, white sleeves, and a red cap. The second man is bending over, pickaxe to his left, and looks toward the first man. He wears white baggy trousers and a red waistcoat. In middle-center ground, two figures sit on the "scarp" and watch the excavators with their backs to the artist. The man on left wears baggy blue trousers, a short -sleeved white shirt, and a red and gold waistcoat, a moustache, a red cap, and boots. The second man, at the right, wears a multi-colored waistcoat, a turban, and a gunpowder funnel strapped across his back. The last figure, who appears older than the others, sits between Maidens #1 and #2, dangling one leg over the edge of the podium. The other leg is bent. He holds a long curved staff in his right hand and is looking at the figures in the center ground. He is bearded, wears a turban, and wears longer baggy trousers.

³⁰³ Roth, Lyons, and Merewether 1997.

³⁰⁴ This may be either a fiction, or the remains of the tall wall seen in Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751. Similarly, it could be the remains of the original wall of the semi-excavated Archaic Temple of Athena, as suggested by G. Ferrari (pers. comm.).

³⁰⁵ These include a lean-to hut with one window and a red tile roof, a crenulated wall, the remainder of an arch above a window, and a three story lean-to tower with red tile roof.

Antonio Chichi. What made Cassas' collection unique was that he was the first to acquire them according to a system. The collection was organized and assembled in 1794 – a watershed year for museums in France with the conversion of the Louvre – and was probably linked to the promotion of Choiseul-Gouffier 1782-1822.³⁰⁶ It certainly served as a pedagogical tool in the 19th century. Among the models was the Erechtheion, which is visible in the foreground of Bance's *Gallerie d'architecture de M. Cassas*.³⁰⁷ This model of the Erechtheion provided an early mode of transmission of the general organization of the building rather than the specificities of the moldings, as had been the focus of the earlier French publications such as Le Roy 1758.

Louis-François-Sebastien Fauvel arrived in Athens in 1781, and by the end of the 18th century, had managed to corner the antiquities market.³⁰⁸ His fortunes rose and fell with the French relationship with the Ottoman Porte. During the Napoleonic wars, he ended up in an Ottoman prison when Napoleon fell out with the Sultan. Not a man to be kept down, however, he returned to Athens and soon became the French vice-consul in Athens in 1803. He appears as a formidable character in many travelers' accounts until to the War of Independence in 1821 when, lacking sympathy with the cause, he moved to Smyrna.³⁰⁹

Before such time, however, Fauvel acted as agent and guide for Choiseul-Gouffier as well as for many other wealthy travelers who sought an antique sculpture or two for their country houses back in Western Europe. He knew whose pocket needed

³⁰⁶ Szambien 1994, pp. 242-246.

³⁰⁷ Bance, *Gallerie d'architecture de M. Cassas*, After 1794.

³⁰⁸ Fauvel stayed in Athens until 1782. He returned for another visit in 1786-1787, during which time he mainly made casts of the Hephaisteion and Parthenon, but also moldings of the Erechtheion and a maiden.

³⁰⁹ For Fauvel's extensive biography and assistance negotiating his paper trail at the *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, see Legrand 1897.

lining and how to find the loopholes in the regulations for removing antiquities, as described in this excerpt from a letter from Choiseul-Gouffier: “Je voudrais bien qu’il put vous servir de prétexte pour enlever quelques beaux Bas-Reliefs ; puisque vous êtes si bien avec le disdar, cela devoit vous être facile ; pourquoi ne pourriez-vous enlever une Cariatide, s’il y en a une bien conservée?”³¹⁰ Tacked on as a secondary, minor request, Choiseul-Gouffier queries whether one of the maidens might be extracted from the South Porch for his collection. Fauvel appears to have ignored this request. Choiseul also asked, in a postscript, that the wall at the east end of the Maiden Porch (omitted in every drawing up until Gell, *Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1801) not be replaced after Fauvel was done excavating (T 32).

Fauvel’s correspondence with Choiseul-Gouffier and others reflects his energetic activities on the Akropolis and describes many of his interactions with the Erechtheion (T 32). On Choiseul-Gouffier’s *firman*, Fauvel excavated both the interior and exterior of the Maiden Porch, and discovered the staircase descending to the South Door. While excavating the eastern interior of the Erechtheion, he also discovered what he later realized was the pavement of the basilica.³¹¹ His colleague, engineer and architect Foucherot, unable to contain his curiosity, wrote to him: “Vous avez sans doute rapporté le fond du pavé du temple d’Érectée avec une hauteur que nous avons connue et mesurée afinque [sic] je la place mes plans; avez-vous trouvé le puits?”³¹² Fauvel reported a few

³¹⁰ Choiseul-Gouffier to Fauvel, August 2, 1786, received August 16, 1786.

³¹¹ “J’y ai trouvé un petit escalier qui communique dans le vestibule où sont les trois fenêtres et dans lequel on entroit par la portique du nord qui est aujourd’hui magasin à poudre. Le plafond du portique existe dans son entier”: Fauvel, *Notes sur Athènes et sur les antiquités grecques*, 1788-1789. Fauvel was under the impression that the East Door to the Maiden Porch was a later modification (T 32). “On a pratiqué une porte au milieu du soubassement de l’élévation occidentale, au dessous de la croisée; mais cette porte est moderne”: Legrand 1808, p. 76.

³¹² Foucherot to Fauvel, October 3, 1786 Paris.

months later to Choiseul-Gouffier that he had not yet found the well.³¹³ Fauvel expressed frustration at the activities of the Christians whom he thinks dug out the east half of the main building: “Ce temple avoit été défiguré de toute manière par les chrétiens. Le pavé que j’avois trouvé est celui qu’ils firent. L’antique étoit au niveau des bases comme à tous les autres temples. Ce qui se voit des murs depuis le niveau de ces bases jusqu’au pavé actuel est fondation, partie marbre partie pierres brutes.”³¹⁴ Thus began the canonical interpretation adopted by Paton et al. that the east half of the Erechtheion had a stylobate at the level of the East Porch.

In 1788, Choiseul wished to push the envelope and so beseeched Fauvel to remove the inscriptions reused as pavement by the Christians under the pretext of continuing the fruitless search for the well. Fauvel did so, but these inscriptions have been only partially published and since lost.³¹⁵ Fauvel was fascinated by what turned out to be Byzantine monolithic columns of *verde antico*. His summary of his activities detail how he managed to “transport” them down the side of the Akropolis on a pile of dung: “J’ai fait voler 3 tronçons de colonnes vert antique et je les ai fait jeter par un Turc du haut des murs de la citadelle sur un tas de fumier.”³¹⁶ Several of these columns were transported to Piraeos and sent to Europe on various ships.

On his second visit of 1786-1787, Fauvel made a cast of one of the Erechtheion maidens. His notes record the difficulties he experienced in executing this task : “Le défaut de plâtre m’avoit empêché jusqu’à présent de travailler au château,”³¹⁷ and,

³¹³ Fauvel to Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, February 20, 1787 Athens.

³¹⁴ Fauvel to Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, October 12, 1788 Athens.

³¹⁵ Fauvel, *Notes sur Athènes et sur les antiquités grecques*, 1788-1789. For subsequent information on these inscriptions which otherwise did not concern the Erechtheion, see Paton et al. 1927, p. 610, note 9.

³¹⁶ Fauvel, *Notes sur Athènes et sur les antiquités grecques*, 1788-1789.

³¹⁷ Fauvel, *Notes sur Athènes et sur les antiquités grecques*, 1788-1789.

Je m'empresse de profiter de l'occasion...pour vous donner avis...de l'embarquement de tous mes plâtres, à l'exception cependant de la Cariatide qui n'a pas pu être montée ayant été obligé de donner tous mes soins à l'encaissement et au transport difficile des autres objets...La cariatide me reste. Elle est montée mais pas entièrement terminée. Je la mettrai en deux caisses que je ferai porter au port chez Mr. *Kairac* où elles attendront une occasion. J'en ferai de même pour quelques autres plâtres qui j'ai encore à prendre.³¹⁸

This cast-making activity was the next level of transmission of artistic and architectural ideas from Greece. Such casts (also made by Elgin's agents as the first stage of their interaction with the monuments on the Akropolis) were the first full-scale three-dimensional glimpse the West had of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion.³¹⁹ A week later, Fauvel finally managed to get the hollow cast of the maiden to Piraeos and onto a *chaloupe* destined for Marseilles (1788).³²⁰

There is a series of letters in the *Bibliothèque nationale de France* written by Fauvel, Choiseul and a Lieutenant Berthelin (ship's captain) dating to 1803-4, regarding the transport of another plaster cast of a maiden and three of the green monolithic columns from the Erechtheion on *L'Arabe*.³²¹ A second plaster cast of a maiden and more of the green columns never made it to Choiseul: first the collection of marbles and casts remained in the Capuchin monastery when Fauvel went to Constantinople in 1792. When Fauvel returned to Athens in 1793, and no longer Choiseul's agent, he held them as security against wages owed. Fauvel was then expelled from Athens during the Napoleonic wars, and finally, after negotiations, Fauvel arranged to send the cargo to

³¹⁸ Fauvel to Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, February 15, 1787 Athens.

³¹⁹ Fauvel also made a smaller scale model of the Akropolis: Fauvel, *Plaster model of the Akropolis*, ca. 1805. See above in this section on the models collected by Cassas.

³²⁰ Fauvel to Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, February 20, 1787 Athens. During the Revolution, Choiseul's collection was confiscated and some of the items were put on display in the Louvre. These were returned to him and the casts and green marble columns appear in the sale catalog of Choiseul's possessions in 1818: Dubois 1818, nos. 313 and 314.

³²¹ See Paton et al. (1927, pp. 594-595) for the excerpts that mention the plaster casts of the maiden and the green columns.

France on a *corvette* called *L'Arabe* in 1803. The English captured the ship, and the items were dropped-off in Malta. The metope from the Parthenon on this shipment ended up in the British Museum, but the whereabouts of the cast of the maiden and the green columns are unknown.³²²

Fauvel demonstrated a sincere and scientific interest in the monuments from which he pillaged sculptures for his aristocratic clients. He produced elevations of the interior North and South walls of the Erechtheion, the earliest surviving example of their kind (Figure 29).³²³ In these elevations, Fauvel simultaneously restores the temple, and indicates which blocks are missing by tracing the outline of the remaining blocks with a thick line.³²⁴ The elevation of the interior North Wall shows that since Pars' 1765 painting, at least one block, NN.07.15, has fallen off the building. More importantly, the extent of the damage to the west end of the North Wall is visible for the first time. The last extant block on each course is as follows: NN.01.07, the western part of NN.02.08,³²⁵ NN.03.07, NN.04.07, NN.05.10, NN.06.10, NN.07.10, half of NN.08.10, NN.09.11, NN.10.11, and NN.11.12. Below this, the North Wall is intact. See Figure 580 for a model of the building in 1789. Fauvel depicts the cistern under the West Corridor, with the top of it rising above the threshold of the North Door. The interior south elevation shows that no blocks have disappeared since 1749 and that the interior of the Maiden Porch has been excavated. Obviously, none of the lower parts of the walls were visible before Fauvel's excavation in the interior of the Erechtheion. He correctly places the

³²² Paton et al. 1927, pp. 611-612.

³²³ Fauvel, *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*, Undated (ca. 1789).

³²⁴ Fauvel makes the North Door two courses too tall.

³²⁵ All the half-thickness blocks to the west of this block are depicted as present, although some fudging may have occurred. The long blocks in alternate courses (the backs of the east anta of the North Porch) are sometimes depicted correctly.

orthostates on both walls for the first time. The interior, half-thickness ashlar blocks of SS.11-12.i that backed the orthostates of the South Wall are missing in this first glimpse of its interior.³²⁶

Fauvel also produced measured drawings of the Maiden Porch and the interior of the West Façade (Figure 27),³²⁷ as well as a plan of the temple after having excavated “partout” (Figure 28).³²⁸ The plan shows the krepidoma running all the way around the Maiden Porch and the East Porch. The krepidoma is missing along the North Wall in Fauvel’s drawing because it was still obscured by the ruins of the North Addition. Fauvel’s plan of the Akropolis shows the outline of the North Addition and the of the Second Ottoman period accretions on the South Wall (Figure 26). The plan shows how the North Addition extends east of the East Porch in addition to the surrounding buildings visible in contemporary drawings: e.g., Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751 (Figure 15), Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765 (Figure 22) and Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 35). The hatched lines on Fauvel’s plan appear to indicate unexcavated areas, namely the central part of the interior of the Erechtheion, the North Addition and the area east of the temple.³²⁹

Fauvel’s story does not end here. Even after he left Athens when the War of Independence broke out, Fauvel remained interested in the discoveries in the

³²⁶ These elevations are used for extrapolating backward in time in the computer model when information is missing for earlier phases owing to the limitations in the perspective of the relevant paintings.

³²⁷ Fauvel, *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*, Undated (ca. 1789). Fauvel’s interior west elevation is less successful. The poor rendition of the northernmost intercolumniation may be due to the remnants of a Ottoman structure inserted into the ancient and Ottoman cuttings above the lintel of the North Door.

³²⁸ Fauvel, *Temple d’Erectée mesurée par Fauvel in J^{er} 1789, après avoir fait fouiller part tout*, 1787.

³²⁹ Other than these features, the plan of the Erechtheion is quite inaccurate such as four columns for the East Porch and two for the West. This is due more to the sketchy nature of the work, since Fauvel had also drawn accurate measured plans as well.

Erechtheion, making notes on his plan of the Ottoman access to the cistern in the North Porch: “Ici une citerne moderne.”³³⁰ Fauvel was hypocritically outraged at the activities of Elgin’s agents (although he did resist taking a maiden for Choiseul): he considered himself a savior of the Erechtheion, and blamed a slow postal service for his inability to acquire the necessary authority from General Brune to put a stop to Elgin’s destruction (T 32).

WATKINS

Englishman, Thomas Watkins, visited Athens in 1788 and wrote an effusive letter about his experience on the Akropolis (T 33). He was truly enamored with the Erechtheion, and preferred it to the Parthenon and other Ionic temples in Italy. He even went so far as to compare it with the Apollo Belvedere, perhaps revealing the influence of recent work by Winckelmann: “It is like the Apollo of the Belvedere, *the unrivalled masterpiece of its kind.*”³³¹ For Watkins, it was a “delight to behold a model of Ionic structure, than which nothing could be more simple, and yet more sublime!” Sublime, maybe, simple, no.

Watkins has a relatively fresh take on the building. He identifies the Erechtheion by its fitting Pausanias’ description as a διπλοῦν οἶκημα, but for him the double aspect of the building is the North Porch and main building. He is non-committal about the location of the cults, but his opinions can be deduced because he says the temple of Pandrosos (he is referring here to the Maiden Porch) is adjoining that of Polias (the main

³³⁰ Paton et al. suggest Fauvel got his information from Elgin’s agents who were granted permission to investigate inside the gunpowder magazine: Paton et al. 1927, p. 547.

³³¹ Watkins 1792, p. 285; Winckelmann 1764. On Winckelmann, see above “Barthélemy.”

building). He follows Chandler and Stuart with regard to the bent olive tree in the Maiden Porch.

By the late 18th century, the term “caryatid” is evidently closely associated with the Erechtheion. Watkins repeats Vitruvius’ story but offers an interesting theory that challenges the standard etiology:

As this building was constructed about fifty years after the sack of Athens by the Persians, it is conjectured, and with all probability, that the order was designed as a satire upon Artemisia, queen of Halicarnassus in Caria; who, though in origin a Greek, assisted the Persian with a fleet against her mother-country...These figures have been spelled *Caryatides* from a supposition that they were indeed to represent women of *Carya* in *Peloponnesus*, a city in league with the Persians; but this is a weak conjecture, as their Asiatic dress alone will prove the contrary.

BISANI

Diametrically opposed in style to Watkins was a contemporary traveler, Alessandro Bisani, who published his *Picturesque tour through part of Europe, Asia, and Africa* anonymously (T 34). His account of the Erechtheion is to the point, although he betrays a misunderstanding of the building by not assigning cults to specific parts of the building, and by confusing Pandrosos with Pandora. His account can be dated to July 1788 and he describes Fauvel’s excavations in the interior of the main building:

A traveler [Fauvel] having obtained permission of the aga to dig in the temple of Erecteus, with a view to discover the well, the salt water of which, according to Pausanias, was agitated by the south wind like the waves of the sea, and on the rock of which Neptune caused his trident to be carved out, they dug up two beautiful columns of ancient green marble, which are trod under foot, no one being at the trouble to elevate them.³³²

Bisani insists that Pausanias mentions the Maiden Porch without mentioning the “mutilated” maidens themselves in his explanation of the Arrhephoreion. For him, the

³³² Bisani 1793, pp. 67-68.

maidens are “*canephors*” or basket-bearers. There is no mention of Vitruvius and the maidens being “*caryatids*.” His last line betrays some familiarity with Wheler’s account, and as Wheler does not make the Vitruvian connection, neither does Bisani. It is interesting to note that by the late 18th century, most travelers are using the more recent works of Stuart and Revett as their guide, instead of Spon and Wheler.

SCROFANI

Xavier Scrofani, Sicilian historian and economist, said of Athens in general in 1794, “Forget everything you have read about Rome, Pompeii or the other capitals of Europe, Athens defies them all.”³³³ Independent travelers like Scrofani and Watkins were, at this time, trickling into Athens, jaded to a certain extent by the well-trampled paths of the travelers on the Grand Tour in Italy. Their efforts to get to Greece were justly rewarded.

Although Scrofani may wax poetical about the Erechtheion, he is a less a reliable source than Watkins (T 35). For example, Scrofani misdates the destruction of the Parthenon by ten years, and says Jupiter and not Hephaistos/Vulcan is honored alongside Neptune and “Butis” in the Erechtheion.

Scrofani was, no doubt, used to seeing a flattened version of an Ionic column as the antae or “*pilastres*” in the Palladian-style buildings in Western Europe. For him, the antae of the Erechtheion represent the Doric style and he therefore chastises the ancient Greeks for mixing the orders:

Les pilastres du mure sont d’ordre Dorique. Mais pourquoi ce mélange d’architecture ? qui oserait décider sur ce qui appartient au goût chez les Grecs. Tout ce qu’on peut dire, c’est que cette union ailleurs monstrueuse et discordant à la vue, non-seulement

³³³ Scrofani 1801, letter XLVIII.

ne choque point ici, mais va même jusqu'à faire plaisir. Une guirlande de fleurs qui règne sur la frise, unit les deux ordres : l'acanthé mêlée aux autres feuillages y produit un effet charmant.³³⁴

He is nevertheless taken with the freshness of the anthemion necking bands, characterizing them as “roses qui ont tant de fraîcheur, qu'on serait tenté de les cueillir.”³³⁵ Like his contemporary Watkins, Scrofani's approach to the Erechtheion is also relatively non-derivative. He is positivist toward the existence of the well of Poseidon: “Avez-vous observé, en montant à la forteresse, le ruisseau d'eau salée? c'est ici qu'il a son origine : il n'y a pas longtemps [sic] on y voyait encore le puits qui portait le nom du dieu des mers ; mais aujourd'hui, l'escalier qui y conduisait, la porte, le puits même, tout est abîmé et comblé.” Scrofani is referring to the Klepsydra Fountain on the North Slope of the Akropolis, north of the Propylaia, and to the steps that ascend toward a door near the so-called House of the Arrhephoroi.

Scrofani shows his awareness of the prevailing theories about the Erechtheion in his comments on the Maiden Porch. He offers several theories including that of the *twelve* daughters of Erechtheus, but espouses Vitruvius' explanation of “caryatid” as the correct interpretation. He imagines that there were once two porches of six maidens each, one at the north and one to the south: “Ces figures, au nombre de six de chaque côté, formaient deux portiques : l'un au midi, et l'autre au nord ; mais il n'en reste plus que quatre de ce dernier côté.” It is hard to imagine that this is due to carelessness, especially his notation of four remaining ones. Among the travelers' accounts, his description of the maidens themselves is the longest so far. Scrofani's imagination runs away from him, and he is driven to understand the passion of Pygmalion. The immediacy of his

³³⁴ Scrofani 1801, p. 76.

³³⁵ Scrofani 1801, p. 76.

obsession and the contemporaneity of his account (in a letter) are underscored by his closing comments: “Une jeune Grecque est venue me vendre des figes délicieuses qui croissent dans un petit jardin de la forteresse. Je savoure ce fruit en vous écrivant cette lettre au pied d’une belle Cariatide, en jetant les yeux tantôt sur la statue, tantôt sur la jeune fille, ou bien sur le temple de Minerve qui menace de m’ensevelir sous ses ruines, en m’occupant de vous, d’Athènes, de l’avenir.”³³⁶

Scrofanì uses Spon’s account and interprets his comments on the Pandroseion as being south of the Parthenon. He found a wall with one of the slabs of the east frieze of the Parthenon built into it. He interpreted it as showing the ceremony of the arrhephoroi. Thomas Hope depicts this very slab the following year in one of his sketches of the Akropolis (Figure 140).³³⁷

Scrofanì’s long-winded ode to the Maiden Porch reflects the growing trend of Romanticism in Western Europe. The Erechtheion has become the source of inspiration, the maidens themselves Muses (although Scrofanì rejects this as their actual significance), for the poetic outburst of this traveler. Even though the account is not written in verse, parallels for its sentiment and flowery language can be found in contemporary poetry of the late 18th century being written by the great English poets Keats, Shelley, and Byron, and even in the art historical writings of Winckelmann.

³³⁶ Scrofanì 1801, p. 80.

³³⁷ Hope, *East Frieze of the Parthenon on the ground*, ca. 1795. On Hope, see below “Hope.” The interpretation of this fragment of the Parthenon’s east frieze may give some credence to Paton et al.’s disbelief that Spon and Wheler were describing the Maiden Porch when they speak of women enclosed in a wall (Paton et al. 1927, p. 532, note 1); however, the maidens’ actual immurement and the hovels that can be constructed adjacent to them still trumps their doubt.

HOPE

Thomas Hope was a Scottish writer and designer born in 1769. At the tender age of eighteen, he embarked on his Grand Tour which encompassed not only Europe, but Asia and Africa as well. He eventually settled in Amsterdam where he became an influential designer in the “English Empire” style. He was strongly inspired by the Greek motifs he encountered on his travels (Figure 687). Hope did not indulge in the typical travel writing as such, but published a novel anonymously.³³⁸ His book caused a great sensation for its innovative description of eastern life.

Hope visited Athens in 1795 on the return leg of his Grand Tour. While he employed painter Michel François Préaux who created the engraving of the northeast view of the East Porch of the Erechtheion that appears in Clarke 1814, Hope also created two plans, one of Athens,³³⁹ and one of the Akropolis (Figure 30).³⁴⁰ The caption for the Erechtheion on the latter is: "G. the temple of Erechtheus, Minerva Polis & Pandrosus foundation of an ancient wall, perhaps pelasgic, it is of hewn stone, well built." Despite the fact that Hope puts six columns in the west room of the Parthenon, his plan of the Erechtheion is fairly well done and does not appear to be simply a tracing of any previously existing plan such as Stuart's or Le Roy's. Unlike Fauvel, he is obviously only interested in the ancient remains, although his drawing of the east frieze of the Parthenon, mentioned above in the context of Spon and Wheler's immured women, illustrates picturesquely how the ancient fragments were an accepted part of the day-to-day built environment of the inhabitants of the Akropolis (Figure 140).³⁴¹

³³⁸ Hope 1819.

³³⁹ Hope, *Map of Athens*, ca.1795.

³⁴⁰ Hope, *Plan of the Acropolis*, ca. 1795.

³⁴¹ See also note 337.

Upon Hope's return to Western Europe, he incorporated elements of the Erechtheion in his designs, such as in his own home at the Duchess Street Mansion, Portland Place, London.³⁴² He does not appear to have used the Erechtheion order on the exterior of his building designs, perhaps considering the temple too elegant for exterior use.³⁴³ When asked for his opinion on the design for Downing College at Cambridge, Hope declared that "he alone in England was qualified to pronounce on architectural matters," pointing out that "Greek architecture, and especially Greek Doric, was the only style worthy of serious imitation," thanks to his experience and travels in Greece. Some social invitations were revoked in reaction to his comments, but with Sir John Soane as one of Hope's supporters, Hope's recommendation that William Wilkins be the architect of Downing College was taken up.³⁴⁴ Ironically, Wilkins "lost his nerve over the Greek Doric and only produced Greek Ionic which, to the layman, is indistinguishable from Roman Ionic."³⁴⁵ Wilkin's design for Downing College in fact uses elements of the Erechtheion's plan and Ionic order (Figure 688).³⁴⁶ In any case, Hope certainly demonstrated his disdain for the "bastardized" Roman orders in his various pamphlets.

MORRITT OF ROKEBY

Born the son of John Sawrey Morritt of Rokeby Parke, Yorkshire, John B.S. Morritt of Rokeby (1771-1843) was educated in Greek and Latin literature at St. John's College, Cambridge. He set out on his Grand Tour at the age of twenty-four, and reached Athens in the same year as Hope, in 1795.

³⁴² The exterior was designed by Robert Adam.

³⁴³ Watkin 1968, p. 103.

³⁴⁴ See below "Wilkins."

³⁴⁵ Watkin 1968, p. 61.

³⁴⁶ Curiously, Watkins does not mention this in his lengthy discussion of the plans for Downing College: Watkin 1968, pp. 61-65.

Morrith returned to England, not to become a designer or architect, but instead an influential country squire and landlord. He later pursued a career in politics, being elected to Parliament for various constituencies. He was not in the House of Commons in 1814, however, when the Select Committee investigated the artistic integrity of Elgin's marbles, although he did testify to the "conditions prevailing at Athens when they were collected," admitting that "when he had been in Athens in 1795, he had bribed the Disdar to allow him to take some pieces of the frieze and a metope but had been prevented by Fauvel."³⁴⁷

Fauvel evidently showed Morrith around the Akropolis, as is betrayed by comments such as "I am assured by our French acquaintance that the North portico is nothing more than an entrance" (T 36).³⁴⁸ Morrith considered the Erechtheion "perfect" but this was more in terms of preservation than aesthetic merit. On the other hand, he is very impressed with the ceiling of the Maiden Porch, observing that "It consists of single marble blocks, which lie across the whole roof, and are worked so admirably within that I have seen few ornaments of stucco in England so light and finished." It is interesting to note the comparison to the arts in England which were evidently flagging to such a degree as to inspire Elgin to declare this as his reason for bringing back the marbles from the Erechtheion and the Parthenon.³⁴⁹

Morrith's description of the Maiden Porch before Elgin's activities is one of the most complete:

In the wall are four female figures, instead of pillars, of the most beautiful design; they are colossal, each about seven feet high, and, having been elevated some height from the ground, are not

³⁴⁷ St. Clair 1997, p. 251.

³⁴⁸ Morrith of Rokeby 1914, pp. 175-176.

³⁴⁹ See below "Lord Elgin, Lusieri, Hunt and Lady Elgin."

delicately carved, but boldly touched to effect; the drapery, however, is exquisite. Their arms are broken, their noses and eyes much defaced, and they are built up in a shabby, rough wall; but originally the spaces between them have been open, and they supported the roof. These, if you talk learnedly, you must call them Caryatides.

The emphasis in this quotation's final sentence demonstrates literally the immediate appeal of the Erechtheion maidens, namely the satisfaction that comes with knowing that they ought to be called "caryatids." Was this not one of the primary motivations for those lucky and/or wealthy enough to embark on the Grand Tour, to become learned and be able to show it in polite conversation?³⁵⁰

Although he seems impressed more by the scale of the maidens than their significance (which he does not dwell on) or their delicacy, Morrill was certainly taken with the Ionic order of the Erechtheion, complaining again, that in England, such feats are no longer attainable.³⁵¹ "I never saw the Ionic order more beautiful, and begin really to think the ancient Grecians were inspired by some genius of elegance and taste that has since given over business, for we do not make any more of these kind of miracles now."³⁵²

THE DAWN OF A NEW AGE: THE 19TH CENTURY

The last accounts and drawings of the Erechtheion before Lord Elgin's interventions were made by Gell and Préaux at the close of the 18th and dawn of the 19th centuries. Lord Elgin's agents changed the landscape on the Akropolis for all time between 1800 and 1803. The most visible changes were not to the Parthenon, but to the Erechtheion, which suffered the loss of a maiden, a whole column and several

³⁵⁰ See Lesk in preparation.

³⁵¹ Robert Adam had already died, and Sir John Soane has taken over as Britain's most important architect in Morrill's time. See below "Robert Adam and Sir John Soane."

³⁵² Morrill of Rokeby 1914, p. 176.

architectural blocks. Many travelers from all over Europe comment on Elgin's activities, most of them criticizing his actions. Some travelers, however, supported Elgin's goals and ambition to improve taste and the quality of art and architecture in Britain. The following sections examine the accounts and depictions of the early travelers who interacted with Erechtheion from just prior to Elgin's interventions through the first two decades of the 19th century.

GELL

Cambridge educated William Gell (1777-1836) first traveled to Greece in 1800-1801 having been elected a Fellow of the Society of Antiquaries. On this trip, he made many sketches of the Erechtheion, from all different angles, some of them unique such as the inside of the Maiden Porch. The attention he lavished on the building would suggest he was quite enamored with the building at this point in time. These sketches are preserved in his notebooks, mainly in the British Museum.³⁵³ Gell also kept a journal of his travels which he never published (T 37).³⁵⁴ The manuscript is in the University of Bristol Library.³⁵⁵ Gell published itineraries of his travels that literally set down the number of paces between successive landmarks, the first of their kind for Greece, and famously used by Lord Byron on his travels.³⁵⁶ In 1811, he returned as a Member of the Society of the Dilettanti and a Fellow of the Royal Society to continue the Society's

³⁵³ The Benaki Museum and the British School at Athens also have some of these notebooks. Fani-Maria Tsigakou of the Benaki and Amalia Kassis, Archivist at the British School, assured me that none of them contain any information on the Erechtheion.

³⁵⁴ Gell, *Diary of a Tour in Greece*, 1801.

³⁵⁵ I consulted a photocopy of this document in the Gennadeion in 2002.

³⁵⁶ Gell 1810; Gell 1827; Simopoulos 1985, pp. 120-143. On problems with using Gell's and other travelers' accounts for reconstructing the topography and demography of the Greek hinterland, see Bennet, Davis, and Zarinebaf-Shahr 2000.

research into Greek antiquities.³⁵⁷ His attitude toward the Erechtheion changed on this trip and he regarded the temple with unveiled contempt (T 51).³⁵⁸ Gell found royal favor and was knighted in 1814. He soon found himself serving as chamberlain to Caroline, the Princess of Wales, on her foreign travels, and in her defense at her divorce trial from George IV in 1820.

The importance of Gell's documentation cannot be underestimated. Not only did he witness the activities of Elgin's agents, he also recorded his thoughts on, and visions of, the building immediately before, during, and after their interventions. Elgin's agent, Lusieri, even appears in Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis, 1801*, making a study of the building while standing on the North Porch (Figure 35).

Gell's unpublished journal contains several important nuggets of new and important information. Nonetheless, he was tremendously bemused by the Erechtheion, and considered its unusual plan to be the result of several successive building projects: "It is difficult to imagine why the ancients should have added two buildings so dissimilar in shape and dimensions, to the western front of a temple, otherwise regular as the Portico and the Pandroseum unless they were erected at different times and on account of some particular worship."³⁵⁹

His account of the Erechtheion is quite disorganized, and is divided between two sections in the manuscript. The first section describes a hollow passage that he related to the miraculous spring of Neptune, which extended from the area northeast of the Propylaia (the Klepsydra). The second section contains the main description, and begins

³⁵⁷ Ridgway 1996.

³⁵⁸ Gell, *Journal of the Dilettanti Mission to Asia Minor & C A: D^w*, 1811.

³⁵⁹ Gell, *Diary of a Tour in Greece*, 1801, p. 68.

like many others: “In a direction due North from the Parthenon of the distance of...” there lies the triple [not double, as in Pausanias, but structurally triple] temple. The “best” approach to the temple is, “to walk over the ruined fragments of sculpture...from the North side of the Parthenon when a path will conduct you by the figures supporting the Pandroseum to the front of the building,” i.e., the North Porch. These directions reflect the arrangement of the roads visible in Fauvel’s rough plan (Figure 26).³⁶⁰

Gell describes the access to the loft in the North Porch for the first time. This loft will soon be drawn by Cockerell and Hansen, and visited by many travelers (although not by Gell himself), several of whom would their marks on the interior of the entablature: “Near the capital of the North eastern pillar is an [sic] hole from which the roof may have been seen composed of marble in square compartments and from it may also be discovered the top of the door now walled up which once led into a passage before the temple of Erectheus.” This is also the first reference to the coffers of the North Porch since the Venetian occupation. Similarly, while Locatelli was the first, and thus far only, traveler to mention the beads in the guilloche of the North Porch capitals, Gell describes them accurately for the first time as “pieces of colored Chrystal [sic]..., placed there for the purpose of adding lustre to the highly finished work.”³⁶¹

Gell’s reasoning for the placement of the cults anticipates Paton et al.’s, namely that Minerva Polias must face east and Poseidon should be in the west half because it is closer to the sea. Gell is also the first to calculate the number of years before Christ that

³⁶⁰ Fauvel, *Rough Plan of the Acropolis*, 1787.

³⁶¹ Locatelli thought the beads were made of lapis and carnelian. They were in fact made of colored glass.

the olive wood statue of Athena Polias was supposed to have fallen from heaven by working out the dates of the reign of Erichthonius.³⁶²

The scientific tone of his description of the Maiden Porch mirrors his lack of emotion for the maidens themselves. He does not consider them to be “of the very first rate workmanship,” but does allow that they, nonetheless, “have a singular effect from without.” Gell’s drawings of the Maiden Porch offer the most important information about the walls between the maidens that were mentioned by Morrith and others.³⁶³ Gell probably depicted the walls between the maidens because he was less emotionally and aesthetically impressed by them, and so was not so compelled to liberate them from their bonds.

Gell’s notebooks in the British Museum’s Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities contain a series of six drawings in various states of completion and attention to detail.³⁶⁴ All in all, this series comprises a full 360 degree description of the state of the building just prior to Elgin’s intervention (Figure 581). Gell uses warm colors: browns, pinks and reds, for the marble blocks. The drawings vary in their degree of accuracy. It is clear from the inconsistencies among them that he finished the details elsewhere.

The most important information to be derived from Gell’s drawings relate to the accretions to the Erechtheion. Although we do not acquire any information about the

³⁶² Although Gell does not specifically state he is doing so, his calculation is perhaps based on the Parian marble. The Parian Marble was brought to London from Smyrna by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel in 1627, and covers the years 895-355 B.C. A smaller fragment of the same inscription, covering the years 336-299 B.C., was found in Paros in 1897: Jacoby 1904; Jacoby 1929, no. 239.

³⁶³ See above “Morrith of Rokeby.”

³⁶⁴ Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 35); Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800 (Figure 36); Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800 (Figure 37); Gell, *Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 32); Gell, *Interior of the Porch of the Maidens*, 1800 (Figure 34); and Gell, *Inside the East Portico*, 1800 (Figure 33).

state of the South Wall for 1800, Gell illustrates what has blocked the lower part of the South Wall since before 1749 (Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast*, 1749 Figure 13): the South Building. Its highest course is level with course 5 of the Erechtheion (i.e., the top of the capitals of Maiden #5 and the east pilaster of the Maiden Porch). The South Building runs the length of the South Wall and incorporates the east part of the Maiden Porch (as visible in Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800, Figure 37). Gell's southwest view (Figure 32) also shows that there was a door half way along the south wall of the South Building.³⁶⁵ Several contemporary travelers such as Morrith (T 36) describe the maidens as being enclosed in a wall. Gell's drawing from the west (Figure 35) describes this visually and explicitly by showing masonry between the maidens. In two of his other drawings of the Maiden Porch (Figure 32 and Figure 34), Gell has either succumbed to the temptation of eliminating the walls between the maidens, or these undated drawings date to 1801, after Lusieri removed them (T 39). The interior of the Maiden Porch had been accessible for a some time, so it was easy for Gell to include the design of the moldings at the top of the back wall of the Maiden Porch in his drawings.³⁶⁶

While Stuart was the first to depict the curious accretion in the angle of the Western Projection of the North Porch, it was without detail. Gell, on the other hand, delineates this structure quite carefully.³⁶⁷ In Gell's drawing, this masonry structure has an additional vertical element that rises up to course 8 of the West Façade in the angle of the Westward Projection of the North Porch. In Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of*

³⁶⁵ The door to the South Building is also depicted in Atkins, *The Erechtheion from the Southwest*, 1801 (Figure 38).

³⁶⁶ The same is true for Dalton's 1749 drawing from the southeast and his detail of the Maiden Porch.

³⁶⁷ Joseph Woods (T 58) tells us it served as the antechamber to the gunpowder magazine in the North Porch: Woods 1828, p. 257.

Erechtheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis, 1801 (Figure 35), Lusieri has placed his ladder on the top of this structure as his means of accessing the roof of the North Porch. Some of the most striking changes to the building are the loss of WW.CC.01-03, WW.BB.01-03, WW.AP.02-04, that is, all the cornice and frieze blocks from the West Façade, as well as the lesbian kymation and bead-and-reel molding above the architrave.³⁶⁸ Several of these blocks appear to be lying on the ground, colored in brown wash, near the bulky masonry accretion in the angle of the Westward Projection of the North Porch and the West Façade. Gell, *Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 32), also offers the earliest indication that the narrow course, WP.04.04, existed in the ancient building.³⁶⁹

Unique among all the drawings of the Erechtheion by early travelers is Gell's depiction of the pointed-arch windows in the intercolumniations of the North Porch (Figure 36).³⁷⁰ Gell is only partially consistent about showing the masonry used to fill in the windows (cuttings in the columns for sills also attest to the existence of the windows), but he is specific enough in his delineation of the masonry to determine that the lines of the arches are the result of a filling-in of, and not the outline of something abutting, the intercolumnar walls of the North Porch.

Gell, *Temple of Erechtheus*, 1800, is the earliest clear view of the pediment of which two blocks, PN.PP.02-03, remain, as only suggested in Le Roy's 1755 view. As mentioned above, a parapet composed of various types of masonry appears to encircle the

³⁶⁸ Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erechtheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis*, 1801. This drawing must date to before July 1801, when Hunt reported to Elgin that he had removed a block of the Erechtheion cornice (T 39).

³⁶⁹ This is confirmed by Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819 (Figure 58). See Chapter III for a discussion of this narrow block's significance.

³⁷⁰ Gell, *Temple of Erechtheus*, 1800. Perhaps other artists did not depict these pointed arches because they did not know what to make of them. The arches were clearly Post-Antique and so it may have seemed reasonable to them to omit them.

roof of the North Porch, creating a walled terrace. Also visible in the same image is the remainder of the North Addition (Figure 36). Gell appears to have gone slightly overboard in his delineation of the masonry of this structure, which in the earlier painting by Pars (Figure 22) and a later drawing by Basevi (Figure 53) appears to be covered in plaster.³⁷¹ Similarly, Gell indulges in the restoration of NN.BB.01 and NN.CC.01, both of which are clearly absent in 1765.³⁷² Also, the crenellation between the cross-wall of the North Addition and the North Porch is almost certainly a figment of Gell's imagination since in the aforementioned earlier and later images, the dilapidation is consistently portrayed.³⁷³

Gell's drawings of the Maiden Porch show its state for the first time after Fauvel's excavations. The podium is almost fully exposed, and brickwork fills in some of the damaged portions of its west side. This shoring-up may have been carried out by Fauvel. Gell executed a lovely drawing of the recently exposed interior of the Maiden Porch, which carefully delineates the damage to the interior of the podium and the state of Maidens #1-#3 and part of #4 (Figure 34).³⁷⁴

Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800 (Figure 37) shows the blocks from the demolition of the North Wall that took place some time between 1749 and 1765 (probably in search of the metal clamps) scattered in the interior. On the East Façade, all but two of the Eleusinian frieze blocks (EE.BB.01, 02, and 05) have fallen from the

³⁷¹ Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765; Basevi, *Erechtheion from the North*, 1818. Gell's rendition of the North Addition through the gap in the North Wall in Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800 (Figure 37) is more in keeping with Pars' and Basevi's depictions. Paton et al. discuss the difficulties under which Gell and others had to work, that is, difficulties which necessitated the completion of details at a later time: Paton et al. 1927, p. 613.

³⁷² These blocks are absent in his other views.

³⁷³ Unless this is another example of a temporary structure like the South Addition.

³⁷⁴ Gell, *Interior of the Porch of the Maidens*, 1800.

building since 1789.³⁷⁵ One of these frieze blocks, perhaps EE.BB.02, lies on the ground between EE.C2 and C3. The two remaining frieze blocks are still aligned with the rest of the architrave in 1800.³⁷⁶ Between EE.C4-C6 are the remains of rough walls, probably left over from when the East Porch was enclosed during its use as a private house.³⁷⁷ The two views of the East Porch show that excavation has revealed the Ionic bases of the columns. The unfinished interior view (Gell, *Inside the East Portico*, 1800, Figure 33) was made at a later date than the southeast exterior view (Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800, Figure 37). It is worth noting that SS.BB.01-02 are absent in both views of the southeast corner, but are present in the distant background in Pomardi, *Erechtheion*, 1804-1805 (Figure 43), and more clearly in Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811 (Figure 46).³⁷⁸ Furthermore, at least SS.BB.01 was still present at the end of the 19th century. Gell and the other artists who omit these frieze blocks may have done so either because the drawings were unfinished, or they did not suit the composition.³⁷⁹ Gell includes these frieze blocks, however, in the background, above SS.01.01 in his southwest view (Figure 32). For a reconstruction of the Erechtheion in 1800, see Figure 581.

Gell's drawings are also useful for information about buildings in the vicinity of the Erechtheion. In the foreground of Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus*,

³⁷⁵ Gell, *Inside the East Portico*, 1800; Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800.

³⁷⁶ Elgin's agents will displace the two remaining frieze blocks during their removal of EE.C6 and the other architectural blocks from the northeast corner of the temple in 1803. See below "Lord Elgin, Lusieri, Hunt and Lady Elgin."

³⁷⁷ Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800. On the walls between the columns of the East Porch, see Chapter VI.

³⁷⁸ These two blocks are also absent in Basevi's unfinished drawing: Basevi, *The Interior of the Erechtheion from the Northwest*, 1818 (Figure 52). They are distinctly present, however, in Thürmer, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1819 (Figure 61).

³⁷⁹ SS.BB.02 appears to have fallen off the building during the War of Independence, and SS.BB.02 in 1834, only to be replaced by Pittakis in 1837 as part of the first anastylosis of the Erechtheion.

Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis, 1801 (Figure 35), and at the right of the Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800 (Figure 36), are the remains of a very grand structure, perhaps made of (reused?) ashlar blocks and brick. When this building was fully standing, it would have easily completely blocked the view of the Erechtheion from the Propylaia. Restoring a tall building east of the Erechtheion goes a long way toward explaining why so many travelers failed to notice the Erechtheion before the Venetian siege when this structure was probably destroyed. Gell depicts a fully standing house to the south of the Erechtheion, complete with a door, windows, and a chimney.³⁸⁰ These two structures correspond in plan to the blocks defined by Fauvel, in Fauvel, *Rough Plan of the Acropolis*, 1787 (Figure 26): the ruined structure depicted by Gell can be placed in the block to the west of the Erechtheion in Fauvel’s plan, and the house with chimney in the block south of the Maiden Porch. According to Gell’s suggested approach to the Erechtheion described above (T 37), this house would have been on his left. The kiln clearly visible in Pars’ painting (Figure 22) reappears at the left of Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800 (Figure 36). It has lost its chimney and vaulted structure so clearly depicted from the other side in 1765 by Pars.

Gell revisited the Erechtheion in 1811 on his return trip to Athens as a Member of the Society of the Dilettanti and a Fellow of the Royal Society, in order to continue the Society’s research on Greek antiquities as mentioned above. By this time, Gell’s distaste for the Erechtheion hardened alongside his ire for Elgin’s activities (T 51). He writes in his journal about this second round of encounters with the temple whose:

...execution is admirable, but the design appears to me very indifferent. The Columns are much too slender, and the Capitals

³⁸⁰ Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800; Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis*, 1801.

overloaded with a multiplicity of lines and small mouldings, which destroy their simplicity and add nothing to their beauty-the drapery of the Caryatids finishes very awkwardly at the bottom and appears as if the lower part was buried in the Plinth on which the figure stands – the junction of the Temple of Pandrosus to that of Minerva Polias is very ill contrived, the mouldings of the Pedestal and Cornice being cut off abruptly without anything for them to stop against.³⁸¹

He remained unconvinced of the Erechtheion's delicacy and charm so often alluded to by his contemporaries. On this visit, he mentions only that EE.C6 has been removed, and that the North Porch continues to serve as a magazine. He ignores entirely the devastation to the Maiden Porch. It is also in this journal entry that he argues again that the fountain with the brackish water (the Klepsydra) is the source of Poseidon's well in the Erechtheion.

Gell's popular *Itinerary of Greece* (Gell 1827), for which the notes were taken on this 1811 trip, pays little homage to the Erechtheion, and barely gives enough of a description to identify the building to the user of his book: "The temple of Minerva Polias, Neptune, Erechtheus, and Pandrosus, is on the north of the Parthenon. The salt spring might possibly be discovered by excavation."³⁸²

CLARKE AND PRÉAUX

Edward Daniel Clarke (1769-1822) traveled Europe, not as an aristocratic on the Grand Tour, but as a tutor and companion to figures such as Lord Berwick. He eventually gained a respectable reputation, obtained a degree, and then later, was appointed to the new post of Professor of Mineralogy at Cambridge. His appointment was accompanied by his gift of the "Ceres" (actually one of two colossal female architectural supports from Eleusis [50 B.C.]) to the Fitzwilliam Museum of the university. Perhaps

³⁸¹ Gell, *Journal of the Dilettanti Mission to Asia Minor & C^o: D^o*, 1811. Friday, April 24.

³⁸² Gell 1827, p. 46.

recognizing the growing market for travel literature, Clarke published the huge manuscript of his travels and made a significant profit.

Clarke visited Athens in 1801. Soon after his arrival, he went looking for his “friend and former companion in the Plain of Troy, *Don Battista Lusieri*” in the Capuchin convent, which incorporated the Lysikrates Monument:

A monk told us that he was then busy in the Acropolis, making drawings in the Erechthéum; therefore leaving our horses and baggage, we set out instantly in pursuit of him, anticipating the gratification we should receive, not only in surprising him by our appearance where he had not the smallest expectation of seeing us, but also in viewing the noblest monuments of antiquity with a Cicerone so well qualified to point out their beauties.³⁸³

Clarke is highly aware of the travelers who had described the monuments of Athens before him (T 38). He is the first of several travel writers who explicitly attempts to not copy the descriptions of the great adventurers, such as Stuart and Revett, who had gone before him: “The author’s remarks will be confined to such observations as, to the best of his knowledge, have not been made by former travelers; but perhaps, even in such a communication, it will not be always possible to avoid repeating what others may have said.”³⁸⁴

Clarke expresses mixed feelings about the despoliation of the Parthenon as he witnesses men working for the “British Ambassador,” and comments introspectively that he had a “Mahometan feeling in this instance, and would gladly see an order enforced to preserve rather than to destroy such a glorious edifice.”³⁸⁵ It is the scale of the despoliation of which Clarke disapproves, as he happily arranged for the controversial removal of the Eleusis maiden, an action that was much to the chagrin of the local

³⁸³ Clarke 1814, pp. 469-470.

³⁸⁴ Clarke 1814, p. 470.

³⁸⁵ Clarke 1814, p. 483.

population who regarded her as essential to the fertility of the landscape.³⁸⁶ When Clarke left the Akropolis, he took a few choice pieces of the Erechtheion with him, but these are now lost.

Clarke's account of the Erechtheion is charmingly anecdotal, partly because it is intertwined with his reunion with Lusieri. It is by Lusieri's name only that he is allowed to enter the Akropolis, and climb about inside the Erechtheion, which was still heaped "with rubbish in the centre of it."³⁸⁷ Like Choiseul-Gouffier, Clarke was impressed by the columns of *verde antico*. One of these, Clarke "purchased from the Disdar; and having with great difficulty removed it from the Acropolis, we sent it to England. It is now in the Vestibule of the University Library at Cambridge."³⁸⁸ Clarke revealed his background as a mineralogist, and focused much attention on the materials which made up the Erechtheion. He is the first to comment on the "bluish-grey limestone"³⁸⁹ of the frieze, but mistakenly attributes the same material to other parts of the temple.

On the one hand, Clarke shows his prowess at independent thought by disagreeing with Stuart's allocation of the cults within the Erechtheion, arguing for the temple to be considered double, and not triple, and that the whole building was called the Erechtheion. According to Clarke, Minerva was in the east chamber, Pandrosos was in the west chamber, and the entrance to Pandrosos' sanctuary was via the North Porch. Clarke was convinced by a contemporary theory that the origin of all temples was sepulchral, and that this Ionic temple got its name from the Tomb of Erichthonios known to have been

³⁸⁶ Tomkinson 2002, pp. 22-27. She was Agia Dimitra to the Greek population.

³⁸⁷ Clarke 1814, p. 496.

³⁸⁸ Clarke 1814, p. 496. The column's present location is unknown according to Paton et al. 1927, p. 502, note 4. It was not transferred from the University Library to the Fitzwilliam Museum along with the Eleusis maiden.

³⁸⁹ Clarke 1814, p. 496.

within the Temple of Minerva Polias. On the other hand, Clarke demonstrates both his knowledge and gullibility when he cites Guillet/Guilletière on the well of Poseidon as proof that the Erechtheion is where Pausanias says it is because Guillet (but not Wheler) saw the well.³⁹⁰ Clarke did not seem bothered that he himself did not see the well with his own eyes, probably because he heard from Lusieri that it had not been found during his or Fauvel’s investigations, and so he assumed that Guillet saw it before the building had collapsed and its interior was filled with rubble.

Lusieri evidently gave him a guided tour of the temple and showed him the loft in the North Porch, which was apparently opened only on certain occasions for certain people. A visit to the loft was primarily to admire up-close the fine workmanship of the moldings:

Lusieri, for whom and for the other artists this passage has been opened said, that he considered the workmanship of the frieze and cornice, and of the Ionic capitals, as the most admirable specimens of the art of sculpture in the world: he came daily to examine it, with additional gratification and wonder.³⁹¹

In contrast to the comments on the damage and dilapidation to the maidens, Clarke reports that the Maiden Porch was in an “extraordinary state of preservation in which the Caryatides of the *Pandroseum* still remained; passing the hand over the surface of the marble upon the necks of these statues, it seemed to retain its original polish in the highest perfection.”³⁹² Also, contrary to Stuart’s theory about the olive tree in the

³⁹⁰ Clarke 1814, p. 502. See above “Guillet” and (T 8).

³⁹¹ Clarke 1814, p. 500.

³⁹² Clarke 1814, p. 500.

Maiden Porch, Clarke proposes a very “Bundgaardian” theory³⁹³ of how the temple was built around ancient olive tree, and cites the contemporary parallel of:

Cawdor Castle, near Inverness in Scotland; in which building a hawthorn-tree of great antiquity is very remarkably preserved.... The *hawthorn-tree* of Cawdor Castle, and the traditional superstition to which it has owed its preservation during a lapse of centuries, may serve as a parallel to the history of the *Athenian Olive*, by exhibiting an example nearly similar; the one being consider as the *Palladium* of an antient Highland Clan, and the other regarded as the most sacred relique of the Cecropian Citadel.³⁹⁴

Michel François Préaux (or Préaulx) was an artist in Constantinople in 1796, and was still in Turkey in 1827. Préaux accompanied Thomas Hope as his painter in 1799 when he came to Athens with Twedell, and he was Clarke's man in 1801.³⁹⁵ Clarke used his drawing of the Erechtheion's East Porch in his book (Figure 31).³⁹⁶ Paton et al. suggest the drawing was made either in 1799 or 1801, but it is of little value for gauging the state of the Erechtheion because Préaux took liberties and restored many blocks. For example, the South Wall was deliberately flattened out to allow for a glimpse of the Parthenon;³⁹⁷ the frieze blocks are all in place, which is possible only if the drawing had been executed in 1799, because in 1800 Gell consistently depicts only two frieze blocks still on the building (Figure 37), and the cornice block above it was already absent in Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765 (Figure 22). Préaux also exaggerates the damage to the columns of the East Porch for a Romantic effect. Paton et al. report that in 1914, a Parisian dealer owned a “large water-color of the west end of the Erechtheum

³⁹³ Bundgaard proposed that almost every anomaly of the Classical Erechtheion can be explained by the pre-existence of the ancient olive tree around which the temple was built: Bundgaard 1976. See Chapter II for a discussion of this theory.

³⁹⁴ Clarke 1814, pp. 501-502.

³⁹⁵ Tolias 1995, p. 22.

³⁹⁶ Préaux, *Temple of Erechtheus at Athens; East Porch of the Erechtheion*, 1799-1801; Clarke 1814.

³⁹⁷ Only the central section of the Parthenon was depicted, and curiously not the part which would have been visible to the east.

from the northwest, signed by Préaulx, showing the same free treatment of details, especially in the rendering of the mouldings of architrave and cornice.”³⁹⁸

SMIRKE

Architect Sir Robert Smirke (1780-1867), son of painter Robert Smirke, was intimately involved with, and generally supportive of, Elgin’s activities on the Akropolis. He was not, however, on the best of terms with Elgin because he had been rejected by him as his artist in 1799.³⁹⁹ Smirke was one of Soane’s students for a short time in 1796, but he left this practice to work with George Dance, the Younger.⁴⁰⁰ Smirke began his Grand Tour in 1801, and wasted little time publishing his travels before building what would become one of the largest architectural firms working in the Greek Revival style of architecture.

Smirke visited Athens in 1803, and executed a rather washed-out view of the Erechtheion from the northwest (Figure 40).⁴⁰¹ This drawing was probably executed before April 1803 because Maiden #3 still appears to be in situ.⁴⁰² The view resembles Gell’s drawings, and includes ruins of large buildings west of the Erechtheion, and houses in good repair south and east of the temple. The ruined cross-wall of the North Addition is visible behind the North Porch, which is still walled in. In contrast to the detail of the buildings surrounding the Erechtheion, he depicts the area north of the Erechtheion as a smooth slope, with no vestige of the kiln or other rubble visible in the earlier depictions.

³⁹⁸ Paton et al. 1927, p. 548, note 1. Unfortunately, this depiction has not come to light.

³⁹⁹ St. Clair 1997, pp. 134-135. On Smirke’s relationship with Elgin, see below “Lord Elgin, Lusieri, Hunt and Lady Elgin.”

⁴⁰⁰ See below “Robert Adam and Sir John Soane.”

⁴⁰¹ Smirke, *The Erechtheum from the Northwest*, ca. 1803. This is now in the Library at Royal Institute of British Architects in London.

⁴⁰² Maiden #3 was removed from the building in April 1803.

LORD ELGIN, LUSIERI, HUNT AND LADY ELGIN

Early collectors, such as Francis I, King of France, and Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel (1586-1646), have often been blamed for the popularization of collecting ancient sculpture.⁴⁰³ It was Lord Elgin’s architect for his house at Broomhall, Thomas Harrison, however, who put the idea of making plaster casts of parts of Athenian buildings into Elgin’s head, the first step on the slippery slope toward wanting the original *objet d’art*, rather than a second rate, plaster copy:

It was, he explained, now admitted that the best models for classical architecture were in Athens, and not at Rome where [Harrison] and other architects in the classical style had studied. Although the remains of the ancient buildings in Athens were now well known to architectural students through engravings, architects could not be fired by mere books.⁴⁰⁴

Elgin’s imagination caught fire. He saw himself as the medium of inspiration for the wholesale improvement of both the fine and smaller arts, as well as the enhancer of taste for the whole of Great Britain. He put it in so many words, and more eloquently: He sought to make his Embassy “beneficial to the progress of the Fine Arts in Great Britain,” and to bestow “some benefit on the progress of taste in England.”⁴⁰⁵ Like the noblemen who went before him, Lord Elgin assembled a formidable team of artists, architects, classicists, plaster cast-makers, and private secretaries.

Unfortunately for Elgin, the British Government was unwilling to invest in this endeavor to improve the arts with cash upfront. Elgin would have to fund the project himself. He approached the twenty-four year-old J. M. W. Turner, offered him a paltry salary, and reserved the right to retain full possession of all the drawings Turner would

⁴⁰³ Augustinos 1994, p. 50.

⁴⁰⁴ St. Clair 1997, p. 6.

⁴⁰⁵ *Select Committee Report*, cited by St. Clair 1997, p. 347, note 23.

produce. On top of that, Turner would be required to give Lady Elgin drawing lessons. Not surprisingly, they could not come to a deal, and so Elgin missed the opportunity to employ one of Britain's most important artists of the day.⁴⁰⁶ Elgin finally found his artist in Italy: Giovanni Battista Lusieri. William Richard Hamilton and John Philip Morier were to be his secretaries, and the Reverend Philip Hunt, his chaplain. Joseph Dacre Carlyle was chosen as the single, Government-funded, member of the team. Carlyle's job was to search out unknown classical manuscripts in the Byzantine monasteries of the Ottoman Empire, a task evidently deemed worthy of tax-payers' dollars.

Elgin was Britain's ambassador to the Sublime Porte at Istanbul from 1799 to 1803. His mission was ostensibly to look out for British interests in the East, to promote trade, to negotiate further privileges for Britain, and to protect all Christians in the Ottoman Empire. He found himself in the middle of a political debacle soon after his arrival, owing to Napoleon's growing ego and forays into the eastern Mediterranean, especially in Egypt, where the French general posed a direct threat to British interests.⁴⁰⁷ The local rulers, the Mamelukes, who managed a semi-independent state within the Ottoman Empire, were no match for Napoleon's army, and were quickly defeated. The Porte was torn about what to do. The French had been its ally in wars against Russia, a fact that had enabled the French Ambassador, the Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, "to corner the market in classical antiquities."⁴⁰⁸

⁴⁰⁶ St. Clair 1997, p. 7.

⁴⁰⁷ Napoleon was granted a *firman* by the khedive of Egypt (Said) to build the Suez Canal in 1800, but owing to engineering issues, construction only began in 1859 and was completed in 1867.

⁴⁰⁸ St. Clair 1997, p. 13; Choiseul-Gouffier was the proud donor to the Louvre of several of the best preserved sections of the Parthenon frieze, including one of the slabs from the east frieze, showing the procession of maidens holding phialai.

Tensions escalated to the point where war was declared, and all Frenchmen living under the Ottoman umbrella were arrested, including the famous Fauvel who had been living in Athens for decades and collecting antiquities on behalf of Choiseul-Gouffier and others. Admiral Nelson quashed the French fleet in Egypt at the battle of the Nile in August of 1798, leaving the French stranded. When Napoleon then took his land forces north to Syria, Britain sent the renegade Sir Sidney Smith to meet him in battle where he trounced them at Acre. Such were the historical circumstances in which Elgin found himself when he arrived to take up his post from Sidney Smith's brother, Spencer, an employee of the Levant Company,⁴⁰⁹ at Istanbul. He was in a position both to offer Britain's support against the French, and to demand special privileges such as the *firman* to make his studies and excavations on the Akropolis.

Described by Byron as “an Italian painter of the first eminence,” Giovanni Battista Lusieri (1755 – 1821) had established himself as a painter of archaeological scenes in Rome whom tourists could hire to create paintings to help them recollect the vistas they were beholding.⁴¹⁰ Unlike his predecessor, Giovanni Battista Piranesi, who added much foliage and created collages of images for picturesque appeal, Lusieri defied the prevailing Romantic sentiment: “It is very true that according to present styles ... pictures are produced which are created in the main part from imagination, but this way of operating I detest [as] one should faithfully imitate nature.” As Elgin's agent in Athens, Lusieri became intimately acquainted with the Erechtheion; Gell drew him taking notes on the roof of the North Porch (Figure 35). Unfortunately, no descriptions or

⁴⁰⁹ The Levant Company generally managed diplomacy on behalf of the British government at the Porte, and was consulted about Elgin's appointment: St. Clair 1997, pp. 16-19.

⁴¹⁰ This quotation comes from the notes to *Childe Harold's Pilgrimage*: St. Clair 1997, p. 187.

drawings of the Erechtheion in its actual state by Lusieri survive.⁴¹¹ He did, however, create an extensive series of restorations which are now in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum.⁴¹²

Arthur Hamilton Smith and William St. Clair have written definitive works describing the events and motivation of Lord Elgin and his agents on the Akropolis.⁴¹³ Excerpts from letters among the team members relevant to the acquisition of elements from the Erechtheion are reproduced in Appendix B (T 39). It is clear from this series of letters that the original intention in 1801 was to acquire and transport the whole Maiden Porch – an idea planted by William Hunt – (not the whole Erechtheion as is sometimes implied in modern literature) back to England, a feat that would have been on a lesser scale than the transportation of the entire Nereid Monument from Xanthos in 1838.⁴¹⁴ Elgin immediately contacted Lord Keith to ask for a ship from the Royal Navy:

Now if you would allow a ship of war of size to convoy the Commissary's ship and stop a couple of days at Athens to get away a most valuable piece of architecture at my disposal there you could confer upon me the greatest obligation I could receive and do a very essential service to the Arts in England. Bonaparte has not got such a thing from all his thefts in Italy.⁴¹⁵

Elgin probably added the reference to the French general, who had recently acquired artifacts such as the Rosetta Stone in 1799, to appeal to the Admiral's

⁴¹¹ Many of Lusieri's watercolors and drawings were lost in a shipwreck in 1828. This is not to be confused with the sinking of the *Mentor* near Kythera, which was carrying many of the Parthenon and Athena Nike marbles to England in 1802. These sculptures were retrieved from the sea floor: St. Clair 1997, pp. 116, 132-133.

⁴¹² Lusieri, *Ortografia Esterna del Tempio di Eritteo del lato rivolta al est*, 1800-1803; Lusieri, *Restored Elevation of the Erechtheion from the West*, 1800-1803; Lusieri, *Restored Elevation of the Erechtheion from the North*, 1800-1801; Lusieri, *Iconografia del Tempio di Eritteo*, 1800-1803; and Lusieri, *Porta del Tempio di Eritteo nel lato del Nord*, 1800-1803. There is a similar set of restorations by Sebastiano Ittar in the same collection: Ittar, *Drawings made for Lord Elgin*, 1800-1803.

⁴¹³ Smith 1916; St. Clair 1997.

⁴¹⁴ Sir Charles Fellows had learned from Elgin's mistakes and difficulties when he wished England to acquire the Nereid Monument. He convinced the British Museum to send him back to Xanthos, with a battleship full of empty crates and a crew of burly sailors to help him abscond with the monument.

⁴¹⁵ St. Clair 1997, p. 100. The letter is preserved among Lord Keith's papers.

competitive spirit.⁴¹⁶ But no ship could be spared, so the integrity of the Maiden Porch was assured for the time being. Elgin’s sense of entitlement to remove the whole of the Maiden Porch is outrageous considering the terms of the famous *firman* recently published by St. Clair.⁴¹⁷ The *firman* allowed Elgin and his crew to make paintings, drawings and casts unmolested, to dig for inscriptions and expose foundations as necessary, even to take away sculpture that had already fallen from the buildings; but it did not condone the wholesale removal of sculpture and architectural blocks still in situ. Elgin was not averse to pressuring and bribing the *voivode* to expand the confines of the terms laid out in the *firman*.⁴¹⁸

In 1801, Lusieri and Hunt wrote to Elgin to report that a block of the Erechtheion cornice had been sawn off the building. The only cornice block in the Elgin Collection belongs to the West Façade (newly missing in Gell’s drawings [Figure 35]).⁴¹⁹ Later in 1801, Lusieri wrote to Elgin discouraging him from attempting to remove the whole Maiden Porch to England on the grounds that one maiden would suffice because they are all so similar, “and not of such fine sculpture as the metopes and reliefs [i.e., of the Parthenon]”.⁴²⁰ But Elgin had his heart set on the whole Maiden Porch and wrote back to Lusieri late in 1801, encouraging him in a rather passive-aggressive manner to get on with the job: “I flatter myself that you have already thought of ways of transporting it.” In the same letter, Elgin put in his order for the other elements of the building: “I should wish to have, of the Acropolis, examples in the actual object, of each thing, and architectural ornament – of each cornice, each frieze, each capital – of the decorated

⁴¹⁶ Shaw 2003, pp. 70-71.

⁴¹⁷ St. Clair 1997, pp. 337-341.

⁴¹⁸ St. Clair 1997, pp. 86-97.

⁴¹⁹ Smith says it was from the North Porch: Smith 1892.

⁴²⁰ T 39: December 7, 1801.

ceilings, of the fluted columns – specimens of the different architectural orders.”⁴²¹

Lusieri reported back early in 1802 that a special, specific, *firman* would be necessary if Elgin wanted the Maiden Porch and that the “Turks and the Greeks are extremely attached to it, and there were murmurs when Mr. Hunt asked for it.”⁴²² Lusieri discouraged Elgin again, on the grounds that the upper parts of the Maiden Porch are in a “pitiful state,” and suggests instead that he “get the best of these Caryatids, to have it restored at Rome, and afterwards to have it moulded. In this way your Excellency might have this little monument quite complete.”

Even Lady Elgin involved herself in the acquisition of the Maiden Porch. Her letter to her husband has both a condescending and silly tone. A Captain Lacy had been persuaded to transport the monument, although he was, at first, against it, “but at last he was keener than anybody and absolutely wished you to have the whole temple of the Cari – something, where the Statues of the Women are.”⁴²³

By October 1802, almost a year since the beginning of the quest, Elgin was still trying to persuade Lusieri to acquire a maiden for him, and any other “fragments of Minerva Polias – a capital from these if possible.” Lusieri finally obliged, and in April 1803, the following parts of the Erechtheion were on Captain Gore’s ship, aptly named *Medusa* – the same ship which brought Elgin’s successor to Constantinople:

1. Maiden #3;
2. EE.C6;
3. NN.01.17 (northeast anta capital);

⁴²¹ T 39: December 26, 1801.

⁴²² T 39: January 11, 1802. See Paton et al. for discussion of Hunt’s failed memory when he testified on this issue to the House of Commons regarding Elgin’s Collection: Paton et al. 1927, p. 597.

⁴²³ T 39: May 25, 1802.

4. 3 epikranitis blocks from the North or South Walls (already on the ground?);
5. EE.AA.05 (northernmost architrave block from East Porch);
6. NN. AA.01 (easternmost architrave block of the North Wall);
7. WW.CC (a piece of the cornice from the West Façade); and,
8. PP.CF.18 (coffer from the ceiling North Porch).

Not surprisingly, the removal of these architectural elements destabilized the building. The Maiden Porch was propped up by a hastily erected masonry pillar, visible in all subsequent views of the Erechtheion, until the 1840s when a French team under the direction of Alexis Paccard restored the Maiden Porch.⁴²⁴ The two remaining frieze blocks from the East Façade were set askew during the removal of the EE.C6 and EE.AA.01. For a reconstruction of the Erechtheion after Elgin's degradation, see Figure 582. Subsequent drawings, beginning with Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811 (Figure 46), show that the northeast anta fell down as a consequence of the removal of EE.C6, the anta capital, and the architrave block that had spanned the space and linked them structurally. The ruin of the rest of the Erechtheion also accelerates after this time.

The fate and controversy of the Erechtheion and Parthenon marbles is well laid-out by St. Clair.⁴²⁵ Elgin was both vilified and quietly applauded by both his peers and the public.⁴²⁶ One of Elgin's supporters, traveler/architect William Wilkins, hints that had

⁴²⁴ See Chapter VIII.

⁴²⁵ St. Clair's agenda is to return the Parthenon marbles to Greece. For the argument against their return, see King 2004.

⁴²⁶ See note 505 for a list of Lord Byron's lampoons of Elgin and his activities.

he not removed the maiden, he would have received much less venom from both the locals and the British government.⁴²⁷

WILKINS

British architect, William Wilkins (1775-1839), visited in Athens between 1800-1804, and intended his publication to be a supplement to Stuart and Revett 1789 (T 40).⁴²⁸ The controversy over the sale of the Elgin Marbles to the British nation delayed the publication of his work because he had intended to use the drawings made by Elgin's artists. In the end, this plan had to be abandoned. Nonetheless, Wilkins provides a knowledgeable study of the Erechtheion and influenced Leake heavily with regard to the Erechtheion.⁴²⁹ Wilkins innovatively employed the Erechtheion in his discussions as a point of comparison with other ancient monuments, a nascent and growing endeavor among these pioneers of architectural history.

Wilkins provided a new reconstruction of the Erechtheion (Figure 39).⁴³⁰ It illustrates for the first time the wall that must have extended perpendicularly westward from the west side of the podium of the Maiden Porch. It also illustrates his theory that “the lower division had no approach from the west”⁴³¹ not because the West Door was hidden, but because he did not consider the West Door to be ancient. Instead, he thought that the “Pandroseum” was “approached through the portico in the south side... the stylagalmatic portico being attached to the latter.”⁴³² The last comment is a very

⁴²⁷ Wilkins 1816, p. 144. On the effect of Elgin's removal of the maidens, see below “Cazenove,” “Attitudes toward Lord Elgin's Activities,” and Shaw 2003, p. 42.

⁴²⁸ Wilkins 1816. Wilkins periodically and thoughtfully referenced, summarized, and challenged Stuart's theories on various aspects of the Erechtheion.

⁴²⁹ See below “Leake.”

⁴³⁰ Wilkins, *Restoration of the Erechtheion from the Southwest*, 1802.

⁴³¹ Wilkins 1816, p. 129.

⁴³² Wilkins 1816, p. 137.

interesting take on the architectural purpose and function of the Maiden Porch on which he elaborates elsewhere:

The floor of the portico at the other angle [corner], where statues of women supply the place of columns, and which may therefore be termed, for distinction sake, stylagalmatic, was nearly level with that of the lower division of the building; whilst the ground without on the south and east was so much higher as to have been level with that in front of the east portico. Under these circumstances, the statues were placed upon a continued pedestal elevated upon three steps so as to be more than eight feet above the ground.⁴³³

Wilkins expresses healthy skepticism about the validity of referring to the Erechtheion maidens as Vitruvian-defined “caryatids,” but his critique flounders at the end of the passage when he forgets that the Karyan matrons of Vitruvius’ story kept their fine clothing.⁴³⁴

The proof of the defection of the Caryans rests upon no other authority than this assertion of Vitruvius; and in the absence of all concurring testimony by historical writers, it is impossible to attach any degree of credit to it. In this instance had it been the intention to record such a fact, the attire of the statues, like that of the Persians, would have been such as to distinguish it from what was common to all Greece: otherwise all Greece would have shared in the obloquy the introduction of female statues is thought to have been designed to perpetuate. The ordinary dress of slaves, it is probable, would have been chosen for this purpose, to commemorate the nature of the punishment inflicted; but as the costume in which they are represented, is similar to that observed in various instances of early Grecian sculpture, the application to any particular nation or class of subjects wholly fails.⁴³⁵

G. E. Lessing was the first scholar to challenge Vitruvius’ story in the 18th century.⁴³⁶ His critical assessment of the issue was widely circulated,⁴³⁷ and Wilkins has picked up on many of Lessing’s points. Wilkins considers the *korai* to be *kanephorai* and

⁴³³ Wilkins 1816, pp. 128-129.

⁴³⁴ See Chapter IV for Vitruvius’ etiology of “caryatid.”

⁴³⁵ Wilkins 1816, pp. 139-140.

⁴³⁶ See Chapter IV for further discussion the reception of Vitruvius.

⁴³⁷ E.g., Kinnard analyzes Lessings arguments at length in his edition of Stuart and Revett: Kinnard 1825. See also Walpole 1817 (T 46).

notes “that they are still called by the modern Greeks by a word of similar import, Κορίτσια.”⁴³⁸

Wilkins is the first to identify the “greyish lime-stone” of the “frize” as Eleusinian, but he makes the mistake of considering the “fastigium of the pediment belonging to the north portico,” as “formed of the same material.”⁴³⁹ Wilkins is also the first to recognize that the iron dowels (or cramps as they are often referred to in the 19th century) are for attaching sculpture, but these attachments, he supposes, are made of bronze rather than of marble. It is worth noting here that none of the Parian marble fragments of the Erechtheion frieze had yet been associated with the temple by the turn of the 19th century.

Wilkins speaks in some detail about Lord Elgin’s activities, and, as an architect, even goes so far to defend him in the name of Architecture:

I am far from joining in the clamour which has been unjustly raised against Lord Elgin, by some recent travelers. As I resided at Athens whilst the collection, now in England, was removing, I can venture to say that the absence of what was actually taken down from the Parthenon will scarcely be felt. Had the Erectheum been suffered to remain untouched, his Lordship might have escaped all well-grounded censure. The advantages, however, that we may confidently expect to derive from the possession of the collection, are of too great a magnitude to permit us long to regret the loss the originals have sustained.⁴⁴⁰

There is a statement buried in the middle of this passage which is of great significance in the light of the ongoing controversy surrounding the rightful home of the sculptures and architectural fragments Elgin removed from the Akropolis: Wilkins

⁴³⁸ Wilkins 1816, p. 141.

⁴³⁹ Wilkins 1816, p. 147.

⁴⁴⁰ Wilkins 1816, p. 144.

implies that had Elgin not removed Maiden #3, there would have been little or no commotion regarding the Parthenon marbles.⁴⁴¹

Wilkins summarizes the state of the Erechtheion succinctly: “Five columns of its portico, and their epistylia, remain; but, mutilated and shaken, they will not long resist the attacks of time and wanton dismemberment. The wall toward the north is nearly level with the ground; that facing the south exists to a considerable height: the transverse walls have almost wholly disappeared.”⁴⁴² The Maiden Porch, too, is in a shabby state of repair, largely thanks to Elgin’s activities. Wilkins offers an almost blow-by-blow account of the process of the removal of the accretions and the maiden destined for the British Museum:

There were originally six statues supporting the south portico of the Pandroseum, four in the front, and one in each return; one of the latter was wanting when Stuart visited Athens. Its place had been ill supplied by a pile of modern masonry which disfigured the ancient building and afforded little aid in upholding it; another has been lately removed, and the unseemliness of the fabric considerably increased, by a substitute of similar rudeness and equal inefficiency. The statue last removed was taken from the front of the building, and consequently is one whose loss is more felt, and whose removal is the more to be lamented.⁴⁴³

Wilkins again emphasizes the great dismay and distress felt by the Ottomans and Greeks alike regarding the removal of one of the “sisters,” about whom travelers will soon record the rumors of weeping statues. On a more scientific note, Wilkins carefully notes the construction features of the Maiden Porch:

The roof, formed in the same blocks, is in four pieces, which extend from the south wall of the main building, and comprise the cornice over the heads of the statues in front: the upper surface is made with a gentle inclination from the wall towards the front: and the joints where the blocks meet are saddled, which clearly

⁴⁴¹ On the further significance of these statements, see below “Attitudes toward Lord Elgin’s Activities.”

⁴⁴² Wilkins 1816, p. 143.

⁴⁴³ Wilkins 1816, pp. 143-144.

indicates the intention of leaving this part of the edifice without any superior roof.⁴⁴⁴

Although he regretted the general despoliation of the Akropolis, he offers the Ottomans a back-handed compliment: “The Turks are accused of mutilating, without distinction, the sculptures of the Acropolis. The comparative state of preservation these statues have retained, although open to public approach and within the reach of every hand, is a proof that so long as a building remains nearly entire, no disfigurement, on the part of the Turks, ensues.”⁴⁴⁵ Wilkins reports that the “unhallowed hand” cannot get at the North Porch because it is all walled-up and serves as a gunpowder magazine, a situation he worries will result in some “sinister accident, similar to that which has already befallen the other buildings of the Acropolis, [which] may level it with the ground in an instant.”⁴⁴⁶ His worries were justified, if only because it made the otherwise intact North Porch a military target. And Wilkins was too confident that the North Porch would remain untouched; Elgin managed to remove one of the marble coffer blocks in 1803.

All in all, the whole tone of Wilkins’ work on the Erechtheion belies his profession as an architect.⁴⁴⁷

LEAKE

British topographer, antiquarian, historian, and numismatist, William Leake (1777-1860) was a man of erudite contradictions and publisher of many works on

⁴⁴⁴ Wilkins 1816, pp. 145-146.

⁴⁴⁵ Wilkins 1816, p. 142.

⁴⁴⁶ Wilkins 1816, p. 145.

⁴⁴⁷ For the influence of the Erechtheion on Wilkins’ later work as an architect, see above “Hope.”

Athenian topography, which differ from each other significantly (T 41).⁴⁴⁸ As a contemporary of Wilkins, Leake visited Athens three times between 1802 and 1805, and stayed in Greece for two years during the last visit.

Leake begins his account by expressing his frustration with Pausanias' ambiguity, and by laying out his own scientific method for approaching the topography of the Erechtheion. Together, Leake and Wilkins'⁴⁴⁹ accounts of the Erechtheion represent the first scholarly attempts to assess the literary, epigraphical, and architectural evidence, and to place the cults accordingly. Their major stumbling block was their conviction that the Pandroseion should be located within the temple.⁴⁵⁰ Leake's rationale for the multiplicity of terms for the Erechtheion is exceedingly well thought-out and argued, despite certain inherent and unavoidable flaws owing to the available evidence at this time:

On comparing these testimonies, therefore, with that of Pausanias, we may conclude that the whole building, which according to the Athenian traditions was founded by Erechtheus and became the place of his interment, was named Erechtheium; and that the Pandroseium was one of its two component parts, the temple of Polias having been the other. It does not appear that Erechtheus had any separate chamber or shrine sacred to him, but only an altar common to him and Neptune, with whom he was often identified in Athenian mythology. Considerable ambiguity in regard to the edifice has arisen from the circumstance of the entire structure having often been called the temple of Minerva Polias, as well as the Erechtheium.⁴⁵¹

⁴⁴⁸ The frontispiece of Leake 1821 shows the Imperial coin with the depiction of the Akropolis from the North (without the Monopteros: see Chapter IV).

⁴⁴⁹ See above "Wilkins."

⁴⁵⁰ Please note: Subsequent lengthy discussions of the development of the scholarship regarding the Erechtheion by early travelers and scholars will be avoided. This topic has been dealt with in excellent detail in Paton et al. 1927, and so will not be dwelled upon any further in this study except to highlight the major discoveries. Focus will remain on the changes to the temple according to the depictions and the cultural reception of the temple in the travelers' accounts.

⁴⁵¹ Leake 1841, p. 340. Wilkins (see above) had said something very similar and more succinctly: "Although the building, when spoken of collectively, was called the Erectheum, the two temples comprised within it were dedicated to Minerva-Polias, and the nymph Pandrosus": Wilkins 1816, pp. 129-130.

His discussion omits, however, some of the details of the building commented upon by those less mired by the complexity of the ancient evidence. This is a symptom of this type of publication, which is a topographical analysis, rather than a travelogue.

Leake and Wilkins are some of the first scholars to recognize that Herodotus saw a very different Akropolis, that is, before the construction of the Ionic Erechtheion, when he visited in the middle of the 5th century B.C.⁴⁵² While, on the one hand, Leake demonstrates his chronological awareness as a trained historian, on the other, he places equal value on the evidence provided by the Chandler Stele, Philochoros and Clemens of Alexandria.

In agreement with Wilkins, Leake inferred from his autopsy of the side walls that there must have been a crypt, or at least a lower level to the main building, which he attributed to Athena Polias. Wilkins claims to have seen “a door opening from a crypt below the temple of Polias, into the cella of the Pandroseium...in the lowest part of the wall of separation.”⁴⁵³ This possibility that there was a lower level (if not two levels in Leake’s view) in the east half of the Erechtheion has generally been ignored since the publication of Paton et al. 1927.⁴⁵⁴

Leake expresses a tender appreciation for the elegance of the building, having “new and elaborate ornaments, imagined with the utmost ingenuity and elegance of taste, and executed with a sharpness and perfection which it could hardly have been supposed that marble was capable of receiving,” but this must be considered in the socio-political

⁴⁵² Leake 1841, p. 574.

⁴⁵³ Leake 1841, p. 579, citing Wilkins 1837, p. 18 (*non vidi*).

⁴⁵⁴ See Chapter II for a discussion of the evidence for the lower level of the east half of the main building.

context of the Athenians' ambition to surpass the monuments of "their Asiatic kinsmen."⁴⁵⁵

Not surprisingly, there are major differences between Leake's two published theories. His publications are separated by two decades, the first of which, was published almost twenty years after his visits to Athens in 1802 and 1805 (see Tables 7 and 8 below). His earlier publication is generally in alignment with Wilkins'.⁴⁵⁶ Both publications are strangely silent on the activities of Lord Elgin's agents with regards to the Erechtheion. This suggests that he visited the Erechtheion prior to the major extractions that changed the building so drastically, e.g., the removal of Maiden #3 and EE.C6, in 1803. Lusieri's activities were, however, tacitly recognized by Leake in his notation of the re-excavation of the podium of the Maiden Porch to expose the staircase, which Wilkins, on the other hand, mentions explicitly. Leake was troubled by this staircase and concluded that it, and the east entrance, could not be original, but that the porch instead acted as an discrete chapel to the main building. Leake's explanation of the theories surrounding the South Porch is a very concise and learned assessment of the so-called facts:

Of the southern prothesis the roof was supported by six Caryatides or columns of which the shafts represented women in long drapery:⁴⁵⁷ of these four still remain⁴⁵⁸ standing upon a podium and basement eight feet above the exterior level, and about fifteen feet above the floor of the building. In the inscription already referred to, these statues are designated by the term αἱ Κόρραι (the young women).⁴⁵⁹

⁴⁵⁵ Leake 1841, p. 575.

⁴⁵⁶ Leake 1821.

⁴⁵⁷ "Mr. Wilkins supposes them to have been Hydriaphorae, and that each had a water-jar in one hand..."

⁴⁵⁸ "A fifth has since been found in an excavation near the spot where it had stood. That which is in the BM, therefore, is the only one now wanting." Note of 1838.

⁴⁵⁹ Leake 1841, pp. 342-343.

Table 7 summarizes the differences between the allocation of the cults in the Erechtheion according to Leake’s 1821 and 1841 publications:

Table 7. Allocation of the Cults in the Erechtheion According to the 1821 and 1841 Versions of Leake’s Texts.

Feature	Location in 1821	Location in 1841
Butadae paintings	Exterior of East Wall	
Cecropium	Central Chamber	Maiden Porch
Altars of Neptune and Vulcan	In East Porch	
Altar of Jupiter	Outside of East Porch	
Pandrosium	West Chamber	West Chamber
Olive Tree and Altar of Jupiter Herceius	West Corridor	Maiden Porch
Wooden Statue of Minerva, Lamp, Altar of Oblivion, serpent, Hermes, Daedalus chair and Persian spoils	East Chamber	East Chamber with crypt
Well	East Chamber	

Table 8 summarizes the significant differences between Leake’s 1821 and 1841 plans:

Table 8. The Differences Between the Plans in Leake’s 1821 and 1841 Publications.

Feature	Location in 1821 plan	Location in 1841 plan (Figure 84)
Temple of Athena Polias	East chamber	East chamber
Cecropieium [sic]	Central chamber	Maiden Porch
Pandroseium [sic]	West & Central chamber	West & Central chamber
Erechtheus and Eumolpus	Due south of the Erechtheion	(North of the) North Porch

These two tables demonstrate that Leake reconsidered the ancient evidence carefully between publications; Table 7 shows that in 1841, he was more confused than ever, hedging his bets on the identification of the cults by omitting the location of the specific relics and cults, and emphasizing instead that features such as the well and the olive tree could not be moved during, or for, the construction of the marble temple after the Persian War.

DODWELL AND POMARDI

Edward Dodwell (1767-1832), amateur English archaeologist, was an inveterate traveler (T 43). On his way to Athens, the guards would not let Dodwell's party enter the city because they had come from Corinth, where the plague was raging. He distracted the guards while his Greek assistants sneaked by with the baggage horses. Then Dodwell galloped off in pursuit as the guards yelled after them.⁴⁶⁰ This highly observant traveler discussed many facets of Greek life in his *Classical and Topographical Tour*, including the illiteracy of females, and how they communicated with each other and their suitors through the language of flowers.⁴⁶¹

Dodwell is loathe to repeat what was already available in other travel books on the ancient topography and antiquities, and he finds many avenues for further research to which to turn his pen. He also is quick to put his artist, Simone Pomardi, to work at creating more accurate elevations and plans than were available in Stuart and Le Roy's works, which he criticizes harshly.⁴⁶²

Dodwell vividly describes the difficult process travelers had to endure in order to acquire from the *dizdar* access to the Akropolis, and the abuse they had to suffer while they worked at creating their visual records:

Being aware, from the experience I had had on my former visit to Athens, that the Disdar was a man of bad faith and insatiable rapacity, I made him a small present the first day, and begged the English agent to conclude a bargain with him for eighty piasters; in consideration of which, I was to have free access to the Acropolis as often as I chose. In order to prevent the Disdar from exacting a larger sum, it was stipulated that the payment should take place after I had completed all my drawings and observations. Many days however had not elapsed before the Disdar became impatient for the money, and asked me for a part of the promised sum: upon

⁴⁶⁰ Dodwell 1819, p. 287.

⁴⁶¹ Dodwell 1819, p. 289. Several other travelers remark on this as well, including Lady Wortley Montagu.

⁴⁶² Dodwell 1819, p. 292.

my refusal of which he prohibited my admission to the Acropolis. But when I returned, I succeeded in gaining an entrance, after enduring some insolent speeches from the soldiers, which I pretended not to understand....The *Dizdar*, however, became more and more impatient for the promised present: and in order to save time, I frequently sent my dinner up to the Acropolis; and with my artist, employed the whole day in drawing.⁴⁶³

The *dizdar* was fascinated and intimidated by the *camera obscura* Dodwell and Pomardi used to help them draw the monuments accurately. The soldiers inhabiting the Akropolis called Dodwell “a Buonaparte,” a Turkish synonym for “magician.” Whenever the *dizdar* caused them problems, Dodwell threatened to trap him inside the magical camera box. In reference to this anecdote, Dodwell dwells on the ironic superstition of the monuments’ custodians: “It is a humiliating reflection that such extreme ignorance should be found within the precincts of a temple, where the Goddess of Wisdom was once not only worshipped by the populace, but received the homage even of the wise.”⁴⁶⁴

On the one hand, Dodwell professed regret at the confiscation of antiquities and their confinement in collections and museums of western Europe. One example is “the colossal statue behind the Thrasyillos monument to London where it has lost all its context and hence interest.”⁴⁶⁵ On the other hand, when he died, he left behind a large collection of sculptures, vases, and bronzes, which the Glyptotek in Munich purchased.

Although it is hard to imagine, like some modern visitors whose expectations of the Parthenon are unreasonably high, Dodwell was initially unimpressed by that canon of temples: the Parthenon. But he soon learned to appreciate its scale, material, and technique, as well as feel the “inexpressible mortification of being present when the

⁴⁶³ Dodwell 1819, pp. 293-294; St. Clair paraphrases this passage and states that Dodwell was on the best of terms with the *dizdar*, and had easy access to the Akropolis on Hunt’s firman: St. Clair 1997, p. 102.

⁴⁶⁴ Dodwell 1819, p. 295.

⁴⁶⁵ Dodwell 1819, p. 295.

Parthenon was despoiled of its finest sculpture, and when some of its architectural members were thrown to the ground.”⁴⁶⁶

Dodwell traveled in Greece between 1801 and 1806. His account and depictions of the Erechtheion can be dated to 1805 because the description of Athens is listed under his second tour in the Table of Contents of *Classical and Topographical Tour*. He also visited the city in 1801 and explicitly refers to this previous visit in his 1805 account. His description of the temple is muddled for the purposes of this study by his constant comparisons to other double temples, both pagan and Christian.⁴⁶⁷

Dodwell disagrees with many of his contemporaries, and places Minerva/Athena in the west part of the temple; he returns to the identification of the Maiden Porch as the Pandroseion, and in doing so, criticizes Stuart and argues for a Vitruvian explanation: “and though they are extremely beautiful, and admirably sculptured, yet they have not the smallest characteristic of the Graces; but figuratively represent the weight of slavery, and the sever forms of Caryan females, rather than the light freedom and easy elegance of the daughters of Venus.”⁴⁶⁸ Not only does Dodwell highlight their ponderous “ungraceful attitude” and similarity of their drapery to the fluting of a column, he also includes an admirable summary of (almost) all the female architectural supports known in the early 19th century, having seen most of them himself on his travels in Italy.⁴⁶⁹

He complains that Stuart misrepresented the ornamentation of the Maiden Porch’s pilaster capitals: “At its north-east and north-west is a pilaster, of which Stuart has erroneously represented the capitals as equally ornamented on all sides; where the eastern

⁴⁶⁶ Dodwell 1819, p. 321. Elgin’s team dropped several blocks of the frieze: St. Clair 1997, pp. 102-103.

⁴⁶⁷ Dodwell 1819, p. 346.

⁴⁶⁸ Dodwell 1819, p. 353.

⁴⁶⁹ Dodwell 1819, p. 355.

side of the one and the western side of the other, are merely adorned with moulding, while the other faces are enriched with foliage, as they have been delineated in Stuart's work,⁴⁷⁰ in other words, the short sides of the pilaster capitals of the Maiden Porch. But his claims are unfounded, at least for ME.PE.01. The western anta capital MW.PW.01, however, was destroyed by the Ottomans in 1826. The eastern third of it survives, and its east face is adorned with an anthemion molding. It would make sense if the western face was not decorated because it would have distracted from the western elevation.⁴⁷¹ Only Gell's southwest view (Figure 32) shows the west face of MW.PW.01 as decorated; however none of Pomardi's drawings, nor Dodwell's own painting show this surface as being decorated with an anthemion pattern. Indeed, none of the rest of the depictions after 1805, until the capital's destruction in 1826, shows the west side of the capital as being decorated. The clearest examples are Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819 (Figure 58), and Williams, *Temple of Pandrosus*, 1817 (Figure 50). Dodwell is incorrect, however, about the eastern pilaster capital which is both in situ, and has an anthemion pattern carved on all three sides (Figure 233).⁴⁷²

Dodwell also comments on the removal of Maiden #3, and states that this occurred in 1801, the year of most of the removals from the Parthenon, and not 1803 as proven by the documentary evidence presented above, and in T 39.

Dodwell puts into words what the perspectives of his and Pomardi's paintings do not show, and which would not be illustrated until Haygarth's view in 1810-1811 (Figure

⁴⁷⁰ Dodwell 1819, p. 356.

⁴⁷¹ See Chapter II for a discussion as to whether the decoration of the west face of the western anta capital of the Maiden Porch was determined by design choice or necessity.

⁴⁷² See also and Paton et al. 1927, pl. 9.

46)⁴⁷³: “When I was first at Athens, the eastern front of the Erechtheion was adorned with an hexastyle colonnade of beautiful proportions and exquisite workmanship: but of the six columns which I beheld, only five remain. The column at the north-east angle has been taken away by the dilapidators [Dodwell’s term for Elgin’s agents], while some of the wall of the cella has been thrown down with part of the architrave and frieze [sic], and the north-east pilaster.”⁴⁷⁴ Many of the epistyle blocks also appear to have fallen into the interior of the temple. Dodwell believes these, and the remaining columns of *verde antico*, comprised the decoration of the interior of the Erechtheion. Otherwise, the interior is still full of debris that is impeding the discovery of the salt well.

It is somewhat ironic that the best description of the North Porch comes from someone who was unable to get permission to go inside it. Dodwell reports second-hand:

The northern tetrastyle portico, being now blocked up with a modern wall, is seen to great disadvantage. Its effect must have been airy, but weak, on account of the contrast of the elegant proportions of the columns with the uncommon breadth of the intercolumniation, which was the diastyle, deviating from the usual Grecian proportions. The interior of this portico is a powder magazine; its ancient ceiling [sic] and door-way, with its beautiful decorations, are entire; the former of which is composed of large beams of marble, twenty-two feet in length, ornamented with square compartments, where the ancient gilding is still visible. I here speak from the authority of others, as I found it impossible to obtain permission to examine the interior of the building, which is highly interesting from its perfect state of preservation. The door which led from the portico to the cella is blocked up.⁴⁷⁵

It is interesting that Dodwell disapproves of the proportions of the colonnade about which most other travelers wax poetical, especially once its intercolumnar walls are removed after the War of Independence.

⁴⁷³ Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811.

⁴⁷⁴ Dodwell 1819, p. 348.

⁴⁷⁵ Dodwell 1819, p. 352.

Dodwell (published 1819) follows Wilkins (published 1816) in recognizing the Eleusinian source of the limestone for the frieze, and he correlates it with the relevant passages in the Chandler Stele. Dodwell muses as to whether the “cramps” were designed to hold bronze or marble sculptures, and decides they must be bronze because “the cramps do not appear of sufficient size and strength to support the weight of marble blocks; besides which, the necessary thickness of the marble would have formed too great a projection for the place which they occupied.”⁴⁷⁶ Here he is trying to fathom slabs like those of the Parthenon frieze attached to the Eleusinian blocks which he, in turn, considers frieze backers.

Pomardi’s views of the Erechtheion were inserted as engraved plates into *A Classical and Topographical Tour*.⁴⁷⁷ They are accurate in their details of the temple, and show the accretions on the west side of the Erechtheion. All three of the images of the temple (including Dodwell’s own)⁴⁷⁸ in Dodwell 1819 focus on the West Façade, the part of the building which he found most pleasing, probably because of its completeness. The three images are consistent with one another with respect to the building, and accurate down to details such as the bosses on the south anta of the West Façade. Dodwell’s colored engraving takes more liberties in order to show more of the ancient building. Nonetheless, it is very useful in confirming elements of the South Building first depicted in Gell and Atkins’ drawings discussed above, and it depicts its state after Lusieri’s clearing of the Maiden Porch, which removed the accretions on its east side.

⁴⁷⁶ Dodwell 1819, pp. 348-349.

⁴⁷⁷ Pomardi, *West End of the Pandrosion*, 1804-1805 (Figure 44); Pomardi, *Erechtheion*, 1804-1805 (Figure 43).

⁴⁷⁸ Dodwell, *South-West View of the Erechtheion*, 1805 (Figure 42).

Both Dodwell, *South-West View of the Erechtheion*, 1805 (Figure 42), and Pomardi, *West End of the Pandrosion*, 1804-1805 (Figure 44), also offer new information about the state of the South Wall. For the first time, Dodwell depicts the eastern pilaster of the Maiden Porch (ME.PE.02) with a broken top; however, previous drawings show it as being absent (because it is obscured by accretions omitted by the earlier artists),⁴⁷⁹ and subsequent drawings show this pilaster still covered by masonry. Either this pilaster was exposed (and hence not destroyed in 1687 along with Maiden #6) during Lusieri's clearing of the Maiden Porch, only to be quickly re-incorporated into its reinforcement, or Dodwell has taken this liberty and restored the pilaster. He was also selective with his depiction of the bulky mass of masonry in the angle of the Westward Projection of the North Porch and the West Façade. His artist, Pomardi, however, does depict it accurately in Pomardi, *Erechtheion*, 1804-1805 (Figure 43). Pomardi's sharply angled view from the northwest of the Maiden Porch offers new information about the state of the South Wall at the west end (Figure 44), namely that SS.03.03-05 are now missing.⁴⁸⁰

Dodwell and Pomardi's paintings are also the first to depict the "ill-built pilaster, of small expense...in order to support the entablature, which will fall as soon as the prop decays"⁴⁸¹ substituted for Maiden #3 which Dodwell dubs in his text "Ἐλγίνος ἐποίησεν" (Elgin made this) or "Opus Elgin" as reported by later travelers for those who did not know Greek.⁴⁸² It is from Dodwell that we hear for the first time about the benefaction of the Earl of Guilford. Having been moved by the distress the removal of Maiden #3

⁴⁷⁹ Unfortunately none of Gell's drawings deal with this area in any detail.

⁴⁸⁰ Fauvel, *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*, Undated (ca. 1789), was the most recent view of this area.

⁴⁸¹ Dodwell 1819, p. 353.

⁴⁸² The pillar replacement for Maiden #6 necessitated by Lusieri's removal of the masonry along the east side of the Maiden Porch, and mentioned by Wilkins, is not visible from either of Dodwell and Pomardi's perspectives.

caused to the local population, the Earl arranged and paid for an artificial stone cast of the maiden to be sent to Athens to replace the rough pillar.⁴⁸³ Incidentally, the British Ambassador to the Porte told Elgin in 1817 that the ugly pillar was still an offensive eyesore and had to be replaced. Elgin sent another one because Lord Guilford's, for some reason, was never actually installed on the building. When Elgin's cast "arrived in Athens the Turks declared that it was the original Caryatid returned to its place because it could not be made to stand erect in England."⁴⁸⁴ In the end, neither cast was ever put on the building. The general rationale for this inaction according to the travelers was that the Ottomans and the Greeks were too proud to accept substitutes.⁴⁸⁵ Dodwell, in the meantime, applauded the Earl's generosity, and urged the British people to return the column (EE.C6), and to keep only a copy of it in the museum.⁴⁸⁶

Dodwell and Pomardi's views are also the first evidence for the already disintegrating blockage of the northernmost window of the West Façade (Figure 41, Figure 42, and Figure 43). This feature does not appear in Gell's drawings, but then again, his rendering of these windows is quite summary (Figure 35).⁴⁸⁷ On the other hand, the blockage does appear in every subsequent illustration of the west elevation until the ashlar intercolumnar walls fall down during the War of Independence.⁴⁸⁸

⁴⁸³ By the time of Dodwell's publication, Maiden #3 was in the British Museum as it took several years for Elgin to sell his Akropolis marbles. Elgin finally sold them to the British people in 1816: see St. Clair 1997, pp. 245-260.

⁴⁸⁴ St. Clair 1997, p. 258, citing Master, *Journal of a Tour in Egypt, Palestine and Greece in 1819*.

⁴⁸⁵ St. Clair 1997, p. 258.

⁴⁸⁶ Dodwell and the Earl of Guilford are also connected through the Dodwell/Guilford Puteal which was once in a courtyard in Corinth, and served as a well-head. Dodwell drew it, and the Earl brought back to England. The "puteal" was recently rediscovered in an outdoor sculpture garden in Yorkshire by Susan Walker, and acquired by the British Museum. It is probably a copy of a very recently unearthed early Augustan archaizing semi-circular monument found at Augustus' *tropaeum* of the Battle of Actium at Nikopolis: Zachos 2003, pp. 89-90.

⁴⁸⁷ Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis*, 1801.

⁴⁸⁸ Taylor, *The Erechtheum from the Northwest*, 1818 (Figure 56); Page, *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*, 1818 (Figure 55); Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819 (Figure 58); Eastlake, *The*

Interestingly, prior to Gell, none of the perspectives of the Erechtheion included a clear view of this window, and afterward, all the southwest views make a point of depicting this blockage. The question is, were all the windows previously blocked up, perhaps as part of making the private, domestic space of the interior of the Erechtheion more secure from male eyes? There had been a tall building from which the Erechtheion needed seclusion directly west of the Erechtheion, and whose remains are depicted in Gell's and Smirke's paintings. Dodwell's depiction of the window blockage shows it in a decrepit state; it only appears fully blocked in Inwood's elevation (Figure 58).⁴⁸⁹

Subsequent to the execution of their drawings, Dodwell vividly recounts the following anecdote about the removal of WW.AA.01:

During my residence at Athens, the work of devastation having been begun by the Christians, was imitated in an humble manner by the Turks, and a large block of the epistylia of the Erechtheion at the south-west angle, contiguous to the Pandroseion, was thrown down by order of the Disdar, and placed over one of the doors of the fortress! As I imagined that he intended to demolish other parts of this elegant edifice, which seemed doomed to destruction, I took the liberty of remonstrating on the impropriety of his proceedings. He pointed to the Parthenon! to the Caryatid portico! and to the Erechtheion! and answered, with a singularly enraged tone of voice, "What right have you to complain? Where are now the marbles which were taken by your countrymen from the temples?"⁴⁹⁰

Since the Erechtheion had remained theretofore in a fairly stable state under Ottoman rule, many travelers and scholars have blamed Lord Elgin for the locals' negative change in attitude toward the monuments. This change was manifested in the actual demolition of the South Wall of the Erechtheion in the search for the iron and lead

Erechtheum, 1818-1820 (Figure 57). Only Thürmer, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1819, omits it, and this is probably owing to the perspective and the desire to show a mountain in the background of the composition (Figure 61).

⁴⁸⁹ Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819.

⁴⁹⁰ Dodwell 1819, p. 352. This block (Figure 292) is at the moment located to the north of the Erechtheion, just south of the public steps that links the upper and lower the terraces. See Paton et al. 1927, pp. 70-72, for a translation of the Ottoman inscription on this block.

of ancient clamps during the Ottoman-British War of 1807-1809.⁴⁹¹ Although there is evidence for the search for metal clamps in the form of deep gouges in the marble in almost every ancient Athenian monument which continued to stand during the Post-Antique period (including the Erechtheion), the monuments themselves were generally not dismantled in order to gain access to this resource.

Dodwell urged the return of the various architectural fragments because the British nation would “be esteemed for such an action by all nations, and particularly by the Greeks and Turks; who, from such an example, would learn to respect the ancient monuments of their country.”⁴⁹² Dodwell, and others advocating the same action, were ignored.

BIDDLE

In Nicholas Biddle (1786-1844), we find a completely different kind of traveler from the sophisticated Leake, Wilkins, and Dodwell (T 44).⁴⁹³ Biddle was an American politician and financier, and traveled to Athens as a young man in 1806 as the American Minister to France. His journal entries are engaging and full of gossip about the relationships among the main figures in Athenian ex-patriot society:

The same thing occurred the other day when I walked in the morning with Lusieri & in the afternoon with Fauvel. Both artists & both here on the same object they lost no opportunity of abusing each other grossly. Yet most of our enmities arise from misintelligence & if men would only explain before they quarrel there would certainly be less disputes. I listened to both these gentlemen with gravity & endeavoured to extract the knowledge of both without entering into the animosities of either. Fauvel is however much the superior man.⁴⁹⁴

⁴⁹¹ See above “Historical Background,” and below “Byron, Hobhouse and Galt.”

⁴⁹² Dodwell 1819, p. 354.

⁴⁹³ I would like to thank Roger Stein for bringing this traveler to my attention.

⁴⁹⁴ McNeal 1993, p. 138.

Biddle's account of the Erechtheion is derivative and non-committal as he does not try to pin down the location of the cults of Erechtheus or Minerva Polias. At the same time, his reference to the remaining sculptures in the Parthenon's pediment as "[H]Adrian and his wife [Sabina]" demonstrates that he is propagating the old mistakes first made by Spon and Wheler, disseminated by Stuart and Revett, and believed by Fauvel,⁴⁹⁵ who was showing Biddle around. It was because Phillip Hunt, one of Elgin's agents, also believed these sculptures to be Roman additions to the Parthenon pediment that they remained in place, and were only removed in the 1980s after acid rain had irreversibly scorched their surfaces.

It is strange that Biddle notes that Elgin took "one entire column" of the Erechtheion but fails to mention the absent maiden whose porch he describes as having "six female figures supporting the roof with a crown or basket of something on their heads."⁴⁹⁶ Biddle's account betrays his rapid and non-specific note-taking based on the account of his guide, Fauvel.

CHATEAUBRIAND

Nobleman, poet, army officer and later a French minister,⁴⁹⁷ François-René, Vicomte de Chateaubriand (1768-1848), provides a stark contrast to his American contemporary, Biddle. Chateaubriand was clearly more interested in waxing poetical about the Erechtheion with which he is obviously quite enamored, rather than giving a scientific account of the building, for which he refers readers to other sources (T 45). As

⁴⁹⁵ St. Clair 1997, p. 104.

⁴⁹⁶ McNeal 1993, p. 140.

⁴⁹⁷ He fled Napoleon and then returned to be his minister, but not without duress.

such, he is a pioneer in the Romantic movement. Chateaubriand traveled to Athens in 1806-1807 and published his *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem* in 1811.

Light and air affected both Chateaubriand and the monuments:

The first thing that strikes you in the edifices of Athens is the beautiful colour of those monuments. In our climate, in an atmosphere overcharged with smoke and rain, stone of the purest white soon turns black, or of a greenish hue. The serene sky and the brilliant sun of Greece merely communicate to the marble of Paros and Pentelicus, a golden tint resembling that of ripe corn or the autumnal foliage.⁴⁹⁸

This description matches the coloring of Gell and Dodwell's paintings well; the marble is a tawny butterscotch.

Chateaubriand also admired the exquisite workmanship of the monuments, in particular that of the Erechtheion. It is in the context of his discussion of the Erechtheion (and not the Parthenon, where we might expect it) where he places Greek architecture above Rome's:

No turner's work in ivory can be more delicate than the Ionic ornaments of the temple of Erectheus; and the cariatides of the Pandroseum are perfect models. If after viewing the edifices of Rome, those of France appeared coarse to me, the structures of Rome now seem barbarous in their turn, since I have seen the monuments of Greece.⁴⁹⁹

Chateaubriand had a lukewarm attitude to Elgin's activities. He recognized the value of the epitome of sculpture being accessible to artists in the West, but "Lord Elgin has counterbalanced the merit of his laudable efforts...The Temple of Erectheus has been robbed of the corner column, so that it is now found necessary to support with a pile of stones, the whole entablature, which is nodding to its fall."⁵⁰⁰ This implies that the northeast anta has not yet (in 1806-7) fallen down, although perhaps his comments are

⁴⁹⁸ Chateaubriand 1811, p. 113.

⁴⁹⁹ Chateaubriand 1824, p. 115.

⁵⁰⁰ Chateaubriand 1811, p. 227.

better understood as a reference to the rough columns holding up the Maiden Porch roof. Despite his condemnation of Elgin, Chateaubriand left the Akropolis with his own souvenir from the Akropolis: a sculpture from the Parthenon.⁵⁰¹

WALPOLE

The Reverend Robert Walpole was an early collector of travel accounts by those who had traveled to Greece. He attempted to decipher the Chandler Stele for himself, and comments on Lessing's analysis of the problem of calling the Erechtheion maidens "caryatids."⁵⁰² He mimics many of Wilkins' criticisms on earlier interpretations of the Erechtheion, but then is unspecific with his own assignments of cults to the various parts of the building (T 46). Walpole's general description of the building is well-written, and he points out the terminology problem with Xenophon's reference to the fire in the *archaios neos*.⁵⁰³

BYRON, HOBHOUSE AND GALT

Lord Byron (1788-1824), John Cam Hobhouse (1786-1869), and John Galt (1779-1839) were all in Athens in 1810, and visited the Akropolis as a party on February 28.⁵⁰⁴ Byron never left any kind of prose description of the Akropolis, but his poetry is full of praise for her monuments and of mud-slinging at Lord Elgin. These poems represent the

⁵⁰¹ St. Clair 1997, p. 192. Published after Chateaubriand's visit, but before his publication, was Legrand 1808. This was a conscientious copy of Stuart and Revett 1762-1816, which he translated to allow his fellow Frenchmen access to this seminal work on Greek architecture. This translation demonstrates that Stuart and Revett's volumes were still the most important and influential works on Athens in the early 19th century. The plates contained therein are copies of Stuart and Revett's engravings.

⁵⁰² Lessing (no date).

⁵⁰³ On Xenophon's reference to the fire in the *archaios neos*, see Chapter III.

⁵⁰⁴ "With Mr. Galt we went to the Parthenon to view more closely the bas-reliefs, two large pieces which have fallen since our last visit": Hobhouse 1910, p. 26.

epitome of young Romanticism.⁵⁰⁵ On the other hand, his friend and travel companion, Hobhouse (Lord Broughton), left a rather inelegant though relatively complete description of the Erechtheion, including its present state of preservation (T 47). Unlike Leake, Wilkins, and Dodwell, Hobhouse was not interested in the ancient evidence for the identification of the various chambers. Hobhouse was a traveler on the Grand Tour, in Athens to observe and absorb the culture, the monuments and the romanticism of the ruins. In contrast to Chateaubriand, who saw the monuments in the early morning light as warm and glowing, Hobhouse perceived the “marble of this ruin [as being] of virgin whiteness,” but agreed wholeheartedly on the quality of the workmanship: “exquisite and the line of no pencil can excel the delicate accuracy of contour in the swell of the torus and the ornaments of the base.”⁵⁰⁶

Hobhouse provides valuable information about the state of the North and South Walls:

In that portion of the Erechtheum which was dedicated to Minerva Polias [i.e., the east chamber], the columns in the front porch are standing, but without any part of their entablature, and unsupported by the walls of the cell, the whole of the south side of which was destroyed during the short war between England and Turkey [1807-1809], and now lies in heaps at the back of the columns, the best specimen of the Ionic in the world, with its base and capital, has been removed by Lord Elgin to England. The remainder will soon fall.⁵⁰⁷

He also provides three other fragments of information, namely that “there is a piece of plastered wall, now filling up the open-work of the small Chapel of Pandrosos [Maiden Porch], between the images that yet remain of the famous Caryatides.”

Hobhouse carefully describes the locations of the remaining maidens and the fates of the

⁵⁰⁵ “Curse of Minerva”; “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” Canto the Second; and “English Bards and Scotch Reviewers.”

⁵⁰⁶ Hobhouse 1813, p. 343.

⁵⁰⁷ Hobhouse 1813, p. 343.

two no longer a part of the building, and for the second time in his account uses the date of 1736 as a benchmark for when the temple was entire. 1736 post-dates Spon and Wheler's visit and the Venetian siege, and predates the earliest extant drawings of the Erechtheion, save for M. and C.-L. Fourmont's problematic 1729 renditions (Figure 10);⁵⁰⁸ therefore, it is not known on what sources Hobhouse based his account.

It is Hobhouse who tells us for the first time about the inscription of Lord Byron's witticism on the plaster wall accretion to the Maiden Porch, although he does not admit specifically that Byron wrote it himself: "On the plaster wall, on the west side of the chapel, these words have been deeply cut: QUOD NON FECERUNT GOTI HOC FECERUNT SCOTI."⁵⁰⁹ The footnote to this quotation is a long diatribe against Elgin; that "the mortar wall, yet fresh when we saw it, supplying the place of the state now in the noble Ambassador's museum, serves as a comment on this text" reminds us that Elgin had not yet managed to sell the Akropolis marbles to the British government. The maiden and all the other fragments of the Erechtheion (and Parthenon) were standing in a shed at Park Lane as depicted in Cockerell, *Lord Elgin's Museum at Park Lane*, 1808 (Figure 700).

In addition to the nuggets of often problematic information Hobhouse offers, he also painted the West Façade of the Erechtheion as part of his view of the Akropolis from the Propylaea (Figure 45).⁵¹⁰ It is a confused composition in that the North Porch has three columns on the return, and the windows of the west colonnade each have pediments

⁵⁰⁸ M. Fourmont, *The Erechtheum*, 1729; C.-L. Fourmont, *The Erechtheum*, 1729. See above "M. Fourmont and C.-L. Fourmont."

⁵⁰⁹ Hobhouse 1813, p. 345.

⁵¹⁰ Hobhouse, *The Akropolis viewed from the Propylaea*, 1809-1810.

above them. This is the first drawing, however, to illustrate the missing WW.AA.01, although it is Dodwell who first mentions its removal by the *dizdar*.⁵¹¹

Scotsman John Galt (1179-1839) shared Byron's literary interests and aspirations, and traveled with the pair for some time.⁵¹² Galt traveled extensively and tried to open up commercial routes for British goods into Europe via Turkey in flagrant disregard of international trade agreements. Galt's take on the monuments in Athens differs from the travelers examined thus far (T 48): not only does he rank the monuments he sees in order of greatness, he considers those on the Akropolis as falling "infinitely short of the ivied cloisters of a monastery, or the ruder masses of a feudal castle."⁵¹³ Galt's preference for the Gothic style would be mirrored thirty years later in the British government's choice to rebuild the burned Palace of Westminster in the Neo-Gothic style in 1836. This caused Elgin much consternation because he believed he had literally brought Greece to England to enlighten the populace in the arts and heal them from the dark gothic medieval past.⁵¹⁴

HAYGARTH

The son of a doctor, William Haygarth was in Athens in 1810 (at the same time as Byron, an acquaintance from his years at Cambridge), and wrote "Greece, a Poem, in

⁵¹¹ Contrary to Paton et al. 1927, p. 553 note 6: Hobhouse, *The Akropolis viewed from the Propylaea*, 1809-1810 (Figure 45) and not Pomardi, *West End of the Pandrosion*, 1804-1805 (Figure 44) is the earliest depiction to show the missing architrave block. The other depictions of the West Façade in Dodwell 1819 (created in 1805) show the architrave block still in place. See above "Dodwell and Pomardi." In the 1855 edition of Hobhouse's travels are two "anonymous" views of the Erechtheion: Hobhouse 1855; Anonymous, *The Erechtheum in 1855, seen from the East*, 1855 (Figure 111); and Anonymous, *The Erechtheum in 1855, seen from the West*, 1855 (Figure 110). These will be discussed in their proper place in the next chapter. There are also some minor differences in the text of this later edition of Hobhouse.

⁵¹² St. Clair 1997, pp. 197-198. Galt's *Athenaid* influenced Byron's *Curse of Minerva*.

⁵¹³ Galt 1812, p. 186.

⁵¹⁴ St. Clair 1997, p. 276.

Three Parts” during this visit.⁵¹⁵ There are many similarities between Haygarth’s poem and Byron’s *Curse of Minerva*, both in construction and content.⁵¹⁶

Haygarth was also an artist. The Gennadius Library in Athens curates a large collection of his watercolors, mostly brown washes, including Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811 (Figure 46). His perspective is original, and the painting shows for the first time the devastation that has been wrought by Lord Elgin’s removal of the column and blocks from the northeast corner of the temple. These blocks are no longer teetering, as described by Dodwell and Hobhouse; they have either fallen or been torn down. The North Wall is now completely absent at least down to the level of the East Porch stylobate. The wall blocks themselves (which were relatively useless to the Ottomans once the metal clamps had been removed because they tended to prefer small stones for building material) are visible in the foreground of the composition.⁵¹⁷ The following blocks of the South Wall have certainly fallen since 1803: SS.01.08-11, SS.02.08-13, SS.03.08-12, SS.04.08-12, and SS.05.08-10, probably as the result of the war of 1807-1809 mentioned by Hobhouse.⁵¹⁸ The two remaining frieze blocks of the East Façade, EE.BB.03-04, are now askew, and would remain so until the Balanos anastylosis in the early 20th century. Incidentally, the ancient metal cramps are still (as of 2004) in these two remaining frieze blocks of the East Façade, which were never removed from the building. All the rest of these frieze blocks were cannibalized for their clamps.

⁵¹⁵ Haygarth 1814.

⁵¹⁶ Randel 1960.

⁵¹⁷ The North Porch and some North Wall blocks just to the west of it are still in place according to later drawings.

⁵¹⁸ See above “Byron, Hobhouse and Galt.”

The dome in the background is that of the mosque inside the Parthenon. The stepped blocks at the right appear to belong to the bombed-out Parthenon rather than the western portion of the Erechtheion's South Wall.

CAZENOVE

At least three travelers composed accounts of the Erechtheion in 1811; all were from different perspectives.⁵¹⁹ Henry Cazenove's narrative of his visit to Athens illuminates the nature of the international community in residence (T 49). Cazenove comes across as quite the socialite by visiting with Lord Byron, Charles Cockerell, and Lusieri.⁵²⁰ Cockerell showed Cazenove's party around the Akropolis.⁵²¹ He complains about the cost of admission to the Akropolis, but his party did not encounter nearly as much difficulty as Elgin's agents or Dodwell:

It cost us above the value of a guinea to gain admission within the Acropolis, merely to take a survey of the ruins; the reason which is, that the governor has been spoiled by the liberal donations of several Englishmen, who have been too lavish of their money when they visited this renowned spot. We have heard that he has received sometimes not less than five or six guineas for granting the mere permission of spending a couple of hours within its walls. This abuse has crept in, and continued to increase in proportion to the curiosity of Europeans who have lately travelled in this country.⁵²²

The Romantic sensitivities offended by the removal of Maiden #3 are eloquently expressed by Cazenove: "The Pandrosium has been much disfigured by the loss of one of the female statues, the Caryatides, which supported its architrave; it is in Lord Elgin's collection, where it cannot, of course, be viewed with all the advantages of its primitive

⁵¹⁹ Cazenove 1813; Douglas 1813; and Gell, *Journal of the Dilettanti Mission to Asia Minor & C A: D^m*, 1811.

⁵²⁰ Cazenove 1813, pp. 215-217.

⁵²¹ On Cockerell, see below "Cockerell."

⁵²² Cazenove 1813, p. 217.

situation.”⁵²³ This “primitive situation,” of course, is on the building itself, which had so quickly disintegrated over the past few years. This is one of the first expressions, with respect to the Erechtheion in any case, of the desire to see works of art in their original context, rather than in the sterile surroundings of a museum.

DOUGLAS

Frederic Sylvester North Douglas (1791-1819) was of aristocratic birth and a graduate in Classics from Christ Church College, Oxford.⁵²⁴ When he returned from his Grand Tour, he was elected a Member of Parliament until his death at a young age in 1819. Douglas did a great deal during his short time on earth, such as writing the first quasi-scientific assessment of the similarities between the ancient and modern Greeks.⁵²⁵ At the same time, Leake was arguing that the Greeks were Slavs due to the 7th century invasions from the Baltic areas.⁵²⁶ Douglas’ account reveals his explicit acquaintance with the travelers who have come before him, from Wheler to Chandler, and from Gell to Chateaubriand, whom he considered obnoxious (T 50).⁵²⁷

Particularly illuminating is Douglas’ assessment of the similarities between the ancient and modern religions of the Greeks. He highlights the continuity between the pagan and Christian religious sites and the polyvalence of the gods and saints, as well as how the Ottomans have continued the local traditions with great “constancy” in the areas

⁵²³ Cazenove 1813, p. 216.

⁵²⁴ Douglas was the son of Baron Glenbervie and the Hon. Catherine Anne North, eldest daughter of Lord North, 2nd Earl of Guilford.

⁵²⁵ Douglas 1813.

⁵²⁶ Leake 1814. The Austrian historian Fallmerayer would soon question whether modern Greeks were related to the ancient Greeks at all: Yalouri 2001, p. 37.

⁵²⁷ Douglas 1813, p. 36.

that they occupy.⁵²⁸ Douglas also dwells on the superstitiousness of both the Greeks and Ottomans, and illustrates his point with the following example:

An illiterate servant of the Disdar of Athens, observing that I expressed to the friend who accompanied me the admiration with which the beautiful Caryatides of the Pandroseum inspire the most unscientific [awe?], while I, perhaps, at the same time, discovered the regret it is as impossible not to feel for the bad taste that has removed one of them, turned round, and assured me, that when the five⁵²⁹ other κορίτσια⁵³⁰ (girls) had lost their sister, they manifested their affliction by filling the air at the close of the evening with the most mournful sighs and lamentations, that he himself had often heard their complaints, and never without being so much affected as to be obliged to leave the citadel till they had ceased; and that the ravished sister was not deaf to their voice, but astonished the lower town, where she was placed, by answering in the same lamentable tones.⁵³¹

This is the earliest of many similar, but slightly differing, magical stories lately attributed to the maidens of the Erechtheion.⁵³² As Wendy Shaw points out, magical powers were often attributed to ancient sculpture, and such powers imbued these objects with a very different significance from that considered by the art historian and archaeologist.⁵³³

Douglas was further dismayed at Elgin's activities with respect to the Erechtheion, deeming it somewhat suitable to rescue sculptures already displaced from their original locations by natural or previous disaster, but not to dismantle something

⁵²⁸ Douglas 1813, pp. 53-60. More recently on this topic, see Shaw 2003, pp. 42-43.

⁵²⁹ Only four maidens, of course, were really on the building at this time.

⁵³⁰ Following Wilkins 1816, p. 141.

⁵³¹ Douglas 1813, pp. 85-86.

⁵³² It is also worth remembering that by 1811, the year of Douglas' visit to Athens, Maiden #3 had long been removed from the lower town to London.

⁵³³ Shaw 2003, p. 42. On the magical properties attributed to one of the female architectural supports from the Lesser Propylon at Eleusis, see above "Clarke and Préaux."

otherwise in perfect condition, such as the column from the East Porch, which not only loses its context in the museum, but ceases to be a “model to the architect.”⁵³⁴

COCKERELL

Artist, archaeologist, teacher and architect, Charles Robert Cockerell (1788-1863) made a major impact on Greek archaeology and architecture during his few years in Greece. Before he left on his Grand Tour, Cockerell trained as an architect in his father Samuel Pepys Cockerell’s office, as well as in that of Robert Smirke.⁵³⁵ In 1840, he became Professor of Architecture at the Royal Academy. As a practicing architect, he incorporated into his designs many specific orders from his own study of ancient buildings. He used Erechtheion-type columns in several of his buildings, including entrance to the Orangerie at Grange Park in 1823.⁵³⁶

Cockerell spent three long periods in Athens in 1811, 1813, and 1814, and appears as someone worth seeking out in the accounts of other travelers.⁵³⁷ The Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum has large collection of Cockerell’s watercolors from his travels, but only one of the Erechtheion survives. Its perspective from within the loft above the gunpowder magazine in the North Porch

⁵³⁴ Douglas 1813, p. 88. For similar sentiments on the decontextualization of ancient architecture in museums, see above “Cazenove.”

⁵³⁵ See above “Smirke.”

⁵³⁶ Cockerell’s design for the Ashmolean Museum incorporated the convex-topped Ionic capitals peculiar to the interior of the Temple of Apollo at Bassae, which he excavated and drew.

⁵³⁷ Cockerell excavated the Temple of Aphaia on Aigina and the Temple of Apollo at Bassae with von Hallerstein, Linckh, and Foster, as well as other archaeologists. Cockerell was one of the first to see multi-colored paint on ancient sculpture and architecture: he oversaw the excavation of the late Archaic pedimental sculpture on Aigina, which still retains patches of bright greens, blues, yellows and reds. Polychromy on ancient architecture and sculpture would become a contentious point of discussion twenty years later as it challenged the (still) common misconception propagated by Winckelmann that ancient art was pure and white. In 1836-1837, Cockerell sat on the committee which attempted to establish whether the Parthenon sculptures and other Greek marbles had ever been painted. It concluded (incorrectly) that they had not. This, of course, had a major influence on the cleaning methods used on the Parthenon sculptures by Duveen’s “henchmen,” as St. Clair calls them, in the late 1920s during the construction of the Duveen Gallery of the British Museum: St. Clair 1997, pp. 293-295.

before its destruction during the War of Independence is unique (Figure 47).⁵³⁸ The watercolor shows the interior of the upper reaches of the North Porch from the west. The tops of the walls between the columns are disintegrating slightly on the east side, and access to the loft is via a ladder visible at the northeast corner.⁵³⁹ Hundreds of travelers climbed up just such a ladder in the 19th century, many of them taking the opportunity to carve his or her mark on the partly sooty architraves, coffers, and wall blocks.⁵⁴⁰

The upper molding of the North Door is visible at the right. Notice both the excavation of this molding in the foreground and the cuttings above the North Door for the repaired lintel's insertion during the major repair, redated by this study to the Hellenistic period.⁵⁴¹ It is in this loft that the family of the Greek commander Gouras would hide during the bombardment of the Akropolis in 1827. It is also where this family would perish when the North Porch's northwest corner collapses, crushing it to death.

TURNER

Author, diplomat, traveler, and Egyptologist (but not the artist), William Turner (1792-1867) — published his day-to-day journals in 1820 (T 52).⁵⁴² His book is deliberately informal and describes the trials and tribulations of travel and residence in the East, as well as the active social life of the foreign community in Athens. Lusieri

⁵³⁸ Cockerell, *The Loft in the North Portico*, 1811-1814; and Hansen, *Inside the North Portico of the Erechtheion*, 1835-1836, is the only other known sketch made of the loft inside the North Porch, but Hansen's depiction shows the loft after its west side had been destroyed.

⁵³⁹ Access to the loft was first described by Gell: see above "Gell."

⁵⁴⁰ For the documentation of these graffiti, see Chapter VIII and Appendix E.

⁵⁴¹ On the attribution of the major repair of the Erechtheion to the Hellenistic period, see Chapter III. See below "Loft" for an interpretation of the Ottoman cuttings between those belonging to the ancient repairs.

⁵⁴² Turner was a correspondent of Talbot's, the inventor of photography. They exchanged information on Assyrian texts according to one letter. See archives at: <http://www.foxtalbot.arts.gla.ac.uk/>, accessed January 19, 2004.

appears to have given Turner and his companions their tour of the Akropolis. His account of the Erechtheion is unremarkable except that he attributes the removal of Maiden #6 to the Romans, perhaps owing to his awareness of the activities of Nero or Domitian, and the copies of the Erechtheion maiden at Rome.

Turner admits explicitly to carving his name on the Parthenon (but not on the Erechtheion) and then goes some way to explain a traveler's compulsion to do so by quoting two witty epigrams:

The passion of English travelers for inscribing their names on the ruins of Athens, has been happily ridiculed by an English officer, in the following Epigram, which is still current in the city:
 Fair Albion smiling sees her son depart,
 To trace the birth and nursery of art;
 Noble his object, glorious is his aim,
 He comes to Athens, and he writes ---- his Name!
 This Epigram was answered by Lord Byron, as follows:
 This modest bard, like many a bard unknown,
 Rhymes on our names, but wisely hides his own;
 But yet, whoe'er he be, to say no worse,
 His Name would sound much better than his verse.⁵⁴³

HUGHES

Traveling in 1813, Thomas Smart Hughes (1786-1847) took himself rather more seriously than did Turner; this is not surprising for someone who eventually became a minister. Well-connected and an acquaintance of Pouqueville, Cockerell, Lusieri, Fauvel, Clarke, and the Archon Logotheti, he boasted about reciting the *First Philippic* in the Pnyx. And when his friend, Charles Cockerell, was sick with malaria, Hughes sacrificed to Panagia Kastriotissa (Our Lady of the Akropolis) for his cure.⁵⁴⁴ And like Turner, Lusieri gave Hughes his tour of the Akropolis as well.

⁵⁴³ Turner 1820, p. 369. See Chapter VIII and Appendix E for the documentation and analysis of the graffiti on the Erechtheion.

⁵⁴⁴ See above "Cockerell."

Hughes is the first traveler to express explicitly the gender contrast between the “manly Doric” and the “feminine...Ionic”⁵⁴⁵ with respect to the Parthenon and the Erechtheion, respectively, an idea that is now quite pervasive in the general perception of the architectural orders (T 53).⁵⁴⁶ Hughes plagiarizes Chateaubriand’s effusive appreciation of the Erechtheion’s workmanship and describes the curious ghostly reputation of the maidens of the South Porch in a very similar fashion to the first version of the magical story published by Douglas in 1813:

These figures are supposed by many Turks and Greeks to be living beings under the influence of enchantment, and the story still obtains credit that one of them which Lord Elgin removed from its place into the lower city, uttered the most doleful cries throughout the night, which were answered by a lamentation in concert from its sisters in the acropolis.⁵⁴⁷

The *dizdar* took an interest in Hughes’ party, and approached it with a query about the “Genii” who had erected this grand building. Hughes “endeavoured to convince him that these giants were the ancestors of the [modern] Greeks, the ghiaours of Athens, [and] he burst into a loud laugh and pointed with his finger to the habitations of the modern city.” Hughes’ story about the lamenting maidens and the vitality of the ancient Greeks in the modern population are both themes borrowed directly from Douglas’ researches, which had been published in the same year as Hughes’ travels, and long before Hughes’ own publication.⁵⁴⁸

Hughes published a second edition of his book in 1830, which included some changes, such as “rayahs” for “ghiaours” and an elaborated section on the Erechtheion.⁵⁴⁹

Hughes is also both an optimist and a positivist regarding the prospect of finding the salt-

⁵⁴⁵ Hughes 1820, p. 259.

⁵⁴⁶ See Onians 1988.

⁵⁴⁷ Hughes 1820, pp. 259-260.

⁵⁴⁸ See above “Douglas.”

⁵⁴⁹ Hughes 1830.

spring of Poseidon. He writes during the War of Independence about his earlier travels: “though we need not despair of seeing [the salt-spring] and many other assertions of the ancient Greek confirmed, when the moderns have established their liberty.”⁵⁵⁰ Thus Hughes foresees the reclamation of the Akropolis and its scientific exploration by the heirs of the ancient heritage.

HANSON

Although he interacted with “the crowd” of international travelers and residents in Athens, we know little to nothing about another traveler, J. O. Hanson, except that he was among the first of the foreign foundation-members of the “Philomouson Hetaireia.”

Alkis Anghelou published Hanson’s private journal in 1971.⁵⁵¹ Hanson provides one of the most confused accounts of the Erechtheion (T 54). He borrows terms and ideas from ancient and modern authors such as “contiguous,” and misuses them. His account of the Maiden Porch is particularly illustrative of this obfuscation:

Adjoining to these remains is a *style* of building known by the name of Caryatides, a style chosen by the Athenians to mark the infamy of the Carians, the *only* people of the Peloponnesus who sided with Xerxes in his invasion of Greece. Female figures in the costume of the Carians are represented bearing the weight of the edifice. They were formerly *seven* in number but have since been reduced to *six* by the spoliation of Lord Elgin during his residence at Athens.⁵⁵²

In 1814, when Hanson was in Athens, there were four maidens in the porch, not six; and there were never seven.

⁵⁵⁰ Hughes 1830, p. 262.

⁵⁵¹ Anghelou 1971.

⁵⁵² Hanson, *Journal*, ca. 1814, in Anghelou 1971.

PRELUDE TO THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

There is a sharp rise in the number of travelers to Athens in the period prior to the War of Independence. Dozens of them left written and visual accounts of the Erechtheion during the last four years before the first shots were fired on the temple in 1821. The following sections analyze the travelers' accounts and depictions of the Erechtheion from 1817-1821.

WILLIAMS

Hugh William Williams (1773-1829) was a Scottish painter who exhibited his works from his travels in Britain, thus disseminating the cult of the picturesque and “real” Greek architecture as it was meant to be seen, in Greece, as part of its original building.⁵⁵³ Williams was accused, however, of a great deal of invention in his compositions, and this is certainly evident in his views of the Erechtheion.⁵⁵⁴ His letters, published in Williams 1820 (T 55), evoke the heady madness of being a tourist with the financial means to see the products of “Pericles, Phidias, Socrates, Plato...&c” up-close and in-person. He tells his reader that he writes his “letter on the sacred marble.”⁵⁵⁵ That marble he describes as being the “brightest orange colour, and grey and sulphury hues, combine in sweetest harmony,” while the columns have “yellow of a brownish cast, admitting here and there a little grey.”⁵⁵⁶

Giorgos Tolia has unfairly called Williams' account “commonplace and superficial.”⁵⁵⁷ Williams' appreciation of the workmanship and refinements of the

⁵⁵³ Most of Williams' paintings of Greece are in the National Gallery in Scotland, in Edinburgh. Williams, *View of the Erechtheum from the North*, 1817, is in a private collection in Athens.

⁵⁵⁴ See James Skene's comments on Williams in Chapter VIII.

⁵⁵⁵ Williams 1820, p. 298.

⁵⁵⁶ Williams 1820, p. 302.

⁵⁵⁷ Tolia 1995, p. 94.

architecture is poetic and observant. For example, the “columns are chastely rich, and the volutes of them remarkable for their ample dimensions and pleasing flow of line.”

Williams is bothered by the “unpleasing...arrangement” of the windows of the West Façade (a common reaction to Hellenistic architecture, when one is accustomed to the strict rules of the High Classical).⁵⁵⁸ Few writers or artists comment on the actual state of such details as the capitals themselves, but Williams pays close attention to their current state of preservation. He is both saddened by the damage and amazed at the preservation of the capitals and fluting under the circumstances, and marvels that they are “still giving important lessons to the world!”⁵⁵⁹ This last comment is revealing about the attitudes of the travelers who visited Greece, and especially those who made it past the *dizdar* to see the Akropolis. Travelers, be they artists, writers, poets, architects, or none of the above, were there to learn from the ruins, to capture the picturesque, and to acquire an appreciation of the “Ancient” which could be transferred back to Western Europe. These ideals would be manifested in the design of buildings whose philosophy was the superiority of purist Greek Architecture over the Roman or the Gothic.

Williams offers an abbreviated version of the story about the maidens mourning their lost companion, and demonstrates that the locals have a long memory for Elgin’s activities. The “Turkish gentleman’s” comments about Elgin and his rough gestures toward the pillar substituted for Maiden #3 were “infinitely more severe than all that has been said at home or here against the proceedings in the Acropolis.”⁵⁶⁰

⁵⁵⁸ See Chapter III on the redating of the major repair of the Erechtheion, which included the whole upper part of the West Façade.

⁵⁵⁹ Williams 1820, p. 306.

⁵⁶⁰ Williams 1820, p. 307.

Williams also offers more information about the contemporary rumor first alluded to by Turner that:

The other missing caryatid is now in Rome, in the possession of Camuccini the historical painter: for many years it was lost to the world, till he discovered it in a garden, I think, on the Pincian Hill. It was purchased for a trifle, and I believe is now for sale. In preservation this caryatid is superior to any of the rest, and has been restored by the great Thorwaldson with taste and judgment.⁵⁶¹

This informs us about the state of understanding about the copies of the Erechtheion maidens and their treatment at the hands of “restorers” in collections in Italy.⁵⁶²

Williams defends the Ottomans’ custodianship of the monuments with several anecdotes including one related to the Erechtheion: “Some midshipmen, on visiting the Acropolis, chipped and broke the drapery of one of the Caryatids of the Pandroséum; the Disdar, on perceiving this, was much in wrath, and threatened vengeance, if he could find them.”⁵⁶³ Alas, the damage was done, and the tourists escaped the *dizdar*’s wrath scot-free.

Williams provides three engraved illustrations of the Erechtheion in his text (Figure 48, Figure 49 and Figure 50).⁵⁶⁴ He describes his view from the north (Williams, *View of the Erechtheum from the North*, 1817, Figure 48), originally a watercolor now in a private collection in Athens, thus:

From the portico of Minerva Polias [North Porch], one of the most magnificent views of the whole ruins presents itself, comprehending the stately Doric of the Parthenon, contrasted with

⁵⁶¹ Williams 1820, p. 307. See above “Turner.”

⁵⁶² Dodwell also mentioned copies in Italy. Maiden #6 was found in 1837 by Pittakis, having been destroyed in the 17th century. On the discovery of Maiden #6, see Chapter VIII.

⁵⁶³ Williams 1820, p. 317. See Laurent 1821 for a similar anecdote regarding the removal of the last remaining nose among the remaining four maidens.

⁵⁶⁴ Williams, *Temple of Pandrosus*, 1817. Williams, *View of the Erechtheum*, 1817, is an engraving of Williams, *View of the Erechtheum*, 1817); and Williams, *Interior of the Acropolis of Athens*, 1817, is an engraving of Williams, *View of the Propylaea*, 1817.

the light and elegant Ionic of the Erectheum, Minerva Polias itself, and the little gem Pandroséum! [Maiden Porch] In colouring, the whole is perfect, especially in the evening light. The columns and entablature of the Parthenon appear in shade, yet rich with colour; the white and slender pillars of the Erectheum, partly relieved against the azure sky, and partly obscured by the shadows of the buildings, seem to embody all the harmonious hues of tenderness and delicacy. The portico of Minerva Polias stands in reflected light, and receives the soft illumination on its tones of orange, grey, and brown. The Pandroséum would hide itself in shade, but the streaming light seeks it out, and gilds the edges of its lovely forms. Even my Turkish friend (who pays me daily visits, while drawing in the Acropolis) conveyed his admiration of this touching scene, by expressive signs and smiles. He seems to have a pride and interest in the ruins, and shews me where architects have made their studies, especially the stations of our famous Cockerell, and the Calmuc employed by the Earl of Elgin.

Williams, *View of the Erechtheum from the North*, 1817 shows the destruction of the South Wall as described by Hobhouse above; however, as an examination of the slightly later and more accurate view by Joseph Thürmer demonstrates, Williams has created a tidier “window of appearance” for a clearer vista of the Parthenon in the background. In the foreground, Williams depicts the remnants of the North Addition, which again have been artificially abbreviated.⁵⁶⁵

Williams’ view of the Maiden Porch (Williams, *Temple of Pandrosus*, 1817, Figure 50) is detailed and much more accurate than Williams, *View of the Erechtheum from the North*, 1817.⁵⁶⁶ He imagined the maidens with a Vitruvian “burden on their head, one hand uplifted to it, and the other hanging down by her side.”⁵⁶⁷ The remains of the building west of the Erechtheion are depicted in the left foreground, as in Gell’s and others’ depictions. The view from the Propylaia (Williams, *View of the Propylaea*, 1817,

⁵⁶⁵ The analysis of George Basevi’s drawings (see below “Basevi”) will show that a significant proportion of the North Addition continued to stand in 1818. There are subtle differences between the watercolor and the engraved version published in Williams 1820, but these relate to the figures added in the foreground rather than to the building itself.

⁵⁶⁶ Williams, *Temple of Pandrosus*, 1817.

⁵⁶⁷ Williams 1829, facing Williams, *Temple of Pandrosus*, 1817.

Figure 49) is sweeping, and summarily depicts the west elevation of the Erechtheion in the distance and the houses of the Ottoman garrison, but it does not offer any additional information about the state of the temple itself.⁵⁶⁸

COMTE DE FORBIN

The Comte de Forbin, director of the Louvre when the Venus de Milo was acquired, visited the Erechtheion in 1817 or 1818. He records that “OPUS PHIDIÆ” was inscribed on either Maiden #2 or Maiden #4, while “OPUS ELGIN” was written on the pillar replacing Maiden #3 (T 56). Dodwell alluded to the latter inscription in Greek.⁵⁶⁹

BASEVI

George Basevi (1794-1845), apprentice to leading architect Sir John Soane, was aged 22-25 years on his Grand Tour. “The lion of Basevi’s early days in Rome was Cockerell, who was then on his return from Greece.”⁵⁷⁰ Basevi had wanted to see Cockerell’s drawings to take inspiration, but by the time they met, Basevi had already found his own style, which he admits, was influenced by “Grecian” Williams.⁵⁷¹ Arthur Bolton, writing about the training of an early 19th century architect, comments that:

...[Basevi’s] most marked advance, however, took place during his own Grecian tour in the summer of 1818. He was constant to the Acropolis, and the Theseum. These drawings of his are much more artistic than the contemporary drawings in the later volumes of Stuart and Revett. It is evident that Basevi did not much like measuring, and his detail study is not that of [other contemporary artists in Rome.]⁵⁷²

⁵⁶⁸ Williams, *Interior of the Acropolis of Athens*, 1817; Williams, *View of the Propylaea*, 1817.

⁵⁶⁹ See above “Dodwell and Pomardi.”

⁵⁷⁰ Bolton 1926, pp. 6-7.

⁵⁷¹ See above “Williams.”

⁵⁷² Bolton 1926, p. 7.

The joys of examining George Basevi's unpublished drawings (Figure 51, Figure 52, Figure 53 and Figure 54) and accounts (T 57) of the Erechtheion kept in the library of the Soane Museum are almost endless. In his letters to his mother, to Nat, and to his mentor Sir John Soane, he describes how there were many Englishmen jostling for the optimal spots from which to draw the monuments on the Akropolis. Basevi also complains about Wilkins' account (Wilkins 1816] was the most up-to-date published commentary on the architecture of Athens), in which he had evidently put a great deal of stock before he left London. Basevi grieves that there are no "Stuarts" or other architecture books available for consultation in Athens, spoiled as he was by easy access to Soane's library in London.⁵⁷³ He claims he has never worked so hard in his life, and supplies of commodities such as sketching paper were extremely limited. Part of his apprenticeship as an architect was to practise drawing the moldings of ancient buildings.⁵⁷⁴ Soane's offices were full of casts and some original fragments of buildings from Greece and Italy, but there was nothing compared to studying the moldings in situ on the monuments to inspire an apprentice.

Basevi describes his hard life to his mother and complains (what else does one do in a letter to one's mother?) that his fellow travelers are stealing his points of view, and are jealous of him:

My daily employment is drawing, drawing - - one day the Parthenon, another the Theseum and so on. We are three artists, I may say here, counting myself, though architect, as one, and a little Jealousy has crept in among us. Lady Ruthven's artist is Jealous of me and Eastlake is not altogether free from this folly. I have been very successful in my choice of points of sight, and of some of the same things have made a grander thing, so it is here thought, and they have been copying me, this among artists is not considered a correct thing to do, but I have never noticed it in any

⁵⁷³ Soane owned Stuart and Revett 1825-1830.

⁵⁷⁴ Bolton 1926, p. 6.

other way than by keeping my sketches when finished more to myself, and never asking to see theirs. They have understood me, and have set about point hunting everywhere, which affords Wilson and self great amusement.

Eastlake has carried this copying plan to a great extent, six or eight things he has made tale quale. He ought to be ashamed of it, as he is a regular established history painter, and the best of it is instead of being obliged to me for these hints for pictures they are Jealous of me. What a pack of fools all artists are with these mean ideas, they may copy all mine, if they would do it openly. I am not a painter nor wish for a reputation as such. I can never interfere with them nor they with me. So much for this nonsense.⁵⁷⁵

In light of these comments, it is worthwhile noting that Basevi resisted drawing the typical southwest view chosen by both Charles Lock Eastlake and William Page.⁵⁷⁶ These candid letters also remind us that the travelers were all interacting with one another, both by receiving information offered by Lusieri and Fauvel as tour-guides, as well as through the long hours of contemplation in the awesome presence of the monuments.

Basevi experienced emotional highs and lows while in Athens. The rumblings of the coming revolution and the Philhellenism of his countrymen elicited the following reaction from Basevi after a particularly grueling trip to Sounion:

I think the Greeks of Athens, except a few half Frank families (all strangers of whatever nations are called Franks) a very low degraded people. I am no lover of the Greeks, with few exceptions they are a bad set, given to dishonesty, the greatest liars in the universe and the greatest braggarts. In England we compassionate them as an enslaved people, but they are unworthy our commiseration, to make them a free nation would be absurd. It would be necessary to alter their nature first. The Albanians are the best of them. They at least do something, and the Turks esteem them more, for they are the only cultivators of the lands, and the only military, a Greek soldier would be a prodigy.⁵⁷⁷

⁵⁷⁵ Basevi to his Mother, August 10, 1818.

⁵⁷⁶ Eastlake's painting is from the exact same view as Basevi's unfinished southwest perspective: Eastlake, *The Erechtheum*, 1818-1820 (Figure 57). See below "Eastlake and Page."

⁵⁷⁷ Basevi to his Mother, August 28, 1818.

Basevi executed four hazy views of the Erechtheion, two of which are unique and indispensable for understanding the temple in the period just prior to the War of Independence. Basevi, *The Interior of the Erechtheion from the Northwest*, 1818 (Figure 52) confirms the information gleaned from Haygarth's even hazier 1810 view (Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811, Figure 46), and shows that SS.05.11 has also fallen off the building in the interim. SS.06.11 can also be confirmed as absent for the first time. Frieze blocks from the East Façade lie scattered just inside the temple. Although SS.BB.01-02 are absent in this unfinished view, they appear in Basevi, *Parthenon viewed from the Inside looking North*, 1818, in which the Erechtheion features clearly in the background.⁵⁷⁸ Basevi's other view from the north (Basevi, *Erechtheion from the North*, 1818, Figure 53) comprises the only evidence for the arrangements of features of the west side of the cross-wall of the North Addition. It shows a niche (with a gently pointing [Frankish] arch), flanked by two small square niches (the niches cannot be windows since they do not show up in Pars 1765 depiction of the other side of this wall: Figure 22). Where the north wall of the North Addition interfaces with the North Porch, there are two square (Frankish-looking) cuttings of uncertain purpose. His final view, Basevi, *West Façade of the Erechtheion*, 1818 (Figure 54), is unfinished and generally unhelpful.

Basevi returned to England and enjoyed success as an architect, but none of his buildings incorporate Erechtheion columns or maidens. He died at a young age from a fall from a scaffolding while supervising work at Ely Cathedral.

⁵⁷⁸ These two blocks also appear in subsequent depictions of the Erechtheion.

EASTLAKE AND PAGE

The fellow-traveler Basevi both depended on, and complained about, was Sir Charles Lock Eastlake (1793-1865).⁵⁷⁹ He was an English Romantic painter, a student of Haydon, and influenced by Turner and Byron, the latter directly inspiring many of his works. As Basevi says in his letter to his mother, by 1818 Eastlake was already an “established history painter” in spite of his youth. His scene of “Napoleon on Board the Bellerophon in Plymouth Sound” of 1815 was his first work to receive general renown.⁵⁸⁰ He used the proceeds from the sale of this painting to fund his Grand Tour. Eastlake, *The Erechtheum*, 1818-1820 (Figure 57) is very pleasing with its rich caramel tones, but it does not give us any additional information about the building or its accretions. In fact, Eastlake chose to omit “Opus Elgin,” and this is the only real difference between his painting and William Page’s (Page, *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*, 1818, Figure 55), who was also in Basevi’s *parea*. William Page (1794 – 1872)⁵⁸¹ was a topographer and landscape painter who trained at the Royal Academy schools in 1812-1813 before setting out on a lengthy Grand Tour in 1818.⁵⁸²

Both Eastlake’s and Page’s paintings show the top of the void under the southwest corner of the Erechtheion, which had once been occupied by the Kekropeion. They also depict the masonry lining which (continued to?) conceal the east pilaster of the Maiden Porch and the architrave above its East Door. Lusieri had cleared the east side of

⁵⁷⁹ See above “Basevi.”

⁵⁸⁰ <http://www.groveart.com>, accessed January 15, 2004.

⁵⁸¹ Not to be confused with the American painter William Page (1811-1885).

⁵⁸² There is a painting in the Museum of the City of Athens which is attributed to either Page or a W. Müller: Artist Unknown, *View of the Erechtheion*, ca. 1818 (Figure 62). It is not in the vein of Page, *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*, 1818: the colors are very different and it lacks the attention to accuracy and detail see in Page’s work. For example, the orthostate blocks of the South Wall are placed two courses too high above the stylobate of the East Porch. The date of this painting is uncertain as well. It is probably best placed around 1818 owing to the building’s state of preservation in other well-dated depictions.

the Maiden Porch of its accretions when he was taking casts of the maidens and searching for the best-preserved maiden to remove for Elgin.⁵⁸³ The destruction to the east side of the Maiden Porch caused by the Venetians must have required some conservation and support, namely the replacement of Maiden #6 with a rough pilaster and the reinforcement of the roof with masonry covering the east pilaster (ME.PE). It is not clear whether the remainder of the South Building has been removed by this time (Dodwell last depicted it in 1805, Figure 42), since it ceases to appear in all views that could possibly include it, beginning with those by Page and Eastlake. The circumstances of the South Building's removal are unknown.

TAYLOR

English painter and architect, George Ledwell Taylor (1788-1873), visited Athens in 1818 as well. He created a wonderful series of paintings of the monuments in Athens, which are now preserved in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London.⁵⁸⁴ Taylor, *The Erechtheum from the Northwest*, 1818 (Figure 56) confirms the accuracy of the information gleaned from Basevi and his other contemporaries.

WOODS

In the same year another British architect, Joseph Woods, wrote a series of letters during his travels (T 58). He visited Athens in March 1818, and his letters concerning the Erechtheion focus on the refinements and measurements of its architecture. He had done his research prior to setting out from England, quoting Stuart and Wilkins, as well as

⁵⁸³ See above “Lord Elgin, Lusieri, Hunt and Lady Elgin.”

⁵⁸⁴ I am grateful to the librarians in the Print Study Rooms at National Art Library in London for their assistance in viewing and permission to photograph these and other paintings from the Victoria and Albert collection.

attributing information to Fauvel and Lusieri. Curiously, Woods attributes the dullness of the black marble (Eleusinian limestone) to lichen, and agrees with Wilkins that the frieze would have been further elaborated in order to balance the heavy decoration of the capitals.

The damage to the flutes of the columns of the East Porch hinder his ability to take accurate measurements in order to refute claims that the Erechtheion colonnade is too slender for modern aesthetic taste. Besides this damage, Woods actually points out that one of the two remaining frieze blocks of the East Porch is off kilter, and that it is a wonder that the South Wall stands at all considering it is only half thickness where the backers of the exterior orthostate blocks had been removed.⁵⁸⁵

Woods delves deeply into the subtleties of the construction of the Erechtheion, putting into words for the first time the puzzle of the so-called East and West Cross-Walls. His description is commendable. He notes for the first time the small holes currently believed to have secured a tarpaulin to protect the interior during the period between a fire and the repair of the ancient temple,⁵⁸⁶ as well as the blocks that were cut back to form the niche in the southwest corner of the interior of the temple.⁵⁸⁷ Woods also applies logic and architectural theory to deduce that the West Door is in fact original to the ancient building, owing to the arrangement of the lintel block and the organization of the clamps. The anomalies of the building continue to confound him, however: “A door in such a situation appears remarkable, but an opening under the angle of the building at the very point of its junction with the Pandroseum, is still more extraordinary:

⁵⁸⁵ The backers had been absent since Stuart’s visit, Woods claims. However, Woods does not realize that the backers were instead regular ashlar blocks. The backers were already absent in Fauvel’s interior elevations of ca. 1789: Fauvel, *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*, Undated (ca. 1789): (Figure 29).

⁵⁸⁶ See Chapter III.

⁵⁸⁷ See Chapter II.

this requires greater strength, and accordingly is covered by a great stone occupying three courses.”⁵⁸⁸ This is, of course, the Kekropeion, depicted for the first time in the paintings from the same year.⁵⁸⁹

Furthermore, Woods points out the awkwardness of the attachment of the North Porch, and is bemused as to why everyone prefers the proportions and elegance of this walled up portico to the “hexastyle” one.⁵⁹⁰ Woods mentions the colored glass beads as being located in the guilloche pattern, but he ascribes them to the base rather than to the capitals: “The bases and lower parts of the columns are buried, but one of them is accessible by digging, and it appears to have been ornamented with inserted pieces of colored glass.”⁵⁹¹ Similarly, he notices that the eyes of the volute were designed to receive additional decoration.

As for the current purpose of the temple, we learn from Woods that, in addition to the usual comments about the gunpowder magazine, “in order to avoid the danger of explosions, the Turks have walled up the opening, and are obliged to make a hole in the wall when they want any powder.”⁵⁹² Woods may have been mistaken about who did the walling-up of the North Porch (i.e., the Franks), and why (i.e., to make an enclosed domestic space), but he offers a feasible explanation for the mass of masonry in the angle of the Westward Projection of the North Porch and the West Façade that has featured in many paintings since Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751 (Figure 15).

⁵⁸⁸ Woods 1828, p. 256.

⁵⁸⁹ See above “Eastlake and Page.”

⁵⁹⁰ This awkward arrangement will concern late 19th and early 20th century archaeologists and inspire their arguments for a symmetrical original plan for the Erechtheion: see Chapter II.

⁵⁹¹ Woods 1828, p. 257. This seems to be a mistake because most of the guilloche molding on the bases were unfinished (Figure 427, Figure 432, Figure 434, Figure 438, and Figure 442), that is, in contrast to the guilloche molding of the capitals (Figure 436 and Figure 437), which have deep recesses for the attachment of the beads.

⁵⁹² Woods 1828, p. 257.

LAURENT

Peter Edmund Laurent (1796-1837) was a traveler, classical scholar (translator of Pindar and Herodotos), and reluctant visitor to the cultural and commercial centers of Greece. He would have toured the hinterlands instead but for the plague that forced him stick to the tourist paths during his 1818-1819 visit (T 59). Laurent’s dislike of tourists paths probably led him to call Pausanias “one of the most insipid writers of antiquity.”⁵⁹³

While he echoes Woods’ letters about how the Turks actually get into their gunpowder magazine,⁵⁹⁴ Laurent does not gush about the maidens, whom he calls “caryatids,” and whom he finds:

...an absurd invention, disgraceful to art; for what can be more ridiculous than to represent the tender frame of a woman supporting the crushing weight of a marble roof. The moderns, anxious to introduce in their buildings all the faults of the ancients, have not failed to ape their example in this respect also; we now constantly see porticos, &c. supported by tender femails, tall Indians, and often – *proh pudor* – by angels.⁵⁹⁵

Simultaneously, back in Western Europe, Erechtheion-type maidens were indeed being erected on new buildings by architects such as Soane, Inwood, and many others.⁵⁹⁶

Laurent’s account suggests that the Ottoman guides are still spreading the same rumors they told Guillet, Spon, and Wheler, namely that the well of Poseidon still exists, but according to Laurent, the well is supposed to be hidden inside the North Porch.

Laurent delayed paying the *dizdar* until after he had come and gone from the Akropolis many times. Nonetheless, Laurent calls him “avaricious.” Before he left, and after

⁵⁹³ Laurent 1821, p. 104.

⁵⁹⁴ “...At least so we are told by the Turks, since the Hall itself is now used as a powder magazine, which can be entered only by breaking down part of the masonry”: Laurent 1821, p. 108. See also above “Woods.”

⁵⁹⁵ Laurent 1821, p. 108.

⁵⁹⁶ The cupola of the Bank of England was designed by Soane in 1818, and W. and H.W. Inwood designed St. Pancras church in 1818 (incidentally, this is before Henry Inwood visited Athens (1819) and wrote his book Inwood 1827: see below “Inwood.”)

concluding that the Akropolis sculptures taken by Elgin are better off in London,⁵⁹⁷

Laurent recounts witnessing the further desecration of one of the maidens:

Hardly do any persons quit the Acropolis without clipping from its monuments some relic to carry back to their country: this rage for destroying has been carried so far that the elegant Ionic capitals, which I before mentioned, have nearly disappeared, and not one of the Caryatides now stands entire. The last time I visited the citadel, when taking a farewell view of the Pandroseon and the Hall of Eretheus I was much displeased at seeing an English traveller, an officer of the navy (for such his uniform bespoke him to be) standing upon the base of one of the Caryatides, clinging with his left arm around the column, while his right hand, provided with a hard and heavy pebble, was endeavouring to knock off the only remaining nose of those six beautifully sculpted statues. I exerted my eloquence in vain to preserve this monument of art.⁵⁹⁸

DUPRÉ

The French painter, Louis Dupré, is most famous for his view of the Akropolis from Fauvel's balcony, which shows the enclosed North Porch in the background peeking above the north wall of the Akropolis (Figure 141).⁵⁹⁹ He traveled in 1819, and made a brief reference to the Erechtheion in his account of his travels in the context of criticizing Lord Elgin (T 60). He also offers a French version of the mourning maidens story: "Les Grecs, dont l'imagination est toujours vive, disaient qu'on entendait alors des gémissemens pendant la nuit, et que ces soeurs, reunites depuis tant de siècles, pleuraient leur séparation."⁶⁰⁰ The use of the past imperfect may imply that this mourning is no longer occurring.

⁵⁹⁷ Laurent put Elgin in a different league among treasure hunters.

⁵⁹⁸ Laurent 1821, p. 109.

⁵⁹⁹ Dupré, *Louis Fauvel in His House Overlooking the Akropolis*, 1819.

⁶⁰⁰ Dupré 1825, p. 36.

INWOOD

Henry William Inwood (ca. 1794-1843), son of architect William Inwood, wrote the first book with “Erechtheion” in the title (T 61).⁶⁰¹ Understandably, his architectural designs for buildings in London drew heavily on features from the temple which he considered “an instance towards the illustrating of the nearer approaches, or even perfection of the art.”⁶⁰² Father and son designed St. Pancras Church in London in 1818 (built in 1819-1822), although it appears that the younger Inwood visited the real thing (in 1819) only after having used the pattern books available (Stuart, Le Roy) and the fragments Lord Elgin brought to London. St. Pancras Church represents one of the earliest examples of Greek Revival architecture in Britain, borrowing wholesale not just moldings or sculptural elements such as the maidens, but entire façades, such as the hexastyle East Porch, the North Door, a curved West Façade (comprising the apse of the church), and a truncated version of the Maiden Porch (Figure 689).⁶⁰³ Two Maiden Porches flank the rear of the church, serve as vestries, and also guard the entrance to the underground burial chambers. The parallel with the sepulchral function of the recently discovered (1818) void under the Maiden Porch is intriguing. The Chandler Stele associates this area with the Kekropeion, though the earliest evidence for understanding the relationship between the Maiden Porch and Kekrops’s tomb by early scholars is Leake’s 1841 plan (Figure 84),⁶⁰⁴ that is, twenty years after St. Pancras was built. The church’s apse is the only non-rectilinear element on the exterior of the building besides

⁶⁰¹ Inwood 1827; Inwood 1831.

⁶⁰² Inwood 1827, p. 91.

⁶⁰³ The construction of the church is brick, faced with Portland stone to look like marble.

⁶⁰⁴ Leake, *Plan of the Akropolis*, 1841.

the Lysikrates Monument-inspired steeple. As a solution, Inwood curved the Erechtheion's West Façade, including the windows.⁶⁰⁵

Henry Inwood traveled to Greece in 1819, apparently while St. Pancras Church was under construction, and published the first study to focus on the Erechtheion and place it in its chronological context with a collection and evaluation of all the ancient evidence.⁶⁰⁶ Inwood, *An Ideal Restoration of the Temple; North-west View*, 1819 is the first realistic one of its kind as it attempts to account for many of the problems and anomalies in the building, such as the boss on the south anta of the West Façade at the level of the architrave of the Maiden Porch, by placing a westward extension with two more maidens (Figure 59). Similarly, the North Door is fully drawn. Access to the design of the lintel was via the loft – the consoles must have been revealed by some gentle excavation.⁶⁰⁷ Inwood reports that he measured the height of the North Door from the inside of the building, although he gives no other candid account of his research experience, other than the fact that he made “slight excavations...unknown to the Turkish guards.”⁶⁰⁸

Inwood is the first both to deduce and depict the doorway, albeit over-elaborately, in the Westward Projection of the North Porch: “There is at present an entrance there into the modern powder magazine, but being concealed by the rough masonry built before it, as shewn in Plate I. it is not clearly ascertained to have been part of the original

⁶⁰⁵ H. and W. Inwood later designed All Saints Church in Camden, London. It shares many of the same features, but does not adhere to the Erechtheion as closely, nor does it contain any maidens.

⁶⁰⁶ This present study is the most recent manifestation of such an undertaking.

⁶⁰⁷ The detail of the lintel and moldings of the North Door are beautifully represented on St. Pancras Church. Inwood probably returned with his own detailed drawings for sculptors to copy during the 1819-1822 construction of the church. Soane had a cast of the North Door lintel, but it is not clear when he acquired it. The lintel remained fairly well concealed in the early 19th century. See above “Cockerell” for an early view of the lintel.

⁶⁰⁸ Inwood 1831, p. 116.

design.”⁶⁰⁹ The position of the southern buttress of the mass of masonry in the angle of the Western Projection and the West Façade varies among the paintings. Perhaps the buttress concealed the area where the Ottomans dismantled the masonry to access magazine via the ancient door. Inwood must have had access to the interior of the mass of masonry through the walled-up arched doorway that is depicted in Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819 for the first time (Figure 58), although at a different orientation from its actual position visible in later paintings and photographs.⁶¹⁰

Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819 is also important for its clear delineation of the rough masonry parapet on the top of the North Porch and the filling-in of the northern window of the West Façade. He also depicts clearly the reinforcement of the east side of the Maiden Porch including the architrave, with pilasters replacing ME.PE and MP.MM.06, as depicted by Page and Eastlake (Figure 55 and Figure 57).⁶¹¹ Inwood carefully delineates the boss left on the south anta of the West Façade, which is the basis for his westward projecting extension of the Maiden Porch in his reconstruction. The North Porch columns are still deeply imbedded in the intercolumnar wall although in several areas, the bases of columns and antae are exposed. Last but not least, Inwood provides the only clear evidence, aside from Gell, *Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 32), for the narrow course (WP.06.04).⁶¹²

Inwood, *Restored Plan of the Interior of the Erechtheion*, 1819 (Figure 60) ignores the evidence for the West Cross-Wall and transitions between the two levels of the temple by means of two sets of stairs: “The steps down, and the colonnade forming

⁶⁰⁹ Inwood 1831, p. 116.

⁶¹⁰ See below “Vault in the North Porch.”

⁶¹¹ See above “Eastlake and Page.”

⁶¹² See above “Gell” and Chapter III for the significance of this block.

the division of the two cells, are entirely imaginary, with the exception of a column of green or Lacedemonian marble found by Dr. Clarke within the temple, which was considered by Mr. Fauvel to have belonged there.”⁶¹³ And although he puts a matching door to the Pandroseion to the east of the North Door in the restoration (Figure 59), he correctly omits it in his plan.⁶¹⁴

Both restorations omit the West Door,⁶¹⁵ argued so convincingly to be original by his contemporary, Joseph Woods, who published his work in 1828, between Inwood’s two editions of 1827 and 1831.⁶¹⁶ Inwood excavated in the region of the West Cross-Wall, and purported to have discovered that it was not original to the building because of the marble fascia blocks he found, and is therefore omitted in his plan. What Inwood probably found were the fascia blocks used in the Byzantine foundations of the church aisles, which were at the same level as the ancient thresholds on the West Cross-Wall. Inwood also found a fragment of the marble frieze while he was clandestinely digging, and associated it correctly with the dowels on the Eleusinian blocks.

Inwood took several architectural fragments home with him in 1819, and sold them to the British Museum for £40 (Table 9):

⁶¹³ Inwood 1831, p. 116.

⁶¹⁴ The arrangement of the doorways behind the hexastyle façade at St. Pancras reflects the symmetrical reconstruction of the smaller, flanking doorways (Figure 689).

⁶¹⁵ Inwood, *An Ideal Restoration of the Temple; North-west View*, 1819 hides the issue behind a statue base in the foreground.

⁶¹⁶ See above “Woods.”

Table 9. Description of the Blocks Inwood Sold to the British Museum.

BM Cat. No.	Description
BM 410	Fragment of an epikranitis block, found to the north of the Erechtheion
BM 411	Fragment of leaf, bead-and-reel, and egg-and-dart moldings from the capital of a pilaster at the west side of the Maiden Porch of the Erechtheion
BM 417	Part of coffer of the East Porch, found near the East Porch: (Paton et al. 1927, p. 29)
BM 418	Part of window lining (Smith 1892: door jamb), perhaps from the East Door: Paton et al. 1927, p. 38.

THÜRMER

Joseph Thürmer (1789-1833) produced another state view of the Erechtheion in 1819, this time from the northeast, that together with Inwood's west elevation, offers an almost 360 degree view for this year (Figure 61).⁶¹⁷

Thürmer's depiction is important because it confirms the state of the west part of the North Wall, a part of the building at which Gell's depictions only hinted. Thus the following are confirmed absent since Fauvel's 1789 elevation (Figure 29): NN.01.08-09, NN.02.08-09, NN.03.08-09, NN.04.08-09, NN.05.09-10, NN.06.09-10,⁶¹⁸ NN.07.09-10, NN.08.09-10, NN.09.10-11, NN.10.09-11, NN.11.10-12, NN.12.10-12, and NN.13.11-13. Thürmer, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1819 also confirms and gives new information on the state of the South Wall. In the past year, that is, since Basevi, *The Interior of the Erechtheion from the Northwest*, 1818 (Figure 52),⁶¹⁹ SS.05.11 has fallen down. The state of the west end of the South Wall as depicted in Pomardi, *West End of the Pandrosion*, 1804-1805 is confirmed (Figure 44), and the following blocks are

⁶¹⁷ Thürmer, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1819; Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819.

⁶¹⁸ And half of block 8. The dowel hole of the middle of the block can be seen in Thürmer's view, suggesting it was destroyed in the search for metal.

⁶¹⁹ Basevi, *The Interior of the Erechtheion from the Northwest*, 1818.

depicted as absent for the first time in the space in between the information available from Pomardi and Basevi's views (i.e., the middle of the South Wall): SS.03.06-09, SS.04.06-09, SS.05.06-09, SS.06.07-09, SS.07.07-09, SS.08.08-09, and SS.09.08.

Thürmer's view is not, however, a perfect record. He restores Maiden #6 in lieu of the pillar, neglects to indicate the latticing in the northernmost window of the West Façade for the picturesque reason of showing the mountain range in the background, and "thinks away" all but the lower courses of the North Addition, which had recently been depicted as standing to a significant height by Basevi in 1818 (Figure 53).⁶²⁰ The view of the interior of the north Akropolis wall immediately to the north of the Erechtheion, on the other hand, is quite clear and helpful. The state of the temple in 1819 is summarized visually in Figure 583.

DONALDSON

Thomas Leverton Donaldson (1795-1885) visited Athens in 1820, just prior to the outbreak of the War of Independence. He became a leading British architect, co-founder, and eventually president of the Royal Institute of British Architects (R.I.B.A.). His experience with the Erechtheion in Athens stayed with him for a long time. In 1876, over fifty years after his visit, Donaldson's recollections were recorded in the commentary on James Fergusson's sessional paper to R.I.B.A.⁶²¹

The glass beads in the guilloche patterns of the North Porch columns have been remarked upon several times by earlier travelers, and were the subject of a presentation by Donaldson to R.I.B.A. in 1842 during the heated discussions about polychromy in

⁶²⁰ Basevi, *Erechtheion from the North*, 1818.

⁶²¹ Fergusson 1876.

ancient architecture and sculpture.⁶²² According to Donaldson’s watercolor of the guilloche pattern (Figure 63), the colored beads were arranged in the following pattern (Table 10):

Table 10. Arrangement of the Colored Glass Beads in the Guilloche of the Columns of the North Porch, According to Donaldson.

Top	Blue	Amber	Blue	Amber	Blue
Middle	Yellow	Purple	Yellow	Purple	Yellow
Bottom	Purple	Blue	Purple	Blue	Purple.

Donaldson also highlighted the iron pins protruding from the sides and back of the capitals, and the treatment of the eyes of the volutes in this document (T 62).⁶²³

The doors of ancient buildings were Donaldson’s other great interest, and the Erechtheion had both the biggest and most elaborate, as well as the simplest in his book; he started with the latter, the South Door, and ended with the former, the North Door.

In Cockerell’s 1811-14 painting of the loft in the North Porch, the consoles of the North Door were not visible, but their excavation had begun.⁶²⁴ Later paintings show that the roof of the vault (as opposed to the floor of the loft) in reality only rose to just below the consoles. Donaldson describes his investigation of the North Door thus:

Even in 1820 this portico was occupied as a magazine; but the top of its ceiling not reaching higher than the consoles, which were quite clear, sufficient space remained to leave a chamber immediately under the soffit of the portico. To this access was gained by a ladder through a hole in the modern wall, which encloses the columns, and which was bricked up by the rapacious Turks after every visit, and reopened for a new traveler, upon his paying the customary ‘bakshish’ to the Disdar Aga.⁶²⁵

⁶²² Donaldson, *Disposition of the coloured glass beads in the interlacing ornament in the capitals of the tetrastyle portico*, 1820. For an assemblage of information about the guilloche pattern and other colored elements for the *Report of Committee on Evidences of Color on the Elgin Marbles*, see Stern 1985, pl. 96.

⁶²³ Donaldson, *Disposition of the coloured glass beads in the interlacing ornament in the capitals of the tetrastyle portico*, 1820.

⁶²⁴ See above “Cockerell.”

⁶²⁵ Donaldson 1833, p. 45.

Donaldson is the first both to recognize that the inner lining of the North Door is of early Christian date, and to comment on the difference in the quality of carving on its lintel.⁶²⁶ He confuses, however, the choice of moldings, which were original, with the style of execution, which was part of the repair.

WOLFE

John Lewis Wolfe (d.1881) also makes his feelings known about the North Door in his notebooks, now at R.I.B.A. (T 63).⁶²⁷ He finds the lintel of the North Door highly offensive: “The great cymatium enriched with an ornament most vilely executed and as vilely designed. It would disgrace the middle ages.”⁶²⁸ The Middle Ages and all things Gothic were considered backward to a forward-looking architect of the Neoclassical style like Wolfe. He also finds the East Porch unpleasant and the necking band “grapy.” He instinctively (and unconsciously) sorts through the original moldings versus those which are replacements from a later period. For example, while the carving of the capitals of the West Façade is “very badly done,” he notes “that of [the West Façade] pilaster [was] done as well as the Tetrastyle Portico.”⁶²⁹

On a more positive note, Wolfe explicitly assesses whether and how he would use the Erechtheion moldings and capitals in his future designs; for example, he writes: “The angle volutes have a very good effect. I should have no hesitation in introducing them in like circumstances.”⁶³⁰ In his critique of the Maiden Porch, he mentally redesigns the

⁶²⁶ See Chapter III on the date of the repair to the lintel of the North Door.

⁶²⁷ I was unable to consult these notebooks at R.I.B.A., although I did find a sketch plan of the Erechtheion by Wolfe. Wolfe’s account of the Erechtheion is therefore based on a transcription in Paton et al. 1927, pp. 599-600.

⁶²⁸ Wolfe, *Sketch-books and Diaries*, 1820 Notebook, p. 39.

⁶²⁹ Wolfe, *Sketch-books and Diaries*, 1820 Notebook, p. 41.

⁶³⁰ Wolfe, *Sketch-books and Diaries*, 1820 Notebook, p. 40.

maidens in order to make them more aesthetically pleasing by adjusting their stance and their hairstyles.

Donaldson and Wolfe were colleagues both in London and Athens, and like-minded in their reception of the Erechtheion. They both had an eye for detail and the subtle differences in the quality and styles of the moldings, a skill belonging to trained architects who would take their experience of the Athenian monuments back to England and continue to change the face of that capital city.

TRAVELERS DURING THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

Travelers to Athens between 1821 and 1833 did not tend to visit the Akropolis because of the War of Independence. If the Greeks were not besieging the Ottomans, the Ottomans were besieging the Greeks, and the monuments were under threat from cannon and gun fire, not to mention the search for metal. Nonetheless, we do not have to depend solely on the depictions created after the war for information about the damage done to the Erechtheion during the conflict.

Several sources (General Makriyannis and Edgar Garston, for example) describe how Commander Gouras lodged his family in the loft in the North Porch above the gunpowder magazine. As in 1687 in the Parthenon, the North Porch of the Erechtheion became a military target. Ottoman fire hit the North Porch in 1827, and its roof partially collapsed, killing all Gouras family members. The Maiden Porch also suffered damage from cannon and gun shot, and the South Wall was further dismantled.

The following sections analyze the accounts of travelers to Athens between 1821 and 1833.

FULLER

English traveler, John Fuller, visited Athens in 1820-1821, and while writing his

Narrative, expressed concern about the survival of the monuments:

I have spoken of all the ancient monuments at Athens as in the state in which they were when I saw them. There has not yet been published any precise account of the damage done to them in the late sieges; but from what we have heard we may hope that it has been trifling.⁶³¹

He also makes some profound statements comparing the intrinsic value of Roman and Greek monuments (T 64):

Unlike the vast masses of brick-work which we can see at Rome, and which, having been despoiled of their original rich casing, remain now in naked deformity, the Athenian buildings are, with one or two exceptions, of solid marble, nor are there any neighbouring *chef-d'oeuvres* of modern architecture to distract our attention or to share our admiration....⁶³²

These comments demonstrate the mixed blessing of Rome having continued as a major city during the Middle Ages and Renaissance as compared to the relatively modest developments of contemporary Athens. When Fuller was traveling and writing his *Narrative*, several new buildings in London had been built using major and minor features derived from the Erechtheion, this temple having become “the model from which all modern buildings of that order have been taken.”⁶³³

WADDINGTON

George Waddington, the Dean of Durham, visited Athens in 1823-1824 when the Greeks controlled the Akropolis. He described the situation of the Greeks (T 65): “The first great step has been accomplished; Athens *was* under the despotism of a Turk; she *is*

⁶³¹ Fuller 1829, p. 541.

⁶³² Fuller 1829, p. 532.

⁶³³ Fuller 1829, p. 541.

under the despotism of a Greek: she had a Mahometan, she has a Christian government: the doors of improvement and civilization are thus thrown open, and the path is broad and easy of discovery.”⁶³⁴

Waddington describes the liberation of Athens and the first siege of the Akropolis: “In the month of April, 1821, about the period of Easter....the city-walls of Athens were scaled by the insurgents, and her streets filled with the victorious shout ‘Christos anesti, - Christ is risen from the dead!’”⁶³⁵ But the regular blockade to take the Akropolis was not put in place until May 7. Terribly short-handed, the Ottomans were forced to use Greeks to guard the Akropolis walls, and the Greeks helped their brethren, using a ruse, and signaling when the Ottomans soldiers were sleeping, so that the Greek Athenians could celebrate their freedom in the lower town. But, Waddington warns, “the more difficult operation was still to be accomplished; the citadel, though indifferently fortified and assailable from three sides, was still powerful against so resourceless an enemy.”⁶³⁶

The Greeks sowed wheat in the fields around the Temple of Theseus (Hephaesteion) to feed themselves, and proceeded to starve out the Ottoman soldiers. When the conflict finally reached a head, Waddington witnessed the atrocities committed by both sides. Waddington recounts the siege of November 1821 (T 65), and with respect to the Erechtheion, reports, “One shot, the only one of which the effect is at all remarkable, struck the Architrave of the Erechtheum, but happily without inflicting any material injury.”⁶³⁷

⁶³⁴ Waddington 1825, p. 40.

⁶³⁵ Waddington 1825, p. 46.

⁶³⁶ Waddington 1825, p. 47.

⁶³⁷ Waddington 1825, p. 57.

Waddington describes how the siege continued and, because of the Muslim attitude toward animals, the Ottomans gave their beasts of burden to the Greeks to prevent them from starving. The occupants of the Akropolis finally broke, and the Ottomans proposed to surrender to the European consuls resident at Athens rather than to the Greeks themselves, whom they did not trust. Only Gropius of Austria, Fauvel of France, and Signor Origoni of Holland were still in Athens.⁶³⁸ Waddington outlines the terms of surrender:

1. Give up the Akropolis and their arms;
2. The Ottomans were to be protected;
3. Every Ottoman family was to be allowed to take a load of clothes;
4. Ottomans may retain one half of their wealth; and,
5. Ottomans may stay in Athens, or leave on a European vessel. They would be given biscuits and cheese, and their passage paid.⁶³⁹

This treaty was signed June 9-12, 1822 at Athens, but was violated almost before the ink had dried. The Ottomans evacuated the Akropolis on June 22, 1822. Butchery and treachery followed on both sides. Soon, there was anarchy.

GARSTON

Garston spent thirty-six hours in Greece in 1825, and left an account of what he saw at Athens during this short period (T 66). His account of the Erechtheion is candid, despite having read Leake and other scholars' arguments on the arrangement of the cults. He was not interested in deciphering which cult belonged to which portion of the temple,

⁶³⁸ Waddington 1825, p. 61.

⁶³⁹ Waddington 1825, p. 62.

thus allowing “you to decide...to your satisfaction, to which deity each of the several compartments of this triple temple has been dedicated.”⁶⁴⁰

The historical information Garston offers is contemporaneous and useful. He alludes retrospectively (with regards to the actual publication date of his book in 1842) to the “melancholy catastrophe which has converted the northern portico (to use the nomenclature of Leake) into a heap of ruins,” and event that occurred in 1827, and to “the weight suddenly added to that of the other objects laid upon the roof for its protection”, that is, the addition of more earth to the roof of the North Porch to insulate it from attack. He also recounts the tragedy of the death of Gouras’ family, which had been hiding out in the loft of the North Porch during the Ottoman siege of 1826-1827. He gives the story the context of a morality tale:

At the time of its [North Porch’s] fall, the widow of Gourrha, her children, her servants, and several of her friends, had sought in it a refuge from the fire of the besiegers, and were crushed to death in its ruins. I was much struck by a remark as to their fate, made to me by a Greek of the old school, what had been one of the followers of Gourrha – ‘Gourrha betrayed the man whose bread he had eaten, and himself and his family paid the forfeit of his treachery.’⁶⁴¹

Garston, self-consciously declaring himself a Philhellene, published his account almost twenty years after his visit, though he brought it fully up-to-date by including details of the intervening restoration of the building. He was slightly misinformed, however, about Andreoli’s, the “Italian artist’s” activities. He was not making a replacement in marble for Maiden #3 taken by Elgin, but restoring the remainder of Maiden #6 which had recently been found by Pittakis.⁶⁴² This Philhellene’s comments about the inappropriateness of an Italian working on the maiden “in the very *studio* of

⁶⁴⁰ Garston 1842, p. 125.

⁶⁴¹ Garston 1842, pp. 126-127.

⁶⁴² On the restoration of the Maiden Porch and the discovery of Maiden #6, see Chapter VIII.

Phidias”⁶⁴³ illustrates the nationalistic associations already accredited to the Athenian monuments and their anastylosis. Incidentally, the restoration activities Garston describes are prior to the French team’s wholesale renovation of the Maiden Porch.

KINNARD

William Kinnard (d. 1839) updated Stuart’s late 18th century discussion of the Erechtheion during the War of Independence (T 67).⁶⁴⁴ He describes the state of preservation of the Erechtheion in 1825, and he notes that the war had not yet had a very adverse effect on the temple.⁶⁴⁵ Kinnard also provides a thorough analysis of the problem of calling the Erechtheion maidens “caryatids.”⁶⁴⁶ This discussion is based on the seminal work on the topic by Lessing “the German antiquary.”⁶⁴⁷

Of particular interest is Kinnard’s prescient statements about the custodial duties of the Greeks toward ancient monuments. They are further testimony to, with respect to the Erechtheion at least, the political importance of ancient monuments and their physical and intellectual ownership by the “modern” Greeks.⁶⁴⁸

From our last accounts from Athens, the substitute [maiden provided by Lord Guilford several years before], however, had not yet been erected, and the unfortunate Greeks are yet too much engaged on the fabric of their own political existence, to devote much thought on the ruined temples of their predecessors: from the fatal catastrophe of Missolonghi, it even yet is far from improbable that the extinction of their own hopes and name, may take place simultaneously with the destruction of the monuments of their ancestors.

⁶⁴³ Garston 1842, p. 131.

⁶⁴⁴ Kinnard 1825.

⁶⁴⁵ Kinnard 1825, p. 60. Kinnard depended mainly on published sources and the word-of-mouth of acquaintances for the current state of the building.

⁶⁴⁶ Kinnard 1825, pp. 61-63. See the discussion of the Erechtheion maidens as “caryatids” in Chapter IV.

⁶⁴⁷ Lessing (no date).

⁶⁴⁸ See Yalouri 2001.

Among all the positivist reconstructions generated by contemporary scholars, Kinnard sensibly warns against proposing “a restoration of [the temple’s] internal arrangement...in our present defective state of knowledge of the interior and foundation of this edifice.”⁶⁴⁹

GROPIUS

There are several eyewitness accounts of the siege of the Akropolis by the Ottomans in 1826-1827. The Austrian consul, Gropius, and his correspondent, Blaquièrre, exchange concerns over the state of the monuments on the Akropolis during the War. One letter, dated April 25, 1824, implies that the Greeks tore down more of the South Wall in the search for lead (T 68).⁶⁵⁰ In that same letter, Gropius asserts responsibility as a member of the [Philomousos] Society, and conveyed deep anxiety for not having been able to move the gunpowder magazine “established by the Turks.” In 1826, Gropius wrote to his fellow consul, Fauvel, urging that they build a new magazine without delay: “Le vestibule du temple de Minerve Polias sera sauvé du danger de sauter un jour dans l’air; on va construire *sans délai* une autre poudrière en chateau.”⁶⁵¹ It would be too little, too late.

MAKRIYANNIS

General Makriyannis (1797-1864) left a memoir of the Greek War of Independence that includes accounts of the siege of the Akropolis by the Ottomans in 1826-1827 and his stormy relationship with the Greek commander, Gouras (T 69). He describes how both Ottomans and Greeks committed atrocities against each other.

⁶⁴⁹ Kinnard 1825, p. 71.

⁶⁵⁰ Blaquièrre 1825, p. 157.

⁶⁵¹ Gropius to Fauvel, March 13, 1826.

Churches full of civilians and soldiers were burnt down; explosions were set in caves where innocent children and women hid. Nor were the Greeks above contemplating the destruction of the Parthenon. They preferred to blow themselves up with it rather than surrender to the Turks. This is what Makriyannis said to Gouras in order to encourage him to help dig the mines:

And when the Turks come on and we cannot stand our ground, we'll touch off the fuses and blow Serpentzé into the air with the Turks who'll be there, and in this way we'll go back fighting into the temple [the Parthenon] itself. And there we'll lay a mine all round and send ourselves and the Turks and the temple into the air. For if the Government does not send us fresh men – or if they refuse to come – shall we abandon the citadel without a fight and quit after doing battle for a month and a half? And where shall we live to hid from the shame of the world, you above all, who have told all the foreign travellers and the people of this town that you could fight on in the citadel for two or three years?⁶⁵²

Makriyannis, for all his military authority and pivotal role in the fight for liberation of a people supported by Philhellenes in the West, does not appear to be aware of the names of the ancient monuments. For example, he states that he was stationed “where there is a cave and two pillars above,”⁶⁵³ that is, the Thrasyllous Monument, and he describes Gouras’ outpost as “a famous temple,” in other words, the Erechtheion. It was this temple that he “heaped over with earth to stop the bombs from breaking in.”⁶⁵⁴

Gouras died October 3, 1826, but was survived for a short time by his wife and children. Makriyannis recounts that “Later that famous temple was destroyed by bombardment, and Gouras’ family was lost with so many other souls. From all these

⁶⁵² Lidderdale 1966, pp. 110-111. The threats of self-immolation were not empty. Greeks did blow themselves up rather than surrender to the Ottomans on several devastating occasions in their struggles for freedom, such as at Moni Arkadi on Crete in 1866, where 300 rebels and 600 women and children blew themselves up when the Ottoman soldiers finally breached the monastery wall: Detorakis 1994, pp. 336-337.

⁶⁵³ Lidderdale 1966, pp. 100-101.

⁶⁵⁴ Lidderdale 1966, p. 102.

there escaped alive but one innocent boy; all the others were killed,”⁶⁵⁵ despite the protection of the earth above.

MICHAUD AND POUJOULAT

For obvious reasons, foreign travelers did not have access to the Akropolis after 1827 when the Ottomans had recovered power in Athens. But this did not stop travelers from visiting Athens. They were given escorts by the *dizdar* when they were taken around the monuments in the lower town to make sure they were not spying, a fear highly reminiscent of the accounts of travelers from the First Ottoman period.⁶⁵⁶ A pair of French travelers, Joseph François Michaud (1767-1839) and Jean Joseph François Poujoulat (1767-1839), visited Athens in 1830. After their guided tour of the Roman Agora, Tower of the Winds, Lantern of Demosthenes, Arch of Hadrian, Temple of Jupiter, Prison of Socrates, and the “Philopatus” monument, their desire to see the Akropolis could only be fulfilled from vantage points from the lower city (T 70).

Here ends the presentation and analysis of travelers’ accounts of the Erechtheion from the Ottoman period.

SYNTHESIS OF TRAVELERS’ RECEPTION OF THE ERECHTHEION

The early travelers – the careful note-takers and painters, whose works survive, and which interest us here – were highly conscious of their role in spreading the word of Hellenism. Travelers journeyed so that they might gain knowledge of things worthy of

⁶⁵⁵ Lidderdale 1966, p. 103. On Makryiannis’ sensitivity to his cultural heritage, see Yalouri 2001, p. 101.

⁶⁵⁶ See above “The Earliest Travelers to Athens.”

being communicated to their nations.⁶⁵⁷ Similarly, there was an appetite for such works, not just among architects and antiquaries, but also among the middle classes. The former used the finely crafted architectural treatises as models and inspiration for their own compositions, and the latter indulged in a desire to improve one's taste by exposure to the classics.

The following sections examine some of the main themes that emerged from the analysis of the travelers' accounts, such as the travelers' way of going about writing their descriptions of monuments; the early development of the scholarship concerning the Erechtheion and the term "caryatid"; trends in the aesthetic reception of the Erechtheion as a whole and of the maidens; the motivation behind the first expeditions to Greece, the travelers on the Grand Tour and Lord Elgin; the role of the Erechtheion in the rise of Philhellenism; attitudes toward Lord Elgin; and a case study of how elements from the Erechtheion were incorporated into the designs of two of the leading London architects who never visited Greece, Robert Adam and John Soane.

MODUS OPERANDI

The modus operandi for the early travelers' descriptions of ancient monuments is very different from our modern one. Their accounts tended to focus on one building at a time, rather than the more modern practice of continually comparing details of one building with any and all others that bear some resemblance. This latter type of analysis is difficult to do, and should not be expected of the early travelers because of the contemporary state of knowledge, and the lack of readily available plans and elevations for buildings: the foundations and stylobates were usually unexcavated, if not obscured

⁶⁵⁷ Augustinos 1994, p. 55.

by rubbish or later structures. The drawings that were available were not easily transportable, contained as they were in large, leather-bound volumes and folios.⁶⁵⁸

Many travelers mention that they consulted “Stuart” and “Le Roy” before setting out, and bemoan the absence of such books in Athens.⁶⁵⁹

Therefore, travelers’ writings remained largely empirical: every traveler rediscovered each monument on his or her own, by autopsy, and with a personal take on Pausanias. Much of the charm (and usefulness) of these accounts comes from the personal, and often insightful, observations recorded by chance. Sometimes, however, travelers simply plagiarized or translated accounts in other languages, but a comparison of the accounts makes this quite easy to detect. Spon and Wheler were the source of most 17th and early 18th century accounts, while Stuart and Revett influenced later 18th century descriptions heavily. In general, travelers only rarely gave a conscientious account of a current condition of the building, as they preferred to discuss the original state and function of the monument.

The travelers’ choice of perspective for their drawings and paintings was generally governed by the “picturesque.” By far, the most popular view of the Erechtheion was from the southwest for the obvious reason that it included the Maiden Porch and the intriguing West Façade. Aside from Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765, depictions that include the north side of the Erechtheion are rare because of its lack of picturesque qualities from the artist’s point of view. The North Addition and the South Building deterred most travelers from using perspectives which included these later accretions to the Classical temple. When it was unavoidable, artists

⁶⁵⁸ Stuart and Revett 1762-1816 and Le Roy 1758, for example, are very large and very heavy.

⁶⁵⁹ See above “Basevi.”

often omitted or truncated these edifices so that more of the ancient building could be shown. Views of the North Addition and South Building tend to have been produced only among the suites of drawings by diligent travelers, such as Gell and Basevi, who also recorded all the other façades.

THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOLARSHIP

Pioneered by Chandler and his initial analysis of his eponymous inscribed stele, the scholarly discussion surrounding the Erechtheion accelerated quickly during the late 18th and early 19th centuries. This development constituted a major change in how the educated traveler approached the building. Each was faced with the daunting task of placing the most important cults and relics of the ancient Athenians using only his eyes, Pausanias, and whatever other Classical sources he happened to be aware of through his own classical education or consultation with previous travelers' accounts. With the rise of serious scholarship (which was perpetually hampered with the lack of information about the Pandroseion west of the Erechtheion) comes the lengthy discussions of the possibilities for the restoration of the interior and function of the various porches.

After the turn of the 19th century, it is somewhat ironic that the most charming, and hence most useful accounts for gauging the aesthetic reaction to the Erechtheion, are the fresh, untainted accounts of the less intensely educated traveler, that is, those more prone to recording the local rumors, such as those about the fate of the missing maiden and her mourning sisters.

The general nature of the depictions of the Erechtheion also changes over time. While the earliest published views of the temple were restorations, such as Pococke, *The Temple of Erectheus at Athens, restored*, 1745 (Figure 12), the later 18th and early 19th

centuries were a time for depicting the Erechtheion “as is.” This can be attributed to the general movement of Romanticism prevalent at this time.⁶⁶⁰ The glamour and appeal of ancient monuments in ruin (sometimes restored slightly to help the viewer understand the structure), complete with additional foliage to complement the composition, was fashionable.⁶⁶¹

While the early scholars who attempted in earnest to understand the Erechtheion were hampered by not knowing about the Pandroseion to the west of the temple, they were also more inclined to trust their own eyes. Most of the reconstructions of the interior of the temple, once it was sufficiently exposed, considered the east half of the temple to be two-storied,⁶⁶² an idea that was quashed by the authors of *The Erechtheum*, and only recently reconsidered by scholars in the 1970s.⁶⁶³

‘CARYATID’ AND THE RENAISSANCE

In 1674, Magni was the first person to call the maidens of the Erechtheion.⁶⁶⁴ While female architectural supports (some based on the Erechtheion-type) had been called “caryatids” throughout the Renaissance in Western Europe and associated directly with Vitruvius, as evidenced by the 15th and 16th century illustrated editions – and, from 1550, indirectly through their incorporation in monuments with “caryatid” in their names, such as the “salle des caryatides” in the Louvre by Jean Goujon – there is not a single record of someone calling the original Erechtheion maidens “caryatids” before Magni. The association between the ancient copies of the Erechtheion maidens surviving on

⁶⁶⁰ On Romanticism, see Levin 1931; Frederick 1966; Eitner 1970; Honour 1979; Webb 1982; Tsigakou 1991; and Kearney and Rasmussen 2001.

⁶⁶¹ Macaulay 1966; Roth, Lyons, and Merewether 1997; Salmon 2000; and Woodward 2001.

⁶⁶² Tétaz 1847-1848.

⁶⁶³ Boyadjief 1977; Platon et al. 1977. See Chapter II for the argument for the lower floor level in the east half of the Erechtheion.

⁶⁶⁴ See above “Magni.”

display in collections in Italy and the Vitruvian label “caryatid” (despite their disassociation from their architectural contexts) was, nonetheless, strong enough to survive the Middle Ages and for the Italian Renaissance artists and architects to begin and continue to employ female architectural supports in architectural contexts. And how did Frenchman Jean Goujon get the idea to use Erechtheionesque maidens in his musician’s gallery and learn to call them “caryatids”? He was a student of (the Italian) Michelangelo, who had access to the best models in the best collections in Italy through the patronage of the Pope and wealthiest families.

What is ground-breaking about Magni’s comment that “architects” call these female architectural supports “caryatids” is the direct association of the term with the Erechtheion maidens themselves. For the first time (in print), a person stood in front of the Erechtheion maidens on the Akropolis in Athens and called them “caryatids.” It is difficult to tell if Magni knew the Vitruvian source of the “caryatid” story or if it was just common knowledge in the late 17th century that Erechtheion-type maidens were called “caryatids” in Italy by architects.

Magni’s reference differs from the arguments put forward in Chapter IV regarding the ancient and modern history of the use of the term “caryatid,” in that all the ancient references to the Erechtheion maidens as “caryatids” were indirect, that is, through ancient copies. In other words, Pliny had called Erechtheion-type maidens “caryatids” by virtue of their presence as copies in Agrippa’s Pantheon. There are no ancient sources that directly call the Erechtheion maidens “caryatids.”

TRENDS IN AESTHETIC REACTIONS

The Erechtheion was generally warmly received by early modern travelers. “Perfect” and “sublime” are just two of the recurring adjectives used to describe the temple. Positive reactions to the fineness of the carving of the moldings and the elegance of the maidens were paradigmatic among both the travelers on the Grand Tour and the traveling architects. There are, however, several dissenters on both counts. Gell, for example, found the maidens rather mediocre, the general composition of the Maiden Porch a mish-mash of forms, and the proportions displeasing. Basevi found the edges of the ornament “a little hard” and Wolfe calls the repaired lintel to the North Door “vile” and “worse than medieval.” Laurent had the strongest measure of disapproval for the maidens, namely that they “are an absurd invention, disgraceful to art; for what can be more ridiculous than to represent the tender frame of a woman supporting the crushing weight of a marble roof.”⁶⁶⁵ But this is due to his impression that they were “caryatids,” a misconception which demonstrates that how one interprets the maidens affects one’s aesthetic reaction to them.

There is no particular time period when the Erechtheion was considered particularly elegant or distasteful. The negative reactions to the building are few, and begin only in the early 19th century. The positive reactions are littered with hyperbole and enthusiasm, with special attention paid to the exquisiteness of the carving of the moldings. In general, the Erechtheion’s maidens and moldings were considered perfect models for the Ionic order in the new architecture of Western Europe.⁶⁶⁶

⁶⁶⁵ See above “Laurent.”

⁶⁶⁶ See above “Watkins” (T 33), “Chateaubriand” (T 45), “Byron, Hobhouse and Galt” (T 48), “Hughes” (T 53), and “Fuller” (T 64).

MOTIVATIONS FOR TRAVEL

The Society of Dilettanti was founded in 1734 by a group of English aristocrats with a taste for travel, conviviality, and the antique. Despite its reputation as a drinking club for aristocrats who liked to dabble in the arts, the Dilettanti had serious scholarly intentions, initiating and funding the first expeditions to the East in order to publish descriptions and drawings of antiquities.⁶⁶⁷ Their mandate was:

To procure the exactest plans and measures possible of the buildings you shall find, making accurate drawings of the bas-reliefs and ornaments, and taking such views as you shall judge proper; copying all the inscriptions you shall meet with, and remarking every circumstance which can contribute towards giving the best idea of the ancient and present state of those places.⁶⁶⁸

This exemplifies the beginnings of a scientific interest in the past, which must begin with exact description, drawing and measurement - and then proceed with excavation. Stuart and Revett were the Society's first envoys to Greece in 1751. They were followed by several subsequent expeditions, including that of Gell.

With similar motivation to the Society of Dilettanti, Elgin had the noble intention of improving taste in England, and of offering the country's artists better models in order to inspire better art.⁶⁶⁹ Sculptors in the Neoclassical style were in desperate need of quality models. The artists of Western Europe were certainly impressed by the sculptures Elgin brought to England, despite the disparagement of the Parthenon marbles by Payne Knight, an eminent art critic of the time.⁶⁷⁰ Elgin's intentions were realized. Even those travelers who did not whole-heartedly approve of his actions admitted "that the Elgin marbles will contribute to the improvement of art in England...They must certainly open

⁶⁶⁷ Greenhalgh forthcoming.

⁶⁶⁸ Chandler 1776, p. 6.

⁶⁶⁹ Elgin's movements and explicit motivations were outlined above in "Lord Elgin, Lusieri, Hunt and Lady Elgin."

⁶⁷⁰ St. Clair 1997, pp. 245-260.

the eyes of the British artists, and prove that the true and only road to simplicity and beauty, is the study of nature.”⁶⁷¹ The poses of the pedimental sculpture of the Parthenon were soon to be found in many painted compositions.⁶⁷²

At the end of the 18th century, Greece became the destination *par excellence* for young, aristocratic participants on the Grand Tour. The inconvenience of travel to Italy caused by the Napoleonic Wars encouraged many such travelers to venture to Greece instead, although most still visited Rome prior to their more exotic forays to the East.⁶⁷³ The reputation of the ruins and romantic vistas, not to mention the fresh source of plunder, soon made Greece a prime destination. How could someone with the means to make travel relatively comfortable resist the temptation to view monuments of solid marble (as opposed to the brick structures of Rome robbed of their veneers), and to pick up an piece of original Greek art, which Winckelmann purported to be so much purer and superior to Rome’s? Youthful apprentice architects also traveled to Greece to study and draw the ancient monuments (especially their moldings), which would later serve as the models for their designs as professionals.

PHILHELLENISM

During the late 18th century and the years prior to the War of Independence in the early 19th century, the natives of mainland Greece enjoyed almost universal support for a revolution that would bring about their freedom from the yoke of Turkish rule. Many books, based primarily on the paintings and accounts of early travelers, have been written in the past twenty-five years about the relationship between the rediscovery of Greece by

⁶⁷¹ Williams 1820, p. 323.

⁶⁷² St. Clair 1997, pp. 261-280. Burne-Jones and Leighton are examples of two such influenced artists.

⁶⁷³ Angelomatis-Tsougarais 1990.

the West and the rise of Philhellenism.⁶⁷⁴ Lord Byron receives a great deal of credit for rallying the West behind the Greek cause through his poetic portrayals of a noble race oppressed by the corruption of the Ottoman Empire, and by placing his own life in danger by fighting alongside the Greeks. Those Greeks who had been living abroad actively participated in raising awareness and funding for the cause. Cultural studies were conducted which tried to prove that the Greeks were the natural inheritors of the ancients, while the “Great Idea” of reforming the lost Byzantine Empire, centered on Constantinople, fuelled dreams of officially re-Christianizing vast areas of the then Muslim Ottoman Empire. This is the political backdrop for the Romantic paintings created by the travelers and political artists from this period. They endeavored to evoke the classical past strangled by the decay of the oppressors through the depiction of crumbling masterpieces in marble, whose seams were bursting with foliage or bound up with creepers.⁶⁷⁵

Many of the travelers discussed above make explicit reference to the future of the Greeks as an independent people, and foresee the custodianship of the Akropolis monuments as playing a very important role in the rediscovery of their identity as a free people.

ATTITUDES TOWARD LORD ELGIN’S ACTIVITIES

The greatest majority of travelers after 1801 describe their disapproval of Lord Elgin’s removal of sculpture and architecture from the Parthenon and the Erechtheion.

⁶⁷⁴ See Tsigakou 1981; Tsigakou 1991; Stoneman 1987; Stoneman 1998; Tournikiotis 1994; Bastéa 2000; and Bouras 2003.

⁶⁷⁵ Woodward 2001. Christopher Woodward addresses the symbolic significance of flora and fauna in British paintings of ancient ruins, and argues that such foliage was not “just picturesque fluff”: Woodward 2003, p. 14. See also Roth et al. 1997.

Lord Byron lampooned Elgin in the form of several poems, the most vitriolic being “The Curse of Minerva.” A few travelers, including Wilkins, state that there would have been much less fuss in both England and Greece had Elgin not removed one of the maidens from the South Porch.⁶⁷⁶ At the time, the absence of Maiden #3 was considered the greatest eyesore brought about by Elgin’s activities. The point of departure for most travelers’ diatribes on Elgin is the missing maiden, and not the removal of the sculptures from the Parthenon. Also, no magical stories were woven around the removal of the Parthenon sculptures as were woven around the remaining maidens, who mourned their missing sister. A small minority did support Elgin’s actions. Their statements claimed the Ottomans held the monuments in utter disregard; were busy selling heads and hands piecemeal to travelers into whose minor collections the fragments were soon to be lost forever; and were burning marble to make lime.

For all the self-righteousness of the travelers who criticized Elgin’s activities, there was a great deal of “the pot calling the kettle black.”⁶⁷⁷ Travelers would complain about Elgin at length in one passage, and then boast about how they picked up a juicy morsel: a foot, a hand, or a whole sculpture. For these travelers, it was a matter of scale. They did not see their own transgressions as being in the same league as those of Elgin and the less-criticized Choiseul-Gouffier.

ROBERT ADAM AND SIR JOHN SOANE

Neither Robert Adam nor Sir John Soane visited Greece on their respective Grand Tours, although Soane’s student George Basevi drew monuments and wrote him letters

⁶⁷⁶ See also the comments of De Vere in Chapter VIII and T 90.

⁶⁷⁷ St. Clair describes the smaller scale removals of marble sculpture and architecture from the Akropolis: St. Clair 1997.

from Athens. Nonetheless, the Erechtheion's Ionic order, including the maidens, made their way into these great architects' grand designs. For example, Robert Adam (1728-1792) included two Erechtheion columns in the fireplace of the drawing room at Shardeloes, and the room's door was modeled on the North Door. Adam must have used his copy of Le Roy 1758, or had a peek at Stuart and Revett's drawings because he incorporated Erechtheion capitals in several of his designs (see Appendix C), and these pre-date the 1789 publication of Volume II of *The Antiquities of Athens*, in which the Erechtheion was described and drawn in detail for the first time for British consumption. The ante-room of Syon House in Middlesex (1761) has monolithic Erechtheion columns with gilt capitals, above which is a band of fascia with little rosettes from the Maiden Porch, plus the anthemion pattern frieze from the North Porch (with interfloral element) picked out in gilt, and dentils above. One last example is the tetrastyle façade of Lansdowne House, Berkeley Square, London (1761-1768), above which is a huge anthemion with interfloral element. Besides five early editions of Vitruvius, Robert Adam owned the great pattern books by Stuart and Revett, Dalton and Le Roy. Soane bought one volume of Stuart and Revett and the Le Roy, but not the Dalton.⁶⁷⁸ Adam also owned "a very fine model in wood from the capital of a column in the Temple of Minerva Polias at Athens, [which was] bought by Dawkins (dealer)."⁶⁷⁹

Soane was evidently quite taken with the Erechtheion maidens, which he had modeled in Coade stone⁶⁸⁰ and erected on the front of his Lincoln's Inn Fields, London

⁶⁷⁸ Christie's 1818, pp. 26-27.

⁶⁷⁹ Christie's 1818, p. 6, no. 71.

⁶⁸⁰ Cast stone/terracotta for making architectural ornaments. See Kelly 1990.

home in 1812 (Figure 690),⁶⁸¹ and which he included in his cupola for the now destroyed Bank of England building (1788; Figure 691). Furthermore, in James Ward's indulgent posthumous portrait of Soane's favorite pet dog, Fanny, an unusual northeast view of the Maiden Porch is included as an element of the fantasy scene (Figure 692).⁶⁸² Soane also had several casts of the moldings from the Erechtheion hanging from the walls in his home, which doubled as an office. Some of these casts appear to have been purchased from Robert Adam's estate according to the auction sale catalogs (Christie's May 22, 1818), some from architect James Playfair (1795), and others were clearly made from elements brought back by Elgin (even before they were acquired by the British Museum in 1816). These three-dimensional casts of moldings constituted the most essential tools for the architect and his designs, and so surpassed the usefulness of the two-dimensional drawings of Le Roy and Stuart. Table 11 describes the plaster cast moldings in Soane's collection:

Table 11. Casts of Parts of the Erechtheion in Sir John Soane's Collection.

Catalog Number	Description	Detail	Current Location in Soane Museum	Comment
M 885	Part of architrave from the North Porch	Three fascia, surmounted by egg-and-dart (e/d) molding, above which is a lesbian kymation.	Located in North Passage, North Wall	Appears blackened by smoke, as in the original in the North Porch.

⁶⁸¹ Incidentally, it is worth noting that the maidens clutch their drapery on their straight-legged side since it was not yet known (and would not be until the 1950s with the discovery of the Tivoli maidens) that they once held phialai.

⁶⁸² Ward, *Posthumous Portrait of Fanny, Soane's 'favourite dog'*, 1822.

M 1419	Part of the (repaired) architrave of the North Door.	From top to bottom: bead-and-reel (b/r), hawk's beak, e/d, b/r, rosette (no hole), b/r, damaged moldings.	Passage under students' room, north wall.	
M 18	Copy of a corner capital from the East Porch, i.e., the column that Elgin brought back.		Museum Corridor, east side	
M 19	Plaster cast of anta capital	Hawk's beak, kymation, b/r, e/d, b/r, anthemion, b/r	Museum Corridor, east side	Cast taken from fragment brought back by Elgin
M901	"Cast of part of the necking of capital of the Erechtheum East Portico"		North Passage, north side	Appears to be flat, as if from an anta or epistyle
M1250	"Cast of half of an Ionic Capital from the Portico of the Erechtheum"	North Porch?	Students' room, east side	Holes drilled into it for attachment of cast
M1290	Another cast of the left half of an Ionic capital from the Erechtheion with holes drilled in it.		Cast store East side, shelf D	
M 1348	Part of one of the antae (see M19) two lotuses and one palmette wide.		Students' room west side	
M1383	Fragment of a capital, photo shows side view of volute with bead-and-reel detailing.		Students' room, west side	

M 1433	Three fragments of anthemion patterns, all labeled “capitals”	L-smaller scale, very bulbous palmettes and droopy lotuses. C-East Porch column (no interfloral element) R-Interfloral elements between palmette and lotus of different style from center lotus and palmette.	Cast store, east side	Poor quality casts
M 700	Piece of ornamental molding “from the architrave of the Temple of Erechtheus at Athens”			No photo
M891	Cast of a fragment of the necking band of the capital of one of the columns East Portico		North Passage, North Wall	
M 900	Cast of fragment of anta anthemion, from the Erechtheion North Porch		North passage, north wall	

Soane also had a collection of plaster models by François Fouquet, which he acquired in 1834 from Edward Cresy.⁶⁸³ Among these is MR 24, a model of the Erechtheion.

It is interesting to note that Soane, and the students who used these moldings to practice on and inspire their architectural compositions, were unaware that the lintel of the North Door was a replacement block from the major repair, and not High Classical.⁶⁸⁴ Nor was Soane aware that he had in his possession a fragment of the Erechtheion frieze.

⁶⁸³ *A New Description of Sir John Soane's Museum* 2001, p. 84.

⁶⁸⁴ The current catalog does not point this out either.

This running female is in exquisite condition, and is included in Fowler's discussion of the frieze.⁶⁸⁵ Soane spoke out vociferously against the pillaging of antiquities (although he seized upon the chance to make casts of the maiden and the moldings to improve his own designs and firm), and would certainly have been quite ashamed that he had known that he owned a fragment of a building he so admired, and with which he surrounded himself in the form of the maidens and moldings. Despite the importance to him professionally of the marbles Elgin brought back, Soane only referred directly to Elgin once, in a diary entry in August 1816, the same month that the government paid 35,000 pounds for the Elgin marbles. He wrote, quoting Byron: "On Lord Elgin's marbles: 'Noseless himself [reference to Elgin's syphilis], he brings here noseless blocks, to shew what time has done and what the pox.'" Though this single example is critical, the scarcity of comment on Elgin by Soane is remarkable. Did Soane struggle with his conscience in using the marbles as models and for casts? Probably not. The temptation to improve one's business was likely too great.

⁶⁸⁵ Paton et al. 1927, p. 270.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE OTTOMAN PERIOD (1458-1821)

Paton et al. described the form and location of all the post-Byzantine cuttings on the Erechtheion as of 1927. Most of the cuttings described for the North and South Walls, however, were meaningless to the authors of *The Erechtheum*. The original location of almost every block with diagnostic cuttings was wrongly restored during Pittakis' and Balanos' haphazard restoration projects. It is now possible, thanks to the correct restoration of the North and South walls by Papanikolaou, to reassess the changes to the Erechtheion during the Byzantine, Frankish, and Ottoman periods. This reassessment involves re-analyzing the information from the early travelers in order to gain a better understanding of the building's immediate surroundings and reuse. For example, for Paton et al., the fourteen, crudely-carved, semi-circular cuttings now in course 9 on the exterior of the South Wall (SS.09.08-11) were scattered all over, in positions SS.03.14, SS.09.09 and SS.10.10 (Figure 197). Similarly on the South Wall, the more carefully carved sockets for roof beams in SS.05.05-07 and SS.06.05-06 are now correctly placed in two rows, rather than being scattered between the North and South Walls (Figure 198, Figure 201, and Figure 202). Before the most recent restoration, some of these cuttings even faced the interior of the building (e.g., SS.08.11). It was therefore impossible for the authors of *The Erechtheum* to interpret some of the valuable information available in the travelers' accounts, such as Spon and Wheeler's reference to "miserable hovels" attached to the south side of the Erechtheion (T 11 and T 12). In light of the invaluable work on the post-Classical Propylaia by Tanoulas, it is

now possible to propose a date for such cuttings based on comparisons between the two buildings.⁶⁸⁶

Paton et al. considered many of the blocks, especially in the North Wall, never to have moved; however, according to the restoration of the temple by Papanikolaou, several of these blocks were in the wrong place and have since been moved to their correct location.⁶⁸⁷

The following sections describe the state of preservation, function, and changes to the Erechtheion during the First Ottoman period, the Venetian bombardment and occupation, and the Second Ottoman period. The damage to the Erechtheion caused by the sieges of the Akropolis during the War of Independence is assessed at the end of this chapter.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE FIRST OTTOMAN PERIOD

The Erechtheion in the First Ottoman period probably continued to serve as a private dwelling along the same lines as the Frankish period (Figure 577). The Gothic arches in the North Porch intercolumniations were filled in at some point (probably with the creation of the harem in this First Ottoman period, and definitely by the time the gunpowder magazine was installed). The spaces between the maidens in the South Porch were also (re-)filled in with masonry, and some blockage of the intercolumniations of the East Porch was maintained, if not raised. The doors themselves were perhaps also blocked up.⁶⁸⁸ Privacy was further enhanced by the blocking up of at least some of the

⁶⁸⁶ Tanoulas 1997.

⁶⁸⁷ Compare the shaded blocks on Stevens' plates to the unshaded blocks on Papanikolaou's drawings (Figure 564, Figure 565, Figure 566 and Figure 567).

⁶⁸⁸ Wheeler's account implies that there was no entrance via the East Porch.

windows of the West Façade, probably due to the close proximity of the multi-story house to the west of the temple.

‘HOVELS’ ON THE SOUTH WALL

Spon and Wheler were the first to comment on the actual state of the building, namely that the maidens of the South Porch were immured, and that there were “ancient hovels” next to it. There are two sets of cuttings for roof beams in the South Wall, specifically the western double row of cuttings in SS.05.05-07 and SS.06.05-06 (Figure 198), which were cut with greater care than the lower, eastern set in SS.09.08-11 (Figure 197). The latter are rounder, and have deeper, straight chisel marks. The edges of the block below were also damaged. This difference in technique suggests they probably belong to two distinct phases. Taking into consideration the ground level in the Ottoman period and the eastern set’s elevation in course 9, it is quite certain that these cuttings belong to an earlier time. Potential comparanda for the cuttings in blocks SS.09.08-11 may be found in the Propylaia: on the east side of the west wall of the north colonnade in front of the Pinakothek (Figure 595). These too have a rounded shape, but are spaced much more widely. Unfortunately, Tanoulas does not offer a date, stating only that “these beams must have formed a rather flimsy shed-roof in a period when the portico was unroofed,” that is, in the Byzantine period.⁶⁸⁹

The western, Ottoman, set of cuttings are at two different levels, one course apart, not far enough to indicate the construction of a second story, but probably indicative of a second phase to the same structure which required a change in roof line. These are very similar to the cuttings in the south passage of the central aisle of the Propylaia, which

⁶⁸⁹ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, p. 298. See Chapter V for more information on these Byzantine cuttings.

Tanoulas dates to A.D. 1640-1700 (Figure 598).⁶⁹⁰ If the “shed-roof” structures in the Propylaia and those attached to the South Wall of the Erechtheion were indeed contemporary, this would allow Spon and Wheler to have seen it attached to the Erechtheion as a “masure” next to the women “enclavées dans un mur.” During the Venetian siege, this area was hit by cannon balls that destroyed Maiden #6, MW.PW.02, and the aforementioned structure east of the Maiden Porch. This area was repaired after the destruction as evinced by the wall on the east side of the Maiden Porch which figures in the accounts and depictions of the early 19th century travelers. The second row of cuttings (probably the upper set) may date to the repair early in the Second Ottoman period, at which time the South Building was also (re-)built.⁶⁹¹

NORTH ADDITION

Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765 (Figure 22), shows the cross-wall of the North Addition in detail. The North Addition was originally constructed in the Frankish period, and continued to be used and underwent some changes in the First Ottoman period. These changes included a new set of beams placed haphazardly above the Frankish set in the cross-wall of the North Addition. This would have provided an ample crawl/storage space on this floor. The beams did not extend all the way to the North Wall of the Erechtheion, and so perhaps we can imagine a set of steps or a ladder between the two floors.

⁶⁹⁰ Tanoulas 1997, vol. 1, p. 168.

⁶⁹¹ See below “Immurement of the Maidens and the South Building.”

CISTERNS

The cistern under the North Addition and North Porch probably continued to function as long as the North Addition itself was occupied. As discussed in Chapter V, Paton et al. considered the circular, brick-lined access to cistern in the North Porch to be Ottoman, but Holland’s later investigations suggested that the three sherds he found in this matrix were Byzantine.⁶⁹² In any case, the brick-lined shaft continued to be used in the Ottoman period (Figure 454).

During the Ottoman period, there was an increased demand on the water supply by the inhabitants of the Erechtheion, when it served as a harem for a “Turk” (see above “Spon and Wheeler”). Evliya Çelebi reported in 1667 that “in the time of the infidel this castle [the Akropolis] had drinkable water from an aqueduct, but now every house collects its own rainwater in a cistern, which keeps it very cold even in July. The need for rain-water is great. Many carry their rainwater up on donkey-back from freshwater springs in the suburbs of the town.” Furthermore, when describing the Parthenon, he mentions the measures taken to collect the precious rainwater: “All the rainwater that falls on this marble roof drains into gutters that carry it in the direction of the *mihrab* down into a large stone cistern built on six columns. It is clean and cold and from it the multitude quench their thirst.” Although Coronelli marks five cisterns in his 1687 plan of the Akropolis, unfortunately no cisterns are indicated in the vicinity of the Erechtheion.⁶⁹³ This fact only implies that he was unable to locate cisterns owing to the temple’s ruinous state after the bombing.⁶⁹⁴ By the same token, it is unwise to argue from negative evidence, namely the lack of any cistern indicated in 1687. It is safe to say that the

⁶⁹² Holland and McAllister 1958, p. 161.

⁶⁹³ Coronelli, *Acropolis Cittadella d’Atene (Blackmer 409)*, 1687.

⁶⁹⁴ Coronelli’s plan is inaccurate in many respects.

cistern below the missing coffer in the North Porch would have functioned as described by Çelebi for the Parthenon: water continued to run in the channels cut in the North Porch's stylobate and drain into the brick-lined shaft (Figure 453 and Figure 454). Water collection in this cistern must have ceased when the North Porch was converted into a gunpowder magazine.⁶⁹⁵

In response to the increased demand for water, a third cistern was built under the West Corridor.⁶⁹⁶ Several detailed early elevations survive which show a vault above the cistern (Figure 98 and Figure 106).⁶⁹⁷ A portion of the vault survives today (Figure 499). The high quality of the brickwork fooled many early scholars into thinking it was original to the building. Paton et al. considered the vaulted cistern under the West Corridor to be medieval [i.e., Frankish] or Ottoman.⁶⁹⁸ The vault cannot be Frankish because it rises above the level of the threshold of the North Door, which contains Classical, Byzantine and Frankish cuttings for doors, but no Ottoman ones. As suggested by the descriptions and depictions of the early travelers, the North Door was partially or completely closed off during the First Ottoman period. Therefore, it seems that the only possible date for the construction of the cistern under the West Corridor is the First Ottoman period.

The creation of the cistern involved cutting into the bedrock in the east part of the West Corridor (Figure 498). Access to this cistern is not clear, but the two candidates

⁶⁹⁵ See below “Vault in the North Porch.”

⁶⁹⁶ The other two cisterns are described in Chapter V.

⁶⁹⁷ Archaeological Society of Athens 1853 (actually published in 1855) and Tétaz 1851 are the sources and origin of many of the elevations which followed, such as Winstrup, *The Interior of the South Wall of the Erechtheion*, 1851. Before Stevens' plates in Paton et al. 1927, these were the most often published “scientific” depictions of the Erechtheion.

⁶⁹⁸ Paton et al. 1927, p. 169.

are the squarish depression in the southwest corner (Figure 500), and the center of the cistern, where there is another dip in the bedrock (Figure 497).⁶⁹⁹

Paton et al. concluded that the depression in the southwest corner was the ancient well of Poseidon, but this cannot be true for chronological and stratigraphical reasons.⁷⁰⁰ The void in the foundations left by the architects for the Kekropeion implies that there was a dense earthen mass over this area. Therefore, the well of Poseidon could not have existed simultaneously with the Kekropeion at this location: if the well were to make its mark in the bedrock in Antiquity, then it would have cut through the sacred remains of the Kekropeion that the ancient architects were at such pains to preserve. Because the bedrock was cut away in the area toward the Maiden Porch, and the bottom of the cistern descends toward the southwest corner, this is the most obvious place to reconstruct the access to the cistern.

The cistern in the West Corridor has resulted in much dismay for scholars attempting to sort out the internal arrangement of the Classical temple, owing to its assumed destruction of everything from the Well of Poseidon to olive tree of Athena. The lining of this cistern was removed in 1909 to discern whether the West Corridor was indeed the location of Poseidon's salt-spring. These investigations revealed that the ancient walls were not water-tight. This means that the whole thing cannot have been the spring described by Pausanias, as previously interpreted by early travelers and archaeologists. Also, the ancient paving slabs were too thin to have spanned the distance over a hollow space, and so they must have been supported by earth.

⁶⁹⁹ Tétaz, *Acropolis d'Athènes. Ruines de l'Érechtheion, état actuel*, 1848, depicts these two depressions surrounded, as if lined, by small stones (Figure 98). On Fauvel's plan of 1787 (Fauvel, *Rough Plan of the Acropolis*, 1787), there are two dots in the middle of the west corridor. These may indicate the heads of the cistern.

⁷⁰⁰ Paton et al. 1927, p. 170.

How the cistern was filled is also unclear. Unlike in the Propylaia and the Parthenon, there are no Post-Antique channels carved in the krepidoma to lead water to the cistern. It must have been collected from whatever remaining roof structure there was over the main building. By the Ottoman period, the central nave of the basilica was probably unroofed, and served as an open courtyard and center of daily life, similar to the usual domestic arrangements in many Mediterranean countries.

THE VENETIANS (1687-1688)

DAMAGE DUE TO THE SIEGE OF 1687

Before the siege of 1687, the Erechtheion served as a dwelling for an Ottoman family. The Venetian siege rendered the main building completely unroofed, and displaced the remnants of the interior organization of the house. The North Addition received heavy fire; the “hovels” on the South Wall were crushed; and Maiden #6 and ME.PE.02 were destroyed. Several of the Venetian diagrams (plans and perspective drawings) showing the bombardment of the Akropolis indicate that cannon-fire came from all directions. After the siege, the Erechtheion was regarded as a ruin whose only function was as a gunpowder magazine for the occupying Venetians and the returning Ottomans.

MAIDEN PORCH

The number of maidens preserved in the South Porch fluctuates among all of the travelers’ accounts. On the one hand, Fanelli and Verneda place only three maidens in the South Porch because they were influenced by the contemporary opinion (promulgated by Spon) that the maidens represented the Three Graces. On the other hand, otherwise observant travelers record that there were six maidens, even after Elgin had removed one

of them. Pococke was the first to recognize, in 1745, that the original number of maidens was six (Figure 12).⁷⁰¹ What can be said for certain is that Maiden #6 does not appear in any depiction, even the earliest (Dalton, *Le Temple d'Ereictheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast*, 1749, Figure 13), and that Maiden #1 remained undamaged until the War of Independence.

Therefore, the question remains as to when Maiden #6 was destroyed. Most of the sculpture was found nearby in many fragments in fairly shallow fill during Pittakis' excavations of 1837.⁷⁰² It is difficult to believe that the Erechtheion suffered no damage during the Venetian siege considering the besieger's apparent lack of concern for the ancient monuments. Maiden #6, Paton et al. suggest, may have been destroyed during the Venetian siege.⁷⁰³ It is not difficult to imagine how artillery, shot from the north and east, as evinced by Verneda and Fanelli's diagrams, could have hit and shattered this maiden, nestled as she was between the South Wall and Maiden #5. In conjunction with the disappearance of Maiden #6 is the perhaps related destruction of most of the northeast pilaster of the Maiden Porch (PE.PE.02), as well as the "hovels" on the South Wall adjacent to it. It is probable, therefore, that these two ancient features, and the first phase of the Ottoman lean-to, were destroyed simultaneously during the Venetian siege.

In sum, besides the destruction of Maiden #6, the walls between the other maidens were probably disrupted, and the beginning of their disintegration began.

Fourmont and Lord Sandwich explicitly mention seeing five maidens, "the sixth being

⁷⁰¹ Pococke, *The Temple of Ereictheus at Athens, restored*, 1745. See above "Pococke."

⁷⁰² Dodwell supposed that Maiden #6 was taken away as opposed to destroyed "probably after the siege of the Venetians: Dodwell 1819, p. 354. This dating evidence is not useful because Dodwell could not have known that the fragments would be found in shallow fill. Several other travelers considered Maiden #6 to have been taken away to Rome where they claim to have seen her. These apparitions in Rome are in fact Roman copies of the Erechtheion maidens in various private collections.

⁷⁰³ Paton et al. 1927, p. 533, note 1.

wanting.”⁷⁰⁴ On the one hand, Fourmont and Dalton show spaces between the maidens, but it is highly likely that they are “thinking away the walls.” On the other hand, Sandwich interpreted the Maiden Porch as a “habitation for the kanephoroi.”⁷⁰⁵ This interpretation implies that he thought the walls between the maidens were original. Such a misunderstanding demonstrates the common difficulty among travelers’ of determining what is ancient. The walls between the maidens in the east part of the South Porch were re-erected in the Second Ottoman period. The second phase of the lean-to to its east, and the related South Building, were also built after the Venetian destruction.⁷⁰⁶

NORTH ADDITION

The North Addition was relatively intact during the First Ottoman period, and suffered severely from the Venetian bombardment. Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765 (Figure 22) is the earliest depiction of the North Addition, and only the cross-wall remains fully standing. The remainder of the north wall of the North Addition steps gradually downward from the cross-wall toward both east and west, and rises upward again as it approaches the North Porch. After the Venetian bombardment, the North Addition is no longer habitable.

VAULT IN THE NORTH PORCH

The date of the installation of the vault in the North Porch is as problematic as it is important to our understanding of the use and function of the Erechtheion in the

⁷⁰⁴ No. 2 of a list of drawings by Fourmont, BnF, *Supplément grec*, 856, fol. 3; Montagu 1799, pp. 64-66.

⁷⁰⁵ Paton et al. interpret these documents as implying that the walls are still extant between the maidens: Paton et al. 1927, p. 537.

⁷⁰⁶ On the South Building, see below “Immurement of the Maidens and the South Building” and Gell, *Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 32), Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800 (Figure 37), Atkins, *The Erechtheion from the Southwest*, 1801 (Figure 38), and Dodwell, *South-West View of the Erechtheion*, 1805 (Figure 42).

Ottoman and Venetian periods.⁷⁰⁷ Working backward in time, the vault in the North Porch (and the gunpowder magazine it housed) existed in the Second Ottoman period. The intact loft above the vault was first mentioned by Gell, and was accessible to the likes of Byron (1809-1811) and Cockerell (1811-1814) via a ladder between PP.C5 and PP.C6. There was grave concern about the safety of the North Porch in the years just prior to this explosion.⁷⁰⁸ It was inside this loft that the Greek General Gouras' family perished when the roof of the North Porch collapsed during the War of Independence.

At the other end of the timeline, the intercolumniations of the North Porch have been filled-in at least partially since the Byzantine period. These intercolumniations had once been pierced by Gothic, pointed-arch windows in the Frankish period, but are shown as filled in the earliest “accurate” drawings of the mid 18th century.⁷⁰⁹ Therefore, any building activity inside the North Porch would have been invisible from the outside, and difficult to detect by early visitors to the Akropolis.

The earliest documentary evidence for the vault in the North Porch is the plan and description of the Akropolis made by the Venetians, Verneda and Fanelli respectively, in 1687; the latter mentions that the North Porch served as “un deposito di polvere.”⁷¹⁰ The symbol inside the North Porch on Verneda's plan appears to represent a vault (Figure

⁷⁰⁷ Paton et al. nowhere lay out the argument for the date and function of the vault: Paton et al. 1927, p. 524.

⁷⁰⁸ Gropius wrote letters to Blaquièrre and to Fauvel expressing his grave concerns (T 68): Blaquièrre 1825, p. 157; Gropius to Fauvel, March 13, 1826. Incidentally, Gropius considered the gunpowder magazine to be Ottoman. See above “Gropius.”

⁷⁰⁹ Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the West*, 1749.

⁷¹⁰ Verneda, *Plan de l'Acropole d'Athènes*, 1687; Fanelli 1707, p. 321. Fanelli is talking about the North Porch, because immediately after he mentions the powder deposit, he discusses the measurements of the North Porch while referring to the structure in the previous paragraph by means of a demonstrative pronoun.

1).⁷¹¹ Therefore it seems that the vault was in place during the Venetian occupation of the Akropolis in 1687-1688.

The question then remains as to whether Spon and Wheler were told that the Erechtheion was a “seraglio” in order to divert attention away from a military installation. If not, then the vault was added after their 1676 visit or by the Venetians. The following is the author’s argument for a Venetian date for the vault.

Verneda’s plan dates to eleven years after Spon and Wheler’s visit, during the 1687-1688 Venetian occupation of the Akropolis. It is entirely possible – if not likely – that the Venetians constructed the vault in the North Porch in 1687 as part of the overall fortification of the citadel. Support for this theory may lie in a casual comment by Wheler when giving his measurements of the Erechtheion: “The less one [North Porch], by which the Entrance is to the other [main building].”⁷¹² In other words, the North Porch and the main building were still connected via the North Door, which would have been filled in if the vault were in place during the First Ottoman period.

It is also important to note that Verneda (and Fanelli, who copied him) comments on the huge marble beams of the North Porch ceiling. Did Verneda see the beams before they were obscured by the vault which took up the entire floor-space of the North Porch? If so, the construction date can be fixed to 1687, since Verneda saw the beams and drew the vault on his plan. Alternatively, the comments on the beams could simply indicate

⁷¹¹ This symbol is often interpreted as being an “N” to match the key: “N. Gran deposito di polvere.” The letters for the key are all written with their bottoms to the west and the symbol in the North Porch is distinctively hourglass in shape; therefore, in no way can the symbol in the North Porch be an “N.” Nor is “N” very near the “R” and “S” – the letters used to denote the North Porch and the Maiden Porch – in the alphabet. There are, on the other hand, many Ls, Ms and Ps used for military installations all over the Akropolis, and the use of symbols to depict gun emplacements and kilns is prevalent. Furthermore, on Fanelli’s more accurate of his two plans, there is no “N” in the North Porch. Nonetheless, it is clear that the North Porch is being used as a gunpowder magazine because of Fanelli’s description.

⁷¹² Wheler 1682, p. 364.

that, as masters of the Akropolis and owners of the magazine, these Venetian officers had access to strategic places: they had simply climbed onto the top of the vault to get a better view of the beams of the North Porch ceiling.

The date of the construction of the gunpowder magazine in the Erechtheion must be placed in the chronology of other magazines on the Akropolis.⁷¹³ This begins with Spon and Wheler, who saw the Temple of Athena Nike being used as a gunpowder magazine in 1676. Tanoulas concludes that the Temple of Athena Nike must have been built into the bastion (and the gunpowder magazine removed) “by the Turks shortly before the Venetian siege when they wanted to reinforce the western access of the Acropolis with a second battery.”⁷¹⁴ Where did the gunpowder go? According to Paton et al., the gunpowder was probably transferred to the North Porch of the Erechtheion.⁷¹⁵ This theory, however, is unconvincing. Instead, the gunpowder from the Propylaia would more logically have been consolidated with the supply already in the Parthenon.⁷¹⁶

Furthermore, an Ottoman deserter told Morosini that:

...most of the enemy gunpowder was stored in the Parthenon. The information was accurate but the Turks, believing that the Christians would never destroy their former cathedral had also filled the building with valuables and moved a number of women and children into it for safety.⁷¹⁷

Therefore, the gunpowder was probably not being stored in the Erechtheion during the 1687 bombardment that ended up being so detrimental to the Parthenon.

⁷¹³ Further comparison of well-dated Venetian and Ottoman powder magazines would be helpful toward resolving this issue.

⁷¹⁴ Tanoulas 1987, p. 438 ; Tanoulas 1997, vol. 2, p. 285.

⁷¹⁵ Paton et al. 1927, p. 532.

⁷¹⁶ It is not clear when gunpowder was first stored in the Parthenon, which had been serving as a mosque since about 1460, but the fact that it was serving as a gunpowder magazine in 1687 is undeniable owing to the massive explosion caused by its ignition.

⁷¹⁷ Mackenzie 1992, p. 19.

The Ottomans' long and traumatic experience with gunpowder magazines, and their efforts to shield them from lightning strikes, would have meant that the North Porch would not be a prime choice to site such a magazine. Paton et al. read between the lines of the accounts of the siege of the Akropolis and saw the Ottomans' anxiety about the risk of further explosions as worry about a possible explosion of the North Porch.⁷¹⁸ The final piece of evidence for a Venetian construction of the vault is Fanelli's remarks that the temple is, *at present*, reduced to housing a gunpowder magazine.⁷¹⁹

The vault in the North Porch was well-built and ran east-west. Both Rey, *The North Portico from the East*, 1843 (Figure 91), and Skene, *Temple of Minerva Polias and Erechtheus*, January 8, 1841 (Figure 85), indicate that the peak of the vault rose to a height half way up the second column drum from the top. Arundale, *View of the Temple of Erechtheus at Athens*, 1834 (Figure 68); Flandin, *The Erechtheum and the Parthenon from the West*, November 15, 1839 (Figure 83); and Caffi, *The Parthenon and the Erechtheion from the West*, 1843 (Figure 88), show there was a small window in the west side of the bricked-up vault.⁷²⁰

Access to the gunpowder stored in this vault is also problematic. After the Venetians, and until Gell's unpublished diary of 1800, there is no mention of the coffers and huge marble beams, although the North Door does show up on Pococke's 1740 plan. Chandler tells us explicitly that the North Door was blocked up in 1765 (T 29). According to Thiersch and Forchhammer, this was done with blocks of the Eleusinian

⁷¹⁸ Paton et al. 1927, p. 533; Laborde 1854, vol. 2, pp. 144, 146, and 158.

⁷¹⁹ Fanelli 1707.

⁷²⁰ The recently discovered sketch in the DAI Archives, Anonymous, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1838-1844, also shows this window.

limestone frieze.⁷²¹ This suggests that the only access to the vault's interior was through the arch that lined the doorway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion. This door was probably installed concurrently with the magazine by the Venetians.⁷²² This arch is only clearly visible for the first time in Skene, *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*, 1839 (Figure 81), and frequently thereafter, such as in Hansen, *The Erechtheion from the Southwest*, 1844 (Figure 95).⁷²³

Access to the arched doorway was concealed by the mass of masonry in the Westward Projection of the North Porch. This masonry structure is first visible in Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751 (Figure 15). Several travelers imply that this is the point of access to the gunpowder magazine in the North Porch, and that a new hole had to be made every time the Ottomans wanted to gain access to it.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE SECOND OTTOMAN PERIOD (1688-1821)

The total effect of the Venetian destruction amounts to the ruin of the North Addition, the east side of the Maiden Porch, and the first phase of the South Building. After the Ottomans reclaimed the Akropolis in 1688, part of its refortification included the construction of a battery just to the northwest of the North Porch. A similar battery (with two gun emplacements) existed there already, according to the plans of the Venetians discussed above, but this appears to have been expanded in the Second

⁷²¹ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 523-524.

⁷²² Paton et al. consider the arched door earlier than, or contemporary with, the construction of the vault: Paton et al. 1927, p. 524. The arch must post-date the Frankish period because when the brick lining was removed in 1909, a graffito in Latin or Italian (from the Frankish period) was discovered on the marble: Paton et al. 1927, p. 524, note 5. Unfortunately, this graffito was not recorded before it faded.

⁷²³ The arch also appears in two approximately contemporary, but undated, depictions: Anonymous, *The Erechtheion from the West*. 1838-1844, and Zahn, *Erechtheum*, ca. 1837. Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819 (Figure 58) may indicate the arch's visibility prior to the War of Independence, but the perspective from which it is depicted is problematic. See above "Inwood."

Ottoman period according to Le Roy, *Plan de la Citadelle d'Athenes*, 1755 (Figure 18), which shows seven or eight gun emplacements. Travelers describe how these guns were fired by the Ottomans at the beginning of Ramadan to mark the beginning of the fast, at the feast of Bairam, and on other special days.⁷²⁴

The Erechtheion was in too ruinous a state to be re-occupied for domestic use after the Venetian siege (Figure 577). The North Porch remained fully enclosed, however, and continued to house the vault of the gunpowder magazine. The walls between the columns of the East Porch had almost completely disintegrated, and the North Addition had been destroyed beyond repair. Other than cuttings for a roof in course 5 of the South Wall, there are no cuttings on the walls or stylobate of the temple that can be associated with the Second Ottoman period. Therefore, building activities must be inferred from the descriptions and illustrations of the Erechtheion.

There are several accretions on the Erechtheion which did not leave their mark on the building itself in the form of cuttings, nor did they feature strongly in the accounts of the early travelers. Certain of these accretions were omitted by the earliest artists to depict the Erechtheion (e.g., Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast*, 1749, Figure 13), but they show up in later depictions such as Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751 (Figure 15) and Dodwell, *South-West View of the Erechtheion*, 1805 (Figure 42).

MASONRY STRUCTURE IN THE WESTWARD PROJECTION OF THE NORTH PORCH

The masonry structure nestled into the angle of the Westward Projection of the North Porch and the West Façade can be extrapolated backward at least to the beginning

⁷²⁴ Mackenzie 1992, p. 24.

of the Second Ottoman period, if not as early as the construction of the vault during the Venetian occupation. It was buttressed on its west and south sides, and rose to a level just above the base of WW.C1.

This structure appears to have functioned as a an additional layer of protection for the access-point to the gunpowder magazine in the North Porch: it blocked up the arched doorway between the North Porch and the Pandroseion, and required the Ottomans to remove part of the masonry in order to gain access to the magazine. The structure may have also served to strengthen the North Porch at the place weakened by the existence of the doorway. The southern buttress of this structure appears in different locations in different depictions; therefore, perhaps the south side of this structure was the point of access to the door to the gunpowder magazine.

IMMUREMENT OF THE MAIDENS AND THE SOUTH BUILDING

The possibility that the inter-maiden walls and the South Building were new around 1800 when they first appear in the depictions is very slim. After the Venetian bombardment which destroyed Maiden #6, the South Porch would have been in dire need of support for its east side, lest it collapse. A solid masonry wall was almost certainly constructed along the Maiden Porch's east side at this time. Whether it was built in 1687-8 by the Venetians, or soon after the Ottoman reoccupation, is unclear.⁷²⁵

The accounts are inconsistent enough to suggest that travelers investigated the Maiden Porch to different degrees, some realizing that Maiden #6 was missing and that there were originally six maidens, others reporting only what they could see easily from

⁷²⁵ It is interesting that measures were taken at all to ensure that the Maiden Porch did not collapse.

the exterior, namely four maidens, and often described as walled-in in 17th and 18th century accounts.⁷²⁶

On the south side of the Erechtheion, there was a long, rectangular structure, as depicted in Gell, *Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1801 (Figure 32); Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800 (Figure 37); Atkins, *The Erechtheion from the Southwest*, 1801 (Figure 38); Dodwell, *South-West View of the Erechtheion*, 1805 (Figure 42); and (in plan) Fauvel, *Rough Plan of the Acropolis*, 1787 (Figure 26). The South Building, as it is called in this study, appears to have risen to a height equal to the top of the south anta of the East Porch, and had a door about half way along its south wall. Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800 (Figure 37) shows that this structure was composed of smallish rectangular blocks with thin leveling courses between them, and lacked a roof, at least at its east end. The maidens appear to have been immured as part of this same construction, thus creating an enclosed, roofed room.

This building must have been constructed sometime after the Venetian bombardment of 1687, perhaps as a replacement for the “hovels” along the South Wall described by Spon and Wheler. Although the structures of the Second Ottoman period generally did not interface with the building through cuttings for roof beams and doorways, perhaps a roof was inserted into the second set of cuttings, that is, in course 5 of the South Wall, as an extension of the roofed room created by the immurement of the maidens. Furthermore, perhaps the rough treatment of the eastern architrave of the Maiden Porch (MS.02.03) is related to the construction of the South Building and support structure for the damaged Maiden Porch (Figure 232).

⁷²⁶ See above “Venetian Reception” for a possible explanation of why travelers reported finding different numbers of maidens.

The South Building and the “inter-maiden” walls are conspicuously absent in the earliest depictions of the Erechtheion, such as in Dalton and Stuart’s drawings. Nonetheless, their presence can be detected because something prevented Dalton from rendering the details of the damaged blocks on the lower portion of the Erechtheion’s South Wall. This structure also caused Dalton to exclude the double-height orthostates of course 12. Fauvel’s 1788 excavations do not appear to have disturbed this structure greatly. By 1788, it appears that the South Building and Maiden Porch were no longer being used.

In fact, it would seem that the walls between the maidens were removed and replaced with some frequency during the Second Ottoman period. For example, Choiseul says he was willing to pay Fauvel not to rebuild “le mur des Cariatides,” in 1786 (T 32); such walls were attested to exist still by Morrill in 1795 (T 36). On the other hand, Stuart expressly states in 1751 that the *dizdar* sent men to sit in the Maiden Porch “to watch our proceedings” in his explanation for his plate wherein he places two such overseers.⁷²⁷ The walls must have been partially absent for there to have been room for them to sit there.

As alluded to above, the reasons behind the contradictions among the accounts of the Maiden Porch may lie either in the varied degrees to which travelers went to investigate the true nature of the structure, or in the transient nature of the structures from the Second Ottoman period: Dodwell recorded that the houses on the Akropolis are:

...miserable huts for the few soldiers of the garrison, and as the stones are only united with mud and earth, instead of mortar, the walls are continually falling; and a heavy rain makes nearly as

⁷²⁷ Paton et al. 1927, pp. 550-551.

much havoc amongst the Athenian cottages, as fire or an earthquake in other countries.⁷²⁸

The weather may have played a similar role in the transient nature of the walls between the maidens and of the South Building.

LOFT

Three, rough, shallow cuttings were added among the cuttings above the lintel of the North Door from the major repair, through the whole thickness of the wall, in order to make an evenly spaced pattern (Figure 351). These cuttings are very similar to those in course 5 of the South Wall east of the Maiden Porch.⁷²⁹ All these cuttings above the North Door were probably used together after the construction of the vault, perhaps to receive wooden supports for the floor of the loft. The cuttings are first depicted in Cockerell, *The Loft in the North Portico*, 1811-1814; the hypothesized support beams are already no longer present. Timber was, and still is, scarce in Attica. As soon as the loft went out of regular use, these beams would certainly have been salvaged for other uses.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE 18TH CENTURY

Aside from general comments by travelers before Dalton that, for example, Maiden #6 is missing and the walls are still standing save for the roof, little can be said specifically regarding the Erechtheion's state of preservation. Using Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast*, 1749 (Figure 13) and Dalton, *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the West*, 1749 (Figure 14) as benchmarks for the actual state of the building in 1749, as described above in detail in “Lord Charlemont and Dalton,” this section will combine the historical and documentary evidence of the

⁷²⁸ Dodwell 1819, p. 358.

⁷²⁹ See above “‘Hovels’ on the South Wall” and “Immurement of the Maidens and the South Building.”

depictions and accounts in order to highlight the destruction suffered by the Erechtheion, and the changes that were later made according to the year (or range of years) in which it occurred.

1749

The state of the West, South and East Façades were described above in the section called “Lord Charlemont and Dalton,” and can be seen visually in the model of the Erechtheion for 1749 (Figure 578).

1751

Stuart and Revett excavate the podium of the Maiden Porch according the caption (T 25) accompanying the engraving of Stuart, *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*, 1751 (Figure 15).

1749-1765

Cornice blocks EE.CC.01-05 fall off or are removed.⁷³⁰ Much of the North Wall falls down including blocks NN.02.09-16,⁷³¹ NN.03.08-15, NN.04.08-14,⁷³² NN.05.11-15, NN.06.09-14, NN.07.11-14, and NN.08.11-13.⁷³³ More of the North Wall may have fallen down, but these blocks cannot be seen in Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765. Pars’ 1765 painting shows that over half of SS.01.01⁷³⁴ has disappeared from the southwest corner of the temple, as well as all of SS.02.02 and SS.03.02.

⁷³⁰ Dalton, *Le Temple d’Erictheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast*, 1749; Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765.

⁷³¹ Plus most of NN.02.08.

⁷³² Plus half of NN.04.15.

⁷³³ Plus half of NN.08.10.

⁷³⁴ This broken block is a recurrent feature in the paintings of travelers through the late 19th century.

1751-1765

Cornice blocks SS.CC.01-02 fall off the building. See Figure 579 for the state of the Erechtheion in 1765.

1765-1766

Chandler, Pars and Revett obtain permission to excavate around the exterior of the North Porch. They discover that the North Door is walled-up, and the debris inside the building extended up to the level of the top of the Maiden Porch door. See Figure 579 for the state of the Erechtheion in 1765.

1785

Cassas portrays the excavation of the exterior of the Maiden Porch; the podium is exposed for the first time.

1786-1787

Fauvel uses Choiseul-Gouffier's *firman* to excavate the eastern interior of the temple, and reports that it is at the same level as the four columns at the North (Porch), that is, 8 ½ feet lower than the level of the base of the east columns.⁷³⁵ He reaches the Christian pavement and is terribly disappointed not to have found the well.

1787-1788

The Ottomans search in vain for the well of Poseidon about which Fauvel had told them. In doing so, the Ottomans clear the interior and expose inscriptions built into the walls and other structures of the Christian modifications.

⁷³⁵ Fauvel reports 9 feet in a later letter: Fauvel to Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier, October 12, 1788 Athens.

1788

Fauvel excavates inside the Maiden Porch and the main building.⁷³⁶ In December, Fauvel removes an inscription (or two) from the pavement, now in the Louvre (*IG II 1336*), and three fragments of green marble columns.⁷³⁷

1789

Fauvel clears and measures the Maiden Porch in January of 1789, discovering, in the process, its eastern entrance. He leaves the masonry which filled it (later removed in 1845), and discovers the staircase leading to the door of the main building. In February, Fauvel removes and sends to Choiseul-Gouffier a complete green column, a fragment of another, and an additional inscription. Fauvel's elevation of the South Wall (Fauvel, *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*, Undated (ca. 1789), Figure 29) shows that by 1789, the half-thickness, single-course ashlar orthostate-backers are missing. For the state of the Erechtheion in 1789, see Figure 580.

1765-1800

Only two frieze blocks of the East Façade remain on the building in 1800 (the previous view being Pars, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1765). At this point, they are not skewed, as they will be after Elgin takes EE.C6 and the architrave above intercolumniation EE.C5-C6.

1789-1801

The following blocks fall off the North Wall of the Erechtheion between 1789 and 1801 according to three of Gell's depictions:⁷³⁸ NN.03.16, NN.04.15, NN.05.09-10 and

⁷³⁶ Bisani 1793.

⁷³⁷ Paton et al. 1927, p. 610, note 7.

16, NN.06.08⁷³⁹-10 and 15, NN.07.09-10 and 16, NN.08.9-10 and 15, NN.09.10-11 and 15, NN.10.09-11 and 14-15, NN.11.10-12 and 15, NN.12.10-15, NN.13.11-15, NN.14.11-15, NN.15.12-15, NN.16.11-14.⁷⁴⁰

A significant portion of the western half of the South Wall has fallen since 1789, according to Gell, *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis*, 1801, and Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800, but it is very difficult to say for certain which blocks have fallen from the building because of the carelessness with which these blocks are depicted in the drawings.⁷⁴¹ For the state of the building in 1801, that is, just prior to Elgin’s interventions, see Figure 581.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION IN THE EARLY 19TH CENTURY

Campaigners for the restitution of the Parthenon Marbles removed by Lord Elgin often say that the Ottomans did little to interfere with the natural decay of the monuments on the Akropolis, so that they may lay the majority of the blame for their destruction on Elgin’s head.⁷⁴² Elgin can also be blamed for starting the trend of removal of parts of the Erechtheion by the Ottoman governor. Elgin removed Maiden #3 and architectural

⁷³⁸ Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800; Gell, *Temple of Erectheus*, 1800; and Gell, *Interior of the Porch of the Maidens*, 1800. The state of the preserved western edge of the North Wall is based on a backward extrapolation from Thürmer, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1819. The usefulness of the information offered by Gell is not high, but the general line of preservation is highly consistent with Thürmer’s engraving, the earliest view of this part of the building since 1801.

⁷³⁹ Half of block 8.

⁷⁴⁰ The assumption that the blocks from courses NN.14-16 have fallen off the building in this interval is due to the necessity of their having been moved according to the studies by Stevens (plates) and Papanikolaou (Akropolis Display signs: Figure 564, Figure 565, Figure 566, and Figure 567) for the North Wall, and because Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800, suggests that the missing portion of the wall dips below the level of the east stylobate. In addition, this is the only opportunity for these blocks to have been removed or to have fallen off the building for two reasons: 1. After this time, the ground level is much higher owing to the debris inside outside the temple, and 2. The North Wall was rebuilt haphazardly by Pittakis soon after the War of Independence (ca. 1838).

⁷⁴¹ See below “1789-1805” for the first confirmable information on this region of the building.

⁷⁴² A notable exception would be the Temple of Athena Nike, which was dismantled entirely by the Ottomans prior to the Venetian siege of 1687. Luckily, these activities preserved the monument.

elements of the East and North Porches in 1803. In 1805, the Ottoman governor removed the southernmost architrave block from the West Façade.⁷⁴³ The Anglo-Ottoman war of 1807-1809 had a profound effect on the North and South Walls of the Erechtheion, and the rest of the north anta of the East Porch fell down in 1810-1811 after having been destabilized by the blocks Elgin removed.

1801

The walls between the maidens, or what remained of them, are removed by Elgin's agents according to a letter from Hunt to Elgin dated July 31, 1801 (T 39). Dodwell also witnesses this dismantlement during his travels of 1801.⁷⁴⁴ The frieze and cornice (probably epikranitis), and some of the moldings of the fascia blocks (WW.CC.01-03, WW.BB.01-03, WW.AP.02-04) of the West Façade are taken down by Elgin's agents.⁷⁴⁵

1802

Lusieri re-clears the Maiden Porch and exposes its krepidoma. He is credited with finding its steps leading down to the South Door.⁷⁴⁶ When the masonry on the east side of the Maiden Porch is removed, a pillar of rough masonry is added in the place of Maiden #6,⁷⁴⁷ and brickwork appears to have lined the interior of the South Porch's east architrave. Depictions of the Maiden Porch from before the War of Independence by Page (Figure 55),⁷⁴⁸ Inwood (Figure 58),⁷⁴⁹ and Eastlake (Figure 57)⁷⁵⁰ show this pilaster

⁷⁴³ WW.AA.01, replaced during the major repair dated by this study to the Hellenistic period, includes a kymation and bead-and-reel molding at top.

⁷⁴⁴ Dodwell 1819, p. 354.

⁷⁴⁵ The cornice block is now located in the basement of the British Museum (BM Cat. no. 415).

⁷⁴⁶ Wilkins 1816, p. 129. Fauvel had already "discovered" them in 1789.

⁷⁴⁷ Wilkins 1816.

⁷⁴⁸ Page, *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*, 1818.

and brickwork. A “cornice” (probably epikranitis) block was shipped on the *Mutine* to Malta in May of 1802.

1803

The removal of Maiden #3 necessitates the erection of another rough pillar, dubbed Opus Elgin by the early travelers (or ΕΛΓΙΝΟΣ ΕΠΟΙΕΙ by Dodwell). More of the “cornice” (probably epikranitis) of the Erechtheion is shipped on the *Braakel* early in 1803.⁷⁵¹ The fragments of the Erechtheion taken by Lord Elgin, and currently in the British Museum, are listed in Table 12.⁷⁵²

Table 12. Architectural and Sculptural Elements from the Erechtheion Removed by Elgin and Now in the British Museum (BM).

BM Catalog No.	BM Accession No.	Grid No.	Description ⁷⁵³ and Comment	Location in the BM	Figure
BM 407		MM.03	Maiden #3	Erechtheion Gallery	Figure 253
BM 408		EE.C6	Northernmost column of East Porch	Erechtheion Gallery	Figure 173
BM 409	BM 1816.6-10.255	NN.01.17	North Anta capital from the East Porch	Basement 2 joining fragments	Figure 177
BM 409		1-NN.XX.OX 2-XX.01.XX 3-XX.01.XX	3 Epikranitis blocks from the East Wall; South Wall: Paton et al. 1977, p. 227; Paton et al. 1927: North Wall ⁷⁵⁴	1- Basement 2&3 - Erechtheion Gallery	Figure 475 and Figure 476

⁷⁴⁹ Inwood, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1819.

⁷⁵⁰ Eastlake, *The Erechtheum*, 1818-1820.

⁷⁵¹ Paton et al. 1927, p. 553, note 3. These are probably blocks from BM 409. See Table 12.

⁷⁵² Based on Smith 1892, pp. 231-238.

⁷⁵³ Based on Smith 1892, pp. 231-238.

⁷⁵⁴ It is very difficult to deduce the original location of these three epikranitis blocks. The epikranitis of the North Wall has been absent since before 1749, and the South Wall's epikranitis was in a stable state of preservation on either side of 1803; and the remaining epikranitis blocks only came down with the dismantlement of the South Wall during the Anglo-Ottoman War of 1807-1809. The East Wall epikranitis

BM 412		SS.06.04 or 02 (now replaced)	Kymation molding from inner architrave of the South Porch of the Erechtheion.	?	
BM 413	BM 1816.6-10.220	EE.AA.05	Northernmost architrave block of the East Porch	Basement	Figure 181
BM 414	BM 1816.6-10.219	Probably NN.AA.01 – matches shape of block in Pars, <i>The Erechtheum from the Northeast</i> , 1765.	Piece of architrave (fascia) from the South Wall of the Erechtheion. Current tag says North Wall, as does Platon et al. 1977. Broken at each end	Basement	Figure 474
BM 415	BM 1816.6-10.289	WW.CC	Piece of corona of cornice, from the North Porch of the Erechtheion. Current tag says West Façade as does Platon et al. 1977.	Used to be artificially attached to BM 413 and 414. Basement	Figure 293
BM 416	BM 1816.6-10.108	PP.CF.18 (location is incorrect in Smith 1892)	Coffer from the North Porch near the opening	Basement	Figure 412

has probably been absent since as early as the Byzantine period. The epikranitis of the South Wall is fully extant today, and was put back together by Papanikolaou's team in the 1970s and 1980s. This team's preparatory study for anastylosis suggests that these three blocks belong to the South Wall (Platon et al. 1977, p. 227); however, now that the anastylosis is complete, and the South Wall is fully extant including all the epikranitis blocks, it looks as if those in the British Museum must belong to the North (or less likely, the East) Wall. If casts of the British Museum blocks were used in the reconstruction of the South Wall, it is very difficult to tell which blocks they are because of the lack of color differentiation of the casts for the replacement blocks. I have compared the pattern of the damage and carving techniques of the epikranitis blocks in the Erechtheion Gallery of the British Museum to the blocks on the South Wall, and have found no matches. These two blocks probably, therefore, belong to the North Wall, as suggested by Paton et al. The third epikranitis block, now located in the basement of the British Museum, is carved in a different style. The palmettes are concave, and the finish is less sharp and technologically competent. Perhaps this block comes from a different part of the building that was less visible, such as above and behind the North Porch on the North Wall. An analysis of the different hands that carved the epikranitis of the Erechtheion has been published by Schädler 1990.

BM 419			Cast of the console from the North Door	?	
BM 420	BM 1816. 6-10.120		Necking of an Erechtheion-type column from the Monopteros	Basement	Figure 613

1789-1805

It can be confirmed by Dodwell and Pomardi's illustrations that the following blocks disappeared from the South Wall between 1789 and 1805: SS.02.04-05 and SS.03.03-05.

1805

In 1805, Dodwell reports that the *dizdar* orders the removal of WW.AA.01, and places it above one of the entrances to the fortress (T 43).⁷⁵⁵ On it, the governor carves an inscription in Arabic script (Figure 292) “in praise of the strong fortress and of the zeal displayed in its construction by Mustapha Effendi, the Voivode.”⁷⁵⁶ Having cut off the back of the block, he places it over the vaulted entrance in the wall running south of the Beulé Gate to the northeast corner of the Odeion of Herodes Atticus. Ottoman cuttings on the front of the block show how it was clamped in place.

This block was only identified as part of the Erechtheion in 1922,⁷⁵⁷ and Dinsmoor recognized its original position in the West Façade in 1924. Balanos had already replaced WW.AA.01 on the building with a new block during his early 20th

⁷⁵⁵ Dodwell 1819, p. 352.

⁷⁵⁶ Paton et al. 1927, p. 72, note 1.

⁷⁵⁷ Schweitzer 1922, col. 251.

century restoration of the West Façade, and the new block remains there to the present day.⁷⁵⁸

Hill and Blegen read the Ottoman year of the inscription in the semi-circle in the middle of the bottom of the inscription as 1220 (A.H.), which corresponds to 1805 of the common calendar.⁷⁵⁹ Despite the damaged nature of the block with the Ottoman inscription, this evidence points directly to its original position as the southernmost architrave block in the West Façade.

1807-1809

Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811, and Thürmer, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, 1819, confirm that the following blocks have fallen off the South Wall of the Erechtheion since 1789, but this date range can probably be narrowed to 1807 to 1809 because Hobhouse says the destruction of the South Wall occurred during the short war between the Ottoman Empire and Great Britain in 1807-1809:⁷⁶⁰ SS.01.08-10 and 13, SS.02.6-13,⁷⁶¹ SS.03.06-12,⁷⁶² SS.04.06-12, SS.05.06-10, SS.06.07-10, SS.07.07-09, SS.08.08-09, and SS.09.08. This destruction was probably caused by the search for the metal in the clamps between the blocks.

How many dismantled blocks does it take to make a cannon ball the size (about 0.15 m in diameter) of the one still preserved at the foot of the Maiden Porch (Figure 701)? If $r=0.075\text{m}$, then the volume of metal (bronze) is $4/3 \times \pi r^3 = 0.001767 \text{ m}^3$. The

⁷⁵⁸ When I first started this study, the 5th century block, WW.AA.01, was sitting in the Pandroseion. It has since been moved to the area between the modern staircase north of the building and the North Façade.

⁷⁵⁹ See note 511 for the problem of who first depicted WW.AA.01 as missing.

⁷⁶⁰ Hobhouse 1813, p. 343 (T 47). Diplomatic relations between Britain and the Sublime Porte were severed in 1807, and Leake, who fought for the Ottomans against the French in Egypt, was put in jail in Thessaloniki.

⁷⁶¹ Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811 is cut off around block 9 of the South Wall.

⁷⁶² See above “1789-1805” for the disappearance of SS.02.04-05 and SS.03.02-05.

volume of a Classical double-T clamp in the South Wall is $(0.31 + 0.091 + 0.091 \text{ m})(0.01 \text{ m} \times 0.03 \text{ m}) = 0.0001476 \text{ m}^3$ according to the dimensions given by Paton et al.⁷⁶³ If one divides the volume of 1 cannon ball by the volume of 1 clamp, then about 12 clamps are required to make a cannon ball. At 2 double-T clamps per block, this means that 6 blocks had to be dismantled to make each cannon ball. A small amount of additional metal would be available in the dowels. The lead surrounding the clamps could have been used for shot. In all, this is a great deal of effort and devastation for such a small profit, thus indicating the dearth and demand for metal at this time.

1803-1811

The following blocks of the South Wall have certainly fallen since 1803: SS.01.08-11, SS.02.08-13, SS.03.08-12, SS.04.08-12, and SS.05.08-10.⁷⁶⁴

1810-1811

The north anta of the East Porch, which had been destabilized by Elgin's removal of its capital, architraves, and northernmost column, was described poetically by Chateaubriand in 1806-7 as "nodding to its fall," "so that it is now found necessary to support [the whole entablature] with a pile of stones";⁷⁶⁵ and even more pessimistically (and prophetically) in 1810 by Hobhouse: "the remainder will soon fall."⁷⁶⁶ First, this implies that the isolated north anta of the East Porch, depicted in three of Gell's drawings, was still standing in 1810. In 1811, Haygarth's drawing shows the anta as having disappeared completely. Therefore, the following blocks have disappeared since 1810: NN.02.16, NN.03.17, NN.04.16, NN.05.17, NN.06.16, NN.07.17, NN.08.16,

⁷⁶³ Paton et al. 1927, p. 197.

⁷⁶⁴ Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811 (Figure 46).

⁷⁶⁵ Chateaubriand 1811, p. 227.

⁷⁶⁶ Hobhouse 1813, p. 343.

NN.09.16-17, NN.10.16, NN.11.16-17, NN.12.16, and NN.13.16.⁷⁶⁷ Furthermore, the toppling of the anta probably also dislodged the following blocks: NN.14.16, NN.15.16, NN.16.15.⁷⁶⁸

1812

Haller von Hallerstein reports to Crown-Prince Ludwig of Bavaria that he purchased an epikranitis block (from the main building) on June 12, 1812. This block is now in the Munich Glyptothek, no. 242.⁷⁶⁹

1817

Lord Guilford sends an artificial stone copy of Maiden #3 to Athens to replace the offensive pillar currently standing in her place, according to a document in the National Library of Scotland.⁷⁷⁰ The British Ambassador had been receiving complaints about the eyesore and commissioned a plaster copy to be sent as well. The Ottomans thought the original had been returned because she refused to stand up straight when she arrived in England.⁷⁷¹ Lord Guilford's replacement was never incorporated into the Maiden Porch. A replacement for Maiden #3 would not be incorporated until the French restoration of the whole Maiden Porch during the 1840s.⁷⁷²

⁷⁶⁷ Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811.

⁷⁶⁸ These blocks must have moved during this interval according to Stevens' and Papanikolaou's plates for the reasons mentioned above in "1789-1801."

⁷⁶⁹ Besides those in the British Museum, the only other epikranitis block outside Greece that has been associated with the Erechtheion is in the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. It is a corner fragment, probably from the East Porch (Figure 186).

⁷⁷⁰ NLS 45649 fol. 127-8: cited by St. Clair 1997, p. 378.

⁷⁷¹ Master, *Journal of a Tour in Egypt, Palestine and Greece in 1819*, unpublished.

⁷⁷² See Chapter VIII.

1805-1818

The South Building ceases to feature in any views of the Erechtheion after 1805, although the east side of the Maiden Porch continues to be reinforced with masonry which lines the architrave, and replaces Maiden #6 and the East Pilaster.⁷⁷³ Perhaps the South Building was destroyed during the abovementioned search for metal in the South Wall.

1810-1818

The following blocks of the South Wall appear to have fallen between 1811-1818 (based on the differences between Haygarth, *Erechtheum from the North*, 1810-1811 and Basevi, *The Interior of the Erechtheion from the Northwest*, 1818, the latter of which was unfinished): SS.05.11 and SS.06.10.⁷⁷⁴

SS.BB.01-02, which appear in paintings through Haygarth (although omitted in Gell's 1800-1801 drawings because they are unfinished⁷⁷⁵) appear in one, but not both of Basevi's 1818 depictions.⁷⁷⁶ It appears that SS.BB.02 fell down during the War of Independence.⁷⁷⁷

⁷⁷³ Page, *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*, 1818.

⁷⁷⁴ Basevi neglects to draw blocks SS.BB.01-02, which appear in subsequent drawings and in another of his own, although at very small scale: Basevi, *Parthenon viewed from the Inside looking North*, 1818 (Figure 51). The last confirmed presence of SS.06.10 was actually in Fauvel, *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*, Undated (ca. 1789) (Figure 29).

⁷⁷⁵ Gell, *Inside the East Portico*, 1800 (Figure 33); Gell, *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis*, 1800 (Figure 37).

⁷⁷⁶ They appear in Basevi, *Parthenon viewed from the Inside looking North*, 1818 (Figure 51), but not in Basevi, *The Interior of the Erechtheion from the Northwest*, 1818 (Figure 52).

⁷⁷⁷ Lange, *Early Excavations on the Athenian Plateau*, 1834, and Bracebridge, *The Erechtheion and the Parthenon from the East*, 1837, suggest that SS.BB.01 met the same fate; however, Cole, *The Erechtheum from the Southeast*, 1833; Arundale, *View of the Temple of Erectheus at Athens*, 1834; and the later Müller, *Parthenon, Erechtheion and Propylaia from the East*, 1837-1844 (as well as other later depictions) indicate that this frieze block remained on the building at all times.

1819

Inwood excavates in the region of the West Cross-Wall, and purports to have discovered that it was not original to the building because of the marble fascia blocks he finds. It is, therefore, omitted in his restored plan (Figure 60). What Inwood has actually found are the Byzantine aisle-separators of the basilica and the lowest course of the repaired (Hellenistic) West Cross-Wall structure reused as the thresholds to the aisles and nave of the basilica.⁷⁷⁸

Inwood also finds a fragment of the marble frieze while he digs clandestinely, and associates it correctly (for the first time!) with the dowels (cramps) on the Eleusinian blocks.

GRAFFITI ON THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE OTTOMAN PERIOD**LORD BYRON**

It has long been known that Lord George Gordon Byron is supposed to have carved his name on the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion in 1810, thus launching a trend in Greece of leaving one's mark on ancient monuments. Lord Byron is also supposed to have carved his name into the Erechtheion according to two later travelers, Nathaniel Parker Willis and Grenville Temple.⁷⁷⁹ This section assesses the authenticity of Byron's signature at Sounion and the likelihood that he carved his name on the Erechtheion.

Some scholars cast doubt on the authenticity of the Sounion graffito, since Lord Byron spoke out against the defacement of monuments in his poems; but Lord Byron's poetic diatribes such as the "Curse of Minerva" focused on damage to monuments on the scale of Lord Elgin's interventions, not what must have seemed at the time like an

⁷⁷⁸ On these Byzantine features, see Chapter V.

⁷⁷⁹ Willis 1853, p. 158; Temple 1836, p. 81.

innocuous little inscription.⁷⁸⁰ On “Sunium’s marbled steep,” Lord Byron’s name appears in a neat, cursive, script: “Byron” (Figure 676). This boldly written graffito matches his signature on a letter on display at Newstead Abbey in Nottinghamshire, his family’s country seat (Figure 678).

Also in support of the authenticity of Lord Byron’s signature at Sounion is Williams’ 1817 complaint that British sailors wrote their names two feet high in black paint or pitch on the architrave, thanks to the influence of a Scottish youth.⁷⁸¹ Lord Byron had been in Attica between December 1809 and March 1810, and again between November 1810 and April 1811, visiting Athens and Sounion on both visits. Furthermore, considering most tourists’ frustration in the search for Byron’s name at Sounion, and Willis’ report that he wrote his name on the Erechtheion in small letters (T 73), simply as “Byron” as we find at Sounion, the graffito is probably not an invention.⁷⁸² Byron always did have a penchant for carving his name on things, including a wooden panel in the Chapel at Harrow (Figure 677), where he went to school, and on a tree trunk, now preserved in a display case in the library at Newstead Abbey. The cursive letters of both (childish) signatures also match the Sounion inscription well.

As mentioned above, at least two travelers report that Byron wrote his name on an Ionic capital in the North Porch of the Erechtheion. Willis recounts that he was shown in the 1833, “on the inside of the capital of one of the columns, the place where the poet had written his name. It was, as he always wrote it, simply ‘Byron’, in small letters, and

⁷⁸⁰ Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage, canto II, verses I-XV; The Curse of Minerva.

⁷⁸¹ Williams 1820. Byron was descended from Scottish clan (Gordon) and wore his tartan regularly, inaugurating a new style of dress with his open shirts and romantically draped tartan cloak.

⁷⁸² Willis 1853.

would not be noticed by an ordinary observer.”⁷⁸³ When scaffolding was in the North Porch in 2001-2002, I searched in vain for this graffito.

There are several possible explanations for the absence of Byron’s graffito in the North Porch. One is that Byron often wrote on monuments in pencil, which could only have been preserved if protected from the elements; and two, the signature may have been on one of the western three capitals which were toppled during the War of Independence. The capital and top drum of NN.C2, for example, have since been replaced with new material owing to its destruction in 1827 (Figure 429).

Byron’s use of the pencil on the Erechtheion is explicitly recounted by the British traveler, Grenville Temple, in 1834:

The Erecthaeum [sic] has not suffered much lately, though one of the Cariatides is lying on the ground. On the brick support, substituted for the figure removed by Lord Elgin, are seen written in pencil (by Lord Byron, as report states), the well known line, ‘*Quod non fecerunt Gothi fecerunt Scoti;*’ and on one of the Ionic capitals in the north portico of the Pandroseium is the poet’s own name, written by himself.⁷⁸⁴

Unfortunately, this graffiti (reported elsewhere as well) has not survived on the Maiden Porch either.

No graffiti prior to the War of Independence survives in the North Porch, although it is clear that travelers climbed the ladder and entered the dark space at its northeast corner. After the War, all the graffiti cluster on the surfaces accessible from the east side of the loft. The west half of the loft was destroyed by the cannon-fire that hit the North Porch in 1827.⁷⁸⁵

⁷⁸³ Willis 1853, p. 158.

⁷⁸⁴ Temple 1836, p. 81.

⁷⁸⁵ On the destruction of the North Porch, see below “North Porch.” The rest of the graffiti in the North Porch and elsewhere on the Erechtheion are dealt with in Chapters V and VIII.

CHANGES TO THE ERECHTHEION DURING THE WAR OF INDEPENDENCE (1821-1833)

1821

The Erechtheion survived the first phase of the War of Independence quite well. Waddington reported on the effects of the siege of 1821: “One shot, the only one of which the effect is at all remarkable, struck the Architrave of the Erechtheum, but happily without inflicting any material injury.”⁷⁸⁶ Paton et al. conjecture that it was actually “the upper part of the window and the filling-in between the south-western semi-columns.”⁷⁸⁷ There was no opportunity for travelers to record this damage (and confirm Paton et al.’s suggestion) because the first images after the War show the intercolumniations of the West Façade completely empty.⁷⁸⁸

AUGUST 3, 1826

According to General Makriyannis’ journal, the Greeks “went up into the citadel on August 3, 1826,”⁷⁸⁹ and the Erechtheion became the Greek commander Gouras’ command post:

The citadel was now ready to devour those who had fed upon it for so many years and had been nourished like prize stock; and every day the slaughter went on. Gouras had prepared for himself a famous temple [i.e., the Erechtheion], which had had heaped over with earth to stop bombs from breaking in, and he had installed his family within and stayed there himself.⁷⁹⁰

Of the battles during the siege, Makriyannis reported, “We were losing heavily in killed. They suffered as much and more on the citadel, for it was stony ground. The men

⁷⁸⁶ Waddington 1825, p. 57.

⁷⁸⁷ Paton et al. 1927, p. 556.

⁷⁸⁸ Cole, *The Erechtheum from the Southeast*, 1833 (Figure 66).

⁷⁸⁹ Lidderdale 1966, p. 100.

⁷⁹⁰ Lidderdale 1966, pp. 93, 102.

were slaughtered by the shells and mortar bombs; the graves upon the citadel became full and we buried the dead at Serpentz .’’⁷⁹¹

EFFECTS OF THE SIEGE OF JUNE 1826- JUNE 1827

The East Porch survived the siege of 1826-1827 relatively intact, but the Maiden Porch suffered severely. The North and South Walls suffered more from the search for lead and bronze than from the impact of Ottoman cannon-fire. The West Fa ade was almost completely destroyed.

MAIDEN PORCH

Maiden #4 was blown away during the siege, and the architrave and roof block (MS.02.02, MS.01.03) that she supported fell down. The capital of the western pilaster (MW.PW.01) was also shot away and destroyed.

NORTH PORCH

Just as the Venetians are blamed for destroying the Parthenon, the Ottoman soldiers are blamed for destroying the Erechtheion. Makriyannis refers to the January 7, 1827 destruction of the North Porch of the Erechtheion during the War of Independence: ‘‘Later that famous temple was destroyed by bombardment, and Gouras’ family was lost with so many other souls. From all these there escaped alive but one innocent boy; all the others were killed.’’⁷⁹²

The bombardment of January 7, 1827 completely shattered the top of PP.C2 and toppled most of PP.C1 and the rest of PP.C2. The entablature of the west half of the North Porch was thrown down (PW.CC.01-04, PW.BB.01-04, PW.AA.01-02, PN.PP.02-

⁷⁹¹ Lidderdale 1966, p. 102.

⁷⁹² Lidderdale 1966, p. 103.

03, PN.CC.01-07, PN.BB.01-05, PN.AA.01-02) including the beams PP.PS.01.b, PP.PS.02.b, and PP.PS.03.b, and the coffer blocks balanced on them (PP.CF.01-16). The earliest depictions to show the state of the bombed North Porch are Arundale, *View of the Temples of the Parthenon and the Erechtheum*, 1834, and Arundale, *View of the Temple of Erechtheus at Athens*, 1834 (Figure 67 and Figure 68).

Von Osten published a letter dated August 21, 1827 that describes the Erechtheion after the Ottoman bombardment, including the collapse of the North Porch.⁷⁹³ According to Ross and Thiersch, the bodies of the eleven people killed by the collapse of the North Porch roof in 1827 were apparently still there in 1832.⁷⁹⁴

SOUTH WALL

The South Wall suffered immensely during the 1826-1827 siege of the Akropolis. Only the southeast anta of the East Porch remained standing. Therefore, since 1819, the following blocks of the South Wall have fallen or been removed from the temple: SS.01.14, SS.02.14, SS.03.13-14, SS.04.05, SS.04.13-14, SS.05.05, SS.05.12-14, SS.06.06, SS.06.11-14, SS.07.05-06, SS.07.10-14, SS.08.06-07, SS.08.10-14, SS.09.06-07, SS.09.09-14, SS.10.07-14, and SS.11.07-14.

It appears that SS.BB.02 (but not SS.BB.01) fell down during the War of Independence.⁷⁹⁵ See Figure 584 for the state of the Erechtheion after the War of Independence.

⁷⁹³ von Osten 1834, pp. 305-309.

⁷⁹⁴ Paton et al. 1927, p. 558, note 5.

⁷⁹⁵ See above note 777.

WEST FAÇADE

Although the West Façade escaped with only minor injuries during the first siege of the Akropolis in 1821, it was almost completely destroyed during the second siege. The West Façade was demolished down to the molding course, WW.11, that is, to the top of the “Greek Wall” which includes the bases of the columns. WW.C2 and WW.C3 remained standing. Therefore, since 1819, the following blocks have fallen from the building: WW.AA.02-05, WW.01.02, WW.02.02, WW.04.02, WP.01.01-03, WP.01.05-06, WP.01.08-11, WP.02.01-05, WP.03.01-06, WP.04.01, WP.05.01-03, WP.05.05-06, WP.05.08-12, WP.06.01-04, WP.07.01-08, WP.08.01-04, WP.09.02-10, WW.C1.01-05, and WW.C4.01-03.

CANNON FIRE AND GUN SHOTS

The North Porch sustained most of the damage during the War of Independence. The northwest corner of NN.12.01 and NN.13.01 preserves the impact of a well-placed cannon-ball; a similar cannon-ball probably caused the western portion of the North Porch to collapse (Figure 333). Most of the North Porch blocks have since been re-erected, but several were smashed into so many pieces that it was impossible to return them to their original places on the building. These include several blocks of the Eleusinian limestone frieze (PW.AA), the necking band of PP.C2, and several of the column drums of PP.C1 and PP.C2.⁷⁹⁶

There are several scatters of pockmarks from gun shot on the Erechtheion, not all of which can necessarily be attributed to the War of Independence. Those that can possibly be associated with this conflict can be seen on PW.AA.01-02.

⁷⁹⁶ A large fragment of this necking-band has recently been published by Korres: Korres 2002a, p. 383 (Figure 431).

Many of the pockmarks are on the south side of the building, however, and so would not have been accessible to the forces attacking from the north. The pockmarks on south side of the Erechtheion should probably be attributed to the actions of idle soldiers from various countries during the First and Second World Wars, although some of the damage might be attributable to the Ottomans as well.

THE OTTOMANS RETURN, 1827

A few months after the destruction of the North Porch and the death of Gouras and his family, the Akropolis was surrendered to Ottoman forces under Kiutaçi, and converted into a kind of barracks for disabled or veteran soldiers, according to the caption for an undated and anonymous painting of the Erechtheion in the Museum of City of Athens.⁷⁹⁷

CONCLUSION

This chapter analyzed as many of the early travelers' accounts and depictions of the Erechtheion from the 17th through 19th century as possible. These documents, several of which have not been examined before for their information on the Erechtheion, shed light on the state of preservation and contemporary function of the various parts of the ancient building and its accretions.⁷⁹⁸

Trends in the travelers' reaction to the building, in particular the maidens of the South Porch, were followed. The reaction to the Erechtheion's moldings was generally

⁷⁹⁷ The painting itself (Artist Unknown, *View of the Erechtheion*, ca. 1818, Figure 62) must have been painted before the War of Independence owing to the state of the building's preservation. Maiden #4 is still in place, as is the West Façade. Also, the figures in the foreground wear Ottoman-style clothing.

⁷⁹⁸ See above "Archaeological Overview" for a summary of the changes to the Erechtheion in the Ottoman period.

positive; however, the maidens were considered unappealing at various times.⁷⁹⁹ The early processes of transmission of architectural features, namely drawings and casts of moldings of the Erechtheion, were investigated through a case study of Sir John Soane's architectural practice.⁸⁰⁰ When Elgin removed Maiden #3 and the northeast corner of the Erechtheion, a new era in the transmission of High Classical models for Neoclassical art and architecture began.

The travelers' reactions to Elgin's actions were assessed; from their accounts, it is possible to conclude that there was generally a stronger reaction to the removal of parts of the Erechtheion than to the removal and acquisition of the Parthenon marbles.⁸⁰¹ The reasons for this may be found in the state of the buildings after Elgin's interventions. The overall appearance of the Parthenon barely changed at all, while the Maiden Porch of the Erechtheion was left looking like it had a missing tooth, and the removal of the column and entablature from the East Porch not only ruined the previously intact hexastyle façade, but also soon resulted in the destruction of the rest of the North Wall. The reason why the current controversy over the return of the sculptures Lord Elgin removed from Greece now focuses entirely on the Parthenon marbles is not only because the Parthenon has become Greece's primary cultural symbol, but because the Erechtheion has been restored to its pre-Elgin state using casts of the missing sculptural and architectural fragments. The Erechtheion no longer looks like a pillaged monument – an eyesore with rough masonry pillars and bricks propping up roofs and walls. And, as Lusieri said, one maiden looks much like another, unlike the uniqueness of the Parthenon sculptures.

⁷⁹⁹ See above "Trends in Aesthetic Reactions."

⁸⁰⁰ See above "Robert Adam and Sir John Soane."

⁸⁰¹ See above "Attitudes toward Lord Elgin's Activities."

Consequently, the four remaining, relatively intact, maidens on display in the Akropolis Museum satisfy the interested local and foreign visitor.⁸⁰²

A refined time-line for the changes to the Erechtheion during the Ottoman period and War of Independence was constructed.⁸⁰³ The main phases of the destruction of the ancient temple between 1458 and 1833 are illustrated in computer models (Figure 577 to Figure 584). This detailed information can improve our understanding of the building at different periods and in different ways. First, it was possible to discern a cutting style that was characteristic for the Ottoman period, and in doing so, build upon the typology of cuttings for the Byzantine and Frankish periods distinguished in Chapters V and VI (Figure 592). This typology, in turn, can be applied and assessed against evidence from other ancient buildings that continued to stand after Antiquity. Second, investigating the state and function of the building during the Ottoman period can help decipher difficult and contradictory passages in the travelers' accounts, and vice versa. And third, a comprehension of the reasons and chronology for the disintegration of the building can assist in the reconstruction of the Erechtheion in Antiquity. The accounts, depictions, and actions of travelers who removed parts of the Erechtheion from the Akropolis sometimes reveal otherwise lost evidence regarding the temple, from fragments of the sculptural frieze and monolithic columns from the church, to the correct reconstruction of the West Façade.⁸⁰⁴

⁸⁰² Maiden #6 remains in fragments in the Akropolis Museum storerooms.

⁸⁰³ See above "Changes to the Erechtheion during the 18th Century," "Changes to the Erechtheion in the Early 19th Century," and "Changes to the Erechtheion during the War of Independence (1821-1833)."

⁸⁰⁴ See above "Dodwell and Pomardi", "Inwood" and Chapter II on the reconstruction of the West Façade.

This chapter set the scene for the examination of the accounts of travelers who visited the Erechtheion during the early years of the nascent Greek state, the subject of the next chapter.

CHAPTER VIII – PERIOD OF GREEK INDEPENDENCE

INTRODUCTION

This chapter summarizes the major changes to the Erechtheion between 1833 and 1853. The images and accounts of the Erechtheion unknown to the authors of *The Erechtheum* in 1927 are presented, as are the previously undocumented graffiti on the temple. The body of the text focuses on new accounts and depictions, while important, previously studied accounts and depictions appear in the footnotes.¹ Although several of the graffiti and images date to after 1853, they are included for the sake of completeness. Because most accounts of the Erechtheion from the 1840s onward are quite scholarly and derivative, only those which are either essential for the current discussion, previously unexamined for their archaeological or reception content, or difficult to access are included in Appendix B.

The revolution whereby Greece was finally liberated from Ottoman rule was a long, complicated, diplomatic, and polemic process. The political watershed of the 1833 liberation of Athens is taken as a starting point for this chapter. The end date for the discussion of the Erechtheion's state of preservation is 1853, because in 1852, a major storm toppled the colonnade of the West Façade once again. The state of the building remained stable until the end of the 19th century when Balanos began its third *anastylosis*. By the second half of the 19th century, the art of photography had also developed to such a degree that the quality of the prints outshone the information gleanable from the paintings of the artist-travelers.² By the end of the century, Balanos was busily restoring

¹ Appendix B contains the travelers' accounts; Appendix D contains the depictions of the Erechtheion.

² On the history of photography on the Akropolis, see Yiakoumis 2000. The earliest photograph of the Erechtheion I have found is a daguerreotype of the Maiden Porch from 1842: Girault de Prangey, *Athènes*.

many of the buildings on the Akropolis, and his reconstruction of the Erechtheion is dealt with in detail by Paton et al. (1927) and in the recent scholarship on the Akropolis restoration projects.

It was the original intention of this study to examine the role the Erechtheion played in Greek Revival and Beaux-Arts buildings in Western Europe and the United States. This has turned out to be impossible within the context of this study because there are so many examples of Erechtheion maidens and Ionic columns in European and North American cities which developed during the 19th and early 20th centuries.³ The reception of the Erechtheion in later 19th and 20th century architecture is a topic now reserved for a separate project. The adoption of the Erechtheion Ionic order and the employment of the Erechtheion maidens in the Neoclassical buildings of Athens will, however, be commented on briefly.

SCHOLARSHIP REVIEW

The historiography of the Greek custodianship and *anastylosis* of the Akropolis monuments is a topic covered in depth by scholars such as Maria Casanaki, Fani Mallouchou-Tufano, and Richard Economakis. These scholars have a unique perspective on the issues as members of the Akropolis Restoration Committee and of the Greek Archaeological Service, and have access to closed archives.⁴ Their publications are thorough and self-critical. Between the review of all the 19th century scholarship on the Erechtheion by Paton et al., and the more recent contributions of these aforementioned

Acropole. Caryatides, ca. 1842. The image is reversed and was on the auction block at Christie's in London in 2004: Sale #6978, Lot #63.

³ See Appendix C for a partial list of the buildings inspired by the Erechtheion.

⁴ Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985; Mallouchou-Tufano 1994; Tufano-Mallouchou 1998; Economakis 1994. Mallouchou-Tufano is the curator of the Balanos archives. The writings of the restorer of the Erechtheion in the 1970s and 1980s, Papanikolaou, are not accessible to the public at present.

scholars, the stages of the restoration of the temple after 1833 are fairly well understood, and so will be only briefly reviewed.

The modern reception of the Akropolis is also a topic which has received a great deal of attention in the past decade. Using anthropological methods, Eleana Yalouri's book *The Acropolis: Global Fame, Local Claim* examines the meaning of the Akropolis for members of Greek society, from school-children to grandfathers, while the contributors to Panayotis Tournikiotis' *The Parthenon and its Impact on Modern Times* examine the reception of the Parthenon from the 15th through 20th centuries. In these volumes, however, the importance of the Erechtheion is often overlooked as it stands in the shadow of the quintessential Parthenon.

The publication of paintings by early travelers has also become a popular endeavor of museum curators and art historians. Recent important contributions include the many publications by Fani-Maria Tsigakou of paintings in the Benaki and National Historical Museums in Athens;⁵ by Margit Bendtsen, Jette Christiansen, and Ida Haugsted of the drawings and paintings of Danish travelers to Greece;⁶ by Marilena Kasimati of a catalogue for the National Portrait Gallery that discusses the German involvement in the creation of modern Athens;⁷ by Richard Stoneman of paintings and photographs in the Getty Museum;⁸ and, by Haris Yiakoumis of invaluable early photographs of the Akropolis.⁹ Other general books on the rediscovery of Greece have also appeared.¹⁰ While these publications are invaluable for bringing these images to the

⁵ Tsigakou 1981; Tsigakou 1991; Tsigakou 1995; Tsigakou 1977; Tsigakou 1985; Tsigakou 1998.

⁶ Bendtsen 1993; Christiansen 2000; Haugsted 1996.

⁷ Kasimati 2000.

⁸ Stoneman 1998;

⁹ Yiakoumis 2000. Also see Tsigakou 1985 for early photographs of the Akropolis in the Benaki Museum.

¹⁰ Stoneman 1987; Schnapp 1996; Etienne 1992; Bracken 1975.

attention of the public, they tend not to discuss a monument's place in time or its function.¹¹ Many of the contributions to the examination of the Erechtheion cited as “new” in this study have been published in such catalogues. Otherwise, they have been found independently by me during searches of museum collections.

There has also been a spate of beautifully illustrated and informative books on the creation of the modern city of Athens.¹² The other side of the coin is the study of Greek Revival architecture, and the decorative elements of the Erechtheion are often recognized in such works.¹³ Bouras' *Athens : From the Classical Period to the Present Day* and Biris' *Neoclassical Architecture in Greece* examine the importance of the buildings of the Akropolis in the creation of new Athens.¹⁴

Finally, books on early travelers now abound, either biographies of specific travelers, or discussions of the whole phenomenon of early travelers, usually from one particular country, such as Great Britain.¹⁵ The reception of Ancient Greece by these travelers takes this type of study to the next level.¹⁶

THE ERECHTHEION BETWEEN 1833 AND 1853

THE AFTERMATH OF THE WAR

Chapter VII described the damage sustained by the temple during the two major sieges (1821 and 1827) of the Akropolis during the War of Independence (Figure 584).

In the second siege, the West Façade was almost entirely felled except for the two central

¹¹ Bendtsen 1993 is an exception, and contains a concise overview of the recent history of the Erechtheion.

¹² Bastéa 2000; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994; Bouras 2003.

¹³ Wiebenson 1969; Crook 1972; Watkin 1982; Kreeb 2003.

¹⁴ Bouras 2003; Biris 2001.

¹⁵ Angelomatis-Tsougarais 1990; Tolia 1995; Osborn 1963; Rankin 1978. On the American reception of Greece, see Larrabee 1957. On the travelers to Greece in general, see Athanassopoulou 2002; Brown 1936; Scott 2003.

¹⁶ Athanassopoulou 2002; Brown 1936; Scott 2003.

columns, WC.02 and WC.03. Most of the North Wall had already collapsed, and several more blocks of the South Wall near the Maiden Porch fell off the building or were dismantled.¹⁷ The Maiden Porch also suffered severe damage. After Elgin's removal of Maiden #3 and the bombardment of Maiden #4 during the War of Independence, most of the roof of the South Porch collapsed, as described in the previous chapter. The west pilaster (MW.PW.01-02) was also destroyed. Four rough pilasters, one behind Maiden #1, one in place of Maiden #3, one just west of Maiden #5, and one to replace the long missing Maiden #6 supported what was left of the roof.¹⁸

The worst damage, however, was to the North Porch. The northwest corner had been hit in January 1827. Cannon-ball fire toppled the upper portions of the PP.C1-C3, and the entire entablature west of PP.C4 collapsed.¹⁹ The earliest depiction of the collapsed North Porch (and the destroyed North and South walls) is Arundale, *View of the Temple of Erectheus at Athens*, 1834 (Figure 67).²⁰ It shows how the three western columns, western entablature and northern entablature have been displaced. The three western monolithic ceiling beams and the four corresponding rows of coffers have collapsed, some of which came to rest on the roof of the vault, now exposed for the first time to public view.

The Akropolis was officially handed over by the Ottomans to Christopher Neezer, a Bavarian officer, on April 1, 1833. Upon surveying the Greeks' new domain, Neezer said (T 75):

¹⁷ Paton et al. suggest the walls were raided for metal clamps by the Greek army: Paton et al. 1927, p. 557.

¹⁸ The podium below the position of Maiden #6 was filled in with field stones (Figure 94).

¹⁹ The state of the Erechtheion after the War of Independence is captured in Cole, *The Erechtheum from the Southeast*, 1833 (Figure 66).

²⁰ This drawing has recently been published (without analysis of its chronological significance) by Stern (1985). Arundale, *View of the Temples of the Parthenon and the Erechtheum*, 1834 is another valuable view of the Erechtheion painted soon after the war, but before the first interventions (Figure 68).

I entered the Acropolis and saw heaps of tumbled marbles. In the midst of the chaotic mass of column capitals, fragments of columns, marbles large and small, were bullets, cannon balls, human skulls and bones, many of which were near the slender Caryatids of the Erechtheion.²¹

An example of the cannon balls can be seen west of the Maiden Porch among the foundations of the Archaic Temple of Athena (Figure 701).

The first detailed depictions of the Maiden Porch after the War of Independence are two views by Danish artist and architect, Christian Hansen in 1835 (Figure 71 and Figure 72), the year the Greek Archaeological Service took over the administration of the Akropolis.²² In order to shore up the northwest corner of the Maiden Porch where the west pilaster and Maiden #4 had been blown away, new masonry pillars were added as a “quick fix” to support the remainder of the roof and a headless Maiden #4 was propped up against “*Opus Elgin.*” Another unanalyzed depiction, Rørbye, *Parti af Erechtheion*, 1836, shows the Maiden Porch just prior to the first official exploration of the Erechtheion, which began in earnest in 1837 (Figure 73).

Indignation at Elgin’s removal of Maiden #3 persisted. Nathaniel Parker Willis (1806-1867), an American who traveled to Greece in the mid 1830s, originally published his travels as letters in the *New York Mirror*, a paper which he founded in 1829 (T 73). He laments the removal of “the superb caryatid of the Erechtheion. Stolen with such barbarous carelessness too, that the remaining statues and the superb portico they sustained are tumbling to the ground!”²³ He takes this critical stance in the face of a strong tide of anti-American sentiment expressed by the English. Interestingly, Willis blames Elgin, not the War of Independence, for the collapse of the Maiden Porch.

²¹ Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, p. 225.

²² Hansen, *Interior of the Maiden Porch from the East*, 1835-1836; Hansen, *The Maiden Porch from the Southeast*, 1835-1836. See Bendtsen 1993, p. 103.

²³ Willis 1853, p. 157.

After the War of Independence, a visit to the remains of the loft in the North Porch, where Gouras' family had perished, became a regular part of a tour of the Erechtheion. Travelers signed their names on the inside of the standing portions of the North Porch, but very few travelers brought their art supplies with them. As described in the previous chapter, Cockerell painted the loft in 1811, depicting it as a dark, airless garret, accessible only by a ladder in the northeast corner (Figure 47). After the war, Hansen made a much livelier and detailed depiction of the loft in 1835 or 1836: Hansen, *Inside the North Portico of the Erechtheion, 1835-1836* (Figure 70). A man in a fez (almost certainly one of his fellow Danes) leans on a fallen coffer block resting on the roof of the vault and gazes between the columns, now freed of the masonry between them.

THE FIRST ANASTYLOSIS

Soon after the handover of the Akropolis, the Greeks had dominion over the ruins. Teams of eminent scholars, archaeologists, and architects from Greece, Denmark, Switzerland, Italy, and Prussia set about the clearing of the Post-Antique accretions on the Akropolis. In 1834, Leo von Klenze suggested the removal of accretions that “have no archaeological, structural or artistic interest.”²⁴ His opinions were representative of the prevailing aesthetic and political principles of the time.²⁵

The new Bavarian king, Othon, echoed von Klenze's sentiments, and set the scene for the future purpose of the monuments on the Akropolis: “All of the vestiges of barbarism must be eradicated from the Acropolis and from all of Greece and the remains

²⁴ Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, p. 226.

²⁵ See Hamilakis and Yalouri 1999. The clearance of post-Classical remains is often compared with the adoption of *katharevousa*, a purist form of Greek that harkens back to the language used in the ancient Greek works of Plato and Aristotle: Yalouri 2001, pp. 55, 203, note 3.

of the glorious past shall shine with a new splendor as a firm base for a glorious present and a glorious future.”²⁶ The Bavarian architect, Karl Friedrich Schinkel, planned to convert the Akropolis into a palace for the new king by clearing the plateau of everything except for the Classical monuments.²⁷ This meant that the Erechtheion had to be cleared of the remnants of the Frankish North Addition, the Venetian vault in the North Porch, the Ottoman masonry structure in the angle of the Westward Projection of the North Porch and the West Façade, and the Frankish and Ottoman alterations of the interior. Luckily Schinkel’s plan was not carried out, and the Akropolis became an archaeological zone. Yalouri correlates von Klenze’s clearance and restoration works on the Akropolis with the inauguration of “Otto’s task of restoring the modern Greek state itself.”²⁸

The material remains of the Frankish and Ottoman cultures were symbolic of the oppression of Greek Orthodox Christians. The driving ideology of the nascent Greek state, the “Megali Idea”, was to re-establish the Byzantine Empire and bring all Orthodox Greeks under its rule and protection.²⁹ The preservation and celebration of the material culture of the ancient (pagan) Greeks did not conflict with this self-image and ethnic identity.³⁰ First, the ancient Greeks could not be blamed for predeceasing Jesus Christ. Second, the newly free Greeks were keen to associate themselves, as descendants and inheritors, with all the positive connotations of ancient Greek culture (philosophy,

²⁶ Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, p. 13. On the reuse of the past, see Brown and Hamilakis 2003, and specifically of the Akropolis, see Yalouri 2001 and Bastéa 2000.

²⁷ Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, pp. 10-17. On Schinkel’s plans and elevations for transforming the Akropolis into the palace for King Othon, see Schinkel 1982; Bergdoll 1994; Tournikiotis 1994, pp. 320-321. Schinkel employed the Erechtheion Ionic order and the maidens in many of his designs in Western Europe. See Appendix C for a partial list of these designs.

²⁸ Yalouri 2001, p. 36.

²⁹ Woodhouse 1984, pp. 165-167; Clogg 1992, pp. 47-49.

³⁰ Clogg 1992, p. 50. On the compatibility of celebrating both pagan Antiquity and Byzantine culture, see Stewart 1994. Charles Stewart terms this phenomenon “disemia.” On “Greek syncretism” and the “sacred heirlooms of antiquity,” see Yalouri 2001, pp. 137-142.

political sophistication, art and theater), and the democratic legacy of ancient Athens in particular. Third, the new state was eager to be as forward-thinking and modern as possible: the Philhellenes who supported the revolution had such a sincere and deep appreciation of their ancient culture that the Classical remains could be viewed by the nascent Greek state as currency to attract well-intentioned foreign investment and protection.³¹ From the beginning of the investigations on the Akropolis, objects identifiable as Byzantine were preserved, many of which are now in the Byzantine Museum at Athens. Efforts were made early on to retain the early Christian items associated with the Erechtheion, e.g., the chancel screen and monolithic columns. These were collected and displayed within the building. With the threat of Jacob Fallmerayer's popular theory that the modern Greeks were not related to the ancient Greeks, Greece's Byzantine legacy rose in national importance.³² Also, in "purifying" the Akropolis of the vestiges of the subsequent occupations, the Greeks were re-writing their history and expelling memories about the times when the Akropolis was not "Greek" in the manner the emerging state wanted it to be understood.³³

The clearing-activities of the archaeologists on the Akropolis met with some contemporary criticism from Western Europeans. A Scottish Classical scholar, William Mure, disapproved of the clearance of the post-Classical remains (T 79), and considered

³¹ Yalouri 2001, p. 36.

³² Jacob Fallmerayer, an Austrian journalist and historian, was enraged by the political naiveté of the Philhellenes. He feared Russian territorial expansion because the Greeks were Orthodox (like the Russians), and he saw the liberation of Greece as a strengthening of Russia. He argued in the 1830s that the modern Greeks were primarily of Slavic descent, based on his research into the Chronicle of Monemvasia and place-names derived from Slavic words. For him, the ancient Greeks had been wiped out by the Slavic migrations from the 7th century onward. These Slavs, exposed to Byzantine culture, adopted the Greek language and religious customs. Fallmerayer's ideas, although influential, were attacked by many for different aspects of his theory. His ideas became not just politically incorrect, but also the main target of Greek nationalism. Fallmerayer's name is still loathed by many Greeks. See Brown and Hamilakis 2003, pp. 5, 15 note 2; Yalouri 2001, pp. 37, 95; Peckham 2001.

³³ Yalouri 2001, p. 55.

“[their] demolition [to] be an act of Gothic barbarism, little short of that of which its constructors may have been guilty, in the robbery of the neighboring buildings to procure materials for their work.”³⁴

German archaeologist and Curator of Antiquities at Athens under the new kingdom, Ludwig Ross, began clearing the debris around the North Porch in 1835, but decided to stop until a systematic operation could be organized.³⁵ Between 1837 and 1840, the new man in charge of the Akropolis was Kyriakos Pittakis. Pittakis brought about enormous changes to the Erechtheion during this first of four major *anastylosis* campaigns in 1837-1838 (Figure 585).³⁶ Pittakis cleared the East Porch and reconstructed its northeastern anta up to and including course 6. He piled up blocks, without consideration for their original location, to recreate part of the North and South Walls, and reinforced the walls with brickwork.³⁷ On the west side of the temple, Pittakis re-erected WW.C4, placed architrave blocks between WW.C2-C4, but left WW.C1 as a stump. He re-erected PP.C1 entirely as well as most of the drums of PP.C2 and PP.C3, but ignored the rest of the North Porch at this time.³⁸ Selina Bracebridge depicted the

³⁴ Mure 1842, p. 66.

³⁵ Ross 1855, p. 98. Christian Hansen (mentioned above) was also a member of the 1834 team of archaeologists on the Akropolis.

³⁶ Paton et al. 1927, p. 561. On one of the blocks, Pittakis commemorated his *anastylosis* by inscribing a stone with the year of the repair's completion in 1838, “[ΕΠΙ]ΣΚΕΥΑΣΘΗ/[...Ο] 1838” (Figure 482): see Tufano-Mallouchou 1998, p. 40. This stone belongs to the North Wall and has since been placed in its correct position (NN.16.13), with the inscription upside-down and facing the interior of the temple. Balanos' *anastylosis* would be commemorated in a similar manner, but this time ironically on one of the iron bars which would cause the marble blocks to crack: “ΑΡΧΑΙΟΛΟΓΙΚΗ ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑ 1908”: see Tufano-Mallouchou 1998, p. 122.

³⁷ The earliest views of the rebuilt North and South Walls are de Chacaton, *View of the Parthenon with the Mosque*, 1838-1839, for the South Wall (Figure 80) and Skene, *The North Portico from the Northwest*, February 27, 1839 (Figure 82). The brickwork on the interior of the North Wall is first depicted in Skene, *The Interior of the Erechtheum*, May 25, 1841 (Figure 86); and on the interior of the South Wall, by Tétaz, *Acropolis d'Athènes. Ruines de l'Érechtheion, état actuel*, 1848 (Figure 98).

³⁸ Flandin's drawing of the Erechtheion from the west is one of the earliest well-dated depictions of the first phase of the restoration of the North Porch: Flandin, *The Erechtheum and the Parthenon from the West*,

whole Akropolis during Pittakis' restoration project.³⁹ The West Façade has been re-erected, but the South Wall has not (Figure 74 and Figure 75).⁴⁰ Her husband, Charles Holt Bracebridge, reported to the Royal Institute of British Architects (R.I.B.A.) on the use of color on the Erechtheion.⁴¹ Mrs. Bracebridge's sketches are among the earliest to show the re-erected West Façade, columns of the North Porch, and partially reconstructed north anta of the East Porch.⁴²

The mass of Ottoman masonry that probably served as (and blocked up) the access point to the gunpowder magazine was removed, and the small arched doorway in the passage to the Pandroseion was revealed. Friedrich Zahn's engraving (Figure 76) is one of the earliest depictions of this door.⁴³ The area of the Kekropeion was cleared and reinforced with masonry because the huge stone, WW.13.01, cracked.⁴⁴

Perhaps Pittakis' most startling discoveries were the fragments of Maiden #6, which most travelers assumed had been taken to Rome because they had seen copies of the Erechtheion maidens there.⁴⁵ Pittakis also reunited the head of Maiden #4 with her body. The two had been separated during the final siege of the War of Independence.⁴⁶ Pittakis replaced her on the podium of the South Porch but did not put the entablature and

November 15, 1839 (Figure 83). Brouskari says that the roof of the North Porch was partially fixed in 1837 (Brouskari 1997, p. 180); however, the drawings and photographs through to the end of the 19th century clearly show that the roof has not been restored at all.

³⁹ S. Bracebridge also wrote a description of Athens: S. Bracebridge 1839.

⁴⁰ S. Bracebridge, *The Erechtheion and the Parthenon from the East*, 1837; S. Bracebridge, *The Erechtheion and the Parthenon from the West*, 1837.

⁴¹ C. Bracebridge, *Patterns and Colours from the Erechtheum*, 1837, April 17, 1837; Paton et al. 1927, p. 229.

⁴² de Chacaton, *View of the Parthenon with the Mosque*, 1838-1839, provides a lovely view of the newly exposed terrace wall of what would be discovered to be the Archaic Temple of Athena half a century later.

⁴³ Zahn, *Erechtheum*, ca. 1837. Skene, *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*, 1839 (Figure 81) is also an important early view despite the inaccurate rendering of the bottom half of the West Façade.

⁴⁴ This crack is first depicted in Marilhat's curious reversed view of the West Façade (Figure 77): Marilhat, *The Erechtheum, Athens*, 1837-1841.

⁴⁵ On the copies in Rome, see references in Chapter VII.

⁴⁶ The headless body of Maiden #4 body is shown propped up against the South Porch in Hansen, *The Maiden Porch from the Southeast*, 1835-1836 (Figure 95).

roof back because her capital was still missing (Figure 585).⁴⁷ We hear from Mure about “a Swiss sculptor...engaged in the execution of a new Caryatid of Pentelic marble, to supply that removed by Lord Elgin.”⁴⁸ Ross reports more accurately than Mure that this Swiss sculptor, named Imhof, mended the neck and hair of Maiden #4.⁴⁹

Pittakis also excavated inside the Erechtheion and exposed the marble pavement of the nave of the basilica. He unearthed several of the graves in the south aisle of the basilica as well.⁵⁰ Pittakis received a great deal of criticism for being “crude and unmethodological.”⁵¹ A new depiction of the Erechtheion from the southwest by Johann Frey (1843) shows the random nature of the re-erection of the South Wall (Figure 90).⁵²

Despite the new export laws that had been passed to prevent the continued despoliation of sculptural and architectural fragments, the temptation for travelers to remove marbles continued to plague the monuments of the Akropolis. A Monsieur Morot admitted in his travel journal that he picked up a fragment of the Erechtheion to take home with him, and then thought better of it (T 81):

L’architecture, d’ordre ionique, est d’une excessive richesse de sculpture. J’étais assez disposé à m’emparer d’un petit fragment

⁴⁷ Pittakis also discovered more fragments of the building accounts, as recounted by Damer 1841, pp. 26-27 (T 80).

⁴⁸ Garston (T 66) also comments on the sculpting of a replacement for Elgin’s maiden, but by an “Italian artist”: Garston 1842, p. 131. He found his nationality to be inappropriate for working in the workshop of Pheidias: see Chapter VII on Garston. The Swiss sculptor, Imhof, worked on the restoration of Maiden #4, not “Elgin’s” Maiden #3: see Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, p. 230. Casanaki and Mallouchou, who prepared this section of Papageorgiou-Venetas’ book, says that it is Maiden #5, but this figure was never damaged or removed from her original location. Andreoli also recarved the back of Maiden #4 according to Brouskari: Brouskari 1984. The replacement for the Maiden #3 was terracotta. See Chapter III for the discussion of the recarving of the backs of Maidens #1, #2, #4 and #5.

⁴⁹ Ross 1855, p. 121.

⁵⁰ Pittakis 1839; Pittakis 1840. According to Ross, perforated marble screens were found during excavations near the Erechtheion. These may be the “gelosie” mentioned by Fanelli. Ross 1855, p. 125, note 6. The date of their discovery was not recorded, but the letter to which a note was added in 1855 was written in 1837. See Paton et al. 1927, p. 534. On the “gelosie” mentioned by Fanelli, see T 15.

⁵¹ These are the words of Rizons-Rangabé, the artistocrat and scholar from Istanbul: see Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, p. 230. Modern scholars also criticize his techniques: see Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, pp. 14-15.

⁵² Frey, *View of the Erechtheion and the Parthenon*, September 3, 1843.

détaché d'une corniche à demi brisée. Je l'avais déjà saisi, mais je le laissai tomber, persuadé que je ne devais point m'approprier ce qui ne m'appartenait pas, bien que l'objet fût de peu de valeur.⁵³

Sir James Skene witnessed many of Pittakis' interventions during his long stay in Athens between 1838 and 1845.⁵⁴ He created a series of drawings of the Erechtheion from every angle (Figure 81, Figure 82, Figure 85, Figure 86, Figure 87).⁵⁵ Skene says explicitly in his diaries that none of his drawings are copies, but are taken directly from the natural scenery they profess to portray, and thus have no embellishments.⁵⁶ His drawings represent a good, though not perfectly accurate, portrayal of the Erechtheion after Pittakis' interventions.⁵⁷ Two more sketches of the Erechtheion remain unpublished in his journals.⁵⁸

Like Sir William Gell, the last traveler to create a series of views of the Erechtheion from all angles, Skene also found aspects of the Erechtheion unappealing:

The *Caryatides* statues used instead of pillars has not a pleasing effect, and seems little consistent with the [...] taste of Greek architecture, especially where the figures, as here in the temple of Minerva Polias, are not disposed in any ornamental attitude but simply bear the burden of the cornice in place of pillars, it is both incongruous and painful [sic]. It would be somewhat less offensive if instead of young women they represented sturdy

⁵³ Morot 1869, p. 45.

⁵⁴ On Skene's sojourn in Greece, see Tsigakou 1998.

⁵⁵ Skene, *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*, 1839; Skene, *The North Portico from the Northwest*, February 27, 1839; Skene, *Temple of Minerva Polias and Erechtheus*, January 8, 1841; Skene, *Akropolis*, March 1843. Skene, *The Interior of the Erechtheum*, May 25, 1841 (Figure 86) is the only depiction of the marble paving of the nave of the basilica other than the well-known and important state plan: Tétaz, *Acropolis d'Athènes. Ruines de l'Érechtheion, état actuel*, 1848 (Figure 98).

⁵⁶ On this issue, Skene criticizes Grecian Williams for not working "from nature" (Figure 48 and Figure 50). He also chastises Wordsworth (Wordsworth, *The Pandroseum*, pre-1821 [Figure 64] and Wordsworth, *The Parthenon and the Erectheum*, 1832-1833 [Figure 65]), of whom he says, "few if any of the representations adhere to truth and all are Britannised [sic] by northern skies that never shone in Greece."

⁵⁷ The vault in the North Porch seems to have been of great interest to Skene. His drawings offer the best glimpse of its structure and also show that the North Door was still blocked up in 1841.

⁵⁸ I was unable to get permission to take photographs of these unpublished drawings by Skene. John Leatham collated the journals. They are now located in Center for Modern Greek Studies in Athens. The sections on the Erechtheion are in Volume "1840" but these mainly date to 1838 (T 82).

porters, though even then not free from objection, when such figures were males they had the name of Atlantes.⁵⁹

Skene also describes the scholarly excitement of the Archaeological Society of Athens upon the discovery of two fragments of the Erechtheion building accounts which refer to the carving of the separate figures for the frieze. Previously, there had been:

...a problem that [had] long puzzled the ingenuity of architects to account for; considering the perfection of this beautiful and highly ornamental structure, how it should come to be altogether destitute of a sculptured frieze...In the Erechtheon [sic] the place of the frieze is occupied by a plain course of dark coloured marble from the quarries of Mount Hymettus which rather disfigures than adorns the graceful structure otherwise of beautiful white Penteliean [sic] marble.⁶⁰

The new fragments of the inscriptions led to the:

...examination of the numerous fragments of sculpture preserved in the acropolis [sic] which had from time to time been turned up in the course of excavating and clearing away the rubbish; and several morsels of high finish, a small size were observed, altogether rough and unpolished on the back, which were found to correspond with each other in size, and also with the height of the dark coloured course of stone occupying the position of the frieze of the Erechtheon. These circumstances afforded a clue to the fact which was shortly afterwards confirmed by the discovery of a fragment of corresponding size and stile [sic] of execution, representing *a young girl prostrated before the figure of a woman*, [...] which it appears to be now proved that the frieze of the temple consisted of a series of small figures in white marble standing out in relief from the dark ground in the form of cameo's which must have given a peculiarly rich effect to the building, and this brilliant effect was also heightened by the capitals of the pillars being gilt and painted, as described in the source inscriptions.⁶¹

The panorama painter, Friedrich Stademann, was particularly impressed by the perfection of the carving of the moldings, and demonstrates his awareness that the Erechtheion was being used as a model (both design and standard of perfection) in new buildings such as the Glyptothek in Munich (T 84):

⁵⁹ Skene, *Diaries*, 1838-1840, verso of p. 115.

⁶⁰ Skene, *Diaries*, 1838-1840, pp. 364-366.

⁶¹ Skene, *Diaries*, 1838-1840, pp. 364-366.

Il est de style ionique et offre une grande profusion d'ornements du goût le plus exquis, et dont le travail a conservé jusqu'aujourd'hui netteté, qu'on a peine à croire possible dans des ouvrages de marbre ; cependant, si ces ornements n'ont pas encore été surpassés, ils ont au moins été égalés dans les nouveaux édifices de Munich, surtout à la Glyptothèque.⁶²

ARCHAEOLOGISTS AND ARCHITECTS 1840-1853

Work stopped on the Erechtheion in 1840 and resumed in 1844 when the nascent Archaeological Society of Athens embarked on the clearance of the North Porch. They could proceed no further with the restoration of the roof due to lack of funds. An early view of the newly cleared North Porch was painted by the English architect and founder of the British School at Athens, Francis Penrose (Figure 97).⁶³

During the hiatus of work between 1840 and 1844, however, many artists drew the Erechtheion. From these depictions, a great deal of information about the construction of the Venetian vault in the North Porch can be gleaned. The vault ran east-west, and had a window and relieving arches.⁶⁴ Two lively oils by the Italian painter Ippolito Caffi (1809-1866) capture the pace of the clearance of the Akropolis as well as the unique hue of the expansive Athenian sky (Figure 88 and Figure 89).⁶⁵ Two paintings of the Erechtheion in the Benaki Museum by Rudolf Müller show the Erechtheion during the hiatus (Figure 78 and Figure 79).⁶⁶ And finally, the series of engravings by Rey and

⁶² Stademann 1841.

⁶³ Penrose, *Portico of Minerva Polias*, April 5, 1847. The first view of the newly cleared North Porch is by Harry Ralph Ricardo: Ricardo, *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*, December 1845 (Figure 96).

⁶⁴ See Chapter VII for an in-depth analysis of the date, form, and purpose of the vault in the North Porch.

⁶⁵ Caffi, *The Parthenon and the Erechtheion from the West*, 1843; Caffi, *The Parthenon and the Erechtheum from the East*, 1843.

⁶⁶ Müller, *Parthenon and Erechtheion from the West*, 1837-1844 (Figure 78); Müller, *Parthenon, Erechtheion and Propylaea from the East*, 1837-1844 (Figure 79). The paintings by Müller are labeled as having been painted in 1863, but they must instead date to between 1837 and 1844 because the Maiden Porch has not yet been repaired and the vault is still in the North Porch. A suite of pencil drawings in a notebook in the DAI Archives by an unknown traveler, perhaps Adolf Schöll, shows the Erechtheion from all four sides, including elevations of the interior and a unique view of the inside of the Maiden Porch:

Chenavard show the Erechtheion from all angles (Figure 91, Figure 92, Figure 93 and Figure 94).⁶⁷ The authors of these rare and detailed volumes of plates also carved their names in the North Porch.⁶⁸

In the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts are preserved Hansen's and other Danish architects' notebooks from travels to Greece. Their notebooks are full of drawings of moldings of the Erechtheion and represent a mode of direct transmission of the moldings back to Copenhagen.⁶⁹ Erechtheion Ionic columns and female architectural supports were incorporated into many buildings in Denmark designed by these architect-travelers, such as the famous Slotskirke in Copenhagen by Christian Hansen (Figure 693).⁷⁰ Characteristic of the Danish depictions is perhaps Hansen, *The Erechtheion from the Southwest*, 1844 (Figure 95). A cast of a maiden in two halves stands in the foreground. The pattern of the damage shows that she was made from Maiden #3 in the British Museum. The cast itself is now in the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts Collection of Casts (KG 392) and may have been taken home by one of the Danish architects as part of a strategy to transmit the features of this unique building.⁷¹ Perhaps

Anonymous, *The Erechtheion from the North*, 1838-1844; Anonymous, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1838-1844; Anonymous, *Plan of the Erechtheion*, 1838-1844; Anonymous, 1838-1844; Anonymous, *Detail of the South Door of the Erechtheion from the North*, 1838-1844; and Anonymous, *The Interior of the Maiden Porch from the East*, 1838-1844. Theodore du Moncel also drew the Erechtheion: du Moncel, *Érechthéum*, 1838-1843, in du Moncel 1843 and du Moncel 1845.

⁶⁷ Rey, *The North Portico from the East*, 1843, and Rey, *Temple of Erechtheus from the Southwest*, 1843, in Rey 1867; Chenavard, *Vue meridionale de l'Erechtheion à Athènes*, 1844, and Chenavard, *Vue orientale de l'Erechtheion à Athènes*, 1844, in Chenavard, Rey, and Dalgabio 1858.

⁶⁸ See below "Graffiti."

⁶⁹ These drawings are published by Bendtsen: Bendtsen 1993. In addition to Christian Hansen, Danish architects who drew the moldings and depictions of the Erechtheion include M. Gottlieb Bindsbøll, Martinus Rørbye, Theophilos Hansen (who designed the Academy and used the Erechtheion Ionic order), Niels Sigfred Nebelong, Laurits Albert Winstrup, and Harald Conrad Stilling. On the last two artists, see below.

⁷⁰ Jørgensen and Porphyrios 1987.

⁷¹ On the cast, see Christiansen 2000, pp. 98-100.

this is the cast of the maiden Elgin too, sent by the Earl of Guilford prior to the War of Independence, that had never been placed in the Maiden Porch.⁷²

With the clearance of the Akropolis, it was possible for the first time to behold all the ancient monuments simultaneously and contemplate the spatial relationships among them. In 1843, George Grenville demonstrated his sensitivity to the topographical landscape and recognized that the Erechtheion rather than the Parthenon is oriented toward the Propylaia (T 87):

Each building stands in the best possible relation to all the rest; and the lines along which Art has arranged that you should approach it are those from which it is to be seen to greatest advantage. As you draw nearer, its proportions become more grand, and the fine mellow complexion of the antique marble, blended rather than contrasted with the rich hues which mantle over the country around, are effects such as no painter can give, and few would dare attempt to copy faithfully.⁷³

The Maiden Porch was repaired by the French architect, Alexis Paccard, between 1846 and 1847 (Figure 586).⁷⁴ This porch was overhauled from the krepidoma to the roof. New marble was inserted (for steps, architraves, and moldings), and marble blocks from other ancient structures were reused, such as in the eastern podium block, ME.04.02. A terracotta cast of Maiden #3 sent by the British Museum was placed on the podium with an iron pole inside her to help support the roof. Maiden #4 received a replacement capital. Italian sculptor Andreoli restored the missing parts of Maiden #6 and recarved the back of Maiden #4 to match the drapery style of Maidens #1, #2 and #5,

⁷² See Chapter VII. It is certainly not the terracotta cast of Maiden #3 that was actually installed on the building in 1846-1847 during the French interventions on the Maiden Porch. The terracotta cast was in a single piece and had a distinct reddish. See note 80.

⁷³ Grenville 1846, p. 14.

⁷⁴ On Paccard's career as a *pensionnaire*, see Guillaume 1870.

which he thought was Classical.⁷⁵ A new capital for the northwest pilaster was carved as well as a new architrave block to be placed over Maiden #4.⁷⁶ The new architrave block may have been placed over Maiden #4, but the coffered roof (MS.01.03) was not replaced until Balanos' interventions at the turn of the 20th century. Paccard used iron in his restoration, and this soon caused severe damage to the integrity of the ancient blocks.⁷⁷

A painting by Henry Cook (1819-1890) appears to be the only evidence for the Maiden Porch during its restoration (Figure 99).⁷⁸ Maidens #1 through #5 are in place, but the roof is entirely missing and Maiden #6 has not yet been restored to its original position. “*Opus Elgin*,” the rough masonry pillar in the place of Maiden #3, has been replaced by a terracotta cast.⁷⁹ In other renditions of the Maiden Porch after this time, artists often represent the difference in color of the replaced Maiden #3.⁸⁰ Cook's enthusiasm for this temple and the other monuments of Athens shines through in the following comments (T 89):

With a profound contempt for all the common-place conventionalities by which so many feel compelled to go into raptures upon certain given occasions, and with the strongest feeling of the propriety of controlling these as well as other emotions, I confess that I should have but little respect for any

⁷⁵ Brouskari 1984. See Chapter III on the Hellenistic recarving of Maidens #1, #2 and #5 due to fire damage and the wholesale replacement of Maiden #6.

⁷⁶ Paton et al. state that iron poles were inserted between Maidens #3, #4 and #5 to support the new architrave by Paccard and his team: Paton et al. 1927, p. 568. This cannot be true because the early photographs of the Maiden Porch (artists may naturally have omitted this obvious modern intervention) from 1848 to 1865 indicate that there were no poles in place. The first well-dated photograph to show the iron poles is Stillman, *The Erechtheum, Porch of the Caryatids*, 1869.

⁷⁷ On the technical problems with Paccard's restoration, see Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985, p. 15 and Papageorgiou-Venetis 1994, p. 230.

⁷⁸ Cook, *The Erechtheion*, ca. 1846.

⁷⁹ One of the many inaccuracies of Cook's depiction is that all the maidens are standing with their weight on the same leg.

⁸⁰ Werner, *View of the Porch of the Caryatids on the Erechtheion*, 1877 (Figure 121); Giallina, *Portico of the Caryatids with Terracotta Cast*, 1891 (Figure 126).

educated man, who could find himself within a few miles of the city of Minerva, and retain at all his normal mental condition....⁸¹

An unpublished drawing in R.I.B.A's Drawings and Archive Collection by Edward Martineau dating to 1850 is the earliest depiction of the fully restored porch (Figure 100).⁸² Also found in R.I.B.A. was a view of the Erechtheion by James Murray, probably created in the same year: Murray, *The Erectheum, Athens*, ca. 1850 (Figure 101).

The debate about Elgin's activities on the Akropolis had not cooled in the half century since Maiden #3 was removed. The notion that the Greeks had been more upset by the removal of Maiden #3 from the Erechtheion than of the Parthenon sculptures was still circulating in the middle of the 19th century.⁸³ Travelers were also still hearing the story of the mourning sisters of Maiden #3. In the words of de Vere (T 90):

The loss of this Caryatis, when Lord Elgin carried it off, occasioned more disturbance of heart at Athens than the removal of the frieze of the Parthenon. The rights of hospitality were violated, as the Athenians thought, by the summary mode in which their captive guest was removed from the abode which had sheltered her so long beneath a sky not less temperate than that of Phrygia; and perhaps they deemed a gallery in the cloudy north but a dungeon compared with the mild prison in which they had so long detained her. The strength of their feeling on this subject is attested by a belief which prevails to this day among the people, a belief that on the night of her second captivity her five remaining sisters were

⁸¹ Cook 1853.

⁸² Martineau, *Athens, Acropolis, The Erectheum*, January 4, 1850. The R.I.B.A. Drawings and Archives Collection is currently moving to the Victoria and Albert Museum (2004).

⁸³ This is in stark contrast to the modern debate about the return of the Elgin Marbles, or "Parthenon Marbles" as the Greeks prefer to call them (on the significance of this nomenclature, see Yalouri 2001, pp. 92, 97-99). The Committee for the Restitution of the Parthenon Marbles is not interested in return of Maiden #3, the northernmost column of the East Porch (EE.C6), or the other architectural fragments from the Erechtheion. I wrote to the Melina Mercouri Foundation and asked whether the return of the missing parts of the Erechtheion was included in their request. The Foundation kindly and swiftly replied that they were not a part of the request. It would seem that for the Committee and the Foundation, only the Parthenon Marbles are emblematic of the epitome Greek culture. The lack of interest in the "Erechtheion Marbles" is perhaps due to their desire not to distract attention from what they consider the main issue, and not to arouse suspicion that further requests for the return of other monuments will follow in the future if the British Museum were to agree to return the Parthenon Marbles. See the conclusion of Chapter VII for a further discussion of this issue.

heard to lament with loud sobbings her fate and their own loss. All night long, as the story goes, the voice of lamentation was echoed among the pillars and wafted eastward over the sea; nor was it till the next morning that the sacred breasts of the mourners were revisited by their ancient peace, and that the beams of the rising sun dried the tears upon their stony faces. The legend at least proves the Athenians have not wholly lost that poetic spirit which called temples and statues into existence when they slept in the quarries of Pentelicus.⁸⁴

And why was this story still circulating half a century after Elgin removed Maiden #3? In the previous chapter, we saw how this story revealed the magical properties ancient sculptures held for both the Ottomans and the Greeks.⁸⁵ What do the maidens represent to a nation of free Greek people? The maidens of the Erechtheion had stood in place for 2200 years watching over Athena's home. They are instantly recognizable, and comprised one of the favored architectural elements to add to the façade of many of the new buildings, both grand and modest, in Athens. They represented both the old and new daughters of Athens: the legacy of the removal of Maiden #3 during the occupation of Athens by a foreign power was a painful reminder of these times and of the lack of custodial power the Greeks had over their cultural heritage.

Just before the French interventions on the Maiden Porch, Antoine de Latour wrote a strange account of them (T 88):

...On y admire surtout trois cariatides d'une légèreté surprenante. Il y en avait une quatrième, plus petite que les autres, mais elle est allée rejoindre en Angleterre les frises du temple de la Victoire sans ailes. Une frayeur superstitieuse a, dit-on, sauvé les autres. Le peuple qui vit partir *la jeune fille* (il nommait ainsi ces cariatides, qu'il regardait comme ses déesses protectrices), la pleura amèrement. La Grèce a retrouvé dans le courage de ces enfants un palladium plus sûr.⁸⁶

⁸⁴ de Vere 1850, pp. 90-92. See Chapter VII on the impact of Elgin's removal of Maiden #3 and the stories of about her sisters.

⁸⁵ See Chapter VII and Shaw 2003, p. 42.

⁸⁶ de Latour 1847, p. 188.

Besides the fact that by 1845, when de Latour wrote his letters, four maidens and not three were standing on the podium, de Latour's comments on what the maidens represent are profound: Greece had found in them, "her children", an emblem of courage and strength. But one of her children remained unredeemed, as did much of the Greek world at this time. Under the romantic, philhellenic overtones, de Latour's account probably reflects the Greek attitude toward the Erechtheion maidens. It was the locals, after all, who propagated the magical stories about them that were written down by the travelers. These Greek sensibilities toward the maidens were perhaps conditioned by the admiration of the Philhellenes: in the maidens, the Greeks found cultural currency that they might exploit for international sympathy and support.

The maidens' symbolism did not, however, answer the perplexing questions of the writer, Gustav Flaubert (T 91), who visited Athens in 1851. While the other temples he visited received just a few descriptive notes in his journal, he posed the fundamental and still contentious questions about the strange design of the Erechtheion:

S'il y avait là deux temples, comme l'inégalité de niveau des murs l'indique, pourquoi cela n'existe-t-il pas extérieurement? Alors pourquoi n'avoir pas fait les deux temples de la même largeur à l'intérieur, quand, à l'extérieur, des deux côtés, c'est une construction faite d'un seul coup?⁸⁷

One of the first accounts of the restored Maiden Porch comes from Baird and was written at some point in time before 1856 (T 94):

But the southern portico, that of the Caryatides, to which we next repaired, was an object of far greater curiosity and interest. Its dimensions are much smaller than those of the others; but here the place of ponderous columns has been assumed by six colossal damsels, whose marble heads support the ponderous roof. Some say that the statues represent the captive women of Carya a town of Peloponnesus, destroyed by the Athenians for siding with the Persian invaders against their country.

⁸⁷ Flaubert 1910, p. 126. Flaubert, incidentally, used Buchon 1843 as a guide (T 83).

But I prefer the other story, which makes them [the maidens] portraits of the finest and most distinguished of Athens' daughters, chosen on account of their beauty to sit for this honourable distinction. Theirs are no meretricious charms, but a dignified and devout expression mingled with indescribable grace:

“A group
Of shrinking Caryatides, they muse
Upon the ground, eyelids half-closed,...
To linger out their penance in mute stone.”

ROBERT BROWNING

In the first instance, this passage shows how deeply the maidens had affected the psyches of Romantic poets such as Browning. In the second, Baird's quotation of Browning in front of the monument which inspired the metaphors demonstrates its magnetic and timeless appeal.

Tétaz and the Greek Commission carried out in-depth studies of the Erechtheion between 1847 and 1853 (Figure 106).⁸⁸ Their elevations and plans constitute the first interior elevations since Fauvel's of ca. 1789 (Figure 29).⁸⁹ Among a series of previously unexamined Danish paintings, there are also elevations of the interior of the Erechtheion by Laurits Winstrup dating to 1851 (Figure 105).⁹⁰ Pittakis' brick-work reinforcement of the North and South Walls is a dominant feature, and the interior elevation of the North Wall shows how the north aisle has not yet been excavated, in contrast to the south aisle.

The other paintings in this Danish series show the state of the Erechtheion just before and after the great storm of October 1852. This storm toppled the West Façade that Pittakis had partially restored in the late 1830s. The first is by Laurits Winstrup

⁸⁸ Tétaz, *Académie des Beaux-Arts de l'Institut de France. Section d'Architecture. Restauration du Temple d'Erechthée à Athènes exécutée par M. Tétaz en 1848*, 1848; Tétaz, *Acropolis d'Athènes. Ruines de l'Érechtheion, état actuel*, 1848; Archaeological Society of Athens 1853, plates. The two irregular masses of concrete (i.e., the pillars stratigraphically between the temple and basilica) in line with the so-called East Cross-Wall were removed by the Greek Commission, section 44.

⁸⁹ Fauvel, *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*, Undated (ca. 1789).

⁹⁰ Winstrup, *The Interior of the North Wall of the Erechtheion*, January 1851; Winstrup, *The Interior of the South Wall of the Erechtheion*, 1851: see Bendtsen 1993, p. 333.

(1851) and was painted just prior to the storm (Figure 104).⁹¹ The second is by Harald Stilling (1853), and is the earliest to show the effects of the storm (Figure 108).⁹² All the columns of the West Façade have fallen into the temple except for the lonely stub of the northernmost one (Figure 586). Later photographs show the fallen columns lying on the vaulted roof of the cistern in the West Corridor.⁹³ In addition, Winstrup and Stilling also created paintings of the Erechtheion from the east and south, which show great detail, and compare in accuracy very well to the contemporary photographs (Figure 102, Figure 103 and Figure 107).⁹⁴

The interior of the temple was fully excavated during the 1850s and 1860s and the paving of the nave was pulled up.⁹⁵ On the exterior, the krepidoma was completely cleared. Balanos led the next large-scale reconstruction effort on the Erechtheion at the turn of the 20th century.⁹⁶ The North Wall, West Façade, and entablature of the East Porch were repaired at this time with questionable accuracy. Seventy years passed before an attempt was made by the Committee for the Preservation of the Akropolis Monuments to rectify these problems and protect the Erechtheion from further damage.⁹⁷ The monument continues to change today: The Akropolis Restoration Service is currently rebuilding the sanctuary of Pandrosos adjacent to the West Façade.

⁹¹ Winstrup, *The Erechtheion from the West*, 1851.

⁹² Stilling, *Erechtheion from the West*, 1853.

⁹³ Sébah, *Porte Septentrionale de l'Erechtheion*, ca. 1874; reproduced by Yiakoumis 2000, p. 184.

⁹⁴ Winstrup, *The Erechtheion from the East*, 1850-1851; Winstrup, *The Erechtheion from the South*, 1851; Stilling, *The Erechtheion from the Southeast*, 1853. Contemporary photographs: see Robertson, *View of the Erechtheion from the southwest*, 1853-1854; reproduced in Tsigakou 1985, no. 37.

⁹⁵ In 1862, Böttischer found an ancient bronze lamp in the form of a ship east of the West Cross-Wall. Only later was it discovered to have been inscribed on its side: 'Ἐρὸν τῆς Ἀθηναίας; see Paton et al. 1927, p. 572.

⁹⁶ The state of the Erechtheion after Balanos' interventions is represented in both the plates of Paton et al. 1927 and Platon et al. 1977.

⁹⁷ For the preparation for this fourth and most recent *anastylosis*, see Platon et al. 1977. For a brief report on the *anastylosis*, see Papanikolaou 1994. Work was carried out between 1979 and 1986.

By the middle of the 19th century, photography was developing quickly and the Akropolis served as one of the earliest subjects for this nascent art form.⁹⁸ The need for travelers to capture their visions of monuments on paper by prolonged gaze slowly began to diminish. Nonetheless, artists continued find the Erechtheion a worthy subject, and their paintings reflect the change in taste and style from Romanticism to Impressionism. Additions to the corpus of depictions of the Erechtheion include:

1. Newton, *View of the Acropolis and the Parthenon*, 1865 (Figure 117);
2. Spiers, *The Erechtheion from the Southeast*, ca. 1866 (Figure 118);
3. Spiers, *The Erechtheion from the Northeast*, ca. 1866 (Figure 119);
4. Spiers, *The North Porch of the Erechtheion from the East*, 1866 (Figure 120);
5. Polenov (1844-1927), *Portico with Caryatids*, 1882 (Figure 123);
6. Gifford, *Ruins of the Parthenon*, 1880 (Figure 122);
8. Skovgaard, *Porch of the Maidens from the East*, 1884 (Figure 124); and,
9. Ellis, *View of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion*, 1890 (Figure 125).

Impressionistic depictions include:

10. Werner, *View of the Porch of the Caryatids on the Erechtheion*, 1877 (Figure 121);
11. Giallina, *Portico of the Caryatids with Terracotta Cast*, 1891 (Figure 126);
12. Hone the Younger, *The Caryatids*, 1891/1892 (Figure 127); and,
13. Hunt, *View of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion from the East*, pre 1875.

⁹⁸ On the Akropolis as the subject of early photography, see Yiakoumis 2000 and Tsigakou 1985.

Here ends this examination of the history of the Erechtheion. Paton et al. provide a detailed summary of the late 19th century scholarship on the Erechtheion in the course of their description of the temple, ending with Balanos' *anastylosis*. The Committee for the Preservation of the Akropolis Monuments has reviewed Balanos' and subsequent *anastyloses* at length.⁹⁹

RECEPTION OF THE ERECHTHEION IN ATHENS

As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the reception of the Erechtheion in mid to late 19th and early 20th century art and architecture in Western Europe has been reserved for a separate project because of the breadth and depth of the evidence.¹⁰⁰ Some general comments can, however, be made about the adoption of the Erechtheion order in many of the new buildings constructed in Athens in the 19th century. This section briefly summarizes some of the main trends and features of this phenomenon.

Architectural features from the Erechtheion, anthemion necking-bands on Ionic column, and maidens being the most recognizable, are well-represented among the new buildings in Athens. These buildings were often designed by Western Europeans, many of whom spent many hours contemplating and painting the Erechtheion.¹⁰¹ The maidens (usually in the form of herms rather than fully sculpted in the round) are almost ubiquitous as ornaments on both grand and modest Athenian residences, and the Erechtheion Ionic order is employed on some of the most important buildings of modern

⁹⁹ Paton et al. 1927; Balanos 1938; Platon et al. 1977; Economakis 1994; Casanaki and Mallouchou 1985; Papanikolaou 1994.

¹⁰⁰ The reception of the Erechtheion in Western European architecture in the 18th and 19th century was discussed in Chapter VII.

¹⁰¹ Panetsos 2003, p. 415.

Athens, such as the Academy of Athens by Danish architect Theophilos Hansen (Figure 695).¹⁰²

While it is difficult to say for certain why female herms on the model of the Erechtheion maidens were chosen for private homes other than for their general appeal and sophisticated associations, it is possible to connect the choice of the Erechtheion-type column for the Academy with the cult of Athena as the Goddess of Wisdom. This connection is underscored by Athena's presence atop a giant votive column at the left side of the Academy's façade. The detail is picked out in bright colors and gilding in an earnest attempt to approximate the original effect of the Classical Erechtheion.¹⁰³

Another building by Theophilos Hansen is the National Library. While Doric on the exterior (based on the Hephaisteion), the reading room consists of a glass-covered peristyle composed of a richly embellished colonnade and entablature based on the Erechtheion order (Figure 696). Again, the choice of order is probably related to the Erechtheion's association with Athena and wisdom. Theophilos Hansen, the younger brother of Christian Hansen, who made so many lively depictions of the Erechtheion, epitomized the characteristics of the "Athenian School" of architecture, that is, the deliberate quotation of ancient monuments, not as ruins or the subject for the study of Antiquity, but as models for new designs.¹⁰⁴

¹⁰² On the Danish in Athens and Athens in Denmark, see Jørgensen and Porphyrios 1987. One of the grandest residences (now demolished) had a façade of four maidens, two of which are of the Erechtheion type. It was located at the corner of Voukouvestiou and Soutsou Streets in Athens and originally belonged to Ioannis Smith. The overall effect more closely approximated the propylon of Herodes Atticus' villa on the Via Appia than the Maiden Porch: Biris 2001, fig. 359. Herms with female bodies and faces similar to the Erechtheion maidens supported the roof of a covered balcony in the second story of a "working class house" in the Kerameikos: Panetsos 2003, p. 434. Similar female herms were used on the grand residences along Odos Vassilias Amalias, including the Benaki Museum, and in the Zappeion in the National Gardens.

¹⁰³ Panetsos 2003, pp. 424-427.

¹⁰⁴ Panetsos 2003, pp. 415-416.

The Erechtheion order was also chosen for the National Museum of Athens (Figure 697). The architect was Ludwig Lange, one of the German witnesses to the early excavation on the Akropolis plateau: Lange, *Early Excavations on the Athenian Plateau*, 1834 (Figure 69). Why chose the Erechtheion Ionic order? One might say that any reader of Pausanias would have recognized that the Erechtheion served as a sort of ancient museum (as did many temples). Also, the Erechtheion order is a logical choice for an architect eager to use a highly decorative Ionic order. The Ionic models offered by the Propylaia and Temple of Athena Nike (the only other surviving Ionic buildings in Athens in the mid-19th century) can appear overly austere on the large-scale façade of a new building. The necking band provides an additional level of interest, whether or not the necking-band is decorated.

Greek architects also frequently chose the Erechtheion order when they designed buildings. The often controversial architect, Lysandros Kaftantzoglou, chose the Erechtheion Ionic for the entrance and atrium of the National Technical University built between 1860-1876.¹⁰⁵ Did he choose this order because of the Erechtheion's association with Athena, and in turn, Athena's association with craftsmanship and industry? Further research is required to answer these questions.

GRAFFITI

In addition to the many accounts and letters, notes and diaries of the early travelers described in this study, there is also an untapped and undocumented record of dozens of other visitors who interacted with the Erechtheion. This testimony takes the form of graffiti and dipinti in the North Porch. At some period in the lifetime of the

¹⁰⁵ Panetsos 2003, pp. 423-424.

Erechtheion, parts of the interior of the architraves of the North Porch, especially on the east side, were blackened, probably by the smoke of fires that burned when the intercolumniations were fully blocked up and the upper space served as a loft.

These blackened surfaces provided a canvas for the signatures of many 19th century travelers. They either etched their mark into the blackened marble, or applied what must be charcoal to the areas that still had a light background. This part of the Erechtheion has never been cleaned, nor exposed to any great degree to the elements. Many of the names and lines of verse are in excellent condition, although some marks are layered above others, presumably from lack of space (Figure 389).

Most of the graffiti are concentrated on the interior of the upper courses of the east side of the North Porch, that is, on the surfaces still accessible from the loft after the collapse of the west half of the North Porch. In the early 19th century, access to the loft was via a ladder in the northeast corner of the porch, as depicted in Cockerell, *The Loft in the North Portico*, 1811-1814 (Figure 47). Hansen, *Inside the North Portico of the Erechtheion*, 1835-1836 (Figure 70), shows the remainder of the loft after the war and the reason for the clustering of the extant graffiti in the east half of the North Portico: only the east half of the loft still existed! Both the creamy and blackened marble surfaces of the upper courses of the North Porch remained accessible until the vault (and hence the loft) was removed in 1845.

In 2001-2002, there was scaffolding in the North Porch in order to give access to the roof for the important repairs carried out by the Committee for the Preservation of the Akropolis Monuments. The 1st Ephorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities kindly granted me permission to climb the scaffolding and take photographs of the graffiti.

Using these photographs, as well as those taken in the early 20th century for other purposes, many of the names and doodles from among the myriad of scratches and squiggles have been deciphered.¹⁰⁶ The results are presented in Appendix E.

In general, most of the graffiti consist of names, very often accompanied by the year. The earliest date is 1820, the latest, 1899. The most active era for writing dates was in the 1830s and 1840s.¹⁰⁷

There were several surprises among the graffiti. Intriguing is the signature of Giovanni Andreoli, the Italian sculptor who restored Maiden #6 when Paccard restored the Maiden Porch in the 1846-1847 (Figure 386 and Figure 388).¹⁰⁸ Other recognizable names include the authors of Chenavard, Rey, and Dalgabio 1849. The marks, “Chenavard *architecte*, Rey *peintre* and Dalgabio *architecte*” are preserved on NN.07.07 in each man’s own hand within an indented frame (Figure 390). A date of 1843 is written above the names, and below, that they are all from Lyon, where their book, *Voyage en Grèce*, was published.¹⁰⁹

Several of these graffiti artists signed their names more than once, even twice in the same year, on consecutive visits: e.g., the Kaloudis (brothers?) (1868, 1875, 1899).¹¹⁰ Some travelers had more than one attempt at writing their name. Annibale Piernovelli

¹⁰⁶ The following photographs in the ASCSA Photo Archive were particularly helpful: AK 33 (Figure 386), AK 34 (Figure 387), and AK 36 (Figure 388).

¹⁰⁷ It is interesting to note that there are five dated signatures during the War of Independence, and all were carved before the North Porch’s collapse in 1827. There is a hiatus after this time until 1832, when travelers returned to the Akropolis. Despite the removal of the loft during the clearance of the North Porch in 1844-1845 (see above “Archaeologists and Architects 1840-1853”), travelers continued to write their names in the upper reaches of the North Porch.

¹⁰⁸ On block PS.AA.04. On Andreoli and the restoration of the Maiden Porch, see above “Archaeologists and Architects 1840-1853”; Brouskari 1968; and Brouskari 1984.

¹⁰⁹ On Chenavard and Rey, see above “Archaeologists and Architects 1840-1853.”

¹¹⁰ Κοστάκης Δ. Καλούδης 1868, Κ.Δ.Κ 1868, and Π. Καλούδης 1899 on PS.AA.03, Middle Fascia; Παναγιώτης Δ. Καλούδης 1875 on NN.05.04; Π. Καλούδης 1899 on NN.06.06. The last time Panayiotis Kaloudis wrote his name (1899) coincided with when Balanos had erected scaffolding in the North Porch, long after the vault had been removed.

Formatore Romano was apparently unsatisfied with his first effort on PS.AA.03. He wrote his first name and then scratched it out (Figure 407). He then found a better spot on the blank band above the anthemion of the epikranitis of NN.05.06 (Figure 371). Two fish, overtly Christian symbols, are found on NN.06.05, one with the name of W. Renaud inside it. These fish are now invisible and can only be seen in an early photograph courtesy of the ASCSA archives (Figure 386). Other travelers, perhaps overcome by Romanticism, seem to have attempted to write various letters of their names in Greek letters, with varying degrees of success.¹¹¹ At least one woman made it up into the North Porch loft: Eliza Claire Fabreguette in 1834 (Figure 398).

Some of the graffiti and dipinti offer a great deal of information. For example, on PE.AA.01: J. Hollinsworth//HM. Ship Kent//17th Sept^e 1851 (Figure 395). Hollinsworth may have been a sailor on the HMS Kent, built in 1799, with a maiden voyage in 1800.¹¹²

As discussed in Chapter VII, two travelers remarked that Lord Byron signed his name inconspicuously on the back of one of the column capitals, but did not specify which one. After examining each of the capitals carefully, only one signature was found on the inside of a capital, that of a certain BALU, perhaps Theodore Ballu who drew a restoration of the Erechtheion in the later 19th century (Figure 441).¹¹³

There are many other examples of graffiti in the North Porch, of which only a few have been commented upon here. The remainder, with preliminary analyses of a few, can be found in Appendix E. There is other graffiti from the 19th century on other parts

¹¹¹ The level of consistency among the Hellenized names varies greatly, e.g., Γ.C. LANG on NN.06.06.

¹¹² KENT - 1800-1801 (Green Book - Underwriters); Master: Captain R. Rivington; Rigging: Ship; sheathed in copper; Tonnage: 820 tons; Construction: 1799 River; Managing owner: H. Bonham; Voyage: sailed for Bengal & Bencoolen on May 3, 1800; (Red Book - Shipowners); Rigging: Ship; Tonnage: 800 tons; <http://www.webruler.com/gprovost/ShipsK.htm>; accessed August 8, 2003.

It is worthwhile noting that this dipinto is very close to the graffito of the two ships discussed in Chapter V.

¹¹³ Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994, p. 230, note 126.

of the Erechtheion as well. The Maiden Porch attracted the sharp tools of many visitors. The clearest graffito was carved by RENOUX[IR] on the right thigh of Maiden # 2 (Figure 252).

In the 20th century, many more visitors to the Erechtheion left their marks in a newly accessible and significantly less lofty part of the North Porch, namely in the underground passage and connection to the Byzantine cistern east of the North Porch (Figure 466). While the Nazis occupied the Akropolis between 1941 and 1944, Herr Bentsch Baldes inscribed his name on June 3, 1941. Next to this graffito are the happy marks of lovers and visitors from as far away as Norway.

There is a photo in the archives of the DAI in Athens of the artificial stone copy of the Maiden #3 in place in the South Porch that shows a swastika carved into her left cheek (Figure 269).¹¹⁴ The German photographer Hege took this photo between 1930 and 1940, that is, before the German occupation, thus providing a terminus ante quem of 1940 for the carving of the swastika. The question is, did the anonymous Nazi-sympathizer deliberately choose to deface this specific maiden, whose different hue betrayed it as the replacement for the Maiden widely known to have been removed by Lord Elgin, and hence strongly associated with Britain?¹¹⁵ If this is so, then this graffito demonstrates in no uncertain terms the strength of the nationalistic associations that revolved around the Erechtheion during its long existence as a temple, church, house,

¹¹⁴ The terracotta copy that had been sent by the British Government in 1846 for Paccard's restoration of the Maiden Porch had been destroyed in 1912: Paton et al. 1927, p. 579.

¹¹⁵ The commentaries in almost every traveler's journal on Elgin's activities, as well as the debate played out in the Greek and foreign press, attest to the widespread acquaintance with the issues surrounding the Elgin marbles, of which the portions from the Erechtheion were an integral part: see St. Clair 1997 and Chapter VII. On the debate's change in focus to the Parthenon, see note 83.

ruin, and resurrected monument so closely associated with the ideals of both ancient and modern Greece.¹¹⁶

The documentation of the graffiti on the Erechtheion adds a valuable additional dimension to the biography and social life of the Erechtheion and sheds light on the human compulsion to include oneself in its history.

CONCLUSION

This chapter summarized the history of the Erechtheion from 1833 to 1853; presented previously unexamined images and accounts by early travelers; and considered the reasons for the adoption of the Erechtheion Ionic order in the new buildings of a liberated Athens. The 19th and 20th century graffiti were also presented and discussed.

The clearance of the post-Classical remains as soon as the Greeks had regained control of the Akropolis was a part of a concerted effort to redefine the country's history in order to fit its vision for its own future. That future was going to be based on a past consisting of the Classical period and the Byzantine Empire.¹¹⁷ The Erechtheion's role in this self-image and national identity was, and continued to be, important in the 20th century. For example, in 1922, Greek historian Demetrios Gregoriou Kampouroglou recounted that “during the War of Independence the olive tree next to the Erechtheion was burnt. During the following years, however, the tree revived, which was considered a miracle.”¹¹⁸ The contemporary paintings show that there was no olive tree growing in the vicinity of the Erechtheion prior to the War of Independence, nor after. An olive tree

¹¹⁶ Semioticians would find many layers of connotive signifiers in this situation: a modern cast of a maiden inserted into an ancient building, inscribed with an ancient symbol that had acquired an entirely new connotation. On the significance of the Byzantine, Frankish and Ottoman accretions to the Western European archaeologists, architects, and king, as well as the recently freed Greek people, see above “The First *Anastylosis*.”

¹¹⁷ Yalouri 2001, p. 36.

¹¹⁸ Kampouroglou 1922, cited by Yalouri 2001, p. 146.

was, however, planted west of the Erechtheion on February 22, 1917. Perhaps this young olive tree fuelled Kampouroglou's imagination, and inspired him to mimic Herodotos' story about its miraculous recovery after having been burnt by the Persians. He also adapts the story of the Erechtheion maidens mourning for their sister; they were apparently revived by the abduction so that they could be heard lamenting their loss every night.¹¹⁹ This story derives from an event that took place over a century earlier. In both cases, the longevity of these legends, whose origins have been examined in this study, demonstrates the tenacity of the Erechtheion in the consciousness of the Greeks, and speaks to the role the building and the sculptures played in the construction of their national identity in the face of different kinds of enemies. Kampouroglou equated the Ottomans with the Persians by adopting this anecdote from Herodotos, and in so doing, used the immolation of Athena's (i.e., Wisdom, Freedom) sacred olive tree (in spite of it not actually being there) as a metaphor for the destruction of the whole Akropolis and the suppression of the Greek spirit. As for the mourning sisters, the insult of Lord Elgin's actions toward the Erechtheion were still strongly felt in the early 20th century, and like any good myth, it continued to metamorphose over time to serve a contemporary purpose.

The exploitation of the monuments on the Akropolis by both Greek and foreign politicians, artists, writers, advertisers, dancers, and unions has been examined in recent years.¹²⁰ While many of these works mention the Erechtheion, the Parthenon remains the focus of reception studies of the Akropolis in studies such as Yalouris'.¹²¹ Most of what

¹¹⁹ Kampouroglous 1922, cited by Yalouri 2001, p. 146.

¹²⁰ Tournikiotis 1994.

¹²¹ Yalouri 2001. Most of the figures in her book depict only the Parthenon, and the captions read, "Acropolis": e.g., Yalouri 2001, p. 197, fig. 7.2.

can be said about the reception of the Parthenon also applies to the Erechtheion because both monuments have always held a special place in the hearts of the Greeks.

As Yalouri says: “History is an essential element in the cohesion of a nation. Lacking a national history means lacking the grounds for national recognition.”¹²² The Erechtheion, as one of the primary and most familiar symbols of ancient Greek culture, has been continuously used as an emblem of this history, both in Greece and abroad. The quotation of the Erechtheion by virtue of one of its elements, usually the Maiden Porch either in part or as a whole, serves as evidence for the nation’s power to survive any challenge in the face of adversity (e.g., Ottomans, Nazis, civil war). These stone *korai* of Athens had survived the vicissitudes of time and changing tides of occupation relatively intact. This longevity acquires “symbolic capital,”¹²³ and this capital can be spent as currency to promote various causes, e.g., national unity, tourism, or ethics.¹²⁴

The Erechtheion was the first monument on the Akropolis to be restored using modern principles, the latest technology, and materials by the Akropolis Restoration Service between 1979 and 1986. This pioneering work demonstrated the country’s ability to protect and display its heritage, and this was the catalyst for further research and restoration of the other Akropolis monuments. The contribution of the restoration of the Erechtheion was recognized on the world stage: the Akropolis became a UNESCO World Heritage site in 1987, the year after work on the Erechtheion was completed. The only non-national funding Akropolis Restoration Service receives is from UNESCO, as it is

¹²² Yalouri 2001, p. 50.

¹²³ Hamilakis and Yalouri 1996.

¹²⁴ By ethics, in this context, is meant international antiquities law. See Yalouri 2001, p. 102; Hamilakis and Yalouri 1996.

believed that monies from other sources (especially commercial) will detract from the integrity of the Akropolis monuments and pollute them with commodification.¹²⁵

The Erechtheion continues to play a major role (alongside the Parthenon) in the historical and nationalistic exploitation of the Akropolis. The ideology of nationalism has been compared to the system of kinship: Greece's children are its antiquities and the key to its wealth.¹²⁶ Having endured both the zeniths and nadirs of Greece's history, the Erechtheion has acquired an "inalienable wealth" that passes from generation to generation.¹²⁷ The Erechtheion is an important member of this family, and a source of polyvalent historical and cultural significance that must be nurtured and protected for future generations.

¹²⁵ Yalouri 2001, p. 105.

¹²⁶ Yalouri 2001, pp. 65-66, 68-69.

¹²⁷ Weiner 1985; Weiner 1992.

CHAPTER IX – CONCLUSION

Each of the previous seven chapters contains a conclusion at its end which summarizes the main themes concerning the reception of the temple, both locally and abroad as relevant to the evidence, during the cultural horizon under discussion. This chapter highlights the main contributions from each of the previous chapters, and proceeds to develop the most important themes from a broader chronological perspective.

The contextualized holistic diachronic approach used in this study has resulted in new discoveries. Using this approach, the archaeological, epigraphical, and literary evidence from all periods under discussion, namely the 5th century B.C. through the 19th century A.D., have been organized and interpreted in a more meaningful way than previously accomplished. For example, from an architectural perspective, it would have been impossible to work out how the Erechtheion was transformed into a Frankish residence without understanding all the changes that occurred previously in the Hellenistic, Roman, Byzantine periods, and subsequently, in the Ottoman and Venetian periods. Similarly, it has formerly been impossible to understand the true nature of the conflation of the term “caryatid” with the Erechtheion maidens before this study treated the archaeological and literary evidence diachronically and using reception theory.

The focus of this study was originally meant to be on the Post-Antique changes to the Erechtheion. Chapters II-IV were required to provide a background for these later phases of the temple; nevertheless, several of the most important contributions of this study have come from these earlier chapters.

The main contribution of Chapter II on the Classical Erechtheion was a new reconstruction of the interior of the Erechtheion and the re-allocation of cults within it

(Figure 542). In brief, the altars of Erechtheus, Hephaistos and Boutes, and the salt-sea of Poseidon were allocated to the east part of the Erechtheion, and the statue of Athena Polias to the west part, with the North Porch serving as the main entrance to the temple. This reconstruction represents the result of a re-examination and reinterpretation of the architectural evidence, in particular on the interior of the temple, as well as a fresh interpretation of the literary and epigraphical evidence, compiled and presented thematically, and then chronologically, in Appendix A. Instead of starting with Pausanias' description of the temple, as most previous reconstructions do, his account was instead used to test the hypothesis proposed in the new reconstruction. Pausanias' account was found to be sympathetic to the new reconstruction, and did not require a single piece of currently available evidence to be explained away or dismissed.

Chapter III examined the changes to the Erechtheion during the Late Classical and Hellenistic periods. The Erechtheion suffered from fires soon after it was built. A major fire damaged the West Façade so severely that the entire colonnade and entablature was replaced. Repairs were also made to the North Door, the Maiden Porch, and the East Porch. This major fire has previously been attributed to the chaos resulting from the Sullan sack of Athens in 86 B.C., and the major repair it necessitated to the Augustan period. The historical evidence for this sequence of events is unlikely. Chapter III redated both the fire and the repair to the 3rd and 2nd centuries, respectively, by finding clues among well-known epigraphic and archaeological evidence. The fire is instead to be associated with the severe decline in the worship of Athena Polias in the second quarter of the 3rd century, and the repair is to be associated with the rise in the cult of Athena, as evidenced by increased votive dedications and the addition of the annual peplos to the

Panathenaia in the second half of the 2nd century B.C. Epigraphical evidence also points to repairs taking place on the Akropolis during this period. The style of the repaired moldings and clamps confirm this redating of the fire as well.

Chapter III also demonstrated that Balanos' reconstruction of a plain Eleusinian frieze on the West Façade (endorsed by Paton et al. and retained in the most recent *anastylosis*) is flawed. Close examination of the earliest depictions of the Erechtheion prove that the (repaired) frieze blocks of the West Façade contained dowel holes for the attachment of sculpture. The reused statue bases that are presently in the frieze course of the West Façade are not a part of the major repair. Another structural conundrum was also reassessed, namely the date and function of the slit windows in the North and South Walls. These have been redated from the Byzantine period (Paton et al.) and the Classical period (Papanikolaou) to the Hellenistic period, and probably, as an accidental side-effect, contributed to the wave-sound phenomenon of the salt-sea of Poseidon described by Pausanias in the 2nd century A.D.

The main contributions of Chapter IV are the relocation of the Monopteros of Rome and Augustus to a position east of the Erechtheion, rather than east of the Parthenon where it is usually restored; a reconsideration of Pausanias' tour of the Akropolis in light of its topography in the 2nd century A.D.; and the discussion of the origin of the association of Vitruvius' term "caryatid" with the maidens of the South Porch of the Erechtheion. By analyzing the ancient archaeological and literary evidence for female architectural supports diachronically and contextually, and by applying reception theory, the conflation of the Vitruvian term "caryatid" with the Erechtheion maidens, called *korai* in the building accounts, can be attributed to the late 1st century

B.C. when the Erechtheion maidens first appear as symbols of submission and humiliation in Augustan (and Agrippan) monuments in Rome.

Chapters V-VIII examined the Erechtheion in the Post-Antique period. The last time a holistic diachronic study of the Erechtheion was attempted was in the early 20th century. The authors of *The Erechtheum* published almost every aspect of the ancient temple, and used the documents produced by the early modern travelers known at that time to outline the later history of the monument. While the focus of that study was on the Classical temple, the focus of this study has been on the alterations to the temple since its construction.

The most recent *anastylosis* in the 1970s and 1980s restored several blocks to their correct position in the ancient building: this has allowed the post-Classical cuttings in the fabric of the temple to be reconsidered. By analyzing all of these cuttings together, it was possible to construct a typology of Post-Antique cuttings that describes the characteristics of Byzantine door and ceiling-beam cuttings; two phases of Frankish door, ceiling-beam, roof, and window cuttings; and Ottoman ceiling-beam cuttings (Figure 592). This typology is not only applicable to the Erechtheion, but also to other ancient Athenian buildings which continued to stand after Antiquity. Using the typology developed in this study, it should now be possible to discern the dates and understand the nature of these other buildings' Post-Antique alterations.

Chapter V examined the Erechtheion in the Late Antique and Byzantine periods. The incorporation of new research on early Christian churches, together with an analysis of the cuttings on the temple, resulted in the discernment of three phases (rather than two) for the conversion of the Erechtheion into a three-aisled basilica church. A re-

examination of the early excavation notebooks led to an improved understanding of the water-supply in the immediate vicinity of the Erechtheion during this period. Three graffiti of ships were discovered in the upper reaches of the North Porch. Their context, features, and cutting style were examined, and it was concluded that they formed part of the Byzantine phenomenon of carving ships on churches, probably by sea-farers seeking protection for their lives and cargos.

The possibility that the Erechtheion was a Frankish residence for the Catholic bishop had never been fully argued or discussed before now. In Chapter VI, the typology of cuttings was used not only to work out the patterns of circulation and the interior divisions of the household, but also to detect two distinct phases in the existence of the Erechtheion as a residence in the Frankish period. In general, the tri-partite basilica form was maintained on the interior with some alterations; the North Porch was fully enclosed and lit by large pointed arched windows in two of the northern intercolumniations; a major, multi-roomed, three-story structure was added to the north side of the North Wall; a strong room was built onto the west side of the North Porch and West Façade; and the Maiden Porch was converted into the residence's main entrance.

The Ottomans did not make many alterations to the Erechtheion when they took over the Akropolis and continued to use the temple as a house. Chapter VII discerned the minor changes made during this period, namely the addition of a cistern under the West Corridor, and perhaps the construction of a structure along the exterior of the South Wall. Analysis of the earliest descriptions of the Akropolis by early modern travelers resulted in the conclusion that the Erechtheion was rarely, if ever, mentioned because of the many accretions concealing it and the many buildings in close proximity surrounding it. When

the first travelers visited Athens, the Erechtheion was concealed on its north and south by large structures, the intercolumniations of the East and North Porches were filled in, and there was a large building immediately west of the Erechtheion.

Many of these accretions and the surrounding buildings were destroyed during the Venetian siege and bombardment of the Akropolis in 1687. The temple itself also sustained damage, in particular to the east side of the Maiden Porch. The date of the vault in the North Porch, constructed to protect the gunpowder stored within it, was narrowed down by this study to the six-month Venetian occupation of the Akropolis. When the Ottomans regained control of the Akropolis in 1688, the temple was no longer fit for domestic purposes because the North Addition had been destroyed and the interior divisions demolished. The Erechtheion was otherwise still relatively intact except for the roof over the main building. The North Porch continued to serve as a gunpowder magazine for the Ottomans during their second occupation of the Akropolis, as well as during the War of Independence.

The descriptions and depictions of the early travelers to Athens document the gradual disintegration of the temple. New documentary evidence in the form of previously unexamined depictions and descriptions of the Erechtheion by early travelers were sought out and discovered in various European libraries and museums. These new additions to the corpus of evidence, in conjunction with this study's diachronic approach, have allowed for a much more refined understanding of the Post-Antique history of the Erechtheion, especially for the Ottoman period.

The depictions of the Erechtheion dated between 1749 and 1853 (the chronological endpoint of this study) were processed in detail on specially developed

grid-sheets (Figure 553-Figure 563), on which was noted the condition and presence of each block. The data from the grid sheets was entered into a computer database. This database allowed the presence or absence of individual blocks at specific points in time to be determined. At the same time, an accurate block-by-block three-dimensional CAD model of the Erechtheion was constructed using the same unique identifiers for each block as on the grid sheets.¹ The database (comprised of a binary code representing each block's presence or absence at a given time) was then used to drive the CAD model and reconstruct the states of the building between 1749 and 1853 (Figure 578-Figure 587). Although other authors have attempted computer reconstructions of ancient buildings, the Erechtheion included, they almost always represent the buildings at one moment in time, usually fully reconstructed, as they stood in Antiquity. The unique contribution of this study has been to show the importance of the separation of spatial and temporal information, and how these can be combined in a powerful way to navigate a building in both space and time. This type of model has major potential as a scholarly and teaching tool. For example, it can be expanded and developed into a valuable instrument for demonstrating different theories on the reconstruction of the Akropolis at different periods.

Chapter VII also investigated the main causes for the gradual disintegration of the Erechtheion, namely the search for the metal clamps between the blocks to make ammunition, and many travelers' inability to resist taking a piece of sculpture or molding home with them. This physical transportation of parts of the Erechtheion represents just one of the many modes of transmission of the Erechtheion's features to Western Europe.

¹ This same CAD model constitutes the basis of the computer generated models of the Erechtheion during other cultural horizons, e.g., the Second Frankish period (Figure 576).

This study examined these modes (i.e., cast making, individual architects' detailed drawings, early publications of moldings and plans of the Erechtheion) to determine the processes by which features of the Erechtheion were accurately (and not so accurately) incorporated into the Neoclassical buildings of Europe. This study also examined the aesthetic reception of the Erechtheion by those who interacted with the temple directly. The architects and antiquarians were generally the most critical of maidens, the temple's proportions and architectural moldings, while the travelers on the Grand Tour, under the influence of Romanticism, were generally the most enthusiastic about expressing their aesthetic pleasure. The political ramifications of Lord Elgin's removal of Maiden #3 and other architectural members of the Erechtheion were also assessed for their long-term impact on the international reputation and social life of the Erechtheion.

In addition to the ship graffiti discussed above, this study documented and analyzed the other graffiti on the Erechtheion in Chapter VIII. Most of this graffiti was clustered in the underground passage and the upper reaches of the North Porch. Some names corresponded with known individuals, including Andreoli, who worked on the restoration of the Maiden Porch in the 1840s, and Chenavard, Rey, and Dalgabio, who produced an exquisite set of draftsmanly engravings of the Erechtheion and other Athenian monuments. The other (otherwise unknown) names of varying nationalities constitute the only record of many whose very intimate interactions with the Erechtheion would otherwise remain undocumented. These graffiti mostly date to the years after the War of Independence when the temple played an important part in the development of the Greek nationalism and the architectural development of Neoclassical Athens.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agora XXIV* = A. Frantz, *Late Antiquity A.D. 267-700*, Princeton 1988.
- Agora XXX* = M. B. Moore, *Attic Red-Figured and White Ground Pottery*, Princeton 1997.
- Alchermes, J. 1994. "Spolia in Roman Cities of the Late Empire: Legislative Rationales and Architectural Reuse." *DOP* 48, pp. 167-178.
- Alcock, S. E., J. F. Cherry, and J. Elsner, eds. 2001. *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, Oxford.
- Alvarez Martínez, J. M. 1982. "El foro de Augusta Emerita," in *Homenaje a Sáenz de Buruaga*, Badajoz, pp. 53-82.
- _____. 1989. "El puente romano de Mérida," in *Primer Seminario Internacional Puente de Alcántara. Cuadernos de San Benito no. 1*, pp. 65-83.
- Alvarez Martínez, J. M., J. L. de la Barrera Antón, and A. V. Jiménez. 2000. *Mérida*, León, Spain.
- Alzinger, W. 1974. *Augusteische Architektur in Ephesos*, Vienna.
- Anderson, R. C. 1998. "The BE-BZ Roman Temple in the Athenian Agora: An Alternative Restoration Incorporating an Additional Step." Typescript.
- Andrews, K. 1979. *Athens Alive*, Athens.
- Angelomatis-Tsougarais, H. 1990. *The Eve of the Greek Revival: British Travellers' Perceptions of Early 19th Century Greece*, London.
- Anghelou, A. 1971. "Private Journal of a Voyage from Smyrna to Venice by J. O. Hanson." *BSA* 66, pp. 13-48.
- Anonymous. 1670. *Castelo di Atene come si ritrova nel presente ano 1670*, Disegno a penna raffigurante l'Acropoli e la valle dell'Illisso. Bassano, Museo Civico di Bassano del Grappa.
- _____. 1670. *Castelo di Atene come si ritrova nel presente ano 1670*, Disegno a penna raffigurante l'Acropoli e la valle dell'Illisso. Bonn, Academy Art Museum of the University of Bonn.
- _____. 1670. *Castelo di Atene come si ritrova nel presente ano 1670*, Stampa raffigurante l'Acropoli e la valle dell'Illisso. In Omont, *Athènes au XVIIe siècle*, 1898, pl. 29.

- Anonymous. ca. 1670. *Plan d'Athènes*. Colored Engraving. Athens, Benaki Museum.
- Anonymous. 1674. *Akropolis from the Northeast*. Ink on paper. Paris, Bibliothèque nationale de France, Ms. Suppl. grec 301 fol. 208^{vo}.
- Anonymous. ca. 1818. *View of the Erechtheion*, from the East-northeast. Watercolor. Athens, Museum of the City of Athens, inv. no. 245.
- Anonymous. 1838-1844. *The Erechtheion from the North*. Pencil on paper. Berlin, DAI Archive, Seite 33.
- _____. 1838-1844. *The Erechtheion from the West*. Pencil on paper. Berlin, DAI Archive, Seite 34.
- _____. 1838-1844. *Plan of the Erechtheion*. Pencil on paper. Berlin, DAI Archive, Seite 35.
- _____. 1838-1844. *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*. Pencil on paper. Berlin, DAI Archive, Seite 36.
- _____. 1838-1844. *Detail of the South Door of the Erechtheion from the North*. Pencil on paper. Berlin, DAI Archive, Seite 39.
- _____. 1838-1844. *The Interior of the Maiden Porch from the East*. Pencil on paper. Berlin, DAI Archive, Seite 40.
- Anonymous. 1855. *The Erectheum in 1855, Seen from the East*. Engraving. In Hobhouse 1855, I, p. 301.
- _____. 1855. *The Erectheum in 1855, Seen from the West*. Engraving. In Hobhouse 1855, I, p. 299.
- Anonymous. ca. 1880. *Erechtheion*, from the West. Albumen print. Los Angeles, Getty Research Institute, no. 92.R.84 (04.06.26).
- Aquilué, X., X. Dupré, J. Massó, and J. R. de Arbulo. 1991. *Tarraco: Guía Arqueológica*, Tarragona.
- Arafat, K. W. 1996. *Pausanias' Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers*, Cambridge.
- Archaeological Society of Athens. 1853. *Πρακτικά τῆς ἐπὶ τοῦ Ἐρεχθείου ἐπιτροπῆς, ἢ ἀναγραφὴ τῆς ἀληθοῦς καταστάσεως τοῦ Ἐρεχθείου γενομένη κατ' ἐντολὴν τοῦ Ἀρχαιολογικοῦ Συλλόγου καὶ ἐκδοθεῖσα δαπανῆσι τῆς Ἀρχαιολογικῆς Ἐταιρίας*, Athens.
- Arundale, F. 1834. *View of the Temple of Erectheus at Athens*, from the north. Pencil drawing. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, no. 1950 12-13 1.

- _____. 1834. *View of the Temples of the Parthenon and the Erectheum*. Pencil drawing. London, British Museum, no. 1950 12-13.2.
- Athanasίου, K. ca. 1880. *The Erechtheion and the Parthenon*, from the west. Albumen print. Paris, Collection Haris Yiakoumis.
- Athanassopoulou, E. F. 2002. "An 'Ancient' Landscape: European Ideals, Archaeology, and Nation Building in Early Modern Greece." *JMGS* 20, pp. 273-305.
- Atkins. 1801. *The Erechtheion from the Southwest*. Athens, Benaki Museum, Room 22, Case 4, #3.
- Aubert, J.-J. 1994. *Business Managers in Ancient Rome: a Social and Economic Study of Institores, 200 B.C.-A.D. 250*, Leiden.
- Augustinos, O. 1994. *French Odysseys: Greece in French Travel Literature from the Renaissance to the Romantic Era*, Baltimore.
- Aurigemma, S. 1996. *Villa Adriana*, Rome.
- Austin, C. 1968. *Nova Fragmenta Euripidea in Papyris Reperta*, Berlin.
- Babin, J. P. 1674. *Relation de l'état présent de la ville d'Athènes* (Blackmer 59), Lyons.
- _____. 1674. *Vüe d'Athenes dont une partie est cachée derriere la colline*. Engraving. in *Relation de l'état présent de la ville d'Athènes*.
- Badian, E. 1972. *Publicans and Sinners: Private Enterprise in the Service of the Roman Republic*, Ithaca.
- Bailey, D. M. 1972. *Greek and Roman Pottery Lamps*, London.
- Baird, H. M. 1856. *Modern Greece: a Narrative of a Residence and Travels in that Country* (Blackmer 64), New York.
- Balanos, N. 1938. *Les monuments de l'Acropole, relèvement et conservation*, Paris.
- Baldassarri, P. 1995. "Augustus soter: Ipotesi sul monopteros dell'acropoli Ateniese." *Ostraka* 4, pp. 69-83.
- _____. 1998. *Sebastoi sotéri: edilizia monumentale ad Atene durante il saeculum Augustum*, Rome.
- Bance. ca. 1794. *Gallerie d'architecture de M. Cassas*. Watercolor. Tours, Musée des Beaux-Arts, no. 981-3-1.
- Baram, U. and L. Carroll, eds. 2000. *A Historical Archaeology of the Ottoman Empire*, New York and London.

- Barletta, B. 2001. *The Origins of the Greek Architectural Orders*, Cambridge.
- Barthélemy, J.-J. 1799. *Plan d'Athènes Pour le Voyage du Jeune Anacharsis*. Engraving. In *Recueil de cartes géographiques, plans, vue et médailles de l'ancienne Grèce, relatifs au voyage du jeune Anacharsis*, Paris.
- _____. 1799. *Recueil de cartes géographiques, plans, vue et médailles de l'ancienne Grèce, relatifs au voyage du jeune Anacharsis*, Paris.
- _____. 1799. *Vue perspective du Parthénon*. In *Recueil de cartes géographiques, plans, vue et médailles de l'ancienne Grèce, relatifs au voyage du jeune Anacharsis*, Paris.
- _____. 1784. *Voyage du jeune Anacharsis en Grèce*, London.
- Basevi, G. 1818. *Erechtheion from the North*. Pencil and Watercolor. London, Sir John Soane's Museum, no. 44-3/15.
- _____. 1818. *The Interior of the Erechtheion from the Northwest*. Pencil on paper. London, Sir John Soane's Museum, no. 44-3/14.
- _____. 1818. *Parthenon Viewed from the Inside Looking North*, with the Erechtheion in the background. Pencil on Paper. London, Sir John Soane's Museum, no. 44-3/11.
- _____. 1818. *West Façade of the Erechtheion*. Pencil on paper. London, Sir John Soane's Museum, no. 44-3.
- _____. July 5, 1818. Letter to his Mother. Sir John Soane's Museum Archive.
- _____. July 30, 1818. Letter to Nat. Sir John Soane's Museum Archive.
- _____. August 10, 1818. Letter to his Mother. Sir John Soane's Museum Archive.
- _____. August 28, 1818. Letter to his Mother. Sir John Soane's Museum Archive.
- _____. 1819. Letter to Sir John Soane. Sir John Soane's Museum Archive.
- Bass, G. 1974. *A History of Seafaring*, London.
- Bastéa, E. 2000. *The Creation of Modern Athens: Planning the Myth*, Cambridge.
- Bendtsen, M. 1993. *Sketches and Measurements: Danish Architects in Greece 1818-1862*, Copenhagen.
- Bennet, J., J. L. Davis, and F. Zarinebaf-Shahr. 2000. "Sir William Gell's Itinerary in the Pylia and Regional Landscapes in the Morea in the Second Ottoman Period." *Hesperia* 69, pp. 343-380.

- Bergdoll, B. 1994. *Karl Friedrich Schinkel: An Architecture for Prussia*, New York.
- Beschi, L. 2002. "L'acropoli di Atene in una veduta del 1670." *NumAntCl* 31, pp. 347-358.
- Beulé, C.-E. 1853-1854. *L'Acropole d'Athènes* (Blackmer 135), Paris.
- Bieber, M. 1977. *Ancient Copies*, New York.
- Binder, W. 1969. *Der Roma-Augustus Monopteros auf der Akropolis in Athen und sein typologischer Ort*, Stuttgart.
- Biris, K. H. 1959. *Τὰ Ἀττικά τοῦ Ἐβλίου Τζελεμπή*, Athens.
- Biris, M. 2001. *Νεοκλασσική αρχιτεκτονική στην Ελλάδα*, Athens.
- Bisani, A. 1793. *A Picturesque Tour Through Part of Europe, Asia, and Africa: Containing Many New Remarks on the Present State of Society, Remains of Ancient Edifices, &c. With plates, after designs by James Stuart. Written by an Italian gentleman* (Blackmer 146, Atabey 109), London.
- Blaquière, E. 1825. *Narrative of a Second Visit to Greece: Including Facts Connected with the Last Days of Lord Byron; Extracts from Correspondence, Official Documents, &c.* (Blackmer 150, Atabey 117) 1, London.
- Blomfeld. 1826. "Some Remarks on the Caryatides of Ancient Architecture." *Museum Criticum* 2, pp. 400-402.
- Boardman, J. 1972. "Hercules, Peisistratos and Sons." *RA* 1972, pp. 57-72.
- _____. 1975. "Hercules, Peisistratos and Eleusis." *JHS* 95, pp. 1-12.
- _____. 1984. "Images and Politics in Sixth Century Athens," in *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery: Proceedings of the International Vase Symposium in Amsterdam, 12-15 April 1984*, H. A. G. Brijder, ed., Amsterdam.
- _____. 1989. "Hercules, Peisistratos and the Unconvinced." *JHS* 109, pp. 159-163.
- _____. 2002. *The Archaeology of Nostalgia: How the Greeks Re-created their Mythological Past*, London.
- Boas, A. J. 1999. *Crusader Archaeology: The Material Culture of the Latin East*, London.
- Boatwright, M. T. 2000. *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*, Princeton and Oxford.
- Bodnar, E. W. 1960. *Cyriacus of Ancona and Athens*, 43, Collection Latonus. Brussels.

- _____. 1970. "Athens in April 1436." *Archaeology* 23, pp. 188-199, 96-105.
- Bolton, A. T. 1922. *The Architecture of Robert and James Adam*, Woodbridge, Suffolk.
- _____. 1926. *Architectural Education a Century Ago: Being an Account of the Office of Sir John Soane, R.A., Architect of the Bank of England, with Special Reference to the Career of George Basevi, his Pupil, Architect of the Fitzwilliam Museum at Cambridge*, London.
- Bommelaer, J.-F. 1991. *Guide de Delphes - le site*, Paris.
- Borchhardt, J. 1976. *Die Bauskulptur des Heroons von Limyra: das Grabmal des lykischen Königs Perikles*, Berlin.
- _____. 1990. *Götter, Heroen, Herrscher in Lykien*, Vienna.
- _____. 1993. *Die Steine von Zemuri: archaeologische Forschungen an den verborgenen Wassern von Limyra*, Vienna.
- _____. 1999. *Limyra*, Istanbul.
- Boulter, P. N. 1970. "The Frieze of the Erechtheion." *AntP* 10, pp. 7-28.
- Bouras, C., ed. 2003. *Athens: From the Classical Period to the Present Day (5th Century B.C.-A.D. 2000)*, New Castle, Del.
- _____. 2003. "Middle Byzantine Athens: Planning and Architecture," in *Athens: from the Classical period to the Present Day (5th Century B.C.-A.D. 2000)*, C. Bouras, ed., New Castle, Del., pp. 220-245.
- Bowden, W. 2003. *Epirus Vetus: the Archaeology of a Late Antique Province*, London.
- Boyardjief, S. 1977. "L'Erechthéion à la lumière de nouvelles données," in *Atti del XVI Congresso di storia dell'architettura 1969*, Roma, pp. 265-280.
- Bracebridge, C. H. April 17, 1837. *Patterns and Colours from the Erechtheum, 1837*. Manuscript Letter. London, Library of the Royal Institute of British Architects.
- Bracebridge, S. 1837. *The Erechtheion and the Parthenon from the East*. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, Inv. E.2090-1931.
- _____. 1837. *The Erechtheion and the Parthenon from the West*. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. E.2084-1931.
- _____. 1839. *Notes Descriptive of a Panoramic Sketch of Athens, Taken May, 1839. Sold in Aid of the Funds of the London Benevolent Repository* (Blackmer 193), London.
- Bracken, C. P. 1975. *Antiquities Acquired, the Spoliation of Greece*. North Pomfret, Vt.

- Breton, E. 1868. *Athènes décrite et dessinée* (Blackmer 199), Paris.
- _____. ca. 1855. *Façade occidentale de l'Érechthéion*. Engraving. Athens, in Breton, E. 1868. *Athènes décrite et dessinée*. Paris.
- _____. ca. 1855. *Plan de l'Érechthéion*. Engraving. Athens, in Breton 1868. *Athènes décrite et dessinée*. Paris.
- _____. ca. 1855. *Porte septentrionale de l'Érechthéion*. Engraving. Athens, in Breton 1868. *Athènes décrite et dessinée*. Paris.
- _____. ca. 1855. *Portique des caryatides*. Engraving. in Breton 1868. *Athènes décrite et dessinée*. Paris.
- _____. ca. 1855. *Portique orientale de l'Érechthéion*. Engraving. Athens, in Breton 1868. *Athènes décrite et dessinée*. Paris.
- Brewer, D. 2001. *The Flame of Freedom: The Greek War of Independence 1821 -1833*, London.
- Broneer, O. 1933. "Excavations on the North Slope of the Acropolis in Athens, 1931-1932." *Hesperia* 2, pp. 329-417.
- _____. 1935. "Excavations on the North Slope of the Acropolis in Athens, 1934-1935." *Hesperia* 4, pp. 109-188.
- _____. 1939. "A Mycenaean Fountain on the Athenian Acropolis." *Hesperia* 8, pp. 317-429.
- Brookes, M., trans. 1922. *Ovid. Metamorphoses*, Boston.
- Broucke, P. B. F. J. 1998. "The Caryatids from Hadrian's Villa at Tivoli and the Pantheon of Agrippa," *100th Annual Meeting of the Archaeological Institute of America*.
- Brouskari, M. 1963. "Kopffragment einer Erechtheion-Kore." *AM* 78, pp. 173-5.
- _____. 1968. "Η έκτη Καρυάτης." *AAA* 1, pp. 61-64.
- _____. 1974. *The Acropolis Museum*, Athens.
- _____. 1984. "Bemerkungen über die vierte und fünfte Karyatide des Erechtheion." *Jahrbuch des Oesterrreichische Arch. Instit.* 55, pp. 55-62.
- _____. 1997. *The Monuments of the Acropolis*, Athens.
- Brown, K. S. and Y. Hamilakis, eds. 2003. *The Usable Past: Greek Metahistories*, New York and Oxford.

- Brown, P. F. 1996. *Venice and Antiquity: the Venetian Sense of the Past*, New Haven.
- Brown, W. C. 1936. "The Popularity of English Travel Books about the Near East, 1775-1825." *PQ* 15, pp. 70-80.
- Brulé, P. 1996. "La cité en ses composantes: remarques sur les sacrifices et la procession des Panathénées." *Kernos* 9, pp. 37-63.
- Bruneau, P., and J. Ducat. 1983. *Guide de Délos*, Paris.
- Bruno, V. J. 1976. "Transformations of a God in Action," in *In Memoriam Otto J. Brendel: Essays in Archaeology and the Humanities*, L. Bonfante and H. von Heintze, eds., Mainz, pp. 55-67.
- _____. 1981. "The Painted Metopes at Lefkadia and the Problem of Color in Doric Sculptured Metopes." *AJA* 85, pp. 3-11.
- Buchon, J. A. 1843. *La Grèce continentale et la Morée. Voyage, séjour et études historiques en 1840 et 1841* (Blackmer 230), Paris.
- Buckley, T. 1996. *Aspects of Greek History: 750-323 B.C.*, London.
- Bundgaard, J. A. 1974. *The Excavation of the Athenian Acropolis 1882-1890*, Copenhagen.
- _____. 1976. *Parthenon and the Mycenaean City on the Heights*, Copenhagen.
- Burden, J. C. 1999. "Athens Remade in the Age of Augustus: A Study of the Architects and Craftsmen at Work" (diss. University of California at Berkeley).
- Burford, A. 1969. *The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros: a Social and Economic Study of Building in the Asklepien Sanctuary, During the Fourth and Early Third Centuries B.C.*, Toronto.
- Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Burt, J. O., trans. 1962. *Dinarchus. Minor Attic Orators in Two Volumes*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Caffi, I. 1843. *The Parthenon and the Erechtheion from the West*. Watercolor. Venice, Museo d'Arte Moderna di Ca' Pesaro.
- _____. 1843. *The Parthenon and the Erechtheum from the East*. Oil on canvas. Venice, Museo d'Arte Moderna Ca' Pesaro.
- Calder, W. M. 1969. "The Date of Euripides' *Erechtheus*." *GRBS* 10, pp. 147-156.
- _____. 1971. *GRBS* 12, pp. 492-495.

- Callebat, L., and P. Fleury. 1995. *Dictionnaire des termes techniques du De architectura de Vitruve*, Zurich.
- Camp, J. M. 1986. *The Athenian Agora: Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens*, London.
- _____. 2001. *The Archaeology of Athens*, New Haven and London.
- _____. 1990. *The Athenian Agora: A Guide to the Excavation and Museum*, Athens.
- Caraher, W. 2003. "Church, Society, and the Sacred in Early Christian Greece" (diss. Ohio State University).
- Carpenter, T. H. 1994. "Harmodios and Apollo in Fifth-Century Athens: What's in a Pose?," *Athenian Potters and Painters*, J. Oakley and W. Coulson, Athens, pp. 171-179.
- Carrey, J. 1674. *The Acropolis*, from the northeast. Oil. Athens, Chartres Museum.
- _____. 1674. *The Acropolis and the City of Athens from the Northeast*. Oil. Athens, National Gallery, on loan from Chartres Museum, France.
- Carroll, K. K. 1982. *The Parthenon Inscription*, Durham, N.C.
- Carter, J. C. 1983. *The Sculpture of the Sanctuary of Athena Polias at Priene*, Reports of the Research Committee of the Society of Antiquaries of London. XLII. London.
- Casanaki, M., and F. Mallouchou. 1985. *The Acropolis at Athens: Conservation, Restoration, and Research, 1975-1983*, Athens.
- Cassas, L.-F. 1786-1787. *The Erechtheion from the Southwest*. Colored engraving. Athens, Benaki Museum, no. 23981.
- _____. 1799. *Voyage pittoresque et historique de l'Istrie et Dalmatie* (Blackmer 295, Atabey 202), Paris.
- Caulfeild, J. 1769. MS in the Royal Irish Academy, Dublin.
- Cazenove, H. 1813. *A Narrative, in Two Parts: Written in 1812 [On a Journey Mainly through France, Switzerland and Greece in the Years 1803-11.]*, London.
- Chandler, R. 1774. *Inscriptiones Antiquae, &c.* (Blackmer 317) 2, Oxford.
- _____. 1775. *Travels in Asia Minor: or, an Account of a Tour Made at the Expense of the Society of Dilettanti, etc.* (Blackmer 318, Atabey 215), Oxford.
- _____. 1776. *Travels in Greece: or an Account of a Tour made at the Expense of the Society of Dilettanti* (Blackmer 319), Oxford.

- _____. 1817. *Travels in Asia Minor, and Greece: or, An Account of a Tour Made at the Expense of the Society of Dilettanti*, 3rd ed., London.
- _____. 1825. *Travels in Asia Minor, and Greece: A New Edition, with Corrections and Remarks by Nicholas Revett, Esq.* (Blackmer 321) 2, 3rd ed., Oxford.
- Chateaubriand, F. R. *Travels in Greece, Palestine, Egypt and Barbary during the Years 1806 and 1807*, London.
- _____. 1824. "The City of Athens." *The Portfolio of Entertaining and Instructive Varieties in History, Literature, the Fine Arts, &c:* 3, pp. 113-116.
- _____. 1811. *Itinéraire de Paris à Jérusalem, et de Jérusalem à Paris in 3 Volumes* (Atabey 225), Paris.
- Cheetham, N. 1981. *Medieval Greece*, New Haven and London.
- Chenavard, A.-M. 1844. *Vue meridionale de l'Erechtheion à Athènes*. Engraving. In *Voyage en Grèce et dans le Levant fait en 1843 et 1844*, (1858 ed.), pl. 16.
- _____. 1844. *Vue orientale de l'Erechtheion à Athènes*. Engraving. In *Voyage en Grèce et dans le Levant fait en 1843 et 1844*, pl. 17.
- Chenavard, A.-M., E. Rey, and J. M. Dalgabio. 1846. *Relation du Voyage fait en 1843 et 1844 en Grèce et dans le Levant par A.M. Chenavard, architecte, E. Rey, Peintre et J.M. Dalgabio* (Blackmer 332), Lyon.
- _____. 1849. *Voyage en Grèce et dans le Levant fait en 1843 et 1844 par A.M. Chenavard, architecte, E. Rey, Peintre et J.M. Dalgabio* (Atabey 229), Lyon.
- _____. 1858. *Voyage en Grèce et dans le Levant fait en 1843 et 1844 par A.M. Chenavard, architecte, E. Rey, Peintre et J.M. Dalgabio* (Blackmer 334, Atabey 230), Lyon.
- Choiseul-Gouffier, M. G. A. 1782-1822. *Voyage pittoresque de la Grèce: 3 vols* (Blackmer 342, Atabey 241), Paris.
- _____. August 2, 1786. Letter to L.-F.-S. Fauvel. *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Fonds fr. 22873*, fol. 157.
- _____. November 4, 1788. Letter to L.-F.-S. Fauvel. *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Fonds fr. 22873*, fol. 161.
- Christiansen, J. 2000. *The Rediscovery of Greece: Denmark and Greece in the 19th Century*, Copenhagen.
- Christie's. 1818. *A Catalogue of a Valuable Collection of Antique Sculpture of Greek and Roman Workmanship...which were procured at great Expense by that*

- distinguished Architect, R. Adam, Esq. to be sold by Auction Friday, May 22nd, 1818, Timber Yard of Mr. Forest, near Westminster Bridge, on the Surrey Side, London.*
- _____. 1818. *A Catalogue of a Valuable Collection of Consisting of Printed Books of Architecture, Among which are many of Rarity and Value, the Property of the Late Robert Adam, Esq. to be sold by Auction on 20 May 1818, Mr. Christie's Great Room, Pall Mall.*
- Cipriani, G. B. 1799. *Monumenti di Fabbriche antiche estratti dei disegni più celebri autori 2*, Rome.
- Clairmont, C. W. 1971. "Euripides' *Erechtheus* and the *Erechtheion*." *GRBS* 12, pp. 485-495.
- Clarke, E. D. 1814. *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa: Greece, Egypt and the Holy Land* (Blackmer 365, Atabey 253), Part II Section the Second, London.
- Clinton, K. 1989. "The Eleusinian Mysteries: Roman Initiates and Benefactors: Second Century B.C. - 267 A.D." *ANRW* 18, pp. 1499-1537.
- _____. 1997. "Eleusis and the Romans: Late Republic to Marcus Aurelius," in *The Romanization of Athens*, M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, eds., Oxford, pp. 161-181.
- Clogg, R. 1992. *A Concise History of Greece*, Cambridge.
- Cockerell, C. R. 1808. *Lord Elgin's Museum at Park Lane*. Pencil drawing. London, British Museum.
- _____. 1811-1814. *The Loft in the North Portico*. Watercolor. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum, formerly of the Council of the Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies in 1927.
- Cohen, E. E. 1992. *Athenian Economy and Society: A Banking Perspective*, Princeton.
- Cole, W. 1833. *The Erechtheum from the Southeast*. Colored plate. From *Select Views of the Ancient Monuments in Greece as at Present Existing*, pl. 9.
- _____. 1835. *Select Views of the Remains of Ancient Monuments in Greece, as at Present Existing, from Drawings Taken and Coloured at the Spot in the Year 1833* (Blackmer 337), London.
- Collignon, M. 1913. "Le consul Jean Giraud et sa relation de l'Attique au XVIIe siècle." *MemAcInscr* 39, pp. 373-425.
- Collins, J., and H. Selina. 1999. *Introducing Heidegger*, New York.

- Connelly, J. B., and A. I. Wilson. 2002. "Hellenistic and Byzantine Cisterns on Geronisos Island." *Report of the Department of Antiquities of Cyprus* 2002, pp. 269-292.
- Connelly, J. B. 1996. "Parthenon and *Parthenoi*: A Mythological Interpretation of the Parthenon Frieze." *AJA* 100, pp. 53-80.
- Constantine, D. 1984. *Early Greek Travellers and the Hellenic Ideal*, Cambridge, U.K.
- Cook, H. 1853. *Recollections of a Tour in the Ionian Islands, Greece and Constantinople*, London.
- _____. ca. 1846. *The Erechtheion*, from the southwest. Lithograph. Athens, City Museum of Athens, no. 88.
- Cooper, F. A. 1996. *The Temple of Apollo Bassitas: the Architecture* 1, Princeton.
- Corinth* XVII = J. C. Biers, *The Great Bath on the Lechaion Road*, Princeton 1985.
- Cormack, S. H. 1992. "'Non inter nota sepulcra': Roman temple tombs of south west Asia Minor" (diss. Yale University).
- Coronelli, V. 1687. *Acropolis Cittadella d'Atene* (Blackmer 409). Engraving. Athens, Gennadius Scrapbook Γ', 2 verso.
- _____. 1685. *Memorie istoriografiche del regno della Morea*, Venice.
- _____. 1687. *Plan of Athens, dedicated to Girolamo Duodo*. Venice, Teatro della Città e Porti principali dell'Europa.
- Corso, A. 1997. "Vitruvius and Attic Monuments." *BSA* 92, pp. 373-400.
- Corso, A. and E. Romano, Translation and commentary. 1997. *Vitruvio: De Architectura* 1, Rome.
- Coulton, J. J. 1976. *The Architectural Development of the Greek Stoa*, Oxford.
- _____. 1977. *Ancient Greek Architects at Work: Problems of Structure and Design*, Oxford.
- _____. 1985. "Incomplete Preliminary Planning in Greek Architecture: Some New Evidence," *Le dessin d'architecture dans les sociétés antiques: Actes du colloque de Strasbourg*, Strasbourg.
- Crook, J. M. 1972. *The Greek Revival: Neo-Classical Attitudes in British Architecture 1760-1870*, London.
- Crusius, M. 1584. *Turcograeciae libri octo* (Blackmer 428), Basel.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. 1990. *The Art of Seeing: An Interpretation of the Aesthetic*

- Encounter*, Malibu.
- Curta, F. 2001. *The Making of the Slavs*, Cambridge.
- Cust, L., and S. Colvin. 1898. *History of the Society of Dilettanti*, London.
- D'Ambra, E. 1993. *Private Lives, Imperial Virtues: The Frieze of the Forum Transitorium in Rome*, Princeton.
- D'Avezac, M. 1839. "Relation des voyages de Saewulf à Jérusalem et en Terre Sainte pendant les années 1102 et 1103." *Recueil de voyages et de mémoires, publiés par la Société de Géographie* 6, pp. 817-854.
- D'Evelyn, M. M. 1988-1999. "Varietà and the Caryatid Portico in Daniele Barbaro's Commentaries on Vitruvius." *Annali di architettura* 10-11, pp. 157-174.
- D'Ooge, M. L. 1908. *The Acropolis of Athens*, New York and London.
- Dakin, D. 1972. *The Unification of Greece 1770-1923*, London.
- _____. 1973. *The Greek Struggle for Independence, 1821-1833*, Berkeley.
- Dalton, R. 1749. *One End of the Building Contiguous to the Temple of Erechtheus*. Engraving. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*.
- _____. 1749. *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the Southeast*. Engraving. Plates in *A Series of Engravings Representing Views in Sicily, Greece and Asia Minor, and Egypt*. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*
- _____. 1749. *Le Temple d'Erictheus a Athènes: View from the West*. Engraving. Paris, Plates in *A Series of Engravings Representing Views in Sicily, Greece and Asia Minor, and Egypt*. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*.
- _____. 1752. *A Series of Engravings, Representing Views of Places, Buildings, Antiquities, etc., in Sicily, Greece, Asia Minor, and Egypt*, London.
- Damer, M. G. E. 1841. *Diary of a Tour in Greece, Turkey, Egypt and the Holy Land* (Blackmer 445, Atabey 315), London.
- Dankoff, R. 2004. *An Ottoman Mentality: the World of Evliya Çelebi*, Leiden.
- Darling, L. T. 1996. *Revenue-Raising and Legitimacy: Tax Collection and Finance Administration in the Ottoman Empire, 1560-1660*, Leiden.
- De Bruges. 1453. *Athènes*. Vellum. Chronique de la Bouquechadière, by de Courcy.
- De Chacaton, J. N. H. 1838-1839. *View of the Parthenon with the Mosque*, with a view of west side of the Erechtheion. Watercolor on paper. Athens, Benaki Museum, no. 23969.

- De Courcy, J. 1416-1422. "Chronique de la Bouquechadière."
- De Courmenin, D. H. 1624. *Voyage de Levant fait par le commandant du Roy en l'année 1621*, Paris.
- De la Rue, R. 1687. *Relatione d'alcune principali Antichità d'Atene. Del Sig.^r Rinaldo de la Rue. Trovandosi egli stesso all'acquisto della medesima città, nella campagna dell'anno 1687, in qualità di Bombista*, in F. von Duhn. 1878. *AZ* 36, pp. 55-65.
- De la Ruffinière du Prey, P. 1985. *Sir John Soane, Catalogues of Architectural Drawings in the Victoria and Albert Museum*. London.
- _____. 1994. *The Villas of Pliny: From Antiquity to Posterity*, Chicago.
- De Latour, A. 1847. *Voyage de. S.A.R. Monseigneur le duc de Montpensier à Tunis, en Egypte, en Turquie et en Grèce - lettres par M. Antoine de Latour*, Paris.
- De Vere, A. 1850. *Picturesque Sketches in Greece and Turkey* (Blackmer 481, Atabey 348), London.
- Dell, J. 1934. *Das Erechtheion in Athen*, Brünn.
- Delouka, K. 1991. "Χάραγμα αρχαίου πολέμικου πλοίου στη Βυζαντινή 'Όμορφη Εκκλησία'." *ΕΝΑΛΙΑ* 3, pp. 30-32.
- Delphes* II, ix = J. Pouilloux, *La région nord du Sanctuaire (de l'époque archaïque à la fin du Sanctuaire)*, Paris 1960.
- Delphes* II, xiii = J.-P. Michaud and J. Blécon, *Le temple en calcaire*, Paris 1977.
- Despinis, G. 1975. *Akrolitha*, Athens.
- Detorakis, T. E. 1994. *History of Crete*, Heraklion.
- Dinsmoor Jr., W. B. 1974. "The Monopteros in the Athenian Agora." *Hesperia* 43, pp. 412-427.
- _____. 1980. *The Propylaia to the Athenian Akropolis*, Princeton.
- _____. 1932. "The Burning of the Opisthodomus at Athens." *AJA* 36, pp. 143-172, 307-326.
- _____. 1947. "The Hekatompedon on the Athenian Acropolis." *AJA* 51, pp. 109-151.
- _____. 1950. *The Architecture of Ancient Greece*, London.
- _____. 1941. "Observations on the Hephaisteion." *Hesperia Supplement* 5, Princeton.
- Dinsmoor, W. B. and W. B. Dinsmoor Jr. 2004. *The Propylaia to the Athenian Acropolis*

II: The Classical Building, Princeton.

- Dix, K., and C. Anderson. 2004. "Small States in the Athenian Empire: the Case of the Eteokarpathioi." *Syllecta Classica* 15, pp. 1-31.
- Dodwell, E. 1805. *South-West View of the Erechtheion*, R. Havell, Engraver. Colored engraving. Gennadeion, Athens, in E. Dodwell, *Views of Greece in Drawings*.
- _____. 1805. *The West Front of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion, from the Propylaea*. Aquatint Engraving. Gennadeion, in E. Dodwell, *Views in Greece from Drawings*.
- _____. 1819. *A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece during the Years 1801, 1805 and 1806* (Blackmer 492, Atabey 356) 1, London.
- _____. 1821. *Views of Greece, from Drawings* (Blackmer 493, Atabey 357), London.
- Dokos, K., and G. Panagopoulos. 1993. *Το Βενετικό κτηματολόγιο της Βόσπιτσας*, Athens.
- Donaldson, T. L. 1820. *Disposition of the Coloured Glass Beads in the Interlacing Ornament in the Capitals of the Tetrastyle Portico*. Watercolor. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum, no. XLII, d Portf. A.
- _____. 1833. *A Collection of the Most Approved Examples of Door-ways, from Ancient Buildings in Greece and Italy, Expressly Measured and Delineated for this Work, Preceded by an Essay on the Usages of the Ancients Respecting Door-Ways*, London.
- Dörpfeld, W. 1887. "Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis." *AM* 12, pp. 25-61 and 190-211.
- _____. 1890. "Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis." *AM* 15, pp. 420-439.
- _____. 1897. "Der alte Athena - Tempel auf der Akropolis." *AM* 22, pp. 159-178.
- _____. 1903. "Zum Erechtheion." *AM* 28, pp. 465-469.
- _____. 1904. "Der ursprünglichen Plan des Erechtheion." *AM* 29, pp. 101-107.
- _____. 1911. "Zu den Bauwerken Athens: Erechtheion und alter Tempel." *AM* 36, pp. 39-49.
- _____. 1921. "Zur ursprüngliche Plan des Erechtheion, eine Entgegnung." *Neue Jahrbuch für das klassische Altertum* 47, pp. 433-439.
- Dörpfeld, W., and H. Schleif. 1942. *Erechtheion*, Berlin.

- Douglas, F. S. N. 1813. *An Essay on Certain Points of Resemblance Between the Ancient and Modern Greeks. Second Edition, Corrected*, London.
- Dryden, J., trans. ca. 1900. *Plutarch's Lives of Illustrious Men*, New York.
- du Moncel, Th. 1838-1843. *Érechthéum*, Engraving. Paris, from *Vues pittoresques des monuments d'Athènes*.
- _____. 1843. *De Venise à Constantinople à travers la Grèce, et retour par Malte, Messine, Pizzo et Naples*, Paris.
- _____. 1845. *Vues pittoresques des monuments d'Athènes*, Paris.
- Dübner, F. 1877. *Scholia Graeca in Aristophanem*, Paris.
- Dubois, L. J. J. 1818. *Catalogue d'antiquités égyptiennes, grecques, romaines et celtiques; copies d'antiquités; modèles d'édifices anciens, sculptures modernes; tableaux; dessins; cartes, plans; colonnes; tables et meubles précieux, formant la collection de feu M. le C^{te} de Choiseul-Gouffier*, Paris.
- Duhn, F. v. 1878. "Ein Bericht über Athen aus dem Jahre 1687." *AZ* 31, pp. 55-65.
- Dupré, L. 1819. *Louis Fauvel in His House Overlooking the Akropolis*. Watercolor. Athens, *Gennadeion*.
- _____. 1825. *Voyage à Athènes et à Constantinople* (Blackmer 517, Atabey 381), Paris.
- Dörpfeld, W. 1919. "Das Hekatompedon in Athen." *AM* 34, pp. 1-40, pl. 3.
- Eastlake, C. L. 1818-1820. *The Erechtheum*, from the southwest. Oil on canvas. Guildford, Sir Ellis Waterhouse Collection.
- École française d'Athènes 1991. *Guide de Delphes - le musée*, Paris.
- Economakis, R., ed. 1994. *Acropolis Restoration: the CCAM Interventions*, London and New York.
- Eitner, L. 1970. *Neoclassicism and Romanticism, 1750-1850*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.
- Elderkin, G. W. 1912. *Problems in Periclean Buildings*, Princeton.
- _____. 1941. "The Cults of the Erechtheion." *Hesperia* 10, pp. 113-124.
- Eliot, C. W. J. 1968. "Gennadeion Notes III. Athens in the Time of Lord Byron." *Hesperia* 37, pp. 134-158.
- _____, ed. 1992. *Campaign of the Falieri and Piraeus in the year 1827, or, Journal of a volunteer, being the personal account of Captain Thomas Douglas*

Whitcombe, Princeton.

Ellis, T. 1890. *View of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion*. Watercolor. Athens, Museum of the City of Athens, no. 7.

Etienne, R. 1992. *The Search for Ancient Greece*, New York.

Fallmerayer, J. P. 1965. *Geschichte der Halbinsel Morea während des Mittelalters*, Hildesheim.

Fanelli, F. 1687. *Plan of the Akropolis after Verneda*.

_____. 1687. *Veduta del cast: d'Acropolis dalla parte di tramontana*, After Verneda. The Bombing of the Parthenon from the Northeast 23 September 1687. Engraving.

_____. 1707. *Atene Attica Descritta da Suoi Principii sino all'acquisto fatto dall'Armi Venete nel 1687* (Blackmer 573), Venice.

Farah, C. E., ed. 1993. *Decision Making and Change in the Ottoman Empire*, Kirksville, Mo.

Fauvel, L.-F.-S. 1787. *Rough Plan of the Acropolis*. Ink drawing. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des Estampes*, G b. 15, b, fol. 3.

_____. 1787. *Temple d'Erectée mesurée par Fauvel in J^{er} 1789, après avoir fait fouiller part tout*, Ink drawing. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des Estampes*, G b. 15, a, fol. 16.

_____. 1788-1789. *Notes sur Athènes et sur les antiquités grecques*. MSS. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, Fonds fr. 22877, fol. 23.

_____. 1789. *Measured drawings of the Porch of the Maidens*. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des Estampes*, G b. 15, fol. 65; a, fols. 12, 14, 15, 17.

_____. ca. 1805. *Plaster model of the Akropolis*. Plaster. Paris, *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*.

_____. Undated. *Sketch plan of the Erechtheion*, with measurements. Ink drawing. Paris, *Département des Estampes*, G b. 15, b, fol. 44 verso.

_____. Undated (ca. 1789). *Interior Elevations of the Erechtheion*. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Département des Estampes*, G b. 15, a, fol. 13, 14.

_____. February 15, 1787. Letter to Choiseul-Gouffier. *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Nouv. acq. fr.* 7558, fol. 1.

- _____. February 20, 1787. Letter to Choiseul-Gouffier. *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Nouv. acq. fr. 7558*, fols. 4 f.
- _____. October 12, 1788. Letter to Choiseul-Gouffier. *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Nouv. acq. fr. 7558*, fols. 9, 10.
- _____. November 21, 1788. Letter to Choiseul-Gouffier. *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Nouv. acq. fr. 7558*, fol. 11.
- _____. May 20, 1803. Letter to Choiseul-Gouffier. *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Nouv. acq. fr. 7558*, fol. 32.
- _____. January 9, 1804. Letter to Choiseul-Gouffier. *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Nouv. acq. fr. 7558*, fol. 35.
- Ferguson, W. S. 1911. *Hellenistic Athens*, London.
- Fergusson, J. 1876. "On the Erechtheum." *Sessional Papers R.I.B.A.* pp. 139-158; and Supplement, pp. 1-10.
- _____. 1880. *Das Erechtheion und der Temple der Athene Polias in Athen*, Leipzig.
- Ferrari, G. 2002. "The Ancient Temple on the Acropolis at Athens." *AJA* 106, pp. 11-35.
- Flandin, E. November 15, 1839. *The Erechtheum and the Parthenon from the West*. Drawing, pencil and white chalk. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. D.274.97 in sketchbook 93 H 7.
- Flaubert, G. 1948. *Lettres de Grèce*, Paris.
- _____. 1910. *Notes des Voyages* 2, Paris.
- Fontenrose, J. E. 1988. *Didyma: Apollo's Oracle, Cult and Companions*, Berkeley.
- Forbin, L. N. P. A. 1819. *Travels in Greece, Turkey, and the Holy Land, in 1817-1818*, London.
- Forchhammer, P. W. 1887. "Akropolis, Mythologie, neueste Entdeckung eines Tempels." *Allgemeine Zeitung* (Munich) 289, cols. 4257-4259.
- Fornara, C. W. 1995. *Archaic Times to the End of the Peloponnesian War*, Translated Documents of Greece and Rome. I. Cambridge.
- Forsyth, G. H. 1968. "The Monastery of St. Catherine at Mount Sinai." *DOP* 22, pp. 8-9.
- Foucherot. October 3, 1786. Letter to L.-F.-S. Fauvel. *Bibliothèque nationale de France, Fonds fr. 22877*, part 1, fol. 27.
- Fourmont, C.-L. 1729. *The Erechtheum*. Ink drawing. Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale,

- Nouv. acq. fr.* 1892, fol. 86.
- _____. 1729. "Voyage fait en Grèce par les ordres du Roy en mil sept cent vingt neuf." *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, Paris, Manuscript Department, *Nouv. acq. fr.* 1892, fol. 86.
- Fourmont, M. 1729. *The Erechtheum*. Ink drawing. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, *Supplément grec*, 853, fol. 11.
- _____. 1729. *The Erechtheum*. Ink drawing. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, *Supplément grec* 856, fol. 17.
- _____. 1729. *Sketches for the drawing of the Erechtheion*. Pencil Sketch. Paris, *Bibliothèque nationale de France*, *Supplément grec*, 856, fol. 15.
- _____. 1729. *Temple d'Erechthée à Athènes*. Ink drawing with grey wash. Paris, *Bibliothèque Nationale de France*, *Supplément grec* 856, fol. 18.
- Frampton, K. 1993. "Letter to the Editor." *Journal of Architectural Education* 46.
- Francis, E., and M. Vickers. 1983. "Signa priscae artis: Eretria and Siphnos." *JHS* 103, pp. 49-67.
- Francis, J. 2001. "Sole Sisters: The Copies of the Erechtheion Karyatids and their Shoes." *AJA* 105, p. 281.
- Frantz, A. 1965. "From Paganism to Christianity in the Temples of Athens." *DOP* 19, pp. 185-205.
- _____. 1979. "Did Julian the Apostate Rebuild the Parthenon?" *AJA* 83, pp. 395-401.
- Frazer, A. 1990. *Samothrace: The Propylon of Ptolemy II*, Princeton.
- Frederick, A. 1966. *Classicism and Romanticism*, London.
- Frey, J. J. September 3, 1843. *View of the Erechtheion and the Parthenon*. Watercolor. Athens, Museum of the City of Athens, no. 532.
- Fuller, J. 1829. *Narrative of a Tour through Some Parts of the Turkish Empire*, London.
- Gadamer, H.-G. 1994. *Truth and Method*, New York.
- Galinsky, K. 1996. *Augustan Culture*, Princeton.
- Gallant, T. W. 2001. *Modern Greece*, London.
- Galt, J. 1812. *Voyages and Travels in the Years 1809, 1810 and 1811* (Blackmer 644, Atabey 473), London.

- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Baltimore.
- Garston, E. 1842. *Greece Revisited, and Sketches in Lower Egypt in 1840: with Thirty-Six Hours of a Campaign in Greece in 1825* (Blackmer 652, Atabey 478), London.
- Gell, W. 1800. *Inside the East Portico*. Watercolor. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Gell Volume XIII: 121 (92).
- _____. 1800. *Interior of the Porch of the Maidens*. Pen and ink. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Gell Volume XIII : 106 (75).
- _____. 1800. *Temple of Erectheus, the North Porch from the north*. Watercolor. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Gell Volume XIII: L. B. 55.
- _____. 1800. *Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis, from the southeast*. Pen and bistre wash. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities of the British Museum, Gell Volume XIII: L. B. 62.
- _____. 1801. *Diary of a Tour in Greece*. Manuscript. Gennadeion no. M 70.15, Athens, Original in the University of Bristol Library.
- _____. 1801. *Pandroseum and Temple of Minerva Polias, Acropolis, from the southwest*. Pen and bistre with bistre and Indian-ink wash. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Gell Volume XIII: L. B. 73.
- _____. 1801. *Western Fronts of the Temples of Erectheus, Minerva Polias, and Pandrosus, Acropolis, Lusieri on the Architrave*. Pen and ink, bistre and Indian-ink wash. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Gell Volume XIII: L. B. 61.
- _____. 1810. *The Itinerary of Greece with a Commentary on Pausanias and Strabo and an Account of the Monuments of Antiquity at Present Existing in that Country Compiled in the Years 1801, 1802, 1805, 1806 by W. Gell Esq. M.A. F.R.S. F.S.A.* (Blackmer 662, Atabey 485), London.
- _____. 1811. *Journal of the Dilettanti Mission to Asia Minor & C A^o: D^{Nl}*. Manuscript. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Notebook 1.
- _____. 1827. *The Itinerary of Greece containing One Hundred Routes in Attica, Boeotia, Phocis, Locris, and Thessaly*, London.
- Ghedini, F. 1984. *Giulia Domna tra Oriente e Occidente*, Rome.
- Giallina, A. 1891. *Portico of the Caryatids with Terracotta Cast*. Watercolor. Private

- Collection.
- Giffard, E. 1837. *A Short Visit to the Ionian Islands, Athens, and the Morea* (Blackmer 683), London.
- Gifford, S. R. 1880. *Ruins of the Parthenon, and the Erechtheion*. Oil on canvas. New York, Metropolitan Museum of Art, on loan from the Corcoran Gallery of Art.
- Gilet, A., ed. 1994. *Louis-François Cassas 1756-1827: Dessinateur - Voyageur - Im Banne der Sphinx*, Mainz.
- Giraud, D. 1989. "The Greater Propylaia at Eleusis, A copy of Mnesnikles' Propylaia," in *Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire*, S. Walker and A. Cameron, eds., London, pp. 69-75.
- Girault de Prangey, J.-P. ca. 1842. *Athènes. Acropole. Caryatides*. Daguerrotype. London, Christie's Auction House 2004, Sale 6978 Lot 63.
- Glowacki, K. 1995. "A New Fragment of the Erechtheion Frieze." *Hesperia* 64, pp. 325-331.
- Glowacki, K., and J. Binder. Unpublished typescript. *Commentary on Gloria Ferrari, "The Ancient Temple on the Acropolis at Athens," AJA 106 (2002) 11-35*, Athens.
- Godley, A. D., trans. 1920. *Herodotus*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Gomme, A. W. 1937. *Essays in Greek History and Literature*, Oxford.
- Graindor, P. 1931. *Athènes de Tibère à Trajan*, Cairo.
- Green, P. 1993. *Alexander to Actium: The Historical Evolution of the Hellenistic Age*, Los Angeles.
- Green, R. 1962. "A New Oenochoe Series from the Acropolis North Slope." *Hesperia* 31, pp. 82-94.
- Greenhalgh, M. forthcoming. *The Greek and Roman Cities of Western Turkey*.
- Gregory, T. E. 1986. "The Survival of Paganism in Christian Greece: A Critical Essay." *AJP* 107, pp. 229-242.
- Grene, D., trans. 1987. *Herodotus: The History*, Chicago.
- Grenville, G. N. T. 1846. *Lands, Classical and Sacred*, 2nd ed., London.
- Gropius. March 13, 1826. Letter to Fauvel. Bibliothèque national de France, MSS, *Fonds fr.* 22874, fols. 220 and 221.
- Gros, P. 1976. *Aurea Temple: recherches sur l'architecture religieuse de Rome à*

- l'époque d'Auguste, Rome.*
- Guillaume, E. 1870. *Discours pour l'inauguration du tombeau d'Alexis Paccard*, Paris.
- Guillet, A. G. 1676. *An Account of a Late Voyage to Athens, containing the Estate both Ancient and Modern of that Famous City, and of the Present Empire of the Turks*, London.
- _____. 1675. *Athènes ancienne et nouvelle, et l'estat présent de l'empire des Turcs* (Blackmer 766, Atabey 539), Paris.
- Gulaki, A. 1981. "Klassische und klassizistische Nikedarstellungen" (diss. University of Bonn).
- Habicht, C. 1970. *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*, Munich.
- _____. 1990. "Athens and the Attalids in the Second Century B.C." *Hesperia* 59, pp. 561-577.
- _____. 1992. "Athens and the Ptolemies." *CA* 11, pp. 68-90.
- _____. 1997. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*, Cambridge, MA.
- _____. 1998. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London.
- Hager, J. 1999. *Pilgrimage: A Chronicle of Christianity through the Churches of Rome*, London.
- Hamilakis, Y., and E. Yalouri. 1996. "Antiquities as Symbolic Capital in Modern Greece." *Antiquity* 70, pp. 117-129.
- _____. 1999. "Sacralising the Past: Cults of Archaeology in Modern Greece." *Archaeological Dialogues* 2, pp. 115-159.
- Hammond, N. G. L. 1986. *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.*, Oxford.
- Hancock, J. E. 1995. "The Interpretive Turn: Radical Hermeneutics and the Work of Architecture," in *ACSA Conference Proceedings*, Seattle.
- _____. 1997. *Theory-ing (Looking at) the Question of "Perfection": Some Observations*, Cincinnati.
- Hänlein-Schäfer, H. 1985. *Veneratio Augusti: eine Studie zu den Tempeln des ersten römischen Kaisers*, Rome.
- Hansen, C. 1835-1836. *Inside the North Portico of the Erechtheion*. Pencil sketch. Copenhagen, Collection of architectural drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 14962.

- _____. 1835-1836. *Interior of the Maiden Porch from the East*. Pencil sketch. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 14654.
- _____. 1835-1836. *The Maiden Porch from the Southeast*. Pencil sketch. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. S 18542,31.
- _____. 1844. *The Erechtheion from the Southwest*. Pencil and watercolor. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 14974.
- Hanson, J. O. ca. 1814. *Journal*. Manuscript. London, British Library, Add. MSS 38591 and 38592.
- Hardy, F. 1812. *Memoirs of the Political and Private Life of James Caulfield, Earl of Charlemont*, 2 vols., London.
- Harprath, R. 1983. "Giulio Romano und die Kenntnis der Korenhalle des Erechtheion." *Boreas* 6, pp. 212-216.
- Harris, D. 1995. *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*, Oxford.
- Harris-Cline, D. 1999. "Archaic Athens and the Topography of the Kylon Affair." *BSA* 94, pp. 309-320.
- Harrison, E. 1977. "Alkamenes' Sculptures for the Hephaisteion. Part I, The Cult Statues." *AJA* 81, pp. 137-178.
- Haugsted, I. 1996. *Dream and Reality: Danish Antiquaries, Architects and Artists in Greece*, London.
- Hawes, H. B. 1936. "The Ancient Temple of the Goddess on the Acropolis." *AJA* 40, pp. 120-121.
- _____. Unpublished (1935). "The Riddle of the Erechtheum." Manuscript in the Smith College Archive, Amherst, Mass.
- Haygarth, W. 1810-1811. *Erechtheum from the North*. Watercolor. Athens, Gennadeion, No 89.
- _____. 1814. *Greece, a Poem, in Three Parts; with Notes, Classical Illustrations and Sketches of the Scenery* (Blackmer 797), London.
- Heidegger, M. 1950. *Holzwege*, Frankfurt.
- _____. 1962. *Being and Time*, New York.
- Hellström, P. 1989. "Formal Banqueting at Labraunda," in *Architecture and Society in*

- Hecatomnid Caria: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1987*, T. Linders and P. Hellström, eds., Uppsala, pp. 99-104.
- Henderson, J. 2002. *Aristophanes IV*, Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge.
- Higgins, R. A. 1980. *Greek and Roman Jewellery*, Berkeley.
- Hill, B. H. Unpublished (1943). "Review of Dörpfeld's *Erechtheion*." Manuscript, in Hill Papers, ASCSA Archives, Box 19 Folder 2.
- Hill, I. T. 1969. *The Ancient City of Athens: Its Topography and Monuments*, Chicago.
- Hobhouse, J. C. 1809-1810. *The Akropolis viewed from the Propylaea*. Colored Engraving. Athens, National Library.
- _____. 1813. *Journey through Albania, and other provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia, to Constantinople, during the years 1809-1810* (Blackmer 821), 2nd ed., London.
- _____. 1855. *Travels in Albania and other Provinces in Turkey in 1809 and 1810*, London.
- _____. 1910. *Recollections of a Long Life* 1, London.
- Hoff, M. C. 1996. "The Politics and the Architecture of the Roman Imperial Cult at Athens," in *Subject and Ruler: The Cult of Ruling Power in Classical Antiquity*, A. Small, ed., *JRA Supplement* 17.
- _____. 1997. "Lacerate Athenae," in *The Romanization of Athens*, M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, eds., Oxford, 33-48.
- _____. 1994. "The So-called Agoranomion and the Imperial Cult in Julio-Claudian Athens." *AA* 1994, pp. 93-117.
- Hoff, M. C. and S. I. Rotroff, eds. 1997. *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska April 1996*, Oxford.
- Holland, L. B. 1924. "The Erechtheum Papers, I, II, III." *AJA* 28, pp. 1-23, 142-169, 402-434.
- Holland, L. B., and M. H. McAllister. 1958. "In the Crypt under the North Portico of the Erechtheum." *Hesperia* 27, pp. 161-162.
- Hollingshead, M. B. 1999. "'Adyton,' 'Opisthodomos,' and the Inner Room of the Greek Temple." *Hesperia* 68, pp. 189-218.
- Hölscher, T. 1985. "Die Geschlagenen und Ausgelieferten in der Kunst des Hellenismus." *AntK* 28, pp. 126-127.

- Holtzinger, H. 1889. *Die altchristliche Architektur in systematischer Darstellung. Form, Einrichtung und Ausschmückung der altchristlichen Kirchen, Baptisterien und Sepulcralbauten*, Stuttgart.
- Holtzmann, B. 2000. "Note sur la frise de l'Erechtheion. Le sujet de MAcr 1073." *BCH* 124, pp. 221-226.
- Holub, R. C. 1984. *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*, London.
- Homolle, Th. 1894. *BCH* 18, pp. 509-528.
- _____. 1917. "L'origine des caryatides." *RA* 5, pp. 1-67.
- Hone the Younger, N. *The Caryatids*. Oil. Dublin, National Gallery of Ireland, no. 1367.
- Honour, H. 1979. *Romanticism*, London.
- Hope, T. 1819. *Anastasius, or, Memoirs of a Greek*, London.
- _____. ca. 1795. *East Frieze of the Parthenon on the ground*. Pen on paper. Athens, Benaki Museum.
- _____. ca. 1795. *Map of Athens*. Pen on paper. Athens, Benaki Museum, no. 27227.
- _____. ca. 1795. *Plan of the Acropolis*. Pen and watercolor drawing on paper. Athens, Benaki Museum, no. 27230.
- Hörmann, H. 1932. *Die inneren Propylaen von Eleusis*, Berlin.
- Hughes, T. S. 1820. *Travels in Sicily, Greece and Albania* (Blackmer 842, Atabey 599), London.
- _____. 1830. *Travels in Greece and Albania Second Edition with Considerable Additions* (Blackmer 844), London.
- Hunt, A. W. ca. 1875. *View of the Parthenon and the Erechtheion from the East*. Watercolor. Athens, Museum of the City of Athens, no. 14.
- Hurwit, J. M. 2004. *The Acropolis in the Age of Pericles*, Cambridge.
- _____. 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*, Cambridge.
- Hutton, W. E. 1995. "The Topographical Methods of Pausanias" (diss. University of Texas at Austin).
- Iakovides, S. E. 1962. *Ἡ Μυκηναϊκὴ Ἀκρόπολις τῶν Ἀθηνῶν*, Athens.
- Inan, J. 1998. *Toroslar'da bir Antik Kent: Lyrbe?, Seleukeia?*, Istanbul.

- Inwood, H. W. 1819. *The Erechtheion from the West, Elevation of the Western Front of the Temple, as it Remained in 1819*. Drawing. from *The Erechtheion at Athens*, pl. 2.
- _____. 1819. *An Ideal Restoration of the Temple; North-west View*. Engraving. In 1831 edition of Inwood's *Erechtheion*, pl. 3.
- _____. 1819. *Restored Plan of the Interior of the Erechtheion*. Engraving. In 1827 edition of Inwood's *Erechtheion*, pl. 2.
- _____. 1827. *The Erechtheion at Athens* (Blackmer 856), London.
- _____. 1831. *The Erechtheion at Athens*, London.
- Iser, W. 1987. *Walter Pater: The Aesthetic Moment*, Cambridge.
- Ittar, S. 1800-1803. *Drawings made for Lord Elgin*. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum.
- Jacoby, F. 1904. *Das marmor Parium*, Berlin.
- _____. 1929. *Die fragmente der griechischen historiker*, Berlin.
- Jahn, O., and A. Michaelis. 1901. *Arx Athenarum A Pausania Descripta*, Bonn.
- Jameson, M. H., C. N. Runnels, and T. H. van Andel. 1994. *A Greek Countryside: The Southern Argolid from Prehistory to the Present Day*, Stanford.
- Jauss, H. R. 1969. "Paradigmawechsel in der Literaturwissenschaft." *Linguistische Berichte* 3, pp. 44-56.
- Jeppesen, K. 1958. *Paradeigmata; Three Mid-Fouth Century Main Works of Hellenic Architecture, Reconsidered*, Aarhus.
- _____. 1979. "Where Was the So-called Erechtheion?" *AJA* 83, pp. 381-394.
- _____. 1983. "Further Inquiries on the Location of the Erechtheion and its Relationship to the Temple of the Polias: 1. Προστομιαῖον and Προστόμιον." *AJA* 87, pp. 325-333.
- _____. 1987. *The Theory of the Alternative Erechtheion*, Aarhus.
- Jimenez, A. V. 1992. *Repertorio de bibliografía arqueológica Emeritense*, Mérida.
- Johnson, P. A. 2000. *On Gadamer*, Belmont, Cal.
- Jones, H. L., trans. 1924. *The Geography of Strabo*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Jørgensen, L. B. and D. Porphyrios, eds. 1987. *Neoclassical Architecture in Copenhagen*

- and Athens*, New York.
- Judeich, W. 1931. *Topographie von Athen*.
- Julius, L. 1878. *Ueber das Erechtheion*, Munich.
- Kampouroglous, D. G. 1922. *Αι παλαιαί Αθήναι*, Athens.
- Karivieri, A. 1994. "The So-called Library of Hadrian and the Tetraconch Church in Athens," *Post-Herulian Athens*, P. Castrén, Helsinki, pp. 89-113.
- Kasimati, M. Z., ed. 2000. *Αθήνσ - Μόναχο· Τέχνη και Πολιτισμός στη νέα Ελλάδα*, Athens.
- Kaufmann, C. M. 1922. *Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie*, Paderborn.
- Kavvadias, P., and G. Kawerau. 1906. *Die Ausgrabung der Akropolis vom Jahre 1885 bis zum Jahre 1890*, Athens.
- Kawerau, G. 1888. "Der Temple der Roma und Augustus auf der Akropolis von Athen." *AntDenk* 1, p. 13.
- Kazanaki-Lappa, M. 2003. "Athens from Late Antiquity to the Turkish Conquest," in *Athens: from the Classical Period to the Present Day (5th Century B.C.-A.D. 2000)*, C. Bouras, ed., New Castle, Del., pp. 194-219.
- Kazhdan, A. P., ed. 1991. *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium*, Oxford.
- Kearney, R. and D. Rasmussen, eds. 2001. *Continental Aesthetics: Romanticism to Postmodernism*, Malden, Mass.
- Keesling, C. M. 2003. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*, Cambridge.
- Kellum, B. 1997. "Concealing/Revealing: Gender and the Play of Meaning in the Monuments of Augustan Rome," in *The Roman Cultural Revolution*, T. Habinek and A. Schiesaro, eds., Cambridge, pp. 158-181.
- Kelly, A. 1990. *Mrs. Coade's Stone*, Reading.
- Keppie, L. 1998. *The Making of the Roman Army: from Republic to Empire*, Norman, Ok.
- Kiel, M. 1999. "The Ottoman Imperial Registers. Central Greece and Northern Bulgaria in the 15th-19th Century, the Demographic Development of Two Areas Compared," in *Reconstructing Past Population Trends in Mediterranean Europe (3000 B.C.-1800 A.D.)*, J. Bintliff and K. Sbonias, eds., Oxford, pp. 195-218.
- Kienast, H. J. 1997. "The Tower of the Winds in Athens: Hellenistic or Roman?," in *The*

- Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska April 1996*, M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, eds., Oxford, pp. 53-65.
- King, D. 1998. "Figured Supports: Vitruvius' Caryatids and Atlantes." *Numismatica e Antichità Classiche* 27, pp. 275-305.
- _____. 2004. *The Elgin Marbles*, London.
- Kinnard, W., ed. 1825. *Antiquities of Athens* 2, 2nd ed., London.
- Kinross, P. B. 1977. *The Ottoman Centuries*, New York.
- Kissas, K. 2000. *Die attischen Statuen - und Stelenbasen archaischer Zeit*, Bonn.
- Kitzinger, E. 1946. "A Survey of the Early Christian Town of Stobi." *DOP* 3, pp. 81-162.
- Kleiner, D. E. E. 1992. *Roman Sculpture*, New Haven.
- Kockel, V. 1991. "Antike Gipsabgüsse von Baugliedern? Überlegungen zu einer Kopie der ionischen Kapitelle der Erechtheion-Nord-Halle." *AA*, pp. 281-285.
- Kokkinos, N. 1987. "Reassembling the Inscription of Glaphyra from Athens." *ZPE* 68, pp. 288-290.
- Kontoleon, N. M. 1949. *Τὸ Ερέχθειον ὡς οἰκοδόμημα χθονίας λατρείας*, Athens.
- Kopytoff, I. 1986. "The Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process," in *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, A. Appadurai, ed., Cambridge, pp. 64-91.
- Korres, M. 1984. "Der Pronaos und die Fenster des Parthenon," in *Parthenon-Kongreß Basel*, E. Berger, ed., Mainz, pp. 47-54.
- _____. 1986. "Σχεδιαστική αναπαράσταση της Β.Α. γωνίας του Παρθενώνος με το βάθρο του βασιλέως της Περγάμου." *BCH* 110, pp. 673-676.
- _____. 1994a. "Recent Discoveries on the Acropolis," *Acropolis Restoration: the CCAM Interventions*, R. Economakis, ed., London and New York, pp. 175-179.
- _____. 1994b. "The Architecture of the Parthenon," in *The Parthenon and Its Impact in Modern Times*, P. Tournikiotis, ed., Athens, pp. 136-161.
- _____. 1994c. "The History of the Acropolis Monuments," *Acropolis Restoration: the CCAM Interventions*, R. Economakis, ed., London and New York, pp. 35-51.
- _____. 1994d. "The Parthenon from Antiquity to the 19th Century," in *The Parthenon*

- and its Impact on Modern Times*, P. Tournikiotis, ed., Athens, pp. 137-161.
- _____. 1997. "An Early Attic Ionic Capital and the Kekropion on the Athenian Acropolis," in *Greek Offerings: Essays on Greek Art in Honour of John Boardman*, O. Palagia, ed., Oxford, pp. 95-107.
- _____. 2002a. "Die klassische Architektur und der Parthenon," *Die griechische Klassik: Idee oder Wirklichkeit*, Mainz, pp. 364-384.
- _____. 2002b. "On the North Acropolis Wall," in *Excavating Classical Culture: Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece*, M. Stamatopoulou and M. Yeroulanou, eds., Oxford, pp. 179-186.
- Kosmopoulou, A. 1996. "Greek Statue Bases" (diss. Bryn Mawr College).
- _____. 2002. *The Iconography of Sculptured Statue Bases in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, Madison.
- Krautheimer, R. 1965. *Early Christian and Byzantine Architecture*, Baltimore.
- Kreeb, M. 2003. "The Antiquities of Athens through the Eyes of Foreign Travellers," in *Athens: from the Classical Period to the Present Day (5th Century B.C.-A.D. 2000)*, C. Bouras, ed., New Castle, Del., pp. 344-369.
- Kroll, J. H. 1982. "The Ancient Image of Athena Polias." *Hesperia Supplement 20*, Princeton, pp. 65-76.
- Kron, U. 1976. *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen*, AM Beiheft 5. Berlin.
- Kurke, L. 1999. "Ancient Greek Board Games and How to Play Them." *ClPhil* 94, pp. 247-267.
- Laborde, L. E. S. J. 1854. *Athènes aux XV^e, XVI^e et XVII^e siècles* (Blackmer 932, Atabey 644), 2 vols., Paris.
- Labraunda* I.2 = A. Westholm, *The Architecture of the Hieron*, Lund 1963.
- Lafever, M. 1839. *The Beauties of Modern Architecture. Illustrated by Forty-eight Original Plates, Designed Expressly for this Work*, New York.
- Lamartine de Prat, M.-L.-A. de 1839. *Travels in the East including a Journey in the Holy Land*, Edinburgh.
- Lancel, S. 1995. *Carthage: a History*, Oxford.
- Lanciani, R. A. 1892. *Pagan and Christian Rome*, Boston.
- Landon, C.-P. 1813. *Grandes vues pittoresques des principaux sites et monuments de la Grèce et de la Sicile et des sept collines de Rome, dessinés et gravés à l'eau-*

forte, au trait, par MM. Cassas et Bence, Paris.

Landström, B. 1961. *The Ship: A Survey of the History of the Ship from the Primitive Raft to the Nuclear-Powered Submarine with Reconstructions in Words and Pictures*, London.

Langdon, M. 1990. "The Basilica and the Early Christian Community," in *Nemea*, S. Miller, ed., Berkeley, pp. 78-96.

Langdon, S. 2001. "Beyond the Grave: Biographies from Early Greece." *AJA* 105, pp. 579-606.

Lange, L. 1834. *Early Excavations on the Athenian Plateau, east of the Parthenon*. Watercolor. Munich, Staatliche Graphische Sammlung.

Lapatin, K. D. S. 1992. "A Family Gathering at Rhamnous? Who's Who on the Nemesis Base." *Hesperia* 61, pp. 107-119.

Larrabee, S. A. 1957. *Hellas Observed: The American Experience of Greece 1775-1865*, New York.

Laurent, P. E. 1821. *Recollections of a Classical Tour through Various Parts of Greece, Turkey and Italy, made in the years 1818 & 1819* (Blackmer 959, Atabey 680), London.

Lauter, H. 1976. "Die Koren des Erechtheion," *AntP* 16.

_____. 1986. *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*, Darmstadt.

Lawall, M. L. 2002. "Early Excavations at Pergamon and the Chronology of Rhodian Amphora Stamps." *Hesperia* 71, pp. 295-324.

Lawrence, A. W. 1979. *Greek Aims in Fortifications*, Oxford.

Le Roy, J. D. 1755. *East Elevation*. Engraving. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce*.

_____. 1755. *Ordre caryatide*. Engraving. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce*.

_____. 1755. *Ordre ionique*. Engraving. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce*.

_____. 1755. *Plan de la Citadelle d'Athenes*. Engraving. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce*, pl. 3.

_____. 1755. *Restitution du Temple d'Erechthée, from the west*. Engraving. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce*.

- _____. 1755. *Vüe du Temple d'Erechthée à Athenes*, view from the northwest. Engraving. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce*, pl. 5.
- _____. 1767. *Observations sur les Édifices des anciens peuples, précédées de réflexions préliminaires sur la critique des ruines de la Grèce, publiée dans un ouvrage anglois [by J. Stuart] intitulé, Les Antiquité's d'Athènes, et suivies de recherches sur les mesures anciennes*, Amsterdam.
- _____. 1758. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce* (Blackmer 1009, Atabey 709), Paris.
- _____. 1770. *Les ruines des plus beaux monuments de la Grèce* 1, 2nd ed., Paris.
- Leake, W. M. 1841. *Plan of the Akropolis*. Engraving. in *Topography of Athens and the Demi of Attica*, vol I., pl. 3.
- _____. 1814. *Researches in Greece* (Blackmer 970), London.
- _____. 1821. *The Topography of Athens with Some Remarks on its Antiquity* (Blackmer 971, Atabey 689), London.
- _____. 1841. *The Topography of Athens and the Demi of Attica* (Blackmer 976 and 977) 2, 2nd ed., London.
- Lechevalier, J.-B. 1802. *Voyage de la Troade; fait dans les années 1785 et 1786. Troisième édition. Revue, corrigée et considérablement augmentée. 3 vols.* (Blackmer 994), Paris.
- Legrand, J.-G. 1808. *Galerie antique, ou Collection des chefs-d'oeuvre d'architecture de sculpture, et de peinture antiques, etc. Tome Premier. Première division: Monumens de la Grèce* (Blackmer 1000), Paris.
- Legrand, P.-E. 1897. *RA* 30, pp. 41-66, 185-201, 385-404.
- Lehmann, P. W. and D. Spittle 1982. *Samothrace: The Temenos*, Bollingen. LX.5. Princeton.
- Lesk, A. L. 1995. "Amphiaraios and Asklepios: A Comparative Study of their Sanctuaries at Oropos and Kos." (Thesis. Dartmouth College).
- _____. In preparation. "Conflation of 'Karyatids' and the Erechtheion 'Korai': The Reception of Vitruvius."
- Lessing, G. E. (No date). "Karyatiden," in *Lessings werke vollstandige Ausgbe in funfundzwanzig Teilen*, J. Petersen and W. von Olshausen, eds., vol. XVII, Berlin, pp. 385-386.
- Levin, H. 1931. *The Broken Column: A Study in Romantic Hellenism*, Cambridge, Mass.

- Lewis, D. M. 1975. "Greek Inscriptions from the Athenian Agora." *Hesperia* 44, pp. 379-395.
- Lewis, D. M., J. Boardman, S. Hornblower, and M. Ostwald. 1994. "The Fourth Century B.C.," *CAH²* 6, Cambridge.
- Liddell, H. G., R. Scott, and H. S. Jones. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*, Oxford.
- Lidderdale, H. A., ed. 1966. *Makriyannis: The Memoirs of General Makriyannis 1797-1864*, London.
- Lithgow, W. 1814. *Travels and Voyages through Europe, Asia and Africa*, 12th ed., Leith.
- Locatelli, A. 1691. *Racconto storico della Veneta Guerra in Levante, Diretta dal Valore del Serenissimo Principe, Francesco Morosini. Opera postuma di Alessandro Locatelli (Atabey 724)*, Colonia [Parma].
- Lorenzen, E. 1964. *The Arsenal at Piraeus: Designed by Philo and Reconstructed after his Description*, Copenhagen.
- Lowe, C. G. 1936. "A Description of Athens in 1588." *Classical Studies* pp. 233-242.
- Lundgreen, B. 2004. "Use and Abuse of Athena in Roman Imperial Portraiture: The Case of Julia Domna," in *Proceedings of the Danish Institute at Athens IV*, J. Eiring and J. Mejer, eds., Athens, pp. 69-91.
- Lusieri, G. B. 1800-1801. *Restored Elevation of the Erechtheion from the North*. Engraving. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Elgin Drawings, vol. I, pl. 40.
- _____. 1800-1803. *Icongrafia del Tempio di Eritteo*. Engraving. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Elgin Drawings, vol. I, pl. 41.
- _____. 1800-1803. *Ortografia Esterna del Tempio di Eritteo del lato rivolta al est*, Restored. Engraving. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Elgin Drawings, vol. I, pl. 37.
- _____. 1800-1803. *Porta del Tempio di Eritteo nel lato del Nord*, Restored. Engraving. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum, Elgin Drawings, vol. I, pl. 35.
- _____. 1800-1803. *Restored Elevation of the Erechtheion from the West*. Engraving. London, Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, Elgin Drawings, vol. I, pl. 39.
- Macaulay, R. 1966. *Pleasure of Ruins*, London.

- Mackenzie, M. 1992. *Turkish Athens: The Forgotten Centuries 1456-1832*, Reading.
- MacMullen, R. 1997. *Christianity and Paganism in the Fourth to Eighth Centuries*, New Haven.
- Magni, C. 1688. *Relazione della Citta d'Athene colle Provinzie dell' Attica, Focia, Boeozia, e Negroponte, ne' tempi che furono queste passeggiate da Cornelio Magni, Parmegiano, L'Anno 1674*, Parma.
- _____. 1692. *Quanto di più curioso, e vago hr' potuto raccorre Cornelio Magi nel secondo biennio da esso consmato in viaggi, e dimore per la Turchia, Seconda Parte* (Atabey 750), Parma.
- Mallouchou-Tufano, F. 1994. "The Parthenon from Cyriacus of Ancona to Frédéric Boissonas: Description, Research and Depiction," in *The Parthenon and its Impact on Modern Times*, P. Tournikiotis, ed., Athens, pp. 164-199.
- Mango, C. 1974. *Byzantine Architecture*, New York.
- Mansfield, J. M. 1985. "The Robe of Athena and the Panathenaic 'Peplos'" (diss. University of California at Berkeley).
- Margarites, P. ca.1855. *The Erechtheion from the West*. Salted paper print. Munich, Collection Dietmar Siegert.
- Marilhat, P. P. 1837-1841. *The Erechtheum, Athens*, French. Oil on canvas. London, The Wallace Collection, Hertford House, no. 334.
- Mark, I. S. 1993. "The Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: Architectural Stages and Chronology," *Hesperia Supplement* 26. Princeton.
- Marszal, J. R. 1988. "An Architectural Function for the Lyons Kore." *Hesperia* 57, pp. 203-206.
- Martin, G. 1819. *Voyage à Constantinople, fait à l'occasion de l'ambassade de M. le Comte de Choiseul-Gouffier à la Porte ottomane. Par un ancien aumonier de la marine royale*, Paris.
- Martin, L. R. 2001. *The Art and Archaeology of Venetian Ships and Boats*, London.
- Martineau, E. H. January 4, 1850. *Athens, Acropolis, The Erectheum*, from the southeast. Pencil drawing. London, R.I.B.A. Library Drawings Collection, Front Study Room Shelf D2.
- Master, R. R. 1819. "Journal of a Tour in Egypt, Palestine and Greece in 1819." MSS, British Library, Add. Ms. 51313.
- McCredie, J. R., G. Roux, S. M. Shaw, and J. Kurtich. 1992. *Samothrace: The Rotunda*

- of *Arsinoë*, Princeton.
- McNeal, R. A., ed. 1993. *Nicholas Biddle in Greece: the Journals and Letters of 1806*, Philadelphia.
- Mee, C., and A. Spawforth. 2001. *Greece: an Oxford Archaeological Guide*, Oxford.
- Mellor, R. J. 1975. *Thea Rome: the worship of the Goddess Roman in the Greek World*, Göttingen.
- Merritt, B. 1934. "Epigraphical Notes." *AJA* 38, pp. 67-70.
- Merritt, B. D. 1927. "An Athenian Naval Catalogue." *AJA* 31, pp. 462-470.
- Michaelis, A. 1889. "Die Zeit des Neubaus des Poliastempels in Athens." *AM* pp. 349-366.
- Michaud, J. F., and J. J. F. Poujoulat. 1833. *Correspondance d'Orient, 1830-1831*, Paris.
- Mikalson, J. D. 1998. *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*, Berkeley.
- Mikocki, T. 1995. *Sub Specie Deae. Les impératrices et princesses romaines assimilées à des déesses. Étude iconologique*, Rome.
- Miller, H. 1972. *Greece Through the Ages*, London.
- Mommsen, A. 1868. *Athenae Christianae*, Leipzig.
- Montagu, J. 1799. *A Voyage Performed by the Late Earl of Sandwich round the Mediterranean in the years 1738 and 1739 Written by Himself* (Blackmer 1149, Atabey 828), London.
- Morgan, J. D. 2002. "A Badly Restored Sculptor's Name in the Erechtheion Accounts." *AJA* 106, p. 296.
- Morgan, M. H. 1960. *The Ten Books on Architecture*, Vitruvius, New York.
- Morot, J. B. 1869. *Voyage de Paris à Jérusalem, 1838 et 1840*, Paris.
- Morrith of Rokeby, J. B. S. 1914. *The Letters of John B.S. Morrith of Rokeby, descriptive of journeys in Europe and Asia Minor in the years 1794-1796*, London.
- Morrow, K. D. 1985. *Greek Footwear and the Dating of Sculpture*, Madison, Wis.
- Müller, R. 1837-1844. *Parthenon and Erechtheion from the West*. Athens, Benaki Museum, Room 23.
- _____. 1837-1844. *Parthenon, Erechtheion and Propylaia from the East*. Athens, Benaki Museum, Room 23.

- Mure, W. 1842. *Journal of a Tour in Greece* (Blackmer 1170), London.
- Murray, J. ca. 1850. *The Erechtheum, Athens*, from the northwest. Pencil drawing.
London, R.I.B.A. Library Drawings Collection, PB199-13 (formerly Y20/13).
- Nagy, B. 1984. "The Peplotheke: What was it?," in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow on his Eightieth Birthday*, Durham.
- Navari, L. 1989. *Greece and the Levant: the Catalogue of the Henry Myron Blackmer Collection of Books and Manuscripts*, London.
- _____. 1998. *The Ottoman World: the Sefik E. Atabey Collection, Books, Manuscripts and Maps*, London.
- _____. 2004. *Greek Civilaization Through the Eyes of Travellers and Scholars: from the Collection of Dimitrius Contominas*, New Castle, Del.
- Neils, J., ed. 1996. *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon*, Madison.
- _____. 2001. *The Parthenon Frieze*, Cambridge.
- Neumann, G. A. 1882. "Ludolphus de Sudheim, De itinere Terre Sancte." *Archives de l'Orient latin* 2.
- Newton, A. P. 1865. *View of the Acropolis and the Parthenon*, Erechtheion from the West. Watercolor on paper. Athens, Benaki Museum, no. 23337.
- Newton, C. T. 1865. *Travels and Discoveries in the Levant in 2 Volumes* (Blackmer 1193, Atabey 869), London.
- Nicolet, C. 1991. *Space, Geography, and Politics in the Early Roman Empire*. Ann Arbor.
- Norlin, G., trans. 1980. *Isocrates with an English Translation*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Norre, A. 1966. "Studies in the History of the Parthenon" (diss. University of California Los Angeles).
- O'Neill, E., trans. 1938. *Aristophanes. Wealth*, New York.
- Oliver, J. H. 1941. "Greek Inscriptions." *Hesperia* 10, pp. 65-90.
- Omont, H. 1901. "Athènes au XVIIe siècle." *Revue des Études Grecques* 14, pp. 270-294.
- Onians, J. 1988. *Bearers of Meaning: The Classical Orders in Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance*, Princeton.
- Orlandos, A. K. 1952. *Ἡ ξυλόστεγος παλαιοχριστιανική βασιλική*, Athens.

- _____. 1961. "Βυζαντινά μνημεία της αιτολοακαρνανίας." *ABME* 9, pp. 3-112.
- _____. 1966. *Les Matériaux de construction et la technique architecturale des anciens Grecs*, Paris.
- _____. 1973. *Τα χαράγματα του Παρθενῶνος*, Athens.
- _____. 1977. *Ἡ ἀρχιτεκτονικὴ τοῦ Παρθενῶνος*, 2 vols., Athens.
- Osborn, J. M. 1963. "Travel Literature and the Rise of Neo-Hellenism in England." *Bulletin of the New York Public Library* 67, pp. 279-300.
- Oncharov, N. 1993. "Άγνωστες απεικόνισεις πλοίων του 14ου και 15ου Αιώνα απο εκκλησίες της βουλγαρίας και των Σκοπίων." *ΕΝΑΛΙΑ* 5, pp. 29-31.
- Overbeck, J. C. 1972. "Some Notes on the Interior Arrangement of the Erechtheum." *AAA* 5, pp. 127-129.
- Page, W. 1818. *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*. Watercolor. Athens, Gennadeion.
- Palagia, O. 1984. "A Niche for Kallimachos' Lamp?" *AJA* 88, pp. 515-521.
- _____. 1993. *The Pediments of the Parthenon*, Leiden.
- _____. 1997. "Classical Encounters: Attic Sculpture after Sulla," in *The Romanization of Athens*, M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, eds., Oxford, pp. 81-95.
- _____. 2000. "Meaning and Narrative Techniques in Statue-Bases of the Pheidian Circle," in *Word and Image in Ancient Greece*, N. K. Rutter and B. A. Sparkes, eds., Edinburgh, pp. 53-78.
- Pallas, D. 1977. *Les monuments paléochrétiens de Grèce découverts de 1959 à 1973*, Rome.
- Pallat, L. 1912. "The Frieze of the Erechtheum." *AJA* 16, pp. 175-202.
- _____. 1935. "Der Fries der Nordhalle des Erechtheion." *JdI* 50, pp. 79-137.
- _____. 1937. "Zum Friese der Nordhalle des Erechtheion." *JdI* 52, pp. 17-29.
- Palma, B. 1981. "Il piccolo donario pergameno." *Xenia* 1, pp. 45-84.
- Panetsos, G. A. 2003. "The Formation of Athenian Neoclassicism," in *Athens: From the Classical Period to the Present Day (5th Century B.C.-A.D. 2000)*, C. Bouras, ed., New Castle, Del., pp. 398-435.
- Papageorgiou-Venetas, A. 1994. *Athens: the Ancient Heritage and the Historic Cityscape in a Modern Metropolis*, Athens.

- Papanikolaou, A. 1978. "Τα σχιστοειδούς μορφής ανοίγματα στο Ερέχθειο." *ArchDelt* 33, pp. 191-197.
- _____. 1994. "The Restoration of the Erechtheion," in *Acropolis Restoration: The CCAM Interventions*, R. Economakis, ed., London, pp. 137-149.
- Parker, R. 1997. *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford.
- Pars, W. 1765. *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*. Brushed drawing in grey and brown wash, with watercolor and bodycolor, some gum arabic, over graphite; on several sheets conjoined. London, Department of Prints and Drawings in the British Museum, no. MM-11-4.
- _____. 1765. *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*. Engraving. In *Antiquities of Athens*, 1789, vol. II, pl. 1 of chap. 2.
- _____. 1765. *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*. Watercolor. Athens, Gennadeion, Inserted in the Gennadeion copy of *Antiquities of Athens*, 1789, vol. II, pl. 1 of chap. 2.
- Parsons, A. W. 1943. "Klepsydra and the Paved Court of the Pythion." *Hesperia* 12, pp. 240-241.
- Paton, J. M. 1940. "The Venetians in Athens, 1687-1688. From the Istorica of Cristoforo Ivanovich." *Gennadeion Monographs* 1. Athens.
- Paton, J. M. 1951. *Chapters on Medieval and Renaissance Visitors to Greek Lands*, Princeton.
- _____. 1951. *Mediaeval and Renaissance Visitors to Greek Lands*, Athens.
- Paton, J. M., L. D. Caskey, H. N. Fowler, and G. P. Stevens. 1927. *The Erechtheum*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Pausanias 1516. *Pausaniae commentarii Graeciam describentes, Hoc est, Atticam, Corinthiacam, Laconicam, Messeniacam, Eleam, Achaicam, Arcadium, Boeotiam*, Venice.
- _____. 1731. *Voyage historique de la Grèce*, Amsterdam.
- Peckham, R. S. 2001. *National Histories, Natural States: Nationalism and the Politics of Place in Greece*, London.
- Pedersen, P. 1989. *The Parthenon and the Origin of the Corinthian Capital*, Odense.
- Penrose, F. C. April 5, 1847. *Portico of Minerva Polias*, North Portico from the east. Watercolor. Athens, House of Director of the British School at Athens, no. BSA-F-7.

- _____. 1888. *An Investigation of the Principles of Athenian Architecture*, London.
- Perrin, B., trans. 1914-1926. *Plutarch's Lives, with an English translation 2*, New York.
- Perry, C. 1743. *A View of the Levant: particularly of Constantinople, Syria, Egypt and Greece. In which Their Antiquities, Government, Politics, Maxims, Manners, and Customs (with many other Circumstances and Contingencies) are attempted to be Described and Treated on. In Four Parts* (Blackmer 1291, Atabey 940), London.
- Petit de Julleville, L. 1868. "Recherches sur l'emplacement et le vocable des églises chrétiennes en Grèce." *Archives des missions scientifiques et littéraires*, Sér. II, vol. V.
- Petrakos, B. 1981. "La base de la Nemesis d'Agoracrite." *BCH* 105, pp. 227-253.
- Pfister, F. 1951. *Die Reisbilder des Herakleides*, Vienna.
- Picard, C. 1935. "Vitruve, le portique des Perses à Sparte, et les origines de l'ordre persan." *CRAI* pp. 215-235.
- Pinney, G. F. 1988. "Pallas and Panathenaea," in *Proceedings of the 3rd Symposium on Ancient Greek and Related Pottery, Copenhagen 1987*, J. Christiansen and T. Melander, eds., Copenhagen, pp. 465-477.
- Pittakis, K. S. 1859. *EphArch* pp. 1809-1810, no. 3647.
- _____. 1835. *L'ancienne Athènes* (Blackmer 1835), Athens.
- _____. 1839. *ArchEph*.
- _____. 1840. *ArchEph*.
- Platon, N., S. Angelidis, J. Demakopoulos, G. Dontas, D. Lazarides, Ch. Bouras, Th. Skoulikidis, and I. Travlos. 1977. *Μελέτη αποκαταστάσεως του Ερεχθείου*, Athens.
- Plommer, H. 1960. "The Archaic Acropolis, Some Problems." *JHS* 80, pp. 127-159.
- _____. 1979. "Vitruvius and the Origin of Caryatids." *JHS* 99, pp. 97-102.
- Pococke, R. 1745. *A Description of the East and some other Countries*. 3 vols. (Blackmer 1323), London.
- _____. 1745. *The Temple of Erectheus at Athens, restored*, from the southwest. Engraving. Athens, from *A Description of the East and some other Countries*, pl. 48.
- Polenov, V. D. 1882. *Portico with Caryatids*, from the west-southwest. Oil on canvas. St. Petersburg, State Russian Museum, SRM 96548.

- Pollitt, J. J. 1986. *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge.
- Pomardi, S. 1804-1805. *Erechtheion*, view from the west. Engraving. Athens, from E. Dodwell, *Tour through Greece* 1, between pp. 346 and 347.
- _____. 1804-1805. *West End of the Pandrosion*, from the northwest. Engraving. Athens, from E. Dodwell, *Tour through Greece*, 1, between pp. 356 and 357.
- Potter, J. 1706. *Archaeologia Graeca: or the Antiquities of Greece* 1, 2nd ed., London.
- Poulter, A. G. 1995. *Nicopolis ad Istrum: A Roman, Late Roman, and Early Byzantine City: Excavations 1985-1992*, London.
- Pouqueville, F. C. H. L. 1822. *Travels in Southern Epirus, Acarnania, Aetolia, Attica, and Peloponesus, or the Morea, &c. &c. in the Years 1814-1815*, London.
- Préaux, M. F. 1799-1801. *Temple of Erectheus at Athens; East Porch of the Erechtheion*. Engraving. From E. Clarke's *Travels thorough Various Countries*, facing p. 498.
- Radt, W. 1984. *Pergamon: An Archaeological Guide*, Istanbul.
- Randel, W. 1960. "William Haygarth: Forgotten Philhellene." *Keats-Shelley Journal* 9, p. 87.
- Rangabé, A. R. 1845. *RA* 2.
- _____. 1882. "Das Erechtheion." *AM* 7, pp. 258-273.
- Rankin, E. A. 1978. "Englishmen on the Acropolis: An historiography of the architecture of the Parthenon c. 1750-1850" (diss. University of Witwatersrand).
- Raubitschek, A. E., and G. P. Stevens. 1946. "The Pedestal of the Athena Promachos." *Hesperia* 15, pp. 107-114.
- _____. 1946. "Octavia's Deification at Athens." *TAPA* 77, pp. 146-150.
- _____. and L. H. Jeffery. 1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis: A Catalogue of the Inscriptions of the Sixth and Fifth Centuries B.C.*, Princeton.
- Ray, J. 1693. *A Collection of Curious Travels and Voyages, in two tomes. The first containing Dr. Leonhart Rauwolff's Itinerary into the eastern countries ..., the second taking in many parts of Greece, Asia Minor, Egypt, Arabia Felix and Patraea, Ethiopia, the Red-Sea, &c from the Observations of Mons. Belon. Mr. Vernon, Dr. Son. Dr. Smith, Dr. Huntingdon, Mr. Greaves, Alpinus, Veslingius, Thevenot's Collections, and others* (Blackmer 1397), London.
- Reinaud, M. 1848. *Géographie d'Aboulféda*, Paris.
- Rey, E. 1843. *The North Portico from the East*. Lithograph. In *Voyage pittoresque en*

- Grèce et dans le Levant*, pl. 25.
- _____. 1843. *Temple of Erechtheus from the Southwest*. Engraving. in *Voyage pittoresque en Grèce et dans le Levant fait en 1843 - 1844* by Rey and Chenavard.
- _____. 1867. *Voyage pittoresque en Grèce et dans le Levant fait en 1843 - 1844 par Et. Rey, peintre et A. Chenavard, Architecte* (Blackmer 1412, Atabey 1037), Lyon.
- Ricardo, H. R. December 1845. *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*. Drawing. London, Library of the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities in the British Museum, pl. 12.
- Rich, J. 2002. "Review of Martin Spannagel, *Exemplaria Principis. Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums*. Heidelberg: Verlag Archäologie und Geschichte, 1999." *BMCR*.
- Ridgway, B. S. 1984. *Roman copies of Greek sculpture: the problem of the originals*, Ann Arbor.
- _____. 1992. "Images of Athena on the Akropolis," in *Goddess and Polis: The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, J. Neils, ed., Princeton, pp. 119-142, 210-215.
- _____. 1993. *The Archaic Style in Greek Sculpture*, Chicago.
- Ridgway, D. 1996. "Gell, Sir William (1777-1836)," in *An Encyclopedia of the History of Classical Archaeology*, N. T. de Grummond, ed., Westport, Conn., pp. 483-484.
- Robert, C. 1890. *Hermes* 25, pp. 437-439.
- Robertson, J. 1853-1854. *View of the Erechtheion from the Southwest*. Albumen print. Athens, Rena Andreadis Collection.
- Robertson, N. 1996. "Athena's Shrines and Festivals," in *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon*, J. Neils, ed, Madison, Wis., pp. 27-77.
- Rodenwaldt, G. 1921. "Die Form des Erechtheions." *Neue Jahrbuch für das klassische Altertum* 24, pp. 1-13.
- Rodger, N. A. M. 1994. *The Insatiable Earl: A Life of John Montagu, Fourth Earl of Sandwich*, New York.
- Rose, C. B. forthcoming. "The Parthians in Augustan Rome." *AJA*.
- _____. 1997. *Dynastic Commemoration and Imperial Portraiture in the Julio-Claudian Period*, Cambridge.
- Rosivach, V. P. 1991. "IG II² 334 and the Panathenaic Hekatomb." *PP* 46, pp. 430-442.

- Ross, L. 1855. *Archäologische Aufsätze* 1, Halle und Leipzig.
- Roth, M., C. Lyons, and C. Merewether. 1997. *Irresistible Decay: Ruins Reclaimed*, Los Angeles.
- Rothaus, R. M. 1992. "Omne ignotum pro sacro: Quadrisectioned gameboards and religious graffiti." *OxfJA* 11, pp. 365-368.
- Roueché, C. 1989. *Aphrodisias in Late Antiquity: the Late Roman and Byzantine Inscriptions including Texts from the Excavations at Aphrodisias conducted by Kenan T. Erim*, London.
- Roux, G. 1961. *L'architecture de l'Argolide aux IV^e et III^e siècles avant J.-C.*, Paris.
- Rumscheid, F. 1994. *Untersuchungen zur kleinasiatischen Bauornamentik des Hellenismus*, Mainz.
- Rutherford, I. 2001. "Tourism and the Sacred: Pausanias and the Traditions of Greek Pilgrimage," in *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, and J. Elsner, Eds., Oxford, pp. 40-52.
- Rørbye, M. 1836. *Parti af Erechteion*, Maiden Porch from the east. Oil. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, on loan from a private collection, Room 238.
- Salmon, F. 2000. *Building on Ruins: the Rediscovery of Rome and English Architecture*, Aldershot, U.K. and Burlington, Vt.
- San Felice, M. 1687. *Plan de la ville d'Athènes*, levé en 1687 par l'ingénieur Verneda sous la direction du comte de San Felice. Engraving by F. Lebel. In Fanelli's *Atene Attica*, p. 318.
- Sanders, G. D. R. In print. "Problems in Interpreting Urban and Rural Settlement in Southern Greece, AD 365-700," in *Landscapes of Change: The Evolution of the Countryside from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, N. Christie and S. Scott, eds.
- Sanders, G. 1999. "A Late Roman Bath at Corinth." *Hesperia* 68, pp. 441-480.
- Sayer, R. 1759. *Ruins of Athens*, London.
- Schädler, U. 1990. "Ionische und Attisches am sogenannten Erechtheion in Athen." *AA* pp. 361-378.
- Schäfer, T. 1998. *Spolia et signa: Baupolitik und Reichskultur nach dem Parthererfolg des Augustus*, Göttingen.
- Schedel, H. 1493. *Athene oder Minerva*, Athens as a German Town. Woodcut. Chronicle of the World (known today as the *Nuremberg Chronicle*), p. 27.

- Schinkel, K. F. 1982. *Collected Architectural Designs*, London.
- Schmalz, G. C. R. 1994. "Public Building and Civic Identity in Augustan and Julio-Claudian Athens" (diss. University of Michigan).
- Schmidt-Colinet, A. 1977. *Antike Stützfiguren: Untersuchungen zu Typus und Bedeutung der menschengestaltigen Architekturstütze in der griechischen und römischen Kunst*, Berlin.
- _____. 1994. "Cassas l'archeologue," in *Louis-François Cassas 1756-1827: Dessinateur - Voyageur - Im Banne der Sphinx*, A. Gilet, ed., Mainz, pp. 207-222.
- Schmidt, E. E. 1973. "Die Kopien der Erechtheionkoren," *AntP* 13. Berlin.
- Schnapp, A. 1996. *The Discovery of the Past: The Origins of Archaeology*, London.
- Schneider, L., and C. Höcker. 2001. *Die Akropolis von Athen: eine Kunst- und Kulturgeschichte*, Darmstadt.
- Schneider, R. M. 1986. *Bunte Barbaren: Orientalenstatuen aus farbigem Marmor in der römischen Repräsentationskunst*, Worms.
- Scholl, A. 1995. "Choephoroi: Zur Deutung der Korenhalle des Erechtheion." *JdI* 110, pp. 179-212.
- _____. 1998. *Die Korenhalle des Erechtheion auf der Akropolis*, Frankfurt and Mainz.
- Schultz, P. 2001. "The Akroteria of the Temple of Athena Nike." *Hesperia* 70, pp. 1-47.
- _____. 2003. "Το εικονογραφικό πρόγραμμα του ναού της Αθηνάς Νίκης στην Ακρόπολη." (diss. University of Athens).
- Schweitzer, B. 1922. *AA* 37, col. 251.
- Schwencke, A. 1854. *Geschichte der Hannoverschen Truppen in Griechenland, 1685-1689*, Hanover.
- Scott, J. 2003. *The Pleasures of Antiquity: British Collectors of Greece and Rome*, China.
- Scrinari, V. 1953-1955. "La donne dei Severi nella monetazione dell'epoca." *BullComm* 75, pp. 117-135.
- Scrofani, X. 1801. *Voyage en Grèce, de Xavier Scrofani, Sicilien, fait en 1794-1795; traduit de l'italien, par J.F.C. Blanvillain in 2 Volumes* (Blackmer 1517, Atabey 1115), Paris and Strasbourg.

- Sealey, R. 1976. *A History of the Greek City-States, ca. 700-338 B.C.*, Berkeley.
- Sébah, P. ca. 1874. *Porte Septentrionale de l'Eretheion*. Albumen print. Athens, Collection Antonis Maïllis.
- Seiler, F. 1986. *Die griechische Tholos*, Mainz and Rhein.
- Setton, K. M. 1944. "Athens in the Later Twelfth Century." *Speculum* 19, pp. 179-207.
- _____. 1975. *Athens in the Middle Ages*, London.
- _____. 1975. *Catalan Domination of Athens 1311-1388*, London.
- Sevinç, N., R. Körpe, M. Tombul, C. B. Rose, D. Strahan, H. Kiesewetter, and J. Wallrodt. 2001. "A New Painted Graeco-Persian Sarcophagus from Çan." *Studia Troica* 11, pp. 383-420.
- Shaw, S., and E. K. Shaw. 1977. *History of the Ottoman Empire and Modern Turkey*, Cambridge.
- Shaw, W. M. K. 2003. *Possessors and Possessed: Museums, Archaeology, and the Visualization of History in the Late Ottoman Empire*, Berkeley, Los Angeles, and London.
- Shear, I. M. 1963. "Kallikrates." *Hesperia* 32, pp. 375-424.
- _____. 1999. "Maidens in Greek Architecture. The Origin of the Caryatids." *BCH* 123, pp. 65-85.
- Shear Jr., T. L. 1966. "Studies in the Early Projects of the Periklean Building Program" (diss. Princeton University).
- _____. 1997. "The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1989-1993." *Hesperia* 66, pp. 495-548.
- Shear, J. L. 2001. "Polis and Panathenaia: The History and Development of Athena's Festival" (diss. University of Pennsylvania).
- Sicilianos, D. 1960. *Old and New Athens*, London.
- Simopoulos, K. 1985. *Ξένοι Ταξιδιώτες στην Ελλάδα, 1800-1810*, 2nd ed., vol. III.i, Athens.
- Simpson, M., Trans. 1976. *Gods and Heroes of the Greeks: The Library of Apollodorus*, Amherst.
- Skene, J. 1838-1840. *Diaries*. Athens, Center for the Study of Modern Greece, AM 21.
- _____. 1838a. *Erychtheium*, from the west-southwest. Pen on paper. Athens,

- Academy of Athens, Center for the Study of Modern Greece, no. 47 in Skene Diary 1840.
- _____. 1838b. *Erychtheium*, from the north. Pen on paper. Athens, Academy of Athens, Center for the Study of Modern Greece, no. 226 in Skene Diary 1840.
- _____. 1839. *The Erechtheum from the Southwest*. Drawing. Woking, Possession of Felix Skene of Send and Maurice Skene-Tytler of Keith Marischal.
- _____. February 27, 1839. *The North Portico from the Northwest*. Drawing. Woking, Possession of Felix Skene of Send and Maurice Skene-Tytler of Keith Marischal.
- _____. January 8, 1841. *Temple of Minerva Polias and Erechtheus*, from the east. Pen and sepia drawing on paper. Athens, National Historical Museum, Room M.
- _____. May 25, 1841. *The Interior of the Erechtheum*, from the southeast. Woking, Possession of Felix Skene of Send and Maurice Skene-Tytler of Keith Marischal.
- _____. March 1843. *Akropolis*, view from the Propylaea of the Erechtheion and the Parthenon. Watercolor. London, British Museum, from "Watercolors in Athens" by James Skene, no. 11.
- Skovgaard, J. 1884. *Porch of the Maidens from the East*. Oil on canvas. Ordrupgaard, Denmark, Ordrupgaard, no. 236.
- Slane, K., and G. D. R. Sanders. forthcoming. "Late Roman Horizons Established at Corinth." *Hesperia*.
- Smirke, R. ca. 1803. *The Erechtheum from the Northwest*. Watercolor. London, R.I.B.A. Library Drawings Collection, Smirke Sketchbook, no. 9.
- Smith, A. 1884. *Glimpses of Greek Life and Scenery*, London.
- Smith, A. H. 1892. *A Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities* 1, London.
- _____. 1916. "Lord Elgin and His Collection." *JHS* 36, pp. 163-372.
- Smith, R. R. R. 1991. *Hellenistic Sculpture*, New York.
- Snijder, G. A. S. 1924. "Sur le Temple de Rome et Auguste et l'Erechthéion sur l'Acropole d'Athènes." *RA* 19, pp. 223-226.
- Sotiriou, G. A. 1927. *Εύρητήριο μωσαιωνικῶν μνημείων τῆς Ἑλλάδος*, Athens.
- _____. 1929. "Αἱ παλαιοχριστιανικὰ Βασιλικὰ τῆς Ἑλλάδος." *PAE* pp. 161-246.

- Spannagel, M. 1999. *Exemplaria Principis. Untersuchungen zu Entstehung und Ausstattung des Augustusforums*, Heidelberg.
- Spawforth, A. J. S. 1997. "The Early Reception of the Imperial Cult in Athens; Problem and Ambiguities," *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska April 1996*, M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, eds., Oxford, pp. 183-201.
- Spencer, T. 1974. *Fair Greece Sad Relic: Literary Philhellenism from Shakespeare to Byron*, Bath.
- Spiers, R. P. ca. 1866. *The Erechtheion from the Northeast*. Watercolor. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. E.2738-1918.
- _____. ca. 1866. *The Erechtheion from the Southeast*. Pencil on tracing paper. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. E.2739-1918.
- _____. 1866. *The North Porch of the Erechtheion from the East*. Watercolor. London, R.I.B.A. Library Drawings Collection, PB 305-23 (formerly V5/60).
- Spieser, J.-M. 1976. "La Christianisation des sanctuaires païens en Grèce," *Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heiligtümern: Internationales Symposium in Olympia vom 10. bis 12. Oktober 1974, anlässlich der Hundertjahrfeier der Abteilung Athen und der deutschen Ausgrabungen in Olympia*, U. Jantzen, ed., Tübingen.
- _____. 1986. "La christianisation de la ville dans l'Antiquité tardive." *Ktéma* 11, pp. 49-55.
- Spira, A. 1960. *Untersuchungen zum Deus ex machina bei Sophokles und Euripides*, Kallmünz.
- Spon, J. 1676. *Bird's Eye View of Athens, from the south*. Engraving. From *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce, et du Levant, fait aux années 1675 et 1676 par Jacob Spon et George Wheler*.
- Spon, J. 1679. *Réponse à la critique publiée par M. Guillet sur le Voyage de Grece de Jacob Spon, Avec quatre Lettres sur le mesme sujet, le Journal d'Angleterre du Sieur Vernon, & la Liste des erreurs commises par M. Guillet dans son Athenes ancienne & nouvelle* (Blackmer 1587, Atabey 1171), Lyon.
- _____. 1679. *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce, et du Levant, fait aux années 1675 et 1676 par Jacob Spon et George Wheler* (Blackmer 1586, Atabey 1170), Amsterdam.
- St. Clair, W. 1997. *Lord Elgin and the Marbles*, London.
- Stademann, F. 1841. *Panorama von Athen* (Blackmer 1595), Munich.

- Stamp, G. 1999. *Alexander 'Greek' Thomson*, Glasgow.
- Stanford, W. B. and E. J. Finopoulos, eds. 1984. *The Travels of Lord Charlemont in Greece & Turkey 1749*, London.
- Stern, E. M. 1985. "Die Kapitelle der Nordhalle des Erechtheion." *AM* 100, pp. 405-426.
- Stevens, G. P. 1940. "The Setting of the Periclean Parthenon," *Hesperia Supplement 3*, Princeton.
- _____. 1946. "Architectural Studies concerning the Acropolis of Athens." *Hesperia* 15, pp. 1-26, 73-106.
- _____. 1936. "The Periclean Entrance Court of the Acropolis of Athens." *Hesperia* 5, pp. 443-520.
- Stewart, A. 1990. *Greek Sculpture: An Exploration*, New Haven.
- _____. 2004. *Attalos, Athens and the Akropolis: The Pergamene 'Little Barbarians' and Their Roman and Renaissance Legacy*, Cambridge.
- Stewart, C. 1994. "Syncretism as a Dimension of Nationalist Discourse in Modern Greece," in *Syncretism/Anti-Syncretism: The Politics of Religious Synthesis*, C. Stewart and R. Shaw, eds., London, pp. 127-143.
- Stilling, H. C. 1853. *The Erechtheion from the Southeast*. Watercolor. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 17736b Neg. no. 912.1995.
- _____. 1853. *Erechtheion from the West*. Watercolor. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 17736a; Neg. no. 912.1993.
- Stillman, W. J. 1869. *The Erechtheum, Porch of the Caryatids*. Albumen print. Ithaca, Dickson White Architectural Photographs Collection, Division of Rare and Manuscript Collections, Cornell University Library, no.15-5/3090.00290.
- Stoneman, R. 1987. *Land of the Lost Gods: The Search for Classical Greece*, Norman and London.
- _____. 1998. *A Luminous Land: Artists Discover Greece*, Los Angeles.
- _____. 2004. *A Traveller's History of Athens*, London.
- Stuart, J. 1751. *One of the Caryatids Viewed in Front and in Profile*. Engraving. In *Antiquities of Athens*.
- _____. 1751. *Stuart Sketching the Erechtheum*. Watercolor. London, R.I.B.A.

- Stuart, J., and N. Revett. 1762-1816. *The Antiquities of Athens* (Blackmer 1618), London.
- _____. 1789. *The Antiquities of Athens 2*, London.
- _____. 1825-1830. *The Antiquities of Athens* (Blackmer 1617), London.
- _____. 1898. *The Antiquities of Athens and Other Monuments of Greece with Seventy-One Plates*, London.
- Stucky, R. A. 1988. "Hellenistische Syrien." in *Akten des XIII Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie Berlin*, Mainz, pp. 25-31.
- Szambien, W. 1994. "La galerie d'architecture," in *Louis-François Cassas 1756-1827*, A. Gilet, ed., Mainz, pp. 242-250.
- Tanoulas, T. 1987. "The Propylaea of the Acropolis at Athens since the Seventeenth Century: Their Decay and Decline." *JdI* 102 , pp. 413-483.
- _____. 1997. *Τα Προπύλαια της Αθηναϊκής Ακρόπολης κατά τον Μεσαιώνα*, 2 vols., Athens.
- Taylor, G. L. 1818. *The Erechtheum from the Northwest*. Drawing. London, Victoria and Albert Museum, no. E.4209-1909, Box A215.
- Taylor, L. R. 1949. *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*, Berkeley.
- Temple, G. 1836. *Travels in Greece and Turkey* (Atabey 1836), London.
- Tétaz, J.-M. 1847-1848. *Mémoire explicatif et justificatif de la restauration de l'Érechthéion d'Athènes*, Paris.
- _____. 1848. *Académie des Beaux-Arts de l'Institut de France. Section d'Architecture. Restauration du Temple d'Erechthée à Athènes exécutée par M. Tétaz en 1848*. Paris, Académie des Beaux-Arts.
- _____. 1848. *Acropolis d'Athènes. Ruines de l'Érechtheion, état actuel*. Engraving. In *RA* 1851, pl.158.
- _____. 1851. "Mémoire explicatif et justificatif de la restauration de l'Érechtheion d'Athènes." *RA* 8, pp. 1-12 and 81-96.
- Thompson, H. A. 1978. "Review of J. A. Bundgaard, *Parthenon and the Mycenaean City on the Heights*." *AJA* 82, pp. 256-258.
- Thürmer, J. 1819. *The Erechtheum from the Northeast*. Engraving. From *Ansichten von Athen und seinen Denkmälern*, Athens, Gennadeion.
- Tobin, J. 1997. *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens*, Amsterdam.

- Tolias, G. 1995. *British Travellers in Greece 1750-1820*, London.
- Tomkinson, J. L. 2002. *Attica*, Athens.
- Tournikiotis, P., ed. 1994. *The Parthenon and its Impact on Modern Times*, Athens.
- Tracy, S. V. 1990. *Attic Letter-Cutters of 229 to 86 B.C.*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Travlos, I. 1960. *Πολεοδομική εξέλιξις των Αθηνων*, Athens.
- _____. 1967. *Νεοκλασσική Αρχιτεκτονική στην Ελλάδα*, Athens.
- _____. 1971. "The Interior Arrangement of the Erechtheion." *AAA* 4, pp. 77-84.
- _____. 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, New York.
- _____. 1973. "Η Πθροπλήσις του Παρθενώνος υπο τών Ερουλών και η Επισκευή του κατα τους Χρόνους του Αυτοκράτορος Ιουλιανου." *ArchEph*, pp. 218-236.
- _____. 1986. "Τὸ τετράκονχο οικόδομημα τῆς Βιβλιοθήκης τοῦ Ἀδριανοῦ," *Φίλια Ἐπη εἰς Γ.Ε. Μυλωνᾶν*, Athens, pp. 343-347.
- Treu, M. 1971. "Euripides' *Erechtheus*," *Chiron* 1, pp. 115-131.
- Trillmich, W. 1990. "Colonia Augusta Emerita, di Hauptstadt von Lusitanien," in *Stadtbild und Ideologie, Die Monumentalisierung hispanischer Städte zwischen Republik und Kaiserzeit*, W. Trillmich and P. Zanker, Munich, pp. 299-318.
- Trummer, R. 1980. "Die Denkmäler des Kaiserkults in der römischen Provinz Achaia" (diss. University of Graz).
- Tsigakou, F.-M. 1977. "Edward Lear in Greece" (diss. University College London).
- Tsigakou, F.-M. 1981. *The Rediscovery of Greece: Travellers and Painters of the Romantic Era*, New Rochelle, N.Y.
- _____. 1985. *Athens 1839-1900: A Photographic Record*, Athens.
- _____. 1985. *Thomas Hope (1769-1831) Pictures from 18th Century Greece*, Athens.
- _____. 1991. *Through Romantic Eyes*, Alexandria, Va.
- _____. 1995. *British Images of Greece from the Benaki Museum Collections*, Athens.
- _____. 1998. *James Skene 1838-1845*, Athens.
- Tufano-Mallouchou, F. 1998. *Η αναστήλωση των αρχαίων μνημείων στη*

νεώτερη Ελλάδα (1834-1939), Athens.

Turner, W. 1820. *Journal of a Tour in the Levant in 3 Volumes* (Blackmer 1687, Atabey 1251), London.

Ugolini, L. M. 1937. *Butrinto: il mito d'Enea, gli scavi*, Rome.

Unger, R. W. 1980. *The Ship in the Medieval Economy 600-1600*, Montreal and London.

Valeva, J. 1993. "Hellenistic Tombs in Thrace and Macedonia: Their Form and Decorations," in *Function and Spatial Analysis of Wall Painting: proceedings of the Fifth International Congress on Ancient Wall Painting*, E. M. Moormann, ed. Leiden.

van der Vin, J. P. A. 1980. *Travellers to Greece and Constantinople: Ancient Monuments and Old Traditions in Medieval Travellers' Tales*, Leiden.

Vandeput, L. 1997. *The Architectural Decoration in Roman Asia Minor, Sagalassos: A Case Study*, Leuven.

Verneda, G. M. 1687. *Athens During the Explosion in the Parthenon on September 23, 1687*, view from the northeast. Venice, Venetian Archives.

_____. 1687. *Pianta del Castello d'Acropolis e Città d'Athene. Tavola delle cose più notabili conteute [sic] nella Pianta del Castello*. Manuscript with gold and red ink. Vienna.

_____. 1687. *Plan de l'Acropole d'Athènes*, Dressé en 1687 par l'ingénieur Capitaine Verneda. Engraving. In L. Laborde, *Athènes aux XV^e, XVI^e et XVII^e siècles*, vol. 2, p. 182.

_____. September 26, 1687. *Veduta del Borgo e del castello di Athene al momento del esplosione di Partenone da una bomba*. Watercolor. Athens, Benaki Museum, Room 23, Case 1.

_____. 1687. *Bombardment of the Akropolis by General Morosini in 1687*. Engraving. Athens, Gennadeion.

Vernon, S. F. January 10, 1675. Letter to Mr. Oldenburg from Smyrna.

Vickers, M. 1985. "Persepolis, Vitruvius, and the Erechtheum Caryatids: The Iconography of Medism and Servitude." *RA* 1, pp. 3-28.

_____. forthcoming. *Alcibiades on Stage*, Oxford.

Viscogliosi, A. 1996. *Il tempio di Apollo in Circo e la formazione del linguaggio architettonico augusteo*, Rome.

- von Osten, A. P. 1834. *Julius Schnellers hinterlassene Werke...herausgegeben von Ernst Münch 2*, Stuttgart.
- Várhelyi, Z. 2001. "Magic, Religion, and Syncretism at the Oracle of Claros," in *Between Magic and Religion: Interdisciplinary Studies in Ancient Mediterranean Religion and Society*, S. Asirvatham, C. O. Pache, and J. Watrous, eds., Lanham, Md., pp. 13-33.
- Waddington, G. 1825. *A Visit to Greece in 1823 and 1824* (Atabey 1307), London.
- Walbank, F. W. 1992. *The Hellenistic World*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Walker, A. S. 1980. "A Chronological Study of the Imperial Coinage of Athens based on the Collection of the Agora Excavations at Athens" (diss. University of Pennsylvania).
- Walker, S. 1979. "Corinthian Capitals with Rigned Voids: the Work of Athenian Craftsmen in the Second Century AD." *AA*, pp. 103-129.
- _____. 1997. "Athens under Augustus," in *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference held at Lincoln, Nebraska April 1996*, M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, eds., Oxford, pp. 67-80.
- Walpole, R. 1817. *Memoirs relating to the European and Asiatic Turkey and Other Countries of the East* (Blackmer 1762, Atabey 1310), London.
- Ward, J. 1822. *Posthumous Portrait of Fanny, Soane's 'Favourite Dog'*. Oil on panel. London, Sir John Soane's Museum.
- Ward-Perkins, B. 1999. "Re-using the Architectural Legacy of the Past, *entre idéologie et pragmatisme*," in *The Idea and Ideal of the Town Between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, G. P. Brogiolo and B. Ward-Perkins, eds., Leiden, pp. 225-244.
- Watkin, D. 1968. *Thomas Hope and the Neoclassical Idea*, London.
- _____. 1979. *English Architecture: A Concise History*, New York.
- _____. 1982. *Athenian Stuart: Pioneer of the Greek Revival*, London.
- Watkin, D., and T. Mellinghoff. 1987. *German Architecture and the Classical Ideal*, Cambridge, Mass.
- Watkins, T. 1792. *Travels through Swisserland, Italy, Sicily, the Greek Islands to Constantinople; through part of Greece, Ragusa and the Dalmatian Isles: In a series of Letters to Pennoyre Watkins, Esq. from Thomas Watkins in the Years 1787, 1788, 1789* (Blackmer 1774), London.

- Webb, T. 1982. *English Romantic Hellenism 1700-1824*, New York.
- Weiner, A. 1985. "Inalienable Wealth." *American Ethnologist* 12, pp. 210-227.
- _____. 1992. *Inalienable Possessions*, Berkeley.
- Weller, C. H. 1921. "The Original Plan of the Erechtheum." *AJA* 25, pp. 130-141.
- Werner, C. F. 1877. *View of the Porch of the Caryatids on the Erechtheion*. Gouache on paper. Athens, Benaki Museum, no. 23958.
- Wescoat, B. 2004. "Samothrace and Delos in the Hellenistic Period," Paper delivered at *Architecture & Archaeology in the Cyclades: Lincoln College, Oxford*.
- Wesenburg, B. 1984. "Augustusforum und Akropolis." *JdI* 99, pp. 161-185.
- Wheler, G. 1675-1682. *Bird's Eye View of Athens*, from the north. Engraving. In *A Journey into Greece by George Wheeler, Esq. In Company of Dr. Spon of Lyons*.
- Wheler, G. 1682. *A Journey into Greece by George Wheeler, Esq. In Company of Dr. Spon of Lyons* (Blackmer 1786, Atabey 1328), London.
- Wickkiser, B. 2003. "The Appeal of Asklepios and the Politics of Healing in the Greco-Roman World" (diss. University of Texas at Austin).
- Wiebenson, D. 1969. *Sources of Greek Revival Architecture*, London.
- Wiegand, T. 1904. *Die archaische Poros-Architektur der Akropolis zu Athen*, Cassel-Leipzig.
- Wilkins, W. 1802. *Restoration of the Erechtheion from the Southwest*. In *Atheniensiæ, or, Remarks on the Topography and Buildings of Athens*.
- Wilkins, W. 1816. *Atheniensiæ, or, Remarks on the Topography and Buildings of Athens* (Blackmer 1798), London.
- Wilkins, W. 1837. *Prolusiones Architectonicae*, London.
- Williams, C. K., and J. E. Fisher. 1975. "Corinth 1974: Forum Southwest." *Hesperia* 44, pp. 1-50.
- Williams, H. W. 1817. *Interior of the Acropolis of Athens*, from the Propylæia. Engraving. From *Select Views of Greece*.
- _____. 1817. *Temple of Pandrosus*, view from the southwest. Engraving. From *Select Views of Greece*.
- _____. 1817. *View of the Erechtheum*, signed. Watercolor. Athens, Private Collection.

- _____. 1817. *View of the Erechtheum from the North*. Engraving. From *Select Views of Greece*.
- _____. 1817. *View of the Propylaea*. Watercolor. Athens, Private Collection.
- _____. 1820. *Travels in Italy, Greece and Ionian Islands in a Series of Letters, Descriptive of Manners, Scenery, and the Fine Arts 2*, Edinburgh.
- _____. 1829. *Select Views in Greece with Classical Illustrations* (Blackmer 1811, Atabey 1337), London.
- Willis, N. P. 1853. *Summer Cruise in the Mediterranean* (Blackmer 1812, Atabey 1338), London.
- Wilson, G. E. 1971. "The Herulian Sack of Athens, A.D. 267" (diss. University of Washington).
- Wilson Jones, M. 2000. *Principles of Roman Architecture*, New Haven.
- _____. 2002. "Tripods, Triglyphs, and the Origin of the Doric Frieze." *AJA* 106, pp. 353-390.
- Winckelmann, J. J. 1760. *Anmerkungen über die Baukunst der Alten*, Leipzig.
- _____. 1764. *Geschichte der Kunst des Altertums*, Dresden.
- Winstrup, L. A. 1850-1851. *The Erechtheion from the East*. Pencil and watercolor. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 5854.
- _____. 1851. *The Erechtheion from the South*. Pencil. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 5850.
- _____. 1851. *The Erechtheion from the West*. Pencil and watercolor. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 5853.
- _____. 1851. *The Interior of the South Wall of the Erechtheion*. Pencil and watercolor. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 6120a.
- _____. January 1851. *The Interior of the North Wall of the Erechtheion*. Pencil and watercolor. Copenhagen, Collection of Architectural Drawings, Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Kunstakademiets Bibliotek, Kbh.KAark. 6120b.
- Wolfe, J. L. 1820. *Sketch-books and Diaries*. London, R.I.B.A. Library Drawings Collection.

- Woodhouse, C. M. 1984. *Modern Greece: A Short History*, London.
- _____. 1969. *The Philhellenes*, London.
- Woods, J. 1828. *Letters of an Architect from France, Italy, and Greece 2*, London.
- Woodward, C. 2001. *In Ruins*, New York.
- _____. 2003. "Ruins," in *Classical Pilgrimages, Consecrated Landscapes: Travellers to the Mediterranean World in the Age of Enlightenment*, I. M. Morris, ed., London, p. 14.
- Wordsworth, C. pre-1821. *The Pandroseum*, Maiden Porch from the southeast. Engraving. In *Greece: Pictorial, Descriptive and Historical*, p. 201.
- _____. 1832-1833. *The Parthenon and the Erectheum*. Engraving. In *Greece: Pictorial, Descriptive and Historical*, p. 200.
- _____. 1836. *Athens and Attica: Journal of a Residence There* (Blackmer 1839), London.
- _____. 1853. *Greece: Pictorial, Descriptive and Historical*, London.
- Wycherley, R. E. 1978. *The Stones of Athens*, Princeton.
- Xyngopoulos, A. 1937. "Ανασκαφή ἐν Γερακίῳ." *PAE* pp. 108-114.
- Yalouri, E. 2001. *The Acropolis: Global Fame, Local Claim*, Oxford and New York.
- Yiakoumis, H. 2000. *The Acropolis of Athens: Photographs 1839-1959*, Athens.
- Yéméniz, E. 1854. *Voyage dans le royaume de Grèce* (Blackmer 1854), Paris.
- Zachos, K. 2003. "The *Tropaeum* of the Sea-Battle of Actium at Nikopolis: Interim Report." *JRA* 16, pp. 62-92.
- Zahn, F. ca. 1837. *Erechtheum*. Engraving. Athens, Gennadeion, Loose engraving.
- Zanker, P. 1988. *The Power of Images in the Age of Augustus*, Ann Arbor.
- Zintzen, C. 2000. *Athen, Rom, Florenz: ausgewählte kleine Schriften*, Hildesheim.
- Ziolkowski, A. 1999. "Pantheon," in *Lexicon Topographicum Urbis Romae*, E. M. Steinby, ed., vol. IV, Rome, pp. 54-61.
- Züchner, W. 1936. "Fragmente auf der Akropolis und im Asklepieion zu Athen." *AA* 51, pp. 304-334.
1852. *Elevations of the Erechtheion*. Colored engraving. Athens, in *Archaeological*

Society of Athens 1853.

2001. *A New Description of Sir John Soane's Museum*, Marlborough.