

THE TOPOGRAPHY OF ANCIENT ATHENS IN THE *MIRABILIA URBIS ATHENARUM*

Introductory Remarks

The text which is labelled *Mirabilia Urbis Athenarum* is a short guide of the antiquities of Athens written for the visitors of this city.¹

This short essay had been traditionally dated to the first years of the Turkish rule because of the mention in the text of a δούξ as an institutional figure of the past which was identified with the Frankish Duke of Athens.² However recently Di Branco rightly pointed out that this δούξ is told in the guide to have gone to pray in a sanctuary of Hera, i. e. he was a pagan³ and suggested a composition of the guide in the middle Byzantine times (XIth or XIIth c.).

It is possible to suggest that this δούξ mentioned in the guide was a military commander in the tetrarchic administration.⁴ The function of Juno as protectress of the Roman Army is very well known.⁵ Thus the official homage of the military commander to this goddess makes sense. Moreover the author of the guide refers to a sanctuary of Hera near the Ilyssus valley which is identified with that of Hera and Zeus Panhellenios seen by Pausanias 1, 18, 9 and established by Hadrian: it is probable that in that sanctuary the empress was worshipped as Hera as well as the emperor was identified with Zeus/Juppiter.⁶ Thus the worship of the goddess would fit the duty of the *dux* to acknowledge the divinity of the imperial couple.

¹ See the recent edition by M. Di Branco, *Atene immaginaria: Il mito di Atene nella letteratura bizantina tra agiografia, teosofia e mirabilia*, Rendiconti Lincei 9. 16 (Rome 2005) 65–134, particularly 101–123, with discussion of the previous relevant bibliography.

² See the bibliography summarized by Di Branco (n. 1) 101–110.

³ See Di Branco (n. 1) 110 and 121 n. 32. The *temenos* mentioned in the guide should be identified with the sanctuary of Hera and Zeus Panhellenios on the Ilyssus' valley (see Di Branco [n. 1] 121 n. 34).

⁴ For this institutional figure, see J. B. Campbell, “Dux”, *DNP* 3 (1997) 852–853 and R. Rees, *Diocletian and the Tetrarchy* (Edinburgh 2004) 27.

⁵ See E. La Rocca, “Iuno”, *LIMC* 5 (1990) 814–856, particularly 815–817.

⁶ See J. Travlos, *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens* (New York 1971) 429. See also Σ. Βλίζος, “Γλύπτα από την περιοχή νοτίως του Ολυμπίου”, in idem (ed.), *Η Αθήνα κατά τη Ρωμαϊκή εποχή: πρόσφατες ανακαλύψεις, νέες έρευνες* (Athens 2008) 411–423, particularly 420.

In fact the marked naivety which is shown in the text and the fact that several identifications of monuments are based more on popular legends than on the ancient written tradition strongly suggest a pre-humanistic date for the writing of this guide. In particular it should pre-date the coming of Cyriac of Ancona to Athens in 1436.⁷ This Italian antiquarian introduced the humanistic approach, based on the use of ancient literary sources, to the study of the antiquities of Athens.⁸

Perhaps the most probable period in which to place the writing of this guide is the late XIIth c.: these decades are characterized in Athens by a growing sense of importance of the glorious past of this city as well as by a continuous coming of pilgrims and visitors to this centre.⁹ The guide could have been written for these pilgrims. Moreover the credit accorded to some popular and unlearned identifications of ancient monuments makes this text the Athenian equivalent to the antiquarian writings collected in the *Patria Konstantinupoleos* of the capital of the Empire.¹⁰

Finally the reference, revealed in the guide, to the Parthenon as a church rather than as a classical temple is a general phenomenon of the XIIth c.¹¹

The title of the guide is “the theatres and schools of Athens” and implies the typically middle-Byzantine interest towards the ancient Greek civilization first of all because of its philosophical and literary heritage. There is still a long way before Cyriac’s “rediscovery” of the Parthenon as the temple of Pallas and the work of Phidias.¹²

Despite the critical limits of this writing, the work is important not only to the scholar of the ‘Nachleben’ of ancient Greece in Byzantine times but also to the scholar of the ancient topography of Athens.

As we shall see, buildings and squares of ancient Athens which later disappeared were still visible at the time of the compilation of this work. Thus the guide offers a few precious clues to the scholar of ancient topography of this city which may contribute to the progress of controversial problems in this field of research.

The *Mirabilia* have been underutilized and rather forgotten by researchers of ancient Athens. This consideration hopefully justifies this short article.

⁷ See E. W. Bodnar, “Athens in April 1436”, *Archaeology* 23 (1970) 96–105.

⁸ On the innovative approach of Cyriac to the study of Greek antiquities, see E. W. Bodnar and C. Foss (eds.), *Cyriac of Ancona* (Cambridge 2003).

⁹ See A. Kaldellis, *The Christian Parthenon. Classicism and Pilgrimage in Byzantine Athens* (Cambridge 2009) 63–162.

¹⁰ Concerning the *Patria* see A. Berger, *Untersuchungen zu den Patria Konstantinupoleos* (Bonn 1988).

¹¹ See Kaldellis (n. 9) 112–162.

¹² See note 7.

The topography of ancient Athens in the guide

First of all it is necessary to report the critical text of the guide as it has been established by the last editor.¹³

ΤΑ ΘΕΑΤΡΑ ΚΑΙ ΔΙΔΑΣΚΑΛΕΙΑ ΤΩΝ ΑΘΗΝΩΝ

Πρῶτον ἡ Ἀκαδημία ἐν χωρίῳ^a τῶν Βασιλικῶν. Δεύτερον ἡ Ἐλαια-
τική εἰς τοὺς Ἀμπελοκήπους· τρίτον τὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος διδασκαλεῖον
εἰς τὸ Παραδείσιον· τέταρτον τὸ τοῦ Πολυζήλου ἐν ὄρει τῷ Ἡμιτίῳ·
πέμπτον τὸ τοῦ Διοδώρου πλησίον τούτου.

Ἐντὸς δὲ τῆς πόλεως ἔστι τὸ διδασκαλεῖον τοῦ Σωκράτους, ἐν ᾧ
εἰσι κύκλω οἱ ἄνδρες καὶ οἱ ἄνεμοι ἱστορισμένοι· κατὰ δύσιν δὲ
τούτου ἴστανται τὰ παλάτια τοῦ Θεμιστοκλέους· καὶ πλησίον τούτου
εἰσιν οἱ λαμπροὶ οἴκοι τοῦ πολεμάρχου· ἴστανται δὲ τὰ ἀγάλματα τοῦ
Διὸς ἔγγυστα τούτων· ἀντικρυς δὲ τούτων ἔστι βωμός, εἰς ὃν ταφῆς
ἄξιόνονται οἱ παγκρατισταὶ καὶ Ὀλύμπιοι, ἐν ᾧ φοιτῶντες οἱ ῥήτορες
τοὺς ἐπιταφίους λόγους ἀνεγίνωσκον.

Κατὰ ἄρκτον δὲ τούτου ὑπῆρχεν ἡ πρώτη ἀγορὰ τῆς πόλεως, εἰς
ἣν ὁ ἀπόστολος Φίλιππος τὸν γραμματέα ἐβύθισεν· ἔνθα ὑπῆρχον καὶ
οἱ λαμπροὶ οἴκοι φυλῆς τῆς Πανδιονίδος· κατὰ δὲ τὸ νότιον μέρος
ὑπῆρχε διδασκαλεῖον τῶν Κυνικῶν φιλοσόφων καὶ πλησίον τούτου
τῶν τραγικῶν. Ἐκτὸς δὲ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως, ὀλίγον πρὸς δύσιν, κατῴκουν
οἱ θαλαμ[...]ῶν^b καὶ πλησίον τούτου ὑπῆρχε διδασκαλεῖον τοῦ Σοφοκ-
λέους· καὶ πρὸς νότον τούτου ἴστατο ὁ Ἄρειος πάγος, ἔνθα ὁ τοῦ
Ποσειδῶνος υἱὸς Λυρόθιος ὑπὸ Ἄρεος ἐθανατώθη.

Κατὰ ἀνατολὰς δὲ τούτου ὑπῆρχον τὰ παλάτια Κλεονίδους καὶ
Μελιτιάδου· καὶ πλησίον τούτων ἀκμὴν ἴσταται διδασκαλεῖον
λεγόμενον τοῦ Ἀριστοτέλους. Ὑπερθε δὲ τούτῳ ἴστανται δύο κίονες·
καὶ εἰς μὲν τὸν ἀνατολικὸν ὑπῆρχε τὸ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἀγαλμα, εἰς δὲ τὸν
δυτικὸν <τὸ> τοῦ Ποσειδῶνος· μέσον δὲ τούτου^c λέγουσιν εἶναί ποτε
Γοργόνης κεφαλὴν ἔνδον κουβουκλείου σιδηροῦ· ἔστι δὲ καὶ ὄρο-
λόγιον τῆς ἡμέρας μαρμαριτικόν.

Ἄντικρυς δὲ τούτου πρὸς μεσημβρίαν ὑπῆρχε διδασκαλεῖον
λεγόμενον τοῦ Ἀριστοφάνους· καὶ ἀνατολικά ἀκμὴν ἴσταται ὁ
λύχνος τοῦ Δημοσθένους· πλησίον δὲ τούτου ἦν τότε καὶ τοῦ
Θουκιδίδου οἴκημα καὶ Σώλωνος, ἀγορὰ τε ἡ δευτέρα, καὶ ὁ οἶκος
τοῦ Ἀλκμαίονος, καὶ βαλανεῖον μέγιστον· καὶ πρὸς νότον τούτου ἡ
μεγάλη ἀγορὰ τῆς πόλεως καὶ τεμένη πλείστα ἀξιάγαστα ἐπὶ τῆς
πύλης νότιδος· ἧς πρὸς τῆς φλιαῆς ἰστόρηται ἔννεκαίδεκα ἄνδρες
<οἱ> τὸν ἕνα ἐδίωκον.^d Ἐκεῖ ὑπῆρχε καὶ τὸ βασιλικὸν λουτρόν, ἐν ᾧ
τὸ μέγαν Βασίλειον διὰ πατάγων φοβῆσαι ἠθέλησαν· ἔνθα καὶ ὁ τοῦ
Μνηστάρχου οἶκος.

¹³ See Di Branco (n. 1) 114–116.

Ἰστανται δὲ κατὰ ἀνατολὰς τούτου καμάρα μεγίστη καὶ ὠραία· εἰσὶ δὲ τὰ ὀνόματα Ἀδριανοῦ καὶ Θησέως· εὐρίσκεται ἕνδον τῆς αὐλῆς [---] μεγίστη ἐτύγγανεν· εἰς ἣν οἶκος βασιλικός· ὑπῆρχε πλείστοις δὲ κίσιν, ὑποκάτωθεν^ε στηριζόμενος, ὅστις ἐλεπτουργήθη πρὸς τῶν δύο καὶ δέκα βασιλέων τῶν τὴν ἄκραν οἰκοδομησάντων.

Πρὸς δὲ νότον τούτων ἐστὶν οἶκος βασιλικός πλὴν ὠραίος, εἰς ὃν κατερχόμενος ὁ δούξ κατὰ καιρὸν εἰς εὐωχίαν ἐκινεῖτο· ἐκεῖ ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ Νεάκρουνος πηγή ἢ Καλλιρρόη, εἰς ἣν λουόμενος ἀνήρχετο εἰς τέμενος τὸ τῆς Ἑρας λεγόμενον καὶ προσηύχετο· νῦν δὲ μετεποιήθη εἰς ναὸν τῆς ὑπεραγίας Θεοτόκου ὑπὸ τῶν εὐσεβῶν.

Κατὰ ἀνατολὰς δὲ τούτου ἐστὶ τὸ τῶν Ἀθηνῶν θέατρον κύκλω περιεχόμενον, ὡσεὶ μιλίου διάστημα, δύο εἰσόδους κεκτημένον [---] βορεινῆ εἰσόδος πλουτεῖ. Ἔτερον δὲ [---] νωτινῆ,^ε ἐπικέκταται· ἑκατὸν δὲ ζῶναις ἐκοσμεῖτο κυκλοτερώς τὸ θέατρον ἐκ μαρμάρου πεποιημένος λευκοῦ, ἐν αἷς ὁ λαὸς καθεζόμενος ἐθεώρει τῶν ἀγωνιζόμενον κατὰ τὴν πάλην.^ε

Ἐκ τούτου οὖν εἰσερχόμενοι τὴν ἀνατολικὴν πύλην, εὐρίσκομεν ἄλλην ἀγορὰν καὶ ἀγωγὸς ὕδατος δύο, οὓσπερ ὁ Ἰούλιος Καῖσαρ Ἀθηναίοις χαριζόμενος κατεσκεύασε καὶ ὕδωρ μήκοθεν τούτοις ἐκόμησεν. Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἕτερος ἀγωγὸς κατὰ τὴν βόριον πύλην φερόμενος, ὃν ὁ Θησεὺς ἐλεπτούργησε καὶ ταῦτα μετὰ τὴν τῆς πόλεως τῶν Ἀθηνῶν τυραννίδα, ὡς φησὶν Ἀβάρης καὶ Ἡρόδοτος ὑπὸ δυοκαίδεκα βασιλέων ἐλεπτουργήθη· Κέκρωψ δὲ ὁ διφυῆς μεγάλως ἐφαίδρυνε, ἐν ποικίλῃ δόξῃ ταύτην ὠραΐσας· τὰ μὲν τεῖχη πρὸς ὕψος ἐγείρας, τὸ δὲ ἔδαφος διαφόροις μαρμάρους καταστρώσας καὶ τὰ τεμένη ἕνδοθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν καταχρύσας, Ἀθήνας, ταύτην ἐπωνόμασεν.^ε

Εἰς γοῦν τὴν ἀκρόπολιν ἡμῶν εἰσερχομένων εὐρίσκομεν ἓνα (sic!) μικρὸν διδασκαλεῖον, ὅπερ ὑπῆρχε τῶν μουσικῶν, ὅπερ Πυθαγόρας ὁ Σάμιος συνεστήσατο. Κατέναντι δὲ τούτου ἐστὶ παλάτιον μέγιστον· καὶ ὑποκάτωθεν τούτου ἴστανται πλείστοι [---] λακῶν,^ε καὶ μαρμάρων πλουτεῖ σὺν τῇ ὀροφῇ καὶ τοῖς τείχεσι. πρὸς δὲ τὸ βόρειον κλείτος ὑπῆρχε πᾶσα καγγελαρία ἐκ μαρμάρου καὶ κιόνων πεποιημένη λευκῶν. Κατὰ νότον δὲ ταύτης ὑπῆρχεν ἡ στοὰ ἐν ποικίλῃ ὠραιότητι περιεχυρομένη γύροθεν καὶ ἔξωθεν καὶ λίθοις τιμίαις κεκοσμημένη διὰ ταύτην καὶ Σταῖκοι φιλόσοφοι ἐλέγοντο οἱ ἐν ταύτῃ μαθητευθέντες· ἀντικρὺς δὲ ταύτης τὸ τῶν Ἐπικουρείων ἡκμαζε διδασκαλεῖον. Περὶ δὲ γε τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς Θεομήτορος, ὃν ᾠκοδόμησαν Ἀπολλῶς καὶ Εὐλόγιος ἐπ' ὀνόματι Ἀγνώστῳ Θεῷ, ἔχει οὕτως· ἔστι ναὸς δρομικώτατος καὶ εὐρύχωρος εἰς μύκος πολὺ ἐπεκτεινόμενος· καὶ τὰ τεῖχη τούτου ἐκ μαρμάρου πεποιημένα· λευκοῦ· τετράγωνος δὲ ἡ τούτων θέσις καθέστηκε, πηλοῦ καὶ ἀσβέστου χωρὶς· διὰ σιδήρου δὲ καὶ μολύβδου ὁ πᾶς τοῖχος ἀνείγεται.^ε ἔκτος δὲ τοῦ τοίχου πλουτεῖ κίονας παμμεγέθεις κυκλικῶς τὸν ναὸν περιέχοντας· μεταξύ δὲ τῶν δύο κιόνων περιέχει πλαγίωσιν. Πρὸς δὲ τῇ ὠραίᾳ πύλῃ καὶ τὸ ἅγιον

βῆμα, ἄπερ εἰσὶ κατὰ λίβαν καὶ θρασῖ--] τὴν τῶν κίωνων στάσιν.ⁿ Ἐπικέκτηται, μέχρι δὲ πολλοῦ προϊούσα εἰς ὕψος, κεφαλαὶ δὲ τῶν κίωνων κεκολλαμμένοι διὰ γλυφῆς σιδήρου εἰς σχῆμα φοίνικος. Εἰσὶ δὲ μεταπεποιημένοι· καὶ τούτου ὑπερθεῖν δοκοῖ ἐκ μαρμάρου πεποιημένοι λευκοῦ τοῖς τείχεσι καὶ τῷ τείχει προσκολλώμενοι,^o πλάκας κεκολλαμένας ὑπεράνωθεν ἔχοντες^p καὶ εἰς ὄροφῆς ὁμοίωμα, ἢ τούτων ἐπιφαίνεται κύρτωσις· στηρίζεται δὲ ὑπὸ τῶν κίωνων καὶ τοίχος ὠραιότατος.

^a εἰς χωρίον Vat., ad sensum potior

^b θαλαμπῖοι, Vat.

^c τούτων Vat., ad sensum potior

^d τὸν ἕνα διώκοντες Vat.

^e ταύτης ἀύλῃ μεγίστη, καὶ οἶκος βασιλικός add. Vat.

^f δὲν τι μαχαίτα τὸν ἢ v. Vat. <ἄ>ντιμαχέτατον ἢ v. sugg. Fiaccadori

^g ἀγониζομένων τὴν πάλην Vat., ad sensum fere potior

^h διὰ τοῦτο χρυσᾶς Ἀθήνας ταύτην ἐπωνόμασεν Vat., ad sensum potior

ⁱ ὑποκάτωθεν τοῦτο κίνες φέρειν πλείονα· λευκῶν δὲ Vat., ad sensum potior

^l πεποιημένου Vindob.

^m πᾶς τεῖχος εἰς ὕψος ἀνάγεται Vat., ad sensum potior.

ⁿ καὶ θρασικίαν διπλὴν τῶν κίωνων ἐπικέκτηται στάσιν. Vat.

^o τοῖς κίωσι καὶ τῷ τείχῳ προσκολόμενοι Vat., ad sensum potior.

^p ἔχοντα Vat., ad sensum potior.

The writer begins his guide by indicating the supposed locations of famous ancient philosophical schools around the city. Then he begins his description of sites and buildings inside the city. He identifies the Tower of the Winds as the school of Socrates, probably on the ground of the interests on meteorology and winds which have been attributed to Socrates in Aristophanes' *Clouds*: a very famous play.¹⁴

On the west of the Tower, thus in the area of the classical ἀγορά, he “sees” the “palace” of Themistocles. Perhaps this identification is reminiscent of the setting of Themistocles's house and estate in Melite, not far from the classical ἀγορά¹⁵ as well as of the possible contribution given by this general towards establishing this ἀγορά as the most important square of Athens.¹⁶

¹⁴ Concerning the fortune of Aristophanes in middle Byzantine times, see e.g. V. Coulon and H. Van Daele, *Aristophane I* (Paris 1934) x–xxii.

¹⁵ See Plutarch, *Themistocles* 22, 1–2.

¹⁶ See for this theory J. K. Papadopoulos, *Ceramicus redivivus* (Princeton (2003) 271–316.

Nearby the writer places the building of the Archon Polemarch: of course he must refer to the Polemarcheion – the official seat of the Polemarch – perhaps on the authority of Aristotle.¹⁷ The Polemarcheion has not been located but it may well have been not far from the classical ἀγορά, where the Polemarch attended important duties.¹⁸ Near that building the writer “sees” statues of Zeus. In the area of the classical ἀγορά there were several statues of Zeus:¹⁹ thus that location of ἀγάλματα of this god makes perfectly sense.²⁰

In front of these statues an “altar” (βωμός) is located: in this topographical context the altar mentioned is probably the most important and monumental among the altars of the ἀγορά: that of the Twelve Gods.²¹ This identification is strengthened by the circumstance that in the guide the place linked to the memory of St. Philip is located north of this βωμός: the church dedicated to this saint is exactly north of the altar of the Twelve Gods.²²

In the area of the altar our writer places honours paid to athletes: exactly in the sanctuary of the Twelve Gods, athletic dedications have been found.²³ This fact can be hardly coincidental and reveals that the writer of the guide could see ancient monuments and areas which later disappeared.

The writer specifies that honours were paid to winners in the pancratium as well as in Olympic games and dedications of winners in the pancratium and at Olympia have been found in the classical ἀγορά.²⁴

The writer continues his information by asserting that the rhetors delivered their speeches there: it is well known that the area in front of the Στοά ποικίλη, just north of the altar of the Twelve Gods, was the privileged spot of rhetors and philosophers.²⁵

¹⁷ See Aristotle, *Athenaion politeia* 3, 5; see also Suidas, s. v. ἄρχων

¹⁸ See R. E. Wycherley, *The Athenian Agora III. Literary and Epigraphical Testimonia* (Princeton, N. J. 1957) sources nos. 258; 274; 582; 588.

¹⁹ See Wycherley (n. 18) sources nos. 2; 26–29; 402; 419.

²⁰ The suggested identification of these statues with the ‘Atlants’ of the Odeion of Agrippa (Di Branco [n. 1] 117–118 n. 6) is hardly acceptable, given the great iconographical distance between the imagery of Zeus and that of these subjects.

²¹ Concerning this altar, J. McK. Camp II, *The Athenian Agora Site Guide* (Princeton, N. J. 2010) 89–90. This βωμός has been identified with the Hephaisteion (Di Branco [n. 1] 118 n. 7). However a reader would have hardly understood the reference of this word, which usually means ‘altar’, to a temple. Moreover the writer specifies that the place sacred to St. Philip is just north of this βωμός while the Church of St. Philip in the ἀγορά lies east – north east of the Hephaisteion.

²² About the Church of St. Philip, see A. Frantz, *The Athenian Agora XXIV. Late Antiquity* (Princeton, N. J. 1988) 73–74.

²³ See Wycherley (n. 18) sources nos. 371, 376, 378. See K. Seaman, “Athletes and Agoraphobia?”, *Nikephoros* 15 (2002) 99–115.

²⁴ See Seaman (n. 23) 105–106.

²⁵ See Wycherley (n. 18) sources nos. 63–65, 69, 72, 74–76, 93–94, 97–98.

The first ἀγορά is located in the area just north of the βωμός, where St. Philip was supposed to have performed a miracle, i. e. where the Church of St. Philip was set up.²⁶ The reference is to the classical ἀγορά: it is regarded πρώτη (first) because in classical times it was the most important square of the city.

The writer of the guide praises the northern part of the ἀγορά probably because the Church of St. Philip retained the memory of the supposed miracle of this saint.

The reference in the guide to the Pandionis tribe may stem from the presence in the ἀγορά of the statue of the eponymous hero Pandion.²⁷

The place where the Cynics held their teaching is also located nearby: this is in keeping with the facts that Diogenes the Cynic lived in his jar just outside the Στοὰ ποικίλη²⁸ and that the Cynic Crates also spent time there.²⁹

The place where tragic actors performed their plays is also located nearby: it goes without saying that the guide refers to the ὀρχήστρα of the ἀγορά and perhaps also to the Odeion of Agrippa.³⁰

Then the guide locates the Θαλαμπῖοι, probable abbreviation of Θαλαμοποιοί. This was the name of a play of Aeschylus³¹ and thus may still refer to the area of the ἀγορά devoted to theatrical performances. In this case the location of the place west of the Acropolis would not be precise because this area lies north – north west of the citadel. Alternatively the θαλαμοποιοί may have been the preparers of the bridal room where the union of the wife of the Archon Βασιλεύς or Βασιλῖννα with Dionysus took place.³² Although nothing is known about that, they may have had their own institutional seat in the area of the classical ἀγορά, considering that the Archon Βασιλεύς attended his duties in this square.³³

Nearby the guide places a building linked to the memory of Sophocles. I suggest that it refers to the Στρατηγεῖον, an institution where Sophocles had been the protagonist of a famous episode.³⁴

The guide specifies that the Areopagus is just south of this building and this circumstance strengthens my identification because the Στρατηγεῖον

²⁶ See note 22.

²⁷ See Wycherley (n. 18) sources nos. 232 and 245 and Camp (n. 21) 66–68.

²⁸ See Wycherley (n. 18) source no. 95.

²⁹ See Wycherley (n. 18) source no. 52.

³⁰ On this area of the ἀγορά see Camp (n. 21) 105 and 114–118.

³¹ See Aeschylus, frgg. 78–78 a Sommerstein.

³² About this union *loci classici* are Demosthenes 59, 73–78 and Aristotle, *Athenaion politeia* 3, 5. See C. Gasparri, “Dionysos”, *LIMC* 3 (1986) 419 and 491–492, nos. 820–826.

³³ See Wycherley (n. 18) sources nos. 38, 1912, 197, 535, 548, 582, 588. Concerning the Στοὰ Βασίλειος see Camp (n. 21) 75–81.

³⁴ See Plutarch, *Nicias* 15, 2. On the Στρατηγεῖον see Camp (n. 21) 51–52.

probably stood on the northern slopes of the Areopagus.³⁵ The building mentioned was no longer visible at the time of the writer (see his use of the verb in the imperfect: ὑπῆρχε).

Then the guide mentions buildings associated with Kleonides and Miltiades which once stood on east of the Areopagus and no longer existed (see ὑπῆρχον). This Kleonides may coincide with the high ranking 5th c. Athenian citizen.³⁶

The building given to Miltiades probably is the fountain Klepsydra which in fact had been promoted by the Philaids and lies exactly on east of the Areopagus.³⁷ Although the fountain had been in fact built by Miltiades' son – Cimon – this undertaking may have been conceived already by Cimon's father. In that case the guide would preserve an otherwise unknown tradition.

The reference to the “so called school of Aristotle” refers probably to the philosophical schools which had been constituted in late antiquity on the south of the Acropolis and where philosophers who became famous for their *commentaria in Aristotelem Graeca* taught.³⁸ The fact that the guide defines this attribution λεγόμενον (said to be) implies that the writer was aware of its convention.

Above this complex the writer sees two columns which are still preserved now, remembers that a head of Gorgon once stood nearby and notes a marble sun-dial.³⁹ His suggestion that statues of Poseidon and Athena once stood above the two columns, which is not correct, derives from the reading of Pausanias 1, 22, 3, who saw a group of Athena and Poseidon on the terrace of the Acropolis. This passage may have led its medieval readers to the conclusion that these statues stood above the two mentioned columns.⁴⁰

Then the guide reports that in front of these monuments towards the south there had been (ὑπῆρχε) the ‘so called school of Aristophanes’

³⁵ It has been suggested that the guide wrongly identifies the Areopagus with the Pnyx (Di Branco [n. 1] 118 n. 15) but this suggestion is unnecessary.

³⁶ See J. Traill, *Persons of Ancient Athens* 10 (Toronto 2001) 488, no. 579370.

³⁷ About this fountain see V. Barkas, *North, East and West Slopes of the Akropolis* (Athens 2004) 13–18. These buildings have been identified with the Odeion of Herodes Atticus but the circumstance that this concert hall still existed in medieval times while the buildings mentioned in the guide had already disappeared goes against this suggestion.

³⁸ See A. Karivieri, “The ‘House of Proclus’ on the southern slope of the Acropolis”, in P. Castren (ed.), *Post-Herulian Athens* (Helsinki 1994) 115–139.

³⁹ The head of Medusa had been seen by Pausanias 1, 21, 3. About the monuments on the southern slopes of the Acropolis, above the theatre of Dionysus, see G. Kavvadias (ed.), *South Slope of the Acropolis* (Athens 2004) 23–24. About the sun-dial set up near the Thrasyllus monument see Schaldach, *Die antiken Sonnenuhren Griechenlands* (Frankfurt a. M. 2006) 91–93, no. 2.

⁴⁰ About the group of Athena and Poseidon, see F. Ghedini, “Il gruppo di Atena e Poseidon sull'Acropoli di Atene”, *RdA* 7 (1983) 12–36. Concerning the fortune of Pausanias in the Byzantine world, see A. Diller, *Studies in Greek Manuscript Tradition* (Amsterdam 1983) 149–162.

(διδασκαλεῖον λεγόμενον τοῦ Ἀριστοφάνους). As usual διδασκαλεῖον in our text does not mean only ‘school’ but more generically a place where someone displayed his skills or left his renown. This architectural complex is of course the theatre of Dionysus Eleuthereus.⁴¹ The reference to Aristophanes makes sense because this comic poet illustrated greatly the Athenian theatre. With the word λεγόμενον the author suggests that he is aware that this nickname of the place is conventional.

On east of the theatre the ‘lamp of Demosthenes’ is said to be still standing: of course it is the monument of Lysicrates⁴² which had been called by the same name in the late XIIth c. also by Michael Akominatos Choniates.⁴³

Then the guide specifies that ‘near’ (πλησίον) Lysicrates’ monument ‘the building (οἴκημα) of Thucydides and Solon was once’ (ἦν τότε) but disappeared. The reference can be only to the Prytaneion: it is associated to Thucydides because the historian in a famous passage (2, 15, 2, see also the scholiast, *ad locum*) narrates that Theseus with his synoecism established a single Prytaneion. It also refers to Solon because this law maker established rules about the meals which were served in the Prytaneion (Chionides in Athenaeus 4, 14, 137 e) and especially as his laws were kept in this institution (see Cratinus, frg. 300 K–A; Plutarch, *Solon* 25, 1; Pausanias 1, 18, 3–4). This identification is nearly certain because no other institution in the area could be linked to both Thucydides and Solon.

The consequence of these considerations is that thanks to this guide we know the area where the Prytaneion was set up: near Lysicrates monument.

Next to this building there was “the second agora” (ἀγορά τε ἡ δευτέρᾳ): since the first ἀγορά, located where the Church of St. Philip is, was of course the classical ἀγορά, the second ἀγορά may be only the other important square of Athens, the archaic ἀγορά.⁴⁴ This passage of the guide assumes an extraordinary importance for the scholar of the Athenian topography because it is the only written text which gives a clear location to this ἀγορά.

The house of Alcmaeon is mentioned just after the ἀγορά. Alcmaeon was the mythical ancestor of the influential aristocratic Athenian family of the Alcmaeonids – which in archaic times played a prominent role in Athens⁴⁵ – and was thought to have been contemporary of Theseus.⁴⁶ Thus the presence of the Alcmaeonids’ house next to the ἀρχαία ἀγορά makes perfectly sense.

⁴¹ About the theatre see S. Gogos, *Das Dionysos Theater von Athen* (Vienna 2008).

⁴² See S. Agelidis, *Choregische Weihgeschenke* (Bonn 2009) 165–168.

⁴³ See Michael Akominatos Choniates, *Τὰ σωζόμενα* 1, 97 and Di Branco (n. 1) 110 n. 221.

⁴⁴ About this ἀγορά see N. Robertson, “The City Center of Archaic Athens”, *Hesperia* 67 (1998) 283–302 and Papadopoulos (n. 16).

⁴⁵ See E. Stein-Hoelkeskamp, “Alkmaionidai”, *DNP* 1 (1996) 509–511.

⁴⁶ See A. Schachter, “Alkmaion (2)”, *DNP* 1 (1996) 508.

Next to this house, ‘large baths’ (βαλανεῖον μέγιστον) are mentioned. I suggest that these baths are identified with the Hadrianic building whose front is constituted by the unfluted columns with their own entablature disposed along Lysicrates Street, in St. Aikaterini Square.⁴⁷ In fact unfluted columns are adopted in buildings pertaining to the sphere of the *opportunitas*, i. e. in public buildings and not in temples. For example at Athens and in the same Hadrianic period very similar unfluted columns are adopted in the Library of Hadrian.⁴⁸ Moreover similar unfluted columns characterized also other 2nd c. AD baths of our city.⁴⁹ Finally a hypocaust of baths was found under Lysicrates Street and probably belongs to the large building in front of the Church of St. Aikaterini.⁵⁰ This find makes the identification of the large baths of our guide with the large architectural complex of Lysicrates Street nearly certain.

As Travlos pointed out⁵¹ the surviving columns pertained to either a perystyle or to the front portico of the baths. The latter hypothesis is more likely: in front of these columns there was the road going from the Gate of Hadrian to Lysicrates’ monument.⁵² South of these baths there was ‘the great agora of the city’: of course it is still the archaic ἀγορά which was regarded the ἀγορά par excellence of the city also by Pausanias.⁵³ Near the ἀγορά there are ‘many sanctuaries worthy of admiration’: of course he refers to the sanctuary of Pity, to the Theseion, to the Anakeion, to the Aglaurion, to the Sarapeion and finally to the temple of Eileithyia which stood in the area.⁵⁴

The representation in the southern gate of 19 men following one man may have been a relief evocation of a πομπή.

Then the guide mentions the ‘royal baths’ as existing once (see ὑπήρχε) between the area which is now St. Aikaterini Square and the gate of Hadrian. These baths may coincide with those discovered below Amalias Avenue.⁵⁵

⁴⁷ Concerning this building see Papadopoulos (n. 16) 284 and G. C. R. Schmalz, “The Athenian Prytaneion Discovered?”, *Hesperia* 75 (2006) 33–81. The identification of this complex with the Prytaneion suggested by Schmalz is unlikely because the find of the hypocaust supports rather the suggestion that baths were installed there.

⁴⁸ See I. Τιγγινάγκα, “Η αφανής αρχιτεκτονική της βιβλιοθήκης του Αδριανού”, in Σ. Βλίζος (ed.), *Η Αθήνα κατά τη Ρωμαϊκή εποχή* (n. 6) 133–152.

⁴⁹ See I. Θρεψιάδες, “Ανασκαφαί νοτίως της Ακροπόλεως”, *Πρακτικά* (1950) 64–121, particularly 82, fig. 15 and G. Daux, “Chronique des fouilles 1959”, *BCH* 84 (1960) 618–868, particularly 642, fig. 5.

⁵⁰ See Δ. Κεραμόπουλλος, “Αθηνών ευρήματα”, *Αρχαιολογική εφημερίς* (1911) 257–261, particularly 259–261 and N. Πλάτων, “Εἰς τὴν οδὸν Λυσικράτους”, *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον* 18 (1963) *Χρονικά* 37.

⁵¹ See Travlos (n. 6) 181, no. H.

⁵² See S. Ficuciello, *Le strade di Atene* (Atene 2008) 76–78.

⁵³ See Pausanias 1, 17, 1. See Robertson (n. 44).

⁵⁴ See Pausanias 1, 17, 1 – 18, 5.

⁵⁵ See *BCH* 49 (1925) 440 and Travlos (n. 6) 181, no. J.

The house of Mnestarchus was the last building before Hadrian's gate: this building is archaeologically unknown, probably because it lies below Amalias Avenue.

Then the guide speaks of the gate of Hadrian as still standing. After the gate the author sees a 'royal building': of course the Olympieion. The attribution of the beginning of this architectural complex to the royal period of Athens – i. e. to remote times – is consistent with Pausanias' report (1, 18, 8) that Deucalion founded it.

South of the Olympieion the guide places the 'royal building' where the δούξ went for festivities. The sanctuary of Hera where the δούξ offered prayers was probably part of this complex: the whole architectural ensemble is probably the Panhellenion (see above). Nearby the fountain Callirrhoe or Enneacrounos is mentioned, according to a long tradition.⁵⁶

Then the stadium of Herodes Atticus is recorded as still extant. After this complex the guide mentions two aqueducts.⁵⁷

Then the guide cites Abaris and Herodotus as authorities on the construction of Athens during the age of the kings. The oracles and poems of Abaris do not survive:⁵⁸ thus his citation cannot be verified. However it may suggest that the author of the guide had still access to sources of information which have been lost at a later moment. Concerning Herodotus, the guide may refer to 6, 137, 2 where the historian attributes the well-built and beautiful walls of Athens to the royal and mythical age of the city.

After these citations the guide begins its description of the Acropolis mentioning a 'school' of musicians. He may refer to a place where musicians were supposed to have performed during the Panathenaic festivals.⁵⁹ Since the Pythagoreans were an important component of the Athenian philosophical world⁶⁰ the reference of the guide to Pythagoras for Athenian musicians is understandable.

The palace mentioned after the school of musicians is of course to be identified with the Propylaea. The north wing of the Propylaea is thought to have had in the past the function of the chancellery. The southern wing is wrongly thought to have been the Στοὰ ποικίλη: we can guess that the

⁵⁶ See R. Toelle-Kastenbein, "Kallirrhoe und Enneakrunos", *Jdl* 101 (1986) 55–73.

⁵⁷ About these aqueducts see S. Leigh, *The Aqueduct of Hadrian with the Water Supply of Roman Athens* (Ann Arbor 2001).

⁵⁸ See G. Bandy, "Abaris", *DNP* 1 (1996) 5–6.

⁵⁹ About the music contests during the Panathenaic festivals see R. Ross Holloway, "Music at the Panathenaic Festival", *Archaeology* 19 (1966) 112–119 and G. Nagy, *Plato's Rhapsody and Homer's Music: the Poetics of the Panathenaic Festival in Classical Athens* (Washington D. C. 2002).

⁶⁰ See A. Barbera, "Another Look at Plato and the Pythagoreans", *AJPh* 102 (1981) 395–410.

portrait of Zenon, the founder of the Stoic school, which was set up in Athens according to Diogenes Laertius 7, 6, was erected in this part of the Acropolis and that thus this spot became linked in the popular memory to the Stoics.

In front of the Propylaea the school of the Epicureans is placed: I am unable to find any explanation of this identification.

Finally the author mentions the Parthenon. His specification that the temple was dedicated to the Unknown God may be explained with the following consideration: already Athenagoras, *Legatio pro Christianis* 17, 4 asserted that the name Athena given to this goddess should be rejected because it is entirely conventional. This opinion may have led to the identification of the deity of the temple with St. Paul's Unknown God.

Finally the guide attributes the Parthenon as church to the patrons or architects Apollos and Eulogius. This information cannot be verified.

A few conclusions

The analysis of the information collected in the guide leads to the following conclusions:

1. At the time of the author of this guide ancient Athens survived much more than at the time of the Grand Tour of the XVIIth and XVIIIth c.: thus it is wrong to identify places and buildings mentioned in the guide only with the antiquities of Athens which still survived half a millennium later.

2. The author of the guide gives the locations also of areas and buildings which no longer existed, on the ground of literary *testimonia*. His citation of Abaris' lost oracles or poems suggests that he used also sources which we no longer have.

3. The author provides important information about several ancient buildings and areas, such as the Polemarcheion, the area around the altar of the Twelve Gods, perhaps the Strategeion, probably the Klepsydra.

4. Finally his description of the area of the archaic ἀγορά offers unique indication about the location of the Prytaneion, of the House of the Alcmaeonids, of the archaic ἀγορά, of the large baths and perhaps also of the royal baths.

Thus the guide should be seriously considered by scholars of the ancient topography of Athens.

Antonio Corso
Athens

Статья посвящена разбору средневекового путеводителя по памятникам древних Афин, чаще всего датируемого XV в. Автор относит этот памятник к концу XII в. и на целом ряде примеров показывает его ценность для изучения топографии древних Афин.