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Abstract

The Erechtheion, the temple dedicated to Athena Polias on the Athenian Acropolis, was an extraordinary structure. The temple was situated on three different levels and had at least six cults worshipped in the complex. Little is known about the interior of the building or the purpose each room served, but the Ionic frieze that would have adorned the temple is the avenue in which this thesis will explore.

The Ionic frieze is believed to be the sole figural decoration on the Erechtheion other than the Porch of the Karyatids, and there is no evidence of pedimental sculpture or statuary akroteria adorning the roof of the building. However, the only extant remains of the frieze are mere fragments of figures and groups of figures. My thesis will explore the possible interpretations of the frieze by first examining the political climate in which the temple and its frieze were created. The myths associated with the gods and heroes included in the sanctuary of the Erechtheion will be considered in my analysis. Lastly, the Erechtheion’s frieze will be regarded in relationship to other fifth century buildings and sculpture in order to determine the frieze’s content and context.
Chapter 1 – Introduction

The Erechtheion, as temple to Athena Polias, was the most important structure on the Athenian Acropolis. Even though the Erechtheion was the most significant of Athena’s shrines, relatively little is known about it. Especially when compared to the information available regarding the largest structure on the Acropolis, the Parthenon, the Erechtheion is to some extent a mystery. Much is known about the Parthenon, especially the sculptures on its exterior and interior, because they were somewhat preserved throughout the years. However, the sculpture from the Erechtheion was almost completely destroyed, and all that remains are mere fragments of figures. As the chief structure religiously on the Acropolis, the sculptural adornment must have represented the authority of Athena and the strength of the Athenian civilization.

As I attempt to decipher the fragmented frieze of the Erechtheion, I will first examine the date and political climate in which the temple and frieze were created, focusing especially on the Persian attack of 480, the Periklean building program and the Peloponnesian War that took place in the late fifth century BCE. I will then, in Chapter Two, discuss the myths associated with the gods and heroes included in the sanctuary of the Erechtheion in order to create a mythical backdrop in which I can place the content of the frieze. Chapter Three will examine the relationship the Erechtheion has with other fifth century Attic sculptural programs as well as the structures included in the Periklean building program. Chapter Four will deal with the extant fragments of the Erechtheion’s frieze which I will then analyze in Chapter Five. I will situate the Erechtheion within the framework of the structures from Chapter Three with the aim of determining the frieze’s content and context.

Persian Attack

In order to thoroughly understand the environment in which the Erechtheion was constructed, the history of fifth century Athens must be examined, beginning with the Persian invasion. The year
480 BCE was a pivotal turning point in Athenian history when the Persians, led by Xerxes, took revenge for their defeat from ten years before. This forced the Athenians to evacuate the city. The Persians then laid siege to Athens’s religious and symbolic center, the Acropolis, as they burned and pillaged citadel walls, temples and shrines.¹ However, before the battle of Plataea, the Greeks and their allies reportedly swore an oath that they would not rebuild what the barbarous Persians had destroyed. They would instead “leave them as memorials for men hereafter.”² Athens, which had been sacked, held this oath strongly. Therefore, there is little evidence in Athens of new buildings between 480 and 450.³

By 477, Athens had set up the Delian League, an alliance of Greek cities allied against Persia. Its treasury, originally on the island of Delos, was moved to Athens in 454 after the Athenians convinced the members of the league of the insecurity of Delos as a holding place for the treasury. The Spartans, however, saw this as Athens’ manipulation of the other cities. They attempted to break Athens’ hold on its empire in the 450s and 440s, but they did not succeed. This struggle perhaps foreshadowed the hostilities of the Peloponnesian War.⁴

**Periklean Building Program**

To recognize the importance of the Erechtheion within the context of other fifth century temples, the structures on the Acropolis that were destroyed by the Persians and eventually rebuilt by Perikles must be discussed. The Acropolis before the Persian attack had been home to numerous temples, shrines and citadel walls, such as the unfinished Older Parthenon, the Old Athena Temple and the Archaic shrine to Athena Nike. During the years 480 to 450 no monumental temple to Athena was built because of the oath taken at the battle of Plataea. It was not until after 450 or 449 that Perikles initiated a public works program that gave Athens the Parthenon, the Propylaia, the Erechtheion and

---

¹ Hurwit 2004, 49.
² Ibid., 53.
³ Pedley 1993, 201.
⁴ Ibid., 200.
the Temple of Athena Nike. The Periklean building program preserved the older, pre-Periklean walls, buildings and statues upon the Acropolis and incorporated them into the new structures. His building program greatly depended on the collective knowledge and reverence of the past events of the Persian War.

Across the entire Periklean Acropolis, the buildings and temples all had a cohesive theme – to be unified in architectural design, sculptural decoration and Athenian pride. Every major element of the Periklean building program was materially, thematically or compositionally bound to at least one predecessor – the Propylaia and Nike bastion to Mycenaean walls and towers, the Erechtheion and Parthenon to late Archaic temples and shrines. All were destroyed by the “barbarians,” the Persians, and they all served as a reminder of that significant day.

**Peloponnesian War**

The Peloponnesian War also brought death and destruction to Athens. Because the Erechtheion was built in the midst of the war, it is imperative to know the effect the war had on the city and its people and how this possibly affected the sculptural program of the temple. The most important source there is of the Peloponnesian War (431 to 404) are the writings of Thucydides. He wrote mostly of war, yet he also described the economic, social and religious endeavors undertaken during this period. Thucydides described why the supposed time of peace between Athens and Sparta that had lasted since 445 erupted into war in 431. Both Athens and Sparta were growing in power during the years of peace, and Perikles had attempted to make Athens a “paragon of beauty and culture.” Enormous amounts of money were spent in order to expand the festivals and cults of Athens while

---

5 Hurwit 2004, 55.
6 Hurwit 2004, 84.
7 Ehrenberg 1968, 259.
8 Thucydides 1, 18, 3.
monumentalizing the religious buildings. According to Ehrenberg, the wealthy population had a large share in these expenses, though it is unclear whether or not they were purely voluntarily given.²⁹

In 445, Perikles struck a thirty-year peace treaty with the Spartans. However, this only lasted fourteen years. Conflict between Sparta and Athens began when Athens participated in the conflict between Corinth and Corcyra, the fight for Potidaea and the Megarian decree.¹⁰ Corcyra and Potidaea were both Corinthian colonies. Corinth was a Spartan ally so naturally the interference of Athens did not bode well with the Spartans. Furthermore, under the guidance of Perikles, Athens issued a decree banning the Peloponnesian city Megara, an ally of Corinth, from the Athenian Agora and harbors throughout the empire. In the spring of 431, Spartan ally Thebes launched a surprise attack on Plataea, one of Athens’s allies. This began the war, but in Thucydides opinion, “the Athenians, growing powerful, scared the Spartans and forced them into war.”¹¹

In 430 a plague entered Athens, and for two years the Athenians were greatly decreased in number. Almost one third of the population perished. Perikles himself died from sickness in 429.¹² After ten years of battle to no end, Athens and Sparta signed a peace treaty, the Peace of Nikias, but Athens was persistent in controlling the empire and fighting broke out again in 415. The Athenian fleet was finally destroyed at Aegosptoami in 405 and the city eventually submitted to Spartan forces in 404.¹³

As will be discovered in following chapters, the invasion of the “barbaric” Persians and the struggle between the Peloponnesians and the inhabitants of Attica greatly inspired art during the fifth century BCE. This not only pertained to the well-known sculptural program of the Parthenon, but I hypothesize that it also played a large part in the thematic composition of the Erechtheion’s frieze.

---
²⁹ Ehrenberg 1968, 233.
¹⁰ Ibid., 260.
¹¹ Hurwit 2004, 89; Thucydides 1.23.6.
¹² Hurwit 2004, 91.
¹³ Pedley 1993, 236.
Chapter 2 – Function of the Erechtheion

Even though Athens had endured plague, death and war during the second half of the fifth century, the Acropolis continued to thrive architecturally and sculpturally. Although Perikles died in 429, his vision of monumentalizing the Acropolis in order to glorify Athens and Athena continued. The Erechtheion, among the structures discussed previously, were all part of his plan. The Erechtheion, the temple dedicated to Athena Polias on the Athenian Acropolis, is a building that is enigmatic in numerous ways. It is a unique structure architecturally, and it is located on the northern side of the Acropolis. The temple was built on three different levels, perhaps owing to the fact that multiple deities were worshipped here. This chapter will discuss not only the plan of the building and the myths relating to Erechtheus, but also the numerous cults worshipped in and around the Erechtheion. I will study these stories in order to create a mythical reference point with the aim of interpreting the frieze in a later chapter.

The Erechtheion is a well-preserved building, still largely standing, yet little is known about the interior of the building, the purpose each room served or the sculptural decoration. In his writings, Pausanias mentioned a Temple of Athena Polias “in which the ancient image is.”\textsuperscript{14} He described the Erechtheion as a “double building” with an altar to Zeus Hypatos on the outside and shrines to Poseidon-Erechtheus, Boutes and Hephaistos on the inside.\textsuperscript{15} The Erechtheion is usually understood to be a replacement for the much larger, late Archaic temple known as “the Dörpfeld Temple” or “the Old Athena Temple” just to the south which had been destroyed by the Persians in 480 BCE, because the Erechtheion’s Karyatid Porch juts out over the older building’s remaining foundations (fig. 1).\textsuperscript{16} However, there are conflicting arguments on this point which will be discussed below.

\textsuperscript{14} Hurwit 2004, 166.
\textsuperscript{15} Ibid., 164.
\textsuperscript{16} Ibid., 166.
The Temple to Athena Polias

The Erechtheion, the temple dedicated to Athena Polias on the Athenian Acropolis, is a building that is shrouded in mystery (fig. 2).

The Erechtheion was the classical building that housed the ancient cult, but there had likely always been a shrine to Athena there as the site of a ritual rarely changes. Sometime in the late sixth century a large temple was built near the center of the Acropolis summit called the *archaios naos*, or “ancient

---

It was designated the ancient temple because it was where the original ancient olivewood statue of Athena Polias was kept.\textsuperscript{18} The remains of the Archaic temple, discovered by Dörpfeld in 1886, are located to the south and south-west of the Erechtheion. The remains, which now consist of the foundations and one stone from the top course of the stylobate, are enough to reveal that the temple was of the common peripteral pattern, meaning it was surrounded by a peristyle. Its two narrow ends faced approximately east and west. The length of the temple excluding the colonnade was about 33.5 meters which is equivalent to about 100 Attic feet.\textsuperscript{19} When the Persians attacked the Acropolis in 480, the \textit{archaios naos} was damaged, perhaps even destroyed. A year later before the battle of Plataea, the Greek allies banded together to swear to an oath stating that the newly destroyed monuments would be left unrepai ne as a constant reminder of what the barbarians had done. It was not until 421, after the first phase of the Peloponnesian War was coming to an end, that the new temple to Athena Polias was built.\textsuperscript{20}

Most of the information we have comes from the descriptions of the Acropolis by Pausanias in the second century CE.

There is also a building called Erechtheion. Before the entrance is an altar of Zeus Hypatos on which they never sacrifice a living creature, but offer cakes, without using any wine either. When one enters, there are altars: one to Poseidon on which in obedience to an oracle they sacrifice also to Erechtheus, a second to the hero Butes, and a third to Hephaistos. On the walls are paintings representing the clans of the Butadai, and…for the building is double. And in the interior there is sea-water in a well. But this is no great marvel, for it is found in other inland regions as well, as for example Aphrodisias in Caria. However, the well on the Akropolis is remarkable for the noise of waves it produces when the south wind blows, and on the rock is the imprint of a trident. These phenomena are said to have appeared as evidence in support of Poseidon’s claim to the land.\textsuperscript{21}

Pausanias later mentions a temple of Athena Polias, but he called it \textit{naos} instead of \textit{oikema}, or treasury, as if this were a new temple he has yet to describe.\textsuperscript{22} This could be because of two reasons, Jeppesen stated. Jeppesen claimed that perhaps there could have been confusion in Pausanias’s notes, but that

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{18} Hurwit 2004, 68.
\item \textsuperscript{19} Frazer 1892, 154.
\item \textsuperscript{20} Rhodes 1995, 131.
\item \textsuperscript{21} Pausanias 1.26.5.
\item \textsuperscript{22} Pausanias 1.27.1.
\end{itemize}
most likely Pausanias distinguished the separate halves of the building by designating the eastern and western halves of the building as “the Temple of the Polias,” or naos, and “the Erechtheion,” or oikema, respectively.\footnote{Jeppesen 1987, 9.} However, it is more likely that Pausanias did not distinguish between the Erechtheion and the Temple of Athena Polias because they are one and the same.\footnote{Hurwit 2004, 166.}

The west end of the Erechtheion, one with a porch of columns on the north and one with a porch of Karyatids on the south, makes the building unusual, with its two side porches, enclosed front and elevated colonnade.\footnote{Jeppesen 1987, 9.} The architect of the Erechtheion chose not build the temple on a single level. Instead he chose to “express, emphatically, those irregularities of site in the plan and elevation” of the temple. As will be shown, by designing the temple in this manner, the architect emphasized the mythological past of the ground on which the temple was located.\footnote{Rhodes 1995, 134.} On the lower level, between the North Porch and the Karyatid Porch was a long corridor-like room that led to the two open rooms west of the space that held the ancient cult image. These two rooms possibly accommodated the three sanctuaries of Poseidon/Erechtheus, Boutes and Hephaistos which Pausanias says he saw in the Erechtheion.\footnote{Jeppesen 1987, 9; Pausanias 1.26.5.} Due to the uneven terrain, the floor of the west chamber and the north porch lie almost on the bedrock, while the east chamber was filled to match the higher grade to the south. The west chamber was the largest room in the building with regards to its height and floor area. Robertson concluded that this must be where the ancient olive wood statue was kept because the size of the room implies importance, yet he was probably mistaken.\footnote{Robertson 1996, 32.} The cult statues were held in the east end of Greek temples, for example as seen in the Parthenon south of the Erechtheion.

The damaged or destroyed archaic temple to Athena seems to have been intentionally incorporated into the architectural planning of its successor, the Erechtheion. It did not only serve a

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Jeppesen 1987, 9.}
\footnote{Hurwit 2004, 166.}
\footnote{Jeppesen 1987, 9.}
\footnote{Rhodes 1995, 134.}
\footnote{Jeppesen 1987, 9; Pausanias 1.26.5.}
\footnote{Robertson 1996, 32.}
\end{footnotes}
specific structural purpose but also created a symbolic link between the Erechtheion and its religious predecessors as well as between the newly restored Periclean Acropolis and the one destroyed by the Persians. Some scholars disagree, however, that the Archaic temple was destroyed. It has been widely acknowledged that the Archaic temple was burned during the Persian attack of Athens in 480. However, Dörpfeld proposed a new theory after his discovery of the foundations that has been revived in recent years by Ferrari, an Archaic and Classical Greek art scholar who focuses primarily on iconography. Some questions left unanswered by Dörpfeld’s discovery of the Archaic temple are why its replacement, the Erechtheion, was less than half the size, and lacked both a peristyle and pedimental sculpture? Why was the Erechtheion not built directly over the remaining foundations of the Archaic temple? Dörpfeld suggested, upon finding foundations beneath the south side of the Erechtheion, that an older temple of Athena Polias must have stood there. He proposed that only the peristyle and entablature of the Archaic temple were destroyed by the Persian invasion, and that its cella remained standing and was even still being used during Pausanias’s visit to the Acropolis in the second century CE, explaining the difference in his description between oikema and naos. This notion, reopened by Ferrari in 2002, however, rejects the historicity of the Oath of Plataea as well as discounting archaeological evidence.

Even the Oath of Plataea remains controversial. Ferrari argued that the Archaic temple destroyed by the Persians was left partly standing and served as a “monument to barbarian sacrilege and Athenian righteousness.” Because the building remained, albeit damaged, it served as a symbolic point of reference to which all other new buildings were built after the Persian invasion. According to Ferrari, debate over whether or not the Oath of Plataea was authentic began already with Theopompos of Chios in the fourth century BCE. Theopompos did not agree with Athens’s military

---

29 Rhodes 1995, 34.
31 Pakkanen 2006, 275.
and governmental decisions and denounced the Oath of Plataea, along with other Athenian claims, as information created to mislead other Greeks. According to Lykourgos’s speech from the late fourth century, because the Athenians held the oath so firmly, “they had the gods on their side to help them,” and even though the other Greeks showed courage, it was the Athenians to whom the most glory was bestowed.\footnote{Lykourgos, \textit{Leokrates} 81.} Ferrari points out, however, that anyone looking at the Acropolis would see that the Athenians indeed had not stood firmly by their oath, as the Parthenon stood towering over the city.\footnote{Ferrari 2002, 14.}

There are reasons, however, why construction on the Parthenon, begun in 447 BCE, might not have broken the Oath of Plataea. Even though some structures were rebuilt between the years 479 and 450, such as the citadel walls, buildings like the Older Parthenon and the Archaic temple were not. It is possible that the Oath of Plataea was nullified by the peace treaty with the Persians in 465, but this peace uneasy and subsequently broke down. It is also a possibility that all the Greeks who fought at Plataea and had sworn to the oath had to agree for the oath to be nullified, not just the Athenians. The more satisfactory renegotiation of the Peace of Kallias in 449 that gave Perikles the opportunity to seek a Panhellenic agreement between all the Greeks present is another possibility for a negation of the Oath of Plataea. Also in 449, Perikles invited all the Greeks to meet in congress at Athens to “discuss the rebuilding of the temples that the Persians had cast down, the sacrifices that they owed the gods, and ways of keeping the peace and guaranteeing freedom of the seas.” Spartans saw this Congress Decree as Perikles’s attempt at re-establishing Athens’s supremacy and they prevented it from taking force. However, Perikles went ahead with his rebuilding plans and presented building proposals before the Athenian assembly probably late in 449.\footnote{Hurwit 2004, 94.}

Much of Ferrari’s argument stems from the epigraphical and literary sources regarding the Dörpfeld Temple/Erechtheion, such as the inscription on the so-called Chandler Stele (\textit{IG} I³ 474). She suggests that a place known as the opisthodomos, referred to in texts in and after 434/433, could

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
  \item \footnote{Lykourgos, \textit{Leokrates} 81.}
  \item \footnote{Ferrari 2002, 14.}
  \item \footnote{Hurwit 2004, 94.}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
possibly refer to the western part of the Archaic temple that was rebuilt to house the ancient olivewood image of Athena after 480, Oath of Plataea or not. The opisthodomos is thought by Ferrari to have occupied the center of the Acropolis during and after the Periklean building program, and it also served as a treasury of gold and silver.\textsuperscript{36} Ferrari argued that if the opisthodomos continued to stand, it is only likely that the cella of the archaic temple also was repaired in order to continue to house the ancient olivewood statue of Athena.\textsuperscript{37} However, there are numerous problems with Ferrari’s theory. There is no direct archeological evidence that supports her theory, only literary and epigraphical references. According to Hurwit, the foremost scholar on the Athenian Acropolis, it would have been more likely that only the eastern part of the Archaic Temple to Athena would be restored because that was the original location of the statue.\textsuperscript{38} When it comes to the location of the Erechtheion, Ferrari states that the Erechtheion was likely a replacement or amplification of a previous shrine mentioned by Herodotos, but the remains of the Archaic temple of Athena Polias continued to serve as the temple.\textsuperscript{39} Ferrari argues that ancient descriptions of the sacred place “leave no doubt that the temple of Erechtheus, although close to the temple of the Polias, was not identical with it.” She notes that the idea that Erechtheus and Athena shared the same temple depends solely on the description in the Catalogue of Ships from the \textit{Iliad} that stated that: “great-spirited Erechtheus, whom once Athena daughter of Zeus reared, but the grain-giving soil bore him, and Athena set him down in Athens in her rich temple” because the Old Athena temple no longer survives.\textsuperscript{40} However, by choosing a different translation of a pronoun, she reads it differently and believes that the passage meant Athena placed Erechtheus “in his own temple” instead of sharing hers with him. Ferrari says that Pausanias mentions “a building called the Erechtheion” and later mentions a second structure called “the temple of Athena

\textsuperscript{36}Hurwit 2004, 76-77.  
\textsuperscript{37}Ferrari 2002, 16.  
\textsuperscript{38}Hurwit 2004, 76-77.  
\textsuperscript{39}Ferrarri 2002, 16; Herodotus 8.55.  
\textsuperscript{40}\textit{Iliad} 2.549.
Polias” which seems to indicate there were two separate buildings.41 She goes on to state that even though Pausanias’s description can be confusing, he must have been following the logic of the terrain when moving from the Erechtheion to the Archaic remains of the temple of the Polias before going towards the Pandroseion and describing the sculpture placed on the terrace of the temple. Philochorus locates the sacred olive tree of Athena, which according to Herodotos was part of the Erechtheion complex, next to and below the temple of Athena Polias. Ferrari says this can only mean that one was adjacent to the other.42 However, I do not agree with her assessment. As Hurwit proposes an easier explanation, it could be that “Erechtheion” referred to a small portion of the building dedicated to the hero and/or Poseidon-Erechtheus and the name became a nickname for the whole building in later years.43

Most of Ferrari’s explanation of why the Erechtheion and the Temple to Athena Polias were two separate buildings deals with the Chandler Stele that gives an account of the construction work on the Acropolis.44 The inscription IG I³ 474 gives a detailed account of an unfinished building project on the Acropolis in 409/08. The inscription lists not only the building blocks found at the site and their dimensions, but also lists the board of supervisors, the epistatai, that oversaw the project along with the dates for their work.45 The heading of the title of the stele contains unmistakable references to the Erechtheion and names the board of supervisors who worked on the “temple on the Acropolis in which (is) the ancient statue.” Ferrari finds it problematic that the building referred to as the archaia naos in the inscription would be the Erechtheion. She states that at first sight it could mistakenly be thought that the temple in which the ancient statue stands is the Erechtheion even though the building was brand new and even still under construction.46

41 Ferrari 2002, 16; Pausanias 1.26.5-6.
42 Ferrari 2002, 16.
43 Hurwit 2004, 166.
44 Ferrari 2002, 16.
45 Pakkanen 2006, 275.
46 Ferrari 2002, 17.
Pakkanen’s stance on the information from the Chandler Stele, however, is in direct opposition to Ferrari’s arguments. Pakkanen, who researches mostly ancient architecture of the Mediterranean, states that the catalogued blocks mentioned on the stele refer only to the Erechtheion, instead of to two separate buildings. The inscription, according to him, cannot be used as evidence that the Dörpfeld temple remained standing after the Persian sack of the Acropolis. Pakkanen not only focuses on the epigraphical evidence, but also takes into consideration the archaeological evidence. The size of the wall blocks mentioned in lines 10-12 are 4 x 2 x 1½ feet, which matches the dimensions of the Erechtheion’s blocks. These measurements, Pakkanen points out, would have been rather narrow for the Old Athena Temple, given the cella wall foundation widths found at the Dörpfeld temple. Pakkanen also suggests that the wall-block width of the Dörpfeld temple would have been greater than two feet, making the blocks more compatible with the Erechtheion’s dimensions. There are, however, some blocks listed that could possibly fit into both temples. A corner block mentioned in lines 13-15, was identified by Caskey to belong to the Erechtheion above the Karyatid porch. Still, such a block could also have belonged in the cella of the Dörpfeld temple where the cross wall meets the long wall. Also named were five normal epikranitis blocks, those that adorn the crown of a wall, and one corner block that would have fit the southwest corner of the Erechtheion, but could also fit the Archaic temple. The next block mentioned in lines 22-25 probably directly indicates the Erechtheion since the epikranitis block inside the cella has a painted ovolo molding which is described by the words γογγούλος λίθος. These molding designs are also mentioned in the section most definitely dealing with the Erechtheion (line 70) further strengthening Pakkanen’s belief that the blocks belong to the Erechtheion and not the Dörpfeld temple. It is possible that the Archaic temple could have had molded epikranitis blocks. However, the Archaic temple would have been Doric in order. The ovolo is an Ionic molding, like

---

47 Pakkanen 2006, 275.
those found on the Erechtheion. If the contents of lines 26-28 are listed in logical order, it only makes sense that they describe the Erechtheion. In Doric architecture, epikranitis blocks are placed at the top of the cella wall, above the pronaos and opisthodomos friezes. However, the inscription describes architrave blocks placed on top of the epikranitis blocks, so they must belong to the Erechtheion.

Ferrari, on the other hand, concentrated mainly on the written sources, therefore neglecting the archaeological evidence needed to examine thoroughly the question of which building is being referred to in the inscription. For example, it seems to say that the frieze of Eleusinian stone was set in place by the overseers who prepared the report. Lines 40-43 are translated by Ferrari: “The remaining ergon (or work load) all around begins with the Eleusinian stone against which the figures (are to be placed), and it was set in place under the present overseers.” However, due to a subject-verb disagreement, Ferrari states that the inscription must refer to two different buildings as “no frieze could be put in place on a wall that lacked masonry courses as well as wall-capitals and a long stretch of the epistyle.” Pakkanen contests Ferrari’s claim that lines 40-43 must not refer to the Erechtheion. Pakkanen uses Caskey’s observations that lines 8-39 refer specifically to the temple’s south wall as proof that the frieze blocks mentioned in lines 40-43 simply belonged to the areas of the temple that were more complete in 439/8. The inscription must refer to the Erechtheion as it is specifically stated in the inscription that “the remaining work all around begins with the Eleusinian stone.” Pakkanen’s identification of all the blocks listed in the inscription as belonging to the Erechtheion nullifies Ferrari’s proposed reconstruction of the architectural topography of the late fifth century Acropolis.
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Erechtheus in the Line of Athenian Kings

Erechtheus, for whom the Erechtheion was named, was exceptionally dear to the heart of the Athenians. He was a notable king of Athens and was closely connected to the city’s patron goddess Athena. In order to understand properly the entirety of the Athenian state cult, one must know the story of Erechtheus, his prominent position among the kings of Athens, his sacred temenos on the Acropolis, and his relationship with Athena herself. Confusion often occurs when attempting to decipher the difference between the names Erechtheus and Erichthonios, both supposed kings of Athens. The names Erechtheus and Erichthonios are sometimes used interchangeably, but according to Apollodoros, Erichthonios was the fourth king of Athens and Erechtheus’s grandfather. However, at some point during the early stages of the myth, the two figures were melded into one. Other than the similarity of the names, both of which mean “very earthly” or “very earth-born,” they both were said to have married a woman named Praxithea and are both supposedly the virgin Athena’s foster children. Homer named a king, Erechtheus, in the Odyssey as the owner of a palace in Athens in which Athena resides perhaps in which to be worshipped. In the Iliad, Homer designated the Athenians as the “people of great-hearted Erechtheus.” The birth of Erechtheus was spoken of specifically in the Catalogue of Ships in the Iliad, where it was written that: “great-spirited Erechtheus, whom once Athena daughter of Zeus reared, but the grain-giving soil bore him, and Athena set him down in Athens in her rich temple.” This description better fits the king Erichthonios, son of Hephaistos and the earth, and it would seem that these two Athenian heroes were one and the same with variant spellings of their names. Erichthonios was partly serpent-shaped. He sprang from the earth as a
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product of Hephaistos’s seed that had landed on the ground after being wiped off Athena’s thigh, following Hephaistos’s attempt to violate her sexually. Athena placed Erichthonios in a chest which she gave to Athens’ first king Kekrops and his daughters Pandrosos, Auglauros and Herse.\footnote{Morford 2007, 593.} Athena is said to have handed a circular basket to the daughters of Kekrops, which mirrors the Panathenaic rite of the priestess of Athena handing the arrhephoroi the secret baskets the night before the procession.\footnote{Robertson 1996, 61.} They disobeyed Athena’s orders to not open the chest after seeing his snake-like appearance. The daughters of the legendary king hurled themselves off of the Acropolis as punishment.\footnote{Morford 2007, 593.} Most accounts of the opening of Erichthonios’s chest, however, indicate that one daughter, normally Pandrosos, remained obedient to Athena and did not suffer the fate of her sisters.\footnote{Morford 2007, 594.} According to Morford, Erechtheus was Erichthonios’s grandson and the successor to Athenian King Pandion who followed Erichthonios.\footnote{Bremmer 1987, 196; Pausanias 1.18.2; Apollodoros Bibl. 3.14.6.} Erechtheus is not described as generously described as Erichthonios is in Morford’s writing, but he stated that Athena prophesized that after Erechtheus’s death he would be worshipped at Athens with his own cult-site, “ringed round with stones,” and that under the title of “Poseidon-Erechtheus, he will be offered sacrifices of bulls,” which followed the activities held at the Erechtheion.\footnote{Morford 2007, 594.} Erechtheus was one of the ten eponymous heroes chosen by the Delphic oracle, and according to Herodotos, he was born from the earth. Herodotos’s account correlates with the stories of snake-like Erichthonios’s creation which could support the theory that they are the same man with variation in the spelling of their names.\footnote{Morford 2007, 593; Euripides Erechtheus fr. 18, 94-98.} However, on fifth-century vases, Erechtheus is shown as a fully human baby born from the earth and handed over to Athena while Kekrops and sometimes
Hephaistos observe.\textsuperscript{68} This would seem to support the notion that Erichthonios and Erechtheus are not the same, since Erechtheus is not depicted in Classical Athenian art as part-snake.

One explanation for the confusion could be that there were new kings invented in order to fill in gaps of time with the intention of making Greek history chronologically sound. Already in the fifth century, there were stories that grouped Attic myths together.\textsuperscript{69} However, while both names are often confused, the uncertainty could be because of the similarity of their names as well as their supposed familial relationship. According to Kastor, Erichthonios was the son of Hephaistos. Pandion I and Kekrops II were the sons of Erichthonios, Pandion I being the father of Erechtheus.\textsuperscript{70} For the purposes of this paper I consider Erichthonios to have been the grandfather of Erechtheus, and that the confusion of them being one and the same, merely being a hero whose name has been altered, was possibly due to continuous oral transmission of the story over centuries. The chronology of this heroic lineage was not compiled until the work of the Atthidographers, the writers of Athenian history, beginning with Hellanikos at the end of the fifth century.\textsuperscript{71} For Athenians in the preceding period, the specific chronological order in which their heroes and gods came to Athens was not of critical importance, but rather the glory the heroes and gods brought to the city in the past; the events described in the “generation of heroes” mattered to them, not those of men.\textsuperscript{72} It is evident that Erechtheus was always deep in the hearts of the Athenians as they called themselves “Erechtheidai” instead of “Erichthoniadai,” which further emphasizes his importance in the Athenian myths and in turn his connection to Athena.\textsuperscript{73} For the Athenians, Erechtheus was bound to Athena as a hero, the principal goddess of the city.
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Importance of Athena to Athens

Athena was worshipped in numerous different ways around the Greek world, but her cult was most developed on the Acropolis in Athens where she was known by multiple names. Most of the shrines on the Athenian Acropolis were dedicated to Athena, but all were not equally important. The building known as the Erechtheion was the most significant of these sanctuaries, on the basis of its identification as the Temple of to Athena Polias. Her epithet Polias originally meant “she who dwells on the [acro]polis” and would later mean “[guardian] of the city.” Athena Polias was considered the principal civic deity of Athens. She was also known as Athena Parthenos, “maiden” or “virgin” Athena, and as Pallas Athena, though neither we nor probably the ancient Greeks knew exactly what pallas meant.74 Athena Promakhos, “fighter in the forefront” or “champion,” was another of Athena’s identities. However, this identity was not associated with wild chaos and rage of war. She was a goddess of strategy and diplomacy. The battle-loving virgin, Athena, stood as a “symbol for and guarantor of the impregnability of her citadel,” the Athenian Acropolis. As she was triumphant in battle, she was also called Athena Nike, goddess of victory.75 All of these versions of Athena were worshipped on the Acropolis, with Athena Polias being the most important.

Myths of Erechtheus

The primary myth associated with Athena and Erechtheus together was the sacrifice of one or more of his daughters to the goddess to ensure the salvation of Athens during his war with Eumolpos and the Eleusians. Eumolpos, a son of Poseidon, fought a war against Erechtheus to avenge his father’s loss of the city’s patronage to Athena. With the help of the city of Eleusis, Eumolpos invaded Athens. Eumolpos was eventually killed by Erechtheus who was in turn killed by Poseidon.

Fragments of Euripides’ lost drama Erechtheus from the second half of the fifth century state that

74 Hurwit 2004, 21.
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Erechtheus was struck down by Poseidon’s trident because he defeated Eumolpos.\textsuperscript{76} Poseidon therefore assumed Erechtheus’s name as an homage to his victory over his son’s murderer.\textsuperscript{77} The inscriptions \textit{IG} IP 1146, from the early fourth century BCE, and 5058, from the Roman imperial period, both suggest that one priest served both Erechtheus and Poseidon in the Erechtheion, further solidifying the connection between Erechtheus and Poseidon. According to Euripides, after Erechtheus was struck down by Poseidon’s trident, he was then “hidden” underground.\textsuperscript{78} Poseidon struck Erechtheus down into an opening of the earth with the blows of his trident as he killed him.\textsuperscript{79} The underground area mentioned probably refers to the antechamber of the western room of the Erechtheion, where a snake, the avatar of Erechtheus, was said to reside.\textsuperscript{80} A hole in the roof of the north porch of the Erechtheion, together with the supposed trident marks on the floor of the porch, seem symbolic of this significant act.\textsuperscript{81}

The story of the sacrifice of Erechtheus’s daughters survives in the fragments of Euripides’ play. According to these fragments, the Delphic oracles predicted that Athens’ victory depended on the sacrifice of one of Erechtheus’s three daughters. Erechtheus and his wife Praxithea consented to the sacrifice, yet the names of the daughters and which one was chosen for the sacrifice remains unknown. According to the \textit{Erechtheus} fragments, however, all three daughters as well as Erechtheus and Eumolpos died. Apollodorus agreed with Euripides. He wrote that the youngest unnamed child was chosen for the sacrifice, and that her siblings chose to commit suicide in honor of their slain sister.\textsuperscript{82}
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Cults of the Erechtheion

Several other individuals, including both heroes and deities, such as Kekrops, Boutes, Zeus Hypatos, Hephaistos, and, as mentioned before, Athena Polias and Poseidon-Erechtheus, appear to have been worshipped at the Erechtheion complex. It seems strange that such an assorted variety of beings would be all worshipped together in the temple of the city’s main deity. However, further investigation reveals the connection between all the heroes and deities: they also stood as symbols of Athenian identity.

The Parian Marble of the third century BCE named Kekrops as the first king of Athens. He, like his much later successor Erechtheus, was named as one of the ten eponymous heroes selected for Kleisthenes’ tribal system in the sixth century BCE.\(^83\) Interestingly, Erechtheus is not the only hero whose cult resides in the Erechtheion that is associated with Poseidon. Kekrops is named as the father of Herse, Pandrosos and Agraulos, who later bore Poseidon’s son Halirrhothios.\(^84\) It was also during his reign that the competition for the title of patron deity of Athens took place between Athena and Poseidon.\(^85\) Kekrops’s mythology is also strongly associated with that of Erechtheus. In Classical Athens, the distant memory of the people of Athens connecting themselves to Kekrops lingered; Athenians once called themselves Kekropidai.\(^86\)

Kekrops was remarkable for his dual natures, and he was often referred to as a “double form.”\(^87\) In my opinion, the mention of the double form of the legendary king intriguingly mirrors Pausanias’s description of the Erechtheion as a “double building.” Hurwit states that Kekrops was born from the earth as part man and part snake, though.\(^88\) No myth specifically describes the events of his birth.\(^89\) Parker notes that Kekrops’s double form could also refer to the fact that he “resembled the creature
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that slips to and fro between the upper and lower worlds,” the worlds of the living and the dead.\textsuperscript{90} Could the correspondence between the living and the dead also refer to the “double building” nature of the Erechtheion housing not one, but two graves of previous kings? G. W. Elderkin maintained that the description of Kekrops as a double form was probably because, according to Diodoros, some of the Athenian kings were originally from Egypt. One such ruler, Petes, was the father of Menestheus who was a Greek soldier in the fight against Troy. Petes gained Athenian citizenship and he secured the kingship soon after. Diodoros notes that the Athenians recognized Petes as a “double form,” most likely meaning his half-human, half-snake appearance, but they could not explain why he appeared that way. Most likely this was because of his double citizenship, therefore making him half-Greek and half-barbarian. The ruler he is referring to is most likely Kekrops.\textsuperscript{91} This theory might explain further why Erechtheus himself was considered to have been the grandson of a man who was part snake. Athenians did not claim their early kings as half-snake only because their ancestor was the earth. Once it was established that their first legendary king was part-serpent, they could pass that anthropomorphizing attribute along to later heroes.

Along the west side of the Erechtheion complex, scholars have identified the supposed tomb of Kekrops and the sacred area dedicated to his daughter Pandrosos, the Pandroseion. Kekrops’s tomb and Pandrosos’s cult had probably always been located here, but the architects of the Erechtheion used the northern foundation of the Archaic Temple of Athena Polias as the southern boundary wall for the Pandroseion. The Karyatid Porch rests on this same wall a little further east, so it stood atop Kekrops’s tomb. Hurwit has proposed that the libations that each karyatid held were to be offered to Kekrops.\textsuperscript{92} He suggested that the tomb of Kekrops, the first legendary king of Athens, was located at the
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Erechtheion for the same reason Erechtheus’s tomb is located there: they were both killed at that spot, by the same god, and buried where they fell.\textsuperscript{93}

The two kings were further connected by the presence of Kekrops at the birth of Erechtheus’s grandfather Erichthonios, as depicted in fifth-century vase painting (fig. 3 and fig. 4).

![Fig. 3 Birth of Erichthonios, Athenian red-figure clay vase, 470-450 BCE](image1)

![Fig. 4 Gaia, Athena and Ericthonios, Attic red-figure kylix, 440-430 BCE](image2)

Vase painters showed Kekrops acting as a witness at the birth of Erichthonios, and Kekrops was always depicted as half-snake, half-man, while Erichthonios is a new-born, human baby. The reason

\textsuperscript{93} Elderkin 1941, 117.
that the two earth-born kings were represented together on vase paintings is to firmly establish the Athenians’ royal line as being born of the earth and therefore securely tied to their land since two of their successors are autochthonous.\(^{94}\) The autochthonous births emphasized the relationship of the Athenians with their land. Parker states that the Athenians probably knew they had inhabited the same place longer than any other Greek states had, and suitably had created a myth to substantiate the idea that they were the only authentic citizens of Greece.\(^{95}\) Another purpose of having legendary kings that have sprung from the earth, as a result of Athena wiping off Hephaistos’s seed, is to place the Athenian people “in the closest relation with Athena, while respecting her virginity.” This act of an attempted union not only makes the Athenians the “blessed children of the gods” but designates them as a “technological” people, since Hephaistos, with the *metis* of Athena, is the god of craft, skill and technology.\(^{96}\) These exceptional myths proved to be especially crucial in the 420s, at a time when anti-Dorian sentiments were raging during the Peloponnesian War.\(^{97}\)

The presence of an altar to Zeus Hypatos on the north porch of the Erechtheion is less easily explained. As mentioned above, Poseidon struck down Erechtheus with his trident and Erechtheus was laid to rest at that spot. The story of Poseidon and Erechtheus could also be told differently, however, and this story can give one explanation why an altar to Zeus Hypatos (‘most high’) was outside the Erechtheion. Once Zeus gained prominence as a god on the Acropolis, the story was somewhat shifted. It has been said that Zeus was the one who smote Erechtheus with his thunderbolt at the request of Poseidon and that is from where the marks in the floor come.\(^{98}\) Because of Zeus’s prominence over Poseidon in later years, an altar to Zeus Hypatos was set up near the trident marks, which in turn became identified as marks made by a thunderbolt instead of by Poseidon’s trident.

Whether Poseidon’s trident drove Erechtheus back into the earth from which he was born or not, or
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Zeus’s lightning bolt buried him on the spot, the tomb of the hero must be below the north porch.99

A second explanation, and probably a more likely one, for the presence of an altar to Zeus Hypatos could be Erechtheus’s relationship to the threshing festival held in the months preceding the Panathenaic festival and the importance of Zeus Hypatos to that festival. This festival, the Skira, commenced with a procession from the Acropolis to the farming fields west of Athens. The Athenians celebrated there the harvesting of grain which was the last great labor of the farming season for that year.100 Erechtheus was also connected to this festival in numerous ways. Firstly, his name is derived the Greek verb for “rend, break or shake violently.”101 Robertson pointed out that the origins of Erechtheus’s name could be connected to the threshing. He stated that derivatives of his name could mean “split,” “flail,” or “grind,” referring to the harvest of vegetables.102 During the festival, there was a procession from the Acropolis to Skiron, near Eleusis, where the priestess of Athena and the priest of Poseidon met with the priest of the sun god. However, on the Acropolis, the sun god was not Helios but Zeus Hypatos. Robertson stated that hypatos alluded to the sun’s high position in the sky, which was extremely vital because after threshing the grain it was necessary that the sun ripen the cut grain, as wetness or dampness would ruin the harvest.103

**Erechtheus and the Panathenaia**

It has been proposed by Connelly that the Ionic frieze of the Parthenon represents the sacrifice of Erechtheus’s daughter for the greater good of Athens.104 While I disagree with her evaluation, it is possible that Erechtheus was somehow involved with the Panathenaic procession depicted on the frieze, especially since the main event of the festival took place in the Erechtheion. The Panathenaic procession began outside the city in the Kerameikos, the city’s cemetery and once center for pottery
production, continued through the agora, the political and religious center of Athens, past the shrine to the Twelve Gods and the courtroom to the Eleusinion before continuing to the Acropolis.\footnote{Lefkowitz 1996, 81.}

According to myth, Erichthonios, Erechtheus’s grandfather, set up the wooden image of Athena on the Acropolis during his kingship and established the Panathenaia.\footnote{Lefkowitz 1996, 82; Apollodoros, \textit{Library}, 3.14.6.} Erechtheus appeared to have been a minor character in the cult activities of the Arrhephoria, the ritual performed by the \textit{arrhephoroi}, the young, virgin priestesses of Athena who wove the peplos for the Panathenaic festival.\footnote{Mikalson 1975, 147 and Hurwit 2004, 107.} During the Panathenaic procession, the peplos, which was woven by the \textit{arrhephoroi}, was presented to the ancient olivewood statue of Athena after the statue had been washed.\footnote{Lefkowitz 1996, 79.} The ancient statue was probably cleaned in one of the two springs found at the foot of the north side of the Acropolis. Robertson even went as far to suggest that the location of the shrine of Athena Polias was located where it was merely because of the access to the springs since the washing of the statue was an integral part of the festival. It was proposed by Robertson that these cleansing rituals took place on the North Porch because it was a large area, yet suitably hidden from public view, since the ritual could not be seen by ordinary eyes.\footnote{Ibid., 33.} Robertson even suggested that the karyatids could represent the young girls who would descend to the springs to fetch the water needed for the cleansing festival. They seem to be lined in a processional arrangement and could perhaps be carrying water jugs on their heads.\footnote{Robertson 1996, 34.}

Now that I have examined the myths associated with the Erechtheion, I can at this point place the temple in the late fifth century Attic context. My comparanda, the Parthenon, the Temple of Athena Nike, the Temple of Apollo at Bassai and the Hephaisteion, were all conceived of and constructed in the aftermath of the Persian war. This information will aid in my understanding of the content of the Erechtheion’s frieze.
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Chapter 3 – Placing the Erechtheion in Late Fifth Century Attic Sculptural Context

Now that the myths regarding Erechtheus and his ancestors have been explored, I can begin to establish a framework of what the frieze could represent by utilizing the notion that the myths have something to do with the content. However, in order to completely understand the significance of the Erechtheion frieze, I must explore the relationship it has with other late fifth century Attic sculpture as well as other structures included in the Periklean building program. Comparanda will include friezes from the Parthenon, the Temple of Athena Nike, the Temple of Apollo at Bassai, the Hephaisteion and its cult statue base. The associations between these structures will help in the comprehensive evaluation and understanding of the Erechtheion’s frieze’s content by revealing contexts and identifications previously unknown.

Parthenon

The Parthenon was a tour de force in Classical architecture. Its architects attempted to express beauty through geometry and perfect numerical ratios. As Rhodes noted, the great architectural monuments of the Periklean Acropolis and their decoration were not solely for the benefit of the gods, but also took into account the perception of the individual.111

The sculptural decoration of the Parthenon included a Doric frieze consisting of triglyphs and metopes along all sides of the exterior of the temple, two sculpted pediments on the east and west ends, and a continuous Ionic frieze over the columns around the exterior cella wall.112 Each section of sculpture had its own theme, yet together they created a unified idea of the success of Athens as a community and as a military power.

The supposed sculptor of the Parthenon’s decorations was Pheidias. It is only known for sure that Pheidias sculpted the cult statue. However, Hurwit and others have assumed that he was master of

---
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the rest of the sculptural program, as well. Because Pheidias was engaged in sculpting the cult statue of Athena Parthenos before 438 and after 438 he worked on the Zeus at Olympia, it is thought that he was too busy to single-handedly create all the sculpture on his own. Instead, he most likely had a team of assistants carving his designs. While the name of one assistant, Menon, is known at the Parthenon, Hurwit proposed that Pheidias’s other well-known assistants Agorakritos and Alkamenes were responsible for the pediments and friezes after his departure.

The sculptural theme of the Doric frieze as a whole is the struggle between civilization and barbarism. There were ninety-two metopes along the entire building. The north side depicted the Trojan War, the east side the Gigantomachy, the west side the Amazonomachy, and the south side, which is the best preserved part of the Doric frieze, depicted the Centauromachy. It must be remembered that the Parthenon was built in the wake of the Persian attack on the Acropolis. While these themes had been seen before on Greek architectural sculpture, on the Parthenon they took on added significance as a metaphor for the Greek struggle against the Persians. The north metopes depicted separate episodes from the Trojan War, a clear interpretation of the west pitted against the east. The Gigantomachy, a battle between the Olympian gods and the giants, was not an unknown subject matter on the Acropolis. In fact, the scene was woven into the peplos presented to Athena and on the inside of Athena Parthenos’s shield. The Amazonomachy, a fight between the Amazons, warrior women from the east, and the Greeks, was also a clear indication of the west overcoming eastern forces, like the images of the Trojan War. In fact, as Hurwit pointed out, the Amazons in their oriental garb and hats even looked like Persians. Like the Gigantomachy, this story was also not unknown on the Acropolis. The story was represented on the exterior of the shield of Athena
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The Centauromachy depicted a brawl between the Lapiths, Greeks from the north, and centaurs, half-men, half-horse creatures. The centaurs, which were known in myth to be barbaric drunks, disrupted the wedding of the Athenian hero Theseus’s friend King Peirithoos to Hippodameia. This, too, was a clear representation of the civilized Greeks overcoming barbaric forces just as they had against the Persians.

The pediments and the Ionic frieze of the Parthenon will be particularly useful for identifying some themes that were important on the Acropolis as well as figures which will help later in deciphering the scenes on the Erechtheion. The west pediment depicts the contest between Athena and Poseidon for patronage of Athens. According to myth, this contest took place on the Acropolis during the reign of Kekrops. Poseidon and Athena raced from Mount Olympos to the Acropolis on chariots in order to bring a gift to Athens. According to Apollodoros, Poseidon arrived first and struck the ground with his trident and produced a salt spring. Athena arrived soon after and planted an olive tree “which can still be seen in the Pandroseion.” Kekrops then chose Athena as winner. On the west pediment the semi-reclining figure in the left-hand corner was most likely Kekrops (fig. 5).

He is identified by the snaky-tail coiled near his feet, while the girl with her arm around his shoulders is most likely Pandrosos, his obedient daughter. It makes sense that they would be at the north end of the pediment since they both had shrines in the Erechtheion complex which was on the north side of
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the Acropolis. Hurwit believed, too, that Kekrops’s other daughters Herse and Aglaruos were present on the pediment. He placed them next to Kekrops and Pandrosos with a small child, probably Erichthonios, between them.

The east pediment depicts the birth of Athena, though there are disputes about the identity of most of the figures (fig. 6).

![Fig. 6 East Pediment of the Parthenon](image)

The birth of Athena took place on Mount Olympos in the presence of other divinities. Hesiod described her birth by stating that “Zeus himself, from his own head, gave birth to bright-eyed Tritogeneia, the terrible one, rousing the battle din, leader of armies, unwearied Potnia, who delights in war-noise, wars and battles.” From the myth, the figures of Zeus, seated upon his throne, and Athena, who has just sprung from his head fully armored, can be identified. According to the Theogony a jealous Hera conceived Hephaistos on her own in response to Zeus bearing Athena without her. However, as Hurwit explained, in vase painting and possibly on the east pediment too, Hephaistos was shown as the one who broke open Zeus’s head in order to let Athena out. Hephaistos, if he was shown here, was to the left of Zeus and was perhaps holding his hammer.
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Because this birth took place in the presence of the gods, the east pediment can be a reference point for certain attributes given to gods. On the south end of the pediment, the fleeing girl, who has just witnessed Athena being born from Zeus’s head, has disturbed the seated matronly figure to the left. The head is missing from the figure, but her pose shows that she has turned to look at the girl. The seated matronly figure has been identified as Demeter and the figure seated beside her has been identified as her daughter Persephone. The male who reclines on a rock covered with a panther skin faces away from the center and is not yet aware of the action taking place. He is thought to be Dionysos (fig. 7).128

![Fig. 7 Dionysos, Demeter and Persephone](image1)

On the north end of the pediment, the seated female, who faces frontally, seems to be about to rise from her seat as she notices the birth of Athena. To her left, the seated figure, with the woman lounging in her lap, seems as yet unaware of the action. Those two figures have been identified as Aphrodite resting in the lap of her mother Dione (fig. 8).129

![Fig. 8 Dione and Aphrodite](image2)
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Even though the pediments have helped in naming a few figures, it is the complex scenery of the Ionic frieze that gives the most information of the context and identification of the Parthenon’s sculptural program. Like the Erechtheion, the Parthenon frieze represented all ages in a harmonious environment. The Ionic frieze of the Parthenon depicted an idealized Athenian society, one that is well-ordered, prosperous, harmonious and in the favor of the Olympian gods. The frieze was completed between 438 and 432, and the designer of the frieze was most likely Pheidias. He almost certainly appointed a leader, probably Alkamenes, in order to keep his sculptors working as a single, homogenous group. Hurwit proposed that since the Ionic frieze was difficult to see and because it did not follow the same direction of the stories on the metopes that perhaps it was not made merely for visitors. Instead, it was probably made as a spectacularly grand version of a votive offering relief usually dedicated by private citizens. Here, however, it was the entire demos of Athens dedicated this relief to Athena. About eighty percent of the Ionic frieze remains today. The most accepted conclusion of what it represents is that of the Panathenaic procession. Panathenaia means literally “all the Athenians,” and while not every citizen participated in the festival, a representative of each social and economical class was present on the frieze: women, children, young, old, citizens, metics and slaves. For Perikles this image symbolized his ideal democracy, a “cosmopolitan melting pot in which everyone had a share of benefits and took pride” especially after the success against the Persians.

According to Hurwit, the general attitude of the entire Ionic frieze is one of “preparation and anticipation rather than of culmination or climax.” The frieze is divided into two streams of action, one line beginning at the southwest corner of the cella running along the west side, and the second line
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beginning on the southwest corner and running east along the south side of the cella. They meet on the east side at the peplos scene (fig. 9).\textsuperscript{136}

![Plan of the frieze](image)

**Fig. 9 Arrangement of the Ionic frieze from the Parthenon**

On the west side of the frieze are twenty-six horsemen, two young attendants and two marshals. This side depicts the preparation of the cavalcade. Of the horsemen, eleven riders are unmounted while one horse is being rejected because of his improperly dressed mane. In the center, one of only two bearded horsemen is trying to tame a wild horse. Hurwit pointed out that this steed seems to be a relief version of the horse seen in the west pediment.\textsuperscript{137}

The riders on the north frieze were divided into ranks, using an overlapping technique that could contain as many as eight figures. Figures placed nearest to the viewer and those farthest away were still the same height. This process made no use of perspective, as Jenkins pointed out.\textsuperscript{138} Most of the riders are dressed in tunics and cloaks or are nude, but one horseman wears full armor. The procession continues with eleven four-horse chariots that move rapidly with drivers and *apotatai*, soldiers competing in a race from moving chariots to finish lines.\textsuperscript{139} Among the charging chariots are a few grooms and marshals. Following them are the figures on foot. Sixteen elders walk along while casually conversing as some fix their hair. Four musicians playing the kithara and four playing flutes walk behind the elders. After the musicians come four youths carrying *hydriai*, water jugs, and three
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youths carrying skaphai, trays for honeycombs and cakes. Following them are attendants leading four sacrificial cows and four sacrificial sheep. The youths carrying the hydriai and the skaphai served as assistants during the roasting and sharing of the meat from the sacrificial animals that were served at the culmination of the festival.

The south frieze is not all that different from the composition of the north frieze, though it is calmer. There are, again, sixty horsemen. Here, though, they are arranged formally into ten ranks of six riders each, and they are all wearing identical, distinctive outfits. Ten chariots with drivers and apobatai who have not yet leapt to the ground follow the horsemen. As in the northern frieze, next come the elders, the musicians, the hydriaphoroi and skaphephoroi. The attendants on this side lead only ten sacrificial cows and no sheep.

The two streams approach each other on the east side. At the south end of the east frieze, a marshal motions for the figures to follow him around the corner from south side. He is preceded by sixteen thickly draped women who are mostly carrying something such as vases holding oil or incense. On the opposite end of the eastern side are thirteen women who are also carrying objects. One of the women has handed over an offering basket to one of the four marshals standing next to them. She is called a kanephoros. She is an elite maiden who takes on the responsibility and honor of leading the sacrificial procession. Many of the other women are most likely kanephoroi as well and can be designated as such by their costumes. From the mid-fifth century on, the kanephoroi were recognized by the festive shoulder mantle they wore. The mantle usually hung down her back over her chiton or peplos. It was usually pinned on the shoulders and fell down the back in wavy folds.
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The *kanephoroi* shown on the Parthenon wear a peplos with their mantles pulled over their shoulders (fig. 10).  

![Fig. 10 Kanephoroi from the Ionic frieze of the Parthenon](image)

After the women come two groups of men who are not actively participating in the procession. Some are bearded elders, some are beardless youths and most of them lean on staffs. These men have been identified as the ten Eponymous Heroes, generic magistrates or generic Athenian fathers or brothers of the *kanephoroi*. Hurwit made a valid point in stating that it would make better sense if they were the ten Eponymous Heroes of Athens. I agree with him because Pheidias had previously created a group of Eponymous Heroes for the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi.  

The Olympian gods follow the ten Eponymous heroes as the scene converges to the center. Six seated gods and goddesses and Nike stand to the left while six seated gods and goddesses and Eros stand to the right. The gods on the eastern frieze are carved in the same way as they are described in epic poetry, and the Classical Athenians would have easily known by seeing their attributes, which gods were represented. Hermes, the messenger god, sits alert and attentive to the procession approaching at the left. He has his *petasos*, or traveler’s hat, and he wears short boots that probably had wings. A drill-hole in his right hand was probably where a metal wand or caduceus was attached. Dionysos, the god of wine, slouches on the shoulder of Hermes. His raised left arm would have rested
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on a staff, probably the thyrsus that was one of his emblems. His feet are interlocked with the female deity to his right. The female to Dionysos’s right was holding a bundle of tightly bound wheat or barley stems while she rested her chin in her now broken away right fist. Her mournful expression signifies her as Demeter, the goddess of the earth’s fertility and the mother of the stolen Persephone. Ares, god of war, leans back on his stool with both feet off the ground. One of his feet would have rested on a spear that was partly carved. His naturalistic and relaxed pose was observably modeled from life (fig. 11).

To the right of Ares stands a second messenger god, Iris. She is caught in the action of fixing her hair with her left arm. She stands partly behind Hera, Zeus’s queen and the goddess of marriage. She holds her veil back as she turns slightly toward her husband. Zeus gazes in the direction of the procession approaching from the south and carved along his right arm is his scepter (fig. 12).  

---

149 Jenkins 2006, 103.
The first god on the north side of the frieze is Eros, the boy god of love. He is leaning into the knee of his mother, Aphrodite, as he holds the long handle of a parasol. Aphrodite is pointing over the shoulder of Eros at the procession coming from the north. Her right arm rests on the thigh of her sister, Artemis, who is seated behind her. Artemis, the goddess of the hunt, looks in the same direction as Aphrodite and their arms are linked. Her raised right arm was probably supported by a metal bow that was attached to the stone. Apollo sits behind his twin sister Artemis. His right arm would have been supported by a metal bow as well, linking his relationship to Artemis. He is turned behind him to face Poseidon, the god of the sea. Poseidon, taps Apollo on the shoulder to alert him that the procession is arriving. He is recognized by his bearded face (Fig. 13).

Hephaistos is seated behind Poseidon. Hephaistos was the crippled god of smiths and his right side is supported by a crutch. He turns behind him to face his half-sister Athena. Athena, the goddess being honored in the Panathenaic festival, sits with her aegis in her lap. She would have had a metal spear attached along her right side (fig. 14).\footnote{Jenkins 2006, 104.}
Directly in between the Olympian gods over the door to the cella are five smaller, hence mortal, figures. Two young women are carrying something on their heads, cushioned stools maybe, while holding something else in their hands, perhaps footstools. The central figure of the eastern side is a matronly woman who helps an approaching girl with her load. The bearded male with his back to her wears a long, unbelted robe. He and the young child appear to be folding up a piece of cloth. Even though the meaning of this scene has been fiercely debated, it is widely accepted to represent the delivering of a new peplos to Athena who sits just to the right of the child (fig. 15).\footnote{Hurwit 2004, 146.}

The Parthenon frieze depicted the Panathenaic procession, an idealized rendering of an event that was central to Periklean Athens. The Panathenaic festival during the middle and third quarter of
the fifth century, when Perikles was the leading political figure of Athens, compelled the citizens to consider the “role of the festival, and of civic religion in general, in a radical democracy and…their role in a city that had recently become the capital of an empire.”

**Temple of Athena Nike**

Even though the completion of the temple of Athena Nike is later in date than Perikles’s death, it can still be considered part of the Periklean Acropolis. The theme of the sculptural program of the Temple of Athena Nike was, understandably, one of victory. The subject was expressed “mythologically, allegorically, and historically.” According to Hurwit, the sculptural decorations of the temple itself and of its bastion were “pound for pound, the richest sculptural program of the Classical Acropolis.”

The parapet wall surrounding the temple was concerned with trophies of victory and sacrifices to Athena who was seated and therefore honored while the Ionic friezes on the temple depicted successful Athenian battles.

The parapet wall was made of Pentelic marble, and there were supposedly six artisans who created the sculptural program on the parapet, each having the job of sculpting half a side, leaving the small bit by the stairs up to the chief master. The decoration of the parapet wall consisted of a series of Nikes setting up trophies of victory and leading sacrificial bulls to Athena as if they were taking place in the Panathenaic procession. However, it is not like the Parthenon’s procession, where a specific story is taking place. On the parapet wall the scenes rarely overlap and the figures do not often interact. The Nikes all resemble each other in that they are wearing the same clothes and are mostly doing similar things (figs. 16 and 17).
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Rhodes pointed out that the parapet wall seems to be purely decorative. However, he also stated that purely decorative enhancement did not fit the “spiritual and physical emblem of the Acropolis.” The parapet wall emphasized the role of Athena Nike, especially after the Persian attack and the recent Peloponnesian War.\footnote{Rhodes 1995, 120.} Stylistically the sculpted frieze dates to 425-415, so the construction may have been interrupted by the Archidamian War of 432/431.\footnote{Jenkins 2006, 113.} The parapet was initially designed to
surround a monument originally intended to represent the victory over the Persians. However, Rhodes attested that the sculpture seems to be more in tune with the attitude about the Peloponnesian War. He saw the stark contrast between the Parthenon style and the Temple of Athena Nike style in direct relation to the changing attitudes of the Athenians in the wake of the Peloponnesian War. Rhodes viewed the non-narrative scenes and swirling drapery of the Nikes on the Parapet wall as a result of the artists’ “retreat into fantasy” that wartime often provokes.

Even though Rhodes viewed the Temple of Athena Nike’s parapet wall in direct opposition stylistically to the Parthenon, the continuous friezes on both temples can be compared. The continuous frieze, which was about twenty-six meters in length, displays not only mythological but also historical subjects. Because the south frieze depicted the historic Battle of Marathon, one of great Athenian victory, Pemberton believed the west and north battle scenes to be of similar victories. Though there are some disagreements, it is thought that the west and north side depict the Athenians battling other Greeks, but it is unsure whether or not it is a mythological or historical battle. It is possible that the frieze represented the struggle between the Athenians and those involved in the Peloponnesian War. If this is the case, then the frieze is unique in that it depicted an event contemporary with those who would see it and who were possibly involved in the battle. The west frieze contains a trophy and a tree stump with a helmet which suggests that a historical battle had taken place and the victor had laid claim to the land. In comparison to the south frieze which depicts a battle underway, the west frieze shows four dead figures. The west frieze also showed less fighting, which according to Pemberton, suggested that the scene showed not so much a battle as annihilation.
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have shown the Athenians defeating the mythological king of Argos, Eurystheus, who was a Spartan ally. The Battle of Marathon that was depicted on the south side was historical, but by the end of the fifth century bordered on legend. According to Hurwit, “in the Classical Athenian mind, the line between history and myth was not clear, and Marathon existed easily in both realms.”

The juxtaposition of heroic battles and divine assemblies has taken place on architectural decoration as early as the sixth century, as seen on the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi and later on the Parthenon. The east frieze of the Temple of Athena Nike, however, depicted an assembly of gods instead of a battle (fig. 18). It is possible that this composition mimics that of the Parthenon’s east frieze in which the gods are assembled to watch Athena receive her peplos.

Instead, here the gods have formed an assembly in order to honor Athena Nike as the guarantor of victory for the battles depicted on the other three sides. As it was on the Ionic frieze of the Parthenon, this frieze can also be used as a reference point in order to identify gods within certain contexts. A fully armed Athena stands next to a virtually lost male figure in the center of the east frieze. Surrounding them are widely spaced standing and seated gods with perhaps a few heroes. Most of the figures are stoic and face frontally. As Hurwit stated, the figures on the east side can be indentified quite surely. Poseidon sits on a rock to the left of Athena and Zeus sits on his throne to the right of the missing male figure. Hermes, the Graces and Hygieia all had shrines nearby, so they are probably facing out towards their respective shrines. The shrine of Aphrodite Pandemos was almost directly
below the south face of the Nike bastion, so Aphrodite and Peitho are found at the southern end of the frieze where they loom over their sanctuary.\(^{167}\) The figures rushing in from the south and north ends, as the elder directing the procession on the Parthenon, meld the frieze together as a whole composition.\(^{168}\)

**Temple of Apollo at Bassai**

Iktinos, one of the architects of the Parthenon, left war-stricken and plague-filled Athens in 429 on a commission to design the temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassai on the Peloponnesian peninsula.\(^{169}\) The epithet Epikourios was explained by Pausanias to describe the help that Apollo gave to the Peloponnesians during the plague.\(^{170}\) But in Thucydides’s accounts of the war, it is stated that the plague never reached the peninsula.\(^{171}\) Instead, the epithet may refer to the Arkadians helping the nearby Messenians in the revolt against the Spartans, and the Messenians were frequently allowed to seek refuge in Arkadian territory. Peace was established between Athens and Sparta in 421, freeing the Spartan forces to focus on Arkadia. This caused the building project to be halted until about 415. It was that year that war resumed between Athens and Sparta, causing the construction of the Erechtheion to halt.\(^{172}\)

The temple of Apollo Epikourious was located in the mountains of Arkadia. The temple was an unusual building in that it faces north instead of east and externally it was a conventionally Doric temple. However, on the inside it had Ionic colonnades and a continuous frieze.\(^{173}\) There was no sculpture in the pediments, and there were two Doric friezes, one over the north porch and the other over the south porch.\(^{174}\) Since Iktinos was one of the designers of the Parthenon, a temple of mixed
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order, it is no surprise that this temple would exhibit mixed order, as well.\textsuperscript{175} Following the lead of the Parthenon and the Temple of Athena Nike, the sculpture of this temple depicts struggle between Greeks and barbarians as well as possibly illustrating the hostilities between the Messenians and Spartans.

Many of the fragments of the Doric metopes depicted women running with their drapery flying out behind them (fig. 19). One girl has a disembodied hand grasping her neck as if she is being attacked. It has been suggested that the metopes on the south end depict the rape of the daughters of Messenian king Leukippos by Kastor and Polydeukes.

![Fig. 19 Temple of Apollo at Bassai metopes](image)

Kastor and Polydeukes were important figures in Spartan cult, so for the Arkadians, this may have stood for the Spartans attacking their neighbors. Also, according to myth, Apollo was the divine father of the Leukippidai.\textsuperscript{176}

All twenty-three blocks of the interior Ionic frieze remain. Ten depict a Centauromachy, twelve depict an Amazonomachy and the remaining block shows Apollo and his sister Artemis in a stag-drawn chariot. Each slab is a self-contained image, unusual for an Ionic frieze. There is very little overlapping from one block to another, as seen at the Parthenon.\textsuperscript{177} A scene overlapping the blocks actually occurs only once. Two slabs are known to join because of a hand and a knee that
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overlap on two Centauromachy slabs.\textsuperscript{178} According to Ridgway, this frieze is not merely a decorative moulding, but instead stands apart from the architecture as a work of art itself.\textsuperscript{179} The relief is high and its composition is crowded. The figures tend to take up the entire space, making them appear squat and stretched out.\textsuperscript{180} The figures are shown in high action, falling, twisting and lunging. The drapery is described by Jenkins as “swirling in turbulent air,” as “falling liquid-like,” and as being “vaporous and transparent” as the sculptor shows the body beneath (fig. 20).\textsuperscript{181}

Fig. 20 Ionic frieze of the Temple of Apollo at Bassai, Amazonomachy Scene

According to Jenkins, these scenes are considered formulaic in comparison to contemporary Athenian art. Even though the style of workmanship can be considered “provincial,” when compared to temples like the Parthenon and the Temple to Athena Nike, versions of the same character type can be seen.\textsuperscript{182} Ridgway pointed out that this frieze is an amalgamation of not only motifs borrowed from the Parthenon, the Temple of Athena Nike and the Parthenon, but it also combines styles. The flamboyant, swirling drapery found at the Temple of Athena Nike is paired with heavy, wet drapery that falls over
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the legs in catenary folds, as seen on the seated figures at the Parthenon.\textsuperscript{183} The sculpture of metropolitan Athens was thus brought to Bassai by Iktinos’s troop of sculptors.\textsuperscript{184}

The mythical subject depicted is a standard one for Greek temples. Most of the Greek heroes are anonymous, but Herakles can be identified by his lion-skin cloak as he fights the Amazon queen Hippolyta. Their scene was placed in the center of the south frieze facing the great north entrance. Their overlapping legs denote strife in generic Greek battle scenes, seen on the west pediment of the Parthenon. In the Centauromachy scene, only one figure can be positively identified – the Lapith Kaineus (fig. 21). According to the story, Kaineus was indestructible and the only means of defeat was when the centaurs literally beat him into the ground.\textsuperscript{185}

![Fig. 21 Ionic frieze of the Temple of Apollo at Bassai, Centauromachy Scene](image)

As Jenkins has acknowledged, the temple to Apollo at Bassai, the Erechtheion and the Temple of Athena Nike all stood for “tokens of defiance” in the face of the Spartan attacks led against both Arkadia and Athens.\textsuperscript{186}

**Hephaisteion**

The Hephaisteion, a Doric temple, is located on “the brow of the sharp low ridge of Kolonos Agoraios” that overlooks the Athenian Agora. Most scholars agree that the Hephaisteion was began
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around the middle of the fifth century and finished before 400.\textsuperscript{187} The hill on which it was located had been a bronze-working pit and foundry during the fifth century, so it is only rational that a temple to Hephaistos, god of craft and metalworking, be located there.\textsuperscript{188} The friezes were most likely carved in the 430s while the metopes, still severe in style, were probably carved in the 440s.\textsuperscript{189} The style of the Hephaisteion, Morgan stated, was the notable “evocation of much earlier types, [its] frequent and quite shameless borrowings from the Parthenon, and [its] whole-hearted and developed presentation of forms and formulae which are essentially those of the fourth rather than fifth century.”\textsuperscript{190}

The Hephaisteion’s sculpture is unique to the history of Greek architectural sculpture in that all the slabs that still occupy the building are in the same place they were in antiquity.\textsuperscript{191} There was a Doric frieze and like Iktinos and Kallikrates, the architect of the Hephaisteion felt the need to include Ionic attributes. Therefore, he added an Ionic frieze over the east and west porches.\textsuperscript{192} The two Ionic friezes of the Hephaisteion, one adorning the eastern side and the other adorning the western side, are made of Parian marble.\textsuperscript{193}

On the Doric frieze, only eighteen metopes are decorated. The metopes are carved in high relief and made of Parian marble. Ten of them depict the nine Labors of Herakles and these are placed on the east façade. The other eight decorated metopes portray the Labors of Theseus and four of these are located on the eastern end of the north side and the remaining four are located on the eastern end of the south side.\textsuperscript{194} According to Pedley, the arrangement of the sculpture, hardly taking up any of the long sides except on the eastern side, indicated that the Hephaisteion was to be approached from the Agora.\textsuperscript{195} The nine out of the twelve Labors of Herakles represented are easily identifiable as the Lion,
Hydra, Hind, Boar which were all part of his Peloponnesian exploits. The adventures that took him elsewhere in the world included the Mares, Kerberos, Amazon, Geryon, and the Apples of the Hesperides. The Labors of Theseus depict, on the north frieze from east to west, his encounters with Prokrustes, Kerkyon, Skiron and the Krommyon Sow. On the south frieze, from west to east, Theseus encounters Periphytes, Sinis, the Marthon Bull and the Minotaur. The key aspect to note for these metopes that tie them together with the rest of the Periklean program is that both Herakles and Theseus, two major heroes of Athens, have fought and defeated beasts or monsters. This is not unlike the analogy depicted on the metopes of the Parthenon or the friezes of the Temple of Athena Nike which showed the struggle between the Greeks and the Barbarians.

The theme of the west frieze was a Centauromachy, a fight between the Lapiths and the centaurs. This was a popular motif in Athens because it involved Theseus and because it stood for the conflict between the Athenians and the Persians. The east frieze’s subject, however, is not as easily identifiable as the west frieze. The most likely interpretation, according to Morgan, was that the scene represented the victory of Theseus over the rebel Pallantids in order to establish his rule over Athens. If this is accepted, then the central figure can only be Theseus. The Olympic gods are also present at this battle, as if watching over their hero. Starting from the left, the southern group of gods consists of Athena wearing her aegis, Hera wearing her veil and Zeus holding his scepter, all identifying attributes that Athenians would recognize. According to Morgan, the northern group consists of Apollo, Aphrodite and Hephaistos. He believed Apollo and Aphrodite to be present because their sacred areas in the Agora were nearby. He chose the last figure to be Hephaistos because his stiff leg implies lameness, and he seems a likely contrast to Athena on the opposite end. The composition of the east
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frieze was probably influenced by the Parthenon. The action takes place in the center of the frieze with relatively quiet and unimportant scenes taking place at the north and south ends.  

**Hephaisteion Cult Statue Base**

Of all the comparanda discussed up to this point, the statue base of the cult statue in the Hephaisteion has the most in common with the Erechtheion frieze – it depicted the birth of Erechtheus’s grandfather, Erichthonios. This relief, probably created by Pheidias’s pupil Alkamenes, depicted Athena and Hephaistos as mother and father of Erichthonios and therefore of the Athenians.  

The lower part of a neo-Attic relief in the Vatican shows Athena’s legs wrapped in a himation as her right leg bends to receive a baby from Gaia (fig. 22).

![Fragment of neo-Attic relief with Birth of Erichthonios, Vatican Museum](image)

Harrison believed this to be a copy of the base of the Hephaisteion’s cult statue and by comparing it with a copy in the Louvre, she attempted to reconstruct the composition (fig. 23).
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The daughters of Kekrops are present at the birth of Ericthonios in the Codrus Painter’s portrayal, and as Harrison stated, it would be natural for them to be there on the statue base in the Hephaisteion as well. His daughters are often called the “Aglaurids” (fig. 24).

Aglauros is the oldest female and can be recognized by her serious expression since she was the daughter who supposedly opened the basket against Athena’s will. Herse, the middle-aged daughter, seems to have a bright disposition, yet it is difficult to know for sure since her head and feet are missing in the Vatican copy. In the Vatican copy, she is dressed wearing a *kandys*, or a sleeved Persian jacket, over her chiton. The *kandys* suggests that she is royalty, and she was in fact the
daughter of a king. Harrison proposed that Herse’s outfit may connect her to the *arrhephoroi*. She supposed these young girls possibly wore such jackets during their rituals that took place during the nighttime. The youngest of the girls, probably Pandrosos, usually has her hair tied at the nape of her neck, and she is recognizable by the distinctive, tightly wound braids that go around her head. She wears a jacket and mantle that is wrapped around her. Joining the Aglaurids on the base would be three more maidens, the Graces, in order to create symmetry. As for the two figures on either end of the base, Harrison only speculated who might belong there. Because Hermes was so closely related to the Graces, and Aphrodite was so closely related to the Aglaurids, Harrison suggested them as candidates to be present on the base. The *arrhephoroi* were connected to Aphrodite in that it was to her shrine that they brought their mystic baskets. She most likely would have been leaning against a tree, much like Alkamenes’ Aphrodite and Hermes would have somewhat echoed her pose. Eros would have been with Aphrodite too as they shared a sanctuary and were paired together on the Parthenon.

Joining Athena and Gaia on the Hephaisteion statue base would have been Zeus, Kekrops and Hephaistos (fig. 25).

![Harrison’s rendering of the statue base from the Hephaisteion](image)

Fig. 25 Harrison’s rendering of the statue base from the Hephaisteion

Zeus would have been seated on a stone block, like he was on the Louvre relief. While he may appear to be smaller in scale than Athena, it must be remembered that he is seated. His height created symmetry between his side and Kekrops’s side. Harrison also pointed out that his smaller size takes
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the emphasis away from him and instead the viewer can focus on the central scene.\(^{207}\) There is no evidence in either the Louvre relief or the Vatican relief for the presence of Kekrops. However, he must have been there, especially if his daughters were. Harrison assigned him to a space on the right side equal in width to the space taken up by Zeus on his stone seat on the opposite side. His snake tail points towards his daughters, which was a clever reminder of their later reaction to seeing Erichthonios’s body. A Roman relief depicting the Birth of Erichthonios showed Hephaistos standing on the right. He seemed to have been leaning on something, most likely his crutch.\(^{208}\)

The Hephaisteion base depicted the Athenians as children of the gods. Harrison even proposed that the theme of “peaceful fruitfulness” and the celebration of fertility shown on the statue base and the “kindly, fostering” expression on the gods’ faces, reflected the Peace of Nikias that took place when these sculptures were being created.\(^{209}\)

Taken as a whole, the overarching theme found in the late fifth century sculptural programs was one of Athenian victory over a foe and the importance of a unified city. Most all of the above discussed programs depicted Athenians battling barbaric foes and triumphing victoriously. Also depicted was the unification of the Athenian people as a harmonious polis protected and overseen by the gods, as seen by the Panathenaic procession on the Parthenon and the assembly of gods honoring Athena Nike for her successful assistance in the battles. By utilizing the programs’ content as a point of comparison, I can attempt to interpret the scenes on the Erechtheion. First, however, I must embark upon the task of categorizing the fragmented figures by grouping them according to size, style and proposed location upon the frieze.

\(^{207}\) Harrison 1977, 280
\(^{208}\) Ibid., 281.
\(^{209}\) Harrison 1977(2), 411.
Chapter 4 – The Frieze Evidence

This chapter will describe a number of the fragments as well as explore the possibilities of placement of the fragments by relying mostly on epigraphical and archaeological evidence, so in the subsequent chapter a conclusion may arise in regards to the composition of the frieze.

Just as there is not an overabundance of information on the interior architecture of the Erechtheion, there is even less on the sculptural decoration adorning the outer part of the temple. An Ionic frieze was believed to be the sole figural decoration on the Erechtheion other than the Porch of the Karyatids as there is no evidence of pedimental sculpture or statuary akroteria adorning the roof of the building.210 The Erechtheion displayed braided column bases, richly decorated anthemions (carved bands of alternating lotus flowers and rosettes), and a continuous frieze.211 However, the only extant remains of the frieze are mere fragments of figures.

The Frieze

As early as 1837, fragments were identified as being those from the frieze of the Erechtheion. By the time these fragments were published by the American School of Classical Studies in 1927 at least 112 had been undoubtedly attributed to belong to the Erechtheion. From 1931 to 1935 more fragments were unearthed during excavations on the North Slope of the Acropolis.212

The frieze of the Erechtheion consisted of blue Eleusinian limestone onto which figures and groups of figures made of Pentelic marble were doweled, “cameo-like” onto the stone.213 The Erechtheion frieze was unlike any other architectural frieze in Greece because of this technique.214 The method in which the figures were attached to the background, merely with one dowel, probably contributed to the complete loss of many of the figures and the poor state of preservation of those
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remaining. However, it is because of this type of attachment that fragments can be identified with those that would have been on the Erechtheion. This method required that each figure have a flat surface on the back in order for easy attachment.\textsuperscript{215} Fowler suggested that this technique of attaching separately carved pieces to the Eleusinian stone background had an economic motive. Smaller pieces of marble could be used and the background would not have to be painted.\textsuperscript{216} However, as Boulter pointed out, it would have taken more work to attach each figure to the background. Even though it was economically sound in Fowler’s mind, it would appear that the seemingly free-standing sculpture would be more luxurious than the customary high relief sculpture seen on the other buildings on the Acropolis.\textsuperscript{217}

The coloring of the frieze mimicked others, such as the one from the Parthenon, in that it had a dark background behind the figures. However, instead of being painted dark like most Greek friezes, the stone itself was naturally dark.\textsuperscript{218} The positions of the dowel holes, however, lead to the assumption that the figures were not placed close together, as seen on the Parthenon frieze where numerous figures overlapped. Instead the Erechtheion frieze is distinctive in that the figures are not crowded. Alternatively they are well spaced just as the decoration on statue bases was organized, such as the base of the cult statue in the Hephaisteion, which will be discussed in detail later, and at the Temple of Nemesis at Rhamnous (fig. 26).\textsuperscript{219} The Nemesis statue base consisted of “an ornately-carved socle of white Pentelic marble; a central die of two pentelic blocks; and a crowning course of dark Eleusinian limestone into which the cult statue was set.” The base was decorated on three sides by widely spaced figures carved in high relief much like the Erechtheion frieze. The symmetrically placed figures consisted of two pairs of males flanking four female figures on the front, three males

\textsuperscript{215} Boulter 1970, 7.
\textsuperscript{216} Paton 1927, 239.
\textsuperscript{217} Boulter 1970, 20.
\textsuperscript{218} Paton 1927, 239.
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and a horse on each of the two shorter sides, while the back side was left blank.\textsuperscript{220} Because of the rarity of style usually reserved for statue bases, it has been easier to establish which fragments found on the Acropolis belong to the Erechtheion.\textsuperscript{221}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig26}
\caption{Nemesis Base from Rhamnous, ca. 430-420 BCE}
\end{figure}

The frieze surrounded the entire building, varying slightly in size between the cella and the North Porch.\textsuperscript{222} The length of the entire frieze of the cella was less than the perimeter of the entire building because the roof of the North Porch interrupted it. The western end of the building was repaired during the Roman period by using plain Eleusinian stone taken from old statue bases. It is therefore unknown if the western end originally consisted of smooth stone with no sculptural decoration. However, the height of the architrave suggests that there were figures on the frieze there. It can be assumed that a frieze including figures were on the eastern, northern and southern sides of the cella. The total length of the frieze on these sides was about forty-nine meters.\textsuperscript{223}

It is difficult to determine the position of the fragments with certainty because the size and location must depend on calculations based on the proportion of the figures. Because some figures were standing, crouching or seated and because there was a difference in scale for deities and mortals, it is hard to decide where these figures belong on the frieze. However, there are some points related to the heights of certain figures which help to place them with greater probability on either the cella frieze

\begin{footnotesize}
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or the frieze of the North Porch. The heights of these figures must be estimated as they are mostly fragments. The Eleusinian blocks of the frieze above the cella wall were 0.617 meters high and those over the North Porch were 0.683 meters high. When dealing with a figure whose bottom portion is preserved, it is much easier to estimate the height the figure would have been. It is possible, then, to know the position of the figure, as well as the proportions of their bodies.

Boulter, who focuses mostly on sculptural styles, believed that the technique was chosen for aesthetic reasons. The style of uncrowded sculpture was not a new concept as it had been seen on the sculpture base at the Hephaisteion which was probably made between the years of 421 and 415. Perhaps the Hephaisteion base’s success aesthetically inspired the designers of the Erechtheion frieze to use the same method. Boulter seemed to think that the design of the frieze took place before 415 when the work on the Erechtheion had to be temporarily halted because of preparations for the Athenian naval expedition to Sicily. The building report of 410/09 stated that the building was in the stages of completion, so logically the frieze had to have been designed prior to this date. The sculpture was, however, not completely finished because no sculpture was mentioned in the building accounts of 410/09. An inscription from the seventh prytany of 408/07, however, recorded the names of some of the artisans responsible for the sculpting as well as their payment of about sixty drachmas per figure. Boulter found that during the tenth prytany of 408/07 another inscription noted sculptors’ work, yet they were only receiving small payments of four to ten drachmas. She assumed that these were payments for small touch-ups or add-ons while the sculpture was already in place. Therefore, Boulter confidently concluded that all of the frieze can be dated between the years 410 and 406.
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The Fragments

When attempting to decipher the location of each of the fragments and place them into a narrative sequence, scholars, such as Pallat and Boulter, have used numerous methodologies. In fact, in order to assist the reader in keeping the fragments organized according to each scholars’ ideas, I have added a table in an Appendix. Pallat, an archaeologist, proceeded by matching the figures’ dowel holes with the Eleusinian background’s dowel holes. However, Fowler, as he analyzed Pallat’s work, pointed out that of the one hundred and twelve figures known to belong to the Erechtheion frieze, only forty-five show undeniable evidence of a dowel hole cutting. None of the holes in the fragments can certainly be attributed to any specific hole in the background. This makes each position merely conjectural. One might think that since the positions of the dowel holes can be seen on the Eleusinian stone as well as on the backs of the fragments, they could easily be placed into the puzzle of the frieze with perfect certainty. However, this is not the case, as Fowler has determined. He also stated that, “as a general rule, the dowel holes in the figures are smaller than those in the blocks of the background.” The dowels were fixed into the holes with lead, the dowels were smaller than the holes and were probably not always set in the exact middle of the hole, therefore making it difficult to match. Therefore, an exact correspondence of figure to background cannot be predicted.230

Boulter chose to analyze the pieces by looking at the style of carving and separating the figures into groups according to “Masters.” However, there is also an issue with this approach. Since the figures of the frieze were sculpted individually and attached later, consecutive scenes would not necessarily have been made by one man, as they would for the Parthenon and the parapet wall of the Temple of Athena Nike. Boulter assumed that each side probably formed a unit and a sculptor was assigned figures to sculpt at random.231 Because of this, the figures cannot be attributed to one certain place on the frieze merely based on style or the groupings of Masters’ work that Boulter has created. It
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can be assumed, however, that the same sculptors worked on both the friezes of the cella and the one on the North Porch.\textsuperscript{232} Perhaps, by combining these two methods, the location of the figures can be better understood, therefore making it possible to decipher what scenes were represented on the frieze of the Erechtheion.

The method I chose to use to understand the placement of these fragments better was to follow Boulter’s process first. I also follow Boulter’s assumption that the same sculptors worked on the entire building and that each master created the figures of each unit. By combining it with Pallat’s method of matching dowel holes, I hope to understand better where on the building these fragments belonged.

**Groups Divided by Style**

Boulter divided the fragments into seven groups according to the Masters to whom she attributed them. The most obvious characteristic of Master I is his use of finely incised lines to create the appearance of diaphanous drapery. Master I of the Erechtheion and Master B of the parapet wall of the Temple of Athena Nike (425-415 BCE) both share, according to Boulter, a “love of chiaroscuro and elaborate movement in drapery.” Master I’s chisel work, however, more closely resembles Master A of the parapet wall in that they were both especially elaborate in the cutting.\textsuperscript{233} It can be deduced that Master I was familiar with the work of the parapet Masters, and that he was trained in the same tradition.\textsuperscript{234} Boulter termed Master I’s work as flamboyant, and his figures were said to be full of movement. She also stated that his over-elaboration of the surfaces could sometimes spoil his work.\textsuperscript{235} Fragment numbers 4, 23, 58, 74, and 78 all belong to the *oeuvre* of Master I of which 4, 23, and 58 belong to the North Porch and 74 and 78 belonging to the cella.

The first of Master I’s work was a female figure, 4, preserved from the neck to the thighs, who was rapidly striding towards the left and forward (fig. 27).

\textsuperscript{232} Ibid., 22.
\textsuperscript{233} Ibid., 10.
\textsuperscript{234} Ibid., 11.
\textsuperscript{235} Boulter 1970, 19.
Her quick movement has caused her belted chiton with sleeves to slip from her left shoulder and expose her left breast. She has thrown her cloak over her extended right arm which she could have been pulling up with her left hand in fear of something behind her.\textsuperscript{236} Boulter compared this pose to those seen on the frieze of the Temple of Apollo at Bassae.\textsuperscript{237} Remnants of fragment 4’s hairstyle can be seen, and it was similar to that of the “maidens” from the Karyatid Porch. Her head was turned back toward the right, probably seeing the action from which she runs. In her left hip is a dowel hole cut horizontally that probably held an attribute. The drapery is cut rather deeply and roughly except where the drapery lies against an arm or a breast, where it is finely incised. Casson believed this figure to depict a winged Victory. However, what he thought to be traces of wings were most likely her billowing drapery.\textsuperscript{238} Casson probably thought it was a winged victory because of its similarity to the figures on the Temple of Athena Nike parapet wall as well as the Nike of Paionios at Olympia (fig. 28).

\textsuperscript{236} Paton 1927, 247.  
\textsuperscript{237} Boulter 1970, 8.  
\textsuperscript{238} Paton 1927, 247.
The folds of the drapery at the waist of the fleeing female figure are very much similar to the drapery of the “Fleeing Nike” from the parapet wall (fig. 29).

The folds create pockets or pouches which billow away from the center of the figure. Boulter pointed out that “in the interior of the pockets it is possible to see raised ridges and finely chiseled grooves.” The fold of the chiton across her right thigh, “not only varies the drapery pattern, but reinforces the impression of rapid movement.” Other such folds can be found on the himation. One particular fold appears on her right thigh, just above the fracture. The chiton is represented as a diaphanous material, executed with “short finely incised lines” over the nude body. A contrast to the fine lines was the thick
himation represented by “a series of tubular ridges and deep valleys.” The drapery is also similar to that of the Nike of Paionios. However, the curving and re-curving of the Nike’s drapery seems to be more artificial. There is no trace of an attachment on the shoulders for wings to suggest that this running female was a Nike. There is, however, a hole cut horizontally into the left hip, that indicates that something was attached, possibly an identifying metal attribute of some sort. Boulter also suggested that she was possibly running next to a chariot.

The surface of fragment 58, another of Master I’s group, is unblemished, and according to Boulter the drapery is created with beauty and delicacy. The neck, shoulders, right breast and part of the left breast remain of this female figure. She is facing forward with her head turned slightly to her right, and she wears a chiton which is tied on the right and pinned on the left shoulder. Her left arm was raised and her right probably extended to the side. Because her proportions are rather large, she probably belonged to the North Porch. Fine lines are utilized below the right breast to suggest transparency of the fabric. The diagonal ridges that slice across her chest give the intimation of movement. The wavy lines that make the folds of the drapery recall that of figure 4.

The third of Master I’s work was the female figure, 74 (fig. 30). She was wearing a chiton and himation and would have been moving rapidly toward the left as her drapery was blowing between her legs. While it is uncertain whether or not this piece belongs to the frieze, the workmanship and material match other fragments. The fragment depicts part of the thighs, and the left leg is partially bare. The female wears a thin chiton shown by the thin incised lines of the drapery giving the chiton a
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crinkly effect much like 78. It is similar to 58 in that the twisted wavy pattern of the fabric between her legs mimics the neckline of 58.\textsuperscript{245}

The last of Master I’s unit, the fragment 78, is of a woman wearing a chiton girdled high on her waist, standing facing forward (fig. 31).\textsuperscript{246} Her chiton blouses at the waist with a kolpos, a folding over of the chiton’s fabric. The figure’s chiton has slipped off her left shoulder, curving above her left breast and outlining it.\textsuperscript{247} She also wears a himation that falls over her right shoulder to her left thigh without being held up.\textsuperscript{248} It “curves from behind her body at her right over the legs in a series of tubular ridges and narrow deeply-cut valleys.” The crimped folds in the himation that fall beneath the chiton are reminiscent of those from the Parapet’s Master A. The upper half of the drapery “seems to have been a complex pattern of broad flat ridges with many fine lines cut into the nude.” The hanging pockets of fabric caused by the gathered chiton are deeply-cut, while their interior consists of finely cut grooves and ridges much like the drapery at the waist of fragment 4. The broad and wavy incised lines along the abdomen create an intricate pattern that seems to represent transparent fabric.\textsuperscript{249} Her weight rests on her right leg and her left foot is placed on a higher level. The remnant of a tree trunk is at the
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right and it is possible that she was leaning against it. Fowler proposed that her foot could have been resting on a tree root while she leaned against a branch. Pallat and Boulter both believed this to be Aphrodite because of the similarity to an Aphrodite from Berlin (fig. 32).²⁵⁰

²⁵⁰ Paton 1927, 262.
Blümel first made the suggestion that these figures were comparable. The pose is similar with both left arms leaning on a support with their left legs raised to rest on an object. The curve of the Berlin Aphrodite’s body is less exaggerated suggesting she is standing still. The Berlin Aphrodite’s drapery, however, is more like the stoic Parthenon style, rather than the “slightly florid, restless drapery of [the] Erechtheion figure.” The drapery over the Aphrodite’s breast is made of broad folds, while the Erechtheion figure’s drapery consists of patterned finely incised lines. This figure can also be compared to another Aphrodite: a leaning type which may be a copy of Alkamenes’ “Aphrodite in the Gardens” from the last quarter of the fifth century (fig. 33).

One such Aphrodite found in Smyrna displays the same style of complex, fine lines that comprise the drapery over her breasts. Similarities also include the deeply-cut loops of the chiton’s overfold as well as her twisting pose. Most copies of this Aphrodite depict her with her drapery slipping off her left shoulder, seen also on the Berlin Aphrodite. These are typical characteristics associated with the goddess, probably copied from the reclining Aphrodite on the Parthenon (Fig. 34).\(^{251}\)

\(^{251}\) Boulter 1970, 9-10.
The difference between Masters I and II are that Master I’s drapery consists of “elaborate and complex movement” while Master II’s drapery is quiet and sensuous. The fragments that belong to Master II’s composition are 10, 13 and 49 all of which belong to the frieze of the North Porch. According to Boulter, the most remarkable characteristic of Master II’s style is “the way in which he models his figures through the use of continuous softly curving drapery lines.” Boulter pointed out that Master II’s signature is that of “continuous drapery lines, to which the surface play of light and shade is subordinated.”

Fragment 10, the lower part of a female, is clad in a chiton with blousing folds and also a himation, the folds of which fall over a seat at the left (fig. 35). She sits turned half towards the right, similar to fragment 9, on a seat so high that her thighs are somewhat straightened in order for her feet to reach the ground line. Casson called what she is seated upon as a rock, but Fowler believed it to be too uniform in shape to be a rock. Her legs are unusually spread slightly apart. As Casson pointed out, it seems as if she has just turned around quickly. Boulter agreed, mentioning the ridges of drapery that fall diagonally across her lap and disappear over her left knee. The tubular ridges follow the form of her body beneath her clothing and are made with deep undercutting, as on fragment 13. The series
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of deeply cut folds between her legs are compared by Carpenter to the “Seated Athena” from the parapet wall of the Temple of Athena Nike.\textsuperscript{256}

Fig. 35 Fragment 10

The second of Master II’s group is this female figure, fragment 13 (fig. 36). She also wears a belted chiton with a himation. She is sitting turned somewhat toward the left. Her left forearm and her feet were carved in the round and are no longer intact. The seat she sits upon is rounded but not cylindrical. The seat seems to be resting on a rock or uneven ground. This well-preserved fragment showcases deep undercutting for the folds of the himation.\textsuperscript{257} The style of her drapery is distinctly different than those made by Master I. The “inflated tubular ridges” of her himation continuously curve across her legs. The ridges occasionally divide, yet they still follow the form of her body beneath the fabric. On her left leg they eventually flatten as the drapery is pulled tight against her shin. The drapery hangs in folds from her shoulder and is deeply undercut to separate the left arm from her body. Her himation hangs in heavy folds over the rocky seat on which she sits. Compared to 78, part of Master I’s group, the grooved folds in her chiton are quite simple. Across her abdomen are finely carved ridges. According to Boulter, “the general impression is one of restraint and delight in the

\textsuperscript{256} Boulter 1970, 11.
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The spirally curved folds frequently seen on the parapet wall of the Temple of Athena Nike are seen in the incised folds of this female’s garment. The group is turned toward the right. The female to the right is standing or perhaps walking slowly toward the right while the female to the left is kneeling. The standing figure stands with her weight on her left leg, and her chiton hangs in deeply cut folds. The fabric “undulates gently” where the folds are interrupted by the knee of the kneeling figure. The himation of the kneeling figure consists of continuous tubular ridges that curve over her legs. The dividing, yet unbroken lines are similar in style to those found on 10 and 13. The treatment of the drapery along her abdomen echoes that found on 13. Casson compares this group to fragment 66, a group of a standing and kneeling males also facing right, because “the figures are in nearly the same position.” However, Fowler stated that the action taking place must have been different because the kneeling female figure’s posture is more erect than that of the male youth. Pallat believed this to represent Athena waiting with Pandrosos to receive
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Erichthonios. Pallat proposed that the standing figure at the right might be Athena, facing towards the right. The kneeling girl, presumably Pandrosas, is in a ready position to receive Erichthonios from Athena.\textsuperscript{262} However, as seen on both an Athenian red-figure vase in the British Museum and in Berlin both from the mid-fifth century, the kneeling figure could represent Gaia handing over a child to Athena (fig. 3 and fig. 4).

![Fig. 37 Fragment 49](image)

Moving on to the figures in Master III’s group, they have little depth to their relief, except for 11, which had to utilize deeper relief to accommodate the child. On both the figure on the left in 77 and the upper portion of 85, the drapery lines are “cut to a minimum and the form beneath is modeled as if nude.” The “inflated tubular folds of the himation across the body, pinched at the curves” are the most recognizable characteristic of Master III’s work.\textsuperscript{263} Boulter recognized Master III’s ability to model the nude body beneath the thin drapery along with his apparent high rank among the sculptors. He was in charge of fragments 18 and 85, both representing divinities on thrones.\textsuperscript{264} Fragments 11 and 18 belong to the North Porch while 77 and 85 belonged to the frieze of the cella.
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The first of Master III’s set is a female wearing a girded chiton and a himation. She is seated angled to the left on a rock in fragment 11 (fig. 38). She holds in her lap a naked boy whose legs were sculpted free from the background and are now broken off.\(^{265}\)

![Fig. 38 Fragment 11](image)

The drapery on the lap as well as the fabric that falls between the leg and the rock are composed of the heavy folds that pinch in at the curves like in nos. 77, 85 and 18.\(^{266}\) This fragment is said to have been located on the north side of the North Porch frieze because of its larger size. It was suggested by Casson that this fragment was part of a symmetrical pair with 84, but the size of 84 fits the cella frieze.\(^{267}\) Boulter suggested that these two groups are derived from the woman with a boy on her lap from the west pediment on the Parthenon.\(^{268}\)

The remains of figure 18 from the waist down is half-seated or leaning against a decorated arm chair (fig. 39).\(^{269}\) The figure is most likely a female.

\(^{265}\) Paton 1927, 249.
\(^{266}\) Boulter 1970, 13.
\(^{267}\) Paton 1927, 249.
\(^{269}\) Paton 1927, 250.
However, the pose of this figure is unclear. Casson proposed that this figure was completely seated, and that the sculptor placed her in this pose because of the steep viewing angle from which the spectator would be seeing it while they looked up from the ground. However, Boulter saw the pose as an attempt to show instantaneous movement such as in fragments 78 and 10.\textsuperscript{270} She is wearing a chiton and himation, and the himation is slipping down.\textsuperscript{271} Boulter believed that the female is rising from the chair since her himation has not yet slipped down from her thighs, as it would have done if the figure was already standing. The figure’s chiton and himation completely cover her legs. In typical style of Master III, the tubular ridges of the himation are pinched in where they curve across her thighs, similar to the drapery of figures 77 and 85.\textsuperscript{272} The pillar-like leg of the chair and the arm that ends in a lion’s head, supported by a sphinx, still remain. The rear-end of the figure is higher up than the arm of the chair, therefore showing that they are not completely sitting down. The right arm is extended downwards and the hand seems to rest on the arm of the chair. The blousing of the chiton is
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reminiscent of the drapery type seen on the statue base of the Nemesis at Rhamnous. The style of drapery from figure 77 resembles the deeply cut folds of this figure. Casson argued that the figure does not possess a womanly figure and could possibly represent Zeus or another male deity. However, this figure is almost certainly female, and was proposed by Pallat to be Athena.\textsuperscript{273}

Fragment 77, another of Master III’s group, shows a group of two women moving slowly to the right as the woman on the right turns to the one on the left, seemingly pulling her along (fig. 40). The style of drapery and detail are reminiscent of fragment 18.\textsuperscript{274} The figure on the left wears a thin, unbelted chiton and himation, and she is facing the front. The chiton reveals the body beneath and can only be indicated by thinly incised lines and a single raised ridge that runs from the left shoulder across the breast and abdomen.

Her breast is rather flat, probably to indicate a youthful female. Two grooves above the navel indicate her abdominal muscles. In contrast to the chiton, the himation hangs in heavy, tubular folds. Her left leg beneath the chiton appears almost column-like and is hardly expressed beneath the drapery. The right-hand figure is turned back slightly toward her companion as she places an arm behind her. She wears a heavy peplos that falls in cylindrical ridges that are pinched where they bend. The left breast
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is indicated by the folds of deeply cut drapery beneath it. The right breast is seen in profile and Boulter pointed out that even though it is covered by the same thick material, it seems rather bare. Boulter proposed that because of the stiffness of the right side of the group, that they may have been located at a corner. She also agreed with Pallat when he said that they could represent Demeter and Persephone.²⁷⁵ Pallat believed they belonged to the eastern end of the cella frieze.²⁷⁶

Figure 85, a female figure facing the left leaning back in an armchair, is the last of Master III’s work (fig. 41). She is wearing a girded sleeved chiton and himation.

Because the left breast is higher than the right, Fowler seems to have thought that she had her left arm raised, perhaps leaning on the back of the chair, the arm of which might have been decorated with a lion’s head supported by a sphinx, much like fragment 18.²⁷⁷ Her chiton has slipped off her right shoulder and bunches into a series of ridges over her right breast. There are ridges beneath her breast that emphasize its form. The double ridge of drapery that hangs down from the right breast matches the pattern of drapery seen on the “Nike Adjusting her Sandal” from the parapet wall of the Temple of Athena Nike. Except for those few ridges, the chiton appears almost diaphanous, therefore revealing

²⁷⁵ Boulter 1970, 12.
²⁷⁶ Pallat 1912, 186.
her body beneath. A roll of flesh created by the way she sits in the chair can even be seen.\textsuperscript{278} Master III’s style is characterized by the inflated tubular folds that pinch where they curve.

Master IV’s work, too, is characterized by the narrow and sharply chiseled ridges that often pinch in where they curve, much like Master V’s work. The pinching-in of folds is an attribute unique to the Erechtheion frieze. The patterns created by Master IV are simple and logical, but according to Boulter they are not monotonous. She found them in stark contrast with Master III’s broad folds of drapery.\textsuperscript{279} Fragments 56 from the North Porch and 66 from the cella are part of Master IV’s collection of work.

The extant lower part of fragment 56, from above the knee to the ground, displays a standing female figure that is facing to the right (fig. 42). She wears a chiton and himation.\textsuperscript{280}

![Fig. 42 Fragment 56](image)

Her himation passes over her hip in broad, sharp ridges that pinch as they curve. The treatment of the falling drapery is similar to that of the youth of fragment 66.\textsuperscript{281} She looks ahead at what Pallat calls a \textit{thronos}, but which Casson mistakenly identified it as a tripod. The \textit{thronos} had a level top and was covered by drapery. On the chair is something measuring 0.18 meters in width by 0.08 meters in height. Pallat suggested that this object is a cushion on which the female presses, but Casson

\textsuperscript{278} Boulter 1970, 12.
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\textsuperscript{281} Boulter 1970, 14.
concluded that it was possibly a wineskin or some sacrificial offering. Fowler pointed out that a depression in the cushion could possibly have been where a baby was present, but is now missing. He said the female could have been resting her left hand on baby while leaning on the cushion with her right hand.

The last of Master IV’s unit, fragment 66, shows two men who are turned toward the right, one of whom stands and one of whom kneels next to him (fig. 43). Both figures are nude other than wearing a himation. The standing figure would have been leaning on a staff that was under his left armpit. The fastening of this staff was in the hanging folds of his garment.  

![Fig. 43 Fragment 66](image_url)

The standing male’s himation curves over his right hip in a series of sharp ridges that pinch in the curves and the garment is gathered over his left arm. The kneeling figure appears to be a youthful male. Fowler stated that he may be wearing a shoe since his foot is smooth. However, it appears to me that his foot is merely hidden beneath his drapery that puddles around him. The youth’s right arm would have been downward and forward while his left arm was bent with the forearm up in the air.
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His left arm was covered by his himation. The drapery pinches perceptibly where it drapes over his arm. The fabric hanging behind his legs consists of furrowed ridges that are sharply raised. The head of the kneeling youth is one of four heads preserved from the frieze. It is carved fully in the round and seems to have had a smooth cap of hair that would have been painted. The eyebrow line is sharp, similar to the head of Nike R from the parapet wall. However, the youth’s eyes are smaller.\textsuperscript{285} It has been suggested by some scholars, including Robert and Casson, that this scene represents a declaration by an oracle. Casson observed that there are marks on the youth’s drapery that could indicate something sitting upon his lap, a tablet for writing perhaps.\textsuperscript{286}

Master V’s typical characteristics include broad, forking ridges of the folds of the himation and the puffed-up, sometimes pinched folds of the chiton. The patterns are complex and the handling of the drapery is somewhat heavy.\textsuperscript{287} Boulter stated that Master V was less technically skilled than his fellow sculptors.\textsuperscript{288} However, Master V could be subtle with the modeling of details, as seen in the foot of figure 48 and the hand of fragment 84.\textsuperscript{289}

The first of Master V’s work, fragment 48, is a female wearing a chiton and a himation who is crouching or kneeling (fig. 44).\textsuperscript{290} Her himation creases in broad, widely spaced, forking folds over her buttocks as she crouches. Sharp, pinched folds make up the fabric of her chiton, and the drapery is pulled tight against her right calf as it projects behind the folds of the chiton.\textsuperscript{291} She is turned toward the left. There is a projection at her right side that seems to be coming from her knee. However, as Fowler pointed out, whatever abutted there could not have been part of her body. It could not be her left foot which would have had to have been farther to the right under the folding drapery. Fowler
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proposed that there might have been a standing figure to the left, perhaps the fragment 49 by Master II, or some other object connected with this figure.\textsuperscript{292}

Fragment 84, a female figure, is seated wearing a chiton with kolpos and apoptygma, blousing folds of fabric that fall over her belting (fig. 45). She is also wearing a himation, and she is facing toward the right. A nude boy rests on her lap with his right hand around her neck.\textsuperscript{293}

\textsuperscript{292} Paton 1927, 256. \\
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Pallat proposed that this scene represent the Kourotrophos. It has been suggested by others to be Demeter and Iacchus, Athena and Erichthonios, Pandrosos and Erichthonios or only a generic scene. The fingers of the female that are resting across the boy’s thigh are unusually long and thin, a subtle characteristic of Master V’s style. The female figure’s chiton and himation hangs from her shoulders and is wrapped around her left hand and legs. The folds of drapery falling across her breast are broad, some of them forking. The drapery falling in her lap curves sinuously back and forth in a continuous ribbon. Master V uses semicircular ridges and triangular ridges to create rich patterns of drapery. The drapery is similar to the undulating raised ridges of Master II’s style, yet Master V’s style is less refined, according to Boulter.

Master VI’s work is too poorly preserved to be able to see his skill clearly. Boulter, however, described the detail of the drapery of fragments 76, 27 and 79 that might belong to his oeuvre. They depend on the long, flowing incised lines that are typical of Master VI’s style. He used sinuous incised lines for both the diaphanous and heavy drapery, as seen in figure 76. Fragment 27 belongs to the North Porch while fragments 76 and 79 belong to the cella.

Fragment 27 is hardly preserved (fig. 46). This youthful female figure, of which only the breast remains, wears a chiton and a himation as she moves rapidly toward the right. Her thin chiton reveals her body beneath and the fabric curves gently as she moves. The broad ridges and long fine lines recall the craftsmanship of figure 76. Casson also added this to his “Nike figure fragments” group.
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The female figure, fragment 76, is wearing a belted chiton with a himation (fig. 47). Her himation falls toward the front over her right thigh which is bent forward as she bears her weight on her left leg. Her right arm would have been raised. Boulter pointed out that this female’s kolpos must have hung over her waist in loops and has a windblown effect, similar to fragment 4.

Fig. 47 Fragment 76
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The folds of her drapery between her legs are made of broad cuts and do not get deeper until the drapery reaches her lower leg. The drapery of her himation, falling in a single fold from each knee, is reminiscent of the Karyatids’ clothing.\textsuperscript{302} According to Fowler, the dowel holes show this fragment could belong to the second hole of the second, third or maybe the fourth block over the eastern porch. It also could belong to the first hole of the seventh block on the eastern porch. Hill believed it to belong at the fourth hole of block II or the first hole of block V from the eastern side. Either way, this fragment most likely belonged on the eastern side of the cella frieze.\textsuperscript{303}

The female figure, fragment 79, stands in front view with her weight resting on her left leg (fig. 48). She is wearing a clingy chiton, and she is pulling a cloak forward with her left hand.\textsuperscript{304} Finely incised lines are used to indicate the diaphanous drapery of this female’s chiton that is drawn tight over her body. The drapery at the left side of figure 76 echoes the shallow-cut folds hanging at her left side.\textsuperscript{305} While Casson believed this figure to represent Aphrodite, Pallat thought this, along with fragment 80 was a Charity or Grace.\textsuperscript{306}

\textsuperscript{302} Boulter 1970, 15.
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Since the Charities were a group of three females, one other female fragment needs to be added to this group.

The only fragment that Boulter attributed to a seventh master is figure 112. She noted that Master VII “is a very skilled craftsman,” but since only one fragment can be credited to him, not much else is known about his style.\(^{307}\) The female figure wears a belted chiton that folds over her waist. The kolpos would have hung far over her chiton, creating a shadow beneath. The only characteristics that can be mentioned is that the fabric is treated with broad valleys and sharply raised ridges. The drapery that hangs between her legs is rendered with tubular folds.\(^{308}\)

**Groups Divided by Size and Type\(^{309}\)**

The number of figures engaged in action on the Erechtheion frieze is surprisingly low compared to the figures that are considered to be spectators.\(^{310}\) According to Pallat, fragments of forty-eight figures and three galloping teams once adorned the frieze of the North Porch.\(^{311}\) Twenty-two figures stood quietly erect. Three of those figures were male (33, 39 and 45), while the remaining nineteen were female (1, 14, 16, 19, 20, 22, 29, 30, 36-38, 40, 41-44, 46, 51 and 54). Pallat added to that group the figures that were moving in some sort of action. There were three female figures moved with a dancing step (6, 7 and 35), six females that were running (2-5, 26 and 28), two females were standing in a bent posture (15 and 56), and three females were kneeling (48-50). There is also a significantly larger number of female figures than there are male figures, forty-three to only five, respectively.\(^{312}\)

Pallat divided the figures found on the cella frieze into 3 groups: a group that are smaller in size than the others, a group that are present at some action, and a group of four men in action. The smaller
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figures should be regarded as human beings, according to Pallat.\textsuperscript{313} These figures were a standing or peacefully walking female (94), a walking female figure (89), a kneeling female figure (93), and a male figure standing with somewhat bent knees (91).\textsuperscript{314} The figures comprising the group who are present at some action are most likely gods or heroes, and consist of eleven figures. Six are male (63-68) and five are females that stood quietly (76, 78-80 and 96). There are three female figures walking (77 and 88) and ten seated figures. Eight are female (73, 81-87) and two are male (62 and 70). The crouching woman (97) belongs to this group, as well. Pallat also included two standing females (75 and 90) and three running females to this group (71, 72, 74 and 95).\textsuperscript{315} The group of four men in action consisted of the kneeling youth from 66, 69, 92 and the male from 106.\textsuperscript{316}

Along with the human figures of the frieze, there were also numerous horses found among the Erechtheion’s frieze fragments. A pair of stallions, fragment 106, were either standing or moving slowly to the right (fig. 49). There is also a chariot and a nude hero standing behind the chariot, not in the chariot.

![Fig. 49 Fragment 106](image)

The curves at the upper part of the chariot are not broken pieces, but instead decoration of the chariot. The horse in the background is so far to the right that his hind legs are even with the horse in the foreground’s shoulders. Fowler pointed out that this could indicate that the horse in the background
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had yet to be harnessed to the chariot. Pallat placed this horse near the middle of the eastern cella wall. Fragment 107 represents what may be a quadriga, a four-horse chariot, galloping to the left (fig. 50). All that remains of the horse in the foreground are parts of the forelegs and the breast, while behind it the breast and the beginning of a neck are visible.

According to Fowler, the remnants of a third horse can be seen on the front side of the first horse. Schoene believed that this fragment and 108 belonged together. While Pallat originally agreed with him, he later attested that the two cannot be joined as it would then be a team of five horses. The rear part of a pair of horses, fragment 111, also belongs to the frieze of the North Porch. Pallat stated that this could possibly belong to the same team found in 107, but the differences in chiseling create doubts.

Fragment 108 agrees in scale with the horses from fragment 111, and Pallat assumed that they could belong together as a group of horses galloping to the left (fig. 51). Fragment 107 depicts horses standing still and probably also belongs on the North Porch frieze. Fragments 105 and 106 are probably also fragments of horses but are from the cella frieze.
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The final fragment that will be discussed in length is the Corinthian helmet attributed by Glowacki to the Erechtheion frieze (fig. 52). The Corinthian helmet, in Glowacki’s opinion, provides new evidence for the possibility of Athena being present as one of the draped figures on the frieze.\textsuperscript{321}

This helmet was found in 1939 during Broneer’s excavations on the North Slope of the Acropolis. The North Slope has been disturbed by erosion and modern building, and the context in which these undifferentiated stone fragments from multiple structures were found are hard to decipher. Some pieces were built into buildings while others were found near the surface in “mixed” fills that contained soil from earlier excavations, making the date difficult to establish. Most of the fragments came from the “late” fills that were possibly from the Turkish period. None of the fragments came from closed contexts dating to the ancient Greek, Roman or Byzantine eras. However, the helmet can

\textsuperscript{321} Glowacki 1995, 326.
confidently be placed among the Erechtheion frieze fragments because it is made of finely-grained Pentelic marble, and its bottom and back surfaces are finished flat, which is a typical characteristic of the Erechtheion frieze sculptures.

The helmet points to the right in three-quarter view and is set against a modeled background seemingly meant to represent stone.\(^{322}\) The rocky background is similar to the rocky projections on which many of the other figures sit.\(^{323}\) The helmet is described by Glowacki:

> An oblong scar at [the] left shows where something in high relief has broken off from the helmet, possibly part of another figure. The upper right portion of the helmet is missing and, although no trace of a cutting survives at the back, may indicate where the fragment was fastened to the background with a dowel, thereby causing the break to occur at this point. The bottom surface is finished completely smooth, while the rear surface is flat and bears traces of a fine-pointed chisel.

The fact that the bottom surface is finished and smooth indicates that the sculpture sat atop the epistyle of the Erechtheion. It also reveals the fact that this helmet was not placed on a pole as a trophy but instead sat on the ground.\(^{324}\) Because the helmet is on the ground, it could rest next to a warrior who is arming or disarming. It could also be on the ground because it sits next to a seated figure, probably Athena. Athena was normally depicted seated with her helmet nearby in the late fifth century. This composition can be seen on the east frieze of the Hephaisteion and on the parapet wall of the Temple of Athena Nike. In both instances, she is seated on a rocky mass with her helmet either in her hand, on her head or resting in her lap.\(^{325}\) However, there are fifth and early fourth century instances where she is shown with her helmet on the ground next to her. Athena is depicted seated on a late-fifth century triglyph block with a Corinthian helmet resting on the ground next to her (fig. 53). Athena is also shown on an early-fourth century proxeny decree from the Acropolis with her helmet nearby while she sits on a rocky throne (fig. 54).

\(^{322}\) Glowacki 1995, 326.
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Most of the preserved seated figures are female, and the relatively large size of the helmet supports the interpretation of it belonging to Athena since she would be represented at a larger scale than mortal
beings. It can also stand as verification that this helmet was originally placed on the frieze of the North Porch.

At this point in my thesis, I have examined the political climate in which the Erechtheion was erected and in which the frieze was created as well as the myths associated with the temple. Because I have analyzed other fifth century Attic sculptural programs, I can now begin to combine the knowledge I have gained about contemporary sculptural themes with the fragments from the Erechtheion in order to reconstruct what I believe was represented on the temple.
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Chapter 5 – Deciphering the Erechtheion Frieze’s Content

Since I do not have the ability to match the figures’ dowel holes with the dowel holes on the Eleusinian backdrop on my own, I must trust Pallat’s analysis of the placement of some of the figures. However, I can attempt to complete the scenes based on iconography and context in comparison to those compositions discussed in the previous chapter. The reader should also keep in mind that the figures I discuss were not the only ones present on each side of both the cella and North Porch friezes. Because of the lack of dowel hole placements as well as the fragmentary state of most of the figures, I can only speculate by using the most significant, best preserved, identifiable extant figures what the main theme on each side represented.

The Cella Friezes

Of the scholars I have studied, none have attempted to reconstruct the scenes found on the cella friezes. They have each mentioned certain fragments and made an effort to identify them. However, none have organized them in any sort of grouping so that they create a unified scene. This is what I will endeavor to establish.

The Cella Frieze, Southern Side

The southern side of the cella wall was the side facing the Parthenon, and is also the side spectators would see as they traversed the Acropolis during the Panathenaic procession. Therefore, I suggest that the southern side of the cella frieze depicted a portion of the Panathenaic procession, particularly the conveyance of the peplos to the Acropolis.

During the Panathenaic procession, the peplos was brought up to the Acropolis. From the scholia on the *Knights* it is known that the peplos served as the rigging on the Panathenaic ship, which probably resembled a float in modern day parades.\(^ {328} \) A fragment from Strattis’s writings stated that

\(^ {328} \) Scholia on Aristophanes, *Knights* 566a (II).
“this peplos, the men without number, hauling with the rigging, drag to the top, just like the sail on a mast.” The passage, by using nautical terminology, suggested the presence of a ship. However, it was not specifically mentioned that a ship was used as a vehicle. It was not until 143 CE that an actual ship which carried the peplos was mentioned. Philostratos described a Panathenaic procession in which “the peplos, hung from the ship, was more pleasant than a painting with a fair wind in the folds, while the ship ran not with beasts of burden pulling her, but gliding forward by means of underground machinery, and the ship, equipped with a thousand oars” traversed the processional route. During the late fifth century, the Athenians may have not yet had the innovation or need to create a ship, and they only carried the mast with the peplos like described in Strattis’s writings. Perhaps it was not until the second century CE that the Athenians began using an actual ship.

Because the peplos was importantly connected to the Erechtheion, it is possible that the peplos would be depicted on the temple. On the other hand, the frieze would not portray the presentation of the peplos because it was already represented on the Parthenon nearby. However, because of the presence of figures like fragments 65 and 92, I propose that the south side of the cella represented a portion of the Panathenaic procession including the mast (fig. 55 and fig. 56). Fragment 65 stood with his weight on his left leg. He was nude other than a himation that was cast about his legs and hung on his left hip. Pallat suggested that the fall of his himation was due to the fact that his hands were occupied, perhaps in helping fragment 92 carry a mast. Pallat originally suggested that fragment 92 was lying down, yet after further observation he inferred that the man may be raising or lowering a mast. Also added to this group are figures listed on the building accounts that were described by Pallat. One of the items was “an object and a wagon for travelling or for freight.”
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inscription listed “a woman beside or on the wagon and the two mules before the wagon.” There may have not been an elaborate ship as documented in the Roman period, yet I believe that some sort of transportation vehicle, like the wagon depicted, was used. Shear maintained that there were no representations of the ship in Athenian art during the third quarter of the fifth century.

Fig. 55 Fragment 65

Fig. 56 Fragment 92

The Cella Frieze, Eastern Side

According to Pallat’s observations, the majority of fragments from the cella frieze belonged to the eastern end. When examining the distance of dowel holes in one block from one another, the holes
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in the central block (IV) of the eastern front are relatively far apart. The dowel holes on the two blocks on either side of IV are closer together. Therefore, it can be assumed that something of importance was happening on block IV.  

The presence of divinities on the eastern friezes of the Parthenon, the Hephaisteion and the Temple of Athena Nike make it probable that the eastern side of the cela portrayed divinities, as well. Even though most of the fragments probably belonged to the eastern end, above all the most important end of the temple, I have had the most trouble deciphering this scene. I have searched through the fragments trying to find a scene that could represent something of great importance, much like the east frieze was designed for the Hephaisteion and the Parthenon, but I find the figures lacking any such group. However, after observing the eastern frieze the Temple of Athena Nike, the Erechtheion’s contemporary, I concluded the friezes must be similar.

The east frieze of the Temple of Athena Nike, as mentioned in the previous chapter, depicted a quiet assembly of gods. Like the Erechtheion’s east cella frieze, they were widely spaced, and some figures were seated while others were standing around Athena as the central figure. I propose that fragment 85 was Athena. As described in Chapter Four, she was seated on a chair in a supposedly relaxed position, as Fowler seems to have thought that she had her left arm raised, perhaps leaning on the back of the chair. When compared to two relief carvings from the fifth and fourth centuries, the resemblance can easily be seen (figs. 53 and 54). It was also here, next to her chair, that the Corinthian helmet discussed by Glowacki would have been placed (fig. 52). Unlike the east frieze of the Temple of Athena Nike, in relation to the other sides of the Temple of Athena Nike friezes, where Athena was honored as the guarantor of military victory, I believe the Erechtheion’s eastern frieze to show her unarmed, therefore not stressing her military prowess. She was shown as relaxed, surrounded by her fellow Olympic deities.
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The composition of this scene seems to echo a triangular, pedimental arrangement of gods and goddesses. Pallat noticed that the dowel holes of block III to the left of the middle block (IV), are at a height of more than 0.40 meters which suggest that the figures attached there were standing upright. He also observed the same for block V to the right of the central block.\(^{338}\) Pallat also suggested that Hole 2 on the central block served to fasten a team of horses and that this is what occupied the center of the eastern frieze with the seated Athena.\(^{339}\) It is here that following Pallat’s suggestion, I place fragment 106. Fragment 106 depicts a pair of stallions, a nude man and a chariot (fig. 49). As stated in Chapter Four, the fact that the man is not yet in the chariot and the horses are not exactly parallel to one another indicates that they are not yet harnessed.\(^{340}\) They, like Athena, are in a quiet stance.

The remainder of the gods and goddesses were most likely positioned from standing to seated as one’s gaze moved away from Athena to the northern and southern ends of the eastern frieze. Most of the seated gods and goddesses are placed upon rocks, such as fragments 82 and 87 (fig. 57 and fig. 58). This could represent the deities being present upon the rocky Acropolis. I also see this placement as strengthening the connection of the Athenians to the earth. As previously stated in Chapter Two, the autochthonous births of Kekrops and Erechtheus emphasized the relationship of the Athenians with their land. Following the Persian invasion and the Peloponnesian War, the Athenians would want to highlight the fact that they were the only authentic citizens of Greece and the children of the gods Athena and Hephaistos.\(^{341}\)

\(^{338}\) Pallat 1912, 185. 
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When combined with the themes of the north and south sides of the cella frieze, sacrifice for one’s polis and the unified Panathenaia, it seems that the east side of the cella frieze depicted Athena as protector of the city. In fact her epithet worshipped at the Erechtheion was Athena Polias – guardian of the city.\textsuperscript{342}

\textsuperscript{342} Hurwit 2004, 21.
The Cella Frieze, Northern Side

I believe the northern side of the cella frieze depicted Erechtheus receiving the prophecy from the Delphic oracle that he must sacrifice his daughter in order for Athens to succeed in battle against Eumolpos. Since there are numerous fragments that are no longer extant, Pallat used the inscriptions listing the figures being made as a means to add to the group. Pallat listed the figures named in the inscription in the same order that they were on the inscription. Even though this does not lead me in any direction as to where they were located, perhaps it will help to place them in groups according to specific scenes on the northern side.

Pallat believed that these figures on the northern side took up the space from the northeast corner of the cella to the north porch. There were about fifty-five figures located on the north frieze of the cella. I see the scene on the north side as a continuous scene that took place over time and in different places, unlike the Parthenon’s frieze which depicted a single unified event on the Acropolis.

The first figure listed was a figure who was “throwing, setting, or laying something upon something or pushing something into something.” Second on the list was “a youth who is busied with some object, a second youth who is writing, and a third standing beside him.” I place fragment 66 with this group, as well (fig. 43). As I mentioned in Chapter Four, it was proposed that fragment 66 represents the declaration by an oracle. Casson observed that there are marks on the youth’s drapery that could indicate something sitting upon his lap, a tablet for writing perhaps. According to Erechtheus’s myth, the victory of Athens was prophesized by a Delphic oracle who stated that that Athens’ victory depended on the sacrifice of one of Erechtheus’s three daughters.

Next on the inscription are listed numerous figures wearing armor who are leading horses. To me, this could represent Erechtheus’s army watching Erechtheus receive the oracle or escorting him back to Athens from receiving the news from Delphi. The yoking of chariots by his grandfather
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Ericthonios was included in the myth of Erechtheus so it would make sense to have horses present with the scene of his army. This sculpture decorates Athena’s most treasured temple, that of Athena Polias, and the presence of horses was not a novel motif in Periklean temple décor as noted in the previous chapter when discussing the Parthenon’s Ionic frieze. Even if horses were a customary solution for filling space on a longitudinal frieze, Connelly has also pointed out the importance of the representation of horses to the Athenian past. The mastery of horses was seen as a noble effort harkening back to the celebrated past of the legendary kings of Athens, which in the wake of the wars overtaking Athens, would be a heroic reminder of the strength of the city.

The oracles are followed in the inscription by “a man standing beside an altar [who] is leaning on his staff” and “a woman who has fallen or is kneeling by a little girl.” I consider this man to be Erechtheus, the woman to be his wife Praxithea and the little girl to be the daughter prophesized to be sacrificed. In relation to the iconography of the older men represented on the eastern frieze of the Parthenon, the man leaning on his staff could be seen as an Eponymous hero, of which Erechtheus was one. Erechtheus is also depicted on an Athenian record relief from 410/09 as a mature male leaning on a staff (fig. 59).

![Record relief from Athens, Erechtheus and the olive tree, 410/09 BCE](image)
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The scene shows Erechtheus wearing a chiton hanging loosely around his hips as he holds a staff under his left armpit. The altar that the older man stands next to from the inscription describing the Erechtheion fragments is most likely the altar on which he will sacrifice his daughter. The motif of a man leaning on a staff near an altar can also be found on fifth century pottery depicting sacrifice scenes, such as an Athenian stamnos from 480-460 showing the preparations for the sacrifice of Clytemnestra and an Athenian bell krater from 430-410 portraying a group preparing an altar for sacrifice (figs. 60 and 61). Both scenes show an altar near a mature man leaning on a staff, not unlike the figures described in the building accounts.

![Fig. 60 Athenian stamnos, Sacrifice of Clytemnestra, 480-460 BCE](image)

![Fig. 61 Athenian bell krater, Sacrifice scene, 430-410 BCE](image)
Pallat suggested that fragments 79 and 80 were Charites and belonged to the eastern end of the cella frieze, but I disagree with him (fig. 48 and fig. 62). Even though there are no extant representations of the sacrifice scene in Periklean art, I propose that the young females were paired with Erechtheus, Praxithea and the young girl, make the royal family complete.

The breasts of fragment 80 are slightly developed so this could be a young female. Her chiton clings closely to her body and almost appears to be transparent. Fragment 79 is wearing a clingy chiton, and she is pulling a cloak forward with her left hand, possibly shielding herself from what is about to happen to her sister. However, the actual sacrifice is not included on the frieze because the customary way in which sacrifice scenes were represented in Classical art was one of the anticipatory moment just before the climactic action. Connelly believed showing the preemptive moment was modeled after the conventions found in Greek tragedies where the actual sacrifice takes place off-stage. For example, vases depicting the sacrifice of Andromeda do not show the death of Andromeda.
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Instead it showed her tied to a chair along with the preparations for her sacrifice to a sea-dragon. Therefore, the fact that the actual sacrifice of one of Erechtheus’s daughters is not shown should be expected.³⁵⁰

The North Porch Friezes

There are remarkably few figures engaged in action on the frieze of the North Porch, not unlike the frieze from the cella. Like the cella, there are also a significantly larger number of female figures than there are male figures, forty-three to only five, respectively.³⁵¹ As a visitor to the Acropolis would see, the eastern side of the North Porch would be viewed before the other sides of the porch as they descended the terrain from the eastern end of the temple to the north side. By examining the dowel holes like Pallet did for the cella frieze, it becomes evident that Block III on the eastern side of the North Porch frieze probably portrayed the primary event, the birth of Erichthonios because to the right and left of this block was a large number of standing and seated figures.³⁵² The west side of the North Porch, according to Pallat, portrayed a chariot race. This scene makes sense next to the north side as it was Erichthonios who was the first to harness a team of four horses as well as establishing the chariot races of the Panathenaia. Because that is the only detail given on the western side, I will not be discussing it in length.

The North Porch Frieze, Eastern Side

Pallat suggested that the birth of Erichthonios was depicted on central block (III) of the eastern side. The dowel holes on the central block, which he designates as 1, 3 and 4, are quite low. He proposed that the position of Hole 3 could indicate Gaia, the earth, from which Erichthonios was born.³⁵³ However, I would venture to say that Hole 1 was where Gaia was located because of the images of his birth discussed previously (fig. 3, fig. 4, fig. 22 and fig. 23). Kekrops was present as

³⁵⁰ Connelly 1996, 66.
³⁵¹ Pallat 1912, 192.
³⁵² Pallat 1912, 194.
³⁵³ Pallat 1912, 194.
well, and his serpent tail probably extended into the large space between Holes 4 and 5. Pallat stated that Hole 2 would have belonged to Athena. Comparing this proposed composition to vase paintings as well as the statue base from the Hephaisteion and its copies, I agree with Pallat’s suggested location of the figures.

Pallat believed fragment 49 to represent Athena waiting with Pandrosos to receive Erichthonios. However, compared to the vases and the statue base from the Hephaisteion, it makes sense that Gaia, not Pandrosos, would be handing Erichthonios to Athena. In fact according to the myth, Pandrosos was not present as the earth bore him, but instead was given Erichthonios after Athena hid him in a chest. Therefore it is not logical for Pandrosos to be handing Erichthonios to Athena.

Fragment 38 probably also belonged to this group tending to the birth of Erichthonios (fig. 63).

Pallat originally saw this fragment as “the upper part of the body of a figure clad in chiton and himation.” However, after seeing representations of Athena at the birth of Erichthonios depicted on Athenian pottery, he decided it looked more like a cloth held by two corners. Various representations
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portray Athena holding a cloth spread out as she receives the child born from the ground (fig. 3). While the woman in fragment 38 cannot be Athena, she could still be modeled after the figure of Athena gathering Erichthonios as a newborn.

Surrounding the central scene were a large number of seated and standing figures. According to Pallat, the figures to the right were all standing, with one exception. The figures to the left were a mixture of both standing and seated figures. For the most part, since the number of female figures greatly outweighs the number of male figures, all of these figures probably represented goddesses witnessing the birth of Erichthonios. As seen on numerous Classical Athenian monuments, a central scene of action is often accompanied by numerous onlookers. On both the Parthenon’s west and east pediments, the central action is flanked by gods, goddesses and heroes. However, the eastern side of the North Porch does not seem to have been as animated as the pediments of the Parthenon. The figures on the Erechtheion were seated or standing quietly. Even though some of the figures on the pediments were calm, the figures next to the central scenes significantly reacted to the action while those on the eastern side of the North Porch do not seem disturbed by the birth of Erichthonios. The witnesses present on the eastern side of the North Porch are more comparable to the assembly of gods on the east frieze of the Temple of Athena Nike and the east frieze of the Parthenon. The assembly on the Temple of Athena Nike consists of gods and heroes, some standing and some seated, who are stoic and facing frontally. Surrounding the central scene of the frieze on the Parthenon is an assembly of the Olympian gods who are seated and calmly watching the procession approach while Athena’s peplos is being prepared. While I think it would seem possible to depict the onlookers of Erichthonios’s birth in tense action, much like those at the birth of Athena in the
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Parthenon’s east pediment, it is more likely that the designer of the eastern frieze of the North Porch must have looked to the Nike and Parthenon friezes for stylistic inspiration.

**The North Porch Frieze, Northern Side**

I previously stated that the kneeling figure next to Athena was not Pandrosos because her role in the myth of Erichthonios was as obedient daughter to Athena’s demands. Her sisters, however, disobeyed and opened the chest. They were frightened by his snake-like appearance and committed suicide. Because Kekrops was probably present on the eastern end, and they are not directly related to the birth, Pandrosos and her sisters are most likely represented on the northern side of the North Porch frieze. Pallat believed that the three dancing females, fragments 5, 6 and 35, could represent Kekrops’s daughters Aglauros, Herse and Pandrosos (fig. 64).

![Fig. 64 Kekrops’s daughters Aglauros, Herse and Pandrosos (?)](image)

However, I propose that fragment 11 represents Pandrosos holding Erichthonios as a child, and this fragment would have been the central figure on the north side (fig. 38). As stated in Chapter Two, Pandrosos was the only daughter of Kekrops to obey Athena’s orders to not open the chest and therefore did not suffer the fate of her sisters.\(^\text{361}\) Erichthonios’s lower body is broken off because it was sculpted free from the background, so it can only be imagined that the rest of his body would have been...

\(^{361}\) Bremmer 1987, 196; Pausanias 1.18.2; Apollodoros *Bibl.* 3.14.6
been snake tails. Following the myth described in Chapter Two, Pandrosos’s sisters ran in fright from the child with snake legs. Fragments 5 and 6, in my opinion, represent these two sisters, Aglauros and Herse. An Attic rhyton from 470-450 BCE showed a version of this story (fig. 65). The rhyton depicted Kekrops, designated by his snaky lower body, receiving a libation from a winged Nike.

![Fig. 65 Attic rhyton, 470-450 BCE](image)

Erichthonios, shown as a youth, is sitting on a rock behind Kekrops while two of his daughters are running to the left, much like they are on the Erechtheion frieze. It is difficult to distinguish which one is Aglauros and which is Herse since only the lower half of the sculpture remains, but from the billowing of both of their clothing, it is apparent that they are fleeing to the left away from the baby in Pandrosos’s lap.

Also belonging to the north side of the North Porch were two women, fragments 18 and 56, one of whom was standing up from a chair and the other who was leaning over a chair (fig. 39 and fig. 42). Fragment 18 was made by Master III like fragment 11, therefore strengthening my placement of it here. Fragment 18 was most likely located on the left side of the frieze, towards where the sisters were running. As mentioned in Chapter Four, Boulter stated that this woman was in the midst of quickly
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standing from her chair. I believe this woman to be reacting to the terrified sisters running towards her. Similar to the seated female on the east pediment of the Parthenon who seems about to rise from her seat as Athena burst from Zeus’s head, this female too is rising from her seat as the action from the scene is getting closer to her (fig. 8). Fragment 18’s body language indicates that she is startled as the sisters run towards her to their eventual death by jumping off the Acropolis. I would venture to place the other female, fragment 56, to the right of Pandrosos and Erichthonios. The woman is standing to the left of a θρόνος, or throne, that had arms, turned legs and a section of drapery that was fastened to the front. The woman seems to be leaning over the seat of the throne and is pressing on the large cushion. In Pallat’s opinion, the woman was preparing the seat for the arrival of Erichthonios, which I think could possibly symbolize the throne he would sit upon as a king of Athens.

They myths of Erechtheus and his family served to remind the Athenians of their connection to the land of Attica. These stories reinforced the connectedness of the Athenians to Athena during a chaotic period in which the Athenians had survived the Persian attack and were struggling against the invading Peloponnesians. The Erechtheion’s frieze demonstrated the importance of loyalty to and harmony of the polis of which the Athenians believed ancestrally belonged to them.
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Scholars can never be certain whether or not the scenes described in Chapter Five are accurate. However, when viewed with regards to the myths of Erechtheus, the Erechtheion’s contemporary temples and their sculpture, and the political climate overwhelming Athens in the fifth century, I am confident of the analysis of the Erectheion’s frieze.

In Chapter Three, as I compared to the rest of the Periklean sculptural program on the Acropolis, especially the Parthenon, the notion of the unified Athenian polis was prominent. This theme was likely found on the south side of the Erechtheion’s cella frieze in the form of the Panatheniac procession. This scene not only displayed the peplos, but like the Parthenon frieze, most likely involved the entire demos. As stated in Chapter Three, for Perikles this image symbolized his ideal democracy, a “cosmopolitan melting pot in which everyone had a share of benefits and took pride” especially after the success against the Persians. The procession scene on the Erechtheion took on a whole new meaning in the midst of the Peloponnesian War.

As discussed in Chapter Five, the north side of the cella frieze probably depicted the sacrifice of Erechtheus and Praxithea’s daughter for the success of Athens. Praxithea, in her speech in Euripides’s Erechtheus, claimed that she was a citizen “concerned primarily for the welfare and honor of the polis” instead of a frightened mother who must choose to sacrifice her daughters. She saw her daughters as property of the state and was proud to be part of the autochthonic kingship of Athens. She stated that she gave birth to her children in order to “protect the altars of the gods and [her] fatherland” and that she considered it selfish to save one life when she could save others. In the midst of numerous oaths of peace taken during the Persian and Peloponnesian Wars, a scene depicting
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the follow-through of such an act, such as the sacrifice of the king’s daughter, would be appropriate for the Athenians. Connelly deemed the story of Erechtheus and his family’s example of loyalty to the state as “giving rise to a sort of renaissance for the worship of the founding hero and his family.”

The story of the birth of Erechtheus’s grandfather Erichthonios, one of the first legendary kings of Athens, was represented on the North Porch. This story recounted the autochthonous birth of the king. He was valuable to the cult of Athena in numerous ways. Not only was he Athena’s adoptive son, but he was also credited with setting up the ancient olivewood statue of Athena on the Acropolis, establishing the Panathenaia in which Athena’s sacred peplos was presented to her. Erichthonios also was responsible for harnessing horses, which Athena had brought to Athens. His name, meaning “very earthly,” connected the Athenians literally to the earth on which they lived. His autochthonous birth emphasized the relationship of the Athenians with their land. Erichthonios’s exceptional myth was especially important during the fifth century when outside invaders, such as the Persians and Spartans, attempted to take the land the Athenians felt innately belonged to them.

Connelly proposed that the plague in Athens and the Peloponnesian War stimulated the retelling of stories about social crisis, especially those dealing with sacrifice for one’s country and keeping oaths. The story of Erechtheus defeating Eumolpos, the first outside invader to try to take Athens, was relevant in the aftermath of the Persian War and in the midst of the Peloponnesian War. I believe this was why the myths of Erechtheus became significant during the fifth century in Athens. As for the sculpture adorning the Erechtheion, these stories from Erechtheus and his family’s lives, especially in regards to the loyalty and bond the Athenians felt towards their city, seem a logical fit during the political climate of the late fifth century in Athens.
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APPENDIX: CATALOGUING THE FRIEZE FRAGMENTS

This table represents the frieze fragments categorized according to number, placement, proposed identification and master by the three scholars discussed in Chapter Four - Pallat, Paton and Boulter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Area of frieze to which it belonged</th>
<th>Proposed Identification</th>
<th>Masters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pallat</td>
<td>Paton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 1</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 2</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>running female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 3</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>running female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 4</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>running female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 5</td>
<td>North Porch, north side</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>one of Kekrops's daughters, Horai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 6</td>
<td>North Porch, north side</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>one of Kekrops's daughters, Horai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 7</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>dancing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 8</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>seated female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 9</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>seated female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 10</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>seated female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>seated female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>seated female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>seated female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>North Porch, north side</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 16 upper</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>North Porch, eastern side, block 4, hole 3 or 7 from left</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 16 lower</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>North Porch, eastern side, block 4, hole 3 or 7 from left</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 17</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>North Porch, north side</td>
<td>female rising from her chair, Athena?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 18</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>North Porch, east side, block 1, hole 3</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 19a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>North Porch, east side, block 1, hole 4 or block 2, hole 1 or block 4 holes 1,4,6</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 19b</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>North Porch, east side, block 1, hole 4 or block 2, hole 1 or block 4 holes 1,4,6</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31, 20</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 3</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>female in rapid motion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>running female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 5</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>running female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 10</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 11</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 12</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>quietly walking female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Notes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 13</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>North Porch, north side</td>
<td>one of Kekrops's daughters, Horai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 14</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 16</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>North Porch, east side</td>
<td>standing female, holding cloth for baby?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 17</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 20</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 21</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 22</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 23</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 24</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 25</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>seated male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 26</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>North Porch, eastern side</td>
<td>kneeling female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 27</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>North Porch, block 3, hole 2, eastern side</td>
<td>Athena (standing) and Pandrosos (kneeling), receiving Erichthonios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>North Porch, north side</td>
<td>kneeling female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 29</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 30</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>quietly walking female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 31</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>quietly walking female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>standing female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32, 33</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>seated male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA 9-14</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>North Porch, north side</td>
<td>Female pressing on a cushion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td>female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>Cella, north or south side</td>
<td>male mortal, spectator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 2</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>male divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 3</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>male divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 4</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td>male spectator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td>male mortal, spectator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 6</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>male spectator, horse attendant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 7</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td>male spectator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 8</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 9</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Cella, north or south side</td>
<td>male mortal, spectator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 10</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 11</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 12</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td>female seated on a wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 13</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 14</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 15</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 16</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end, hole 2 of block 2, 3, or 4; or hole 1 of block 7; at corner</td>
<td>Demeter and Persephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 17</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>Aphrodite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 18</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>Charite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 19</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>Charite</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 20</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end, hole 2 of block 4</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 21</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 22</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>Gaia or Themis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 23</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>Kourotrrophos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 24</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 25</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33, 26</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end, hole 1 on block 2 or hole 4 on block 5</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 1</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 3</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 4</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 5</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td>man with mast, sack of Troy?, peplos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 6</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td>girl fleeing to statue base, sack of Troy?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 7</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 9</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>Cella, eastern end</td>
<td>divinity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA 3-8</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>Cella, southern side of eastern end</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td></td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 10</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Cella</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 11</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>Cella, middle of eastern front</td>
<td>horse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 12</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>North Porch, west side</td>
<td>four horse chariot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34, 13</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>North Porch, west side</td>
<td>four horse chariot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AJA 15-18</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>North Porch, west side</td>
<td>pair of horses that formed a four horse chariot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112</td>
<td>North Porch</td>
<td></td>
<td>VII</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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