The North Doorway of the Erechtheum

Author(s): Robt. Weir Schultz and E. A. Gardner

Source: *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, Vol. 12 (1891), pp. 1-16

Published by: [The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/623506>

Accessed: 29/01/2015 04:08

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at
<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

The Society for the Promotion of Hellenic Studies is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE NORTH DOORWAY OF THE ERECHTHEUM.

[PLATES I.—III.]

WHILE engaged recently on a careful analysis of the architectural detail of the Erechtheum, I chanced to observe certain peculiarities in connection with the north doorway which, as far as I am aware, have not been previously commented on, and which may be of sufficient importance to warrant my bringing them forward.

The date of the north doorway of the Erechtheum has been generally accepted as contemporary with that of the rest of the building, at least I have not found any published evidence which calls it in question: this of course excludes the thin inner linings which are supposed to have been added by the Christians when they turned the temple into a church. My investigations have led me to the conclusion that none of the original doorway is *in situ*, that the main jambs are of a period not far removed from the time of the building but not contemporary, and that the lintel, brackets and cornice are still later insertions. I shall endeavour in the following paper to state my reasons for these assumptions, and it may help us to follow them more clearly if we commence by observing the various parts which go to make up the composition of the doorway as it now stands.

First, then, we have the thin inner linings to the jambs and lintel, and inserted over these a second thin lintel piece; next come the main heavy door jambs, with their enriched mouldings and carved rosettes, extending each in one piece the whole height of the opening; resting entirely on these is the main lintel of a similar ornamental nature, with an additional moulding on the top worked on the same stone; and over this again is the cymatium or cornice, with a richly carved band of ornament running along its face. Abutting on the lintel at each end and apparently supporting the ends of this cornice were two carved brackets or consoles, one of which has disappeared. The combined depth of the lintel and cornice is equal to that of two courses of the adjacent walling. Above the doorway are two courses of plain walling, and over that again the band of richly carved so-called honeysuckle ornament and enriched moulding forming a continuation of the capitals of the antae along the wall face as a cornice, and coming immediately below the heavy-beamed and coffered ceiling of the portico.

We may now proceed to examine the evidence in favour of an earlier door, and in this connection I would draw attention to the fact that all the

lintels of the smaller existing doors are equal in height to two clear courses of the walling, while the present lintel of this the largest door in the building has two stones in the same depth.

Adjoining this present lintel on the west is a curious stone (Fig. 1) equal in depth to two of the wall courses and rebated on its upper part to allow the topmost of these two courses to lap over on to it. This may have been one end of the *original lintel* of the door. On the end abutting on the present lintel it has a carefully cut joint, but the finer arris from one to two inches wide, which we see on the return face of the other wall stones against the jambs, is wanting in this instance, which seems to be a further indication that the stone was cut short here and this end piece allowed to remain when the second lintel was inserted. This

FIG. 1.

appears to be the most reasonable explanation of the existence of this curious stone, which, as far as I can see, was not wanted for any other purpose. The rebating of the upper end can be very simply explained as a necessity in order to carry up the regular alternation of the jointing of the wall surface (see Plate II.). In the other doors, where the thick lintels have straight joints at the ends, this was not requisite, the door in the west wall having a string course immediately over it; and in the case of the small door in the north porch the lintel extends right across from the anta to the side of the large door.

At the other side of the lintel this rebated stone is not apparent, although it must have existed there also, but the deep part has been cut off

ALTERNATE COURSES

FIG. 2.

to allow of the insertion of the console, which on the west side was only dowelled on to the face of this stone. Another thing which tends to confirm me in my opinion about this lintel is that the courses of the north anta of the west wall of the building which comes immediately behind this rebated stone are, both above and below the lintel, formed, in conjunction with corresponding courses of the north wall, out of one stone, while the part of the anta behind this one stone is a separate piece two courses high, thus obviously showing that our rebated stone was part of a big lintel, otherwise there seems to be no reason why it should not have been wider and formed part of the anta like the others.

We will now turn for a moment to the references from the inscription,¹ and consider the position of the *θύραι* which were lying unfixed at the time the inventory was made. These were four in number, and were each of a length of eight and a quarter and of a breadth of two and a half *Attic feet*.

¹ See Appendix to this paper: 'Note on the Evidence from the Inscription' by E. A. Gardner.

The Attic foot was slightly less than an English foot, the latter being '305 of a metre and the former '296 or 11½ inches.¹ The length of each of these stones is therefore practically eight *English feet*.

These *θύραι* have been usually appropriated for the east door, but if we compare the relative heights of the two porticoes we shall see that there is a difference of nearly three and a half feet between them.² The east door must therefore have been proportionately smaller. I think we are thus safe in saying that they did not belong to the east door, which would have been about thirteen feet high. As to the smaller doors, although the height of eight feet would suit the one in the north portico, when we examine it we see that there is nothing to lead us to suppose that it ever had any linings at all. In the case of the one in the west wall, although it has been widened and the cill lowered in later times, it was always a subsidiary door and not generally seen, and originally it was too low to suit these; and it is unlikely that it was ever more than a plain opening like the other. Therefore, as they evidently did not belong to these smaller doors, let us see how they would do for the original north door. The height of the present door, leaving out of account the later Christian linings, measures sixteen English feet from the top of cill to the underside of lintel, so that two of these slabs placed one above the other on each side would exactly fit in. Having been mere linings to be fixed after, and not constructional parts, there was no particular reason why they should have been in one piece in height, and two stones would have been lighter and more easily raised and fixed. These *θύραι* might therefore very well have formed part of our first door. But we have not yet examined how their breadth, which is given at 2½ Attic feet, would fit in. 2½ Attic feet is equal to about 29 inches. The thickness of the wall adjoining the door measures 2 feet 2½ inches, or practically 26½ inches. Let us assume that they were fixed flush with the inside face of the wall as the present ones are, and we get a projection of 2½ inches beyond the face of the wall outside. This agrees with the projection of the moulding on a slab forming part of another door lining of a similar nature which is lying near the Erechtheum (Fig. 3), and which I shall refer to further on as likely to have been part of the east door.

I have already shown that the lintel of the first door was possibly a block of the height of two courses, built in as a structural part of the wall and rebated at ends for adjacent wall stones. We have also seen that it is probable that the jamb linings were thinner than those now in position, and were made of two stones in their height and fixed afterwards. We now come

¹ See W. Dörpfeld in the *Mittheil. d. Deutsch. Arch. Inst. zu Athen*, vol. vii. 1882, pp. 277 sqq. Since this article was set up in type another paper by Dr. Dörpfeld on this subject has appeared in the same periodical (1890, pp. 167 and 234) in which he withdraws his previous assertion that the Attic foot was '296 and tries to prove that it was '328, but his previous arguments seem at least as convincing in them-

selves as his later ones and have the advantage of being confirmed by the positive testimony of the Oxford Metrological relief. See article by Michaelis in this journal (*J.H.S.* Vol. IV. p. 335).

² See Penrose, *Athenian Architecture*. Plate 42 gives the height of the pillars of north portico as 25'030 feet. Plate 44 gives those of east portico as 21'612 feet.

to consider what was the decorative nature of this earlier door. I am inclined to say it was much simpler in every way.

The east door is generally thought to have been the main entrance to the temple or at least the entrance to its most sacred part, the shrine of Athena Polias. As I have already remarked, it must have been smaller in proportion to our north door, as the east portico is of less height. The decoration of the east portico is simpler than that of the north; the continuous ornamental band round the necks of the capitals and antae and along the wall is less elaborate, the bases to the columns are much plainer, having a series of simple parallel channels running round the upper and lower torus, as against the richer guilloche on those of the north pillars. I do not however think that this extra richness was given to the north portico as an approach to the

FIG. 3.

temple, but rather follow the view that it was done to emphasize it for its own sake as a special shrine outside the temple, the shrine in which stood the important altar of the *θυηχός*, and under which lay the sacred trident marks of Poseidon who shared with Athena the honour of the worship here. And these reasons may also account to a great extent for the squarer form of its plan, a form essentially more suitable to its peculiar purpose than the usual flat porch like that at the east end, which is more traditional of an approach to a shrine within.

Thus while the east portico was simpler, its doorway may have been more elaborate; and while the north portico was more decorative for its own sake, its doorway may have been plainer as being an entrance to a less sacred part of the temple. I am thus inclined to accept the view that the fragments of the somewhat elaborate doorway which I have alluded to as lying near the

Erechtheum (Fig. 3) belong to the destroyed eastern door and not, as one would have liked to suppose, to our original north door.¹

This we ought to feel more strongly when we know that no fragments of a third door have been brought to light. It is very likely that the Greeks removed completely the old pieces of the earlier door when they altered it; whereas the Christians, when they pulled down the east door to build their apse, probably used portions of it elsewhere, or at any rate as building material, and so these fragments have been preserved to us. These pieces give us valuable data for reconstructing our first door. I have already shown how they tally with the projection which our jambs would have had from the wall face. They are also comparatively thin ($6\frac{3}{4}$ inches), and a piece of the lintel remains showing the starting of a cornice moulding over that of the jambs. I should therefore say that our jambs were very similar but less ornamental, and that the lintel had the same mouldings running round it, with perhaps a simple cornice over.

Another important point to notice on these fragments is that the return in of this lining is only dressed back about two inches,² and beyond that it is rough. This leads me to think that the original doors had an additional lining of bronze inside the stone frame.

A PLAN OF THE DOOR

FIG. 4.

We now come to consider the door as it stands (Plates I. and II.).³ We will begin with the thin inner linings (a, a, Fig. 4), which can be put down

¹ Inwood (p. 15) mentions that two pieces of this door lining were found built into a late wall which used to stand immediately to the west of the Erechtheum. One piece is now in the British Museum.

² Letter A on figure 3.

³ See also figures 4 and 5 and details of the

same figures, plate III. figures 3 and 4. I should like here to draw attention to the fact that many of the details of this building which are given in Inwood's work (*The Erechtheion at Athens*, H. W. Inwood, F.S.A., London, 1831) and reproduced in the German edition (*Das Erechtheion zu Athen*, A. F. von Quast, Berlin,

as quite late, even later than the conversion of the temple into a church. They were undoubtedly added after the present lintel met with the accident

FIG. 5.

which cracked it across, and which broke away a considerable part of its lower surface; but when this happened we have no means of saying. It seems reasonable to suppose that these stones were put in to conceal this damage to the lintel rather than mainly to support it, for as a matter of fact they do very little of the latter (see Fig. 5). The top of the thin lintel is about five inches below the underside of the broken one; the second lintel piece is merely a facing to hide the damaged part of the main lintel, and it goes back only about six or eight inches at the foot, and is quite thin at the top and splayed away. The five-inch space between the two lintels shows clearly from the inside, and there are only a few small pieces of stone roughly put in as a prop at one end, which may have been done quite recently. Of the existing lintels the only one that is not cracked is the lowest of all. The feet of these thin inner linings are sunk in chases cut into the threshold about one inch deep.¹ The surface of these stones is very roughly dressed; you can see distinctly the chisel lines running the long way of the stones in parallel rows about half an inch wide, and with a slight ridge between each indicating that the workman held his chisel in a slightly bevelled manner while working; but although the manner of finishing the dressing is roughly done, the stones are fairly worked with a good level surface and bed. The ogee moulding tells us nothing as to the date.

Let us next examine the main part of the door. Possibly the first lintel was seriously damaged through an earthquake or from some other cause, and necessitated the insertion of

1840) are not actual outlines of the ornament and mouldings as they exist but are rather diagrams enlarged from the originals for use in the building of the church of St. Pancras,

London, the detail of which is an exact copy of that of the Erechtheum but to a considerably larger scale.

¹ See elevation of door, plate II.

another. It would have been difficult, almost impossible, to have cut out the whole of the lintel and replaced it as it stood, so they altered the arrangement and design of the door by putting in new heavy jambs (b, b, Fig. 4) in one stone strong enough to support the new lintel, and so did away with the necessity of again resting and tying it into the wall on each side; and to facilitate the raising of this lintel they made it in two pieces in height instead of in one stone, which would have been a great weight to lift and fix in position at one time.

The return face of the jambs and lintel into the door is smoothly dressed right through from back to front, which seems to show that when the thicker jambs were inserted the bronze inner lining which, as I have already observed, may have existed in the earlier door was done away with.

I feel convinced that the lintel now in position is not contemporary with the jambs. I take this view after a careful examination of the architectural detail. The ornament of the Erechtheum, although varying to some extent in elaboration or in minor points of detail, has still the same general characteristics throughout. The ornament on these door-jambs differs considerably from that on the rest of the building. The detail, however, is quite equal to that on any other part of the building for delicacy and excellence of execution, and here as elsewhere it shows a general refinement throughout. While on the lintel-stone, which repeats the same detail, it varies considerably in different places, alters its style and proportion, and is generally more clumsily done; in fact, it looks like the work of a man who had tried to copy what he found but lacked the spirit and appreciation to reproduce it with all the refinement of the original. This is to be noticed all through—on the running leaf ornament, which is much coarser, on the rosettes, and even in the plain mouldings. I do not mean to uphold a mechanical repetition; but what we find on this lintel is not legitimate variety, but rather general carelessness of execution. The bed moulding of the cornice, which may not have been copied from the older lintel but have been an addition or alteration when this one was made, is quite late in section when contrasted with other similar ones in the building; and the same remarks about the carving apply to the egg and tongue enrichment, where we find the foot of the eggs at one end are quite pointed and altogether different to those at the other. To return to the rosettes, those *on the jambs* (see Plate II.) have the centres bored out for the purpose of inserting a wooden plug on which was fixed a bronze disc. These circular holes taper slightly to allow of the wood being firmly wedged in.¹ Inwood mentions a bronze disc which was found amongst the rubbish formerly filling up this doorway, and the diameter of which would just fit the centre of these rosettes. It had been fixed to the wood by a bronze nail or pin going through a hole in the centre, and by four sharp points on the back. It was divided into twelve leaves like the rosettes.² On the lintel the centres are

¹ Remnants of these plugs still remain in some of the holes.

² Inwood thinks that this bronze disc belonged

to the door itself, which may have been bronze covered, but it is more likely that it formed the centre of one of the rosettes on the marble jamb,

solid of a convex form, and must have been merely painted or gilded over; and the general form and section of the leaves are much less refined.

I should therefore think that the first alteration to the door and the insertion of these second jambs took place very shortly after the completion of the building, say within fifty years, while the tradition of the carving and the accuracy of the workmanship and finish was still to be found; and that the lintel of that time having again become damaged was replaced by the present copy at a later date, perhaps contemporary with the columns and entablature of the temple of Jupiter Olympius, the enriched bed-mould of which corresponds fairly well with that on this stone.¹

Let us now look at the brackets or consoles on each side of the lintel. These, I consider, may have been put in when the lintel was renewed for the second time. The inscription tells us that the east door had consoles, but no mention is made of any on the north door, and it is probable that none existed here before this time.

I am inclined to believe that the second lintel had no bed-moulding and cymatium, or, if it had, that they were of a different character from the present ones. An interesting point to notice is that the width of the jambs and of the part of the lintel corresponding with them is exactly that of one course of the walling. There seems to have been some particular reason for making them of this width, and I think it may be explained in the following way. The second lintel was probably made in two pieces of equal thickness, the lower piece being the continuation of the mouldings of the sides; having narrowed the door by inserting heavier jambs, they probably thought that this thickness would be strong enough for the lintel. Over this they inserted a plain block or blocks, and either cut on them, having made them project slightly from the face of the wall, or fixed on in front afterwards, some ornamental scroll and leaf work in the form of an acroterion. There exists in the Central Museum at Athens the top of a stele of the beginning of the fourth century B.C. which was found in the Ceramicus, and which is ornamented in the way I mean. I have roughed out, as a mere suggestion, a sketch showing this treatment used thus over the lintel of the door (Fig. 6). This form of finishing was not an uncommon one amongst the Greeks. It often occurs on stelae, but I cannot recollect an example of its actual use on a doorway. Some of the restorations, however, of this identical north door of the Erechtheum show such a finish on the top of the present cornice,² although there are no marks or other indications to lead us to assume that anything had ever been placed there.

This construction allowed the lintel and stones over to be fixed without

as it was found in the rubbish filling up the doorway close to the underside of the bracket and far above the ground. It is quite probable that it had become detached from its wooden plug during the building up of the doorway and had remained where it fell. See Inwood, *Erechtheum*, page 15 and plate 20.

¹ I take Penrose's view (*Athenian Architecture*, p. 76) that this work at the temple of Jupiter Olympius is more likely to belong to the age of Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 175-164, than to the time of Augustus or Hadrian.

² See Inwood, *Erechtheum*, plate 3.

damaging the wall by cutting holes for supports. The broken lintel having been gradually cut out and let down, the wall over was supported by beams of wood running through under the stones above and resting on strong uprights both outside and inside of the wall. The jambs having been set up, the lintel was hoisted into position on the top, and the side bearers being removed, the smaller stones were inserted, taking part of the bearing of the wall on to them, and through them to the new lintel and jambs, and finally the central stone was put in.

When the lintel was again damaged and the third one substituted, as we have assumed during the second century B.C. or even later, the brackets were probably added for the first time.

FIG. 6.

This last lintel has a square joint at each end, rather rougher than we find in the earlier work; and against the east end abuts the bracket which still remains in position, and which is tailed right through the wall, the thicker part of the end of the first lintel having been cut off to make way for it. The bracket on the west side which no longer exists was only dowelled in to the face of the end of the old lintel, and the holes for the two dowels by which it was fixed are still visible (Fig. 1, see also Plate I).

The reason why this one did not also go through the wall may possibly be explained thus. The north anta of the west wall, as we have already noticed, being immediately behind this, any further cutting of the old lintel would have disturbed it and have been rather a difficult business. This may

not be very apparent as the anta now stands, as it is rebated back half its thickness (Fig. 7), and the stone could easily be got at from behind in

FIG. 7.

order to cut it; but I do not think that this rebating is earlier than the period when the west wall was altered to its later form, probably in Roman times; when these brackets were added to the doorway the anta stretched across the full thickness of the west wall. There are many points about these brackets which would lead one to suppose they were better workmanship than that of this later time, but on closer examination we see that the work is less careful in many parts. The whole design, how-

ever, is very good, as is also the general detail: the palmetto on face, for instance, being quite of the same character as those on the carved wall-bands. The inner side next the end of the lintel is only worked as far back as it can be seen, and the rest of it is plain. I cannot think that the men who built the Erechtheum would have, originally, placed brackets in this position, which seems to me both constructively and decoratively false, set back as they are, in reality supporting nothing and half hid behind the projecting architrave so that only a small part of the inner face can be seen, and their full value lost to any one standing in front of the door. The most we can say for them is that they may have been copied from the original consoles of the east door, which were probably of similar detail, but I trust more suitably placed in relation to the other parts of the composition. They also seem to me to be too small in proportion to the great architrave and cornice of this door as it now stands. It is curious to note how the tail part of the bracket, which is built into the wall, goes up the full height of the two courses, and is notched to receive the cymatium over it at the top, and how the leaf under, which is now broken away, has hung over the face of the stone below.

There remains yet the cymatium of the cornice for us to examine.¹ This stone, which is considerably thinner than the main lintel, goes right through the wall and is finished flush with inside face. It is longer where it projects beyond the wall, and is rebated to pass in front over the brackets (fig. 8).

FIG. 8.

I can hardly think that it is of the same date as the lintel and the brackets under it; the nature of its ornament varies so much from that on the others, in fact it is of quite a different type (plate III. fig. 2).

While that on the lintel and brackets is a fairly faithful copy, although, as I have

already said, wanting in the delicacy of the original, this on the cymatium is much rougher in composition and outline; and although evidently intended to be on the lines of that on the wall-band over (plate III. fig. 1)

¹ See section fig. 5 and detail on plate III. fig. 4.

—one can see at a glance the general similarity—it has been executed by a man who was not a mere copyist, but who worked in his own way, getting his main idea from something else but putting his own impression into it, and doing it in a way perhaps rougher and coarser but more straightforward. You notice this in every line. Compare the sections of the two ornaments and you see that he did not trouble about how it went on the original, but put it in as he thought it ought to go. You see it in the scrolls, in the curves, and in the leaves; they are bad in many ways, much worse than the Roman copyist would have done them, but they still show life and vigour. You will observe the difference between the deadness of a good Roman copy and the rough life which still existed in this later Greek work, if you compare it with the copies of Erechtheum detail on the remains of the temple of Rome and Augustus lying to the east of the Parthenon.

We must however, I think, believe that this cymatium is contemporary with the lintel and brackets, and that whereas in the latter the workman had to stick closely to a copy, in the former he had a freer rein. The line of the curve of the moulding shows us that it may very well be of the second or third century B.C., and there are various points in the carving which remind one of characteristics in the later Ionic temples in Asia Minor.

Before closing there are still one or two points of miscellaneous evidence to be considered.

On the underside of the stones immediately over the cornice are a series of somewhat roughly cut square holes about five inches wide by four inches deep, and going right through the wall from front to back.¹ These were almost certainly cut there, at the time the last lintel and cornice were inserted, for the beams necessary to temporarily support the wall. On account of the nature of the cornice stone these beams could not have been put in under the stones, which, as I have already explained, might have been done on a former occasion. There are six of these holes in all, three under each stone. On the top bed of the cornice there are also some flat sinkings corresponding to them in position and made no doubt during the progress of the fixing in order to get the stone more easily into its place. In the exact centre, from the ends, of the top bed of this cornice an oblong lewis hole is sunk in. It is $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide, $4\frac{1}{4}$ inches long, 4 inches deep, and about 1 inch longer at the foot, bevelling down at the ends but of the same width across. It is six inches back from the front of the cornice. If we were able to examine the top bed of the cornice under the wall we should probably find another hole further back. These were used for raising the stone which was balanced and drawn up much as we should do the same thing to-day.

The upright joints on either end of the main lintel were left from $1\frac{1}{4}$ inches to $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide in order to get the stone more easily into position.

¹ See d, d, fig. 5, and also plate II. The projection of the cornice of the doorway prevents these holes from being seen by any one standing in the portico below.

In these joints have been inserted iron wedges, probably two in the thickness of the wall, which could have been let down from above before the cornice was fixed. There still remains at the east end a wedge run in with lead, but I should not like to say it is an old one although it may be. In front these wide joints would be concealed to a great extent by the projection of the brackets, and at the back they may have been hid perhaps by a lining. On the back of the console block on the side next the lintel is a sunk hole which also extends across into the top of the lintel itself: a cramp has evidently been fixed here, let in from above before the cornice stone was put in position. I should think there were two of these in the width of the lintel stone.

The back of the main lintel is now very much broken away, but there are still traces of a series of bevelled holes running along its inner face about four inches above the underside. Two of these remain and they measure 4 inches long, $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches wide, and 4 inches deep, and they are bevelled wider as they go in. Assuming that they continued along at equal intervals there would have been eight in the length of the lintel. I should think they were used for the purpose of fixing a bronze hood or cornice over the doorway to receive the top of the door which was hung clear of the wall inside, as we know from the sockets for the hinges, which remain in the threshold. I have however found nothing to indicate the existence of a complete bronze lining round the door on the inner face of the wall.

On the top of each door jamb is a pin or dowel hole which has no corresponding sinking in the lintel over. These holes may have been used for dowelling on the second lintel and were probably discarded when the last one was inserted.

On the upper part of the jamb at the east side of the door and on the inside angle is a long rebate extending down four feet eight inches from the lintel (see plan of this, Fig. 9). It measures seven inches from the back and five inches from the side.

FIG. 9.

In one face of it are cut two small dowel holes one above the other. I do not find any trace of a similar sinking on the opposite jamb, but it might have existed as the jamb is very much broken away at this point. This rebate may have been for two purposes: either, the actual door was not the full height and a great flat slab was filled in across the upper part of the opening on the inside to this depth, or, this corner of the jamb had got damaged in fixing, and the defective part was cut out and a new piece inserted. The dowel holes seem to favour the latter view, which I think the more likely one.

In every course of the walling at the sides of the opening we find traces of iron cramps, sometimes one, sometimes two, in the width of the wall (c, c, c, fig. 4); they were of a T shape, the cross end having been fixed in the wall as it was built, and the tail projecting out to receive the jambs. Their principal use would have been to steady the jambs not to actually tie

them back, and the slightly wider and downward turn of the holes cut in the jambs themselves would be necessary in adjusting them into position. We must assume that they were intended originally for the thin earlier linings, and they may have extended right through the thickness of the slabs and been turned over or wedged up tightly from the outside. This would have been possible, as we have already shown how the inside face of the first jambs was probably rough and had an inner bronze casing. When these first linings were discarded the ends of the cramps were probably cut off and left, and the holes made to suit them in the present jambs.

Let us now sum up very briefly the main points which I have advanced. The door as it stands is presumably not the original one. The original door had a lintel the depth of two courses of the wall face. The original jambs were thinner casings and in two pieces in height, and were probably identical with the *θύραι* of the inscription. The original lintel having been damaged not long after the completion of the building it was cut out, leaving however the ends in, and the present heavy door jambs were inserted to support a second lintel which was again broken and gave place in its turn to the one which now exists.

At the time this last lintel was fixed, brackets were added to each side and a cornice inserted above, and, in order to do this, holes were cut in the wall stones over to take the beams necessary for their temporary support. The difference in the nature of the carving of the same ornaments on the jambs and lintel implies clearly that the latter must be of later time, and the workmanship of the cornice has none of the characteristics of contemporary Erechtheum work, but shows rather those of a later period. The brackets were of no use constructively but merely badly placed decorative shams. Along the inside of the lintel was probably fixed a bronze hood or capping over the door. The second jambs were steadied in their place by the iron cramps or dowels which had been used for the purpose of fixing the first linings. Last of all, the thin inner linings were put in in order to conceal, as much as possible, the damage to the present main lintel.

I do not offer this paper as a final solution of any of the points I have brought forward. I give my investigations and theories merely for what they are worth, trusting that they may open up grounds for a further and more complete analysis of this door and of the complex building of which it forms such an interesting part; and I venture to say in conclusion that, altered and transformed as I have endeavoured to prove it has been, the north doorway of the Erechtheum as it stands to-day is still the finest and most beautiful example of a doorway that has been handed down to us from classical times.

ROBT. WEIR SCHULTZ.

BRITISH ARCHÆOLOGICAL SCHOOL, ATHENS,
March, 1890.

APPENDIX.

NOTE ON THE EVIDENCE FROM THE INSCRIPTION.

AT Mr. Schultz's request I have collected the passages in the Erechtheum inscription which may be connected with the north door, and added such notes upon their interpretation as are necessary. For the architectural inferences deduced from these passages Mr. Schultz is alone responsible; but I have endeavoured to present them in such a form as to enable any reader to judge for himself whether they afford sufficient ground for the conclusions arrived at. No previous explanation of these passages in the inscription is satisfactory, or free from grave difficulties; and there is therefore every reason for applying to them a new theory, which certainly seems to suit them much better than any which has previously been suggested.

Several passages in the great Erechtheum inscription (*C. I. G. I.* 322; *Brit. Mus. Inscr.* (Hicks) I. xxxv.) have been or may be referred to the north door. The clearest of these is that which calls it the *θύρωμα*, and uses it to define the *πρόστασις ἢ πρὸς τοῦ θυρώματος*, which still lacked the altar of the *θυηχός* and parts of the roofing, clearly the north portico. But this tells us nothing about the door itself, except that it was a recognized and conspicuous part of the building. A second passage referred by Boeckh to this door must now be given up. The inventory, describing the unfinished parts of the building *in situ*, mentions certain portions as *ἀκατάξεστα*, lacking their final work and polish. Among these are 32 feet of the curved moulding (*γογγύλος λίθος*) of the internal wall (Hicks corrects *ἐντός*, for Boeckh's *ἐκτός*), and 48 feet of the wall in the *προστομαῖον*. Boeckh had read 8 for 48 (*τετραποδίας δ' ὅ* for *Δ Ι Ι*), and had suggested accordingly that *προστομαῖον* meant the lintel of the door; but with the change of the number his theory falls to the ground of itself. It may be added that no probable explanation has, to my knowledge, been suggested for *προστομαῖον*, for the number equally precludes Bötticher's suggestion that it is the little porch outside the S.W. door of the N. portico. But with the loss here of any reference to the N. door disappears all documentary evidence for its decoration with a richly decorated moulding such as we now see round it. Of course the silence of the documents cannot be quoted as evidence against such a moulding, for the lintel may have been finished before the rest and so be passed over in silence, or may have been mentioned in a missing part of the inscription. A third passage referring to some door or doors of the Erechtheum offers considerable difficulty. Among portions of the buildings lying on the ground, and partly or completely finished and ready to be set in their places, are mentioned the following:—

‘Four marble *θύραι*, $8\frac{1}{2}$ feet long and $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet broad. These were otherwise completely finished, *ἐς τὰ ζυγὰ δὲ ἔδει τοὺς λίθους τοὺς μέλανας ἐνθεῖναι*,’

which we may translate 'but there was wanting for the ζυγά the setting in of the black stones.'

The first problem is the meaning of θύραι and ζυγά. In an inscription (Michaelis' *Parth.* p. 317) the word θύραι is used to mean the leaves of the great door of the Hecatompedos, and ζυγά for the 'rails' of the same door. Michaelis seems to think that the same meanings must be accepted in this Erechtheum inscription; and if so, all attempts to associate the inscription with extant parts of the building must be given up. But there are serious difficulties in the way of such an interpretation, especially since a door with marble leaves seems very improbable; and therefore most authorities have taken θύραι to mean jambs and ζυγά to mean lintel and cornice. The principal objection to this is that in such a case the obvious method of description would have been to mention two θύραι and two ζυγά—not to mention four θύραι and in the very next line to call two of them ζυγά—at least in a list intended to be readily intelligible. That ζυγά should be first included under θύραι and then used to mean ὑπέρθυρον, which occurs in the next line in its proper sense, seems an absurd suggestion, unless it was the intention of those who make this inventory to puzzle their successors. Throughout the rest of the inscription all technical terms seem to be used, so far as can be judged, with perfect accuracy. Again, if ζυγά meant lintel and cornice, it is hard to see why the lintel, cornice, and upper parts of the two jambs, as Boeckh suggests, should be in four pieces of equal length and breadth, while the lower parts of the jambs were not prepared at all. On the other hand, the number four precludes our supposing that the lintel only and jambs are meant by the θύραι. The only explanation left, therefore, is that these four θύραι, if they belong to one door, must be the upper and lower part of the jamb on each side, each jamb being made in two parts, to avoid the awkward necessity of a block of marble $16\frac{1}{2}$ Attic feet long by $2\frac{1}{2}$ feet broad. This measurement I give merely from the inscription; the accuracy with which it fits the aperture of the north door of the Erechtheum is very remarkable, and might alone suggest the inference which Mr. Schultz has drawn from quite different evidence. The measurement is, on the other hand, much too large for the east door of the Erechtheum, with which Boeckh and others associated their θύραι.

If then these four θύραι are the jambs, what are we to make of the ζυγά? This is a difficulty I cannot solve with certainty; and I doubt if it can be solved without a more exact knowledge than we possess of the meaning of the architectural terms employed. But I may add that no even probable explanation seems to have been suggested by those who have adopted other interpretations, and therefore that my interpretation is in this respect no worse—though no better—than theirs. One thing is clear—the ζυγά must be some part of the θύραι as we see from the expression 'τούτων τὰ μὲν ἄλλα ἐξετετέλεστο, ἐς δὲ τὰ ζυγά ἔδει κ.τ.λ.' So far as we can judge from the usual meanings of the word, ζυγά ought to signify cross-bars of some sort; and for these—or into these—black stones were to be let in. I do not know that we can get any nearer to the meaning than this. If we possessed the

original jambs, we should probably be able to make it out; but those who have compared conjectural restorations of any building or part of a building with the original, when discovered, know how little use there is in theorizing on such a matter, and how little probability of hitting on the real meaning.

One more passage may be noticed, which immediately succeeds the last; it mentions an *οὔς* or console for the cornice of the east door, half finished.

The order here is worth noticing. After stones for the pediment, the inventory mentions as lying on the ground these *θύραι*, then the console for the east door, and then the stones for the altar of the *θυηχός* in the north portico. I do not think we can infer much from this; but it does not seem to tell for Boeckh's association of the *θύραι* with the east door; if the console belonged to the same door as the *θύραι* mentioned immediately before, it seems improbable that the east door would be mentioned in connexion with the console only.

E. A. GARDNER.

THE NORTH DOORWAY OF THE ERECHTHEUM.

THE NORTH DOORWAY OF THE ERECHTHEUM

DETAIL OF ORNAMENT ON WALL BAND OVER DOOR.

FIG. 1.

DETAIL OF ORNAMENT ON CYMATIUM OF

FIG. 2.

A SECTION THROUGH THE JAMB LINING
WITH A DETAIL OF THEIR ORNAMENT

FIG. 3.

CYMATIUM OF CORNICE OF DOOR.

G. 2.

JAMB LININGS
ORNAMENT

6 inches

FIG. 4.

LS OF THE NORTH DOORWAY.