CAMBRIDGE LIBRARY COLLECTION

Books of enduring scholarly value

Archaeology

The discovery of material remains from the recent or the ancient past has always been a source of fascination, but the development of archaeology as an academic discipline which interpreted such finds is relatively recent. It was the work of Winckelmann at Pompeii in the 1760s which first revealed the potential of systematic excavation to scholars and the wider public. Pioneering figures of the nineteenth century such as Schliemann, Layard and Petrie transformed archaeology from a search for ancient artifacts, by means as crude as using gunpowder to break into a tomb, to a science which drew from a wide range of disciplines - ancient languages and literature, geology, chemistry, social history - to increase our understanding of human life and society in the remote past.

The Topography of Athens

William Martin Leake (1777–1860) was a British military officer and classical scholar specialising in reconstructing the topography of ancient cities. He was a founding member of the Royal Geographical Society and was elected a Fellow of the Royal Society in 1815. After his retirement in 1815 he devoted the rest of his life to topographical and classical studies. First published in 1821, this pioneering volume contains Leake's reconstruction of ancient Athens. Leake analyses and compares ancient descriptions of the city with the archaeological remains as they existed at the time of publication, identifying ancient structures and suggesting where the remains of other buildings may be found by excavation. This book was regarded as authoritative for the structures of ancient of Athens for most of the nineteenth century, with Leake's work being influential in shaping perceptions of classical archaeology and historical topography into the twentieth century.

Cambridge University Press has long been a pioneer in the reissuing of out-of-print titles from its own backlist, producing digital reprints of books that are still sought after by scholars and students but could not be reprinted economically using traditional technology. The Cambridge Library Collection extends this activity to a wider range of books which are still of importance to researchers and professionals, either for the source material they contain, or as landmarks in the history of their academic discipline.

Drawing from the world-renowned collections in the Cambridge University Library, and guided by the advice of experts in each subject area, Cambridge University Press is using state-of-the-art scanning machines in its own Printing House to capture the content of each book selected for inclusion. The files are processed to give a consistently clear, crisp image, and the books finished to the high quality standard for which the Press is recognised around the world. The latest print-on-demand technology ensures that the books will remain available indefinitely, and that orders for single or multiple copies can quickly be supplied.

The Cambridge Library Collection will bring back to life books of enduring scholarly value (including out-of-copyright works originally issued by other publishers) across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences and in science and technology.

The Topography of Athens

With Some Remarks on Its Antiquities

William Martin Leake

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

Cambridge, New York, Melbourne, Madrid, Cape Town, Singapore,
São Paolo, Delhi, Dubai, Tokyo

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108017626

This edition first published 1821
This digitally printed version 2010

ISBN 978-1-108-01762-6 Paperback

THE TOPOGRAPHY

OF ATHENS

WITH SOME REMARKS ON ITS

ANTIQUITIES

BY LIEUT.-COL. W. M. LEAKE R.A.

LL.D. F.R.S.

MEMBER OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES AT BERLIN.

JOHN MURRAY LONDON

MDCCCXXI.

CONTENTS.

CONTENTS.

ERRATA.

Page xxxii, line 2, *for* Cæsareia Philippi, *read* Cæsareia Stratonis.
lv, line 1, *for* The spirit of tolerance, *read* By the spirit of tolerance.
lxii, note, line 4, *for* the preceding note, *read* a preceding note.
12, line 1, insert in the margin, *Cap.* 11.
12, line 2, insert in the margin, *Cap.* 14.
16, line 11, insert in the margin, *Cap.* 17.
24, line 18, *for* rivers of Athens, *read* rivers of the Athenians.
25, line 21, *for* quarries of Pentelicum, *read* quarry at Pentele.
34, line 14, *for* Ænobius, *read* Œnobius.
84, line 15, *for* Œgaleos, *read* Ægaleos.
117, &c. *for* Pæcile, *read* Pœcile.
145, note 2, *for* See page 16, *read* See page 25.
157, note 1, *for* See page 17, *read* See page 26.
161, note 1, *for* See page 18, *read* See page 27.
169, note 2, line 1, *for* πὴν, *read* τὴν.
192, line 2, *for* 1656, *read* 1676.
266, line 1, *for* ἐπισσάται, *read* ἐπιστάται.
273, note 1, *for* See Section 1, *read* See Introduction, p. xxxvi.
314, *for* Plutarch, &c. *read* Diodorus Cosmographus apud Plutarch, &c.
400, line 7, *for* Panhelleneium, *read* Panhellenium.

*** The reader will find two ancient coins of Athens, referred to in several passages of this volume, as being in the title-page. It has been found necessary, instead of inserting them in the title, to place them upon a separate paper, to face the title.

INTRODUCTION.

AS inquiries into the topography and antiquities of Athens require a frequent reference to the primeval history of the Athenians, and to their mythology, which differed in many respects from that of the rest of Greece, it is intended, in a few preliminary pages, to recall to the reader's recollection those parts of the history of Athens, whether real or fabulous, which are most necessary to the elucidation of its topography and antiquities. The remainder of this Introduction will be devoted to a rapid view of the progressive ruin of ancient Athens, and of those monuments of art, which were its peculiar distinction.

There can be no stronger proof of the early civilization of Athens than the remote period to which its history is carried in a clear and consistent series. We have some reason to believe that Cecrops, an Egyptian, who brought from Sais the worship of Neith (by the Athenians

called Ἀθήνη), was contemporary with Moses. It is probable that, even before that time, the worship of Jupiter had been introduced into Athens from Crete. The rock of the Acropolis, which at that early period contained all the habitations of the Athenians, received from Cecrops the name of Cecropia.

Among the successors of Cecrops, those whose names have been chiefly recorded in Athenian tradition are, 1. Amphictyon, son of Deucalion of Thessaly, who is said to have succeeded to the throne in right of his wife Atthis, daughter of Cranaus, a native Athenian, who succeeded Cecrops. 2. Erechtheus the first, who, by later writers, is called Erichthonius[1]. He set up an image of Minerva, made of olive wood, in the Cecropia, and instituted festivals, called Athenæa, in the Attic cities, which were then twelve in number. Erechtheus was fabled to have been the son of Neptune and of the Earth, to have been educated by Minerva, to have been her assistant in the invention of war-

[1] In reconciling the authorities, relating to the ancient history of Athens, it is a very important preliminary to establish the identity of Erichthonius with Erechtheus the first. For this purpose it is sufficient to compare Homer (Il. β. v. 552.) and Herodotus (l. 8. c. 55.) with Apollodorus, (l. 3. c. 14.) Lucian, (in Philopseud.) Pausanias, (Attic. c. 2. 18.) and Aristides the Sophist, (in Minerv. et in Panathen.)

horses and chariots, and to have been buried in the temple which he had dedicated to her in Cecropia, and which, from the circumstance of his interment in it, was to the latest period called the Erechtheium. 3. Pandion the first. In his reign lived Triptolemus, who was supposed to have been instructed in the arts of agriculture by Ceres, and to have instituted the Eleusinian mysteries. 4. Erechtheus the second. He colonized a part of Eubœa, and defeated Eumolpus, who, with a body of Thracians, had seized Eleusis; but he was slain in the action. The daughters of Erechtheus devoted themselves to death, that their father might obtain success in the Eleusinian war[1]. About the same time the daughters of Leos were sacrificed, to avert a contagious sickness, in obedience to the Delphic oracle, which required human sacrifices upon this occasion[2]. These and similar remains of barbarism appear from Homer to have prevailed among the Greeks as late as the time of the Trojan war. 5. Ægeus, who, after the direct succession had been considerably disturbed by the collateral branches, recovered the throne, and enjoyed a long reign of thirty-

[1] Apollod. l. 3. c. 15.

[2] Aristid. in Panathen. Schol. Thucyd. l. 1. c. 20. Suidas in Λευκόριον. Ælian. Var. Hist. l. 12. c. 28. Pausan. Attic. c. 5.

nine years. 6. Theseus. In his way to Athens from Trœzen, where he had been living in obscurity, Theseus cleared the country of the robbers who opposed him, and for these brilliant exploits was acknowledged by Ægeus and the Athenians as successor to the throne. He afterwards relieved Athens from a disgraceful tribute to the king of Crete, and, having succeeded to the royal authority, laid the foundation of the early pre-eminence of his country, by founding the Prytaneium, as a court of judicature, common to all Attica, and by establishing the Panathenæa in the Erechtheium, as a sacred festival for the whole province. The immediate consequence of this change, which occurred about the year 1300 B. C., was the decline of the other eleven Attic cities, a concentration of government in Athens, and a great increase of population in Attica, attracted by the security and justice resulting from the new laws of Theseus.

Homer, the earliest of Greek historians, has left us a strong confirmation of the reality of those facts, which are not obviously fabulous, in the history of the two great heroes of ancient Attic story, Erechtheus and Theseus[1]. He

[1] Οἱ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον, ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον
Δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος, ὃν ποτ' Ἀθήνη
Θρέψε, Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος Ἄρουρα,
Κὰδδ' ἐν Ἀθήνῃς εἶσεν, ἐῷ ἐνὶ πίονι νηῷ·

notices the temple of Erechtheus, and those periodical sacrifices of an ox and a sheep, which we know to have been performed to a very late period of Athenian superstition[1]; and with respect to the political changes of Theseus, instead of naming all the cities of Attica, as he has done in the other provinces of Greece, he speaks of Athens alone, and of the people of Erechtheus, that terrible Δῆμος, whose first specimen of tyranny and ingratitude was the banishment of their great benefactor himself, whom they left to die an exile in the island of Scyrus. Theseus introduced the worship of Venus and Peitho[2]: that of Apollo Delphinius he appears to have found already established[3].

During the six or seven centuries which elapsed between the Trojan war, and the reign of Pisistratus, the Athenians seem to have

> Ἐνθάδε μιν ταύροισι καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἱλάονται·
> Κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων, περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν·
>
> Il. B. v. 546.

Another allusion to the Erechtheium occurs in the Odyssey, H. v. 78.

> . . . . . ἀπέδη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη
> * * * * * * * * * * *
> Ἵκετο δ' ἐς Μαραθῶνα καὶ εὐρυάγυιαν Ἀθήνην
> Δῦνε δ' Ἐρεχθῆος πυκινὸν δόμον. . . .

[1] Philochorus et Staphylus ap. Harpocrat. in Ἐπιδόσιον.

[2] Pausan. Attic. c. 22.

[3] Pausan. Attic. c. 19.

been not more engaged in foreign wars or internal commotions than was sufficient to maintain their martial spirit and free government, both of which were essential to the progress made by them in civilization, commerce, and a successful cultivation of the arts. The change of chief magistrate from king to decennial, and then to annual archon, indicates that gradual increase of popular authority, which ended in a purely democratical government. Solon, apparently aware of the evils to which these changes tended, endeavoured to correct them by enacting that none but men of a certain landed property should be eligible to magistracies; but the restriction was insufficient, or at least came too late. The excess of democratic power led to its usual result; and Pisistratus not only usurped all the functions of government to himself, but made them hereditary also in the persons of his two sons, which caused so strong a re-action in favour of democracy, that Cleisthenes, Cimon, and Pericles could only direct affairs by flattering the people, and adding to their privileges. Hence the lowest classes were made eligible to all offices, and were even paid for attending those multitudinous assemblies of the Pnyx and Theatre, which embarrassed all rational business, and threw the fate and character of the country

into the hands of those who might chance to possess the popular favour.

It was in the early part of this interval of time[1], that the Pelasgi, a people of uncertain origin, but who came to Athens from the northward, fortified the Acropolis for the Athenians, and obtained a settlement among them. As the Athenians had already built several temples, it would seem that the superior skill which recommended the Pelasgi to them was chiefly in the branch of military architecture; and it is not improbable that the Greeks were indebted to these people for that polygonal masonry which distinguishes some of their most ancient works of defence[2].

[1] B. C. 1192. Larcher Hist. d'Herod. tome 7.

[2] In this mode of building, the facing of the wall is entirely formed of large blocks of stones, which are for the most part irregular polygons, but which, however varied they may be in magnitude, or the number of their sides, are carefully fitted together without cement. It has been customary to denominate this kind of masonry Cyclopian; but without much propriety; for, from an inspection of the walls of Tiryns, which are cited by Pausanias, as the most remarkable Cyclopian work in Greece, as well as from his description of the structure of those walls, it is evident that they were not formed of artificial polygons, such as I have just described, but of rude masses of rock, the interstices of which were filled up with smaller stones; a mode of building essentially different from the beautiful masonry seen at Athens, (in the Pnyx), at Argos, Ambracia, Æniadæ, and so many other fortresses in Greece.

In the course of the same ages, we may suppose that several of the Athenian temples were founded or renewed upon a more magnificent plan. It was probably about the eighth century before the Christian æra that the Athenians built the Hecatompedum, or great temple of Minerva, in the Acropolis, which was then rendered necessary by the inadequacy of the temple of Minerva Polias to the increased dimensions of Athens, and to the multitudes assembled from every part of Greece, by the growing celebrity of the Panathenaic festival.

The usurpation[1] of the ambitious, but humane, enlightened, and patriotic Pisistratus, far from being an impediment to the prosperity of Athens, operated in aid of its rapid improvement in splendor and civilization, as has often happened when power has fallen into the hands of a person of taste and magnificence. By establishing a public library, and by editing the works of Homer, Pisistratus and his sons fixed the Muses at Athens.

Many fine examples of polygonal masonry are also found in Italy, in the ruins of some of the cities, which flourished in independence before the preponderance of Rome, and where this mode of building seems to have been introduced by the Pelasgi, or by whatever other Grecian people the Latins were indebted to for their alphabet, and for the Æolic dialect of the Greek language, which forms the basis of the Latin.

[1] B. C. 561.

They founded the temple of Apollo Pythius[1], and began the building of that of Jupiter Olympius[2]. They greatly advanced the dignity of the republic among the states of Greece, by raising each quinquennial revolution of the Panathenaic festival to a footing of equality with the other great assemblies of Greece; and it was not long after their time that the splendor and riches of Athens, by moving the envy and cupidity of the Persians, became one of the causes of the invasion of Attica, which was defeated at Marathon[3].

Hitherto, however, the progress of the useful and ornamental arts had not been greater at Athens than in many other parts of Greece, as at Sicyon, Corinth, Ægina, Argos, Thebes, and Sparta. Still less was she able to bestow that encouragement upon the arts which they received in the opulent republics of Asia; for, although her territory was more extensive, and her resources already greater than those of any other city of Greece Proper, except Sparta, we are told that, before the invasion of Xerxes, the whole annual revenue of the state did not exceed 130 talents[4].

[1] Thucyd. l. 6. c. 54. Meurs. Pisist. c. 9.

[2] Aristot. Polit. l. 4. c. 11. Vitruv. proem in l. 7.

[3] B. C. 490.

[4] Demosth. Philip. 4. p. 141. Reiske. This sum was equivalent at that period to about 300,000*l.* of our present cur-

It was to an event the most unlikely to produce such a result, that Athens was indebted for a degree of internal beauty and splendor, which no other Grecian city ever attained. The king of Persia, in directing against Greece an expedition of a magnitude unparalleled in the operations of one civilized nation against another, made the capture of Athens his principal object. His success was most fortunate for the Athenians; for, by forcing them to concentrate all their exertions in their fleet, in which they were as superior in numbers to each of the other states of Greece as they were in skill to the Persians, it led to their acquiring the chief honours of having obliged Xerxes to return in disgrace to Persia, accompanied with such a degree of influence in Greece, that even the rivals of Athens were under the necessity of giving up to her the future conduct of the war, now become exclusively naval. By these means the Athenians acquired an unlimited command over the resources of the greater part of the Greek islands, and of the colonies on the coasts of Asia, Macedonia, and Thrace; and thus, at the very moment when the destruction of their city rendered it necessary for them to renew all

rency. For some remarks on the relative value of the Attic talent at different periods, see the additional Note X. at the end of the volume.

their principal buildings, fortune gave them the means of indulging their taste and magnificence to the utmost extent. The same sources of wealth continued to enrich the republic during the fifty years which intervened between the victory of Salamis and the Peloponnesian war; and it was in this short space of time that all the edifices were constructed, which continued to be the chief pride and ornament of Attica, until barbarism resumed its reign in Greece.

If we follow literally the evidence of Herodotus[1], we must suppose that, after the retreat of the Persians, the Athenians had again to lay out every street in Athens, and that they had to renew every public building from its foundations. But experience shows that an invader, in the temporary possession of an enemy's capital, seldom has the power and leisure for destruction equal to his will; and that the total annihilation of massy buildings constructed of stone is a work of considerable difficulty[2]. It appears from Pausanias, that there still remained

[1] Herod. l. 9. c. 13.

[2] Among several existing ruins which might be named in proof of this observation, there is none more remarkable than Egyptian Thebes, whose magnificent remains, still bearing the marks of the Persian invaders, show, at the same time, how small a progress had been made in their destruction.

at Athens at a late period several monuments of an age anterior to the Persian war.

The remarks of that traveller, upon the temples of Bacchus and of the Dioscuri, and upon the state of the temples of Juno, in the Phaleric road, and of Ceres at Phalerum, cannot be reconciled with the words of Herodotus, unless we take those words in a sense admitting of considerable latitude and exception. It is probable that the vengeance of the Persians was chiefly directed against the works of defence, and against the most important of the public buildings. We have reason to believe that they destroyed the great temple of Minerva, in the Acropolis, so completely, that Themistocles had no scruples in applying the ruins to the repairing of the walls of the Acropolis, while with regard to the Odeium, Erechtheium, Lenæum, Anaceium, and the temples of Venus, and those of Vulcan and Apollo Pythius, the destruction was confined to the roofs and combustible parts only; so that they were probably left, together with a great number of the smaller fanes and heroa, in such a state, that it was not difficult to restore them.

The new buildings which rose at Athens in the half century of her highest renown and riches may be divided into those erected under the administrations of Themistocles, of Cimon,

and of Pericles. Utility appears to have been the sole object of the first of these great men. The private opulence and liberal disposition of Cimon inspired him with views of magnificence, which were completed by Pericles, at the expense of the tributary states.

The earliest of the buildings of Cimon was the temple of Theseus. The Pœcile, which was adorned with pictures, executed in part by the same artist who painted the Theseium, seems, from this circumstance, to have been nearly of the same date. The Dionysiac theatre, principally intended to furnish a place of representation for the tragedies of Æschylus, was begun about the same period, although it was not finished until long afterwards. The Stoæ, the Gymnasia, and the embellishments of the Academy and of the Agora, which Cimon executed in great part at his own expense, were probably the next in order; and it seems not to have been until after the battle of the Eurymedon[1] that the southern wall of the Acropolis and the Long Walls were built, the expense of these works having been chiefly defrayed out of the Persian spoils[2].

For Pericles was reserved the completion of the military works, which Themistocles had con-

[1] B. C. 470. [2] Plutarch in Cimon.

ceived, and which Cimon had partly executed. He made considerable progress also in the building of the new Erechtheium; he constructed some of the Stoæ of the Cerameicus; and probably repaired several of the temples destroyed by the Persians in various parts of Attica. But his great works were the entire construction, from the foundations, of those magnificent buildings, the mystic temple of Eleusis, the Parthenon, and the Propylæa; in all which we are at a loss whether most to admire the rapidity or the perfection of the execution.

But the meridian of Athenian prosperity was now passed. The Peloponnesian war gave a sudden check to the great designs of Pericles. The Lacedæmonians, in hostile invasion, were in sight from the walls of Athens; and during twenty-seven years, the necessities of an army of 32,000 men, and those of a navy of 300 triremes[1], left hardly a drachma disposable for the embellishment of the city.

[1] Meurs. de fortunâ Athenarum, c. 7. Attic. Lect. l. 1. c. 1.

The public revenue of Athens at this time was partly domestic and partly foreign. The former was chiefly derived from maritime commerce, the markets, the μετοικοι, or sojourners, the tribunals, and from the silver mines of Laurium, the profits of which were first applied to the expenses of the navy by Themistocles, in the Æginetic war. The origin of the foreign tribute paid to Athens was the sum

The command of the seas, which had enabled the Athenians to carry on the war with glory for so many years, in despite of the imprudence, inconsistency, and extravagance of

assessed by Aristides, after the retreat of Xerxes, upon the cities which did not send ships to join the Athenians in carrying on the war with Persia. This treasure, which was collected at Delus, was called ὁ ἐπ' Ἀριστείδου φόρος, and amounted annually to 460 talents, (Thucyd. l. 1. c. 96.) It was transferred to Athens, converted into a permanent revenue of the Athenian state, and increased to 600 talents, by Pericles, (Thucyd. l. 2. c. 13.) Alcibiades raised it to 900, (Andocid. adv. Alcib. p. 116. R.) and it was increased in the course of the Peloponnesian war to 1200 or 1300, (Æschin. de fals. leg. p. 337. R.—Plutarch in Aristid.) Aristophanes, who (Vesp. v. 657.) has enumerated the different sources of revenue, estimates the sum total at near 2000 talents; whereas Xenophon states its amount, both foreign and domestic, at 1000 only. It probably did not in any year exceed 1600 or 1800 talents, a sum equivalent at that period to about three millions and a half of our present currency. If such an income should appear inadequate to the support of so large a military establishment as that of Athens, and of which the land forces were often augmented by foreign mercenaries, and often employed upon foreign expeditions, it must be remembered, on the other hand, that the navy was in great part composed of triremes, fitted out at the expense of opulent Athenians, or by the maritime cities tributary to Athens; for the φόρος, or tribute in money, was chiefly supplied by the inland towns. The tributary cities appear from the comic poet, to have amounted in all to no less than a thousand.

Εἰσίν γὲ πόλεις χίλιαι αἳ νῦν τὸν φόρον ὑμῖν ἀπάγουσι.
Aristoph. Vesp. v. 705.

their government, was at length lost. Their rivals learnt to beat them upon their own element; and the loss of the army in Sicily, together with the defeat of the fleet at Ægusspotami, placed Athens at length at the mercy of the Lacedæmonians[1]. The only injury, however, which she suffered in her buildings, was the destruction (probably not very complete) of the Long Walls and walls of Peiræeus; and only ten years had elapsed, when the enemy having in their turn been defeated by Conon at Cnidus, the Athenians resumed their naval superiority in Greece, again commanded the resources of the greater part of the islands and colonies, and once more applied their wealth to the defence or adornment of the city. The Long Walls, and the walls of the maritime city, were re-established in the year after the battle of Cnidus[2]. The work was performed by the Persian fleet, and by the fleet of Conon, then lying in the Athenian harbours, by the Bœotian and Argive troops, then acting as auxiliaries to the Athenians, and by mercenary artificers attracted from every part of Greece by the liberal pay which Conon offered[3].

Athens had soon so far recovered from the

[1] B. C. 404. [2] B. C. 393.

[3] Xenoph. Hell. l. 4. c. 5. Diodor. Sic. l. 4. c. 85. Corn. Nep. in Conon.

effects of the Peloponnesian war, that, when the management of the finances fell into the hands of a prudent and active administration, the resources of the republic were almost as great as they had ever been[1]. The Dionysiac theatre was now completed, a stadium was constructed for the Panathenaic contests, and a Gymnasium was built in the Lyceium. Lycurgus, son of Lycophron, who had the credit of having caused the execution of these works, was not less attentive to the military safety of the republic, than to the ornament of the city. He formed a large magazine of offensive and defensive armour in the Acropolis, built covered docks for the ships of war in Peiræeus, and filled the storehouses with a complete equipment for 400 triremes[2].

[1] Plutarch de X Rhet. in Lycurg. According to a census taken in the year B. C. 377, the whole property of Attica, in lands, houses, and goods, was valued at about 6000 talents, (Polyb. l. 2. c. 62.—Demosth. περὶ συμμοριῶν, p. 183. R.) the talent being then equivalent to about 1450*l.* sterling, of the present day. An income-tax of ten per cent. upon the annual revenue of this property, would not raise much above 40,000*l.* sterling. The customs produced no more than 30 or 40 talents, (Andocid. de Myst. p. 66. R.) and the mines of Laurium had not improved. The φόρος, therefore, from the tributary cities must still have been the chief branch of Athenian revenue. Under Lycurgus it amounted to 1200 talents; but the talent was now less than half its value in the time of Pericles.

[2] Lycurgus died B. C. 328.

But the time was fast approaching when naval superiority over the republics of Greece, could no longer secure the preponderance, or even ensure the safety of Athens. Her own bright example, and the light of genius and science kindled within her walls, spread around her beyond the bounds of Greece, and produced the effects of order and civilization, among nations which had never entered into the political system of Greece, in the earlier periods of her history. Attica was unfortunately not an island; and as soon as all the natural resources of the fertile and extensive regions of Macedonia were called forth by a strong and enlightened government, the conflicting interests of a collection of republics could not long withstand the highly disciplined armies of a warlike nation, directed by the undivided councils of an active, crafty, and ambitious monarch.

Nothing at this time saved Athens, and the other states of Greece, from becoming dependencies of Macedonia, but the dispersion of the Macedonian power in the distant conquests of Egypt and Asia. The consequences of this dispersion, and of these conquests, totally changed the complexion of Grecian politics. Epirus and Ætolia, relieved from the pressure of Macedonian power, and rising above the disunited and uncivilized state, which had hitherto kept them

in obscurity, now obtained a considerable weight in the Grecian balance of power. The new kingdoms established in the east by the successors of Alexander, soon became members also of the Grecian system; and, by enlarging the boundaries of the language, manners, and civilization of Greece, brought the whole country from Sardinia to Persia within the scope of the Grecian statesman. Instead of confining his attention to a few small republics, acting upon one another, and upon one great foreign power, he had now to watch the motions, learn the interests, and speculate upon the designs of many powerful monarchies, among which Athens, deprived of a great part of her external influence, and soon rivalled, upon her favourite element, even by the republic of Rhodes, could not hope to enter as a power of equal rank, though still able to maintain a high degree of prosperity and political importance.

It was now her wisest course to side with the strongest. Such was the constant aim of the most able and honest of her later statesmen; and it was by means of her alliance with Macedonia, and afterwards with Rome, that she preserved her station during the remaining ages of independent Greece. At no period was Athens more happy and secure than when Demetrius of Phalerum, supported by a Macedonian gar-

rison, administered its affairs[1]. So flourishing was the revenue, that, among many other works undertaken at this time, a dodecastyle portico was added to the mystic temple at Eleusis, by the celebrated Philo; and the same architect was employed to build an arsenal in the Peiræeus, which was considered one of the most wonderful of the Athenian edifices. Twice only after this period did Athens suffer any material injury from hostile attacks. Having joined the Romans, assisted by the naval forces of Attalus, and the Rhodians, against Philip, the Macedonians invested Athens before the Romans could come to her assistance, demolished the groves of the suburban Gymnasia, and destroyed every building in the plain of Athens[2]. In the latter instance, by too readily espousing the cause of Mithridates, when he carried the war into Greece, and thus abandoning the alliance of Rome, she forgot the prudent policy which had been her protection for more than a century, and exposed herself to the vengeance of the most cruel of Roman conquerors[3].

The military importance of Athens expired

[1] Strabo, p. 398. The power of Demetrius, which lasted twelve years, ended in 307 B. C.

[2] B. C. 200. Liv. Hist. l. 31. c. 24, 26.

[3] B. C. 86.

at once with the destruction of the Peiraic fortifications by Sylla. Accumulation of capital, the attachment of commerce to an accustomed route, and commercial security, which increased as the Roman power became established by land and sea, may have still maintained a considerable degree of opulence in Athens; but her gradual downfall as a maritime state was inevitable: and, in less than a century after the siege by Sylla, the Athenian navy was almost extinct, little remained either of the Peiraic or Long Walls, and the maritime city was reduced to a cluster of habitations round each of the ports[1].

But the respect which the arms or political influence of Athens could no longer command, was still paid to the recollection of her former glory; to her having been, from the æra of the battle of Marathon, almost the sole depository of the science and literature of Greece; and to her still continuing to be the school in which were found the most skilful artists, and the best productions in architecture, sculpture, and painting.

Of the surrounding nations, there was not any in which this feeling had a stronger effect than among the Romans, who, from the period

[1] Strabo, p. 396. Lucan. Pharsal. l. 3. v. 181.

of the conquest of Corinth and Carthage[1], had applied themselves with a rapidly increasing ardour to Grecian arts and literature, and who, from that time, treated Athens with a filial respect and indulgence, which was in a certain degree shown to her even by Sylla himself[2]. Although Julius Cæsar had to pardon the Athenians for their adherence to the adverse party of Pompey, Antony for their having espoused the cause of Brutus and Cassius[3], and Augustus for the favours which they bestowed upon Antony, Athens received distinguished benefits from all these mighty Romans. Julius Cæsar bestowed some donations upon the city, which contributed to the erection of one of the still existing buildings[4]. Antony made Athens his favourite place of residence, during his frequent expeditions into the east; flattered the Athenians, by assuming their manners and mode of life; and bestowed upon them the islands of

[1] Corinth and Carthage were taken and destroyed in the same year, B. C. 146. 102 years afterwards, or B. C. 44, they were both restored and colonized by Julius Cæsar, (Appian. in R. Pun. ad fin.)

[2] Strabo, p. 398. Appian. Mithrid. c. 38, 39. Plutarch. in Sylla.

[3] The Athenians erected the statues of Brutus and Cassius, by the side of those of Harmodius and Aristogeiton, in the Cerameicus. Dion. Cass. l. 47. c. 20.

[4] The Propylæum of the new Agora. See the inscriptions upon this monument in Stuart's Ant. of Ath. vol. 1. c. 1.