



Ancient Upcycling: Social Memory and the Reuse of Marble in Athens

Citation

Rous, Sarah Adler. 2016. Ancient Upcycling: Social Memory and the Reuse of Marble in Athens. Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, Graduate School of Arts & Sciences.

Permanent link

<http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:33493528>

Terms of Use

This article was downloaded from Harvard University's DASH repository, and is made available under the terms and conditions applicable to Other Posted Material, as set forth at <http://nrs.harvard.edu/urn-3:HUL.InstRepos:dash.current.terms-of-use#LAA>

Share Your Story

The Harvard community has made this article openly available.
Please share how this access benefits you. [Submit a story](#).

[Accessibility](#)

*Ancient Upcycling:
Social Memory and the Reuse of Marble in Athens*

A dissertation presented

by

Sarah Adler Rous

to

The Department of the Classics

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in the subject of

Classical Archaeology

Harvard University

Cambridge, Massachusetts

May 2016

© 2016 Sarah Adler Rous

All rights reserved.

Ancient Upcycling: Social Memory and the Reuse of Marble in Athens

Abstract

In this dissertation I examine the various ways Athenians of several periods of antiquity purposefully reused stone artifacts, objects, and buildings in order to shape their own and their descendants' collective ideas about their community's past and its bearing on the present and future. I develop the concept of "upcycling" to refer to this intentionally meaningful reuse, where evidence is preserved of an intentionality behind the decision to re-employ a particular object in a particular new context, often with implications for the shared memory of a group. My investigation makes use of archaeological, literary, and epigraphical evidence to connect seemingly disparate cases of meaningful reuse within a long chronological span, treating the city of Athens as a continuously evolving cultural community.

By taking a wide view of reuse with a focus on intentionality and visibility, I fruitfully re-examine some well known cases like the North Acropolis Wall, constructed largely of material from the temples destroyed by the Persians in 480 BCE, and the "itinerant" Temple of Ares, moved from the deme of Pallene into the heart of the Agora in the late 1st century BCE, in conjunction with other case studies including the reuse of the Mycenaean Bastion beneath the Classical Sanctuary of Athena Nike at the entrance to the Acropolis, the preservation of Archaic statues burnt by the Persians and described by Pausanias in the 2nd century CE, the repeated renewal of the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes in the Agora, a group of Classical and

Hellenistic portrait statues on the Acropolis rededicated to Roman honorands in the Early Roman period, and the 3rd-century CE Post-Herulian Wall, traditionally dismissed as a typically Late Antique *spolia*-construction.

After an introductory chapter establishing upcycling as a new approach to studying reused material culture, I organize the cases I treat by the level of visibility of the reuse and the correlate effect on social memory I identify. First is a chapter focusing on reuse that accentuates or actively displays the upcycled material in its new context. Next is a group of cases involving reuse that is more subtly visible, where the act of upcycling perpetuates and preserves social memory by making the reused object blend in more or less seamlessly with its surrounding context. In the following chapter I examine cases where the act of reuse itself was meant to be invisible, having the effect, I argue, of altering existing social memory. The final chapter comprises a chronological synthesis and a discussion of the role of upcycling within broader efforts of memory construction at Athens, concluding that reusing physical remains of the past played a key role in the clusters of memory projects that occurred in periods of profound and challenging social or political transformation.

In establishing upcycling as a distinct phenomenon of intentionally meaningful reuse, this study offers a process- and agency-focused alternative to the traditional discourses on *spolia* and reuse, and identifies a crucial component within the overall “work of memory” within a community. Through this interdisciplinary approach, I have identified a vital practice through which Athenians shaped social memory in the physical realm, literally building their history into their city.

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments.....	vii
Chapter 1. Introducing Upcycling.....	1
What is Upcycling?	5
Upcycling vis-à-vis <i>Spolia</i> Studies.....	8
Upcycling and Social Memory.....	19
Six Short Stories about Upcycling.....	26
Stone Window Frames in Munich.....	26
A Golden Necklace.....	28
Polish Holocaust Memorials.....	29
Cypriot Stones in the Suez Canal.....	30
Ogham Stones in <i>Souterrains</i>	31
A Second Marble Antioch.....	33
An Extra Turn of the Kaleidoscope.....	35
Chapter 2. Creating Social Memory through Reuse That Accentuates.....	44
The Themistoclean City Wall.....	44
The North Acropolis Wall.....	50
The Post-Herulian Wall.....	57
The Temple of Ares.....	75
Chapter 3. Perpetuating Social Memory through Reuse That Preserves.....	103
Pausanias' ἀρχαῖα ἀγάλματα.....	104
The Old Athena Temple.....	108
The Mycenaean Bastion and the Sanctuary of Athena Nike.....	146
Chapter 4. Altering Social Memory through Reuse Meant to be Invisible.....	167
The Monument of the Eponymous Heroes.....	168
Upcycling Honors.....	195
Honorifics and the Ethic of Reciprocity.....	195

Reusing Statues as Honorifics.....	199
Dio Chrysostom’s <i>Rhodian Oration</i>	201
The Attalid Pillar Monuments.....	207
Upcycled Statue Monuments on the Acropolis.....	211
Chapter 5. Upcycling and Athenian Social Memory over the <i>Longue Durée</i>	233
The Late Archaic Period.....	241
The Persian Wars and Aftermath.....	243
The Periclean Period.....	250
The Peloponnesian War.....	256
Stasis at the End of the Fifth Century.....	258
The Fourth Century.....	261
The Lykourgan Period.....	263
The Hellenistic Period.....	268
The First Century BCE and the Early Roman Period.....	273
The Imperial Period and Second Sophistic.....	281
Hadrian and Athens.....	283
Herodes Atticus and Athens.....	285
The Late Imperial Period.....	288
Conclusions.....	292
Epilogue.....	296
Bibliography.....	301

Acknowledgments

Completing a project like this incurs many debts of gratitude, large and small, owed to mentors, colleagues, and friends near and far. At Harvard I would like first to thank Adrian Stähli, whose guidance was instrumental, particularly in the initial development of my topic and methods. Our wide-ranging discussions always left me excited and inspired. Immeasurable thanks are due to Emma Dench, who has been a continual font of wisdom and rock of support throughout my time at Harvard. Ruth Bielfeldt and Bettina Bergmann were phenomenal mentors and models in my formative years here. I would also like to thank Paul Kosmin for his interest in my project and for generously sharing his office with me while away on leave. Teresa Wu and Alyson Lynch have been invaluable dispensers of wise advice, solvers of problems, and most of all supportive friends. I owe any current success in large part to the faculty of the Department of Classics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, especially J. C. McKeown, without whom I would not be a classicist, and William Alyward, without whom I would not be an archaeologist.

Of my colleagues at Harvard I am especially grateful to Tiziana D'Angelo for continually modeling the way forward, to Liz Engelhardt and David Camden for hearty friendship including pulled pork dinners and trivia nights whenever distractions were most in order, and particularly to Lauren Curtis and Rob Cioffi for constantly and graciously going above and beyond the call of friendship and collegiality in supporting me both personally and intellectually, through all the ups and the downs. Finally, it is impossible to imagine having gotten to this point without the friendship of Rebecca Miller, and her seemingly endless supply of Spotted Cow, Wisconsin cheese, and good company.

I was fortunate to spend two years as a fellow at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens (ASCSA), where I was able to complete the bulk of the research and writing of this project. For affording me this opportunity, I am extremely grateful to the Norton Fellowship from the Harvard Department of the Classics and to the Martin Ostwald and Samuel H. Kress Fellowships from the ASCSA. I would like to express my profound thanks to the School's Director and Assistant Director, Jim Wright and Nick Blackwell, and the entire School staff, including Ioanna Damanaki, Pandelis Paschos, and Denise Giannaris. The Blegen Library was an idyllic and productive workspace, and I am grateful to Senior Librarian Maria Tourna and all the library staff. I would also like to thank the staff of Loring Hall, especially Niamh Michalopoulou, Voula Stamati, and Helen Canuzo, who made a grand old building feel welcoming and cozy. Joanie and Penelope Blackwell made it feel like a home.

By far the greatest resource of the ASCSA is people it brings together. I have benefitted profoundly from the expertise and guidance of Jim Wright, Nick Blackwell, John Camp, Guy Sanders, Ann Steiner, Richard Janko, and Jeremy McNerney, whose seminar on epigraphy in Athens proved essential training for this project. Mellon Professors Margie Miles and Kevin Daly have had a profound influence on my development as a scholar. It was a true honor to be able to scamper around Athens and Attica in their footsteps, soaking in their vast knowledge and keen insights. I am also grateful for the many deep friendships forged at the ASCSA. For many fruitful discussions about marble and memory-making, and especially for the many memories we made in the marble portico, I thank in particular Dylan Rogers, Emily Wilson, Colin Whiting, Jennifer LaFleur, Marya Fisher, Phil Katz, Sebastian Anderson, Trevor Van Damme, Aaron Hershkowitz, Hilary Lehmann, David Idol, and Kurtis Tanaka. Phil Katz generously provided

astute comments on some portions of this work. I also thank Astrid Lindenlauf, Aileen Ajootian, and audiences in San Francisco, Winnipeg, Athens, Dublin, and New York for helpful feedback on talks relating to this project.

Finally, I owe *tusen takk*, a thousand thanks, to Anders Andreassen, for making a year that should have been full of stress and anxiety full of joy and excitement instead.

I dedicate this work in memory of my dad, Jerry Rous, and to my mom, Patti Rous, who in fact first suggested “upcycling.” Among their many gifts to me, I am especially grateful for the sense of adventure we’ve shared, a curiosity and delight in learning new things, without which none of this would have been possible. Thank you.

Chapter 1. Introducing Upcycling

In his description of the sanctuary of Nemesis at Rhamnous on the northeastern coast of Attica, the 2nd-century CE travel writer Pausanias relates that the cult statue of the goddess was sculpted by Pheidias out of a block of Parian marble that the Persians had hubristically brought to nearby Marathon in 490 BCE, intending to erect a battlefield trophy after their expected victory over the Athenian-led Greeks. But with Nemesis on their side the Athenians had prevailed, founded the sanctuary in her honor at Rhamnous, and eventually had their most renowned artist turn the captured stone into a different sort of victory monument.¹ This episode nicely encapsulates the topic and themes of my project: the reuse of that specific piece of marble, a spoil taken from the Persians at Marathon, in that specific new form and context, a cult statue of Nemesis, was intentionally imbued with meaning, and is therefore an example of what I call “upcycling.” The origin of the marble produced additional meaning and value for its incarnation as the cult statue; knowing whence the block came and for what use it was originally intended, the viewer of the statue understood an extra layer of significance beyond the current physical appearance of the image. Through this upcycling, the statue of Nemesis physically embodied divine retribution against *hubris*.

As I will elaborate below, a monument or object containing upcycled material often impacts the social memory of a community. This example of ancient upcycling indeed becomes even more interesting when we examine the issues of social memory involved. It turns out, based

¹ Paus. 1.33.2–3: Μαραθῶνος δὲ σταδίους μάλιστα ἐξήκοντα ἀπέχει Ῥαμνοῦς τὴν παρὰ θάλασσαν ἰοῦσιν ἐς Ὀρωπόν. καὶ αἱ μὲν οἰκίσεις ἐπὶ θαλάσσει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις εἰσὶ, μικρὸν δὲ ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἄνω Νεμέσεώς ἐστιν ἱερόν, ἣ θεῶν μάλιστα ἀνθρώποις ὕβρισταις ἐστὶν ἀπαραίτητος. δοκεῖ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἀποβάσιν ἐς Μαραθῶνα τῶν βαρβάρων ἀπαντῆσαι μῆνιμα ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ ταύτης: καταφρονήσαντες γὰρ μηδὲν σφισιν ἐμποδῶν εἶναι τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐλεῖν, λίθον Πάριον ὄν ὡς ἐπ’ ἐξειργασμένοις ἦγον ἐς τροπαίου ποιήσιν. τοῦτον Φειδίας τὸν λίθον εἰργάσατο ἄγαλμα μὲν εἶναι Νεμέσεως, τῆ κεφαλῇ δὲ ἔπεστι τῆς θεοῦ στέφανος ἐλάφους ἔχων καὶ Νίκης ἀγάλματα οὐ μεγάλα.

on Jung's recent re-examination of archaeological, epigraphic, and literary evidence, that the sanctuary of Nemesis at Rhamnous was in fact founded long before the Battle of Marathon, probably in the 6th century BCE.² The decorative program of the 5th-century temple and statue base had little to do with the Persian Wars but instead relied on an older legend, and the cult had a narrowly local focus until the end of the 4th century.³ Alas, the story Pausanias tells about the cult statue is wholly implausible to the modern reader. As a matter of historical fact, according to Jung, Rhamnous had nothing to do with the victory at Marathon. Nevertheless, Pausanias himself seems to have accepted this explanation of the statue's origins, and his is far from the only surviving account to mention this reuse. More interesting than whether Pheidias (or more likely his pupil Agorakritos) actually made the cult statue from the Persians' would-be trophy is the general belief that this was so.⁴ How and when did this (false) memory about the statue and the sanctuary come to be? Why, and with what effect? How was it perpetuated?

Written sources attesting to the upcycled history of the Nemesis statue are mostly of Roman imperial date, including Pausanias and Ausonius.⁵ Of several related epigrams in the Greek Anthology though, the well-developed version by Parmenion is as old as the 1st century BCE, and is a good indication that the idea was already current earlier in the Hellenistic period:

² Jung 2006, 191–202.

³ Jung 2006, 195–198. Also arguing against the veracity of the story is the fact that battlefield *tropaia* seem to have arisen in Greece only after the Persian Wars; see Trundle 2013, esp. 126–128.

⁴ Other sources give Agorakritos as the sculptor (Pliny *HN* 36.5; cf. Zenobius 5.82). Strabo (9.1.17) names Agorakritos or an otherwise unknown Diodotus. After Despini's painstaking reconstruction of the many fragments into which the statue was smashed, scholarly consensus is that Agorakritos sculpted it circa 430 BCE or a bit later, indeed out of one block of Parian marble. See Despini 1971, Part I; Petrakos 1986; Lapatin 1992. For sources on Agorakritos and his works, see *Der Neue Overbeck* 2014, vol. 2, 390–407. For the new temple built for the statue, see Miles 1980b.

⁵ Aus. *Epist.* 27.51–57, *Epigr.* 42. Aelius Aristides's *Panathenaic Oration* includes a vague reference (1.12) that some have taken to imply a connection between Nemesis and Marathon; see Lapatin 1992, 107, n.1 and Jung 2006, 193, n. 76.

Μήδοις ἐλπισθεῖσα τροπαιοφόρος λίθος εἶναι
ἠλλάχθην μορφήν καίριον εἰς Νέμεσιν,
ἔνδικος ἰδρυνθεῖσα θεὰ Ῥαμνοῦντος ἐπ’ ὄχθαις
νίκης καὶ σοφίης Ἀτθίδι μαρτύριον.

I, the stone which the Medes hoped would be their trophy-bearer, had my shape timely changed to Nemesis, the righteous goddess seated on the shores of Rhamnous, bearing witness to Attica of victory and of art.⁶

Jung has shown that the connection between Rhamnous and the Battle of Marathon was fostered in the late 4th century when the deme became militarily important to Athens as the site of a border fort.⁷ The stationing of a garrison and an ephebic corps there after Lykourgos’ reform of the *ephebeia* coincided with the evolution of the goddess’s purview to include belligerent revenge. The development of the connection between the cult at Rhamnous and the nearby battlefield was logical.⁸ In the late 4th century the Persian Wars had become the pivotal event in the Athenians’ collective conception of their past as a community—that is, in their social memory. Their ideas of their city’s leadership of the victorious Greeks over the hubristic barbarians shaped their identity in the present. The notion that the cult of Nemesis had a direct causal relationship with the nearby Battle of Marathon made sense, and was surely deliberately cultivated through the ephebic curriculum, in which the memory of Marathon played an oversized role.⁹

Although we cannot say precisely when or by whom the tradition of the cult statue’s

⁶ *Anth. Pl.* 222. Trans. Gow and Page 1968, 297. Parmenion’s epigram was part of the collection known as *The Garland of Philip*; see also Miles 1980b, 137–138. Other epigrams on the use of the Persian stone for the statue of Nemesis are *Anth. Pl.* 221 and 263, the later also in a Latin translation by Ausonius, *Epig.* 42.

⁷ Jung 2006, 198.

⁸ Jung 2006, 200–201.

⁹ Jung 2006, 201.

origin was invented, the utility of such a story in this military context in the late 4th century is clear. Lykourgos, among other Athenian leaders, had worked hard to establish the analogy of the contemporary Macedonian threat to Greece with the barbarian threat of old, the Persians. In Jung's analysis, just as this historical analogy served generally to unify Athenians, motivate them to action, and encourage their confidence in ultimate victory, the more specific analogy at Rhamnous fostered the loyalty and ambition of the *ephebes* stationed there. Nemesis had already avenged the *hubris* of the Persians, and the cult statue wrought from the spoils stood as proof. The collectively held notion of the marble's past created a continuity between Nemesis' past vengeance and the reliance on her ongoing aid.¹⁰ Circulated by the military personnel stationed at Rhamnous, this notion became ingrained in the social memory not only of the community in the deme itself but of the larger Athenian community. The many later references indicate how widely known and believed (and believable) the origin story became in the ancient world, even if for some time (perhaps as long as a few centuries) it existed only as an oral tradition. Pausanias probably knew the statue's past before his arrival at Rhamnous, but if not, he would certainly have heard it from local guides or interlocutors, just as he learned that two youthful figures on the statue's base were brothers of Oinoe.¹¹

With this tale of (invented) ancient upcycling as a frontispiece of sorts, I turn now to introduce the topic, goals, and scope of this project. In the chapters that follow I examine the various ways Athenians of several periods of antiquity purposefully reused stone artifacts, objects, and buildings in order to shape their own and their descendants' collective ideas about

¹⁰ Jung 2006, 201–202.

¹¹ Paus. 1.33.8: ἐς τούτους ἄλλο μὲν ἤκουσα οὐδέν, ἀδελφοὺς δὲ εἶναι σφᾶς Οἰνόης.

their community's past and its bearing on the present and future. I investigate several cases of the reuse of marble and related monuments that preserve evidence of an intentionality behind the decision to re-employ a particular object in a particular context. Analyzing archaeological, historical, and literary evidence, my investigation attempts to tease out the meanings involved in those decisions, both in terms of the motivation of and effect intended by the agent responsible for the reuse, and in terms of the response of the audience(s) to the reused material in its new context. I demonstrate that these decisions to reuse material had ramifications for the dynamics of Athenian social memory, and that the reactions to them, intended or actual, can usefully be interpreted as the creation, preservation, or alteration of social memory at Athens. I organize my case studies into three chapters based on those effects on social memory, and end with a concluding chapter discussing in a more chronological fashion the place of upcycling within the evolution of Athenian social memory over the *longue durée*.

What is Upcycling?

I develop the term “upcycling” to refer to the type of reuse I examine in this project. I define upcycling most basically as intentionally meaningful reuse. It is an act of reuse undertaken with some sense of purpose and consequence by the artist/patron/conceiver, and meant to have implications for its viewer/reader/audience, achieved through the perpetuation of some degree of knowledge about the past function of the reused material. Whereas “reuse” is a neutral blanket term, and “recycling” connotes a return to the essential material, “upcycling” refers more specifically to an act of self-conscious reuse that involves attention not only to the materiality of the object but also to the visibility of the prior life of the object and of the act of

reuse itself—that is, to the “visibility of the trace.”¹² Because it makes explicit reference to the past in the present, serving as a nexus between the two, a monument or object containing upcycled material often affects the social memory of groups that interact with it.

The term “*spolia*” for reused material has long been used in art historical and archaeological scholarship, but without an agreed-upon definition and usually encumbered by etymological connections to material captured in war and by the negative connotations of its early modern usage.¹³ “Upcycling,” by contrast, can encompass “repurposing,” “reworking,” “renovating,” “relocating,” “re-carving,” etc., while retaining a sense of nuance that “reuse” lacks. “Upcycling” is both broad enough to refer to columns built into walls, the maintenance of ruins, recut inscriptions, and the relocation of temples, among the diverse cases I treat, while at the same time distinguishing such cases from and within the wider phenomenon of reuse driven by economics and pragmatism that was pervasive in the ancient world.

The concept of upcycling accompanied by the term itself has gained currency in modern popular culture and in contemporary art and art criticism, though it has not yet entered academic discourse.¹⁴ While definitions on websites like wikipedia.com and urbandictionary.com highlight the “up” in “upcycling” in terms of a change in status or worth—for example, “the practice of converting waste materials into products of greater value”¹⁵—and while some commercial enterprises in upcycling do emphasize the transformation of useless or environmentally

¹² This phrase is adapted from Nora’s conception of “the materiality of the trace” and the “visibility of the image” upon which he sees modern memory relying (1989, 13).

¹³ For a recent summary of these issues, see Frey 2016, 10–13.

¹⁴ With a few recent low-impact exceptions in scholarship on modern art (Manco 2012), fashion design (Kwan 2012), and steampunk (Barber and Hale 2013).

¹⁵ <<http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=Upcycling>> Accessed 18 Feb. 2015.

hazardous waste into socially valued goods,¹⁶ in actual practice there is seldom a stress placed on the increased value or quality the object accrues through reuse, nor are the chosen objects necessarily discarded or of low value. Similarly, in modern art and design it is the new context and the visibility of the older object or material within its new context that is most prescient, not its value or status. As artist M. Johansson has explained, “objects gain their value through the situations in which they are placed—in other words, what defines the value of an object is not the material it is made from or the function it serves, but its position in a context.”¹⁷ In my usage of the term “upcycling” there is no value claim; the material being reused need not have been discarded or degraded, and it need not be transformed into a high status object. Rather, it is the knowledge or visibility of some aspect of the material’s previous function that is crucial.

In thinking about how the creation of meaning through upcycling depends on the visibility and knowledge of the act of reuse, I find I. Kopytoff’s concept of a “cultural biography of things” useful.¹⁸ Through various activities of human actors, objects in the course of their existence can undergo physical changes, natural or anthropogenic, they can move or be moved, they can be exchanged, they can have their value, function, or meaning reinterpreted. All such events in an object’s life make up its biography. The stages of its biography can be “encoded” in the object physically and/or in “supplements” of oral tradition or written documents.¹⁹ Upcycling operates by making some element(s) of the object’s past life meaningful in a new context. In

¹⁶ For example, a Lebanese jewelry design team combines used non-biodegradable plastic bags with Swarovski crystals: Cigainero, J. “Upcycling Coins, Plastic Bags and Keys for Social Change.” *The New York Times*, 17 Nov. 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/18/style/international/lebanese-jewelry-brand-vanina-has-a-social-message.html?_r=0> Accessed 18 Feb. 2015.

¹⁷ Quoted in Manco 2012, 9.

¹⁸ Kopytoff 1986. Gosden and Marshall 1999 is a useful elaboration of the concept.

¹⁹ Kinney 2011b, 106.

contemporary culture, we see upcycling at work in items like handbags made of Coca-Cola cans, skirts made from neckties, library desks built from books, and chairs crafted from garbage bins.²⁰ The cachet of these objects lies in what their materials used to be; it is essential to the viewer's understanding of them that he or she realizes that they were once Coke cans, neckties, books, and bins, and not merely aluminum, silk, paper, and plastic.

I see upcycling as a nearly universal phenomenon, a choice available to people across most if not all cultures and time periods, and occurring in a range of materials. The impact of upcycling can be aimed at or reach any scale of social group, from a family to a nation-state or beyond. It is not always recognizable to those outside the target group, or in retrospect. The knowledge of an object's biography preserved through upcycling—"the visibility of the trace"—is not necessarily permanent or unchanging; this knowledge can be lost or reinterpreted, or the act of reuse can become invisible, or—as for the statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous—new "knowledge" of the object's past can arise. The meaning of an act of upcycling can be interpreted variously by different social groups or different generations. It can be remembered, misremembered, or forgotten.

Upcycling vis-à-vis Spolia Studies

I will now discuss the efficacy I see for studying upcycling within or in contrast to the more traditional sphere of inquiry into *spolia*, before examining the intersections between upcycling and social memory and presenting several disparate examples of the phenomenon to demonstrate its scope and significance.

²⁰ The "bin seats" project was an entry by the firm Designboom in the 2005 design competition "RE think + RE cycle."

Scholarship on *spolia*, while expanding in many directions since its inception in the mid-20th century, has for the most part remained focused on the reuse specifically of decorative architectural members from the Roman period, mostly in Late Antiquity and the Medieval period, primarily in Italy and Western Europe, from a predominantly art historical point of view. The traditional view that the phenomenon of *spolia*-use or spoliation began with the Arch of Constantine and the Constantinian basilicas in Rome has largely eroded, but these important and unique monuments continue to dominate much of the discourse in the field.²¹ Increasingly though, attempts have been made to broaden all of the above mentioned foci, and particularly to expand the definition of *spolia* beyond the reuse of architectural stone. Since D. Kinney and J. Frey have recently contributed detailed historiographies of the development of *spolia* studies, here I will simply identify the key trends that have shaped the current trajectory of the field.²²

The primary thrust of modern work on *spolia* since its beginning in the 20th century, apart from collecting examples, has been the search for motives and ideologies behind reuse.²³ The earliest contributions, and many subsequent ones, attempted to identify an overarching explanation for the practice across some degree of time and space. The classic clash of R. Krautheimer, arguing for a renewal of Classical antiquity as the driving motivation behind *spolia*-use, and F. Deichmann, arguing for aesthetics or economy, was joined by B. Brenk, who conceived a new Medieval aesthetic of *varietas* as the prime motivation for *spolia* architecture.²⁴

²¹ The continued focus within *spolia* scholarship on Constantinian reuse can be seen in Kinney 1995, Ward-Perkins 1999, Elsner 2000, Liverani 2004 and 2011, and Brandenburg 2011, all still responding to L'Orange's influential work on the Arch of Constantine (1939).

²² Kinney 2006; Frey 2016, 9–22 (and cf. Frey 2006, Chapters 1–3).

²³ Notable collations of examples include: Deichmann 1975; Settis, ed. 1986; Greenhalgh 1989, 1999, 2009, and 2012; de Lachenal 1995; Clemens 2003; Hansen 2003.

²⁴ Krautheimer 1961; Deichmann 1940 and esp. 1975; Brenk 1987 and 1996.

Such universalizing explanations were eventually criticized as resting on little evidence, and increasingly scholars like B. Ward-Perkins and P. Liverani adduced pragmatic factors over and above ideological ones.²⁵ The question of whether modern scholars can fairly identify ideology at work in most or even any architectural *spolia* remains hotly contested, as the recent and rather impassioned pieces by M. Greenhalgh and M. Hansen show.²⁶ The most useful contribution to this issue, as I see it, is R. Coates-Stephens' emphasis on the multiplicity of motives and interpretations possible amongst builders and viewers in the past.²⁷ Just as there are multiple opinions amongst contemporary historians and art historians, there need not have been a single or monolithic attitude towards reuse in any individual case or within a culture in general. Coates-Stephens also usefully stresses that in investigating "conceptual motives" for *spolia*-use we must search for goals that would not have been achievable through building in new materials, and step away from the ideology vs. pragmatism dialectic of older art historical discourse.²⁸

As the earliest studies of *spolia* with their broad-stroke explanations came to be less convincing, the field saw a move toward more focused contextualized studies of individual buildings or monuments or small groups of similar monuments within a confined geographical and temporal space.²⁹ This in turn gave rise to a growing dissatisfaction with the perceived inability to make comparisons between the more restricted case studies, and consequently several

²⁵ Ward-Perkins 1999; Liverani 2004.

²⁶ Greenhalgh (2011 and cf. 2012, 284–288) argues that there is very rarely evidence for ideology, while Hansen (2013) defends her own attempt (2003) to propose broad ideological explanations.

²⁷ Coates-Stephens 2002, esp. 295–296.

²⁸ Coates-Stephens 2003, 341–344.

²⁹ The 1996 volume *Antike Spolien in der Architektur des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, edited by J. Poeschke, and the 2009 volume *Spolien im Umkreis der Macht*, edited by T. G. Schattner and F. Valdés Fernández, include many examples of this more restricted approach.

scholars began to devise categorizations for *spolia*-use. The desire to place examples in categories went back to A. Esch's groundbreaking 1969 article on *spolia*, where he identified five explanations for their appearance in Medieval Italy: convenience/availability/material value, exorcism, *interpretatio christiana*, political legitimation, and aesthetic appeal.³⁰

Even more influential, particularly in the field of art history, has been R. Brilliant's development of the concepts *spolia in se* (physical reuse of material objects) and *spolia in re* (reuse of "virtual" objects, e.g., citation of verbal or visual imagery).³¹ Kinney "appropriated" *spolia in re* to refer to a specific class of Roman artistic citation, while A. Cutler and Liverani have added a third category of *spolia in spe* and *spolia in me*, respectively.³² Liverani further distinguishes within *spolia in se* two categories corresponding to the ancient definition of *spolia* as war booty ("*spolia P*") and to its "derivative, archaeological signification" of architectural reuse ("*spolia IP*").³³ S. Settis took a different approach to categorizing *spolia*, focusing on the attitudes of contemporary builders and viewers towards antiquity as *continuità*, *distanza*, or *cognoscenza*.³⁴ It is worth pointing out that as with the earlier studies that attempted to find overarching explanations for the phenomenon of *spolia*, these attempts at categorizing the uses

³⁰ Esch 1969. *Interpretatio christiana* is used to refer to reuse and reinterpretation in a Christian light of a formerly pagan object, in order to neutralize it. For one example of a study employing the concept, see Marinescu 1996.

³¹ First proposed in Brilliant 1982.

³² Kinney 1997, 137–140; Cutler 1999, 1064–1066; Liverani 2011, 45–48. Kinney uses *spolia in re* "to designate a peculiarly Roman form of artistic citation in which the cited form visibly retains its own identity while also participating in a new artistic statement with a different subject" (p. 137). Cutler defines *spolia in spe* as referring to "objects used in the expectation that their selection and mode of employment are understood as referential, as allusions to domains not explicitly denoted by artefacts that lack their presence" (p. 1064). Liverani defines *spolia in me* as an instance where the reference is subjective, "dictated by a convention accepted by the observer or reader" (p. 48).

³³ Liverani 2011, 45 and 2013.

³⁴ Settis 1986.

of *spolia* also portray them as universally applicable while drawing on specific examples almost exclusively from Italy. By contrast, Greenhalgh has collected examples of the reuse of marble throughout the Christian and Islamic regions of the Medieval Mediterranean, and subsequently enumerated a pyramid of 17 possible types of reuse in an effort to “render order out of chaos.”³⁵

Concurrent with the most recent trend of categorizing *spolia*, an anxiety has spread about the appropriateness of the term itself. Many scholars see “*spolia*” as inextricably linked with the connotations of forcibly captured booty lent by its Latin etymology and Roman usage, and with the resoundingly negative views of depredation, degeneracy, and decline held by the 16th-century artist-antiquarians who resurrected the word.³⁶ Among several suggested replacements, the very general “reuse” (and its equivalents *Wiederverwendung*, *reimpiego*, *remploi*) has gained the most favor, especially as many scholars have tried to expand the field beyond the traditional realm of Late Antique and Medieval architectural reuse.³⁷ “Recycling” is occasionally used, usually uncritically and without definition as an apparent synonym of “*spolia*” or “reuse.”³⁸ When carefully considered, though, recycling is clearly distinct from reuse of an object *per se*, as Kinney has made explicit. In recycling, “form and function are obliterated, and the object is reduced to its material.”³⁹ Similarly, M. Schiffer’s “life history” model of archaeological

³⁵ Greenhalgh 2011, 82–88. The monumental collections of examples are Greenhalgh 1989, 2009, and 2012.

³⁶ On the history of the term, see esp. Kinney 1995, 53–56. For growing anxiety about its use, see Alcheres 1994, 178; Kinney 1997, 119–122 and 2006, 233–234; Greenhalgh 2011, 78–81.

³⁷ Altekamp 2013, 168.

³⁸ See, for example, Kinney 1997, 118, 134; Cutler 1999, 1073; Greenhalgh 2012 (*passim*). Alcheres (1994, 178) suggests “recycling” as a substitution for “spoliation” but seems to acknowledge that the modern understanding of recycling does not quite match the phenomenon he sees in Latin Antiquity.

³⁹ Kinney 2011a, 3.

formation processes defined recycling as an object's return to the manufacturing stage.⁴⁰

I suggest that “upcycling” can provide the concept and the terminology that *spolia* scholars have sought with growing urgency. The arguments in favor of adopting “reuse” center on its neutrality and generality as opposed to “*spolia*.” Greenhalgh, for example, calls it “colorless and non-judgmental.”⁴¹ This is true, and makes it a very useful word for discussing objects in new contexts in a general way. This also means, though, that as an analytic classification it is not especially useful. As Kinney states baldly, “reuse is ubiquitous and usually unremarkable.”⁴² As scholars we will have a hard time saying anything meaningful, interesting, or consistently true about “reuse,” or “reused objects.” It is those rarer remarkable instances, those where “reuse emerges as value-laden,” that we want to talk about.⁴³ Scholars commonly acknowledge that it is only some cases of reuse that they (or the field) are interested in. B. Kiilerich distinguishes the class of materials reused in ways that make them recognizable as distinctive forms as “obviously...the one that is worth studying.”⁴⁴ Frey submits that “it is only in contrast to non-meaningful use, or even outright rejection, that specific examples of reuse gain the status of *spolia*.”⁴⁵ Similarly Esch, who often now uses “reuse” alongside “*spolia*,” admits that “it is not accidental use, dictated by the occasion and by what lay at hand, that is the proper

⁴⁰ Schiffer 1972, 158.

⁴¹ 2011, 79.

⁴² Kinney 2011a, 2. And elsewhere, “the reuse of building materials is an obvious and universal practice” (1997, 122).

⁴³ Kinney 2011a, 2.

⁴⁴ 2006, 135.

⁴⁵ 2016, 21.

object of *spolia* studies, but rather conscious, targeted choice.”⁴⁶ This conscious, targeted choice lies at the heart of the concept of upcycling. Upcycling as intentionally meaningful reuse encompasses those instances under the umbrella term of “reuse” that scholars are most interested in studying.

Within this discourse on terminology, Cutler earlier attempted to draw a line between “use” and “reuse,” arguing that much of what we see as unremarkable reuse undertaken without awareness of the object’s past is actually still merely “use.” “Reuse,” in his conception, only occurs when the “second user” is aware of his “posterior status,” and undertakes the act at least partially as a conscious “historicist gesture.”⁴⁷ Cutler raises important issues about intentionality—about when deploying an old object is/was meaningful—but his attempt to redefine “reuse” has not been successful. His understanding of the prefix “re-“ is too narrow, and has not taken hold within the louder clamor for “reuse” as a substitute for “*spolia*.”⁴⁸ In addition, if we narrow the definition of “reuse,” we are left without our necessary neutral umbrella term. Instead, we should use “upcycling” to define those instances within the broader group that encompass the intentionality Cutler rightly identified as crucial.

The concept of upcycling also has the advantage of being broadly applicable across cultures and time periods and across the academic disciplines that study them. In studying “*spolia*,” we are essentially stuck in the Middle Ages, and stuck in the realm of reused

⁴⁶ Esch 2011, 22.

⁴⁷ Cutler 1999, 1056–1057. Kinney (2011b, 112) attempted to complement Cutler’s distinction by adding that “reuse” might be understood only when the function of the object has changed. This only confuses this situation, since people can put old objects to new purposes without the historicist understanding that Cutler’s definition of “reuse” requires.

⁴⁸ Cutler himself does not see “reuse” as a substitute for “*spolia*”: “The study of reuse is different from the study of *spolia*. The latter may well be part of the former, but it is not co-extensive with it” (1999, 1061).

architectural ornament. Any work on *spolia* even more broadly defined will at least implicitly and probably explicitly refer back to the burgeoning of that type of reuse in Late Antiquity. In studying upcycling, on the other hand, we are free to explore connections within and between any cultures. A 2006 colloquium attempting not entirely successfully to compare ancient *spolia*-use with contemporary art theory and postmodern appropriation art demonstrates the need for this concept and term. The organizers, Brilliant and Kinney, admit that “final agreement on the nature and the validity of these parallels eluded us,” but the “highly focused, sometimes tense, and ultimately exhilarating discussion” that the question provoked shows that “the study of *spolia* can indeed be enriched by enlarging its critical horizons, and that history is not lacking for the art of our own time.”⁴⁹ I suspect that a similar colloquium comparing upcycling practices in premodernity and postmodernity would be even more fruitful and would overcome some of the obstacles to comparison that the history of the term “*spolia*” sets up.⁵⁰

Even within a single cultural context, studying upcycling allows for meaningful comparisons of examples of reuse that may not have fit together under any definition of *spolia*. In this project, for instance, I examine a defensive wall built from what is almost always called *spolia* in the relevant literature, alongside similar but earlier architectural reuse that has only very rarely and very recently been referred to in such terms, but also alongside renamed statues and purposefully preserved ruins—objects that very few definitions of *spolia* would encompass.

“Upcycling” also affords more interdisciplinary inquiry than “*spolia*.” The recent proliferation of

⁴⁹ Brilliant and Kinney 2011, xv.

⁵⁰ The demotion of “*spolia*” from the title of the colloquium, “The Mirror of *Spolia*: Premodern Practice and Postmodern Theory,” to the subtitle of the published proceedings, “Reuse Value: *Spolia* and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine” may reflect the need for a more appropriate term in the search for such parallels.

volumes on “the uses of the past in the past” shows that a concept that can embrace meaningful reuses of all sorts of things, places, and ideas with attention to their history is a real desideratum in archaeology, history, anthropology, etc.⁵¹

In the more anthropological realm, T. Kristensen’s recent development of “cumulative cycling” as a complement to “recycling” and “lateral cycling” within Schiffer’s life-history model is a worthy attempt to address many of the same issues I have raised here.⁵² Kristensen uses it to describe “ideological spoliation” in “situations where knowledge of the former uses and meanings of an object is accumulated and exploited in a new context” and applies it to the study of reused statues in Late Antiquity.⁵³ While I agree with the need for a concept to delimit such situations, I believe “upcycling” can be more useful than “cumulative cycling” because it is not tied to an explicitly archaeological model, as the examples I will soon outline will make clear.⁵⁴ “Cumulative” also suggests a successive piling up that could make it more limited in its applicability than “upcycling” for cases where elements of an object’s life history are deliberately reinterpreted or ultimately forgotten through its reuse.

Esch’s contribution to the above mentioned colloquium was a reflection on the different but potentially complementary perspectives of archaeologists, historians, and art historians in the

⁵¹ These include Bradley and Williams, eds. 1998 (issue of *World Archaeology* on “The Past in the Past: Re-use of Ancient Monuments”), Yoffee, ed. 2007 (*Negotiating the Past in the Past: Identity, Memory, and Landscape in Archaeological Research*), Aldrich and Wallis, eds. 2009 (*Antiquaries & Archaists: The Past in the Past, the Past in the Present*), Barstad and Briant, eds. 2009 (*The Past in the Past: Concepts of Past Reality in Ancient Near Eastern and Early Greek Thought*), Georgiadis and Gallou, eds. 2009 (*The Past in the Past: The Significance of Memory and Tradition in the Transmission of Culture*), and Ker and Pieper, eds. 2014 (*Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World*, proceedings of a conference titled “Valuing Antiquity in Antiquity”).

⁵² Kristensen 2013.

⁵³ Kristensen 2013, 26.

⁵⁴ Milanese (1999, 131–132) also discusses *spolia* and reuse within depositional and formation processes. Notably, Milanese uses the phrase *visibilità delle tracce*, but not in the same way as Nora nor I.

field of *spolia* studies.⁵⁵ Archaeologists and art historians have usually come at *spolia* from opposite chronological ends, the former more interested in identifying and reconstructing the earlier, ancient, stages of the object’s life and the latter focused on the new context, usually with art historical issues like aesthetics in mind.⁵⁶ Increasingly, though, a strongly humanistic strain has come to the fore, evidenced by more explicit interest in the *practice* of taking and reusing *spolia*—that is, interest in the people undertaking and responding to reuse—as opposed to the reused objects themselves. This is reflected within *spolia* studies by a move toward discussing “spoliation” or *Spolierung* instead of simply “*spolia*” or *Spolien*.⁵⁷ Cutler has expressed more explicitly than most the efficacy of focusing on reuse and the reuser rather than the reused. In rearranging our priorities, “the balance is thereby redressed in favor of the human beings”—the people we are most essentially interested in studying.⁵⁸ “Upcycling” is helpful here too, since it refers to the practice or the act of intentional reuse; a thoughtful human actor is inherent in the concept.

In studying upcycling rather than reused objects, we are ultimately studying the motivations and outcomes of deliberate actions. Though we of course study the objects themselves, in context, in order to get at those human intentions and interpretations, dividing

⁵⁵ Esch 2011. See also Esch 2005, a longer discussion of the same topic.

⁵⁶ The advent of Medieval archaeology, a collocation that hardly existed half a century ago, helped bridge the gap between disciplines, the “no-man’s-land” where the study of reuse initially resided. See Esch 2011, 14, 20. A more recent and promising move toward more explicit and holistic attention to reuse in primary archaeological exploration is exemplified by Underwood 2013.

⁵⁷ This trend is particularly evident in the first volume of the series *Perspektiven der Spolienforschung*, subtitled *Spolierung und Transposition* (Altekamp, Marcks-Jacobs, and Seiler, eds. 2013). See esp. Kinney’s contribution, which begins: “The study of spoliation, as opposed to *spolia*, is quite recent” (2013, 261).

⁵⁸ Cutler 1999, 1073–1074. Cf. Frey’s call for a new approach concentrating on the process of reuse and a recognition that “in studying *spolia*, we are not examining objects as much as we are attempting to identify the less tangible and potentially much more informative evidence of an individual’s interaction with them” (2016, 22). Frey introduces the “agency approach” to facilitate this emphasis on process (2016, 22–35).

those objects into categories as has been attempted with *spolia* is not particularly useful.⁵⁹ Even within the more narrowly defined realm of Late Antique and Medieval architectural reuse, the existing classification systems have not facilitated many meaningful insights. *Spolia in se* and *in re* have simply accrued rhyming cousins, and Greenhalgh’s impressive 17-category pyramid may actually produce more chaos than order.⁶⁰ In this project I organize my case studies not by the characteristics of the object or material that was reused but by the relative visibility of significant elements of its biography within its new context, which I see as correlated with different intended effects on social memory. I have found this the most logical and useful way to examine Athenian upcycling, but it may not be the best organizational scheme for other work on upcycling.⁶¹ Nor do I claim that the divisions I make here would have been made in antiquity; while the decision to upcycle something in Athens was an intentional choice and action of a person or group, I make no claim that it would have been conceived as part of a category of “creating social memory through reuse that accentuates” etc.⁶² I have used the relative “visibility of the trace” as an organizing principle because it is so crucial to the intersection between upcycling and social memory, an intersection to which I now turn.

⁵⁹ Cf. Frey’s conclusion that “in the end, this longstanding inability to reach a commonly accepted definition has much to do with the fact that it has always been an action and not a specific set of physical characteristics that serve to make objects into *spolia*” (2016, 20).

⁶⁰ This may have been Greenhalgh’s ironical intention; cf. his comment that reused inscriptions can “sometimes be interpreted as giving a firm and demonstrable connection with the classical past – if we believe in re-use having ‘meaning’” (2012, 217, and elaborated at 284–290).

⁶¹ It is worth noting that Förtsch, in his 1995 work on reused monuments in antiquity as “witnesses of the past,” divides his examples into two groups based on whether the reuse placed the object in isolation or in a new context, discussing the “contrast effect.” Although he does not dwell on reuse *per se*, and does not mention memory or *spolia*, I would consider Förtsch’s essay a predecessor of my own project. Many of the examples he mentions could be considered upcycling.

⁶² It is not pithy enough for a category name (unlike *spolia in se/re/me/spe*), for one thing, and that is at least partly intentional.

Upcycling and Social Memory

Memory is another “hot” topic in need of the concept of upcycling. In the last few decades work on memory has exploded in disciplines as diverse as sociology, history, cognitive psychology, anthropology, archaeology, philosophy, literature, and education, such that some scholars now speak of a field of “memory studies.” Most scholars involved in such research trace memory’s origin as a topic of academic discourse to the sociologist M. Halbwachs, whose concept of “collective memory” (*mémoire collective*) became hugely influential in the 1990s.⁶³ Redefinitions, modifications, and replacements for his term have since proliferated.⁶⁴ I use the concept of social memory, which I see as very close to Halbwachs’ “collective memory,” in favor of other collocations like “cultural memory,” “historical memory,” or “intentional history,” that are more narrowly defined and more culturally or temporally specific.⁶⁵

⁶³ Halbwachs 1925, 1941, and 1950, with English editions 1980 and 1992.

⁶⁴ For one among many summaries and critiques of the proliferation, see Kansteiner 2002.

⁶⁵ Most influential of the alternatives to or elaborations of Halbwachs’ “collective memory,” especially in Classical studies, has been Jan and Aleida Assmann’s “cultural memory” (*kulturelle Gedächtnis*), which is often used by others simply as a synonym of “collective memory” (J. Assmann 1988a, 1992, 1995, 2011; A. Assmann 1999, 2011). While their explanation of “communicative” living and embodied (orally-transmitted) memory and “cultural” stored, objectified, and archival memory as two distinct aspects of Halbwachs’ “collective memory” is developed in compelling detail for ancient Egypt and Early Modern Europe, I do not find their conception of “cultural memory” applicable to ancient Greece in the same way. Their “cultural memory” is a unified thing, rather than a multiple and negotiated process (Shear 2013, 514, n. 19; cf. Jung 2006, 18–19). “Social memory” as I define and use it below incorporates both “communicative” and “cultural” memory (see esp. J. Assmann’s re-elaboration [2006, 1–30, “What is ‘Cultural Memory?’”]). See also the distinction made between cultural and social memory by Bommas (2011, 4), the review of theorists by Bungert (2008, 198–199), the redefinition of “cultural memory” as an umbrella term by Erll (2010, 4–6), the narrow applicability adduced by Zierold in the same volume (2010, 401), and the discussion of the development of the concept at Heidelberg by Harth (2010). Within Classics and ancient history, Chaniotis’ “historical memory” (2009, cf. 2012, 2014) and Gehrke’s “intentional history” (2001, 2010; cf. Grethlein 2010a and 2010b) have arisen more recently, the former tied to the Assmanns’ “cultural” and “collective memory” and the latter focused on identity construction and serving as a replacement of sorts for Hobsbawm and Ranger’s “invented tradition” (1983) which, as Dench has rightly pointed out, has been too uncritically applied to ancient societies (2005, 195–197; cf. Steinbock 2013, 16). Both “historical memory” and “intentional history” have been used effectively (see, e.g., Foxhall, Gehrke, and Luraghi, eds. 2010), but both are tied to a sense of historical consciousness (cf. Funkenstein 1989 and Crane 1997) in a way that “social memory” does not need to be. “Social memory” is thus more broadly appropriate—every society had/has it, irrespective of factors like literacy, archival practices, historiography, or oral tradition—and does not carry the essentialist connotations of “collective” that have made Halbwachs’ term controversial (on which see, e.g., Gedi and Elam 1996, 35–39; Erll 2010, 4; Dessingé 2015).

Following J. Fentress and C. Wickham's classic definition, I understand social memory as "an expression of collective experience, identify[ing] a group, giving it a sense of its past and defining its aspirations for the future."⁶⁶ It consists of a network of associations constructed and maintained within a community through various modes and media including: physical space and the objects and images within it, oral tradition, ritual behavior, and textual documents.⁶⁷ It can encompass shared ideas of the recent past as well as any more distant past, however that past is culturally conceived. Social memory is dynamic. An image of the past can be shaped or contested by groups within, outside of, or posterior to the society in question. It can be "idealized" or "distorted;" it can be subsequently forgotten.⁶⁸ Shared memories often coalesce around particularly significant events or figures.⁶⁹ The remembering group can be of nearly any size and variously constituted: a family, an ethnicity, the residents/citizens of a town or nation, members of a professional organization, an army, etc. Thus, numerous overlapping "memory communities" exist within any society at a given time, so that even dominant notions about the past should not be seen as universally or unquestioningly held, and no "monolithic group mind"

⁶⁶ 1992, 25.

⁶⁷ For memory as a network of associations, see Carruthers 1998, 54. Price (2012, 17) identified the four contexts in which networks of memories were created as: objects and representations, places, ritual behavior (and associated myths), and textual narratives. Similarly, Alcock (2002, 18) identified: ritual, ritual performances, and cult activity; viewing of artistic representations; oral tradition; and the physical world and tangible objects. Burke (1989, 100–102) identified five categories of media through which memory is transmitted: oral traditions; memoirs and other written records; images, pictorial or photographic, still or moving; actions, especially ritual actions and commemorations; space. Assmann (1988a, 12) identified texts, rites, monuments, and institutionalized communication as the basic cultural forms through which memory is kept alive.

⁶⁸ Idealization and distortion within social memory are emphasized in Steinbock's definition (2013, v, 2, 7–8). Burke (1989, 108–110), the contributors to the volume edited by Forty and Küchler (1999), Connerton (2008), Price (2012, 27–29), and Algazi (2014) in particular have emphasized the role of forgetting along with remembering within the process of social memory.

⁶⁹ J. Assmann (1997, 7) has called these "constellative myths." Such events can be of a traumatic nature, but the over-emphasis on trauma in memory studies has drawn criticism: Olick and Robbins 1998, 119–120; Klein 2000, 138–142; Alcock 2002, 19–20; Kansteiner 2002, 186–187; Hamilakis and Labanyi 2008, 14; Kansteiner and Weilnböck 2010.

should be imagined.⁷⁰

Rather than rehash the short but dense history of memory studies and social memory, in deference to several recent and comprehensive summaries, I will instead outline a few key trends and anxieties within the field and the contribution to be made by adding upcycling to the mix.⁷¹ One of the most intense debates has been over the juxtaposition, interaction, or conflict between “memory” and “history”—“the question of memory and/or/as history,” as A. Erll puts it.⁷² Decades after P. Nora polemicized the opposition of the two in his immense and immensely influential project on the *lieux de mémoire* of modern France, it has now become more common and productive to think of different modes of remembering within a culture, which can include oral traditions, historiography, mythology, etc.⁷³ The crucial advantage of studying social memory alongside other approaches of historical inquiry is that it foregrounds the self-understanding of a community and allows us to gain a clearer view of the cultural mindset behind its choices and their outcomes.⁷⁴ Questions of agency, intention, and reception are central

⁷⁰ On “memory communities,” developed first by Burke (1989, 107), see esp. Alcock 2002, 15–16 and Steinbock 2013, 12–13; cf. Kansteiner (2002, 188–189) on “mnemonic communities.” On the connection between social memory and identity construction, see e.g. Yoffee, ed. 2007; Gehrke 2010; Bommas, ed. 2011; Chaniotis 2012.

⁷¹ Good summaries of the history and state of the field include Olick and Robbins 1998; Alcock 2002, 1, 15–18; Olick 2008; Borić 2010; Steinbock 2013, 7–19. Several recent compendia and companions include: Grabbe and Schindler, eds. 2008; Erll and Nünning, eds. 2010; Radstone and Schwarz, eds. 2010; Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Levy, eds. 2011 (and book review symposium in the journal *Memory Studies*; Belvedresi et al. 2014); Kattago, ed. 2015.

⁷² Erll 2010, 7. One could also add “of” to this collection of conjunctions. On these issues, see esp. Halbwachs 1980, 78–87; Burke 1989; Nora 1989; Thompson 1994; Davis and Starn 1989, 4–5; Bourguet, Valensi, and Wachtel 1990; Gedi and Elam 1996; Olick and Robbins 1998, 110–122; Klein 2000; Ho Tai 2001; Climo and Cattell 2002; Kansteiner 2002, 184; Ricoeur 2004; Cubitt 2007; Hamilakis and Labanyi 2008; Price 2012, 15–16.

⁷³ For “modes” of remembering, see Erll 2010, 6–7; Grethlein 2010a, 11; cf. A. Assmann 2011, 122–123. Nora’s polemic is most clearly laid out in Nora 1989, which serves as the introduction to the three-volume English version, *Realms of Memory* (Nora 1996–1998), of his seven-volume *Le lieux de mémoire* (1984–1992). Another English translation in four volumes is titled *Rethinking France* (Nora 1999–2010). On translation into German, see Majerus 2014, 159–160.

⁷⁴ Price 2012, 16; Steinbock 2013, v. See also Confino 1997 and 2010 on memory and the “history of mentalities.”

to productive study of social memory. “The key issue with social memory,” S. Price recently suggested “is to think about how it operates, how it is constructed and transmitted, and by which social groups.”⁷⁵ Similarly, at the outset of the “memory boom” P. Burke set out as the crucial questions: “who wants whom to remember what, and why?”⁷⁶ By focusing on the visibility of the trace through reuse, these are precisely the questions I aim to address through my investigation of the phenomenon of upcycling in ancient Athens.

Upcycling can be seen as one of the ways social memory is constructed and transmitted within a community. Because it involves a conscious decision by some person or group to reuse an existing object or material in a new way or context, with attention to the visibility of the trace, it very often has some effect on the social memory of at least one memory community for some period of time. Since the depth, duration, and nature of these effects are variable, upcycling is an interpretive framework of the sort J. Shear has recently called for: one that “accommodates the complexity” of the process of remembrance, operating on both the individual and collective levels.⁷⁷ The upcycled object serves a nexus between the past and the present. In examining instances of upcycling, we can and should address both the intrusion of the past into the present and the role of the present in the construction of the past.⁷⁸ The visibility of the trace serves as the stimulus to the communication that makes individual memory collective, and vice versa.

⁷⁵ 2012, 16. See also Davis and Starn 1989, 2.

⁷⁶ 1989, 107.

⁷⁷ 2013, 513. For the long-running debate about individual versus collective memory and the (in)appropriateness of applying cognitive psychology at a collective level, see also: Funkenstein 1989; Gedi and Elam 1996; Crane 1997; Kansteiner 2002, 185–190; Welzer 2002; Green 2004; Manier and Hirst 2010; Steinbock 2013, 8–13; Morgan 2014, 175–176. For the “extended mind” model as an alternative, see esp. Hirst and Stone 2015; Arrington 2015, 13–17. Yates’ work (1966) on the “art of memory” as a rhetorical technique of the Greeks and Romans and its use by Renaissance philosophers was a foundational humanistic approach to individual memory.

⁷⁸ The so-called Neo-Freudian and Neo-Durkheimian views of the relationship between past and present. See Olick 2010, 159; Steinbock 2013, 18–19.

Studying upcycling, then, allows us to address the central how?, who?, and why? questions of social memory, and its reception as well as its construction.⁷⁹

Anticipated by the work of J. Assmann and T. Hölscher on monumentality and its relationship to history and memory, materiality has again begun to take on a larger role in recent investigations into how social memory works.⁸⁰ The “material framework” of memory (*cadre matériel*)—what S. Alcock has called “the physical setting of remembrance”⁸¹—was an important element in Halbwachs’ original conception of collective memory, but his argument that memories were localized in objects and places was largely dismissed in the earliest wave of memory studies, including in P. Connerton’s foundational 1989 book *How Societies Remember*.⁸² Since memory discourse has entered the field of archaeology, though, material objects have received new emphasis as carriers or conduits of memory.⁸³ Alcock has examined how monuments and landscape can provoke social remembering, and Y. Hamilakis, arguing that “all archaeology is about memory,” has emphasized that “at the center of remembering and forgetting

⁷⁹ On the need for more attention to reception within memory studies, see Confino 1997, 1395–1399; Ho Tai 2001, 917; Kansteiner 2002, 180, 195–197; Low and Oliver 2012, 8–9.

⁸⁰ Assmann 1988b; Hölscher 1988. Hölscher 2014 further develops the connection between the mentalities behind monuments and history and collective memory.

⁸¹ 2002, 23–25.

⁸² Halbwachs 1992, 200 [French original 1941, 159]; Connerton 1989, 37–39. Connerton’s dichotomy of inscribing vs. incorporating practices of memory (72–79), further developed by Rowlands (1993), has been influential, with some archaeologists viewing inscribing practices as those that leave traces in the archaeological record (see, e.g., Bradley 2000, 157–158; Alcock 2002, 28). Hamilakis (2010, 191–192) has recently criticized this binary, arguing that incorporating practices like eating and drinking do leave recoverable traces.

⁸³ With Assmann’s work (1988b) on monumentality and ancient Egyptian cultural memory as an important precedent, the recent “archaeology of memory” boom took off with Alcock 2001a and 2002 and Van Dyke and Alcock, eds. 2003. See also, e.g: Bradley and Williams, eds. 1998; Boardman 2002; Williams, ed. 2003; Olivier 2004; Jones 2007; Yoffee, ed. 2007; Hamilakis and Labanyi 2008; Barbiera, Choyke, and Rasson, eds. 2009; Georgiadis and Gallou, eds. 2009; Borić, ed. 2010; Hamilakis 2010; and the critique of “archaeology of memory” by Morgan (2014).

is material and materiality.”⁸⁴

Hamilakis further suggests that the way forward in memory studies lies in focusing on “the *work of memory*, the practices involved and the effort and the time expended in materially producing mnemonic effects.”⁸⁵ Upcycling, as one key way that mnemonic effects are materially produced, is a useful concept through which we can examine this *work of memory*. Studying upcycling also allows us to broaden the scope of material and objects we consider as part of the construction and transmission of social memory. The most valuable contribution of Nora’s project and his development of the concept of *lieux de mémoire*, as I see it, is the awareness that memory can work through or be involved in many objects, places, institutions, and ideas that we would not be inclined to call “memorials” or “monuments.”⁸⁶ Lacking the etymological connotations, we often overlook memory at work in objects or structures that seem at first glance merely “utilitarian” or “practical,” but would reward a second look. Cases of reuse and potential upcycling are good places to start taking these second looks, as I hope to demonstrate by re-examining cases like fortification walls and the maintenance of ruins.

The influence of Nora’s concept (and especially, his phrase)⁸⁷ has been profound, and the proliferation of studies of *lieux de mémoire* and its translations like *Erinnerungsorte* and *luoghi della memoria* in different cultures and time periods are one major strain within the explosion of

⁸⁴ Alcock 2002, esp. 28–32; Hamilakis 2010, 188, 189.

⁸⁵ 2010, 194.

⁸⁶ This is why many Anglophone scholars use *lieux de mémoire* rather than its closest English translation “sites of memory,” which more strongly implies a physical memorial setting. “Places” or “realms” of memory also do not quite capture the embrace of the French phrase. On issues of translation, see den Boer 2010, 22–23.

⁸⁷ Many subsequent scholars have taken on his term with insufficient attention to the specific circumstances for which he developed it, namely contemporary France, and its juxtaposition with disappeared *milieux de mémoire*. Critiques of the concept and of the wide adoption of the phrase include Wood 1994; Ho Tai 2001; Kansteiner 2002, 183–184; Ricoeur 2004, 401–411; Erl 2010, 10; Schwarz 2010; Hutton 2015, 27–30 (more sympathetic).

memory studies in many disciplines.⁸⁸ As with *spolia* studies though, there has been increasing criticism both within and outside memory studies of the now diffuse nature of the field. Many disparate case studies using variable terminology have made it difficult to establish theoretical and methodological commonalities, leading to criticisms of memory as “fashionable,” “undertheorized,” or merely a substitute for older notions of “tradition,” “influence,” “myth,” or “culture.”⁸⁹ There is widespread anxiety about whether memory studies is or should itself be considered an academic field, and about its inter-, intra-, multi-, and/or trans-disciplinarity.⁹⁰

I submit that the concept of upcycling can contribute to relieving these anxieties by serving as a focal point around which case studies in various disciplines may coalesce, since it is a phenomenon within nearly all cultures and eras and since studying it inherently involves historical, sociological, and anthropological modes of inquiry. J. Davis has stressed the potential for archaeological memory studies to be “an integrative force in the humanities and social science.” His agenda for future research specifically highlights reused objects as the key focus of integrative inquiry: “The afterlives of objects are vitally important not only to archaeologists: there is a significant intersection between archaeological memory studies, the notion of ‘reception’ in the history of art, and the anthropological concept of ‘object biographies.’ All such

⁸⁸ Examples include François and Schulze 2001 (on German *Erinnerungsorte*); den Boer et al. 2011–2012 (on European *Erinnerungsorte*); Isnenghi 1996–1997; 2010 (on Italian *luoghi della memoria*); Hebel 2003; 2010 (on American “sites of memory”). On the trend see also Majerus 2014. For extensions to the ancient world, see esp. Stein-Hölkeskamp and Hölkeskamp 2006 and 2010 (on *Erinnerungsorte* in ancient Rome and Greece); Jung 2006 (on Marathon and Plataea as *lieux de mémoire*); Haake and Jung 2011 (on Greek sanctuaries as *Erinnerungsorte*); Gangloff 2013 (on *lieux de mémoire* in the Greek East in the Imperial period).

⁸⁹ Memory as fashionable and standing in for a lack of evidence: Greenhalgh 2011, 79–80. Memory as over used and undertheorized: Confino 1997, 1386–1387 and 2010, 79–80; Chapman 2009, 13. Memory as replacing “invention of tradition”: Low 2004, 934. Memory as replacing “influence”: Herzfeld 2004. Memory as replacing “myth”: Gedi and Elam 1996, 31, 47. Memory as replacing “culture”: Berliner 2005.

⁹⁰ See esp. Roediger and Wertsch 2008, Olick 2008, Radstone 2008, and Brown 2008 (all in the first volume of the journal *Memory Studies*); Erll 2010, 3; Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Levy 2011, 5.

approaches necessarily emphasize the mutability and the transience of the memories and meanings associated with particular objects and monuments.”⁹¹ Upcycling may prove to be just the concept we need for robust interdisciplinary investigation of the dynamics of social memory. To state the point baldly: what the study of reuse needs is memory, and what the study of memory needs is reuse.

Six Short Stories about Upcycling

With a nod to Alcock’s method of discussing social memory,⁹² I would now like to illustrate the phenomenon of upcycling through several examples that demonstrate the range of its cultural contexts and memorial effects, before I move on to the context of ancient Athens that will be my primary focus.

Stone Window Frames in Munich

I begin with an example of upcycling from modern architecture. In an apartment building constructed by the firm Hild und K in Munich in 2009, several stone neo-Romanesque window frames from the ground floor of the previous building on the same site were reused within the modern plaster façade.⁹³ The juxtaposition of materials and styles makes it clear to the viewer that the stone arches are in secondary use. This case is useful for demonstrating the importance of the knowledge of the reused object’s past or age, and how that knowledge can be selectively

⁹¹ 2007, 251.

⁹² Alcock 2002, 2: “Six Short Stories about Social Memory.”

⁹³ Meier 2011, 232. This sort of architecture juxtaposing old and new is quite popular in Germany; see Pehnt 2009 and Meier 2011 and 2013 for many more examples and discussion.

held, change, or disappear. Longtime residents of the Munich neighborhood of Lehel may recognize the windows as having originated in the building's predecessor and may thus be led to recall that older building, friends who lived there, or any number of related associations, strengthening those memories through the recollection. I, however, am not part of that memory community and know this information about the windows' origins only from reading about it in H.-R. Meier's article on reuse in modern architecture. The ideas of the past that this knowledge provokes for me are more vague and of course not my own personal memories, yet the knowledge leads me to wonder about the history of the old building and its residents.

Those of us with knowledge about the windows' past can share it with others, but it is likely that the specific origin of the windows will become less and less widely known as time goes on. Nevertheless, even present-day viewers without that knowledge might suppose the windows to be older than the surrounding plaster façade, and might thus be led to wonder whether they have some special significance. But viewer interpretation is always subject to change. We can imagine a future scenario in which not only the provenance of the windows will have been forgotten, but architectural styles and tastes may have changed such that juxtapositions of radically different materials and styles as seen in the Munich apartment building are now in the future commonly achieved using all new materials. In that case, the act of reuse itself would no longer be visible; the stone window frames would no longer convey the alterity that made their reuse meaningful in the first decade of the 21st century, and no memory communities would actively remember their past life.⁹⁴

⁹⁴ In ancient Athens this example is perhaps most analogous to the late 6th-century BCE reuse of marble metopes from the Hekatompedon temple as revetment along the base of the prehistoric West Cyclopean Wall; see Chapter 3, with n. 171.

A Golden Necklace

A useful example to show how intentional reuse can be meaningful on a very small scale (i.e., to a very small group of people) is a gold necklace my mother gave me, shortly after my father had passed away, whose small pendant is made from a ring that he used to wear. It has been refashioned by a jeweler in such a way that no one who had not seen it as a ring would now recognize that it had once had that form. Yet, the distinctive striations and three small diamonds make it immediately recognizable to me, my mother, and perhaps a few other close relatives as indeed being that specific ring. While I appreciate the necklace on an aesthetic level, I value it even more highly because I know that in its past life it was a ring belonging to my father, and I never wear it without thinking of that connection. Elements of its former history produce extra meaning in its reused incarnation, but only for the few of us for whom that history is recognizable. Because it also happens to be a very nice necklace, I often receive compliments when I wear it, and I usually respond by explaining the extra significance it holds for me. Thus the knowledge of its past and its upcycled nature slowly spreads, and will perhaps be maintained within my family for some generations to come, yet if we imagine an archaeologist someday encountering it in the absence of a written or oral family history, she surely would have no way of recognizing the transformation from ring to pendant. This is an important point to keep in mind—what was once upcycling may not be visible as such (or even as reuse) within the archaeological record.⁹⁵

⁹⁵ This hypothetical archaeological recovery of my necklace calls to mind Reiterman's study of *keimelia* in ancient archaeological contexts (2014), where she in essence attempts to reconstruct social memory on a personal and family level.

Polish Holocaust Memorials

A prime venue for upcycling has been the realm of overt memorials, particularly those commemorating events of war. An example that finds echoes in the story of the intended-Persian-trophy-turned-Nemesis-statue is the Warsaw Ghetto Monument designed by Nathan Rapoport in the immediate aftermath of World War II. Like many war memorials it has been the subject of controversy and conflicting opinions amongst various memory communities, but most relevant here is the source of its granite blocks. Rapoport traveled to Sweden in 1947 in search of appropriate stone and found a huge number of blocks already cut and prepared for shipment at a major quarry. He learned upon inquiry that they had been quarried for the German sculptor Arno Breker during the war, to be used in a grand victory monument for Hitler in Berlin. They thus seemed to Rapoport perfect in every way for use in his own monument, which would be dedicated on the fifth anniversary of the Warsaw Ghetto Uprising.⁹⁶ While the appropriation of the blocks has been overshadowed by interest in the monument's iconography and the political and religious uses to which it has been put in the decades after its erection, nevertheless the story of the upcycling circulates as a small part of the discourse about the memorial; it remains a significant aspect of how the memorial produces meaning.

In another example from Poland, in 1983 a large wall was constructed in the Kazimierz district of Krakow using Jewish tombstones that had been uprooted by Nazi occupiers. In this case the knowledge of multiple stages in the stones' biography was preserved through the orally constructed memory of residents, who recounted with pride that when the stones were first reused as pavers in the the Gestapo headquarters (formerly a Franciscan monastery) during the

⁹⁶ Young 1989, 83. Young's article is a superb investigation of a monument through its cultural biography.

war, the Polish workmen had taken pains to lay them carefully with their blank sides up to preserve the inscribed epitaphs from wear or further desecration.⁹⁷ Within the new memorial wall, the orally transmitted memory about the attempted preservation of the stones complemented the visibility of the destruction they had previously suffered.⁹⁸

Cypriot Stones in the Suez Canal

Paralleling the story surrounding the Rhamnousian Nemesis statue in a different way is the well known legend that the stones of archaeological sites in Cyprus were taken away by the British for the construction of the Suez Canal in Egypt. Although this connection has been shown to be not strictly true (the date of the British arrival on Cyprus, for one thing, precludes their direct involvement during the Canal's construction), the dearth of stone in Cyprus is commonly attributed to the Suez Canal in scholarship, guidebooks, and local lore.⁹⁹ According to the thorough analysis by E. Hoak-Doering, the stones of Cyprus, especially cut ashlar and rubble, were indeed reused widely both on the island and abroad into the 20th century (including almost certainly in the new town of Port Saïd at the Mediterranean end of the Canal), but for the most part their reuse was not upcycling. They had become a commodity and were traded for their value as building material; their provenance or previous function was not considered important

⁹⁷ Young 1993, 200.

⁹⁸ Kazimierz gained attention and fame as the site where Steven Spielberg shot the film *Schindler's List* in 1993. On the making of the film, including an image of Spielberg in front of a similar memorial wall (after p. 140), see Palowski 1998. Kazimierz has since become a locus for the renewal and celebration of Jewish culture in Poland, hosting a major Jewish Culture Festival each year.

⁹⁹ Hoak-Doering (2102) has investigated the legend in depth, examining both the reuse practices and stone trade in and from Cyprus and the geopolitical and memorial implications of the narrative.

and was not recorded or remembered.¹⁰⁰

Eventually though, what had been a matter of economics became something more, as the absence of stones on the island was explained by locals through the Suez Canal story. This destination for the stones that “went to Egypt” became a matter of pride for Cypriots and gave a meaning to the stones’ absence in Cyprus.¹⁰¹ It also retrospectively granted a new layer of significance to the Suez Canal itself for those believing that it was lined with the walls of ancient Amathus and the Gothic churches of Famagusta.¹⁰² As with the Nemesis statue, issues of social memory play a huge role in this invented upcycling. What we as scholars might be inclined to call a legend, lore, or even “invented tradition” was and is held as a real, believed memory by Cypriots, as Hoak-Doering has demonstrated, including within some families who remember their ancestors’ direct participation in transporting Cypriot stones to the Canal.¹⁰³

Ogham Stones in Souterrains

Now for a contrasting example of actual reuse that probably was intentionally meaningful, but the implications of which are no longer clear.¹⁰⁴ Monuments known as ogham stones have been found throughout Ireland and Wales, inscribed with the earliest written form of Irish during the 4th through 7th centuries CE. It seems that most were originally set upright and served as memorials or markers of land ownership and boundaries. Many have been discovered

¹⁰⁰ Hoak-Doering 2012, 201.

¹⁰¹ Hoak-Doering 2012, 202.

¹⁰² Hoak-Doering 2012, 199.

¹⁰³ Hoak-Doering 2012, 220–221.

¹⁰⁴ This case is quite similar to that of the Beulé Gate at the entrance to the Acropolis, discussed in Chapter 2 below.

in contexts of later reuse, however, especially commonly in underground structures known as *souterrains*.¹⁰⁵ Their frequent use as lintels and door posts seems due not only to their suitable sizes and shapes but also to the presence of the inscriptions. To an archaeologist, this prominent placement appears to show off the inscription, making the past life of the stone visible. This looks like upcycling: perhaps the stones were chosen for their ability to serve as protective talismans, J. Waddell has suggested, as much as for their suitability for building.¹⁰⁶ But in many cases it is difficult to say more. Lacking much evidence for the perceptions and intentions of the Early Medieval builders, we cannot know what (if indeed any)¹⁰⁷ specific meaning they intended to convey through the conspicuous reuse of ogham stones. The stones' past is visible, but our interpretation of the intentions behind this reuse cannot extend very far into realms of cultural continuity or appropriation, apotropaism, etc.

Here we can think of Halbwachs' remark about reused ancient building materials in contemporary Roman houses: "their antiquity cannot be established by their form or their appearance but only by the fact that they still show the effaced vestiges of old characters."¹⁰⁸ Like those faded Latin inscriptions, the ogham inscriptions serve as the visibility of the trace in revealing that the stones were reused, perhaps with meaningful intentions. Even if evidence supporting further interpretation in such cases is lacking, we should not be completely

¹⁰⁵ Clinton 2001, 68–73; Waddell 2014, 82.

¹⁰⁶ 2014, 84; cf. Clinton 2001, 73.

¹⁰⁷ The *spolia* collection embedded in the lower exterior of the Tribune Tower in Chicago is a useful corrective to an assumption that any conspicuous reuse had a specific intended meaning. Small nondescript chunks of stone from over 150 significant sites and buildings all over the world are identifiable only by small labels next to them. Though this reuse was obviously intentional and collecting the pieces required a lot of effort on many people's parts, archival documentation of Col. McCormick's vision reveal little more than a rather naïve antiquarianism. The stones go unnoticed by most Chicagoans and visitors, a neglected cabinet of curiosities. See Wharton 2011.

¹⁰⁸ 1992, 47.

discouraged from examining specific contexts and discrete memory communities where we can. Davis has shown in the case of Ottoman-period Albania that cultural continuity is by no means necessary for reuse to be imbued with meaning and to draw on and influence social memory. “In some cases,” he concludes, “meaning can only be surmised to have existed, and any precise significance is unclear, even in a historical context: it should not be assumed that those who chose to incorporate *spolia* in later structures produced, or imagined that they themselves were descendants of the producers’ of those artifacts, that there was a ‘referential, historiographic understanding’ of the past. Yet it is evident... that those who reused buildings or incorporated *spolia* in new structures could draw on a wealth of shared memories of multiple pasts.”¹⁰⁹ Indeed, in at least one instance, at Uaimh na gCat (“the Cave of the Cats”) at Crúachain, Waddell has been able use complementary cultural and archaeological evidence to interpret the intentional reuse of ogham stones for lintels as a reflection of Early Medieval cosmological beliefs.¹¹⁰

A Second Marble Antioch

Finally, an example much closer in time to my Athenian case studies and one that has been discussed in some of the scholarship on *spolia*.¹¹¹ In 540 CE the Sasanid king Chosroes I captured and looted the famous city of Antioch during his war with Justinian. A variety of contemporary and later sources attest to his stripping the city of its marble, down to the revetment slabs of the walls, in order to create outside his own capital of Ctesiphon a brand new “Antioch of Chosroes” for the captured citizenry of the old city. The differing perspectives of our

¹⁰⁹ Davis 2007, 248, with quote from Herzfeld 2004, 198.

¹¹⁰ 2014.

¹¹¹ Most notably by Coates-Stephens (2003, 344–349).

surviving sources give us an unusually rich picture of how this reuse was portrayed and interpreted. Procopius's relatively straightforward account is supplemented by his fellow contemporary, the church historian John of Ephesus, who makes clear the thoroughness with which the marble was gathered from the old Antioch for use in the new.¹¹² Several centuries later many Arabic sources relate the capture and transference of the Antiochene stone, the most reliable of which is included in the 10th-century historian al-Tabari's fifteen-volume *History of the Prophets and Kings*.¹¹³ Here, the story includes the details that the new city was built on exactly the same scale and plan as the old Roman city, and was called al-Rumiyyah—variously translated but clearly full of implications.¹¹⁴

That Chosroes probably did actually despoil and recreate Antioch to a significant extent is compelling, but even more interesting are the differing memories that grew up around the cannibalization.¹¹⁵ For al-Tabari and his sources, as Coates-Stephens concludes, the message of triumphalism through reuse was clear: “[Chosroes] had become master of his enemy, the Roman-Byzantine state, through the possession of its citizens and its marbles, its animate as well as its inanimate attributes.”¹¹⁶ Meanwhile, in the Byzantine world another interpretation was given to the upcycled city, comprising an apologia of sorts. Theophylact, writing in the mid-7th century, comments: “It is said that the emperor Justinian provided Chosroes son of Kabadēs with Greek

¹¹² Procopius, *Pers.* 2.9.14–17, 2.14.1–2. John of Ephesus' description is preserved in the 8th-century *Chronicle of Zuqnin*, also known as Pseudo-Dionysius, compiled in Syriac (Witakowski 1996, 64).

¹¹³ *History of al-Ṭabarī* 898 (see Bosworth 1999, 157–159).

¹¹⁴ Translations have included “the city of the Greeks,” “the city of the Romans,” “the Roman city,” and “Rome;” see Coates-Stephens 2003, 346–347.

¹¹⁵ Coates-Stephens 2003, 346–347. Coates-Stephens returns here to Brenk's *spolia*-as-cannibalism analogy (1987, 103).

¹¹⁶ Coates-Stephens 2003, 347.

marble, building experts, and craftsmen skilled in ceilings, and that a palace situated close to Ctesiphon was constructed for Chosroes with Roman expertise.”¹¹⁷ To Byzantine eyes, the only explanation for such a well-marbled city in such a place was that Justinian himself had facilitated it.¹¹⁸

This example is also important in re-emphasizing that all stone, even plain revetment slabs, can be meaningfully reused, not just those with ornament or sculpture. The reuse of plain blocks, tiles, etc. need not have been purely pragmatic, as has sometimes been asserted.¹¹⁹ Even if Chosroes had been able to procure freshly quarried marble, constructing the city from new material could not have expressed the same meaning as upcycling the marble of Antioch won in war did. As Coates-Stephens has underlined, “the significant factor would seem to be more the despoilers’ (and the audience’s) knowledge or belief regarding the precise source of the re-used materials, rather than such materials’ intrinsic worth or form.”¹²⁰ The varied sources reveal that different memory communities held different notions of the spoliation of Antioch and the reuse of its marbles, and how these memories could change and develop over time.

An Extra Turn of the Kaleidoscope

As Alcock put it colorfully, a focus on memory in archaeological research does not require brand new sources of information, but instead demands “an extra turn of the kaleidoscope, bringing heterogeneous relevant elements into unforeseen but enlightening

¹¹⁷ *History* 5.6.10 (trans. Whitby and Whitby [1986, 140]); See also Coates-Stephens 2003, 346.

¹¹⁸ Coates-Stephens 2003, 346.

¹¹⁹ E.g., by Ward-Perkins (1999, 230).

¹²⁰ 2003, 347.

conjunctions.”¹²¹ By marshaling all sorts of archaeological, historical, and literary evidence, this study of upcycling is an attempt to discover these newly illuminated and illuminating connections. There is of course some degree of speculation inherent in such an enterprise, and as the short stories revealed, upcycling and its impact are not always recognizable in retrospect. This is an important limitation to bear in mind. Sometimes, reuse that is visible to us in the archaeological record can look intentional, but we may no longer have the salient knowledge of the past life of the reused object to be able to interpret the intention or effect of the act. Other times, upcycling that was indeed intentionally meaningful may no longer even be discernible as reuse. Still, asking questions about visibility, agency, intention, and effect may bring innovative interpretations into focus. I suggest that the key is to begin by concentrating on cases where we have relatively clear evidence of some intentionality behind an act of visible reuse, and to embrace an interdisciplinary perspective in order to take advantage of all the evidence and modes of inquiry available.

The story Pausanias tells about the Nemesis statue discussed at the beginning of this introduction shows that the concept of intentionally meaningful reuse was indeed a phenomenon within Greco-Roman culture. That the Persian block would be reused for the statue, and that the statue would thereby accrue added significance based on its origin, was clearly believable, and indeed widely believed. Pausanias is in fact one of our most useful sources in studying ancient upcycling, because in his descriptions, reports, and tales of the monuments of Greece in the 2nd century CE, he often acts as a social rememberer.¹²² His unique project of describing “all things

¹²¹ 2002, 183.

¹²² For the *Periegesis* as a “memory work” (*Erinnerungsarbeit*), see Goldmann 1991; for Pausanias’ project as the creation of “landscapes of memory,” see Alcock 1996.

Greek” (πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά) (1.26.4) resulted in ten books of descriptions and accounts (λόγοι), after 20 years of travel and research.¹²³ His frequent interactions with (and not uncritical reliance on) local guides and “expounders” (ἐξηγηταί) means that his text often incorporates local oral tradition and reveals how it can be shaped or contested, and how it can differ from historiographically transmitted ideas.¹²⁴ In a somewhat programmatic statement early in the work, Pausanias claimed that what he was about to say about Hipparchos and Hippias had never been written down before, but was generally believed by the Athenians, showing that he valued oral tradition as a source of evidence for his work, and grasped the significance of writing it down.¹²⁵ “By recognizing this importance of local tradition,” M. Pretzler has underlined, “we can also turn Pausanias into a source for attitudes and self-perception of particular communities in Roman Greece.”¹²⁶ When we treat Pausanias as a rememberer we can sometimes gain critical insights into the “network of associations” that made up the social memory of a community, not in the realms of physical space and oral tradition separately, but in the convergence of those modes within the matrix of memory.

Pausanias is just one example of existing evidence that can fruitfully be reexamined through an extra turn of the kaleidoscope. My project will incorporate many such turns, as I aim to take a wide view by investigating a practice that spanned extensive chronological and

¹²³ On Pausanias’ process, see esp. Pretzler 2004a.

¹²⁴ On Pausanias and his guides, see esp. Jones 2001; also Habicht 1985, 144–146; Goldmann 1991, 150; Pretzler 2005a. Pretzler (2004a, 205) emphasizes that “ancient travel was communicative,” and Pausanias would have been constantly consulting locals on practical as well as professional matters (205).

¹²⁵ Paus. 1.23.2: λέγω δὲ οὐκ ἐς συγγραφήν πρότερον ἦκοντα, πιστὰ δὲ ἄλλως Ἀθηναίων τοῖς πολλοῖς. See Pretzler 2005a, 235. See also Pretzler 2013 on where and why Pausanias rejects local tradition.

¹²⁶ 2004b, 43–44. Pretzler 2005b on Pausanias’ treatment of Mantinea, traditionally seen as full of errors, is an excellent example of how reexamining Pausanias as a rememberer can lead to important conclusions about local tradition.

topographical ranges at Athens, from the years of the nascent democracy in the 5th century BCE through the ascent of the Macedonians and Romans and into the Late Antique period, and from the outermost city walls into the civic cores of the Acropolis and Agora. At the same time, by focusing on a specific though multiform practice, I address social memory as a continually evolving aspect of the Athenian community, its self-identity, and its self-posturing. Much interesting recent work has been done on reuse of specific groups of objects in Athens, on reuse and/or memory in particular parts of the city, and on reuse and/or memory in particular periods of the city's history.¹²⁷ The jigsaw puzzle of Athenian social memory is being reconstructed with great zeal, as the large quantity of high quality recent work on the construction and function of memory in the oral and textual realms shows.¹²⁸ There has also been a spate of recent approaches to Greek material evidence as it relates to memory and notions of the past, most not explicitly discussing reuse.¹²⁹ Building on much of this work, I seek to show how the practice of upcycling shaped social memory in the physical realm, impacting how and what Athenians remembered and forgot across nearly a millennium and across their whole city.

My project, therefore, provides a heretofore missing piece of the puzzle, bridging the

¹²⁷ Some the most important of these are: Buchert (2000) on the preservation of historical monuments in Greece; Alcock (2002) on social memory in Roman Greece; Loraux (2002) on Athenian memory and forgetting of stasis; Lindenlauf (2003) on the memory of the Persian Wars; Hurwit (2004) on the Periclean Acropolis as a landscape of memory; Kousser (2009) on destruction on the Acropolis; Perrin-Saminadayar (2009) on "resemantization" of Athenian buildings; Krumeich and Witschel (2010) on the post-Classical Acropolis as the center of Athenian identity formation; T. Hölscher (2010) on Athens as an *Erinnerungsort*; Hartmann (2010, 499–505) on the Acropolis as an *Erinnerungsort*; Shear (2011) on social memory and revolution in the late 5th and 4th centuries BCE.

¹²⁸ See, e.g., Wolpert (2002), Grethlein (2010a), Hesk (2012), Steinbock (2013), and Engels (2014) on the creation and distortion of memory in Athenian oratory, Lambert (2010b and 2012) on attitudes toward the past revealed in inscribed laws and decrees, Chaniotis (2012 and 2014) on the sharing of memories through diplomatic rituals and on inscriptions constructing memory in the 4th century and later, Shear (2013) on remembrance in Athenian funeral orations, and Luraghi (2010) and Shear (2012) on honorific decrees.

¹²⁹ These include: Hartmann (2010) on objects as "relics" in the ancient world; Mango (2010) on Athenian *Erinnerungsräume* in the 1st century BCE; von den Hoff (2010a) on Athenian memories of Theseus in different media; Shapiro (2012) on Attic heroes and political monuments in the 5th century BCE; Low (2012) on public monuments to Athenian war dead in the Classical period; Higbie (2003 and 2014) on the Lindian Chronicle and on "forged" Homeric artifacts; Reiterman (2014) on *keimelia* as valued antiques; Arrington (2015) on the memory of the war dead in the 5th century.

discourses of memory and reuse. In both these discourses, as discussed above, emphasis on comparative case studies from disparate cultural contexts has often inhibited consequential conclusions. By instead bringing together many instances of upcycling within a chronologically and geographically continuous (though not necessarily homogeneous nor consistent) cultural community, I aim to make a significant contribution in both spheres through this project, making sense of a distinct phenomenon of meaningful reuse otherwise studied only piecemeal, and illuminating an important driving force in the overall operation of social memory within a society.

While upcycling is a nearly universal phenomenon, ancient Athens is a fertile place to begin studying it, because of the wealth of instances of intentional reuse that have been documented archaeologically, and because of the great variety of types and sources of evidence to draw upon in investigating the particular social and historical contexts surrounding acts of reuse and their reception. Especially after the institution of democracy and the ultimately victorious Persian Wars, Athenians had a strong sense of their city as playing a unique role in the Greek world, as a political, cultural, and artistic leader. Even in periods when Athens no longer actually played such a role, the past occupied a central place in the conception of the contemporary importance of city, even increasingly so in Hellenistic and Roman periods.

This sense of the past influenced Athenians' collective identity and made for a very rich social memory developed and evolved through commemorative practices like civic festivals and rituals, victory monuments, honorific statues, public funerary orations, and inscription of everything from enacted decrees to temple inventories to lists of war dead.¹³⁰ As Hölscher has put it, Athens did not simply *have* a unique history, it had *created* for itself an exceptionally

¹³⁰ On the "epigraphic habit" in Athens, see esp. Hedrick 1999.

strong collective memory, becoming eventually a memorial of itself.¹³¹ We therefore have abundant material evidence related to the workings of memory in the physical realm, but we also have ample literary, rhetorical, and historiographic evidence, particularly but not exclusively from the Classical period, that can reveal a fuller picture of the matrix of memory—the rituals, traditions, and documents through which, along with physical objects, a community builds and maintains shared notions of the past, present, and future. The participatory nature of Athens’ democratic civic institutions means that what emerges as an official or public method of commemoration or version of events was the result of relatively inclusive negotiation and ultimately does reflect widely held memories.¹³² It was not simply the top-down imposition of an elite narrative, though of course elites will have played leading roles in even democratic negotiations.¹³³ We also have evidence like plays and court speeches that can sometimes give us glimpses of otherwise hard-to-see competing memories and different memory communities.

Though other materials like metals and terracotta were surely also sometimes upcycled in Athens, I have chosen to focus on the upcycling of marble because of marble’s relative durability and hence survival in the archaeological record, but also because of its status in antiquity as a desirable material for architecture and statuary. In her preface to *Agora XI*, E. Harrison wrote: “Stone, being a partly re-usable material, is far less apt than terracotta to lie quietly in the bed of its destruction. It is always jumping out, into higher levels and lower uses.”¹³⁴ While this is both

¹³¹ “Athen hat nicht einfach eine einzigartige Geschichte *gehabt*, sondern hat sich ein ungemein starkes kollektives Gedächtnis *geschaffen*” (2010, 130); “Athen wurde zum Denkmal seiner selbst” (2010, 146).

¹³² Luraghi (2010, 247–248) calls the *polis* inscribing a decree a “monument to its deliberation,” that “expressed the collective will of the political community in a more direct way than any other text.”

¹³³ As Wolpert (2002, xv) has pointed out about Athenian oratory, “the stakes were too high for public speakers to risk professing values and beliefs that were not commonly shared among their fellow citizens, in the same way they tended to depict the past as their audience preferred to imagine it.”

¹³⁴ 1965, v.

a wonderful image and certainly largely true, there are some instances in the archaeological record where stones have instead jumped to higher uses—uses where their past produced meaning within their new context. The high status of marble compared with other stones correlates with this reuse that is meaningful beyond motivations of practicality. In some cases, for example, it is clear that the “marbleness” of an object made it appropriate for a given secondary context.

Marble is most usefully defined as any hard stone that takes a polish. Neither in antiquity nor today are more technical geological definitions consistently agreed upon.¹³⁵ Marble is hard, and heavy; recarving and/or moving it is relatively labor intensive compared with other stones, so that the thought and effort put into reusing it is also often greater.¹³⁶ I do include within some of my case studies non-marble remains from earlier periods or composite monuments that are not wholly marble, which I nonetheless see as a part of the larger phenomenon I am studying in the way that the act of reuse has acknowledged the previous functions and contexts of the objects. The built environment of Athens included several varieties of marble and other stone, but public architecture and monuments like statue bases were dominated from the 5th century BCE onward by marble quarried locally from the nearby mountains of Pentelikon (a fine-grained, translucent white marble) and Hymettos (a fine-grained, blueish-white marble).¹³⁷ Both were quarried into the Late Roman period.

In short, ancient Athens was a city rich in marble, monuments, and memory. The

¹³⁵ Greenhalgh 2009, 26–27. On Pausanias’ vocabulary for marble and other stones, see Arafat 1996, 50–51.

¹³⁶ Cf. Kinney (2006, 235) on the reuse of stone in the Medieval period: “Marble was always a special case. It was a luxury stone, and its reuse was ornamental, not expedient.”

¹³⁷ On the Hymettos and Pentelikon quarries and their marble, see Dodge and Ward-Perkins 1992, 153–154; Korres 1995 (on Pentelikon); Goette et al. 1999; Pike 2009. On other stone used in Athens, see Kouzeli and Dimou 2011. Among the ancient sources on Athenian marble, see esp. Strabo 9.1.23.

phenomenon of upcycling stone with the intention to influence social memory can be seen over many centuries, in cases as diverse as reinscribing statue bases on the Acropolis and relocating entire temples into the Agora. I have chosen to bound my study chronologically by the Themistoclean fortification walls of the early 5th century BCE and the Post-Herulian fortification wall of the late 3rd century CE. This is in some ways an arbitrary choice since I do not mean to claim that upcycling only occurred within this time frame, but it is not an illogical one. The aftermath of the Persian Wars makes a good place to start, since the experience radically changed Greek and Athenian perceptions of themselves and quickly came to be seen as a turning point in their own history.¹³⁸ In addition to more immediate commemorations, the Persian Wars became a rallying post, particularly in matters where collective action was again deemed necessary. They became paradigmatic, especially but not only in Athens, of Greeks banding together to defeat foreign enemies with Athenians at the head, and of Athens' justified supremacy in Greece.

At the other end of the chronological range, the end of the 3rd century CE makes a reasonable place to cut off this study. More profound cultural changes, such as the spread of Christianity, meant that the traditional social framework and memory communities changed more drastically in Late Antiquity than they had in the preceding centuries, and symbols and forms took on new or altered significance. Moreover, while upcycling certainly continued, the vast general increase in the prevalence of architectural reuse in the 4th and 5th centuries, long noted in scholarship on *spolia*, does seem to mark a broad change in economic circumstances and

¹³⁸ See esp. Lindenlauf 2003, and below, Chapter 5.

attitudes toward reuse.¹³⁹ Thus, while I do not think it fair to say that the Herulian invasion of 267 CE marked the end of the ancient city of Athens and the beginning of the medieval village, as I will argue in Chapter 2, its aftermath does provide a fitting bookend for this project.

¹³⁹ Altekamp (2013) has provided the best explanation to date for this widespread increase in reuse, arguing that the combination of the monumentality in durable materials and the modularity of earlier Greco-Roman architecture made reuse not only economically pragmatic but also an efficient way to deal with old abandoned structures that would otherwise mar the *κόσμος* of a city (a key concern of much of the Late Antique legislation concerning reuse, on which see esp. Alchermes 1994 and Noethlichs 2013). He acknowledges that while display or continuity of function were not usually intended by Late Antique reusers, still in certain cases the conspicuous placement of interesting *spolia* “reflected more than curiosity” (194–195). See below, Chapter 5, for discussion of some recent examples of how careful study of these later cases of conspicuous reuse can be revealing even when written sources for chronology and context are lacking.

Chapter 2. Creating Social Memory through Reuse That Accentuates

The Themistoclean City Wall

I begin with something of a counter-example that will, I hope, serve to clarify my approach. The Themistoclean city wall, famously described by Thucydides, is one of the earliest and most widely-known examples of the large-scale reuse of stone in Athens. Following the Greek victories over the Persians at Plataea and Mycale in 479 BCE and the subsequent siege of Sestos on the Hellespont, the Athenians returned home in 478 to find their city utterly devastated by Mardonius and the Persian army upon its withdrawal to the Boeotian plain.¹ Under the leadership of Themistocles, the Athenians began first to refortify their city as quickly as possible, against the desires of their then-allies in Sparta. Diplomatic trickery on the part of Themistocles kept the construction activity secret from the Spartans until the wall had reached a defensible height.² Under conditions of such haste, the entire Athenian population worked together to build the wall using anything they could find within the debris from the Persian destruction, including grave stelai.³ “Even now,” wrote Thucydides nearly fifty years later, “it is clear that the structure

¹ Thuc. 1.89.2–3. The extent of the Persian destruction of the lower city in 479 was by all indications vast indeed. Thucydides (1.89.3) says that apart from a few houses in which the Persian officers had stayed, most of the houses in Athens were in ruins and only small portions of the encircling wall remained standing (τοῦ τε γὰρ περιβόλου βραχέα εἰστήκει καὶ οἰκίαι αἱ μὲν πολλαὶ ἐπεπτώκεσαν, ὀλίγαι δὲ περιῆσαν, ἐν αἷς αὐτοὶ ἐσκήνωσαν οἱ δυνατοὶ τῶν Περσῶν). Herodotus too (9.13) describes almost total destruction by Mardonius: before withdrawing, he burned the city and threw down and made into a heap any standing wall, house, or shrine (ὑπεξεγώρεε ἐμπρήσας τε τὰς Ἀθήνας, καὶ εἴ κού τι ὀρθὸν ἦν τῶν τειχέων ἢ τῶν οἰκημάτων ἢ τῶν ἱρῶν, πάντα καταβάλων καὶ συγχώσας). After examining the evidence from the Agora, Shear (1993, 406) concurred: “The sealed and abandoned wells ought surely to signal a general horizon of destruction which considerably disrupted the city’s life.” Cf. also the similar conclusions reached by Lynch 2011.

² Thuc. 1.90–91.

³ Thuc. 1.90.3. Themistocles advised that everyone in the city, men, women, and children, should take part in the wall-building, using any suitable material from private or public buildings: τειχίζειν δὲ πάντας πανδημει τοὺς ἐν τῇ πόλει, καὶ αὐτοὺς καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ παῖδας, φειδομένους μήτε ἰδίου μήτε δημοσίου οἰκοδομήματος ὅθεν τις ὠφελία ἔσται ἐς τὸ ἔργον, ἀλλὰ καθαιροῦντας πάντα. Given other accounts and evidence of the extent of the Persian destruction (above, n.1), it is assumed that most of the buildings from which material was taken for the wall would already have been in a more or less ruinous state.

was made hastily. For the foundations are of stones of all sorts, and of stones not worked to join there, but just as they were when each worker brought them, and many grave stelai and ashlar stones were built in.”⁴ Indeed, archaeological exploration has confirmed the presence of reused material within the remains of the Early Classical city wall, including material from Archaic grave monuments (stelai, stelai bases, and sculpture) in the well-preserved segments of the wall and its gates in the area of the Kerameikos necropolis, largely in accordance with Thucydides’ acclaimed description.⁵

But was this upcycling? It is, surely, the first instance most classicists think of when the topic of reuse of stone in Athens is broached. But to answer this question, and to see whether my interpretive framework can be useful here, we must focus more carefully on the issues of intention and visibility. What can we say about the motives of Themistocles and the wall builders? How was the “materiality of the trace” preserved or concealed in the act of reuse? Some scholars, while not using the term or the concept of upcycling, have treated the reuse of the grave stelai in particular as a very conscious action on the part of the Athenians, with clear ideological or reverent purposes. K. Stähler, for example, saw the immuring of the grave monuments as an attempt to imbue the wall with a protective apotropaic force, harnessing the power of the dead as if they were all heroes.⁶ C. Keesling, by contrast, has suggested that a desire to deprive the stones of any power of the dead may account for the mutilation seen on some

⁴ Thuc. 1.93.2: καὶ δὴλη ἡ οἰκοδομία ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐστὶν ὅτι κατὰ σπουδὴν ἐγένετο. οἱ γὰρ θεμέλιοι παντοίων λίθων ὑπόκεινται καὶ οὐ ξυνεργασμένων ἔστιν ἢ, ἀλλ’ ὡς ἕκαστοὶ ποτε προσέφερον, πολλαὶ τε στήλαι ἀπὸ σημάτων καὶ λίθοι εἰργασμένοι ἐγκατελέγησαν.

⁵ The early 20th century saw a debate about the plausibility and trustworthiness of Thucydides’ account of the city wall (see, e.g., von Stern 1904; Busolt 1905; Meyer 1905), but thanks partly to the archaeological discoveries in the Kerameikos (on which see below), his historicity here is generally not now challenged.

⁶ Stähler 1993, 13–24.

sculpted stelai, making them “symbolically impotent.”⁷ L. Schneider and C. Höcker, on the other hand, argued that because taking grave monuments away from their tombs and reusing them should normally have been considered sacrilege, their use in the Themistoclean wall must have been a politically motivated anti-aristocratic gesture by the new democracy.⁸ B. Bäbler has elucidated numerous logical flaws and problems in the evidence adduced for both these divergent interpretations.⁹ Beginning instead from the physical evidence of the wall itself, a different picture of intentionality emerges.

Remains of the city wall of Athens dated to the Themistoclean period have been documented in 19 stretches along its circuit, of which at least ten included limestone and marble material in secondary use.¹⁰ The wall consisted of a stone socle with one or two courses as a foundation and one or two courses above ground, surmounted by a mud-brick superstructure. The socle itself was between 2.50 and 3.25 meters thick, with a rubble core between two stone faces. The top of the socle was leveled to ensure a secure join with the mud brick.¹¹

Noack, in the first thorough study of the remains of the wall in the Kerameikos, recognized signs of haste in the wall’s construction while noting that the varied building material seemed to have been chosen on the basis of maximizing the stability of the wall. Pieces of tomb sculpture, therefore, were placed only in the foundation proper and not in the upper courses that

⁷ Keesling 1999, 515–518.

⁸ Schneider and Höcker 1996, 123–124.

⁹ Bäbler 2001, 6–11.

¹⁰ Theodoraki 2011, 104–105.

¹¹ Theodoraki 2011, 104; Knigge 1991, 54.

received the mud-brick superstructure.¹² According to the A. Theodoraki, whose recent and impressively comprehensive study has incorporated evidence from the many rescue excavations conducted in Athens in the last century, these signs of hasty construction are evident throughout the wall's circuit. The top surface of the socle, for example, was not treated the same way in all segments, and "the building material of its two walls was usually rough hewn, preserving details of its earlier use."¹³ It has long been recognized that many of the grave stelai reused in the wall running through the Kerameikos were reworked in some way, usually with parts of relief sculpture chiseled away. After examining these stelai, many of which had been removed from the wall by archaeologists, R. Kousser found that this reworking was rough and approximate and seemed designed to make the blocks as close to squared ashlar as possible. Overall, they gave an impression of "pragmatic alteration to fit the requirements of the wall."¹⁴ One further indication of the urgency with which the Athenians built their wall comes from the evidence of the cleanup of the Persian destruction debris in the Agora. In his thorough study of the well deposits that represent this cleaning effort, T. Shear concluded that it was almost two years before the Athenians were able to begin rebuilding private homes and public buildings, and that refortification of the city with a wall had by necessity been the first priority of the community.¹⁵

¹² Noack 1907, 129. After Noack, the main excavation reports dealing with the Themistoclean city wall in the Kerameikos are Ohly 1965; Knigge 1991, 49–73; Löringhoff 1995; and Kuhn 1995.

¹³ Theodoraki 2011, 105. As Theodoraki points out, some of the inconsistency in the masonry must be due to the reuse of such varied materials. In most of the wall segments outside of the Kerameikos, the original functions or locations of the material reused in the wall has not been identified. A possible exception is a gate excavated by Travlos just north of the Olympieion, which may have incorporated pieces of limestone column drums from the unfinished Peisistratid temple. The excavation is not fully published, but see Travlos 1971, 402; Vanderpool 1960, 267–468; and Theodoraki 2011, 108.

¹⁴ Kousser 2009, 266, 279 n. 45. For several examples of the variety of grave monument fragments found in the wall, see Richter 1961; Willemsen 1963; and Keesling 1999.

¹⁵ Shear 1993, 417.

After the foregoing survey it should now be clear that pragmatism was the main factor behind the reuse of Archaic gravestones and other stone material in the Themistoclean city wall. Thucydides' account emphasizes the desperation of the Athenians—that they were in such a hurry to build the wall, for reasons both of actual physical security and of political maneuvering lest the Spartans thwart their efforts, that *even* women and children helped with construction, and that they *even* used grave stelai and all sorts of other stones. This desperation is seen in the archaeological evidence as well. Stones were chosen based on proximity and suitability, and modified with an eye toward the structural stability of the wall above all else. Of course, pragmatism can be a factor in reuse without precluding other motivations. Almost all of the cases of upcycling I examine in this project involve some degree of practicality and economy. Still, interpretations of the Themistoclean city wall that see some grand motivation like magical apotropaism or anti-aristocratic sacrilege as intentions behind the reuse in wall go too far. This is not to say that some individual Athenian man, woman, or child working on the wall could not have had such thoughts or hopes, or perhaps more likely a feeling of sadness or trepidation at being compelled to use grave monuments in this way, but there is no evidence for a communal motivation beyond pragmatism for reusing the stelai (or any of the other Persian destruction debris) in the city wall.

But what about the visibility factor? Was the act of reuse discernible? It is clear that there was no real attempt during the wall's construction, amidst the haste discussed above, to hide the fact that the stone material was in secondary use. Thucydides obviously could see that this was the case half a century later, and much more recently Theocharaki observed that some details of

the previous uses of the immured stones were preserved throughout the course of the wall.¹⁶ But it is crucial to remember that only one or two thin courses of masonry were visible above ground. There was no room for aesthetic consideration of the appearance of those courses next to the functional consideration of their stability beneath the looming mud-brick superstructure. So, the act of reuse was visible to the observant viewer, but was not enhanced or emphasized in any way. The reused material was not accentuated or shown off. It could be noted, but it was not noteworthy, and it was not upcycling.

To belabor the point just slightly further though, could the connotations of the reuse in the wall have changed over time? Could the wall have been seen by later Athenians as having some greater symbolic or memorial significance even if such was not the original intent? Can an act of reuse that cannot be viewed as intentional upcycling nevertheless come to be remembered or interpreted differently? Yes, of course it can, just as collective attitudes toward any monument, building, event, etc. can shift under changing political or social circumstances. Later in this chapter I will discuss a case of reuse whose memorial outcomes changed dramatically over time, such that what was originally a strikingly obvious act of upcycling was eventually not remembered as reuse at all. But in the case of the Themistoclean city wall, we have no real evidence that the reused materials were ever a subject of attention or controversy. They themselves were in fact probably invisible by the early 4th century BCE, when a major repair project added a one-meter high base of polygonal limestone blocks atop the Themistoclean stone socle. At this point the ground level had risen, and the earlier reused material was completely

¹⁶ Theodoraki 2011, 105.

underground.¹⁷ In the literary sources, we see that the wall was remembered with pride as a symbol of collective effort, of an instance of the sacrificing of private property for the security of the community.¹⁸ Diodorus Siculus' discussion of the wall in the mid-1st century BCE, while clearly derivative of Thucydides, emphasizes even further the universal participation (πολυχειρία) in the project and the hasty zeal (μεγάλη σπουδή) and eagerness (προθυμία) with which each wall-builder worked.¹⁹ In an alternative tradition, seen for example in Plutarch's *Life of Themistocles*, the wall-building came to symbolize Themistocles' guileful diplomacy in either bribing (χρήμασι πείσας) or hoodwinking (παρακρουσάμενος) the Spartans.²⁰ In sum then, the Themistoclean city wall, while always a prominent example of reuse in the minds of classicists, was not seen as such within the Athenian cityscape.

The North Acropolis Wall

Let's transition now to the citadel wall on the north side of the Acropolis—a contemporary and only slightly less well-known wall in which we can indeed recognize upcycling at work and can investigate the dynamics of social memory associated with that upcycling. Considering the Themistoclean city wall and the North Acropolis Wall in tandem

¹⁷ Knigge 1991, 52 fig. 51, 54. In the early scholarship on the wall there was confusion about whether the polygonal courses belonged to the Themistoclean phase (von Alten 1878, followed by Judeich 1905) or early 4th-century Kimonian phase (Noack 1907, followed by Judeich 1931). Ohly's excavation of a cross-section of the wall in the Kerameikos from 1956–1961 clarified the phasing (Ohly 1965). See also Theodoraki 2011, 89, 103.

¹⁸ Lindenlauf 2003, 56–57.

¹⁹ Diod. Sic. 11.40.1–2: οἱ δὲ Ἀθηναῖοι μετὰ μεγάλης σπουδῆς ὤκοδόμουν τὰ τεῖχη, οὔτ' οἰκίας οὔτε τάφου φειδόμενοι. συνελαμβάνοντο δὲ τῶν ἔργων οἱ τε παῖδες καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες καὶ καθόλου πᾶς ξένος καὶ δοῦλος, οὐδενὸς ἀπολειπομένου τῆς προθυμίας. παραδόξως δὲ τῶν ἔργων ἀνυομένων διὰ τε τὰς πολυχειρίας καὶ τὰς τῶν ἀπάντων προθυμίας...

²⁰ Plut. *Vit. Them.* 19.1: γενόμενος δ' ἀπὸ τῶν πράξεων ἐκείνων εὐθὺς ἐπεχείρει τὴν πόλιν ἀνοικοδομεῖν καὶ τειχίζειν, ὡς μὲν ἱστορεῖ Θεόπομπος, χρήμασι πείσας μὴ ἐναντιωθῆναι τοὺς ἐφόρους, ὡς δ' οἱ πλείστοι, παρακρουσάμενος. Cf. also Dem. *Lept.* 20.73–74, *Nep. Them.* 6–7.

demonstrates how the specifics of reuse—which individual materials and objects are chosen for reuse and how and where they are reused—can result in very different outcomes in terms of how the reused material and the new structure to which it belongs are viewed. In the North Acropolis Wall, as we’ll see, the visibility of the reused material was a key element in the design of the new fortification and impacted how the memory of the Persian destruction took shape.

Like the lower city, the Athenian Acropolis suffered severe damage at the hands of the Persians. Shortly before the Battle of Salamis, Xerxes’ troops in Athens managed to find a way up the steep and unguarded east side of the Acropolis and quickly overcame the few Athenians holding out on the citadel. According to Herodotus, Xerxes’ men killed all the Athenians there, then plundered the temple and burned the whole Acropolis, a level of destruction corroborated by archaeological evidence.²¹ At some point following their recovery of the city, the Athenians rebuilt the fortification wall (also in effect a retaining wall) along the north side using stone that had been thrown down by the Persians. In addition to ashlar blocks, the reused material included entablature blocks (marble metopes and limestone triglyphs and architrave blocks) and at least 16 column capitals from the Temple of Athena Polias, or the *archaios neos*—the most important Athenian temple and surely the one to which Herodotus refers—and at least 29 marble column drums from the unfinished Older Parthenon, which had been under construction at the time of the sack and whose wooden scaffolding presumably facilitated the conflagration.²²

²¹ Hdt. 8.53.2: ἐπεὶ δὲ σφί πάντες κατέστρωντο, τὸ ἱρὸν συλήσαντες ἐνέπρησαν πᾶσαν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν. The great late-19th-century excavations on the Acropolis are published by Kavvadias and Kawerau 1906. See also Bundgaard’s 1974 edition of Kawerau and Dörpfeld’s original drawings, and Lindenlauf 1997, Steskal 2004, and Stewart 2008 for modern treatments of the material evidence of the Persian destruction on the Acropolis (the so-called *Perserschutt*).

²² Korres 2002, 184; Tschira 1940, 242; Hurwit 1999, 142. On the evidence of severe fire damage on the extant remains of the Older Parthenon, see Hill 1912, 557–558; Hurwit 1999, 136; Korres 1994b, 176; Korres 2002, 184. For a detailed study of the column drums from the Older Parthenon, see Tschira 1940.

The dating of the North Acropolis Wall has until recently been controversial. Although several later sources refer to the south Acropolis wall as Kimonian,²³ we have no explicit literary evidence on the dating of the north wall. Some, wanting to see the whole circuit as Kimonian, have seen the lack of continuity and the segmented appearance of the north wall as less impressive than the more uniform south wall, arguing that its technical superiority made only the south wall worthy of mention.²⁴ Earlier uncertainty about the date of the Older Parthenon has also played a role in the debate, since its destruction must serve as a *terminus post quem* for the construction of the wall.²⁵ M. Korres, however, has now made a convincing case for dating the sections of the north wall in question to the Themistoclean period, based on the now well-established pre-Persian date for the Older Parthenon and especially on his careful examination of the order of construction of the various segments of the wall and their relationship to the large deposit of destruction debris containing mutilated statues from the initial clean-up of the Acropolis, which the wall supported.²⁶

I have just argued that the widespread reuse of damaged material in the Themistoclean city wall was due mostly to pragmatic motivations, and had little to do with memory. Accepting Korres' dating, does the same then hold true for the Themistoclean Acropolis wall? The lack of

²³ Using the spoils from the Battle of the Eurymedon. Plut. *Vit. Luc.* 44.5, *Vit. Cim.* 13.5; Nep. *Cimon* 5.2.5; cf. also Paus. 1.28.3.

²⁴ It has also been noted that the south wall too contains some blocks from the Temple of Athena Polias, but these could be Periclean repairs. See Hurwit 1999, 142, 345 n.19. For the debates about the relationship between the south and north walls, see Lambrinouidakis 1999, 551–553 (who connects the reuse in the wall with its religious role as a *peribolos* wall) and Di Cesare 2004, 110–115.

²⁵ For a summary of the debates on dating the North Acropolis Wall and the Older Parthenon, see Dinsmoor Jr. 1980, 63–64 and now Korres 2002. Significant contributors include: Tschira 1940, 261; Büsing 1970, 11–13; Bundgaard 1976, 121–133; Drerup 1981, 31–33; Wrede 1996; Lindenlauf 1997, 70–73.

²⁶ Korres 2002. See Kavvadias 1886 and Bundgaard 1974, 11–14 for the discovery of the Archaic statues in the fill against the north wall, and Chapter 5 below for further discussion.

continuity in form could be taken as an indication of haste, and if the Persians had destroyed parts of the citadel's fortifications in the course of the sack,²⁷ it would make sense that rebuilding them would be relatively high on the list of priorities after the recovery of the city. It was also likely the case that the material from the temples, even the materials designated for the Older Parthenon but not yet erected, were considered sacred, the property of the goddess, and therefore could not leave the sanctuary or simply be tossed away.²⁸ Thus, reuse in a fortification wall was a logical, pragmatic way to deal with them, especially those blocks that were too structurally unsound (i.e., too badly burnt) to be useful in reconstructing the temples themselves.

But when we examine how and where the temple materials were placed in the wall, an intentionality beyond hasty pragmatism is clear. The arrangement of the blocks in the outer face of the wall is strikingly deliberate: the triglyphs, metopes, and architrave blocks from the Temple of Athena Polias were put together to reconstitute the temple's entablature within the wall; the column drums were stacked at least two high and arranged in a long row, evoking a colonnade or peristyle. The segment with the entablature blocks was not only the first section of the wall to be constructed, and thus central to the overall plan of the project, but was also placed almost directly below the entablature's original position on the temple that had previously dominated the visual landscape of the north side of the Acropolis.²⁹ These reused blocks are thus prominently

²⁷ For a suggestion that part of the cyclopean Mycenaean wall of the Acropolis at the southwest end was thrown down by the Persians and less than skillfully repaired, see Eiteljorg 1993, 53–56.

²⁸ See Ridgway 1999, 205–206 and Miles 2011, 670–673 for discussion of architectural blocks as divine property alongside sculptural dedications (see Donderer 1991–1992) and other votive offerings. Miles convincingly demonstrates that the first, gigantic, block carrying inscribed lists of *aparchai* to Athena (the so called *lapis primus* of the Athenian tribute lists) was originally quarried as an architrave block for the Older Parthenon (see below, Chapter 5).

²⁹ Korres 2002, 181, 184.

visible from the city below, especially from the Agora,³⁰ and their previous function as temple architecture is immediately recognizable—the “visibility of the image through the materiality of the trace,” to adapt P. Nora’s words.³¹ Any Athenian, accustomed to seeing the north side of the Temple of Athena Polias when looking up to the Acropolis from below, would readily have identified that same entablature within the new wall.³² Monumental column drums, likewise, would have looked completely out of place in a fortification wall, and clearly understood as belonging to a temple. Overall then, the material chosen for reuse in the wall was not that which was best for wall building, as in the city wall below, but that which was “most distinctively templelike,” and it was used in such a way as to make its former life as temple architecture most plainly discernible.³³

So it is clear that the ruined temple materials were chosen for reuse in the North Acropolis Wall with more careful consideration for their appearance and visibility than were the grave stelai and other stones in the city wall. While the stelai were theoretically visible but not on display, the temple parts were accentuated and shown off to the city below. We can usefully view the recognition of the former temple architecture within the north wall as nascent social memory; seeing the wall prompted viewers to remember the Temple of Athena and the grand new Parthenon project, their destruction by the Persians, and the Athenians’ own recovery of their

³⁰ Korres 1994a, 42. Martin-McAuliffe and Papadopoulos (2012, 348–352) have suggested that buildings in the newly developed Classical Agora, particularly the Stoa Poikile and the Stoa Basileios with its oath stone (see Chapter 5, n. 29), were orientated specifically to take advantage of the view of the memorial in the North Acropolis Wall.

³¹ Nora 1989, 13.

³² The appearance of the wall from the inside, i.e., to viewers on the Acropolis itself, has not been discussed, and might warrant investigation, though later repairs may have obscured any relevant evidence.

³³ Kousser 2009, 271. This point weakens the case of Steskal (2004, 211), who is nearly alone in arguing that the wall-builders on the Acropolis had only practical concerns and that assigning any “propagandistic” meaning to the reuse in the wall is too speculative.

city. By displaying the reused marble so conspicuously—preserving and magnifying both its prior context and the ravages it suffered in that context—the North Acropolis Wall functioned as an overt war memorial, a reminder to the Athenians of the impiety of the Persian barbarians and an attempt, both physical and ideological, to prevent similar devastation in the future.³⁴ The wall stood as a symbol of the ultimate triumph of the Athenians (at the head of the Greeks) over the Persians, and as a goad to rouse them to action in the face of future threats to their homeland.³⁵ We might liken it to a huge banner spread above the city exhorting its citizens to “Never Forget.”³⁶ To the Persians, were they to have returned, the symbolic force of the wall might have been a demonstration of the resilience of the Athenians and indeed their unwillingness to forget or forgive.³⁷

That the upcycling in the North Acropolis Wall played a role in the formulation of how the Athenian community remembered the Persian Wars can be seen in the increasing emphasis in the mid-5th century on sacrilege, ἀσέβεια, as the defining crime of the Persians and as a rallying point for the Greeks. During the wars themselves, the Athenians were far from innocent of such offenses, having participated in the burning of Sardis during the Ionian Revolt in 498 BCE, for which Darius famously vowed revenge.³⁸ But by the 460s the ideological dichotomy of the noble, temperate Greek and the barbaric, hubristic, and violent Asiatic was well developed and

³⁴ For this evaluation of the memorial function of the wall, see e.g., Rhodes 1995, 32–33; Martin-McAuliffe and Papadopoulos 2012, 346–348; Miles 2014, 132; Gawlinski 2015, 64; Klein 2015, 138.

³⁵ See also Di Cesare 2004, 117, where the wall is called *una specie di litote*, symbolizing not destruction but victory.

³⁶ On memory construction at Ground Zero in New York after September 11, 2001, see Gutman 2009.

³⁷ Lindenlauf (2003, 55) connects this to the idea underlying Herodotus’ story of Athena’s olive tree, which had already sprung a new shoot amidst the ruins of the temple the day after the Persian sack (8.55).

³⁸ Hdt. 5.105.

was used to explain many of the causes and outcomes of the Persian Wars.³⁹ Herodotus has Themistocles use Xerxes’ burning of temples and overthrowing of cult statues as a key charge against him during his otherwise rather deceitful speech to the Athenians after Salamis.⁴⁰ All this was influenced by the constant display of the evidence of Persian sacrilege above the city, “a looming reminder of the impiety of the barbarians,” in J. Hurwit’s words.⁴¹ The impiety of the Persians barbarian would become something of a *topos* in the Periclean ideological scheme, seen also on the Acropolis in, e.g., the Parthenon metopes.⁴²

Comparing the two great Themistoclean refortification projects shows how reuse that can be considered upcycling—that involves an intention to convey meaning through the act of reuse—can affect the collective memory of a community, where reuse that does not consider the visibility of the past life of the material being reused is less likely to do so. Though the North Acropolis Wall and the Themistoclean city wall were part of the same general cleanup and rebuilding effort, they had different goals and messages.⁴³ When the Athenians returned home, their first priority was clearly the outer circuit wall. Building it to a defensible height before the Spartans could find out and intervene was key to Themistocles’ plan, as we learn from Thucydides,⁴⁴ and had to be done as quickly as possible with no concern for how the wall looked

³⁹ See Lindenlauf 2003, 55.

⁴⁰ Hdt. 9.109: ὅς τὰ τε ἱρὰ καὶ τὰ ἴδια ἐν ὁμοίῳ ἐποιέετο, ἐμπιπράς τε καὶ καταβάλλων τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα.

⁴¹ Hurwit 1999, 142.

⁴² See Ferrari 2000. The Oath of Plataea, or the later conception of such an oath, is of course relevant here, and will be discussed in Chapter 3 below.

⁴³ Some though, have seen the difference in quality of material and construction as an argument against dating them both to the Themistoclean period. As Korres points out (2002, 181, 184), there is no reason the Acropolis wall should be as rough as the city wall, given the differences in the materials available nearby and the structural functions of the two walls.

⁴⁴ Thuc. 1.90.3.

or any message it could convey. After that was done, Themistocles frankly informed the Spartans that his city was now walled and that they were dealing with men who knew full well how to look after both themselves and the common interest.⁴⁵ With this, the Athenians could then begin to clean up and refortify the Acropolis with less urgency and with more consideration for the memorial outcomes of their actions. The temple material on the Acropolis, and its very location on the Acropolis, made it more suitable for the construction of a memorial than any of the destruction debris in the lower city, and the Athenians took advantage of the opportunity to construct a remarkable reminder of the tribulations and triumphs of the Persian Wars.⁴⁶

The Post-Herulian Wall

Given its striking visibility within the Athenian landscape even today, and the relatively firm historical evidence of the events preceding its construction, an interpretation of the North Acropolis Wall as a war memorial has found wide acceptance.⁴⁷ The much later Post-Herulian Wall, though it shares several fundamental characteristics with the North Acropolis Wall, has generally not been interpreted in this same way. Re-examining this wall in light of the memory-creating effect of its predecessor, however, can help to make sense of the visible accentuation of reused material throughout the wall, which, I will argue, did indeed have memorial implications.

So, let's fast-forward 750 years to the 3rd century CE. Although Greece had now been under Roman provincial control for centuries, Athens in particular retained a significant degree

⁴⁵ Thuc. 1.91.4.

⁴⁶ On the differing commemoration strategies on the Acropolis vs. the Agora and Kerameikos, see Lindenlauf 2003, 56–57 and below, Chapter 5.

⁴⁷ Of the Acropolis after the Persian Wars Lindenlauf (2003, 55) writes, “it has become a commonplace that the destroyed religious heart of Athens served at some point as a war memorial.”

of civic autonomy because of its cultural heritage, its prestige as the empire's university town, and the maintenance by elite families of their traditional roles in the political life of the city outside of the Roman aristocratic structures.⁴⁸ The Panathenaic Festival with its great procession through the old Agora and up to the Acropolis continued to be celebrated into the 4th century CE.⁴⁹ Despite economic decline in the first half of the 3rd century, traditional civic institutions like the Kleisthenic deme and tribe system, the Areopagus council, and the office of archon remained intact and important alongside Roman magistracies like the proconsulship.⁵⁰

In 267 CE the city was ravaged in a raid by a Germanic tribe from the Black Sea region—the so-called Herulian sack.⁵¹ Arriving in Greece from the northeast, the Heruli passed through Attica and into the northern Peloponnese. After ravaging Athens, they were ultimately driven away by a band of two thousand Athenians under Publius Herennius Dexippus, an Athenian historian who later wrote an account of their liberation of the city that included his own rousing speech.⁵² Their actions may have saved the Acropolis, but the Heruli inflicted

⁴⁸ On this phenomenon among Athenian elites, in contrast to powerful local families elsewhere in the empire, see Millar 1969, 21.

⁴⁹ Himer. *Or.* 47.12–14. See Frantz 1988, 23–24.

⁵⁰ Frantz 1988, 12. No extant prytany decrees can be dated to after the Herulian sack, but it is likely that the *ephebeia* did continue after 267; see Kapetanopoulos 1983 and Castrén 1999, 213.

⁵¹ On the historiography of the Heruli and their invasion of Greece, see Millar 1969, 26–27; Frantz 1988, 1–2; Brown 2011, 82–88. For more detailed analyses of the written sources, see Alföldi in Cook 1939, 721–723 (*CAH* XII, 1st ed.), and Straub 1952, 40–74. On the origins of the Heruli, see esp. Ellegård 1987.

⁵² The foundational treatment of Dexippus and his milieu by Millar (1969) is now joined by Brandt 1999 and the editions and translations (German and Italian, respectively) of his surviving fragments and testimonia by Martin (2006) and Mecella (2013). Martin in particular addresses the political and cultural background of Dexippus and his family. For a full treatment of the family with stemmata, see Kapetanopoulos 1973. Dexippus' speech is *FGrH* 100 F28. De Ste. Croix (1981, 654–655, n. 42) has argued in a footnote that Dexippus' role in the defense is “a probable fiction” and “a modern myth,” but this is at least in part countered by Fowden (1988, 51 with n. 13) in his investigation of the topography of the defense (1988, 50–53); see also the biographical essay by McNerney in *Brill's New Jacoby*, “Dexippos (100)”.

considerable damage throughout the lower city, especially in the old Agora.⁵³ In the following decade, facing intermittent but continued threats from the north, the Athenians constructed a new city wall around a much smaller core of the urban area than the old Themistoclean circuit had encompassed, including the Acropolis but excluding the Agora, and utilizing much of the architectural and sculptural material damaged in the sack. In several areas of the circuit the wall was even laid directly on the foundations or floors of ruined buildings.⁵⁴

Because of this use of pre-existing foundations and because most of the materials in the wall were not moved very far from their original locations, scholars have tended to view the wall as merely a pragmatic and economical solution for a city that was drawing itself inwards. “A.D. 267,” wrote A. Frantz, whose 1988 *Agora XXIV* volume on Athens in Late Antiquity remains the standard and most comprehensive treatment of the Post-Herulian Wall,⁵⁵ “defines clearly the end of the ancient city and its transition to the status of a minor provincial town, a character which it retained all through the Middle Ages, with life disrupted to such an extent that the old pattern

⁵³ Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 208–209; Frantz 1988, 3–5; Camp 2001, 223. Whether the documented damage to the Parthenon and other Acropolis structures in the Late Roman period was due to the Heruli, Alaric’s Visigoths, or an accidental fire is still a matter of contention. See esp. Travlos 1973 and Frantz 1979.

⁵⁴ Most of the primary investigation of the Post-Herulian Wall, including the dismantling of several sections, towers, and gates, took place in the mid-19th century and in the earlier years of the American excavations in the Ancient Agora. See reports in Pittakis, Charamis, and Eustratiades 1852, 7–8, Koumanoudes 1861, 14–18, 37 and Shear 1935, 1937, 1938, 1940. Chronological confusion has meant that the wall has gone by several names in earlier scholarship, including the “Valerian Wall.” Valerian’s interest in fortifying Greece is mentioned by Zosimus (1.29.2–3), but the “Valerian Wall” of Athens is now agreed to have been a refurbishment of the outer city wall largely along the Themistoclean circuit, and was probably constructed under Valerian’s son Gallienus (260–268 CE). See Frantz 1988, 1 and Theocharaki 2011, 131. For Gallienus’ visit to Athens and interest in its defense, see Armstrong 1987.

⁵⁵ The bulk of the work on the Post-Herulian Wall, published in an appendix to Frantz’s 1988 volume, was completed by John Travlos. Theocharaki’s compilation of excavation reports relevant to each documented segment of the wall is an extremely valuable contribution (2011, 151); see also Di Cesare and Marchiandi in Greco 2014, 1138–1139.

could never be resumed.”⁵⁶ Though this bleak view of life in Late Antique Athens has been largely rebuked in the last few decades,⁵⁷ still research on the wall itself has focused on determining more precisely its course and on identifying the buildings and monuments from which its materials came.⁵⁸ These are not unimportant questions, but paying greater attention to the contemporary context and physical and aesthetic setting of the wall can help us go further in interpreting its significance and consequences.

It is now generally agreed that the Post-Herulian Wall enclosed an area of the city north of the Acropolis and extended around the Acropolis to include the important sanctuaries and monuments of its south slope.⁵⁹ The Wall itself ran north from the east end of the Acropolis along the east side of the Panathenaic Way and continued to the northeast corner of the ancient Agora along the former shop-front wall of the Stoa of Attalos, where it turned west toward the Library of Hadrian, which acted as a fortress of sorts along the wall. It then continued west along modern Αδριανού (Hadrian) street, eventually turning south in the area of the so-called “Diogeneion,” or

⁵⁶ Frantz 1988, 3. This negative view is also seen in Wilson 1971 (122–123): “The construction of the new circuit wall...must, of course, be regarded as symptomatic of decline, not vitality.” Wilson’s treatment of the wall is misguided in many particulars. More recently Miles (2014, 138) has echoed this negative assessment, seeing “no scope here for cherishing the remains of temples as memorials,” and surmises that the wall was built in haste and “later became a sort of unplanned memorial to a grim time for Athens.” A recent treatment by Oikonomidis (2013, 339–341) exaggerates the level of destruction in the lower city, claiming that “the entire ancient Agora cut and transported is packed between two external spolia walls...” (340).

⁵⁷ See, e.g., Castrén 1989 and 1994; Martin 2006, 15–24.

⁵⁸ See, e.g., the report of the dismantling of a tower in the Agora in Thompson 1960, 350–359 for work on identifying the sources of wall material. From the 1960s onward rescue excavations by the Greek Archaeological Service have brought to light small sections of the wall, mostly in the Plaka district. The reports of these excavations in *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον* are gathered in Bouras 2010, 32 n. 98. More synthetic treatments of the recent discoveries relating to the wall can be found in Tsoniotis 2008, Bouras 2010, and Sourlas 2013 and 2014. The wall is usually referred to in the Greek scholarship as the “Late Roman Wall” (υστερορωμαϊκό τείχος).

⁵⁹ This is based on the discoveries of Korres in the Stoa of Eumenes (Korres 1988a, 18–19), and has come to be generally accepted over the old view (found in Frantz, *inter alios*) that the circuit included only the area north of the Acropolis. Tanoulas (1997, 255) confirmed that part of the later Ottoman *Serpentze* fortification wall running from the west end of the Acropolis to the Odeion of Herodes Atticus was built on the foundations of the Post-Herulian Wall.

Gymnasium of Diogenes.⁶⁰ The eastern part of the circuit remains largely unknown, but it eventually turned west again to surround the Acropolis, running along the western section of the *analemmata* wall of the Theater of Dionysos, the north wall of the Stoa of Eumenes, and the south wall of the Odeion of Herodes Atticus.⁶¹ The thickness of the wall varied from 2.5 to 3.5 meters, with two solidly built faces filled with a mortared core of fragments of broken architecture, sculpture, and inscriptions, and unworked stone rubble.⁶² The highest preserved section is 7.5 meters high.⁶³

Because much of the wall still lies buried under the dense urban accumulation of the Plaka district of central Athens, and because several of the towers, gates, and wall segments were dismantled in the 19th century, open questions remain and the limitations of our evidence must be acknowledged. It is still not entirely certain, for example, how the wall interacted with the entrance to the Acropolis at the ancient Propylaia, and whether the Beulé Gate, itself a stunning example of upcycling, composed almost entirely of the dismantled 4th-century BCE choregic monument of Nikias, is contemporary with the wall (see below). The patronage of the overall fortification project is also not completely understood; while we can be confident that the impetus for the project came from within the Athenian community itself and not from the Roman

⁶⁰ Most of the rescue excavations that revealed parts of the wall within the past few decades have been concentrated in this area. See Choremi 1985 and Tsoniotis 2008 for several examples of the types of excavations and their discoveries. On the area of the Diogeneion, see Di Cesare in Greco 2014, 745–749, 752–753.

⁶¹ Korres 1988a, 18–20.

⁶² Frantz 1988, 126. Among the sculpture found in the core of the wall, an interesting group is the *kosmetai* portraits found in 1861 on the site of the small Byzantine church of Agios Demitrios Katephoris east of the Tower of the Winds. Originally herm portraits of the magistrates of the *ephebeia*, they most likely stood in the Diogeneion, where some had already been recut for subsequent display. They are now in the National Archaeological Museum, nos. 384–416; see Graindor 1915; Harrison 1953, 90–92, 98–100; Lattanzi 1968; Bergmann 1977, 87–88; Smith 1998, 79–81; Krumeich 2004 and 2008, 161–165.

⁶³ Travlos estimated the original height to have been up to 11.5 meters! In Frantz 1988, 127.

imperial administration,⁶⁴ it is unclear whether the entire wall was the responsibility of a single prominent Athenian or whether several elites took charge of different sections of the wall over a longer period of time.

Despite these limitations, significant conclusions can be drawn based on a particularly well-preserved section of the wall in the Agora, reports of the excavation of other segments and towers, and on several inscriptions found in association with the wall. If we look at this section still standing in the Agora, some similarities with the North Acropolis Wall are immediately obvious. Surely it did indeed make practical and economic sense to reuse the ruined material scattered nearby. This was an efficient way to clean up or dispose of the material without having to move it very far, at the same time saving the cost of quarrying fresh stone. But the wall was not hastily or carelessly built; instead, attention was paid to its aesthetic appearance and to the visibility of the act of reuse, that is, to preserving the knowledge that the marble architectural elements had once been the familiar monuments of the Agora before their destruction at the hands of the Heruli.⁶⁵ In this segment, materials have been identified as coming from several Agora buildings, including the Southwest Temple, the Southeast Stoa, the Library of Pantainos, the Metroön, and the Odeion of Agrippa, and the beginning of construction has been dated to the reign of the emperor Probus (276–282 CE) based on numismatic evidence found within a

⁶⁴ Camp 2010, 135.

⁶⁵ Brown (2011, 85) is one of few scholars to note the attention paid to the appearance of the wall, observing that it “shows no evidence of emergency construction, having been built with great care and attention to detail in its course and external appearance.”

dismantled section of the wall.⁶⁶ This material is clearly in secondary use, as are the column drums and temple entablature within the North Acropolis Wall, and is carefully arranged with both strength and functionality and the striking visual effect of alternating courses of limestone and different types of marble in mind. Therefore, like its predecessor, the wall had the potential to serve as a reminder of the Herulian sack and the subsequent renewal of the city.

The use of color contrast in different courses is one of the key strategies by which the reused material was accentuated and shown off within the wall. This is clear not only in the extant section of the wall in the Agora, but also in a recently excavated section in the Diogeneion at the northeast angle of the wall. J. Travlos, in what seems a determined effort to see nothing but pragmatism driving the wall's construction, wrote that the alternating sections of different stones had only to do with what was nearby, having "no relation either to the solidity or to the appearance of the wall. It arises from the availability of material from marble or poros buildings, whichever were closest to that particular section of the wall."⁶⁷ Since even within the same section different materials were employed in a patterned way, this seems an unnecessary and incorrect supposition. While reusing material close to its prior location surely did involve a measure of pragmatism, and while different sections of the wall may indeed have looked quite different from each other based on what ruined material was available close by, these contrasts would have made the fact of reuse even more apparent and thereby increased the potency of the memorial message. In further rebuttal to Travlos' insistence on purely pragmatic motivations, it

⁶⁶ Shear 1938, 332; Thompson 1959, 65; Frantz 1988, 6, 130–131; Camp 2010, 135–136. Di Branco (2006, 67–72) and Greco (2009, 217–220) dispute the way this numismatic evidence has been used, among other objections to the conclusions of the American excavators of the Agora, arguing that the dating and nomenclature of the wall as "Post-Herulian" is not well founded and that the chronology of the wall should remain an open question. These objections have not been taken up outside Italian scholarship.

⁶⁷ In Frantz 1988, 128.

is important to note that not all the material in the wall came from very nearby sources. At least fifteen inscribed fragments of public funerary monuments were found within or in the immediate vicinity of the Post-Herulian Wall.⁶⁸ These were originally set up in the area of the *demosion sema* northwest of the Kerameikos, and were presumably also victims of the Heruli, who are thought to have entered the city from that direction.⁶⁹

In addition to the willingness to transport material from outside the previous city walls for use in the new wall, the several-year gap between the sack itself and the construction of the wall indicates that the level of haste seen in the erection of the Themistoclean city wall, for example, was not such a factor in the Post-Herulian Wall.⁷⁰ As mentioned above, the beginning of construction of at least one section of the wall in the Agora began in the reign of Probus between 276 and 282 CE. While it is impossible to account for this gap precisely, the evidence suggests a gradual economic and cultural recovery in the years after 267, with potting activity in the Kerameikos resuming fairly quickly, along with the activities of the rhetorical and sophistical schools that drew so many visitors to Athens.⁷¹ Meanwhile the continued threat of barbarian raids from the north loomed. Perhaps by the following decade then, elites like Illyrius saw a need not only for additional fortification but also for a reminder of the trauma of the Herulian invasion, lest the Athenians forget what it had cost them and how they had narrowly triumphed

⁶⁸ Aliferi 1992–1998, 198–199.

⁶⁹ See Frantz 1988, 4 for the theory that the Heruli entered the city in two bands. On the evidence of the Herulian sack in the Kerameikos, see Kübler 1931, 80–81 and Hoepfner 1976, 174–175. Of the vast scholarship attempting to identify the form of the *demosion sema* and its place within the topography of Athens, see esp. Patterson 2006a, 53–56 and 2006b, 27–31; Arrington 2010 and 2015, Ch. 2, 55–90; Low 2012, 14 with n. 6, 23–32.

⁷⁰ Tsioniotis (2008, 68) points to the elaborate foundations for the wall on the west side of the Library of Hadrian as another indication that the construction of the wall was less rushed than is often assumed.

⁷¹ See Castrén 1989, 1994, 1999; Millar 1969.

in the end. The situation was thus much more akin to the contemplative reuse of temple material in the North Acropolis Wall than to the hasty and slapdash construction of the Themistoclean city wall.

The Post-Herulian Wall is also a direct physical echo of the North Acropolis Wall. Especially here in the Agora the visual connection is clear—one cannot help but view the later wall in conjunction with the earlier memorial stretching across the Acropolis. The relationship between the two walls would have been particularly affecting during the great Panathenaic procession, as Athenians walked directly along the Post-Herulian Wall on the Panathenaic Way up to the Acropolis. As mentioned above, the Panathenaic Festival and other civic institutions continued well beyond 267 CE, and it has now become clear that daily life in Athens returned fairly quickly to normal after the Herulian sack. Rather than representing an abandonment of the rest of the city, the Post-Herulian Wall was intended as a temporary refuge should another such threat become imminent.⁷² To whom, then, was the memorial message of the wall directed? Based on the available evidence, it seems the inner face of the Post-Herulian Wall was also well built and displayed reused material prominently, though the outer face received the most emphasis. As with the North Acropolis Wall, which dominated sight lines both for Athenians within the city walls and for those approaching the city from beyond, I would thus suggest that the message of the Post-Herulian Wall was directed as a reminder and exhortation to Athenian citizens themselves, both within and without the wall, and as a warning to potential attacking enemies.

⁷² See Castrén 1990, 60 and 1994, 1.

Beyond the conceptual similarities and spatial connections with the North Acropolis wall, the memorial significance of the Post-Herulian Wall is demonstrated by two associated dedicatory inscriptions that give us a crucial window into the cultural context and ideological motivations surrounding its construction.⁷³ Both inscriptions are in verse, written in a similar and traditional script,⁷⁴ and were found at the location of known or presumed gates in the wall.⁷⁵ The first, *IG II/III² ed alt.* 13289, now only partially preserved, was found at the eastern side of the wall, and proclaims in a typically Athenian epigram:⁷⁶

Ἀμφίων Μούσαις κιθάρης ἔστησεν Θήβης
τείχεα· νῦν δ' ἐπ' ἐμᾶς πατρίδος Ἰλλυριῶς
ἀδύλογον Μοῦσαν μεθέπων· τῶ καὶ δοκέουσι
ἄκμητες ῥέζειν πείρατα πάντα τέχνας.

Amphion put up the walls of Thebes by the music of his cithara; now Illyrius (put up the walls) in my home city, following the sweet-voiced muse. Thus, untiringly (the workmen) seem to achieve all of the limits of their craft. (Trans. E. Sironen)

This Illyrius was Claudius Leonticus Illyrius, a prominent Athenian citizen, member of the Areopagus council and the Proconsul of Achaëa, son of a former eponymous archon and

⁷³ The basic editions and most thorough treatment of both inscriptions is by Sironen in Castrén 1994, 21–22 and Sironen 1997, 98–102. See also Frantz 1988, 9–11.

⁷⁴ Sironen 1994, 60. “The two contemporary epigrams share more than their topic: no elongated forms, consistent use of pronounced serifs and a very traditional script with square *epsilon* and traditional *sigma* and *omega*.” Perhaps this was deliberate archaizing to match the epigrams’ references to the legendary past.

⁷⁵ A few Italian scholars have questioned whether the inscriptions can be seen as associated with the Post-Herulian Wall because they were found reused in later churches associated with gates in the wall, rather than within the fabric of the wall itself: Baldini Lippolis 1995, 173–174 (whose discussion of Illyrius’ dates was already out of date), repeated by Baldini Lippolis in Lippolis 2006, 295; di Branco 2006, 67–69.

⁷⁶ Sironen 1997, 100.

Areopagite, and grandson of a former Proconsul of Achaëa.⁷⁷ Importantly, Illyrius is compared in the inscription to the legendary hero Amphion, famous in Greek mythology for building the great walls of Thebes by charming the stones with his music.

The second inscription, *IG II/III² ed alt.* 13290, consisting of fragments of two epigrams found near the western side of the wall in the Agora, boasts that neither Amphion’s music nor the hands of the Cyclops were necessary for the construction of this wall, the latter plausibly a reference to the Bronze Age Mycenaean walls of the Acropolis, revered by later Athenians:⁷⁸

A: οὐ τὰδε θελξιμελῆς Ἀμφιονίς ἤρα[ρε φόρμιγξ]
οὐδὲ Κυκλωπείας χεῖρὸς ἔδ[ειμε βία].
B: [– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡] πειθούς
[– ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ◡ ◡ – ἄ]ρετᾶ[ς].

This (wall) was not put together by Amphion’s sweet-sounding lyre. Neither did the powerful hands of the Cyclops build (this wall).
[---] of obedience. [---] of virtue (?) (Trans. E. Sironen)

The similarities in content, form, script, and topographical context make it clear that both these inscriptions belong to the Post-Herulian Wall, but since only the first names Claudius Illyrius, there remains debate about whether he was solely responsible for the entire project.⁷⁹ Regardless, through these inscriptions Illyrius and his potential collaborators established an overt connection between contemporary Athens and the all-important Greek past, and proclaimed the

⁷⁷ On Illyrius and his career, see Groag 1939, 94–95; Christol 1986, 177–182; Frantz 1988, 9–10; Byrne 2003, 197–198 no. 424. Interestingly, Illyrius was also responsible for building fortification walls at Lapethos on Cyprus; see Mitford 1950; Robert and Robert 1951, 206–208; Bowersock 1982; and Frantz 1988, 9 n. 54. A small but distinct phenomenon of commemorating the wall-building activities of provincial officials with inscribed epigrams has been noted, but the trend and the place of the Post-Herulian Wall within it deserve more attention. See Robert 1948 for more examples, and Jones 1972 for fuller discussion of one example from Anemurium.

⁷⁸ This epigram finds a close parallel in the *Greek Anthology* (*Anth. Pal.* 7.379), where the city of Dicaearchia and the sea converse about sea walls seemingly built by Κυκλώπων χεῖρες.

⁷⁹ Wilkes suspects that the Illyrius inscription indicates that a “central authority” was behind the project, focused on creating a secure area for soldiers, officials, and stores (1989, 191).

ability of modern Athenians to equal the achievements of their legendary predecessors.⁸⁰ Here again is evidence that the wall was a deliberate monument and not simply a stop-gap defensive measure. Illyrius and other Athenian elites like Dexippus were justifiably proud of their actions in eventually overcoming the Heruli and recovering their city – without, it should be mentioned, any help from the Roman armies.⁸¹ Both Illyrius and Dexippus received honorific statues on the Acropolis, carrying inscriptions that emphasized their descent from established and traditional Athenian families and their own services to their city.⁸² Dexippus was praised specifically for his historical writing, showing that memorialization of the recent past, including the sack and defense, was seen as a key part of recovery in its aftermath.

The references in the epigrams to Amphion, as M. Di Branco has elucidated, had deep implications within the Neoplatonic circles at Athens and Eleusis to which Dexippus certainly and Illyrius probably belonged. Amphion’s connection to music and wall-building was a common trope in Early Imperial literature, and in later literature those powers took on magical aspects. By Late Antiquity, Amphion was seen as an archetypal philosopher and magus, while

⁸⁰ Johnson (1983, 65), in a cursory treatment, unconvincingly interprets the epigrams as “half-humorous grumblings about the difficulty of their task” relative to Amphion’s. Thompson (1959, 64) had seen “transparent envy” in their language, and Gregory (1982, 17) similarly sees them as complaints.

⁸¹ See Wilkes 1989, 189; Tsoniotis 2008, 56.

⁸² *IG II/III² ed. alt.* 13262 (= *IG II² 3669*) for Dexippus and *IG II/III² ed. alt.* 13263 (= *IG II² 3689*) and *IG II/III² ed. alt.* 13264 (= *IG II² 3690*) for Illyrius. See Sironen 1994, 18–20 and 1997, 55–63 for texts, translations, and discussion. Illyrius’ statues were erected by another prominent Athenian with a well-established ancestry, Marcus Iunius Minucianus, who was a sophist and priest at Eleusis; see Millar 1969, 17–18. For further discussion of epigraphical evidence relating to Dexippus, see also Puech 2002, 210–225. For the suggestion that he is represented by a series of portraits preserved throughout Greece, see Harrison 1953, 100–105 and Sturgeon 1987, 143–144. An inscription (*IG II/III² ed. alt.* 13282 = *IG II² 4008*) from the Library of Hadrian dated to the late 4th century or later, unfortunately damaged in key lines, suggests the possibility that the line of Dexippus continued to be prominent and proud of its descent; on a broken Doric column reused as a statue base, it records that Lysicles dedicated the statue of his son Dexippus, honored as an “offspring of Kekrops” (Κέκροπος ἐ[κγεν]έτης, line 7) whom the emperors had already honored for his (building?) works. It remains uncertain, though, whether these men were in fact descendants of the 3rd-century rhetor. See esp. Sironen 1997, 78–81, no. 21 and Kapetanopoulos 2000–2003, 136–139.

the Cyclops, as the other extreme of virtue, was the strong primeval man of action.⁸³ Thus the epigrams portrayed a very meaningful image of Illyrius as “the perfect synthesis of incarnate virtue.”⁸⁴

An intriguing inscription on the Propylaia further illuminates Dexippus’ civic involvement and the continued flourishing of civic institutions around the time of the sack. Inscribed on the central pier of the west face of the southwest wing of the Propylaia, directly facing the Athena Nike altar and temple, *IG II² 3198* records that Dexippus, as *agonothetes* of the Great Panathenaia, paid for the *akrostolion* (some part of the Panathenaic ship)⁸⁵ on the Acropolis (lines 7–8) and set up the statue (ἔδος) of the goddess (lines 10–12). The date of Dexippus’ *agonothesia* is unknown, but has traditionally been placed before the Herulian sack.⁸⁶ Only D. Giraud and B. Puech have fully considered the possible historical circumstances behind the inscription, and only Giraud considers its physical location, which is rarely even mentioned by other commentators. Puech relates the ἔδος of the inscription to the cult statue of Athena Polias, whereas Giraud connects it with Athena Nike, both imagining repair or renewal after the sack.⁸⁷ Given the uncertainty about the extent of Herulian damage to the Acropolis, these are both tenuous suggestions, but Giraud is right to emphasize the inscription’s location. If its date is post-Herulian, the connotations of “victory” on that spot are surely salient.

⁸³ Di Branco 2006, 78–81.

⁸⁴ Di Branco 2006, 81. Di Branco assumes both inscriptions referred to Illyrius and were commissioned by the Neoplatonists of Eleusis. Di Branco’s conclusions are also presented in a slightly abbreviated French version (2004).

⁸⁵ On the specific meaning of ἀκροστόλιον, see Millar 1969, 20; Puech 2002, 218.

⁸⁶ See Geagan 1967, 133; Frantz 1988, 12, n. 9; Byrne 2003, 295.

⁸⁷ Puech 2002, 217–220; Giraud 1994, 53–55.

Overall, the epigraphic evidence makes clear that the construction of the Post-Herulian Wall was something in which Athenian elites took great pride, and which they exploited to place themselves, their actions, and the recent experiences of their city within the line of its remembered past. The wall should thus be interpreted, as I've argued, within the cultural continuum of the built memorial space of Athens, rather than a line in the sand of history marking the end of the ancient city and the beginning of the medieval village. It too, like the North Acropolis Wall, was intended as a visible memorial, creating a collective memory of destruction and revitalization through the preservation of knowledge about the prior life of the marble upcycled within it.

Before moving on from the Post-Herulian Wall, let me return briefly to the question of the Beulé Gate, named for the French archaeologist Ernest Beulé, who uncovered it on the western slope of the Acropolis in 1852.⁸⁸ Constructed almost entirely from the dismantled Nikias Monument, it is striking example of upcycling. The original hexastyle prostyle temple-like monument was dedicated by Nikias, son of Nicodemus, after his choregic victory of 320/19 BCE, and was located on the south slope of the Acropolis west of the Theater of Dionysus, facing west.⁸⁹ The later Stoa of Eumenes clearly respected the Nikias Monument, its east side ending just north of the monument. When the structure was dismantled to be used in the construction of the Beulé Gate and its flanking towers, the geisa had been numbered while still in

⁸⁸ Beulé 1862, 50–52. Dörpfeld (1885a) was the first to actually analyze the gate and determine that the reused blocks all came from the Nikias Monument, rather than several different buildings as Beulé had suggested.

⁸⁹ Dinsmoor (1910) was the first to correctly identify the foundations and provide a thorough reconstruction of the monument. Versakes (1909) successfully identified more blocks from the monument around the Beulé Gate and on the south slope of the Acropolis. On the importance of the monument within the development of Greek architectural forms in the 4th century, see Knell 2000, 161–164.

situ to facilitate their placement in the gate.⁹⁰ The Doric frieze of limestone metopes and marble triglyphs was carefully rebuilt along the top of the gate. The architrave though, was rebuilt in two rows sandwiching the frieze, with the result that two blocks of the three-block dedicatory inscription are above the frieze, while the remaining block is below, centered above the doorway. The characteristic alternation of courses of different colored marbles seen in the Post-Herulian Wall is also visible in the Beulé Gate, particularly on its main (west) face. The new monument thus attempted to conform to its surroundings, with the Doric façade of Propylaia directly above and behind, but showed off the fact that it was made from an earlier building. The act of reuse was clearly visible.

The date of the Beulé Gate has always been uncertain. Most scholars now assign it to the 3rd century CE, either as part of the Valerian fortification project in the decade before the Herulian sack (a refurbishment of the outer circuit largely along the course of the Themistoclean city wall), or as a part of the Post-Herulian Wall after the sack.⁹¹ This uncertainty has limited any interpretation of the wholesale reuse of the Nikias Monument in the gate. Travlos' belief that the gate was Valerian has been extremely influential, though it is founded on little more than his

⁹⁰ Dinsmoor 1910, 463–465.

⁹¹ The Valerian camp, though small, has been vociferous and firm following Travlos (1971, 161, 357, 483), e.g., Gregory 1982, 16. The Post-Herulian camp on the other hand, while growing, has been quite cautious in drawing its conclusions: Tanoulas 1994, 56, and 1997, 265–266; Fullerton 1996; Hurwit 1999, 283–285 (characteristically less cautious than others). Some have assigned a 3rd-century date without choosing a side of the sack: Dinsmoor 1910, 481–482; Frantz 1979, 396, 1982, 34–36, and 1988, 118 n. 9; Townsend 1982, 216; Bouras 2010, 30. Camp (2001, 225) seems to favor a Post-Herulian date, but never names the Beulé Gate explicitly. Surprisingly, Theocharaki 2011 does not discuss the gate. Others have thought it was much later: Graindor 1914 and Judeich 1931 (4th century, before Alaric's sack); Dörpfeld 1911 (Late Roman/Byzantine). Graindor's opinion was based on his association with the Beulé Gate of a 4th-century inscription recording a gift of a gate by a Septimius Marcellinus, found further down the slope of the Acropolis. This association is extremely tenuous; see Frantz 1982, 35–36; Sironen 1994, 28–29 and 1997, 104–106.

conviction that making the Acropolis more difficult of access would have been desirable during the course of refurbishing the outer circuit wall of the city.⁹²

Importantly, Travlos also believed that the Post-Herulian Wall stopped at the west and east ends of the Acropolis, enclosing only the part of the city north of the Acropolis and providing no access to the citadel itself.⁹³ Korres' redrawing of the Post-Herulian circuit to include the south slope of the Acropolis, while widely accepted, has not been brought into the debate about the Beulé Gate as much as it should be.⁹⁴ We cannot be certain of the date of dismantling of the Nikias Monument, but its connection with the Stoa of Eumenes, whose construction respected it, is crucial and has been overlooked. There is evidence that some blocks from the Stoa were used in a section of the Valerian Wall 400 meters to the south.⁹⁵ The back (north) wall of the Stoa was later used as part of the Post-Herulian circuit, indicating that it was by then at the latest no longer functioning as a stoa. It seems more likely that the Nikias Monument would have been dismantled, moved, and reused for part of *the same fortification circuit* at this later date than that it would have been moved to stand alone at the Acropolis entrance while material from the Stoa was moved in the opposite direction.

Additionally, T. Tanoulas' recent investigations of the west slope of the Acropolis show that the Beulé Gate was well integrated with the Post-Herulian Wall. The flanking towers were constructed at the same time as the gate itself—they too are constructed almost entirely of blocks

⁹² It is worth pointing out that Travlos had previously assumed that the gate did belong to the same building phase as the Post-Herulian Wall (1960, 128–129), as did Homer Thompson (1959, 63–64).

⁹³ In Frantz 1988, 125.

⁹⁴ Korres 1988a, 18–19, and above, n. 57.

⁹⁵ Dinsmoor 1910, 481; Travlos 1971, 523. On the Stoa of Eumenes generally, see now Korres 2014, 128–149.

from the Nikias Monument⁹⁶—and were connected to the upper slope via walls to the Mnesiklean Terrace and to the Nike Bastion. Just to the southeast of the Beulé Gate Tanoulas identified a small gate of the Post-Herulian Wall, which also included at least one architrave block from the Nikias Monument. To the north of the gate, Tanoulas sees the fortification of the Klepsydra spring within the Post-Herulian Wall as a key reason to take such concern for the western approach to the Acropolis.⁹⁷

None of these reasons, of course, are definitive proof that the Beulé Gate could not have already existed at the Acropolis entrance when the Post-Herulian Wall rose to meet it. But knowing now that the Post-Herulian circuit enclosed the Acropolis, a new (or like-new) monumental gate at the Acropolis entrance seems a fitting part of the overall project. Not only does the gate fit the course of the Post-Herulian Wall, it fits its ethos—an ethos of upcycling. Although it is entirely speculative, I find the suggestion of J. Binder attractive, that perhaps Dexippus himself was responsible for the Beulé Gate, monumentalizing the entrance to the sanctuary and citadel he had saved.⁹⁸ If the Beulé Gate did belong to the Valerian fortification project, it would have been an even more arresting sight standing alone in front of the Acropolis, and its upcycling of the Nikias Monument would probably have been inspiration for the builders of the Post-Herulian Wall.

The example of the Beulé Gate demonstrates how even when we can be fairly confident in recognizing upcycling at work, when the reuse was clearly well-planned and made visible, sometimes the meaning and consequences of that upcycling are lost to us. Without some

⁹⁶ Townsend 1982, 198–216.

⁹⁷ Tanoulas 1997, 265–266.

⁹⁸ As reported by Tanoulas (1997, 269 n.10).

knowledge of the circumstances leading up to and surrounding the act of reuse, it is difficult to carry interpretations very far without crossing over into pure speculation.⁹⁹ This has been one of the factors limiting more thoughtful scholarly discussion of the Post-Herulian Wall, because it is most often thought of in comparison with other *spolia*-filled walls of Late Antique Greece, most of which are later and understudied, rather than in connection with its own physical environment and cultural background within Athens.¹⁰⁰ Treating the reuse in the Post-Herulian Wall as upcycling and evaluating the memory dynamics at play in its conception and reception allows us to take a more emic view. It is difficult, from the perspective of a modern classicist, not to see decline over the *longue durée* from Classical to Byzantine or Medieval Athens, and to try to mark its beginning or its turning point. But an Athenian contemplating his city after the Herulian sack, particularly a civic or intellectual leader like Illyrius or Dexippus, would have focused on how to rebuild, how to commemorate, how to move forward, inspired by the exempla-rich past of his city; he would not have thought that the Middle Ages had begun. This investigation of the Post-Herulian Wall in tandem with the North Acropolis Wall has demonstrated, I hope, the

⁹⁹ This has been one of the main challenges facing those engaged in more traditional *spolia* studies—how to find meaning in reuse when there is little evidence for the motives and intentions behind it. Greenhalgh, a leading scholar of *spolia*, has called the Beulé Gate a “tricky middle case” of reuse where something more than economics seems to have been involved (2009, 12).

¹⁰⁰ By contrast, the reuse in the North Acropolis Wall is only very rarely (e.g., Dally 2009, 48; Frey 2016, 32) discussed as *spolia*. Frey’s illuminating recent re-evaluation of Late Antique *spolia*-filled walls at Aegina, Sparta, and Isthmia is a major contribution toward reversing this dismissive trend. The importance of local tradition and context in the construction of the Post-Herulian Wall, demonstrated here, is also key to Frey’s analysis of the wall at Aegina in particular. For the older view, see e.g., Millar 1969, 29; Gregory 1982; Frantz 1988, 5; Tsoniotis 2008, 55. The most apt of these comparanda in terms of date and construction technique is perhaps that at Olympia, enclosing the Temple of Zeus and a small area to its south (Mallwitz 1972, 110–113). But its setting in a sanctuary rather than a city, and its much smaller size, are crucial differences. Wilkes (1989, 190–192), relying on comparison with walls in the sanctuaries at Olympia, Eleusis, and on Aegina, has called the Post-Herulian Wall a “topographical monstrosity” that Athenian citizens would not have willingly built, even under duress. In his treatment of “statue-walls” in Rome and the end of the statue habit, Coates-Stephens (2007, 176) briefly compares the Post-Herulian Wall (“walls built around the Acropolis of Athens in around 280”) to the Aurelian Walls of Rome and several other city walls mainly in Gaul and Italy, without adequately accounting for specific local circumstances, i.e., the Herulian Sack.

efficacy of examining reuse and social memory hand-in-hand, and of interpreting chronologically disparate instances of meaningful reuse in relation to each other within their common societal milieu.

The Temple of Ares

I turn now away from fortification walls and to the complementary but contrasting case of the “itinerant” Temple of Ares, transplanted wholesale into the heart of Athens during the late 1st century BCE. This constitutes an example of upcycling that in its immediate effect showed off the then four-hundred-year-old temple within its new setting of the ancient Agora, but in which the act of reuse eventually became invisible. As with the accentuation of reused marble within the walls discussed above, this type of upcycling worked to generate social memory. Rather than commemorating actual events, however, it created an artificial memory, wrapped up in ideas of identity, inheritance, and stewardship as Athenians navigated the post-Actian waters and their relationship to Rome and its new sole leader. Over the longer term, the line between memory and history was blurred; the constructed memory took hold, and was thus no less real than the memory of the Persian and Herulian sacks commemorated through upcycled walls.

Scholarship of the past three decades has coalesced around a *communis opinio*, debated in a few particulars, of the Temple of Ares and its altar along with the Odeion of Agrippa as part of an “Augustan building program” at Athens, strongly connected with events, monuments, and

ideologies in Rome, and perhaps with the Imperial cult.¹⁰¹ D. Steuernagel has recently presented a new and more Atheno-centric interpretation of the temple and its wandering, based on a sound reanalysis of the archaeological and historical evidence.¹⁰² His conclusions are convincing, and have yet to be taken up in subsequent scholarship.¹⁰³ I will thus recapitulate several of his arguments in the following discussion of the state of our evidence for the historical circumstances surrounding the upcycling of the temple, before expanding on his interpretation in the realm of social memory.

The foundations of a large temple in the northeast region of the Agora were uncovered in excavations by the American School of Classical Studies in 1937 and quickly assigned to the Temple of Ares mentioned by Pausanias.¹⁰⁴ After his lengthy discussion of the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes Pausanias has a short digression on Demosthenes, then says that near the statue of Demosthenes was a sanctuary of Ares, where there were placed two images of Aphrodite, one of Ares made by Alkamenes, and one of Athena made by a Lokros of Paros. He adds that there was also a statue of Enyo made by the sons of Praxiteles, and that around the

¹⁰¹ Scholars who subscribe to this general view include: Shear 1981; Bowersock 1984, 170–174; Thompson 1987; Siebler 1988, 109–118; Hartswick 1990, 267–272; Schmalz 1994; Torelli 1995 (who sees the Agora as divided into Augustan and Agrippan halves); Schäfer 1998; Baldassarri 1998 and 2001 (who identifies four phases of the building program, aligning with phases of Augustus' rule in Rome—cf. critical review by Schörner 2001); Burden 1999 (who sees an emphasis on the Panathenaic processional route); Whittaker 2002; Alcock 2002, 51–58 (superseding Alcock 1993, 191–196); Kantiréa 2007, esp. 110–113; Stefanidou-Tiveriou 2008 (who sees two categories of projects, those of the city/local elites and those of the central authority); Borg 2011; Marchetti 2012. Goette and Hammerstaedt (2004, 151) see a coherent building program, but without Augustus at its head. Dally (2008a) takes a critical view of the construction of an Augustan program by Baldassarri and Schäfer, among others. Similarly, Bergemann (2007) adduces the evidence of Classical Athenian grave stelai reworked in the Early Roman period to argue against the idea of a Roman impetus behind classicizing architecture in Athens. Mango (2010, 132–136) acknowledges the difficulties of the evidence and eschews interpretation of the Temple of Ares within a discussion of Augustan-period building at Athens.

¹⁰² Steuernagel 2009a, 282–296.

¹⁰³ Later work that does not respond to Steuernagel's interpretation: Camp 2010, Mango 2010, Borg 2011, Marchetti 2012, Spawforth 2012; Raja 2012. It is included in Di Cesare's review of scholarship in Greco 2014, 1055–1061.

¹⁰⁴ Dinsmoor 1940, 3. Pausanias has repeatedly proved a helpful topographical assistant in the Athenian Agora; see Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 204–207; cf. Osanna 2014.

temple stood statues of Heracles, Theseus, Apollo, Kalades, and Pindar. Not far off were statues of the Tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton.¹⁰⁵ Several marble architectural members belonging to a temple had already been discovered in the vicinity of the foundations, allowing W. Dinsmoor to produce a more or less complete reconstruction of the Temple of Ares in 1940, supplemented by the presentation of additional blocks of the superstructure and further exploration of the temple terrace and accompanying altar foundations by M. McAllister in 1959.¹⁰⁶

The temple foundations consisted of five uniform courses of limestone blocks in secondary use atop a packing layer of broken stone and clay set directly on the soft Agora bedrock.¹⁰⁷ Based on ceramic evidence found within this packing layer, the foundations were dated to the late 1st century BCE to the early 1st century CE—roughly speaking, the Augustan period.¹⁰⁸ The temple itself, on the other hand, was a 5th-century BCE Doric peripteral temple

¹⁰⁵ Paus. 1.8.4–5: τῆς δὲ τοῦ Δημοσθένους εἰκόνος πλησίον Ἄρεώς ἐστὶν ἱερόν, ἔνθα ἀγάλματα δύο μὲν Ἀφροδίτης κεῖται, τὸ δὲ τοῦ Ἄρεως ἐποίησεν Ἀλκαμένης, τὴν δὲ Ἀθηναῖν ἀνὴρ Πάριος, ὄνομα δὲ αὐτῷ Λόκρος. ἐνταῦθα καὶ Ἐνυοῦς ἀγάλμα ἐστὶν, ἐποίησαν δὲ οἱ παῖδες οἱ Πραξιτέλους. περὶ δὲ τὸν ναὸν ἐστᾶσιν Ἡρακλῆς καὶ Θησεὺς καὶ Ἀπόλλων ἀναδοῦμενος ταινία τὴν κόμην, ἀνδριάντες δὲ Καλάδης Ἀθηναίος ὡς λέγεται νόμους γράφας καὶ Πίνδαρος ἄλλα τε εὐρόμενος παρὰ Ἀθηναίων καὶ τὴν εἰκόνα, ὅτι σφᾶς ἐπήνεσεν ἄσμα ποιήσας, οὐ πόρρω δὲ ἐστᾶσιν Ἀρμόδιος καὶ Ἀριστογείτων οἱ κτείναντες Ἴππαρχον.

¹⁰⁶ Dinsmoor 1940; McAllister 1959. Supplemented again by Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 162–165. A set of sculpted figures in high relief may also belong to the temple. On these and the very little else that is known of the sculptural program of the temple, see Thompson 1951, 57–58; Gottlieb 1957; Freyer 1962; Delivorrias 1974, 94–161 with a review by Harrison 1976; Harrison 1986; Harrison 1990, 177–179. On a set of stelai with elephants supposedly brought from the Temple of Ares to Constantinople in the 5th century CE and on view at the Golden Gate in the 15th century, see Wycherley 1957, 54, no. 116; Frantz 1988, 74–76; Schmalz 1994, 94–95. It seems that the Temple of Ares survived the Herulian sack at least mostly intact. Later structures including the Palace of the Giants on the site of the Odeion respected the site of the temple, and the material from the temple that ended up in the Post-Herulian Wall belongs to later repairs. See Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 165; Thompson in Frantz 1988, 97 with n. 9; Castrén 1994, 11.

¹⁰⁷ Dinsmoor 1940, 5–6. A few large blocks in hard gray limestone had distinctive drafting on all four corners. Korres (1992–1998, 100–104) has suggested that these and similar blocks found in foundations in and around the Agora, and as far removed in time and space as the Philopappos Monument, belonged originally to the Hellenistic “Arsenal” on the slopes of the Kolonos Agoraios, probably destroyed by Sulla.

¹⁰⁸ McAllister 1959, 2. On the modern conservation of the area of the foundations, see Thompson 1952, 93–94 and McAllister 1959, 3.

with six by thirteen columns in a distinctive Pentelic marble.¹⁰⁹ In its proportions and architectural details it was quite similar to the Hephaisteion on the Kolonos Agoraios above the Agora and to the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion, and has thus been dated to the third quarter of the 5th century.¹¹⁰ There are, however, mason's marks inscribed on the tops of each of the temple's blocks whose letter forms are much later than the 5th century. Most commentators have agreed that the letters instead look generally early Imperial. Combined with the evidence from the foundations, this means that at some point around the time of Augustus a 5th-century temple was carefully dismantled, transported to the Agora, and reassembled on new foundations, all with the help of an elaborate system to record the precise position of each block within the temple.¹¹¹ Ten meters to the east of the temple there was an altar whose foundations matched those of the temple in material and construction technique. The terraced area between the temple and altar was paved in Hymettian marble. The altar must thus have been reconstructed on the site at the same time as the temple, though it itself has been dated to the 4th century BCE—about a century younger than the temple—based on the moldings of an orthostate found nearby and likely belonging to it.¹¹²

¹⁰⁹ On the peculiar gray-green chlorite veins in the Pentelic marble of the temple, see Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 162.

¹¹⁰ Dinsmoor (1940, 47) assigned the Temple of Ares the third spot in his tetrad of temples by the "Theseum Architect," along with the Temple of Hephaistos (sometimes thought instead to be the "Theseum"), the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion, and the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous. Knell (1973) instead identified two separate groups, the Temples of Hephaistos and Ares earlier, and the Temples of Poseidon and Nemesis later. For a full discussion of the "Theseum Architect," and an argument that in fact no architectural hand can be identified, see Miles 1980b, 158–161; cf. Korres 2003, 22–23.

¹¹¹ This sequence of events is agreed upon by all commentators except Lippolis (1998–2000), who is alone in thinking that the mason's marks do not indicate that the temple was moved, and dates the construction of the temple in the Agora to the fourth century BCE.

¹¹² Thompson 1951, 56–60; McAllister 1959, 3–6; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 164.

The question of the original location of the temple, long a vexing topic, has now been conclusively answered. Korres has shown that the temple foundations uncovered in 1994 in Stavros, in the ancient deme of Pallene, fit exactly the temple remains from the Agora, and conform to the strict and standardized type known from the Hephaisteion and the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion. No elements of a temple superstructure have been found in the vicinity, leading to the conclusion that the Temple of Ares in the Agora was originally the Temple of Athena Pallenis in Pallene and was relocated in its entirety.¹¹³ Additionally, no remains of an altar or foundations for an altar have been found in association with the temple foundations at Pallene, leaving open the possibility that the altar of Ares came originally from the deme of Acharnai. Before the discovery of the foundations in Stavros, Acharnai had gained wide acceptance as the most likely candidate for the original location of the Temple of Ares, based on strong epigraphic evidence of a cult (but not specifically a temple) of Ares and Athena Areia established there since at least the 4th century BCE (see below).¹¹⁴

The spatial arrangement of the altar vis-à-vis the temple and the Odeion of Agrippa is key to the conventional understanding of the patronage, chronology, and function of the Temple of

¹¹³ Korres 1992–1998. On the excavations at Stavros see: Platonos-Giota 1994, 1997a, 1997b. Korres’ analysis also enables the correction of a few aspects of the temple’s reconstruction: the east and west ends were equal, creating a balanced pronaos and opisthodomos that is more like the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion than the Hephaisteion in Athens (Dinsmoor had thought the Temple of Ares and that of Hephaestus nearly twins); the foundations suggest the possible presence of an inner colonnade in the cella, for which there is no evidence among the Agora remains. See Korres 1992–1998, 91–97 and 2003, 21–22; and Steuernagel 2009a, 284.

There is strong evidence that at least one side of the flanking sima of the re-erected Temple of Ares came originally from the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion. It is unclear exactly why this was necessary, but presumably that part of the Temple of Athena Pallenis had been damaged at some point; see Dinsmoor 1974. Thompson (1981, 353; followed by Evans 2011, 91) suggests that all of the temples whose parts eventually wandered to the Agora had been victims of Philip V’s devastation of rural Attica in 200 BCE.

¹¹⁴ Thompson (1962) was the first to propose Acharnai and was soon followed by nearly all. Earlier proposals for the original site were the Roman Agora and the Areopagus hill (Dinsmoor 1940, 50). Of scholars who were aware of the discovery at Stavros and of Korres’ publication, only Kantiréa (2007, 111 with n. 3) does not accept the identification and still prefers Acharnai as the original location of the temple.

Ares. The altar lies directly on the east-west axis of the temple, but also roughly on the north-south axis of the Odeion.¹¹⁵ Largely perhaps because the Odeion is such a huge building within the traditionally empty space at the center of the Agora, it has been assumed to have come first, dictating the orientation of the temple and altar either at some later point or as part of a cohesively planned project. The Odeion is the one building project during the Augustan period in Athens with the surest indications not only of imperial funding but also of Roman design and construction. Its identification with Agrippa is supported by the combined evidence of Pausanias and Philostratus, and usually taken as evidence that Agrippa visited Athens during his eastern tour ca. 16–14 BCE.¹¹⁶ If the Temple of Ares and its altar were placed in deliberate reference and deference to the Odeion, as has been assumed, the idea of some sort of imperial connection in terms of planning and execution of the relocation is not unreasonable. But if not, there is very little to suggest any Roman or imperial involvement.

Steuernagel, by succinctly reversing the relative chronology of the Odeion and temple, has been able to debunk the widely held but weakly supported opinions that have been born out of the assumed connection of the temple to an imperial initiative. A drainage channel running north from the orchestra of the Odeion takes an elbow turn to skirt the Altar of Ares on its west side before continuing to the Panathenaic Way. The drain clearly postdates the erection of the

¹¹⁵ See McAllister 1959, 8 n. 23 and state plan Plate A for the alignment of temple and altar. The axuality with the Odeion was especially emphasized by Shear (1981, 362), who states that the altar was “aligned precisely with the northern entrance on the axis of the Odeion.” Current site plans (e.g., in Camp 2010) show the altar as *precisely* aligned with the temple, and only roughly aligned with the Odeion.

¹¹⁶ Paus. 1.8.6–1.9.3; Philostr. *V S* 2.5.4, 2.8.3–4. On Agrippa’s eastern tours, see Reinhold 1933, 106–123; Roddaz 1984, 421–450; Halfmann 1986, 163–166; Sawiński 2004.

altar, as had been noted already by McAllister.¹¹⁷ A secondary adjustment to the course of the drain had been suggested by H. Thompson, but never documented.¹¹⁸ This small but critical archaeological detail has been overlooked by scholars before Steuernagel, perhaps in their eagerness to be able to anchor the temple to the Odeion and the imperial implications that flowed from the connection.¹¹⁹

With the temple and altar now seen to precede the Odeion, the well worn questions about their patron, motive, and intent require rethinking. We are left with a picture of an ancient temple of Athena reused wholesale through transportation to the northern part of the otherwise still mostly open space at the center of the Agora, where it was rededicated to Ares, sometime in the late 1st century BCE, probably at least before ca. 16. It was likely among the first of the many building projects dated to the early Imperial period.¹²⁰ It was reconstructed facing due east, and rather than “filling in” the center of the Agora as the Odeion would later do, it in effect delimited

¹¹⁷ Steuernagel 2009a, 287; McAllister 1959, 4. The drain was surely an element of the original construction of the Odeion, and not a later addition; Thompson (1950, 78) emphasizes that the orchestra floor pitched slightly to the point near the northwest corner where the drain began.

¹¹⁸ The suggestion was made in person to Spawforth (see Spawforth 1997, 196 n. 22, repeated in Spawforth 2012, 65) and in print by McAllister (1959, 4). Thompson does not mention a possible alteration in his initial excavation report (1952, 97). Baldassarri (1998, 157), Burden (1999, 118), and Rose (2005, 52) explicitly mention an alteration of the drain; most others do not mention it. Schmalz (2007–2008, 23 n. 61) notes that it is not impossible that the Temple of Ares was earlier than the Odeion, without mentioning the drain or any other chronological evidence.

¹¹⁹ Lippolis (1998–2000, 198–199) also discusses the evidence of the drain, but thinks that the altar and temple were erected in the 4th century BCE (see above, n. 104).

¹²⁰ The *monopteros* dedicated to Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis, along with the restoration of the Erechtheion, is also usually considered one of the earliest, dated to ca. 19/8 BCE based on its dedicatory inscription (Schmalz 2009, 80–82, no. 103). Most of the other projects (e.g., the refurbishment of the Tholos [see Thompson 1940], the Northeast “Stoa” [see Thompson 1951, 53–56 and Shear 1971, 261–265], the annex of the Stoa of Zeus Eleutherios [see Thompson 1966], and the Temple of Aphrodite Ourania in the Agora [see Shear 1984, 33–40 and 1997, 495–507, and below, this chapter n. 178, and Chapter 5 with n. 162.]), lack precise chronological indicators, but seem to be later based on stratigraphic, spatial, stylistic, or contextual grounds.

the northern side of the space, just as the Stoa of Attalos and the South Stoa had done on the east and south sides in the second century.¹²¹

There is no good evidence, archaeological or historical, to point to Roman provincial officials or imperial circles as agents behind the reuse of the temple and altar, nor of any connection to the imperial cult. Pausanias' list of the statues in and around the temple includes Greek heroes and historical figures, but no members of the imperial family. The often adduced connection between the rededication of the temple to Ares and an inscription honoring Gaius Caesar as a "new Ares" (νέος Ἄρης) is far-fetched.¹²² The inscription was found in the Theater of Dionysus, far from the Temple of Ares, and, since it almost certainly dates to the time of his visit to Athens ca. 2 BCE, is more than a decade later than the relocation of the temple. It is better seen as part of a trend of Greek cities honoring Gaius after his *profectio* from Rome and his subsequent eastern campaign, and as part of a longstanding phenomenon at Athens of honoring a benefactor by declaring him a new incarnation of a worthy figure from the past, human or divine. It was an honor designed to seem, to Roman eyes, specially befitting of the heir hailed as the new Martian *ultor* by Ovid, but to an Athenian, rather more run-of-the-mill.¹²³ An epigram by Ovid's contemporary Automedon, preserved in the *Greek Anthology*, mocks the practice by claiming

¹²¹ Steuernagel 2009a, 288–290.

¹²² *IG* II² 3250; Schmalz 2009, 100–101, no. 129. See Stefanidou-Tiveriou 2008, 26; Steuernagel 2009a, 293. Those who connect the Temple of Ares with Gaius and the Imperial cult include: Dinsmoor 1940, 49–51; Shear 1981, 362–363; Bowersock 1984, 173–174; Siebler 1988, 117–118; Hartswick 1990, 269; Böhme 1995, 58–62; Baldassarri 1998, 260; Kajava 2001, 88; Spetsieri-Choremi 2003, 178 (claiming that "both the statue and the base were found near the temple"); Kunnert 2005, 183; Borg 2011, 226. Perhaps unsurprisingly, there is much overlap between this view and the connection of Ares in the Agora to Mars Ultor; see below, n. 126.

¹²³ Ov. *Ars am.* 1.179–182:

*Parthe, dabis poenas: Crassi gaudete sepulti,
signaque barbaricas non bene passa manus.
Ultor adest, primisque ducem profitetur in annis,
bellaque non puero tractat agenda puer.*

that if anyone gives the Athenians a pig, he is Triptolemos himself, and if he gives cabbage stalks, lentils, or snails, he can be Erechtheus, Kekrops, or Kodros—no one cares at all (οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἐπιστρέφεται)!¹²⁴ In the case of the Gaius inscription the Romans at least were meant to care, but clearly this dedication should not be taken as evidence of the Temple of Ares as an Imperial cult building.¹²⁵

What of another commonly adduced Roman connection, that of Mars Ultor and the Forum of Augustus in Rome? It has been thought that because Ares had not been a particularly prominent deity in Athens, the rededication of the transplanted temple to him must be related to Augustus' promotion of Mars in his role as Avenger.¹²⁶ Linked with this is the idea that the *monopteros* dedicated to Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis in Athens was modeled on a round temple to Mars Ultor on the Capitoline in Rome, which was probably never actually built.¹²⁷ Steuernagel and others have rejected this fanciful proposal, and emphasized that while

¹²⁴ *Anth Pal.* 11.319:

Ἀνθρακίων δέκα μέτρα φέρων, ἔσο καὶ σὺ πολίτης·
ἦν δὲ καὶ ὃν ἀγάγης, αὐτὸς ὁ Τριπτόλεμος.
δεῖ δὲ καὶ Ἡρακλείδῃ ὑφηγητῆρι δοθῆναι
ἢ καυλοῦς κράμβης, ἢ φακόν, ἢ κοχλίαις.
ταῦτ' ἔχε, καὶ λέγεσαν τὸν Ἐρεχθέα, Κέκροπα, Κόδρον,
ὃν κ' ἐθέλης· οὐδεὶς οὐδὲν ἐπιστρέφεται.

See Bowersock (1984, 172), who saw the Gaius inscription as high praise, and Robert (1981) on Automedon's epigram.

¹²⁵ The view espoused by Spawforth 1997 of the Imperial cult as relatively slow to develop in Athens remains convincing, though Spawforth himself has largely renounced it (2012, esp. 83 n. 111). See also Evans 2011 for a view of the particular form of the Imperial cult in Athens as a natural extension of Hellenistic ruler cult and other traditional practices in the city. The small and relatively uniform *arae Augusti* constitute the clearest evidence for the earliest existence of an Imperial cult in Athens; see Benjamin and Raubitschek 1959.

¹²⁶ Romer 1978, 201–202 n. 35; Bowersock 1984, 173–174; Thompson 1987, 9; Siebler 1988, 118; Hartswick 1990, 263–264; Torelli 1995, 23; Baldassarri 1998, 261; Schäfer 1998, 93; Burden 1999, 115–116; Kajava 2001, 88; Whittaker 2002, 35–36; Rose 2005, 52; Kantiréa 2007, 110–113; Borg 2011, 225–226; Evans 2011, 89. Marchetti 2012 links the Temple of Ares and the Agora to the Campus Martius in Rome, rather than the Forum of Augustus. On Athenian Ares see Parker 1996, 397–399.

¹²⁷ Baldassarri (1998, 45–63) and Schäfer (1998, 45–67) argue this point based on coin types minted in Asia Minor and Spain; Rose (2005, 50–53) argues that the round temple was not only connected with Mars Ultor but also was designed to commemorate Augustus' recovery of the Roman standards from the Parthians.

the Forum of Augustus and the Temple of Mars Ultor that actually was constructed within it do have numerous and well-known citations of Classical Athenian architecture and ornament, the exchange does not go both ways. There are no explicit signs or even hints of the Roman Mars in Athens.¹²⁸

So, if the patron of the upcycled temple was not imperial, and the purpose of its reuse was not the assimilation of the Imperial cult or of the Roman Mars Ultor, why was an old temple moved to house a new cult? A simple economic or pragmatic explanation does not work in this case—even less so than for the fortification walls examined above.¹²⁹ The painstaking dismantling, transport, and re-erection of the temple was clearly an “architectonic-city planning gesture,” in Steuernagel’s words.¹³⁰ By looking to more intra-Athenian motives, Steuernagel has outlined a convincing narrative identifying the council (βουλή) of the Areopagus as the agent responsible for the reuse of the temple, with the intention of making a statement about Athenian identity and its own leading position within the city and vis-à-vis Roman authority.

The Areopagus council, the exclusive body made up of ex-archons who met on the low hill south of the Agora legendarily named for the first defendant to be tried there, came to be

¹²⁸ Steuernagel 2009a, 293–294. Dally (2008a, 46–47) and Stefanidou-Tiveriou (2008, 21–23) are also critical of Baldassarri and Schäfer’s use of inapt numismatic evidence to link the *monopteros* to Rome.

¹²⁹ Another reason that the project has been assumed to have been imperially sponsored is the idea that only with imperial resources could the relocation have been achieved. As Alcock (2002, 55) has cautioned, “it is vital not to confuse reuse and reconstruction with doing things on the cheap. Itinerancy, in other words, cannot be reduced to economizing.” Still, relocating the temple was surely cheaper than building a new one from freshly quarried stone, and while it must have required the ability to coordinate a large local labor force and not-negligible financial means, it may actually have been an efficient process (see Burden 1999, 136–137). It was not a cheap or easy endeavor, but it was also not one necessitating vast imperial resources.

¹³⁰ 2009a, 285 (“ein architektonisch-städtebaulicher Gestus”).

extremely influential in the Roman period.¹³¹ It was highly esteemed both by Athenians themselves and by Roman statesmen alike. Its judicial powers and traditional prestige, dormant in certain periods of Athenian history, were augmented in the Late Hellenistic period by the accumulation of additional administrative and economic responsibilities. By the late 2nd century BCE it had authority to enforce the law on weights and measures,¹³² and by the mid-1st century it had become the principal ruling body of the Athenian *polis*, acting alongside but also independently from the *boule* of the five (or six) hundred and the *demos* of the Athenians. Geagan has demonstrated that the Areopagus council came to function very similarly to an *ordo decurionum* of a Roman colony or *municipium* under the Roman empire—with control over the city’s finances and financial obligations to Rome, authority in dealing with other cities, and responsibility for determining citizenship status—and that these developments began well before the Augustan period.¹³³

Cicero recognized the already prominent position of the Areopagus council in several dialogues and private letters. In *de Natura Deorum*, composed in 45 BCE and likely set ca. 77 BCE, Cicero has Balbus use the Areopagus council as an illustrative analogy for the governance of the world by divine providence: *sed id praecise dicitur, ut si quis dicat Atheniensium rem publicam consilio regi, desit illud ‘Arii pagi,’ sic, cum dicimus providentia mundum administrari, deese arbitrato ‘deorum.’*¹³⁴ In the *de Officiis*, written a year later, Cicero maintains that the

¹³¹ On the Areopagus council generally, its meeting places and procedures, and ancient testimonia, see Boegehold et al. 1995, 44–47, 126–135. On the history of the Areopagus and its significance in the 5th and 4th centuries BCE, see Zelnick-Abramovitz 2011.

¹³² *IG II²* 1013, lines 59–62.

¹³³ Geagan 1974.

¹³⁴ Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.74. For further discussion of this passage, see Accame 1946, 172–175 and Rawson 1985, 60–61.

Areopagus, as constituted by Solon, would always preserve Athenian laws and ancestral institutions (*hoc consilio leges Atheniensium, hoc maiorum instituta servantur*).¹³⁵ Cicero had close personal dealings and friendships with several contemporary Areopagites, and at least once (in February 61) reported approvingly to Atticus that the Roman Senate was behaving like the Areopagus: *senatus Ἄρειος πάγος. nihil constantius, nihil severius, nihil fortius*.¹³⁶ But the dominance of the Areopagus and its maintenance of its traditional *nomophylakia* was not just a literary *topos*; Cicero also records a specific example of its authority in managing the territory and property of Athens when he discusses Memmius's need for permission (ὑπομνηματισμός) from the Areopagites to raze the house of Epicurus in 51 BCE.¹³⁷ The Areopagus' authority over the larger territory of Attica was also proclaimed visually a few decades later, when a dedication was erected in the Amphiareion of newly regained Oropos, incorporating a statue (the Areopagus personified?) next to a stele likely representing the laws the council guarded.¹³⁸

The circumstances of the resurgence of the Areopagus council in the Late Hellenistic and early Roman period are not fully understood. While its oligarchic character and ancient pedigree surely appealed to Roman elites, resembling in their eyes their own ideal Roman Senate,¹³⁹ it is now generally agreed that the rise of the Areopagus was an indigenous development in Athens in the 1st century BCE rather than the result of a new constitution imposed by Sulla or directly

¹³⁵ Cic. *Off.* 1.75. See further discussion in Rawson 1985, 63. That the Romans (and many Greeks) thought Solon was the originator of the Areopagus council certainly factored into the respect they had for it; see Rawson 1985, 59.

¹³⁶ Cic. *Att.* 1.14.5. On his Areopagite friends, see Rawson 1985, 44–59.

¹³⁷ Cic. *Att.* 5.11.6; cf. *Fam.* 13.1. For discussion see Geagan 1974, 54 and Rawson 1985, 52. On the ὑπομνηματισμός as an exclusive prerogative of the Areopagus council, see Geagan 1967, 42–44.

¹³⁸ See Petrakos 1997, 378–380, no. 461; Ma 2007b, 95–96.

¹³⁹ See Geagan 1974, 51 on the Romans' trust in political bodies that seemed to match their own ideal forms.

influenced by Roman wishes.¹⁴⁰ A decree inscribed probably shortly before or after Sulla's conquest of the city in 87/6 attests to the Areopagus council in the role of *nomothetai*, having proposed a new law code to be accepted by the *demos* as a whole.¹⁴¹ Another significant development around the time of Sulla was the emergence of the Herald of the Areopagus as one of the top two civic magistrates along with the hoplite general.¹⁴²

That the political stabilization of Athens with the Areopagus council at its head happened relatively quickly in the aftermath of Sulla's attack had less to do with the Sullan "restoration" noted by Appian and more to do with the economic and social conditions in the city after the sack.¹⁴³ Sulla and his soldiers wrought vast swaths of destruction throughout the Agora, and seem to have targeted strategic military facilities and cultural monuments in particular.¹⁴⁴ The extent to which the Athenian economy recovered between 87/6 and Octavian's ultimate victory over Antony at Actium in 31 BCE is still debated, but it is clear that very little new construction or even rebuilding of damaged structures took place.¹⁴⁵ It is clear too that the leading position of the Areopagus council was perhaps not as stable as Cicero made it out to be, as Athens repeatedly chose the wrong side in the Roman civil wars. So we have, after the salt-spray of the Battle of Actium clears, an Athens still strewn with ruins and damaged buildings led by an oligarchic council eager to (re)assert its continued preeminence.

¹⁴⁰ Against the conception of the changes examined in, e.g., Geagan 1967 as a "Sullan Constitution" see Kallet-Marx 1995, 213–220; Habicht 1997, 315–321; Santangelo 2007, 42–45.

¹⁴¹ Geagan 1971; Woodhead 1997, 467–469, no. 333. See also Badian 1976, 116–117.

¹⁴² See Geagan 1967, esp. 57–60.

¹⁴³ App. *Mith.* 6.39. See Santangelo 2007, 42–44.

¹⁴⁴ Hoff 1997; Mango 2010, 122–123.

¹⁴⁵ Hoff 1997, 42–43. On the financial situation in Athens between Sulla and Augustus, see Habicht 1997, 328–337.

Here we can pick up Steuernagel’s narrative of the Temple of Ares. In Roman Athens (as in Roman Rome), all reforms rested on a “return” to original arrangements, laws, and constitutions, and this was no less true in the case of the expanded responsibilities of the Areopagus.¹⁴⁶ How could the return to the old order and power of the *boule* of the Areopagus have been better expressed, Steuernagel submits, than with the establishment of a cult of Ares—not newly-created but already long existing—in the heart of the city? And even more so for that cult to wear the garb of a High Classical temple?¹⁴⁷ We have already seen in Cicero’s discussion of Memmius’ construction plans that the Areopagus council exercised control over the territory and property of the *polis*. At the very least, no other group or official, imperial or otherwise, could have ordered the temple and altar moved without a resolution from the Areopagus council, or the Areopagus together with the *boule* and *demos*.¹⁴⁸

A key piece of evidence in Steuernagel’s reconstruction is an inscription, probably found on the Areopagus hill,¹⁴⁹ recording the dedication of a thank-offering (*χαριστήριον*) to Ares and Augustus, when Apollophanes was priest of Ares, by the *koinon* of the Acharnians.¹⁵⁰ The dedication dates from either 20/19 or 18/7 BCE, based on the short-named eponymous archon

¹⁴⁶ Steuernagel 2009a, 295.

¹⁴⁷ 2009a, 295: “Was aber hätte die Rückkehr zur alten Ordnung und Macht des ‘Rates vom Areshügel’ besser zum Ausdruck bringen können als die Ansiedlung eines nicht neu kreierte(n), sondern bereits seit Langem (in Acharnai) existierenden Areskultes im Herzen der Stadt, und dies umso mehr, als der Kult in das historische Gewand eines hoch-klassischen Tempels gekleidet wurde?”

¹⁴⁸ Athens was, after all, a *civitas libera et foederata*: Steuernagel 2009a, 290.

¹⁴⁹ Certainly not found in Acharnai (modern Menidi) as often assumed in older (and some more recent) scholarship; see Spawforth 1997, 188.

¹⁵⁰ *IG II²* 2953. See Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 165; Spawforth 1997, 187–188; Steuernagel 2009a, 290–292; Schmalz 2009, 72–72, no. 90.

(not preserved, but ca. six letters).¹⁵¹ As mentioned above, Acharnai was the primary candidate for the original location of the Temple of Ares prior to the discovery of the foundations in Pallene. This hypothesis was based on a 4th-century BCE document relief concerning the erection of altars to Ares and Athena Areia and depicting Athena crowning Ares,¹⁵² and on another 4th-century BCE inscription recording a priest of Ares and Athena Areia at Acharnai.¹⁵³

On current evidence, Acharnai remains the most likely origin of the 4th-century Altar of Ares moved to the Agora along with the Temple of Athena Pallenis. The “*koinon* of the Acharnians” that dedicated a thank-offering to Ares and Augustus in the late 1st century is otherwise unattested.¹⁵⁴ There was, however, a *koinon* for Athena Pallenis in the Classical period, which incorporated citizens not only from the deme of Pallene, but also from the affiliated demes of Gargettos, Paiania, and Acharnai.¹⁵⁵ The trend of decline and depopulation of Greece outside the major urban centers examined by Sue Alcock looks to have affected Pallene to a larger

¹⁵¹ Schmalz 2009, 72–73.

¹⁵² *SEG* 21.519; Ecole Française d’Athens Inv. I.6. Robert 1938, 293–296; Daux 1965, 87–90; Holtzmann 1972, 73–79; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 165; Lawton 1984, 296–298; Meyer 1989, 304, no. A 137; Hartswick 1990, 261–263; Kellogg 2013a, 161–164, 205–206 (text and trans.).

¹⁵³ This is the famous inscription recording the Ephebic Oath and the Oath of Plataea, and was probably originally found in association with the document relief. Robert 1938, 296–316; Daux 1965, 79–87; Meyer 1989, 284, no. A 65; Hartswick 1990, 262; Rhodes and Osborne 2003, 440–448, no. 88; and most recently Kellogg 2013a, 161–162, 206–208 (text and trans.) and Kellogg 2013b.

¹⁵⁴ Whitehead 1986, 362–363.

¹⁵⁵ On the *koinon* of Pallene see Solders 1931, 114–118; Peek 1942, 24–30; Schlaifer 1943, 44–47; Parker 1996, 330–331; Goette 1997, 123–163; March 2008. According to Athenaeus (6.234f), παράσιτοι Ἀχαρνέων participated in sacrifices to Apollo, during the festal activities for Athena Pallenis; see Schlaifer 1943; Stanton 1984, 292–298; Parker 1996, 330–331; Steuernagel 2009a, 291 n. 43. For inscriptions from around the deme of Pallene, see Goette 1992–1998.

degree than Acharnai.¹⁵⁶ Steuernagel suggests that the *koinon* of the Acharnians was either a part of or a successor to the Athena Pallenis *koinon*, and that when the Areopagus council conceived the plan to create a new-old cult of Ares in the Agora, the Acharnian *koinon*, as the local elites responsible for the preservation of ancient sacred property, would have passed the formal decision allowing the reuse of the temple and altar.¹⁵⁷ The thank-offering to Ares and Augustus then, especially with its likely provenance on the Hill of Ares, was probably related to the relocation project.¹⁵⁸

Conceived as a project of the Areopagus council, the rededication of an Athena temple to Ares—or perhaps better, the amalgamation of Athena and Ares cults—is a logical choice with deeply Athenian roots and intended outcomes. While there is no evidence for the presence of Ares within the cult of Athena Pallenis, an old and well-attested cult, the two martial deities were already linked in the cult at Acharnai.¹⁵⁹ Pausanias’ description of the statues in the temple in the Agora included an image of Athena by Lokros of Paros along with an image of Ares by Alkamenes, a 5th-century sculptor. Harrison has recently argued compellingly that the Athena by Lokros was the original 5th-century bronze cult statue that accompanied its temple from Pallene to Athens, that the Ares by Alkamenes may have originally stood on the Areopagus hill itself, and

¹⁵⁶ Alcock 1993; see esp. p. 194: “While it is more than likely that the Attic rural landscape was less widely inhabited than formerly, it does not necessarily follow that temples in the countryside were automatically abandoned.” Cf. Alcock 2002, 48–51. The fact that part of the roof of the temple when re-erected in the Agora was supplied by the Temple of Poseidon at Sounion may indicate that the temple had not been perfectly maintained in Pallene (see above, n. 106.)

¹⁵⁷ Steuernagel 2009a, 291–292.

¹⁵⁸ It is worth emphasizing that this inscription, especially on its own, does not provide good evidence for a connection between the cult of Ares and the Imperial cult, since it specifically names a priest only of Ares. See Steuernagel 2009a, 292; Spawforth 1997, 188 and, less cautiously, 2012, 66.

¹⁵⁹ On the cult of Athena Pallenis see Schlaifer 1943. Harrison (2005, 123) points out that both Ares at Acharnai and Athena Pallenis seem to have had a particular concern for *ephebes*.

that the group was first put together in the relocated temple.¹⁶⁰ We also learn from Pausanias that there was still in his time an altar of Athena Areia on the Areopagus, said to have been dedicated by Orestes after his acquittal there, as immortalized by Aeschylus.¹⁶¹ The rededication of the temple to Ares—with Athena perhaps as *paredros* but certainly at least maintaining a presence within the sanctuary—allowed the Areopagus council to promote their deity to a new prominence in the civic religious landscape, while tying this promotion to the city’s eponymous protective patron, in her traditional martial guise.¹⁶² The new sanctuary was thus also a return to the ancient order, underlined by the reuse of genuinely ancient structures.

The precise spot to which the temple was relocated may also have had a previously established significance, following the recent intriguing suggestion of Rotroff and Lamberton that a Mycenaean chamber tomb beneath the north foundation of the temple was revered by Classical Athenians as a grave of fallen Amazons.¹⁶³ Two deposits of lekythoi suggest that the tomb was accidentally disturbed and subsequently propitiated and resealed twice in the 5th century, and Rotroff and Lamberton suggest that an earlier shrine above the “Amazon grave” may have been obliterated in the digging of the foundation pit.¹⁶⁴ Since Ares was the father of the

¹⁶⁰ Harrison 2005. Harrison sees Pausanias’ statues of Aphrodite and Enyo as secondary to the grouping of Ares and Athena. Whether this was the case or not, the logic of their inclusion is not hard to grasp. On the Ares statue see also Hartswick 1990, who attempts (less than successfully according to Harrison 2005, 121, 129 n. 8) to show that the Ares Borghese type was a Roman invention.

¹⁶¹ Paus. 1.28.5.

¹⁶² Stefanidou-Tiveriou (2008, 25) argues that the cult in the Agora was a joint cult of Ares and Athena, following Harrison 2005, who is rather more cautious in her conclusions. It is worth pointing out that the connection of Ares to the Areopagus led the earliest investigators to posit the hill as the original location of the temple: Dinsmoor 1940, 43 with n. 96. Korres (1996, 113, n. 70 and 2003, 30) has documented cuttings on the easternmost and highest part of the hill, which he assigns to a small temple similar to and roughly contemporary with the Temple of Athena Nike.

¹⁶³ Rotroff and Lamberton 2014, esp. 132–135. On this tomb (Agora J 7:2), see esp. Townsend 1955; Immerwahr 1971, 183–190, Tomb VII.

¹⁶⁴ 2014, 134–135. On these later deposits, see Townsend 1955, 195–196, 218–219 nos. 39–47; Moore 1997, 258 nos. 840, 841, 843.

Amazons, it may indeed be more than coincidence that the Areopagus council chose this spot for the new temple in his honor.

Steuernagel emphasizes identity construction as the main motive and goal of the Areopagus' project. The old temple, moved to a new context, had an identity-generating power that a wholly new temple would not have had in the post-Actian era. It signaled that the contemporary Athenians were still the autochthonous Athenians of old, and underpinned the claims of the Athenian elite to be the rightful heirs of their city's distinguished past. They were not relying on the glory of their ancestors to save them from themselves, as Julius Caesar could taunt after Pharsalus, but on their own worthiness as descendants of those great men.¹⁶⁵ The ancient temple, re-emphasized in its new context, was meant to serve a communicative function, declaring that Athens was in the hands of venerable and capable men, devoted to traditional values. The old Athenians were not extinct, and the city was not ruled by a rebellion-prone rabble, as Gnaeus Calpurnius Piso would allege two generations later.¹⁶⁶

Along with the Temple of Ares Steuernagel also examined the Temple of Apollo at Corinth and the Temple of Zeus at Cyrene, and concluded that in each case the cities' own traditions, symbolically represented by the ancient temples, oriented their own citizens but also

¹⁶⁵ App. *B Civ.* 2.13.88. In pardoning Athenian suppliants, Caesar asked: ποσάκις ὑμᾶς ὑπὸ σφῶν αὐτῶν ἀπολλυμένους ἢ δόξα τῶν προγόνων περιώσει; cf. Plut. *Vit. Sull.* 14.5, where Sulla, in moderating his sack of the city, is said to have made some encomium of the ancient Athenians and forgiven a few for the sake of many, the living for the sake of the dead: ἐγκώμιόν τι τῶν παλαιῶν Ἀθηναίων ὑπειπὼν ἔφη χαρίζεσθαι πολλοῖς μὲν ὀλίγους, ζῶντας δὲ τεθνηκόσιν. On Caesar's sparing of Athens and the "imbricated pattern" of sacking and sparing in Athenian history, see Alcock 2012, 93–94.

¹⁶⁶ Tac. *Ann.* 2.55. In 18 CE, Piso attacked Germanicus for being too civil to the undeserving Athenians: *Germanicum perstringens quod contra decus Romani nominis non Atheniensis, tot cladibus extinctos, sed conluviem illam nationum comitate nimia coluisset...* Cf. Steuernagel 2009a, 296, and Rawson's summation that in Cicero's eyes the Areopagus council was "that bulwark against the deplorable tendency of the Athenians toward outright democracy" (1985, 59).

portrayed an identity and status to the province and empire.¹⁶⁷ This is an important analysis, but in the case of Athens, where the Temple of Ares was reused in such a complete and unique way, more can be said about the dynamics of social memory at play in the assertion of an identity rooted in the deep past.

While it has not often been discussed as such, the translocation of the temple and altar clearly constitutes an example of reuse, and, moreover, of the meaningful reuse that I identify as upcycling.¹⁶⁸ The old temple in Pallene was chosen deliberately, based on its antiquity and perhaps on its resemblance to the Hephaisteion above the Agora, its state of preservation, and the declined activity of its cult or depopulation of its deme. Its new siting in the Agora and its new incarnation as a temple of Ares were also carefully thought out. The old but newly erected temple would have stood out in its new context. Though it did not “fill in” the empty space of the Agora the way the Odeion of Agrippa would, it did become the largest structure in the area to west of the Panathenaic Way, and presented a contrast to the existing buildings in the Agora, most of which were newer than it, but many of which still lay in a state of semi-ruin after Sulla’s sack. Thus, in a similar way but on a larger scale than with the architectural materials in the fortification walls discussed above, the upcycled temple and altar were accentuated by their placement in the ancient heart of the city.

What Steuernagel sees as a powerful statement of identity also served to build up a collective memory within the community. Couching the new in the language of restoration and

¹⁶⁷ Steuernagel 2009a, 327: “Solche Traditionen, zeichenhaft durch die alten Temple dargestellt, dienten nicht nur der Orientierung der eigenen Bürgerschaft, sondern begründeten ebenso bezogen auf Provinz und Reich die Identität und den Stellenwert der jeweiligen Städte.”

¹⁶⁸ Schmalz (2007–2008, 25) and Miles (2014, 137) refer to the reuse of temple architecture in the Temple of Ares and the other itinerant temples as “recycling.”

return to tradition was the *sine qua non* of effective political and social action in the time of Augustus, for Romans and Greeks alike. Just as every successful reform “had to be recommended virtually as a return to the customs of the ancestors,”¹⁶⁹ a new monument—in order to make a successful statement—had to embody an august antiquity. In the case of both a new law or a relocated temple, this could necessitate the refabrication of some of the elements of its life story. The construction of a new old temple by the Areopagus council in turn constructed, over time, a memory of the Temple of Ares always having been in the Agora, of the Agora always having had a religious character,¹⁷⁰ of Ares always having been a major civic deity alongside Athena, of the Areopagus always having played the leading role in governing the *polis*.

The construction of a collective memory that does not accord with reality is a somewhat more complicated and time consuming endeavor than the commemoration of an actively remembered battle, sack, or triumph, as in the case of the upcycled fortification walls. The immediate effect, message, and interpretation of the Temple of Ares by the various memory communities in Athens was different from the conception of it that developed in the longer term. To whom was the initial statement of identity addressed? Certainly the elite Areopagites had at least one eye on Rome. The promotion of Ares clearly accorded well with Augustus’ special emphasis on Mars Ultor. While not the driving force behind the project, the correspondence a visitor might recognize between the Greek and Roman gods would not have been overlooked by the council. Likewise, the translocation of the temple could have seemed to Roman eyes to fit the

¹⁶⁹ Oliver 1980, 44.

¹⁷⁰ Steuernagel calls the early Imperial Agora, with its new emphasis on religious buildings, a *hiera agora*—an ancient concept epigraphically attested at Augustan Demetrias. See Steuernagel 2009a, 290 with n. 39; Marzolff 1976. On the new significance of the Agora as an *Erinnerungsraum* with commercial activities moved to the new marketplace (the so-called “Roman Agora”), see Mango 2010; cf. Alcock 2002, 61–63.

spirit of Augustus' zealous religious restoration initiatives in Rome, though of course it was actually something much more innovative. It is also worth pointing out that the itinerancy and reincarnation of the temple was actually in stark contrast to the much discussed decree of the Athenian *ekklesia* (IG II² 1035) from later in the Augustan period concerning the reclamation of small shrines and sacred property from private hands and their restoration "to the gods and heroes, to whom they belonged."¹⁷¹ The rededication of the temple to Ares is the opposite of such actual restoration. Perhaps though, we can take the decree as evidence that the move was successfully spun as a return to the old, if in its *apparent* restoration of tradition it influenced the program of actual restoration described in the decree, which has conventionally been read as influenced by Augustus's moral and restorative zeal.¹⁷²

So, Roman perspectives were likely considered in the conception and execution of the temple's upcycling, but the message was addressed by the Areopagites to their fellow Athenians more directly.¹⁷³ The new old temple was a statement by the elite leaders on behalf of but also to the *polis*, urging Athenians to remember their identity as heirs of a glorious past, and to live up to that identity in the present. There must have been much civic pride produced in seeing a

¹⁷¹ IG II² 1035, frag. A, line 4. This decree has frequently been discussed in relation to the Temple of Ares, but the temple has almost always been viewed at least as part of the same phenomenon as the decree, if not more closely related. Only Steuernagel (2009a, 292) emphasizes the contrasting contexts. Schmalz (2007–2008) has recently produced a thorough analysis of the decree and its long list of shrines to be restored, and has fixed its previously controversial date to the last decade of the 1st century BCE. His discussion of the decree as it relates to cultural memory in Augustan Athens is astute, but he too treats the Temple of Ares directly alongside the restored shrines of the decree (22–24), despite noting the possibility that the Temple of Ares could be earlier than the Odeion of Agrippa (23, n. 61). See also Culley 1975 and 1977; Shear 1981, 365–368; Schmalz 2009, 10–11, no. 2.

¹⁷² See Steuernagel 2009a, 327–328 for the idea that the reuse, in various ways, of the ancient Greek temples he discusses is only *apparent* preservation and restoration.

¹⁷³ It is worth pointing out that although the Areopagus council has been called a "pro-Roman body" in scholarship (by, e.g., Rawson 1985, 64), Geagan's analysis of honors decreed from the middle of the 1st century BCE to the early 3rd century CE shows a predominance of Roman citizens and imperial figures among those honored by the *boule*, the *demos*, and the Areopagus council together, but a predominance of Athenian citizens without Roman citizenship among those honored by the Areopagus council alone (1967, 41).

(re)construction like this in the middle of the city. There had been very little large-scale construction in Athens in living memory, and a considerable local work force must have been directly involved in the labor. The Areopagus council said to the populace: this is our rightful inheritance, and together—under our leadership—we can show that we are not just stewards of our cultural heritage, but we are in control of how we use that cultural capital to build our present and our future.

How was this statement of identity received in the longer term? While the temple was clearly accentuated in its new context when first re-erected, and anyone witnessing or participating in the project could not have forgotten the relatively sudden appearance of an ancient temple in the Agora, there is no evidence to suggest that any attempt was made to preserve the knowledge of the temple's itinerancy. Its age must have been apparent—there was no touching up of painted decoration or the like, and it could easily be compared with the Hephaisteion above it to the west—but not its wandering past.¹⁷⁴ A casual viewer who had not witnessed or participated in the relocation of the temple would not realize that it had been moved. The more farsighted aim was thus the evolution of an a-historic memory—to create the impression that the temple had been there since its beginning. If the creation of a new social memory was successful, the act of relocation itself should eventually have become invisible. In later archaeological and historical evidence we have some clues to how the processing of identity statement to established social memory proceeded.

Based on the evidence of the other itinerant temples in the Agora, it seems that for at least a few generations the fact that the Temple of Ares was upcycled was remembered. Very little can

¹⁷⁴ On the painted decoration of the temple, see esp. McAllister 1959, 43–45.

be said with confidence about these structures, other than that they were almost certainly erected later than the Temple of Ares.¹⁷⁵ As Dinsmoor has shown, the so-called Southwest Temple, facing west in the angle between the Odeion of Agrippa and the Middle Stoa at the southwest corner of the Agora, was constructed probably in the mid-1st century CE using material taken mostly from the unusual Doric double stoa at Thorikos. The so-called Southeast Temple, built with material from the Ionic Temple of Athena at Sounion, was placed directly next to the Panathenaic Way as it rises toward the City Eleusinion at the very southern end of the Agora, perhaps as late as the middle of the 2nd century CE.¹⁷⁶ Thus, like the Temple of Ares, both temples employed upcycled building material from Classical temples or temple-like structures in Attica. This phenomenon is poorly attested elsewhere in any period, so knowledge of the relocation of the Temple of Ares is the most likely source of influence for the reuse seen in the later itinerant temples.¹⁷⁷ Both the later temples, however, are small Roman-style podium temples rather than reconstructions of those ancient structures from which their material came,

¹⁷⁵ Another itinerant structure, the large late 4th-century BCE altar northeast of the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes, preserves no chronological evidence for its move beyond the letter forms of the rather crudely cut mason's marks, which could date anywhere in the 1st centuries BCE or CE. It was most likely moved from the Pnyx and dedicated to Zeus Agoraios. See Thompson 1952, 91–93 and Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 160–161. Burden (1999, 150–153) argues for a pre-Augustan date.

¹⁷⁶ On the Southwest and Southeast Temples, including the suggestion of extremely tenuous identifications with Livia and Demeter, respectively, see Dinsmoor 1982. On the double stoa at Thorikos, see now Miles 2015. The material from these temples, as well as another still “floating” set of Ionic columns—of which one has been set up in the south stairwell of the Stoa of Attalos (see Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 166)—was found in the Post-Herulian Wall and its towers.

¹⁷⁷ A Late Archaic ionic temple reused in early Roman Thessaloniki may be another example of the phenomenon of itinerant temples, though the excavators believe the temple remained in its original location rather than being moved. See esp. Tasia, Lola, and Peltekis 2000; Voutiras 2009; and below, Chapter 5, n. 2. It has also been suggested that cults transferred to the Augustan colonies of Patras and Nikopolis also involved transport of temples; see Rizakis 2009, 24–27.

and so are clearly not part of the same project or products of the same patronage as the Temple of Ares.¹⁷⁸

Beyond a few generations' remove from the translocation of the temple, we have evidence that the idea that it had always stood in the Agora had taken hold. By the time of Pausanias in the third quarter of the second century CE, the constructedness of the fabricated memory seems to have been forgotten. Pausanias describes simply "a sanctuary of Ares," and the statues in and about "the temple," making no mention of the past life of the temple or its arrival in the Agora.¹⁷⁹ Because Pausanias otherwise takes such delight in the Classical Greek past, and in telling his readers stories and historical tidbits he thinks they may not know about the Classical past, it is hard to imagine him not commenting on the itinerancy of this 5th-century temple if he had learned of it from local guides or was otherwise aware of it. Similarly, Pausanias does not mention a cult of Ares in Acharnai, though his entire short description of the place comprises a list of deities worshiped there, showing that if the altar in the Agora did indeed originate in Acharnai, its journey was no longer remembered.¹⁸⁰ By then too the temple and altar were not as alone in the central space of the Agora as they had been when first put on display there. Without this accentuation and with more competition for the viewer's attention, the knowledge of the building's actual history faded away more easily. This was conceivably the

¹⁷⁸ In design and possibly even patronage, they may be more closely linked to the early Imperial podium temple in the Sanctuary of Aphrodite Ourania at the northwest corner of the Agora. On this sanctuary see Shear 1984, 33–40 and 1997, 495–507; Camp 2007, 641–642. For an alternative identification as the Sanctuary of Hermes Agoraios, see Osanna 1992 and 1995.

¹⁷⁹ Paus. 1.8.4. Thompson and Wycherley (1972, 205) note this as a surprising omission.

¹⁸⁰ Paus. 1.31.6. See also Borg 2011, 220–221; Kellogg 2013a, 164–168. Pausanias has nothing at all to say about Pallene, so that if was not already depopulated by the late 1st century BCE, it likely was two centuries later. Relatedly, Pausanias famously misidentifies the Temple of Poseidon on the promontory of Sounion as the Temple of Athena (1.1.1), which had by then wandered to the Agora, and there are no subsequent ancient references to the temple(s) at Sounion (Dinsmoor 1974, 233).

original intention in the specific placement of the temple *within* the central space but *along* its north side, echoing the framing stoas on the south and east.

Further evidence that the sanctuary came to be seen as a genuinely ancient cultural spot can be adduced from the list of statues Pausanias sees in and around it. They include distinctly Athenian heroes, like Heracles and Theseus, esteemed Athenian statesmen like Lykourgos, Kallias, Demosthenes, and Kalades, and the beloved tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton.¹⁸¹ Excavations have revealed a veritable “grove” of monument bases in this area of the Agora, most unfortunately preserving little about their date or identification, but attesting nonetheless to the popularity of this area and its venerable associations.¹⁸²

How does this new conception of the Temple of Ares as an upcycled monument proclaiming the autochthony of the Athenians of the late 1st century, and constructing a new remembered history of its life in the Agora, fit into notions of an Augustan building program at Athens? If we detach the Temple of Ares from any Augustan, Agrippan, or generally Roman initiative, as argued by Steuernagel and demonstrated above, one major cornerstone of the house of cards is removed; it becomes very hard to see a centrally formulated and forethoughtful plan or agenda through the remaining evidence. This is not to deny Augustus or Agrippa any interest in the Athenian built environment, or to deny Athenians any interest in taking Roman and imperial perspectives into account. It is also undeniable that the appearance and presumably the character and function of the Agora changed dramatically in the course of the early Imperial period. Alcock’s thought-provoking discussion of the results of the filling in of the Agora with

¹⁸¹ Paus. 1.8.2–5. Cf. Alcock 2002, 56: “To his eyes, the Ares temple was a particularly congenial spot for Greek, and especially for Athenian, heroes to gather.”

¹⁸² Thompson 1953, 42–43; McAllister 1959, 8.

religious and cultural buildings on various memory communities in Athens remains apt.¹⁸³ The monuments themselves and the altered Agora as a whole were multivalent. Roman soldiers, emperors, or students; Athenian priests, *ephebes*, women; Greek and non-Greek visitors—all could go to the Agora for different purposes and “move through their own version of the space.”¹⁸⁴ The Agora remained an experienced space; with its amalgamation of old, new, and new-old monuments, it was less a static “museum” and more a memorial playground.¹⁸⁵

The relocation of the Temple of Ares was itself purposefully multivalent. The initial statement of identity, aimed with differing connotations at multiple audiences, evolved into collectively held memor(ies) within the communit(ies). Pausanias provides one view of how it was remembered, but there were other possibilities. Perhaps to a Roman officer an analogy to Mars Ultor would indeed have been striking. An associate of the Julio-Claudian family might have remembered Gaius and his immortalization as the “new Ares.” A resident of Pallene or Acharnai could conceivably have remembered with pride or lamentation the removal of the temple and altar.

This was a period of delicate negotiation on each side, and those negotiations certainly were manifested through architecture and monuments, seen for example in the emphasis on the *demos* and Athenian officials and their positions in the dedication of the *monopteros* honoring Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis, or in the dedication on the arch at the entrance of the new

¹⁸³ Alcock 2002, 51–73. Even if we would now see less Roman influence in the Temple of Ares relocation, Alcock’s identification of agency behind the changes in the Agora is prudently cautious: “the existence of one force behind all these moves seems highly unlikely, although a degree of central Roman intervention is difficult to dispute” (2002, 65).

¹⁸⁴ Alcock 2002, 65.

¹⁸⁵ On the problematic nature of the idea of “musealization” in the early Imperial Agora and sacred spaces in general, see Alcock 2002, 54 and Steuernagel 2007 and 2009b.

marketplace, constructed at least partially through imperial financing.¹⁸⁶ We might also see this subtle negotiation at work in the way monuments feed off associations with other monuments.¹⁸⁷ The Odeion of Agrippa, a project that certainly did involve more direct imperial patronage and design than any other project in Athens in the early Imperial period, took its position and alignment from the Middle Stoa and especially from the Temple of Ares and its altar. It was surely meant to derive some of its significance from the juxtaposition with those still new ancient monuments.

I will have more to say about Augustan designs on Athens and its memorial landscape in my concluding chapter. For now, it is sufficient to reiterate that in the Temple of Ares we have evidence of Athenian elites making a profound statement about their authority over the cultural heritage of their city and their ability to marshal that heritage to their own ends—in this case to underline their identity as true heirs of the old Athenians by showing off a new old temple in the ancient heart of the city.¹⁸⁸ The well known story of the statue of Athena on the Acropolis turning and spitting blood in the direction of Rome in connection with Augustus' visit in 22/1 BCE demonstrates the acrimony that could flare up in Roman-Athenian relations. Augustus clearly exercised power in the affairs of Athens, taking Aegina and Eretria away from their control and forbidding them to sell citizenship.¹⁸⁹ But in relocating an ancient temple and rededicating it to

¹⁸⁶ On these inscriptions see below, Chapter 5, with nn. 155, 159.

¹⁸⁷ On “monuments feeding off associations” see Alcock 2002, 54 citing Bradley 1993, 129.

¹⁸⁸ Compare this to Borg's conclusion, in one of the most recent treatments of an “Augustan program” in the Agora, that “the Temple of Ares is probably the most Roman and potentially most offensive addition to the old Agora” (2011, 226).

¹⁸⁹ Cass. Dio 54.7.2–3: Ἀθηναίων δὲ τὴν τε Αἴγιναν καὶ τὴν Ἐρέτριαν ἔκαρποῦντο γὰρ αὐτάς', ὥς τινές φασιν, ἀφείλετο, ὅτι τὸν Ἀντώνιον ἐσπούδασαν, καὶ προσέτι καὶ ἀπηγόρευσέ σφισι μηδένα πολίτην ἀργυρίου ποιεῖσθαι. καὶ αὐτοῖς ἐς ταῦτα ἔδοξε τὸ τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀγάλματι συμβᾶν ἀποσκῆψαι: ἐν γὰρ τῇ ἀκροπόλει πρὸς ἀνατολῶν ἰδρυμένον πρὸς τε τὰς δυσμὰς μετεστράφη καὶ αἶμα ἀπέπτυσεν.

their own special deity, rather than executing an agenda imposed upon them by Augustus,¹⁹⁰ the leaders of the Areopagus council sought to assert their control over civic property, identity, and memory.

The case study of the Temple of Ares has provided, I hope, an interesting complement to the North Acropolis Wall and the Post-Herulian Wall discussed in the first half of this chapter. There, I argued that upcycling damaged architectural marble in a new context that accentuated the visibility of the act of reuse and of the past experiences of the materials created social memories through essentially similar commemorative processes. In the case of the Temple of Ares, the upcycling of the whole temple was similarly highlighted within its new context. But because it was reused in its entirety, and because its new context itself saw many changes and additions in a short time, the visibility of the act of reuse—the knowledge of its itinerancy—faded over time. Here, rather than commemoration solidifying the memory of an actual event, an artificial memory was fabricated. Where the material in the walls had its past life on display, the Temple of Ares eventually proclaimed that all its long life had played out on this venerable spot in the Agora.

¹⁹⁰ A “trickle-down” view of cultural change recently espoused by Spawforth (2012), heavily influenced by Wallace-Hadrill (2008). See also critical reviews by Stewart (2012) and Galinsky (2012). Torelli (1995) similarly saw the translocation of the temple as a “politico-cultural operation” of the oligarchy governing Athens, i.e., the council of the Areopagus, but did not develop the idea and envisioned Agrippa as instigator, mastermind, and enforcer.

Chapter 3. Perpetuating Social Memory through Reuse That Preserves

In this chapter I will treat examples of reuse that differ from those discussed above in terms of the degree to which the visibility of the reused materials is deliberately heightened and in terms of the effect the act of reuse had on social memory. In these cases, knowledge of the previous function and/or context of the stone object is perpetuated through upcycling, but in such a way that the fact that the material has been reused is discernible only much more subtly than in the cases in my first chapter. In contrast to the examples there, here the reused materials are not given a starkly different function than in their past lives, like an entablature made into a wall, or put in a starkly different context, like a temple moved wholesale into the Agora. Rather than being explicitly shown off or accentuated in their secondary use, the materials in this chapter have their existence preserved by reuse that is visible but is meant to blend in more or less seamlessly with the surrounding context. Here, it is the visible preservation of the life history of the material that was of primary concern to those undertaking the upcycling. A deliberate choice was made to preserve the object and at least part of its biography, when it may have been easier or otherwise arguably preferable to dispose of it entirely or to obscure its experiences through renovation, burial, renaming, etc.

Less forceful than accentuating reuse that actively forges memory within the community, this category of reuse that preserves—no less meaningful than the first—has the effect of maintaining an existing knowledge collectively held by its audience. This type of preservative upcycling can work to perpetuate both difficult memories of communal hardships, to inspire and exhort future and current generations, as well more positive memories of the city's deep-rooted identity. I will focus in this chapter on two major case studies, the Archaic Temple of Athena

Polias and the sanctuary complex of Athena Nike, again examining questions concerning the “visibility of the trace”—the degree to which the reuse of the structures and their biographies were discernible—the agency and motivations behind the reuse, and viewer perceptions of the secondary context. I aim to illuminate examples of the perpetuation of both more positive and more negative valences of social memories through upcycling on the Acropolis in the 5th century BCE, in which monuments of both the very recent and the much deeper past were preserved through creative reuse. In these two cases it is for the most part not marble itself that was reused, but rather architecture and monuments of different sorts of limestone that were marked in some way as significant. The reuse of this older stone, as I will demonstrate, was sometimes made intentionally more meaningful through the juxtaposition of a new and contrasting material, especially marble. The contrast between new and old could heighten the effect of upcycling by making the age or past function of an object or building more recognizable.

Pausanias’ ἀρχαῖα ἀγάλματα

I begin with a small scale but relatively clear example. Pausanias, near the end of his visit to the Acropolis in the area of the Temple of Athena, mentions some old statues of Athena, intact but rather blackened and too weak to withstand a blow: ἔστι δὲ Ἀθηνᾶς ἀγάλματα ἀρχαῖα· καὶ σφισιν ἀπετάκη μὲν οὐδέν, μελάντερα δὲ καὶ πληγὴν ἐνεγκεῖν ἔστιν ἀσθενέστερα. Pausanias goes on to blame their visible damage on the Persians’ thorough sack of the city after most of the able-bodied Athenians had sought refuge in their ships: ἐπέλαβε γὰρ καὶ ταῦτα ἡ φλόξ, ὅτε ἐσβεβηκότων ἐς τὰς ναῦς Ἀθηναίων βασιλεὺς εἶλεν ἔρημον τῶν ἐν ἡλικίᾳ τὴν πόλιν.¹

¹ Paus. 1.27.6.

These ἀρχαῖα ἀγάλματα identified as Athenas were probably Archaic marble *korai* that were grouped together and re-erected sometime shortly after the Persian sack in 480 BCE, as C. Keesling has convincingly argued.² A. Scholl has recently suggested that based on Pausanias' description of their state of preservation the statues were more likely to have been of bronze, but I follow Keesling in thinking that bronze statues would probably have melted too much in the conflagration to be re-erected.³ Additionally, we have evidence that a few marble *korai* likely survived above ground when most of their companions were buried in the huge *Perserschutt* or “*Kore* pit” deposit against the North Acropolis Wall.⁴ Archaic *korai* found before P. Kavvadias and G. Kawerau's excavations in 1885 include the so-called Lyons Kore (Acropolis Museum no. 269), whose upper half was in the Lyons Museum by 1810;⁵ Acr. no. 687, whose head was found east of the Parthenon in 1882 and whose torso was found in 1843, preserving traces of burning and evidence of an ancient repair;⁶ Acr. no. 584, the torso of a small *kore* found before 1843;⁷ and Acr. no. 620, the fire-damaged lower part of a seated figure, which was found in 1838 and likely represented Athena.⁸ Due to their dates of discovery, findspots, and evidence of burning and/or long exposure to weathering, some or all of these may have been among the old images

² Keesling 2003, 128–129. Keesling makes this identification in the course of her argument that *korai* may have been understood as representations of Athena in antiquity. Stieber claims instead that “some religious sculptures were set back up” after the sack, to which Pausanias later referred, and takes this as evidence against the identification of *korai* as representations of divinities (2004, 19).

³ Scholl 2010, 255; Keesling 2003, 129. Some earlier scholars also assumed they were bronze, including Hitzig and Blümner (1896, 297) and Dickins (1912, 153).

⁴ On this deposit see above, Chapter 2, nn. 21 and 26, and further discussion in Chapter 5 below.

⁵ This upper half joins fragments of the lower half and the left arm found on the Acropolis. See esp. Dickins 1912, 106, and for further discussion and bibliography: Payne 1936, 14–18; Langlotz 1939, 66–67, no. 25; and Brouskari 1974, 60–61.

⁶ See esp. Langlotz 1939, 59–61, no. 19 with bibliography; Keesling 2003, 245 n. 20.

⁷ See esp. Dickins 1912, 121–122; Langlotz 1939, 102, no. 53; Brouskari 1974, 103, all with bibliography.

⁸ See esp. Dickins 1912; Payne 1936, 47; Langlotz 1939, 109, no. 59; Brouskari 1974, 47, all with bibliography.

Pausanias saw, which were likely re-erected together on or near the terrace of the Temple of Athena. A decision to preserve a few of the damaged statues and redisplay them together, perhaps as a distinct group on a new base, finds parallels in the sanctuaries of Hera on Samos and of Apollo Ptoios in Boeotia.⁹

Another interesting parallel is the well-known Endoios Athena, identified as Acropolis Museum no. 625. Pausanias saw this seated image of Athena on the Acropolis as well, and mentions it at the beginning of his description of the area of the Temple of Athena on the north side of the citadel.¹⁰ Although he does not mention any Persian-inflicted damage, he is aware of the statue's great age, reporting that its inscription says it was dedicated by Kallias and made by Endoios, whom Pausanias asserts was a pupil of Daedalus.¹¹ This statue thus seems to have been held in great esteem by the Athenians—Endoios was one of the great sculptors of the second half of the 6th century, to whom were attributed famous cult statues in wood, ivory, and marble at Ephesus, Erythrai, and Tegea¹²—and to have been preserved or re-erected in a position

⁹ Kienast 1992; Ducat 1971, 456–457.

¹⁰ On this statue see esp. Dickins 1912, 160–163; Payne 1936, 46–47; Langlotz 1939, 109–111, no. 60; Raubitschek 1949, 491–495; Brouskari 1974, 71–72; Viviers 1992, 62–67, 162–169; Angiolillo 1997, 173–175; Scholl 2010, 253–254. Marx 2001 provides an illuminating examination of the findspot of Acr. no. 625, concluding that it was purposefully built into a Late Antique wall below the north slope of the Acropolis, sketched by William Gell in the early years of the 19th century. This strengthens its identification with Endoios' Athena seen by Pausanias, *contra* Ridgway (1992, 138–139), who inexplicably thought that Endoios' Athena was “the only pre-Persian monument listed” by Pausanias on the Acropolis, but that Acr. no. 625 rolled down the north slope from the *Perserschutt* pit.

¹¹ Paus. 1.26.4. Ἐνδοῖος ἦν γένος μὲν Ἀθηναῖος, Δαιδάλου δὲ μαθητῆς, ὃς καὶ φεύγοντι Δαιδάλω διατὸν Κάλω θάνατον ἐπικολούθησεν ἐς Κρήτην· τούτου καθήμενόν ἐστιν Ἀθηναῖς ἄγαλμα, ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον ὡς Καλλίας μὲν ἀναθείη, ποιήσειε δὲ Ἐνδοῖος. This Kallias is most likely the Kallias son of Phainippos who was Olympic victor and bitter opponent of the Peisistratids (Hdt. 6.121–122); on the question see Raubitschek 1949, 492; Viviers 1992, 65–67.

¹² Artemis at Ephesus: Plin. *HN* 16.79. Erythrai: Paus. 7.5.9. Tegea: Paus. 8.46.1, 5.

somewhat separate from the other Archaic statues chosen as survivors and witnesses, perhaps on the east rather than the west side of the temple terrace, based on Pausanias' description.¹³

Scholl has collected and discussed several other dedications described by Pausanias that, based on his descriptions, should date to the Archaic period. These include a bronze statue of Kylon, an Olympic victor and would-be tyrant of the 7th century, which Scholl suggests may have been erected at the end of the 6th century,¹⁴ the bronze chariot dedicated as a tithe after the Athenian victory over the Chalcidians and Boeotians in 507 BCE,¹⁵ and a bronze lion near the entrance to the Acropolis dedicated in honor of a woman named Leaina ("Lioness") who had been unjustly killed in the intrigues surrounding the fall of the Peisistratid tyranny.¹⁶ While at least some of these objects probably did genuinely date to the period before the Persian Wars, in none of these cases does Pausanias specifically address their Archaic date or any damage they may have suffered or escaped at the hands of the Persians.

The burnt Athenas, by contrast, had the most impact on Pausanias in clearly evoking the memory of the Persians sack. While the other pre-Persian dedications may have been *survivors*, the burnt Athenas were more overtly *witnesses* of the sacrilege of the barbarians. If they were indeed marble *korai*, they represented the iconic dedication of the Archaic Acropolis. They were deliberately chosen for redisplay, probably based on the fact that the ravishes they had suffered were clearly visible yet their original identity also remained easily recognizable. Their purpose as re-erected was to serve as a painful reminder of the Persian destruction of many more such

¹³ On Endoios and his career, see esp. Raubitschek 1949, 491–495; Viviers 1992, 55–102, 153–174; Angiolillo 1997, 173–184; *Der Neue Overbeck* 2014, vol. 1, 268–280.

¹⁴ Paus. 1.28.1; Scholl 2010, 256–257.

¹⁵ Paus. 1.28.2; Scholl 2010, 257–262.

¹⁶ Paus. 1.23.1–2; Scholl 2010, 252–253.

dedications, a metonymy for the general desecration of their fellows, most of which had been put to rest through ritual burial. Like the temple architecture immured in the North Acropolis Wall, the burnt Athenas were a memorial of the Persian sacrilege, but unlike the temple elements, they also continued to perform their original function in their secondary context. What was important for the effectiveness of the memorial message was the knowledge of what they had suffered at the hands of the Persians, and the visibility of that damage was enhanced through their arrangement in a group. Upcycled in this way, their traumatic past remained present; they were recognized as testimony of the Persian sack by viewers like Pausanias even so many centuries later.¹⁷

The Old Athena Temple

I turn now to a similar case of the preservation of damage wrought by the Persians on the Acropolis, this time on a much larger scale, but in a commemorative monument that has been less visible, or at least less so-viewed, by modern researchers. This is the case of the Late Archaic Temple of Athena Polias, commonly now called the “Old Athena Temple” and known in antiquity as the *archaios neos*, whose entablature was built into the North Acropolis Wall. The temple was located on the foundations north of the Parthenon discovered by W. Dörpfeld in 1885—the so-called “Dörpfeld foundations,” after which the temple is sometime still referred to

¹⁷ Scholl (2010, 262–263) also sees the preservation of a small number of pre-Persian monuments, particularly the Endoios Athena and the ἀρχαῖα ἀγάλματα of Athena, as keeping alive the collective memory of the sack of the sanctuary. However, Scholl places this within a phenomenon of a musealization of the Acropolis, which I believe undervalues the statues’ continued function as votive dedications within the sanctuary and the viewer’s ability to engage with them as both sacred objects and memorials. Scholl also overstates the emphasis Pausanias placed on the Persian destruction of the Acropolis, arguing that he was deeply influenced by Augustan propaganda of the Persian Wars.

as the “Dörpfeld Temple.”¹⁸ The earlier Temple of Athena Polias, the “Hekatompedon” or “Blue-Beard Temple,” was most likely on this same site and perhaps on the same foundations. It has also been suggested, based on scant remains of terracing and a prehistoric column base found nearby but not in situ, that this area of the Acropolis was the site of the Mycenaean-era palace, which undoubtedly influenced its choice as the seat of the city’s patron goddess.¹⁹ This area was thus traditionally the most sacred space on the citadel; not until after the Battle of Marathon was the southern site of the current Parthenon developed into a suitable space for a temple, with the immense podium constructed for the Older Parthenon.²⁰

The history of the Old Athena Temple has been fiercely debated in many of its particulars, but most scholars now believe, as did many throughout the past century, that at least some part of the temple, in some degree of ruination or repair, continued to stand on this spot until at least the mid-5th century. That is, there is agreement that it was not completely demolished either during the Persian sack or during the cleanup of the Acropolis in its immediate aftermath. While there are many unanswered and some perhaps unanswerable questions about this temple, its life, and afterlife, the striking fact remains that no other structure was built on this

¹⁸ On the clearing of later structures from the Acropolis before Dörpfeld’s discovery, see Mallouchou-Tufano 1994, 69–78.

¹⁹ On the evidence for the palace and the column base in Acropolis limestone, found east of the Erechtheion, see esp. Mountjoy 1995, 41–42 and Iakovidis 2006, 190–196. Two other limestone column bases found within the Dörpfeld foundations were taken by some to be Mycenaean (e.g. Holland 1924b, 162–169) but were shown to be later and likely not in situ; see esp. Nylander 1962 and Iakovidis 2006, 65–68. They probably originated in a late Geometric/Early Archaic predecessor; see, e.g., Scholl 2006, 18–23.

²⁰ This topography has of course been highly debated, but there is now some consensus on the view outlined here. See esp. Kissas 2008, 43–45, 99–112, and Paga, 2015. Dinsmoor’s (1947) pronouncement that the H-architecture belonged to a temple on the southern site has taken half a century to erode, and is still upheld by prominent voices like Korres 1997 (followed by Stewart 2008, 401 with n. 109), on the very weak evidence of a small shrine he discovered in north *pteron* of the Parthenon in the course of restoration work, and of a bedding for a wall west of the Parthenon whose orientation he claims suggests an earlier temple. No photographs or drawings of the wall have been published; it was first reported in Korres 1988b. For a summary of the prevailing theories on the controversy over the last century and a thorough refutation of Korres, see now Paga 2015, 175–187. The definitive publication of the Older Parthenon and its podium remains Hill 1912.

vast and most sacred site of the Acropolis until the medieval period. On almost any view, whatever was preserved here, even if it was just a broad open space, must have been significant to the community.²¹

Here I will argue, following Dörpfeld and G. Ferrari, that on the most straightforward reading of the combined evidence, it is most likely that what remained of the temple after the Persian sack was deliberately left standing, with minimal repair and in some state of ruin, and continued to function as the Temple of Athena Polias—*the* Temple of Athena on the Acropolis—until the time of Pausanias.²² Ferrari’s recent resurrection of Dörpfeld’s conviction has been summarily, but far from thoroughly, dismissed by those scholars who have taken it up.²³ In particular, her important discussion of the ancient view of ruins, their evocative power, and the memorial implications of their preservation has been overlooked. After examining afresh the evidence for history of the building, I will take up her ideas again in light of M. Miles’ recent illuminating analysis of burnt temples in the ancient Greek landscape.

²¹ In the only real attempt to date to explain the lack of later building in the area if nothing remained of the temple, Gerding (2006) argues that the cult was moved to the Erechtheion to the north in order to create a large open space for the gathering of participants in the Panathenaic procession.

²² Dörpfeld’s position was developed, expanded, and maintained over fifty years: 1885b, 1886a, 1886b, 1887a, 1887b, 1890, 1897, 1919, 1934. Ferrari (2002, 11–14) provides a summary of Dörpfeld’s ideas and the opposition they faced, culminating in Dinsmoor’s influential narrative of the Acropolis’ history more or less winning the day in 1942, two years after Dörpfeld’s death. In his last published response to Dinsmoor, Dörpfeld disclosed his intention to publish a monograph detailing his views on the “Haupttempel” of the Acropolis (1934, 249).

²³ Ferrari 2002, dismissed by Holtzmann 2004, Pakkanen 2006, esp. 280, Gerding 2006, 390 with n. 11, Marginesu 2010, 55, n. 120. Linders (2007, 781, n. 39) and Hartmann (2010, 184, n. 826) while not entirely dismissive, accept only parts of Dörpfeld and Ferrari’s conception of the building’s history. Sève 2003 and Davison 2009, 569–570 summarize Ferrari’s views. Kellogg (2008, 360, n. 17) and Arrington (2015, 147) seem to accept Ferrari’s view, and Lindenlauf (2003), Di Cesare (2004, 120 with n. 66), and Martin-McAuliffe and Papadopoulos (2012, 346) are also sympathetic. Hurwit was initially dismissive (2004, 265–266, n. 17) but later more open to continued existence of a ruin and its memorial implications (2005, 22–25). That Ferrari’s idea is not discussed by Miles in her excellent article on burnt temples (2014) is a surprising omission. Ferrari’s resuscitation of Dörpfeld’s theory was anticipated by Buchert (2000, 203–227) and in Osanna’s treatment of Pausanias on the Acropolis (2001, esp. 338).

As the building's life is traced through the ample archaeological, literary, and epigraphic sources, an image emerges of a still-functioning but clearly commemorative monument. The temple's preservation effected a deliberate perpetuation of the memory of the Persian Wars, largely analogous to a well-known modern war memorial, the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche (Kaiser Wilhelm Memorial Church) in Berlin. As other Acropolis buildings grew up around it, particularly during the second half of the 5th century with the construction boom attributed to Pericles, the Old Athena Temple was preserved as part of a deliberate and powerful juxtaposition of old and new, similar to the charred steeple of the Gedächtniskirche preserved at the core of Egon Eichmann's strikingly modern post-World War II rebuilding of the church complex.

Most of the individual pieces of evidence on the history of the Old Athena Temple are well-trodden, to say the least, but a fresh look at the whole, particularly a view not beginning from a preconceived notion that the temple was completely destroyed, is worthwhile here. Many names and appellations preserved in the extant sources have been suggested as applying to the Old Athena Temple, and many elaborate rejections of those identifications have been constructed. If we do not assume that the temple ceased to exist, most of the references to the "*megaron*," "*palaios neos*," "*archaios neos*," "*opisthodomos*," and "Temple of Athena Polias" are most easily understood as referring to this very temple.

We begin on the pre-Persian Acropolis. The Temple of Athena Polias had been constructed in the last decade of the 6th century, a monumental work of the new democracy.²⁴ It was built in the Doric order, with a peristyle of six by twelve columns. The plan, as reconstructed from the foundations, had very shallow porches at both the west and east, a large cella at the east,

²⁴ The older view that it was Peisistratid has been overturned; see esp. Stähler 1972 on the sculpture and Childs 1994 on the architecture.

divided by two internal colonnades, a somewhat smaller room at the west, and two chambers in the center, whose direction of access is uncertain.²⁵ The temple was built mostly in limestone, but was embellished with roof tiles, raking geisa, tympana, pedimental sculpture, and likely akroteria of Parian marble and metopes and akroteria bases of Hymettian marble.²⁶ The pediments probably carried a Gigantomachy scene and a scene of two lions devouring a bull.²⁷ The akroteria bases originally belonged to the temple's predecessor, the Hekatompedon, and were reworked for reuse.²⁸

Herodotus, in his description of the Persian sack of the Acropolis, reports that once the Persians had breached the citadel, some of the Athenians defending it threw themselves from the walls, while others fled into the “*megaron*”: οἱ δὲ ἐς τὸ μέγαρον κατέφευγον.²⁹ On the Acropolis as it was in 480, the Temple of Athena Polias on the Dörpfeld foundations was the only structure that could be referred to, in whole or in part, as a *megaron*. The Older Parthenon was far from finished, and the other οἰκήματα were small and insignificant in comparison to the monumental temple.³⁰ It is clear as Herodotus continues his narrative that the temple did not provide adequate protection from the attackers. It is uncertain just how much of the temple was destroyed, but as

²⁵ Dörpfeld's measurements and observations (esp. 1886a) have remained the foundation for subsequent studies of the temple's plan, including Wiegand 1904, 115–126, and Riemann 1950.

²⁶ Kissas 2008, 112.

²⁷ For a recent reexamination of the pedimental sculpture, with some discussion of the architecture and other sculptural elements, see Santi 2010, Ch. 5, 229–291. Kissas' analysis of the newly identified raking geisa fragments has implications for the reconstruction of the pedimental scenes (2008, 59–60).

²⁸ Kissas 2008, 87–93. Over 500 marble fragments have been assigned to the Old Athena Temple during the systematic investigation of marble piles and stores on the Acropolis begun in 1977. Kissas reports on several classes of these rediscovered fragments, and calls for a thorough reexamination of the Dörpfeld foundations and further investigation of the many poros architectural pieces kept on the south side of the Acropolis (2008, 110–112); see also Vlassopoulou 2000.

²⁹ Hdt. 8.53.2: ὡς δὲ εἶδον αὐτοὺς ἀναβεβηκότας οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόπολιν, οἳ μὲν ἐρρίπτεον ἑωυτοὺς κατὰ τοῦ τείχεος κάτω καὶ δεφθεῖροντο, οἳ δὲ ἐς τὸ μέγαρον κατέφευγον.

³⁰ On the enigmatic life history of these “small limestone buildings,” see esp. Klein 2015.

seen in Chapter 2, a large part of its entablature and at least 16 of its column capitals were soon built into the North Acropolis Wall.³¹ Much of its pedimental sculpture and elements of its roof were buried amongst the other *Perserschutt*.³² We should thus imagine a profound, but not total, destruction. The much-revered ancient olive-wood statue of Athena had almost certainly been removed from the temple and taken to Salamis for safekeeping at the evacuation of the city.³³

In another reference to the *megaron* on the Acropolis, Herodotus provides key evidence that at least some part of the temple survived the Persian sack. Describing the chains of the Chalcidian prisoners of war captured by the Athenians in 507, he reports that they were still to be seen in his day, hung on the wall burnt by the Persians, “set against the *megaron* that faces west” (ἀντίον δὲ τοῦ μεγάρου τοῦ πρὸς ἐσπέρην τετραμμένου).³⁴ As it has been understood by most readers, the chains were hung on the western terrace wall of the Temple of Athena Polias, and the “*megaron* facing west” was the large rear chamber of the late 6th-century temple.³⁵ At least this much of the temple, then, continued to function in the third quarter of the 5th century. That Herodotus specifies the *megaron facing west* makes even more sense if something more of the temple remained to the east. The similarity of these pre- and post-Persian references by a contemporary eyewitness, with no hint of a change in the structure’s function, are important background to the other sources referencing the temple.

³¹ On the entablature see esp. Kissas 2008, 51–52; on the column capitals see Korres 2002, 184 with n. 11.

³² For a summary of the findspots of the various temple material, see Ferrari 2002, 23.

³³ This is based on Plutarch’s report that during the evacuation the gorgoneion was lost from the statue of the goddess, giving Themistocles a pretext to search through all the baggage (*Vit. Them.* 10.4). See also Ridgway 1992, 122, countering Mansfield’s alternative reading (1985, 135–136, 154–156, nn. 12–15). On the appearance of the statue, based particularly on the evidence of some 3rd-century BCE Athenian bronze coins, see Kroll 1982.

³⁴ Hdt. 5.77.3: αἱ περ ἔτι καὶ ἐς ἐμὲ ἦσαν περιεοῦσαι, κρεμάμεναι ἐκ τειχέων περιπεφλευσμένων πυρὶ ὑπὸ τοῦ Μήδου, ἀντίον δὲ τοῦ μεγάρου τοῦ πρὸς ἐσπέρην τετραμμένου.

³⁵ Dinsmoor 1947, 110, n. 4.

Another critical reference to the temple, this time as the *archaios neos*, comes in the so-called “Praxiergidai decree” of the mid-5th century, prescribing a series of rituals to be taken up by that *genos*, affirmed by an oracle of Apollo as their customary rites (νόμιμα) and ancestral privileges (πάτρια), including dressing the statue of Athena with the peplos.³⁶ The decree directs the erection of a marble stele on the Acropolis “behind the old temple”—ὄπισθεν τῷ νεῷ τῷ ἀρχαίῳ.³⁷ This is most clearly understood as a reference to the Old Athena Temple, since the only other temple on the Acropolis at this point was what remained of the unfinished Older Parthenon, in comparison to which the Archaic temple was indeed older.³⁸ This decree reveals that at mid-century, or perhaps a bit earlier, the Praxiergidai were custodians of the ancient olive-wood statue of Athena, in a building that could be described as a νεῷς and was able to be secured.³⁹ It is thus crucial evidence for the state of the Old Athena Temple several decades after the sack: it continued to function as the Temple of Athena Polias, to house the ancient cult statue, and to serve as a focal point around which important documents were displayed.⁴⁰ As D. Lewis admitted, “to a follower of Dörpfeld this will present no difficulties.”⁴¹

³⁶ *IG I³ 7*. See Mansfield 1985, 398–404 and most recently Robertson 2004, with earlier bibliography on p. 111, n. 1. Robertson suggests that the dressing of the statue in a *peplos* was an innovation at this time.

³⁷ *IG I³ 7*, lines 5–6: ...ἐν στέ[λει λιθίνει καταθεῖναι ἐμ πόλει] | [ὄπισ]θεν τῷ νεῷ τῷ ἀρχ[αί]ο·

³⁸ The decree cannot be dated with precision, but 460–450 is the clear consensus. Even if the decree were slightly later, when the Parthenon was under construction, the reference to the *archaios neos* would logically be to the Old Athena Temple.

³⁹ Lewis 1954, 20.

⁴⁰ A scholiast to Aristophanes’ *Lysistrata* (273) gives evidence of another stele set up next to the ἀρχαῖος νεῷς, inscribed with the penalties assessed against the Athenian followers of Kleomenes in his unsuccessful bid for the tyranny at Athens in 507/6 BCE: καὶ ἀναγράφαντες εἰς στήλην χαλκῆν ἔστησαν ἐν πόλει παρὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον νεῶν (Hangard 1996, 16–17). This statement is best taken as evidence for “*archaios neos*” as the common name for the Temple of Athena Polias at the time of the scholiast (or his source, which may have been Krateros in the early 3rd century CE; see Buchert 2000, 209–210) or the time of Aristophanes, rather than in the late 6th century.

⁴¹ 1954, 20. Lewis goes on to make a convoluted argument for a much more difficult reading involving Holland’s pre-Erechtheion structures (see below, n. 47).

A slightly later topographical reference helps round out our picture of the temple's state in the 5th century. A decree dated between 440 and 420 BCE provides for the erection of a column on the Acropolis “behind the *opisthodomos*.”⁴² This *opisthodomos* is best taken as the same room as Herodotus’ “*megaron* facing west,” i.e., the large rear room of the Old Athena Temple. As in the Praxiergidai decree, we see that the area south or west of the temple was a prominent spot for displaying stelai and monuments. This *opisthodomos* is also in all likelihood the same *opisthodomos* referred to in the roughly contemporary Kallias decrees.⁴³ The first Kallias decree, traditionally dated 434/3 BCE, stipulates that the Treasurers of the Other Gods should steward the money of the gods on the Acropolis in the *opisthodomos*, and should lock and seal the doors of the *opisthodomos* together with the treasurers of Athena, who presumably already kept the money of Athena in this room.⁴⁴ The second decree specifies that the money of Athena should be kept in the right hand side of the *opisthodomos*, and the money of the Other Gods in the left.⁴⁵ Using the ample evidence of the Parthenon inventories, T. Linders has recently demonstrated convincingly, as others had earlier suspected, that “the *Opisthodomos*” used as the

⁴² *IG I³ 207*, lines 14–15, following Hiller’s restoration (*IG I² 139*):[... κ]ίονα καταθῆναι ἐμ [πόλει δ]||[πισθ]εν τῷ ὀπισθοδόμῳ

⁴³ For treatment of the Kallias decrees and their extensive bibliography, see esp. Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 154–161, no. 58; Kallet-Marx 1989; and Marginesu 2010, 36–39. The orthodox date of 434/3 BCE upheld by Meiggs and Lewis was challenged by Kallet-Marx and again by Kennelly 2003 against the evidence of Pericles’ accounting of the city’s assets in 431 in Thu. 2.13.3. The exact date of the decree in the second half of the 5th century does not affect the identification of the *opisthodomos* as the rear chamber of the Old Athena Temple.

⁴⁴ *IG I³ 52A*, lines 15–18: *hoῦτοι δὲ ταμειούντων ἐμ πόλει ἐν τῷ Ὀπισθ[οδό]μοι τὰ τῶν θεῶν χρέματα ἡόσα δυνατόν καὶ ὄσιον, καὶ συνανοιγόν|τον καὶ συγκλειόντων τὰς θύρας τῷ Ὀπισθοδόμῳ καὶ συσσεμαινόσθ|ον τοῖς τῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας ταμίαις.*

⁴⁵ *IG I³ 52B*, lines 23–25: *τα[μειεύεσθ]ο τ|[ἄ μὲν τῆς Ἀθ]ηναίας χρέματα [ἐν τῷ] ἐπὶ δεξιά τῷ Ὀπισ[θοδό]μῳ, τὰ δ|[ἐ τῶν ἄλλων θ]εῶν ἐν τῷ ἐπ’ ἀρ[ιστερ]ά*

secure Treasury of Athena in the mid-fifth century was indeed the rear room of the Old Athena Temple.⁴⁶

On the combined evidence up to this point then, it is most probable that at least the western half of the Archaic temple remained standing and functional after 480 BCE. The west room, the *opisthodomos*, was able to be closed and locked for the security of the treasury held inside, and so probably underwent at least minimal repairs to its roof and doors after Persian sack. To the east of the *opisthodomos* some part of the temple remained, sufficient to protect the ancient cult statue of Athena under the care of the Praxiergidai. This could have been the whole east cella, probably again with repair to the roof, a reduced segment of the east cella, or perhaps the area of the twin chambers at the center of the building, converted into a space usable as a cella. Any of these possibilities is a more likely home for the most sacred Athenian image over several decades than a temporary “baldacchino” in the open area to the north of the temple suggested by W. Dinsmoor on L. Holland’s scant evidence of vanished small enclosure in this area.⁴⁷

During the last third of the 5th century, the elaborate Ionic complex now known as the Erechtheion was constructed immediately north of the eastern half of the area of the Old Athena Temple. The Karyatid Porch jutting out from the south wall of the building rests directly on the Dörpfeld foundations, where the northern peristyle would previously have stood. The

⁴⁶ Linders 2007. Curtius (1890, 163) was the first to suggest that the western room of the Dörpfeld Temple remained standing as a freestanding structure called “the *opisthodomos*” after the Persian sack. This view has remained popular: Dinsmoor 1932b, 316–317; 1947, 140; Travlos 1971, 143; Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 161; Harris 1995, 40–41 (with earlier bibliography on the debate).

⁴⁷ Dinsmoor 1932b, esp. 318; 1947, 109–110 n. 4; Holland 1924a, 16–23; 1924c, 407–421. Dinsmoor admitted that Dörpfeld was correct in insisting on the complete absence of evidence for an earlier temple beneath the Erechtheion, but clung to Holland’s “small but vanished enclosure” in the area of the east cella as the underpinning for his construction of the later history of the Erechtheion. The idea of this “pre-Erechtheion” as a “small but still functioning shrine of Athena Polias” found new life in Hurwit 1999, 144–145 with fig. 115, and 2004, 166.

Pandroseion, an open-air enclosure below and west of the Erechtheion proper, used the temple's huge foundations as its southern retaining wall.⁴⁸ This physical connection between the old and the new buildings was probably indicative of a close ideological and perhaps ritual connection between the structures as well; Athena and Erechtheus, one of the chief occupants of the new shrine complex, were closely linked on the Acropolis at least since the legendary formulation of the Homeric Catalogue of Ships, where Athena installed Erechtheus in his own temple.⁴⁹ Herodotus places the pre-Persian shrine of Erechtheus within the sacred precinct of the Acropolis, the ἱρόν, by which he surely meant the sanctuary of Athena Polias.⁵⁰ Similarly, in Euripides' *Erechtheus*, staged in 423/2, Athena instructs Erechtheus' widow to construct his σήκος, "sacred enclosure" or "precinct."⁵¹ Holland's small enclosure in the area of the east cella could perhaps reflect this earlier σήκος.⁵² We should thus view the new and innovative Erechtheion as a part of the larger sacred complex of Athena Polias, physically and spiritually connected, though a distinct and separate precinct.

Several inscribed building accounts related to the Erechtheion show that the two structures were administratively connected as well, though they have not been read this way.

⁴⁸ On the visibility of the Old Athena Temple foundations below the Karyatid Porch and in the Pandroseion, see Rhodes 1995, 34.

⁴⁹ Hom. *Il.* 2.546–51, following Ferrari's reading of ἐῶ ἐν πίονι νηῶ in line 249 as "in his own temple," with non-reflexive ἐός, rather than "in her own temple" as often taken; see Ferrari 2002, 16, n. 29.

⁵⁰ Hdt. 8.55 (in his famous report of the miraculous regrowth of Athena's sacred olive tree the day after the Persian sack): ἔστι ἐν τῇ ἀκροπόλει ταύτῃ Ἐρεχθέος τοῦ γηγενέος λεγομένου εἶναι νηός, ἐν τῷ ἐλαίῳ τε καὶ θάλασσα ἐνι... ταύτην ὧν τὴν ἐλαίην ἅμα τῷ ἄλλῳ ἱρῷ κατέλαβε ἐμπρησθῆναι ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων. Herodotus' use of the term νηός for the shrine of Erechtheus has been shown by Jeppesen (1987, 38–44) to be inappropriately used (though Jeppesen's overall theory of an "alternative Erechtheion" in the House of the Arrephoroi has not found support, nor has Robertson's fanciful revision [1996, 37–44]). Dionysius of Halicarnassus, following Herodotus' account of the miraculous olive tree, corrects νηός to σηκός, "precinct" (*Ant. Rom.* 14.2: Ἀθήνησι μὲν ἐν τοῦ γηγενοῦς Ἐρεχθέως τῷ σηκῷ ἱερά τις ὑπ' Ἀθηναῖς φυτευθεῖσα ἐλαία). Dinsmoor (1947, 323–324) unwarrantedly took this passage as evidence that the Erechtheion was started before the Peloponnesian War.

⁵¹ Austin 1968, fr. 65, 90–91.

⁵² Holland 1924a, 16–23; 1924c, 407–421.

There is debate about when construction of the Erechtheion began, but by 409/8 BCE it was nearing completion.⁵³ In that year the *epistatai* in charge of supervising the project produced an inscribed record of the state of the work, perhaps at the end of their term, revealing that the Karyatid Porch was nearly completed and the frieze of Eleusinian limestone had been partly set, while more work remained on the walls at the southwest corner, toward the Kekropion.⁵⁴ The heading of this report names the members of the board of overseers as [ἐ]πιστάται τῷ νεῷ τῷ ἐμ πόλει ἐν ἡδὶ τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἄγαλμα, the “overseers of the temple on the Acropolis in which [is] the ancient statue.”⁵⁵ While this has conventionally been read as an indication that the ἀρχαῖον ἄγαλμα of Athena was housed in the Erechtheion (and by extension that the Erechtheion *became* the Temple of Athena Polias, the “*archaios neos*,” and “the *Opisthodomos*”)⁵⁶ it is more clearly and more easily understood at face value—as an indication that the Erechtheion project was overseen by the officials in charge of the temple that held the ancient cult statue of Athena

⁵³ The traditional view dates the beginning of the project to 421 and the Peace of Nikias, and so not formally part of Pericles’ designs. There is growing consensus, though, that it was at least projected if not begun in the 430s. Korres (1997, 243 with n. 99; cf. 2003, 24) attributes the plan to Mnesikles and dates construction to 438–431, contemporary with the Propylaia, without accounting for the later building accounts. For a summary of the changing tide, see Hurwit 2004, 173–174, 275, n. 25.

⁵⁴ *IG I³ 474*. The largest fragment is the opisthographic “Chandler Stele,” removed from the steps of a house on the Acropolis by Richard Chandler in 1765, now in the British Museum (1785,0527.1). Also belonging to the main set of Erechtheion building account inscriptions are *IG I³ 475*, 409/8 BCE; and *IG I³ 476*, 408/7 (and 407/6?) BCE. For texts, translations, and discussion related to the architecture, see esp. Caskey 1927.

⁵⁵ *IG I³ 474*, line 1.

⁵⁶ For a summary and defense of this most widely accepted traditional view of the Erechtheion, see Hurwit 2004, 166–168.

Polias.⁵⁷ As we have seen, the evidence suggests that this temple was indeed still the Old Athena Temple; therefore, the building account shows that the Erechtheion itself was considered part of the existing Athena Polias sanctuary.

An earlier precedent for a board of *epistatai* with responsibility over a larger area or set of projects than simply one distinct building on the Acropolis is found in an Eleusinian decree of ca. 450 BCE.⁵⁸ Here a certain Thespheus proposed that a board of overseers be established to take charge of the property of the Eleusinian goddess on the model of the Athenian board “in charge of the works on the Acropolis who supervised the temple and the statue” (καθάπερ ἡοὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐμ πόλει ἔργοις ἐπεστάτων τῶν νεδὶ καὶ τῶ ἀγάλματι).⁵⁹ In the years preceding the construction of the Parthenon, *the* temple and *the* statue on the Acropolis, used without qualification outside Athens proper, are again most easily taken as the Old Athena Temple and its ancient cult image of Athena Polias.⁶⁰ Perhaps this board supervised whatever repair or restoration the temple

⁵⁷ This is the literal reading called for by Ferrari: “Strictly speaking, what the building accounts from 409/8 allow us to say is that the *epistatai* of the temple that housed the ancient image were in charge of the construction of the Erechtheum. That the Erechtheum and that temple are one and the same is a reasonable inference, which, however, *contradicts all other available evidence* [my emphasis]. One may then consider an alternate interpretation: that the charge of the overseers of the Archaic temple, with its statue, extended to other shrines on the Acropolis, or at least shrines that might be considered part of its temenos, namely the Pandroseum, Cecropium, and Erechtheum” (2002, 17). Ferrari’s further suggestion that *IG I³ 474* recorded construction work on both the Old Athena Temple and the Erechtheion has been refuted by Pakkanen (2006), who showed that all the blocks listed in the account fit better the known architecture and measurements of the Erechtheion. Some scholars (e.g. Gerding 2006), have taken Pakkanen’s deconstruction of this particular argument as disproof of the whole of Ferrari’s thesis (“that after the Persian sack the temple was left standing and made into a monument to barbarian sacrilege and Athenian righteousness,” 14), which it plainly is not.

⁵⁸ *IG I³ 32*. For the history of scholarship on this decree, see Cavanaugh 1980, Ch. 2, 33–100 and 1996, Ch. 2, 19–27. Marginesu (2010, 35–36) has recently renewed the argument for a later date, and cf. now Tracy 2014, 113.

⁵⁹ *IG I³ 32*, lines 10–13: τούτο|[ς] δὲ ἐπισ[τῆ]ναί [τ]οῖς χρέμασι τοῖς τοῖν θ|[ε]οῖν καθάπερ ἡοὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐμ πό[λ]ει ἔργ[ο]ι|[ς] ἐπεστ[ά]των τῶν νεδὶ καὶ τῶ ἀ[γ]άλματι.
Ferrari (2002, 17–18) points out that the use of the imperfect ἐπεστάτων indicates that the Athenian board was already in existence and had either completed or was continuing its task at the time of the decree.

⁶⁰ On the assumption that nothing was left of the Archaic temple after the sack, Mattingly (1961, 171–173; 1984, 347) and others argued for a date in the 430s for this inscription. Ferrari (2002, 18, n. 41) points out the circularity of this reasoning.

underwent in the aftermath of the Persian sack, among other ἔργα on the Acropolis. It should not be considered an anomaly, then, for the *epistatai* overseeing the Temple of Athena Polias infrastructure to also be in charge of the Erechtheion project.

In 406 BCE, shortly after the completion of the new Erechtheion complex, a fire broke out in the Archaic temple. Xenophon mentions this fire as one of the major events of the year, along with a lunar eclipse: τῷ δ' ἐπιόντι ἔτει, ᾧ ἢ τε σελήνη ἐξέλιπεν ἐσπέρας καὶ ὁ παλαιὸς τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεὸς ἐν Ἀθήναις ἐνεπρήσθη.⁶¹ This is the only reference to a *παλαιός* temple of Athena in Athens, rather than the more conventional ἀρχαῖος νεός, and should be understood as referring to the Old Athena Temple.⁶² Neither the brand new Erechtheion complex nor the thirty-year-old Parthenon could have been named in such an unmarked way as simply “old.” About this same time, in 407/6 or 406/5, “the *archaios neos*” shows up in the Parthenon inventories for the first time,⁶³ when several dedications were transferred to the Hekatompedon (i.e., the cella of the Parthenon)⁶⁴ “from the *archaios neos*.”⁶⁵ Linders has demonstrated convincingly that around this same time, i.e., shortly after the fire, the monetary treasury that had been kept in the

⁶¹ Xen. *Hell.* 1.6.1.

⁶² See Casevitz 2004 for an argument about the semantic difference between ἀρχαῖος and παλαιός in the Classical period. No real distinction seems to hold here.

⁶³ A similar inscribed inventory (*IG I³ 403*) dating 416/5 and referring to the removal of objects from the *archaios neos* to the Parthenon (lines 18, 21) is tantalizing since it definitely precedes the completion of the Erechtheion, but it probably refers to the sanctuary of Artemis at Brauron. See Linders 1972, 14–16; Ferrari 2002, 17, n. 37.

⁶⁴ See Linders 2007 for the establishment of the nomenclature of the various parts of the building now known as the Parthenon in the inscribed inventories. On the Acropolis inventories generally, see esp. Harris 1995 and Hamilton 2000, Ch. 4, 247–344. They were first published in 434 BCE and continued with modifications to the system until the end of the 4th century.

⁶⁵ *IG I³ 341*, line 2. There is debate about whether this fragmentary inscription and *IG I³ 342* should be considered part of the same series as the earlier Hekatompedon inventories. Samons (2000, 286–287) interprets their anomalies as markers of the coming financial ruin of the city, while West and Woodward (1938, 77) see *IG I³ 341 = IG II² 1383* as evidence of a regime change; see also Hamilton 2000, 291, n. 34.

opisthodomos of the Old Athena Temple was transferred to rear room of the Parthenon.⁶⁶ Another set of inscriptions that have been associated with the Erechtheion building accounts, though they post-date the completion of the building, attest to repair work to “the parts of the temple that were burned,”⁶⁷ perhaps more specifically “on the walls towards the Pandroseion,”⁶⁸ in the years after 406/5.⁶⁹ Elaborate narratives have been constructed to suggest that these repairs were made on the Erechtheion itself, victim of the spreading fire, but again the most straightforward reading of the combined evidence is that the Old Temple of Athena suffered a fire in 406, had some of its dedications and treasury moved to the Parthenon for safekeeping, and underwent repairs.⁷⁰

After these repairs were completed the treasury seems to have been returned to the *Opisthodomos*, and dedications were again kept in the temple. At the climax of Aristophanes’ *Plutus*, staged in 388 BCE, Ploutos (Wealth) is resettled “where he used to reside, in the *Opisthodomos* of the Goddess,” to always keep guard over the treasures within.⁷¹ As several ancient scholiasts and more recent commentators have noted, this meant that wealth itself, rather than, e.g., a statue of Ploutos, was to returned to the *Opisthodomos*, since that was where the

⁶⁶ Linders 2007.

⁶⁷ IG II² 1654, line 28: τῶ τε γεὼ τὰ κεκα[υμένα (Lambert 2000, 159).

⁶⁸ IG II² 1654, lines 35–36: ἐπὶ τῶν τοίχων — — — —] | .ς κατὰ τὸ Πανδρόσειο[v — — — .

⁶⁹ Lambert (2000) establishes the date of the upper and lower fragments of IG II² 1654 as 406/5 and 405/4, respectively. This inscription along with IG I³ 477–479, although written in the Ionic script rather than Attic, is associated with the earlier Erechtheion accounts based on the repetition of names of workmen in the two sets, as Lambert convincingly demonstrated. See also Lewis’ note following IG I³ 479 for further bibliography.

⁷⁰ Buchert (2000, 217) and Hartmann (2010, 184 with n. 831) suggest that IG XII.1 977 = IG I³ 1454, a document concerning the relationship between the Athenians and a community on Karpathos, also relates to the post-fire repair of the Old Athena Temple. While the cypress the Eteokarpathians gave for “the temple of Athena who cares for Athenians” (lines 9–11, trans. Ma) may indeed have been for the Old Athena Temple, as Ma maintains, the date of the inscription and the gift might be better in the 440s or 430s, rather than the date of 394/3 given by Hartmann. See esp. Ma 2009, 129–136, 143, n. 11.

⁷¹ Ar. *Plut.* 1191–1193: ἰδρυσόμεθ’ οὖν αὐτίκα μάλ’, ἀλλὰ περίμενε | τὸν Πλοῦτον, οὗπερ πρότερον ἦν ἰδρυμένος | τὸν ὀπισθόδομον ἀεὶ φυλάττων τῆς θεοῦ. An earlier version of the comedy was staged in 408 BCE.

treasury (τὸ ταμειῶν or τὰ χρήματα) was kept.⁷² One scholiast located this *opisthodomos* “behind the temple called the Temple of Athena Polias” and another “behind the Temple of Athena.”⁷³

Linders believes that after the fire of 406 the Old Athena Temple went out of use entirely, and that the rear room of the Parthenon was hereafter called “the *opisthodomos*.”⁷⁴ The epigraphic evidence of repairs to the “the parts of the temple that were burned” and Aristophanes’ ability to speak of Wealth returning to the *Opisthodomos* argues instead for the re-establishment of the treasury in the rear chamber and the continued functioning of whatever was left of the temple in front of the *opisthodomos*.⁷⁵ Additionally, in the 4th century inventories began to be inscribed to record dedications “in the *archaios neos*,” echoing the transfer of items “from the *archaios neos*” at the time of the 406 fire.⁷⁶ These inventories as preserved record a coherent and stable group of dedications each year from 374 to 367.⁷⁷ Our corpus is much diminished for the ensuing decades, but the inventories “in the *archaios neos*” continue as the

⁷² Holzinger 1979, 322. For the scholia, see Chantry 1994, 189–190.

⁷³ Chantry 1994, 189–190, no. 1193a, α (ὀπίσω τοῦ νέου τῆς καλουμένης Πολιάδος Ἀθηνᾶς διπλοῦς τοῖχος ἦν, ἔχων θύραν, ὅπου ἦν θησαυροφυλάκιον) and β (ἐνθα ἦν τὸ ταμειῶν, ὀπισθεν τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ναοῦ). Other scholiasts and lexicographers explaining “*opisthodomos*” as behind the Temple of Athena are collected by Ferrari (2002, 15, n. 21). As Ferrari astutely points out, against the claim that the Erechtheion became the Temple of Athena Polias while the rear chamber of the Archaic temple stood alone, “from no significant viewpoint on the Acropolis, however, this *Opisthodomos* would appear to be behind the Erechtheum and, in effect, anyone looking for it there would find himself in the Pandroseum” (2002, 15).

⁷⁴ Linders 2007, esp. 781.

⁷⁵ Linders (2007, 781) gives a misleading reading of the *Plutus* passage that ignores the οὐπὲρ πρότερον ἢν ἰδρυμένος (translated by Linders as “again,” without providing the Greek text).

⁷⁶ These have generally been treated as “Treasures of the Erechtheion,” following the conventional narrative argued against here. See, e.g., Harris 1995, Part VI. Hamilton (2000, 260) is more circumspect. Both Harris and Hamilton provide translations of the collected inventories, Harris’ arranged by item classification and Hamilton’s by physical location over time.

⁷⁷ Hamilton 2000, 260. This group of 24 objects contains mostly gold and gilded items. Many are crowns, including that dedicated by Konon, and others dedicated in the 390s.

most coherent group after 340, continuing all the way to 305/4.⁷⁸ Among the inventoried items is a group of objects that are almost certainly the ornaments for the ancient wooden cult statue of Athena Polias, including: “a diadem, 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.”⁷⁹ This group of ornaments is present in seven of the years for which there are extant inventories, spanning 375/4 to 314/3.⁸⁰ We should thus imagine the continued presence of the ancient image and her accoutrement in her customary *archaios neos* through at least the 4th century.⁸¹

Demosthenes records another(?) fire, this time “in the *Opisthodomos*,” which is the last extant reference to simply “the *Opisthodomos*” in the ancient sources. The reference is in his speech against Timocrates delivered in 353/2 BCE, but the date of the fire to which he refers cannot be precisely established.⁸² It is conceivably the same fire as that recorded by Xenophon in 406 BCE. At any rate, this passage is certainly not conclusive evidence for the final destruction

⁷⁸ Harris 1995, 206; Hamilton 2000, 266.

⁷⁹ *IG* II² 1424a, lines 362–366: στεφάνη, ἣν ἡ θεὸς | ἔχει· πλάστρα, ἃ ἡ θεὸς ἔχει· ὄχθοιβος, ὃν ἔχει ἐπὶ τῷ | τραχήλῳ· ὄρμοι πέντε· γλαυξ χρυσοῦ· αἰγὶς χρυσοῦ· | γοργόνειον χρυσοῦν· φιάλη χρυσοῦ, ἣν ἐν τῇ χειρὶ | ἔχει

⁸⁰ Harris 1995, 209, no. VI 20.

⁸¹ Harris’ summation of the significance of the *archaios neos* inventories is insightful. Though she believes the “*archaios neos*” was the Erechtheion, her conclusions are all the more meaningful when the Old Athena Temple is considered the referent: “The range of items in the [*archaios neos*] was neither so broad nor so multitudinous as in the Parthenon. It might be explained by the suggestion that the [*archaios neos*] was the primary cult centre of the fourth-century Akropolis, and had to be functional. It could not have been crowded with as many items as filled the Hekatompedon, since it was necessary to have room to worship and to take care of the wooden image. The sacrificial knife, incense-burner, phialai, and *aporranterion* were all functional objects which may have played important roles in the ceremonies. The description of such items in the inventories is a primary source of evidence for the use of the temple in the period of its prime” (1995, 221–222).

⁸² Dem. 24.136: καὶ οἱ ταμίαι ἐφ’ ὃν ὁ Ὀπισθόδομος ἐνεπρήσθη, καὶ οἱ τῶν τῆς θεοῦ καὶ οἱ τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν...

of the Old Athena Temple or its rear chamber, as it has sometimes been interpreted.⁸³ It is best taken simply as an indication that an audience of the late 350s would have understood what “the *Opisthodomos*” was without further qualification. It follows that it is most likely the same structure to which Aristophanes referred in the 380s.

One final and much later reference to an *opisthodomos* lends weight to the identification of “the *opisthodomos*” of the 4th century as the rear room of the Old Athena Temple, and suggests that it was thus understood for centuries. In Plutarch’s life of Demetrios Poliorketes the Athenians devise as a special honor for Demetrios that he should lodge “in the *opisthodomos* of the Parthenon” (ὀπισθόδομος τοῦ Παρθενῶνος) with the *Parthenos* herself.⁸⁴ By the time of Demosthenes the term ὁ παρθενῶν was used for the whole of building we too now call the Parthenon.⁸⁵ Plutarch is thus probably accurately reflecting the terminology in use at the end of the 4th century. Therefore, to specify the back room of the Parthenon, he had to be explicit; had he written simply “the *opisthodomos*” alone, presumably the rear chamber of the old Temple of Athena Polias would have been understood.⁸⁶ If, as Linders believes, “the *Opisthodomos*” could

⁸³ Nor is there any reason to assume with Linders (2007, 781) that it can only refer to the rear chamber of the Parthenon and not the rear chamber of the Old Athena Temple. Linders’ reasoning here is circular, and based on her misreading of Aristophanes *Plut.* 1191–1193 (see above, n. 71). The date of Demosthenes’ fire has been much debated. I find it most likely that Demosthenes too refers to the fire of 406, despite his promise to cite examples only after the archonship of Eukleidos (403/2 BCE, 24.133), but no arguments regarding this fire are entirely convincing. I disagree with Linders (2007, 781, n. 34) that Demosthenes’ specification of both the Treasurers of Athena and the Treasurers of the Other Gods precludes a date when the two bodies issued inventories together, from 406 to 385 BCE. Dinsmoor first dated Demosthenes’ fire to 377/6 (1932a, 160–169), then to 353 (1947, 128, n. 93), thinking it the final destruction of the *opisthodomos* of the Old Athena Temple, while Dörpfeld maintained (1934, 251–252) that there was only one fire, in 406.

⁸⁴ *Plut. Vit. Demetr.* 23.3: τὸν γὰρ ὀπισθόδομον τοῦ Παρθενῶνος ἀπέδειξαν αὐτῷ κατάλυσιν: κάκεϊ δίαιταν εἶχε, τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς λεγομένης ὑποδέχεσθαι καὶ ξενίζειν αὐτόν, οὐ πάνυ κόσμιον ξένον οὐδὲ ὡς παρθένῳ πρῶως ἐπισταθμεύοντα.

⁸⁵ *Dem.* 22.76. At the beginning of the Parthenon’s life, ὁ παρθενῶν seems to have referred, in the inscribed inventories, specifically to the rear chamber of the building; see Linders 2007.

⁸⁶ Linders (2007, 778) reads this passage nonsensically, as evidence that the *opisthodomos* was located in the Parthenon in both Plutarch and Demetrios’s time.

only mean the back room of the Parthenon in 304 BCE and later—if, that is, the Old Athena Temple was by then completely gone—Plutarch had no need of such redundant language.

After the inscribed temple and treasury inventories cease, our evidence for the topography of the Acropolis grows more sparse. Still, we are not completely in the dark, and there is ample evidence to show that the Old Athena Temple remained a key location for the display of certain significant documents and honors. The famous “Chremonides decree” of the 260s BCE stipulates that the alliance between the Athenians, Spartans, other Greeks, and Ptolemy II against Antigonos Gonatas of Macedonia be inscribed on a bronze stele set up on the Acropolis beside the Temple of Athena Polias.⁸⁷ A century later, between 169 and 134 BCE, the *demos* honored a certain Ptolemaios, perhaps a senior official of the Egyptian king, with a bronze equestrian statue set up beside the same temple.⁸⁸ Importantly, the wording of this decree equates the Temple of Athena Polias explicitly with “the *archaios neos*”: *παρὰ τὸν νεὸν τὸν ἀρχαῖον τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος*.⁸⁹ This is a strong indication of continuity, suggesting that the Old Athena Temple, the *archaios neos*, remained the functioning Temple of Athena Polias as in previous centuries. It also attests to the continued venerable respect accorded the old temple, since a

⁸⁷ *IG* II² 687, lines 43–44: ἐν στήλῃ χαλκ[ῆ] καὶ στήσῃ ἐ]ν ἀκροπόλει παρὰ τὸν νεὸν τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος. See Austin 2006, 130–133, no. 61 for bibliography on the Chremonides decree, including debates over its date.

⁸⁸ *IG* I³ 983. Habicht (1992, 81–82) convincingly argues that this Ptolemaios, son of Ptolemaios, should not be identified with any king or prince, given the lack of customary titles and the ubiquity of the name in Egypt at this time.

⁸⁹ *IG* I³ 983, lines 4–6: στήσῃ | [δὲ] αὐτοῦ καὶ [εἰ]κόν[α] χαλκῆν ἐφ’ [ἵππου τὸν δῆμον παρὰ τὸν] | [νε]ὸν τὸν ἀρχαῖον τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος.

honorary statue in this spot was a unique and significant honor, designed to be visible to all those coming from Egypt and to make the Athenians' gratitude public, as the decree proclaims.⁹⁰

At the very end of the 2nd century too, the Temple of Athena Polias is attested in two extant inscribed decrees. One, dated 108/7 BCE, honors the *parthenoi* who have worked the wool for the *peplos* of Athena and calls for the erection of a marble stele “beside the Temple of Athena Polias.”⁹¹ This decree is preceded on the same stele by another more fragmentary decree of the same year that has been plausibly restored to involve regulation of the Panathenaic procession, including the handing over of the *peplos* to the Praxiergidai.⁹² The location for the display of this stele was clearly influenced by its content and connection to the cult of Athena Polias, and we might even imagine that it was set up next to the Praxiergidai decree of the mid-5th century.⁹³ Another fragmentary decree of ca. 100 attests one more time to “beside the Temple of Athena Polias” as a special place for display, perhaps in this case along with the Agora.⁹⁴

Though the above-mentioned honorary decree for Ptolemaios in the mid-2nd century is the latest epigraphic reference to “the *archaios neos*,” the geographer Strabo supplies key evidence that the name remained current at the end of the 1st century BCE. In his succinct but

⁹⁰ *IG* I³ 983, lines 6–9: ὅπως ἢ αὐτῶι ἀπο[[δ]ιδομένη τιμὴ πᾶσι τοῖς ἀφικ[νουμένοις ἐξ Αἰγύπτου κατα][φα]νῆς ὑπάρχει καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίν[ηται] πρωτεύων ἐν χά[[ρι]τος ἀποδόσει. These are of course common Athenian “formulae of disclosure,” but not therefore insignificant; see esp. Hedrick 1999, whose restoration of φαίνηται πρωτεύων I follow (p. 426). Habicht (1992, 82, n. 84) points out that ἐξ Αἰγύπτου in line 7, while probable, could also be restored as, e.g., ἐκ Κυρήνης or ἐκ Κύπρου. See also Kotsidu 2000, 419–420, n. 297.

⁹¹ *IG* II² 1036, line 25: ἐν ἀκροπόλει παρὰ τὸν ναὸν τῆς Ἀθη[νᾶς τῆς Πολιάδος

⁹² *IG* II² 1060. On the restoration of Πραξιεργίδαι in line 2, see the new edition by Aleshire and Lambert (2003, 71). Robertson (2004, 139–148) agrees with this but takes a different view of the some of the details of ritual in these two decrees.

⁹³ On the location of the stele, see Aleshire and Lambert 2003, 79 and Robertson 2004, 140.

⁹⁴ *IG* II² 1055, lines 24–26. On the date of this decree, dealing at least in part with a grant of citizenship, see Osborne 1976, 120–121.

well-researched description of the Acropolis,⁹⁵ he clearly states that there are two temples of Athena on the citadel, the *archaios neos* of the Polias, in which is the ever-burning lamp, and the Parthenon, which was built by Iktinos, in which is the ivory statue of Athena, the work of Pheidias: ἐπὶ δὲ τῇ πέτρᾳ τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερόν ὃ τε ἀρχαῖος νεὸς τῆς Πολιάδος ἐν ᾧ ὁ ἄσβεστος λύχνος, καὶ ὁ παρθενῶν ὃν ἐποίησεν Ἰκτῖνος, ἐν ᾧ τὸ τοῦ Φειδίου ἔργον ἐλεφάντινον ἡ Ἀθηνᾶ.⁹⁶

The conventional identification of Strabo’s “*archaios neos* of the Polias” has been the Erechtheion, based on the assumption—now shown to be highly dubious—that the Old Athena Temple had disappeared, leaving the Erechtheion and the Parthenon as the largest structures on the citadel. This identification of the *archaios neos* and the Temple of Athena Polias with the Erechtheion was then retrojected into the preceding centuries, requiring elaborate contortions of all the evidence laid out above.⁹⁷ As with that evidence, we are best to take Strabo straightforwardly at his word and recognize that the Old Athena Temple and the Parthenon remained the only two major temples on the Acropolis at the turn of the first century.⁹⁸

Vitruvius, writing at about the same time but with characteristic ambiguity, compares the Temple of Castor in the Circus Flaminius at Rome with a temple on the Athenian Acropolis and the Temple of Athena at Sounion (*Athenis in arce et in Attica Sunio Palladis Minervae*). All three

⁹⁵ 9.1.16. Strabo recuses himself from a lengthier description, citing the periegete Polemon of Ilion’s four books on the dedications on the Acropolis.

⁹⁶ Strabo 9.1.16.

⁹⁷ For an excellent treatment of the history of scholarship on this and related questions, see Ferrari 2002, 11–13. Two examples of such contortions are the claim that the Praxiergidai inscription refers to the site of the Erechtheion, several decades before its construction (e.g., Lewis 1954, 20; Harris 1995, 201), and that the old statue was housed in the Erechtheion while it was under construction, despite its age, fragility, and sacredness (e.g. Dinsmoor 1932b, 319; Harris 1995, 202).

⁹⁸ As Ferrari (2002, 15) usefully points out, even if Strabo were using the term “*archaios neos*” in a purely descriptive sense rather than in accordance with the conventional established nomenclature, “in that case he draws a distinction between an old and venerable structure (which, therefore, cannot be the Erechtheum) and the Classical Parthenon.”

had cellas double in length compared with their breadth, according to Vitruvius, and with the features usually on the fronts transferred to the sides.⁹⁹ We should probably read *Palladis Minervae* with *Athenis in arce* as well as *in Attica Sunio*, but this is not hugely helpful in making sense of the reference.¹⁰⁰ Based on the known plan of the Temple of Athena at Sounion, it seems most likely that Vitruvius was comparing it with the unique plan of the Erechtheion.¹⁰¹ Although little weight should be put on this passage, it could indicate that indeed the Erechtheion complex was considered a part of the Sanctuary of Athena Polias, as demonstrated above in its earlier history, to the point of possible conflation by imprecise commentators.

This brings us to the well-worn passage of Pausanias, the last extant ancient reference to the Temple of Athena Polias. Pausanias' description of the north side of the Acropolis has been unnecessarily impugned and much of the confusion in modern scholarship has been blamed on the supposed confusion of his narrative. A reader who does not assume that nothing remained of the Old Athena Temple in the mid-2nd century CE will find Pausanias a helpful guide. When he makes his way to the north side of the Acropolis from the eastern end, after a long digression on Olympiodoros (1.25.2–26.3), he reminds himself to pick up his narrative, since his task is a description of all Greek things, πάντα τὰ Ἑλληνικά (1.26.4). He thus moves on to Endoios' Athena discussed at the beginning of this chapter, and then a “building called the Erechtheion”:

⁹⁹ Vitr. *De arch.* 4.8.4: *hoc autem genere primo facta est, uti est Castoris in circo, Athenis in arce et in Attica Sunio Palladis Minervae. earum non aliae sed eadem sunt proportiones. cellae enim longitudinibus duplices sunt ad latitudines uti reliquae; ex is omnia, quae solent esse in frontibus, ad latera sunt translata.*

¹⁰⁰ Not all translators read it this way; e.g., Rowland 1999, 61: “the temple on the Acropolis in Athens, and in Attica, at Sunium, the temple of Pallas Minerva.”

¹⁰¹ Some have understood him to refer to the Parthenon, but his description is thus extremely difficult to make sense of. Dörpfeld suggested the idea that perhaps parts of the peristyle of the Old Athena Temple had been preserved or re-erected on two sides, such that it indeed mirrored the colonnades of the Temple of Athena at Sounion. This is a creative suggestion, but of course difficult to support, and was rejected by Dörpfeld himself as not impossible but very improbable (1919, 26).

ἔστι δὲ καὶ οἶκημα Ἐρέχθειον καλούμενον (1.26.5). He mentions the altar of Zeus Hypatos outside the entrance, then describes the interior of this building: there are altars to Poseidon (also used for sacrifice to Erechtheus), Butes, and Hephaestus; the walls have paintings of the *genos* of the Butadae; there is a remarkable sea-water cistern; the mark of Poseidon's trident is on the rock. He also notes, presumably by way of explaining how so many different sorts of things were in one building, that the building is double—διπλοῦν γὰρ ἔστι τὸ οἶκημα (1.26.5).

Then Pausanias transitions rather abruptly, as is his wont, to Athena. He begins (μέν) by emphasizing that both the city and the whole land are sacred to Athena, that she is honored even in the demes where other gods are worshipped, but (δέ) that the most holy symbol for all, even before the demes were brought together, was the ἄγαλμα of Athena on the Acropolis (1.26.6). He mentions the legend that this statue fell from the sky, and describes the wonder of Athena's ever-burning golden lamp, made for her by Kallimachus, with its fireproof wick, and a bronze palm above reaching to the roof to draw off the smoke (1.26.7). After a short digression on the reputation of this Kallimachus, Pausanias returns to Athena, now specifying objects in the temple of the Polias (κεῖται δὲ ἐν τῷ ναῷ τῆς Πολιάδος, 1.27.1): a wooden Hermes obscured by myrtle boughs and the noteworthy ancient dedications including a folding stool made by Daedalos, and Persian spoils, namely the breastplate of Masistios and the sword said to have belonged to Mardonius.¹⁰² Pausanias expresses skepticism that the Athenians could actually have acquired Mardonius' sword, then reports that there is not much to report about Athena's olive tree, other than its miraculous regrowth after the Persian sack (1.27.1–2).

¹⁰² Could this Hermes be the ἀνδριάς whose *aporranterion* is listed in the *archaios neos* inventories (e.g., *IG II²* 1424, lines 10–11)?

From the Temple of Athena he moves on to the adjacent temple of Pandrosos (τῷ ναῷ δὲ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς Πανδρόσου ναὸς συνεχῆς ἐστὶ, 1.27.3), then relates what he learned about the ritual of the *arrephoroi*, who dwell not far from the Temple of the Polias (παρθένοι δύο τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Πολιάδος οἰκοῦσιν οὐ πόρρω, 1.27.3). Afterwards he begins to discuss the statues in the area of the Temple of Athena (πρὸς δὲ τῷ ναῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἔστι..., 1.27.4), including one the Athenians call Erechtheus and the ἄγαλματα ἀρχαῖα of Athena burnt by the Persians (1.27.6). After several stories inspired by the statues round about, Pausanias has made his way to the Athena Promachos of Pheidias (1.28.2) and soon continues west to begin his descent from the Acropolis (1.28.4).

Pausanias' account accords well with the picture of the Old Athena Temple environs built up by the earlier literary, epigraphic, and archaeological sources. Approaching from the east, he first encounters the Erechtheion with its numerous altars and elements, then moves next door to the Temple of Athena, which, as we have seen, was probably best or only preserved at its west end after the Persian sack. He then continues to the northwest, first to the adjacent Pandroseion, which used the massive temple foundations as its southern wall, and then on to the house of the Arrephoroi.

We need not be overly concerned by Pausanias' prolepsis in first addressing the centrality of Athena in the religious history of the city and the wondrous story of her statue's heavenly provenance before directly naming "the temple of the Polias." Pausanias frequently employs this kind of transition, beginning first to explain a legend, historical event, or artist related to a building or statue before explicitly mentioning the object itself. We can see this technique, for example, in his description of the Endoios Athena, which begins not with the statue itself but with Pausanias' knowledge of the artist: Ἐνδοῖος ἦν γένος μὲν Ἀθηναῖος, Δαιδάλου δὲ μαθητής,

ὅς καὶ φεύγοντι Δαιδάλω διὰ τὸν Κάλω θάνατον ἐπηκολούθησεν ἐς Κρήτην (1.26.4). This then leads into his report of the statue and its inscription: τούτου καθήμενόν ἐστιν Ἀθηνᾶς ἄγαλμα, ἐπίγραμμα ἔχον ὡς Καλλίας μὲν ἀναθείη, ποιήσκει δὲ Ἐνδοῖος (1.26.4). We should read Pausanias' grand statement about all of Athens and Attica as sacred to Athena (1.26.6) as a sign that he has now moved on from the Erechtheion which he has just been describing. When he does specify "the temple of the Polias" in 1.27.1, he is bringing his narrative back to the physical space after a musing on the artist Kallimachus.

Pausanias' description also matches well with Strabo's a century and a half earlier. Strabo is much more succinct, naming only the most essential details of the Acropolis (that it has two temples of Athena), of the Old Temple of the Polias (that it has the never-extinguished lamp), and of the Parthenon (that it was made by Iktinos and holds Pheidias' ivory statue of Athena). Significantly, Pausanias begins his description of the Temple of Athena with the ancient statue and with the same remarkable lamp, about which he has more to say than the statue. He discusses the most quintessential objects first, before adding other items of interest like the image of Hermes and the Persian spoils.

In sum, nothing in Pausanias' narrative of the north side of the Acropolis is particularly troublesome in relation to the straightforward reading of the ample earlier evidence laid out above. The Temple of Athena Polias continued to stand, housing the ancient cult image and some storied dedications, and the Erechtheion complex immediately to its north was considered closely connected with it, though a distinct building—almost an elaborate appendage of Athena's sanctuary. Pausanias' description of the Erechtheion is the most informative we have, but other references to the Erechtheion support this picture as well. The Plutarchian *Life* of the Attic orator

Lykourgos includes the only other ancient attestation to the building as named by Pausanias. As a member of the Eteoboutadai family Lykourgos claimed descent from Erechtheus, the *Life* explains, and the succession of fathers and sons who had been priests of Poseidon was inscribed on a tablet set up ἐν Ἐρεχθείῳ.¹⁰³ Others reference the building in terms that fit the conception of it as a separate shrine or set of shrines, but not a conventional temple. In Cicero's *de Natura Deorum*, for example, Erechtheus is cited as a mortal who became divine, with a shrine (*delubrum*) and a priest (*sacerdos*) in Athens.¹⁰⁴

The Pandroseion seems to have been a key physical link between the Temple of Athena proper and the area of the Erechtheion, and the sacred olive tree was probably in or near it below the temple terrace. Philochoros had reported a bad omen that occurred in 306 BCE, when a dog entered the temple of the Polias, then descended into the Pandroseion and lay down on the altar of Zeus Herkeios, beneath the olive tree.¹⁰⁵ Herodotus had linked the olive tree to the sanctuary of Erechtheus, and Pausanias treated it directly after expressing skepticism about the Persian spoils and directly before naming the Pandroseion as adjacent to the Temple of Athena.¹⁰⁶ The Pandroseion had also been used as a reference point in the building accounts for specifying the location of repairs after the fire in the old temple in 406 BCE.¹⁰⁷

¹⁰³ [Plut.] *X orat.* 843E: κατήγον δὲ τὸ γένος ἀπὸ τούτων καὶ Ἐρεχθέως...καὶ ἔστιν αὕτη ἡ καταγωγή τοῦ γένους τῶν ἱερασαμένων τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος ἐν πίνακι τελείῳ, ὃς ἀνάκειται ἐν Ἐρεχθείῳ, γεγραμμένος ὑπ' Ἴσμηνίου τοῦ Χαλκιδέως.

¹⁰⁴ Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.49: *sed si sunt hi di, est certe Erechtheus, cuius Athenis et delubrum vidimus et sacerdotem.*

¹⁰⁵ *FGrH* 328 F67 (preserved in Dionysius of Halicarnassus): κύων εἰς τὸν τῆς Πολιάδος νεῶν εἰσελθοῦσα καὶ δῦσα εἰς τὸ Πανδρόσειον, ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ἀναβᾶσα τοῦ Ἐρκείου Διὸς τὸν ὑπὸ τῆι ἐλαίαι κατέκειτο.

¹⁰⁶ Hdt. 8.55; Paus. 1.27.2.

¹⁰⁷ *IG* II² 1654, lines 35–36.

To summarize briefly the history of the Old Athena Temple, as best reconstructed from the surviving evidence: after standing on the Acropolis as the city's most monumental and most important temple for a quarter of a century, it suffered serious damage at the hands of Xerxes' army in 480 BCE. The damage was such that most, but perhaps not all, of the peristyle, entablature, and roof fell, and much of this material was soon built into the North Acropolis Wall or buried in the fill supporting it after the ultimately victorious Athenians returned home. Some parts of the building, particularly on the western end, probably remained standing. Enough repair or rebuilding took place to ensure that the rear room, the *opisthodomos*, could continue its function as the Treasury of Athena, and that the cella, or some modified part thereof, could again house the ancient wooden cult image of Athena. A fire in 406 BCE caused enough damage that the treasury and some dedications were moved to the Parthenon, but after repairs the Temple of Athena again resumed its customary functions.¹⁰⁸ Through the Hellenistic period the temple continued to be an important spot for the display of significant decrees, honors, and alliances, and in the Roman period a visitor like Pausanias could recount many stories and legends remembered by the Athenians about the temple, its contents, and the statues set up around it.

But what about the Oath of Plataea? The idea that before the decisive battle against the Persians the Greek allies pledged not to rebuild the temples that the barbarians had ravaged but to leave them as memorials for future generations must obviously enter into any discussion of the post-Persian history of the Old Athena Temple. Indeed, this oath has been used as evidence by both sides in the debate over the fate of the temple. To some, the Oath of Plataea means that the Archaic temple cannot have been rebuilt or repaired after the war, and that therefore a new place

¹⁰⁸ Dörpfeld (1919, 39) suggested that the ancient statue was temporarily housed in the Erechtheion during post-fire repairs; Osanna recently agreed (2001, 339).

for the cult statue, treasury, and dedications must have been used by the Athenians and must be sought by scholars.¹⁰⁹ To others, the Oath means that the temple cannot have been completely gone after the war; there must have been something left to function as a memorial for the oath to have been meaningful.

Debate over the authenticity of the Oath of Plataea has raged over more than a century, with the tides turning back and forth between consensus that an oath was actually sworn in 479 in some version represented by the epigraphic and rhetorical sources, or on the other hand that the entire concept was instead an invention of those 4th-century orators.¹¹⁰ Archaeological evidence has been marshaled to support both views, mostly in arguments that quickly become circular.¹¹¹ However, in the last decade important work by P. Krentz and D. Kellogg in particular, with astute elaboration by Miles, has combined to form a very convincing picture of the Oath.¹¹² Firstly, it should be completely credible to us now, as it was in later antiquity, that an oath was sworn by the Greek troops gathered before Plataea. Other such collective pre-battle oaths are attested, as, for example, the oath before Thermopylae paraphrased by Herodotus,¹¹³ and were probably worked out in the course of alliance negotiations.¹¹⁴

¹⁰⁹ This view was especially developed by Bates (1901) in the wake of Dörpfeld's discovery. On the influence of Bates' ideas see Ferrari 2002, 12–14.

¹¹⁰ For a summary of these sources, see Miles 2014, 128–131. It is often said that the debate over the authenticity of the oath began in antiquity, based on Theopompos of Chios's 4th-century claim, in denouncing the Athenians, that the oath was falsified (*καταψεύδεται*) (*FGrH* 115 F 153). What exactly was meant by this is unclear.

¹¹¹ For one example of a dogmatic view of the Oath of Plataea based on archaeology, see Bundgaard 1976, 134 (“it is an archaeologically substantiated fact that the Athenians deliberately left the city's most important sanctuary lying for more than twenty years in the very same state it was abandoned by Mardonius”).

¹¹² Krentz 2007; Kellogg 2008 and 2013b; and Miles 2014, replacing earlier influential work like that of Siewert 1972. For summaries of earlier arguments see Meiggs 1972, 504–507; Krentz 2001; and Flower and Marincola 2002, Appendix C, 323–325.

¹¹³ *Hdt.* 7.132.

¹¹⁴ Krentz 2007, 739–741. See also Miles 2014, 132.

It is very unlikely, however, that the temple clause Lykourgos included at the end of the oath was an original part of anything sworn before Plataea: καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν τῶν ἐμψησθέντων καὶ καταβληθέντων ὑπὸ τῶν βαρβάρων οὐδὲν ἀνοικοδομήσω παντάπασιν, ἀλλ' ὑπόμνημα τοῖς ἐπιγιγνομένοις ἔάσω καταλείπεσθαι τῆς τῶν βαρβάρων ἀσεβείας.¹¹⁵ This final clause is present only in some literary sources, not in any inscribed versions, and in content and purpose is antithetical to the other elements of such oaths, which focus on creating unity toward collective goals in the immediate present.¹¹⁶ Instead, this clause was invented in the 4th century, probably by Isokrates, who attributed it to the Ionian Greeks, as a tool in his campaign to reunite warring Greeks against the Persians.¹¹⁷ It was then picked up by others later in the century, particularly Lykourgos, and similarly used in an attempt to unify and incite the Greeks against the new barbarian threat, the Macedonians. The use of archival documents, real or plausibly real, was a popular way to compare the behavior of contemporary Athenian audiences with their great 5th-century ancestors.¹¹⁸

As Kellogg has demonstrated, the Oath of Plataea and other traditional oaths like the one sworn by the *ephebes* were remembered, perpetuated, and actively used in the 4th century for didactic purposes, particularly in the education of young men during their integration into the *polis* society through the institution of the *ephebeia*.¹¹⁹ Such oaths instilled a sense of collective

¹¹⁵ Lycurg. *Leoc.* 81.

¹¹⁶ Miles 2014, 132–133.

¹¹⁷ Isocr. *Paneg.* 155–156.

¹¹⁸ Kellogg 2013b, 273. On the increasing respect for and use of written documents in the 4th century, see also Kellogg 2008, 368–372.

¹¹⁹ Kellogg's thorough analysis (2008 and esp. 2013b) of the stele set up at Acharnai inscribed with both the Ephebic Oath and an oath sworn by the Athenians when they were about to fight the barbarians (which Krentz [2007] has shown to be the Oath of Marathon) is a major contribution to our understanding of the social function of such oaths in the 4th century.

identity and purpose based upon collectively-held memories of the past. In Miles' words, "the repetition of oaths contributed to the ongoing process of forming social memory about the Persian Wars, and how Athenians should behave in the face of an invading enemy."¹²⁰

In order for the didactic use of such oaths and especially the rhetorical use of the temple clause to have been effective, as the orators must certainly have thought it would be, some damaged temples must actually have been left in some state of visible ruin after the Persian Wars. We know from Herodotus that many temples in Greece and Ionia were burned by the Persians.¹²¹ As Miles has shown, burnt temples were a key theme and framing device in Herodotus' history of the Persian Wars.¹²² Burnt sanctuaries form a "geographical roll call" of resistance to Xerxes along his march,¹²³ and Herodotus has the Athenians cite their duty to avenge the burning and destruction of the statues and homes of their gods as their first and foremost motivation to continue fighting.¹²⁴ There are also good archaeological examples of burnt temples remaining visible in the landscape, such that Herodotus' use of them was not simply a literary device, and the 4th-century orators were not simply taking inspiration from their reading of his narrative.¹²⁵ Those like Isokrates and Lykourgos who employed the Oath of

¹²⁰ Miles 2014, 131.

¹²¹ E.g., Hdt. 8.32–33, 35.

¹²² Miles 2014, 113–120.

¹²³ Miles 2014, 118.

¹²⁴ Hdt. 8.144.2: *πρῶτα μὲν καὶ μέγιστα τῶν θεῶν τὰ ἀγάλματα καὶ τὰ οἰκήματα ἐμπερησμένα τε καὶ συγκεχωσμένα, τοῖσι ἡμέας ἀναγκαίως ἔχει τιμωρέειν ἐς τὰ μέγιστα μᾶλλον ἢ περ ὁμολογέειν τῶ ταῦτα ἐργασαμένῳ*

¹²⁵ Miles (2014, 123–124) discusses examples in Attica at Eleusis, Rhamnous, and Sounion (with bibliography, n. 34), and at Kalapodi/Abai in Phokis (for more on which see below, this chapter), in addition to the North Acropolis Wall and *Perserschutt* deposit in Athens. There are also indications that some temples were rebuilt soon after the war. Plutarch mentions the Temple of Athena Areia at Plataea, financed by spoils from the battle (*Vit. Arist.* 20.3), and a burnt temple Themistocles restored (*ἐπεσκεύασε*) in the deme of Phlya, as well as a new one he established near his house in Melite; these were not popular moves, in Plutarch's telling (*Vit. Them.* 1.3, 22.1–2). See also Ferrari 2002, 26 and Miles 2014, 125–126.

Plataea towards didactic and political ends must have either believed that their ancestors had actually sworn not to rebuild the burnt temples as purposeful memorials, or at least trusted that their audiences would plausibly so believe. The purpose of the temple clause within the Oath in the 4th century, as Miles concludes, was “to impress into memory the idea that burnt temples were in fact left by those who fought as a deliberate memorial to the barbarians’ impiety.”¹²⁶

One element of the temple clause of the Oath that has not been the subject of debate is what exactly would have been meant by—and more importantly understood by—a pledge not to “rebuild” (ἀνοικοδομήσω) and to “allow to remain as a memorial” (ὑπόμνημα ἔάσω καταλείπεσθαι). I do not think we can assume that the Greeks’ idea that temples were purposefully left and not rebuilt carried the implication that they ceased to perform their religious function. Instead, what is probably implied is that the communities did not raze whatever remained of their temples and build replacement temples afresh. Rather, they continue to use the damaged temples; the memorial message would be clearer and more omnipresent if the community were actively engaged with the memorialized buildings. No scholar has suggested that there was a building boom in the 470s as Greek cities rushed to replace the many temples we know were burned, yet we certainly should not imagine (as 4th-century Greeks also would not have) that the rituals that had taken place in and around these temples ceased.

Still, the modern assumption that the Old Athena Temple, if in accordance with the Oath of Plataea it was left as a ruin, was finally cleared away by Pericles because it had become “an

¹²⁶ Miles 2014, 132–133.

eye-sore to the Athenians”¹²⁷ and “disfigured the Acropolis”¹²⁸ is based on the presumption that temples “left as reminders” were at the same time abandoned as temples. Pausanias remarks upon several temples he sees that are “half-burnt” (ἡμίκαυτοι)¹²⁹ or “damaged by fire” (ὑπὸ τοῦ πυρὸς λελυμασμένοι)¹³⁰ and claims to know in some instances that they were intentionally left in that state after the Persian Wars. He even cites a decision the Greeks made (σφίσιν ἔδοξεν) to leave such temples as “memorials of hatred” (τοῦ ἔχθους ὑπομνήματα).¹³¹ The oracular Temple of Apollo at Abai was even burnt twice, he reports, once by the Persians and once by the Thebans.¹³² It is very unlikely that Pausanias would have been able to cite these ruined buildings by name, or even identify them as temples, much less cite the Persians as the cause of their ruination, if they had not continued to function as temples through at least some of the intervening centuries. His reports are evidence that the memory of the Persian destruction had

¹²⁷ Bates 1901, 322.

¹²⁸ Frazer (1892–1893, 187), arguing against Dörpfeld’s theory “that the pre-Persian temple, shorn of its colonnade, was restored after its destruction in 480 B.C., and that it continued to disfigure the Acropolis all through the rest of the classical ages.” This strain of thought is found in much more recent scholarship too; cf. Gerding’s claims that in the second half of the 5th century damaged buildings on the Acropolis were replaced one-by-one as “the ravaged sanctuary was restored to its former glory,” and that “it could not have been the intention of the planners [of the Erechtheion] to leave the severed remains of the Old Athena Temple standing in front of it” (2006, 389, 391). Similarly, Hollinshead (1999, 211) asks, “why would an old utilitarian structure be retained for so long while aesthetically sophisticated buildings were constructed all around it?” Like Ferrari, Miles too (2014, 111) criticizes the retrojection of the modern “nostalgic reaction to ruin;” on this nostalgia and other modern reactions to ruins, see also the collection of essays accompanying the Getty Center exhibition, *Irresistible Decay* (Roth, Merewether, and Lyons 1997).

¹²⁹ Paus. 10.35.2, on temples in the territory of Haliartus, the Temple of Hera on the road from Athens to Phaleron, and the Temple of Demeter at Phaleron. In the case of Haliartus Pausanias was mistaken in assigning the damage to the Persians. Holleaux (1895) established that the Romans instead were the culprit in their war against Perseus, and that Pausanias likely misinterpreted ἐν τῷ Περσικῷ πολέμῳ; see also Habicht 1985, 99.

¹³⁰ Paus. 7.5.4, on the Temple of Hera on Samos and the Temple of Athena at Phokaia.

¹³¹ Paus. 10.35.2: Ἐλλήνων δὲ τοῖς ἀντιστάσι τῷ βαρβάρῳ τὰ κατακαυθέντα ἱερὰ μὴ ἀνιστάναι σφίσιν ἔδοξεν, ἀλλὰ ἐς τὸν πάντα ὑπολείπεσθαι χρόνον τοῦ ἔχθους ὑπομνήματα. Similarly, Cicero (*Rep.* 3.9.15) describes Philip and Alexander’s excuse for renewed war against the Persians as a desire to avenge the Greek temples, which the Greeks had thought proper not to rebuild so that a proof of the Persian crime might remain ever in sight for future generation: *hanc bellandi causam inferebat, quod vellet Graeciae fana poenire; quae ne reficienda quidem Graii putaverunt, ut esset posteris ante os documentum Persarum sceleris sempiternum.*

¹³² Paus. 10.35.3.

indeed been perpetuated through the preservation of damaged temples—and more specifically the preservation of the visibility of that damage—just as the temple clause of the Oath of Plataea, invented though it may have been, prescribed.

Let's return more specifically to the Old Athena Temple. The Oath of Plataea as we now understand it fits well with the continued functioning of the Archaic temple—with its reuse as a ruin. We do not know how much of the temple remained standing after the Persian sack, or how much repair, rebuilding, or modification it underwent afterward. There is no ancient testimony of its appearance, and the archaeological evidence is promising but difficult.¹³³ We might wonder if the temple's common moniker ἀρχαῖος could have been a reference not only to its relative age but also to its physical state. Could it have been a stand-in for “damaged,” or even an allusion to its non-peripteral plan post-sack? We are learning that non-peripteral temples can no longer be assumed to be “early,” but perhaps a lack of columns would have been seen as a chronological marker to the Athenians.¹³⁴

Although there is no surviving direct reference to the Old Athena Temple as a victim of the Persian flames or a memorial of barbarian sacrilege, we should nevertheless see it as part of the discourse that developed surrounding other burned temples and the Oath of Plataea in antiquity. Lykourgos of course addressed the Athenians specifically, and emphasized that their

¹³³ Ferrari (2002, 22–24) discusses in some detail the findspots of various parts of the temple, noting that the pediments with their sculptures and the frieze of the porches and cella (if it existed) may have survived, since none were found in the closed *Perserschutt* deposit. She provides images (figs. 4–6) of a digital model of one possibility for the appearance of the temple after the sack (which Korres [2002, 184, n. 11] shows to be wrong at least in the number of columns potentially still standing). Buchert (2000, 226, fig. 46) gives another idea. Both the architectural and sculptural remains assigned to the temple are in need of further study, as are many unassigned limestone elements still on the Acropolis; see Kissas 2008, 110–112.

¹³⁴ See Fisher 2015 on rethinking conventional views of non-peripteral temples.

own Athenian ancestors stood by the Oath so firmly that they won the favor of the gods.¹³⁵ If the Acropolis had been cleared of ruins and debris during the Periclean renovation, how could Lykourgos have made such a bold claim?¹³⁶ Plutarch, writing in the 2nd century CE, discusses what has become known as the “Congress Decree” whereby Pericles attempted to call together all the Greeks to abrogate the oath they had sworn concerning the sanctuaries burned by the barbarians, thus allowing him to undertake his grand rebuilding program.¹³⁷ The authenticity of this decree, attested only by Plutarch, is of course highly questionable, but more importantly it shows that still in Plutarch’s time the existence and binding nature of an oath about temple rebuilding, and its particular application in Athens, was credible.

In its initial reuse, then, we should imagine that the state of the Old Athena Temple clearly showed that it had indeed suffered at the hands of the Persians. That the Athenians made a deliberate decision to reuse the temple more or less as it was is shown by the related decision to immure many of its most recognizable parts in the grand memorial of the North Acropolis Wall. Oath of Plataea or not, the Athenians clearly chose to turn some of Athena’s ravaged property into deliberate memorials, including some of the burnt statue dedications and the temple itself. These commemorative monuments then worked together: the temple elements in the wall were put to a conspicuous new use in order to solidify the message that the Persian sack must never be forgotten, and the statues and temple perpetuated the memory of the sacrilege in a more painful

¹³⁵ Lycurg. *Leoc.* 82: οὕτω τοίνυν, ὃ ἄνδρες, σφόδρα ἐνέμειναν ἐν τούτῳ πάντες ὥστε καὶ τὴν παρὰ τῶν θεῶν εὐνοίαν μεθ’ ἑαυτῶν ἔσχον βοηθόν, καὶ πάντων τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀνδρῶν ἀγαθῶν γενομένων πρὸς τὸν κίνδυνον, μάλιστα ἡ πόλις ὑμῶν εὐδοκίμησεν.

¹³⁶ Ferrari 2002, 14.

¹³⁷ Plut. *Vit. Per.* 17.1–3. According to Plutarch, the decree was ineffective at calling the Greeks together, and Pericles went ahead with his plans nonetheless.

and emotional way as the community continued to interact with the memorialized ruins during festivals and rituals.

If the initial “re”use of the Old Athena Temple was little more than a deliberate decision to use it “again” rather than in a new way or a new form, this intentional preservation was profoundly elaborated through the Periclean rebuilding of the Acropolis. Attention to the past and its potential role in the present and future was a hallmark of the overall transformation of the Acropolis from the 440s to the end of the 5th century. Preservation and reuse of many sorts were key elements in this transformation, such that J. Hurwit has called the Periclean Acropolis a “marblescape of memory,”¹³⁸ where nearly every element “was materially, thematically, or compositionally bound to at least one predecessor.”¹³⁹ As Ferrari has emphasized, the Old Athena Temple was the focal point of this new composition, the “centerpiece of an extensive choreography of ruins” along with the North Acropolis Wall, the burnt statues of Athena, and other reminders of the Persians Wars like Pheidias’ colossal bronze Athena “Promachos” statue, supposedly financed with the spoils of Marathon.¹⁴⁰ The old temple in particular was accentuated by its contrast to the new marble structures around it—the Propylaia through which it would be seen upon ascending the citadel, the magnificent Parthenon to its south, and most notably the neighboring Erechtheion.

Whenever and by whomever it was initially planned, perhaps Mnesikles, the Erechtheion was designed to glorify the Old Athena Temple, as an “ornate and elegant appendage.”¹⁴¹ Its plan

¹³⁸ Hurwit 2004, 86.

¹³⁹ Hurwit 2004, 84.

¹⁴⁰ Ferrari 2002, 25. On the colossal bronze Athena, see Paus. 1.28.2, 9.4.1 and below, Chapter 5.

¹⁴¹ Ferrari 2002, 21.

is highly unusual not only because it incorporated the *martyria* of the contest between Athena and Poseidon, the heroön of Kekrops, and the shrine of Erechtheus, but also because of its physical relationship with the old temple, as mentioned above. The foundation of the temple literally underlies the Karyatid Porch, which Ferrari sees as “the element most suggestive of an explicit link of the dainty classical structure to the bulk of the poros temple.”¹⁴² The symbolism of the Karyatids has been much discussed, but their placement has not always received due emphasis. Their disposition toward the temple is surely significant. Whatever their identity or purpose, they likely have more to do with the sacred area they gaze upon than, for example, the heroön of Kekrops below.¹⁴³ I would suggest that the position of the Karyatid Porch may be a reason for thinking that the eastern half of the temple was missing in its post-Persian instantiation, or at least contracted. This would allow the Karyatids to both see and be seen. Perhaps any open area there was at the former east end of the temple was then used as a gathering space for rituals under the eyes of the Karyatids, and the strangely blank south wall of the Erechtheion to their east may have been used for display of the peplos or other ritual objects.¹⁴⁴

¹⁴² Ferrari 2002, 22.

¹⁴³ As in Scholl 1995 and 1998. Rhodes (1995, 145) has suggested that the Karyatids were a reference to the Persian Wars, “forced to survey eternally the Greek destruction wrought by the Persians and their Greek sympathizers.”

¹⁴⁴ Gerding (2006) has suggested that the entire space of the Dörpfeld foundations was given over to a gathering space for the Panathenaic procession. While I find this a reasonable explanation for the use of any open space there was, I think it implausible that cult was moved to the Erechtheion specifically for the purpose of creating this open space, as Gerding argues.

A strange reference in a dialogue of Lucian (*Piscator* 21) may relate to the use of this eastern space; during a mock trial of “Frankness” by old philosophers come back to life, Philosophy suggests that court be held “somewhere round about in the pronaos of the Polias;” the priestess would arrange the benches and they could pay reverence to the goddess in the meantime: ἄγε δὴ, πάρεσμεν γὰρ ἐνθα ἐχρήην, ἐνταῦθά που ἐν τῷ προνάῳ τῆς Πολιάδος δικάσωμεν. ἢ Ἰέρεια διάθες ἡμῖν τὰ βάρηρα, ἡμεῖς δὲ ἐν τοσοῦτῳ προσκυνήσωμεν τὴν θεόν. Could this relate to actual gatherings of Athenians in the eastern end of the temple or where the eastern end used to be?

The Erechtheion was to the Old Athena Temple what Egon Eiermann's new church, bell tower, and attached chapel are to the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche in Berlin.¹⁴⁵ The initial plan to reconstruct the heavily bombed church after World War II involved removing the ruins, but was met with ardent protests. Eiermann's revised plan instead reused the ruins as part of the new composition. The strikingly modern concrete and glass additions contrast with the blackened late 19th-century core, just as the Erechtheion would have looked distinctly modern next to the late 6th-century Archaic temple remains to an ancient viewer. Eiermann explained his conscious use of juxtaposition as complementary contrast: "contrasting in spirit, contrasting in material, contrasting in form, but in such a way that the new buildings make the ruin central; they support it, and do not leave it hopelessly isolated."¹⁴⁶ His purpose in reusing the ruin is reminiscent of the Oath of Plataea: "I want (subsequent generations) to understand those who experienced horrors, those for whom the ruin bears witness to the suffering they had to undergo."¹⁴⁷

We should see the intentional preservation of the Old Athena Temple within the new-look Acropolis—the upcycling of the ruin—as closely analogous to the study in contrast achieved in

¹⁴⁵ On the reconstruction of the Gedächtniskirche and its reception, see esp. Feireiss 1994; Kappel 2004, 2011.

¹⁴⁶ In Pehnt 1994, 10.

¹⁴⁷ In Pehnt 1994, 9–10.

the rebuilt Gedächtniskirche.¹⁴⁸ Both projects aimed to perpetuate the memory of a traumatic event by preserving the visible signs of that trauma in the buildings where it had been profoundly felt. In the case of the Old Athena Temple and the development of the Oath of Plataea, we can see upcycling as one part of the larger ongoing construction of the memory of the Persian Wars. In the 4th century, the swearing of oaths by the *ephebes* as part of their integration into *polis* society, their tour of important Attic sanctuaries at the beginning of their training, orators' use of archival documents, and the visible preservation of a burnt temple combined to form the network of associations that together made up the social memory of the Persian Wars. In this case, as rarely in antiquity, we can see all four of the contexts S. Price distinguishes for these networks working together: ritual behavior, places, textual narratives, and objects and representations.¹⁴⁹ The memory of the Persian Wars, like any social memory, was subject to changing interpretations as the actual events receded into the past. But the intersection of these multiple networks of associations, including the preserved ruined temples, kept the authenticity of the past destruction vividly alive. Athenian viewers likely continued to interpret the deliberately

¹⁴⁸ There are several other examples of European churches damaged in World War II whose reconstruction made evocative use of their ruins, perhaps most notably England's Coventry Cathedral. Here, the hollowed-out cathedral with its standing tower had acquired a symbolic and memorial nature for the community and the country soon after its destruction, and the new church ultimately built between 1956 and 1962 was connected to it via a porch, but was a largely separate and modern structure. Basil Spence's design maintained the ruin itself essentially as it had been since the war, an open public space, used for staging religious dramas and occasional services. See esp. Thomas 1987 and Campbell 1996. A pamphlet published in England in 1945 urged the creation of several similar "garden ruins" (Casson, *Bombed Churches as War Memorials*). In a more detailed comparison of reconstruction and memorialization practices involving bombed churches, it would be interesting to add the Dresden Frauenkirche to the mix. In this case, the burned ruin was simply left—more than actively preserved or maintained—during the five decades of the GDR, until, after the reunification of East and West Germany, a project was begun to completely rebuild the church from the rubble. Completed in 2005, the reconstructed church incorporates the old blackened stones, in their original spots where possible. This reconstruction according to "archaeological principles" was an extremely painstaking process, compared with simply using all new stone to execute the original design. But it was considered crucial that the past of the blackened stones—and by metonymy, the past of the church itself—be strikingly visible. On the history and reception of this politically controversial reconstruction, see esp. Lühr 2002; Jarzombek 2004; Hertel 2005; Glaser 2005; Meier 2009; and the journal *Die Dresdner Frauenkirche: Jahrbuch zu ihrer Geschichte und zu ihrem archäologischen Wiederaufbau*, published annually since 1995.

¹⁴⁹ Price 2012, 16, on Carruthers' "network of associations" (1998, 54). See above, Chapter 1, n. 67.

constructed commemorative monument of the Old Athena Temple in more or less the intended way, because the associated oral traditions about the Persian Wars could not easily be forgotten.¹⁵⁰

Why has the preservation of the Old Athena Temple and its memorial significance been so difficult for modern scholars to recognize and accept, and why do none of our extant ancient sources specifically reference the Persian Wars in connection with this temple? There are perhaps some simplistic answers to the last question. For one thing, there is so much else to talk about on the Acropolis! We can suppose that Polemon of Ilion's four books on the Acropolis dedications, cited by Strabo, included many more references to the Persian Wars than any of the far less detailed accounts that have survived.¹⁵¹ Pausanias was hurrying himself along on the Acropolis, like Strabo not wanting to let himself be distracted from his much larger task. Still, he does pause to discuss the Persian spoils in the temple, and to ponder their authenticity.

It is also the case that our most descriptive sources were not Athenians, and thus were not part of the community for which the upcycled temple was meant to perpetuate collective memory. As Ferrari has illuminated, “the signifying power” of monuments with “intentional commemorative value” like the Old Athena Temple, “depends upon the viewer’s ability to recognize which event is commemorated and, most importantly, to share a sense of its value and to register its emotional impact.”¹⁵² The Chremonides decree discussed above allows us a glimpse into a more Athenian perspective in the mid-3rd century. This alliance, the grandest Greek coalition since the Persian Wars, formed to meet the new barbarian threat in Macedon—

¹⁵⁰ Miles 2014, 133.

¹⁵¹ On Polemon of Ilion see now Engels 2014.

¹⁵² Ferrari 2002, 28.

explicitly compared with the Persians of old in Athenian rhetoric¹⁵³—was inscribed and set up next to the Old Athena Temple. This special spot was almost certainly chosen for the display and dissemination of the new alliance because of the temple’s Persian War connections. The memorial machinations of the preceding centuries had succeeded. But, to paraphrase Ferrari, when the memory community that assigned the commemorative value to such monuments declines, the visibility of the trace becomes ineffectual.¹⁵⁴ The memory of the Persian destruction was no longer actively perpetuated by the ruined temple after antiquity; thus, cultural and historical distance accounts for the difficulty of grasping the temple’s memorial role in the modern centuries. Monumentalization like that of the Old Athena Temple and the Gedächtniskirche is indeed most easily recognized “in the past that we remember.”¹⁵⁵

The Mycenaean Bastion and the Sanctuary of Athena Nike

My final case study in this chapter examines another area of the Acropolis where the Athenians had to deal with the physical remains of the Persian destruction and negotiate how they would shape the memory of their ultimate victory. Here though, a more explicit link with the deeper Bronze Age past of the city had always been present, and would be the focus of later reuse. The Sanctuary of Athena Nike, seated on the Mycenaean Bastion at the far southwest

¹⁵³ For examples of this comparison, especially by Demosthenes and Aischines, see Kellogg 2008, 363–368.

¹⁵⁴ Ferrari 2002, 28.

¹⁵⁵ Ferrari 2002, 28. This loss of commemorative value after antiquity could account for much of the reason why the Old Athena Temple was ultimately reduced to its foundations during the medieval period and beyond, whereas buildings like the Parthenon and Erechtheion remained standing and were converted to other uses, before being “restored” to their 5th-century form in the modern period. The medieval, early modern, or modern viewer “has no trouble comprehending the monumentality of the surviving Periclean buildings in terms of size, wealth of materials, and quality of the workmanship,” but the monumentality of the Old Athena Temple depended on the viewer’s engagement with the events and ideas that led to its monumentalization (Ferrari 2002, 27). Similarly, Dörpfeld suggested that “his” temple was first broken up in the medieval period, when evidence of new walls first appeared on the site of his foundations, perhaps so that the stone could be used to reinforce the citadel walls (1919, 39).

corner of the Acropolis, incorporated upcycling in all of its phases. It was a key locus for the notion of Athenian autochthony, as well as of Athenian victory (νίκη). Though small, the sanctuary was always very visible atop the bastion, extending outward above the western approach to the Acropolis, indicating metonymically that the concepts of autochthony and victory were central to the essence of the whole sacred citadel.

As with the post-Persian cleanup efforts on the rest of the Acropolis, in the Sanctuary of Athena Nike we can see similar priorities and strategies of protecting the cult statue, intentional burial, and preservation of ruins through minimal reconstruction. In later phases, a similar embellishment of older construction through the addition of new contrasting material enhanced the visibility of the reuse, as with the framing of the Old Athena Temple by the Parthenon and Erechtheion. The bastion and its sanctuary also provide another example of how memory preserved through upcycling can be used or manipulated later, as in the development of the Oath of Plataea in the 4th century. Throughout the sanctuary's life, the most potent instances of reuse in and around it involved the deliberate preservation of the visibility of the bastion and some knowledge of the past life of the cult seated there.

The architectural history of the Sanctuary of Athena Nike has been studied in detail by I. Mark, who established four stages based on thorough analysis of the available preserved remains and of the archival material relating to N. Balanos' exploration and restoration project in 1935–1939.¹⁵⁶ Mark's work was an extremely valuable contribution to scholarship on this archaeologically complex area of the Acropolis, particularly in making known the stage of the

¹⁵⁶ Mark 1993. Balanos wrote a brief report in 1940, which was published along with some photographs in 1956, but his findings were not well known or understood until Mark's publication. The Temple of Athena Nike was the first of the Acropolis monuments to be "restored" to its 5th-century condition after Greek independence, in a project started by Ludwig Ross in 1835. For a summary of the earliest restoration and the circumstances surrounding it, see Holliday 2005.

sanctuary that lies truncated but still accessible within the bastion today—the *naïskos* and altars that preceded the sheathing of the bastion and the construction of the now iconic marble Ionic temple.¹⁵⁷ While Mark’s architectural phases remain the foundation of our understanding of the sanctuary’s history, his chronology of those phases has been improved in subsequent scholarship. Here I will present the history of the sanctuary chronologically, discussing the various instances of upcycling along the way.

That the bastion on which the Sanctuary of Athena Nike was founded was a work of the Bronze Age inhabitants of Athens has never been in doubt, but its exact nature and role within the fortification system at the western entrance to the citadel has been much debated. The bastion was a high tower-like structure of characteristic cyclopean masonry built on a small ridge of projecting bedrock.¹⁵⁸ I. Shear’s reconstruction of the Mycenaean entrance system, taking into account all of the extremely fragmentary evidence of the remains and modifications to the bedrock in the area, is the most convincing. Shear reconstructs the bastion as the enlarged western end of the fortification wall running along the south side of the Acropolis, constructed in the LH IIIB period (late 13th century BCE), forming part of a gate system analogous to the contemporary one at Tiryns.¹⁵⁹

At some point later in the same period, as at Tiryns, the entrance system was modified with the addition of another interior cyclopean wall placed on a level plateau 22 meters east of

¹⁵⁷ Mark concluded that Balanos accurately reset the *naïskos*, repository, and rectangular altar where he had found them when the bastion was restored (1993, 6, n. 29). Subsequent restoration projects have done likewise; for a summary of the recently completed project, see Michalopoulou 2012.

¹⁵⁸ Bundgaard’s belief (1976, 43–44) that the bastion was a large natural outcropping that had sacred significance in the Bronze Age was based on a misreading of a poor-quality plan in Welter 1939; see Mark 1993, 5.

¹⁵⁹ Shear 1999, 93–102. Others consider the bastion as part of a terrace system (e.g., Bundgaard 1957, 194; 1976, 44) or a freestanding tower (e.g., Wright 1994, 341–342; Iakovidis 2006, 118) unconnected to the circuit wall. For a thorough review of the scholarship on the Mycenaean entrance to the Acropolis, see Wright 1994.

the west end of the bastion and at a right angle to the south wall.¹⁶⁰ This wall, now commonly referred to as the West Cyclopean Wall, was straighter, thicker, and on a higher level than the other cyclopean masonry of the Acropolis, and would survive and indeed be preserved largely intact throughout antiquity and beyond.¹⁶¹ Within the western face of the bastion was a large niche, possibly as wide as five meters with at least one columnar support dividing the space, encompassing a “gate shrine” perhaps akin to those known at Mycenae.¹⁶² Unlike other citadels, Athens suffered no great destruction at end of the Mycenaean period, and the well-built bastion and most of the rest of the circuit wall remained intact until the modifications and destructions of the 5th century.¹⁶³

The earliest preserved evidence for the reuse of the Mycenaean Bastion in the historical period is traces of a rubble crown intended to repair and level the top surface, probably in the Late Geometric period.¹⁶⁴ While any evidence of the use of the bastion at that period has been obliterated by later reconstruction, this leveling activity indicates that the bastion was already considered a significant spot, almost certainly because of its cyclopean masonry and clear Bronze-Age origin, combined with its conspicuous location above the western approach to the Acropolis. From the Archaic period comes our first sure evidence of the sacralization of the

¹⁶⁰ Shear 1999, 102–104.

¹⁶¹ Shear 1999, esp. 91.

¹⁶² Iakovidis 1983, 79. The size, appearance, and nature of the niche during the Bronze Age is far from certain. Confusion has arisen from the discrepancies between Balanos’ notes and his published statements and drawings. There may have been a second niche further to the north; Iakovidis believes there must have been two columnar supports within a five-meter wide niche, and sees evidence of cult activity in a small hollow north of the niche where Balanos reported burned sherds. See Balanos 1956, 790–791; Iakovidis 1983, 80 and 2006, 118–121; Mark 1993, 13–14; Wright 1994, 329–332.

¹⁶³ Iakovidis 1983, 73.

¹⁶⁴ Mark 1993, 17–18; Wright 1994, 340. The original height of the bastion has been an ongoing point of disagreement between Mark and Wright; see Mark 1993, 15; Wright 1994, 340–341; Mark and Wright 1995, 383.

bastion (Mark’s Stage I).¹⁶⁵ An limestone block dating to the mid-6th century holds a five-line inscription recording its dedication as an altar of Athena Nike by a certain Patrok(l)edes.¹⁶⁶ This surviving block probably formed part of the dado of a larger built altar.¹⁶⁷ There is also evidence for a cult statue during this period; two blocks of gray-brown limestone survive from what was likely a large base supporting a marble seated statue.¹⁶⁸ Later descriptions of this statue suggest that she was a wingless xoanon with a pomegranate in her right hand and a helmet in her left hand, establishing that the nature of Nike in this sanctuary had more to do with military than athletic victory.¹⁶⁹ Although no trace of a temple has survived from this phase, it seems likely that the cult statue would indeed have been housed in a small temple for protection, and Mark has suggested that the floating “A-Architecture” found on the Acropolis is of the right size and date to have belonged to an early Temple of Athena Nike.¹⁷⁰

When the Mycenaean Bastion was reused as a huge podium for the Sanctuary of Athena Nike in the Archaic period, it was clearly very visible, but since it was basically unmodified by new construction, it did not necessarily stand out to the Athenian viewer any more than it had

¹⁶⁵ In addition to that of Athena Nike, one or two other small shrines occupied the bastion at its east end, perhaps dedicated to the Graces and Artemis/Hekate Epipyrgidia. See Paus. 1.22.8, 2.30.2; Travlos 1971, 148; Palagia 1990; Giraud (Ζιρώ) 1994, 32–34.

¹⁶⁶ *IG* I³ 596: τῆς Ἀθε[ναίας] | τῆς Νίκης | βομός. | Πατροκ<λ>έδ[εις] | ἐποίησεν. See Raubitschek 1949, 359–364, no. 329.

¹⁶⁷ Mark 1993, 32–34.

¹⁶⁸ Mark 1993, 20–30. Mark dates the base to 600–560. Others reconstruct a standing statue, including Giraud (32, figs. 8–9) and Hurwit 2004, 181.

¹⁶⁹ Esp. a fragment of the 2nd-century BCE Atthidographer Heliodoros, preserved in Harpokration (*FGrH* 373 F2): ὅτι δὲ Νίκης Ἀθηναῖς ζῶνον ἄπτερον, ἔχον ἐν μὲν τῇ δεξιᾷ ῥόαν, ἐν δὲ τῇ εὐωνύμῳ κράνος, ἐτιμᾶτο παρ’ Ἀθηναίοις, δεδήλωκεν Ἡλιόδωρος ὁ περιηγητὴς ἐν α’ Περὶ ἀκροπόλεως. Pausanias also refers to the statue as a wingless xoanon (5.26.6) or wingless ἄγαλμα (3.15.7). The mid-6th century date of this phase of the sanctuary has led some scholars (first Welter 1939, cols. 13–14) to see a connection with the establishment of the Great Panathenaia in 566 BCE. There is no strong evidence for the relationship; see Mark 1993, 126–127.

¹⁷⁰ Mark 1993, 34–35.

previously. That the altar and statue base were relatively large built structures of orthogonal limestone masonry, however, would have contrasted with the cyclopean masonry of the bastion, thereby re-emphasizing its presence and its changed nature. We should also think of the nearby West Cyclopean Wall in connection with the Athena Nike Sanctuary. Still standing at least about five meters tall in the mid-6th century, it would have formed the huge backdrop of the sanctuary on the bastion. A viewer gazing up at the altar and statue or temple would have seen them mounted in a frame of cyclopean masonry. The importance of the West Cyclopean Wall to the overall character of the western approach was emphasized in the late 6th century, when it was embellished with marble revetment composed of a row of metopes from the Hekatompedon temple.¹⁷¹ During the period when grand building projects began to transform the Acropolis, the deliberate preservation and continued use of the monumental Bronze Age structures at its entrance were a means to convey the deep-rootedness of Athenian identity, to honor and benefit from Athenian autochthony.

The Sanctuary of Athena Nike seems to have been heavily damaged during the Persian attack on the Acropolis in 480 BCE. The cult statue was almost certainly removed for safekeeping during the evacuation of the city, like the ancient statue of Athena Polias. The Persian assault began at the western approach, with burning arrows shot from the Areopagus, according to Herodotus.¹⁷² Since the Older Parthenon was under construction, work on the Old Propylon had been suspended so that building materials could be transported to the top of the

¹⁷¹ Eiteljorg showed that the line of metopes and therefore the West Cyclopean Wall continued north in the Late Archaic phase, beyond where they are now preserved in situ (1993, 25–26). On the placement of the metopes see esp. Dinsmoor 1980, 24–27; Shear 1999, 108–110. While this reuse of temple material was surely a carefully considered choice, I doubt that the former metopes would have been easily recognized as such once used as revetment, and therefore in their redeployment they would not have had a large impact as upcycled pieces unless some tradition, now lost to us, perpetuated the knowledge of their origin.

¹⁷² Hdt. 8.52.1.

Acropolis more easily. There must have been a temporary but defensible wooden barrier across the entrance, such that some Athenians could think they were complying with the oracle by taking refuge in the “wooden walls” of the Acropolis.¹⁷³ Once the Persian arrows had kindled and destroyed this wooden barrier, the Athenian defenders rolled down huge boulders (ὄλοιτρόχοι), which Shear has convincingly claimed must have come from the Mycenaean cyclopean walls.¹⁷⁴ When the citadel was eventually breached from the east and the remaining Persian attackers streamed up through the western entrance, the Sanctuary of Athena Nike, the Mycenaean Bastion itself, and the whole cyclopean circuit suffered severe damage. Only the West Cyclopean Wall was left relatively undisturbed by the Persians, presumably because it lay on a higher and flatter level of the citadel rather than on the edge, and must have seemed to them more a subsidiary wall than an integral part of the circuit.¹⁷⁵ It may simply have been too sturdy to topple; it survived to a height of 4.85 meters in the second half of the 5th century, and was six meters thick.¹⁷⁶

The only remains from the Archaic phase of the Athena Nike sanctuary that survived into the post-Persian period owe their survival to reuse. As already seen, these are significant but scant, indicating heavy damage at the hands of the Persians. Mark has distinguished an uneven destruction layer (his Stage II) across the top of the bastion, which was not cleared away in the next building phase. Instead, a new rectangular altar and small *naïskos* were founded directly on

¹⁷³ Shear 1999, 119.

¹⁷⁴ Hdt. 8.52.2; Shear 1999, 119. Others have suggested the ὄλοιτρόχοι were column drums of the Older Parthenon (Wrede 1996) or large chunks of bedrock (Wesenberg 2004).

¹⁷⁵ Shear 1999, 91, 104. If it was indeed a later addition to the entrance system, as Shear proposed, the West Cyclopean Wall would not have bonded with the south wall, which may also have factored into its survival. Giraud has shown that the current bond with the south wall is a medieval or modern repair (1994, pls. 4–7; see also Shear 1999, 88).

¹⁷⁶ Shear 1999, 97; Iakovidis 2006, 177.

this destruction surface.¹⁷⁷ This reconstruction of the sanctuary almost certainly occurred very shortly after the Persian Wars, probably in conjunction with the erection of the North Acropolis Wall and the necessary work on the Propylon to secure the Acropolis entrance, and constituted a fairly minimal rebuilding.¹⁷⁸ This phase of the sanctuary (Mark's Stage III) would last roughly half a century until it was engulfed within the new raised and sheathed bastion, where Balanos discovered it largely intact when the bastion was deconstructed prior to restoration work in 1936.

The survival of the cult statue probably precipitated the construction of the *naïskos*, a simple Π-shaped cella of Aeginetan limestone, open at the east, measuring only 3.65 meters long by 2.47 meters wide.¹⁷⁹ The two surviving blocks of the Archaic base of the cult statue were modified to serve as a repository, and set in the northwest corner of the *naïskos* 0.25 m. beneath the floor level.¹⁸⁰ A deeper hollow had been cut within the original plinth cavity, which Balanos found containing handmade terracotta figurines, a few ceramic sherds, and a few small bones.¹⁸¹ The terracotta figurines, ranging from 0.04 to 0.10 meters tall, were long thought lost but were rediscovered in Acropolis Museum storerooms in 1989–90.¹⁸² Reanalysis has shown them to be Archaic, anywhere from 610 to 480 BCE, rather than Mycenaean or sub-Mycenaean as had

¹⁷⁷ Mark 1993, 36–41; Mark and Wright 1995, 384.

¹⁷⁸ For this date of this reconstruction of the sanctuary, see Giraud 1994, 34–38; Shear 1999, 120–123; Gill 2001, 278; Miles 2014, 125 with n. 36. Mark had argued for a date in the mid-5th century, reviving Bundgaard's idea that the Nike Temple building decree (*IG I³ 35*) referred to the *naïskos*, rather than the marble temple. See below, n. 200.

¹⁷⁹ Mark 1993, 42.

¹⁸⁰ Mark 1993, 20, 29, 52. Cooper (1988) has suggested that this base was taken as booty from a tetrastylon in the Sanctuary of Aphaia on Aegina; see also Martin-McAuliffe and Papadopoulos 2012, 346.

¹⁸¹ Welter 1939, col. 11; Balanos 1956, 785; Mark 1993, 22.

¹⁸² Georgaka 2013, 30. The rediscovered group of 210 figurines from the Sanctuary of Athena Nike includes both those found within the repository and those found by Orlandos in excavations around the Stage III altar east of the *naïskos* (reported by Walter 1940), no longer separated by findspot; see Georgaka 2013, 37–38.

sometimes been suggested based on Balanos' published photograph.¹⁸³ This repository probably represents not primary ritual use, but rather a foundation deposit for the tiny new temple, filled with votives recovered during cleanup and preparation for construction.¹⁸⁴ It was either set into the *naïskos* or the *naïskos* may have been built around it, and the cult statue would have been reinstalled on a new base above it. It was thus honored through deliberate burial, as with the sculpture in the main *Perserschutt* deposit against the North Acropolis Wall, but also continued to play a role in the sanctity of the cult and still physically underlay the ancient cult statue. Similarly, the inscribed block of the Archaic altar dedicated by Patrokledes survived as the underpinning block of one corner of a new square altar of Aeginetan limestone placed north of the larger rectangular altar, other corners of which rested on "a salient boulder" of the bastion itself and on the earliest rebuilding of the bastion crown.¹⁸⁵ As Mark has emphasized, the Archaic survivors of the sack and reconstruction were central objects of the cult, and were reused "in the nature of religious relics," underlying and supporting their successors in the continued functioning of the sanctuary.¹⁸⁶

The erection of the simple and small *naïskos*, which was clearly no larger than required by the cult statue, as a minimal provision for the continuation of cult practice after the Persian Wars finds parallels elsewhere in Athens and at Kalapodi in ancient Phokis (now Boeotia). The other Athenian *naïskoi* are not well known, but are similar in construction, size, and date. As

¹⁸³ Georgaka 2013, 38. On the confusion in earlier scholarship, see Mark 1993, 4.

¹⁸⁴ Mark 1993, 52–53, 66–67. Mark suggests (p. 30) that its lid was broken up and removed either during Stage IV construction or in the Turkish period, when the bastion was used as a crypt.

¹⁸⁵ Balanos 1956, 786; Mark 1993, 55–56.

¹⁸⁶ Mark 1993, 56.

Travlos concluded, “they are simply small rectangular cellas for the cult statues.”¹⁸⁷ The parallel at Kalapodi is much better understood.¹⁸⁸ Excavations there since the 1970s have revealed a particularly well preserved sequence of temples, including two next to each other sacked and burned by Xerxes’ army on its way south after Thermopylae.¹⁸⁹ In the 470s a provisional cult building was constructed within the ruined north temple, directly on the former cella, with mudbrick walls atop a socle made from damaged column drums.¹⁹⁰ A bronze statuette was placed on a limestone block as a provisional cult image, and other votives were discovered collected on and around it, a sort of offering table perhaps akin to the repository of terracotta figurines collected during cleanup of the Athena Nike sanctuary.¹⁹¹ There was also a deposit of iron weapons interpreted as a foundation dedication.¹⁹² The ruins of the south temple were not rebuilt but simply surrounded by a square installation of blocks from the Archaic sanctuary.¹⁹³

While later construction and disturbances make it impossible to know the exact state of the Sanctuary of Athena Nike in the post-Persian Wars period, the situation at Kalapodi was roughly analogous, and the treatment of the provisional cult building there during more intensive

¹⁸⁷ Travlos 1971, 148. Travlos, writing before Mark published Balanos’ archival material, dated the *naïskos* and altar of the Nike sanctuary to the interval between the Battles of Marathon and Salamis.

¹⁸⁸ Shear (1999, 121) first suggested the comparison between the Sanctuary of Athena Nike and the shrines at Kalapodi.

¹⁸⁹ There is continued debate about the identification of this sanctuary as either the sanctuary of Artemis Elaphebolos and Apollo, as long thought, or the oracular sanctuary of Apollo at Abai, as maintained by the current excavators. See esp. Felsch 1980, 38–42 and 1991, 85; McInerney 1999, 288–289; Niemeier 2013, 34.

¹⁹⁰ Felsch 1980, 85–89; 1988, 63; 2007, 19.

¹⁹¹ Felsch 1980, 89–99; Niemeier 2013, 41.

¹⁹² Felsch 1980, 99; 2007, 19.

¹⁹³ Niemeier 2013, 42.

rebuilding later in the 5th century will also parallel the fate of the Nike *naïskos* and altar.¹⁹⁴ As with the Old Athena Temple too, in the minimal rebuilding of the Nike sanctuary the Athenians showed enough respect for and preservation of the ruins left by the Persian destruction for the later development of the temple clause within the Oath of Plataea to be meaningful. It is significant for the overall picture of the Athenian construction of the memory surrounding the Persian Wars that this almost ostentatiously minimal *naïskos* was built on the spot most explicitly associated with Athenian Victory. The Greeks had won the war, after all, and with Athens at their head. Yet the sanctuary of Victory was not emblazoned with any grand boastful monuments. Instead, the Athenians chose to make prominent the suffering and struggle they had endured and the barbarity that motivated their courageous action, rather than the successful result of that action. The Mycenaean Bastion itself and the West Cyclopean Wall behind it were probably viewed as victory monuments of a sort themselves. They remained standing amidst so much destruction on the Acropolis—testimony of the autochthonous strength the 5th-century Athenians had inherited. Their contemporary victory was founded on their collective identity which had allowed for strong unified action.¹⁹⁵

The little *naïskos* and its accompanying altars stood without major modifications until the construction of the marble Ionic temple and the accompanying sheathing of the bastion in its last

¹⁹⁴ The excavations at Kalapodi have revealed something of a tradition there of provisional cult buildings after temple destruction; for descriptions of the stratigraphy and phasing, see Felsch 2007, 1–27; Niemeier 2013. The sanctuary is perhaps more unique in the state of preservation of the sequence of the temples than in the sequence itself.

¹⁹⁵ On the notion of Athenian autochthony and its development, see esp. Montanari 1981; Connor 1994, 35–38; Shapiro 1998; Cohen 2000, 91–103; Loraux 2000, Ch. 2, 13–27; Isaac 2004, 114–124; Gruen 2013, 3–4.

Classical phase.¹⁹⁶ It is often thought, however, that the new plan of the sanctuary originated much earlier, during the initial stages of Pericles' grand designs for the transformation of the Acropolis.¹⁹⁷ Though this idea stems partly from the early dating of the decree authorizing the construction of a new temple and altar, long accepted but now debunked, it is close to certain that at least the raising of the bastion to a higher level was planned in the Periclean era. This was essentially necessitated by the higher level of the new Propylaia and its southwest wing, which would provide the main access to the Nike Sanctuary.¹⁹⁸ The sheathing of the bastion, however, seems not to have been foreseen in Mnesikles' plan of the Propylaia, so the earliest Periclean intentions for the sanctuary were either not yet concrete and detailed, or were eventually modified or scrapped.¹⁹⁹

When Pericles died in 429, construction of the new Pentelic marble temple either just had or soon would begin. An inscription set up on a marble stele within the sanctuary recorded the decision to appoint a priestess for Athena Nike, democratically chosen, and to have Kallikrates fit the sanctuary with doors and design a temple and marble altar. It also provided for the compensation of the priestess, the letting out of contracts, and the election of a three-man board

¹⁹⁶ The rectangular altar was enlarged with a mudbrick addition at some point during the Stage III sanctuary; see Mark 1993, 67–68. On the area of the Athena Nike sanctuary in later periods, see Tanoulas 1997, 234–236, 285–286. The intriguing inscription *IG II² 3198*, discussed in Chapter 2, may relate to the sanctuary in the late 3rd century CE. Inscribed directly facing the Athena Nike altar and temple on the central pier of the west face of the southwest wing of the Propylaia, it records the beneficence of Publius Herennius Dexippus, the historian who led the defeat of the Heruli, during his *agonothesia*.

¹⁹⁷ The Temple of Athena Nike is not listed among the projects Plutarch describes in his account of the Periclean building program (*Vit. Per.* 13). For discussion of the problematic reconstruction of the “program” from Plutarch’s lone account, see Hurwit 2004, 94–105.

¹⁹⁸ On the relationship of the new Temple of Athena Nike to the Propylaia as a *skenographia*, see Hoepfner 1997a; cf. Arvanitis 1997.

¹⁹⁹ Mark 1993, 79–82.

to work with Kallikrates.²⁰⁰ This inscription was long a victim of the three-bar sigma dogma,²⁰¹ despite its otherwise developed letter forms, its three-barred sigmas led to the orthodox dating of pre-448, resulting in many proposals accounting for the twenty-year “gap” between Kallikrates’ design of the temple and its eventual execution, which is agreed on architectural grounds to have been in the 420s.²⁰² A date for the building decree ca. 430 or in the 420s was long supported by H. Mattingly based on several epigraphic and historical arguments, including the rider inscribed on the back of the same stele arranging the payment of the priestess, securely dated to 424/3, the chronological evidence provided by the epitaph of the first priestess to serve the temple, and the course of Kallikrates’ career, which probably included construction of the middle Long Wall to the Piraeus, part of the south wall of the Acropolis, several other small Ionic amphiprostyle temples including the temple on the Ilissos River, and perhaps a hand in the Parthenon.²⁰³ Now that the sigma controversy can be declared over, the only criterion for the earlier dating of the

²⁰⁰ *IG I³ 35*. On the history of scholarship on this much-discussed inscription, see esp. Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 107–111, no. 44; Mattingly 2000; Gill 2001, 265–269.

²⁰¹ For a succinct synopsis of the controversy and its resolution, see Gill 2001, 274–276.

²⁰² Mark (1993, 58–67, 104–107) essentially removed the gap by keeping the high date of the decree and applying it to the *naïskos* phase of the sanctuary, which he dated to the mid-5th century based on his belief that an earlier rebuilding would have violated the Oath of Plataea. Bundgaard had earlier suggested a connection between the building decree and the *naïskos* (1976, 48–53). Mattingly (1982, 385), Wesenberg (1998), Shear (1999, 120–125), and Gill (2001) in particular have conclusively shown the flaws in this reasoning, and the clear consensus is that the decree authorized the construction of the marble temple, as Giraud too argued (1994, 38–43). Tomlinson (1995) and de Waele (1997) explicitly accepted Mark’s chronology and interpretation of the building decree. Other proposals to account for the gap focused on delay due to the necessary order of construction projects on the Acropolis (Meiggs, 1972, 496–503; Shear 1999, 124–125), political and religious arguments about the plan (Schachermeyr 1968, 35 with n. 72), and the exigencies of war (Wesenberg 1981, 47–53). On the architectural date of the marble temple, see esp. Miles 1980a, 323–352; Wesenberg 1981; Mark 1993, 82–86.

²⁰³ Mattingly 1961, 169–171; 1982; 2000. Mattingly has most recently (2000, 605–606) proposed a date of 425 BCE, in the same prytany as the Great Reassessment (*IG I³ 71*; see below, n. 215), followed by Gill (2001, 266) and Lippman, Scahill, and Schultz (2006, 559), with further discussion. The decree on the salary of the priestess is *IG I³ 36*. The epitaph of the first priestess, Myrrhine, is *IG I³ 1330* (*SEG XII 80*); see Papademetriou 1951 and now Lougovaya-Ast 2006 (who maintains the traditional early date of the building decree and accounts for the “gap” by identifying two distinct epigrams within the epitaph). On Kallikrates’ career see also Shear 1963 and 1999, 125 with n. 219; Gill 2001, 276–278. On the other small Ionic amphiprostyle temples very similar to the Nike temple, see esp. Korres 2003, 29–32 and Leventi 2014 (with a focus on the architectural sculpture). On the temple on the Ilissos as it relates to the Nike temple, see esp. Miles 1980a; Wesenberg 1981; Korres 1996.

decree has vanished, and a clearer understanding of the last phase of the sanctuary (Mark's Stage IV) has been reached.

Circa 430, or perhaps a bit later given the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, the decision was made to renovate the sanctuary on a plan that included the raising and sheathing of the bastion in limestone ashlars, the construction of the marble Ionic amphiprostyle temple atop it, and the partial preservation of the *naïskos* and its altars within it. This project marked a major change, but within the bright new sanctuary a few visible reminders of its past life remained. Notably, the *naïskos* and altars were deliberately immured inside the bastion. The doors Kallikrates was instructed to provide probably were to secure the earlier sanctuary while construction on the new sanctuary proceeded. The top of the *naïskos* was truncated by the foundations of the marble temple,²⁰⁴ and so the cult statue was probably removed early on, but it is conceivable that the earlier sanctuary continued to serve the cult until the new temple was completed. Afterwards, it probably remained theoretically accessible, though not meant to be visible. We can again compare this to the situation in the sanctuary at Kalapodi, where the post-Persian provisional cult building in the ruins of the northern temple continued to function while a new peripteral temple was built around it beginning ca. 460. When the new temple was complete enough to use, the cult was transferred through a last burnt sacrifice and the provisional cult building with its offering table was ritually buried and covered over with mudbrick.²⁰⁵ At both Kalapodi and in the Nike sanctuary the choice was made to preserve earlier small, plain cult buildings at least in part even though construction of the new temples would have been easier

²⁰⁴ Mark 1993, 72–73.

²⁰⁵ Felsch 1988, 63; Niemeier 2013, 41. Kienast (1988, 103) sees evidence of an Attic architect in the plan of the Classical temples at Kalapodi, perhaps strengthening the connection between the Athenian and Kalapodian treatment of earlier cult buildings.

with their simple removal. In the Athenian case, the continuity of the cult of Athena Nike on that same spot must have been crucial, witnessing, however humbly, the victory in the Persian Wars and the bastion's long history protecting the Acropolis entrance.

A much more visible preservation of the old within the new sanctuary was achieved through the sheathing of the cyclopean masonry of the bastion in Piraeus limestone ashlar.²⁰⁶ That this sheathing was meant to enhance and not simply hide the bastion is clearly evidenced by the polygonal “window” left on the north face and the large niche built into the west face. On the north, the side most prominent to those ascending the Acropolis, a cyclopean boulder projects into an irregular polygonal opening in the ninth and tenth courses of the ashlar sheathing, about at eye level.²⁰⁷ The lowest courses of the sheathing bulge out in places, giving the impression of more protruding boulders within, helping the window achieve the meaningful metonymy. The emerging cyclopean block, in dark Acropolis limestone, was quite conspicuous within the white limestone sheathing and against the marble Propylaia and new temple, and successfully conveys the idea that the sheathing overlies more of the same masonry. The viewer was meant to remember that the new sanctuary was still founded on the ancient Mycenaean Bastion. The West Cyclopean Wall, respected by Mnesikles' Propylaia, remained the prominent backdrop of the sanctuary to the viewer approaching from the west, enhancing the recognizability of the salient boulder within the sheathing.

The large niche in the west face of the bastion replicated and regularized the Bronze-Age niche built into the cyclopean masonry, complete with the central pillar. A small window in the

²⁰⁶ Mark 1993, 69–70.

²⁰⁷ Mark (1993, 70) suggested that in antiquity this opening was “capped by a thin polygonal slab, now missing,” and reports anathyrosis on the sides of the opening (n. 4). I could not detect any sign of anathyrosis in December 2014, and have not seen other scholars respond to either of these claims.

back of the southern half again reveals the darker stone of the bastion itself. It is unclear how the Mycenaean niche had been used before the sheathing of the bastion, but the supporting pillar Balanos found within it was almost certainly an Archaic or Classical replacement of a prehistoric circular support, showing that it had certainly been recognized and preserved.²⁰⁸ The replication of the niche in the sheathing reemphasized the idea of cult continuity and the importance of long-standing Athenian piety to the achievement Athenian victory.

By the time the sheathing was complete, the temple was nearly finished, and the priestess was installed in 424/3, the Athenians had scored a rash of victories against the Spartans and their allies, including a major triumph under the demagogue Kleon at Sphacteria off Pylos in 425, and victory in the Peloponnesian War looked to be theirs.²⁰⁹ Kleon, aspiring to be seen as “the new Pericles,” and his democratic allies would take charge of the Nike sanctuary project, if they had not already been its driving force earlier on, to fully exploit its memorial potential.²¹⁰ In the iconography of the temple’s frieze and the slightly later parapet and in other adornments of the sanctuary the leadership of these “new politicians” is clear.²¹¹ They turned the bastion and sanctuary into an ostentatious victory monument of the sort not seen in Athens in the immediate aftermath of the Persian Wars.

²⁰⁸ Cf. Wright (1994, 341): “The one enduring and impressive remnant [of the original form of the bastion] was the niche with its column, a symbolic element that made a strong impression on the early Athenians.”

²⁰⁹ On the political situation in Athens in the 420s, see Kallet 2009, who emphasizes Kleon’s similarities to Pericles despite the critical views taken by his contemporaries Thucydides and Aristophanes.

²¹⁰ Schultz 2009, 150–151. That the priestess of the cult was chosen by democratic lot (on which see Lambert 2010a, 153–156), and that the decree establishing her salary was passed in the same year as Kleon was elected general and given unprecedented honors by the *boule*, has been seen as strong evidence of Kleon’s leadership in finishing the temple. See Lippman, Scahill, and Schultz 2006, 558–560 for a summary of the “series of historical connections that exist between the final rise of the radical democrats, a series of spectacular Athenian victories in the mid 420s (Pylos included), and the final completion of the Nike temple itself.”

²¹¹ A term developed by Connor 1971 to convey the perceived change in the relationship of the *demos* to a leader.

In addition to the sheathing and the temple itself, a statue of Athena was erected in the sanctuary funded by the spoils of victorious battles in northern Greece in 426/5 BCE. A Lykourgan-era inscription authorizing its repair records that the spoils were taken from the Ambrakiots in Olpai, the revolutionaries at Kekyra, and the Anaktorians, all battles won by Kleon's associates.²¹² Whether it was a new cult statue or a separate monument within the sanctuary,²¹³ this was a new thing; although the bastion was clearly associated with victory, it does not seem to have been a locus of dedications or thank-offerings after successful battles. Perhaps this was due largely to its small size. Victory monuments like Pheidias' Athena Promachos or the display of the quadriga and chains taken from the Chalcidian prisoners were more effective in the relatively open space atop the Acropolis. The new Athena statue would thus have been a point of emphasis as perhaps the first substantial victory monument within the rebuilt sanctuary.

Even more conspicuous was the use of the bastion sheathing as a background for the display of bronze shields. A convincing recent reconstruction of 99 pairs of cuttings in the sheathing noted by Dinsmoor before the restoration work of the 1930s, argues that 99 of the 120 Spartan shields captured by Kleon at Pylos in 425 were mounted on the bastion with their handles still attached (i.e., still usable), a move criticized by Aristophanes in his *Knights* (843–

²¹² *IG* II² 403. See Lippman, Scahill, and Schultz 2006, 559–560 for discussion and earlier bibliography, and Lambert 2010b, 226–228, 232 and 2012, 271–272, no. 21 for the Lykourgan repair. Pausanias also mentions that the Athenians dedicated a bronze statue of Athena on the Acropolis as a memorial of the events at Sphakteria (4.36.6), which Julia Shear argues stood in the Nike sanctuary (2001, 780).

²¹³ Most see it as a new cult statue, but the argument that it was not is based on another decree (*IG* I³ 64A) relating to the building project that mentions τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἄγαλμα in the Nike sanctuary, indicating the continued survival of the ancient cult statue. See Mark 1993, 108–110 for this reconstruction. Mattingly (2000, 605–606) agrees with Mark's reading but disagrees with his interpretation, without adequately addressing would have happened to the explicitly mentioned old cult image if the new statue were its replacement.

859), staged the following year.²¹⁴ Kleon famously dedicated some of these Spartan shields in the Stoa Poikile in the Agora, a conventional place for the dedication and display of war spoils, where Pausanias later saw them,²¹⁵ but mounting such a quantity of them on the bastion was an even more remarkable statement. In Aristophanes' portrayal of a contest for the favor of Demos, Kleon ("Paphlagon") boasts that his victory at Pylos will gag his rivals for as long as even one of the Spartan shields remained visible to remind them of his triumph.²¹⁶ The gleaming mass of bronze on the new bastion surface would indeed have been intensely visible from afar, especially from the Pnyx, where Aristophanes sets the imagined debate in *Knights*.²¹⁷

The embellishment of the temple and the iconography of its frieze and of the sculpted parapet added at the bastion's edge, though much debated, are probably also best understood in connection with Kleon's victories and ambitions.²¹⁸ The temple's central akroterion was likely a pair of Nikes flying over shields, clearly echoing the shields displayed on the bastion below.²¹⁹ The west frieze probably depicted a recent battle, either the victory at Sphakteria/Pylos or against the Ambrakiots.²²⁰ The north frieze, as recently argued by P. Schultz, portrayed the capture and

²¹⁴ Lippman, Scahill, and Schultz 2006; Dinsmoor 1926, 3, n. 2. On Thucydides' views of Kleon, echoing Aristophanes' criticisms, see Yunis 1996, 87–92.

²¹⁵ Paus. 1.15.5. A shield discovered in the Agora in 1937 in a 3rd-century BCE context, inscribed ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΙ ΑΠΟ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ ΕΚ ΠΥΛΟΥ, suggests that not all 120 shields were dedicated in the Stoa Poikile; see Shear 1937, 346–348. For a discussion of the shields dedicated in the stoa in light of Gell's theory of social agency of art, see Whitley 2006.

²¹⁶ Ar. *Knights* 844–846: ἐμοὶ γὰρ ἐστ' εἰργασμένον τοιοῦτον ἔργον ὥστε | ἀπαξάπαντας τοὺς ἐμοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἐπιστομίζειν, | ἕως ἂν ἦ τῶν ἀσπίδων τῶν ἐκ Πύλου τι λοιπόν.

²¹⁷ See Lippman, Scahill, and Schultz 2006, 557.

²¹⁸ For a recent summary of the architectural sculpture of the temple and parapet, see Leventi 2014, 57–106. For bibliography of the debate over the "historical" vs. "legendary" character of the battle scenes on the frieze, see Schultz 2009, 161 n. 9. On the consensus date of the mid- to late 420s for the frieze, see Schultz 2009, 148, 164, n. 70. For a discussion of the iconography of war dead within the sculptural program, see Arrington 2015, 172–176.

²¹⁹ Schultz 2001, 30–36.

²²⁰ See Boersma 1970, 85; Hurwit 2004, 186–187; Schultz 2009, 150, 166, n. 85.

killing of Eurystheus during the legendary battle for the Herakleidai near Athens, which represented “the first in a tradition of pious triumphs over invading Peloponnesians and their allies.”²²¹ Just as the Persian Wars would become a precedent for later alliances against barbarian invaders in the rhetoric of 4th-century orators, this version of the defeat of Eurystheus was taken to be a factual event of the Athenian past and set out by Kleon and his allies as a precedent for their victories over the Spartans.

The iconography of the parapet, probably added closer to the time of the temple’s completion than previously thought, alluded to the symbolic tribute of arms and cattle Athens demanded of its allies in the Great Reassessment of 425, which had been proposed by Thoudippos, likely Kleon’s son-in-law.²²² In addition to all the allusive iconography, the significance of the physical location of all this boastful commemoration should not be overlooked. Although the sanctuary was largely remade, the old cult remained central; the ancient cult statue stood (or sat) in the new temple, the *naïskos* and the upcycled survivors of the pre-Persian sanctuary remained immured within the bastion, and the bastion itself was recognizable within its new frame. Contemporary victory was founded upon past victory, upon a massive military fortification that, because of contemporary military triumphs, no longer needed to fulfill a military function. “In this climate of triumph,” conclude M. Lippman, D. Scahill, and

²²¹ Schultz 2009, 154.

²²² *IG I³ 71*. Mattingly and Gill have proposed that this decree was passed in the same prytany as the Nike temple decree (*IG I³ 35*), which, if correct, would make the connection between Kleon’s democrats and the completion of the temple almost impossible to deny. See Lippman, Scahill, and Schultz 2006, 559 for discussion. On the date of the parapet, see Lippman, Scahill, and Schultz 2006, 559; on its iconography and technique, see esp. Brouskari 1999.

Schultz, the shield-covered bastion “became *the* symbol of Athenian victory, not just the victory at Pylos but victory in the Peloponnesian War as a whole.”²²³

This ostentatious celebration of victory in the new Sanctuary of Athena Nike, so different from the commemoration of the Greek victory over the Persians on the same spot, might in fact have played a role in the later re-emphasis of the memory of the Persian Wars discussed above in relation to the Old Athena Temple. In their earlier commemorative strategies on the Acropolis the Athenians had deliberately reused ruins, as in the Old Athena Temple, re-erected damaged statues, as in Pausanias’ burnt Athenas, and undertaken minimal reconstruction directly atop the destruction debris to enable the resumption of cult practices, as in the Athena Nike sanctuary, in order to perpetuate the memory of the Persian barbarity and impiety that compelled them to fight. The renovation of the sanctuary in the 420s, by contrast, preserved in particular the memory of the deeper prehistoric past that underlay Athenian autochthonous identity, rather than the active memory of the painful destruction of the Persian Wars; the post-Persian era of the sanctuary was important and therefore preserved, but out of sight—more suppressed than perpetuated. Even more, Kleon and his allies turned the whole sanctuary of Athenian victory, Athena Nike, into a monument to their own contemporary victories. While these significant victories would continue to be a matter of pride, we must of course remember that Athens was not, in the end, victorious in the Peloponnesian War, as they thought they were or would soon be in the mid-420s. The boastful celebration of ultimately fleeting victories may have been part of the reason why the 4th-century orators like Isokrates and Lykourgos needed to resuscitate the memory of the Persian Wars and re-emphasize the memorial techniques of the post-Persian

²²³ 2006, 560.

generations through the Oath of Plataea. The Old Athena Temple and the burnt *korai* were still standing by to serve as their witnesses.

Chapter 4. Altering Social Memory through Reuse Meant to be Invisible

Whereas the previous chapter focused on cases of upcycling where the visible preservation of the life history and experiences of materials was of primary concern to those undertaking the reuse, this chapter will discuss instances of more subtle reuse, where the fact that an object or monument had been reemployed or changed was intended to be nearly invisible, or at least not subsequently noticeable. While the agents behind the upcycling discussed in the previous chapter made use of the “visibility of the trace” to encourage the perpetuation of collectively held knowledge and memories, in the following case studies the Athenian *demos* chose to reuse monuments in such a way that the *invisibility* of the act of reuse itself was meant to effect a change in an existing social memory. These case studies primarily encompass portrait statues and monuments composed thereof, both in the Agora and especially on the Acropolis, and although some of them involve the erasure of inscriptions or removal of statues, most of them do not constitute “memory sanctions,” nor are they examples of the phenomenon we call by the modern term *damnatio memoriae*, whose real significance lay in the visibility of the obliteration.¹

As we will see, the ethos behind portrait statues, and particularly those bestowed by *poleis* in order to honor benefactors in the reciprocal system of euergetism developed in the Hellenistic period, was inextricably bound up with the idea of memory perpetuation. Nevertheless, statues and their bases were easily and not infrequently reused. This practice caused considerable angst for some, most notably perhaps for the rhetor and sophist Dio

¹ On “memory sanctions,” see esp. Flower 2006; on *damnatio memoriae*, see esp. Varner 2004 and further bibliography below, Chapter 5, n. 19. For more on both concepts as they relate to Athenian social memory, see Chapter 5 below.

Chrysostom, whose *Rhodian Oration* I will discuss at some length below. The materials I examine in this chapter, however, are again distinguished by a notable intentionality discernible in the reuse. Beyond any possible economic motivations, other significant factors seem to have been at work in the choice to reuse a given statue monument in a certain social, political, temporal, and spatial context. In these cases, the subtle changes achieved through upcycling, I argue, led to consequent or at least intended changes in Athenian social memory.

The Monument of the Eponymous Heroes

I begin with a long-lived monument of central civic importance at a central node within the urban fabric of Athens, the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes near the southwest corner of the Agora. This monument underwent several remodelings over the course of several centuries, which I treat as reuse of the monument as a whole, each designed to be essentially unnoticeable to the casual observer. In fact, the changes were intended to be largely invisible even to one observing more closely, since all Athenian citizens interacted with the monument on a regular basis. The effect of this repeated but inconspicuous renewal, I will argue, was change in the collective conception of the tribal system, the foundation of Athenian public life, by making it seem as though the old Kleisthenic system had always included what were in fact new tribes.

The long rectangular monument, of which some few but informative fragments are presented in situ in the Agora today, was constructed in the third quarter of the 4th century BCE, running north-south at the eastern edge of the major road along the west side of the Agora, across from the Metroön and Bouleuterion. The history of the monument has been convincingly reconstructed by T. Shear, through detailed study of the archaeological remains and through

ancient testimonia, including the account of Pausanias.² In all phases of its existence, the monument consisted of a fenced *peribolos* surrounding a tall rectangular pedestal, which supported life-size bronze statues of the heroes who gave their names to the tribes (*phylai*) after the fundamental reorganization of the Athenian citizenry by Kleisthenes in 508/7 BCE, which instituted ten new tribes in place of the four Ionic tribes.³ The original ten Eponymoi, eventually believed to have been chosen by the Delphic oracle from a list of one hundred names Kleisthenes submitted to the Pythia,⁴ were later joined by foreign monarchs in the Hellenistic and Roman periods.

The monument and its predecessor were well known in antiquity as the location for the posting of public notices of various sorts. This important civic function is referenced in numerous ancient authors, from Aristophanes to Libanios.⁵ Amongst the items written on boards (*ἐν σανίσιν* or *εἰς λεύκωμα*) and posted on or before the Eponymoi (usually *πρὸ* or *πρόσθε(ν)* *τῶν ἐπωνύμων*) were muster lists for military service,⁶ lists of new *epebes*,⁷ necessary laws and legal contradictions found by the *nomothetai*,⁸ other legislation proposed before meetings of the

² Shear 1970. With the exception of Vatin 1995, Shear's reconstruction of the monument's life history has won almost universal agreement. Pausanias 1.5 is our fullest description of the monument. For the initial excavation of the monument, see Stillwell 1933, 137–139; for the establishment of its identification, see Vanderpool 1949, 129–132. For extensive earlier bibliography, see Ioakimidou 1997, 105–106.

³ Hdt. 5.66, 69. The Ionic tribes were named after the sons of Ion: Geleon, Aegikores, Argades, and Hoples. On Kleisthenes' reorganization of the tribes, see esp. Anderson 2003, 36–40, 123–134.

⁴ Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 21.6: ταῖς δὲ φυλαῖς ἐποίησεν ἐπωνύμους ἐκ τῶν προκριθέντων ἑκατὸν ἀρχηγετῶν, οὓς ἀνεῖλεν ἡ Πυθία δέκα. Pausanias also reports that the Eponymoi gave their names to the Athenian tribes in accordance with a Delphic oracle (10.10.1). The ten Kleisthenic Eponymoi were: Erechtheus, Aigeus, Pandion, Leos, Akamas, Oineus, Kekrops, Hippothoon, Ajax, and Antiochos. On these figures generally, see esp. Kron 1976.

⁵ The ancient testimonia referencing the monument are collected in Wycherley 1957, 85–90, nos. 229–255.

⁶ Ar. *Pax* 1183–1184, with scholiasts (see below, n. 12).

⁷ Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 53.4.

⁸ Andoc. 1.83; Aischin. *In Ctes.* 3.38–39.

ekklesia,⁹ notices of lawsuits,¹⁰ and public announcements of honors decreed.¹¹ It seems that such notices, particularly lists for ephebic and military service, were posted by tribe, on the pedestal beneath the statue of the appropriate hero. We should thus imagine the average citizen often approaching the monument in order to look for his name on such lists, peruse proposed new laws, and gossip about litigation. That posting on the monument was indeed a great way to make information widely known is particularly clear in the references of Isaios (5.38), where Dikaiogenes is publicly shamed for failing to deliver money promised for the safety of the city, and of Demosthenes (21.103), where Meidias hires a false accuser simply so that notice of a charge of desertion against Demosthenes would appear before the Eponymoi for all to see.

Since the monument identified in the Agora is not earlier than the mid-4th century, but literary references to the function of the Eponymous Heroes Monument as a public notice board are as early as the 420s, there must have been an earlier predecessor to 4th-century version of the monument.¹² None of the later references distinguish the successor from its predecessor in any regard.¹³ Shear recognized this, and after “judicious probing” revealed that no earlier monument

⁹ Dem. *Lept.* 20.94; 24.18, 23; Suda, *s.v.* ἐπώνυμοι.

¹⁰ Isae. 5.38; Dem. *Meid.* 21.103; Lib. *Declam.* 1.43 (*Apologia Socratis*).

¹¹ Isoc. 18.61.

¹² Aristophanes’ *Peace*, composed in 421 BCE contains the earliest reference that most take as secure: standing by the statue of Pandion, a citizen sees his own name listed for military service (εἶτα προστάς πρὸς τὸν ἀνδριάντα τὸν Πανδίωνος εἶδεν αὐτόν, lines 1183–1184). One scholiast expanded that the statue was among the eponymous tribal statues on which were posted muster lists (εἷς ἐστὶ τῶν ἰβ’ ἀνδριάντων ἐν οἷς ἐγράφοντο οἱ στρατιωτικοὶ κατάλογοι καὶ τὰ κηρύγματα), and another added that this was a place at Athens by the Prytaneion, in which stand the statues they call Eponymoi (τόπος Ἀθήνησιν παρὰ πρυτανεῖον ἐν ᾧ ἐστήκασιν ἀνδριάντες, οὓς ἐπωνύμους καλοῦσιν); see Holwerda 1982, 169. It is usually assumed that this second scholiast has confused the Prytaneion, which was not in the Agora, with the Tholos, which housed the *prytaneis* and was sometimes called the “Prytanikon” (see further discussion below). A reference in Aristophanes’ *Knights* (lines 977–980), composed three years before *Peace*, speaks of old men disputing in the place where the lawsuits are displayed (τὸ δεῖγμα τῶν δικῶν). This could also refer to the Eponymous Heroes Monument, but we cannot be certain, and no scholiasts commented to such an effect.

¹³ Shear 1970, 204.

stood on the spot of the later one,¹⁴ proposed that the foundations of a large early monument base excavated beneath the western end of the Middle Stoa had held the statues of the heroes from the mid-5th century until the erection of its replacement about a century later. The preserved foundations of this monument measure 9.70 meters in length and 2.35 meters in width, somewhat smaller than the later monument.¹⁵ It was also oriented north-south, and stood within the major thoroughfare at the southwest corner of the Agora, eight meters north of the Aiakeion, from which it took its orientation, and about fifty meters due south of location of the later monument.¹⁶ Based on the stratigraphy of the road to either side of it, Shear estimated that it was constructed ca. 430–425, and was carefully and systematically dismantled and its foundations covered over with crushed bedrock fill in the mid-4th century, perhaps to facilitate the flow of traffic on the road.¹⁷

Against Shear's identification, U. Kron has objected that the estimated length of nine meters for the statue-bearing surface of the monument beneath the Middle Stoa, being about five meters shorter than the crowing course of the first phase of the later monument, is too small to have held ten statues and provided enough room for the posting of notices.¹⁸ Kron also finds the lack of a *peribolos*, characteristic of every phase of the later monument, a significant problem

¹⁴ Shear 1970, 146, 204.

¹⁵ Shear 1970, 207, 220.

¹⁶ Shear 1970, 205–207.

¹⁷ Shear 1970, 208–219.

¹⁸ Kron 1976, 229.

with Shear's proposal,¹⁹ and instead suggests that prior to the 4th century notices were perhaps posted somewhere in or around the concentration of Herms in the northwest area of the Agora.²⁰

J. Travlos put forward the idea that the original monument might have been located in the Old Agora, that is, in the predecessor to the Classical Agora located in the eastern part of the city, where the Prytaneion is known to have been located.²¹ This suggestion is based on three brief references: a scholiast to Aristophanes' *Peace* who claims that the statues called the Eponymoi were near the Prytaneion; the statement in the Aristotelian *Athenaion Politeia* that the (eponymous) archon had his office in the Prytaneion; and the Suda's claim that the archon's headquarters were beside the Eponymoi.²² Most scholars have thought instead that Aristophanes' scholiast confused the Tholos, sometimes called the "Prytanikon," for the Prytaneion, and Travlos' proposal has not gained traction.

Some have sympathized with Kron's objection about the size of the monument beneath the Middle Stoa,²³ and there is also disagreement about whether any original monument would necessarily have been built contemporaneously with the Kleisthenic reforms themselves,²⁴ but on the whole, Shear's proposed identification seems the most likely solution on present evidence. A nine-meter long base is certainly long enough for ten statues, leaving close to a meter between

¹⁹ Kron 1976, 231.

²⁰ Kron 1976, 232–236.

²¹ Travlos 1971, 210. On the Prytaneion and its location, see most recently Schmalz 2006.

²² Schol. Ar. *Peace* 1183–1184 (see above, n. 12); Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 3.5; Suda, s.v. ἄρχων.

²³ E.g., Mattusch 1994, 76 and 1996, 50. Hintzen-Bohlen (1996, 92) does not address Shear's proposal but says the location of the earlier monument is not known.

²⁴ Mattusch (1994, 76) thinks the monument should exist from about the time of the reforms; Brogan (2003, 197–198) suggests ca. 480–465. Kron (1976, 232) and Hölscher (1998, 162) think any original monument should be Periclean.

the centers of each, despite the somewhat greater length of the later monument, which, as will be discussed shortly, also carried two tripods in addition to the ten statues.²⁵ The spatial relationship between the two monuments, their general similarity in shape, their complementary chronologies, and the evidence that the earlier monument was carefully dismantled combine to form the economical interpretation that the later monument replaced the earlier in a more protected but still prominent spot near the most important civic buildings in the Agora. It is a reasonable suggestion, though one that cannot be proven or disproven, that the statues of the 5th-century monument were removed and reused on the new slightly larger base.²⁶

Whatever the circumstances of its predecessor, the structure we know as the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes was first constructed in the second half of the 4th century, consisting of a circa 1.25-meter high *peribolos* fence of wooden rails between stone posts surrounding a built pedestal whose top was probably a bit higher than eye level.²⁷ The pedestal was centered within the fence, leaving a gap of about 0.40 meters between the sill and the pedestal on all sides.²⁸ The sill, fence posts and caps, and euthynteria course of the pedestal were of limestone,²⁹ while Pentelic marble was used at least for the step course of the pedestal and the capping course

²⁵ Shear 1970, 220.

²⁶ Mattusch (1994, 79) is particularly in favor of this idea. Hölscher (1969, 422) finds it more likely that new statues were made. Kron (1976, 230) finds the idea of reuse incredible.

²⁷ Because the clamps on the capping course were left exposed (Shear 1970, 165). The *peribolos* fence of this phase finds a striking parallel to that surrounding the Altar of the Twelve Gods; see Shear 1970, esp. 150, and Gadbery 1992, esp. 471, 472.

²⁸ Shear 1970, 161, n. 25.

²⁹ Shear 1970, 151, 162.

that acted as a plinth for the statues and was adorned with a unique cornice-like projecting molding.³⁰ The pedestal was 16.036 meters long and 1.263 meters wide at the capping course.³¹

For the date of this first phase of the monument, the *Athenaion Politeia* provides a terminus ante quem of 332–322 BCE, placing the Eponymous Heroes in front of the Bouleuterion.³² Shear advocated a date closer to the middle of the century, based on the use of double T clamps rather than the hook clamps that became common in the 330s.³³ However, after S. Rotroff published a fragmentary inventory inscription from a heroön in the Agora, listing ten silver kylikes dedicated by the *demos* to the Eponymous Heroes in 328/7, and suggested that the dedication had been made to commemorate either the beginning or culmination of the monument's construction, a weak consensus has formed around a date ca. 330, or more generally in the Lykourgan period.³⁴

The two largely intact marble capping blocks of the pedestal preserve critical clues for the appearance of the statuary of the monument in this phase, and for understanding the subsequent alterations to the monument. Labeled with masons marks beta and kappa, they were the second and twentieth blocks, respectively, from the northern end of the monument.³⁵ The

³⁰ Shear 1970, 163, 168. Shear adduces the Lysikrates monument as the closest parallel for the molding (p. 168).

³¹ Shear 1970, 163–167.

³² Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 53.4. On the date of composition, see esp. Rhodes 1981, 51–53.

³³ Shear 1970, 196.

³⁴ Rotroff 1978, esp. 208–209; followed by Hintzen-Bohlen 1996, 92–94; 1997, 42; Knell 2000, 94; Papastamati-von Moock 2007, 322; and Monaco 2011, 227. This inscription is the strongest evidence, admittedly weak, that the Eponymoi were worshipped as a group, in addition to their individual cults. For discussion of the question, including some ambiguous references in Demosthenes, see Rotroff 1978, 207–208. On the individual tribal cults, see Anderson 2003, 130–131.

³⁵ Shear 1970, 167. The block labeled beta is Agora Inv. A 61 and the block labeled kappa is Agora Inv. A 66; both were found near the monument after being used as cover slabs for the Great Drain in Late Antiquity, and have now been placed on reconstructed pedestals at the southern end of the *peribolos*.

twentieth block is the final block on the southern end, finished with the crown molding on three sides and with anathyrosis on the fourth, is slightly longer than the second block, and preserves clear cuttings for the three feet of a bronze tripod, while the second block has a cutting for the tenon of a slightly over life-size bronze statue, perhaps in a Polykleitan *contrapposto* stance.³⁶ In this first phase then, the capping course consisted of twenty blocks carrying a row of bronze statues of the ten Eponymous Heroes, flanked by tripods at each end. Shear concluded from the placement of the tenon on the second capping block and from later work on the *peribolos* fence that the statues faced east, into the open area of the Agora.³⁷ The tripods were aesthetically useful framing devices, but were also appropriate accoutrements of heroes and may have been intended as a reference to the Delphic oracle's sanction of the ten heroes.³⁸

In the second phase of the monument's life, Shear has demonstrated that the pedestal was extended at both ends through the shifting of each of the terminal blocks toward the fence and the addition an extra block at each end. The euthynteria of the pedestal now came to rest directly on the sill with its ends flush against the fence posts.³⁹ Cuttings on the southern capping block reveal that the original T clamps were carefully removed and hook clamps were used in the same sockets, showing that the block was moved. Similarly, the second capping block at the north end had its original T clamps replaced by hook clamps on the northern side, but those on its southern side remained in place, indicating that northern terminal block was also moved, but the rest were

³⁶ Shear 1970, 163–167, 170.

³⁷ Shear 1970, 169. That the statues faced east rather than west seems likely, but not certain. Vatin's (1995) rather fanciful reconstruction of five heroes facing each direction, contrived in order to make the monument match the order in which Pausanias lists the heroes, has not won support (see below, n. 77).

³⁸ Shear 1970, 169–170; Kron 1976, 232; Hintzen-Bohlen 1996, 94.

³⁹ Shear 1970, 171–173.

left unchanged.⁴⁰ Thus, the length of the pedestal was extended to the maximum extent possible without alteration of the *peribolos* fence. This added almost two meters to the capping course, allowing for the addition of two new statues on the inserted blocks.⁴¹

Given what we know through written evidence of changes in the Athenian tribal system, this remodeling of the monument should correspond to the creation of two new tribes named in honor of the Macedonians Antigonos (Monophthalmos) and his son Demetrios (Poliorketes) in 307/6, shortly before they took for themselves the title of king.⁴² This honor was perhaps the highest of the suite of honors bestowed by the Athenians on Antigonos and Demetrios as liberators after the latter's defeat of Demetrios of Phaleron, who had been ruling Athens at Kassander's behest.⁴³ The monument in the Agora needed to be updated to reflect the changes, since notices relevant to the two new tribes required a spot for display equal to the rest. Thus, the flanking tripods were moved outward, and statues of Antigonos and Demetrios were inserted on new capping blocks beside the old heroes. Whatever the order of the original statues had been, the new incarnation of the monument at least did not reflect the order that the tribes took in official documents, since the original ten statues were not moved.⁴⁴

⁴⁰ Shear 1970, 173.

⁴¹ Shear 1970, 175.

⁴² Diod. Sic. 20.46.2; Plut. *Vit. Demetr.* 10.4. On the dating of the tribes' establishment sometime after the fifth prytany of 307/6, see Pritchett 1937; on their deme composition, see Pritchett 1940.

⁴³ Amongst the other honors moved by the demagogue Stratokles and approved by the Athenians were, according to Diodorus Siculus (20.46.2), the appellation as savior gods with sacrifices and games, golden statues in a chariot near those of the Tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton in the Agora, crowns worth two hundred talents, and their images woven into Athena's sacred peplos. Plutarch (*Vit. Demetr.* 10–12) adds that an altar of Demetrios Kataibatos was set up on the spot where Demetrios had first alit from his chariot, and that the Athenians changed the name of the month Mounychion to Demetrian, and that of the festival Dionysia to Demetria. For a full treatment of the honors and their contexts, see Brogan 2003.

⁴⁴ Shear 1970, 199.

A cutting for a tenon on the top of the terminal capping block on the southern end of the monument shows that at one time the tripod was carefully removed and replaced by a bronze statue. This represents the third phase of the monument, comprising, as far as the preserved evidence suggests, only that minor modification to the composition of the group on the elongated pedestal.⁴⁵ This change corresponded to the addition of a thirteenth tribe in 224/3 BCE in honor of Ptolemy III Euergetes during an era of good relations between Athens and the Egyptian dynasty.⁴⁶ Maintaining the *peribolos* as it was must have taken priority over the symmetry of the composition, and Ptolemy's statue replace one of the flanking tripods.

A quarter century later, circa 200 BCE, the Athenians found themselves at war with the Macedonian king Philip V, who, on the pretext of an alliance with the Acharnanians, laid waste to Attica in a devastating invasion.⁴⁷ Athens reacted by abrogating the honors previously awarded to Philip's ancestors, Antigonos and Demetrios, including destroying a gilded equestrian statue and throwing the pieces into a well, an extreme expression of condemnation when bronze and gold could be easily melted down and reused.⁴⁸ Meanwhile, Athens had come under the protection of a new foreign ruler, the Pergamene king Attalos, who led an alliance that included the Rhodians and Romans in defense of the freedom of the Greeks versus Philip. When Attalos visited Athens from his base on nearby Aegina, he was heaped with honors that included

⁴⁵ Shear 1970, 175–176.

⁴⁶ The precise circumstances surrounding the bestowal of this honor are not known, but the date of the tribe's establishment has been securely worked out based on epigraphic evidence; see Pritchett 1942 (with summary of foregoing debate and discussion of the tribe's deme composition) and Meritt 1969.

⁴⁷ See Livy 31.14.6–10.

⁴⁸ Several fragments of the statue were found in a well in the Agora in 1971; see Shear 1973, 165–168; Houser 1982, 229–238 and 1987, 255–281; Brogan 2003, 199–203. On the “memory sanctions” enacted against Philip and his ancestors, see esp. Flower 2006, 34–41 and Byrne 2010.

inclusion amongst the Eponymous Heroes with a cult and priesthood.⁴⁹ These tribal changes—the abrogation of the Macedonian tribes and the creation of the tribe Attalis—were probably enacted at the same time,⁵⁰ and perhaps even on the same occasion as the passing of the decree condemning Philip and his ancestors.⁵¹

These changes were officially recorded in the deme list inscribed on the orthostates of the Great Altar of Athena on the Acropolis,⁵² and must have been reflected on the monument in the Agora, though the surviving blocks have preserved no traces of the modifications of this phase. Shear's reasonable inference is that when the statues of the two Macedonians were removed, a statue of Attalos replaced that at the north while the statue of Ptolemy at the south was shifted north to fill the gap and the terminal tripod was replaced.⁵³ This would accord with the account of Pausanias, who reported the statues of Ptolemy and Attalos but made no mention of the Macedonians.⁵⁴

For the next several hundred years the tribal system remained unchanged, with twelve tribes named after the original Kleisthenic decad plus Ptolemy and Attalos. The monument too seems to have remained unaltered in this period, with the only archaeologically visible change

⁴⁹ Polyb. 16.25; Livy 31.14.11–15.6. A prytany decree dating 193/2 BCE (*Agora* XV no. 259, line 86) is the first attestation of priests of Attalos and Ptolemy III; see Habicht 1990, 562.

⁵⁰ As argued by Traill 1986, 64–74 and supported by Stanton 1994, 193–194 and Byrne 2010, 159. On the deme composition of the new tribe Attalis, see also Pritchett 1943, 33–36.

⁵¹ See Byrne 2010, 158–159 for a critique of Livy's chronology, which puts the decree a year after the initial invasion. Pritchett (1954, 163–164) saw the invasion as the precipitating cause of the abrogation of the tribes, while Traill, arguing that all the tribal changes were contemporary, saw Attalos' visit as the more likely inspiration for the idea, since “just as Attalos' services pertained to the same historical events as Philip's disservices, so the means of honoring Pergamum were joined with those of dishonoring Macedonia, and it may even have been the idea of creating Attalis that first suggested the abrogation of Antigonis and Demetrias” (1986, 73).

⁵² *IG* II² 2362. On this inscription, see esp. Pritchett 1954; Traill 1975, 98–100, 132; Traill 1986, 52–78; Stanton 1994, 193–199.

⁵³ Shear 1970, 199–200.

⁵⁴ Paus. 1.5.5.

being an “extensive, if rather haphazard” repair of the *peribolos* fence.⁵⁵ All along the west side and at the southeast corner the fence was reset in new cuttings. Some but not all of the posts were shifted, resulting in irregular spacing that while probably not considered ideal must have been less important than maintaining the continuous line of the fence capping using the damaged pieces, now of different lengths.⁵⁶ On the short north and south ends, the corner posts were moved inward and the fence across those ends was eliminated, the material going toward the repairs along the west side.⁵⁷ On the east side, a central gate seems to have been added, perhaps both to facilitate entry for the officials who posted notices on the pedestal and to free up more materials for the repair job.⁵⁸ Shear, again reasonably, used a small amount of stratigraphic evidence and historical circumstances to assign this repair work to the aftermath of Sulla’s destructive entry into the city in 86 BCE.⁵⁹

The modifications to the monument in its final phase were the most radical, but still show an attempt by much later builders to match the form and aesthetic of the original monument. The *peribolos* was extended 2.75 meters at the southern end for the erection of a new pedestal.⁶⁰ Additionally, the fence along the eastern side of the now expanded monument was replaced in a Pentelic marble version, similar in form and dimensions to the previous limestone fence, though slightly taller, and with irregular spacing of the posts as on the repaired west side.⁶¹ Only the

⁵⁵ Shear 1970, 176.

⁵⁶ Shear 1970, 176–177.

⁵⁷ Shear 1970, 178–179.

⁵⁸ Shear 1970, 180.

⁵⁹ Shear 1970, 201.

⁶⁰ Shear 1970, 181.

⁶¹ Shear 1970, 184. The stubs of three of the marble posts are in situ on the sill today.

lowest foundations of the new pedestal survive, but the use of concrete gives us a date in the Roman period for the addition, and the extant foundations suggest that the new pedestal was somewhat longer than the space allotted for each statue on the main pedestal, probably close to the same width, and stood very near but was not physically connected with its predecessor.⁶² The statue it held may likewise have been noticeably larger than those of the other 12 Eponymoi.⁶³ The Roman workmanship along with the evidence of a statue base reused as a plinth for the extension of the *peribolos* fence, dated first to 50/49 BCE but turned upside down and reused for a second statue in the intervening period, suggest that this last phase of the monument should be connected with the establishment of a tribe named after the Roman emperor Hadrian around the time of his visits to Athens in the mid-120s CE.⁶⁴ Pausanias attests to the beloved philhellene's statue amongst the Eponymoi, having been placed there in Pausanias's own time, significantly later than those of Ptolemy and Attalos.⁶⁵

The Monument of the Eponymous Heroes remained remarkably similar throughout its half millennium of useful life, despite significant changes in the political organizational system it embodied and in the larger political structures and fortunes of the community for whom it played a central civic role. For the date of its eventual abandonment we have no clear evidence, though it is sometimes assumed that, like many of the monuments in the Agora, it was a victim of the Herulian Sack in 267 CE.⁶⁶ The function of the monument as the central public notice board for

⁶² Shear 1970, 186.

⁶³ Shear 1970, 203.

⁶⁴ Shear 1970, 202. There is uncertainty about the precise date of the new tribe's establishment; see Notopoulos 1946; Arafat 1996, 171. On the deme composition of the tribe Hadrianis, see Pritchett 1943, 37–39.

⁶⁵ Paus. 1.5.5: ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶνδε φυλὰς ἔχουσιν, Ἀττάλου τοῦ Μυσοῦ καὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Αἰγυπτίου καὶ κατ' ἐμὲ ἤδη βασιλέως Ἀδριανοῦ.

⁶⁶ E.g., Travlos 1971, 210.

Athenian citizens should not be underemphasized in evaluating the significance of the later alterations made to it. The many ancient references to the various sorts of notices posted before the heroes give us a good indication of the high level of interaction the average Athenian citizen would have had with the monument. As the tribe was the fundamental conduit for a citizen's participation in civic life, in terms of rights, benefits, and duties, so the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes was the central confluence of communication within the tribal system. Changes in the numbers and names of tribes, therefore, necessitated corresponding changes to the monument, so that it could continue to fulfill its communicative function.

This official function seems to be the crucial point differentiating the monument in the Agora from the Athenian monument(s) at Delphi that featured Eponymous Heroes, which have often been compared with the Agora monument and deserve a short digression here.⁶⁷ The monuments at Delphi, though perplexing in many respects, illuminate by contrast the image of timeless stability established by the Agora monument. One of these monuments, attested only in Pausanias and usually referred to as “the Miltiades monument,” was presumably located just inside the entrance to the sanctuary along the Sacred Way (below the wooden horse, ὑπὸ τὸν ἵππον τὸν δούρειον, according to Pausanias).⁶⁸ Pausanias describes a base that held 16 statues:

⁶⁷ The scholarship on these monuments is extremely confused, with some scholars wittingly or unwittingly conflating the two. Raubitschek 1974 is amongst the clearest treatments, though few (e.g., Partida 2000, 50–52 and Jung 2006, 96–108) agree with his suggestion that there was only one monument that was moved. The specific points of contention (many not openly acknowledged to be such) are beyond the scope of this discussion, but for the most significant contributions, see: La Coste-Messelière 1942–1943; Kron 1976, 215–227; Gauer 1980; Stähler 1991; Vatin 1991, 165–234; Ioakimidou 1997, 66–77, no. 11; Krumeich 1997, 93–102; Amandry 1998; Jacquemin 1999, 228–230; Neer 2004, esp. 66, 82–83; Davison 2009, 303–318.

⁶⁸ Although several attempts have been made to attach extant remains to the monument Pausanias describes, no identifications have gained acceptance. Nevertheless, what was a spindly line of rubble on excavation state plans has become the neat rectangular monument marked on subsequent site plans; see, e.g., the progression from the 1897 plan by Tournaire published by Frazer (1965, vol. 5, pl. 5, facing p. 258) to the state plan (pl. 2, no. 110) and restored plan (pl. 5, no. 110) in Bommelaer's 1991 site guide. For the falsely attributed blocks, with bibliography, see Ioakimidou 1997, 66–67.

Athena, Apollo, and Miltiades; of the Eponymous Heroes Erechtheus, Kekrops, Pandion, Leos, Antiochos, Aigeus, and Akamas; also the non-Eponymoi Kodrus, Theseus, and Phyleus; and Antigonos, Demetrios, and Ptolemy. Pausanias reports that the first 13 statues were sculpted by Pheidias and were a tithe (δεκάτη) taken from the spoils of the Battle of Marathon. The last three, the Hellenistic kings, he claims were sent to Delphi by the Athenians later, out of fear in the case of the Macedonians but out of goodwill in the case of Ptolemy.⁶⁹

This monument has puzzled scholars for several reasons, including the dearth of archaeological remains, the seemingly contradictory statements that the statues were both a tithe from the 490 BCE Marathon battle and by Pheidias, whose career is thought to have begun thirty years later, and the presence of the mortal general Miltiades amongst gods and heroes. Also baffling, and particularly germane to any comparisons with the monument in the Agora, are questions about the inclusion of seven of the ten Kleisthenic Eponymoi, but three additional non-Eponymous heroes, the apparent updating of the monument according to the first two changes to the tribal system, and the apparent lack of any further updates.⁷⁰ The composition of the monument certainly featured the Eponymoi, but far from exclusively or comprehensively.

Another Athenian monument at Delphi, this one attested only by physical remains and apparently not referenced in any surviving written source, though it was certainly still there in

⁶⁹ Paus. 10.10.1–2: τῷ βάθρῳ δὲ τῷ ὑπὸ τὸν ἵππον τὸν δούρειον διη ἐπίγραμμα μὲν ἐστὶν ἀπὸ δεκάτης τοῦ Μαραθωνίου ἔργου τεθῆναι τὰς εἰκόνας: εἰσὶ δὲ Ἀθηνᾶ τε καὶ Ἀπόλλων καὶ ἀνὴρ τῶν στρατηγησάντων Μιλτιάδης: ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἡρώων καλουμένων Ἐρεχθεύς τε καὶ Κέκροψ καὶ Πανδίων, οὗτοι μὲν διη καὶ Λεῶς τε καὶ Ἀντίοχος ὁ ἐκ Μήδης Ἡρακλεῖ γενόμενος τῆς Φύλαντος, ἔτι δὲ Αἰγεύς τε καὶ παίδων τῶν Θησέως Ἀκάμας, οὗτοι μὲν καὶ φυλαῖς Ἀθήνησιν ὀνόματα κατὰ μάντευμα ἔδοσαν τὸ ἐκ Δελφῶν: ὁ δὲ Μελάνθου Κόδρος καὶ Θησεύς καὶ Φηλεὺς ἐστὶν, οὗτοι δὲ οὐκέτι τῶν ἐπωνύμων εἰσὶ. [2] τοὺς μὲν διη κατελεγμένους Φειδίας ἐποίησε, καὶ ἀληθεῖ λόγῳ δεκάτη καὶ οὗτοι τῆς μάχης εἰσὶν: Ἀντίγονον δὲ καὶ τὸν παῖδα Δημήτριον καὶ Πτολεμαῖον τὸν Αἰγύπτιον χρόνῳ ὕστερον ἀπέστειλαν ἐς Δελφούς, τὸν μὲν Αἰγύπτιον καὶ εὐνοία τινὶ ἐς αὐτόν, τοὺς δὲ Μακεδόνας τῷ ἐς αὐτοὺς δέει. The hero given in the manuscripts as Phyleus is usually emended to Neleus or Philaios.

⁷⁰ For discussions of these questions and possible textual problems, see esp. Harrison 1979, 82–83.

some form in Pausanias' day, may also have held statues of the Eponymous Heroes. This is the so-called "Marathon base," a long limestone base running directly below the Treasury of the Athenians along the Sacred Way.⁷¹ The base preserves an inscription, the original recut not earlier than the 3rd century BCE, restored as recording that the Athenians dedicated it as first-fruits (ἀκροθίνια) from the Battle of Marathon, taken from the Medes.⁷² What the base held is in fact far from clear, but the excavators' assertions that it originally consisted of 10 blocks, was at some point modified by the addition of two blocks on the eastern end, and again at some later point by the addition of a thirteenth block in the middle, has led some to the easy assumption that it held statues of the Eponymous Heroes.⁷³ Tripods have sometimes been put forth as more appropriate, and the cuttings on top of the blocks have variously been taken as decisive proof of contradictory restorations.⁷⁴

It has proved tempting to compare the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes in the Agora with one or both of these monuments at Delphi. Some would like to consider the monument described by Pausanias as a privately dedicated version of an Eponymous Heroes monument, erected by Miltiades' son Kimon as part of his campaign to rehabilitate his father's legacy, and the Marathon base below the Treasury as the official public version mirroring the Agora

⁷¹ The physical relationship of the base and the treasury, and therefore the dating of the Treasury as pre- or post-Marathon, is of course quite contentious and also beyond the scope of this discussion. For important recent contributions to the debate, see Amandry 1998 and von den Hoff 2009.

⁷² See Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 35, no. 19 (= *FdD* III.2, no. 1; *SIG* 23b): Ἀθηναῖοι τ[ὸ]ι Ἀπόλλων[ι ἀπὸ Μέδ]οῦ ἀκ[ροθ]ίνια τῆς Μαραθ[ὸ]νι μ[άχε]ς].

⁷³ As in Bommelaer 1991, 137. See also the more detailed discussion by Jacquemin (1999, 227–229), who, although acknowledging the terminus post quem of the first addition as 290–280 BCE, nevertheless sees the modifications as tied to the changes in the tribal system.

⁷⁴ Eg., Gauer (1980, 127) claims the cuttings must have held trophies first and then post-Classical statues, while Stewart (2008, 392, n. 55) claims that the Polykleitan stance indicated by the cuttings dates the base to after ca. 450 BCE.

monument. Shear, for example, taking Pausanias at face value, sees the Pheidian statues of the Miltiades monument as the chief inspiration for the statues of the original Agora monument.⁷⁵ Indeed, one or both of these monuments likely bore some relation, official or otherwise, to the monument in the Agora, even if only in the overlapping representations of the Eponymoi Pausanias listed. It could be argued that the Athenian tribes embodied the *demos* as a whole, and the heroes were therefore an apt stand-in for the *demos* at the great Panhellenic sanctuary. Likewise, the Battle of Marathon came to stand as the most potent reference to Athenian leadership, bravery, and triumph, so a mash-up of the Eponymoi with Marathon could have enhanced the signifying force of both.⁷⁶

However, the situation at Delphi is extremely complicated, with a larger degree of uncertainty in the evidence and confusion in the scholarship than most commentators acknowledge. Therefore, we cannot rely on either of the Delphi monuments to tell us much about the Agora monument.⁷⁷ What they do underline by contrast, though, is the timeless and collective nature of the official monument in Athens. Where the Delphi monument(s), whatever their exact history, seem certainly to have included other figures and were modified but not kept up-to-date, the Eponymous Heroes Monument in the Agora was continually brought in line with the current tribal makeup, commensurate with its notice-board function.

If the changes in the tribes necessitated the changes in the Agora monument though, they did not necessarily dictate the way those modifications were executed. The architectural history

⁷⁵ Shear 1970, 222.

⁷⁶ Harrison (1979, 84–85) and Jung (2006, 104–105) express similar sentiments.

⁷⁷ Vatin's far-fetched reconstruction of the Agora monument (1995), based on his own unsubstantiated claims about the Delphi monuments (1991, 165–234) and a convoluted reading of Pausanias, should stand as a cautionary example.

of the monument shows that, with the possible exception of the Hadrianic phase, each renovation was designed with the intention of making the fact that changes had occurred as invisible as possible. The core of the monument—the pedestal and *peribolos* sill and fence—were maintained essentially intact for five hundred years. Rather than creating new monuments when decreeing these significant changes in the civic organization of the community, the *demos* continually reused the 4th-century monument.

This continuity cannot be accounted for by economic or pragmatic concerns. In the first renovation, for example, an easier, quicker, and cheaper way to add two statues to the monument would have been simply to replace the flanking tripods. The tripods were thus clearly significant to the monument, probably in connection with the idea that the Delphic oracle chose the original ten heroes, and perhaps even more closely connected with an Athenian delegation of ten hieropoioi, including Lykourgos, that traveled to Delphi around 330 BCE.⁷⁸ Their visit, commemorated by a tripod dedication, may have coincided with the completion of the monument in Athens, as H. Knell has suggested.⁷⁹ Rather than removing these important elements of the monument in the first renovation then, instead the pedestal was expanded as much as possible within the existing fence, the tripods moved outward, and the gaps filled in and topped by the statues of the Macedonian Eponymoi. There seems to have been an overall driving desire to keep the monument within the bounds of the original *peribolos*, since after the initial expansion of the pedestal the next addition of a statue was achieved by removing one of the tripods—a move which had clearly been deliberately avoided in the renovation of the previous

⁷⁸ Knell 2000, 95–96, and see above, n. 38.

⁷⁹ Knell 2000, 95–96. For the tripod at Delphi, see Pomptow 1909, 153–157; Bourguet 1929, 337–338, no. 511.

century. Further tribal changes made room for the tripod to be replaced less than a quarter century later, and thus the monument could revert to the appearance it had had (excepting the identities of the outermost heroes) during the living memory of most citizens.

The history of the *peribolos* fence too shows a desire to create the impression of unchanged continuity. The original fence apparently was maintained in good condition until significant damage compelled repair along the west side. Despite the uneven size of the salvageable pieces, the repair work was executed by reusing the original materials. If Shear is correct in assigning the damage to the Sullan sack, it is possible that the Athenians were unable to procure new materials for such a repair in the difficult economic circumstances of the 1st century BCE.⁸⁰ Yet, if it did take place under the impoverished post-sack conditions, the repair itself would be a powerful testament to the importance of the monument and to the desire to keep up the impression of its eternal continuity. Of the other Agora structures thought to have been damaged in the sack, only the Tholos seems to have received immediate repairs; it too played a large role in the day-to-day operations of the Athenian government as the dormitory and dining hall of the *prytaneis*.⁸¹ While the repair to the fence of the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes may not have been immediate, the reuse of the broken materials indicates that they probably did not lie around long enough to be scavenged and scattered.

It is apparent, then, that perpetuating the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes in as near to its original form as achievable was a goal of successive generations of Athenians. If the statues of the ten Kleisthenic heroes were indeed transferred from the predecessor monument in the

⁸⁰ See above, Chapter 2, with n. 145.

⁸¹ Hoff 1997, 42, table 1.

330s, as is plausible, an extremely strong element of continuity was inherent to even the first phase. This remains speculation, but would surely be in keeping with the Lykourgan ethic of renewal of the past.⁸²

As for the appearance of the statues themselves, we have very little evidence to go on, though several later statues including the Riace bronzes have been suggested to be Roman copies of the Agora Eponymoi.⁸³ Pausanias offers no description, nor do any other references to the monument attempt any. Although the Eponymous heroes do appear individually and perhaps collectively in other media, there seems never to have been a well-established, or at least highly distinguished, iconography for them. In vase painting they appear somewhat frequently in the late 6th and early 5th centuries, usually as individual bystanders at the edges of scenes, draped and bearded.⁸⁴ They appear in a similar form, draped and bearded, in several 4th-century document reliefs.⁸⁵ They likely also appear together on the east frieze of the Parthenon, flanking the Olympian gods.⁸⁶ On the Agora monument, then, we should probably imagine a rather nondescript and undifferentiated group of standing figures, probably draped, perhaps a mixture of bearded and unbearded. The emphasis was on the collective group rather than on any

⁸² As in, e.g., Hintzen-Bohlen 1996; Lambert 2010b.

⁸³ For the Roman copies see, e.g., Hölscher 1969; Dontas 1988. Dontas argues that the Riace bronzes were 5th-century originals carried off from the Agora by Sulla, and that Pausanias saw their replacements.

⁸⁴ Mattusch 1994, 77–79. Harrison (1979, 83) further suggests a mix of soldier and civilian dress in order to “adequately symbolize the range of jurisdiction of the tribal organization over the life and death of the Athenian citizen.”

⁸⁵ See Kron 1976 for the most thorough treatment of representations of the Eponymoi. Smith 2003, 15–30 collects images of the Eponymoi in sculpture and painting. Mattusch 1996 treats representations in sculpture (pp. 38–53) and painting (pp. 53–58).

⁸⁶ See esp. Harrison 1979 and Kron 1984. These draped male figures have also been identified as archons (Jenkins 1985) or generic prominent citizens, among other proposals, depending on how they are counted. For discussion and bibliography, see esp. Neils 2001, 158–161; Connelly 2014, 188.

individualized iconography.⁸⁷ I would speculate that the statues added in the Hellenistic period were likely executed in a similar mode, designed more to match the group than to emphasize the individual portrayed.

When we come to the Hadrianic addition to the monument, the intentions behind the renovation are a little more ambiguous. A separate pedestal was built, somewhat larger than the main one, and executed in a Roman technique. The fence beside the new pedestal was seated in reused blocks that did not match the original limestone sill at all, and the eastern fence was replaced in Pentelic marble. Yet, given the chronological gap, these changes are far from radically different. The new pedestal was about the same width and nearly abutted the original, the marble fence approximated the old limestone fence fairly well, and it also served to connect the new and old pedestals behind a uniform course that matched the marble of the original capping course, drawing the whole together visually. If this last renovation was not as invisible as the earlier ones, it does seem to have been in a similar spirit.

Why was there such a strong impulse to make changes to the monument go unnoticed? Why hide the fact that the monument was being reused? The effect of these invisible renewals, I argue, was to create the lasting impression that the tribal system had always been the way it was at any given moment, from time immemorial. After the initial modification, the monument would suggest that the status quo had been in place since the beginning of the monument's life. The tribal system was seen as one of the most fundamental elements of Kleisthenes' democratic reforms, and since tribal membership structured so much of a citizen's daily life, it was important that the ancient arrangement appear to remain in place.

⁸⁷ Mattusch 1994, 76–77; 1996, 52.

Demosthenes, although he is speaking about the 4th-century monument's predecessor, encapsulates this point beautifully when he claims that it was Solon who ordered proposed laws to be displayed before the Eponymoi for the citizenry's consideration.⁸⁸ Of course, the Kleisthenic Eponymoi did not yet exist in Solon's time, but we should not consider this merely a careless anachronism.⁸⁹ In his oration for the Athenian war dead after the battle of Chaironeia in 338, Demosthenes demonstrates the importance of the Eponymoi in Athenians' everyday lives in depicting the valiant soldiers gaining inspiration from their knowledge and memory of their tribes' heroes.⁹⁰ In another speech, Demosthenes again emphasized how long the procedure for posting laws before the Eponymoi had been in place.⁹¹

In a city that was increasingly looking to its ancestors for inspiration, identity, and legitimacy, everything rested on a connection with the past and tradition. This reliance on the past only increased in later periods, so that when the decision was taken to honor a foreign king with inclusion among the Eponymoi, reusing the same monument in such a unobtrusive way was an effective strategy for indicating that tradition was in fact still being upheld, slotting the new in with the old. If a citizen had his tribal affiliation changed, at least he still interacted with the same monument in the same way. Soon, the new status quo did not seem so new, as the collective memory about the tribal system gradually changed. The additions and subtractions were not remembered; rather, the names were simply names, the old system intact, the old monument still functioning.

⁸⁸ Dem. *Lept.* 20.94: καὶ πρὸ τούτων γ' ἐπέταξεν ἐκθεῖναι πρόσθε τῶν ἐπωνύμων.

⁸⁹ Wycherley, e.g., says Demosthenes is "speaking loosely" (1957, 87).

⁹⁰ Dem. 60.27–31. For further discussion, see Shear 2013, 522–523.

⁹¹ Dem. 24.23–24: Οὔτοι πάντες οἱ νόμοι κεῖνται πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον (24).

Pausanias' account once again proves useful as evidence of collective understandings in the mid-2nd century CE. In the case of the Eponymous Heroes Monument, it is a good indication that the subtle upcycling of the monument had indeed affected the social memory about the history of the tribal system.⁹² Farther up (ἀνωτέρω) from the Tholos, Pausanias reports, stand statues of the heroes from whom the tribes of the Athenians subsequently took their names (1.5.1: ἀνδριάντες ἐστήκασιν ἡρώων, ἀφ' ὧν Ἀθηναίους ὕστερον τὰ ὀνόματα ἔσχον αἱ φυλαί). After referring his reader to Herodotus for information on the change from four to ten tribes under Kleisthenes, Pausanias discusses the monument in some detail, naming all the Eponymoi whose statues he sees, including some genealogical information. He lists Hippothoon, son of Poseidon and Alope, the daughter of Kerkyon; Antiochos, one of children of Heracles by Meda, daughter of Phylas; Ajax, son of Telemon; Leos, an Athenian who sacrificed his daughters for the safety of the community in obedience to an oracle; Erechtheus, who conquered the Eleusinians; Aigeus; Oineus, the bastard son of Pandion; and Akamas, one of the children of Theseus (1.5.2). Pausanias next admits that in the case of Kekrops and Pandion, whose statues he also saw amongst the Eponymoi, he does not know which heroes of those names are honored, going on to discuss several he knows of as possibilities (1.5.3–4).⁹³

These ten heroes, he summarizes, are the Athenian Eponymoi of the ancients, but they also have tribes named after the later heroes, Attalos the Mysian, Ptolemy the Egyptian, and, in Pausanias' own day, the emperor Hadrian (1.5.5: Οἶδε μὲν εἰσιν Ἀθηναίους ἐπόνυμοι τῶν

⁹² Paus. 1.5 is the description of the monument proper; the discussion it inspires goes through 1.8.1.

⁹³ Arafat (1996, 168) takes this discussion as evidence that Pausanias' main goal in addressing the monument is as "almost an excuse to retell myths associated with the original ten Eponymous Heroes." In fact, he says very little about the other eight, and delves into stories of Kekrops and Pandion only because he is not able to determine which figures of those names the statues are meant to be.

ἀρχαίων· ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ τῶνδε φυλάς ἔχουσιν, Ἀττάλου καὶ κατ' ἐμὲ ἤδη βασιλέως Ἀδριανοῦ). After praising Hadrian's piety and generosity towards his subjects, Pausanias makes the much-discussed claim that because the history of Attalos and Ptolemy is more ancient, and their chroniclers neglected, tradition (φήμη) about them had vanished (1.6.1: ὥς μὴ μένειν ἔτι τὴν φήμην αὐτῶν).⁹⁴ He then takes it upon himself to narrate the early history of their dynasties, the Egyptian in some detail (1.6.2–1.7.3) and the Pergamene more briefly (1.8.1), before he moves on to other Agora monuments.

The most striking aspect of Pausanias' account of the monument compared with what we know of its history through archaeological and other historical sources is the absence of any mention of the Macedonian former Eponymoi. Their statues had been removed from the monument, and apparently their past presence had been forgotten completely. It is hard to imagine that Pausanias would not have mentioned this had he known of it, especially since Antigonos and Demetrios appear in his narration of early Ptolemaic history. Furthermore, he does mention their statues, along with that of Ptolemy, in the Miltiades monument at Delphi, in which he identified seven Eponymoi, but clearly does not recognize them as having been added on that basis. Instead, he insinuates that the Athenians had added them as an obsequious act of fearful kowtowing.⁹⁵ Neither in his research nor from local guides did Pausanias learn of the disbanded tribes Antigonis and Demetrias—a strong indication that the subtle updating of the Eponymous Heroes monument had achieved its intended goal of eventually altering the collective memory of the tribal structure.

⁹⁴ For the scholarship on this statement, see Hutton 2005, 278, n. 11.

⁹⁵ Paus. 10.10.2. See above, n. 68.

Pausanias does, however, know that Ptolemy, Attalos, and (naturally) Hadrian were later additions to the original ten Eponymoi. While it is possible that he simply visually recognized the Hellenistic statues as later on grounds of style or preservation, he was also interested in the history of the rulers and had done prior research (citing Herodotus on the Kleisthenic reform, for example), so he clearly was primed to recognize those elements of the monument as non-original.⁹⁶ Yet his claim that the φήμη of Attalos and Ptolemy was no longer current because of their antiquity indicates his perception that most viewers of the monument, even the citizens who interacted with it more intimately, had little reason to distinguish those two statues from the older ones. Even for a scholar like Pausanias, the exact identity of two of the original Eponymoi, Kekrops and Pandion, was also murky. What is more, Pausanias himself was wrong about which Ptolemy was represented in the monument, thinking it Ptolemy II Philadelphos instead of Ptolemy III Euergetes.⁹⁷ Thus, the social memory about tribal changes that did survive into the 2nd century CE did not include the circumstances of those changes. Rather than the specific histories of their heroes and the merits that earned them eponymous status, it was the collective nature and civic function of the group that the Athenians seem to have remembered, surely encouraged by the deliberately subtle way the Agora monument was updated.

Since the Hadrianic renovation was necessarily less subtly achieved, there has been speculation that his new presence among the Eponymoi was meant to be much more conspicuous than the earlier additions. K. Arafat, in particular, sees the remodeled monument as a glorification of Hadrian, specifically as a portrayal of Hadrian as the new incarnation of Theseus,

⁹⁶ Still, what he actually says is that there are tribes named after those later heroes, not explicitly that their statues are later than the other ten.

⁹⁷ Paus. 1.8.6, where he mentions near the Odeion a statue of Philadelphos, οὗ καὶ πρότερον μνήμην ἐν τοῖς ἐπωνύμοις ἐποιήσαμην.

since Theseus himself is absent from the group but his father Aigeus and his son Akamas are present.⁹⁸ Although Hadrian is known to have been compared with Theseus, as famously on his arch near the Temple of Olympian Zeus, this interpretation of the Eponymous Heroes Monument is a decided stretch given how little the individual histories of the heroes seem to have factored into perceptions of the group.⁹⁹

Even more questionably, Arafat interprets Pausanias' entire narrative of the monument, including his discourse on Hellenistic history, as building up to a promotion of Hadrian, whose statue Arafat thinks would have been "prominent and highly visible to all who walked in the Agora, serving as a daily reminder of his existence."¹⁰⁰ While Hadrian's statue undoubtedly was noticeably different from the rest on its new pedestal, this conception of Pausanias's account goes too far. In view of the entire architectural history of the monument, the message of Hadrian's statue was perhaps more one of *primus inter pares* than *par inter pares*, but as I have argued, the modifications to the monument were designed more to connect the new with the old than to distinguish it conspicuously.

Unfortunately we have no evidence, archaeological or historical, for the history of the monument after Pausanias, so the effect of this last modification on collective perceptions of the monument and the civic order it represented is unmeasurable. One more crucial point can be made, though, about the intentions and outcomes of the Athenians' earlier modifications to the

⁹⁸ 1996, 169.

⁹⁹ On the Arch of Hadrian and the Temple of Olympian Zeus, see below, Chapter 5, with n. 185.

¹⁰⁰ 1996, 168–171, quote at 169. Arafat writes (p. 169) of Pausanias' mention of the later heroes (1.5.5): "While this may be a simple list (as it is in chronological order), it has the effect of working up to Hadrian..." The list is not in fact chronological, as Pausanias names Attalos before Ptolemy. Vatin, by contrast but on equally weak reasoning, assumes that Hadrian would not have wanted to be conspicuous at all, and so assigns the later pedestal to sometime after Pausanias' visit (1995, 37–38, 41).

tribal system. It is generally agreed or assumed that the elevation of foreign kings to Eponymoi was considered a profound honor, both by the Athenian honorers and the royal honorees. There is no reason to doubt this, but yet we have seen that the memory of the honoring, its circumstances and the acts that merited it, was largely fleeting. In the system of reciprocal benefactions and rewards that lay at the heart of Hellenistic diplomacy, the preservation of the memory of those specific details of the transaction was of paramount importance in encouraging future good deeds and positive relations. This will be a key theme throughout the rest of this chapter, but what is important to underline here is that the inclusion of the Hellenistic kings within the Eponymous Heroes, particularly in the way the Agora monument was reused, assimilated the foreign kings to distinctly Athenian heroes.¹⁰¹ These heroes were great, and most had well-developed myths associated with them individually, but their collective group identity had come to have more significance than their individual merits. Included in this large group, the foreign kings were also great, but were not uniquely important.¹⁰² Moreover, they were Athenian, not Macedonian, Egyptian, Pergamene. This forced assimilation wrapped in a cloak of flattering honor may have been for the Athenians a method of mediating their dependence on the foreign rulers for their protection and freedom. I will argue that we can see a similar strategy at work on the Acropolis in the Early Roman period.

¹⁰¹ Brogan elaborates this point well with specific reference to the Antigonid honors and their later repercussions (2003, esp. 203–205).

¹⁰² It is tempting to connect with this idea the tradition (Arist. [*Ath. Pol.*] 21.6; cf. Paus. 10.10.1) that the original ten heroes were chosen from a list of 100 names Kleisthenes submitted to the Pythia; the ten chosen heroes were special, but not uniquely so.

Upcycling Honors

The second major case study in this chapter is a group of upcycled statue monuments from the Athenian Acropolis. Originally set up as votive dedications and portraits in the Late Classical and Early Hellenistic periods, they were rededicated—statue and base integrally—in the Early Roman period, mostly for high-ranking Roman officials. Before analyzing this group of monuments in detail, it will be useful to include a brief discussion of the development of honorific portrait statues and their memorial function within the system of euergetism based on reciprocity that flourished in the Hellenistic period. I will then present some evidence for the reuse of such monuments elsewhere in Greece as background for the Athenian phenomenon, with a focus on Dio Chrysostom's *Rhodian Oration* as key testimony on the practice of and attitudes toward changing inscriptions on honorific portraits.

Honorifics and the Ethic of Reciprocity

Reciprocal social relationships between individuals and groups formed the essential glue of Greek – and especially of Athenian – society, from the Classical period onward. The ethic of reciprocity and the institutions that formalized it played a fundamental role not only in the inner workings of Athenian democracy, but also in interstate relations, and this remained the case through the changes in the balance of power in the Mediterranean world in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. In shifting winds, the Athenians relied on the give-and-take of benefaction and attendant honors to keep their own ship remarkably well afloat, all things considered.

In the Athenian democracy of the 5th century, the system of *euergesia* was formalized through the institution of *leitourgia*, in which wealthy citizens were required to perform specific

services (liturgies) for the state, including the *trierarchia*, requiring the equipping of a trireme and its 200-man crew, *choregia*, sponsorship and arrangement of the dramatic chorus, and the *hippotrophia*, the keeping of a horse for war service, among others.¹⁰³ Although these liturgies could be burdensome, and grew more so in the late 5th century, they were exploited for political influence and standing by competitive elites engaged in rivalry for honor—the aristocratic ideal of *philotimia*. In the 4th century and increasingly into the Hellenistic period, the honors given to the *euergetai* in return for their benefactions became more or less standardized as the system was expanded to encompass the interactions of the Athenians with powerful outsiders.¹⁰⁴

Attesting to this increasing standardization in the honoring end of the bargain are various types of epigraphic evidence collectively referred to as honorific inscriptions.¹⁰⁵ Honorific inscriptions could be private, given by an individual client to a patron, for example; public, given by cities (by far the most common in the surviving evidence); or semiprivate, given by groups (*phratries*, tribes, soldiers, *epebes*, etc.).¹⁰⁶ Under this umbrella, the most informative type of inscriptions is the large body of honorary decrees passed by public bodies, inscribed and set up on stone stelai. In a quite formulaic manner, honorific decrees recorded the reason for the bestowing of honors on the honorand as well as the actual honors given to him. While the benefactor's services were often reported only very generally in the "motives" section of the

¹⁰³ On the liturgical system, see Davies 1971, xvii–xxxi; 1981, 9–37; Christ 1990. On its relationship to democracy and empire, see Kallet 1998, 54–58.

¹⁰⁴ For the most comprehensive treatments of the honorific system in the Hellenistic world and the statues it produced, see Gauthier 1985 and now Ma 2013a. More succinct treatments are found in Ma 2007a and 2012. For an empire-wide treatment of the relatively homogeneous practices involving honorific statues in the Roman period, see Fejfer 2008, 17–72.

¹⁰⁵ On honorific inscriptions generally, see esp. Oliver 2007, 181–182; Luraghi 2010, 248–252; Ma 2013a, 15–63.

¹⁰⁶ On the awarding of portrait statues by different groups and institutions, see Oliver 2007, 190–193. On private honorific statues, see esp. Ma 2013a, 196–202; 2013b, 171–179.

decree (with, for example, a phrase like ἐπειδὴ so-and-so ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός ἐστιν περὶ τὸν δῆμον, inasmuch as so-and-so is a generous man with respect to the people), the honors bestowed were listed very explicitly and systematically. These honors could include a public crowning, the erection of a statue, meals in the Prytaneion for the honorand and his descendants at public expense (*sitesis*), and a seat of honor at city contests (*proedria*).

Between these sections giving the reasons for the honors and listing those actually decided upon comes the key pivot of the exchange, the statement of “hortatory intent.”¹⁰⁷ Here, the reciprocity involved in the benefaction-earns-honors transaction is made explicit, and potential future benefactors are encouraged. Common formulations like “therefore, so that it may be manifest to all that the people knows how to return adequate thanks to benefactors for the services they have performed” (ὅπως ἂν οὖν φανερόν εἴ πᾶσιν, ὅτι ὁ δῆμος ἐπίσταται χάριτας ἀποδιδόναι τοῖς εὐεργέταις ἀξίας ὧν ἂν εὐεργετήσωσιν) and “in order that the council and the people may be clearly seen to honor” (ὅπως ἂν οὖν ἡ βουλή καὶ ὁ δῆμος φαίνωνται τιμῶντες) served to emphasize the fact that the city was upholding its end of the bargain, and would continue to do so.

Of the standard honors, the award of a statue was considered the most prestigious.¹⁰⁸ Judging by their surviving bases, honorific statues themselves were almost always bronze and near life-size, though we unfortunately cannot say much about their iconography beyond the generalities of standing, striding, or equestrian figures.¹⁰⁹ The inscriptions carried on the bases of

¹⁰⁷ On “hortative clauses,” see esp. Luraghi 2010, 250–251; Ma 2013a, 58–59. See also Hedrick 1999, 408–435 on the larger phenomenon of formulae of disclosure in Athenian decrees.

¹⁰⁸ Oliver 2007, 183–190,

¹⁰⁹ Krumeich and Witschel 2009, 211; 2013, 49–51.

such statues were essentially condensed versions of the honorific decrees that precipitated their erection. The decree and statue could be spatially complementary as well—the decree often specified the location of each—so that in theory a viewer might be able to read the specifics of the honorand’s benefactions and rewards in conjunction with the abbreviated version given on his statue base, which likely conformed to the so-called “honorific formula.”¹¹⁰ The typical formula gives the name of the bestowing group or individual in the nominative case and the name of the honorand in the accusative.¹¹¹ Often a summary of the reason for the statue is given, in very general terms, for instance “on account of his excellence and goodwill and beneficence” (ἀρετῆς καὶ εὐνοίας καὶ εὐεργεσίας ἔνεκα), and there may also be a sculptor’s signature (so-and-so ἐποίησεν).

This honorific formula, simplified as “X dedicated Y,” can be distinguished from the so-called “votive formula” of simply “X dedicated” common in the 6th and 5th centuries, though of course no strict distinction existed between honorific monuments and votive dedications, particularly when the former were set up in sanctuaries like the Acropolis.¹¹² In the earlier formulation, the name and by extension the memory of the dedicator is the most crucial information conveyed, whereas with the development of portrait statues and their growing importance as honors, the human identity of the statue itself was equally if not more significant and memory-worthy. This importance of identity *cum* memory preservation comes across clearly in Pausanias’ work, which frequently confirms, as C. Keesling puts it, “that the purpose of all

¹¹⁰ Oliver 2007, 196.

¹¹¹ For a detailed and wide-ranging investigation of the significance of case use in dedicatory and honorific inscriptions, see Ma 2013a, part I, 15–63.

¹¹² On the votive vs. honorific formulae, see esp. Keesling 2003, 167–168; Ma 2013a, 17–38. On the religious and votive nature of state honors, see Krumeich 2007, 383–384; 2014b, 72–73.

kinds of statue base inscriptions, including traditional votive dedications, victor statues, and honorific inscriptions, was to ensure name preservation and the continuing association of the statues displayed in Greek sanctuaries with the correct individuals.”¹¹³

Reusing Statues as Honorifics

In spite of this fundamental emphasis on memory and name preservation, there exists reliable evidence of several sorts for the wholesale reuse of honorific portrait statues in Greek sanctuaries. I should emphasize the primary distinction I am making here between reuse of just a statue base, with its statue removed for some reason and a new one added, usually after flipping the base over, and reuse of the entire monument integrally, statue and base. While the former practice was common, it is difficult to discuss the circumstances of individual instances meaningfully without knowing when or why the first statue was removed.¹¹⁴ The latter sort of reuse is harder to recognize in the archaeological record and signs of it have often been overlooked in initial investigations, but nevertheless new scholarly attention is showing that it may have been more common than previously imagined, especially in the 1st centuries BCE and CE.¹¹⁵

From Pausanias we hear of a few examples of portrait statues that had been given a new identity by means of a new inscription, and we get an inkling of the anxiety this could cause a

¹¹³ Keesling 2003, 30.

¹¹⁴ See, e.g., Krumeich 2014b, 74.

¹¹⁵ See esp. Keesling 2010 on the prevalence of hard-to-detect reuse. Fejfer (2008, 64–65, 215–217) also emphasizes that reuse of honorific statues was likely an ongoing practice. On the general practice of reusing inscribed objects, see also Kajava 1995, 209–210.

viewer.¹¹⁶ In the Old Agora in Athens, Pausanias mentions the statues of Miltiades and Themistocles near the Prytaneion that had been reinscribed to represent a Roman and a Thracian.¹¹⁷ Interestingly, he does not give the Roman and Thracian names which he must have read, but does know and report the original, remembered, identification of the statues.¹¹⁸ Similarly, in the Kerameikos he describes seeing a Poseidon on horseback fighting the giant Polybotes, but says that the “inscription of our time” gives the statue to someone else, and not to Poseidon.¹¹⁹ The potential persistence of the memory of original identities of reused statues is also clear in Pausanias’ description of two images in the agora of Sikyon: “after this are bronze statues; they say that they are the daughters of Proitos, but the inscription referred to other women.”¹²⁰

Apart from these sporadic examples in Pausanias, we also have evidence of more systematic reuse of honorific statues in particular places at particular times, along with evidence for some of the possible motivations behind such reuse. A decree from Lindos on Rhodes dated to 22 CE speaks to economic factors as the driving force behind the decision to reuse statues. The *boule* of the city resolved to auction off the right to reinscribe anonymous (ἀνεπίγραφοι καὶ ἄσαμοι) older statues (ἀνδριάντες) on their acropolis, as part of a larger plan to improve the

¹¹⁶ Blanck (1969) adapted the term “metagraphe” (μεταγραφή) to refer to the replacement of an inscription on a statue base with a new one. Cf. German *Umschreibung*.

¹¹⁷ Paus. 1.18.3: τὰς γὰρ Μιλτιάδου καὶ Θεμιστοκλέους εἰκόνας ἐς Ῥωμαῖόν τε ἄνδρα καὶ Θρᾷκα μετέγραψαν.

¹¹⁸ For the suggestion that the Roman and Thracian were Julius Nicanor and King Rhoemetalces III, respectively, see Robert 1962, 155.

¹¹⁹ Paus. 1.2.4: τοῦ ναοῦ δὲ οὐ πόρρω Ποσειδῶν ἐστὶν ἐφ’ ἵππου, δόρυ ἀφίεις ἐπὶ γίγαντα Πολυβώτην, ἐς δὲ Κόφους ὁ μῦθος ὁ περὶ τῆς ἄκρας ἔχει τῆς Χελώνης· τὸ δὲ ἐπίγραμμα τὸ ἐφ’ ἡμῶν τὴν εἰκόνα ἄλλω δίδωσι καὶ οὐ Ποσειδῶνι.

¹²⁰ Paus. 2.9.8: τοῦτου δὲ εἰσὶν εἰκόνες ἐφεξῆς χαλκαῖ· τὰς Προίτου θυγατέρας λέγουσιν εἶναι σφᾶς, τὸ δὲ ἐπίγραμμα ἐς γυναῖκας ἄλλας εἶχεν.

city's finances.¹²¹ It is unclear how exactly these portraits had become anonymous; perhaps their inscriptions had simply become worn, or their rubrication deteriorated, rendering them less legible.¹²² This shows, importantly, that the city maintained control of and authority over the honorific statues it had bestowed in the past, and that those old statues continued to hold real economic value, even after their natural use life—that is, as long as their identity was preserved—had ended.

Dio Chrysostom's Rhodian Oration

Economic motivations likely also lay at the heart of what looks to have been a widespread practice of the reinscription of older honorific statues at Rhodes in the 1st century CE, if we can judge from Dio Chrysostom's oration to that city (*Oration* 31), written at a time when Rhodes had free status, either during the reign of Vespasian (69–79 CE) or Trajan (98–117 CE).¹²³ By far the longest and most rhetorical of Dio's speeches, the oration lambasts the Rhodians for making themselves into laughingstocks and degrading the otherwise shining reputation of their city by reinscribing existing honorific statues in honor of new benefactors, mostly Romans.

As Dio summarizes near the beginning of his speech, no doubt embellishing for effect, “whenever you vote a statue to anyone... a most absurd thing happens: for the *strategos* points

¹²¹ I.Lindos 419, lines 30–44 (Blinkenberg 1941, col. 773–789); see also Blanck 1969, 101–103; Keesling 2010, 307.

¹²² Blanck suggested that the rubrication had worn away (1969, 102).

¹²³ On the *Rhodian Oration*, see esp. Blanck 1969, 11–14, 98–105; Jones 1978, Ch. 4, 26–35; Seeck 1996, 121–122; Shear 2007a, 224–225, 242–246; Platt 2007, 252–271; Bailey 2015. On its disputed date, see von Arnim 1898, 210–218 (reign of Titus); Jones 1978, 133 (reign of Vespasian); Sidebottom 1992 (Trajanic); Swain 1996, 206 and Appendix C, 428–249 (Trajanic).

out whichever of those statues that have already been dedicated appears to him. Then, after the inscription that was previously on it has been removed, and the name of another has been engraved, the business of honoring is finished” (31.9).¹²⁴ Like the Lindians, the Rhodians clearly thought they had authority over the honorific statues in their city, but Dio questions this. Even if they technically belonged to the city, the statues actually belonged to each honorand individually, he claims. The city may own the statues in a general sense, the same sense in which “the Rhodians” own Rhodes, but not in the sense of exercising authority, which private property owners have over their own estates (31.47).

Dio has a fictive Rhodian interlocutor defend the practice on economic grounds. The reuse was not a matter of lack of sculptors or lack of space in their sanctuaries, but a matter of cost-saving, as at Lindos. The imagined Rhodian defender claims that their reuse is not dishonorable because they choose old statues and those without inscriptions, again reminding us of the Lindos decree. But Dio scoffs that this is even worse, since statues of gods and heroes usually were not inscribed, so the Rhodians may unwittingly be using those, having forgotten their divinity (31.91–93). To the possible defense that they were reusing statues only of not very famous people or of people with no surviving relatives (31.72), Dio counters that the Rhodians may as well say that they only injure orphans (31.73). Besides, he points out later, one would not plunder an old tomb just because the occupant was forgotten or had no living relatives. As for the lack of fame of some of the original honorands—it is not their fault that we are ignorant, says Dio. The onus was on us to remember them (31.74). The Rhodians definitely know what they are

¹²⁴ ὅταν γὰρ ψηφίσθησθε ἀνδριάντα τινί ... συμβαίνει δὲ πρᾶγμα ἀτοπώτατον: ὁ γὰρ στρατηγὸς ὄν ἂν αὐτῷ φανῆ τῶν ἀνακειμένων τούτων ἀνδριάντων ἀποδείκνυσιν: εἶτα τῆς μὲν πρότερον οὐσίας ἐπιγραφῆς ἀναιρεθείσης, ἑτέρου δ' ὀνόματος ἐγγραφαθέντος, πέραις ἔχει τὸ τῆς τιμῆς.

doing is wrong, he further asserts, because they are not openly telling the new honorands that they are receiving other peoples' statues (31.38). Nevertheless their actions are notorious and much gossiped about (31.39).

Dio sees this practice at Rhodes as deeply problematic for many reasons, comparing it liberally with sacrilege and impiety, but at the heart of the matter is the fact that the Rhodians are breaking their end of the reciprocal social contract through memory obliteration.¹²⁵ By removing the honors and thereby *dishonoring* their previous benefactors, the Rhodians are making potential future benefactors think twice, taking their *arete*, *eunoia*, and *euergesia* elsewhere. Just as counterfeiters make the whole monetary system suspect, argues Dio, "so those who annul any of the honors or the punishments are destroying the whole system and showing that it is worth nothing" (31.24).¹²⁶ Thinking of the hortatory intent clauses of honorific decrees, it is not hard to see how reinscribing statues, whether their original inscriptions were already damaged or freshly erased, could be seen to have quite the opposite effect from the intent of the honor: "to make it evident to all that the people know how to repay favors to benefactors."

While Dio acknowledges that the practice of reinscribing statues was happening elsewhere, he seems to think of it as a problem having more or less originated at Rhodes. What do we know of the topographical spread of reusing honorific statues? We have already seen Pausanias' evidence for Athens, and the explicit decree from Lindos. Another speech preserved in the corpus of Dio Chrysostom attests to the practice at Corinth as well. *Oration 37*, the

¹²⁵ Keesling 2010, 307.

¹²⁶ ὥσπερ οὖν οἱ παραχαράττοντες τὸ νόμισμα, κἂν μέρος λυμῆνῳνται, τὸ σύμπαν διεφθαρκέναι δοκοῦσιν ὑπαίτιον ποιήσαντες, ὁμοίως οἱ τῶν τιμῶν τινὰς ἢ τῶν τιμωριῶν ἀναιροῦντες ὅλον τὸ πρᾶγμα καταλύουσι καὶ τοῦ μηδενὸς ἄξιον δεικνύουσι.

Corinthian Oration, was probably written by Favorinus, a student of Dio's and later the teacher of Aulus Gellius and Herodes Atticus, sometime in the second quarter of the 2nd century CE.¹²⁷

Apparently the Corinthians had set up a statue of Favorinus himself ten years prior, but it had disappeared. While it is not certain from the text that reuse accounted for his statue's disappearance, he does make clear reference to wholesale reuse with reinscription in his speech: "statues of other men still stand and are recognized, although they have the labels of others."¹²⁸ As part of his tirade, Favorinus raises some of the same objections as Dio about the breakdown of the system, particularly emphasizing the idea that once an honorific statue is erected it has a certain sanctity, and the city should therefore protect it as a votive offering, recognizing that statues and honors are valid for the term for which they are erected, that is, forever. Otherwise, Favorinus asks the Corinthians, what could they say to someone asking the reason why "their honors are mortal, but their dishonors immortal?"¹²⁹

But what about Athens? Despite Pausanias' few examples, and despite Dio's views on the general depravity of Athens in his day,¹³⁰ Dio does not think the Athenians are reusing honorific statues as the Rhodians were. "In the matter of statues," he concedes, "you do not see the same thing happening among them" (31.123).¹³¹ The archaeological evidence from Athens, to which I will turn shortly, suggests that perhaps Dio is correct, and by his time what reuse was happening

¹²⁷ On the consensus on Favorinus' authorship, see König 2001, 141, n. 1. On the manuscript tradition, see Amato 1999.

¹²⁸ [Dio Chrys.] 37.40: ἕτεροι δὲ ἐστᾶσι καὶ γινώσκονται, τὴν δὲ ἐπιγραφὴν ἔχουσιν ἐτέρων

¹²⁹ [Dio Chrys.] 37.30: τί δὲ καλὸν ἔξετε λέγειν πρὸς τοὺς ἀπαιτοῦντας ὑμᾶς τὸν λόγον τοῦ τὰς μὲν τιμὰς εἶναι παρ' ὑμῖν θνητάς, τὰς δὲ ἀτιμίας ἀθανάτους;

¹³⁰ E.g., the Athenians shamefully gave the title of Olympian to a Phoenician bumpkin, and set a statue of slovenly contemporary poet next to that of Menander (31.116), and they love gladiatorial spectacles even more than the Corinthians, going so far as to put them on in the venerable Theater of Dionysus (31.121).

¹³¹ 31.123: τὸ γὰρ τῶν εἰκόνων οὐκ ἔστι παρ' αὐτοῖς ἰδεῖν οὕτω γιγνόμενον.

at Athens had petered out. There is, however, one more bit of important literary evidence for the prevalence of the practice at Athens in the mid-1st century BCE, and this comes from Cicero. In a letter to Atticus in 50 BCE, Cicero recounts learning of Appius Claudius Pulcher's plans to erect a propylon at Eleusis. Wondering whether he himself could undertake something similar without looking foolish, he confesses that he loves Athens and would like it to have a memorial of himself. But, he says, he hates false inscriptions on other people's statues (*odi falsas inscriptiones statuarum alienarum*).¹³² The offhand nature of this remark makes it seem that the practice was widely recognized, at least among the elites who would have been in the position to compete for honors at Athens.¹³³ Cicero also gives us the strong sense that a reused statue was thought truly to belong to its original honorand, rather than to whomever a second, *falsa*, inscription bestowed it.

If we turn now to the archaeological and epigraphical evidence for the reuse of honorific statues, with the issues raised by Cicero, Dio, and Favorinus as contemporary observers in mind, we see that the results of reuse could leave complex interpretive puzzles for viewers ancient and modern. Although economic factors may have been the primary motivation behind reuse at Rhodes and Lindos, there exist some seemingly distinct groups of reused honorific statues (or other types of statues reused for honorific statues) that allow us to test the contemporary criticisms on the ground, and to see that sometimes something more nuanced was happening.

¹³² Cic. *ad Att.* 6.1.26: *unum etiam velim cogites. audio Appium πρόπυλον Eleusine facere. num inepti fuerimus si nos quoque Academiae fecerimus? "puto" inquires. ergo id ipsum scribes ad me. equidem valde ipsas Athenas amo. volo esse aliquod monumentum; odi falsas inscriptiones statuarum alienarum.*

¹³³ In a similar vein, Barry has pointed out that for Dio, as an aristocrat, the reciprocal system of benefactions and rewards mattered a great deal (1993, 85).

One such group comes from the Amphiareion of Oropos, on the border between Attica and Boeotia. A line of almost 30 statues crowded a terrace running west from the great stoa and ending northeast of the Temple of Amphiaraos, almost all dating to the 3rd century BCE.¹³⁴ The western group, composed mostly of equestrian statues, probably for royal honorands, and the central group, probably composed mostly of statues for civic honorands, accumulated first, in the early 3rd century. Beginning in the last third of the century, a group of private honorific statues, dedicated by Oropians, was set up at the eastern end of the terrace. All the monuments were considered as spatial resources of the city from early on, as proxeny decrees were inscribed on their bases—in some cases filling all available space—beginning ca. 230–220.¹³⁵ Apart from these “epigraphical pigeons,” as J. Ma has called them, most of the monuments in the western and central groups experienced reuse of another sort.¹³⁶

Beginning with Sulla in 86 BCE, almost all of the monuments apart from the eastern group of private honorifics were reused in a manner quite similar to that described by Dio: their statues remained intact while their dedicatory inscriptions were thoroughly erased and new names were attached, almost all of high-ranking Roman generals and officials, including Appius Claudius Pulcher and Marcus Agrippa. The statues chosen for reuse seem always to have been the best then available in terms of prominence (size and visibility). In Ma’s assessment, the

¹³⁴ The most comprehensive study of these monuments and their chronology is Löhr 1993. For further analysis see Ma 2007b; 2012; 2013a, esp. 139–142.

¹³⁵ For a thorough presentation of the epigraphical material, see Petrakos 1997.

¹³⁶ 2012, 247–248.

Oropians were thus seizing control of their own statues as a civic resource they could usefully reemploy, after emerging from a long period of civic decay and outside control.¹³⁷

The Attalid Pillar Monuments

At Athens, one group of reused monuments that recalls Dio's diatribe are the Attalid Pillar Monuments, of which the one just below the northern wing of the Propylaia at the entrance to the Acropolis, later rededicated to Marcus Agrippa, is the best preserved and understood.¹³⁸ The rectangular shaft of Hymettian marble rose above three Pentelic marble steps to reach a total height of nearly nine meters. It supported a bronze quadriga, and was inscribed near the center of the front face.

Two other pillar monuments that matched the Agrippa monument in materials, form, and technique, are well attested: one at the northeast corner of the Parthenon is indicated by cuttings in the bedrock and 70 collected blocks, including several that preserve fragments of a dedicatory inscription, and another stood in the Agora in front of the Stoa of Attalos, near its center.¹³⁹ Most of its blocks were found built into a tower of the Post-Herulian Wall, including three blocks of a

¹³⁷ Ma 2013a, 141. By contrast, Palagia (1997, 81) presents a negative interpretation of the reuse at Oropos (and at Athens) more akin to Dio's attitude toward the Rhodians.

¹³⁸ On the Agrippa monument, see esp. Korres 2000a, 314–319 and Jünger 2006, 318–321, 346–347, 370–371. See also Kreikenbom 1992, 131–132; Baldassarri 1998, 247–249; Kotsidu 2000, 83–84; Schollmeyer 2001, 107–108; Krumeich 2010, 331.

¹³⁹ On the monument in front of the Parthenon, see esp. Korres 2000a, 320–325. See also Korres 1994c, 139–140; Kotsidu 2000, 85–86; Schollmeyer 2001, 109; Queyrel 2003, 300–302; Stewart 2004, 197–198; Rose 2005, 50, n. 166; Jünger 2006, 323–324, 372. Stevens (1946, 17–21) presented the cuttings but assigned the quadriga monument of Pronapus to them. Several other pillar monuments are sometimes suggested as belonging to this group as well: the monument by the Dipylon gate investigated by Goette 1990 (see also Korres 2000a, 328); one at the west end of the Middle Stoa in the Agora (Korres 2000a, 328); another opposite the Agrippa monument south of the Acropolis ramp (discussed only by Korres 2000a, 325–328); and one in front of the Stoa of Eumenes purportedly found by Korres and Martin Kreeb but never fully discussed in print (mentioned in passing by Brogan 1999, 283 and Stewart 2004, 198); Foundethakis (1989–1991) suggested that the Agrippa pillar served as a donor monument for the Stoa of Eumenes.

dedicatory inscription.¹⁴⁰ Because of their distinctive coordinating aesthetic of contrasting dark Hymettian marble and light Pentelic marble in pseudo-isodomic masonry style and similarities moldings and dimensions, all three are agreed to have been constructed for the Attalid kings of Pergamon, whose dynasty cultivated close cultural and political ties with the Athenians from the 3rd century until the mid-2nd century BCE.¹⁴¹ It is generally agreed that each held a bronze quadriga with one or more of the Attalid kings, but which king(s) stood where is a matter of much dispute and speculation.¹⁴² Only in the case of the pillar in front of the Stoa of Attalos is there consensus: the monument was likely constructed in connection with the stoa by Attalos II, for which reason it is sometimes called “the Donor’s Monument.”¹⁴³

The chief reason for the uncertainty about the initial phases of the pillar monuments is the fact that they were reused in the Early Imperial period. In all three cases, the original dedicatory inscription seems to have been carefully and thoroughly erased and replaced by a contemporary

¹⁴⁰ On the monument and inscription, see esp. Vanderpool 1959; see also Schalles 1982, 107; Kreikenbom 1992, 132; Bringmann and von Steuben, eds. 1995, 446–447; Korres 2000a, 320; Kotsidu 2000, 86–87; Schollmeyer 2001, 108–109; Queyrel 2003, 299–300; Jünger 2006, 321–323, 371–372.

¹⁴¹ On the used of two colored marbles as a Pergamene idiom, see Goette 1990, 273; Jünger 2006, 342. For a chart of Attalid pillar monuments at Delphi, Samos, Athens, and Priene, see Hintzen-Bohlen 1992, 128–129. The nature of the monuments in Athens and the circumstances surrounding their erection are uncertain. Many (e.g., Dinsmoor 1920; Habicht 1990, 573; Queyrel 2003, 299, 306–308) have connected one or more of the monuments with the victories of the four sons of Attalos I (Eumenes II, Attalos II, Philetairos, Athenaios) in various chariot racing events at the Panathenaic festivals of 178 (all four brothers), 170 (Eumenes II and Attalos II), and 162 (Eumenes II); on the relevant victor lists see esp. Habicht 1990, 568–569 and Tracy and Habicht 1991. Others think the monuments have nothing to do with agonistic victories (e.g., Schollmeyer 2001, 107–109), but instead with military ones (Brogan 1999, 87; Stewart 2004, 197). On the question in general, see also Brogan 1999, 103–104, 282–288; Jünger 2006, 328–331; Krumeich 2014a, 142. On relations between the Attalids and Athens, see esp. Habicht 1990.

¹⁴² For the Agrippa pillar, the most prevalent view is that it held either Eumenes II alone (e.g., Travlos 1971, 493; Hurwit 1999, 278) or together with his brother Attalos II (e.g. Kreikenbom 1992, 131; Jordan-Ruwe 1995, 41). Korres’ reconstruction allows for either possibility (2000a, 318). For the Parthenon pillar, some argue for Eumenes II (e.g., Goette 1990, 278), some for Attalos II (e.g., Hoepfner 1997b, 143–146; Hurwit 1999, 278; Monaco in Greco 2010, 80) and others for Attalos I (e.g., Stewart 2004, 197–198.). Jünger (2006, 347–352) proposes a chronological sequence with Attalos I and Philetairos, the founder of the dynasty, on the pillar at the Acropolis entrance, which he takes as the most ideal spot. All arguments are essentially assumptions, though Queyrel (2003, 299) asserts that his identifications of Attalos II in front of his stoa as well as in front of the Parthenon, and Eumenes II at the Acropolis entrance are more or less certain.

¹⁴³ Vanderpool 1959, 86.

one.¹⁴⁴ The inscriptions rededicating the monument at the Acropolis entrance to Agrippa and the monument in front of the stoa to the emperor Tiberius can be reconstructed with confidence, while the new dedicatee of the third pillar is uncertain; on epigraphical grounds Claudius is most likely, though many assign Augustus to this monument because of its prime location in front of the Parthenon.¹⁴⁵ Only in the case of the Agrippa monument is the crown of the pillar preserved, and in a recent reanalysis of the cuttings on its surface, M. Korres has confirmed what W. Dinsmoor had suspected already in 1920, that there were in fact three distinct phases in the monument's life history.¹⁴⁶ After its initial Attalid phase, the chariot group was replaced twice, once when the monument was rededicated to Antony during his Athenian sojourn in the 30s BCE, and again two decades later when Agrippa replaced his vanquished foe.¹⁴⁷ By analogy, it is usually assumed that the other pillars received new statue groups when they were rededicated as well, but this need not be the case.

Thus, the situation with these monuments may not be exactly like that of the Rhodian honorific statues Dio discusses, if indeed none of the statues was reused along with its glorified

¹⁴⁴ The erasures were reported only haphazardly in previous scholarship, though in the case of the Agrippa monument the prior erasure was noted already in the 18th century by Fauvel. See Keesling 2010, 307–308 for history of scholarship on the Agrippa inscription (*IG II/III*² 4122) and its underlying erasures.

¹⁴⁵ The inscription for Agrippa is *IG II/III*² 4122. The inscription for Tiberius is *IG II*² 4209 + Agora I 6120a + Agora I 6120b; see Vanderpool 1959. The inscription on the pillar northeast of the Parthenon is *IG II*² 3272, but see Korres 1994c, 139, fig. 1 and 2000a, 322–325 for alternate reconstructions; for the titulature as uniquely Claudian, see Schmalz 2009, 117–119.

¹⁴⁶ Dinsmoor 1920; Korres 2000a, 314–319.

¹⁴⁷ More precisely, the horses were changed twice and the chariot itself once (Korres 2000a, 314). The second phase is assigned to Antony based largely on Plutarch's statement (*Vit. Ant.* 60.6) that colossal statues of Eumenes II and Attalos II that had been reinscribed to Antony were knocked down ominously in a storm, though whether or not statues in a quadriga monument could be called *κολοσσοί* is a matter of debate. Dinsmoor conflated this Plutarch passage with Dio Cassius' remark (50.15.2) that statues of Antony and Cleopatra fell into the Theater of Dionysus from the Acropolis; on whether these were one or two distinct occasions, see Hölscher 1985, 126; Kreikenbom 1992, 59–60, 131–132; Queyrel 2003, 302–306; Shear 2007a, 244; Keesling 2010, 307, n. 21. On the date of the rededication to Agrippa, see Schmalz 1994, 201. Agrippa's description as thrice consul in the inscription gives a *terminus post quem* of 27 BCE; most prefer ca. 16–13 BCE, during Agrippa's stay in the Aegean.

base. These were also not run-of-the-mill portrait statues, but were honors on a much larger scale, literally and figuratively. Since their original inscriptions are not preserved, it is uncertain whether the pillar monuments were actually erected as public honors by the Athenians or were private dedications by the Pergamenes themselves, but since they are in such significant public spaces, the *demos* must have approved them at the very least.¹⁴⁸

In their secondary use, all were official state honors given by the *demos* and other public bodies. The first rededication to Agrippa was probably motivated not only by a desire to honor a great benefactor of Athens, but also by the desire to remove Antony's statue. The other two pillars probably had their Pergamenes intact when they were reused, and whether or not these statues were physically replaced, the pillars' size and prominence, combined with the high opinion the Romans shared of the Attalids, must have added significantly to the prestige of the honor.¹⁴⁹ Reusing the pillar at the entrance to the Acropolis—and *epiphanestatos topos* if ever there was one—for Agrippa made the new incarnation of the monument more meaningful than a wholly new pillar monument would have been, and in that way it can be seen as stimulating the larger phenomenon of upcycling old statues on the Acropolis for new honorands in the Early Imperial period, to which I turn now.¹⁵⁰

¹⁴⁸ On this uncertainty, see Jordan-Ruwe 1995, 42–43; Jünger 2006, 358–359; Krumeich 2007, 397, n. 47; Krumeich and Witschel 2009, 209.

¹⁴⁹ Vanderpool (1959, 89–90) argues that the rededication of the Stoa of Attalos pillar to Tiberius probably happened early in his reign, when his popularity at Athens and elsewhere was high. The use of *θεός* in the dedication is significant in this regard, since he was not actually deified after his death—this must have been a high honor indeed; see also Schmalz 2009, 105–106. Kreikenbom (1992, 73–74) argues that the reuse of the pillar monuments in Athens constituted a reorientation back to the Attalids that paralleled the honoring of Augustus at Pergamon.

¹⁵⁰ For the pillar monuments as “super-monuments” because of their “super-visibility” in *epiphanestatoi topoi*, see Ma 2013a, 117.

Upcycled Statue Monuments on the Acropolis

In Athens honorific portrait statues, though they have clear precedents in the preceding centuries, really proliferated at the beginning of the 4th century.¹⁵¹ This coincided with the growing prominence of locations other than the Acropolis for dedications, like the Asklepieion and the sanctuary of Dionysus.¹⁵² The Agora became the most common location for honorific portrait statues, followed by the Theater of Dionysus and later the Acropolis.¹⁵³ According to Keesling's accounting, 330 statue bases from the 6th and 5th centuries survive from the Acropolis, but only 39 for the 4th and 3rd centuries. Many factors, including issues of survival related to reuse, played a part in this trend, but attempts to connect the decrease with political factors are probably misguided.¹⁵⁴ When the decision was taken by the Athenians to reuse existing portrait statues for honorifics beginning in the first century BCE, they chose to use older monuments from the Acropolis, rather than more recent statues in the Agora.¹⁵⁵ At Oropos, by contrast, the oldest of the reused bases dated to the 3rd century.

Reuse of the sort involved in the Acropolis bases can be hard to recognize and has often been overlooked in the past. Entries in *Inscriptiones Graecae* and other collections like those of E. Loewy, A. Raubitschek, and H. Blanck give inconsistent and sometimes contradictory

¹⁵¹ See Keesling 2003, 166, 170; Oliver 2007, 190. After the statues of Harmodius and Aristogeiton awarded for their tyrant-slaying, the statues in the Agora awarded to Konon and Evagoras, the king of Cypriot Salamis, in 393 after their victory over the Spartans at Knidos are considered the next public honorific statues. On the Late Classical origins of honorific portrait statues, see esp. Ma 2013b, 166–171.

¹⁵² Keesling 2007, 141.

¹⁵³ Von den Hoff 2003, 175–178; Krumeich 2007, 391; 2008, 354; Krumeich and Witschel 2009, 190–196. On the locations of honorific portraits in Athens, see esp. Ma 2013a, 103–107.

¹⁵⁴ Keesling 2003, 61; see also Oliver 2007, 195; Ma 2013a, 106.

¹⁵⁵ Although Pausanias reference the two reinscribed monuments in the lower city mentioned above, all of our extant examples come from the Acropolis.

accounts of erasure and reuse.¹⁵⁶ After a project undertaking the thorough re-examination of all surviving Acropolis bases, R. Krumeich has cataloged 20 instances of the reuse of a base with its bronze statue left intact, which he usefully divides into two categories: those with erasure of at least part of the original inscription, and those without erasure of the original inscription.¹⁵⁷ The first category would at first glance seem to be an example of the phenomenon discussed by Dio, but the second category is almost entirely unique in the Greek world.

Of the 20, six date originally to the 5th century, six to the 4th, and five to the Early Hellenistic period (about the other three we are uncertain). Importantly perhaps, all were originally private dedications, not given by the *demos* or *boule*, and all had recognizably human subjects.¹⁵⁸ Ten preserve sculptors' signatures. In several cases the original signature appears to have been recut when the monument was reused, as Keesling has demonstrated, showing that what were assumed based on letter forms to be much later and otherwise unattested sculptors with famous namesakes are in fact "prosopographical phantoms."¹⁵⁹

In their secondary use, all were given as honorific statues by the *demos* and/or *boule*, and most seem to date to the Augustan and Julio-Claudian periods, with a few exceptions earlier in the 1st century BCE and prosopographical uncertainty in some cases. The new honorands, besides two Thracian kings allied with Rome and one possibly Athenian citizen, were all prominent Romans, including six to eight consuls, the son of a consul, and possibly a prefect of

¹⁵⁶ Loewy 1885; Raubitschek 1949; Blanck 1969.

¹⁵⁷ See Krumeich 2010 for the catalog and fullest treatment of the bases including earlier bibliography. The project, begun in 2004, and its findings are also discussed with differing emphases in Krumeich 2007; 2008; 2011; 2014a; 2014b; and Krumeich and Witschel 2009 and 2013. Shear 2007a also uses categories of erasure vs. no erasure in discussing many of these bases and the interpretative issues involved.

¹⁵⁸ Keesling 2003, 187.

¹⁵⁹ Keesling 2007, 149–154; 2010, 309–321. Krumeich expresses skepticism about at least some of Keesling's suggestions (e.g., Krumeich 2010, 332, 336).

Egypt. Although Blanck attributed this phenomenon to the poverty of the Athenians, they were also erecting many honorific monuments *de novo* during this period, suggesting other motivations for the choice to reuse existing statues for these important Romans.¹⁶⁰ As J. Shear has rightly asserted, “these were not men whom the Athenians could please with second-hand honors.”¹⁶¹

To investigate how these clearly second-hand monuments could thus be more than second-hand honors, let us now examine the bases themselves. Using Krumeich’s numbering for convenience, I will start with A2, because this is the only example in the corpus which conforms precisely to the practice we envision when we read Dio’s *Rhodian Oration*.¹⁶² In this case, the original inscription was completely erased, and a very simple new inscription was engraved: “The *demos* honors Barea, son of --- Soranus.”¹⁶³ We do not know the original date of the monument, but since the base is Eleusinian limestone, it is probably later than the 5th century, when Pentelic marble was predominant.¹⁶⁴ This second honorand Soranus was a prominent Stoic who was suffect consul in 52 CE, and later proconsul of Asia. About the original honorand

¹⁶⁰ Blanck 1969, 99. After examining all the extant bases from this period, Krumeich has determined that over 85% of the documented 158 monuments dedicated between 100 BCE and 100 CE were newly constructed, mostly on traditional low square bases that did not differ markedly from those of previous periods (2014a, 145–146, 153; 2014b, 80). The large quantity of new honorific monuments in this period is overlooked by Galinsky (2008, 7–8), who is far wide of the mark in claiming that “it was almost the norm in places like Athens and Rhodes to leave the entire statue intact and simply change the name” in a practice of “calculated disrespect.” Perrin-Saminadayar (2004) too overstates the prevalence of the practice in discussing reuse as a practical, economic solution to many of the difficulties cities faced in erecting honorific statues. Boardman (2002, 103) cites “opportunism, tempered with some respect for antiquity” as the motivation behind this reuse.

¹⁶¹ Shear 2007a, 222.

¹⁶² EM 1904. For discussion of this base, see esp. Blanck 1969, 85, B 40; Krumeich 2010, 369–370.

¹⁶³ *IG II/III*² 3792: ὁ δῆμος | [Βαρέαν – –]ου ὑὸν Σωρ[ανόν]

¹⁶⁴ On the shift from Pentelic to Hymettian as the usual stone for statue bases, see Keesling 2010, 309.

though, no information is preserved at all. We can imagine Dio lamenting the loss of memory, and thus the removal of the honor from the original subject.

This first example, however, is exceptional in its lack of memory preservation. In seven of the eleven examples with erasure, the name of the original honorand or dedicator seems to have been recorded elsewhere on the base when it was erased from the front and the monument was reused. For example, A4, reinscribed for the Thracian king Rhaskouporis I in an erasure on the front of the base, also bears a small and rather sloppy inscription on the back side saying simply: Satyros, son of Semon<i>des, from Prospalta.¹⁶⁵ Likewise, base A5, reinscribed for Rhaskouporis' son Kotys, has the name Eumnestos, son of Sosikratides, from Paiania inscribed on the back.¹⁶⁶

Several others have names in the nominative case inscribed on their top faces, between the feet of the statue or along an edge. For example, A6 and A7, preserve the names of what were likely two brothers, Phanomachos and Archinos, sons of Phantias, from Eleusis.¹⁶⁷ Base A6 preserves the signature of Mikion, and was rededicated to L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, probably the consul of 16 BCE and Nero's grandfather.¹⁶⁸ Base A7 was signed by Kephisodotos and was later rededicated to P. Cornelius Lentulus, probably the consul of 14 BCE.¹⁶⁹ On the top of A7,

¹⁶⁵ Σάτυρος | Σημώνδου | Προσπάλιος. The later inscription is *IG II/III*² 3442. Krumeich publishes the inscription on the back for the first time (2010, 370–371). For discussion of this base, see also Keesling 2007, 151–153; Krumeich 2014b, 77–78.

¹⁶⁶ Εὔμνηστος Σωσικρατίδου Παιανιεύς. The later inscription is *IG II/III*² 3443. For discussion of this base, see esp. Keesling 2007, 151; Krumeich 2010, 371–372.

¹⁶⁷ A6: Φανόμαχος Φανίου | Ἐλευσίνιος. A7: Ἀρχίνος Φανίου Ἐλευσίνιος. For the best treatment of these two bases, see Keesling 2010, 313–316.

¹⁶⁸ For discussion of this base, see also Blanck 1969, 81, B 31; Krumeich and Witschel 2009, 217–218; Krumeich 2010, 332–335, 372–373; 2014a, 147–148; 2014b, 76.

¹⁶⁹ For discussion of this base, see also Blanck 1969, 78 B 25; Keesling 2007, 148–150, 2010; Shear 2007a, 225–229; Krumeich 2010, 333–335, 373–374; 2014b, 77.

the Archinos' name is actually inscribed twice beside the left foot—once along the base's edge in even lettering, and once in a less careful version. Base A8 preserves the name of Kleidikos, son of Kineas, from Lamprai, cut nicely along the top edge of the left side of the base, which was reinscribed for Gnaeus Acerronius Proculus, a proconsul of Achaëa under Claudius.¹⁷⁰

Base A9 records even more than just a name between the feet of the statue: Dionysios, son of Simos, from Kydonia, *proxenos*, dedicated (a statue of) Lampon.¹⁷¹ This is most easily interpreted as a recording of the entire original honorific inscription—apart from the signature of Praxiteles that was simply recut—at the time when it was reused as Gaius Aelius Gallus, perhaps the prefect of Egypt from 26 to 24 BCE.¹⁷²

We see then, that in most of the cases of erasure and reinscription, the Athenians acknowledged the need to remember the identity of the original honorand and/or dedicator of the statue by recording that information elsewhere on the monument itself—out of sight but not unseeable.¹⁷³ It is worth pointing out here that Ma has found evidence of similar recording on at least a few of the bases reinscribed for Romans at Oropos.¹⁷⁴ There are other strong indications that the reuse of these monuments on the Acropolis was not haphazard and pragmatic but thoughtfully conceived. Unlike Dio's Rhodian *strategos*, pointing at the first statue he sees, the

¹⁷⁰ Κλειδικός Κινέου Λαμπρεύ[ς]. The later inscription is *IG II/III*² 4181. For discussion of this base, see esp. Blanck 1969, 85, B 39; Keesling 2007, 153–156; 2010, 309–313; Krumeich and Witschel 2009, 218–219; Schmalz 2009, 200–201, no. 257; Krumeich 2010, 374–375; 2014a, 148.

¹⁷¹ *IG II/III*² 3882: Διονύσιος Σίμου Κυδωνιάτ[ης] | πρόξενος ἀνέθηκεν Λάμπωνα. For discussion of this base, see esp. Blanck 1969, 84, B 37; Keesling 2007, 153–154; 2010, 312–314; Shear 2007a, 229–233; Krumeich and Witschel 2009, 219–220; Krumeich 2010, 336–337, 375–376; 2014b, 76.

¹⁷² The letter forms are certainly late, but the use of *proxenos* indicates that the content is earlier (Shear 2007a, 232). The later inscription is *IG II/III*² 4117. On the identity of Praxiteles, see Keesling 2007, 152–154; 2010, 310–313.

¹⁷³ Krumeich has called these secondary inscriptions “*Memorierungs-Inschriften*” (2014a, 148–149) and “*Erinnerungs-Inschriften*” (2014b, 77).

¹⁷⁴ Ma 2007b, 93–4.

Athenians were deliberate in their choice of the appropriate statue to reuse in a given context. The two statues reused for the Thracian kings, for instance, were both by the same Early Hellenistic sculptor, Antignotos.¹⁷⁵ The sculptor's signature, in fact, seems to have been one of the main reasons for choosing a statue for reuse. Eight of the eleven bases in this first category include a sculptor's signature, either left un-erased or indeed recut for emphasis during the reuse.¹⁷⁶ Most of these sculptors are otherwise known to us from sources like Pliny the Elder's *Natural History*, and it is not hard to imagine that receiving a statue made by a famous "old master" like Praxiteles, Kephisodotos, or Apollodoros might in fact be a higher honor than receiving a newly-made image.¹⁷⁷

How though, was the viewer meant to interpret these new-old monuments? On the one hand, the act of reuse must have been quite visible to any viewer reading closely. Any 400-year-old statue, no matter how lovingly tended, would have shown signs of its age, whereas the inscriptions for Romans would clearly not have looked as old. On the other hand, since the statues had presumably already been standing on the Acropolis, the casual visitor may not have immediately noticed when their identities changed.¹⁷⁸ The new inscriptions, after all, do not give much information about the Roman honorands or their benefactions. We primarily see simply ὁ δῆμος followed by the Roman *trinomina* in the accusative, plus εὐνοίας or ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα, as was

¹⁷⁵ See Keesling 2007, 152; Krumeich 2010, 370–372.

¹⁷⁶ A1, A3, A4, A5, A6, A7, A8, A9. For discussion of base A1 (with a signature of Apollodoros), see esp. Raubitschek 1949, 161–162, no. 146; Blanck 1969, 79–80, B 28; Schmalz 2009, 192–193, no. 247; Krumeich 2010, 368–369. For discussion of base A3 (with a signature of Xenocles), see esp. Blanck 1969, 81, B 32; Krumeich 2010, 370.

¹⁷⁷ Raubitschek 1949, 460; Shear 2007a, 223, 244–245.

¹⁷⁸ The precise location of these monuments on the Acropolis, both in their original state and as rededicated, is impossible to determine in most cases. The most popular spots were probably along the Sacred Way north of the Parthenon and around the large altars. See Krumeich 2008, 354; 2010, 329; Krumeich and Witschel 2009, 210.

traditional for honorific statues. And, it is worth stating explicitly, the inscriptions are still in Greek.¹⁷⁹

I would argue, then, that this form of upcycling allowed the Athenians at the same time to give important Roman benefactors prestigious honors, yet also to maintain control over the memory involved in the transaction. The preservation of the older names elsewhere on the bases is extremely important here. This reuse is not equivalent to cases of erasure we call *damnatio memoriae*, where the very visibility of the obliteration was the real goal. In changing the identity of the statue in what was actually a rather subtle manner, the Athenian *demos* changed the viewer's conception of the monument.

Returning to Dio momentarily, we see that even if a reinscribed statue was felt to *belong* to the original honorand, it was conceived as *being* the new honorand (ὄντα): “we hear of a statue of a certain athlete which stands here, that it is (ὄντα) an utter weakling of a man, quite ordinary of body.”¹⁸⁰ Did making Greek statues into Romans therefore also entail making Romans into Greeks? Although the contrast between old and new would have struck discerning viewers, the *act* of reuse is essentially meant to be invisible. The intent was not to dishonor the original subject or overturn the social contract of reciprocity, but rather to change the viewer's perception of the monument's history. The statues, in Favorinus' pithy summation, have the character of Greeks, but the fortunes of Romans (τρόπον μὲν Ἑλλήνων, τύχας δὲ Ῥωμαίων).¹⁸¹

¹⁷⁹ On the use of Latin versus Greek in honorific inscriptions throughout the empire, see Fejfer 2008, 29–32.

¹⁸⁰ 31.156: ἀθλητοῦ τινος ἀνδριάντα ἐστάναι, ὡς ὄντα ἀνθρώπου παντελῶς ἀσθενοῦς καὶ μετρίου τὸ σῶμα. See Shear 2007a, 225.

¹⁸¹ [Dio Chrys.] 37.40.

The juxtaposition of Greek and Roman, old and new, is effected even more visibly and confusingly in Krumeich’s second category of reused statue bases. In these nine cases, there is no erasure at all, but instead a second inscription was added, usually with some relationship to the first in terms of spatial arrangement and/or content. Five of the six 5th-century bases in the whole corpus belong to this second category, and must have been among the earliest portrait statues dedicated on the Acropolis. Because of their uniqueness, it will be useful to look at these bases one by one.

Base B1 held a standing figure with right foot forward.¹⁸² The first inscription, from the first half of the 4th century, reads: “Having been saved from great dangers, Lysimachos set up this statue for Pallas Tritogeneia. Lysimachos, son of Lysitheides, of Agryle.”¹⁸³ Directly below this, in larger letters, a second inscription reads: “The *demos* (honors) Marcus Licinius Crassus Frugi on account of his reverence towards the emperor (*eusebeia*) and his goodwill and benefaction towards the *demos*.”¹⁸⁴ This second inscription fills the length of the base just as the first does, suggesting that they be read together. The statue is thus identified as both Lysimachos, son of Lysitheides, of Agryle, labeled in the nominative, and Marcus Licinius Crassus Frugi, either the consul of 27 CE or his son, consul in 64 CE.

Base B2 and its inscriptions are fragmentary. As restored it was a late 4th-century dedication by Aischronides, made by Kephisodotos, and then given by the *demos* to an unknown

¹⁸² For discussion of this base (EM 447), see esp. Blanck 1969, 85, B 41; Keesling 2007, 145; Shear 2007a, 233–235; Krumeich 2007, 408–409; 2010, 338–340, 378–379; 2014b, 79.

¹⁸³ *IG II/III*² 4323: σωθε[ι]ς ἐγ̅ μεγάλων κινδύνων εικόνα τήνδε | στήσεν Λυσίμαχος : Παλλάδι Τριτογενεῖ | Λυσίμαχος Λυσιθείδο : Ἀγρυλῆθεν.

¹⁸⁴ *IG II/III*² 4189: ὁ δῆμος | Μάρκον Λικίνιον Κράσσον Φρούγι εὐσεβείας τε τῆς πρὸς τὸν | Σεβαστὸν ἔνεκα καὶ τῆς πρὸς | τὸν δῆμον εὐνοίας καὶ εὐεργεσίας.

Julius on account of his excellence.¹⁸⁵ The second inscription was placed in the large *vacat* before the sculptor’s signature, indicating again that it was meant to be read together with the older inscription.¹⁸⁶

Base B3 was originally a dedication to Athena from the mid-5th century, and held a statue with right foot held back and three sickle-shaped objects embedded into the top of the base.¹⁸⁷ The first inscription is fragmentary, but tells us that an Athenian from Lamprai dedicated the statue as a tithe to Athena.¹⁸⁸ In the reuse, the *demos* honored Publius Octavius, son of Publius, on account of his excellence and goodwill.¹⁸⁹ This is probably the acting proconsul of Crete and Cyrene under Tiberius.

Base B4 was also a dedication from the mid-5th century and held a statue with a wide stance, probably a warrior in an attacking pose.¹⁹⁰ The first inscription reads: “Thrasyllos and Gnathios, sons of Mneson, from Leukonoion set it up for Athena.”¹⁹¹ Below this, the second inscription reads: “The *demos* (honors) Lucius Aemilius Paullus, son of Paullus, on account of his excellence.”¹⁹² This is thought to have been the Lucius Aemilius Paullus who was consul in 1

¹⁸⁵ EM 9604. *IG* II/III² 4915: [Αι]σχωρων[ι]δ[η]ς ...φ — — — — | ἀνέ[θηκε] *vac.* [Κ]η[φισ]όδδ[οτος ἐποίησε?]. For discussion of this base, see esp. Blanck 1969, 84 B 36; Keesling 2007, 155; Krumeich 2010, 379.

¹⁸⁶ *IG* II/III² 3916: ὁ δῆμος | Ἰούλιον — — — — | ἀρετῆς [ἔνεκα].

¹⁸⁷ Acropolis 13250. For discussion of this base, see esp. Raubitschek 1949, 156–158, no. 140; Blanck 1969, 81–82, B 33; Krumeich 2010, 379–380; 2011, 95–102; 2014a, 149–150; 2014b, 78. By comparison with dedications to Artemis Orthia at Sparta, Krumeich suggests that the three recesses on top of the base held sickles, dedicated as part of the original monument perhaps in thanksgiving for a bountiful grain harvest or a flourishing blacksmithing business (see esp. 2010, 340; 2011, 96–102).

¹⁸⁸ *IG* I³ 859: [— — — — —] ο Λαμπτροῦ[ς] | [ἀνέθηκεν(?)] δεκ[άτην] τῆι Ἀθηναίαι.

¹⁸⁹ *IG* II/III² 4156: ὁ δῆμος | Πόπλιον Ὀκταίου Ποπλίου | [υἱ]ὸν [ἀ]ρετῆς ἔνεκα καὶ εὐνο[ίας].

¹⁹⁰ Acropolis 13171 + EM 13232. For discussion of this base, see esp. Raubitschek 1949, 116–117, no. 112; Blanck 1969, 78–79, B 27; Keesling 2003, 190; Krumeich 2008, 360–361; 2010, 341, 380–381.

¹⁹¹ *IG* I³ 833: [Θρά]συλλος : καὶ Γνάθιος : Μνέσονος : *θυιῆ* | [ἐγ Λ]ευκονοίο : ἀνεθέτεν : τὰθηναίαι.

¹⁹² *IG* II/III² 4147: ὁ δῆμος | [Λεύκτιο]ν Αἰμίλιον | [Παύλλου υἱὸ]ν Παῦλλον | [ἀρετῆς ἔ]νεκα.

CE, and it is most likely that the statue originally represented Mneson, the father of the dedicators, based on other comparanda of early portrait dedications.¹⁹³

Base B5 presents a much more complex original inscription.¹⁹⁴ It also likely held a striding warrior figure, given the dowel cuttings and the reference to Ares in the inscription, which is metrical and stoichedon: “Hegelochos, the father and son of Ekphantos, dedicated me here to Athena Parthenos as a memorial to the toils of Ares; and, having a share of great *philoxenia* and of all excellence, he lives in this city. Kritios and Nesiotes made (me).”¹⁹⁵ The later inscription is much less informative. The first line, “the *boule* and the *demos*,” comes right below the earlier inscription, and the rest, “Lucius Cassius on account of his excellence,” is closer to the bottom.¹⁹⁶ Interestingly though, an attempt seems to have been made to line up the ἄρετῆς of the second inscription with that of the first. This Lucius Cassius was either the Lucius Cassius Longinus who was suffect consul in 11 CE, or more likely his homonym who was consul in 33 CE. Giving him an ancient portrait of a warrior, sculpted between 480 and 460 BCE by the famous sculptors of the Tyrannicides, must have been a very high honor.

Base B6 presents another twist. In this case a two-figure group of Lysiphanes son of Lysidemus of Hagnous and his mother Sostrate was given by the *demos* to Lucius Valerius

¹⁹³ Keesling 2003, 190.

¹⁹⁴ Acropolis 13206. For discussion of this base, see esp. Raubitschek 1949, 126–129, no. 121; Blanck 1969, 80–81, B30; Keesling 2003, 186–190; 2007, 154; 2010, 304–305; Shear 2007a, 235–238; Krumeich 2008, 359–360; 2010, 341–343, 381–382; 2011, 89–95; 2014a, 150–152; 2014b, 78; Krumeich and Witschel 2009, 219; Schmalz 2009, 193, no. 248.

¹⁹⁵ *IG* I³ 850:
[Πα]ρθένοι Ἐκφάντο με πατέρ ἀνέθε-
κε καὶ ἡμιός / ἐνθάδ’ Ἀθηναίει μνῆμα
πόνον Ἄρεος / Ἐγέλοχος μεγάλε<ς> τε φι-
λοχσενίης ἀρετῆς τε / πάσας μοῖραν
ἔχον τένδε πόλιν νέμεται.
Κριτίος : καὶ Νεσιότες : ἐποίησάτεν.

¹⁹⁶ *IG* II/III² 4168: ἡ βουλὴ καὶ ὁ δῆμος | Λεύκιον Κάσιον | ἀρετῆς ἕνεκα.

Catullus and his mother Terentia Hispulla in either the Augustan or Tiberian period.¹⁹⁷ This is the only base in the second category made of Hymettian marble rather than Pentelic, and the only one originally dating as late as the Early Hellenistic period, ca. 300. The first set of inscriptions reads, at the left: “Lysiphanes, son of Lysidemos, from Hagnous. Kallias, son of Demalkes, of Skambonidai adopted him.” Then at the right: “Sostrate, the daughter of Eukrates, of Epikhephisia, the wife of Lysidemos.” Then we have the sculptor’s signature, Πίστων ἐποίησεν, centered beneath those two.¹⁹⁸

The later inscriptions begin immediately after the first, thus on different lines from each other, and engulf, we might say, the signature. This second set reads: The *demos* (honors) Lucius Valerius Catullus, the son of Lucius, on account of his excellence and moderation (σωφροσύνη).” And at the right, “The *demos* (honors) Terentia Hispulla, the daughter of Gnaeus, the mother of Catullus.”¹⁹⁹ Although the two later inscriptions were apparently cut by different hands, they were clearly planned and executed in conjunction with each other.²⁰⁰ Statue groups showing a mother and a son were not common in any period, so considerable care must have been taken in choosing an appropriate monument to reuse for Catullus and his mother when they both received

¹⁹⁷ For discussion of this base, see esp. Blanck 1969, 78, B 26; Keesling 2007, 144, 148; 2010, 307; Shear 2007a, 238–241; Schmalz 2009, 191, no. 245; Krumeich 2010, 343–344, 382–383.

¹⁹⁸ *IG* II/III² 3850:

Λυσιφάνης Λυσιδήμου	Σωστράτη Εὐκράτους
Ἄγνούσιος. Καλλίας	Ἐπικηφισίου θυγάτηρ
Δημά<λ>κους Σκαμβωνίδης :	Λυσιδήμου γυνή.
[ἐ]ποίησατο ὑὸν ἑαυτῶι.	
	Πίστων ἐποίησεν.

¹⁹⁹ *IG* II/III² 4159:

[ὁ δῆ]μος Λούκιον Οὐαλέ-	ὁ δῆμος Τερεντίαν Ναίου
[ριον Λο]υκίου υἱὸν Κάτυλλον	θυγατέρα Ἴστυλλαν
[ἀρετῆς] ἕνεκα καὶ σωφροσύνης.	Κατύλλου μητέρα.

²⁰⁰ Shear 2007a, 239–40.

honors from the *demos*.²⁰¹ In this case, the subject matter seems to have been more crucial than the fame of the sculptor, though his signature was still respected by the later inscriptions.

Base B7 represents only one block of an original base consisting of at least three blocks, judging by the anathyrosis on both sides.²⁰² It held a standing figure with left foot forward. The original inscription extended to the neighboring (lost) blocks, but has been dated to the end of the 5th century and restored with the familiar votive formula: “someone, the son of Chairis, from Cholargos set it up.”²⁰³ The second inscription is in smaller letters below, just off center but probably centered to the statue. It reads: “The *boule* (honors) Marcus Quirinius on account of his goodwill.”²⁰⁴ It seems likely to me that the remainder of this statue group, like the group of Lysiphanes and his mother, was reused at one and the same time with additional honorands, and that only this block has survived, later built into a Turkish cistern west of the Parthenon. If that was the case, we may have another example of a monument chosen for reuse based on its content and arrangement.

Base B8 presents part of another statue group, at least part of which was reused.²⁰⁵ At the top edge is preserved part of a label naming Philomelos, son of Philippides, whose statue stood on this block. After a *vacat* part of the votive formula is preserved in larger letters. Beginning on the neighboring block, it has been restored as: “Philomelos, son of Philippides, from Paiania, dedicated it.” The ἐποίησε part of a sculptor’s signature is preserved at the bottom left of the

²⁰¹ Keesling 2010, 307.

²⁰² For discussion of this base, see esp. Raubitschek 1949, 209–210, no. 177; Blanck 1969, 80, B 29; Krumeich 2010, 344–345, 383–384.

²⁰³ *IG I³ 900*: [— — — Χα]ίριδος Χολαργεὺ[ς ἀνέθεκεν].

²⁰⁴ *IG II/III² 4143*: ἡ βουλὴ | Μᾶρκον Κυρήνιον | εὐνοίας ἔνεκεν.

²⁰⁵ For discussion of this base, see esp. Blanck 1969, 84, B 38; Keesling 2007, 148; Krumeich 2010, 345, 384.

block.²⁰⁶ To these original early 4th-century inscriptions was added another in the Early Imperial period: “The *demos* (honors) Alexander, son of Athenodoros, on account of his excellence.”²⁰⁷

This is the only one of the reused portraits whose secondary honorand may be an Athenian citizen. It is not certain whether the rest of the monument was also reused and reinscribed or whether the other statue or statues had already disappeared by the 1st century, but given that we know reuse with erasure was happening in other cases, I would posit that the original inscriptions were purposefully preserved as part of an intact monument, otherwise the fragments would have been erased.

The last base in the group, B9, is fragmentary and therefore we cannot be sure that the statue was actually reused along with the base.²⁰⁸ Nevertheless, the existence of two non-contemporary inscriptions on the front side fits the pattern we have seen here. The original 5th-century inscription preserves part of the votive formula: “[Someone] from Lamptrai dedicated it.”²⁰⁹ The second inscription, from the early 1st century CE, reads: “The *demos* (honors) King Archelaos son of Archelaos,” who was the last king of Cappadocia.²¹⁰

What are we to make of these statues with doubled identities? Or more importantly, what were ancient viewers to make of them? As with the monuments with erasure of the original

²⁰⁶ *IG* II/III² 3823:

[— — — — —] Φιλόμελος Φιλιππίδο[— —]

vac.

[Φιλόμελος Φιλιππίδο Παιανιεὺς ἀνέθηκε.

vac.

[— — —]ς ἐπόησε.

²⁰⁷ *IG* II/III² 3912: ὁ δῆμος Ἀλέξανδρον | Ἀθηνοδώρου | ἀρετῆς ἔνεκα.

²⁰⁸ Acropolis 13183. For discussion of this base, see esp. Raubitschek 1949, 327–328, no. 305; Krumeich 2010, 385.

²⁰⁹ *IG* I³ 869: [— — — — —]μο Λαμπτρεὺς ἀνέθε[κεν].

²¹⁰ *IG* II/III² 3434: ὁ δῆμος | βασιλέως Ἀρχε|λάου υἱὸν | Ἀρχέλαον.

inscription, a discerning viewer would surely notice that the statue had been reused, since different parts of its inscription were not matching in appearance and were thus inscribed at different times. Still, the act of reuse was not emphasized, and the later inscriptions were cut in spatially logical places on the front of the bases, generally preserving the symmetry of the older arrangement. Here, we might think of the upcycling of the monument as more holistic: the statue was being reused body and soul, since the identity and memory of the original dedicator/honorand was not just kept alive by being slyly recorded elsewhere, but was directly maintained and perpetuated.²¹¹ Reuse of this sort can even be considered a form of monument conservation, a renewal of the memory of the monument's origins through its upcycling.²¹²

But for the new honorand, would receiving a statue that was clearly labeled as also being or belonging to someone else be considered a prized honor, as it probably was to receive an “old master” portrait? I think the answer is yes. As we have seen in most of these examples without erasure, there are indications that the two inscriptions are meant to be read in connection with, but not in competition with, each other.²¹³ The original meaning of the monument then, is used to enhance the significance of the new monument through its upcycling, just as the Pergamene pillars must have done for their new Imperial denizens.

²¹¹ Krumeich assumes that several of the originally bearded statues would have had their heads replaced in their secondary incarnations to conform to the beardless fashion of the Augustan period (e.g., Krumeich 2010, 352; 2014b, 75). Krumeich's own thorough treatment of the evidence on this question suggests the contrary (2010, 346–350). It seems to me that a new beardless head on a 5th-century body would have been far more jarring and incongruous to viewers and honorands than the maintenance of an “old-fashioned” bearded head (which Krumeich thinks they could not have stomach), especially since the age of the statue was such a crucial factor in its selection for rededication. On the changing popularity and signification of beards on portrait statues in the Greek East, see also Smith 1998, esp. 89–90.

²¹² Krumeich 2010, 354, 365; 2014b, 80.

²¹³ Shear (2007a, 242) makes this point particularly clearly.

This enhancing effect can be seen clearly in one of the only other examples known from the Greek world of such reuse and reinscription without erasure of the original. This comes from the island of Kos, where a 3rd-century BCE statue of Delphis, a local writer of elegies, was reinscribed two centuries later in honor of another successful local poetess, whose name is now lost.²¹⁴ As Ma has emphasized, not only was care taken here to preserve the original identity of the statue, but “the reuse was clearly and explicitly planned to produce extra meaning.”²¹⁵ Such care and planning is definitely discernible in some of the Acropolis examples, like the mother and son group. We can imagine too, that the monuments whose original inscriptions were lengthier or more informative had some particular relevance to the new honorand. Perhaps, for example, the statue of Lysimachos was chosen for Marcus Licinius Cassius Frugi because he had also been saved from great dangers.

If the older monuments were chosen for upcycling based on their ability to enhance the meaning and prestige of a new honor, the viewer was still faced with a potentially incongruous image—an old statue looking Greek, named as both a Greek and (in most cases) a Roman. In the examples with erasure, Romans in Greek garb or “heroic” lack thereof were no less incongruous, but the doubling would have made the effect even more peculiar here.²¹⁶ Although C. Hallett has demonstrated that Romans of the Late Republican and Early Imperial periods willingly appropriated the conventions of Greek nude portraits and that Roman officials were probably not infrequently depicted in traditionally “Greek” modes in honorific portraits in the East, it seems

²¹⁴ See Bosnakis 2004; Ma 2007b, 94–95.

²¹⁵ Ma 2007b, 95.

²¹⁶ On the costumes of honorific portrait statues in the Imperial period, including the choice of toga versus himation, see Fejfer 2008, 183–200; on the Greek East more specifically, see Smith 1998, 63–70. On nudity in such statues, see Fejfer 2008, 200–207. On nudity in Greek and Roman portraiture generally, see Hallett 2005.

that viewers could indeed distinguish Greek and Roman aspects of honorific statues.²¹⁷ Dio, for example, describes the Rhodian statues as actors, playing different parts at different times, Greek, Roman, Macedonian, or Persian. And in some cases, he says, the deceit is obvious to the beholder at once, “for the clothing and the footwear and all other such things expose the fraud.”²¹⁸ But in our examples without erasure the statue is playing two roles simultaneously. It has its Greek character and Roman fortune, as in Favorinus’ formulation, and both aspects worked together to create a monument laden with significance and memory.

As discussed above, memory in general was central to the Greek ethic of reciprocity and the honorific system. Preserving the memory of a benefactor’s good deeds and his subsequent rewards was the basic motivation behind the development of honorific decrees and their attendant monuments or memorials. Even if the eventually formulaic nature of honors bestowed strikes us now as rote and mechanical, such standardization emphasizes that it truly mattered that both sides of the transaction were carried out correctly. Loss of memory is the chief reason Dio is so vexed about what he sees happening at Rhodes. Reinscribing an honorific statue erased the memory of the former benefaction and thereby dishonored the benefactor. If future benefactors could not be certain that their deeds and honors would be remembered, there would be a breakdown in the system.

In these upcycled monuments on the Acropolis too, the collective social memory of the community is the force most at stake and at work. The Athenian *demos*, named prominently in

²¹⁷ 2005, esp. Ch. 4, 102–158, cf. 303–304.

²¹⁸ 31.155: φασὶ γοῦν πολλοὶ τοὺς Ῥοδίων ἀνδριάντας ὁμοίους εἶναι τοῖς ὑποκριταῖς. ὥσπερ γὰρ ἐκείνων ἕκαστον ἄλλοτε ἄλλον εἰσιέναι, καὶ τοὺς ἀνδριάντας ὑμῖν ἄλλοτε ἄλλα λαμβάνειν πρόσωπα καὶ μικροῦ δεῖν ὑποκρινομένους ἐστάναι. τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν νῦν μὲν εἶναι Ἕλληνα, νῦν δὲ Ῥωμαῖον, πάλιν δ’ ἂν οὕτω τύχη, Μακεδόνα ἢ Πέρσην: καὶ ταῦτ’ ἐπ’ ἐνίων οὕτως ὥστε τὸν ἰδόντα εὐθὺς εἰδέναι. καὶ γὰρ ἐσθῆς καὶ ὑπόδεσις καὶ τοιαῦθ’ ἕτερα τὸ ψεῦσμα ἐλέγχει.

almost every secondary inscription, transmitted the memory of a very specific past, and attempted to construct memory of the present in relation to that past. By choosing to reuse what must have been amongst the oldest statues they had available, the Athenians were tying the present in to the most ancient past they could—the Classical past that had become their greatest resource by the Roman period.²¹⁹ And they did so in the sanctuary most closely associated with that past, the Acropolis, even though it was not the usual place for honorific statues in any period.²²⁰

Whereas Dio continually criticizes the Rhodians for betraying their past in mistreating their statues, the Athenians reused their statues in a way that instead upheld and renewed their past.²²¹ In so doing, they showed that they themselves were in control of their own cultural heritage and its resources. At a time when their actual power to control their own political affairs had been limited for centuries, their assertion of this particular authority was far from insignificant. This upcycling was a means for the Athenians to affirm their continuing role as cultural leaders by preserving and renewing the social memory of specific artistic, military, and cultural achievements of their most renowned and respected past. Even more than making Greek statues into Romans, perhaps the reinscribed monuments were meant to make Romans into venerable Athenian citizens, just as the inclusion of foreign kings amongst the Eponymous

²¹⁹ Krumeich 2010, 355.

²²⁰ Oliver 2007, 197; Keesling 2010, 306; Krumeich 2014a, 142; 2014b, 80–81.

²²¹ Jones 1978, 29.

Heroes worked to both honor and Atticize them, and should thus be interpreted as honors *summa cum laude*.²²²

I will conclude by returning once more to Pausanias, who can help us understand when and where this strategy of upcycling monuments and doubling identities succeeded in altering the collective conception of a monument and its subject, and when it was less successful. Thinking back to the reinscribed statues he reports seeing in the Agora and the Kerameikos, mentioned above, I think we can imagine that these statues too may have had their original inscriptions left intact when the second was added, just as in our second group from the Acropolis. Pausanias somehow knows the original identity of the statues and the fact that they had been given to others, but chooses to report only the first identity explicitly (Miltiades and Themistocles; Poseidon) and the more recent ones only very generally (a Roman and a Thracian; someone else).²²³

This is a useful reminder that individuals and different memory communities could view monuments in quite diverse ways. The polysemy inherent in most monuments was even more dramatic in these upcycled statues. The Athenian *demos* may have intended to affect social memory by making Greeks into Romans and Romans into Greeks, but the viewer was still free to choose his own interpretation from among the multivalent possibilities, and here Pausanias was not having it—they were still Greeks. Perhaps the reason the practice petered out at the end of the Julio-Claudian period was a similar refusal by contemporaries to accept such doubled identities. Pausanias gives us another illustrative example in this regard, at the Argive Heraion,

²²² Krumeich 2010, 366. A century later, Favorinus would argue that he, as a Hellenized Roman, especially deserved a statue at Corinth, a Hellenized Roman city ([Dio Chrys.] 37.26): ὅτι Ῥωμαῖος ὢν ἀφῆλληνίσθη ὥσπερ ἡ πατρις ἢ ὑμετέρα. See König 2000, esp. 142.

²²³ Paus. 1.18.3, 1.2.4.

where he sees a statue of a hero that the Argives say is Orestes, although it has an inscription saying it is Augustus: τὸν γὰρ ἐπίγραμμα ἔχοντα, ὡς εἶη βασιλεὺς Αὐγουστος, Ὀρέστην εἶναι λέγουσιν (2.17.3). This is a clear indication that even when a statue's original inscription was erased, its original identity could yet live on in the memory of the community. This seems to have been what Pausanias encountered at Sikyon too, when the Sikyonians claimed that statues of two women were the daughters of Proitos, despite an inscription to the contrary (2.9.8).

Returning to Athens though, we have evidence that reusing and reinscribing statue monuments could indeed affect an actual change in the perception of its history. In the case of the reused Attalid pillar monuments—if indeed both the inscriptions and the statues were completely replaced—there was no intention to preserve the identity of the previous honorand or the memory of the monument's past life. The reuse was meaningful (the past life added to the prestige of the honor) but was meant to be invisible, even more so than in the reused statues on the Acropolis, and it seems that in this case the Athenians did achieve a change in social memory more effectively in the long term. Despite their huge size and prominent locations in the Agora, at the entrance to the Acropolis, and directly in front of the Parthenon, Pausanias does not mention any of the pillar monuments in his description of the city. This omission becomes less surprising if the monument was thought of by Pausanias and his guides as a thoroughly Roman artifact of the sort he is generally uninterested in throughout his project—that is, if the social memory of the monument's history had been altered substantially. Given his claim in reference to the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes that the history of the Attalid dynasty was little known and that he intended to spread their φήμη anew, we would expect him, if he knew the origins of the pillar monuments, to have found them worthy of mention.

One last monument at the entrance to the Acropolis will serve as a fitting culmination to this discussion of upcycling honors. On the northern anta of the Propylaia, just behind the later Attalid pillar monument, stood a mid-5th century bronze equestrian statue, dedicated by the hipparchs Lakedaimonios, Xenophon, and Pronapes after a cavalry victory.²²⁴ It was sculpted by the well-known artist Lykios, son of the famous Myron.²²⁵ Sometime shortly before 18 BCE, the base of the statue was turned upside down, moved to the south anta of the Propylaia, and received a new equestrian statue, while a new matching base and statue were added to the north anta. Both bases, the new one at the north and the inverted one at the south, were inscribed with a copy of the original dedicatory inscription, in deliberately archaizing script. On the north face of the southern anta, just below the statue and inscription, a second inscription was added that identified the statue as a portrait of Germanicus dedicated by the *demos*.²²⁶

Although the dowel holes on the inverted base show that the original statue was not reused but instead a new one was added, probably also in archaizing style,²²⁷ this example of reuse shows especially clearly how the doubled identity was an intentional and sought-after effect on the part of the Athenian honorers. The original 5th-century incarnation of the monument was so crucial to the significance of the new honor for Germanicus that the old inscription was slyly and subtly “preserved;” the act of reuse was essentially invisible.

²²⁴ On the history of this monument and its inscriptions, see esp. Raubitschek 1949, 147–152, nos. 135, 135a, 135b; Krumeich 1997, 56–57; 2008, 262; 2010, 355–360, 365.

²²⁵ *IG I³ 511*: *hoi hi[ππ]ῆς [:] ἀπὸ τῶν [πο]λεμίων : hiππαρχ[χ]ό[v]των : Λακεδαιμονίο [:] Ξ[ε]νοφόντος : | Προν[ά]π[ο] | ς : Λύκιο[ς] : ἐποίησεν [:] Ἐλευθερεὺς [:] Μύ[ρ]ων[ος].*

²²⁶ *IG II/III² 3260*: *ὁ δῆμος | Γερ[μ]ανικ[ὸν] Κα]ίσαρα | θεοῦ Σε[βαστοῦ] ἔγγονον*. Geagan (1984, 72) has argued that because of the dedicatory formula used in this inscription, it must date to the Augustan rather than Tiberian period; see also Krumeich 2010, 358, n. 147.

²²⁷ Raubitschek 1949, 149; Krumeich 2010, 357.

Germanicus enjoyed high popularity in Athens, and once again we should see the upcycling of a Classical monument in a very prominent position as a particularly lofty honor. Here, the honor worked to assimilate Germanicus to an Athenian cavalryman, altering both the public's perception of the identity and nature of the honorand and the communal memory of the history of the monument.²²⁸

Once again though, the statue's binary identity left much to the viewer's interpretation. Over a century after Germanicus' death, Pausanias and/or his Athenian guides identified the equestrian statues flanking the Acropolis entrance as either the sons of Xenophon (presumably misinterpreting the 5th-century inscription with the name of the hipparch Xenophon) or else as simply decorative appurtenances.²²⁹ It seems then, that this uniquely Athenian strategy for honoring important Romans in the Early Imperial period through upcycling in which venerable statues accrued additional contemporary identities—while perhaps a successful way to conserve and maintain authority over their cultural resources—resulted in over-determined monuments whose polysemy ultimately proved too much for viewers to incorporate into a single holistic conception.

By upcycling honors, the Athenians were innovating in the way they dealt with the memory issues at the heart of the reciprocal system of euergetism. Although the Athenian strategy pointedly did not tend toward the total oblivion to which Dio later saw the Rhodian statues subjected, actors merely playing different parts at different times, it did result in statues that acted two parts simultaneously. This sort of performance on the stage of the Acropolis may

²²⁸ Krumeich 2010, 359.

²²⁹ Paus. 1.22.4: τὰς μὲν οὖν εἰκόνας τῶν ἰππέων οὐκ ἔχω σαφῶς εἰπεῖν, εἴτε οἱ παῖδες εἰσιν οἱ Ξενοφῶντος εἴτε ἄλλως ἐς εὐπρέπειαν πεποιημένοι.

have been applauded by contemporary Athenians and their Roman honorands, but was apparently misunderstood or rejected by later audiences.

Chapter 5. Upcycling and Athenian Social Memory over the *Longue Durée*

After the in-depth examinations of significant instances of upcycling in Athens presented in the foregoing chapters, two major and related sets of questions emerge: first, to what extent is this phenomenon of intentionally meaningful reuse unique to Athens? And to what extent does it have anything to do with Athenian democracy? Second, how did upcycling fit into larger projects of social memory formation? Was upcycling used to complement or contrast other commemorative strategies and other modes of shaping social memory? Was upcycling employed more frequently or in different ways during different periods of Athenian history? In order to address these questions, in this concluding chapter I will take a birds'-eye view in examining within a more chronological framework how memory was shaped during certain important eras and concerning certain key events in the city's history, evaluating how and when upcycling played a role in constructing and reconstructing the memorial landscape.

Reusing objects and materials in ways that allow their past lives to produce additional meaning in their secondary contexts is not, of course, a practice unique to the ancient Athenians. As I emphasized in my introductory chapter, I see upcycling as an almost universal phenomenon, a choice available to people of all cultures and time periods. My "six short stories about upcycling" began to demonstrate the range and scope of the practice, from a small golden necklace to a whole marble city, from an affected memory community of only a few to the population of a whole island, and from communities of antiquity to those of the present. It is my hope that investigating meaningful reuse as intentional upcycling may be considered as a useful approach for making connections and driving contextualized interpretations by scholars in many fields and of many parts of the world, leading eventually to a more holistic and/or more nuanced

notion of upcycling's place in the “work of memory” across human history.¹

Even within ancient Greece, the Athenians were certainly not alone in reusing their material cultural heritage in meaningful ways. Several examples of conspicuous reuse that merit reinvestigation as potential upcycling include the afterlife of a Bronze Age tholos tomb at Orchomenos (Pausanias' “Treasury of Minyas” [9.38.2]) as a Hellenistic heroön and a shrine to the Roman Imperial cult, the translocation of an Archaic temple into Thessaloniki in the Early Roman period, and the use of thousands of Hellenistic painted grave stelai in the construction of towers along the city walls of Demetrias in Thessaly in the 1st century BCE.² In an illuminating reexamination of the reuse of the interior colonnade from the Archaic Temple of Apollo at Corinth in the South Stoa during the Roman period, J. Frey has clearly demonstrated the efficacy of investigating the entire life history of reused materials alongside questions of visibility, agency, audience, and reception.³ Without using the term, Frey indeed productively treats the reuse of the colonnade as upcycling, along the lines I develop in this project.⁴ J. Ma, too, embraces a contextualized approach to interpreting the reinscription of honorific portrait monuments in the Amphiareion at Oropos, with insightful results.⁵

So, while there are certainly other important instances of upcycling at sites throughout the

¹ For a discussion of a focus on “the work of memory” as a productive way forward, see Hamilakis 2010, 194, and above, Chapter 1.

² On the Orchomenos tholos, see esp. Alcock and Cherry 2006; see also, Antonaccio 1995, 127–130; Fittschen 1999, 57–60; Alcock 2001b; Boardman 2002, 57–59. On the Thessaloniki temple, see Voutiras 1999 and 2007; Tasia, Lola, and Peltekis 2000; Allamani-Souri 2003, 103–106; Karadedos 2006a and 2006b. On the Demetrias stelai, see esp. Arvanitopolous 1908; 1909, 63–93; Stählin and Meyer 1934, 247–248.

³ Frey 2015.

⁴ Frey concludes with a further call to rethink the conventional terminology of “*spolia*” and “reuse” which sees the former as negative and characteristic of Late Antiquity (169–171); cf. Frey 2016, 19–22 (“Defining *Spolia*”). As discussed in Chapter 1, I suggest that the concept of upcycling can provide the solution to this problem.

⁵ Ma 2007b; see above, Chapter 4.

Greek world, a few already understood and likely many more yet to be fully considered, still the concentration of examples at Athens seems remarkable—more so than can be accounted for simply by differences in the survival of material evidence, or by the combination of that material evidence with the relatively rich available evidence for cultural, political, and social context in Athenian history, which, as the foregoing chapters have shown, is invaluable in interpreting meaningful reuse when we recognize it. Athens did have good sources of high-quality stone nearby in Mount Pentelikon and Hymettos, which probably contributed to its penchant for monuments, immortalized in Thucydides’s claim that were both great cities to become desolate, Sparta would seem to have been far less significant than her actual power, whereas Athens would seem twice as great as she was (1.10.2). Yet the relatively easy availability of marble makes the occasional choice to reuse existing monuments rather than to quarry fresh stone even more noteworthy. Far from being a statistical anomaly then, the prevalence of upcycling projects in Athens is instead indicative of the high degree to which the past mattered and was actively constructed and reconstructed in the present from the Classical period onward. Through this continual engagement with the unique history of their city, Athenians created for themselves an exceptionally strong social memory, in T. Hölscher’s summation.⁶

In the chronological overview that follows I will sketch out a pattern of Athenian interaction with the past, in which methods established in the 5th century BCE were reemployed and adapted by later generations. Beginning after the Persian Wars and especially in the mid-5th century flourishing of their democracy and their naval empire, Athenians looked to their past—

⁶ 2010, 130.

recent and legendary—as “a foundation for [their] radically innovative present.”⁷ Upcycling physical remains of that past played a key role within this effort of memory construction, in conjunction with engagement through other modes including ritual, rhetoric, and iconography. Through the rest of antiquity we observe clusters of memory projects, including upcycling, undertaken particularly in periods of profound and challenging social and/or political transformation, including during the decade of oligarchic and democratic revolutions at the end of the 5th century, the Lykourgan period in the later 4th century, and the Early Roman period of the 1st century BCE. Democracy, although it had little to do with the construction of memory through the 5th century, later became central to the civic ideology and self-identity of the community, such that in later periods, projects of upcycling and other work of memory were often very much tied to a conception of the long-standing democratic character and institutions of the city.

D. Boedeker’s view of the significance and utility of the past for Athenians in the decades after the Persian Wars will be shown to be a recurring theme in the city’s history: “for such a community, which deems the future hidden but the past luminously visible, it is essential—inevitable—to find continuities, analogies, foreshadowings that connect present with past, whether in events (barbarian attempts on the home citadel), civic attributes (protecting the weak), or policies (leadership of Ionians).”⁸ In examining social memory in relation to empires, S. Alcock has concluded that “if social memory is never inert, reworking of the past is most

⁷ Boedeker 1998, 195.

⁸ 1998, 195. I would argue, though, that far from being an inevitable response, this sort of active engagement with the past is only one among several strategies open to such a community. Repudiating a well-known past in favor of a new path could surely seem attractive in some cases or to some groups. As Alcock asserts about the Early Roman period in Greece, “loyalties to the past were neither automatic nor inevitable; this is dramatically underlined if one considers the variety of options open at this juncture” (2002, 51).

pronounced in periods of dramatic social transformation.”⁹ This looks to be true throughout Athenian history more generally. In those periods where its future seemed most hidden, Athens’ luminous past was made to shine with refocused relevance.

The treatment that follows is not intended to be exhaustive, but to identify trends and themes of memory efforts in and across eras, briefly illustrated by key examples. Much recent scholarship on certain aspects of Athenian social memory in various modes and periods has illuminated segments of this larger picture more brightly.¹⁰ Future work will surely bring other aspects into sharper focus as well. Throughout this broad-strokes sketch, then, several important considerations raised in the opening chapter should be borne in mind. First, we must remember that when we discuss social memory, we are really talking about individual, thoughtful people—human actors interacting with each other and their physical and natural environment. Likewise, in thinking about meaningful reuse—“upcycling” and not “*spolia*”—we are examining process and the human agency and intentions involved in that process, rather than the reused objects *per se*.¹¹ Through this approach we thus think of memory as “voluntary effort,”¹² demanding “constant and active decision-making.”¹³ From this perspective, Athenian engagement with the past is enlivened and functional; we should be wary of terms like “musealization” and “nostalgia” that tend to make agents passive and interactions static. Instead, we should view

⁹ Alcock 2001a, 325.

¹⁰ See examples above in Chapter 1, nn. 127–129

¹¹ Frey emphasizes this distinction in taking an “agency approach” to Late Antique reuse (2016, esp. 22–35).

¹² An approach called for by Hamilakis and Labanyi (2008, 14), in part to counter the disproportionate weight given to trauma in memory studies.

¹³ Alcock 1996, 249.

social memory as dynamic and multi-faceted, made up of “overlapping spheres”¹⁴ of memories that could resonate differently for various memory communities.

We should also imagine the decision-making involved in memory work as contentious and reactions to eventual decisions as multiple. Modern parallels are helpful in this regard; for example, the well documented public controversies surrounding specific details of plans to rebuild churches bombed in World War II, such as the Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche in Berlin, discussed in Chapter 3, and the Dresden Frauenkirche, rebuilt only after the reunification of East and West Germany, give us some idea of the discussions we might imagine Athenians having amongst themselves in the aftermath of the Persian or Herulian sacks.¹⁵ In the case of Athens, the participatory democratic system meant that eventual decisions regarding public monuments did reflect collective ideas to a significant extent.¹⁶

The potentially negative motivations of memory work and negative valences of resulting social memory are also important to keep in mind. Memory strategies like upcycling were used not only to create or preserve memories of great events, achievements, and heroes. Instead, as we have seen, such work could be directed toward memorializing devastating sacks, as motivation for preparedness or revenge. And on a more personal level, a prominent aspect of memory dynamics in Athens seems to be a tendency toward public shaming of individuals.¹⁷ A prime example is the bronze stele displayed on the Acropolis recording and condemning the traitorous

¹⁴ Shear 2013, 535.

¹⁵ On the bombed churches, see above, Chapter 3, nn. 145, 148. On the importance of considering the contested decisions behind ancient monuments, see Shear 2011, 11–12 and Hölscher 2014, 254.

¹⁶ Cf. Lambert’s assertion that inscribed laws and decrees represent “a deliberate and significant expression of the collective Athenian mind” (2012, 255).

¹⁷ Flower 2006, 22.

deeds of Hipparchos, son of Charmos, after his ostracism in 487 BCE. In his speech against Leocrates, Lykourgos claims that the stele was made by melting down Hipparchos' statue when he was sentenced to death but could not be found, and Lykourgos has the decree authorizing the melting down of the statue read out in court, as well as the list of names of traitors later added to the stele (117–118). Similarly, Thucydides could still read a stele on the Acropolis listing the crimes of and penalties imposed on the Peisistratids (6.55.1–2), and Livy reports that three hundred years after the expulsion of the tyrants the Athenians chose to impose on Philip V of Macedon, after his devastation of the Attic countryside in 200 BCE, the specific penalties that had been voted for the Peisistratids (31.44.8, probably following Polybius).¹⁸ This sort of public shaming seems to have been favored at Athens, as opposed to or in conjunction with other modes of “memory sanctions” like the erasure from inscriptions and targeted defacement of images that would become common in the Hellenistic and Roman periods and is now often referred to as *damnatio memoriae*.¹⁹

While examining the construction of social memory, another aspect to keep in mind is of course forgetting. Forgetting can be much harder to study than remembering, but is no less important. In the treatment that follows we will see that in contrast to the Persian and Herulian sacks, some less pleasant or less useful events were not emphasized by memorial work in Athens, or indeed were more actively suppressed, and did not find a lasting place in social memory. Athens' role in the Ionian Revolt and burning of Sardis is one example of such a

¹⁸ For further discussion see Flower 2006, 34–41 and Byrne 2010.

¹⁹ Flower (2006) is a comprehensive treatment of memory sanctions in the Roman world; Chapter 2, “Did the Greeks Have Memory Sanctions?” examines Greek precedents and differences. For *damnatio memoriae* in the Roman world, see also Kajava 1995; Varner 2004 and 2010; Højte 2005, 56–64; Galinsky 2008; many of the contributions in Benoist and Daguët-Gagey 2008; Pollini with Storage 2010; Cadario 2013; and extensions and re-evaluations of the concept in the volume edited by Scholz, Schwedler, and Sprenger (2014).

forgotten event, as is the Peloponnesian War, more generally speaking. Perhaps unsurprisingly, victories tended to be remembered more actively and more lastingly than defeats, but not strictly so—context and enemy had a role to play. Within the “imbricated pattern” of sacking and sparing of Athens identified by Alcock, it was the attacks by the more “foreign” cultural groups—the Persians and the Heruli—that were commemorated more actively than the sacks of the Macedonian Philip V or the Roman Sulla, or the sparing of the city by the Spartans in 404 BCE and Caesar in 48 BCE.²⁰

Finally, when examining the role of upcycling within the work of memory, we should remember that although marble was particularly well suited for meaningful reuse, as discussed in Chapter 1, any material could be upcycled. Examples of upcycling in metal are of course far less likely to survive than those in stone, and even less likely to preserve visible evidence of reuse. Still, significant examples of upcycling bronze are known from literary references, including the use of Hipparchos’ honorific portrait as the raw material for the stele recording his treason. Although we would likely have no indication of the past life of the stele’s raw material were we to unearth it today, the previous form of the bronze as a statue was clearly known and surely added to the dishonor of the public shaming. Indeed, Lykourgos interprets the action not as simply the destruction of a memorial but as the creation of another, lasting, memorial of the past Athenians’ attitude toward traitors (119).²¹ We should also keep in mind the use of upcycling on a smaller scale, involving personal objects or artifacts more akin to the example of my gold

²⁰ Alcock 2012, 93–94.

²¹ See Ober 2008, 187–189 for further discussion. Lykourgos is our only source for this stele and its interesting history. That history may be a later tradition, akin to the story of the origin of the marble of the cult statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous (discussed in Chapter 1), but that Lykourgos had not only the decree but also the inscription and list of names on the stele itself read out, makes its authenticity more plausible.

necklace presented in Chapter 1. Such upcycling can be very hard to recognize archaeologically, but recent work on the reuse of Bronze Age artifacts as votive offerings in later Greek sanctuaries and on portable objects with interesting biographies “curated” as heirlooms (κειμήλια) has shown the potential of examining reuse on this smaller physical scale.²²

The Late Archaic Period

While the Persian Wars and their aftermath were the watershed moment for Athenian social memory, we can identify in the Late Archaic period and the first decades of the democracy the beginnings of what would become key trends in the way Athenians valued their past and shaped their physical environment through monuments. On the general level of civic consciousness, the reforms after 510 BCE, whatever exactly they entailed, created unity and confidence amongst Athenian citizens.²³ Modern debates continue about who was responsible for the “Kleisthenic” reforms and how new those measures actually were, but they certainly entailed an attempt to “create a usable past.”²⁴ Couching reform in the language of return and restoration will become a *sine qua non* in Athens, and the past useful indeed.

In the physical realm, the Late Archaic period saw a shift away from private art toward publicly commissioned art, and the development of what Hölscher terms “political monuments”—art set up in public spaces to present famous achievements. These developments

²² On Bronze Age artifacts as later votives, see Van Damme 2012, Ch. 2, pp. 37–62; on *keimelia*, see Reiterman 2014.

²³ Raaflaub 1998, 16.

²⁴ Kennedy 2005, 317. Key contributions to debates about the reforms after 510 are Ober 1989 and Anderson 2003.

took place throughout Greece, but with Athens as a protagonist.²⁵ The statue group of the Tyrannicides Harmodius and Aristogeiton created by Antenor and set up in the Agora was a revolutionary precedent for later monuments.²⁶ Calling it the “first truly political monument in Greece,” Hölscher illuminates its importance as a physical work of memory, the first monument intended to raise the actual past into the present or to hand down the present to the future. Set up not in a sanctuary but in public space, the monument directed itself to the future by conceiving the present as an authoritative past for that future.²⁷ Another significant monument of the early democracy was that celebrating the victories of the Athenians over the Boeotians and Chalcidians in 506 BCE, consisting of a bronze quadriga and the chains of ransomed prisoners, displayed on a terrace wall of the Acropolis.²⁸ This monument would be an important precedent for the celebration of Persian War victories on the Acropolis through grand dedications to Athena. While not involving physical upcycling, these monuments are indicative of an awakening consciousness of the utility of material objects for conveying collective memories of

²⁵ Hölscher 1998, esp. 158.

²⁶ For bibliography on this monument and its later replacement by Kritios and Nesiotes, see most recently Krumeich in Kansteiner et al. 2007, 8–14; F. Hölscher 2010; Shapiro 2012, 161–162, with n. 6 on the debate about a pre- or post-Marathon dating; *Der Neue Overbeck* 2014, vol. 1, 292–297 (Antenor), 475–479 (Kritios and Nesiotes).

²⁷ T. Hölscher 1998, 158; 2010, 138–139.

²⁸ Hdt. 5.77.3–4. On the monument and its inscription (*IG I³ 501*), see Raubitschek 1949, 191–194, no. 168 and 201–205, no. 173; Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 28–29, no. 5; Hurwit 1999, 129; and below, n. 32.

important events from one generation to the next.²⁹

The Persian Wars and Aftermath

Alcock has identified the Persian Wars as the “most potent ‘constellative myth’ for Greeks” in the Early Roman period, adopting J. Assmann’s conception for paradigmatic events around which shared memories come to cluster.³⁰ The Persian Wars were indeed potent and paradigmatic long before the arrival of the Romans in Greece, and the responses of Athenians and other Greeks in the immediate aftermath of the wars and the ensuing few decades reveal some of the means by which individual memories of recent events were transformed into shared social memories and began to coalesce into such a constellative myth. We see experimentation with different responses in the aftermath of the wars, including differing strategies in different parts of the city, a variety of interconnected modes of memory work undertaken, and changing emphases of that memory work.³¹ Throughout this period, a crucial development is the active effort of equating the recent past and its heroes with the legendary and mythic past.

The first important thing to note may be that although 479 BCE marked a profound

²⁹ Upcycling of material objects was of course not an entirely new thing after the Persian Wars, as work on the Iron Age reuse of Bronze Age remains has shown (e.g., Morris 1988; Antonaccio 1994 and 1995; Boardman 2002; Prent 2003; Cosmopoulos 2014). While questions of cultural discontinuity are often raised in discussions of such reuse, we would do well to keep in mind Davis’ reminder that cultural continuity is by no means necessary for reuse to draw on and affect social memory (2007, 248, and see above, Chapter 1). An intriguing but mysterious case of upcycling Bronze Age material in Athens is the probable reuse of a large lintel from a Mycenaean tholos tomb or gateway as the oath-taking stone (simply ὁ λίθος in the ancient sources) in the Stoa Basileios. The stoa was begun ca. 500 and damaged in the Persian sack, but whether the oath stone originated in another location, perhaps the old Prytaneion, and whether it was already in place in the Stoa Basileios in the pre-Persian period are open questions. See esp. Shear 1994, 242–245; Papadopoulos 1996, esp. 114–115, 125–126; Papadopoulos 2003, 291–292; Van Damme 2012, 116–118; Martin-McAuliffe and Papadopoulos 2012, 352, 360, n. 137.

³⁰ Alcock 2002, 74. Assmann developed the term in the context of a discussion of the stark dichotomy between Israel and Egypt crystallized in the narrative of the Exodus (1997, 6–7).

³¹ Kousser 2009, 272.

change for Athens, amongst the initial responses of the victorious Athenians returning to their devastated city was the replacement of the Tyrannicides monument stolen by Xerxes with new statues by Kritios and Nesiotes, and the repair of the victory monument over the Boeotians and Chalcidians, the chains of which now hung on a wall blackened by Persian flames.³² These were key emotional and symbolic acts establishing connection and continuity with great moments of their recent past and with the new commemorative strategies developed in the first years of the democracy.

I have already discussed in Chapter 2 how the immediate response to the Persian sack was different in the lower city and on the Acropolis. In the lower city, the first priority was a defensive wall—the Themistoclean city wall—and the practical clean-up of residential areas, as evidenced by the many well deposits excavated in the Agora.³³ As A. Lindenlauf has shown, the Kerameikos and the Agora were not used as places for memorials immediately after the sack, apart from the replacement of the Tyrannicides. Instead, the goal in these areas of the city was a return to normal civic and everyday functions as quickly as possible.³⁴ The Acropolis, on the other hand, was indeed used for such memorials. Already considered the appropriate place for memorials of civic and public character, the Acropolis “stood for Athens,” and the damaged

³² T. Hölscher 2010, 138–139; Hdt. 5.77.3. The date of the replacement of the Boeotian and Chalcidian victory monument is much debated. I follow Funke (2001, 12–13) in thinking it likely that it was replaced soon after the end of the Persian Wars, rather than in the 450s as others believe. See also Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 28–29; Dally 2008b, 231–233.

³³ On these deposits see Shear 1993 and Lynch 2011; cf. Camp 1996, 233 for further evidence of the Persian destruction in the Agora.

³⁴ Lindenlauf 2003, 56–57. Di Cesare similarly emphasizes the non-ideological nature of reuse in the Themistoclean city wall and in the reconstruction of civic buildings in the Agora (2004, 105–108).

temples and statues there were well suited for commemorative (re)uses.³⁵

The North Acropolis Wall, examined at length in Chapter 2, is certainly the most striking example of commemorative reuse on the Acropolis, along with the maintenance of the standing ruins of the Old Athena Temple, investigated in Chapter 3. But the Athenians had other thoughtful ways of dealing with damaged material too, including through burial. Of the Archaic *korai* damaged in the sack, many of those that were not re-erected and still standing in Pausanias' day (see Chapter 3) were carefully buried together in a large deposit of clean-up debris on the north side of the Acropolis conventionally called the *Perserschutt* or “*Kore* pit,” excavated by Kavvadias and Kawerau in 1885.³⁶ The deliberate arrangement of the *korai*, most with the same orientation, suggests that this was conceived as a special deposit for Athena in advance of a more general cleaning sweep. The sight of the mutilated maidens must have been painful for Athenians and Athena, and this honorable burial may have acted as a *pars pro toto* treatment of all the damaged Acropolis votives.³⁷ The function of the deposit as the supporting fill of the North Acropolis Wall was probably symbolically significant too, as the filling of the deposit and building of the wall went directly hand-in-hand.³⁸ The few burnt statues that were redisplayed and later described by Pausanias thus stood in a sense for all their peers, preserving memory of the trauma they all had suffered without being an overly gruesome display of the entirety of the

³⁵ Lindenlauf 2003, 57. Monaco (2014) reaches similar conclusions about the Acropolis as the key commemorative locus. See also Wycherley in Lewis 1992, 206–222 (*CAH V*, 2nd ed.) for a general overview of rebuilding after the Persian Wars.

³⁶ On the stratigraphy and dating of the *Kore* pit and other deposits containing *Perserschutt* material, see esp. Hurwit 1989; Lindenlauf 1997; Stewart 2008. Both Lindenlauf and Stewart conclude that only this large northern deposit contains exclusively pre-Persian material.

³⁷ Lindenlauf 2016. Stieber (2004, 13) speaks more generally of *korai* “graveyards.”

³⁸ Korres 2002, 184.

devastation wrought by the Persians.

It was not long after the initial recovery that commemoration of victory over the Persians appeared in the Agora too, in the form of Kimon's three famous herms erected after his success in mopping up a Persian stronghold at Eion in Thrace in 476.³⁹ The longest of the three inscribed epigrams compares Kimon to Menestheus, the leader of the fifty Athenian ships at Troy (*Il.* 2.552–556), in epic diction and with Homeric echoes.⁴⁰ This was the most vociferous early attempt at drawing a parallel between the Trojan War and the Persian Wars and at equating present leaders with legendary heroes.⁴¹ Kimon was a protagonist in this effort of memory construction, not only through the epigrams on his herms, but also in his feat of “bringing home” the bones of Theseus, the Athenian hero *par excellence*, from Skyros to Athens in 476/5, as instructed by an oracle and accompanied by a procession to a new Theseion and the establishment of the Theseia festival.⁴² Efforts to play up Theseus' presence in the epic tradition would continue through the 5th century in reimagined rituals and in visual media from vase painting to monumental sculpture.⁴³

Kimon's circle was also responsible for the construction of the Stoa Poikile in the Agora

³⁹ Thuc. 1.98.1; Hdt. 7.107.1; Aeschin. 3.183–185; Plut. *Vit. Cim.* 7. See Shapiro 2012, 162–165 for a discussion of the Pan Painter's perhaps cheeky portrayal of Kimon's herms on a red-figure pelike. The herms were located on the north side of the Agora in the Stoa of the Herms in the mid-4th century, but their original location is not agreed upon. See Harrison 1965, 108–117, esp. 111; Shapiro 2012, 165.

⁴⁰ Shapiro 2012, 166–168.

⁴¹ Shapiro 2012, 167.

⁴² Plut. *Vit. These.* 36.1–4; Plut. *Vit. Cim.* 8.3–6; Ar. *Plut.* 627–28. See Parker 1996, 168–169; Steinbock 2013, 67. On the Kimonian monuments in Athens and elsewhere, see also Castriota 1992, Ch. 2, pp. 33–95; Bloedow 2005; Di Cesare 2014.

⁴³ On an *interpretatio Theseana* in rituals and festivals see Parker 1996, 169–170; on vase painting see Shapiro 2012, 169–173. For Theseus in sculptural ensembles, see esp. von den Hoff 2009 and 2010; Barringer 2009. On Theseus' major role in memory creation in Classical Athens generally, see esp. Andersen 2008; for Theseus as an *Erinnerungsort*, see von den Hoff 2010b.

in the 460s, which takes its name from the paintings by leading artists like Polygnotos displayed inside. These paintings furthered the equation of the recent past of the Persian Wars, particularly the battle of Marathon, with the legendary past of Athens and the larger Greek world through scenes of Theseus leading the Athenians against the Amazons and the Greeks discussing the fate of Ajax after taking Troy (Paus. 1.15.1–3).⁴⁴ As this revival and promotion of older heroes and myths grew stronger, the idea of Athenian autochthony developed in corresponding fashion, firmly linking present Athenians to legendary ancestors in the shared civic imagination.⁴⁵

Another important aspect of memory work in the decades after the Persian Wars is the differing emphasis or de-emphasis placed on certain aspects or events of the war over time. A key case in point is the Ionian revolt and the fall of Miletos in 498 BCE, and the subsequent burning of the Persian satrapal capital at Sardis, a major catalyst in motivating later Persian invasions of Greece.⁴⁶ According to Herodotus, the destruction of Miletos was so painful for Athenians that an audience burst into tears when the playwright Phrynikos depicted it on stage. Phrynikos was fined and a decision was taken to prohibit future restaging of the play (6.21.2). As Lindenlauf has illuminated, this action constituted deliberate suppression of memory of the early phases of the conflict on the part of the *polis*, and encouraged social forgetting of the Athenian role in the events leading up to the Persian invasions.⁴⁷ The Ionian revolt and burning of Sardis indeed do not figure in later images of the history of the Persian Wars, apparently absent in the

⁴⁴ Kousser 2009, 273. On the painting program of the Stoa Poikile, see esp. Castriota 1992, 28–32, 76–89, 127–130; Stansbury-O’Donnell 2005; on the Marathon painting, see esp. Harrison 1972. On the discovery of the stoa’s remains in an ongoing excavation in the northern part of the Agora, see Shear 1984, 5–19 and Camp 2007, 649–651; 2015, 476–480.

⁴⁵ For a thorough treatment of the concept of Athenian autochthony in the 5th century, see Shapiro 1998.

⁴⁶ Hdt. 5.28–6.32.

⁴⁷ 2003, 53.

portrayals of the past in the annual public funeral orations (*epitaphioi logoi*) for Athenian war dead, begun in the 460s. By the time of Lysias' funeral oration in the early 4th century, the process of social forgetting of the Ionian revolt was complete: the conflict begins with Persian *hubris*.⁴⁸

This image of Persian *hubris* and attendant sacrilege was the main point of emphasis in the decades after the wars, as evidenced in monuments like the North Acropolis Wall and redisplay of some burnt *korai*. This Persian impiety was emphasized throughout Greece generally, in particular by the large number of burnt temples preserved in the Greek landscape as signs of sacrilege, attested archaeologically and on display in Herodotus' later treatment, as recently discussed by M. Miles.⁴⁹ By the 460s, a binary of temperate Greeks opposed to hubristic and sacrilegious barbarians was established.⁵⁰ Concurrently and perhaps consequently, a further refocusing of Persian War memories in Athens emphasized the victory at Marathon, since the Greeks owed the Marathon victory to the Athenians alone.⁵¹ In the 470s there had been more attention to Salamis and Plataea, as seen in, for example, the dedication of a captured enemy trireme at Sounion as first-fruits from the battle of Salamis, and the "new" Simonides elegy on the battle of Plataea.⁵² The painting in the Stoa Poikile is one example of this refocusing on Marathon, as is the marble column and trophy monument set up by the Athenians on the

⁴⁸ See Steinbock 2013, 52. That Herodotus' account is the only surviving ancient source on the Ionian revolt may be related its elision in Greek social memory.

⁴⁹ 2014.

⁵⁰ Castriota 1992, 17–28. See also Lindenlauf 2003, 55; Kousser 2009, 272–274.

⁵¹ Lindenlauf 2003, 54, 57. On the changing memory of Marathon, see esp. Flashar 1996; Hölkeskamp 2001; Jung 2006; Zahrt 2010.

⁵² On the trireme dedicated at Sounion and others dedicated at Isthmia and Salamis, see now Lorenzo 2015. On the "New Simonides" papyrus (*POxy* 3965), see esp. Boedeker and Sider, eds., 2001; Kowerski 2005.

Marathon battlefield itself,⁵³ and perhaps too the colossal bronze statue of Athena by Pheidias conventionally called “Promachos” in modern scholarship. Probably begun in the mid-460s with spoils from Kimon’s victory at the Eurymedon around 466, Pausanias claimed twice that it was built with Marathon spoils, and as J. Hurwit has concluded, “the victory at Marathon was surely implicit in the symbolism of the statue.”⁵⁴ As R. Kousser has argued, the statue’s decorative program attempted to represent the Persian Wars through mythic metaphor, foreshadowing the sculptural program of the Parthenon and further solidifying the link between recent and legendary past.⁵⁵

What is great about the post-Persian Wars period and the 5th century generally, from the perspective of a scholar of social memory, is that here, as rarely, we have evidence preserved of multiple modes of memory work undertaken more or less concurrently.⁵⁶ We can see the network of associations that make up social memory being formed through physical monuments and memorial, some involving upcycling, through literary efforts like Simonides’ elegy, which already began drawing an analogy between Homeric heroes and modern Greek heroes,⁵⁷ through battlefield rituals, ceremonies, and permanent monuments,⁵⁸ and through oral constructions of

⁵³ See esp. Vanderpool 1966.

⁵⁴ Hurwit 1999, 152. Paus. 1.28.2; 9.4.1. Demosthenes (*De falsa legatione* 19.272) says simply that the *polis* dedicated it as victory monument of the war against the barbarians and that Greeks contributed the funds, usually understood to mean that members of the Delian League contributed part of their share of the spoils after Eurymedon. See, e.g., Lindenlauf 2003, 54. For more scholarship on this statue see Kousser 2009, 281, n. 91. The “Marathon base” below the Athenian Treasury at Delphi, if it is indeed later than the Treasury (see most recently von den Hoff 2009) may be another example of a monument built with “first-fruits” (ἀκροθίβια) of Marathon several decades later.

⁵⁵ 2009, 272.

⁵⁶ Boedeker (1998, 195–196) identifies several stages of “Athenian use of the past to suit the need of the present” in the 5th century, but these modes and emphases surely overlapped in practice.

⁵⁷ Boedeker 1998, 190.

⁵⁸ On battlefield rituals, see e.g. Lindenlauf 2003, 54; Jung 2006; Zahrnt 2010.

shared narratives of the past in the annual public funeral orations.⁵⁹ In these differing modes and media we can recognize a “common impetus” to analogize the present with the past.⁶⁰

In some ways of course the importance of the Persian Wars to social memory and civic identity was not at all unique to Athens among Greek city-states. By the Roman period, participation in the Persian Wars was enough of a “litmus test for civic esteem”⁶¹ that the Romans too got in on the act by equating their contemporary enemies the Parthians to the Persians of old.⁶² But for Athens, the pronounced, sustained, and varied effort of building the memory of the events of the wars as analogous to and inseparable from legendary battles and heroes made the Persian Wars ever-present in the physical and psychological civic landscape, to a larger and more influential degree than in other poleis. The Athenians also succeeded, especially through their increasing emphasis on Marathon as the pivotal battle of the conflict, in eventually constructing a Atheno-centric view of the Persian wars amongst other Greeks, seen, for example, in the Attalids of Pergamon modeling themselves on Athens as new champions of Greeks against barbarians after their victories against the Gauls.

The Periclean Period

In the mid-5th century, particularly under the leadership of Pericles from ca. 460 to 429,

⁵⁹ On social memory construction and the funeral orations, see Loraux 1986 and now esp. Shear 2013 and Steinbock 2013, 49–58. For an examination of the material evidence of monuments, objects, and images involved in shaping a collective notion of the Athenian war dead in conjunction with the more thoroughly studied funeral orations, see Arrington 2015.

⁶⁰ Boedeker 1998, 189.

⁶¹ Alcock 2002, 82.

⁶² See Spawforth 1994, 237–243 for a compilation of official representations of the Parthians as Persians reincarnate.

the trend of equating past and present was continued and amplified, and reuse including upcycling formed a central part of a larger project to uphold the connection between the past of the Persian Wars period and the legendary past, while adding the present seamlessly into the equation. This period illustrates well Y. Hamilakis' image of reuse "materializ[ing] time as co-existence."⁶³ In this period too we can glimpse this effort taking place in various modes, including the continued elaboration of monuments, rituals, and orations associated with the annual burial of the war dead. The crucial new factor in this period, nascent in the preceding decades, is Athens' hegemony over a large empire, and the concomitant influx of wealth. The refocusing of Persian War memory more narrowly on Marathon now meant that celebrating the Persian Wars was implicitly about a claim to superiority over other Greeks, using a specific view of the past to justify Athens' leading role in the present.

The new wealth generated by the empire supported ambitious building plans, particularly on the Acropolis, often thought of as a "Periclean program."⁶⁴ Although innovative, the new buildings and monuments were thoughtfully integrated with older structures and ruins. Not only did new buildings respect existing ones, even more than that they worked to embellish them and refocus their memorial messages. On the "marblescape of memory" of the Periclean Acropolis, new and old were woven together in a manner that was mutually beneficial.⁶⁵ The shining new constructions highlighted the venerability of their older neighbors, and the esteemed ruins in turn offered the legitimation for the new monuments and the justification for Athens' place as

⁶³ 2010, 193.

⁶⁴ Of the immense bibliography on Pericles and his building program, see esp. Knell 1979; Hurwit 2004.

⁶⁵ Hurwit 2004, 86.

hegemon.⁶⁶ Isokrates offers a vivid image of how this program was received almost a century later, claiming that after Themistocles persuaded the Athenians to endure a few days away from their city [in which time the Persians sacked the Acropolis] as the price for becoming the leaders of the Greeks for many years to follow, Pericles so adorned the city with temples, monuments, and everything else that visitors to the city even in Isokrates' day thought Athens worthy to rule not only all Greeks but the whole world.⁶⁷

We have already seen in Chapter 3 how the initial preservation of the ruined remains of the Old Athena Temple was taken a step further in the Periclean program, as it became the “centerpiece of an extensive choreography of ruins,” embellished in particular by the Erechtheion as “an ornate and elegant appendage.”⁶⁸ The grand new Parthenon, innovative in so many ways, also incorporated significant reuse of earlier remains.⁶⁹ Its architects re-employed the huge platform and all the useable material from its predecessor the Older Parthenon, whose burnt column drums stood evocatively in the North Acropolis Wall. This reuse surely had elements of practicality, but was not easily achieved.⁷⁰ And although the act of reuse was not ultimately visible or remembered, as far as we know, it may indeed have been intentional and meaningful in the shorter term, perhaps analogous to the honorable burial of the large group of *korai* in the more immediate aftermath of the Persian sack. The intentional preservation of a tiny

⁶⁶ Lindenlauf 2003, 56.

⁶⁷ Isoc., *Antid.* 15.233–234. (Περικλής... ἐκόσμησε τὴν πόλιν καὶ τοῖς ἱεροῖς καὶ τοῖς ἀναθήμασι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν, ὅστ' ἔτι καὶ νῦν τοὺς εἰσαφικνουμένους εἰς αὐτὴν νομίζειν μὴ μόνον ἄρχειν ἀξίαν εἶναι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἀλλὰ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀπάντων.)

⁶⁸ Ferrari 2002, 25, 21.

⁶⁹ For an astute discussion of reuse in the Parthenon, see Kousser 2009, 275–276.

⁷⁰ Kousser (2009, 275) asserts that the Parthenon stands out in comparison to other projects of reuse of sanctuary building materials “for the extent of material recycled and the limitations this placed on the design of the new temple.”

naïskos within the northern colonnade, which has only recently come to light and may date as early as the mid-6th century, may thus have stood for the other buried older materials just as the select re-erected *korai* stood for the much larger number that had suffered damage.⁷¹ Kousser's conclusion illuminates the potential memorial effect on contemporary Athenians: "as the Athenians constructed their new temple on the site of the Older Parthenon, using materials derived from it, they could imagine that the ruined sanctuary had been reborn, larger in scale, more elaborate in its sculptural decoration, but also physically connected to the past."⁷² The later tradition that the Parthenon was built after the victory at Salamis (see below) may suggest that the reuse of the Older Parthenon platform had worked to conceptualize the Parthenon as a post-Persian War dedication to Athena, just as its predecessor had been after Marathon.

Another intriguing example of upcycling within the Periclean monumentalization of the Acropolis is the reuse of a gigantic block of marble intended for the architrave of the Older Parthenon for recording the annual *aparchai* paid to Athena by members of the Delian League. This is the so-called *lapis primus* of the Athenian Tribute Lists, recently reinvestigated by Miles.⁷³ Considerably larger than all other inscriptions on the Acropolis, the *lapis primus* gained metaphorical significance from its conspicuity, as Miles argues, and even if the original intended function of the block was not remembered later, its choice for such an important and symbolic inscription was surely deliberate. This is a great example of one piece in the larger project of again refocusing the communal memory of the significance of the Persian Wars, as the ruins still stood as witnesses of barbarian sacrilege, but also were increasingly portrayed as the ashes from

⁷¹ On the *naïskos*, see Korres 1997, 227–229; Hurwit 2004, 74–76.

⁷² 2009, 276. See also Hurwit 2004, 72–74.

⁷³ 2011.

which Athens rose to lead its empire.⁷⁴

The Odeion of Pericles constructed on the south slope of the Acropolis is another structure that may have included upcycling as an element of its architectural message. Although our sources are much later (Vitruvius, Plutarch, and Pausanias), a tradition grew up about the building that it was designed in imitation of Xerxes' tent,⁷⁵ and that its vast roof was constructed with wood from Persian ships captured at Salamis.⁷⁶ Here we may have a situation more akin to the statue of Nemesis at Rhamnous discussed in Chapter 1, whose interesting history was developed only later. But even if the wood in the Odeion's roof had not originated as Persian masts forty years earlier, the prevalence of the story later suggests that the building was indeed connected with the Persian Wars in Athenian social memory early on, as so many Periclean monuments were. As M. Miller has concluded, "the interest of the Odeion lies in the fact of its existence and its ability to look Persian to a Greek, an ability which must be intentional."⁷⁷

The sculptural iconography of the new buildings, especially the Parthenon, was another key medium through which the efforts of analogizing past and present and of dichotomizing Greeks and barbarians were furthered. Kousser has illuminated how the metopes of the Parthenon and the sculptural decoration ornamenting the colossal statue of Athena Parthenos emphasized the price of victory in their mythically allusive subject matter, including the setting

⁷⁴ Lindenlauf 2003, 55–56.

⁷⁵ Plut. *Vit. Per.* 13.9–11; Paus. 1.20.4.

⁷⁶ Vit. 5.9.1. On the Odeion of Pericles see esp. Miller 1997, Ch. 9, 218–242. All three of these later commentators saw the replacement of the original structure, which was damaged in the course of the Sullan sack (perhaps by the Athenians themselves lest Sulla use the wood in a siege of the Acropolis [App. *Mith.* 38]). The building was apparently rebuilt along the same design a few decades later by Ariobarzanes II, King of Cappadocia, with Roman architects in charge. See *IG II²* 3426 and 3427; Thompson 1987, 4.

⁷⁷ 1997, 239.

of the Amazonomachy on the Parthenos' shield on the Acropolis itself. These mythological battles conveyed the inevitability of Greek victory over barbarians after initial sufferings.⁷⁸ Meanwhile, other public art forms like tragedy also communicated parallels between past and present, contributing to the “co-existent” notion of time.⁷⁹ The development of genealogies in this period worked to fill in the “floating gap” between individually remembered and socially constructed pasts, and provided a “bridge between family pride and civic ideals.”⁸⁰

Although the relationships between empire, democracy, and public art have been much discussed in past scholarship, it is worth emphasizing here that the force and focus of memory work in the Periclean period had seemingly little to do with democracy as a political system or civic attribute.⁸¹ In the rich landscape of “political monuments” and in the use of the past in forming an image of the present, there are no explicitly democratic monuments.⁸² Other Greek cities were also developing public monuments and engaging with the past in this period, and Athens' place as protagonist of these trends had more to do with her actual and remembered role in the Persian Wars and her consequent leadership of an empire than with her democratic nature. We will see the rise of democracy as a key aspect of civic consciousness and identity only a bit

⁷⁸ Kousser 2009, 276–277. On the powerful symbolic iconography of the Parthenon, see esp. Neils 2001 and many of the essays in Cosmopoulos 2004 and Neils 2005. On the Persian Wars and the Parthenon sculpture see also Castriota 1992, Chs. 4–5, pp. 134–229.

⁷⁹ Boedeker (1998, 191) discusses, e.g., Aeschylus' *Suppliants* of the late 460s in relation to Euripides later version. On tragedy and politics, see also Saïd 1998; on the mythic past in tragedy, see e.g. Knox 1979, 1–24.

⁸⁰ Boedeker 1998, 197. On the “floating gap” in historical memory, a phenomenon described by Vansina (1985, 23–24, 268–269), see also Assmann 2011, 34–36.

⁸¹ For numerous insightful investigations of the relationships between democracy, empire, and art in the 5th century, see Boedeker and Raaflaub, eds. 1998.

⁸² See Hölscher 1998, 181; Boedeker and Raaflaub 1998b, 326. The original Monument of the Eponymous Heroes, if it did date to the mid-5th century (Shear 1970, 208–209) or more specifically the Periclean period (Kron 1976, 232; Hölscher 1998, 162), would be an exception in its reference to the structure of the democratic citizenry. See above, Chapter 4.

later, at the very end of the 5th century.

The Peloponnesian War

After Pericles' death in 429 and through the ups and downs of the long Peloponnesian War, we see the continuation of some of the general strategies and methods of engaging with the past developed in the previous decades, but with a further shift in emphasis. Ultimately, Athenian defeat necessitated a break with prior conceptions of the city's past and the connection of that past with its present.

In the physical record, the best place to see these changes is perhaps the Sanctuary of Athena Nike atop the Mycenaean Bastion, examined in Chapter 3. As discussed there, the initial treatment of the damaged sanctuary immediately after the Persian Wars was minimal restoration with respectful burial or reuse of sacred material, in keeping with the ethos of other work on the Acropolis after the Athenians' return, like the North Acropolis Wall and the *korai* deposit. Here on the spot dedicated to Athenian victory, the initial emphasis was on suffering, barbaric sacrilege, and Athenian piety. No boastful expressions of ultimate or inevitable victory were erected in the Nike sanctuary, and this solemn state was maintained through the Periclean redesign of the Acropolis that complemented the small sanctuary and its limestone *naïskos* with the new Propylaia. But major renovations to the sanctuary took place in the early years of the Peloponnesian War and marked a distinct change. The raised and sheathed bastion and new marble temple emphasized victory in a newly vociferous fashion. Yet the deliberate preservation of the *naïskos* and older altars within the new bastion show that thoughtful treatment of earlier material was still considered an important memorial strategy, as does the sheathing of the bastion

in a manner that enhanced, rather than hid, the Cyclopean masonry beneath, as well as the continued use of the massive West Cyclopean Wall as the backdrop for the sanctuary.

The final touches of the new sanctuary though, particularly the sculpted frieze and parapet, were newly ostentatious in their celebration of contemporary victory, comprising a different strategy of the “new politicians” led by Kleon. The iconography of the frieze is debated, but certainly employed a by now familiar strategy of equating legendary and recent battles, now through the analogy of the defeat of Eurystheus represented on the north as a precedent for victories over contemporary Peloponnesian enemies, like that at Sphacteria/Pylos shown on the west side.⁸³ A statue of Athena funded by spoils from campaigns in the north against fellow Greeks in 426/5 and the display of Spartan shields all around the bastion after Pylos in 425 were perhaps conceived as being in the same vein as the Athena “Promachos” and the chains displayed in the monument for victory over the Boeotians and Chalcidians, yet they were newly arrogant in celebrating victory without acknowledgment of the attendant sacrifice and suffering that the Periclean ensemble had highlighted.

This ostentatious and multi-faceted victory monument thus “became *the* symbol of Athenian victory” in the Peloponnesian War.⁸⁴ But the war ultimately ended in defeat for Athens, and so the same sort of easy analogy between past and present that was cultivated earlier in the 5th century was no longer possible. The “co-existent” notion of time constructed through earlier memory efforts in Athens came under criticism, for example by practitioners of the new genre of historiography, most especially Thucydides, who viewed time instead as linear and logical, and

⁸³ See above, Chapter 3, nn. 220–221.

⁸⁴ Lippman, Scahill, and Schultz 2006, 560.

was more interested in examining change than continuity.⁸⁵ Defeat alone would have required a break with past commemorative strategies, but more than the loss of the Peloponnesian War itself, the decade of oligarchic and subsequent democratic revolutions that followed necessitated a refocusing of collective notions of Athens' past, present, and future.

Stasis at the End of the Fifth Century

Both the oligarchic regimes of the Four Hundred in 411 and the Thirty in 404, as well as the restored democracy of the interim, sought to “claim the past” and reshape social memory through constitutional changes portrayed as restoration of ancestral customs and institutions—a *patrios politeia* handed down by figures like Draco, Solon, and Kleisthenes.⁸⁶ After the overthrow of the Thirty in 403, the again restored democracy once more looked to the past, both distant and recent, and through various measures involving politics, rituals, buildings, and monuments, successfully established what would be an enduring notion of the inherently democratic nature of Athens. Thus, the period after 411 marked the birth of a “democratic self-consciousness,” according to J. Shear, author of pioneering recent work on the dynamic efforts of memory in this period.⁸⁷

In the first restoration of the democracy in 410, measures that sought to reclaim the past from the oligarchy included the reinscription of Draco's Law on Homicide, set up in front of the Stoa Basileios in the Agora in 409/8. Beyond any significance of the textual content, this

⁸⁵ Boedeker 1998, 196–199; Boedeker and Raaflaub 1998b, 339. It is worth noting that Shrimpton's work on the use of memory by ancient historians led him to the opposite conclusion, that ancient historiography was “a collection of memories in service to the collective memory” of the community (2014, 38; see also 1997).

⁸⁶ See esp. Rhodes 2011 and Shear 2011.

⁸⁷ Shear 2007b, 2007c, and esp. 2011. Quote is at 2007b, 114.

constituted an innovative monument, carefully sited in the Agora as a display of “the democracy in action.”⁸⁸ Other projects like the addition of wings to the Stoa Basileios designed to display huge marble stelai inscribed with the freshly collected laws of the city, the construction of a New Bouleuterion, and the establishment of the city archives in the Old Bouleuterion combined to make the Agora “the space of the democratic citizen.”⁸⁹ On the Acropolis, the resumption of work on the Erechtheion, begun in the 430s or 420s but interrupted by the Peloponnesian War, was a loud statement of connection with the earlier democracy.⁹⁰ As discussed in Chapter 3, the Erechtheion project in general and the Karyatid Porch especially furthered the upcycling of the old Temple of Athena Polias as a witness of the civic past. Supporting the Karyatid Porch, the Old Athena Temple was now literally the foundation for the first major building project of the restored democracy.⁹¹

In 403 the returned democrats employed similar strategies as those of 410 after overthrowing the Thirty, as Shear has shown, but with a greater focus on the *demos* and on building explicit connections with the 5th-century past as well as with Draco, Solon, and Kleisthenes. They worked to set up a direct opposition between democracy and oligarchy, where previously tyranny was conceived as democracy’s opposite.⁹² They had learned the lesson from

⁸⁸ Shear 2011, 102.

⁸⁹ Shear 2007b, 91. Shear also emphasizes the decree and oath of Demophantos from 410/9, preserved in Andokides’ *On the Mysteries* (1.96–98), through which all Athenians pledged to kill anyone who attempted to overthrow the democracy (2007c and 2011, *passim*). Canevaro and Harris (2012) have questioned the authenticity of the text of the decree as inserted by Andokides, and consequently argue that it cannot be used as evidence in the way Shear has used it.

⁹⁰ Shear 2011, 123–128. On the date of the plan and first stages of construction, see above, Chapter 3, n. 53.

⁹¹ Shear emphasizes the significance of the Karyatid Porch (2011, 127), while adhering to the traditional view of the Erechtheion as the new Temple of Athena Polias.

⁹² Shear 2011, 300–301.

410 that stasis had no winners, and so they constructed the memory of the 403 revolution as victory in war. Acts like the public burial of the dead democrats in the *demosion sema* and state support of their orphaned children helped to cast the oligarchs as a foreign enemy, the Spartans.⁹³ In the ritual sphere a new sacrifice to Athena was instituted on 12 Boedromion, the date of the democrats' return from Phyle, and it is likely that the cult of Demokratia was initiated then too.⁹⁴

A project of selective remembrance of the events of 404/3 included the oath “not to remember past wrongs” (μη μνησικακεῖν), which singled out only a few for blame and facilitated unity amongst the citizens.⁹⁵ This project included recreating the physical environment of the past democracy as well, through measures like reinscribing decrees with explicit reference to their originals' destruction by the Thirty.⁹⁶ The Tyrannicides were put to work again too, appearing on Panathenaic prize amphorae in 403/2.⁹⁷ Through these efforts of “making the democratic past physically visible,”⁹⁸ the restored democracy succeeded in “re-establishing” a *patrios politeia* based on laws of Draco and Solon. From this point forward, Rhodes has concluded, no Athenian could openly disagree with democracy or favor oligarchy; instead, there was a growing realization that democracy could be modified, without revolution.⁹⁹

Importantly for the big picture of Athenian social memory over the *longue durée*, the

⁹³ Shear 2011, 291–292.

⁹⁴ On the sacrifice to Athena, see Shear 2011, 287, 289–290. On the beginning of the cult of Demokratia, see Raubitschek 1962, 241.

⁹⁵ See Loraux 2002, 94–169; Wolpert 2002, 119–136; Shear 2011, Ch. 7, 188–226; and cf. Shrimpton 2004.

⁹⁶ See Shear 2011, Ch. 8, esp. 235; Lambert 2012, 257.

⁹⁷ Krumeich in Kansteiner et al. 2007, 11–12, with n. 32.

⁹⁸ Shear 2011, 133.

⁹⁹ 2011, 29.

successful reclamation and promotion of Draco and Solon as democratic lawgivers gave Athenian democracy a longer history. Democracy did not simply appear suddenly with the Tyrannicides or Kleisthenes, it now had a prehistory. Consequently, events could be added to its tradition and trajectory at the other end too—the present and future.¹⁰⁰ The honorific statues decreed for the generals Konon and Evagoras after their victory at Knidos in 394/3 were a key next step. The first honorific portrait statues of living men decreed in Athens, they were set up in the Agora next to the Tyrannicides, which until this time were the only statues standing in the Agora.¹⁰¹ The physical connection made the ideological connection of democratic Athenians hard to miss, analogizing contemporary heroes with legendary ones in a return to the post-Persian Wars strategy of equating past and present.

The Fourth Century

In the 4th century, Athenian engagement with the past intensified as the rise of the Macedonians had deep effects on Greek foreign and domestic policy. This intensification culminated in the period after the Greek defeat at Chaironeia in 338, a period dominated at Athens by the leadership of Lykourgos, and one often seen as paradigmatically retrospective. Much recent work on important sets of evidence from the 4th century has shown how public speeches and inscribed laws and decrees made frequent and increasing reference to archival documents, events of the past, and to physical monuments and memorials within the civic landscape.¹⁰² In inscribed honorific decrees, for example, the conventional motivation clause

¹⁰⁰ Shear 2011, 320–321.

¹⁰¹ See esp. Shear 2007b, 107–109; 2011, 237.

¹⁰² See in particular Kellogg 2008, 368–372; Lambert 2012; Steinbock 2013.

sometimes became actual historical narrative, as the *demos* took on an authoritative voice shaping views of sometimes contentious figures and events.¹⁰³ Another key feature of memory construction in the 4th century is the development of the genre of Atthidography, in which tales about the legendary past of Athens—essentially written accounts of social memory—“served the function of explaining the origins of features of Athenian society that were fundamental to the national identity.”¹⁰⁴

The focal point of memory work in the 4th century was once more the Persian Wars,¹⁰⁵ and the overall aim of much of the effort, especially on the part of Athenian orators, was to reunite Greek cities within the so-called Second Athenian Confederacy and to again justify Athens’s leading role in opposing collective threats. The development of the idea of the Oath of Plataea, discussed in Chapter 3, is indicative of the memory work of the period, bringing the Persian Wars firmly into the present consciousness and focusing again on sacrilege, *asebeia*. Isokrates was a key figure in this effort, and his probable invention of the “temple clause” of the oath made use of the physical memorial landscape in motivating contemporary Athenians to remember past wrongs of the Persians.

In the second half of the century orators like Demosthenes used similar tactics to establish the Macedonians as the new barbarian threat, again analogous to the Persians of the 5th century. Particularly revealing is Demosthenes’ interpretation of some of Athens’ most important civic monuments. His assertion that the Parthenon and Propylaia were constructed after the battle

¹⁰³ Luraghi 2010, esp. 253–258.

¹⁰⁴ On Atthidography, see esp. Harding 2008 (quote at p. 3) and Rhodes 2014 (with discussion of Jacoby 1949).

¹⁰⁵ Gehrke calls the cultivation of the memory of the Persian Wars in 4th-century Athens “intentional history in its purest form” (2010, 28).

of Salamis (22.13) is probably not a willful lie but rather a reflection of the desire to associate physical manifestations of Athenian greatness with victory over barbarians, and an indication that the Periclean effort of integrating the new buildings of the Acropolis with the existing Persian War-related remains had been successful.¹⁰⁶

The Lykourgan Period

After the Greek defeat at Chaironeia in 338, Athens experienced a period of relative peace and prosperity under the leadership of Lykourgos, who exercised great control over the city's finances, though the specific offices or powers he held are uncertain.¹⁰⁷ The state of the relationship between Athens and Macedonia was uncharted territory, though, and the future was uncertain. This was thus another key transformative period where we can see intense engagement with the past and a concerted effort of memory construction ongoing in many spheres.¹⁰⁸

Parallels with such efforts in the Periclean period include a substantial building program that deliberately juxtaposed old and new, making effective citations of the past within what was really an innovative agenda, the use of new and renewed rituals and cults as an aspect of memory construction, and an emphasis on the Persian Wars as the focus of retrospection. New elements in memory work of the Lykourgan period included an increased focus on areas of the city like the Agora and the theater district on the south slope of the Acropolis in addition to the Acropolis

¹⁰⁶ See Steinbock 2013, 90.

¹⁰⁷ For peace as key to financial recovery after Chaironeia, see Mitchel 1973, 193. On the uncertain position of Lykourgos, see e.g., Engels 1992; Lewis 1997. Against Brun's (2005) doubts about Lykourgos' direct or indirect influence over Athenian affairs, see Rhodes 2010 and Faraguna 2011.

¹⁰⁸ On the period and its retrospective trends generally, see esp. Mitchel 1965 and 1973; Hintzen-Bohlen 1996; Lambert 2011.

itself, an emphasis on democracy (a trend intensified since 403), the celebration of cultural achievements of the past in addition to military victories,¹⁰⁹ including celebration of the Periclean period itself,¹¹⁰ and elision from social memory of intervening events less worthy of remembering, such as the Peloponnesian War and the battle at Chaironeia.

Building projects assigned to the Lykourgan period are many and varied, and marked by architectural innovation combined with significant citations of older monuments.¹¹¹ Physical reuse of older materials through upcycling does not seem to be a pronounced strategy within this program, as far as we can tell, although the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes, if it is correctly dated to the 330s and if the statues from the earlier monument were transferred and re-erected (see Chapter 4), would be a striking example. But the reuse of cultural ideas of the past, physically manifested through choices of style, materials, sites, or sculptural motifs, was a key component of the program, as B. Hintzen-Bohlen has illuminated.¹¹²

Chief examples of efforts to build a connection between 5th-century past and 4th-century present through such means include the reconstruction of the Temple of Artemis Aristoboule, built by Themistocles in the deme of Plataea after the battle of Salamis, the remodeling of the Periclean Telesterion at Eleusis, portrait statues of the great tragedians Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides near the newly renovated Theater of Dionysus, and the new Temple of Apollo Patroös

¹⁰⁹ Boedeker and Raaflaub (1998a, 8) emphasize the 5th-century focus on military achievements over cultural ones in the realm of civic pride and commemoration. For the new emphasis on cultural achievements, see also Hölscher 1991, 377–378.

¹¹⁰ Mitchel (1965, 189) christened this period as the Silver Age of Lykourgos, in reference to the Golden Age of Pericles.

¹¹¹ On construction projects during the Lykourgan period, see esp. Hintzen-Bohlen 1996 and 1997; Knell 2000. See also Marconi 2002, 337 and Brun 2005 for criticism of over-attribution to Lykourgos. See Townsend 2004 for another investigation of 4th-century innovation with 5th-century forms.

¹¹² 1996, esp. 90.

on the west side of the Agora, which, according to Knell's reconstruction, cited the east façade of the Erechtheion.¹¹³ In integrating Apollo within Athenian legendary history through a promotion of the genealogical relationship between him and Erechtheus, the Temple of Apollo Patroös is a key example of another phenomenon of the period, the renewal and promotion of older cults through new or revived rituals and festivals in combination with new structures and monuments.¹¹⁴ Lykourgos referenced some of these renewed cults explicitly in his only surviving speech, *Against Leokrates*.¹¹⁵

The emphasis on the 5th century seen in the building program is also clear in other heavily symbolic acts of renewal that created links with past cultural achievements and military victories. One such act was the replacement of the golden Nikai on the Acropolis, set up by Pericles but liquidated as a financial resource at the end of the Peloponnesian War.¹¹⁶ Another was the repair of the statue of Athena Nike that had been dedicated after the victories of 426/5, accompanied by the inscribed decree authorizing it, which listed the specific campaigns and enemies whose spoils funded the original.¹¹⁷ In the ritual realm, the 5th-century past was made present in, for example, the enhancement of the annual Little Panathenaia festival through leasing land referred to as "the Nea" in order to pay for cattle to sacrifice to Athena and Athena

¹¹³ On the Temple of Artemis Aristoboule, see Threpsiades and Vanderpool 1964; Amandry 1967–1968; Travlos 1971, 121–123; Mitchel 1973, 197; Hintzen-Bohlen 1997, 50–51. For an Archaic *naïskos* in the same area, likely burnt by the Persians, see Best 2015, 102–104. On the Telesterion renovation, see Hintzen-Bohlen 1997, 18–21. On the portraits of the tragedians and the Theater of Dionysus project, see Hintzen-Bohlen 1997, 21–31; Knell 2000, 126–147. On the Temple of Apollo Patroös, see esp. Knell 1994; see also Hedrick 1988; Hintzen-Bohlen 1997, 45–48; Lippolis 1998–2000, 142–162; Knell 2000, 80–89.

¹¹⁴ On the genealogical relationship, which included Lykourgos in a sense, as a member of the Eteoboutadaï, see Hintzen-Bohlen 1996, 90–91. On religious reforms, see Parker 1996, 242–253; Hintzen-Bohlen 1997, 119–126.

¹¹⁵ E.g., Lycurg. *Leoc.* 17. Engels 2014, 28.

¹¹⁶ See Parker 1996, 244; Lambert 2010b, 228.

¹¹⁷ *IG II²* 403. See esp. Lambert 2010b, 226–228, 232.

Nike on the Acropolis.¹¹⁸ S. Lambert has called this a “ritual innovation... containing retrospective paideutic intentionality” meant to recall Athens at its mid-5th-century height in the minds of the population participating in the festival.¹¹⁹

This concept of “past-as-*paideusis*”¹²⁰ also found expression in the program of institutionalized training of young citizens known as the *ephebeia*, begun or at least newly formalized in the 330s as a program of active social memory construction through patriotic education.¹²¹ The two-year program of military and civic training involved visits to temples and sanctuaries throughout Attica, where interactions with monuments were enhanced through collective oaths and rituals that worked to instill knowledge of the city’s gods and heroes.¹²² This period also saw the founding of Aristotle’s Peripatos, soon to be joined by the Zeno’s Stoa and Epicurus’ Garden as the chief philosophical schools of Athens, along with Plato’s Academy. These schools would play a large role in the increasingly ingrained connection between Athens’ past cultural greatness and her contemporary place in the world.¹²³

The centrality of democracy within Athenian civic identity became even more entrenched in the Lykourgan period. The cult of *Demokratia*, likely instituted in 403, was by now certainly established, as official offerings by the *strategoï* are attested in 332/1 and 331/0 after a colossal

¹¹⁸ *IG* II³ 447.

¹¹⁹ 2010b, 232. See also Rhodes and Osborne 2003, 396–403, no. 81.

¹²⁰ Lambert 2010b, 233.

¹²¹ On the dating of the *ephebeia* and ephebic oath, see esp. Kellogg 2013b, 264–266. The details of the system are set out in the nearly contemporary *Athenaion Politeia* (42.3–5)

¹²² See esp. Steinbock 2011, 294–299; Kellogg 2013b. Steinbock argues that Lykourgos unusual speech prosecuting Leokrates aimed to draw on jurors’ memories of their own ephebic training.

¹²³ Mitchel 1973, 213; Habicht 1997, 105–111.

statue of Demokratia was set up in the Agora by Boule in 333/2.¹²⁴ The new Monument of the Eponymous Heroes also contributed to the visible presence of democratic institutions in the memorial landscape, as did the large number of inscribed decrees set up in this period—many more survive than from any other period of equal length, and many were proposed by Lykourgos himself.¹²⁵ Lambert has concluded that this penchant for inscribing decrees has to do with an awareness of such decrees' potential to act as monuments.¹²⁶ Through them the *demos* made itself and the democracy literally visible, setting up “monuments to its deliberation.”¹²⁷

Oratory continued to be another key mode of shaping social memory in the Lykourgan period. Our only surviving speech of Lykourgos himself, his prosecution of one Leokrates on a charge of treason for deserting Athens after Chaironeia, is informative and representative of his overall program, as B. Steinbock and J. Engels have recently demonstrated.¹²⁸ Prosecuting the case as *eisangelia* gave Lykourgos a large audience of 1501 jurors, in front of whom he could set an example of the duty of a patriotic orator to educate the citizens on proper civic behavior.¹²⁹ Almost half his speech (75–130) is dedicated to an “appeal to the past,” including discussion of oaths, the patriotism and sacrifice of Kodrus and Erechtheus, quotations of Homer and Euripides,

¹²⁴ Offerings by the *strategoi*: *IG II²* 1496; Raubitschek 1962, 239; Mitchel 1973, 206–207. On the base of the statue of Demokratia, see Raubitschek 1962. On the statue, Hintzen-Bohlen (1997, 42–44) follows Palagia (1982) in identifying the large female torso Agora S 2370 as Demokratia, but see Palagia 1994 for a revised identification as Agathe Tyche.

¹²⁵ Lambert 2010b, 236.

¹²⁶ 2010b, 236.

¹²⁷ Luraghi 2010, 247.

¹²⁸ Steinbock 2011; Engels 2008, 2014.

¹²⁹ Engels 2014, 22–23, 27–28.

and praise for the Athenian fighters at Marathon.¹³⁰ He also includes what amounts to a short and careful *epitaphios logos* for the fallen at Chaironeia (46–50), aligning them with the valorous Athenians of old.¹³¹ Although 750 jurors did side with him, the fact that Lykourgos lost the case warns us again to avoid imagining social memory as universal assent to an official view of history. Multiple interpretations were always open, and contention within and between memory communities was perhaps especially vibrant in such transformative periods of civic life.

The Hellenistic Period

Despite sailing uncharted waters, Athens managed quite well under the leadership of Lykourgos. But after the death of Alexander in 323 and Antipater's defeat of the Athenian-led Greek coalition in the Lamian War in 322, Athens came under the direct control of Macedonia. The ensuing decades—and indeed, centuries—saw Athens more or less subject to a revolving door of foreign powers and kings, with varying degrees of autonomy in conducting its internal affairs.¹³² Significant memory work is still in evidence, though we do not see the concerted and multi-faceted efforts of early periods like those led by Pericles and Lykourgos. Trends like the emphasis on democracy and Athenian cultural achievements do continue and become even more deeply embedded in the civic consciousness. The upcycling of the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes, examined in Chapter 4, is perhaps the clearest emblem of this long period as a whole.

The monument's continual remodeling in the least visible way achievable emphasized the

¹³⁰ See Engels 2014, 25–26. On the use of Kodrus as an exemplar, see Steinbock 2011.

¹³¹ See Engels 2014, 26–27. For an investigation of commemoration of Chaironeia on the battlefield itself, by both victorious Macedonians and defeated Thebans, see Ma 2008.

¹³² On Athens in the Hellenistic period generally, see esp. Bouras 1990; Habicht 1997; Rathmann 2010.

unchanging underlying civic order—that is, democracy—in a period of frequent changes of allegiance and authority.

The system of euergetism briefly outlined in Chapter 4 above became especially significant in the Hellenistic period, as wealthy benefactors were increasingly responsible for new constructions and other donations toward civic well-being. Perhaps the increased prominence of individual agents and patrons in building projects helps account for less concerted and coordinated efforts of shaping of social memory, including upcycling. Individual benefactors, especially foreign ones, did not fully command the material heritage of the city and could not reuse monuments at will.

Still, we do have evidence for some particular moments and monuments where prior established strategies of building connections with the past were again employed. The first major example is the posthumous honors decreed for Lykourgos himself in 307/6, after the Athenians rid themselves of the Macedonian puppet Demetrios of Phaleron, installed by Kassander after the Lamian War. Though the Athenians were aided greatly in this effort by Antigonos (Monophthalmos) and his son Demetrios (Poliorketes), the ousting was conceived as a restoration of democracy.¹³³ As one of the first acts of this restored democracy, the honorific decree cited Lykourgos' honored ancestors, some of his building projects on behalf of the city, and his implacable opposition to Alexander, praising him for being “unimpeachable on behalf of the fatherland and the salvation of all Greeks throughout his life, striving for the freedom and

¹³³ See Lambert 2012, 254, 263.

autonomy of the city by every means.”¹³⁴ Through this decree, Lambert has recently concluded, “Lykourgos the great citer of historical examples has now himself become one big historical example, a role he was to continue to perform in Hellenistic Athens.”¹³⁵ Democracy was now so firmly embedded in civic identity that it would always be reactivated, even if that reactivation necessitated outside help.¹³⁶ In this first instance, that outside help from Antigonos and Demetrios demanded of the Athenians a novel response, which ultimately included a host of honors for the liberators and their insertion into the city’s past through inclusion amongst the Eponymous Heroes. As discussed in Chapter 4, this “forced assimilation” of Antigonos and Demetrios into Athenian heroes was conceived as mutually beneficial.

But Athens would soon sour on the Antigonids when the restored democracy was not maintained, and the 286 revolt from Demetrios Poliorketes (this time with the assistance of Ptolemy I) was followed by familiar strategies of realigning memory, as Shear has recently demonstrated.¹³⁷ Shear argues persuasively that because the situation prior to Demetrios Poliorketes’ arrival on the scene was the period of oligarchy and tyranny presided over by Demetrios of Phaleron, the Athenians in 286 had to look further back in order to return to democracy, and modeled their actions on the democratic responses to oligarchy in 410 and 403. Again we see a re-emphasis on the visible presence of the *demos* in inscribed decrees and honors, and a familiar desire to remember stasis as war against external enemies, in this case, as

¹³⁴ Trans. Lambert 2012, 275. *IG* II² 457, lines 14–17: ἀνεξέλεγκτον αὐτὸν ὑπέ]ρ τῆς πατρίδος καὶ τῆς τῶ[ν Ἑλλήνων ἀπάντων σωτηρίας] διὰ παντὸς τοῦ βίου παρ[έχων καὶ ὑπὲρ τοῦ τὴν πόλιν] ἐλευθέραν εἶναι καὶ αὐτ[όνομον πάσῃ μηχανῇ ἀγωνι]ζόμενος. Lambert (2012, 264) like Mitchel (1973), concludes that Lykourgos’ actual policies and stances were not as openly confrontational toward Alexander as the later honors suggest.

¹³⁵ 2012, 265.

¹³⁶ Lambert 2012, 254.

¹³⁷ 2012.

war against the Macedonians.¹³⁸

Athenian efforts to place the present in direct association with the great past continued in the Hellenistic period, though the sometimes conflicting roles of foreigners as benefactors, honorees, and enemies often complicated those efforts. For example, sometime after 277 a certain Herakleitos, an Athenian citizen, *agonothetes*, and general of the Macedonian garrison in the Piraeus dedicated a monument to Athena Nike celebrating Antigonos Gonatas—no enduring friend to Athens—as an expeller of barbarians and upholder of Greek traditions after the defeat of a group of Gauls at Lysimachea, “subtly incorporat[ing] the victory of the Macedonian king into Greek traditions of military victories over the barbarians,” in A. Chaniotis’ recent analysis.¹³⁹ We can recognize this as a similar effort of memory to that of Kimon and his herms, with their epigrams referencing the Trojan War, or the statues of Konon and Evagoras placed next to the Tyrannicides in the Agora. While the effort may seem rather incongruous in the case of a foreign king from whom Athens would later revolt, we should bear in mind that Kimon too fell from favor, ostracized in 461, and that Evagoras too was an honored foreign king, from Salamis on Cyprus.

The juxtaposition of old and new continued to be an evocative strategy in buildings and monuments, seen best perhaps in the benefactions in Athens by the Attalid rulers of Pergamon. The Stoas of Attalos and Eumenes enhanced key civic gathering spots—the Agora and the theater district—and the massive pillar monuments fed off close associations with neighboring 5th-century monuments, particularly the Propylaia and the Parthenon (see Chapter 4). Through

¹³⁸ See Shear 2012, esp. 282–286, 292–295.

¹³⁹ *IG II² 677*, lines 3–6. See Chaniotis 2012, 57–58.

such measures the Hellenistic benefactors, especially the Attalid kings—through work in Athens itself and at home in Pergamon—stimulated the already developing image of Athens as the cultural and historical center of Greece, the city most closely associated with the Persian Wars and defense of Greek freedom from barbarians, and the best artistic and cultural model.¹⁴⁰ This image would be propagated in the Roman period too, by Romans and Athenians alike. But it is an intriguing and perhaps significant observation that the historical analogy of the invasions of the Gauls into Greece and Asia Minor with the Persian invasions of the 5th century—an analogy that was actively cultivated by the Attalids both in Pergamon and at Athens following Athenian precedents of constructing the memory of the Persian Wars—never caught on in Athens.¹⁴¹ The parallel was important in some Greek places and texts, including Pausanias, but the lack of this strain in Athenian memory may hint that throughout the Hellenistic period Athenians remained the primary shapers of their own social memory, not overly influenced by foreign benefactors and their monuments. Outside efforts like the Pergamene “Little Barbarians” set up on the Acropolis to celebrate Attalid-led victories over the Gauls could apparently only go so far in shaping Athenian social memory.¹⁴² Through the Hellenistic period, as C. Habicht concluded, Athens “succeeded in surviving as [a] vital social organism.”¹⁴³

¹⁴⁰ On the Hellenistic kings stimulating the sense of Athens as a cultural center, see T. Hölscher 2010, 146–147.

¹⁴¹ See Chaniotis 2009, 255 for the notion that the invasions of the Gauls formed part of “collective memory” for all communities in Greece and Asia Minor, but became part of “cultural memory” only in Pergamon.

¹⁴² On the “Little Barbarians,” see esp. Stewart 2004.

¹⁴³ 1997, v.

The First Century BCE and the Early Roman Period

The 1st century BCE saw the ever-increasing presence of Rome on the Greek stage and the sometimes intrusive appearances of individual Romans in Athens. The most destructive of these was of course Sulla, whose soldiers brought devastation to the Athenian built landscape in 87/6, as punishment for Athens' support of Mithridates of Pontus. As alluded to in Chapter 2 above, this began a long streak for Athens of choosing the losing protagonist in Roman wars, including Pompey and then Brutus, and culminating in support of Antony, who spent part of the years 42 and 40 in the city and actively cultivated its friendship.¹⁴⁴ After 39, Athens was Antony's chief residence, along with his wife Octavia and later Cleopatra, and he enjoyed great popularity as the "new Dionysus."¹⁴⁵ As discussed in Chapter 2, repair or rebuilding efforts after the Sullan sack were minimal, and the economic picture in Athens in the following decades was bleak, made worse by fines and indemnities demanded by the Roman victors.¹⁴⁶

After Octavian's decisive victory at Actium, Athens may have expected the worst in return for its close association with Antony. On a very brief visit immediately after the battle, Octavian mostly saw to the needs of his fleet, but did send a positive signal by participating in the Eleusinian mysteries and distributing grain.¹⁴⁷ We have very little knowledge of the decade following Actium, but in his first major trip to the East in 22/1 after arranging affairs at Rome, now-Augustus sought to consolidate his control over Greece. Largely concerned with meting out

¹⁴⁴ Habicht 1997, 360. Cf. Plut. *Vit. Ant.* 23. On Athens' choices and their consequences, see also Hoff 1989a.

¹⁴⁵ Habicht 1997, 361–365. Cf. Plut. *Vit. Ant.* 33.6–34.1; App. *B Civ.* 5.8.76. Habicht (1997, 362) suggests that the story reported by Cassius Dio (48.39.2) that Antony married Athena and demanded an outrageous dowry from the Athenians is almost certainly later propaganda on the part of Octavian's supporters.

¹⁴⁶ On the lack of rebuilding after the sack, see Hoff 1997; Rotroff 1997, 34–36; Mango 2010, 124–125; Borg 2011, 215–218; Lynch 2011, 72.

¹⁴⁷ Plut. *Ant.* 68.6–8; Cass. Dio 51.4.1; see Toher 2014, 129. On the grain distribution, see also Hoff 1992.

rewards and punishments to Greek cities, Augustus indeed made his displeasure with the Athenians felt, taking away their right to sell citizenship and their control over Aegina and Eretria. After the notorious incident when the statue of Athena on the Acropolis was seen to turn toward Rome and spit blood, Augustus withdrew to Aegina for the winter, effectively avoiding open confrontation but making his anger and authority known.¹⁴⁸ Although upset, it seems that he respected Athens, probably at least in part due to its cultural legacy, and would not be another Sulla. This trip began a period of careful negotiations on both sides, played out in various modes, including monuments. J. Oliver concluded that Augustus must have eventually won the Athenians over, but M. Toher has recently investigated these early negotiations and made the attractive suggestion that Herod the Great, king of Judea, interceded with Augustus on behalf of the Athenians, as he is known to have done with Agrippa on behalf of the Ilrians, and was thereafter honored on the Acropolis.¹⁴⁹ The reconciliation as Augustus was on his way back to Italy in 19 involved the Athenians delaying the Eleusinian procession so that Augustus could be initiated into the greater mysteries and the commencement of several building projects at Athens, including the Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis in conjunction with repairs to the Erechtheion financed by Augustus.¹⁵⁰

We see these delicate negotiations continue in the last decades of the 1st century BCE, as “Athens remained a free city, aware of the precariousness of that status, but free nevertheless,” in Oliver’s words.¹⁵¹ These decades thus mark another key transformative period in Athenian

¹⁴⁸ See Toher 2014, 129–131. For the incident, see Cass. Dio 54.7.2–3 (above, Chapter 2, n. 189).

¹⁴⁹ Oliver 1981, 414; Toher 2014.

¹⁵⁰ Toher 2014, 131; Cass. Dio 54.9.10.

¹⁵¹ 1980, 45.

history, very much akin to the Lykourgan period, where conditions of peace allowed economic and physical recovery, but also reflected uncharted territory. Again the Athenian response was a multi-faceted effort of reorientation in relation to their past. Alcock has written that the “memorial work of early Roman Greece required effort and inventiveness,” particularly on the part of local elites.¹⁵² This is certainly true, but in Athens there was already a tradition of such concerted efforts of memory.

As already discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, Athenian bodies like the *demos* and Areopagus council were creative and inventive in finding solutions to new problems through upcycling ancient monuments. Such control of cultural heritage (material and otherwise) as a resource in the present was an overarching theme of the large number of building projects undertaken in the last decades of the 1st century BCE. As is doubtless clear by my avoidance of the term “Augustan period,” I do not see these projects as belonging to an “Augustan building program” at Athens, as least not in the sense in which many have discussed it, assuming imperial financing and direct or very closely directed imperial dictates of plan, site, style and ornament, etc. Imperial encouragement and money surely were involved in some cases, and the Odeion of Agrippa is an example of a more direct benefaction in the Hellenistic tradition. But overall, we should see much greater Athenian initiative and agency, and more intra-Athenian motivations, than have traditionally been ascribed to projects of this period. The re-examination of the Temple of Ares by D. Steuernagel and the extended interpretation of its relocation by the Areopagus council presented in Chapter 2 are indicative of this new approach, which may prove useful in

¹⁵² 2002, 50–51.

future re-examination of other works of this period.¹⁵³

Even a brief look at the projects of this period reveals striking similarities with Lykourgan-era efforts. A hallmark of both periods is the effort of connecting past with present through constructions that juxtapose old and new while in fact being quite innovative. The relocation of the Temple of Ares and the reuse of old statues as honorific portrait monuments on the Acropolis are prime examples of this phenomenon, as is the Temple of Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis. The architectural form—a small round “monopteros”—while not entirely unique in either Greek or Roman traditions, is unusual in Athens. The details of its Ionic order make a nod to the past and the physical surroundings by citing the nearby Erechtheion, which was undergoing repairs around the same time the temple was erected.¹⁵⁴ It was also a temple dedicated to two deities of an unconventional sort in Athens, a foreign city and its ruler, but the inscription focuses on Athenians and their traditional Athenian magistracies and priesthoods, and begins with the *demos* itself: “the *demos* to the goddess Roma and Caesar Augustus when Pammenes son of Zenon of Marathon was hoplite general and priest of the goddess Roma and Augustus Soter on the Acropolis, and when Megiste, daughter of Asklepidēs of Halai was priestess of Athena Polias. In the archonship of Areios son of Dorion of Paiania.”¹⁵⁵ The siting of

¹⁵³ Steuernagel 2009. Bergemann’s (2007) investigation of reworked Classical grave markers as evidence for classicizing tendencies amongst Athenians in the Imperial period is another informative example of this approach. Alcock (2002, Ch. 2, esp. 51–73 on the Athenian Agora) also usefully calls into question some older assumptions about “Imperial” Greece.

¹⁵⁴ On the Ionic order of the temple and its relationship to the Erechtheion, see Travlos 1971, 494–497; Shear 1997, 506–507; Fouquet 2012, 61–65. On the repair of the Erechtheion, see Paton 1927, 223–224; Korres 1994a, 48; and Fouquet 2012, 77–79 who questions the contemporaneity with the *monopteros*. The cause of the fire damage to the Erechtheion is sometimes assigned to the Sullan sack, but this is far from certain; see esp. Hoff 1997, 41–42; Fouquet 2012, 78–79.

¹⁵⁵ *IG II² 3173*: [ὁ] δῆμος θεᾶι Ῥώμηι καὶ Σεβαστῶι [Καίσαρι] στρα[τηγ]οῦντος ἐπὶ τ[οῦς] ὀπλίτας Παμμένους τοῦ Ζήνωνος Μαραθωνίου ἱερέως θεᾶς Ῥώμης καὶ Σεβαστοῦ Σωτήρος ἐπ’ ἀκροπόλει, ἐπὶ ἱερείας Ἀθηνᾶς Πολιάδος Μεγίστης τῆς Ἀσκληπίδου Ἀλαιέως θυγατρὸς. ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Ἀρήου τ[οῦ] Δωριώωνος Παιανιέως : See also Schmalz 2009, no. 103, pp. 80–82; Aleshire and Lambert 2011, 570–571.

the temple directly in front of the Parthenon worked as an additional juxtaposition of new and old, and surely added to the degree of the honor for Augustus.¹⁵⁶ Yet, the temple is relatively tiny, and Augustus is essentially dwarfed by his august backdrop. Although the subject of many studies, this little temple remains something of an enigma.¹⁵⁷

The so-called “Roman Agora” is another intriguing complex finished in this period.¹⁵⁸ In this case we can say confidently that Roman money contributed towards the construction of the new marketplace, as attested by a letter of Cicero to Atticus and by the dedicatory inscription on the Arch of Athena Archegetes at the west entrance to the market.¹⁵⁹ This large colonnaded square was also a new set of forms for Athens, which scholars have sought to compare with Hellenistic *agorai*, Roman complexes like Caesar’s new forum in Rome or the Macellum in Pompeii, or *kaisareia* in Alexandria and Antioch.¹⁶⁰ Yet the arch, facing the Classical Agora at the end of the broad colonnade street connecting the complexes, was dedicated to Athena the Founder and cited the Propylaia in its architectural form, thus making clear connections to

¹⁵⁶ There are some who argue that the square foundation directly in front of the Parthenon could not have held the temple; the question was recently reopened by Fouquet (2012, 66–67).

¹⁵⁷ The most important work includes: Binder 1969; Kajava 2001; Whittaker 2002; Rose 2005, 50–52; Thakur 2007; Dally 2008a; Fouquet 2012; and see above, Chapter 2, n. 127–128.

¹⁵⁸ On the Roman Agora, see esp. Hoff 1988, 1989b, and 2001; Baldassarri 1998, 99–113; Sourlas 2008 and 2012; Tsoniotis 2014.

¹⁵⁹ *IG II² 3175*: ὁ δῆμος ἀπὸ τῶν δοθεισῶν δωρεῶν ὑπὸ Γαίου Ἰουλίου Καίσαρος θεοῦ. καὶ Αὐτοκράτορος Καίσαρος θεοῦ υἱοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Ἀθηναῖ Ἀρχηγέτιδι στρατηγοῦντος ἐπὶ τοὺς ὀπίτας Εὐκλέους Μαραθωνίου τοῦ καὶ διαδεξαμένου τὴν ἐπιμέλειαν ὑπὲρ τοῦ πατρὸς Ἡρώδου, τοῦ καὶ πρεσβεύσαντος, ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος Νικίου τοῦ Σαραπίωνος Ἀθμονέως. See Schmalz 2009, no. 102, pp. 79–80, and cf. Cic. *Att.* 6.1.25: *Es heus fgenua? vos a Caesare per Herodem talenta L extorsistis? in quo, ut audio, magnum odium Pompei suscepistis...* [By the way, have you [Athenians] really wrung 50 talents out of Caesar through Herodes? I hear you’ve stirred up the anger of Pompey in the matter...]

¹⁶⁰ See Mango (2010, 143–144) for a summary of scholarship on the architectural form of the Roman Agora.

Athens' great past.¹⁶¹

One further example of the juxtaposition of innovation and tradition is the small Ionic tetrastyle prostyle podium temple of Aphrodite Ourania in the northwestern corner of the Agora. The podium temple was a new architectural form in Athens, with obvious Roman connotations, and facing due south into the Agora instead of toward the east, yet it was placed within a well-established sanctuary, and aligned precisely with the Archaic altar of Aphrodite just over two meters in front of it.¹⁶² Some of these projects certainly involve upcycling, and all fit within the general strategy seen in the Lykourgan and Periclean periods particularly of combining old and new such that the contrast brings out the references to the past, and connects the present with the past as remembered and embodied in those references.

Another parallel with the Lykourgan period in the memory work of the late 1st century BCE is the focus on the 5th century and its monuments, which we can see in the upcycling of the Temple of Ares and of the portrait statues on the Acropolis, examined in Chapter 4. The more recent past, by contrast, is largely ignored. In the Lykourgan projects, that de-emphasized intervening past included the Peloponnesian War and the loss at Chaironeia. In the late 1st century, that de-emphasized past was the Sullan sack and Athens' poor choices in the subsequent Roman civil wars fought largely on Greek soil and seas. Unlike the Persian sack, Sulla's rampage was not actively commemorated. By the time the Athenian economy was sufficiently recovered to enable a real clean-up effort to deal with the physical damage, the best choice seems to have

¹⁶¹ On the citation of the Propylaia, see Dally 2008a, 47. The placement of a bronze quadriga statue of Lucius Caesar as an apex acroterion, very unusual for a Greek propylon, makes the arch itself an interesting architectural hybrid; see esp. Hoff 2001 and Schmalz 2009, no. 130, pp. 101–102 (arguing that the statue is a later addition).

¹⁶² On the Temple of Aphrodite Ourania, see esp. Shear 1984, 33–40; 1997, 495–507; Borg 2011, 223 and above, Chapter 2, n. 178.

been to clean up quietly and, where possible, to reuse material without fanfare.¹⁶³ The reuse of material in the Roman Agora seems to have been in this vein of practical and neutral repurposing of usable blocks, used mostly as packing material in foundations.¹⁶⁴

By the late 1st century Athens had not experienced much building activity since prior to the Sullan sack, so the plethora of new projects made for a very dynamic period of active engagement with the past through the built environment as Athenians asserted control over their city's monuments and cultural heritage, recognizing their significance as symbolic capital. This fits a general trend of historical consciousness in Early Roman Greece, as Alcock has illuminated, but at Athens this engagement is varied and idiosyncratic, and of course not a new phenomenon.¹⁶⁵ We should again be reminded not to think of the Agora or the city generally as a "museum," or be overly influenced by the perspective expressed by Cicero, where Roman visitors cannot help but tread on history wherever they wander through the city.¹⁶⁶ For Athenians, engagement with their past through monuments and other modes was an active and dynamic strategy, and one which they would continue to utilize through the Imperial period. Later Roman emperors generally respected Athens, so the strategy was in essence effective.¹⁶⁷ It never became simply a static strategy of maintaining a status quo, though, as we can see in periods of renegotiation like Nero's reign, when Athens honored him with a large dedication in bronze

¹⁶³ Mango suggests instead that perhaps the ruined buildings were purposefully left as reminders of the sack (2010, 125).

¹⁶⁴ See Hoff 1988; 220–221, 223; 1997, 43.

¹⁶⁵ See Alcock 1997 and 2002, esp. Ch 2, pp. 36–98.

¹⁶⁶ *Fin.* 5.2.5: *Quamquam id quidem infinitum est in hac urbe; quacumque enim ingredimur, in aliqua historia vestigium ponimus.* Cf. *Att.* 5.10.2, 5.11.5, where Cicero is proud not to have looted anything from Athens during his official visit in 51 BCE, in contrast to other rapacious Roman magistrates (see *Pis.* 40.96, where Cicero mentions *laceratae Athenae*).

¹⁶⁷ On later emperors' relationships with Athens, see esp. Oliver 1981.

lettering added to the eastern architrave of the Parthenon in 61/2 CE, yet during a subsequent visit to Greece lasting over a year, Nero avoided visiting the city.¹⁶⁸

The memory work of the Early Roman period “encouraged a sense of ongoing cultural distinction” among Greeks.¹⁶⁹ At Athens a notion of cultural distinction had been cultivated for centuries already, so the Athenians of the 1st century BCE had a rich memorial landscape to work with. Engagement with the past as a strategy for the present and future would continue to be at the forefront in Athens and throughout the Greek world in the first centuries CE, during the period or movement conventionally called the Second Sophistic. Schmitz and Wiater have recently show that a key difference between attitudes of the 1st century BCE and those of the next centuries is that in the Second Sophistic, Athens had come to mean and to stand for Classical Greek culture, writ large. In the 1st century BCE, in contrast, Athens remained strikingly marginal in the texts of Greek authors like Diodorus Siculus.¹⁷⁰ Despite Cicero’s view of the city as a landscape of memory for Roman tourists, Greek writers did not yet equate the still poor and ruinous city with the Classical past. The concerted memory work of the late 1st century BCE on the part of the Athenians, including upcycling of monuments of that very Classical past, surely played a role in the establishment of that image of Athens as heir to Classical culture that would predominate through the end of antiquity and indeed into the modern era.¹⁷¹

¹⁶⁸ On the Parthenon inscription, see Carroll 1982; Spawforth 1994, 234–237; . On Nero’s visit, see Oliver 1981, 417. Cassius Dio (62.14.3) claims that Nero avoided Athens because the Furies resided there, while Suetonius (*Ner.* 34.4) mentions his avoidance of the Eleusinian mysteries.

¹⁶⁹ Alcock 2002, 97.

¹⁷⁰ Schmitz and Wiater 2011, esp. 37–38; cf. Schmitz 2011.

¹⁷¹ On the development and reception of the trope the “School of Athens” or of Athens as the “School of Greece,” see Most 2006.

The Imperial Period and Second Sophistic

As is now well known, the first centuries of the common era in Greece saw the widespread development of a consciousness of the cultural achievements of the Greek past and of efforts to construct present identities in relation to that past. Noted first in the literary output of the public figures and rhetors identified by Philostratus as “sophists,” this interest in the Greek past has now been recognized in all sorts of cultural avenues, including in art and material culture of many media. Thus, the Second Sophistic is now better thought of as a “value system,” a “mode of thought,” or a “cultural sphere” rather than a literary movement.¹⁷² While scholars like Goldhill have usefully cautioned against generalizations of the period, an interest in the past is still considered a pronounced hallmark of these centuries in Greece.¹⁷³ *Paideia*, Greek cultural education, inherently included knowledge about the past and its traditions. Knowing the world meant knowing the past.¹⁷⁴

Far from marking a decline in the present and longing for “the good old days” though, as the identification of this retrospection as “nostalgia” has traditionally suggested, the interest in the past was instead an active engagement, part of a strategy for the present, with a view toward the future, as recent work on the period has emphasized.¹⁷⁵ Pliny’s famous letter to a young colleague on his way to take up the post of overseer (*corrector*) of the free cities of Achaëa gives us a hint at the practical effect this strategy could have, and indeed at the need for such a strategy

¹⁷² Borg 2004, 1–2.

¹⁷³ Goldhill 2001.

¹⁷⁴ Borg 2004, 1.

¹⁷⁵ See, e.g., many of the contributions in Goldhill, ed., 2001 and Borg, ed., 2004; also, Schmitz 1997, Alcock 2002, esp. 38–44, 96–98. One might compare the traditionally negative view of Second Sophistic “nostalgia” with the traditional view of the Lykourgan period as “degenerate” in comparison with the 5th century; see Engels 2014, 21–22.

in the face of often rapacious imperial officials. Pliny urges his colleague to remember that he has been sent to the true and pure Greece, which gave birth to literature and culture, justice and laws, and bids him respect the gods, founders, legends, and antiquity of the Greeks and not take anything away from their *dignitas*.¹⁷⁶ Pausanias gives us a glimpse of the consequences of a community's inability to employ such a strategy, when he asserts that the Messenians, because of their long exile from the Peloponnesus, were largely ignorant of their past and thus could not stand up to others' claims against them.¹⁷⁷

The past was thus a potentially powerful resource for Greek cities, and projects of developing civic social memory tying the present to the past were undertaken throughout the Greek East. M. Pretzler has recently shed light on the process of constructing local memory as a valuable asset by investigating the case of Mantinea through Pausanias' inadvertently revealing "errors."¹⁷⁸ Although "what he reports is wrong in a strictly historical sense," Pretzler concludes, Pausanias, in reporting a narrative based on local sources, "managed to offer a glimpse of the desperate and ultimately successful attempts of a community to restore its lost past."¹⁷⁹

Athens of course participated in this trend too, but as is by now quite clear, this sort of memory work is far from a new development at Athens. Athenians had been actively engaging with their past through efforts of memory in various spheres—rhetoric, ritual, and physical monuments including the practice of upcycling—for many centuries and with a recent flourish in the late 1st century BCE. Perhaps in part at least due to these centuries of such work, as

¹⁷⁶ Plin. *Ep.* 8.24.1–5. See Alcock 2002, 42–43 for further discussion.

¹⁷⁷ 3.13.2. On Messenian memory, see Alcock 2002, Ch. 4, pp. 132–175.

¹⁷⁸ Pretzler 2005b; Paus. 8.7–12.

¹⁷⁹ 2005b, 32.

previously mentioned, the major change for Athens during the Second Sophistic is its now entrenched primacy in the Greek cultural landscape. Athens' own cultural and historical past was now the paradigmatic Greek past, an idea promoted not only by Athenians themselves but also by other Greeks and foreigners, many of whom came to Athens seeking *paideia*.¹⁸⁰ Within the cultural activity of these centuries, two figures of the 2nd century CE had particularly noteworthy effects on the memorial landscape of Athens: the Emperor Hadrian and the Athenian sophist Herodes Atticus.

Hadrian and Athens

Hadrian's esteem for all things Greek and his many travels through and benefactions to Greek cities and sanctuaries are well known. His special regard for Athens left a large mark on the city's landscape, as any modern visitor strolling along *odos Adrianou* will be well aware. Hadrian embraced Athens more fully than any other Roman emperor, and Athens returned the embrace. He was made an honorary citizen and held the archonship before he became emperor; nearly one hundred altars later dedicated to him in the city attest to his great popularity.¹⁸¹ His establishment of the Panhellenion, a league of Greek cities and *koina* with established ancient pedigrees, with its headquarters at Athens, was a huge boon to civic pride, prestige, and presumably finances, by confirming and further promoting Athens' status as the cultural capital

¹⁸⁰ On education in Athens during the Second Sophistic, see esp. Watts 2006, Ch. 2, 24–47.

¹⁸¹ On Hadrian and Athens, see esp. Graindor 1934; Kokkou 1970; Follet 1976, 107–135; Willers 1990 and 1996; Calandra 1996, 85–115; Boatwright 2000, 144–157; Karivieri 2002; Knell 2008, 59–78; Giudice 2013. For his archonship see *IG II²* 3286 and *SHA Hadr.* 19.1. On the altars to Hadrian in Athens and elsewhere in the Greek world, see esp. Benjamin 1963.

of Greece.¹⁸² Plutarch may have been involved in the formulation and promotion of such a league, and seems to have envisioned Hadrian as inspired by a plan of Pericles in establishing the Panhellenion.¹⁸³ Aelius Aristides, in his *Panathenaic Oration* of 155 CE, underlined the centrality of Athens within Panhellenic identity, claiming hyperbolically that there was no Greek who would not prefer to be an Athenian than to be a citizen of his own city.¹⁸⁴

Whether or not Hadrian had Pericles in mind at its founding, the Panhellenion is representative of the efforts of memory that placed Hadrian in the line of great Athenian leaders, and indeed as another founder of Athens. The placement of his statue within the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes, discussed in Chapter 4, marks one significant part of this effort. Hadrian's finishing of the massive Temple of Olympian Zeus, begun by Peisistratos and furthered by an earlier philhellene and would-be Athenian hero, Antiochus IV, was another loud statement of civic refounding and renewal, as was of course the new arch at the entrance to the Olympieion complex, which explicitly compared Hadrian to Theseus as a founder of Athens.¹⁸⁵ Perhaps even more important for the relationship of Athenian past and present than these physical monuments is the Athenians' request that Hadrian redraft the laws of Draco and Solon.¹⁸⁶ This gesture reveals that the *patrios politeia*, so contested at the end of the 5th century,

¹⁸² On the Panhellenion, see esp. Oliver 1970, Ch. IV, 92–138; Spawforth and Walker 1985 and 1986; Willers 1990, 54–60; Jones 1996; Spawforth 1999; Boatwright 2000, 147–150; Doukellis 2007; Riccardi 2007; Nasrallah 2010, 96–101.

¹⁸³ Oliver 1970, 94, 132 and 1981, 419; cf. Plut. *Vit. Per.* 17.

¹⁸⁴ 1.334: Πέλλη μὲν γὰρ οὐδεὶς ἂν φιλοτιμοῖτο πατρίδι οὐδὲ Αἰγαῖς, Ἀθηναῖος δὲ οὐδεὶς ἔστιν Ἑλλήνων ὅστις οὐκ ἂν εὖξαιτο μᾶλλον ἢ τῆς ὑπαρχούσης πόλεως πολίτης γεγονέναι.

¹⁸⁵ On the Olympieion, see esp. Wycherley 1964; Willers 1990, 26–53; Tölle-Kastenbein 1994; Boatwright 2000, 150–153. Completing this massive temple could be considered reuse of a sort; further study from this perspective may be revealing. On the Arch of Hadrian, see Zahrnt 1979; Adams 1989; Willers 1990, 68–92; *IG II²* 5185.

¹⁸⁶ See Oliver 1981, 419.

remained the essential civic foundation in the minds of Athenians five centuries later. Hadrian as new founder was placed firmly within that democratic tradition. Hadrianic benefactions in Athens included a massive library complex, continuing the emphasis on culture and education in the city begun centuries earlier and promoted recently in the Library of Pantainos, built on the east side of the Agora in the Trajanic period.¹⁸⁷

The impact of Hadrian on Athens is hard to overstate, as summed up by Oliver: “it is not too much to say that morally and intellectually Athens became a second capital of the empire.”¹⁸⁸ It is worth returning to Pausanias again here, as a nearly contemporary witness of the Hadrianic period in Athens and Greece. Pausanias frequently mentions works of Hadrian, “in my own day” *vel sim.*, but with revealing nuances. He often discusses Hadrianic monuments that are closely integrated with more ancient ones, while sometimes omitting mention of known Hadrianic monuments that were not so integrated with older ones.¹⁸⁹ This reveals a way of looking at the world in which the past is present and important, and demonstrates that Hadrian’s projects frequently encouraged such a view.

Herodes Atticus and Athens

Judging solely from the remains of his benefactions in Greece and Athens, we might think the Athenians enjoyed a similarly happy relationship with Herodes Atticus as they had had with Hadrian. This enormously wealthy native son and sophist *par excellence* came to the fore in

¹⁸⁷ On the Library of Hadrian, see esp. Willers 1990, 14–21; Karivieri 1994a, 89–105; Spetsieri-Choremi 1995; Boatwright 2000, 153–157; Choremi-Spetsieri and Tigginaga 2008; Tigginaga 2008. On the Library of Pantainos, see Parsons 1949; Travlos 1971, 432–435; Thompson and Wycherley 1972, 114–116; Oliver 1979.

¹⁸⁸ 1981, 419.

¹⁸⁹ See Bowie 1996, 221–226.

Athens after his father Atticus died in the same year as Hadrian, 138 CE.¹⁹⁰ Thanks to literary and epigraphic evidence, however, particularly Philostratus' *Life*, we get a more nuanced view of the complicated and conflicted relationship between benefactor and Athenians, elite and non-elite.

The trouble began early, with Herodes' contestation of Atticus' will, which had left to each Athenian one *mina* per year. Herodes' wheelings and dealings resulted in a new Panathenaic stadium all in marble, paid for by money most Athenians apparently would have preferred to have in their own pockets.¹⁹¹ Herodes continued to come into conflict with the Athenians in the next decades, as he moved in imperial circles in Rome, held the imperial priesthood in Athens, and built lavishly on the model of Hadrian—most impressively perhaps in the grand odeion on the southwest slope of the Acropolis.¹⁹² His benefactions never successfully won over or mollified the Athenians, who ultimately charged him with “acting like a tyrant.” Which specific actions this behavior entailed is nowhere spelled out, but the vast trove of Athenian antiquities—including the famous “Marathon Stone” that probably originally adorned the Athenian battlefield *polyandron*—found in Herodes' villa at Loukou in the Peloponnesus essentially represents systematic looting of Athenian cultural heritage, and very likely contributed to the charge.¹⁹³

Given the now incredibly long-standing aversion to tyrants built up in Athenian social

¹⁹⁰ On Herodes and Athens, see esp. Tobin 1997; Galli 2002, 12–57. On Herodes' life generally, see also Ameling 1983.

¹⁹¹ On the contestation of Atticus' will, see Tobin 1997, 27–30; Philostr. *VS* 2.549. On the new marble stadium, see Tobin 1997, 162–185; Galli 2002, 12–28.

¹⁹² On the Odeion of Herodes Atticus, built in honor of his wife Regilla after Herodes was acquitted of blame for her death (see Pomeroy 2007), see esp. Tobin 1997, 185–194; Galli 2002, 32–57; Korres 2014.

¹⁹³ On the Marathon Stone and other looted material at the villa at Loukou, see esp. Steinhauer 2004–2009; *SEG* LVI 430; Tentori Montalto in Galli 2014, 294–297. On the ancient material at the Loukou villa, see Tobin 1997, 333–354; Spyropoulos 2001; Galli 2002, 174–176.

memory, we should not be surprised that this was a very serious charge. It was so serious, in fact, that Herodes, by then in his late 70s, traveled through winter to defend himself in front of his friend and former student, Marcus Aurelius, while he was encamped with the Roman army at Sirmium near modern Belgrade.¹⁹⁴ The emperor's interventions led to Herodes' voluntary exile in Epirus and his return to Athens a year later after a letter from Marcus explicitly asked the Athenians to forgive Herodes because of his past benefactions. The reconciliation seems to have only gone so far; statues Herodes set up increasingly included curses to ward off vandals, and his own tombstone too suffered defacement, as J. Tobin and J. Rife have illuminated.¹⁹⁵

The charge of acting like a tyrant and the larger relationship between Herodes and Athens is important in showing how strong the civic self-conception as a democracy remained in 2nd-century Athens. It also reveals that Athenians felt and exercised considerable autonomy in controlling civic affairs, and did so with a consciousness of their long remembered past. Herodes modeled himself on Hadrian, thought himself the equal of Marcus Aurelius and Lucius Verus, and was responsible for building projects on par with imperial ones. Yet, Herodes was not an emperor, and equating himself to one only made him look like a tyrant to his fellow Athenians. In Hadrian and Herodes we thus have two similar yet contrasting images of Second Sophistic benefactors, one of whom successfully built on existing Athenian social memory to create a new but grounded present, while the other's relationship with the Athenian past was of a more predatory nature.¹⁹⁶

¹⁹⁴ Philostr. *V S* 2.560–562; Tobin 1997, 1–4, 285–287.

¹⁹⁵ 1997, 182, 294. On the curse inscriptions, see Tobin 1997, Ch. 3, pp. 113–160. On the erasure of Herodes' name from his epitaph, see Tobin 1997, 182, 294; Rife 2008, esp. 112–122.

¹⁹⁶ As Tobin discusses (1997, 292–293), it is intriguing that although Herodes consciously emulated Hadrian, ancient authors often compared him with Nero, and never with Hadrian.

The Late Imperial Period

Athens' place as the empire's cultural capital would endure well into the Late Imperial period and indeed through the 5th century CE. Just as Athenian engagement with the past did not begin with the Second Sophistic, it did not end there either. We have already seen in Chapter 2 how the Herulian Sack of 267 CE interrupted only rather briefly a civic life that was rich with long established institutions, rituals, and cultural and educational traditions. The traditional civic magistracies continued to be important, and institutions like the Panathenaia, Eleusinian mysteries, the *ephebeia*, and especially the philosophical schools flourished.¹⁹⁷ Economic recovery was achieved in most sectors after Dexippus and his band drove away the Heruli, and we saw in the Post-Herulian Wall investigated in Chapter 2 one significant example of the memory work involved in the recovery. As the wall-builders were compared with legendary heroes and commemorated with honorific statues, again the present was set in a direct line with the remembered past of the city—visible in the monumental landscape thanks to earlier upcycling like the North Acropolis Wall—with a view toward the city's future.

The philosophical schools played a huge role in drawing visitors to Athens, and significant building projects in the 4th and 5th centuries speak to a vibrant civic life involving active engagement with the past, not only intellectually but also materially. Villas were built on the north slope of the Areopagus in the second half of the 4th century, and may have been connected with the schools.¹⁹⁸ Some building activity of the mid-4th century, including a repair

¹⁹⁷ See above, Chapter 2, nn. 49–50.

¹⁹⁸ On the villas on the slope of the Areopagus, see Frantz 1988, 37–42, 44–48; Camp 1989; Fowden 1990, 495–496; on the similar but larger “House of Proclus” on the south slope of the Acropolis, see Frantz 1988, 42–44; Karivieri 1994b; Fowden 1995, 564–565. See also Anghel 2012 for the statue collections found in association with these houses. On the schools and their teachers, see esp. Vatsend 1994, 367–378; Bowersock 2006; Watts 2006, Ch. 4, 79–110.

of the Parthenon, is possibly attributable to the emperor Julian, as part of an effort of pagan revival. The state of the evidence prevents certainty, but the city's status as the cultural center of pagan Hellenism makes Julian's involvement in such projects a plausible suggestion.¹⁹⁹ Either way, Christianity was, relatively speaking, very slow to take hold in Athens.

Another barbarian raid, this time by Alaric and the Goths at the very end of the 4th century, seems to have brought significant physical damage.²⁰⁰ Again though, the archaeological evidence suggests recovery, rebuilding, and the continued flourishing of the philosophical schools, which would not close until Justinian ordered them to do so in 529.²⁰¹ The early 5th-century building boom may have included a project of upcycling in the so-called "Palace of the Giants"—essentially a major renovation of the Odeion of Agrippa in the Agora. Very little is known about the function, patronage, or social context of this structure, so it is hard to say more at this point about the reuse and any possible intended meanings. But the structure does seem to respect the site of the Temple of Ares, which may indeed be a significant choice.²⁰² Another major project likely dating to the early 5th century is the addition of the Tetraconch Church within the Library of Hadrian. This intriguing but little understood structure, perhaps associated with the Athenian-born Empress Eudocia and her husband Theodosius II, may have replaced a

¹⁹⁹ On the repair of the Parthenon, see esp. Travlos 1973 and Frantz 1979.

²⁰⁰ Alaric's actions in Athens and the rest of Greece have been much discussed, and it remains a matter of debate how much of the destruction noted archaeologically at the end of the 4th century is directly attributable to him and his army; see esp. Frantz 1988, 49–56; Brown 2011, 88–96.

²⁰¹ On Athens in the century after Alaric, see esp. Frantz 1988, 57–82; Bazzechi 2013 and 2014. On Justinian's closing of the schools, see esp. Hällström 1994; Fowden 1995, 565–567; Watts 2006, Ch. 5, 111–142.

²⁰² On the Palace of the Giants, see esp. Thompson in Frantz 1988, 95–116; Sironen 1990 and 1994, 52–54; Fowden 1990, 497–498; Pagano 1993; Baldini Lippolis 2003.

shrine of the imperial cult, and may have been the first Cathedral of Athens.²⁰³

Here, with the arrival of Christianity in Athens, we are closer perhaps to the prevailing situation of the Byzantine centuries that would follow, and therefore at a suitable place to end this overview of Athenian social memory.²⁰⁴ For a variety of reasons articulated best and most recently by S. Altekamp, architectural reuse became much more prevalent throughout the Mediterranean world in Late Antiquity than it had been previously. Due to a combination of the monumentality in durable materials and the modularity of earlier Greco-Roman architecture, Altekamp argues, reuse was not only economically pragmatic in later centuries but also was an efficient way to deal with old abandoned structures that were dangerous or would otherwise mar the *kosmos* of a city.²⁰⁵ Some of this later reuse was surely intentionally meaningful upcycling, employed in memory projects like those examined here. But often in these later cases we are missing key contextual information, including chronology, that is necessary for further interpretation. The cultural shift to Christianity complicates the picture; while cultural continuity is certainly not a prerequisite for upcycling, such a profound shift does open up new interpretive possibilities and valences, such as reuse as *interpretatio Christiana*, as triumphalism, or as exorcism.²⁰⁶

²⁰³ See Fowden 1990, 498–499; Karivieri 1994a, 105–113; Castrén 1999, 218–219. Fowden in particular connects both the Palace of the Giants and the Tetraconch church to Eudocia, and promoted the suggestion (1995, 559–562) that the church was Athens’ first Cathedral. On Eudocia and Athens, see esp. Burman 1994.

²⁰⁴ On the transition from paganism to Christianity in Athens, including the conversion of temples to churches, see Frantz 1965; Fowden 1990; Baldini Lippolis 1995, 182–189; Castrén 1999; Živkov 2003 (who sees conversion as deliberate preservation); Baldini 2014; Cosentino 2014. On the continued civic importance of Athens in the Early Medieval period, see Zavagno 2009, Ch. 2, 33–60.

²⁰⁵ 2013.

²⁰⁶ See Davis 2007, 248 for the point that cultural continuity, real or imagined, is not a necessary prerequisite for reuse to be imbued with meaning. On possible interpretations of reuse in Christian churches, see esp. Hansen 2003 and 2013.

Still, upcycling as an approach to reuse should prove helpful in future work on the Late Antique and Medieval periods too. Several recent studies have taken a similar approach, reinvestigating instances of reuse where the visibility of reused material was clearly considered, suggesting thoughtful intentionality at work. These studies show the great potential of thorough and contextualized re-evaluations of reuse and its implications for social memory. They include B. Kiilerich's study of the Little Metropolis in Athens, which concludes that after the Ottoman occupation of Athens in 1456, the *spolia*-filled church was built as "a monument to Athens and the Orthodox faith in the form of a church that displayed tangible physical evidence of Athens' Byzantine and antique culture."²⁰⁷ Another example is G. Sanders' investigation of the church at Merbaka in the Argolid, where Sanders concludes that the church's patron, William of Moerbeke—Archbishop of Corinth and an accomplished Classical scholar of the late 13th century—carefully chose and arranged various *spolia* in order to express specific political and personal statements.²⁰⁸

Intentionally meaningful reuse in later periods was not undertaken only through Classical remains, though, as W. Caraher has established in investigating the reuse of material from Early Christian basilicas in Greece. Caraher suggests that the reuse of such material in new churches may have been intended to create links of continuity between new structures and their predecessors.²⁰⁹ Furthermore, as Frey and H. Dey have skillfully shown, it was not only in churches that reuse was undertaken with thoughtful intentionality in Late Antiquity and beyond, but also in fortification walls, traditionally dismissed as utilitarian structures built in haste but in

²⁰⁷ Kiilerich 2005, 111.

²⁰⁸ Sanders 2015.

²⁰⁹ Caraher 2010.

fact large-scale communal efforts with great symbolic importance for their communities.²¹⁰

Conclusions

Through the case studies investigated above and through the bird's-eye-view glance at Athenian social memory from the Late Archaic period through Late Antiquity presented in this chapter, upcycling emerges as a useful tool within a strategy of anchoring or reorienting the present in relation to the past, with a view toward the future. As such a tool, upcycling is not only powerful but also flexible, as the range of Athenian examples has shown. Attention to the “visibility of the trace”—that is, to preserving knowledge of the act of reuse and of the past life of the reused material—allowed Athenians to produce various effects on the community's shared self-understanding. Reuse that accentuated materials in secondary contexts worked to actively construct shared memories, as in the commemoration of the Herulian sack through the thoughtful use of damaged material in Post-Herulian Wall. Reuse that aimed to preserve existing materials or monuments, as in the continual reuse and preservation of the Mycenaean bastion in the Sanctuary of Athena Nike, served to perpetuate collective notions of the past and its role in the present. Reuse was also sometimes undertaken in a more understated manner, carefully executed so as to be nearly invisible. Efforts like the remodeling of the Monument of the Eponymous Heroes brought about subtle changes to existing social memory, modifying long-standing notions to reflect current circumstances. The flexibility of upcycling as a tool is also indicated by the differing scales and types of monuments involved in such efforts of reuse at Athens. Upcycling affected shared memories of everything from major pivotal events like the Persian Wars, to key

²¹⁰ Frey 2016; Dey 2012.

civic institutions like the tribe system of the democracy, to individuals like the recipients of reused portrait statues.

Upcycling is thus an important piece of the larger jigsaw puzzle of Athenian social memory. It was often employed in conjunction with memory work in other spheres, helping to create a broad network of associations alongside civic festivals and religious rituals, annual funeral orations and other public oratory, and various visual expressions ranging from the iconography of temple sculpture, to public inscriptions, to vase painting. We see this combined effort of memory construction particularly clearly in the mid-5th century BCE, when the successful outcome of the Persian Wars and Athens' new-found hegemony over an empire put the community on an uncharted course. Actively constructing an analogous past and present in several modes, Athenians shaped and employed memories of the recent Persian Wars through efforts of upcycling like building ruined temple material into the North Acropolis Wall, redisplaying a few of the burnt dedications left lying on the Acropolis, and continuing to use their chief civic temple of Athena Polias in its semi-ruined state.

This concerted and multi-faceted effort of the mid-5th century, successful in establishing a traditional foundation for grand contemporary political and cultural achievements, would provide a precedent for later generations of Athenians. The decades after the Persian Wars marked the beginning of Athenians' active engagement with the past and the development of a deep sense of the importance of their city's history to its present. Similar coordinated efforts would be undertaken in the following centuries, especially in other periods of profound transformation marked by uncertainty about the future. In the Lykourgan period of the 4th century and the Early Roman period of the late 1st century BCE, Athenians worked hard to

reorient the contemporary trajectory of the city on the basis of particular aspects and achievements of its luminous past. In the face of newly ascendant Macedonians and then Romans, Athenians looked to their past for inspiration, strength, and strategies, combining innovation with emulation in various cultural spheres including architecture and monuments. Efforts of the Lykourgan period were crucial in firmly solidifying the central place of democracy within civic identity, while memory work of the Early Roman period largely focused on reasserting civic autonomy through measures like the transplantation of the Temple of Ares and the upcycling of ancient statue monuments as honorific portraits, which demonstrated that Athenian civic bodies exercised effective control over Athenian cultural heritage as a useful resource.

In the Imperial period, the central position of Athens within the cultural sphere of the Second Sophistic reflected the overall success of centuries worth of memory efforts. The characteristic retrospection of the period in the Greek world, the effort of using the past to construct and reconstruct the present, was by now a long-established strategy in Athens. As a metropolis for education and the headquarters of the Panhellenion, Athens profited from a now widely shared view of the importance of its own past, particularly its cultural and political achievements in the 5th century BCE, which Athenians themselves had celebrated and utilized since the 5th century itself. The city's citizens over time had created a rich, deep, and dynamic well of social memory, and upcycling was one key method of construction, literally and figuratively. While by no means exclusive to ancient Athens, upcycling of various types of objects and materials proved an efficacious strategy for influencing the shared understanding of past, present, and future in a city so rich in marble, monuments, and memory.

In this project I have employed an “extra turn of the kaleidoscope” in bringing archaeological, literary, and historical evidence to bear on disparate examples of reuse in ancient Athens, illuminating the various ways Athenians of several periods of antiquity purposefully reused stone artifacts, objects, and buildings in order to shape their own and their descendants’ collective ideas about their community’s past and its bearing on the present and future. In establishing upcycling as a distinct phenomenon of intentionally meaningful reuse, I have offered a process- and agency-focused alternative to the traditional discourses on *spolia* and reuse, and have identified a crucial component within the overall “work of memory” within a community. Through this interdisciplinary approach to Classical Archaeology I have identified a vital practice through which Athenians shaped social memory in the physical realm, literally building their history into their city.

Epilogue

In the evening hours of Sunday, July 5, 2015, thousands of Athenians young and old gathered in Syntagma Square, in front of the Greek Parliament building, to celebrate that day's resounding rejection of a bailout plan offered to Greece by the European "troika" of financial institutions in an unprecedented public referendum. Sixty-one percent of Greeks, and a majority in every region, had voted 'OXI ("NO").¹ The vote had huge practical political significance, since European leaders—Germans in particular—had campaigned hard for a "YES" vote and threatened grave consequences for a "NO" vote, including Greece's exit from the Eurozone of common currency.² But the vote had perhaps even greater symbolic significance for Greeks. Many drew a direct parallel between this vote to say *όχι* to German politicians and the famous *όχι* celebrated each year on October 28 ("Ochi Day"), the date when in 1940 Greek prime minister Ioannis Metaxas rejected Mussolini's ultimatum demanding occupation of Greece as a means of impressing Hitler.³

As they connected their collective, democratic action that day with a moment of great pride from their past, these celebrating Athenians did so in the presence of a symbol of an even more distant Greek rejection of foreign domination. Though few of the Athenians that night may have paid it much attention, the long and austere Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, stretching

¹ "Final results of the July 5th, 2015 referendum," Greek Ministry of the Interior. <<http://www.referendum2015.gov.gr/en/news/ellinika-telika-apotelesmata-dimopsifismatos-5is-iouliou-2015/>> Accessed 02 Mar. 2016.

² See, e.g., "Europe's big guns warn Greek voters that a no vote means euro exit," *The Guardian*, 29 June 2015. <<http://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/jun/29/greek-crisis-referendum-eurozone-vote-germany-france-italy>> Accessed 02 Mar. 2016.

³ Metaxas' *όχι* that day led to a devastating German occupation of Greece, the atrocities of which were increasingly in the news in 2015 as many Greeks renewed the call for war reparations. On the role of antiquity in the ideology of the Metaxas dictatorship, see Hamilakis 2007, Ch. 5, 169–204.

between the square and the Parliament building and constantly attended by traditional *Evzones* guards, presented several citations of Classical antiquity, including fictive column drums set in the wall in direct evocation of the Persian-damaged drums made memorial in the North Acropolis Wall in the 470s BCE.

No examination of Athenian social memory over the *longue durée* could be complete without mention of the extremely effortful memory projects of the modern period in Greece, in which the events and remains of the Classical past have figured hugely, and been re-employed both materially and conceptually. Y. Hamilakis is a leader in the study of modern Greek social memory, particularly as it involves the physical remains of antiquity. He and others have documented the profound shift in attitude that took place during the period of the Greek struggle for independence from the Ottoman Empire in the early 19th century.⁴ Where previously the prevailing attitude toward antiquities was marked by fear and a sense of cultural distance, the War of Independence was accompanied by a concerted effort on the part of contemporary Greeks to reclaim the Greek past as their own heritage, aided by the Enlightenment ideals of European philhellenes like Lord Byron.⁵ The war against the Ottomans was conceived as a continuation of the Greek struggle against barbarians in the Persian Wars.⁶ Antiquities and the past were increasingly seen as “symbolic capital,” and projects of resurrecting the Classical past and asserting control over its remains proliferated.⁷

⁴ On issues of memory, antiquity, and antiquities in modern Greece, see esp. Yalouri 2001; Hamilakis 2007; Loukaki 2008.

⁵ See Hamilakis 1999, esp. 306–307; 2003, esp. 59–66. On the period surrounding the Greek War of Independence, see esp. Hamilakis 2007, Ch. 3, 57–123.

⁶ Hamilakis 2001, 6.

⁷ Hamilakis and Yalouri 1996, 121.

One prime example of such projects is of course the first Acropolis restorations, which began almost immediately upon Greek independence and proceeded quickly.⁸ The Acropolis was “restored” to its 5th-century state, and the Parthenon lost nearly all signs of its lives as a Christian church, Venetian powder depot, and Ottoman mosque.⁹ These projects resurrecting certain memories also thus involved much forgetting, through the destruction of the remains of many interesting centuries, which modern scholars increasingly regret.¹⁰ Another intriguing example of similar elision is the trend of towns and villages throughout Greece “reverting” to Classical toponyms, where there may or may not have been any actual topographical continuity.¹¹ Later in the modern period, interest in the Byzantine past grew as the *Megali Idea* conceived a recreation of the Byzantine Empire through reconquest of the disintegrating Ottoman Empire.¹² Antiquities were used as proof of cultural continuity, and assertions of control and ownership of the remains of the past grew more vociferous. “Missing” antiquities like the Elgin marbles in the British Museum took on new meaning, starting an international debate that still rages.¹³

Suffice it to say that the period of the modern Greek state has been another significant period of transformation, met by concerted efforts of memory construction through which the past came to have great bearing on the present and future trajectory of the nation. In their use and

⁸ On the history of the Acropolis restorations, see esp. Mallouchou-Tufano 1994 and 2007.

⁹ Subtle signs of these other lives do remain, for example the mutilation of the heads on the frieze, carried out when the building was converted to a church; see Pollini 2007.

¹⁰ See Nixon 2012, 209 on forgetting and the Parthenon restoration.

¹¹ On the adoption of ancient toponyms and emblems, see esp. Alexandri 2002.

¹² See Davis 2007, 239–245.

¹³ On the evolution of the Elgin marbles debate, see esp. Hamilakis 1999 and 2007, Ch. 7, 243–286.

reuse of the ideas, materials, and monuments of the Classical past in innovative juxtapositions of old and new, the memory projects of this period greatly resemble those of other important moments of profound change in Athens, especially in the mid-5th century BCE under the leadership of Pericles, in the later 4th century BCE under Lykourgos, and in the late 1st century BCE after the rise of Augustus.

The Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and its surrounding monument serves as a poignant case in point. Although in some ways akin to the collective tombs of war dead on the ancient *demosion sema*, it was really a new sort of monument, part of a trend of such monuments in the European capitals in the 1920s—though where other countries’ monuments honored the casualties of World War I, the Greek monument commemorated those fallen in struggles of territorial expansion in attempted fulfillment of the *Megali Idea*.¹⁴ Contention over its design delayed its completion until 1932, reminding us once again of the sort of decision-making process we should imagine behind the ultimate appearance of ancient memorials too. As eventually constructed, the monument includes several and various citations of Classical antiquity, including excerpts from Thucydides’ Periclean funeral oration engraved in bronze, an imitation of a 5th-century relief from Aegina depicting a fallen hoplite, and bronze hoplite shields whose decorative devices use Classical, Byzantine, and modern symbols. A low marble retaining wall displays the names of battles ranging from the Greco-Turkish War of 1897 to the campaign against Turkey in Cyprus in 1974, with “strangely barbarian names of many modern battlefields...awkwardly rendered in the Greek alphabet.”¹⁵

¹⁴ On this monument see esp. Davis 2007, 240–245. On the European Tombs of the Unknown Soldier, see Mosse 1990, 94–98.

¹⁵ Davis 2007, 245.

At both ends of the long marble wall, a row of roughly finished fictive column drums deliberately evokes the unfinished and burnt column drums of the Older Parthenon immured in the North Acropolis Wall. Just as it had in the 3rd century CE when Athenians sought a way forward after the Herulian sack, the memorial message of the North Acropolis Wall—achieved through upcycling—could still resonate and find influence a millennium and a half later. Once more the idea of temple architecture within a wall works to commemorate battles of Greeks against barbarians and to anchor a contemporary monument, and more importantly a contemporary community, to a deep cultural past. The North Acropolis Wall continues to serve modern Athenians as a backdrop and model for active engagement with the past in the face of new challenges for the future.

Bibliography

- Accame, S. 1946. *Il dominio romano in Grecia dalla guerra acaica ad Augusto*. Rome: A. Signorelli.
- Adams, A. 1989. "The Arch of Hadrian at Athens." In *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium*, edited by S. Walker and A. Cameron, 10–16. *BICS Suppl.* 55. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Alcherms, J. 1994. "Spolia in Roman Cities of the Late Empire: Legislative Rationales and Architectural Reuse." *DOP* 48:167–178.
- Alcock, S. E. 1993. *Graecia Capta: The Landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 1996. "Landscapes of Memory and the Authority of Pausanias." In *Pausanias Historien*, edited by D. Musti et al., 241–267. *EntrHardt* XLI. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.
- . 1997. "The Problem of Romanization, the Power of Athens." In *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*, edited by M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, 1–7. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . 2001a. "The Reconfiguration of Memory in the Eastern Roman Empire." In *Empires: Perspectives from Archaeology and History*, edited by S. E. Alcock et al., 323–350. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2001b. "Remembering the Emperor in a Tholos: 'A Wonder Second to None.'" *AJA* 105(2):266 (abstract).
- . 2002. *Archaeologies of the Greek Past: Landscape, Monuments, and Memories*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2012. "Spare Values: The Decision Not to Destroy." In *The Construction of Value in the Ancient World*, edited by J. K. Papadopoulos and G. Urton. *Cotsen Advanced Seminar Series* 4. Los Angeles: Cotsen Institute of Archaeology Press.
- Alcock, S. E., and J. F. Cherry. 2006. "'No Greater Marvel': A Bronze Age Classic at Orchomenos." In *Classical Pasts: The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome*, edited by J. I. Porter, 69–86. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Aldrich, M. B., and R. J. Wallis, eds. 2009. *Antiquaries & Archaists: The Past in the Past, the Past in the Present*. Reading: Spire Books.

- Aleshire, S. B., and S. D. Lambert. 2003. "Making the *Peplos* for Athena: A New Edition of *IG II² 1060 + IG II² 1036*." *ZPE* 142:65–86.
- . 2011. "The Attic *gene* and the Athenian Religious Reform of 21 BC." In *Priests and State in the Roman World*, edited by J. H. Richardson and F. Santangelo, 553–575. Potsdamer altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 33. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Alexandri, A. 2002. "Names and Emblems: Greek Archaeology, Regional Identities and National Narratives at the Turn of the 20th Century." *Antiquity* 76:191–199.
- Algazi, G. 2014. "Forget Memory: Some Critical Remarks on Memory, Forgetting and History." In *Damnatio in memoria: Deformation und Gegenkonstruktionen in der Geschichte*, edited by S. Scholz, G. Schwedler, and K.-M. Sprenger, 25–34. Zürcher Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft 4. Cologne: Böhlau.
- Aliferi, S. 1992–1998. "Τὰ διεσπαρμένα μνημεῖα ὡς πηγὲς γιὰ τὴν καταστροφὴ τοῦ Δημοσίου Σήματος." *Horos* 10–12:183–203.
- Allamani-Souri, V. 2003. "The Imperial Cult." In *Roman Thessaloniki*, edited D. V. Grammenos, 98–119. Thessaloniki Archaeological Museum Publications 1. Thessaloniki: Thessaloniki Archaeological Museum.
- Altekamp, S. 2013. "Architectural Re-Use Processes in Late Antique North Africa: Prolegomena." In *Perspektiven der Spolienforschung I. Spolierung und Transposition*, edited by S. Altekamp, C. Marcks-Jacobs, and P. Seiler, 159–205. Topoi Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 15. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Altekamp, S., C. Marcks-Jacobs, and P. Seiler, eds. 2013. *Perspektiven der Spolienforschung I. Spolierung und Transposition*. Topoi Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 15. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- von Alten, G. 1878. "Die Thoranlagen bei Hagia Triada." *AM* 3:28–48.
- Amandry, P. 1967–1968. "Thémistocle a Méliè." In *Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδον* 4, 265–279. Archaeological Society at Athens Library 54. Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens.
- . 1998. "Le socle marathonien et le trésor des Athéniens." *BCH* 122(1):75–90.
- Amato, E. 1999. *Alle origini del Corpus Dioneum: per un riesame della tradizione manoscritta di Dione di Prusa attraverso le orazioni di Favorino*. Υπομνήματα 3. Salerno: Helios.
- Ameling, W. 1983. *Herodes Atticus*. 2 vols. Subsidia Epigraphica 11. Hildesheim: G. Olms.

- Andersen, Ø. 2008. “Palasstiden som polisens speil: Theseus og athenernes forestillinger om fortiden.” In *Fra palass til polis. Den greske verden mellom bronsealdersivilisasjoner og bystatskultur*, edited by J. W. Iddeng, 259–301. Skrifter utgitt av Det norske institutt i Athen 7. Oslo: Novus Forlag.
- Anderson, G. 2003. *The Athenian Experiment: Building an Imagined Political Community in Ancient Attica, 508–490 B.C.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
- Anghel, S. 2012. “Living with the Past: The City and Its Philosophers in Late Antique Athens.” *Zeitschrift für Religionswissenschaft* 20(1):94–119.
- Angiolillo, S. 1997. *Arte e cultura nell’Atene di Pisistrato e dei Pisistratidi. Ὁ ἐπὶ Κρόνου βίος.* Bari: Edipuglia.
- Antonaccio, C. M. 1994. “Contesting the Past: Hero Cult, Tomb Cult, and Greek Epic in Early Greece.” *AJA* 98(3):389–410.
- . 1995. *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece.* Greek Studies: Interdisciplinary Approaches. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Arafat, K. W. 1996. *Pausanias’ Greece: Ancient Artists and Roman Rulers.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Armstrong, D. 1987. “Gallienus in Athens, 264.” *ZPE* 70:235–258.
- von Arnim, H. 1898. *Leben und Werke des Dio von Prusa.* Berlin: Weidmann.
- Arrington, N. T. 2010. “Topographic Semantics: The Location of the Athenian Public Cemetery and Its Significance for the Nascent Democracy.” *Hesperia* 79(4):499–539.
- . 2015. *Ashes, Images, and Memories: The Presence of the War Dead in Fifth-Century Athens.* Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Arvanitis, I. 1997. “Die perikleische Akropolis und die Anfänge der ΣΚΗΝΟΓΡΑΦΙΑ.” In *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis: Internationales Symposium vom 7. bis 9. Juli 1995 in Berlin*, edited by W. Hoepfner, 195–208. Berlin: Archäologisches Seminar der Freien Universität Berlin.
- Arvanitopolous, A. S. 1908. “Η σημασία τῶν γραπτῶν στηλῶν τῶν Παγασῶν.” *ArchEph* (1908): cols. 1–60.
- . 1909. *Θεσσαλικά Μνημεῖα I. Αθανασάκειον Μουσείον Ἐν Βολῶ.* Athens: Estia.

- Assmann, A. 1999. *Erinnerungsräume: Formen und Wandlungen des kulturellen Gedächtnisses*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- . 2011. *Cultural Memory and Western Civilization: Functions, Media, Archives*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Assmann, J. 1988a. “Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität.” In *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, edited by J. Assmann and T. Hölscher, 9–19. suhrkamp taschenbuch, wissenschaft 724. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1988b. “Stein und Zeit. Das ‘monumentale’ Gedächtnis der altägyptischen Kultur.” In *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, edited by J. Assmann and T. Hölscher, 87–114. suhrkamp taschenbuch, wissenschaft 724. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1992. *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- . 1995. “Collective Memory and Cultural Identity.” *New German Critique* 65:125–133.
- . 1997. *Moses the Egyptian: The Memory of Egypt in Western Monotheism*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- . 2006. *Religion and Cultural Memory: Ten Studies*, translated by R. Livingstone. Cultural Memory in the Present. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford UP.
- . 2011. *Cultural Memory and Early Civilization: Writing, Remembrance, and Political Imagination*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Austin, C. 1968. *Nova fragmenta Euripidea in papyris reperta*. Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Übungen 187. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Austin, M. M. 2006. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. 2nd ed., augmented. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Badian, E. 1976. “Rome, Athens and Mithridates.” *AJAH* 1:105–128.
- Bailey, C. 2015. “‘Honor’ in Rhodes: Dio Chrysostom’s Thirty-First Oration.” *Illinois Classical Studies* 40(1):45–62.
- Balanos, N. 1956. “Η νέα ἀναστήλωσις τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς Νίκης (1935–1939).” *ArchEph* (1937) Γ:776–807.

- Baldassarri, P. 1998. ΣΕΒΑΣΤΟΙ ΣΩΤΗΡΙ: *Edilizia monumentale ad Atene durante il saeculum augustum*. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- . 2001. “Lo specchio del potere: Programmi edilizi ad Athene in età augustea.” In *Constructions publiques et programmes édilitaires en Grèce entre le IIe siècle av. J.-C. et le Ier siècle ap. J.-C. Actes du colloque organisé par l'École française d'Athènes et le CNRS, Athènes 14–17 Mai 1995*, edited by J.-Y. Marc and J.-C. Moretti, 401–425. *BCH Suppl.* 39. Athens: École française d'Athènes.
- Baldini, I. 2014. “Atene: la città cristiana.” In *Gli Ateniesi e il loro modello di città: Seminari di storia e archeologia greca I: Roma, 25–26 giugno 2012*, edited by L. M. Calì, E. Lippolis, and V. Parisi, 309–321. Thiasos Monografie 5. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- Baldini Lippolis, I. 1995. “La monumentalizzazione tardoantica di Atene.” *Ostraka* 4(1):169–190.
- . 2003. “Sistema palaziale ed edifici amministrativi in età protobizantina. Il settore settentrionale dell'Agora di Atene.” *Ocnus* 11:9–23.
- Barber, S., and M. Hale. 2013. “Enacting the Never-Was: Upcycling the Past, Present, and Future in Steampunk.” In *Steaming into a Victorian Future: A Steampunk Anthology*, edited by J. A. Taddeo and C. J. Miller, 165–183. Lanham, Md.: Scarecrow Press.
- Barbiera, I., A. M. Choyke, and J. Rasson, eds. 2009. *Materializing Memory*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Barringer, J. M. 2009. “A New Approach to the Hephaisteion: Heroic Models in the Athenian Agora.” In *Structure, Image, Ornament: Architectural Sculpture in the Greek World: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the American School of Classical Studies, 27–28 November 2004*, edited by P. Schultz and R. von den Hoff, 105–120. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Barry, W. D. 1993. “Aristocrats, Orators, and the ‘Mob’: Dio Chrysostom and the World of the Alexandrians.” *Historia* 41(1):82–103.
- Barstad, H. M., and P. Briant, eds. 2009. *The Past in the Past: Concepts of Past Reality in Ancient Near Eastern and Early Greek Thought*. Institute for Comparative Research in Human Culture Serie B 130. Oslo: Novus.
- Bates, W. N. 1901. “Notes on the Old Temple of Athena on the Acropolis.” *HSCP* 12:319–326.
- Bazzechi, E. 2013. “Athenian Identity in Late Antiquity: An Investigation of the Urban Elite and their Connection with the Monumental Aspect of the City.” In *SOMA 2012. Identity and*

- Connectivity: Proceedings of the 16th Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology, Florence, Italy, 1–3 March 2012*, Vol. 1, edited by L. Bombardieri et al., 467–474. BAR-IS 2581. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- . 2014. “I Ceramici in età tardoantica: sviluppo topografico e mutamenti funzionali.” In *Gli Ateniesi e il loro modello di città: Seminari di storia e archeologia greca I: Roma, 25–26 giugno 2012*, edited by L. M. Calì, E. Lippolis, and V. Parisi, 337–350. Thiasos Monografie 5. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- Bäbler, B. 2001. “Die archaischen attischen Grabstelen in der themistokleischen Stadtmauer.” *Philologus* 145(1): 3–15.
- Belvedresi, R. E., et al. 2014. “Book Review Symposium (Revs. and Response of Olick, Vinitzky-Seroussi, and Levy 2011, *The Collective Memory Reader*).” *Memory Studies* 7(1): 108–138.
- Benjamin, A. S. 1959. “The Altars of Hadrian in Athens and Hadrian’s Panhellenic Program.” *Hesperia* 32(1):57–86.
- Benjamin, A., and A. E. Raubitschek. 1959. “*Arae Augusti*.” *Hesperia* 28(1):65–85.
- Benoist, S., and A. Daguet-Gagey, eds. 2008. *Un discours en images de la condamnation de mémoire*. Centre régional universitaire lorrain d’histoire, Site de Metz 34. Metz: Centre régional universitaire lorrain d’histoire, Site de Metz.
- Bergemann, J. 2007. “Klassizismus West und Ost: Romanisierung und Tradition im Spiegel der klassischen Form.” In *Neronia VII: Rome, l’Italie et la Grèce. Hellénisme et philhellénisme au premier siècle après J.-C*, edited by Y. Perrin, 453–462. *CollLatomus* 305. Brussels: Latomus.
- Bergmann, M. 1977. *Studien zum römischen Porträt des 3. Jahrhunderts n. Chr.* Bonn: Habelt.
- Berliner, D. 2005. “The Abuses of Memory: Reflections on the Memory Boom in Anthropology.” *Anthropological Quarterly* 78(1):197–211.
- Best, J. 2015. “Roadside Assistance: Religious Spaces and Personal Experience in Athens.” In *Autopsy in Athens*, edited by M. M. Miles, 100–107. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Beulé, E. 1862. *L’Acropole d’Athènes*. Paris: Firmin Didot.
- Binder, W. 1969. *Der Roma-Augustus Monopteros auf der Akropolis in Athen und sein typologischer Ort*. Stuttgart: Paul J. LIG Photo-Offsetdruck.

- Blanck, H. 1969. *Wiederverwendung alter Statuen als Ehrendenkmäler bei Griechen und Römern*. Studia Archaeologica 11. Roma: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- Blinkenberg, C. 1941. *Lindos II. Inscriptions. Tome II*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Bloedow, E. F. 2005. "Aspects of Cimon's Cultural Legacy." In *Omni pede stare: Saggi architettonici e circumvesuviani in memoriam Jos De Waele*, edited by S. T. A. M. Mols and E. M. Moormann, 21–38. Studi della Soprintendenza archeologica di Pompei 9. Naples: Electa Napoli.
- Boardman, J. 2002. *The Archaeology of Nostalgia: How the Greeks Re-created Their Mythical Past*. London: Thames & Hudson.
- Boatwright, M. T. 2000. *Hadrian and the Cities of the Roman Empire*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Boedeker, D. 1998. "Presenting the Past in Fifth-Century Athens." In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, edited by D. Boedeker and K. A. Raaflaub, 185–202. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Boedeker, D., and K. A. Raaflaub, eds. 1998. *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- . 1998a. "Introduction." In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, edited by D. Boedeker and K. A. Raaflaub, 1–13. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- . 1998b. "Reflections and Conclusions: Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens." In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, edited by D. Boedeker and K. A. Raaflaub, 319–344. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Boedeker, D., and D. Sider, eds. 2001. *The New Simonides: Contexts of Praise and Desire*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Boegehold, A. L., et al. 1995. *The Lawcourts at Athens: Sites, Buildings, Equipment, Procedure, and Testimonia. Agora XXVIII*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Boersma, J. S. 1970. *Athenian Building Policy From 561/0–405/4*. Scripta Archaeologica Groningana 4. Groningen: Wolters-Noordhoff.
- Bommas, M. 2011. "Introduction." In *Cultural Memory and Identity in Ancient Societies*, edited by M. Bommas, 1–9. Cultural Memory and History in Antiquity. London: Continuum.

- Bommelaer, J.-F. 1991. *Guide de Delphes: le site*. Athens: Ecole française d'Athènes.
- Borg, B. E., ed. 2004. *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*. Millennium Studies 2. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2004. "Introduction." In *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, edited by B. E. Borg, 1–10. Millennium Studies 2. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2011. "Who Cared About Greek Identity? Athens in the First Century BCE." In *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and Their Past in the First Century BCE*, edited by T. A. Schmitz and N. Wiater, 213–234. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Borić, D. 2010. "Introduction: Memory, Archaeology, and the Historical Condition." In *Archaeology and Memory*, edited by D. Borić, 1–34. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Bosnakis, D. 2004. "Zwei Dichterinnen aus Kos. Ein neues inschriftliches Zeugnis über das öffentliche Auftreten von Frauen." In *The Hellenistic Polis of Kos: State, Economy and Culture*, edited by K. Höghammar, 99–108. Boreas 28. Uppsala: Department of Archaeology and Ancient History, Uppsala Univ.
- Bosworth, C. E. 1999. *The History of al-Ṭabarī. An Annotated Translation*. Vol. V: *The Sāsānids, the Byzantines, the Lakhmids, and Yemen*. New York: State Univ. of New York Press.
- Bouras, Ch. 1990. "Hellenistic Athens." In *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie, Berlin 1988*, 267–274. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- . 2010. *Βυζαντινή Αθήνα, 10ος – 12ος αι.* Athens: Benaki Museum.
- Bourguet, É. 1929. *Inscriptions de l'entrée du sanctuaire au trésor des Athéniens*. *FdD* III.1. Paris: De Boccard.
- Bourguet, M-N., L. Valensi, and N. Wachtel, eds. 1990. *Between Memory and History*. Chur, Switzerland: Harwood Academic Publishers.
- Bowersock, G. W. 1982. "No Senator from Cyprus." *Tituli* 5:669–670.
- . 1984. "Augustus and the East: The Problem of Succession." In *Caesar Augustus. Seven Aspects*, edited by F. Millar and E. Segal, 169–188. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2006. "The Great Teachers of Late Antique Athens." *Archaioignosia* 14:169–182.
- Bowie, E. L. 1996. "Past and Present in Pausanias." In *Pausanias Historien*, edited by D. Musti et al., 207–230. *EntrHardt* XLI. Geneva: Fondation Hardt.

- Böhme, C. 1995. *Princeps und Polis: Untersuchungen zur Herrschaftsform des Augustus über bedeutende Orte in Griechenland*. Quellen und Forschungen zur antiken Welt 17. Munich: Tuduv.
- Bradley, R. 1993. *Altering the Earth: The Origins of Monuments in Britain and Continental Europe*. Society of Antiquaries of Scotland Monograph Series 8. Edinburgh: Society of Antiquaries of Scotland.
- . 2000. *An Archaeology of Natural Places*. London: Routledge.
- Bradley, R., and H. Williams, eds. 1998. *The Past in the Past: Re-use of Ancient Monuments*. *WorldArch* 30(1).
- di Branco, M. 2004. “Entre Amphion et Achille: réalité et mythologie de la défense d’Athènes du IIIe au IVe siècle.” In *Roman Rule and Civic Life: Local and Regional Perspectives*, edited by M. Di Branco et al., 373–388. Impact of Empire (Roman Empire, c. 200 B.C – A.D. 476) 4. Amsterdam: J.C. Gieben.
- . 2006. *La città dei filosofi: Storia di Atene da Marco Aurelio a Giustiniano*. Florence: L.S. Olschki.
- Brandenburg, H. 2011. “The Use of Older Elements in the Architecture of Fourth- and Fifth-Century Rome: A Contribution to the Evaluation of *Spolia*.” In *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, edited by R. Brilliant and D. Kinney, 53–73. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Brandt, H. 1999. “Dexipp und die Geschichtsschreibung des 3. Jh. n.Chr.” In *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh. n.Chr.*, edited by M. Zimmermann, 169–181. *Historia Einzelschriften* 127. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Brenk, B. 1987. “Spolia from Constantine to Charlemagne: Aesthetics Versus Ideology.” *DOP* 41:103–109.
- . 1996. “Spolien und ihre Wirkung auf die Ästhetik der *varietas*. Zum Problem alterneirender Kapitelltypen.” In *Antike Spolien in der Architektur des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*, edited by J. Poeschke, 49–92. Munich: Hirmer.
- Brilliant, R. 1982. “I piedistalli del giardino di Boboli: spolia in se, spolia in re.” *Prospettiva* 31:2–17.
- Brilliant, R., and D. Kinney, eds. 2011. *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*. Farnham: Ashgate.

- Bringmann, K., and H. von Steuben, eds. 1995. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Brogan, T. M. 1999. "Hellenistic Nike: Monuments Commemorating Military Victories of the Attalid and Antigonid Kingdoms, the Aitolian League and the Rhodian Polis ca. 307 to 133 B.C." (diss. Bryn Mawr College).
- . 2003. "Liberation Honors: Athenian Monuments from Antigonid Victories in Their Immediate and Broader Contexts." In *The Macedonians in Athens, 322–229 B.C.: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001*, edited by O. Palagia and S. V. Tracy, 194–205. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Brouskari, M. S. 1974. *The Acropolis Museum. A Descriptive Catalogue*, translated by J. Binder. The Museums of Greece Second Ser. Athens: Commercial Bank of Greece.
- . 1999. *Το θωράκιο του Ναού της Αθηνάς Νίκης*. *ArchEph* 137 (1998). Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens.
- Brown, A. R. 2011. "Banditry or Catastrophy?: History, Archaeology, and Barbarian Raids on Roman Greece." In *Romans, Barbarians, and the Transformation of the Roman World: Cultural Interaction and the Creation of Identity in Late Antiquity*, edited by R. W. Mathisen and D. Shanzer, 79–96. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Brown, S. D. 2008. "The Quotation Marks Have a Certain Importance: Prospects for a 'Memory Studies.'" *Memory Studies* 1(3):261–271.
- Brun, P. 2005. "Lycurge d'Athènes: un législateur?" In *Le législateur et la loi dans l'Antiquité: hommage à Françoise Ruzé: actes du colloque de Caen, 15–17 mai 2003*, edited by P. Sineux, 187–200. Caen: Presses universitaires de Caen.
- Buchert, U. 2000. *Denkmalpflege im antiken Griechenland: Massnahmen zur Bewahrung historischer Bausubstanz*. New York: P. Lang.
- Bundgaard, J. A. 1957. *Mnesicles: A Greek Architect at Work*. Scandinavian University Books. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.
- . 1976. *Parthenon and the Mycenaean City on the Heights*. Copenhagen: National Museum of Denmark.
- Bundgaard, J. A., ed., G. Kawerau, and W. Dörpfeld. 1974. *The Excavation of the Athenian Acropolis 1882–1890: The Original Drawings*. Copenhagen: Gyldendal.

- Bungert, H. 2008. "Memory and Migration Studies." In *The Merits of Memory: Concepts, Contexts, Debates*, edited by H.-J. Grabbe and S. Schindler, 197–219. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Burden, J. C. 1999. "Athens Remade in the Age of Augustus: A Study of the Architects and Craftsmen at Work" (diss. Univ. of California, Berkeley).
- Burke, P. 1989. "History as Social Memory." In *Memory: History, Culture and the Mind*, edited by T. Butler, 97–113. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Burman, J. 1994. "The Athenian Empress Eudocia." In *Post-Herulian Athens: Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens, A.D. 267–529*, edited by P. Castrén, 63–87. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 1. Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö.
- Busolt, G. 1905. "Thukydides und der themistokleische Mauerbau." *Klio* 5:255–279.
- Büsing, H. 1970. "Vermutungen über die Akropolis in Athen." *MarbWPr* (1969):1–30.
- Byrne, S. G. 2003. *Roman Citizens of Athens*. Studia Hellenistica 40. Dudley, Mass.: Peeters.
- . 2010. "The Athenian *Damnatio Memoriae* of the Antigonids in 200 B.C." In *ΦΙΛΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ = Philathenaios: Studies in Honour of Michael J. Osborne*, edited by A. Tamis, C. J. Mackie, and S. G. Byrne, 157–177. Athens: Hellenike Epigraphike Hetaireia.
- Cadario, M. 2013. "La destruction délibérée des statues pour des raisons politiques dans le monde romain." In *Destruction: Archaeological, Philological and Historical Perspectives*, edited by J. Driessen, 415–433. Louvain-la-Neuve: UCL, Presses universitaires de Louvain.
- Calandra, E. 1996. *Oltre la Grecia: alle origini del filellenismo di Adriano*. Naples: Edizioni scientifiche italiane.
- Camp, J. McK., II. 1989. "The Philosophical Schools of Roman Athens." In *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium*, edited by S. Walker and A. Cameron, 50–55. *BICS Suppl.* 55. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- . 1996. "Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1994 and 1995." *Hesperia* 65(3):231–261.
- . 2001. *The Archaeology of Athens*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- . 2007. "Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 2002–2007." *Hesperia* 76(4):627–663.
- . 2010. *The Athenian Agora: Site Guide*. 5th ed. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

- . 2015. “Excavations in the Athenian Agora, 2008–2012.” *Hesperia* 84(3):467–513.
- Campbell, L. 1996. *Coventry Cathedral: Art and Architecture in Post-War Britain*. Clarendon Studies in the History of Art. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Canevaro, M., and E. Harris. 2012. “The Documents in Andocides’ *On the Mysteries*.” *CQ* 62(1): 98–129.
- Caraher, W. R. 2010. “Abandonment, Authority, and Religious Continuity in Post-Classical Greece.” *International Journal of Historical Archaeology* 14(2):241–254.
- Carroll, K. K. 1982. *The Parthenon Inscription*. Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Monographs 9. Durham, N.C.: Duke University.
- Carruthers, M. J. 1998. *The Craft of Thought: Meditation, Rhetoric, and the Making of Images, 400–1200*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Casevitz, M. 2004. “Remarques sur le sens de ὀρχαῖος et de παλαιός.” *Mètis* n.s. 2:125–136.
- Caskey, L. D. 1927. “The Inscriptions.” In *The Erechtheum*, edited by J. M. Paton, 277–422. Cambridge: Harvard UP.
- Casson, H. 1945. *Bombed Churches as War Memorials*. Surrey: The Architectural Press.
- Castrén, P. 1989. “The Post-Herulian Revival of Athens.” In *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium*, edited by S. Walker and A. Cameron, 45–49. *BICS* Suppl. 55. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- . 1990. “Post-Herulian Athens.” In *Greek and Latin Studies in Memory of Cajus Fabricius*, edited by S.-T. Teodorsson, 59–64. *Studia Graeca et Latina Gothoburgensia* 54. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- . 1994. “General Aspects of Life in Post-Herulian Athens.” In *Post-Herulian Athens: Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens, A.D. 267–529*, edited by P. Castrén, 1–14. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 1. Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö.
- . 1999. “Paganism and Christianity in Athens and Vicinity during the Fourth to Sixth Centuries A.D.” In *The Idea and Ideal of the Town between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages*, edited by G. P. Brogiolo and B. Ward-Perkins, 211–223. Leiden: Brill..
- Castriota, D. 1992. *Myth, Ethos, and Actuality: Official Art in Fifth-Century B.C. Athens*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.

- Cavanaugh, M. B. 1980. “Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion and Politics in the Second Half of the Fifth Century, B.C.” (diss. Cornell Univ).
- . 1996. *Eleusis and Athens: Documents in Finance, Religion and Politics in the Fifth Century B.C.* American Philological Association American Classical Studies 35. Atlanta: Scholars Press.
- Chaniotis, A. 2009. “Travelling Memories in the Hellenistic World.” In *Wandering Poets in Ancient Greek Culture: Travel, Locality and Panhellenism*, edited by R. Hunter and I. Rutherford, 249–269. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2012. “The Ritualized Commemoration of War in the Hellenistic City: Memory, Identity, Emotion.” In *Cultures of Commemoration: War Memorials, Ancient and Modern*, edited by P. Low, G. J. Oliver, and P. J. Rhodes, 41–62. Proceedings of the British Academy 160. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . 2014. “Mnemopoetik: Die epigraphische Konstruktion von Erinnerung in den griechischen Poleis.” In *Medien der Geschichte – Antikes Griechenland und Rom*, edited by O. Dally, et al., 132–169. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Chantry, M., ed. 1994. *Scholia in Aristophanem. Pars III. Scholia in Thesmophoriazusas; Ranas; Ecclesiazusas et Plutum. Fasc. IV^a. Scholia Vetera in Aristophanis Plutum.* Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Chapman, J. 2009. “Notes on Memory-Work and Materiality.” In *Materializing Memory*, edited by I. Barbiera, A. M. Choyke, and J. Rasson, 7–16. BAR IS 1977. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Childs, W. A. P. 1994. “The Date of the Old Temple of Athena on the Athenian Acropolis.” In *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy. Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years Since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4–6, 1992*, edited by W. D. E. Coulson et al., 1–6. Oxbow Monographs 37. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Choremi, A. 1985. “Ανασκαφικές εργάσιες. Υστερορωμαϊκό τείχος στο χώρο του Διογενείου.” *ArchDelt* 40, Chron.:6–9.
- Choremi-Spetsieri, A., and I. Tigginaga. 2008. “Η Βιβλιοθήκη του Αδριανού στην Αθήνα. Τα ανασκαφικά δεδομένα.” In *Η Αθήνα κατά τη ρωμαϊκή εποχή: Πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες έρευνες = Athens during the Roman Period: Recent Discoveries, New Evidence*, edited by S. Vlizos, 115–131. Benaki Museum Suppl. 4. Athens: Benaki Museum.
- Christ, M. R. 1990. “Liturgy Avoidance and *Antidosis* in Classical Athens.” *TAPA* 120:147–169.

- Christol, M. 1986. *Essai sur l'évolution des carrières sénatoriales dans la seconde moitié du IIIe siècle ap. J.C.* Paris: Nouvelles Editions Latines.
- Cigainero, J. 2014. "Upcycling Coins, Plastic Bags and Keys for Social Change." *The New York Times*, November 17, 2014. <http://www.nytimes.com/2014/11/18/style/international/lebanese-jewelry-brand-vanina-has-a-social-message.html?_r=0> Accessed 18 Feb. 2015.
- Clemens, L. 2003. *Tempore Romanorum constructa: Zur Nutzung und Wahrnehmung antiker Überreste nördlich der Alpen während des Mittelalters*. Monographien zur Geschichte des Mittelalters 50. Stuttgart: Anton Hiersemann.
- Climo, J. J., and M. G. Cattell, eds. 2002. *Meaning in Social Memory and History: Anthropological Perspectives*. Walnut Creek, Calif.: AltaMira Press.
- Clinton, M. 2001. *The Souterrains of Ireland*. Bray: Wordwell.
- Coates-Stephens, R. 2002. "Epigraphy as *Spolia* – the Reuse of Inscriptions in Early Medieval Buildings." *PBSR* 70:275–296.
- . 2003. "Attitudes to *Spolia* in Some Late Antique Texts." In *Theory and Practice in Late Antique Archaeology*, edited by L. Lavan and W. Bowden, 341–358. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2007. "The Reuse of Ancient Statuary in Late Antique Rome and the End of the Statue Habit." In *Statuen in der Spätantike*, edited by F. A. Bauer and C. Witschel, 171–187. *Spätantike – Frühes Christentum – Byzanz: Kunst im ersten Jahrtausend Studien und Perspektiven* 23. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Cohen, E. E. 2000. *The Athenian Nation*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Confino, A. 1997. "Collective Memory and Cultural History: Problems of Method." *AHR* 102(5): 1386–1403.
- . 2010. "Memory and the History of Mentalities." In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Nünning and A. Erll, 77–84. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Connelly, J. B. 2014. *The Parthenon Enigma: A Journey into Legend*. London: Head of Zeus.
- Connor, W. R. 1971. *The New Politicians of Fifth-Century Athens*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- . 1994. "The Problem of Athenian Civic Identity." In *Athenian Identity and Civic Ideology*, edited by A. L. Boegehold and A. C. Scafuro, 34–44. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

- Connerton, P. 1989. *How Societies Remember*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Cook, S. A. 1939. *CAH*, Vol. 12: *The Imperial Crisis and Recovery, A.D. 193–324*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Cooper, F. A. 1988. “The Tetrastylon in Greek Architecture.” *AJA* 92(2):280 (abstract).
- Cosentino, S. 2014. “Aspetti di storia sociale di Atene nel VI secolo d.C.” In *Gli Ateniesi e il loro modello di città: Seminari di storia e archeologia greca I: Roma, 25–26 giugno 2012*, edited by L. M. Calì, E. Lippolis, and V. Parisi, 351–364. Thiasos Monografie 5. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- Cosmopoulos, M. B., ed. 2004. *The Parthenon and its Sculptures*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2014. “Cult, Continuity, and Social Memory: Mycenaean Eleusis and the Transition to the Early Iron Age.” *AJA* 118(3):401–427.
- Crane, S. A. 1997. “Writing the Individual Back into Collective Memory.” *AHR* 102(5):1372–1385.
- Cubitt, G. 2007. *History and Memory*. Historical Approaches. Manchester: Manchester UP.
- Culley, G. R. 1975. “The Restoration of Sanctuaries in Attica: *IG*, II², 1035.” *Hesperia* 44(2): 207–223.
- . 1977. “The Restoration of Sanctuaries in Attica, II.” *Hesperia* 46(3):282–298.
- Curtius, E. 1890. “Sitzungsberichte der Archäolog. Gesellschaft zu Berlin.” *AA* 1890:161–164.
- . 1891. *Die Stadtgeschichte von Athen*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Cutler, A. 1999. “Use or Reuse? Theoretical and Practical Attitudes toward Objects in the Early Middle Ages.” In *Ideologie e pratiche del reimpiego nell’alto Medioevo: 16–21 aprile 1998*. Vol. 2, 1055–1083. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo 46. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull’alto Medioevo.
- Dally, O. 2008a. “Athen in der frühen Kaiserzeit – ein Werk des Kaisers Augustus?” In *Η Αθήνα κατά τη ρωμαϊκή εποχή: Πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες έρευνες = Athens during the Roman Period: Recent Discoveries, New Evidence*, edited by S. Vlizos, 43–53. Benaki Museum Suppl. 4. Athens: Benaki Museum.
- . 2008b. “Zwischen serieller Ausfertigung und ‘Kopie.’ Zur Bedeutung der Wiederholung von Inschriften im östlichen Mittelmeerraum zwischen dem 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr. und der

- römischen Kaiserzeit.” In *Original und Kopie: Formen und Konzepte der Nachahmung in der antiken Kunst. Akten des Kolloquiums in Berlin, 17.–19. Februar 2005*, edited by K. Junker and A. Stähli, 227–241. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- . 2009. “Spolien in Italien und dem östlichen Mittelmeerraum vor dem Beginn der römischen Kaiserzeit.” In *Spolien im Umkreis der Macht = Spolia en el entorno del poder. Akten der Tagung in Toledo vom 21. bis 22. September 2006*, edited by T. G. Schattner and F. Valdés Fernández, 45–57. *Iberia Archaeologica* 12. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Daux, G. 1965. “Deux stèles d’Acharnes.” In *Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδου* 1, 78–90. *Archaeological Society at Athens Library* 54. Athens: Archaeological Society of Athens.
- Davies, J. K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families, 600–300 B.C.* Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 1981. *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens.* New York: Arno Press.
- Davis, J. L. 2007. “Memory Groups and the State. Erasing the Past and Inscribing the Present in the Landscapes of the Mediterranean and Near East.” In *Negotiating the Past in the Past: Identity, Memory, and Landscape in Archaeological Research*, edited by N. Yoffee, 227–256. Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press.
- Davis, N. Z., and R. Starn. “Introduction.” *Representations* 26, *Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory*:1–6.
- Davison, C. C. 2009. *Pheidias. The Sculptures and Ancient Sources*, edited by G. B. Waywell. Vol. 1. *BICS Suppl.* 105-1. London: Institute of Classical Studies, School of Advanced Study, University of London.
- Deichmann, F. W. 1940. “Säule und Ordnung in der frühchristlichen Architeckture.” *RM* 55:114–130.
- . 1975. *Die Spolien in der spätantiken Architektur.* Bayerische Akademie der Wissenschaften, philosophisch-historische Klasse Sitzungsberichte Jahrgang 1975 Heft 6. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Delivorrias, A. 1974. *Attische Giebelskulpturen und Akrotere des fünften Jahrhunderts.* Tübingen: E. Wasmuth.
- Den Boer, P. 2010. “*Loci memoriae—Lieux de mémoire.*” In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning, 19–25. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Den Boer, P., et al., eds. 2011–2012. *Europäische Erinnerungsorte.* 3 vols. Munich: Oldenbourg.

- Dench, E. 2005. *Romulus' Asylum: Roman Identities from the Age of Alexander to the Age of Hadrian*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Despinis, G. 1971. Συμβολέ στή μελέτη του έργου του Αγορακρίτου. Athens: Ερμής.
- Dessingué, A. 2015. "From Collectivity to Collectiveness: Reflections (with Halbwachs and Bakhtin) on the Concept of Collective Memory." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Memory Studies*, edited by S. Kattago, 89–101. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Dey, H. 2012. "Spolia, Milestones and City Walls: The Politics of Imperial Legitimacy in Gaul." In *Patrons and Viewers in Late Antiquity*, edited by S. Birk and B. Poulsen, 291–310. Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Antiquity 10. Aarhus: Aarhus UP.
- Di Cesare, R. 2004. "La storia murata. Note sul significato del riutilizzo di materiali architettonici nel muro di cinta dell'acropoli di Atene." *NumAntCl* 33: 99–134.
- . 2014. "Cimone e l'immagine di Atene nel dopoguerra persiano." In *Gli Ateniesi e il loro modello di città: Seminari di storia e archeologia greca I: Roma, 25–26 giugno 2012*, edited by L. M. Caliò, E. Lippolis, and V. Parisi, 139–162. Thiasos Monografie 5. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- Dickins, G. 1912. *Catalogue of the Acropolis Museum*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Dinsmoor, W. B. 1910. "The Choragic Monument of Nicias." *AJA* 14(4):459–484.
- . 1920. "The Monument of Agrippa at Athens." *AJA* 24(1):83 (abstract).
- . 1926. "The Sculptured Parapet of Athena Nike." *AJA* 30(1):1–31.
- . 1932a. "The Burning of the Opisthodomos at Athens. I. The Date." *AJA* 36(2):143–172.
- . 1932b. "The Burning of the Opisthodomos at Athens. II. The Site." *AJA* 36(3):307–326.
- . 1940. "The Temple of Ares at Athens." *Hesperia* 9(1):1–52.
- . 1942. "The Correlation of Greek Archaeology with History." In *Studies in the History of Culture. The Disciplines of the Humanities*, 185–216. Menasha, Wis.: George Banta.
- . 1947. "The Hekatompedon on the Athenian Acropolis." *AJA* 51(2):109–151.
- Dinsmoor, W. B., Jr. 1974. "The Temple of Poseidon: A Missing Sima and Other Matters." *AJA* 78(3):211–238.

- . 1980. *The Propylaia to the Athenian Akropolis. 1: The Predecessors*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- . 1982. “Anchoring Two Floating Temples.” *Hesperia* 51(4):410–452.
- Dodge, H., and J. B. Ward-Perkins, eds. 1992. *Marble in Antiquity: Collected Papers of J.B. Ward-Perkins*. Archaeological Monographs of the British School at Rome 6. London: British School at Rome.
- Donderer, M. 1991–1992. “Irreversible Deponierung von Großplastik bei Griechen, Etruskern und Römern.” *ÖJhBeibl* 61: cols. 193–276.
- Dontas, G. 1988. “Some Remarks on the Statues of Riace Marina.” In *Πρακτικά του XII Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασικής Αρχαιολογίας, Αθήνα 4-10 Σεπτεμβρίου 1983*, 89–96. Athens: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.
- Doukellis, P. N. 2007. “Harian’s *Panhellenion*: A Network of Cities?” *Mediterranean Historical Review* 22(2):295–308.
- Dörpfeld, W. 1885a. “Das choregische Monument des Nikias.” *AM* 10:219–230.
- . 1885b. “Der alte Athena-Tempel auf der Akropolis zu Athen.” *AM* 10:275–277.
- . 1886a. “Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis.” *AM* 11: 337–350.
- . 1886b. *AntDenk* 1: pls. I–II.
- . 1887a. “Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis II.” *AM* 12:25–61.
- . 1887b. “Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis III.” *AM* 12:190–211.
- . 1890. “Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis IV.” *AM* 15:420–439.
- . 1897. “Der alte Athenatempel auf der Akropolis V.” *AM* 22:159–178.
- . 1911. “Zu den Bauwerken Athens.” *AM* 36:39–72.
- . 1919. “Das Hekatompedon in Athen.” *JdI* 34:1–40.
- . 1934. “Der Brand des alten Athena-Tempels und seines Opisthodomos.” *AJA* 38(2):249–257.
- Drerup, H. 1981. “Parthenon und Vorparthenon – zum Stand der Kontroverse.” *AntK* 24:21–38.

- Ducat, J. 1971. *Les Kouroi du Ptoion. Le sanctuaire d'Apollon Ptoieus a l'époque archaïque*. Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 219. Paris: De Boccard.
- Eiteljorg, H. 1993. *The Entrance to the Athenian Acropolis before Mnesicles*. Archaeological Institute of America Monographs 1. Dubuque: Kendall/Hunt.
- Ellegård, A. 1987. "Who Were the Eruli?" *Scandia* 53(1):5–34.
- Elsner, J. 2000. "From the Culture of *Spolia* to the Cult of Relics: The Arch of Constantine and the Genesis of Late Antique Forms." *PBSR* 68:149–184.
- Engels, D. 2014. "Polemon von Ilion. Antiquarische Periegesis und hellenistische Identitätssuche." In *Athen und/oder Alexandria? Aspekte von Identität und Ethnizität im hellenistischen Griechenland*, edited by K. Freitag and C. Michels, 65–97. Cologne: Böhlau.
- Engels, J. 1992. "Zur Stellung Lykurgs und zur Aussagekraft seines Militär- und Bauprogramms für die Demokratie vor 322 v. Chr." *Ancient Society* 23:5–29.
- , ed. 2008. *Lykurg: Rede gegen Leokrates*. Texte zur Forschung 93. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- . 2014. "Lykurgos' Speech *Against Leokrates*: Creating Civic Identity and Educating Athenian Citizens." In *Attitudes Towards the Past in Antiquity: Creating Identities*, edited by B. Alroth and C. Sheffer, 21–31. Stockholm Studies in Classical Archaeology 14. Stockholm: Stockholm Univ.
- Erll, A. 2010. "Cultural Memory Studies: An Introduction." In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning, 1–18. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Erll, A., and A. Nünning, eds. 2010. *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Esch, A. 1969. "Spolien: Zur Wiederverwendung antiker Baustücke und Skulpturen im mittelalterlichen Italien." *Archiv für Kulturgeschichte* 51:1–64.
- . *Wiederverwendung von Antike im Mittelalter: Die Sicht des Archäologen und die Sicht des Historikers*. Hans-Lietzmann-Vorlesungen 7. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2011. "On the Reuse of Antiquity: The Perspectives of the Archaeologist and of the Historian." In *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, edited by R. Brilliant and D. Kinney, 13–31. Farnham: Ashgate.

- “Europe’s Big Guns Warn Greek Voters That a No Vote Means Euro Exit,” *The Guardian*, 29 June 2015. <<http://www.theguardian.com/business/2015/jun/29/greek-crisis-referendum-eurozone-vote-germany-france-italy>> Accessed 02 Mar. 2016.
- Evans, N. 2011. “Embedding Rome in Athens.” In *Rome and Religion: A Cross-Disciplinary Dialogue on the Imperial Cult*, edited by J. Brodd and J. L. Reed, 83–97. Society of Biblical Literature Writings from the Greco-Roman World Supplement Series. 5. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.
- Faraguna, M. 2011. “Lykourgan Athens?” In *Clisthène et Lycurgue d’Athènes: Autour du politique dans la cité classique*, edited by V. Azoulay and P. Ismard, 67–86. *Histoire ancienne et médiévale* 109. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- Feireiss, K., ed. 1994. *Egon Eiermann. Die Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtnis-Kirche*. Berlin: Ernst & Sohn.
- Fejfer, J. 2008. *Roman Portraits in Context*. Image & Context 2. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Felsch, R. C. S. 1980. “Apollon und Artemis oder Artemis und Apollon? Bericht von den Grabungen im neu entdeckten Heiligtum bei Kalapodi 1973–1977.” *AA* 1980:38–123.
- . 1988. “Das Heiligtum bei Kalapodi in vor- und frühklassischer Zeit.” In *Πρακτικά του XII Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασικής Αρχαιολογίας, Αθήνα 4-10 Σεπτεμβρίου 1983*, 61–64. Athens: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.
- . 1991. “Tempel und Altäre im Heiligtum der Artemis Elaphebolos von Hyampolis bei Kalapodi.” In *L’espace sacrificiel dans les civilisations méditerranéennes de l’antiquité*, edited by M.-T. Le Dinahet, 85–91. Publications de la Bibliothèque Salomon Reinach 5. Paris: De Boccard.
- , ed. 2007. *Kalapodi: Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen im Heiligtum der Artemis und des Apollon von Hyampolis in der antiken Phokis*. Vol. II. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Fentress, J., and C. Wickham. 1992. *Social Memory*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ferrari, G. 2000. “The Ilioupersis in Athens.” *HSCP* 100:119–150.
- . 2002. “The Ancient Temple on the Acropolis at Athens.” *AJA* 106(1):11–35.
- “Final Results of the July 5th, 2015 Referendum,” Greek Ministry of the Interior. <<http://www.referendum2015.gov.gr/en/news/ellinika-telika-apotelesmata-dimopsifismatos-5is-iouliou-2015/>> Accessed 02 Mar. 2016.

- Fisher, M. 2015. "How to Look at a Non-Peripteral Temple." In *Autopsy in Athens*, edited by M. M. Miles, 154–162. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Fittschen, K. 1999. "Ο Μέγας Αλέξανδρος στη Βοιωτία." In *Αλέξανδρος ο Μέγας: από τη Μακεδονία στην Οικουμένη*, 49–60. Veroia: Νομαρχιακή Αυτοδιοίκηση Ημαθίας.
- Flashar, M. 1996. "Die Sieger von Marathon – Zwischen Mythisierung und Vorbildlichkeit." In *Retrospektive: Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, edited by M. Flashar, H.-J. Gehrke, and E. Heinrich, 63–85. Munich: Biering & Brinkmann.
- Flower, H. I. 2006. *The Art of Forgetting: Disgrace and Oblivion in Roman Political Culture*. Chapel Hill: Univ. of North Carolina Press.
- Flower, M. A., and J. Marincola, eds. 2002. *Herodotus: Histories Book IX*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Follet, S. 1976. *Athènes au II^e et au III^e siècle. Études chronologiques et prosopographiques*. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres."
- Forty, A., and S. Küchler, eds. 1999. *The Art of Forgetting*. Oxford: Berg.
- Foundethakis, M. G. 1989–1991. "A Minor Study of the Monument of Agrippa and Two Other Pergamene Pedestals Dedicated in Athens during the Second Century B.C." *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* (unpublished).
- Fouquet, J. 2012. "Der Roma-Augustus-Monopteros auf der Athener Akropolis: Herrscherkult und Memoria 'ad Palladis templi vestibulum?'" *Thetis* 19:47–95.
- Fowden, G. 1988. "City and Mountain in Late Roman Attica." *JHS* 108:48–59.
- . 1990. "The Athenian Agora and the Progress of Christianity [Rev. of Frantz 1988]." *JRA* 3:494–501.
- . 1995. "Late Roman Achaia: Identity and Defence [Rev. of Gregory 1993 and Castrén 1994]." *JRA* 8:549–567.
- Foxhall, L., H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, eds. 2010. *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Förtsch, R. 1995. "Zeugen der Vergangenheit." In *Stadt und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*, edited by M. Wörrle and P. Zanker, 173–188. Munich: C. H. Beck.

- François, E., and H. Schulze, eds. 2001. *Deutsche Erinnerungsorte*. 3 vols. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Frantz, A. 1965. "From Paganism to Christianity in the Temples of Athens." *DOP* 19:185–205.
- . 1979. "Did Julian the Apostate Rebuild the Parthenon?" *AJA* 83(4):395–401.
- . 1982. "The Date of the Phaidros Bema in the Theater of Dionysos." In *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture, and Topography: Presented to Homer A. Thompson*, 34–39. *Hesperia* Suppl. 20. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- . 1988. *Late Antiquity, A.D. 267–700. Agora XXIV*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Frazer, J. G. 1892–1893. "The Pre-Persian Temple on the Acropolis." *JHS* 13:153–187.
- . 1965. *Pausanias's Description of Greece*. Vol 5. New York: Biblio and Tannen.
- Frey, J. M. 2006. "Speaking through Spolia: The Language of Architectural Reuse in the Fortifications of Late Roman Greece" (diss. Univ. of California - Los Angeles).
- . 2015. "The Archaic Colonnade at Ancient Corinth: A Case of Early Roman Spolia." *AJA* 119(2):147–176.
- . 2016. *Spolia in Fortifications and the Common Builder in Late Antiquity*. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 389. Leiden: Brill.
- Freyer, B. 1962. "Zum Kultbild und zum Skulpturenschmuck des Arestempels auf der Agora in Athen." *JdI* 77:211–226.
- Fullerton, M. D. 1996. "The Post-Herulian Wall at Athens Reconsidered." *AJA* 100(2):396 (abstract).
- Funke, P. 2001. "Wendezeit und Zeitenwende: Athens Aufbruch zur Demokratie." In *Gab es das Griechische Wunder?: Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.: Tagungsbeiträge des 16. Fachsymposiums der Alexander-von-Humboldt-Stiftung, veranstaltet vom 5. bis 9. April 1999 in Freiburg im Breisgau*, edited by D. Papenfuss and V. M. Strocka, 1–20. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Funkenstein, A. 1989. "Collective Memory and Historical Consciousness." *History and Memory* 1(1):5–26.
- Gadbery, L. M. 1992. "The Sanctuary of the Twelve Gods in the Athenian Agora: A Revised View." *Hesperia* 61(4):447–489.

- Galinsky, K. 2008. "Recarved Imperial Portraits: Nuances and Wider Context." *MAAR* 53:1–25.
- . 2012. Rev. of Spawforth 2012. *CJ* 108(1):121–123.
- Galli, M. 2002. *Die Lebenswelt eines Sophisten: Untersuchungen zu den Bauten und Stiftungen des Herodes Atticus*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- . 2014. "Lucio Vero, Atene e le memoria persiane." In *Gli Ateniesi e il loro modello di città: Seminari di storia e archeologia greca I: Roma, 25–26 giugno 2012*, edited by L. M. Calì, E. Lippolis, and V. Parisi, 275–297. *Thiasos Monografie* 5. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- Gangloff, A., ed. 2013. *Lieux de mémoire en Orient grec à l'époque impériale*. *Echo* 9. Bern: P. Lang.
- Gauer, W. 1980. "Das Athenerschatzhaus und die marathonischen Akrothinia in Delphi." In *Forschungen und Funde: Festschrift Bernard Neutsch*, edited by F. Krinzinger, B. Otto, and E. Walde-Spenner, 127–136. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Gauthier, P. 1985. *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*. *BCH Suppl.* 12. Athens: Ecole française d'Athènes.
- Gawlinski, L. 2015. "Securing the Sacred: The Accessibility and Control of Attic Sanctuaries." In *Cities Called Athens: Studies Honoring John McK. Camp II*, edited by K. F. Daly and L. A. Riccardi, 61–87. Lewisburg, Penn.: Bucknell UP.
- Geagan, D. J. 1967. *The Athenian Constitution after Sulla*. *Hesperia Suppl.* 12. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- . 1971. "A Law Code of the First Century B.C." *Hesperia* 40(1):101–108.
- . 1974. "Ordo Areopagitarum Atheniensium." In *ΦΟΡΟΣ. Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt*, edited by D. W. Braden and M. F. McGregor, 51–56. Locust Valley, N.Y.: J. J. Augustin.
- . 1984. "Imperial Visits to Athens: The Epigraphical Evidence." In *Πρακτικά του Η' Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ελληνικής και Λατινικής Επιγραφικής*. Αθήνα, 3–9 Οκτωβρίου 1982. Vol. 1, 69–78. Athens: Υπουργείο Πολιτισμού και Επιστημών.
- Gedi, N., and Y. Elam. 1996. "Collective Memory — What Is It?" *History and Memory* 8(1):30–50.

- Gehrke, H.-J. 2001. "Myth, History, and Collective Identity: Uses of the Past in Ancient Greece and Beyond." In *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, edited by N. Luraghi, 286–313. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . 2010. "Greek Representations of the Past." In *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, edited by L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, 15–33. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Georgaka, V. D. 2013. "Ἀττικὰ χειροποίητα εἰδώλια ἀρχαϊκῶν χρόνων ἀπὸ τὴν Ἀκρόπολη τῶν Ἀθηνῶν. Ἡ θέση εὐρέσεώς τους." *ArchEph* 152 (2013):29–41.
- Georgiadis, M., and C. Gallou, eds. 2009. *The Past in the Past: The Significance of Memory and Tradition in the Transmission of Culture*. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- Gerding, H. 2006. "The Erechtheion and the Panathenaic Procession." *AJA* 110(3):389–401.
- Gill, D. W. J. 2001. "The Decision to Build the Temple of Athena Nike (IG I³ 35)." *Historia* 50(3):257–278.
- Giraud, D. G. 1994. *Μελέτη αποκαταστάσεως του ναού της Αθηνάς Νίκης: Αρχιτεκτονική μελέτη αποκαταστάσεως = Study for the Restoration of the Temple of Athena Nike: Architectural Study for the Restoration of the Building*. Athens: Ministry of Culture Committee for the Preservation of the Acropolis Monuments.
- Giudice, A. 2013. "Atene in età adrianea: la funzione ecumenica della *pólis* nell'ideologia del principato." *Göttinger Forum für Altertumswissenschaft* 16:347–369.
- Glaser, G., ed. 2005. *Die Frauenkirche zu Dresden: Werden, Wirkung, Wiederaufbau*. Dresden: Stiftung Frauenkirche Dresden, Michel Sandstein Verlag.
- Goette, H. R. 1990. "Eine große Basis vor dem Dipylon in Athen." *AM* 105:269–278.
- . 1997. "Athena Pallenis und ihre Beziehungen zur Akropolis von Athen." In *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis: Internationales Symposium vom 7. bis 9. Juli 1995 in Berlin*, edited by W. Hoepfner, 116–131. Berlin: Archäologisches Seminar der Freien Universität Berlin.
- . 1992–1998. "Ο δήμος της Παλλήνης. Επιγραφές από την περιοχή του ναού της Ἀθηνᾶς Παλληνίδος." *Horos* 10–12:105–118.
- Goette, H. R., and J. Hammerstaedt. 2004. *Das antike Athen: Ein literarischer Stadtführer*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

- Goette, H. R., et al. 1999. "Investigation of the Greyish-Blue Marble of Pentelikon and Hymettus." In *Archéomatériaux: marbres et autres roches*, edited by M. Schvoerer, 83–90. ASMOSIA IV. Talence: CRPAA.
- Goldhill, S., ed. 2001. *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2001. "Introduction. Setting an Agenda: 'Everything Is Greece to the Wise.'" In *Being Greek under Rome: Cultural Identity, the Second Sophistic and the Development of Empire*, edited by S. Goldhill, 1–25. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Goldmann, S. 1991. "Topoi des Gedenkens. Pausanias' Reise durch die griechische Gedächtnislandschaft." In *Gedächtniskunst: Raum, Bild, Schrift. Studien zur Mnemotechnik*, edited by A. Haverkamp and R. Lachmann, 145–164. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Gosden, C., and Y. Marshall. 1999. "The Cultural Biography of Objects." *WorldArch* 31(2):169–178.
- Gottlieb, C. 1957. "The Pediment Sculpture and Acroteria from the Hephaisteion and the Temple of Ares in the Agora at Athens." *AJA* 61(2):161–165.
- Gow, A. S. F., and D. L. Page. 1968. *The Greek Anthology: The Garland of Philip, and Some Contemporary Epigrams*. 2 vols. London: Cambridge UP.
- Grabbe, H.-J., and S. Schindler, eds. 2008. *The Merits of Memory: Concepts, Contexts, Debates*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Graindor, P. 1914. "L'entrée de l'acropole sous l'Empire." *BCH* 38:272–295.
- . 1915. "Les cosmètes du Musée d'Athènes." *BCH* 39:241–401.
- . 1934. *Athène sous Hadrien*. Le Caire: Imprimerie nationale.
- Greco, E. 2009. "Su alcuni studi di topografia Ateniese alla SAIA: Vecchie ipotesi e nuove prospettive." *ASAtene* 87 ser. III,9,1:217–233.
- . 2010. *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* Tomo 1. SATAA 1. Athens: Pandemos.
- . 2014. *Topografia di Atene. Sviluppo urbano e monumenti dalle origini al III secolo d.C.* Tomo 3. SATAA 1. Athens: Pandemos.

- Green, A. 2004. "Individual Remembering and 'Collective Memory': Theoretical Presuppositions and Contemporary Debates." *Oral History* 32(2):35–44.
- Greenhalgh, M. 1989. *The Survival of Roman Antiquities in the Middle Ages*. London: Duckworth.
- . 1999. "Spolia in Fortifications: Turkey, Syria, and North Africa." In *Ideologie e pratiche del reimpiego nell'alto Medioevo: 16–21 aprile 1998*. Vol. 2, 785–932. Settimane di studio del Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo 46. Spoleto: Centro italiano di studi sull'alto Medioevo.
- . 2009. *Marble Past, Monumental Present: Building with Antiquities in the Mediaeval Mediterranean*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2011. "Spolia: A Definition in Ruins." In *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, edited by R. Brilliant and D. Kinney, 75–95. Farnham: Ashgate.
- . 2012. *Constantinople to Córdoba: Dismantling Ancient Architecture in the East, North Africa and Islamic Spain*. Leiden: Brill.
- Gregory, T. 1982. "The Fortified Cities of Byzantine Greece." *Archaeology* 35(1):14–21.
- Grethlein, J. 2010a. *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2010b. "Beyond Intentional History: A Phenomenological Model of the Idea of History." In *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, edited by L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, 327–342. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Groag, E. 1939. *Die römischen Reichsbeamten von Achaia bis auf Diokletian*. Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.
- Gruen, E. 2013. "Did Ancient Identity Depend on Ethnicity? A Preliminary Probe." *Phoenix* 67(1–2):1–22.
- Gutman, Y. 2009. "Where Do We Go from Here? The Pasts, Presents, and Futures of Ground Zero." *Memory Studies* 2(1):55–70.
- Haake, M., and M. Jung, eds. 2011. *Griechische Heiligtümer als Erinnerungsorte: Von der Archaik bis in den Hellenismus*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Habicht, C. 1985. *Pausanias' Guide to Ancient Greece*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.

- . 1990. “Athens and the Attalids in the Second Century B.C.” *Hesperia* 59(3):561–577.
- . 1992. “Athens and the Ptolemies.” *ClAnt* 11(1):68–90.
- . 1997. *Athens from Alexander to Antony*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Halbwachs, M. 1925. *Les cadres sociaux de la mémoire*. Paris: F. Alcan.
- . 1941. *La topographie légendaire des Évangiles en Terre Sainte: Étude de mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- . 1950. *La mémoire collective*. Paris: Presses universitaires de France.
- . 1980. *The Collective Memory*, translated by F. J. Ditter, Jr., and V. Yazdi Ditter. New York: Harper and Row.
- Halbwachs, M., and L. A. Coser. 1992. *On Collective Memory*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Halfmann, H. 1986. *Itinera Principum: Geschichte und Typologie der Kaiserreisen im römischen Reich*. Heidelberger althistorische Beiträge und epigraphische Studien 2. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Hallett, C. H. 2005. *The Roman Nude: Heroic Portrait Statuary 200 BC–AD 300*. Oxford Studies in Ancient Culture and Representation. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Hamilakis, Y. 1999. “Stories from Exile: Fragments from the Cultural Biography of the Parthenon (or ‘Elgin’) Marbles.” *WorldArch* 31(2):303–320.
- . 2001. “Monmental Visions: Bonfils, Classical Antiquity and Nineteenth-Century Athenian Society.” *History of Photography* 25(1):5–12.
- . 2003. “Lives in Ruins: Antiquities and National Imagination in Modern Greece.” In *The Politics of Archaeology and Identity in a Global Context*, edited by S. Kane, 51–78. Archaeological Institute of America Colloquia and Conference Papers 7. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America.
- . 2007. *The Nation and its Ruins: Antiquity, Archaeology, and National Imagination in Greece*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . 2010. “Re-collecting the Fragments: Archaeology as Mnemonic Practice.” In *Material Mnemonics: Everyday Memory in Prehistoric Europe*, edited by Y. Hamilakis, K. T. Lillios, and V. Tsamis, 188–199. Oxford: Oxbow.

- Hamilakis, Y., and J. Labanyi. 2008. "Introduction: Time, Materiality, and the Work of Memory." *History and Memory* 20(2), *Special Issue: Remembering and Forgetting on Europe's Southern Periphery*:5–17.
- Hamilakis, Y., and E. Yalouri. 1996. "Antiquities as Symbolic Capital in Modern Greek Society." *Antiquity* 70:117–129.
- Hamilton, R. 2000. *Treasure Map: A Guide to the Delian Inventories*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Hangard, J., ed. 1996. *Scholia in Aristophanem. Pars II. Scholia in Vespas, Pacem, Aves et Lysistratam. Fasc. IV. Scholia in Aristophanis Lysistratam*. Groningen: Egbert Forsten.
- Hansen, M. F. 2003. *The Eloquence of Appropriation: Prolegomena to an Understanding of Spolia in Early Christian Rome*. Rome: L'Erma di Bretschneider.
- . 2013. "The Use of Spolia in Early Christian and Medieval Churches: Possibilities of Interpretation." In *Perspektiven der Spolienforschung I. Spolierung und Transposition*, edited by S. Altekamp, C. Marcks-Jacobs, and P. Seiler, 85–96. Topoi Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 15. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Harding, P. 2008. *The Story of Athens: The Fragments of the Local Chronicles of Attika*. New York: Routledge.
- Harris, D. 1995. *The Treasures of the Parthenon and Erechtheion*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Harrison, E. B. 1953. *Portrait Sculpture. Agora I*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- . 1965. *Archaic and Archaistic Sculpture. Agora XI*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- . 1972. "The South Frieze of the Nike Temple and the Marathon Painting in the Painted Stoa." *AJA* 76(4):353–378.
- . 1976. Rev. of A. Delivorrias 1974. *AJA* 80(2):209–210.
- . 1979. "The Iconography of the Eponymous Heroes on the Parthenon and in the Agora." In *Greek Numismatics and Archaeology: Essays in Honor of Margaret Thompson*, edited by O. Mørkholm and N. Waggoner, 71–85. Wetteren: NR.

- . 1986. “The Classical High-Relief Frieze from the Athenian Agora.” In *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums, vom 22.–25. April 1985 in Athen, 2*, edited by H. Kyrieleis, 109–117. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- . 1990. “Repair, Reuse, and Reworking of Ancient Greek Sculpture.” In *Marble: Art Historical and Scientific Perspectives on Ancient Sculpture*, 163–184. Malibu: J. Paul Getty Museum.
- . 2005. “Athena at Pallene and in the Agora of Athens.” In *Periklean Athens and Its Legacy: Problems and Perspectives*, edited by J. M. Barringer and J. M. Hurwit, 119–131. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Harth, D. 2010. “The Invention of Cultural Memory.” In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning, 85–96. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hartmann, A. 2010. *Zwischen Relikt und Reliquie: Objektbezogene Erinnerungspraktiken in antiken Gesellschaften*. Berlin: Verlag Antike.
- Hartswick, K. J. 1990. “The Ares Borghese Reconsidered.” *RA* n.s. 1990(2):227–283.
- af Hällström, G. 1994. “The Closing of the Neoplatonic School in A.D. 529: An Additional Aspect.” In *Post-Herulian Athens: Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens, A.D. 267–529*, edited by P. Castrén, 141–160. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 1. Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö.
- Hebel, U. J., ed. 2003. *Sites of Memory in American Literatures and Cultures*. American Studies 101. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- . 2010. “Sites and Memories in U.S.-American Histories and Cultures.” In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning, 47–60. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hedrick, C. W., Jr. 1988. “The Temple and Cult of Apollo Patros in Athens.” *AJA* 92(2):185–210.
- . 1999. “Democracy and the Athenian Epigraphical Habit.” *Hesperia* 68(3):387–439.
- Hertel, C. 2005. “Beyond In/Authenticity: Dresden’s Frauenkirche.” In *Architourism: Authentic, Escapist, Exotic, Spectacular*, edited by J. Ockman and S. Frausto, 42–49. New York: Prestel.
- Herzfeld, M. 2004. “Whatever Happened to Influence? The Anxieties of Memory.” *Archaeological Dialogues* 10(2):191–203.

- Hesk, J. 2012. "Common Knowledge and the Contestation of History in Some Fourth-Century Athenian Trials." In *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, edited by J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones, and C. Maciver, 207–226. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 6. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- Higbie, C. 2003. *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of Their Past*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . 2014. "Greeks and the Forging of Homeric Pasts." In *Attitudes Towards the Past in Antiquity: Creating Identities*, edited by B. Alroth and C. Sheffer, 9–19. Stockholm Studies in Classical Archaeology 14. Stockholm: Stockholm Univ.
- Hill, B. H. 1912. "The Older Parthenon." *AJA* 16(4):535–558.
- Hintzen-Bohlen, B. 1992. *Herrscherrepräsentation im Hellenismus: Untersuchungen zu Weihgeschenken, Stiftungen und Ehrenmonumenten in den mutterländischen Heiligtümern Delphi, Olympia, Delos und Dodona*. Cologne: Böhlau.
- . 1996. "Retrospektive Tendenzen im Athen der Lykurg-Ära." In *Retrospektive: Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, edited by M. Flashar, H.-J. Gehrke, and E. Heinrich, 87–112. Munich: Biering & Brinkmann.
- . 1997. *Die Kulturpolitik des Eubolos und des Lykurg: Die Denkmäler- und Bauprojekte in Athen zwischen 355 und 322 v. Chr.* Berlin: Akademie.
- Hirst, W., and C. B. Stone. 2015. "A Unified Approach to Collective Memory: Sociology, Psychology and the Extended Mind." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Memory Studies*, edited by S. Kattago, 103–115. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Hitzig, H., and H. Blümner, eds. 1896. *Pausaniae Graeciae descriptio*. Leipzig: O.R. Reisland.
- Hoak-Doering, E. 2012. "Stones of the Suez Canal: A Discourse of Absence and Power in Cyprus and Egypt." *Journal of Balkan and Near Eastern Studies* 14(2):199–228.
- Hobsbawm, E. J., and T. O. Ranger. 1983. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Hoepfner, W. 1976. *Das Pompeion und seine Nachfolgerbauten. Kerameikos X*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 1997a. "Propyläen und Nike-Tempel." In *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis: Internationales Symposium vom 7. bis 9. Juli 1995 in Berlin*, edited by W. Hoepfner, 160–177. Berlin: Archäologisches Seminar der Freien Universität Berlin.

- . 1997b. “Hermogenes und Epigonos. Pergamon zur Zeit Attalos I.” *Jdl* 112:109–148.
- Hoff, M. C. 1988. “The Roman Agora at Athens” (diss. Boston Univ.).
- . 1989a. “Civil Disobedience and Unrest in Augustan Athens.” *Hesperia* 58(3):267–276.
- . 1989b. “Early History of the Roman Agora at Athens” In *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium*, edited by S. Walker and A. Cameron, 1–8. *BICS Suppl.* 55. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- . 1992. “Augustus, Apollo and Athens.” *Museum Helveticum* 49(4):223–232.
- . 1997. “*Laceratae Athenae*: Sulla’s Siege of Athens in 87/6 B.C. and Its Aftermath.” In *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*, edited by M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, 33–51. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . 2001. “An Equestrian Statue of Lucius Caesar in Athens Reconsidered.” *AA* (2001): 583–599.
- Holland, L. B. 1924a. “Erechtheum Papers. I: The Remains of the Pre-Erechtheum.” *AJA* 28(1): 1–23.
- . 1924b. “Erechtheum Papers. II: The Stronghouse of Erechtheus.” *AJA* 28(2):142–169.
- . 1924c. “Erechtheum Papers. III: The Post-Persian Revision.” *AJA* 28(4):402–425.
- Holleaux, M. 1895. “Pausanias et la destruction d’Haliarte par les Perses.” *RPhil* 19(2):109–115.
- Holliday, P. J. 2005. “Early Photography and the Reception of Classical Antiquity: The Case of the Temple of Athena Nike.” In *Periklean Athens and its Legacy: Problems and Perspectives*, edited by J. M. Barringer and J. M. Hurwit, 237–252. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Hollinshead, M. B. 1999. “‘Adyton,’ ‘Opisthodomos,’ and the Inner Room of the Greek Temple.” *Hesperia* 68(2):189–218.
- Holtzmann, B. 1972. “Collection de l’École française. Sculptures.” *BCH* 96:73–99.
- . 2004. Rev. of Ferrari 2002. *RA* 2004(2):334.
- Holwerda, D., ed. 1982. *Scholia in Aristophanem. Pars II. Scholia in Vespas, Pacem, Aves et Lysistratam. Fasc. II. Scholia Vetera et Recentiora in Aristophanis Pacem*. Groningen: Bouma’s Boekhuis.

- Holzinger, K. 1979. *Kritisch-exegetischer Kommentar zu Aristophanes' Plutos*. New York: Arno Press.
- Ho Tai, H.-T. 2001. "Remembered Realms: Pierre Nora and French National Memory." *AHR* 106(3):906–922.
- Houser, C. 1982. "Alexander's Influence on Greek Sculpture as Seen in a Portrait in Athens." In *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, edited by B. Barr-Sharrar and E. N. Borza, 229–238. *Studies in the History of Art* 10. Washington: National Gallery of Art.
- . 1987. *Greek Monumental Bronze Sculpture of the Fifth and Fourth Centuries B.C.* New York: Garland Pub.
- Hölkeskamp, K.-J. 2001. "Marathon – vom Monument zum Mythos." In *Gab es das Griechische Wunder?: Griechenland zwischen dem Ende des 6. und der Mitte des 5. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.: Tagungsbeiträge des 16. Fachsymposiums der Alexander-von-Humboldt-Stiftung, veranstaltet vom 5. bis 9. April 1999 in Freiburg im Breisgau*, edited by D. Papenfuss and V. M. Strocka, 329–353. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Hölscher, F. 2010. "Die Tyrannenmörder – ein Denkmal der Demokratie." In *Die Griechische Welt: Erinnerungsorte der Antike*, edited by K.-J. Hölkeskamp and E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, 244–258. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Hölscher, T. 1969. "Ein attischer Heros." *AA* 1969:410–427.
- . 1985. "Die Geschlagenen und Ausgelieferten in der Kunst der Antike." *AntK* 28(2):120–136.
- . 1988. "Tradition und Geschichte. Zwei Typen der Vergangenheit am Beispiel der griechischen Kunst." In *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, edited by J. Assmann and T. Hölscher, 115–149. suhrkamp taschenbuch, wissenschaft 724. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- . 1991. "The City of Athens: Space, Symbol, Structure." In *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy: Athens and Rome, Florence and Venice*, edited by A. Molho, K. Raaflaub, and J. Emlen, 355–380. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- . 1998. "Images and Political Identity: The Case of Athens." In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, edited by D. Boedeker and K. A. Raaflaub, 153–183. *Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia* 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.

- . 2010. “Athen – die Polis als Raum der Erinnerung.” In *Die Griechische Welt: Erinnerungsorte der Antike*, edited by K.-J. Hölkeskamp and E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, 128–149. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- . 2014. “Monumente der Geschichte – Geschichte als Monument?” In *Medien der Geschichte – Antikes Griechenland und Rom*, edited by O. Dally et al., 254–284. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Hurwit, J. M. 1989. “The Kritios Boy: Discovery, Reconstruction, and Date.” *AJA* 93(1):41–80.
- . 1999. *The Athenian Acropolis: History, Mythology, and Archaeology from the Neolithic Era to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2004. *The Acropolis in the Age of Pericles*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2005. “Space and Time: The Setting of the Parthenon.” In *The Parthenon. From Antiquity to the Present*, edited by J. Neils, 9–33. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Hutton, P. H. 2015. “History as an Art of Memory Revisited.” In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Memory Studies*, edited by S. Kattago, 23–37. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Hutton, W. 2005. *Describing Greece: Landscape and Literature in the Periegesis of Pausanias*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Højte, J. M. 2005. *Roman Imperial Statue Bases from Augustus to Commodus*. Aarhus: Aarhus UP.
- Iakovidis, S. E. 1983. *Late Helladic Citadels on Mainland Greece*. Leiden: Brill.
- . 2006. *The Mycenaean Acropolis of Athens*. The Archaeological Society at Athens Library 240. Athens: The Archaeological Society at Athens.
- Immerwahr, S. A. 1971. *The Neolithic and Bronze Ages. Agora XIII*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Ioakimidou, C. 1997. *Die Statuenreihen griechischer Poleis und Bünde aus spätarchaischer und klassischer Zeit*. Munich: Tuduv-Verlagsgesellschaft.
- Isaac, B. H. 2004. *The Invention of Racism in Classical Antiquity*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Isnenghi, M., ed. 1996–1997. *I luoghi della memoria*. 3 vols. Storia e società. Rome: Laterza.

- . 2010. “Italian luoghi della memoria.” In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning, 27–36. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Jacoby, F. 1923–1958. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- . 1949. *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Jacquemin, A. 1999. *Offrandes monumentales à Delphes*. Athens: Ecole française d’Athènes.
- Jarzombek, M. 2004. “Disguised Visibilities. Dresden/‘Dresden.’” In *Memory and Architecture*, edited by E. Bastéa, 49–78. Albuquerque: Univ. of New Mexico Press.
- Jenkins, I. D. 1985. “The Composition of the So-Called Eponymous Heroes on the East Frieze of the Parthenon.” *AJA* 89(1):121–127.
- Jeppesen, K. 1987. *The Theory of the Alternative Erechtheion: Premises, Definition, and Implications*. Acta Jutlandica 63:1, Humanities Series 60. Aarhus: Aarhus UP.
- Johnson, S. 1983. *Late Roman Fortifications*. London: Batsford.
- Jones, A. 2007. *Memory and Material Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Jones, C. P. 1972. “The Inscription from the Sea-Wall at Anemurium.” *Phoenix* 26(4):396–399.
- . 1978. *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- . 1996. “The Panhellenion.” *Chiron* 26:29–56.
- . 2001. “Pausanias and His Guides.” In *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*, edited by S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, and J. Elsner, 33–39. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Jordan-Ruwe, M. 1995. *Das Säulenmonument: Zur Geschichte der erhöhten Aufstellung antiker Porträtstatuen*. Asia Minor Studien 19. Bonn: Habelt.
- Judeich, W. 1905. *Topographie von Athen*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- . 1931. *Topographie von Athen*. 2nd ed., rev. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Jung, M. 2006. *Marathon und Plataiai: Zwei Perserschlächten als “lieux de mémoire” im antiken Griechenland*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

- Jünger, F. 2006. *Gespann und Herrschaft: Form und Intention grossformatiger Gespanndenkmäler im griechischen Kulturraum von der archaischen bis in die hellenistische Zeit*. Antiquitates 36. Hamburg: Kovač.
- Kajava, M. 1995. "Some Remarks on the Erasure of Inscriptions in the Roman World (with Special Reference to the Case of Cn. Piso, Cos. 7 B.C.)." *Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum* 104:201–210.
- . 2001. "Vesta in Athens." In *The Greek East in the Roman Context: Proceedings of a Colloquium Organised by the Finnish Institute at Athens, May 21 and 22, 1999*, edited by O. Salomies, 71–94. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 7. Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö.
- Kallet, L. 1998. "Accounting for Culture in Fifth-Century Athens." In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, edited by D. Boedeker and K. A. Raaflaub, 43–58. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- . 2009. "War, Plague, and Politics in Athens in the 420s B.C." In *Art in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*, edited by O. Palagia, 94–127. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Kallet-Marx, L. 1989. "The Kallias Decree, Thucydides, and the Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War." *CQ* 39(1):94–113.
- Kallet-Marx, R. M. 1995. *Hegemony to Empire: The Development of the Roman Imperium in the East from 148 to 62 B.C.* Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Kansteiner, S., et al., eds. 2007. *Text und Skulptur: Berühmte Bildhauer und Bronzegießer der Antike in Wort und Bild*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kansteiner, S., et al., eds. 2014. *Der Neue Overbeck: Die antiken Schriftquellen zu den bildenden Künsten der Griechen*. 5 vols. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Kansteiner, W. 2002. "Finding Meaning in Memory: A Methodological Critique of Collective Memory Studies." *History and Theory* 41(2):179–197.
- Kansteiner, W., and H. Weilnböck. 2010. "Against the Concept of Cultural Trauma (or How I Learned to Love the Suffering of Others without the Help of Psychotherapy)." In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning, 229–240. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kantiréa, M. 2007. *Les dieux et les dieux Augustes. Le culte impérial en Grèce sous les Julio-claudiens et les Flaviens*. Μελετήματα 50. Athens: Κέντρον Ελληνικής και Ρωμαϊκής Αρχαιότητας, Εθνικόν Ίδρυμα Ερευνών.

- Kapetanopoulos, E. 1973. "The Family of Dexippos I Hermeios." *ArchEph* (1973):133–172.
- . 1983. "Some Remarks on Athens of about 270." *Αρχαιολογικά ανάλεκτα ἐξ Αθηνών* 16(1–2):51–57.
- . 2000–2003. "P. Herennius Dexippos (I) Hermeios." *Horos* 14–16:129–140.
- Kappel, K. 2004. "Raster vs. Ruin. The Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtniskirche in Berlin." In *Egon Eiermann (1904-1970), Architect and Designer: The Continuity of Modernism*, edited by A. Jaeggi, 50–58. Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz.
- , ed. 2011. *Egon Eiermann - Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtnis-Kirche Berlin 1961–2011*. Lindenberg im Allgäu: Kunstverlag Josef Fink.
- Karadedos, G. 2006a. "Ο 'περιπλανώμενος' υστεροαρχαϊκός ναός της Θεσσαλονίκης. Πρώτες εκτιμήσεις για την αρχιτεκτονική του." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και στη Θράκη* 20:319–331.
- . 2006b. "Ο 'περιπλανώμενος' υστεροαρχαϊκός ναός της Θεσσαλονίκης. Μουσειολογική παρουσίαση των αρχιτεκτονικών μελών - Προοπτικές." *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και στη Θράκη* 20:333–339.
- Karivieri, A. 1994a. "The So-Called Library of Hadrian and the Tetraconch Church in Athens." In *Post-Herulian Athens: Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens, A.D. 267–529*, edited by P. Castrén, 89–113. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 1. Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö.
- . 1994b. "The 'House of Proclus' on the Southern Slope of the Acropolis: A Contribution." In *Post-Herulian Athens: Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens, A.D. 267–529*, edited by P. Castrén, 115–139. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 1. Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö.
- . 2002. "Just One of the Boys: Hadrian in the Company of Zeus, Dionysus and Theseus." In *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks. Studies in Cultural Interaction*, edited by E. N. Ostenfeld, 40–54. Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 3. Aarhus: Aarhus UP.
- Kattago, S., ed. 2015. *The Ashgate Research Companion to Memory Studies*. Farnham: Ashgate.
- Kavvadias, P. 1886. "Ἀνασκαφαὶ ἐν τῇ ἀκρόπολει." *ArchEph* (1886):73–82.
- Kavvadias, P., and G. Kawerau. 1906. *Η ανασκαφή της ακρόλεως: Απο του 1885 μέχρι του 1890 = Die Ausgrabung der Akropolis vom Jahre 1885 bis zum Jahre 1890*. Athens: Estia.

- Keesling, C. M. 1999. "Endoios's Painting from the Themistoklean Wall: A Reconstruction." *Hesperia* 68(4):509–548.
- . 2003. *The Votive Statues of the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2007. "Early Hellenistic Portrait Statues on the Athenian Acropolis." In *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context*, edited by P. Schultz and R. von den Hoff, 141–160. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2010. "The Hellenistic and Roman Afterlives of Dedications on the Athenian Akropolis." In *Die Akropolis von Athen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, edited by R. Krumeich and C. Witschel, 303–327. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kellogg, D. L. 2008. "Ὁὐκ ἔλαττω παραδώσω τὴν πατρίδα: The Ephebic Oath and the Oath of Plataia in Fourth-Century Athens." *Mouseion* 8(3):355–376.
- . 2013a. *Marathon Fighters and Men of Maple: Ancient Acharnai*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . 2013b. "The Place of Publication of the Ephebic Oath and the 'Oath of Plataia.'" *Hesperia* 82(2):263–276.
- Kennedy, R. F. 2005. Rev. of Anderson 2003. *CJ* 100(3):316–318.
- Kennelly, J. J. 2003. "Kallias A (IG I³ 52A) and Thucydides 2.13.3." In *Gestures: Essays in Ancient History, Literature, and Philosophy Presented to Alan L. Boegehold*, edited by G. W. Bakewell and J. P. Sickinger, 284–286. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Ker, J., and C. Pieper, eds. 2014. *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World. Proceedings from the Penn-Leiden Colloquia on Ancient Values VII. Mnemosyne Suppl. 369*. Leiden: Brill.
- Kienast, H. J. 1988. "Die klassischen Tempel im Heiligtum bei Kalapodi." In *Πρακτικά του XII Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασικής Αρχαιολογίας, Αθήνα 4-10 Σεπτεμβρίου 1983*, 100–103. Athens: Ταμείο Αρχαιολογικών Πόρων και Απαλλοτριώσεων.
- . 1992. "Topographischen Studien im Heraion von Samos." *AA* 1992: 171–213.
- Kiilerich, B. 2005. "Making Sense of the *Spolia* in the Little Metropolis in Athens." *Arte Medievale* 4:95–114.
- . 2006. "*Antiquus et modernus: Spolia* in Medieval Art – Western, Byzantine and Islamic." In *Medioevo: Il tempo degli antichi. Atti del Convegno internazionale di studi, Parma, 24–28 Settembre 2003*, edited by A. C. Quintavalle, 135–145. Milan: Montadori Electa.

- Kinney, D. 1995. "Rape or Restitution of the Past? Interpreting *Spolia*." *Papers in Art History from the Pennsylvania State University* 9, *The Art of Interpreting*:53–67.
- . 1997. "*Spolia. Damnatio and renovatio memoriae*." *MAAR* 42:117–148.
- . 2006. "The Concept of *Spolia*." In *A Companion to Medieval Art: Romanesque and Gothic in Northern Europe*, edited by C. Rudolph, 233–252. Oxford: Blackwell.
- . 2011a. "Introduction." In *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, edited by R. Brilliant and D. Kinney, 1–11. Farnham: Ashgate.
- . 2011b. "Ancient Gems in the Middle Ages: Riches and Ready-mades." In *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, edited by R. Brilliant and D. Kinney, 97–120. Farnham: Ashgate.
- . 2013. "Spoliation in Medieval Rome." In *Perspektiven der Spolienforschung I. Spolierung und Transposition*, edited by S. Altekamp, C. Marcks-Jacobs, and P. Seiler, 261–285. Topoi Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 15. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kissas, K. 2008. *Archaische Architektur der Athener Akropolis: Dachziegel, Metopen, Geisa, Akroterbasen. AF 24*. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Klein, K. L. 2000. "On the Emergence of Memory in Historical Discourse." *Representations* 69, *Special Issue: Grounds for Remembering*:127–150.
- Klein, N. 2015. "The Architecture of the Athenian Acropolis before Pericles: The Life and Death of the Small Limestone Buildings." In *Cities Called Athens: Studies Honoring John McK. Camp II*, edited by K. F. Daly and L. A. Riccardi, 137–163. Lewisburg, Penn.: Bucknell UP.
- Knell, H. 1973. "Vier attische Tempel klassischer Zeit. Zur Problem der Baumeisterzuschreibung." *AA* 1973:94–114.
- . 1979. *Perikleische Baukunst*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- . 1994. "Der jüngere Tempel des Apollon Patroos auf der Athener Agora." *JdI* 109:217–237.
- . 2000. *Athen im 4. Jahrhundert v. Chr.: eine Stadt verändert ihr Gesicht: archäologisch-kulturgeschichtliche Betrachtungen*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.
- . 2008. *Des Kaisers neue Bauten: Hadrians Architektur in Rom, Athen und Tivoli*. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.

- Knigge, U. 1991. *The Athenian Kerameikos: History, Monuments, Excavations*. Athens: Krene.
- Knox, B. 1979. *Word and Action: Essays on the Ancient Theater*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.
- Kokkou, A. 1970. “Αδριανεία έργα εις τας Αθήνας.” *ArchDelt* 25A:150–173.
- Kopytoff, I. 1986. “Cultural Biography of Things: Commoditization as Process.” In *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, edited by A. Appadurai, 64–91. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Korres, M. 1988a. “Εργασίες στα μνημεία.” *ArchDelt* 35[1980], Chron. Β’1:9–21.
- . 1988b. “Acropole.” *BCH* 112(2):612.
- . 1990. *Die Explosion des Parthenon: Eine Ausstellung des Kulturministeriums Griechenlands, 1. Ephorie der Altertümer (Akropolis/Athen), 23. Juni–23. September 1990*. Berlin: Staatliche Museen Preussischer Kulturbesitz.
- . 1994a. “The History of the Acropolis Monuments.” In *Acropolis Restoration: The CCAM Interventions*, edited by R. Economakis, 34–51. London: Academy Editions.
- . 1994b. “Recent Discoveries on the Acropolis.” In *Acropolis Restoration: The CCAM Interventions*, edited by R. Economakis, 175–180. London: Academy Editions.
- . 1994c. “The Parthenon from Antiquity to the 19th Century.” In *The Parthenon and Its Impact in Modern Times*, edited by P. Tournikiotis, 136–161. Athens: Melissa.
- . 1995. *From Pentelicon to the Parthenon: The Ancient Quarries and the Story of a Half-worked Column Capital of the First Marble Parthenon*. Athens: Melissa.
- . 1996. “Ein Beitrag zur Kenntnis der attisch-ionischen Architektur.” In *Säule und Gebälk. Zu Struktur und Wandlungsprozeß griechisch-römischer Architektur. Bauforschungskolloquium in Berlin vom 16. bis 18. Juni 1994 veranstaltet vom Architekturreferat des DAI*, edited by E.-L. Schwandner, 90–113. Diskussionen zur Archäologischen Bauforschung 6. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- . 1997. “Die Athena-Tempel auf der Akropolis.” In *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis: Internationales Symposium vom 7. bis 9. Juli 1995 in Berlin*, edited by W. Hoepfner, 218–243. Berlin: Archäologisches Seminar der Freien Universität Berlin.
- . 1992–1998. “Από τον Σταυρό στην αρχαία Αγορά.” *Horos* 10–12:83–104.

- . 2000a. “Αναθηματικά και τιμητικά τέθριππα στην Αθήνα και τους Δελφούς.” In *Cent ans après la Grande Fouille. Essai de bilan. Acts du colloque international organisé par l’École Française d’Athènes, Athènes – Delphes, 17–20 Septembre 1992*, edited by A. Jacquemin, 293–329. *BCH Suppl.* 36. Athens: École française d’Athènes.
- . 2000b. “Κλασική αθηναϊκή αρχιτεκτονική.” In *ΑΘΗΝΑΙ: Από την Κλασική Εποχή έως Σήμερα (5ος αι. π.Χ - 2000 μ.Χ)*, edited by Ch. Bouras et al., 2–45. Athens: Kotinos.
- . 2002. “On the North Acropolis Wall.” In *Excavating Classical Culture: Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece*, edited by M. Stamatopoulou and M. Yeroulanou, 179–186. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- . 2003. “Athenian Classical Architecture.” In *Athens: From the Classical Period to the Present Day (5th Century BC – AD 2000)*, edited by Ch. Bouras, et al., 2–45. New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Press.
- . 2014. *Η στέγη του Ηρωδείου και άλλες γιγάντιες γεφυρώσεις*. Athens: Melissa.
- Kotsidu, H. 2000. *TIMH KAI ΔΟΞΑ: Ehrungen für hellenistische Herrscher im griechischen Mutterland und in Kleinasien unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der archäologischen Denkmäler*. Berlin: Akademie.
- Koumanoudes, S. 1861. *Γενική συνέλευσις τών μελών της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας*. Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens.
- Kousser, R. M. 2009. “Destruction and Memory on the Athenian Acropolis.” *ArtB* 91(3):263–282.
- Kouzeli, C., and E. Dimou. 2011. “Building Materials (except Pentelic Marble) Used in Ancient Athens.” In *ΛΕΥΚΟΣ ΛΙΘΟΣ*, edited by P. Jockey, 291–308. ASMOSIA VIII. Paris: Karthala.
- Kowerski, L. M. 2005. *Simonides on the Persian Wars: A Study of the Elegiac Verses of the “New Simonides.”* New York: Routledge.
- König, J. 2001. “Favorinus’ *Corinthian Oration* in Its Corinthian Context.” *PCPS* 47:141–171.
- Krautheimer, R. 1961. “The Architecture of Sixtus III: A Fifth-Century Renaissance?” In *De Artibus Opuscula 40: Essays in Honor of Erwin Panofsky*, edited by M. Meiss, 291–302. New York: New York Univ. Press.
- Kreikenbom, D. 1992. *Griechische und römische Kolossalporträts bis zum späten ersten Jahrhundert nach Christus*. *JdI-EH* 27. Berlin: de Gruyter.

- Krentz, P. M. 2007. "The Oath of Marathon, Not Plataia?" *Hesperia* 76(4):731–742.
- Kreutz, N. 2001. "Der Eid von Plataeae und der frühklassische Tempelbau." *Thetis* 8:57–67.
- Kristensen, T. M. 2013. "The Life Histories of Roman Statuary and Some Aspects of Sculptural Spoliation in Late Antiquity." In *Perspektiven der Spolienforschung I. Spolierung und Transposition*, edited by S. Altekamp, C. Marcks-Jacobs, and P. Seiler, 23–46. *Topoi Berlin Studies of the Ancient World* 15. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Kroll, J. H. 1982. "The Ancient Image of Athena Polias." In *Studies in Athenian Architecture, Sculpture, and Topography: Presented to Homer A. Thompson*, 65–76. *Hesperia* Suppl. 20. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Kron, U. 1976. *Die zehn attischen Phylenheroen. Geschichte, Mythos, Kult und Darstellung. AM-BH 5*. Berlin: Gebr-Mann.
- . 1984. "Die Phylenheroen am Parthenonfries." In *Parthenon-Kongreß Basel: Referate und Berichte 4. bis 8. April 1982*, edited by E. Berger, 235–244. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Krumeich, R. 1997. *Bildnisse griechischer Herrscher und Staatsmänner im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* Munich: Biering & Brinkmann.
- . 2004. "'Klassiker' im Gymnasion: Bildnisse attischer Kosmeten der mittleren und späten Kaiserzeit zwischen Rom und griechischer Vergangenheit." In *Paideia: The World of the Second Sophistic*, edited by B. E. Borg. *Millennium Studies* 2. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2007. "Ehrenstatuen als Weihgeschenke auf der athener Akropolis. Staatliche Ehrungen in religiösem Kontext." In *Kult und Kommunikation: Medien in Heiligtümern der Antike*, edited by C. Frevel and H. von Hesberg, 381–413. *ZAKMIRA* 4. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- . 2008. "Formen der statuarischen Repräsentation römischer Honoranden auf der Akropolis von Athen im späten Hellenismus und in der frühen Kaiserzeit." In *Η Αθήνα κατά τη ρωμαϊκή εποχή: Πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες έρευνες = Athens during the Roman Period: Recent Discoveries, New Evidence*, edited by S. Vlizos, 353–370. *Benaki Museum Suppl.* 4. Athens: Benaki Museum.
- . 2010. "Vor klassischem Hintergrund. Zum Phänomen der Wiederverwendung älterer Statuen auf der athener Akropolis als Ehrenstatuen für Römer." In *Die Akropolis von Athen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, edited by R. Krumeich and C. Witschel, 329–398. Wiesbaden: Reichert.

- . 2011. “Vom Krieger zum Konsul. Zwei frühklassische Weihgeschenke auf der Akropolis von Athen und ihre Weiterverwendung in der frühen Kaiserzeit.” In *Keraunia: Beiträge zu Mythos, Kult und Heiligtum in der Antike*, edited by O. Pilz and M. Vonderstein, 87–104. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde 298. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- . 2014a. “Ehrung Roms und Stolz auf die Polis. Zur Repräsentation römischer Magistrate auf der Akropolis von Athen.” In *Polis und Porträt. Standbilder als Medien der öffentlichen Repräsentation im hellenistischen Osten*, edited by J. Griesbach, 141–153. Studien zur antiken Stadt 13. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- . 2014b. “Denkmäler für die Ewigkeit? Zum Fortbestehen kollektiver und individueller Erinnerung bei wiederverwendeten Statuen auf der athenen Akropolis.” In *Weiter- und Wiederverwendungen von Weihstatuen in griechischen Heiligtümern. Tagung am Archäologischen Institut der Universität Zürich 21./22. Januar 2011*, edited by C. Leypold, M. Mohr, and C. Russenberger, 71–86. Zürcher Archäologische Forschungen 2. Rahden/Westf.: Verlag Marie Leidorf.
- Krumeich, R., and C. Witschel. 2009. “Hellenistische Statuen in ihrem räumlichen Kontext: Das Beispiel der Akropolis und der Agora von Athen.” In *Stadtbilder im Hellenismus*, edited by A. Matthaei and M. Zimmermann, 173–226. Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform 1. Berlin: Verlag Antike.
- . 2010. “Die Akropolis als zentrales Heiligtum und Ort athenischer Identitätsbildung.” In *Die Akropolis von Athen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, edited by R. Krumeich and C. Witschel, 1–53. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- . 2013. “‘Statuen wie Schauspieler’ – Zur statuarischen Ausstattung der Akropolis von Athen in Hellenismus und der römischen Kaiserzeit.” *AntW* 44(3):49–56.
- Kuhn, G. 1995. “Das themistokleische Heilige Tor.” *AA* 110:649–659.
- Kunnert, U. 2005. “‘τὰ δαμόσια συνφυλάσσειν τὰ ἀπὸ προγόνων παραδεδομένα’ – ‘Denkmalschutz’ in der römischen Kaiserzeit?” In *Vis Imaginum. Festschrift für Elisabeth Walde zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by G. Grabherr et al., 178–188. Innsbruck: Institut für Klassische und Provinzialrömische Archäologie der Universität Innsbruck.
- Kübler, K. 1931. “Spätantike Stempelkeramik.” *AM* 56:75–86.
- Kwan, J.-S. 2012. “Based on the Perspective of Sustainability, the Characteristics of Upcycle Fashion Design.” *Journal of the Korean Society for Clothing Industry* 14(1):13–23.
- de Lachenal, L. 1995. *Spolia. Uso e reimpiego dell’antico dall III al XIV Secolo*. Milan: Longanesi.

- La Coste-Messelière, P. de. 1942–1943. “Le socle marathonnier de Delphes.” *RA* 19:5–17.
- Lambert, S. D. 2000. “The Erechtheum Workers of *IG II²* 1654.” *ZPE* 132:157–160.
- Lambert, S. D. 2010a. “A Polis and Its Priests: Athenian Priesthoods before and after Pericles’ Citizenship Law.” *Historia* 59(2):143–175.
- . 2010b. “Connecting with the Past in Lykourgan Athens: An Epigraphical Perspective.” In *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, edited by L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, 225–238. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- . 2011. “Some Political Shifts in Lykourgan Athens.” In *Clisthène et Lycurgue d’Athènes: Autour du politique dans la cité classique*, edited by V. Azoulay and P. Ismard, 175–190. *Histoire ancienne et médiévale* 109. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- . 2012. “Inscribing the Past in Fourth-Century Athens.” In *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, edited by J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones, and C. Maciver, 253–275. *Edinburgh Leventis Studies* 6. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP.
- Lambrinoudakis, V. 1999. “Le mur de l’enceinte classique de l’Acropole d’Athènes et son rôle de péribole.” *Comptes rendus des séances de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 143(2):551–561.
- Langlotz, E. 1939. *Die archaischen Marmorbildwerke der Akropolis. I: Die Koren*, edited by H. Schrader. Frankfurt am Main: August Oesterrieth.
- Lapatin, K. D. S. 1992. “A Family Gathering at Rhamnous? Who’s Who on the Nemesis Base.” *Hesperia* 61(1):107–119.
- Lattanzi, E. 1968. *I ritratti dei cosmeti nel Museo Nazionale di Atene*. Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider.
- Lawton, C. L. 1984. “Attic Document Reliefs of the Classical and Hellenistic Period. Their History, Development, and Use” (diss. Princeton Univ.).
- Leventi, I. 2014. *Πόλη σε κρίση. Αρχιτεκτονική γλυπτική της Αθήνας στην περίοδο του Πελοποννησιακού πολέμου*. Athens: Καρδαμίτσα.
- Lewis, D. M. 1954. “Notes on Attic Inscriptions.” *BSA* 49:17–50.
- . 1997. “On the Financial Offices of Eubulus and Lycurgus.” In *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History*, edited by P. J. Rhodes, 212–229. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

- Lewis, D. M., et al. 1992. *CAH*, 2nd ed., Vol. 5: *The Fifth Century B.C.* Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Lindenlauf, A. 1997. "Der Perserschutt der athener Akropolis." In *Kult und Kultbauten auf der Akropolis: Internationales Symposium vom 7. bis 9. Juli 1995 in Berlin*, edited by W. Hoepfner, 46–115. Berlin: Archäologisches Seminar der Freien Universität Berlin.
- . 2003. "Constructing the Meaning of the Persian Wars in Athens." In *SOMA 2002: Symposium on Mediterranean Archaeology: Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Meeting of Postgraduate Researchers, University of Glasgow, Department of Archaeology, 15–17 February, 2002*, edited by A. Brysbaert et al., 53–62. *BAR-IS* 1142. Oxford: Archaeopress.
- . 2016. "A Depositional Analysis of the So-Called Kore Pit on the Acropolis of Athens." *Archaeological Institute of America 117th Annual Meeting Abstracts*, 276–277 (abstract). Annual Meeting Abstracts 39. Boston: Archaeological Institute of America.
- Linders, T. 1972. *Studies in the Treasure Records of Artemis Brauronia Found in Athens*. Acta Instituti Atheniensis Regni Sueciae 4^o, 19. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet i Athen.
- . 2007. "The Location of the Opisthodomos: Evidence from the Temple of Athena Parthenos." *AJA* 111(4):777–782.
- Lippman, M., D. Scahill, and P. Schultz. 2006. "Knights 843–59, the Nike Temple Bastion, and Cleon's Shields from Pylos." *AJA* 110(4):551–563.
- Lippolis, E. 1998–2000. "Apollo Patroos, Ares, Zeus Eleutherios: Culto e architettura di stato ad Atene tra la democrazia e i Macedoni." *ASAtene* 76–78:139–217.
- . 2006. *Mysteria: Archeologia e culto del santuario di Demetra a Eleusi*. Milan: Mondadori.
- Liverani, P. 2004. "Reimpiego senza ideologia: La lettura antica degli spolia dall'arco di Costantino all'età carolingia." *RM* 111:383–434.
- . 2011. "Reading *Spolia* in Late Antiquity and Contemporary Perception." In *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, edited by R. Brilliant and D. Kinney, 33–51. Farnham: Ashgate.
- . 2013. "Il museo come 'Spolienraum.'" In *Perspektiven der Spolienforschung I. Spolierung und Transposition*, edited by S. Altekamp, C. Marcks-Jacobs, and P. Seiler, 351–365. Topoi Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 15. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Loewy, E. 1885. *Inschriften griechischer Bildhauer*. Leipzig: Teubner.

- L'Orange, H. P. 1939. *Der spätantike Bildschmuck des Konstantinsbogens*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Loraux, N. 1986. *The Invention of Athens: The Funeral Oration in the Classical City*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- . 2000. *Born of the Earth: Myth and Politics in Athens*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- . 2002. *The Divided City: On Memory and Forgetting in Ancient Athens*. New York: Zone Books.
- Lorenzo, K. 2015. "Triremes on Land: First-fruits for the Battle of Salamis." In *Autopsy in Athens*, edited by M. M. Miles, 126–138. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Lougovaya-Ast, J. 2006. "Myrrhine, the First Priestess of Athena Nike." *Phoenix* 60(3/4):211–225.
- Loukaki, A. 2008. *Living Ruins, Value Conflicts. Heritage, Culture and Identity*. Burlington: Ashgate.
- Low, P. 2004. "Ancient Uses of the Past." [Rev. of Boardman 2002, Alcock 2002, Van Dyke and Alcock 2003]. *Antiquity* 78:930–934.
- . 2012. "Monuments to the War Dead in Classical Athens: Form, Contexts, Meanings." In *Cultures of Commemoration: War Memorials, Ancient and Modern*, edited by P. Low, G. J. Oliver, and P. J. Rhodes, 13–39. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 160. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Low, P., and G. Oliver. 2012. "Comparing Cultures of Commemoration in Ancient and Modern Societies." In *Cultures of Commemoration: War Memorials, Ancient and Modern*, edited by P. Low, G. J. Oliver, and P. J. Rhodes, 1–11. *Proceedings of the British Academy* 160. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Löhr, C. 1993. "Die Statuenbasen im Amphiareion von Oropos." *AM* 108:183–212.
- Löringhoff, B. von F. 1995. "Untersuchungen in Turm N." *AA* 110:639–649.
- Luraghi, N. 2010. "The Demos as Narrator: Public Honours and the Construction of Future and Past." In *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, edited by L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, 247–263. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Lühr, H.-P., ed. 2002. *Die Dresdner Frauenkirche: Geschichte ihres Wiederaufbaus*. *Dresdner Hefte* 71. Dresden: Dresdner Geschichtsverein.

- Lynch, K. 2011. "Depositional Patterns and Behavior in the Athenian Agora: When Disaster Strikes." In *Pottery in the Archaeological Record: Greece and Beyond. Acts of the International Colloquium Held at the Danish and Canadian Institutes in Athens, June 20–22, 2008*, edited by M. L. Lawall and J. Lund, 67–74. Aarhus: Aarhus UP.
- Ma, J. 2007a. "Hellenistic Honorific Statues and Their Inscriptions." In *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World*, edited by Z. Newby and R. Leader-Newby, 203–220. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2007b. "Observations on Honorific Statues at Oropos (and Elsewhere)." *ZPE* 160:89–96.
- . 2008. "Chaironeia 338: Topographies of Commemoration." *JHS* 128:72–91.
- . 2009. "Empire, Statues and Realities." In *Interpreting the Athenian Empire*, edited by J. Ma, N. Papazarkadas, and R. Parker, 125–148. London: Duckworth.
- . 2012. "Honorific Statues and Hellenistic History." In *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius*, edited by C. Smith and L. M. Yarrow, 230–251. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . 2013a. *Statues and Cities: Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- . 2013b. "The History of Hellenistic Honorific Statues." In *Epigraphical Approaches to the Post-Classical Polis: Fourth Century BC to Second Century AD*, edited by P. Martzavou and N. Papazarkadas, 165–179. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Majerus, B. 2014. "Lieux de mémoire: A European Transfer Story." In *Writing the History of Memory*, edited by S. Berger and B. Niven, 157–171. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Mallouchou-Tufano, F. 1994. "The History of Interventions on the Acropolis." In *Acropolis Restoration: The CCAM Interventions*, edited by R. Economakis, 68–85. London: Academy Editions.
- . 2007. "The Vicissitudes of the Athenian Acropolis in the 19th Century. From Castle to Monument." In *Great Moments in Greek Archaeology*, edited by P. Valavanis, 36–57. Athens: Kapon Editions.
- Mallwitz, A. 1972. *Olympia und seine Bauten*. Munich: Prestel.
- Manco, T. 2012. *Raw + Material = Art: Found, Scavenged, and Upcycled*. New York: Thames & Hudson.

- Mango, E. 2010. “*Tanta vis admonitionis inest in locis*. Zur Veränderung von Erinnerungsräumen im Athen des 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.” In *Die Akropolis von Athen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, edited by R. Krumeich and C. Witschel, 117–155. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Manier, D., and W. Hirst. 2010. “A Cognitive Taxonomy of Collective Memories.” In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning, 253–262. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Mansfield, J. M. 1985. “The Robe of Athena and the Panathenaic ‘Peplos’” (diss. Univ. of California, Berkeley).
- Marcadé, J. 1953. *Recueil des signatures de sculpteurs grecs* 1. Paris: De Boccard.
- March, D. A. 2008. “Kleisthenes and the League of Athena Pallenis.” *Historia* 57(2):134–141.
- Marchetti, P. 2012. “Métamorphoses de l’agora d’Athènes à l’époque augustéenne.” In *Basiliques et agoras de Grèce et d’Asie Mineure*, edited by L. Cavalier, R. Descat, and J. des Courtils, 207–223. Mémoires 27. Bordeaux: Ausonius.
- Marconi, C. 2002. Rev. of Knell 2000. *CR* 52(2):336–337.
- Marginesu, G. 2010. *Gli epistati dell’Acropoli: Edilizia sacra nella città di Pericle, 447/6–433/2 A.C.* Studi di Archeologia e Topografia di Atene e dell’Attica 5. Athens: Pandemos.
- Marinescu, C. A. 1996. “Transformations: Classical Objects and Their Re-Use during Late Antiquity.” In *Shifting Frontiers in Late Antiquity*, edited by R. W. Mathisen and H. S. Sivan, 285–298. Aldershot: Variorum.
- Mark, I. S. 1993. *The Sanctuary of Athena Nike in Athens: Architectural Stages and Chronology*. *Hesperia* Suppl. 26, AIA Monograph n.s. 2. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Mark, I. S., and J. C. Wright. 1995. “Levels Taken on the Nike Bastion.” *Hesperia* 64(3):383–389.
- Martin, G. 2006. *Dexipp von Athen: Edition, Übersetzung und begleitende Studien*. *Classica Monacensia Münchener Studien zur Klassischen Philologie* 32. Tübingen: Narr.
- Martin-McAuliffe, S., and J. K. Papadopoulos. 2012. “Framing Victory: Salamis, the Athenian Acropolis, and the Agora.” *JSAH* 71(3):332–361.

- Marx, P. A. 2001. "Acropolis 625 (Endoios Athena) and the Rediscovery of its Findspot." *Hesperia* 70(2):221–254.
- Marzolff, P. 1976. "Untersuchungen auf der 'Heiligen Agora.'" In *Demetrius I*, edited by V. Miložić and D. Theocharis, 47–58. Beiträge zur ur- und frühgeschichtlichen Archäologie des Mittelmeer-Kulturraumes 12. Bonn: Habelt.
- Mattingly, H. B. 1961. "The Athenian Coinage Decree." *Historia* 10(2):148–188.
- . 1982. "The Athena Nike Temple Reconsidered." *AJA* 86(3):381–385.
- . 1984. Rev. of *IG I³*. *AJP* 105:340–357.
- . 2000. "The Athena Nike Dossier: *IG I³ 35/36 and 64 A-B*." *CQ* 50(2):604–606.
- Mattusch, C. C. 1994. "The Eponymous Heroes: The Idea of Sculptural Groups." In *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy. Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years Since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4–6, 1992*, edited by W. D. E. Coulson et al., 73–81. Oxbow Monographs 37. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . 1996. *Classical Bronzes: The Art and Craft of Greek and Roman Statuary*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- McAllister, M. H. 1959. "The Temple of Ares at Athens: A Review of the Evidence." *Hesperia* 28(1):1–64.
- McInerney, J. 1999. *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Mecella, L. 2013. *Dexippo di Atene: Testimonianze e frammenti*. I frammenti degli storici greci 6. Tivoli: Tored.
- Meier, H.-R. 2009. "Paradigma oder Büchse der Pandora? Die Frauenkirche — oder wie Dresden zum Zentrum der gegenwärtigen Rekonstruktionswelle wurde." *Die alte Stadt* 36(1), *Zur Zukunft der alten Stadt: in memoriam August Gebeßler*, edited by H. Bodenschatz and A. Gebeßler, 59–76.
- . 2011. "Spolia in Contemporary Architecture: Searching for Ornament and Place." In *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, edited by R. Brilliant and D. Kinney, 223–236. Farnham: Ashgate.

- . 2013. “Rückführungen. Spolien in der zeitgenössischen Architektur.” In *Perspektiven der Spolienforschung I. Spolierung und Transposition*, edited by S. Altekamp, C. Marcks-Jacobs, and P. Seiler, 333–349. Topoi Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 15. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Meiggs, R. 1972. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Meiggs, R., and D. Lewis, eds. 1988. *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* Rev. ed. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Meritt, B. D. 1969. “Philinos and Menekrates.” *Hesperia* 38(3):432–441.
- Meyer, E. 1905. “Der Mauerbau des Themistokles.” *Hermes* 40:561–569.
- Meyer, M. 1989. *Die griechischen Urkundenreliefs. AM-BH 13*. Berlin: Gebr. Mann.
- Michalopoulou, D. 2012. “The Temple of Athena Nike.” In *Acropolis Restored*, edited by Ch. Bouras, M. Ioannidou, and I. Jenkins, 33–40. British Museum Research Publication 187. London: British Museum.
- Milanese, M. 1999. “Processi di spoglio e riuso in età postclassica. Osservazioni su recenti documenti archeologici.” In *Atti X Giornata Archeologica. Il passato riproposto: Continuità e recupero dall’antichità ad oggi (Genova, 28 Novembre 1997)*, edited by B. M. Giannattasio, 131–172. Pubblicazioni del D.AR.FI.CL.ET. Nuova Serie. Genoa: D.AR.FI.CL.ET.
- Miles, M. M. 1980a. “The Date of the Temple on the Ilissos River.” *Hesperia* 49(4):309–325.
- . 1980b. “The Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous” (diss. Princeton Univ.).
- . 2011. “The *Lapis Primus* and the Older Parthenon.” *Hesperia* 80(4):657–675.
- . 2014. “Burnt Temples in the Landscape of the Past.” In *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World. Proceedings from the Penn-Leiden Colloquia on Ancient Values VII*, edited by J. Ker and C. Pieper, 111–145. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 369. Leiden: Brill.
- Millar, F. 1969. “P. Herennius Dexippus: The Greek World and the Third-Century Invasions.” *JRS* 59:12–29.
- Miller, M. C. 1997. *Athens and Persia in the Fifth Century BC: A Study in Cultural Receptivity*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Mitchel, F. W. 1965. “Athens in the Age of Alexander.” *GaR* 12(2):189–204.

- . 1973. “Lykourgan Athens: 338–322.” In *Lectures in Memory of Louise Taft Semple*, edited by C. G. Boulter et al., 163–214. University of Cincinnati Classical Studies 2. [Cincinnati]: Univ. of Oklahoma Press.
- Mitford, T. 1950. “Some New Inscriptions from Early Christian Cyprus.” *Byzantion* 20:136–139.
- Monaco, M. C. 2011. “Offrandes publiques et privées sur l’Acropole et l’Agora d’Athènes à l’époque lycurguénne (340–320 av. J.-C.).” In *Clisthène et Lycurgue d’Athènes: Autour du politique dans la cité classique*, edited by V. Azoulay and P. Ismard, 219–230. *Histoire ancienne et médiévale* 109. Paris: Publications de la Sorbonne.
- . 2014. “Atene e la memoria delle guerre. Appunti per una topografia dei luoghi.” In *Guerra e memoria nel mondo antico*, edited by E. Franchi and G. Proietti, 153–175. Quaderni 6. Trento: Università degli Studi di Trento, Dipartimento di lettere e filosofia.
- Montanari, E. 1981. *Il mito dell’autoctonia: Linee di una dinamica mitico-politica ateniese*. 2nd ed. Chi Siamo 9. Rome: Bulzoni.
- Moore, M. B. 1997. *Attic Red-Figured and White-Ground Pottery. Agora XXX*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Morgan, C. 2014. “Archaeology of Memory or Tradition in Practice?” In *Attitudes Towards the Past in Antiquity: Creating Identities*, edited by B. Alroth and C. Sheffer, 173–181. *Stockholm Studies in Classical Archaeology* 14. Stockholm: Stockholm Univ.
- Morris, I. 1988. “Tomb Cult and the ‘Greek Renaissance’: The Past in the Present in the 8th Century BC.” *Antiquity* 62(237):750–761.
- Mosse, G. L. 1990. *Fallen Soldiers: Reshaping the Memory of the World Wars*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Most, G. W. 2006. “Athens as the School of Greece.” In *Classical Pasts: The Classical Traditions of Greece and Rome*, edited by J. I. Porter, 378–388. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Mountjoy, P. A. 1995. *Mycenaean Athens*. Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Nasrallah, L. S. 2010. *Christian Responses to Roman Art and Architecture: The Second-Century Church Amid the Spaces of Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Neer, R. 2004. “The Athenian Treasury at Delphi and the Material of Politics.” *CIAnt* 23(1):63–93.
- Neils, J. 2001. *The Parthenon Frieze*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.

- , ed. 2005. *The Parthenon: From Antiquity to the Present*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Niemeier, W.-D. 2013. “Kultkontinuität von der Bronzezeit bis zur römischen Kaiserzeit im Orakel-Heiligtum des Apollon von Abai (Kalapodi).” In *Sanktuar und Ritual. Heilige Plätze im archäologischen Befund*, edited by I. Gerlach and D. Raue, 33–42. Menschen - Kulturen - Traditionen. Studien aus den Forschungsclustern des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts 10. Rahden/Westf.: Liedorf.
- Nixon, L. 2012. “Building Memory: The Role of Sacred Structures in Sphakia and Crete.” In *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*, edited by B. Dignas and R. R. R. Smith, 187–214. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Noack, F. 1907. “Die Mauern Athens. Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen.” *AM* 32:123–160.
- Noethlichs, K. L. 2013. “Kaiserzeitliche und spätantike staatliche Regularien zur Spolierung – ein Kommentar.” In *Perspektiven der Spolienforschung I. Spolierung und Transposition*, edited by S. Altekamp, C. Marcks-Jacobs, and P. Seiler, 11–21. Topoi Berlin Studies of the Ancient World 15. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Nora, P., ed. 1984–1992. *Le lieux de mémoire*. 3 vols. Paris: Gallimard.
- . 1989. “Between Memory and History: *Les lieux de mémoire*.” *Representations* 26:7–24.
- , dir. 1996–1998. *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, edited by L. D. Kritzman, translated by A. Goldhammer. New York: Columbia UP.
- . 1999–2010. *Rethinking France: Les lieux de mémoire*, edited by D. P. Jordan, translated by M. Seidman Trouille. 4 vols. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Notopoulos, J. A. 1946. “The Date of the Creation of Hadrianis.” *TAPA* 77:53–56.
- Nylander, C. 1962. “Die sog. mykenischen Säulenbasen auf der Akropolis in Athen.” *OpAth* 4:31–77.
- Ober, J. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology, and the Power of the People*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- . 2008. *Democracy and Knowledge: Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Ohly, D. 1965. “Kerameikos-Grabung Tätigkeitsbericht 1956–1961.” *AA* 1965:277–375.

- Oikonomidis, S. 2013. "Spolia and Spoilage of the Archaeological Environment. Construction-Destruction-Reconstruction: The Case of the Historical Center of Athens." In *Destruction: Archaeological, Philological and Historical Perspectives*, edited by J. Driessen, 337–354. Louvain-la-Neuve: UCL, Presses universitaires de Louvain.
- Olick, J. K. 2008. "'Collective Memory': A Memoir and Prospect." *Memory Studies* 1(1):23–29.
- . 2010. "From Collective Memory to the Sociology of Mnemonic Practice and Products." In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning, 151–161. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Olick, J. K., and J. Robbins. 1998. "Social Memory Studies: From 'Collective Memory' to the Historical Sociology of Mnemonic Practices." *Annual Review of Sociology* 24:105–140.
- Olick, J. K., V. Vinitzky-Seroussi, and D. Levy, eds. 2011. *The Collective Memory Reader*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Oliver, G. J. 2007. "Space and the Visualization of Power in the Greek Polis: The Award of Portrait Statues in Decrees from Athens ." In *Early Hellenistic Portraiture: Image, Style, Context*, edited by P. Schultz and R. von den Hoff, 181–204. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Oliver, J. H. 1970. *Marcus Aurelius: Aspects of Civic and Cultural Policy in the East. Hesperia* Suppl. 13. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- . 1979. "Flavius Pantaenus, Priest of the Philosophical Muses." *HTR* 72(1/2):157–160.
- . 1980. "From *Gennētai* to *Curiales*." *Hesperia* 49(1):30–56.
- . 1981. "Roman Emperors and Athens." *Historia* 30(4):412–423.
- Olivier, L. 2004. "The Past of the Present: Archaeological Memory and Time." *Archaeological Dialogues* 10(2):204–213.
- Osanna, M. 1992. "Il culto di Hermes Agoraios ad Atene." *Ostraka* 1(2):215–222.
- . 1995. "Thesmophorion ed Eleusinion ad Athene: Problemi topografici e culturali." *Ostraka* 4(1):103–118.
- . 2001. "Pausania sull'Acropoli: tra l'Atena di Endoios e l'*algama* caduto dal cielo." *MÉFRA* 113(1):321–340.
- Osborne, M. J. 1976. "Athenian Grants of Citizenship after 229 B.C." *Ancient Society* 7:107–125.

- Paga, J. 2015. "The Claw-Tooth Chisel and the Hekatompedon Problem: Issues of Tool and Technique in Archaic Athens." *AM* 127/128:169–203.
- Pagano, M. 1993. "Il 'palazzo dei Giganti' nell'Agorà di Atene: la residenza della famiglia di Eudocia?" *ASAtene* 66–67:159–161.
- Pakkanen, J. 2006. "The Erechtheion Construction Work Inventory (*IG* 1³ 474) and the Dörpfeld Temple." *AJA* 110(2):275–281.
- Palagia, O. 1982. "A Colossal Statue of a Personification from the Agora of Athens." *Hesperia* 51(1):99–113.
- . 1990. "A New Relief of the Graces and the *Charites* of Socrates." In *Opes Atticae. Miscellanea philologica et historica Raymondo Bogaert et Hermann van Looy oblata*, edited by M. Geerard, 347–356. *Sacris Erudiri* 31. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
- . 1994. "No Demokratia." In *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy. Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years Since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4–6, 1992*, edited by W. D. E. Coulson et al., 113–122. *Oxbow Monographs* 37. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . 1997. "Classical Encounters: Attic Sculpture after Sulla." In *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*, edited by M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, 81–95. Oxford: Oxbow.
- Palowski, F. 1998. *Witness: The Making of Schindler's List*. London: Orion.
- Papademetriou, I. 1951. "Αττικά Ι." *ArchEph* (1948–1949):146–153.
- Papadopoulos, J. K. 1996. "The Original Kerameikos of Athens and the Siting of the Classical Agora." *GRBS* 37(2):107–128.
- . 2003. *Ceramicus Redivivus: The Early Iron Age Potters' Field in the Area of the Classical Athenian Agora*. *Hesperia* Suppl. 31. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Papastamati-von Moock, C. 2007. "Menander und die Tragikergruppe: Neue Forschungen zu den Ehrenmonumenten im Dionysostheater von Athen." *AM* 122:273–327.
- Parker, R. 1996. *Athenian Religion: A History*. Oxford: Clarendon.

- Parsons, A. W. 1949. "A Family of Philosophers at Athens and Alexandria." In *Commemorative Studies in Honor of Theodore Leslie Shear*, 268–272. *Hesperia* Suppl. 8. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Partida, E. C. 2000. *The Treasuries at Delphi: An Architectural Study*. Jonsered: Paul Åströms Förlag.
- Patterson, C. B. 2006a. "'Citizen Cemeteries' in Classical Athens?" *CQ* 56(1):48–56.
- . 2006b. "The Place and Practice of Burial in Sophocles' Athens." In *Antigone's Answer: Essays on Death and Burial, Family and State in Classical Athens*, edited by C. B. Patterson, 9–48. *Helios* Suppl. 33. Lubbock: Texas Tech Univ. Press.
- Payne, H., and G. M. Young. 1936. *Archaic Marble Sculpture from the Acropolis*. London: Cresset Press.
- Peek, W. 1942. "Attische Inschriften." *AM* 67:1–217.
- Pehnt, W. 1994. "Die Grenzen der Regeln." In *Egon Eiermann. Die Kaiser-Wilhelm-Gedächtnis-Kirche*, edited by K. Feireiss, 7–15. Berlin: Ernst & Sohn.
- . 2009. "Ein Ende der Wundpflege? Veränderter Umgang mit alter Bausubstanz." *Die alte Stadt* 36(1), *Zur Zukunft der alten Stadt – in memoriam August Gebeßler*, edited by H. Bodenschatz and H. Schultheiß, 25–44.
- Perrin-Saminadayar, É. 2004. "Aere Perennius. Remarques sur les commandes publiques de portraits en l'honneur des grands hommes à Athènes à l'époque hellénistique: modalités, statut, réception." In *Iconographie impériale, iconographie royale, iconographie des élites dans le monde gréco-romain*, edited by Y. Perrin and T. Petit, 109–137. Saint-Etienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Etienne.
- . 2009. "Du remploi des statues à celui des édifices publics: l'exemple athénien (IV^e siècle av. J.-C. – II^e siècle ap. J.-C.)." In *S'approprier les lieux. Histoire et pouvoirs: la resémantisation des édifices de l'Antiquité au mouvement de patrimonialisation contemporain*, edited by Y. Perrin, 23–34. Centre de Recherche en Histoire, Travaux du CERHI 9. Saint-Étienne: Publications de l'Université de Saint-Étienne.
- Petrakos, V. C. 1986. "Προβλήματα της βάσης του αγάλματος της Ραμνουσίας Νεμέσεως." In *Archaische und klassische griechische Plastik. Akten des Internationalen Kolloquiums, vom 22.–25. April 1985 in Athen*, 2, edited by H. Kyrieleis, 89–107. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- . 1997. *Οι Επιγραφές Του Ωρωπού*. Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens.

- Pike, S. 2009. "A Stable Isotope Database for the Ancient White Marble Quarries of Mount Pentelikon, Greece." *ASMOSIA VII*, edited by Y. Maniatis, 699–708. *BCH Suppl.* 51. Athens: Ecole française d'Athènes.
- Pittakis, K., D. Charamis, and P. Eustratiades. 1852. *Επιγραφαί ανεκδότοι*, fasc. 2. Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens.
- Platonos-Giota, M. 1994. "Σταυρός Γέρακα." *ArchDelt* 49, Chron. B'1:71–73.
- . 1997a. "Σταυρός Γέρακα." *ArchDelt* 52, Chron. B'1:90–91.
- . 1997b. "Το ιερό της Αθηνάς Παλληνίδος." *Αρχαιολογία* 65:92–97.
- Platt, V. 2007. "'Honour Takes Wing': Unstable Images and Anxious Orators in the Greek Tradition." In *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World*, edited by Z. Newby and R. Leader-Newby, 247–271. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Poeschke, J., ed. 1996. *Antike Spolien in der Architektur des Mittelalters und der Renaissance*. Munich: Hirmer.
- Pollini, J. 2007. "Christian Destruction and Mutilation of the Parthenon." *AA* 122:207–228.
- Pollini, J., with W. Storage. 2010. "Recutting Roman Portraits: Problems in Interpretation and the New Technology in Finding Possible Solutions." *MAAR* 55:23–44.
- Pomeroy, S. B. 2007. *The Murder of Regilla: A Case of Domestic Violence in Antiquity*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Pomtow, H. 1909. "Studien zu den Weihgeschenken und der Topographie von Delphi. V." *Klio* 9(2):153–193.
- Prent, M. 2003. "Glories of the Past in the Past: Ritual Activities at Palatial Ruins in Early Iron Age Crete." In *Archaeologies of Memory*, edited by R. M. Van Dyke and S. E. Alcock, 81–103. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Pretzler, M. 2004a. "Turning Travel into Text: Pausanias at Work." *GaR* 51(2):199–216.
- . 2004b. Rev. of S. E. Alcock, J. F. Cherry, and J. Elsner, eds., 2001, *Pausanias: Travel and Memory in Roman Greece*. *Hermathena* 176:39–57.
- . 2005a. "Pausanias and Oral Tradition." *CQ* 55(1):235–249.

- . 2005b. “Pausanias at Mantinea: Invention and Manipulation of Local History.” *PCPS* 51:21–34.
- . 2013. “Greek Tradition and Roman Innovation: Adapting Cults and Local Identities in Pausanias’ Greece.” In *Cults, Creeds and Identities in the Greek City after the Classical Age*, edited by M. Pretzler et al., 215–240. Leuven: Peeters.
- Price, S. 2012. “Memory and Ancient Greece.” In *Historical and Religious Memory in the Ancient World*, edited by B. Dignas and R. R. R. Smith, 15–36. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Pritchett, W. K. 1937. “Note on the Attic Year 307/6.” *AJP* 58(2):220–222.
- . 1940. “The Composition of the Tribes Antigonis and Demetrias.” *AJP* 61(2):186–193.
- . 1942. “The Tribe Ptolemais.” *AJP* 63(4):413–432.
- . 1943. “The Five Attic Tribes after Kleisthenes” (diss. Johns Hopkins Univ.).
- . 1954. “An Unfinished Inscription, *IG II² 2362*.” *TAPA* 85:159–167.
- Puech, B. 2002. *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d’époque impériale*. Textes et traditions 4. Paris: Librairie philosophique J. Vrin.
- Queyrel, F. 2003. *Les portraits des Attalides: fonction et représentation*. Athens: Ecole française d’Athènes.
- Raaflaub, K. A. 1998. “The Transformation of Athens in the Fifth Century.” In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, edited by D. Boedeker and K. A. Raaflaub, 15–41. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Radstone, S. 2008. “Memory Studies: For and Against.” *Memory Studies* 1(1):31–39.
- Radstone, S., and B. Schwarz, eds. 2010. *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates*. New York: Fordham Univ. Press.
- Rathmann, M. 2010. “Athen in hellenistischer Zeit – Fremdbestimmung und kulturelle Anziehungskraft.” In *Die Akropolis von Athen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, edited by R. Krumeich and C. Witschel, 55–93. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Raubitschek, A. E. 1949. *Dedications from the Athenian Akropolis*. Cambridge, Mass: Archaeological Institute of America.
- . 1962. “Demokratia.” *Hesperia* 31(3):238–243.

- . 1974. “Zu den zwei attischen Marathondenkmälern in Delphi.” *Mélanges helléniques offerts à George Daux*, 315–317. Paris: De Boccard.
- Rawson, E. 1985. “Cicero and the Areopagus.” *Athenaeum* 63:44–67.
- Reinhold, M. 1933. *Marcus Agrippa, a Biography*. Geneva, N.Y.: W. F. Humphrey.
- Reiterman, A. S. 2014. “Keimêlia in Context: Toward and Understanding of the Value of Antiquities in the Past.” In *Valuing the Past in the Greco-Roman World. Proceedings from the Penn-Leiden Colloquia on Ancient Values VII*, edited by J. Ker and C. Pieper, 146–172. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 369. Leiden: Brill.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1981. *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . 2010. “‘Lycurgan’ Athens.” In *ΦΙΛΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΣ = Philathenaios: Studies in Honour of Michael J. Osborne*, edited by A. Tamis, C. J. Mackie, and S. G. Byrne, 81–90. Athens: Hellenike Epigraphike Hetaireia.
- . 2011. “Appeals to the Past in Classical Athens.” In *Stability and Crisis in the Athenian Democracy*, edited by G. Hermann, 13–30. *Historia* Suppl. 220. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- . 2014. *Atthis: The Ancient Histories of Athens*. Kieler Felix-Jacoby-Vorlesungen 2. Heidelberg: Verlag Antike.
- Rhodes, P. J., and R. Osborne. 2003. *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 404–323 BC*. Oxford: Oxford UP.
- Rhodes, R. F. 1995. *Architecture and Meaning on the Athenian Acropolis*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Riccardi, L. A. 2007. “The Bust-Crown, the Panhellenion, and Eleusis: A New Portrait from the Athenian Agora.” *Hesperia* 76(2):365–390.
- Richter, G. M. A. 1961. *The Archaic Gravestones of Attica*. New York: Phaidon.
- Ricoeur, P. 2004. *Memory, History, Forgetting*, translated by K. Blamey and D. Pellauer. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Ridgway, B. S. 1992. “Images of Athena on the Akropolis.” In *Goddess and Polis. The Panathenaic Festival in Ancient Athens*, edited by J. Neils, 119–142. Hanover, NH: Hood Museum of Art, Dartmouth College.

- . 1999. *Prayers in Stone: Greek Architectural Sculpture ca. 600–100 B.C.E.* Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Riemann, H. 1950. “Der peisistratidische Athenatempel auf der Akropolis zu Athen.” *MdI* 3:7–39.
- Rife, J. L. 2008. “The Burial of Herodes Atticus: Élite Identity, Urban Society, and Public Memory in Roman Greece.” *JHS* 128:92–127.
- Robert, L. 1938. *Études épigraphiques et philologiques*. Bibliothèque de l’École des Hautes Études 272. Paris: Champion.
- . 1948. “Epigrammes relatives à des gouverneurs.” *Hellenica* 4:35–114.
- . 1981. “Une épigramme satirique d’Automédon et Athènes au début de l’Empire (*Anth. Pal.* XI-319).” *RÉG* 94:338–61.
- Robert, L., and J. Robert. 1951. “Bulletin épigraphique.” *RÉG* 64(299–301):119–216.
- . 1962. “Bulletin épigraphique.” *RÉG* 75(354–355):130–226.
- Robertson, N. 1996. “Athena’s Shrines and Festivals.” In *Worshipping Athena: Panathenaia and Parthenon*, edited by J. Neils, 27–77. Wisconsin Studies in Classics. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.
- . 2004. “The Praxiërgidai Decree (*IG I³ 7*) and the Dressing of Athena’s Statue with the Peplos.” *GRBS* 44(2):111–161.
- Roddaz, J.-M. 1984. “Marcus Agrippa.” *BÉFAR* 253. Paris: De Boccard.
- Roediger, H. L., III, and J. V. Wertsch. 2008. “Creating a New Discipline of Memory Studies.” *Memory Studies* 1(1):9–22.
- Romer, F. E. 1978. “A Numismatic Date for the Departure of C. Caesar.” *TAPA* 108:187–202.
- Rose, C. B. 2005. “The Parthians in Augustan Rome.” *AJA* 109(1):21–75.
- Roth, M. S., with C. L. Lyons and C. Merewether. 1997. *Irresistible Decay: Ruins Reclaimed*. Bibliographies & Dossiers, The Collections of the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities 2. Los Angeles: The Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities.
- Rotroff, S. I. 1978. “An Anonymous Hero in the Athenian Agora.” *Hesperia* 47(2):196–209.

- . 1997. *Hellenistic Pottery: Athenian and Imported Wheelmade Table Ware and Related Material. Agora XXIX*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Rowland, I. D., trans., and T. N. Howe, illus. 1999. *Vitruvius: Ten Books on Architecture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Rowlands, M. 1993. “The Role of Memory in the Transmission of Culture.” *WorldArch* 25(2): 141–151.
- Saïd, S. 1998. “Tragedy and Politics.” In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, edited by D. Boedeker and K. A. Raaflaub, 275–295. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- Samons, L. J., II. 2000. *Empire of the Owl: Athenian Imperial Finance. Historia Monographs* 142. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Sanders, G. D. R. 2015. “William of Moerbeke’s Church at Merbaka: The Use of Ancient Spolia to Make Personal and Political Statements.” *Hesperia* 84(3):583–626.
- Santangelo, F. 2007. *Sulla, the Elites and the Empire. A Study of Roman Policies in Italy and the Greek East. Impact of Empire* 8. Leiden: Brill.
- Santi, F. 2010. *I Frontoni archaici dell’Acropoli di Atene*. Supplementi e Monografie delle Rivista “Archaeologia Classica” n.s. 1, 4. Rome: L’Erma di Bretschneider.
- Sawiński, P. 2004. “Agrippa’s Mission in the East.” *Eos* 91(2):242–250.
- Schachermeyr, F. 1968. *Religionspolitik und Religiosität bei Perikles. SBWien* 258, Bd. 3. Vienna: Hermann Böhlau.
- Schalles, H.-J. 1982. “Die hellenistische Umgestaltung der athener Agora im 2. Jh. v. Chr. – Ausdruck von Rationalität oder Entpoitisierung?” *Hephaistos* 4:97–116.
- Schattner, T. G., and F. Valdés Fernández, eds. 2009. *Spolien im Umkreis der Macht = Spolia en el entorno del poder. Akten der Tagung in Toledo vom 21. bis 22. September 2006*. Iberia Archaeologica 12. Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern.
- Schäfer, T. 1998. “*Spolia et Signa*: Baupolitik und Reichskultur nach dem Parthererfolg des Augustus.” *NAkG* (1998)2:3–81.
- Schiffer, M. B. 1972. “Archaeological Context and Systemic Context.” *American Antiquity* 37(2):156–165.

- Schlaifer, R. 1943. "The Cult of Athena Pallenis (Athenaeus VI 234–235)." *HSCP* 54:35–67.
- Schmalz, G. C. R. 1994. "Public Building and Civic Identity in Augustan and Julio-Claudian Athens." (diss., Univ. of Michigan).
- . 2006. "The Athenian Prytaneion Discovered?" *Hesperia* 75(1):33–81.
- . 2007–2008. "Inscribing a Ritualized Past: The Attic Restoration Decree *IG II² 1035* and Cultural Memory in Augustan Athens." *Eulimene* 8–9:9–46.
- . 2009. *Augustan and Julio-Claudian Athens: A New Epigraphy and Prosopography*. *Mnemosyne* Suppl. 302. Leiden: Brill.
- Schmitz, T. A. 1997. *Bildung und Macht: zur sozialen und politischen Funktion der zweiten Sophistik in der griechischen Welt der Kaiserzeit*. *Zetemata* 97. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- . 2011. "The Image of Athens in Diodorus Siculus." In *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and Their Past in the First Century BCE*, edited by T. A. Schmitz and N. Wiater, 235–251. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Schmitz, T. A., and N. Wiater. 2011. "Introduction: Approaching Greek Identity." In *The Struggle for Identity: Greeks and Their Past in the First Century BCE*, edited by T. A. Schmitz and N. Wiater, 15–45. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Schneider, L., and C. Höcker. 1996. *Griechisches Festland: Antike und Byzanz, Islam und Klassizismus zwischen Korinthischem Golf und nordgriechischen Bergland*. Cologne: DuMont.
- Scholl, A. 1995. "Choephoroi: Zur Deutung der Korenhalle des Erechtheion." *JdI* 110:179–212.
- . 1998. *Die Korenhalle des Erechtheion auf der Akropolis. Frauen für den Staat*. Frankfurt am Main: Fischer Taschenbuch Verlag.
- . 2006. "ΑΝΑΘΗΜΑΤΑ ΤΩΝ ΑΡΧΑΙΩΝ. Die Akropolisvotive aus dem 8. bis frühen 6. Jahrhundert v. Chr. und die Staatswerdung Athens." *JdI* 121:1–173.
- . 2010. "'Es sind da auch alte Athena-Statuen...' Pausanias und die vorpersischen Akropolisvotive." In *Die Akropolis von Athen im Hellenismus und in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, edited by R. Krumeich and C. Witschel, 251–263. Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Schollmeyer, P. 2001. *Antike Gespannendenkmäler*. *Antiquitates* 13. Hamburg: Kovač.

- Scholz, S., G. Schwedler, and K.-M. Sprenger, eds. 2014. *Damnatio in memoria: Deformation und Gegenkonstruktionen in der Geschichte*. Zürcher Beiträge zur Geschichtswissenschaft 4. Cologne: Böhlau.
- Schörner, G. 2001. "Athen und Augustus." Rev. of Baldassarri 1998. *JRA* 14(2):621–624.
- Schultz, P. 2001. "The Akroteria of the Temple of Athena Nike." *Hesperia* 70(1):1–47.
- . 2009. "The North Frieze of the Temple of Athena Nike." In *Art in Athens during the Peloponnesian War*, edited by O. Palagia, 128–167. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Schwarz, B. 2010. "Memory, Temporality, Modernity: *Les lieux de mémoire*." In *Memory: Histories, Theories, Debates*, edited by S. Radstone and B. Schwarz, 41–58. New York: Fordham Univ. Press.
- Seeck, G. A. 1996. "Gegenwart und Vergangenheit bei Dion von Prusa." In *Retrospektive: Konzepte von Vergangenheit in der griechisch-römischen Antike*, edited by M. Flashar, H.-J. Gehrke, and E. Heinrich, 113–123. Munich: Biering & Brinkmann.
- Settis, S. 1986. "Continuità, distanza, conoscenza. Tre usi dell'antico." In *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*, edited by S. Settis, vol. 3, 373–486. Biblioteca di storia dell'arte n.s. 3. Torino: G. Einaudi.
- , ed. 1986. *Memoria dell'antico nell'arte italiana*. 3 vols. Biblioteca di storia dell'arte n.s. 3. Torino: G. Einaudi.
- Sève, M. 2003. "Rapports avec l'archéologie." *RÉG* 116:574–591.
- Shapiro, H. A. 1998. "Autochthony and the Visual Arts in Fifth-Century Athens." In *Democracy, Empire, and the Arts in Fifth-Century Athens*, edited by D. Boedeker and K. A. Raaflaub, 127–151. Center for Hellenic Studies Colloquia 2. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard UP.
- . 2012. "Attic Heroes and the Construction of the Athenian Past in the Fifth Century." In *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, edited by J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones, and C. Maciver, 160–182. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 6. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- Shear, I. M. 1963. "Kallikrates." *Hesperia* 32(4):375–424.
- . 1999. "The Western Approach to the Athenian Akropolis." *JHS* 119:86–127.
- Shear, J. L. 2001. "Polis and Panathenaia: The History and Development of Athena's Festival" (diss. Univ. of Pennsylvania).

- . 2007a. “Reusing Statues, Rewriting Inscriptions and Bestowing Honours in Roman Athens.” In *Art and Inscriptions in the Ancient World*, edited by Z. Newby and R. Leader-Newby, 221–246. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2007b. “Cultural Change, Space, and the Politics of Commemoration in Athens.” In *Debating the Athenian Cultural Revolution: Art, Literature, Philosophy, and Politics, 430–380 BC*, edited by R. Osborne, 91–115. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2007c. “The Oath of Demophantos and the Politics of Athenian Identity.” In *Horkos: The Oath in Greek Society*, edited by A. H. Sommerstein and J. Fletcher, 148–160. Exeter: Bristol Phoenix Press.
- . 2011. *Polis and Revolution: Responding to Oligarchy in Classical Athens*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2012. “The Politics of the Past: Remembering Revolution at Athens.” In *Greek Notions of the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians*, edited by J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones, and C. Maciver, 276–300. Edinburgh Leventis Studies 6. Edinburgh: Edinburgh Univ. Press.
- . 2013. “‘Their Memories Will Never Grow Old’: The Politics of Remembrance in the Athenian Funeral Orations.” *CQ* 63(2):511–536.
- Shear, T. L. 1935. “The Campaign of 1933.” *Hesperia* 4(3):311–339.
- . 1937. “The Campaign of 1936.” *Hesperia* 6(3):333–381.
- . 1938. “The Campaign of 1937.” *Hesperia* 7(3):311–362.
- . 1940. “The Campaign of 1939.” *Hesperia* 9(3):261–308.
- Shear, T. L., Jr. 1970. “The Monument of the Eponymous Heroes in the Athenian Agora.” *Hesperia* 39(3):145–222.
- . 1971. “The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1970.” *Hesperia* 40(3):241–279.
- . 1973. “The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1971.” *Hesperia* 42(2):121–179.
- . 1981. “Athens: From City-State to Provincial Town.” *Hesperia* 50(4):356–377.
- . 1984. “The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1980–1982.” *Hesperia* 53(1):1–57.

- . 1993. “The Persian Destruction of Athens: Evidence from Agora Deposits.” *Hesperia* 62(4):383–482.
- . 1994. “Ἴσονόμους τ’ Ἀθήνας ἐποησάτην: The Agora and Democracy.” In *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy. Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years Since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4–6, 1992*. Edited by W. D. E. Coulson et al., 225–248. Oxbow Monographs 37. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . 1997. “The Athenian Agora: Excavations of 1989–1993.” *Hesperia* 66(4):495–548.
- Shrimpton, G. S. 1997. *History and Memory in Ancient Greece*. Montreal: McGill-Queen’s Univ. Press.
- . 2004. Rev. of Loraux 2002 and Wolpert 2002. *Phoenix* 58(3/4):356–360.
- . 2014. “Memory and History in the Ancient World.” In *Writing the History of Memory*, edited by S. Berger and B. Niven, 25–45. London: Bloomsbury Academic.
- Sidebottom, H. 1992. “The Date of Dio of Prusa’s Rhodian and Alexandrian Orations.” *Historia* 41(4):407–419.
- Siebler, M. 1988. *Studien zum augusteischen Mars Ultor*. Munich: Editio Maris.
- Siewert, P. 1972. *Der Eid von Plataia*. Vestigia 16. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Sironen, E. 1990. “An Honorary Epigram for Empress Eudocia in the Athenian Agora.” *Hesperia* 59(2):371–374.
- . 1994. “Life and Administration of Late Roman Attica in the Light of Public Inscriptions.” In *Post-Herulian Athens: Aspects of Life and Culture in Athens, A.D. 267–529*, edited by P. Castrén, 15–62. Papers and Monographs of the Finnish Institute at Athens 1. Helsinki: Suomen Ateenan-instituutin säätiö.
- . 1997. *The Late Roman and Early Byzantine Inscriptions of Athens and Attica*. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy.
- Smith, A. C. 2003. “Athenian Political Art from the Fifth and Fourth Centuries: Images of Tribal (Eponymous) Heroes.” In *Dēmos: Classical Athenian Democracy*, edited by C. Blackwell, 1–31. (A. Mahoney and R. Scaife, eds., *The Stoa: A Consortium for Electronic Publication in the Humanities* [www.stoa.org]).

- Smith, R. R. R. 1998. "Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century A.D." *JRS* 88:56–93.
- Solders, S. 1931. *Die außerstädtischen Kulte und die Einigung Attikas*. Lund: Berlingska boktryckeriet.
- Sourlas, D. 2008. "Νεότερα στοιχεία για τη Ρωμαϊκή Αγορά της Αθήνας." In *Η Αθήνα κατά τη ρωμαϊκή εποχή: Πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες έρευνες = Athens during the Roman Period: Recent Discoveries, New Evidence*, edited by S. Vlizos, 99–114. Benaki Museum Suppl. 4. Athens: Benaki Museum.
- . 2012. "L'agora romaine d'Athènes. Utilisation, fonctions et organisation intérieure." In *Tout vendre, tout acheter. Structures et équipements des marchés antiques. Actes du colloque d'Athènes, 16–19 juin 2009*, edited by V. Chankowski and P. Karvonis, 119–138. Paris: De Boccard.
- . 2013. "Πρόσφατες αρχαιολογικές έρευνες στη Ρωμαϊκή Αγορά, στη Βιβλιοθήκη του Αδριανού και τις όμορες περιοχές." In *Αρχαιολογικές συμβολές, 2*, edited by S. Oikonomou and M. Donga-Toli, 149–168. Athens: Museum of Cycladic Art.
- Spawforth, A. J. S. 1994. "Symbol of Unity? The Persian-Wars Tradition in the Roman Empire." In *Greek Historiography*, edited by S. Hornblower, 233–247. Oxford: Clarendon.
- . "The Early Reception of the Imperial Cult in Athens: Problems and Ambiguities." In *The Romanization of Athens: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at Lincoln, Nebraska (April 1996)*, edited by M. C. Hoff and S. I. Rotroff, 183–201. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . 1999. "The Panhellenion Again." *Chiron* 29:339–352.
- . 2012. *Greece and the Augustan Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Spawforth, A. J., and S. Walker. 1985. "The World of the Panhellenion. I. Athens and Eleusis." *JRS* 75:78–104.
- . 1986. "The World of the Panhellenion. II. Three Dorian Cities." *JRS* 76:88–105.
- Spetsieri-Choremi, A. 1995. "The Library of Hadrian at Athens: Recent Finds." *Ostraka* 4(1): 137–147.
- . 2003. "Urban Development and Monumental Buildings in Athens under Augustus and Hadrian." In *Athens: From the Classical Period to the Present Day (5th Century BC – AD 2000)*, edited by Ch. Bouras, et al., 166–193. New Castle, Del.: Oak Knoll Press.

- Spyropoulos, G. 2001. *Drei Meisterwerke der griechischen Plastik aus der Villa des Herodes Atticus zu EVA/Loukou*. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Stansbury-O'Donnell, M. D. 2005. "The Painting Program in the Stoa Poikile." In *Periklean Athens and its Legacy: Problems and Perspectives*, edited by J. M. Barringer and J. M. Hurwit, 73–87. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Stanton, G. R. 1984. "Some Attic Inscriptions." *BSA* 79:289–306.
- . 1994. "The Trittyes of Kleisthenes." *Chiron* 24:161–207.
- Stähler, K. 1972. "Zur Rekonstruktion und Datierung des Gigantomachiegiebels von der Akropolis." In *Antike und Universalgeschichte. Festschrift Hans Erich Stier*, 88–112. Münster: Aschendorff.
- . 1991. "Zum sogenannten Marathon-Anathem in Delphi." *AM* 106:191–99.
- . 1993. *Form und Funktion: Kunstwerke als politisches Ausdrucksmittel*. Münster: UGARIT-Verlag.
- Stählin, F., and E. Meyer. 1934. *Pagasai und Demetrias. Beschreibung der Reste und Stadtgeschichte*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- de Ste. Croix, G. E. M. 1981. *The Class Struggle in the Ancient Greek World: From the Archaic Age to the Arab Conquests*. London: Duckworth.
- Stefanidou-Tiveriou, T. 2008. "Tradition and Romanization in the Monumental Landscape of Athens." In *H Αθήνα κατά τη ρωμαϊκή εποχή: Πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες έρευνες = Athens during the Roman Period: Recent Discoveries, New Evidence*, edited by S. Vlizos, 11–40. Benaki Museum Suppl. 4. Athens: Benaki Museum.
- Steinbock, B. 2011. "A Lesson in Patriotism: Lycurgus' *Against Leocrates*, the Ideology of the Ephebeia, and Athenian Social Memory." *ClAnt* 30(2):279–317.
- . 2013. *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse: Uses and Meanings of the Past*. Ann Arbor: Univ. of Michigan Press.
- Steinhauer, G. 2004–2009. "Στήλη πεσότων τῆς Ἐρεχθίδος." *Horos* 17–21:679–692.
- Stein-Hölkeskamp, E., and K.-J. Hölkeskamp. 2006. *Erinnerungsorte der Antike: Die römische Welt*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- . 2010. *Die griechische Welt: Erinnerungsorte der Antike*. Munich: C. H. Beck.

- von Stern, E. 1904. “Der Mauerbau in Athen und die List des Themistokles.” *Hermes* 39:543–562.
- Steskal, M. 2004. *Der Zerstörungsbefund 480/79 der athener Akropolis. Eine Fallstudie zum etablierten Chronologiegerüst*. Antiquitates 30. Hamburg: Kovač.
- Steuernagel, D. 2007. “Erscheinung und Funktionen griechischer Tempel in der Zeit römischer Herrschaft.” In *Antike Religionsgeschichte in räumlicher Perspektive*, edited by J. Rüpke, 157–161. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- . 2009a. “Romanisierung und *Hellenismós*: Drei Fallstudien zur Gestaltung und Nutzung griechischer Tempel in den römischen Provinzen Achaia und Cyrenaica.” *JdI* 124:279–345.
- . 2009b. “Wozu brauchen Griechen Tempel? Fragen und Perspektiven.” In *Die Religion des Imperium romanum. Koine und Konfrontationen*, edited by H. Cancik and J. Rüpke, 115–138. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.
- Stevens, G. P. 1946. “The Northeast Corner of the Parthenon.” *Hesperia* 15(1):1–26.
- Stewart, A. 2004. *Attalos, Athens, and the Akropolis: The Pergamene ‘Little Barbarians’ and Their Roman and Renaissance Legacy*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- . 2008. “The Persian and Carthaginian Invasions of 480 B.C.E. and the Beginning of the Classical Style: Part 1, the Stratigraphy, Chronology, and Significance of the Acropolis Deposits.” *AJA* 112(3):377–412.
- Stewart, D. R. 2012. Rev. of Spawforth 2012. *BMCR* 2012.12.04.
- Stieber, M. C. 2004. *The Poetics of Appearance in the Attic Korai*. Austin: Univ. of Texas Press.
- Stillwell, R. 1933. “Architectural Studies.” *Hesperia* 2(2):110–148.
- Straub, J. 1952. *Studien zur Historia Augusta*. Bernae: Aedibus A. Francke.
- Sturgeon, M. C. 1987. *Sculpture I: 1952–1967*. Isthmia IV. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Swain, S. 1996. *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Tanoulas, T. 1994. “The Propylaea and the Western Access of the Acropolis.” In *Acropolis Restoration: The CCAM Interventions*, edited by R. Economakis, 52–67. London: Academy Editions.

- . 1997. *Τα Προπύλαια της αθηναϊκής Ακρόπολης κατά τον Μεσαίωνα*. Athens: Archaeological Society at Athens.
- Tasia, A., Z. Lola, and O. Peltekis. 2000. “Θεσσαλονίκη – Ο υστεροαρχαϊκός ναός.” *Το αρχαιολογικό έργο στη Μακεδονία και στη Θράκη* 14:227–246.
- Thakur, S. 2007. “Identity under Construction in Roman Athens.” In *Negotiating the Past in the Past: Identity, Memory, and Landscape in Archaeological Research*, edited by N. Yoffee, 104–127. Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press.
- Theocharaki, A. M. 2011. “The Ancient Circuit Wall of Athens: Its Changing Course and the Phases of Construction.” *Hesperia* 80(1):71–156.
- Thomas, J. 1987. *Coventry Cathedral*. The New Bell’s Cathedral Guides. London: Unwin Hyman.
- Thompson, H. A. 1940. *The Tholos of Athens and Its Predecessors*. *Hesperia* Suppl. 4. Baltimore: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- . 1950. “The Odeion in the Athenian Agora.” *Hesperia* 19(2):31–141.
- . 1951. “Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1950.” *Hesperia* 20(1):45–60.
- . 1952. “Excavations in the Athenian Agora: 1951.” *Hesperia* 21(2):83–113.
- . 1959. “Athenian Twilight: A.D. 267–600.” *JRS* 49:61–72.
- . 1960. “Activities in the Athenian Agora: 1959.” *Hesperia* 29(4):327–368.
- . 1962. “Itinerant Temples of Attica.” *AJA* 66(2):200 (abstract).
- . 1966. “The Annex to the Stoa of Zeus in the Athenian Agora.” *Hesperia* 35(2):171–187.
- . 1981. “Athens Faces Adversity.” *Hesperia* 50(4):343–355.
- . 1987. “The Impact of Roman Architects and Architecture on Athens: 170 B.C. – A.D. 170.” In *Roman Architecture in the Greek World*, edited by S. Macready and F. H. Thompson, 1–17. Society of Antiquaries of London Occasional Papers n.s. 10. London: Thames and Hudson.
- Thompson, H. A., and R. E. Wycherley. 1972. *The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape, and Uses of an Ancient City Center*. *Agora XIV*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.

- Thompson, P. 1994. "Believe It or Not: Rethinking the Historical Interpretation of Memory." In *Memory and History: Essays on Recalling and Interpreting Experience*, edited by J. Jeffrey and G. Edwall, 1–13. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America.
- Threpsiades, J., and E. Vanderpool. 1964. "Themistokles' Sanctuary of Artemis Aristoboule." *ArchDelt* 19A:26–36.
- Tigginaga, I. 2008. "Η αφανής αρχιτεκτονική της Βιβλιοθήκης του Αδριανού." In *Η Αθήνα κατά τη ρωμαϊκή εποχή: Πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες έρευνες = Athens during the Roman Period: Recent Discoveries, New Evidence*, edited by S. Vlizon, 133–152. Benaki Museum Suppl. 4. Athens: Benaki Museum.
- Tobin, J. 1997. *Herodes Attikos and the City of Athens: Patronage and Conflict under the Antonines*. APXAIΑ ΕΛΛΑΣ 4. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben.
- Toher, M. 2014. "Herod, Athens and Augustus." *ZPE* 190:127–134.
- Tomlinson, R. A. 1995. Rev. of Mark 1993. *JHS* 115:238.
- Torelli, M. 1995. "L'immagine dell'ideologia augustea nell'agorà di Atene." *Ostraka* 4(1):9–31.
- Townsend, E. D. 1955. "A Mycenaean Chamber Tomb under the Temple of Ares." *Hesperia* 24(3):187–219.
- Townsend, R. F. 1982. "Aspects of Athenian Architectural Activity in the Second Half of the Fourth Century B.C." (diss. Univ. of North Carolina, Chapel Hill).
- . 2004. "Classical Signs and Anti-Classical Signification in 4th-century Athenian Architecture." In *XAPIΣ: Essays in Honor of Sara A. Immerwahr*, edited by A. P. Chapin, 305–326. *Hesperia* Suppl. 33. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Tölle-Kastenbein, R. 1994. *Das Olympieion in Athen*. Cologne: Böhlau.
- Tracy, S. V., and C. Habicht. 1991. "New and Old Panathenaic Victor Lists." *Hesperia* 60(2): 187–236.
- Trails, J. S. 1975. *The Political Organization of Attica: A Study of the Demes, Trittyes, and Phylai, and Their Representation in the Athenian Council*. *Hesperia* Suppl. 14. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- . 1986. *Demos and Trittyes: Epigraphical and Topographical Studies in the Organization of Attica*. Toronto: Athenians, Victoria College.

- Travlos, J. 1960. *Πολεοδομική εξέλιξις τῶν Ἀθηνῶν*. Athens: Constantinides and Michalis.
- . 1971. *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*. New York: Praeger.
- . 1973. “Ἡ πυρπόλησις τοῦ παρθενῶνος ὑπὸ τῶν Ἑρούλων καὶ ἡ ἐπισκευή του κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τοῦ Αὐτοκράτορος Ἰουλιανοῦ.” *ArchEph* (1973):218–236.
- Tschira, A. 1940. “Die unfertigen Säulentrommeln auf der Akropolis von Athen.” *Jdl* 55:242–261.
- Tsoniotis, N. 2008. “Νέα στοιχεία για το υστερορωμαϊκό τείχος της Αθήνας.” In *Ἡ Αθήνα κατὰ τη ρωμαϊκὴ εποχή: Πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες ἐρευνες = Athens during the Roman Period: Recent Discoveries, New Evidence*, edited by S. Vlivos, 55–74. Benaki Museum Suppl. 4. Athens: Benaki Museum.
- . 2014. “Lo scavo del lato est dell’Agorà Romana di Atene (2000–2003): dati stratigrafici e risultati.” In *Gli Ateniesi e il loro modello di città: Seminari di storia e archeologia greca I: Roma, 25–26 giugno 2012*, edited by L. M. Caliò, E. Lippolis, and V. Parisi, 323–336. Thiasos Monografie 5. Rome: Edizioni Quasar.
- Underwood, D. 2013. “Reuse as Archaeology: A Test Case for Late Antique Building Chronologies in Ostia.” In *Field Methods and Post-Excavation Techniques in Late Antique Archaeology*, edited by L. Lavan and M. Mulryan, 383–409. Late Antique Archaeology 9. Leiden: Brill.
- Van Damme, T. 2012. “Remembering the Mycenaeans: How the Ancient Greeks Repurposed their Prehistoric Past” (MA thesis, Univ. of Victoria).
- Vanderpool, E. 1949. “The Route of Pausanias in the Athenian Agora.” *Hesperia* 18(1):128–137.
- . 1959. “Athens Honors the Emperor Tiberius.” *Hesperia* 28(1):86–90.
- . 1960. “News Letter from Greece.” *AJA* 64(3):265–271.
- . 1966. “A Monument to the Battle of Marathon.” *Hesperia* 35(2):93–106.
- Van Dyke, R. M., and S. E. Alcock, eds. 2003. *Archaeologies of Memory*. Malden, Mass.: Blackwell.
- Vansina, J. 1985. *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: Univ. of Wisconsin Press.
- Varner, E. R. 2004. *Mutilation and Transformation: Damnatio Memoriae and Roman Imperial Portraiture*. Monumenta Graeca et Romana 10. Leiden: Brill.

- . 2010. “Reconfiguring Roman Portraits: Theories and Practices.” *MAAR* 55:45–56.
- Vatin, C. 1991. *Monuments votifs de Delphes*. *Archaeologia Perusina* 10 and *Parchaeologica* 100. Rome: Giorgio Bretschneider Editore.
- . 1995. “La base des Héros éponymes à Athènes au temps de Pausanias.” *Ostraka* 4(1): 33–41.
- Vatsend, K. 1994. “Det etterklassiske Athen – skole og museum.” In *I skyggen av Akropolis*, edited by Ø. Andersen and T. Hägg, 335–380. Skrifter utgitt av Det norske institutt i Athen 5. Bergen: John Grieg.
- Versakes, F. 1909. “Τὸ μνημεῖον τοῦ Νικίου.” *ArchEph* (1909):221–238.
- Viviers, D. 1992. *Recherches sur les ateliers de sculpteurs et la cité d’Athènes à l’époque archaïque. Endoios, Philergos, Aristoklès*. Mémoire de la classe des Beaux-Arts, Collection in-8°, 3^e sér., tome I. Brussels: Académie royale de Belgique.
- Vlassoroulou, C. 2000. “Παρατηρήσεις στη Μαρμάρινη Κεράμωση του Αρχαίου Ναού στη Ακρόπολη.” In *Paria Lithos. Parian Quarries, Marble and Workshops of Sculpture*, edited by D. Schilardi and D. Katsonopoulou, 341–346. *Archaeological and Historical Studies* 1. Athens: The Paros and Cyclades Institute of Archaeology.
- von den Hoff, R. 2003. “Tradition and Innovation: Portraits and Dedications on the Early Hellenistic Akropolis.” In *The Macedonians in Athens, 322–229 B.C.: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the University of Athens, May 24–26, 2001*, edited by O. Palagia and S. V. Tracy, 173–185. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . 2009. “Herakles, Theseus and the Athenian Treasury at Delphi.” In *Structure, Image, Ornament: Architectural Sculpture in the Greek World: Proceedings of an International Conference Held at the American School of Classical Studies, 27–28 November 2004*, edited by P. Schultz and R. von den Hoff, 96–104. Oxford: Oxbow.
- . 2010a. “Media for Theseus, or: The Different Images of the Athenian Polis-Hero.” In *Intentional History: Spinning Time in Ancient Greece*, edited by L. Foxhall, H.-J. Gehrke, and N. Luraghi, 161–188. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- . 2010b. “Theseus – Stadtgründer und Kulturheros.” In *Die Griechische Welt: Erinnerungsorte der Antike*, edited by K.-J. Hölkeskamp and E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, 300–315. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Voutiras, E. 1999. “Η λατρεία της Αφροδίτης στην περιοχή του Θερμαίου Κόλπου.” In *Ancient Macedonia VI. Papers Read at the Sixth International Symposium Held in Thessaloniki*,

- October 15–19, 1996*, 1329–1343. Institute for Balkan Studies 272. Thessaloniki: Institute for Balkan Studies.
- . 2007. “Aphrodite und Aineias am thermaischen Golf.” *Thetis* 13/14:121–124.
- Waddell, J. 2014. “The Cave of Crúachain and the Otherworld” In *Celtic Cosmology: Perspectives From Ireland and Scotland*, edited by J. Borsje et al., 77–92. Mediaeval Studies 26. Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.
- de Waele, J. 1997. “The Temples of Athena Nike on the Acropolis of Athens.” *Pharos* 5:27–48.
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. 2008. *Rome’s Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP.
- Walter, O. 1940 “Archäologische Funde: Athen.” *AA* 1940: cols. 144–170.
- 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*, edited by G. P. Brogiolo and B. Ward-Perkins, 225–244. Leiden: Brill.
- Watts, E. J. 2006. *City and School in Late Antique Athens and Alexandria*. Berkeley: Univ. of California Press.
- Welter, G. 1939. “Vom Nikepyrgos.” *AA* 1939: cols. 1–22.
- Welzer, H. 2002. *Das kommunikative Gedächtnis: Eine Theorie der Erinnerung*. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Wesenberg, B. 1981. “Zur Baugeschichte des Niketempels.” *JdI* 96:28–54.
- . 1998. Rev. of Mark 1993. *Gnomon* 70(3):235–240.
- . 2004. “ΟΛΟΙΤΡΟΧΟΙ. Zur Verteidigung der Akropolis im Sommer 480 v. Chr. (Herodot 8,52–53).” In *ΕΓΚΥΚΛΙΟΝ ΚΗΠΙΟΝ (Rundgärtchen). Zu Poesie, Historie und Fachliteratur der Antike*, edited by M. Janka, 145–162. Munich: K. G. Saur.
- West, A. B., and A. M. Woodward. 1938. “Studies in Attic Treasure-Records (Continued).” *JHS* 58(1):69–89.
- Wharton, A. J. 2011. “The Tribune Tower: *Spolia* as Despoliation.” In *Reuse Value: Spolia and Appropriation in Art and Architecture from Constantine to Sherrie Levine*, edited by R. Brilliant and D. Kinney, 179–197. Farnham: Ashgate.

- Whitby, M., and M. Whitby. 1986. *The History of Theophylact Simocatta. An English Translation with Introduction and Notes*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Whitehead, D. 1986. *The Demes of Attica, 508/7 – ca. 250 B.C.: A Political and Social Study*. Princeton: Princeton UP.
- Whitley, J. 2006. “Classical Art and Human Agency: A Tale of Two Objects in Fifth-Century Greece.” In *ΓΕΝΕΘΑΙΟΝ. Αναμνηστικός τόμος για την συμπλήρωση είκοσι χρόνων λειτουργίας του Μουσείου Κυκλαδικής Τέχνης*, edited by N. Stampolides, 227–236. Athens: Nicholas P. Goulandris Foundation, Museum of Cycladic Art.
- Whittaker, H. 2002. “Some Reflections on the Temple to the Goddess Roma and Augustus on the Acropolis at Athens.” In *Greek Romans and Roman Greeks. Studies in Cultural Interaction*, edited by E.N. Ostenfeld, 25–39. Aarhus Studies in Mediterranean Archaeology 3. Aarhus: Aarhus UP.
- Wiegand, T. 1904. *Die archaische Poros-Architektur der Akropolis zu Athen*. Cassel: Th.G. Fisher.
- Wilkes, J. J. 1989. “Civil Defence in Third-Century Achaia.” In *The Greek Renaissance in the Roman Empire: Papers from the Tenth British Museum Classical Colloquium*, edited by S. Walker and A. Cameron, 187–192. *BICS Suppl.* 55. London: Institute of Classical Studies.
- Willemsen, F. 1963. “Archaische Grabmalbasen aus der athener Stadtmauer.” *AM* 78:104–153.
- Willers, D. 1990. *Hadrians panhellenisches Programm: Archäologische Beiträge zur Neugestaltung Athens durch Hadrian*. *AntK-BH* 16. Basel: Vereinigung der Freunde antiker Kunst.
- . 1996. “Die Neugestaltung Athens durch Hadrian.” *AntW* 27:3–17.
- Williams, H., ed. 2003. *Archaeologies of Remembrance: Death and Memory in Past Societies*. New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Wilson, G. E. 1971. “The Herulian Sack of Athens, A.D. 267.” (diss. Univ. of Washington).
- Witakowski, W. 1996. *Pseudo-Dionysius of Tel-Mahre. Chronicle (Known Also as the Chronicle of Zuqnin)*. Part III. Liverpool: Liverpool Univ. Press.
- Wolpert, A. 2002. *Remembering Defeat: Civil War and Civic Memory in Ancient Athens*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP.

- Wood, N. 1994. "Memory's Remains: *Les lieux de mémoire*." *History and Memory* 6(1):123–149.
- Woodhead, A. G. 1997. *Inscriptions: The Decrees. Agora XVI*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Wrede, H. 1996. "Waffen gegen die Perser." *AA* 1996(1):37–41.
- Wright, J. C. 1994. "The Mycenaean Entrance System at the West End of the Akropolis of Athens." *Hesperia* 63(3):323–360.
- Wycheley, R. E. 1957. *Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia. Agora III*. Princeton: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- . 1964. "The Olympieion at Athens." *GRBS* 5:161–179.
- Yalouri, E. 2001. *The Acropolis: Global Fame, Local Claim. Materializing Culture*. New York: Berg.
- Yates, F. A. 1966. *The Art of Memory*. Chicago: Univ. of Chicago Press.
- Yoffee, N., ed. 2007. *Negotiating the Past in the Past. Identity, Memory, and Landscape in Archaeological Research*. Tucson: Univ. of Arizona Press.
- Young, J. E. 1989. "The Biography of a Memorial Icon: Nathan Rapoport's Warsaw Ghetto Monument." *Representations* 26:69–106.
- . 1993. *The Texture of Memory: Holocaust Memorials and Meaning*. New Haven: Yale UP.
- Yunis, H. 1996. *Taming Democracy: Models of Political Rhetoric in Classical Athens*. Ithaca: Cornell UP.
- Zahrnt, M. 1979. "Die 'Hadriansstadt' von Athen." *Chiron* 9:393–398.
- . 2010. "Marathon – das Schlachtfeld als 'Erinnerungsort', einst und jetzt." In *Die Griechische Welt: Erinnerungsorte der Antike*, edited by K.-J. Hölkeskamp and E. Stein-Hölkeskamp, 114–127. Munich: C. H. Beck.
- Zavagno, L. 2009. *Cities in Transition: Urbanism in Byzantium between Late Antiquity and the Early Middle Ages (500–900 A.D.)*. BAR-IS 2030. Oxford: Archaeopress.

- Zelnick-Abramovitz, R. 2011. "The Guardian of the Land: The Areopagus Council as a Symbol of Stability." In *Stability and Crisis in the Athenian Democracy*, edited by G. Herman, 103–126. *Historia* Suppl. 220. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner.
- Zierold, M. 2010. "Memory and Media Cultures." In *A Companion to Cultural Memory Studies*, edited by A. Erll and A. Nünning, 399–407. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Živkov, S. 2003. "Christian Adaptations in Athens in Late Antiquity [end of 5th–beginning of 7th Century]." *Hortus Artium Medievalium* 9:213–219.