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J. W. White

THE OPISTHODOMUS ON
THE ACROPOLIS AT ATHENS.
PREFATORY NOTE.

The following discussion is the substance of a lecture given at the American School of Classical Studies on March 1, 1894. Since that time I have fortunately been able to lay the argument before Dr Fränkel of Berlin and Professor Loeschcke of Bonn. I am indebted to both these gentlemen for valuable criticisms and suggestions; but neither of them is responsible for the argument as here advanced.

The present paper is privately printed in a limited number of copies. It will appear later in fuller and revised form.

JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE.

ATHENS, GREECE,
May 5, 1894.
THE OPISTHODOMUS ON THE ACROPOLIS
AT ATHENS.

In inscriptions of the 5 Cent. and 4 Cent. B.C. and in Aristophanes, Demosthenes and Lucian, references occur to a structure on the Acropolis at Athens which is called simply ὁ ὀπισθόδωμος, without further designation. The scholiasts, however, on the passages in which the Opisthodomus is thus referred to and the ancient lexicographers define its situation with singular unanimity.

August Boeckh believed that the Opisthodomus in question was the western chamber of the cella of the Parthenon, and maintained this view with vigour. So Leake, K. F. Hermann, Boetticher, Michaelis and many others. This has been and remains the generally accepted view. It makes the “Parthenon” in the restricted sense,—the well-known treasure-chamber named in inscriptions,—a part of the νεῶν ἐκατὸμτεῦδος and places within it the great chryselephantine statue of Athena. Ussing believed that the western chamber of the cella was the “Parthenon,” that the western portico was the Opisthodomus proper, and that the two together constituted the Opisthodomus of the inscriptions. This is also Petersen’s view. Köhler maintains that the statue stood in the Hecatompedos, not in the “Parthenon,” but refuses to identify the western chamber of the

1 Staatsauskaltung der Athener, 1886, 1, p. 517 ff., especially p. 519, note c. See also CIG. 1, p. 177 f.
2 Topography of Athens, 1841, 1, p. 559.
3 Die Hypäthratempel des Altherums, 1844, p. 27 ff.
4 Philologus, 1862, XVIII., plan; Untersuchungen auf der Akropolis, 1863, p. 165 ff.
5 Der Parthenon, 1871, p. 26 f. See also p. 109.
6 See the important series, CIA. 1, 161 ff.
cella, which he believes to have been the Opisthodomus, with the "Parthenon." Lolling also believed this to be the Opisthodomus, although he held new and revolutionary views in regard to the application of the terms "Parthenon" and Hecatopmedon. Dörpfeld, on grounds independent of those on which Ussing had based his argument, concluded that the western chamber of the cela was "Parthenon," and that, in official language, Opisthodomus always meant the western portico of the temple. This view was adopted by Fränkel, and is held by Frazer. Recently Fürwängler has declared for a complete identification of "Parthenon" and Opisthodomus; not only does he believe, with Ussing, that the term Opisthodomus was applied to the western chamber of the cela and the western portico, taken together, but also declares expressly that the name "Parthenon" likewise included them both. Finally, since the discovery of the Hecatompedon, Dörpfeld has maintained that the term Opisthodomus in the inscriptions and authors designates the complex of three rooms constituting the western half of this temple, which, as is well known, he believes to have been still in existence in the time of Pausanias.

One might conclude that this variety of views exhausted the possibilities; and, with the difficulties of a choice among them so considerable, not unnaturally feel disposed to resent as obtrusive any further suggestion as to the situation and nature of the vexed structure called the Opisthodomus. Nevertheless, I venture again to present for consideration our sources of information about it, and purpose to discuss as the main thesis of this paper the proposition

10 'Athén., 1890, ii. p. 627 ff.
12 In Boeckh, Staatskunsflattung, 1886, ii. p. 106*, note 729.
14 Meisterwerke der Griechischen Plastik, 1893, p. 177.
15 The temple of Athena whose foundations lie close to the Erechtheum on the south. For Dörpfeld's description of it as a structure, see Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1886, xi. p. 327 ff. See also Mitth. 1885, x. p. 275 ff. and Antike Denkmäler, 1886, plates I., II. Dörpfeld himself names it "Alter Athena-Tempel," but this name seems to be misleading to those who do not believe that it was the oldest temple of Athena on the Acropolis. Petersen calls it "Peisistratischer Tempel" (note 8 above), Frazer "Pre-Persian Temple" (note 13 above). Dörpfeld maintains that the name which he has assigned to it is correct (Mitth. 1892, xvii. p. 158, note 1). The official name, which will be used in this paper, is τοῦ Ἐκατομπεδοῦ. See CJA. iv. p. 137 ff.; Δελτιοντολογ. Π. II. 1890, p. 92 ff.; 'Athén., 1890, ii. p. 627 ff.
that the Opisthodomus on the Acropolis, referred to in the inscriptions and authors simply as ὁ ὀπισθόδωμος, was not, as has been supposed, a part of some existing temple, but was a separate building, complete in itself.

The current view, if I may so name it, would seem to be expressly contradicted by the testimony of the lexicographers and scholiasts. An important part of this testimony, with the original passages in the authors of which it is an explanation, is the following:

ὁν ὄσπως δὲ μὴ θορυβήσῃ μοι μηθείς, πρὶν ἀν ἀπαντᾶ εἰπω ἀνέφεξαν ὁπίσων πρόφητι τινὲς τῶν ὀπισθόδωμων. [Dem.] XIII. 14.

Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ συντάξεως ἀνέφεξαν ὁπίσων πρόφητι τινὲς τῶν ὀπισθόδωμων. ὁ οἶκος ὁ ὀπισθαν τοῦ νεοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς οὐτω καλεῖται, ἐν ὁ απείτθεντο τὰ χρηματά. Ἑραποριόν s.v. ὀπισθόδωμος.


μέρος τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τῶν Ἀθηναίων, ἐνθα ἐν τῷ ταμιεῖον ὀπισθαν τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ναοῦ, ἐν ὁ απείτθεντο τὰ χρηματά. Δημοσθένης ἐν τῷ περὶ συντάξεως ἀνέφεξαν ὁπίσων πρόφητι τινὲς τῶν ὀπισθόδωμων. Suidas s.v. ὀπισθόδωμος.

идρυσόμεθ' οὖν αὐτίκα μάλ', ἅλλα περίμενε,
τὸν Πλούτον, ὃπερ πρῶτον ἦν ἵδρυμενος
τὸν ὀπισθόδωμον αἰει φιλάττον τῆς θεοῦ.


ὀπισθαν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἦν θησαυροφυλάκιον.

17 The statement, ἐν τῷ...φόρος, is also in B.
18 ὀπισθόδωμος μέρος τῆς ἀκροπόλεως...χρηματά. Schol. V Lucian Fug. 7. The Scholiast did not observe that Lucian was talking about an opisthodomus at Olympia!
19 The scholium is complete in neither R nor V. See Dübner's note (Schol. Græca in Arist. 1841, p. 613), who also gives the variant in Par. 2821.—ἀδος is the conjecture of Michaelis (Pass. descip. arc. Athen., 1880, p. vii. add. ad c. 24, 47 n. 7 a fin.), and must be right. He compares Paus. 1. 26. 5, δισπλοῦ χάρι ἔστι τὸ ὀθημα.
THE OPISTHODOMUS ON

The meaning of the interpreters here seems to be clear. With singular unanimity they say that the Opisthodomus was a house, or a place on the acropolis, or a part of the acropolis, behind the temple of Athena, which was used as a treasury.

These old Greek interpreters have been variously dealt with by modern writers who have discussed the Opisthodomus. By the most of the scholars named above they have been silently ignored, for whatever reason; by others they have been taken seriously; by others still their testimony has been rejected as worthless. In some instances it is impossible to tell by what interpretation of the Greek lexicographers and scholars some of the moderns arrive at the conclusion embodied in the current view.

The text of the scholion is a jumble. The first correction seems probable.

20 The text of the scholion is a jumble. The first correction seems probable.

21 By Bockh, for example (CIG. 1. p. 177 f.), whose interpretation is discussed p. 21 f. His interpretation is now also that adopted by Dürpfeld, communicated to me by letter on March 9, 1894.

22 By Michaelis, whose treatment of the evidence is considered on p. 13 f.

23 Leake, for example, cites the lexicographers and scholiasts, but gives no explanation how from their statements he reaches the conclusion that the Opisthodomus was the western apartment of the cella of the Parthenon. Frazer (p. 337) says: 'The scholiasts and lexicographers tell us that the opisthodomus was a compartment [alaeon] or treasury at the back of the temple of Athena.' Frazer is here restating Dürpfeld's view, who in interpreting the phrase ὁπισθοδόμος τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νέω had used the phrases "hinter dem Tempel" (Mitth. 1887, XII. p. 34) and...
THE ACROPOLIS AT ATHENS.

If in the interpretation as quoted above the words νεός and ἱερόν mean temple, it is possible to obtain the definition of Opisthodomus adopted in the current view only by attaching to ὑποστήν the meaning in the back part of. ὡκος ὑποσθήν τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεός would then mean a room in the back part of the temple of Athena. But this meaning of ὑποσθήν with the genitive expressing the place where cannot be established. It is recognized by none of the lexicographers. In order to express the desired meaning ὑποσθήν must be combined adjectively with the article; the genitive that follows is then partitive. Pausanias, for example, in telling where certain paintings are in the temple of Messene, daughter of Triopas, says (IV. 31. 11), γραφεὶ δὲ κατὰ τοῦ ναοῦ τὸ ὑποσθήν οἱ βασιλεύσαντες εἰσὶν Μεσσηνίσι, i.e. in postica templi eius parte.

It may be well to establish the uses of ὑποσθήν in this author, who naturally had occasion to use the word often. In Pausanias ὑποσθήν may be used, as above, adjectively. Sometimes it is used adverbially. In the great majority of the instances of its occurrence, it is followed, as an adverb of place, by the genitive. In the most of these it clearly means behind; in some cases the meaning is indeterminable, because the statement is brief, and we have no other means of arriving at the facts; in no instance can it be proved that the word means in the back part of.

In the following cases ὑποσθήν signifies, in my judgment, behind: καὶ σφᾶς ὑπερβάλλων τῆς Ἀθηνᾶι τῶν κοιλωσίων ἀναθέτει ὑποσθήν τοῦ ναοῦ. I. 18. 6. Pausanias has just said that the peribolus of the temple (the Olympieum at Athens) is full of statues of Hadrian; but the Athenian colossal overtopped all of the rest. The statue had a commanding position, facing the Acropolis. Cf. VIII. 9. 6; 30. 7; 30. 8. ἐστι δὲ ὑποσθήν τοῦ Δυναίων Νίκου μνῆμα. I. 19. 4. Cf. II. 31. 3. Here also probably belong III. 16. 6; VIII. 14. 10. μετὰ τούτα ἐς τὸ τοῦ Διώς τέμνεις ἐσελθὼν ναὸς ἐστὶ θεᾶς ἄξιος: τὸ δὲ ἄγαλμα οὐκ ἐξειργάσθη τοῦ Διώς . . . ὑποσθήν δὲ τοῦ ναοῦ κεῖται έξωλα ἡμέρα . . . ἐν δὲ αὐτῷ τῶν ναῶν τρεῖς αὐτῶν ἐνάκειται χαλκοὺς ἐμβολον. I. 40. 4, 5. The phrase ἐν δὲ αὐτῷ τῶν ναῶν makes it certain that the ἐξώλα ἡμέρα?

"hinter dem Athenatempel" (ibid. p. 39). Frazer himself would seem (p. 164) to take νεός in the Greek phrase just quoted in the sense of "temple." There is at least no intimation that he here attaches to the word the meaning cella. Opisthodomus he defines to mean literally back-building.

21. 12 4; 3 5; II. 20. 7; V. 10. 8; VI. 5. 6; VIII. 45. 7; X. 19. 4.
22. 1. 3; 3 1; V. 20. 2; VI. 5. 6; X. 26. 5.
were not in the temple. τὴν δὲ πηγήν, ἣ ἐστιν ὄπισθεν τοῦ ναός, II. 5. 1. τοῦτον δὲ [τοῦ θεάτρου] ὄπισθεν ὕφασσαν οἰκοδόμησι σταδίων πλευρά μία, ἀνέχουσα τε ἀυχὴ τοῦ θεάτρου καὶ ἀντὶ ἐρείτουοο σύνολου ἕκαστο χρυσάν. II. 29. 11. ἐστὶ δὲ τῆς στοάς ταύτης ὄπισθεν ἱρών. III. 15. 1. Cf. I. i. 3. ὄπισθεν δὲ τῆς Χαλκοῦκου ναός ἐστιν Ἀφροδίτης. III. 17. 5. καὶ ὄπισθεν γενὴ αὐτοῦ. v. 17. 9. Cf. v. 19. 6. ἠρώτησε δὲ [ἀρμα Κλεοπάτρινα] ὄπισθεν τοῦ Δίων τοῦ ἀνασκεφήστος ὑπὸ Ἑλλάνεων. vi. 10. 6. Cf. x. 9. 9. ὑπομινύεσ τῆς τάξεως ὄπισθεν οἱ οἰκεῖοι τοῖς θεάτρῳ οἰκον. ἐγένοντο χρυσάν. x. 19. 10. The following are indeterminate, but that in them ὄπισθεν means behind can hardly be doubted in view of the preceding clear instances of this meaning: II. 11. i; II. 13. 7; v. 15. 7; vIII. 22. 7. In Pausanias ὄπισθω is almost always an adverb accompanying a verb of motion; the following example shows its meaning when followed by the genitive: ἐστὶ δὲ τῆς στοίς ὄπισθω Ἀφροδίτης ναός. vi. 25. 2. It should finally be noted, as important in establishing the meaning of ὄπισθεν and ὄπισθω with the genitive of place, that the counter-idea is generally expressed by προ with the genitive, where by no contrivance can the preposition signify in the front part of.

In view of these facts, it is impossible to interpret ὄπισθεν τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεώ to mean in the back part of the temple of Athena.

But, as is well known, νεός may signify cella, as well as temple, although this is comparatively very rare both in the literature and in inscriptions. If this signification of the word could be established for the phrase οἶκος ὄπισθεν τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεώ, we should arrive at the meaning demanded by the current view of the Acropolis, the view of the Opisthodomus.

The question is limited to the use of νεός in its actual application to temples of Athena on the Acropolis at Athens. Fortunately the successive labours of scholars have collected the existing literary and epigraphical evidence not only for the word νεός but also for the other terms, and we are enabled to adduce instances as follows: that the temple in question is the temple called the Parthenon, and the altar of Nike. See Michaelis, "Arth. Opisth. 1781", pp. 32-32. 23. In this phrase the term νεώ occurs. Cf. 1. 19. 10. 24. οὐδὲν ἁρμαν. 25. See Michaelis, "Abh. öf. d. Arch. 1781", p. 32. 26. Cf. 1. 19. 10. 27. This occurs above in the schol. Arist. Plat. 1193 and in the schol. Dem. 27. 44. 28. This is The consideration of the etymology of the word πρόσωπος is pertinent, but does not establish the meaning cella for νεώ. That which πρόσωπος names doubtless marked the first stage of development of the original νεός from a single room to a more complicated structure; at this time πρόσωπος meant (porch) before the temple. νεός and ἄνωθεν were then identical. The original νεός kept its name when, with the permanent addition of the porch in front and the porch behind, that name received a larger application and designated (as it had exclusively at first) the entire structure.
the other terms designating these temples and their parts, and it is now not difficult to reach trustworthy conclusions in regard to their use and application. The law of use for νεὼς and ἱερόν requires that, when they have the limited sense cella, this shall always be clearly indicated either by an added epithet or by the context. Such instances are surprisingly rare. I proceed to an examination of the evidence.

We meet first cases in which the old temple of Athena is referred to as ἀρχαῖος or παλαιός νεῶς, where the epithet excludes the meaning cella for νεῶς. Xenophon records that the old temple was set on fire; Strabo contrasts it with the Parthenon. It would be as forced to suppose that νεῶς means cella in any of these instances as in the scholium on Arist. Παρ. 605, the source of which is Philochorus, καὶ τὸ ἄγαλμα τὸ χρυσόν τῆς Ἄθηνας ἑστάλη ἐς τὸν νεὼν τὸν μέγαν, in which it is important to note the epithet. Here ὁ μέγας νεῶς is the Parthenon, and yet we know that the statue was in the cella.

The meaning cella for νεῶς is excluded also in the inscriptions that relate to the building of the old temple of Athena and to its restoration after the burning described by Xenophon; also in those referring to the setting up of stelae παρὰ τῶν νεῶν and to the approach of the panathenaic ship.

There are other instances in which νεῶς certainly means temple, although it is not easy to categorize them. Some of these refer to

and the theatre-terms ἐκφύρ and προσκήνιον. The original etymological force of πρόσκηνιον is seen in its adjectival use, which is not uncommon. Cf. βυσσοῦν πρόσκηνιον, Aesch. Suppl. 494; τῆς Προανήθης Ἀθηναῖς, Hdt. viii. 37; Ἀθηναὶ καὶ Θρησκεύματα πρόσκηνιον, Paus. ix. 10. 2.


21 ἱερόν occurs twice above, in the schol. Arist. Plat. 1191 and in E. M.

22 In this paper "old temple of Athena" means the Erechtheum or its predecessor on the same site.

23 C. L. 19, 27 (p. 3 f.); I. 93, 6; II. 74 a, 14; 163, 9; 464, 6; 672, 43; 733 A, col. ii. 6; Xen. Hdt. 1, 6. 1; Schol. Arist. Lyra 273; Strabo ix. p. 396. C. L. 751 b, 9, 19, and 758 A, col. ii. 8, do not belong here. See Lähnemann, Über die athenischen Schatzverzeichnisse, 1890, p. 79. Some others also of these examples may have to be excluded for the same reason.

24 C. L. 60, 3; 325, 14, 4, 8; iv. 321, col. iii. 27 (p. 74 ff.); ii. 332, 44, 829, 3; Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1883, viii. p. 59, 25; C. L. iii. 776, 3.

I—5
the Parthenon, others to the old temple of Athena. In some of them, although the object referred to was probably in a specific part of the temple, it is still clear that the temple as a whole was in the speaker's mind when he used the word ἐκλός. These are of the same nature as the quotation from Philochorus above (schol. Arist. Pax 605).

There are three passages in dispute. If in these ὁ τῆς Πολιάς ἐκλός means the cella of the Polias, it should be observed that this results solely from the demands of the context. For in the majority of the instances of the occurrence of the phrase it is generally agreed that the reference is to the temple of Athena. The argument

36 Aristot. hist. an. vi. 24, p. 577 b, 30 (cf. Aelian de nat. an. vi. 49); Philochorus in schol. Arist. Pax 605; Plut. de soll. an. 13, p. 970 b; Paus. i. 24, 5 and 8; Schol. Dem. xxii. 13; Hesych. s. v. Ἑκάστοκτερος; Pat. Bib. in Bull. corr. Hell. 1877, i. p. 139, Ἐκκατομπτερος; E. M. s. v. Ἐκκατομπτερος (cf. Bekk. Anc. I. p. 283, 15); Suidas s. v. Ἐκκατομπτερος ἐκλός.

37 Hom. Il. ii. 249; CIG. 6280 A, 31 = Kaibel Ep. Gr. 1066, 90; Plut. quaest. conv. ix. 6, p. 741 b; Paus. i. 27, 2 and 4; Himer. Ecl. v. 30; Clem. Alex. Protr. iii. 45, p. 13 Syll. (cf. Apollod. Ill. 14. 7); Eust. Il. xxii. 45 (cf. Hesych. s. v. Αἰδεύς βωμός; Eust. Od. i. 357; Schol. Arist. Lyr. 759. The last two relate to the sacred snake, a sort of invisible genius loci, about whose exact lodging-place there was no fixed tradition. The snake was in the old temple, for there the σπώμαι were set out. Hesychius (s. v. οἰκουρίδων δρόφω) alone names an exact spot, and places the snake where we should expect to find it, ἐν τῷ λόφῳ τῷ Ερεχθέως. This must interpret for us the σπώμαι of Plutarch (Them. 16). In Dion. Hal. Ant. xiv. 2 similarly we find ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ τοῦ Ερεχθέως τῷ σπώμα, where he is speaking of the olive. See, for the snake, the passages in John-Michaelis, Paus. desc. an. Athen. 1880, p. 27 (c. 27, 7*).

38 Plut. Cim. 5, Anth. Pal. vi. 2 (Simonides); Xen. Hell. ii. 3, 20.—If Paus. i. 24, 3 is to be taken into account, it belongs in this general category.

39 To this category belongs also Hdt. viii. 55, if one believes that there ἔρημος ἐκλός refers to the whole building, as in the following modern use of the word "Erechheum." If one does not believe this, however, that the οἰκομία ἔρημος καλαίσχουσα of Pausanias (i. 26, 5) is the double western half of the old temple, then the expression in Herodotus is not to be taken into account, since the present inquiry is limited to the investigation of the meaning of ἐκλός and ἐπώς in their application to temples of Athena.

40 Philochorus frg. 146 (Dion. Hal. de Dini. 13); Paus. i. 27. 1 and 3.

41 See Michaelis's discussion of the passages, Mitth. d. Inst. Athen. 1877, ii. p. 31 ff., with notes 25 and 27. The negative argument by which in Paus. i. 27, 3 ὁ νεῶν τῆς Πολιάς is made to refer to the cella of the Polias has not met with acceptance.

42 Strabo ix. p. 396; CIA. ii. 332, 44; Mitth. d. Inst. Athen. 1883, viii. p. 59, 75; Himer. Ecl. v. 30; Clem. Alex. Protr. iii. 45, p. 13 Syll.; Eust. ll. xxii. 451 and Od. i. 356.
from the context, in fact, led to this interpretation of these three passages.

There are two instances in which νεώς means cella. In the first of these the inscription names the whole building, the Hecatompedon, and then its parts, ὁ νεώς, τὸ πρωνίον, and τὰ οἰκήματα τὰ ἐν τῷ ἐκατομπεδῷ. Here the signification of νεώς is made clear by its collocation with πρωνίον. The second instance is the well-known use of the word in the treasury-documents, where it always has an epithet, ὁ νεώς ὁ ἐκατομπεδός.

The facts for the use of ἵερον are altogether similar. In some instances it signifies either sacred precinct or temple, generally the latter; in two it refers to the Parthenon. In none of these has it a more limited meaning than temple.

In a single instance it means cella. But here, as above in the case of νεώς, its meaning is made clear by the context, since it is interpreted by the preceding ἀδοτον.

Here, then, we have abundant instances, both literary and epigraphical, of the uses of νεώς and ἵερον, extending from the earliest to the latest times, and among them all only three in which they certainly signify cella. In each of these three instances, moreover, the context or an added epithet makes clear that this is the signification. In the passages from the lexicographers and scholiasts, on the contrary, that are quoted above, no limitation whatever of the meaning of νεώς and ἵερον is indicated. And yet the especial purpose of these exegetes was to give a definition; nor were they ignorant of the fact, that ἵερον and ἵερον seemed to them to be liable to misinterpretation, that the unmistakable ἀδοτον, an Homeric word, and νεώς were ready to their hand.

If, nevertheless, we seek to attach to νεώς and ἵερον in these passages the restricted sense of cella, we encounter an unexpected difficulty. The schol. Arist. Plut. 1193 says that the Opisthodomus

41 CIA. iv. p. 137 ff.
42 CIA. i. 146, 154, 158, 159; ii. 672 A, 15.
43 Hdt. v. 96; viii. 41, 51 (δίκη), 53, 54, 55 (δίκη); Thuc. i. 126; Phot. s. v. ταυλῆ (quoting Aristot., frg. 422 Rose, Bekk. Anec. p. 306, 7, and note Aristot.
45 See Hesych. s. v. οἰκονομὸν δήν, and note 37 above.
46 Hdt. V. 72.
lay behind the νεὼς of Athena Polias. Those, therefore, who hold the current view in regard to the situation of the Opisthodomus must either establish the worship of Athena Polias in the Parthenon or Hecatompedon, or reject the evidence. If the evidence is trustworthy and if the term Polias designates, as is commonly believed, Athena of the Erechtheum or of the temple that preceded it on the same site, then we are forced, on the supposition that νεὼς here has the restricted sense, to the conclusion that the Opisthodomus lay in the Erechtheum. But this is impossible. Boeckh saw these difficulties, and felt himself forced to declare that the scholiast had blundered; although he himself accepted and in part sought to explain the remaining testimony of the scholiasts and lexicographers.

That in the phrase οἶκος or οἶκημα ὑπέλεγον τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς νεῶ the words οἶκος and οἶκημα may signify house will at once be granted. This is the first and common meaning of οἶκος and is perfectly established for οἶκημα, and if demanded by other considerations, namely the use of ὑπέλεγον and νεῶ just discussed, it must be allowed. This use of οἶκος to denote a separate structure that was a treasury receives striking confirmation from the names officially recorded of four of the treasuries and magazines at Delos, Ἀνδρέων οἶκος, Ναξίων οἶκος, Δηλίων οἶκος, and Πάρανος οἶκος. In charge of the anathema and materials stored in these were the ἰεροποιοί, whose functions corresponded closely to those of the ταιμάι τῆς θεοῦ at Athens.

The same word is used by Hesychius in defining θρησκευόμενος, namely: εἰς ἕγκαθήματος καὶ χρημάτων ἱερῶν ἀπόδειξιν οἶκος.

If the preceding discussion of the terms ὑπέλεγον, νεῶ, and οἶκος is sound, we must either agree that the Opisthodomus was neither in the Parthenon nor in the Hecatompedon, but was a separate building, or else reject the testimony of the lexicographers and scholiasts as to its situation. This Michaelis does, declaring their explanation of the name for the most part worthless. He makes an exception in favour of Harpocrates, but the reasons for this are not apparent. In Harpocrates’s definition, ὁ οἶκος ὁ ὑπέλεγον τοῦ νεῶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς οὔτω κατέστη, one might be tempted to construe ὁ ὑπέλεγον οἶκος τοῦ νεῶ, and render the back chamber of the temple; but this construction is excluded by the phraseology of the Epitome, ἐκαλέστω δὲ οὔτως οὖν ὁ

48 Staatsausbauung, 1886, 1. p. 517 f.
50 Der Parthenon, 1871, p. 293.
Therefore, who held the Olyphodamos name in the Parthenon, if the evidence is more commonly believed that preceded it on the evidence that νεῶς here in the Olyphodamos note by Chrisch did see these lines that the scholars held in part sought a translation and lexicographical aid to the θῆς Αθήνας νεῶς it at once be part of the θῆς Αθήνας νεῶς and is perhaps another consideration, and it must be allowed that this was a term officially recorded in the Ανθρώπων νεῶς, in the light of the anthology θῆς Αθήνας νεῶς, whose further edited θῆς Αθήνας νεῶς at Athens.

Οπωσον τοι νεῶ τῆς Αθήνας νεῶς, where the genitive τοι νεῶ cannot be partitive. Michaelis’s rejection of the evidence seems to justify the conclusion that he did not believe it possible to interpret ὁπωσον and νεῶς in the manner demanded by the current view.

The testimony of these later writers receives unexpected confirmation from an early and important inscription:

τὸ δὲ τιερὸν ἀργυροῦ τὸ μὲν ἐκ
tὸς ὁτὲν τὸ τᾶσ Ἀθηναῖας ἀρχαῖον τῆς
ε'i ἐμ πόλει.

C.I.A. iv. 1 c, 25—29 (p. 331).

This inscription, to which we shall return, says at least so much, if we accept the restorations, that in the first half of the 5 cent. B.C. treasure of the Eleusinian goddesses was kept in an enclosure to the south of the old temple of Athena on the Acropolis; that is, here is a clear statement, strikingly similar to those of the lexicographers and scholiasts quoted above, that the money was not kept in that temple.

We have, further, excellent testimony to the existence of a treasury at Athens, which is mentioned in connexion with the Stoa Poecile and Temple of Castor and Pollux in such a manner as to make it highly probable that it was a separate structure.

Λυκοῦργος ἐν τῷ περὶ τῆς τιεραίας. περὶ Πολυγράφου του ξωγράφου, Ἑατιῶν μὲν τὸ γένος, νεῶ ήτο καὶ μαθητὸν Ἀγλάοφωντος, τυχόντος δὲ τῆς Αθηναίων πολιτείας ήτοι ἐπὶ τὴν Πολικήν στοιν ἐγραφη προκείμενον, ή, ὡς ἐπειρο, τοῖς ἐν τῷ Θησαυρῷ καὶ τῷ Ἀνακείῳ γραφαῖ, ἰστορήσαν ἄλλοι τὰ καὶ Ἀρτέμιον ἐν τῷ περὶ ξωγράφου καὶ Ἰάβας ἐν τοῖς περὶ γραφικῆς. Harpocratio s.v. Πολύγραφος.

In Photius and Suidas (s.v. Πολύγραφος) and in Eudocia (340, ed. Flach, 1880), this reads as follows:

οὗτος ξωγράφος μὲν ἔμεν ἔν τῇ τέχνῃ, Θαύσιος δὲ τὸ γένος, νεῶ ήτο καὶ μαθητὴν Ἀγλαοφωντός, τυχόντος δὲ τῆς Αθηναίων πολιτείας, ἔπει τὴν Πολικήν στοιν ἄνεγραφη προκείμενον, ἔτη τοῖς ἔν τῷ Θησαυρῷ καὶ τοῖς ἐν Ἀνακείῳ γραφαῖς.

The only authenticated reading is τῷ Θησαυρῷ. Editors without due warrant have changed this by conjecture to Θησαῦρος or Θησαῦρος

61 Dittenberger, SIG. 385.
In this they have disregarded the testimony of Pausanias, who ascribes the paintings in the Theseum to Micon. The supposition, expressed above, that this Θησαυρός at Athens which was adorned with paintings by Polygnotus was a separate building, is strengthened by the well-known fact that the treasure-houses at Olympia and Delphi were called θησαυροὶ—and were separate structures. I shall endeavour to show below that it is probable that the Θησαυρός of the passages quoted above is identical with the Opisthodomus of the lexicographers and scholiasts.

If the theory that the Opisthodomus on the Acropolis which was used as a treasury was a separate building is contradicted by any inscriptive or literary evidence, it must be abandoned. Is it thus contradicted? This Opisthodomus is mentioned four times in Greek literature. Three of the passages are quoted above. The fourth is the following:

ΔΗΜ. ἀλλὰ καὶ πλουτεῖς τὸν ὁπισθόδομον διορίζεις. ΤΙΜ. οὗ διώρυκται οὐδὲ οὐκος, ὡστε ἀπίθανον καὶ τὰ ταύτα. Lucian, Timon 53.

There is no intimation in any one of these four passages that the Opisthodomus mentioned was the western chamber or chambers of the cella either of the Parthenon or of the Hecatompedon. On the contrary, so far as they contain any implication at all, it is easier to suppose that the burning recorded by Demosthenes and the spoliation imagined by Lucian relate to a building that stood apart and was at least of a semi-secular character than to a part of a great temple. It is fairly incredible that the Parthenon should have been set on fire in the early years of the 4 Cent. B.C., and no distinct mention of so notable an event have come down to us; and one may well wonder how Lucian imagined Timon to have set to work to dig through its massive walls.

There are two other references to an opisthodomus on the Acropolis:

τὸν γὰρ ὁπισθόδομον τοῦ Παρθενώνων ἀπεδέκαν αὐτῷ (the Athenians to Demetrius) κατάλυσαν, κακεὶ δέιξιν ἔχει. Plut. Demet. 23.

52 See Overbeck, Antike Schriftquellen, 1868, no. 1042; Michaelis, Der Parthenon, 1871, p. 27, note 84; Bocckh, Staatsausfaltung 5, 1886, 1, p. 518, note c.
53 L. 17. 3—4. See Overbeck, Schriftquellen, no. 1086.
54 Paus. vi. 19; X. ii. 1, 2, and 5. Cf. the definition of θησαυρός by Hesych., quoted above.
55 [Dem.] xiii. 14 (p. 3); Arist. Plut. 1191-1194 (p. 5); Dem. xxiv. 136 (p. 6).
THE ACROPOLIS AT ATHENS.

-ἐξουτι δὲ οὔτω μοι γίγνεται δύσις ονειρίων τοιάδε: ἐδοκοῦν εἶναι μὲν Ἀθηνᾶς ἄρτι καταρκῆς, οἷς ἔδοξε ἐξόπισθε τῆς ἀκροπόλεως ἐν οἰκίᾳ θεοδότου τοῦ ἵππου, εἶναι δ᾽ αὐτὴν πρῶτη πρὸς ἥλιον ἀνύσχεται· τοῦ δὲ νεῶ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ὁρᾶσαι τὸν ὀπισθόδομον ἀπὸ αὐτῆς, καὶ εἶναι πολὺ καταστέρα τῆς ἀκροπόλεως τῆς οἰκίας. Aristides, l. p. 548, 14, Dindorf.

The disgraceful housing of Demetrius and his mistresses in the Parthenon is a well-known event. Plutarch's record of it contains an implication of importance to the present discussion. When, namely, the Opisthodomus is referred to by Demosthenes, Aristophanes and Lucian, no specification of its situation is necessary. It is sufficient to say ὁ ὀπισθόδομος. But Plutarch in designating the place in which Demetrius was lodged felt it necessary to name it τὸν ὀπισθόδομον τοῦ Παρθενῶν. Aristides, likewise, who as the context shows undoubtedly refers to the Parthenon, says τὸν νεῶ τῆς 'Αθηνᾶς τῶν ὀπισθόδωνων, not simply τὸν ὀπισθόδομον. The inference is that these two opisthodomoi were not the same. This tells against the view of those who believe that the Opisthodomus was the western chamber of the cella of the Parthenon.

The theory that the Opisthodomus on the Acropolis which was used as a treasury was a separate building is not contradicted by any references to it in literature. The references to it in inscriptions are the following:

"οὔτοι δὲ ταμιευόντων ἐμπόλει εἰν τῷ ὀπισθόδομῷ τὰ τῶν θεῶν χρῆματα, ὅσα ὑπάτῳ καὶ ὄσιν, καὶ τινακακούστοις καὶ συγκλητοῦσι τῶν θώρα τοῦ ὀπισθόδωμον καί συνομαννόσθων τοῖς τῶν τῆς 'Αθηνᾶς ταμίων. CIA. 1. 32 A, 15—18.


56 ἐξιστάθη τῆς ἀκροπόλεως means south of the Acropolis. Cf. Hdt. viii. 53. ἐκαρκόθε πρὸ τῆς ἀκροπόλεως.—I am indebted for the reference to Aristides to Professor Edward Capps of the University of Chicago. Search might reveal other references to an opisthodomus on the Acropolis in other late writers. There is no such reference, other than those cited in this paper, in Homer, the Dramatists, Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, Plato, the Orators, Aristotle, Diodorus Siculus, Lucian, or Pausanias.
THE OPISTHODOMUS ON

The striking fact here, as before, is that the great treasure-house of Athens is referred to simply as ὁ ὀπισθόδομος. Whatever other information about it we may be able to gather from these important records, there certainly is no implication in any one of them that the Opisthodomus mentioned was the western chamber or chambers of the cela either of the Parthenon or of the Hecatompedon.

The case, therefore, now stands as follows: The assumption that the Opisthodomus was not a separate building involves the rejection of the testimony quoted above of the lexicographers and scholiasts, who, as Harpocratio, were often drawing on excellent sources and whose special purpose was a definition. The authors and inscriptions, on the contrary, say nothing about the situation of the Opisthodomus because they unconsciously assume that this is known. On the other hand, the assumption that the Opisthodomus was a separate building, a fact clearly declared by the lexicographers and scholiasts, finds no contradiction in passages in the authors or in inscriptions that refer to the Opisthodomus, and is supported by two independent
concerns of weight. In other words this theory reconciles the evidence.

The question that now evidently presses for answer is the following. If the Opisthodomus was not the rear chamber or chambers of an existing temple, either the Parthenon or the Hecatompedon, but a separate building, where on the Acropolis was it situated?

Here, as before, and for the same reason, we expect no help from the authors and inscriptions; but the lexicographers and scholiasts give us the desired information. They say that the Opisthodomus lay behind the temple of Athena, and specifically behind the temple of Athena Polias. If, further, the generally accepted restoration of ἄρχαιον in CIA. iv. i. 28 be allowed, we have evidence that money was kept, although the Opisthodomus is not here named, to the south of the old temple of Athena, νότοβ[ν] τοῦ τῆς Ἀθηναίων ἄρχαιον νεόν. ἔρευν αἰώνιον, at least as early as 460 B.C.57

What was the temple of Athena Polias? Until very recently there was but one answer to this question. The term Πολιάς, when used of the protecting goddess of Athens, was the epithet of Athena in her oldest temple on the Acropolis, as distinguished from Ἀθηνᾶ Παρθένου and Ἀθηνᾶ Πρώμαχος, and this oldest temple, ὁ ἄρχαιον νεός, was the Erechtheum or the temple that preceded it on the same site. The eastern chamber of the cella of this temple had been from early times the shrine of the ancient wooden image of the goddess to which alone belonged the title of Ἀθηνᾶ Πολιάς.

On the discovery of the Hecatompedon, Dörpfeld took issue with the prevailing view. The oldest temple on the Acropolis was the Hecatompedon, not the Erechtheum, which was only a shrine of Erechtheus. The Hecatompedon was the original temple of Athena Polias, but not the only one; the temple of Athena Polias par excellence was the Parthenon.58

Dörpfeld's attempt to wrest the name temple of Athena Polias from the Erechtheum has not met with acceptance. It has been considered and successively rejected by Petersen,59 Curtius,60 Frazer,61 and Michaelis,62 all of whom maintain the traditional view that the

---

57 Quoted in part on p. 13. See also below, p. 23.
60 Stadthisthichte von Athen, 1891, pp. 124, 151.
oldest temple of Athena on the Acropolis was the temple of Athena Polias and that this was the Erechtheum.

I here rest upon the traditional view.

What is meant, then, when it is said that the Opisthodomus lay behind the temple of Athena Polias?

If the front of the old temple of Athena, i.e. of the Erechtheum, was at the east of the temple, as was generally true of Greek temples, the Opisthodomus must have lain to the west of it, behind the Pandroseum, and must be sought for there. On this supposition there must have once existed at this place a substantial and independent structure, no trace of the foundations of which, however, have been brought to light by the recent thorough excavation of the Acropolis.

This brings us face to face with a question of great apparent difficulty. Namely, how is it possible that the treasury of Athens, a separate building as has been proved, was called an opisthodomus?

Pollux (1. 6) after defining the uses of the word σηκώσεως continues: τὸ δὲ πρὸ αἴτου πρόδομον, καὶ τὸ κάτω αἰτιαθῦδομον. Varro (de lingua Lat. V. 160, ed. Müller) gives the same definition: domus Graecum et idem in aedibus sacris ante cellam, ubi sodes dei sunt, Graeci dicunt πρόδομον, quod post σηκώσεως. This use of σηκώδομος, to designate the back portico of a temple, is confirmed by its actual employment in the literature. It is thus applied to the western porticos of the temples of Zeus and Hera at Olympia.

This established application of the word seems to contradict hopelessly the view that the Opisthodomus on the Acropolis was a separate building; but in fact it itself indicates the solution of the difficulty.

Lolling also denies that the Parthenon could have been called the temple of Athena Polias (Ἀθηνα ὁρυγός, 1890, p. 651, note 4), but shares Dörpfeld's opinion that after the Parthenon began to be built the Hecatopledon could be called ἀρχαιος or ταλαϊτός νεός (p. 643). Furtwängler assigns these terms wherever they occur exclusively to the Hecatopledon to the end of the 5 Cent. n.c. Then he transfers them bodily to the Erechtheum, although according to his view the Parthenon was an older temple than the Erechtheum (Meisterwerke, 1893, p. 181). He believes that the Erechtheum, notwithstanding the difference of level of its eastern and western parts, was built in exact imitation of the Hecatopledon, and was its direct successor and heir.

I reserve the consideration of the application of the terms Πολιάτ and ἀρχαιος or ταλαϊτός νεός for the fuller discussion of the present theme mentioned in the prefatory note.

Paus. V. 10-9; 13. 1; 15. 3; 16. 1; Lucian Hdt. 1; Fug. 7; de morte Perig. 32.
Whether in early times the northern or eastern portico of the Erechtheum was regarded the front of the temple cannot be surely determined; but it seems probable that, at least in the time of the sources from which Harpocrates and the other lexicographers and the scholiasts drew their information, the front of the temple was thought to be at the north. Here lay the broad portico through which Pausanias entered the temple\(^66\). If the front of the temple was at the north, the Opisthodomus, which was situated διπλοδωμος τοιον χεων, must have lain to the south of the Erechtheum.

Here in fact we find it, the Opisthodomus of the old Hecatompedon, rebuilt, after the destruction of the temple in the Persian Wars, to serve as it had served before the coming of Xerxes\(^67\) as treasury of the gods and of the state. The peristyle of the temple disappeared\(^68\); its cela was not restored; the Opisthodomus, consisting of the complex of three rooms and the western portico, was alone rebuilt\(^69\). This was the Opisthodomus to which reference is made, in the times following the Persian Wars, simply as δ διπλοδωμος, the διπλοδωμος that was adorned with paintings by Polygnotus\(^80\).

It was a treasury and was doubtless so spoken of, but its official name was δ διπλοδωμος and in the 4 Cent. B.C. this name became current as its general designation\(^72\). Aristophanes, Demosthenes,

---
\(^66\) I. 25 ff.
\(^67\) The mention of the ταμανα the Hecatompedon inscription (CIA. IV. p. 137 ff.) makes this certain. Furtwängler (Meisterwerke, p. 160), who denies that the ἑκατογεια in the western part of the cells of the Hecatompedon were used as a treasury, says that the ταμανα of the inscription were not "bliss Schatzverwalter." This is true, but they were none the less Schatzverwalter, and by all analogy the treasure under their charge must have been housed in the temple. See Frazer, Journ. of Hell. Studies, 1892—93, xiii. p. 162, note 24. For the Persian ταμανα τεα θεοι see Hdt. vili. 51, and Lolling, Θηρανία, 1890, ii. p. 646. For the general functions of the ταμανα see Thurner in Hermann's Griech. Staatsalt., 1892, 1. ii. p. 625 ff.

\(^68\) So also Dörpfeld, Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1887, xii. p. 205.

\(^69\) See the plan, Mitth. d. Inst. Athen, 1886, xi. p. 337.

\(^70\) For the date of Polygnotus, see Brunn, Geschichte d. Griech. Künstler, ii. 14 ff.

\(^71\) Frazer (Journ. Hell. Stud. 1892—93, xiii. p. 152 f.) thinks it remarkable, if the Opisthodomus was in use as a treasury after 480 B.C., that the first mention of it occurs in two decrees of 435 B.C., and draws the inference ex silento that there was no Opisthodomus before the completion of the Parthenon. This apparently remarkable fact is accounted for by our lack of documents for the time between 480 and 435 B.C. The name Opisthodomus for the Athenian treasury does not indeed occur during that time, not does any other. In fact we have only
and Lucian could so speak of it, without danger of confusion. There was another opisthodomus on the Acropolis, but when this was meant the speaker said ὁ ὀπισθόδωμος τοῦ Παρθενώνος or used an equivalent expression.

This solution, which we owe to the insight of Ernst Curtius, explains at once the name. Opisthodomus in its application to the Athenian treasury and some apparently contradictory testimony of the scholiasts. To what extent the tradition that this treasury was once in fact the rear chambers in the cela of an actual temple was preserved in the centuries that followed the invasion of Xerxes is uncertain; the name ὀπισθόδωμος would serve to keep the tradition alive, and it probably never completely died out so long as there was an Opisthodomus. It must certainly have been well known

a single reference in all of these years to a place on the Acropolis where money was kept (CIA. iv. 1, quoted on p. 13 and discussed on p. 23), and yet we know that the public and sacred money-treasure housed on the Acropolis was greater between 454 and 435 B.C. than ever afterwards. Frazer himself says (p. 162) that in this time the Athenians must certainly have had some strong place in which to store the public and sacred treasures, but comes simply to the conclusion that we do not know where this was. I cannot agree with him, further, in thinking that in the two decrees of 435 B.C. (quoted in part on p. 15) the Opisthodomus is mentioned as if it were now for the first time to be used as a treasury. The references to it there (it is called simply ὁ ὀπισθόδωμος) seem to me, on the contrary, to imply that it was a well-known place whose use was already established. See p. 25 ff.

73 Curtius, in the November session of the Archaeological Society of Berlin, 1890 (see Archäologischer Anzeiger, 1890, p. 163): “Der alte Tempel nach der Zerstörung durch die Perser wurde nur in seinem Hinterhause wieder aufgebaut, um als Schatzkammer zu dienen. Es sind zahlreiche Zeugnisse vorhanden nach denen der Opisthodom ein selbständiges Gebäude der Akropolis gewesen sein muss.” See also Stadtgeschichte, 1891, pp. 132, 152. I came independently to the conclusion that the Opisthodomus must have been a separate building, convinced by the testimony of the lexicographers and scholiasts, but erred at first in supposing that it lay west of the Erechtheum. Curtius’s suggestion has been received with favour.

The word was so peculiar a name for a separate building that, as we should naturally expect, we find it defined etymologically, quite without reference to its application. Photius, the Et. Mag., and Bekk. Anec. p. 286, 26, prefix to their clear explanation of the true Opisthodomos, as given above p. 6, the remark τὸ ὀπισθὸν παρῶν ὄχημαρος, where they are evidently, as lexicographers, attempting an etymological explanation. So the scholiasts on Arist. Plut. 1193: τὸ ὀπισθὸν τοῦ ὀλεου, ἦτον τοῦ ναοῦ. L.B. τὸ ὀπισθὸν τοῦ ὄλου. Dorn. τὸ ὀπισθὸν τοῦ ναοῦ. Par. 2817. And on id. 1191: τὸν ὀπισθὸν ὄλου τῆς θεοῦ. L.B.
to Aristophanes and Demosthenes; and probably the exeges
to first explained their references to the Opisthodomus had some
knowledge of the truth. This supposition is not contradicted by
the fact that the scholiasts and lexicographers already quoted give no
intimation that they had knowledge of the tradition; for the Opis-
thodomus in the time of which they take cognizance was in fact a
separate building, and their purpose was to explain the word con-
formably to the facts then existing. On the other hand, we ought
to be surprised if we sometimes get an explanation that seems to
take cognizance of the tradition. We have one explanation of this
sort, perhaps two.

τῶν ὀπισθόδομον ἄρξας] ὅς ἱερόσυλον διαβάλλον ταῦτα φησιν· ὁ γὰρ
ὀπισθόδομος ἱερόν· τὸ ὀπισθέν ἅ ὁ ἄδυτον οὖτως ἔλεγεν. Schol. V
Luc. Tīm. 53 (quoted on p. 14).\textsuperscript{18}

The point of view of the scholiast should here be noted. His
mind is dwelling, not on the Opisthodomus, but on the act of
sacrilege. He adds the statement τὸ ὀπισθέν ἅ τοῦ ἄδυτου οὖτως
ἔλεγεν in explanation of the previous predication ἱερόν. Any opis-
thodomus was a sacred place because it stood behind the sanctuary
of the god, as did this Opisthodomus originally. His point of view, in
other words, is essentially different from that of the lexicographers
and scholiasts quoted above.

Of the same nature, perhaps, is the following:

ταμάσα ἦν δὲ ὁ ὀπισθόδομος τὸ ὀπισθέν τῆς θεοῦ, ὡς ὅν καὶ τὰ χρῆ-
ματα. Schol. RY Dem. xxiv. 136\textsuperscript{20}.

Beecb\textsuperscript{21} bases his belief that the Opisthodomus was the western
chamber of the cella of the Parthenon on the scholium on Luc. Tīm.
53. In two other passages to which he refers\textsuperscript{22} he thinks that ναὸς is
equivocal and must be interpreted by the single scholium on Lucian.
This ignores, as we have seen, the established use of the word ναὸς.

\textsuperscript{18} The variant on this reads: ὅτι ὁ ὀπισθόδομος ἱερόν, τὸ ὀπισθέν τοῦ ἄδυτου οὖτως
ἔλεγεν, ἐν ὑπὲρ τὰ δημόσια ἀπέκτειν χρήματα. (This should probably be: ὅτι ὁ
ὀπισθόδομος ἱερὸν· τὸ ὀπισθέν <ὁπισθέν> κτλ.)

\textsuperscript{19} The phraseology is so odd in this scholium that one may well feel doubt
what the exegete meant. τὸ ὀπισθέν τῆς θεοῦ may signify the place behind the
goddess in the sense of behind her temple quite as naturally as in that of behind her
status.

\textsuperscript{20} CIG. i. p. 177 f.

\textsuperscript{21} In this paper all of the evidence bearing on the question under discussion
that is known to the writer has been quoted in full.
in its application to temples of Athena on the Acropolis. The 
existence of the Hecatompedon, brought to our knowledge by Dör-
feld's brilliant discovery, was not known to Boeckh. If it had been, 
he would not have maintained with such vigour against Osann87 and 
"Britanni nonnulli88" the thesis that there was no other opistho-
domus on the Acropolis than that in the Parthenon89.

If the conclusion that the Opisthodomus was a separate building 
and that it consisted of the rebuilt complex of three chambers and 
western portico that before the Persian Wars constituted the western 
half of the cela of the Hecatompedon is correct, it should be con- 
firmed by a consideration of the uses to which the Opisthodomus 
was put. If it fails, as thus constituted, to account adequately for 
any established facts, the conclusion is in so far invalidated.

The lexicographers and scholiasts, in the first place, call it a 
ταμεῖον or θησαυρόφυλλαῖον. In it, by their testimony, were housed 
τὰ χρήματα, both the sacred treasure, τὰ ἱερὰ χρήματα, τὰ χρήματα τῶν 
θεῶν, and the public treasure, τὰ δημόσια χρήματα, τὰ δημόσια 
ἀργύριον καὶ ὁ φόρος.

Our earliest documentary proof of the existence of the hecatom- 
pedon is the celebrated inscription, already referred to87. This 
inscription names the ταμεῖα frequently88, and, although much muta-
lated, evidently contained important prescriptions of their duties.
Among these it is specified τὰ οἰκήματα [τὰ ἐν τῷ ἑκάτον μέτῳ αὐξίων 
τῶν ταμεῖα (ii. 17, 18). It is generally agreed that the chambers 
here referred to are those in the western half of the cela and that 
they were treasure-chambers89. These are the rooms which accord-

80 Dodwell, Classical Tour in Greece, 1819, i. p. 345; Wilkins, Atheniast or 
Michaellis has a remark about the Englishmen: "Die früher vielfach beliebte Unterscheidung 
od des Opisthodomos im Parthenon und eines zweiten Opisthodomos als selbständigen 
Staatsschatzhauhes hat jetzt nur noch historisches Interesse"! (Der Parthenon, 
p. 27, note 85.) I must confess, with shame, that I knew nothing about the views 
of the Englishmen until my own views on the question were already formed and 
expressed in writing.

81 Cic. quart. 177 f.
82 See note 15, end.
83 1. 8 (?), 11. 1, 3, 8, 13, 16, 18, 25.
84 Furtwängler denies this. (See note 67.) Where the treasury was at this 
time he does not know (Meisterwerk, p. 169). In these chambers he establishes the 
cult of Erechtheus (p. 153 ff.), which was afterwards transferred to the Erechtheum 
ing to the treasury.

The phrase open, which is used to indicate the question of the 
theatres, is not used by the earlier writers in the sense of the 
"Parthenon". The phrase open was kept.

88 See 
89 It is 
"Parthenon" 
given in 
been able to 
also with 
(Cf. Harpertz, 
"Parthenon"") 
kindly info. 
P. 153 f.
ing to the conclusions to which we have come constituted the treasury referred to as ὑπὸ Ὀσιοθόδουμος in later times.

The inscription quoted in part on p. 13, which in date falls between 480 and 460 B.C., records the fact that the treasury was kept in a precinct south of the old temple of Athena. The περίβολος here mentioned, if the lacuna has been properly supplied, was that of the Hecatompedon, in which at the time of the decree stood the restored treasury, and in this treasury the money in question must have been kept.

That it was safely housed is certain, however general the phrase [ἐν περίβολῳ] may be; the treasury was not kept in the open.

(p. 192 ff.). In the western chamber of the cela of the Parthenon he establishes the cult of the παρθένου (p. 177 ff.), where he also puts the treasury, thus identifying ὑπὸ θυσίαμα and παρθένων (p. 177 ff.). So far as considerations of worship affect the question, there is no reason why the treasury should not be set up in one cult-chamber as soon as in the other.—Against the identification of ὑπὸ θυσίαμα and παρθένων, see the weighty considerations urged by Dörpfeld, Mitth. d. Inst. Athen. 1887, XII. pp. 35, 204 with note 2, 209 f. Furtwängler says truly (Meisterwerke, p. 177 f.) that CIA. I. 184, 185, A, 13, which he regards as the “Hauptstüke” of his argument for the identification of Opisthodomus and “Parthenon,” proves the existence of money in the “Parthenon,” and properly objects to Dörpfeld’s explanation of the fact (Mitth. 1887, XII. p. 35). But this is an isolated instance (no other can be adduced), and, significantly, falls in the last four months of 413—11 B.C., the troubled time of the rule of the Four Hundred. The natural supposition is that the παρθένων transferred the treasury temporarily from the Opisthodomus to the “Parthenon” for its greater safety. We have proof (CIA. IV. 225 c, p. 168, quoted on p. 160) that in 408—7 it was again in the Opisthodomus, and probably the re-transfer occurred much earlier. Cf. also CIA. I. 191 (406—5 B.C.).

See Dittenberger, SIG. 384.

It is by no means certain that [περίβολῳ] is right. The phrase [ἐν περίβολῳ] gives a suspiciously vague designation of the place where the money was kept. It occurred to me that the letters preserved on the stone, which I had not been able to examine, might be ΘΑΩ. In this case we should read

ταμεῖον

with twenty-five letters to the line, and possibly [ἐν ὁποτιθεν] for [ταμεῖον]. (Cf. Harpocrates and the others quoted above, p. 5 f.; and for τοῦ νεοῦ τοῦ ἕμι τοῦ, CIA. I. 322, 1.) But Dr Murray of the British Museum kindly informs me that the stone undoubtedly reads ΘΑΩ. Curtius (Stadtgeschichte, p. 132, note) conjectures [ἐν τῆς θεόλακτος], but this falls short by a letter. We might read [ἐν ταῖς θεόλακτοι] (with 23 letters to the line), if it were certain that Hesychius s.v. θεόλακτα, in his definition: κυρίως καμάρα, meant by καμάρα a vaulted room. Still—even then a group of three such rooms would be odd, whereas
In 454 B.C. the chest of the Delian Confederation was transferred to Athens, and from this date the funded treasure of the state, which consisted of the surplus of its yearly income and was kept on the Acropolis, was large. This was public money, δημιουργός, in contrast with sacred treasure, ἱερό. The two funds were kept separate, but the reserve treasure of the state as well as the other was under the charge of the ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ, to whom the helleontamines paid over the yearly surplus of the tribute, and from whom they received the sums which they dispensed under the terms of their office. This system of financial control existed from the time of the transfer of the Delian fund to Athens.

Now the theory that the public and sacred treasure of Athens was stored in the Opisthodomus of the Parthenon fails to provide a place for it before the completion of that temple in 438 B.C. This fact is so formidable that once the advocates of the theory even resorted to the supposition that the opisthodomus of the Parthenon must have been completed and put to use as early as 454 B.C. when the Delian fund was brought to Athens. The view, on the contrary, that makes the restored Opisthodomus of the Hecatompédon the treasury on the Acropolis provides adequately for all demands from the Persian Wars to the latest times.

After the Persian Wars to the time of the completion of the Parthenon the treasures in kind of Athena must have been stored partly in the old temple, partly in the treasury. In the latter was

Curtius's suggestion of a single δήμος would be intelligible, if otherwise permissible. The dual is excluded by Lolling's objection ('A θηρά, 1890, ii. p. 654, note 4) that there are three σειχώρα to be accounted for.—[δημούργος] is Dörpfeld's conjecture (Mith. d. Inst. Ath., 1887, XII, p. 39), but he there fails to take account of the preceding OAO. Furtwängler ('Meisterwerke', p. 165, note 3) is in error in saying that [δημούργος] contains one letter too many. The original of the remnant οίαο perhaps yet remains to be found.

There was a fund before this time, but it was relatively small. See Thaeer, Hermann's Griech. Staatsalt., 1892, i. 2, pp. 629 and 662.

Furtwängler ('Meisterwerke', p. 175, note 4) rightly emphasizes this important fact. In this he supports Kirchhoff (Geschichte der Athenischen Staatschoten, 1876, p. 33), however much he differs from him on his main proposition. See p. 27 below.

CIA. i. 273, 2 ff., 25 ff.; 180, 7 ff., 18 f.; 183, 9 f., 11 ff., 13 f., 15 f.; 184, 185, A, 21 ff.; 188, 3 ff. Cf. also CIA. iv. 179 b, 7, 179 c, 7 (p. 30 ff.).

Kirchhoff, Athen. Staatsalt., pp. 32, 33. The language of CIA. i. 32 shows the previous existence of a large fund. See p. 25 f. below.

Some of the Persian spoils were still there in the time of Pausanias (1. 27, 1).
also the sacred money of Athena, and, as we have seen\(^92\), likewise of some of the other gods. On the completion of the Parthenon the treasures in kind were transferred, as is well known, to the Pronaos, Neos Hecatompedos and “Parthenon” of the new temple\(^93\). In 435—4 were passed the two celebrated decrees (CIA. i. 32 A, B) which brought all of the finances of the state into order. In them we clearly perceive the influence of Pericles, under whose careful financial policy Athens was preparing herself for the great struggle with Sparta that was to follow. The provisions of these two decrees are met with singular fitness on the supposition that the public and sacred money was housed in the restored Opisthodomus of the Hecatompedon.

The money now stored in the treasury had become a great sum (A 2ff.). This fact is confirmed by the testimony of Thucydidès\(^94\). The amount of coined silver on the Acropolis at the time when the decree was passed was 9700 talents\(^95\). This included both the state-reserve and the treasure of the goddess. The existence of so great a

---

\(^92\) CIA. iv. 1 (p. 13) is a decree relating to the Eleusinian goddesses.

\(^93\) But not the money. Frazer’s argument (Journ. of Hell. Studies, 1892—3, XIII. p. 163 f.) for making the western portico of the Parthenon the Opisthodomus in brief, that the treasury documents name four compartments where treasure was stored, and that if three of these were in the Parthenon the natural inference is that the fourth, namely the Opisthodomus, was also there) overlooks the important fact that the objects stored in these three compartments were essentially different from the contents of the fourth. We have no evidence that anything except money was stored in the Opisthodomus from the completion of the Parthenon to the end of the Peloponnesian War. It was a treasury, and a treasury in which was kept a great sum of money. Against this view, moreover, is the testimony of Plutarch (quoted on p. 14), who tells us distinctly what the opisthodomus of the Parthenon was. Nobody supposes that Demetrius was lodged in the western portico.

\(^94\) XI. 13.

\(^95\) Loeschcke, de titulis aliquot attici quae estores historicae, 1876, p. 3 ff.; Kirchhoff, Staatsk. p. 23; Dittenberger SIG. 14, note 1.—The fact of the existence of this great treasure seems to me to be fatal to the view that the Opisthodomus was the western portico of the Parthenon. (See Dörpfeld, who formerly held this view, and Frazer, as cited on p. 4.) This portico was altogether inadequate for the purpose. (See Furtwängler, Meisterwerke, p. 177.) It is pertinent, further, here to add that it was open to view on three sides, where bronze gratings between the columns were all that barred a thieving public. Can we believe, moreover, that this great treasure was cramped into this small place, and yet that the large room beyond it, the “Parthenon” in the limited sense, was left practically empty, containing, as the treasure documents show (CIA. i. 161—175), only a relatively small number of articles employed at festival-time ("einige Dutzend Klingen und Stühle," Petersen, Mith. 1887, XII. p. 69)?
treasure in 435 B.C., which must have been the accumulation of years, necessarily implies the existence of a treasury before the completion of the Parthenon.

It is noteworthy that the decrees assume certain facts. The fact of the existence of a treasury is taken for granted, just as that of the boards of the hellenotamiai, logistae, and ταμιά τῶν ἱερῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας. The treasury is named three times (A 15, 17, B 23), simply as ὁ ἐπισημοδόμος, in such a way as to imply that it was a well-known place in established use. The specification, further, of the duty of the hellenotamiai in B 18 ff. to deposit the yearly surplus from the tribute with the treasurers of the goddess simply recognizes and emphasizes, as Kirchhoff has shown, a previous practice. The one important new provision is the establishment of the board of the ταμιά τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν (A 13 ff.). This necessitated certain rearrangements in the use of the Opisthodomus. From this time the tamiæ of Athena are to store her money-treasure ἐν τῷ ἐνὶ δεξαμενῷ τῶν ἐπισημοδόμων, the tamiæ of the other gods ἐν τῷ ἐπὶ ψευδερα. This must mean, as Dörpfeld has already pointed out, the room to the right and the room to the left in the back part of the Opisthodomus. Since now we know that there was a third treasure, and that it was large, which although under the charge of the treasurers of Athena was still kept separate, we cannot but conclude that it was stored in the larger chamber that lay in front of the two smaller chambers. It had probably been here from the first establishment of a state-fund. This use of the larger chamber explains the provision in A 15 ff. (quoted on p. 15). This provision, in which the words δύνατον καὶ δύσων imply a limitation, means, as I think, that the ταμιά τῶν ἄλλων θεῶν are not to have access to the chamber in which the treasure of which they are in charge is stored except

---

90 Athen. Staatsthr. p. 33.
91 Mitth. 1887, xiii. p. 38.
92 Is this division into a "double house" (the half to the east being set aside to the gods, that to the west to the state) what the scholiast on Arist. Phit. 193 (quoted on p. 5) means? The Hecatombedon was probably modelled on the old temple of Athena (see Furtwängler, Meisterwerke, p. 194 f., who however reverses the case), and of the western division of this Pausanias says διπλῶν γὰρ ἄνω τῆς ὕπατης (I. 26. 5). The "door" named by the scholiast would be the large door which was the only means of entering the double structure from the western portico. For parallel expressions to that just quoted, see Pans. II. 10. 2; 15. 13; vi. 20. 3; viii. 9. 1, and Schubart, Philologus, 1859, xv. 394 f. See also Bornmann, Mitth. 1881, vi. p. 373 ff.

---

93 Athen. Staatsthr.
94 This is the Metroon of the Ptolemies (see the Ptolemaic Rhoës). Also Sfakia, P. 1958. Sfakia, p. 1958. See also P. 1958.
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in company with the ταμίαι τῶν τῆς Ἀθηναίας, not that they are always to be present when the other rooms are opened. To reach their own chamber they were obliged to pass through that set aside for the reserve fund of the state, which was in charge, under the authority of the state, of the more ancient and much more important board. It must not be forgotten that the state exercised absolute control over all of these treasures, although it employed the form of a fictitious loan when it drew upon the resources of Athena and of the other gods. The outward symbol of this authority was the key of the treasury held by the ἐπιστάτης τῶν προτάνων, of whom Aristotle says 99, τηρεῖ δ' οὖν τὰς κλείσις τῶν ἑαυτῶν ἱερῶν ἐν ὀσίᾳ τα χρηματὰ ἑστιν καὶ ἀνευρετον τῆς πόλεις. The custody of the key did not imply responsibility for the actual management of the funds.

In the previous discussion I have assumed that the prescription in CIA. 1. 32 B, 18—20, [ἐκ δὲ τῶν φόρων] ἑκατοθείναι κ[ατὰ τὸ]ν ἑυαντου τὰ ἐκ[στάτω γενομένα παρὰ τὸ]ν ἄναμισι τῶν [τῆς Ἀθηναίας] τῶν Ἑλλήνων[ταμιῶν], means that only the surplus of the tribute was paid over to the ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ by the hellenotamiai, after deducting the sums necessary for the purposes of the confederation. Even this view establishes a state treasure on the Acropolis. It is obvious, however, that the argument advanced in this paper is strengthened if the interpretation of Kirchhoff 100 and others is accepted, namely that the hellenotamiai turned over the whole of the tribute when they had received it to the ταμίαι τῆς θεοῦ and drew on them for all of the expenditures with which they were charged. A place must then be provided on the Acropolis for the entire treasure of the Athenian state.

99 Ath. Pol. 44.
100 The first of the two ἱερά here meant is the Opisthodomus. (The other was the Metron, down in the town.) Cf. Poll. viii. 96; ἔχει δὲ οὖν τῶν ἱερῶν τὰς κλεῖσις ἐν ὀσίᾳ τὰ χρήματα καὶ τὰ γράμματα. Eust. Od. xvn. 455: τὰς τε κλεῖς <τῶν ἱερῶν Ροες> ἐν ὀσίᾳ τὰ χρήματα εἰσὶ φολάττει καὶ τὰ γράμματα τῆς πόλεως. Cf. also Suidas and E. M. s. v. ἐπιστάτης. Less exactly the Argument to Dem. xxii. p. 590. See Wachsmuth, Stadt Athen, 1890, ii. 1, p. 338.

101 Geschichte der Athen. Staatschafte, 1876. For the literature of the discussion, see Thunser, Hermann's Griech. Staatsalt., 1892, i. 2, p. 630, note 1. See also Furtwängler, Meisterwerke, p. 175, note 1.
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