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There is an enormous diversity of design work that can be found on Greek archaeological sites. While working for the Mt. Lykaion Excavation and Survey Project in Greece (seasons 2013-15), having the opportunity to visit ancient sites and see the ways we go about representing archaeological material, a rather simple divide became visible: In some instances a site gets the royal reconstruction treatment with local stone and local masons. In others, a site gets nuts, bolts, and plywood. Or somebody’s sketch printed on a sign that’s tastefully small and set out of the way so as not to impact a visitor’s core interpretation of something. Why is it appropriate to re-make one thing, to design something entirely new where another thing used to be, and yet still other times not appropriate to do anything at all? In other words, what’s the difference between the Menelaion and the Parthenon?

The hypothesis of this thesis is that the most important conceptual reason for this methodological divide lay in how defensible our idea of any given piece of the past is. Our idea of the original form of the Parthenon is very defensible. It’s tenable, so to speak. Its past is so storied, we can inhabit the details. We can talk about a period of significance for the Parthenon. On the contrary, the Bath House
at Mt. Lykaion is like a puzzle with half the pieces missing. If I were just to try and draw up a restored plan, we could populate a second thesis with the possibilities. And yet, although the pieces of Lykaion that remain are few and disparate, why should the site be confined to nuts and bolts and plywood? At the heart of this question is the fact that tenable sites are quite not restricted to practical preservation efforts, whereas untenable sites often are. The way a preservationist treats the problem of depicting a piece of the past (or presenting it for interpretation) is directly related to how much or how little we know about it.

We can draw a line between these two types of sites. We can classify them. This helps to make light of what kind of preservation work is appropriate at either. And so the question becomes how should we treat those sites, our full image of which is untenable at best? How can we contend with Mt. Lykaion? Can we describe a method of preservation that lies somewhere in between a steel beast of practicality that says “anything but shedding water is beside the point,” and anastylosis?

While these are very old questions, their position in the discourse of preservation is relatively young, and largely concerned with protective enclosures. The vast majority of literature and materials concerning the architecture of sheds has been produced in the last thirty years. Though a number of earlier cases do exist—Herculaneum, Pompeii, even the shed designed by Frederick Law Olmstead Jr. for the archaeological site at Casa Grande, in southern Arizona—the protective treatment of ruins as a critical discipline began to grow rapidly in the post war period.

In the early 1960’s, shed design and experimental anastylosis cropped up, simply put, as a reactionary line of thinking prompted by the pressing need for European nations to deal with the problems that the Second World War had caused for sites of cultural heritage.
While the architectural Avant-Garde, through outfits like the Florentine-based Superstudio were busy railing against what they perceived to be a strangling sense of historicism by the early 1970s, other architects like Andrea Bruno and Franco Minissi were already deeply involved in generating the theoretical discourse surrounding revitalizing and reinvigorating heritage sites by way of design.

To gain a simple statistical overview of the growth of this paradigm we can look at the Getty Conservation Institute’s 2013 publication of an extensive catalog, specifically concerning the conservation of mosaics in situ. In the Getty’s review of archaeological shelters, 218 references are made. Of them, 4 date to the 1960’s, 1 dates to the 1970’s, 43 in the 1980’s, 52 more in the 1990’s, and by 2007 another 118 projects or papers on protective shelters alone were published.¹ This growth helps explain the young age of the paradigm. It is still important the realize that the focus of that research was primarily mosaic conservation, and while useful in explaining the growing trend in both protective and experimentally protective thought through the last few decades, a body of non-shed projects are quite conspicuously absent, begging the question of what rubric the authors made for excluding material from their catalog. No mention is made of the enormous effort at the Athenian Acropolis made by Bernard Tschumi in 2009, for example. This thesis would be remiss to dismiss the architectural works of Marcello Guido, Alberto Bruno, Peter Zumthor, and all.

What we find across the board is that a number of attempts have been made in the case of sheds to define operable design criteria. Still, design criteria for preventative measures vary from site to site, from project to project. The evaluation of the success of a structure is either not undertaken to any convincing degree or it’s accepted that a structure has rather obviously failed (see the shelter at the Temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassae, for example,

¹. Conservation of Mosaics in Situ literature review, Getty Conservation Institute. 60
or Minissi’s work at the Teatro Heracleo Minoa). If we move out of the realm of sheds, however, there are a wealth of interesting approaches to supplementation, infill, or speculative completion. In an article published in E-Flux Magazine in 2015, Professor Jorge Otero-Pailos proposed that supplementing a decaying monument is predicated on what he called an ‘editorial viewpoint,’ meaning that installations are necessarily interpretive, in a hierarchical sense. In order to restore an architectural monument, some decision must be made about the significance of that monument—which is then reinforced by the nature of the architectural supplement. This editorial viewpoint implicates the architect in actively re-designing the significance of a monument. Professor Otero-Pailos went on to propose the neologism ‘Monumentary’ to categorize these objects which have been altered in some way that not only acts to preserve the material but also serves an expressive, sometimes pedagogical purpose.

In pursuit of finding a method of design for untenable sites, the goal of this thesis is to propose a design intervention at Mt. Lykaion. This intervention (or set of interventions) will be educated by the classification of sites described herein, and in further detail below, as well as by classifying the types of work which are commonplace in this sector. By identifying a site typology, and three major installation typologies, the design proposal for Mt. Lykaion will address the great need for a theory of design (or experimental anastylosis) on untenable sites.

Just as the design must be informed by the cannon of preservationist thought, it must also be derived from an understanding of the historical significance of the site, and of its character both ancient and contemporary. This thesis is structured

---

2. Jeffries, presentation materials from the IIC conference in Istanbul in 2010 depict the structure’s issues
3. Stanley-Price, The Decision to Shelter Archaeological Sites, describes the greenhouse effect and vegetation problems caused by Minissi’s plexiglass installations.
4. Otero-Pailos, Monumentaries: Toward a Theory of the Apergon. 2015
to give a historical account of the significance of the site first. Then, a brief overview of modern and contemporary excavation efforts undertaken at Lykaion. With an understanding of the historic role of the site, we will look at the ways in which an architectural method can be incorporated into the evolving interpretation of a place, for better and for worse. The objects proposed for Lykaion will have an irrevocable effect on the way visitors see and interact with the site. The following chapter will include a discussion of site typologies and intervention typologies, and relevant precedent studies. Finally, the thesis will outline the design theory and strategy, and present the structures conceived for Mt. Lykaion.
The significance of Mt. Lykaion extends, as we will see, into pre-classical, pre-archaic, and as far back as pre-historic eras. Today, the site is occupied by a contemporary excavation (working since 2004), and is home to a number of local Greek communities. In addition, much of the architectural material (the ruins) on site has been moved, removed, destroyed, lost, or is on rare occasion incorporated by local shepherds into vernacular constructions—which date from the Byzantine era to present-day. The site is very active, and little-to-nothing is being done to protect Lykaion’s architectural heritage. Moreover, interpreting the site’s ancient character is a task founded on understanding the information collected in the state plan; an initiative of the current excavation.

Because of Lykaion’s scattered, hyper-ruined state, both
interpreting the architecture on site and protecting it from activity and exposure to the elements are quite difficult. And yet, while the present-day character of the site is an important dimension of the significance of Lykaion, in order to understand the full scope of heritage in this place we must begin by looking at the mountain’s role in the archaic world.

The ancient Greeks maintained a rather whimsical amount of disagreement concerning the mythological birthplace of Zeus. Though contested, regional differences likely did less in the way of establishing the truth of such a matter, and more in the way of expressing the particular details of Zeus’s involvement with the character of either place. By most accounts Zeus—the greatest of all Olympian gods—was the son of Kronos and Rhea, though there are many different versions of the story of his birth. According Hesiod, Kronos had at some point taken to swallowing his children whole immediately after they were born for fear of one of them eventually rising to succeed his rule. Rhea, terrified for the life of her yet unborn son Zeus, sought the advice of Uranus and Ge toward his protection, and she was sent to Lyetos in Crete. And so Zeus was born in a cave on Mt. Aegaeon and to conceal his life Rhea presented Kronos with a swaddled stone which he devoured, believing it to be the infant Zeus.⁵ By Homeric tradition, it wasn’t Mt. Aegaeon but rather a cave on Mt. Ida to which Rhea fled.⁶ This account is the most prevalent, though the Cave of Rhea is an object of folklore not unlike the shards of the crucifix in Christian tradition; find any pilgrimage church in Europe and it will boast a splinter of the exact, original tree, but put them all together and the cross would stand ten miles high.

Of all the accounts of the origin of Zeus, there are two which remain the most compelling; one simply for the breadth of tradition, and another which was advocated in antiquity, and has gained an

---

5. Hesiod, Theog. 453-491
incredible dimension of archaeological weight in very recent history. According to the Cretans (and Homer, recall), Zeus was born in a cave on the slopes of Mt. Ida; on Crete. And yet according to the rest of the Peloponnesus, Zeus was an Arkadian. In the 3rd Century BCE, a Greek poet by the name of Callimachus opened a series of hymns with a verse addressing Zeus. In this famous hymn Callimachus beseeches him personally to confess whereupon he was born in truth. He writes:

“How shall we sing of him? As lord of Dicte [Crete] or Lycaeum? My soul is all in doubt since debated is his birth. O Zeus, some say that thou wert born on the hills of Ida, others, O Zeus, say in Arkadia; did these or those, O Father, lie? Cretans always lie.”

Down the northeastern slopes of Mt. Lykaion there lies a ridge, called Cretea, and on that ridge the Arkadians had found their own Cave of Rhea. Here was reared Lykaion Zeus, and his cult established a massive pre-classical sanctuary at Mt. Lykaion very early on. The sprawling sanctuary at Lykaion stretches across the entire southern summit of the mountain, and though the architectural remains are estimated to be 5th Century BCE at the oldest, the archaeological evidence of ritualistic activity and likely an archaic (non-monumental) architectural presence stretches back quite a bit further. What is it which makes Callimachus’s curious endorsement of the Arkadian origin story to compelling? In order to address this question, we must make a brief departure to evidence uncovered very recently by the contemporary excavation.

At the summit of Lykaion, there is an ash altar dedicated to Zeus whereupon votive offerings and animal sacrifice took place in his honor. Excavations at the altar reveal that the soil here is predominantly ash up to a depth of 1.5m. However, in 2007, modern

7. Callimachus, Hymns I: To Zeus; LCL 39 p. 36-37
excavations uncovered scorched bones, ashes, and other evidence of ritualistic animal sacrifices to a deity which pre-dates Zeus on Mt. Lykaion. Ceramic fragments from this material are estimated to be of the 4th millennium BCE—the Final Neolithic Period—a full 900 years before Greek-speaking peoples and their religious tradition are commonly thought to have migrated south from the Balkans. By the very oldest account, Zeus appears as a figure of early Greek mythology only by 1400 BCE, referenced by Linear B texts. The implications of this discovery are broad.

Dr. David Gilman Romano, the present co-Director of the excavation taking place since 2004 on Mt. Lykaion said of the findings that they “suggest that the tradition of devotion to some divinity on that spot is very ancient,” and that it “very likely predates the introduction of Zeus in the Greek world.” His contemporaries tend to agree. What this means for the way we read Callimachus is that the Arkadian tradition of Zeus’s birth might be understood as the cultural memory of a migratory adaptation of the local traditions by

---

8. Wilford, New York Times
9. Ibid.
the very early Greeks. The lines between ritualistic canon and the archaeological narrative become quite thin. We might consider that when we discuss the birth of Zeus on Mt. Lykaion, we are referring to the pre-archaic emergence of the Greek identity. Speaking on the findings, the Director of the Institute of Archaeology and Antiquity at the University of Birmingham in England, Ken Dowden, found the notion to be not only a compelling one, but a precedented one. “Christians would on occasion reuse a pagan sanctuary in order to transfer allegiance from the preceding religion to Christianity.”¹⁰ The adaptation and amalgamation of localized tradition is one of the most common phenomenon involved not only in the spread of ideology by conquest, but in the development of associated architectural languages as well. While the precise nature of the earliest inhabitation of Mount. Lykaion remains opaque, the archaeological evidence suggests that the site was a crucible for the pre-archaic development of the Greek.

01 The Ancient Site
b. Contextualizing the 5th Century Remains at Lykaion

What we see left on site in the form of fragmentary, monumental architecture is only roughly as old as the 5th Century BCE. Already, a gap is visible in the typology of archaeological evidence present on sites like Lykaion in Greece. In order to contextualize what architectural remnants are left at Lykaion, and in the hopes of understanding what it is that remains and why it remains, it is prudent to place the construction at Lykaion in the broader scope of architectural development in Greece at large. Before approximately the 7th Century BCE (this date varies by location for a number of reasons¹¹), the findings are small by comparison, so to speak.

¹⁰. Ibid., as cited by Wilford
¹¹. Development in this way would have been regionally dependent on a list of factors including funding available, architectural skills, skilled labor, and quality of education
Bone fragments, studies of soil composition and stratigraphy, ceramics, votive offerings; broadly cast: the accouterments of life. Beginning as early as the 7th Century, however, architecture makes a dramatic entrance into the typology of remnants by sheer virtue of the permanence of stone construction. It was at this critical juncture in the history of all Western culture that the fabric of the built environment begins to turn to stone. The petrification of architecture in the pre-classical world has remained a topic of both archaeological and architectural fascination since Vitruvius first attempted to explain the origin of the Orders (and even still Vitruvius resorted to folklore and anecdote, himself). The earliest stages of the transition from a wooden architecture to stone are uncertain. J.J. Coulton argues in his exploration of this question, “Ancient Greek Architects at Work,” that the Greek colonial presence in Egypt prior to the 7th Century must have had a reverent effect on her own comparatively adolescent methods of building. The migration of Egyptian monumental design, theory, and construction methodology would not have happened quickly; the nature of, the duration of, and the intensity of this suggested period of Egyptian influence is unclear.

At the same time, occurring between the 8th Century and the beginning of the 6th Century BCE, it is important to keep in mind that the birth of monumental architecture coincides with a paradigm shift in what we might otherwise refer to as the Greek Way; a phenomenon not unlike Edith Hamilton’s Miracle in spirit and in all-encompassing nature. And that was, as Coulton describes it, a “marked growth of interest in the Heroic past of Greece.”

12. Vitruvius writes in the first chapter of Ten Books on Architecture that Callimachus passed by an acanthus plant which had grown around the funerary monument set at a young girl’s grave and come to hoist the monument up into the air. Struck by its beauty, he designed the Corinthian order to reflect the image of an acanthus growing round the funerary icon.
13. Coulton, pg. 24
14. In reference to Edith Hamilton’s treatment of the nature of onset of Classical Greek culture; The Greek Way
15. Coulton, p. 30
sake of clarity, let us consider these events chronologically.

Up until about 750 BCE, there is no remaining trace of any Greek architecture. Impermanent, practical, utilitarian, vernacular, constructed with local materials; what was built prior to this point we might call simply folk architecture. By the middle of the 8th Century, primarily in Athens among other locations, the tradition of marking graves with massive pots and ceramics on the scale of a meter and a half high appears, signaling the desire to memorialize or to construct some type of lasting effect.16 It is by no chance that during this time the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are completed, and as works of literature become inextricably woven into the conception of the Greek identity. It is here for example that the temple typology as every student of classical architecture knows it, is born. How or why, is another question altogether and one which could be considered the father of those questions of order and ornament. We might say in an abstract sense that those architectural aspects which were born into convention during this era were registers of the desire for a sense of Heroic permanence. Viewed as a form of condensation, such conventions or registers act as transitional objects, which mark the awakening of the Greek. The form of the plinth, the presence of the colonnade and portico, the necessity of the cella and cult image—all facets of the typology that follow closely on the heels of this paradigm shift, which leaves in its wake the need for a timeless presence to be sought out, established, and perfected. There is a Greek term (which will be discussed in some depth later on) which belonged to the architectural trade and acted to conflate the act of writing with the act of drawing. That tool, called the anagraph (xxx), bore the responsibility of translating an idea to a construction. It is in this space where drawing and writing are inseparable from the notion of design and which is so fundamentally Greek, that we find the act of architecture so well prepared to contend with depicting the past.

---

Around this time in the 8th Century, lasting grave-markings become prevalent in Greek culture. The tradition of epic prose and the Heroic past of Greece is composed. Architecture begins to solidify into a permanent cultural fixture. The influence of the Egyptian scale matures. Greek architects of this period turn to the cyclopean Bronze Age remnants of a past they have forgotten to educate the architecture of the next age. While the exact nature of how these changes occurred is a question that remains unanswered, Coulton touches very briefly on an architectural point which I would like to press; one which will become a relevant thread of the design process. It begins with the 8th Century Greek’s interest in the Heroic Past.

In the early 8th Century the Temple of Hera at Samos was constructed. While it was re-constructed over the next hundred years as the Doric type developed, it is the original folk scheme which is so fascinating in terms of ambition; it can be seen in some sense as an admission of a young rhetoric. The temple consists of an elongated proto-cella which is little more than a long hallway open on one end. Directly down the center of the space stood a row of columns which supported a roof structure, likely either thatched or flat clay. 17 Inside

17. Coulton p. 31
this space, however, the cult image would not have been able to be set on center—as would quickly become a matter of architectural integrity of the highest degree. At Samos I, the rather crude compromise was the displacement of the image; set off-axis to one side of the central colonnade. This compromise might be understood as an admission of failure. That the proper structure of the space was forsaken in an attempt to press a different ideal altogether.

Along a similar vein, perhaps most peculiar is the nature of the portico. Hera at Samos is encapsulated by the oldest known portico in Greek architecture, and yet at Samos I it appears to have absolutely no structural value at all. Moreover, the portico is set outside the cella wall at a distance of only 1.3m, rendering it a poor option for providing any sort of practical shelter or serving as a functional ambulatory. Non-structural, non-functional, the earliest Greek portico appears as a beast of aesthetic at a time when Homeric tradition is breathing new life into the romanticized depiction of the immaculate porticoes that characterized the new Heroic image of the Bronze Age palace. While Coulton presents this connection, he does so only in passing. The literary implication is quite striking, however. That Samos was “quite far away in time and in space”\textsuperscript{18} allows for this arguably childish misinterpretation of the Heroic aesthetic; something which might have influenced the 8\textsuperscript{th} Century Greek architect in his search for a way to imbue the present with the weight of the past. The literary nature of the hypothesis, however conjectural, is a compelling new dimension to our understanding of the evolution of monumental architecture.

\textsuperscript{18} Coulton, p. 31
Over the course of the 7th Century, material evidence of the shift from wood to stone is understandably scant; anything prior to the new petrified method has simply worn away if it wasn’t already replaced in antiquity. We do find evidence of the finals stages of that conversion—which illustrates the slow, likely economically driven transition from wooden form to stone form in Greece—visible in the development of the Temple of Hera at Olympia, constructed in the early 6th Century.19 The temple is raised on a base of masonry blocks which form the foundation, the stereobates and stylobate of the plinth, and the lower courses of the cella walls. Likely due to economic strain20 the upper portions of the temple were constructed of wood and mud block, and the columns initially of wood as well. The cheap, archaic posts were replaced by monumental Doric columns over time. According to Pausanias, a Roman traveler and historian, there was still at least one wooden column in place on the rear of the temple as late as AD 170.21 As it was put so elegantly by Coulton in his treatment of the temple, “—the development of

19. E. Curtis, F. Adler (Olympia excavation 1890-7)
20. Coulton, p. 44
21. Pausanias, Description of Greece 5.16.1
monumental architecture in Greece was not precisely unlike a dose of hemlock, producing a slow petrification that worked steadily up from the ground”

22. Coulton, p. 43

Fig 06: Temple of Hera at Olympia; Plan and Elevation
By the time we come to the likely period of construction of what remains at Lykaion in the 5th-4th Century BCE, the Greeks have been comfortably working in stone for some 2-300 years. We have established, however, the pre-archaic nature of the site, which is to say that what we see of Lykaion architecturally today is only what remains of this particular period forward. The folk presence maintained on site for thousands of years prior forms the foundation for what Lykaion would become in the Classical and eventually the Hellenistic period.

Fig 07: The Parrhasian Heritage Park, Arkadia
Mount Lykaion lies in a central region of the Peloponnesus known since ancient times as Parrhasia. From this peak, almost all of the Peloponnesus is visible on a clear day—from the Eurotas river valley leading to Taygetos and Sparta to the bay of Pylos, from Mt. Minthi to modern day Kalamata, Mt. Lykaion lies at the symbolic and strategic heart of Arkadia, very near the tri-fold border of all three Parrhasian prefectures: Elis, Messenia, and Arkadia. The archaeological site at Lykaion consists of two major areas: The Upper Sanctuary and the Lower Sanctuary. The Upper Sanctuary includes the temenos, the Columns of Zeus, and the Ash Altar. The Lower Sanctuary rests just below the summit, and includes the main architectural body of the site; ten buildings or otherwise unidentified architectural ruins are located in the Lower Sanctuary. Few first-hand accounts from this period exist which document Lykaion in any significant analytical detail outside of what inscriptions and stele were excavated on site.

*Fig 08: Mt. Lykaion, Lower Sanctuary*
The primary function of the Lower Sanctuary during this period was athletic in nature. The inscriptions in question are all directly related to the ancient Lykaion Games—a festival of athletic events which rivaled the Olympic games in size and renown.\textsuperscript{23} It has been suggested further that the Lykaion Games even predate those famously held at Olympia.\textsuperscript{24} The Games were known well enough to earn mentions from a number of reputable sources including Pliny, Pindar, and Plutarch alike. Participants traveled to Lykaion from all over Greece; the islands, the Peloponnesus, and from the mainland as far north as Thrace for a chance to compete.\textsuperscript{25} Victor inscriptions made during this period give us scarce details about the nature of the athletic events held on site outside of names, dates, events, and locations. While the Lykaion Games form a significant portion of the site’s importance during the Classical period, Thucydides makes a notable mention of Lykaion in reference to the Peloponnesian War; one which further serves to illustrate the Pan-Hellenic importance of the Sanctuary of Zeus.

According to Thucydides, the Spartan King Pleistoanax was exiled for treachery involving negotiating a retreat with the Athenians during a military engagement. For his crimes, Pleistoanax was cast out of Sparta into Arkadia, where he made his home in the temenos at Mount Lykaion. That Pleistoanax lived in the temenos is no coincidence. There are a number of legends surrounding the sacred area at the summit of Lykaion; Pausanias tells us that the sun will cast no shadow inside the precinct.\textsuperscript{26} It is also known that any who

\textsuperscript{23} Compiled by D.G. Romano and M.E. Voyatzis; listed in Hesperia, 2014.
\textsuperscript{24} Upon arriving in Ano Karyes in 2003, the villagers pressed the excavation to locate proof of this, discussed in Expedition Vol. 52 no.1: Excavating at the Birthplace of Zeus
\textsuperscript{25} In the village of Ano Karyes, the nearest modern town to the summit of Lykaion, a ‘museum’ is set up which houses a number of artifacts that the villagers have saved over the centuries not only from the site, but from the history of their village as well. Among these objects are several ancient inscriptions removed from the site, listing the names of ancient victors of the Lykaion Games. They sit year round in the company of old farming equipment, and grainy photographs of family members.
\textsuperscript{26} Polybius, Histories; 16.12.7
venture into the temenos would die within the year.\textsuperscript{27} Thucydides tells us that Pleistoanax lived here free of this curse for seventeen years and constructed his home such that it sat half inside the temenos and half outside it, so that if ever he was pursued or threatened during his exile he had only to retreat to the portion of his home which lay inside the precinct, and none would follow for fear of their own lives. Remote sensing undertaken by the present excavation overseen by Dr. Romano and Dr. Voyatzis turned up no evidence of Pleistoanax’s house; a curious discrepancy as Thucydides is considered a highly reliable source in this regard.\textsuperscript{28} Still, the lack of any permanent foundations does not rule out all plausibility of Pleistoanax’s involvement with Lykaion. In any case, Pleistoanax was recalled to Sparta after word from the Oracle at Delphi, though some maintain he somehow managed to tamper with the process.

Outside of inscribed material, the most complete source of primary information comes from a 3\textsuperscript{rd} Century AD Roman traveler and chronicler, Pausanias. In order to understand the importance of this particular author to Mt. Lykaion and his indispensability to Greek archaeologists at large (Pausanias lies in the vein of Thucydides in terms of scholarly utility), it’s necessary to illustrate the analytical role that Pausanias’s work plays in so many Greek excavations today. In the preface to a collection of essays dedicated to examining the work of Pausanias published in 2001, Susan Alcock describes the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{27} Pausanias 8.38.6
\item \textsuperscript{28} Remote Sensing undertaken at the Temenos, see Hesperia, 626-627
\end{itemize}
enigmatic historians shape-shifting style of applicability, calling his work:

“... a happy survival, a marvelous cornucopia, and ancient Baedeker, and a sturdy resource to mine for names and places, fragments of history, and versions of myth.” 29

Pausanias’s Description of Greece is one of the most in-depth pictures of the ancient Greek world that has ever been compiled and its author has been the subject of endless archaeological, scholarly, and theoretical discourse for centuries. It is commonly accepted that Pausanias endeavored to give his readers an image of Greece, and not necessarily an image of Greece ruled by Romans. While there are instances of attention paid to Roman affects, 30 Pausanias by and large omits things which cannot be considered inherent in the Greek identity. To this end, Pausanias’s accounts of Greece are quite highly regarded, and quite intensely debated. The archaeological importance of his texts is rich. It is a fairly common practice for archaeologists to make direct use of the text in attempting to sort out the unknown areas of a site’s topography, provided he treated it. Many notable examples exist, though perhaps the most interesting case study is that of Sparta.

Pausanias’s description of Sparta is unique with respect to the rest of his volumes. In Sparta, he structures his narrative as an enormous list which is centered on the Agora. 31 Pausanias travels the roads out from the Agora, listing what he sees, then returns and takes another road out to do it again. The problem is that only a handful of features on the Spartan landscape have been verified archaeologically. The location of the Spartan Agora, troublingly,

29. Alcock, Travel and Memory in Roman Greece p. vii
30. Pausanias, 3.11.4 – 3.11.5
31. Pausanias 3.12.7 – 3.12.11 serves a good example of this stylistic choice
is not known. Pausanias lists over a hundred unique sites and/or structures of varying importance. Archaeologist C.M. Stibbe published his findings at the Spartan excavation in 1989\textsuperscript{32}—of the fixed points are structures including the Temple of Artemis Orthia, the Roman Theater, the Hippodrome and Dromos—major features the built or otherwise curated landscape. In the space between these iconic fixtures of Sparta, however, it’s hard to say. In order to provide a more comprehensive theory of the Spartan topography and primarily to attempt to locate the Agora, Stibbe created a map of Pausanias’s exact route through Sparta, using the text as his guide. This allowed him to estimate the location of the Agora, and as a result fix the bulk of the archaeological unknowns into more particular areas. Stibbe thus produced a more complete theory of the Spartan topography, however, because Stibbe’s Agora is contested the vast majority of his map of Sparta is an educated conjecture at best. Simply put, through the lens of Pausanias the Agora controls the archaeological image of the city. A thesis completed by Eleni Kourinou in 2000 re-interpreted both Pausanias and Stibbe’s work, locating the Agora farther north.\textsuperscript{33} Kourinou’s interpretation has gained some favor.

\textsuperscript{32} Stibbe, Beobachtungen Zur Topographie Des Antiken Sparta. 62
\textsuperscript{33} Ελένη Κουρίνου. Σπάρτη : συμβολή στη μνημειακή τοπογραφία της. Αθήνα: Ηρός
At Mt. Lykaion, Pausanias gives an exhaustive description of the Upper and Lower sanctuaries. Fortunately, his accounts are not as tenuous in Arkadia as in Sparta, and his texts have been consistent and enormously helpful to various excavations’ efforts to locate particular features on the mountaintop over the centuries. Only one major effect of Lykaion remains unlocated: the Sanctuary of Pan.\footnote{In the modern excavations’ 2014 publication in Hesperia, Romano and Voyatzis discuss the Sanctuary of Pan briefly, noting that it is still missing. See Hesperia, p. 245} Pausanias gives a thorough description of the temenos,\footnote{Pausanias 8.38.6} the columns of Zeus,\footnote{Pausanias 8.38.7} the Ash Altar\footnote{Pausanias, 8.38.7} and mysteriously yields from describing and ritualistic affairs, saying that he thinks it best to let them remain their own, to “… let them be as they were from the beginning.”\footnote{Pausanias 8.38.7}

The position of Mt. Lykaion in the work of Pausanias solidifies the site as a fixture not only in the mind one of the most prolific historians of his age, but gives an image of Lykaion so far from antiquity—in a time when no other such image was made. Further still, Pausanias’s account of the Arkadian site is one of the most complete historical documents that still exists today.
There have been a number of post-archaic travelers, modern archaeological excursions, and full-scale excavations undertaken at Mt. Lykaion over the years. The earliest noteworthy example of these following the encompassing work of Pausanias appears to be the documents produced by Frenchman Guillaume Abel Blouet in part of the *Expedition scientifique de Moree* between 1831 and 1838. The Greek War of Independence from the Ottoman Empire saw French land intervention as early as 1828. In the tradition of Napoleon’s Egyptian Campaign, the French military troops were accompanied by a commission of experts in the fields of antiquities and natural history, whose wartime documentation of the country included everything from topographical maps and botanical catalogues all the way to completing speculative paper-reconstructions of ruined architectural antiquities. Among these scholars was the architect Blouet. The Morea expedition would offer the most systematic and complete documentation of the state of Greek antiquities then to date. Blouet was designated the head of the Fine Arts section of the publication’s effort, and with the Morea expedition team he documented as much of the Lower Sanctuary as was visible above ground. Blouet, however, did not conduct any excavations at Lykaion. The archaeological merit of his work is not unquestionable; the suggestion that the Bath House consists of a southern reservoir appears to be informed by mistaking a set of rubble-wall agricultural terraces for ancient foundations, and Blouet’s work also includes the misidentification of a fountain house as being the legendary Agno Fountain—described by Pausanias. No doubt Blouet and his

39. And yet, the agricultural walls might be constructed on ancient foundations and could be younger than the Morea expedition entirely. Evidence observed in the field in 2015 seems to support this hypothesis.
40. Blouet, Guillaume Abel. Contained in the modern excavation’s “Early Travelers”
compatriots were well familiar with Pausanias's writings and were likely referencing him as a guide. The quality of Blouet’s topographical renderings of the Lower Sanctuary are unprecedented, and also of note are his (possibly liberal) restorations of the athlete’s bathing basins at the Bath House.

60 years later, the Greek travel journals of one Samuel J. Barrows were published in Boston by the Cambridge University Press, in 1898. In the relatively unknown book,41 entitled The Isles and Shrines of Greece, Barrows chronicled his expedition to Greece with a number of other professors and family members—not the least among them being the well-known Dr. Wilhelm Dorpfeld; director of the German Archaeological Institute at Athens; making up a caravan of tourists and scholars determined to see the land of Homer first hand. Barrows’ journals contain a segment where the ‘frailer’ members of their troupe remain behind at Megalopolis while he and a small number of men press onward over Mt. Lykaion in pursuit of the Temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassai several days ride to the southwest. Barrows’ quick description of the wild, untouched ruins of Lykaion form the first detailed document to appear since Blouet’s handful of notes and drawings. Resting atop the south summit, Barrows remarks that his group stood “…at the very heart

41. Barrows description of Lykaion, while curious, is very thin at best. He sticks to the viewsheds and the quality of their lunch.
of the Peloponnesus in a sanctuary of peaks and altars." Barrows' image of Lykaion, while picturesque at heart and of little analytical interest, forms an important interpretive link in the history of the site, and helps bridge the gap between the 19th Century and the arrival of Kontopoulos and Kourouniotis.

Seven years after Barrows' journals were printed in Boston, A Greek archaeologist by the name of Kontopoulos conducted an excavation on site, and shortly thereafter Konstantinos Kourouniotis—both of the archaeological society of Athens. Kourouniotis published his findings, the second archaeological excavation undertaken at Mt. Lykaion. Kourouniotis's finds appeared in Praktika in 1905, and together with Kontopoulos constitute the first thorough academic investigations of the ruins since the sparse documentation of

42. Barrows, 284
43. Kourouniotis, Praktika 1905
the Morea expedition by the French almost eighty years prior. Kourouniotis’s materials, however, do not include any architectural drawings beyond a few largely useless sketches. A small number of grainy photographs remain as do his extensive written journals, which are currently in the process of being translated to English by the present excavation. One curious aspect of the materials he left is the presence of an Ionic hemicycle building at the south end of the stoa, photographed still standing in stark contrast to the ruined nature of the site.\(^4^4\) Today, there is no trace of the building left. Kourouniotis played a large role in identifying most of Pausanias’s objects of interest, engaged in guerilla anastylosis of a column drum in the temenos,\(^4^5\) and despite his lack of graphic documentation his journals and publications provide an enormous catalog of finds and hypotheses concerning the nature of Lykaion in antiquity.

Following the work of Kourouniotis the site remained untouched by archaeologists for nearly a century. In the late 1990s, the Ephor of Laconia and Arkadia, Spyropoulos, dug a number of disparate trenches that yielded very little. Finally, in 2004, Dr. David Gilman Romano and Dr. Mary E. Voyatzis began preliminary survey work on site and the current excavation’s efforts commenced in 2006.\(^4^6\) From 2006 to 2010, architectural survey work continued while formal excavations began in both the Upper and Lower Sanctuaries. Following the 5-year dig, seasons 2011-2015 allowed time for finds to be categorized, analyzed, and treated by archaeological specialists in the apotheke. From the outset in 2004, the excavation has maintained a close working relationship with students of architecture.

\(^4^4\) Photographs surviving from Kourouniotis’s documents and publications depict an ionic hemicycle building, though missing friezes by that time, the columns were visibly complete with ionic capitals. Today only the foundation remains at the south end of the Stoa, making his photographs the only record of its existence on site.

\(^4^5\) Hesperia, p. 576 2014 (v. 83)

\(^4^6\) Hesperia 570 2014 (v. 83)
One of the excavation’s primary goals is the creation of an actual-state plan drawing of the entire mountaintop including both the Upper and Lower sanctuaries. Since 2006, the excavation has consisted of a team of architects whose charge is the documentation of each individual architecturally significant block on site, in situ. Each block is drawn by hand on site, and later digitized and added to the growing map of the site. The result is a comprehensive digital plan drawing of the architectural ruins which spans the entire mountaintop. Following the first 5-year excavation season, architects continued to live on site during the summer seasons 2011-2015, carrying forward the documentation process for the actual-state plan drawings. During this time, the first archaeological literature encompassing new material
on Mt. Lykaion in a century was published in the American School of Classical Studies at Athens’ scholarly journal *Hesperia*. The two-part publication summarizes the work conducted on site between 2006 and 2014.\(^{47}\) Excavations are slated to resume in the summer 2016.

\(^{47}\) Hesperia 569, in the publication abstract, 2014 (v. 83)
With material so scattered on site at Mt. Lykaion, the state plan is one of the most important tools we have to make sense of it all. While shelters might be a strong word to describe the sorts of constructions that have been added to the site over the years, there have been light interventions, or otherwise attempts to stymie some of the natural forces that keep the site actively falling apart. There are two primary types of interventions, the first being practically preventative, and the second being interpretive supplements. Put simply, rebar and chicken wire fences to keep the goats off the stones, and simple signage which is made use of by local hunters for target practice. Both of these modes are integral to a successful intervention on site, but so too are the problems that befall them. The need for an intervention at Lykaion is at once a matter of preserving the character of the ancient place and also a matter of making the protection of it relevant to the Greek community. In questioning the nature of such an object, we look to three case studies: The work of Frederick J. Woodbridge, which provides a window into the ways the analytical state-plan can be both used and misused in the name of accuracy (which is a questionable motive on untenable sites as we will yet see). The second is a project by Franco Minissi, which poses the problem of material quality and performance. And the third is a set of drawings by Giovanni Battista Piranesi, which portray the depth of the impact that a representation of a thing has on it’s changing identity. In short, Piranesi’s work herein embodies the issue of interpretive capacity.

Theory and design have always been present in archaeology. In their critique of the modern archaeological profession, Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley posited that archaeologists “write the past.” What does that mean? Consider the all-too-common
illustrated picture books that can be found lounging on gift shop shelves in Tschumi’s museum at the Acropolis (or most any other museum, for that regard); they have acetate pages in them and photographs of the ruins, and the reconstructed overlay says something jovial like “this is what it would have looked like in the 4th Century, BCE.” We flip back and forth. Then, now. Then, now. What exactly is that object? How honest is it? What are the stories that we’re trying to tell with them? These are questions which flit between architecture and the second mode of the archaeologist, the conjecturer; the interpreter; the creature of hypothesis. Quite obviously, that object is something designed. At this point, we will investigate the nature of the archaeological conjecture on the terms of architectural design. This line of inquiry is a storied one.

Frederick J. Woodbridge studied classical architecture in Greece, Rome, and North Africa for two years beginning in 1923, with the American Academy in Rome.49 Woodbridge served as the primary architect on site at Psidian Antioch in Turkey, and at Carthage in Tunisia during this time. His drawings completed with the excavation team at Psidian Antioch are of particular note in describing this relationship, and the early nature of archaeological simulation.

Antioch was founded during the Seleucid Dynasty and was revived as a Roman colony by Augustus in 25 BCE for trade reasons.50 The colony was visited famously according to Biblical teachings by St. Paul during his travels in Asia Minor. In 1924, the excavation commenced and concentrated on the largest buildings on site—one of which was a triumphal arch that served an urban gateway. The architectural pieces which remained were scattered and what was left in situ was largely only foundational. Still, Woodbridge was able to create measured drawings of each piece. He operated, at first, to catalog. Much like the work being done presently by the

---

49. Ossi, Adrian Architectural Reconstruction Drawings of Psidian Antioch by Frederick J. Woodbridge, p. 5
50. Ibid. p. 6
architecture students at the Mt. Lykaion excavation. Woodbridge’s work acts as a canonical lens to depict the trajectory of architectural thought in archaeology. His drawings are isolated to individual blocks and representations of blocks joined in detail, as the excavation was ongoing and continuously turning up new material. There were blocks he suspected had been connected, and Woodbridge tested his theories with axonometric drawings that related block to block. What makes Woodbridge’s work so noteworthy in this discussion is the fact that he was keeping pace, documenting his continuous re-imagining of the archway as more and more information was turned up by the ongoing excavation. Building on his smaller theories, Woodbridge quickly produced by these quasi-analytical conjectural processes the first fully reconstructed image of the gateway.

Fig 14: Woodbridge’s first depiction of the gate

That original effort likely drew inspiration from two sources. The first are his and the architectural team’s analytical documentation.
of what lie in situ. Woodbridge built on that foundation, speculating for example on the completed forms of the molding to what he imagined was a reasonable degree. The second point was an understanding of conventional typology. The triumphal archway is a well-known architectural type. Any neoclassical era student of architecture and antiquity would be very familiar with the Arch of Titus in Rome; the Arch of Trajan in Benevento. With these two informants in mind, viewing the drawings begs the question: what are we looking at?

Is it the arch? An architectural photograph dug up from its grave, polished, dressed, and returned to the present? Surely not. If we look very closely at the rendering, we can read the inscription in the architrave. It reads:

“BRONZE INSCRIPTION WAS HERE ONCE”

Though the drawing is an analytical, architectural rendering, it is without a doubt an image of a structure which has never existed. It was at this point that the archaeologists dug up the footing of a third pier. Shortly thereafter, the fourth surfaced. The arch now, it seemed, was possessed of three bays instead of one. Woodbridge scribbled a revised image of the archway on a notecard as soon as the information came out of the trench.51 Now, however, we’re no longer dealing with the same base of precedent. And yet, Woodbridge doesn’t much revise his design for the single bayed arch so much as he cuts and pastes two more identical bays, extruding his initial logic to fit this newfound information. This might either be correct, or be a curious artifact of his steadfast bias. Or further, the function of fitting a small amount of knowns to the image of a vastly larger unknown. In all of his documentation from this point forward, save the very last drawing, Woodbridge imagined the structure as contextualized.

51. Ossi, p. 15; Woodbridge’s sketch appears on a 3x5 notecard and is his first attempt at situating the arch within some sort of urban context.
by the excavation’s other urban finds and theories. His drawings and sketches depict the arch in the company of a populated ancient cityscape. They are objects of interpretation, betraying the image of the place which Woodbridge had conjured to mind. This cityscape could just as easily be considered an appendage of the conventions of architectural rendering of his time, as it could be a specter of his drive to envision the site whole through drawing.

The final drawing, however, is austere. Woodbridge omits his imaginary statues in each pier to show the nooks empty—a conventional admission of what is known as opposed to what is unknown in analytical architectural renderings of the time—and lops off the top of the structure entirely, greatly reducing the height of the entablature. His omission of urban context is also a relic of the time and it is likely that he was encouraged to have done so by the Academy. Let us return for a moment to the issue which lies at the heart of the conjectural archaeologist. And that is that in many cases, such as the case of Woodbridge’s arch, the objective truth of the structure’s original form is both extant and impossible to know. It is evidenced in the remnants left behind, but to toil after it is only

52. Ossi, p. 17; the author discusses this practice as common amongst architectural drafting in academia at the time
ever to reach for what is beyond one's grasp. What Woodbridge has produced are not reconstructions as we commonly call them. They are not restorations either; nothing has been restored. It is a visual representation of the ever-specifying theory. The production of that theory in turn relies in a contingent fashion upon the architectural simulation as a method of communication and testing of a hypothesis. The hypothetical structure of the past is carried to fruition by the hand of the architect, and while these representations do not generate analytical knowledge, nor do they inform the process of excavations, they are vessels for continued interpretation.

Also of note, the inscription visible in the architrave of the final drawing reads,

“THESE BRONZE LETTERS WERE FOUND IN PLACE HOLES INDICATE INSCRIPTION THAT RAN NEARLY ENTIRE LENGTH OF ARCHITRAVE”

In keeping with the same line of inquiry, we'll jump forward in time
to look at another very particular case study. Designers have been experimenting with the completion of form for a long time, but the practice wasn’t a very popular one in major polemical channels until the post-war period in Europe. The idea that a ruin could be supplemented in some way that would both restore some aspect of the object’s character and protect what remained of it at the same time was a thing to explore in the mid 20th century. While Woodbridge’s work gives insight into the changing process of testing formal archaeological hypotheses, the work of Italian architect Franco Minissi informs the material character of re-making.

Minissi completed a number of such projects in Italy during the fifties and sixties. By no means the only architect interested in the pedagogical and polemical nature of this process as a fixture of the architectural perspective—Andrea Bruno was a contemporary of Minissi and helped to pioneer this period of Italian thought—Minissi developed a syntax or material rhetoric which dealt directly with the idea that true restoration should be sought out. Minissi was a proponent of using newer materials, namely glass, plexiglass and plastics to intervene on deteriorating sites. One such intervention Minissi imagined at Santa Maria dei Greci, which stands on the site of an ancient Doric temple. Built into the walls of the present church are column drums from the original structure, and below, its foundations. Minissi proposes to demolish the wall, free the columns, and construct a raised glass floor so that the ruins beneath can be seen from grade. 53 This is a formal move which would be carried through at a much larger scale by Bernard Tschumi sixty years later at the Athenian Acropolis. Minissi’s work frequently reads as though he is freeing some imprisoned and forgotten aspect of our past from the confines of ruin and aggregation.

Glass would prove to be a poor material choice for Franco Minissi soon enough. In an infamous project at the Theater of Heraclea Minoa, Minissi completes the abstracted form of a ruined theater seat by capping the shattered stone in plexiglass. In effect, the supplement re-constructs not the original volume of the bench but an abstraction of it, while at the same time alluding to the conjectural nature of the object by way of introducing a ghostly material in contrast with the original ancient stone. In a short amount of time, however, the hollow installation created a greenhouse effect which promoted plant growth inside, which promptly ruined both the architectural armature and the stone it claimed to protect.

Regardless of their performances, what is important in this case to understand about Minissi’s interventions is that they were intended to operate in some space between the original object as it was and the need to protect it as it is. Minissi interprets the ruin for us, the viewers, and his conclusions are the resultant transparent primary forms—as Corbusier might have described them.  

54. Corbusier, in *Towards a New Architecture* discusses the Primary Form in a small
obvious what is new, as if it is the ghost of something deceased. In a sense, Minissi’s formal rhetoric act as transitional objects themselves.

In considering the role of architectural simulation in the process of ‘writing the past,’ or rather as this thesis is intending to posit, outright designing the past, we might shift from entertaining the supplementary nature of simulation to look at its interpretive power. Giovanni Battista Piranesi; architect, artist, archaeologist, etcher, theorist, antiquarian; the undisputed reigning champion of architectural ruin fantasy put to paper. It is Piranesi’s work on the Vasi, Candelabri which are of illustrative import, though some of his work completed in Rome will play a role in this investigation as well.

Fig 18: Etching from Piranesi’s Vasi, Candelabri

In 1769, Piranesi came into possession of a number of small pottery fragments, from ceramics dating to the time of Hadrian.

---

section entitled Mass, in which he defines them as those simple forms which our eyes are made to see in the light; p. 02
Piranesi, working with his business partner at the time—a British antique dealer—sought to create paper reconstructions of the intricate, decorative works. Sort of. What ensued was the publication Vasi, Candelabri, in which Piranesi provided lavishly detailed etchings which illustrated the completed images of illustrious, enormous Roman artifacts. And yet, the most Piranesi had for any one object was no more than a handful of loosely related sherds.\(^55\) The objects which Piranesi displays in his renderings are fantastical on an order much higher than Woodbridge’s archway; in fact, they are wholly untenable. Piranesi’s Vasi, Candelabri are little more than antiquarian fantasies, incontestably of quasi-original neoclassical make—not of ancient make. Entirely of Piranesi’s own interpretive doing, he created a set of quintessential decorative antiquities.

The Vasi, Candelabri are particularly interesting because they allow us to pose the question—if these objects evoke a sense of the “Roman” while being anything but, what is the capacity for a simulation to influence our perception of the past, or generate new alleys of perception altogether?

In a characteristic etching from one of Piranesi’s earlier sets, the Prima Parte, called “Part of a spacious magnificent harbor in

\(^55\) From the outset, it seems, it was Piranesi’s intent to fabricate as much as he fancied.
the manner of the ancient Romans," Piranesi constructs another complete fantasy. This time not of an artifact but of an ancient vista of a Roman harbor based on his observations of the ruins present. It is important to understand however, that this particular etching cannot be said to have been intended as a restoration or a reconstruction. Piranesi is using his knowledge of the Roman manner to construct an archetypal image, not a representational one. A typological dream, not a figurative image. The use of the etymological root of Mannerism by Piranesi in titling the piece is not coincidental, and the canonical implications of his work in that regard were surely not lost on him. Nothing in this picture of the Roman harbor ever existed. Piranesi spent years creating these fantastical collages of Roman "manner." One curious point is the story that Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s own image of Rome was so steeped in Piranesi’s imagery that he was quite disappointed when he finally made his first visit. Comparing the real thing to Piranesi’s representation of it was quite the letdown.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{56} Description as referenced by the Metropolitan Museum of Art, where the etching is currently housed

\textsuperscript{57} An interesting and illustrative anecdote provided by Miraglia, in her essay \textit{Piranesi’s Vasi, Candelabrì Re-interpreted} Published in Visual Resources, p. 221-233, 2011
In order to offer a design method which is appropriate for Mt. Lykaion, we must build an understanding for the types of interventions which happen on archaeological sites in Greece. This section concerns the introduction of a system by which to categorize archaeological sites, and further, to categorize the types of interventions which we find on those sites. In creating this system and illustrating it with the following case studies, the aim is to situate Mt. Lykaion as exemplary of a kind of site for which there exists no cohesive design method.

Consider the Temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassai. Compare the state of the temple to the state of the ancient Menalaion, just southeast of Sparta. For the sake of ease, we might refer to Apollo Epikourios and other places like it ‘complete,’ as opposed to ‘incomplete’ sites like the Menelaion, but that’s not wholly correct. In fact, it’s not even remotely correct. Both sites are incomplete, the difference is more complicated, but we can find evidence of it in how the sites are treated by the efforts of preservationists. This is an important point: That what we know or what we think we know...
about a thing is often betrayed in the way we contend with it. The way we’ve contended with Apollo Epikourios is to put it back together. The site is such that the level of detail which is being pursued by preservationists, conservationists, and masons in the restoration process is, simply put, defensible. The forms which are being filled back in at Apollo Epikourios constitute an arguable position to hold regarding the building’s original form, given its architectural context. Said another way, Apollo Epikourios is a tenable operation. It is a tenable site.

The Menelaion is an untenable site. The nature of the architecture here is too contestable to merit the same sort of treatment. Implicit here between these two site typologies, again, are the ramifications that this separation has on the ways that preservationists can appropriately contend with the site. Is our idea of the original form of the building a tenable or an untenable one? On some sites, those whose stories are much deeper and fuller like the Athenian Acropolis for example, a site so well understood that questions of ‘period of significance’ even might have a chance at
entering the dialogue. But on those sites on which even the building's primary form alone is contestable, what do preservationists do?

It is here we will introduce one major component of the question of design on archaeological sites. And that is that tenable sites are not restricted to practical efforts, while untenable sites often are. What this means is that we’re usually comfortable pushing preservation into the realm of an interpretive supplement if we feel we understand the subject material well enough to abstract it for one reason or another. When the theory of what was is less precise or when practical needs and funding demand only that a structure be shored up, preservation can become much less expressive and interpretive and much more pragmatic. The consequence is that on tenable sites preservation is used to state with objective clarity only what we already know, and on untenable sites we lose the ability to use preservation as a polemical process in the act of generating an image of the past. This is because any action which is not directly practical is considered an intolerable reach or presumption. By evaluating archaeological sites in terms of tenability, we can get a picture of the kinds of preservative actions that happen under certain circumstances. There are three types of interventions yielded with this approach.

The first type of interventions are patches. Patches are simple armatures which are common on Greek sites, and can be as primitive as nuts and bolts and plywood. These are practical interventions taken only as spot-preventative measures. The second type of intervention is the shed. Sheds are protective enclosures designed to encapsulate the site and protect it from environmental deterioration. The third category, Anastylosis, involves the design of a method of re-making the historical object in question. Anastylosis is a wide ranging term that refers to a number of different practices, and can contain anything from standing up a fallen stone to the speculative restoration
of an entire structure with modern materials. And arguably anything in between. These are the three classifications which will inform the following case studies, and which will serve to situate the way this thesis will propose contending architecturally with Lykaion. In the last hundred years, our thoughts on archaeological restoration have changed drastically both socially and culturally.

04 Modern Design on Ancient Sites
b. Case Studies in Intervention

Knossos is one of the most infamous examples of intervention gone awry. Entrepreneur, wealthy son, antiquarian, and archaeological enthusiast Arthur Evans acquired the ancient site of the Palace at Knossos in 1985 after setting up the Cretan Exploration Fund with his family fortune. After gaining the support of the local Ottoman
administration, Evans purchased the entirety of the site in pieces over a number of years and would conduct a full six seasons of excavations at Knossos. By 1906, Evans was financially destitute. Using an allowance from his father, Evans constructed a small home for himself near the site and together with his architect, CCT Doll, oversaw various stages of restorations of the palace. Evans and Doll’s restoration work included among other things the wildly liberal (by modern standards) use of invasive cast-in-place concrete infill, steel reinforcement, and what we might call artistic license. Much of what the visitor sees at Knossos today is a facsimile of questionable authenticity, designed and re-constructed with harmful then-modern materials by Evans and Doll.

On the other end of the spectrum and only some ten years or so later, Frederick Law Olmsted Jr. is commissioned to design a simple shelter over the Hohokam site of Casa Grande in Arizona. Olmsted’s shed is intended only to protect the architectural remains

58. The Conservation of Archaeological Sites in the Mediterranean Region: and International conference organized by the Getty Conservation Institute; from the proceedings in May 1995 p. 116
from the rain and exposure, and forms a sort of benchmark for shed design overall. Four posts and a roof that bears on poured concrete footings which are sunk well outside and away from the ruin’s ancient foundations, the Casa Grande intervention is the quintessential diagram of a reversible protective enclosure.

Moving chronologically forward we pass by Franco Minissi’s work which we have already illustrated to glance briefly at the work of his contemporary, Andrea Bruno. Designed by Bruno over a period of twenty years, the restoration efforts at the Castello di Rivoli began in 1961 with simple supports introduced to brace the decaying walls. Funding for anything further was a problem. By 1967, Bruno returns to shore up the crumbling atrium, dated to 900AD. In 1978 the building was in such poor condition due to water damage that portions of the second floor began to collapse. This prompted the Piedmont Region to initiate a new restoration plan. Andrea Bruno was brought on as the leading architect.\textsuperscript{59} Bruno re-programs the museum space

\textbf{Fig 24:} Castello di Rivoli, restoration by Andrea Bruno

\textsuperscript{59} From the current museum’s website which gives a brief account of the history of the building’s restoration: \url{http://www.castellodirivoli.org}
and opts for a modern aesthetic in order to avoid the appearance of trying to re-make an anachronistic cope of the damaged parts of the structure. In this way Bruno’s approach circumvents the problems inherent in Evans’ treatment of Knossos.

Back at the Temple of Apollo Epikourios at Bassai, restoration work began in 1987 and is still underway today. In ’87, the widely reviled tent megastructure was constructed over the ruins for reasons not dissimilar to Olmsted’s shed.\textsuperscript{60} Meanwhile, underneath the tent, a beautiful type of Anastylosis is taking place. One which has become a common standard for tenable sites throughout Greece today. Using analogue three-axis mapping tools, Greek masons are working with newly cut stone to create intricately detailed custom-fit pieces. These new stone blocks are used as infill, toward the end of reconstructing the building’s form in its entirety. The method is alluring for a number of reasons. First, it employs Greek masons who are trained to cut

\textsuperscript{60} Vikatou, Olympia; from the Greek Ministry of Culture’s brief chronology of conservationist efforts at Bassai, \url{http://odysseus.culture.gr}
stone in a way analogous to the ancient method. On some sites like Bassai, the stone itself is coming out of the very same ancient quarry which supplied the original stone in antiquity. Further, the new stone is cut and finished exactly as it would have been, which creates the visible difference between the new material and the old material: The old stone is weathered whereas the new stone is crisp, bright, and obvious. And yet, even with that rather violent juxtaposition one can rest assured that here in the structure we can see stones as they would have looked, a very accurate image of the building’s entire form from antiquity, and take away the understanding that in another two thousand years the new stone will have blended sensitively into the old fabric.

While this method is beautiful, it only works when the archaeologists, architects, and masons have a complete enough structure to know beyond a reasonable doubt what they should be cutting. It only works on tenable sites. And even then, the result is to state something which is already known, and nothing more. On tenable sites, we have a very full understanding of the original
form of the buildings, often times down to the moldings fronting the stereobates. At Mt. Lykaion, and other sites (Onchestos, Sparta, etc.) the simple fact is that not nearly enough is known about the buildings’ original form to justify cutting new stone in this way. Said another way, this method is a type of infill. Some sites are decayed beyond a point that could be fixed by infill. This kind of work would be an intolerable reach on untenable sites, and Mt. Lykaion is one.

One particular quality which characterizes experimental anastylosis and separates that type from infill is the injection, or re-injection of architectural program into the ancient site. Italian architect Marcello Guido completed a project at Piazza Toscano in 2001, and the program was quite complex. Not only does the structure act as a shed over the ancient Roman site, which lay in the middle of a modern town square, it also was tasked with the “—rejuvenation of a highly degraded area of Cosenza.” Guido’s design provides protection for the ruins and open, public areas as well in order to make the archaeological material available. In a sense, in order to return it to the city.

61. From the project description housed on the Architect’s website; http://www.marcelloguido.com
Bernard Tschumi’s Acropolis Museum is a world renowned project. Rather than focus on staring through the patterned glass at the ancient foundations twenty feet below, we are interested instead in the nature of the exhibition armatures inside the building. Abstractions which, while hard sometimes to puzzle out the material intent (Tschumi employs liberal and confounding use of stone, plaster, steel, and glass fixtures to display the various antiquities contained in the museum and in no apparent cohesive logic), a number do go quite a long way still toward taking a disconnected piece and giving an impression of the lost whole. In one figure, a column capital rests on an abstraction of the body of the column. Rendered in steel, the height is truncated so as to set the viewer on the proper plane to see the capital. The proportion of the fins, intended to give the impression of a fluted drum, are too large, too few, too deep, and yet the display tells us so much about the fragment it houses.
Another armature relays the height and scale of the original object, and approximates where each extant fragment would have fit together with those that remain lost to represent some aspect of the whole. In doing, the armature doesn’t suffer any of the problems which commonly befall strict restoration. This isn’t a facsimile. The result is an entirely unique interpretive object. It is a simple device which allows us to read height, scale, and the fragmented relationships between the disparate pieces more effectively. Here, we catch a glimpse of something wonderful: An object which has joined the incomplete ruined pieces of a thing together, with no pretense for analytical accuracy, but while all the same managing to convey something true to the visitor about their character, that may have not been visible from where they lay on the ground. From an untenable set of objects, by an armature of contemporary design, a facet of the
The second and final example of experimental anastylosis presented here is another, much more recent work from Andrea Bruno. It is a bit of a departure in terms of cultural content, but the spirit of the project is at home in this discussion, and helps us press the boundary of what we call anastylosis. In 2011, Andrea Bruno submitted a proposal concerning the site of the famously razed Buddha statue, sited in the mountainous region just outside of Afghanistan. Bruno’s concept is simple. He stated that “The Taliban didn’t win because they didn’t destroy the memory of the Buddha. The empty space is much more important than the monument.”

The empty space left behind, carved into the sheer face of the mountainside which was once occupied by the enormous Buddha statue is a testament. Not only to the endurance of memory but to the complete failure of the Taliban to eradicate this facet of Afghan memory. The hole left behind is a footprint, and the whole mountain will have to come down to make us forget what set foot here. Bruno’s

---

62. From an article published by RS News, following a lecture given by Bruno concerning the project at Herat University; http://www.rs.nato.int
proposition is a small observation deck to be constructed beneath the cavity, allowing viewers to peer upward through the empty space that the statue occupied, shifting the visitor’s orientation from before the Buddha, to beneath the void that remains.
The Sanctuary of Zeus at Mt. Lykaion consists of the ruins of some twelve buildings or otherwise unidentified architectural structures / important locations. They are:

- Three Funerary Masks

![Site Plan](image1)

**Fig 31:** Mt. Lykaion topographical plan and elevational section

![Section I Looking North](image2)
In the Upper Sanctuary

1. The Temenos
2. The Columns of Zeus
3. The Ash Altar to Zeus

In the Lower Sanctuary

1. The Stoa
2. The Fountain House
3. The Hippodrome
4. The Administrative Building (formerly the Xenon)
5. Seats/J-Steps
6. The Corridor
7. The Bath House
8. The Agno Fountain
9. The Sanctuary of Pan (as of yet unlocated)

Detailed archaeological information regarding the character of each of these features is under study currently by the modern excavation and as such has been published extensively in other forums. Due to the sprawling nature of the site and because the design aspect of this thesis is focused on the creation of experimental armatures which target specific points in the Upper and Lower Sanctuary, evaluation of the site will be restricted to three particular areas of interest. For each of these three points, evaluation will be centered not only on the historical character of the ruins but also on the role that each location plays in the continued inhabitation of Mt. Lykaion; the site is very active today and figures intricately into the use of the region. Mt. Lykaion is a living site. Recall that the injection, or re-injection of contemporary architectural program into the interpretive capacity of the ancient material is a method by which we might offer Lykaion something more than a wholly intellectual or sculptural object. A

63. See D.G. Romano and M.E. Voyatzis in Hesperia, Vol. I and II
method by which we might apply architectural strategies, educated by concerns of preservation, to the multivalent and continuing interpretation of the site.

Before discussing the intervention points, it's prudent to synthesize the preceding information into a coherent design strategy for application on untenable sites. We've established that while beautiful and thorough, the quilt-like restoration taking place not just at Apollo Epikourious at Bassai but also at Ancient Olympia, at Epidauros, at the Athenian Acropolis, and many other sites across Greece won't work on a site like Lykaion. There is not enough information encoded in the remains at Lykaion to merit a restoration which are this far from abstraction. As such, the following criterion are proposed to guide preservationists as they approach and contend with untenable sites:

1. The installations must possess a quality of conjecture.

2. The installations must not be permanent, or must posess a quality of reversibility.

3. The Installations must include, however abstract, an aspect of contemporary program by which they are re-integrated to the modern state or use of the site.

The installations at Lykaion have to deal with stones that aren’t protected under a shed or superstructure, where detailed work can fit a new stone perfectly inside a measured fissure and complete a known form. At Lykaion, the remains of what was once the seat of the Arkadian League are annually drowned in snow runoff and trampled underfoot by roving livestock. How, then are they to be treated?

To begin exploring the design perspective which tends to these
complex needs, I’ll offer a metaphor. In the tradition of ancient Greek theater there is a term, πρόσωπον, prosopon, -a, which most literally translates to the word ‘face.’ Prosopona were masks worn by actors to express or project a character’s emotional state to the audience. The term enjoys broad applications and extends to Greek theology as well, embodying the concept of the manifestation of the individual, and though relevant, for the sake of simplicity we’ll confine the illustration now to talks of masks. The concept of an expressive mask in Greek culture also extends to a different sort of prosopon, or face, as well. And that is the funerary mask. Burial masks like the Bronze Age artifact uncovered famously at Mycenae possessed a purpose not dissimilar from their theatrical cousins: the preservation of the

**Fig 32:** Prospon 5: Material study at the Bath House
physical features of the dead.

Rather than try and fail to make a judgement as precise as those made at sites which are as complete as the Propylaea for example, or which are as tenable as Apollo Epikourios, the installations presented at Lykaion should instead be educated both by
the expressive function of the theatrical mask, and the preservative function of the burial mask. The material character of the installations can learn from the successes of Franco Minissi, in that it is possible to build in a sense of abstraction to a site that demands it. In approaching design on an untenable site, there is something to be gained by studying the successes of armatures which press the visual limitations of Anastylosis as we see attempted by Tschumi, Bruno, Guido, and even Zumthor at Chur. The armature of interpretation might then close the trenches and protect the stones like the earth has protected them for over two thousand years.

What this means is that the installations proposed herein are attempts to find a way to re-conceptualize what it means to re-bury what we have exposed. But this time, we'll supply the object with an architectural funerary mask. This is the conceptual method I am proposing to fill a gap: the ability of preservation to act as a polemical tool in the construction of an expressive, interpretive object on untenable sites. By re-framing the design process as an act of expressive re-burial, we offer an interpretive object to an untenable site.

Material concerns are of incredible importance in upholding this approach. The ghostly quality of Minissi’s work; the transparent shell created by Tschumi over the ancient foundations—this degree of uncertainty is central. The major issue with Minissi’s failure at Sardinia was that the armature was essentially a greenhouse. This was caused by two factors: first, the armature was hollow, and second, it was entirely transparent. Is there a way to mitigate these issues while maintaining the inherent abstraction of using opaque materials; one that could bridge the gap between the necessity of abstraction and the conservative conviction of the stone infill method? This thesis proposes the use of pre-cast resin.

Resin is a plastic, which ensures a sense of permanent
longevity. More importantly, cast resin would result in solid blocks, which when combined with an opaque mixture would provide none of the weaknesses that resulted in Minissi’s greenhouse. The process proposed here would be to transfer precisely the same tools, skills, and labor which is being employed all across Greece to achieve the patchwork stone restoration instead to the carving of solid pre-cast resin blocks. Rather than complete a known form with materials that make a literal connection, the same method could be applied to creating a supplementary form which suggests an abstract connection. Encasing, rather than infilling. Supplementing rather than re-making. Because each intervention will include modern program, the need for a contrast in material logic is apparent.

Therefore, the preservative aspect of each armature will consist of cut resin and the modern aspect will consist of local, dry-stacked masonry. The use of local stone in a dry-stacked construction plays directly into the existing material language which has grown up on site since antiquity. Byzantine structures recycled ancient stones; local agricultural terraces dot the landscape made of dry-stacked local material, even the modern shepherd shelters and fixtures which

Fig 34: Agricultural terracing visible at the Bath House
characterize the environment are constructed with found objects and local stone. By applying the same material logic, the projects aim for integration.

The final aspect of material continuity between the three installations is the use of modern connecting empoleons. Among archaeologists who engage in the literal re-burial of a site once it has been excavated (a common practice for many sites which are foundational at best), there exists the tradition of leaving behind coins from the modern era in the trenches before refilling them. This is thought to ensure no lapse of communication between future generations who may need to re-open the work. Because of the incredible longevity of plastic based materials, the question arises whether or not the armatures will outlast the actual stones themselves. The armatures are intended to be reversible. Set atop and around the stones, ‘encasing’ them in a sense. They should be considered, again, in the vein of funerary masks applied to an object re-interred. In order to supply the coin, so to speak, we look to modern material strategies which would most readily betray our era. The use of aluminum empoleons in restored masonry fits the narrative quite well. Where the wooden joining members of antiquity have weathered away, modern practice in anastylosis re-fits the joint with a standard empoleon made of plastic and aluminum. By designing the resin armatures to make use of these connections, they simply date themselves.

*Fig 35: Diagram of the function of the empoleon*
With this in mind, we will enter into a discussion of each of the three interventions. All three are intended to fulfill the criteria for anastylosis on untenable sites congruent with this thesis, and will be presented in terms of a site plan, photographs of the current state of ruin, material rhetoric diagrams, and perspectival renderings of the final scheme.
Anagrapheia

INTERVENTION ONE: The Columns of Zeus

Fig 36: Site Plan, Columns of Zeus in red
Fig 37: What remains of the Columns of Zeus in situ
Fig 38: Prosopon 3: Material study diagram
The first intervention will be sited in the Upper Sanctuary at the Columns of Zeus, adjacent to the Byzantine structure dedicated to the Profitis Elias (the Prophet Elijah). Pausanias provides a notably detailed description of the state of the threshold; his description is the most complete primary account of the location. Pausanias writes:

“On the highest point of the mountain is a mound of earth, forming an altar of Zeus Lykaios, and from it most of the Peloponnesus can be seen. Before the altar on the east stand two pillars, on which there were of old gilded eagles. On this altar they sacrifice in secret to Lykaion Zeus.”

Of these columns, only two bases and a single drum remain today. The drum sits atop the southern base and is not in situ; Kourouniotis documents finding the drum having rolled down the mountainside some distance and replaced it himself. Judging by the fluting pattern on the drum the columns were of the Doric type, which stands in conjunction with the rest of the material on site at Lykaion. Several Doric column capitals were found at the stoa.

Fig 40: Stele base reclaimed at the church

64. Pausanias 8.38.7
65. Romano, Voyatzis; Hesperia, 576 2014 (v.83)
66. Jordan, Pamela Architecture as Artifact and the Re-Rendering of Fragmentary Experience, a thesis; p. 11
While the Columns of Zeus do suffer from exposure to the elements, vegetation growth, and are subjected to being almost completely covered in annual snowfall, the most important facet of the blocks’ continued life is simply by proximity to the yearly festival of the Prophet Elijah held at the Byzantine chapel nearby. Every year, the local village of Ano Karyes holds a festival which takes place in part at the south summit of the mountain at this small chapel, adjacent to the temenos and the Columns of Zeus. Dozens of cars are driven up the winding road and parked in the temenos, and the villagers socialize at the ancient site during the afternoon. A stele base has been relocated from some location to the church site, and is routinely used during the festival as a table leg. The area immediately surrounding the Columns of Zeus makes for an impromptu public space; the temenos for a parking lot.

The first installation will seal, entomb, or re-bury the columns and re-create the threshold as part of a larger plan for a less passive public space, which will connect the Columns of Zeus to the Byzantine chapel while leaving the temenos as a natural cutting. By creating a public space, the columns are re-oriented as a focal object at the Upper Sanctuary, in such a way that incorporates the contemporary use of the site and is sensitive to modern demands.
Fig 41: Site Plan, Bath House in red
Fig 42: Bath House, North Reservoir as it stands today
Fig 43: Prosopon 4: Material study diagram
Fig 44: Design proposal, perspective rendering.
The second intervention will be sited at the Bath House, in the north reservoir basin. Adjacent to a small open field at the northeast end of the Hippodrome, the Bath house lies at the boundary of the Lower Sanctuary. The function of the reservoir today, however, is most nearly a disposal area for rubble. Local shepherds seeking to clear the rubble from the field to the southeast deposit the stones haphazardly into the reservoir, and over the years the pile has grown so large that the reservoir floor is fully covered and the depth of the entire basin is unknown. Also of note is that architecturally significant blocks are visible among the rubble. Above, the north wall is leaning and certain blocks lying atop the pile below have clearly fallen out of course in recent times.

The Bath House, more particularly the north reservoir wall, is the most architecturally complete structure on site. The location has drawn the attention of antiquarians and archaeologists immediately as far back as the work of Blouet. At present, there are questions of the extent of the Bath House facility, and evidence both in the form of remote sensing in the adjacent field, and architectural cuttings found on a rubble course which extends in the same direction suggest that the Bath House complex was much larger than what is currently known.\(^{67}\)

The intervention at the Bath House will be a phased proposal; one which will involve optimistically wrapping up the presence of local shepherds with speculative preparations for cleaning the reservoir and excavating further into the field. Immediately to the southwest, a shanty constructed of found objects and scrap steel forms the bones of a shelter and small pen for livestock, which is in annual use by one regional shepherd. The second intervention proposes that the Bath House reservoir be cleaned of rubble, architecturally significant blocks therein be relocated to the adjacent field and catalogued

\(^{67}\) Remote sensing done in the field adjacent turned up evidence of regular geometries; Hesperia 257
in the spirit of ‘block yards’ found at most any sizeable site in the Peloponnesus, and finally that the program of the shelter nearby be relocated into the empty reservoir footprint post-excavation. The intervention will be a small shepherd dwelling located below grade, inside the cleaned reservoir volume. By doing so, the intervention provides local stakeholders with the incentive to maintain the most complete architectural form on site, rather than adapt it into a natural trash can.
Anagrapheia

INTERVENTION THREE: The Fountain House

**Fig 45:** Site Plan, Fountain House in red
Fig 46: Fountain House, as it stands in situ today
Fig 48: Design proposal, perspective rendering
The third and final intervention will take place at the Fountain House, west of the Stoa in the Lower Sanctuary. While water drainage and runoff plague the majority of the site in terms of natural deterioration, it’s important to understand that the site is a latticework of routes made by multiple local shepherds, whose livelihood depends on the interwoven pathways they have established across Lykaion. At the Fountain House, one such path sees herds of goats tramp directly over the ancient stones every few days during the summer and fall seasons. This causes serious damage to the ruins. In order to prevent this from happening at the Fountain House, the Stoa, the Agno Fountain, and many other locations on site the current excavation has erected small wire fences supported by rebar to force the livestock to move around. These structures are corroded and leaning, deteriorating and hardly perform. The issue is that any more direct action taken to ward off the livestock presents a massive problem for the local presence, and obstructs the ongoing shepherding practice. In addition, a large scrap-metal and found object structure winds around and down the watershed away from the Fountain House that functions as a goat trough for drinking. The presence of water for the herd at this point is crucial to maintaining the shepherd’s route, and also crucial in attracting the livestock to the Fountain House.

The architectural program for this intervention will be concerned with ridding the site of the scrap steel structure, replacing it with an appropriate trough, and connecting that function to the protection of the Fountain House; that the route may be maintained, updated, and yet not cause further harm to the stones. By improving the site’s naturally adapted function with a preservative intervention, the Bath House armature not only acts as an interpretive object but a locally functional one as well.
Preservation is the common tongue of architects and archaeologists. In order to understand the complex ground on which architects and archaeologists attempt to interpret the evidence of the past, it is prudent to explore the ways in which both disciplines are tied together.

Historian, critic, and theorist Mark Wigley has described the architect as a cultural alchemist of sorts; a dilettante by trade, whose job is the schizophrenic identification of common threads which, allegedly, flit between and connect what are otherwise mistaken for autonomous disciplines. The architect toils to collect these threads into a theoretical tapestry, and is tasked with presenting the final woven image as an object of either cosmic elucidation or utter insanity. Put simply, Wigley’s architect is a creature of hypothesis.

In their theoretical examination of contemporary practice re-published in 1992, “Re-Constructing Archaeology,” Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley paint the picture of the archaeologist as a crazed antiquarian, Daedalus lost, wandering through an endless labyrinth of narrow corridors and locked doors. Armed with ‘analytical keys,’ some archaeologists compile lists of what embalmed artifacts lie in each room, still others try to map the floor plan in the hopes that there is a true way to be found through the maze; one which leads back to a picture of the unperturbed past. Consumed by ‘antiquarian amnesia’ and the obsessive collection of ‘self-evident truths,’ these figures, too, are creatures of hypothesis.

Both accounts of professional madness betray the presence of a common ancestor alive in the minds of both: an inclination to

68. Wigley, Lecture at Columbia University Fall 2015.
69. Shanks, Tilley, pg. 7
70. Ibid, p.8
connect and to re-connect. An inclination to hypothesize, theorize, and formalize. An inclination to design. For ease of syntax, let us call design as it’s applied here the process by which contingent conjectures are structured and communicated. Design, as its conventionally considered, is the prerogative of the architect. It’s said of us by the layman; if an architect does anything at all surely it’s design. That archaeology has anything to do with formalization at all might not be so readily apparent.

One of the most curious facets of the archaeologists’ charge is the reality that, while a static truth of the historical state of any given thing does exist, all-too-frequently it is impossible to gather in absolution and therefore the aim to discover and represent the truth is, in most cases, irrelevant. What, then, is an archaeologist? If the presentation of the past as it was, in full, is off the table, the nature of his product resembles a set of conjectures. Freed from the presence of an objective image of the past as it was, and yet anchored to the real by what is left of that image, archaeology might appear to retain its position as a science only when staged in the theoretical environment. While it is a crucial function of the discipline to relate the facts of the site to a visitor in a cohesive fashion, the capacity of the archaeologist surely doesn’t stop there. This thesis argues that a structure to connect and communicate the evidence at hand must be designed, and that the architect is uniquely positioned to shoulder the task. Fragments of the past are used to construct models. The archaeologist’s products are simulations of the case. An image of the ruins re-connected becomes one of the most thorough tools at his or her disposal for testing and conveying the extents of a theory. It’s here that archaeology emerges as a true polemical design discipline.

The goal of this thesis is not to paint archaeology as an act so fragile as to be tainted by the subjective experience of the present (as Michael Shanks and Christopher Tilley have been criticized for doing
on more than one occasion, included in their address to criticism in the second edition of “Reconstructing Archaeology”\(^1\), or as something which must bow to individual bias. On the contrary, it is to describe the act of piecing together an understanding of the past as one of design by nature; one architectural in character and rigor. And further, to lend the tools of the architect to the formulation of a theory of the past—that the creation of a simulated image constitutes both one of the Architect’s alchemical threads and one of the amnestic archaeologists analytical keys at the same time. What are the tools of the architect, and why are they relevant to the continued re-interpretation of the past?

On the subject, in Nietzsche’s 1923 publication *The Genealogy of Morals*, he declares that:

“The is no set of maxims more important for an historian than this: that the actual cause of a thing’s origins and its eventual uses, the manner of its incorporation into a system of purposes, are worlds apart; that everything that exists, no matter what its origin, is periodically re-interpreted by those in power in terms of fresh intentions; that all processes in the organic world are processes of outstripping and overcoming and that, in turn, all outstripping and overcoming means re-interpretation, re-arrangement, in the course of which the earlier meaning and purpose are necessarily either obscured or lost.”\(^2\)

In structuring theoretical conjecture, the process of architectural design and representation should be re-considered. We might regard the architectural process as a discursive object; one which comes after the scientific archaeology of relic gathering and fact-categorizing, and yet which comes before the charged, literary

\(^{71}\) Instances of criticism and response entertained by the authors appears in *The Norwegian Archaeological Review*, vol. 22.1. 1989
\(^{72}\) Nietzsche, *The Geneology of Morals* p. 20
re-interpretation of what remains. The architectural method—the
conception of which for Mount Lykaion will be treated at length
herein—the thesis concludes, constitutes an object of transition
between these two states of archaeology.

We cannot presume to offer an architectural intervention at
Lykaion before contending with the place that architectural expression
occupies in the field of archaeology. It’s been said that archaeologists
“write” the past.\textsuperscript{73} It is my contention to press that archaeologists
design the past. The implication therein is that the reading this written
or designed image of the past through the lens of preservation both
educates and tempers what objects are proposed, in the end, to be
erected on site. At the heart of this matter are issues of interpretation
which are native to the preservationist: that the handling of an object
of the past necessitates imposing upon it the perspective of the
present. This contamination-by-proximity is a reality of our contention
with our own heritage. Said another way, the very act of exposing
and putting our hands on an artifact subjects it to weathering, decay,
to misinterpretation, and to the editorial viewpoint\textsuperscript{74} of any who would
seek to use it for pedagogical gain.

To better describe the nature of the architectural objects
pursued by this thesis, let me propose an allegory concerning the
mystery of the ancient Greek ‘ἀναγραφεύς’ (\textit{anagrapheus}). The
term is derived from the ancient Greek ‘γράφω’ (\textit{grapho}) meaning
either to write or to draw, and refers to a type of architectural tool or
template which was used to specify some particular aspect of design.
There is no consensus on the precise nature of the anagrapheus.
Because the word is a derivative of γράφω meaning \textit{either} the act of
writing or the act of drawing, dependent contextually, the architect’s
anagrapheus may either have been a description of some aspect
of a design, or a physical delineation of it. What is commonly

\textsuperscript{73} Shanks, Tilley p.18
\textsuperscript{74} See Otero-Pailos, \textit{Monumentaries}
accepted is that the anagrapheus is an archaic tool belonged to Greek architects that acted as a model of sorts, aiding builders in the translation of concepts to constructions. Born of the conflation of writing and drawing the anagrapheus is a transitional object; a tool which lies between the conceptualization of a structure and the construction of it. So might we consider the role of architectural simulation in archaeological conjecture. The depiction of a structure as it might have been is a formalization of a theory of the past. It is a hypothesis in structure—a synthesis sought out within the framework first delineated by the analytical archaeologist, which serves to communicate the nature of a thing long gone by careful study of its remaining fragments. Such is the discursive duty of simulation. A simulation (or re-construction) is usually confined to the paper realm, so to speak. When simulation moves into the built realm, it falls under the broad banner of anastylosis. The different pressures which effect preservation and the architecture of anastylosis form the body of this study, and my contention with them is predicated on the understanding of the role of architectural expression in the realm of antiquity outlined here.

With this in mind, this thesis concludes that there are avenues of study which would yield appropriate design interventions on untenable sites, and that those products should not be restricted to practicalities alone. It is possible to design expressive structures which preserve archaeological materials, which communicate something about the past, and which are integrated into the communities that surround them.
The following five drawings were completed during the summer season, 2015, while preparing for this thesis. Some were completed over winter season 2015-16 while back in Greece. The collection investigates a small selection of Greek cultural matters ranging from objects of national independance, Spartan architectural experimentation, issues of misrepresented archaeological artifacts, and modern coal-burning power plants which supply power to every rural village in the Mt. Lykaion area. The fifth drawing remained in Greece, in the posession of a friend of the excavation.
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