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Introduction

The biographer Plutarch, in a few brief paragraphs of the *Life of Perikles* (13), provides the single surviving narrative source that describes one of the most extraordinary cultural and artistic phenomena of classical Athens. That is the construction of sacred buildings and other monuments commonly attributed to the administration of Perikles in antiquity, and often called collectively by modern writers the Periklean building program. Plutarch here speaks of “the works of Perikles,” while such phrases as “when Perikles was overseer of the works”\(^1\) or “when Perikles was building a temple on the Acropolis”\(^2\) are to be found elsewhere in Plutarch’s writings and in several other ancient authors. It was precisely consistent with the biographer’s purpose of displaying his hero’s greatness of spirit to dwell at some length on the buildings of Perikles as the most enduring, tangible evidence of the man’s *megalophrosyne*. They were monuments which, far more than the ancient history of military victories or of political speeches, could dazzle the visitor of Plutarch’s own day; their beauty, as he notes, seemed “untouched by time.” There can be no doubt that Plutarch was enormously moved by his visits to the Acropolis and viewed its marble temples as the manifest exemplar of Perikles’ towering stature as a statesman.

Despite Plutarch’s obvious admiration, however, his account of the Periklean buildings raises almost as many questions as it answers. The biographer mentions specifically the Parthenon, the Telesterion at Eleusis, the Odeion, the Propylaia, the gold and ivory statue of Athena, and the middle Long Wall, which connected Athens to the Peiraieus by means of a fortified corridor. Fundamental questions arise immediately from the very specificity of this group of monuments. We should like to know in the first place what criterion makes them a group, what thread of common purpose can have tied them together. Since the modern term “building program” implies a coherent public policy, its use suggests that investigation might disclose the factors that motivated their choice. Still more perplexing is the attribution of these buildings specifically to the statesman Perikles. In what sense, we ask, are they to be regarded as the “works of Perikles.” Phrases that recur repeatedly in the literary tradition—“having appointed Perikles construction overseer,”\(^3\) “he was appointed manager,”\(^4\)—clearly imply his appointment to some position of official administrative oversight. Moreover, we shall see in due course that for the administration of public works the Athenians habitually made use of annually elected committees, officially entitled *epistrota* (overseers), who managed all aspects of construction and published accounts of their receipts and expenditures, inscribed on stone, during each year of building operations. Even though the inscriptions have come down to us in woefully fragmentary condition, it is plain to see that there is no place in these documents for the insertion of
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1 Strabo 9.1.12 (p. 395).
2 Plut. *Mor.* 970A.
3 Aristodemos, *FGrH* 104 F 16.1.
Perikles' name as some sort of construction manager, serving year after year, as the literary references seem to imply.\(^5\)

Then, too, there is the problem of Plutarch's apparent omissions from the list of monuments ascribed to Perikles. In addition to the four buildings named by Plutarch, even the most cursory glance at the archaeological remains of Athens and Attica reveals the existence of no fewer than eight other marble temples, all of which were constructed in the second half of the fifth century. Both the Temple of Athena Nike and the Erechtheion were built at this time and are obviously important parts of the classical embellishment of the Acropolis (Figs. 1, 2). In the Agora below, the Hephaisteion occupied the low hill overlooking the market square, while outside the city walls on the east bank of the Ilissos River stood a small Ionic temple, identified by some scholars as the Temple of Artemis Agrotera. Two temples dedicated respectively to Poseidon and to Athena Sounias dominated the heights of Cape Sounion at the southeastern tip of Attica. At Rhamnous in northeastern Attica was the Temple of Nemesis, and its close contemporary was the Temple of Ares, which in Roman times was moved to the center of the Agora but stood originally in the deme of Pallene as the Temple of Athena Pallenis.\(^6\) Since none of these eight buildings is included among the “works of Perikles,” modern commentators have been inclined to remark upon the incompleteness of Plutarch's list of monuments.\(^7\) Plainly, any attempt to describe public building in fifth-century Athens must account for a total of ten temples dedicated to different deities; the Propylaia, the entrance gateway to the city's principal sanctuary; and the Odeion, the venue for musical contests at the city's principal festival, the Panathenaia. We shall see that some of these buildings were being built at the same time, and much of their construction falls in the period from the 450s to the 420s.

Plutarch referred collectively to κατασκευαί οἰκοδομήματων ἐν ἐκκόσμησιν ὁ Περικλῆς τὰς Ἀθηναίς (Per. Comp. 3.7), “construction of buildings with which Perikles adorned Athens,” and else-
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\(^5\) See pp. 43–48 below.


where he called them more specifically ἀγάθηματα (Per. 12.1), that is, sacred dedications offered to the gods and set up in their sanctuaries. The notion that the city of Athens was adorned with new sacred buildings during the period of Perikles’ political ascendency by no means finds its earliest expression in the writings of Plutarch. Although it suited the biographer’s purpose to give a more detailed description of the buildings than has survived elsewhere, it is important to emphasize that he drew upon a long tradition that first appeared in the fifth century, received rhetorical embroidery
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at the hands of Athenian orators of the fourth century, and was quoted thence in the Greek lexicons and by later scholiasts on classical authors.

Our first surviving reference to the embellishment of Athens comes from the chorus of cavalrymen who gave their name to Aristophanes’ Knights, a play that was produced in the winter of 424, less than five years after Perikles had passed from the stage of history:

Let us eulogize our fathers, since they were mighty men
worthy of their native soil and worthy of Athena’s robe,
who always winning everywhere in battles on dry land
and in the ship-fenced host beautified this city [τήνδ’ ἐκσμηξαν πόλιν].

The aristocratic young horsemen praise a whole generation of Athenians, their fathers who fought the wars of the first half of the century. By their victories on land and sea, they had built up the empire that lesser men were now trying to hold together. Particularly noteworthy is the juxtaposition of military victories and the beautification of the city, although in the poetic ellipsis it may not be obvious that the former enables the latter. As every contemporary spectator knew, however, on the morrow of the battle, the victors amassed the spoils. Those from the battles of Marathon and Salamis, Plataia and the Eurymedon were legendary, and their enormous value at sale was a well-known source of revenue both for the obligatory thank-offerings to the gods and for all manner of public works.

Athenian public speakers of the fourth century liked to berate their less worthy contemporaries by extolling their fifth-century forebears, whose exploits came by the alchemy of oratory to form the mythology of Athens’s heroic past. The adornment of Athens with sacred buildings and dedications was a frequently cited example of the virtues of the Athenians’ ancestors; but the orators imply that these monuments were thought of almost as trophies erected from the spoils of the Persian Wars. There seems, in fact, to have been a general assumption that the temples of the third quarter of the fifth century were associated in some way with the titanic events of that illustrious decade that began at Marathon and ended at Plataia. Demosthenes, in his Third Olynthiac oration, delivered in 349, likened the temples generally to trophies celebrating military victory:

Many and honorable trophies [τρόπαι] for victories on land and sea did they erect, themselves campaigning in the field; and they alone of mankind left behind them by their exploits a glory too great for envy. Such was their place in the Greek world: as pertains to the city itself, look around you and see what manner of men they were both in public and in private. In public, they built for us so many buildings and monuments of such beauty, temples and votive offerings to the gods, that to none of those who come after is there left a hope of surpassing them.

An ancient scholiast on the passage understood the text of Demosthenes to be a more specific reference to monuments commemorating the victories of the Persian Wars:

All these they made and dedicated from the Persian spoils, the silver-footed throne of Xerxes, and the scimitar of Mardonios, and they erected the Propylaia of the Acropolis, and the bronze statue of Athena and that of gold and ivory.

Some years earlier, in 355, Demosthenes had given the same theme greater rhetorical development in two passages of his speech Against Androtion (22):
One could cite many instances, both ancient and modern, but of those that are most familiar for all to hear, take, if you please, this. The men who built the Propylaia and the Parthenon, and adorned the other temples from the spoils of the barbarians, men in whom we all take natural pride—you know this of course from tradition that after they abandoned the city and shut themselves up in Salamis, it was because they had the triremes that they were victorious in the sea battle and saved the city and all their belongings, and they made themselves authors for the rest of the Greeks of many and great benefits, of which not even time can erase the memory. (13)

For possessing at one time the greatest wealth of all the Greeks, they spent it all for love of honor; they made donation from their private fortunes and shrank from no danger for the sake of glory. Therefore immortal possessions are passed down to the Athenian people, on the one hand the memory of their exploits, on the other the beauty of the votives erected in their honor, yonder Propylaia, the Parthenon, the stoas, the ship-sheds. (76)

In the first of these two passages, Demosthenes’ rhetoric gets the better of chronological accuracy, for his syntax makes the builders of the Propylaia and the Parthenon, the grammatical subject of the verb, the same men who saved the city by winning the sea battle at Salamis. Indeed, one ancient commentator on the passage, writing about the time of Plutarch, was at pains to set the record straight. Even though his commentary has come down to us as a mutilated papyrus fragment that preserves only the right half of a column of text, the writer plainly cited a decree moved by Perikles himself to show that Demosthenes had misdated the construction of the Propylaia and the Parthenon by thirty years.12 Of greater interest, however, than the orator’s chronological inexactitude is the fact that he clearly believed the great temples of the fifth century to have been built and adorned with Persian spoils. Moreover, he regarded it as common knowledge, a fact with which every member of the great citizen jury was perfectly familiar. Other ancient scholia on the same passage state that the two famous colossal statues of Athena made by Pheidias, the one of bronze and the other of gold and ivory, were funded from the spoils of the battles of Marathon and Salamis, respectively.13 Indeed, Demosthenes himself later made an explicit statement to that effect about the bronze Athena, when, in 343, he had occasion to mention an inscribed stele that stood beside that statue:

    By Zeus, was the inscription set up just anywhere as it chanced? No. Even though the whole of our Acropolis is a holy place, and although its area is so large, it stands at the right hand beside the great bronze Athena that was dedicated by the city as a meed of valor of the war against the barbarians, with money given by the Greeks.14

It was also known to the orators of the fourth century that the embellishment of Athens with sacred buildings was in some way to be attributed to Perikles, and that statesman was said to have been responsible for depositing on the Acropolis large sums of money from which the temples could be financed. A clear statement comes from Isokrates, writing in advanced old age; but he was born in 436, when the sculptures of the Parthenon were still being carved and the Propylaia had just been begun, and he is as close to an eyewitness as our sources will bring us.

13 Schol. Demosth. 22.13 (45 Dilts); and cf. schol. VM Aristoph. Knights 1169a (Koster).
14 Demosth. 19 Embassy 272; for the dedication of the statue from the spoils of Marathon, cf. Paus. 1.28.1, 9.4.1; chap. 2, pp. 17–21 below.
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Finally, Perikles, because he was both a good leader of the people and an excellent orator, so adorned the city with temples, sacred dedications, and other monuments, that still to this day visitors who come to Athens think her worthy to rule not only the Greeks, but all the world as well; and in addition he carried up to the Acropolis no less than ten thousand talents.\textsuperscript{15}

Still more explicit is a brief quotation that has survived from a speech of Lykourgos against Kephisodotos, and in favor of the honors proposed for the orator Demades: “Perikles, who captured Samos and Euboia and Aigina, who built the Propylaia and the Odeion and the Hekatompedon, and who carried up to the Acropolis ten thousand talents of silver, was crowned with a wreath of olive.”\textsuperscript{16}

These passages show that well-informed Athenians of the fourth century gave credit to Perikles not only for the beautification of the sanctuaries with sacred dedications in general, but also for the construction of specific buildings. Lykourgos mentioned by name the Propylaia, the Odeion, and the Parthenon, all of which were to appear later in Plutarch’s account of the Athenian buildings. Philochoros, in the fourth book of his \textit{Atthis}, named Perikles as overseer of the Lykeion gymnasium, although this notice appears nowhere else.\textsuperscript{17} Most notorious of the “works of Perikles,” however, that which caught the popular imagination and received the most fanciful embroidery, was his alleged involvement with the gold and ivory statue of Athena in the Parthenon. In the fourth century, Philochoros cited the dates of the eponymous archons to prove that the golden statue was dedicated seven years before the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, but he simply stated as a well-known fact that Perikles was overseer of the statue.\textsuperscript{18} The contemporary historian Ephoros of Kyme gave the incident elaborate and lengthy development, including direct quotation of Aristophanes’ lines, in his discussion of the causes of the Peloponnesian War; but he too made Perikles’ administrative collaboration with Pheidias the basis for his account. Ephoros’s narrative was later quoted at length by Diodoros and abridged by Aristodemos.\textsuperscript{19} These references to the dedication of sacred buildings, few and scattered as they may be, indicate that Athenians traditionally thought of these monuments as commemorating the military victories of the Persian Wars and associated their construction with the name of the statesman Perikles.

Comparison of the literary tradition of the fourth century and later with the archaeological record of the temples themselves reveals a striking chronological discrepancy. None of the buildings discussed above began construction much before 450, and some were begun as late as the 420s, whereas the great battles of the Persian Wars that they were thought to commemorate had occurred fully a generation earlier. It would be easy to conclude that the orators were simply poorly informed about Athenian history of the previous century and mistakenly assumed that the dedication of splendid monuments to the gods was a response to the unexpected good fortune of epic military victories. This erroneous assumption was then embroidered and embellished by later writers, who developed the anecdotes about Perikles personal involvement. Finally, Plutarch attributed the temples and sacred dedications to the greatness of Perikles’ statesmanship. That this is an overly simplistic re-

\textsuperscript{15} Isokr. 15 \textit{Aantid.} 234; and cf. the closely similar statements Isokr. 7 \textit{Areop.} 66, 8 \textit{Peace} 126; see also Plut. \textit{Mor.} 343D, 348D, 351A.

\textsuperscript{16} Frag. 58 (Conomis) = Glossa Patmia, s.v. \textit{Hekatompedon} (\textit{BCH} 1 [1877] 149). Hekatompedon, the official name of the eastern cella, was sometimes applied to the whole building: Harpokration, s.v. (f 17 Keaney).

\textsuperscript{17} Harpokration, s.v. \textit{Lykeion} (f 30 Keaney) = Philochoros, \textit{FGrH} 328 F 38.

\textsuperscript{18} Schol. RV \textit{Aristoph. Peace} 605 (Holwerda) = Philochoros, \textit{FGrH} 328 F 121.

\textsuperscript{19} Ephoros, \textit{FGrH} 70 F 196, quoted by Diodoros 12.39.1–41.1; Aristodemos, \textit{FGrH} 104 F 16.1–2; cf. Plut. \textit{Per.} 31.2–5, 32.6; \textit{Suda}, s.v. \textit{Φειδίας} (f 246 Adler).
construction will become apparent in detailed discussion of the individual buildings in subsequent chapters, which will attempt to elucidate some of the difficulties that emerge upon first reading the literary references to the Periklean buildings. If, on the other hand, the orators' statements preserve reliable information, then the Parthenon and the other temples are to be interpreted as thank-offerings to the gods for the victories of the Persian Wars. In that case, it will be necessary to explain why more than three decades elapsed between the battles of Salamis and Plataia and the beginning of construction on the Parthenon, while thereafter a flurry of continuous temple building occupied much of the rest of the century.

The lack of building activity in the second quarter of the fifth century is the more surprising because Athens reacted so differently to the victory at Marathon in 490. There is now fairly general agreement that the first great marble temple on the Acropolis, the Older Parthenon, began to be built in the immediate aftermath of that battle. The building was planned as a Doric peristyle temple of huge scale, measuring 23.53 × 66.94 m, with a peristyle of 6 × 16 columns. It was to be the largest temple on the mainland of Greece at the time of its design, and it was to be entirely of Pentelic marble. The new temple would have greatly surpassed in grandeur the Old Temple of Athena Polias that stood on the north side of the Acropolis. It was a perfect expression of the exuberant outpouring of thanks to the goddess Athena for bestowing the victory, and of civic pride in the military achievement of the young democracy. In the early years of the 480s, work began on the poros podium that formed an artificial platform to support the temple. The builders progressed to the setting of the lowest column drums of the peristyle and the orthostates of the cella walls before construction was abruptly disrupted by the Persian destruction of the Acropolis in 480.

At about the same time, the Athenians seem to have built their famous treasury at Delphi and dedicated to Apollo the firstfruits (ἳδιαν) of the battle. Many scholars have now come to accept a date in the 480s for the building’s construction, as long espoused by the French excavators. This view has recently found support in Amandry’s demonstration that the Marathon base, along the building’s south flank, rests in part on a foundation course projecting 0.15–0.30 m from the south wall of the treasury, and obviously so built to support the base. So, in addition to a new temple on the Acropolis, the Athenians celebrated their defeat of the Persians by erecting a marble treasury for Apollo. It was the first Athenian monument dedicated in a Panhellenic sanctuary, prominently located at a turn of the Sacred Way, where every visitor ascending to Apollo’s temple would pass its southern flank. There, along the foot of the wall, the inscription on the base proclaimed to all that Athens had dedicated the firstfruits of the Battle of Marathon.

Quite different was Athens’s response to the decisive victories at Salamis and Plataia. To be sure, according to Herodotos (9.13.2), both the Acropolis and the entire lower city were reduced to ruins when Mardonios’s army withdrew to central Greece. So it is only natural that the returning Athenian refugees would turn first to the repair of their private houses, and then to the city’s fortification walls, as Thucydides tells us. But it was a moment when all Greeks could exult in the final repulse of Xerxes’ armies, and by long tradition thank-offerings to the gods were obligatory. Indeed, immediately after the Battle of Salamis, the Greeks sent captured Phoenician triremes to Poseidon.

21 On the date of the podium, see endnote 2, pp. 395–397 below.
24 Thuc. 1.89.5, 90.3, 93.2.
at Sounion and the Isthmus, and another to Ajax at Salamis (Hdt. 8.12.1). In due course, sale of the
booty from the battles enabled the dedication of colossal bronze statues of Apollo at Delphi, of Zeus
at Olympia, and of Poseidon at the Isthmus.25 Most famous of all the Greek votive offerings was
the gilded tripod dedicated to Apollo at Delphi. The tripod itself was supported by a tall column
formed of three intertwined serpents, and on the coils of their bodies were inscribed the names of
the thirty-one cities that fought the war for the deliverance of Greece.26 In all this activity, the gods
of the Panhellenic sanctuaries were richly rewarded for their help in the defeat of the barbarians, but
Athena at Athens is conspicuously absent. Her temple on the Acropolis suffered heavy damage at the
hands of the Persians, and the great new temple, the Older Parthenon, was abandoned in the early
stages of construction.

There is no evidence for the dedication of thank-offerings on the Acropolis before the 460s.
The only building activity seems to have involved reconstruction of the northern fortification wall,
which was carried out in large part with spolia from the ruined temples.27 Blocks from the entabla-
ture of the Old Athena Temple were reassembled in their correct order, with triglyphs and metopes
from the frieze resting on architraves and surmounted by parts of the Doric cornice. Another part
of the wall consisted of unfinished marble column drums for the Older Parthenon, many of them
heavily calcined from the fires that consumed the scaffolding on the building site.28 Placed in this
way, the spolia were clearly intended to be visible, as they are to this day, to all who frequented the
Agora below. This was no votive offered to the goddess, but a grim memorial for all time of the de-
struction wrought by the barbarians. In the years after the defeat of Persia, the Athenians seemingly
made no effort to repair the damaged peristyle of the Old Athena Temple. It is obvious, too, that
work on the Older Parthenon was indefinitely suspended. Although many of the column drums
in the north wall are far too damaged to be used in the building, and so were consigned to reuse as
spolia, many others, still lying about the Acropolis in good condition, were abandoned in the early
stages of dressing the stone.

Athens’s conspicuous failure to rebuild the temples on the Acropolis in the immediate after-
math of the Persian Wars has often encouraged scholars to explain this phenomenon by recourse to
the so-called Oath of Plataia. It is well known that a tradition was current in fourth-century Athens
of a solemn oath allegedly sworn by the Greek armies before the Battle of Plataia. A version of this
oath, swearing to stand firm against the barbarian invaders, was later inscribed on stone in the fourth
century.29 A slightly different version was quoted by the orator Lykourgos about 330 and later re-
peated almost verbatim by Diodoros, presumably drawing on Ephoros.30 The literary versions of the
oath, but not the text of the inscription, include a pledge not to rebuild the temples burned by the
Persians but to allow them to remain as “memorials of the barbarians’ impiety.” It is, of course, this
part of the oath that has been invoked to account for the lack of building activity in Athenian sanc-
tuaries during the second quarter of the fifth century. But the authenticity of the Plataian oath was
already impugned in the fourth century by Theopompos of Chios, who regarded it as an Athenian

25 Hdt. 8.21.2; Paus. 10.14.5 (Apollo); Hdt. 9.81; Paus. 5.23.1–2, 6.10.6, 10.14.5 (Zeus); Hdt. 9.81 (Poseidon). See
26 Hdt. 9.81; Thuc. 1.32.2–3; [Demosth.] 59 Near. 97; Diod. 11.33; Paus. 10.13.9; ML 27; Gauer, **Weihgeschenke aus
186.
28 See A. Tschira, *JdI* 55 (1940) 242–261. A completely different history of the site is proposed by G. Ferrari, *AFA* 106
(2002) 11–35, who attempts to revive the unconvincing theory of Dörpfeld that the ancient Temple of Athena Polias was
not destroyed by the Persians and continued standing until the Roman period.
29 Rhodes and Osborne, *GHI* 88.
30 Lyk. *Leoko* 81; Diod. 11.29.3.
fabrication. This, combined with Herodotos’s silence about any such oath in his detailed account of the preliminaries leading up to the battle, has caused a majority of modern historians to disbelieve in its historicity. Even if one accepts that religious prohibition exerted its force on Athenians of this period, that sanction would only have exacerbated an underlying problem that has been overlooked in the lengthy debate about the authenticity of the Plataian oath.

That problem was largely inherent in the process of building a Greek temple and was completely obscured by Plutarch’s misunderstanding of the economics of public works in the fifth century. In his lively account of the debates on the buildings (Per. 12), the biographer ascribed to Perikles the argument that public works were a source of economic power and profit: “They put, as it were, the whole city on the payroll” (σχημάζοντας δικαιάς ευμεταβολήν τῆν πόλιν [12.4]). He then goes on to characterize Perikles’ social policy in terms that foreshadow the welfare state: “In his desire that the disorganized crowd of common laborers should neither have no share at all in the public receipts, nor take payment for being idle and lazy, he proposed enthusiastically to the people projects for great constructions” (12.5). Plutarch goes on to list the raw materials to be used and the many specialized skills needed to supply and work these materials, which provides the most detailed and accurate picture of the complexities of ancient building operations that has come down to us in literature. Furthermore, most of the details can be verified in the records of actual builders of the fifth and fourth centuries. On the other hand, what is disconcerting in Plutarch’s description, and completely anachronistic in the Classical period, is his picture of the Athenian labor force as “τῶν ἀσώντακτων καὶ βάκνουσον ἄχον” (the disorganized crowd of common laborers) that is “ἀργοὺς καὶ σχολάζοντας” (idle and lazy). Both language and imagery conjure up a vast urban proletariat, largely unemployed and unskilled, such as confronted successive emperors in the Roman capital of Plutarch’s day. But such a picture could hardly be farther from the reality of classical Athens, where, as we shall see, the problem confronting building administrators was almost precisely the opposite. For most of the Classical period the chief difficulty lay in finding and attracting a sufficiently large number of sufficiently skilled workmen to carry out the complex tasks involved in building a marble temple. It is clear that Plutarch has misunderstood the economics and sociology of the Greek city-state in the fifth century, and in so doing has greatly skewed our picture of Athenian temple building.

There is abundant evidence that ancient builders and craftsmen were a migratory lot, who moved readily from place to place as demand for their services changed. Masons and quarrymen, carpenters and gilders, painters and plasterers, architects and sculptors, theirs was a small community of highly skilled and specialized artisans whose livelihood depended on building projects in different cities and sanctuaries. To the administrators of such a project, it was important to attract these craftsmen from all over Greece, and much effort was evidently expended on the search for skilled


personnel. The available evidence illustrates the practice of the fourth century and later periods, but there is no reason to believe that time-honored procedures of the building trades underwent significant changes with the passage of decades. We learn from the inscribed accounts that representatives from Epidaurus let contracts at Corinth, Argos, Megara, Aigina, Tegea, and elsewhere. The overseers of the Tholos at Epidaurus dispatched a herald to recruit Athenian labor, and next to his wages in the annual account, they recorded the price of paper on which they wrote the contracts that he offered, and they listed the traveling expenses of two Athenian workmen whom he managed to engage. As a result of these and similar efforts, the building records from the sanctuary of Asklepios list by name no fewer than forty Corinthian contractors, nineteen from Argos, and thirteen from Athens, who worked at Epidaurus over the years.

At about the same time, similar heralds from Delphi sought to recruit skilled labor for the new Temple of Apollo, and as a result craftsmen and contractors from Athens, Corinth, Argos, and Tegea journeyed to Delphi to take work in the sanctuary. Among them appears to be Philon, the Athenian architect of the arsenal in the Peiraeus, who took a contract to manage the stoa in the gymnasium. The builders of all periods seem to have formed heterogeneous crews summoned from all the corners of Greece for a single enterprise or a few years' work. The accounts of the fourth century abound in payments to workmen traveling to and from building sites, and in living expenses paid to foreign laborers recruited for the job. The Eleusinian overseers hired men and dealt with retailers from Megara and Troizen for work in the sanctuary, and Thucydides reports (5.82.6) that Athenian carpenters and stonemasons helped build the long walls of Argos in 417. The prominence of resident aliens on the payrolls of the Erechtheion overseers is well known; there are no fewer than 42 metics among the 107 workmen whose names survive, while only 24 are known to have been Athenian citizens.

Fluctuations in the availability of skilled labor were a major factor affecting the conduct and timing of building operations and are no doubt reflected, if only indirectly, in the building accounts. At Epidaurus, the accounts show that the Temple of Asklepios was built quickly and efficiently and stood fully complete in four years and eight months. The Tholos, however, was still unfinished after work dragged on for twenty-seven years. In the year of the priest Damopeitheus, the only payment was for inscribing the account on the stele; and in Years 23, 24, and 25 no work at all was done.40

In her study of the economics of building temples, A. M. Burford has particularly emphasized the remarkable lack of building operations in much of Greece from the end of the Peloponnesian War

34 Recruitment of Athenian labor, *IG IV²* 103, lines 158–161; the ἐγνώριζε who let the contracts in various cities, *IG IV²* 103, lines 4–5, 44–45. The numerous heralds whose missions are recorded in *IG IV²* 102, lines 222–259. See Burford, *Temple Builders*, 103, 132–133, 160–163.
35 Prosopography of the Epidaurian inscriptions is listed in Burford, *Temple Builders*, 232–245; ethnics are included where known.
down through the first quarter of the fourth century. She has argued convincingly that "the only really satisfactory explanation for this widespread building recession is not shortage of money, not war, but a widespread scarcity of skilled labour." It may be suggested that similar conditions affected the building trades in mainland Greece during the period after the Persian Wars. This was a period when the absence of public works under construction in mainland Greece contrasted conspicuously with the situation in contemporary Sicily and South Italy. There, in the wake of the Greek victory over the Carthaginians at Himera in 480, the tyrants of Sicily indulged in an extravagant campaign of temple building. During the period ca. 480 to ca. 460, at least nine Doric peripteral temples began to be built, and work continued on others begun in earlier years. Much the greater number of Greek construction workers was no doubt employed in these operations.

In the chapters that follow, we shall examine in detail the buildings of an equally extravagant program of temple construction. By reviewing the monuments each in turn, it will be possible to observe among the buildings unusual similarities of detail in both design and decoration, which are probably best attributed to teams of skilled craftsmen moving from one building to the next. What will also emerge from this survey is the unusual number of anomalies in the tempo of construction: long delays at various stages of the work, changes in plans as work progressed, removal of personnel from one project to another, and stonework left unfinished. Some of these anomalies may be due in part to the logistics of constructing multiple buildings on different sites at the same time. But others, it will be argued, are best explained by fluctuations in the number and skills of the available labor force. Unfortunately, the copious details preserved in the building accounts from Epidauros, Delphi, and Delos are not found in the Athenian documents until the end of the fifth century. This is partly because the inscriptions themselves are extremely fragmentary, but also because the earlier texts show a much more rudimentary form of accounting. Nevertheless, variations in the pace of work can often be detected in the construction history of the buildings themselves.

A good example of this can be seen on the Acropolis itself in the remains of the Older Parthenon. Construction of that temple seems to have begun in the years just after the Battle of Marathon and was certainly cut short by the destruction of 480. So work continued for eight or nine years at the most, possibly for as few as five. In these years the foundation podium and crepidoma were built, and marble blocks for the colonnade and superstructure began to be prepared. All eighteen examples of bottom column drums show by the dressing of their upper and lower surfaces that they were set in place on the stylobate. Only three of the eight surviving drums of the second tier were set in their columns, while those intended for higher positions in the shafts had barely been roughed out when work was abandoned. So in the five to eight years that the temple was under construction, the builders had barely begun to raise the columns of the peristyle. By striking contrast, the Periklean Parthenon, a slightly larger building on the same foundations and with more columns in its peristyle, was finished to the rooftop, with all of its sculpture in place, except for the pediments, in only ten years. This glaring discrepancy in the speed of construction surely indicates that a substantially high demand for labor affected the tempo of work in the late fifth century.

41 Burford, PCPS 191 (1965) 32.

42 At Syracuse, Temple of Athena; at Himera, Temple of Nike; three temples at Akragas: "Hera Licinia," Athena, and Demeter; three temples at Selinous: Hera (ER), A, and O; at Paestum, Temple of Hera II. See Dinsmoor, AAG, 107–111. Work continued on the colossal temples of Olympian Zeus at Akragas (Dinsmoor, AAG, 101–105) and of Apollo (Temple GT) at Selinous (Dinsmoor, AAG, 99–101).

43 See Tischira, JdI 55 (1940) 245–246. All but one of the eighteen bottom drums are in the north wall. Of the drums in course II, only nos. 5, 14, and 25 were set in place. For drums abandoned in the early stages of dressing, course I, no. 32 (fig. 9); course III, no. 44 (fig. 2); course IV, no. 45 (fig. 8). The peristyle columns of the Periklean Parthenon have eleven courses of drums to complete the height of the shaft.

44 The Periklean building was begun in 447/6 and completed, except for the pediment sculpture, in 438/7. See chap. 3, pp. 67–68 below.
larger, more skillful, and more experienced group of craftsmen had been assembled at Athens by the middle years of the century.  

As we pass in review the anathemata that arose in the sanctuaries of Attica during the second half of the fifth century, we shall need to observe, where possible, evidence for the timing and tempo of their construction, and in some cases how the construction of one affected or influenced the design of others. Then, too, we shall need to emphasize the extraordinary fact of their sheer numbers, that the city of Athens erected ten marble temples, all of which were at some stage in the process of construction in the period from 450 to 420. We saw earlier how orators of the fourth century spoke of the temples generally as monuments commemorating the victories in the Persian Wars. So it will be important to ask whether individual buildings reveal any evidence to support such an overarching theme, either in the deities to whom they were dedicated or in the design and decoration of their architecture. Taken as a group, the anathemata will tell us much about Athens’s attitude toward the Persian Wars, and how that attitude developed as the decades lengthened after the deliverance of Greece. In one respect the modern visitor to the Acropolis can agree with Plutarch and the orators that the builders of the fifth century, in the words of Demosthenes, passed down “immortal possessions to the Athenian people.”

45 Cf. Burford, Temple Builders, 203.