

Constructing continuity: heritage listing and monument preservation in Greater Athens from the 1920s to the 1970s

Georgios Karatzas 

Urban Environment Lab, National Technical University of Athens
gkaratzas@teemail.gr

New perceptions in Greek national historiography during the late nineteenth century brought forward new heritage paradigms. In the interwar, Athens' Byzantine heritage was thoroughly studied, protected by special laws, and popularized to wider audiences. After the Second World War Byzantine and ancient remains were given equal attention. The nineteenth-century neoclassical legacy came to take a place in the discussion about heritage at a time when the first apartment blocks made their appearance and it, too, would be protected by special laws. Through aspects of identification, protection, and restoration of Athens' built heritage, this paper explores the physical and discursive articulation of the city's past.

Keywords: Athens; heritage landscape; urban history; national historiography; identity

This paper¹ examines how Athens' urban heritage was perceived and promoted during the second and third quarters of the twentieth century.² Advances in urban heritage management over this fifty-year timespan had a profound effect on both the shape and the physical limits of the urban heritage space. Changes in perceptions are best exemplified in the management of Vlasarou, Vrysaki and Plaka, three historic neighbourhoods north of the Acropolis. The first two were hastily demolished between 1925 and 1931 for the excavation of the ancient Agora beneath (1931–), resulting in

1 Competing interests: The author declares none.

2 This research derives from the author's PhD thesis 'Ιστορία και Χώρος, Ο ρόλος της ανάδειξης και της διαχείρισης ιστορικών μνημείων και τοποθεσιών στην συγκρότηση και αναπαράσταση του Εθνικού Παρελθόντος. Διάδοση αφηγημάτων, ανασκαφική έρευνα, συντήρηση και αποκατάσταση μνημείων τον 20ο αιώνα', completed in 2015 at the National Technical University of Athens under the supervision of Professor Nikos Belavilas. The author is grateful to Professor David Ricks and the anonymous reviewers of BMGS for their constructive comments.

© The Author(s), 2023. Published by Cambridge University Press on behalf of the Centre for Byzantine, Ottoman and Modern Greek Studies, University of Birmingham. This is an Open Access article, distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution licence (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted re-use, distribution and reproduction, provided the original article is properly cited.

DOI: [10.1017/byz.2023.9](https://doi.org/10.1017/byz.2023.9)

the creation of a vast archaeological site detached from the modern city's functions. The third was the subject of a pioneering preservation study and eventually an action plan during the 1970s and the early 1980s, which in addition to social objectives also aimed at the restoration of the area's post-Independence urban form and image.

How was Athens' historical landscape painstakingly constructed so as to exemplify the historiographical narrative of cultural continuity? The emphasis of the present article will be on the wider scale rather than on the historical landscape's constituent parts – the monuments themselves – although key processes, people, and practices are discussed. Restored monuments, the result of physical interventions organized by divisions of the Archaeological Service, will be read as heavily signified texts that reach out to broad and diverse audiences. Influential writings of the period contribute to the discussion, as they testify to the cultural assumptions of the time. Statutes, such as laws on antiquities, royal decrees, and ministerial decisions that placed buildings and sites under legal protection, thus elevating them to heritage status, document official perceptions of what was considered of national importance. A brief description of on-site works of selected preservation projects adds to our understanding of the ever-changing preservation and restoration frameworks in theory and practice.

From the narrative of revival to the narrative of continuity: the heritage landscape of Athens in the 1920s

The first royal decree on antiquities, issued in 1834,³ placed under state protection works of architecture and sculpture, everyday objects, and weapons from ancient to early Christian times, reflecting the official ideology of the newly formed Greek state and the prevalence of the narrative of revival in Greek historiography, according to which the ancient nation was awakened during the Neohellenic Enlightenment and was at last liberated from foreign rule. Through this law, based on the 1829 draft law 'Περί προστασίας των αρχαιοτήτων' submitted to Ioannes Kapodistrias,⁴ all ancient ruins belonged to the state and private initiative was restricted. Half a century later, a new law on antiquities, issued in 1899,⁵ extended the heritage timespan to include medieval Hellenism, consistent with the tripartite narrative framework of cultural continuity, an articulation of national history based on a genealogical succession of Hellenisms.

The transition from the narrative of revival to the narrative of cultural continuity during the second half of the nineteenth century had a profound effect on the understanding, structure, and perception of what has been called 'national time'.⁶ This

3 Royal Decree (RD) 10/22-05-1834, Government Gazette Issue (GGI) no.22 (16/06/1834).

4 For the draft law authored by Andreas Moustoxydis, see A.G. Kalogeropoulou and M. Prouni-Filip, *Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς ευρετήριον, πρώτης και δευτέρας περιόδου 1837–74*, I (Athens 1973) 73–5.

5 Law 2646, GGI no.158 (27/07/1899).

6 A. Liakos, 'Προς επισκευήν ολομέλειας και ενότητα: η δόμηση του εθνικού χρόνου', in T. Sklavenitis (ed.), *Επιστημονική συνάντηση στη μνήμη του Κ. Θ. Δημαρά* (Athens 1994) 180.

shift of historical paradigm served the irredentist vision of the Great Idea and took shape in publications such as Spyridon Zambelios' collection of folk songs⁷ or Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos' history.⁸ The narrative of cultural continuity merged the nation's cultural and political history into a single field,⁹ and its dissemination was accelerated by political events such as the competition among Balkan nationalisms and the clash of opposing irredentist visions.¹⁰ Cultural continuity recognized the value of the Byzantine heritage,¹¹ as well as more recent architectural styles and manifestations of folk culture,¹² whose study and promotion to the broader culture would become the focus of newly established learned societies¹³ and state institutions.¹⁴ By the time of the Balkan Wars cultural continuity had prevailed as an indisputable framework of national history, and writings by Pericles Giannopoulos and Ion Dragoumis¹⁵ show its impact on national imagination and public discourse. Change in the historical paradigm, however, could not be more evident than in the amendment to the founding chapter of the Archaeological Society at Athens in 1917 to include Byzantine and Christian monuments in its scope.¹⁶

7 S. Zambelios. *Άσματα δημοτικά της Ελλάδος: Εκδοθέντα μετα μελέτης ιστορικής περί Μεσαιωνικού Ελληνισμού* (Corfu 1852).

8 K. Paparrigopoulos. *Ιστορία του Ελληνικού Έθνους από των αρχαιστάτων χρόνων μέχρι των νεωτέρων* (Athens 1865–74).

9 Liakos, 'Προς επισκευήν ολομέλειας και ενότητος', 184.

10 For the close ties between Greek irredentist claims and the incorporation of medieval times into the nation's historical continuum, see P. M. Kitromilides, 'Ίδεολογικά ρεύματα και πολιτικά αιτήματα', in D. Tsaousis (ed.), *Όψεις της ελληνικής κοινωνίας του 19^{ου} αιώνα* (Athens 1984) 23–38; R. Clogg, 'The Byzantine legacy and the Megali Idea', in L. Clucas (ed.), *The Byzantine Legacy in Eastern Europe* (New York 1988) 253–81; A. Politis, *Ρομαντικά χρόνια: ιδεολογίες και νοστροπίες στην Ελλάδα του 1830–1880* (Athens 1993); P. M. Kitromilides, 'On the intellectual content of Greek nationalism. Paparrigopoulos, Byzantium and the Great Idea', in D. Ricks and P. Magdalino (eds.), *Byzantium and the Modern Greek Identity* (Aldershot 1998) 25–33.

11 For the nationalization of the Byzantine architectural heritage, see G. Karatzas, 'On the articulation and popularization of Christian built heritage, representing national continuity in nineteenth-century Athens', in D. Damjanović and A. Łupienko (eds.), *Forging Architectural Tradition. National narratives, monument preservation and architectural work in the nineteenth century* (New York 2022) 123–46.

12 For the discovery and reception of vernacular architecture in the twentieth century, see G. Karatzas, 'From local vernaculars to the national folk architecture and back: on the articulation, popularisation and preservation of Greek traditional architecture (1902–1981)', *Journal of Mediterranean Studies* 30.1 (2021) 41–62.

13 Learned societies centred on historical research with particular focus on Byzantine and post-Byzantine archaeology and art included the Historical and Ethnological Society of Greece and the Christian Archaeological Society established in 1882 and 1884 respectively.

14 New institutions within the Archaeological Service included the Byzantine and Christian Museum (1914), the Ephorate of Byzantine Antiquities (1916) and the Museum of Greek Folk Art (1918).

15 See P. Giannopoulos, *Έκκλησις προς το πανελλήνιον κοινόν* (Athens 1907); I. Dragoumis, *Ελληνικός Πολιτισμός* (Alexandria 1913).

16 *Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* (ΠΑΕ) (1917) 21.

Despite new perceptions and attitudes towards early Christian, Byzantine and post-Byzantine architectural heritage, especially during the time of the state's territorial expansion in the early twentieth century, the Greek capital's heritage landscape was still dominated by its ancient past. Restoration of ancient monuments in Greece began as early as 1834¹⁷ and by the first decades of the twentieth century had produced a network of monuments on and around the Acropolis, in a form that took only their ancient strata into account. By 1922, the Acropolis had already been purged of its post-classical additions, while landmark classical and Roman remains had already been restored in a similar manner and had become urban focal points within the growing city.¹⁸ Prominent monuments of this network that made up the Greek capital city's initial heritage space, included the choragic monument of Lysicrates (Fig. 1), Hadrian's Library, the Temple of Hephaestus (Theseion), Philopappos Monument, Olympeion, and Hadrian's Gate.¹⁹ The restoration of the Panathenaic Stadium had already been completed to host the first modern Olympic Games in 1896. Late *belle époque* Athens aspired to be an elegant European city, where ancient heritage was beautifully framed by neoclassical public and private buildings, while the already restored Soteira Lycodemou church at the heart of the city and Daphni monastery on its outskirts were pleasant curiosities.²⁰

Large-scale public buildings, accommodating the new institutions of the nation-state, and the lavish residences of the incoming Greek and the foreign bourgeoisie made up the new landmarks of the capital city and were designed in elegant neoclassical proportions and built of high-quality materials. For the middle-class dwellings, built mainly in areas around the Acropolis and the new suburbs, neoclassical references were, however, primarily a design feature that would be limited in the front elevation, leaving interior spaces organized in more traditional patterns.²¹ The juxtaposition of this neoclassical present²²

17 Restoration of the Parthenon began in August 1834 with a solemn ceremony attended by King Otto. In what would reveal the general strategy towards ancient monuments, the architect Leo von Klenze stated in his address to the young monarch that all relics of barbarism would be wiped out from the Acropolis and from Greece in general, and that the ancient past's new glow would light both the present and the future. See Y. Hamilakis, *To éthnos kai ta ereipia tou: arxaióthta, arxaiologia kai eθνικό φαντασιακό στην Ελλάδα* (Athens 2007) 86–7.

18 For the role of archaeology in Greek nation-building in the early nation-state, see E.F. Athanassopoulos, 'An "ancient" landscape: European ideals, archaeology, and nation building in early modern Greece', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 20.2 (2002) 273–305.

19 See F. Mallouchou-Tufano, 'From the 19th to the 21st century: metamorphoses of the archaeological landscape in Athens', in M. Korres and Ch. Bouras (eds.), *Athens: from the classical period to the present day (5th century B.C. – A.D. 2000)* (New Castle, DE 2003) 318–30.

20 For the restoration of Soteira Lycodemou and Dafni monastery in the nineteenth century, see Karatzas, 'On the articulation and popularization of Christian built heritage', 128–9 and 135–6. During the first half of the nineteenth century, the city's Byzantine heritage has been seen as of little value: *ibid.* 127–30.

21 See D. Philippides, *Νεοελληνική Αρχιτεκτονική* (Athens 1984) 101–3.

22 For the modernizing role of neoclassical architecture and town-planning in Greek cities, see e.g. V. Hastaoglou-Martinidis, 'City form and national identity: urban designs in nineteenth-century Greece', *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 13.1 (1995) 99–123.



Fig. 1. The choragic monument of Lysicrates (335/4 BC) as seen today. During the nineteenth and early twentieth century, monuments such as this were stripped of their post-classical layers and matched beautifully to the neoclassical dwellings built around them. Demolition of unwanted heritage, in this case a Capuchin monastery established in the seventeenth century, gave the necessary breathing space for their aesthetic enjoyment and made them focal points within the growing city. Juxtaposition of the purified ancient past and the neoclassical present provided a powerful image of the narrative of revival. Photograph by the author.

and the purified ancient past established a direct visual link and provided a powerful image of the narrative of revival.

A change of attitude towards the Byzantine heritage of the city is indicated by the royal decree of 1921²³ which placed under statutory protection a number of surviving churches and monasteries, such as the late tenth-century Agioi Apostoloi Solaki, the mid-eleventh-century Agioi Theodoroi, the late twelfth-century Panagia Gorgoepikoos, the eleventh-century Kaisariani monastery, and the early twelfth-century Agios Ioannis Kynigos. Equally important, the royal decree of 1923²⁴ listed as many as 91 historic churches and monasteries in suburbs such as Marousi and Chalandri, and satellite towns and settlements such as Paiania, Koropi and Eleusina.

The change of historiographical – and hence representational – paradigm is echoed in the architectural guides. From *Ta Mνημεία των Αθηνών* in 1884,²⁵ for instance, to

23 RD 19-04-1921. GGI no. 68 (26/4/1921).

24 RD 09-07-1923. GGI no. 194 (17/7/1923).

25 P. Kastromenos, *Ta Mνημεία των Αθηνών*, 1st edn (Athens 1884).

Μνημεία Αθηνών in 1928,²⁶ city guides would evolve from describing exclusively monuments of classical, Hellenistic and Roman antiquity to addressing the heritage of all three phases of Hellenism. The modern period is represented by neoclassical attractions, such as the Zappeion and the Athenian triptych: the National Library, the Academy of Athens, and the University of Athens.

Dominant representations of built heritage insisted on univocal interpretations based primarily on archaeology and national history. This, however, did not exclude different approaches to cultural continuity. In *Αι Παλαιαί Αθήναι* (1922), description of Athens' ancient, Byzantine, and Ottoman built heritage is based on the folk imaginary, making the book itself a reference of the lost pre-modern belief system of lay culture. Contrasting archaeological to folklore interpretations, the author noted of the Philopappos Monument, for instance, that:

Let the archaeologists say what they want, that the monument was erected by the prince of Commagene Philopappos, grandson of King Antiochus Epiphanes and resident of Athens, in honour of his ancestors and the emperor Trajan. The Athenian people know that the monument that tops the hill is the tomb of an old matchmaker who was murdered by a friend after a quarrel due to the failure of the matchmaking he was sent to do.²⁷

In *Αι Παλαιαί Αθήναι*, the Byzantine past was confined to and best represented in churches and monasteries, while Ottoman heritage embraced mosques, khanqahs, the town's madrasa, the Voivode's and the Qadi's mansions, and public baths.

Identification, preservation and restoration of monuments during the interwar period

The aftermath of 1922 saw the influx of refugees, deep political and social divisions, the alternation of pro- and anti-royal governments, coups and the establishment of the Fourth of August regime (1936), which collapsed with the German invasion (1941).

Statutes concerning the Greek capital's Byzantine built heritage, starting with the royal decree of 1921, would continue to be issued throughout the interwar period until 1936, hence re-directing the focus from the centre of Athens to Attica's surrounding areas.²⁸ Interestingly, during the Metaxas regime no such statutes were

26 A. Philadelphus, *Μνημεία Αθηνών* (Athens 1928).

27 D. Kampouroglou, *Αι Παλαιαί Αθήναι* (Athens 1922) 26.

28 Overall, between 1921 and 1936, 17 decrees were issued for the regional units of Boeotia, Argolis, Corinthia and the Saronic islands placing 176 new monuments and sites under statutory protection. Of these, 155 concerned prominent Christian temples and monasteries. See G. Karatzas, *Ιστορία και Χώρος*, 94–100.

published, indicating perhaps the regime's lack of interest in exploring the potential contribution of this field to social conditioning.

The first three volumes of the *Ευρετήριο των μνημείων της Ελλάδος*,²⁹ a series published by the Ministry of Education and Religious Affairs, identified the entirety of the surviving and historically documented Byzantine and Ottoman-era buildings in and around Athens. Printed between 1927 and 1933, they provided ample documentation for each individual monument described, the vast majority of which were churches and monasteries. Over the years, many of these were elevated to heritage status, and several would eventually be repaired and restored, a wish expressed in the series introduction.³⁰ These three volumes can be seen in retrospect as the first stage towards the construction of a network of monuments depicting Hellenism's medieval phase.

Between the wars, the Archaeological Service's initiative intensified, assisting the activities of established learned societies and foreign archaeological institutes. At a time when the city centre was being refurbished with new, multi-storey buildings,³¹ its main task of rescue excavations – which undoubtedly added to the knowledge of the city's historic topography – was complemented by a few systematic excavations. Archaeological excavations within the limits of the ancient city provided further glimpses of Hellenism's first phase and included among others the Acropolis Propylaea (1929),³² the Roman Forum (1930–1),³³ Kerameikos (1927–8),³⁴ the North and North-East defensive city walls (1927–8),³⁵ and the Odeon of Pericles (1914–32).³⁶ Further away from the city centre, sites included the temple of Apollo Zoster in

29 G. Sotiriou, 'Μεσαιωνικά Μνημεία Αττικής', in K. Kourouniotis and G. Sotiriou (eds.), *Ευρετήριο των Μνημείων της Ελλάδος* (Athens 1927); A. Χυγοπούλου, 'Μεσαιωνικά Μνημεία Αθηνών: τα Βυζαντινά και Τουρκικά μνημεία των Αθηνών', in K. Kourouniotis and G. Sotiriou (eds.), *Ευρετήριο των Μνημείων της Ελλάδος* (Athens 1929); A. Orlandos, 'Μεσαιωνικά Μνημεία της πεδιάδος των Αθηνών και των κλιτύων Υμηττού- Πεντελικού- Πάρνηθος και Ατγάλεω', in K. Kourouniotis and G. Sotiriou (eds.), *Ευρετήριο των Μνημείων της Ελλάδος* (Athens 1933).

30 Sotiriou, *Μνημεία Αττικής*, introduction.

31 The general building law of 1929 regulated for the first time a series of town-planning issues, such as horizontal ownership in multi-level structures, permissible building volumes and heights, percentages of plot coverage, etc. This had a profound effect in the Athenian urban landscape and paved the way for the eventual pre-eminence of the apartment building.

32 For the excavations at the Propylaea by Ephor Antonios Keramopoulos, see *Αρχαιολογικών Δελτίων-Χρονικά* (Χρονικά) 12 (1929) 73–86.

33 For the excavations at the Roman Forum by the director of the Archaeological Service Konstantinos Kourouniotis and Ephor Nikolaos Kyparissis, see appendix *Χρονικά* 13 (1930–1) 1–16.

34 For the excavations at Kerameikos by Ephor Antonios Keramopoulos, see *Χρονικά* 11 (1927–8) 111–22.

35 For the excavations at the defensive walls by Ephor Nikolaos Kyparissis, see appendix *Χρονικά* 11 (1927–8) 51–3, 56–9.

36 The Odeon of Pericles was described in architectural guides as early as in 1893; see e.g. G. Kastromenos, *Τα Μνημεία των Αθηνών*, 2nd edn (Athens 1893) 152–3. Excavations were facilitated by funds from the Archaeological Society at Athens.

Vouliagmeni (1927–8)³⁷ and the Eleusinian Telesterion (1930–6).³⁸ Undoubtedly, however, the physiognomy of Athens' heritage space was mostly shaped by the joint initiative of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens and the Archaeological Society at Athens, which aimed at revealing the Ancient Agora by clearance of the inhabited historic neighbourhoods that laid on top of it.³⁹ The revelation of the heart of the ancient city had been a rallying-cry⁴⁰ since the times of the first urban plans of the city⁴¹ and a major urban intervention in the centre of the contemporary city, albeit at a time of a housing crisis intensified by the influx of refugees from Asia Minor.⁴² By 1931, when excavations began, most of the properties within the boundaries of the future archaeological site had been expropriated and demolished, amounting to a total of 350 age-old dwellings inhabited by over 5000 people in an area of roughly 25 acres.⁴³

Advances in the research of Athens' ancient topography are best illustrated by Walther Judeich's *Topographie von Athen* (1931), a valuable reference work on the capital's ancient heritage, aiming at both experts and the amateur. Progress in the restoration of the Acropolis' monuments is recorded in two well-illustrated publications (extremely rare in terms of project completion documentation), which offer at the same time a glimpse into on-site restoration practices at the time – many deemed unacceptable by our standards. *H Αναστήλωση των Μνημείων της Ακροπόλεως* (1940),⁴⁴ described works at the Propylaea (1909–17), the Erechtheum (1902–8), the Parthenon's north (1922–30) and south (1932–3) colonnades, whereas *H νέα αναστήλωση του Ναού της Αθηνάς Νίκης* (1940)⁴⁵ described the dismantling and re-assembly of the Temple of Athena Nike between 1935 and 1939. There, one

37 For the excavations at Apollo Zoster by Konstantinos Kourouniotis, see *Χρονικά* 11 (1927–8) 9–52.

38 For the excavations at the Telesterion by Konstantinos Kourouniotis and Ioannes Travlos, see appendix *Χρονικά* 13 (1930–1) 17–30; appendix *Χρονικά* 14 (1931–2) 1–30; *Χρονικά* 15 (1933–5) 54–114; *ΙΑΕ* (1936) 10–11, 34–40.

39 For the clearance of Vrysaki, see S. Dumont, *Vrysaki: a neighborhood lost in search of the Athenian Agora* (Princeton 2020).

40 See e.g. G. Mistriotis and A. Philadelphus, *Διαλέξεις περί της Ανασκαφής του Αρχαίου των Αθηνών Άστεως και της κατασκευής Νέας Μεγάλης Λεωφόρου Περικλεους- Ασπασίας εν τη πόλει των Αθηνών* (Athens 1911).

41 For the space allocated to archaeological excavations in the plan of S.Kleanthis-E.Schaubert (1832–3) and its revision by Leo von Klenze (1834), see A. Papageorgiou- Venetas, *Αθήνα, Ένα όραμα του κλασικισμού* (Athens 2010).

42 This project of 'national' character and of 'immense' importance [K. Kourouniotis, *H Ανασκαφή των Αρχαίων Αθηνών* (Athens 1926) 19] incurred high costs, partly due to the increase in land values caused by the abrupt rise of the city's population following 1922, which compelled the Greek government to ask for assistance. The American School responded positively and agreed to undertake the venture in association with the Archaeological Society at Athens [*ΙΑΕ* (1925) 18]. The joint venture was praised as a model of cooperation between the two peoples [*ΙΑΕ* (1925) 18–19] and negotiations on the terms were completed in 1927 [*ΙΑΕ* (1927) 16–18].

43 H. Thompson, 'Η Στοά του Αττάλου και οι ανασκαφές της Αρχαίας Αγοράς', *Ζηγός* 10 (1956) 16.

44 N. Balanos, *H Αναστήλωση των Μνημείων της Ακροπόλεως. Προπύλαια Ερέχθειον Παρθενών* (Athens 1940).

45 N. Balanos, *H νέα αναστήλωση του Ναού της Αθηνάς Νίκης (1935–1939)* (Athens 1940).

may see Nikolaos Balanos' restoration methodology that included, among other things, combination of unrelated architectural fragments, geometrical deformation of architectural members for optimal adaptation, extensive use of iron ties with insufficient protection from rust, and a widespread use of mortars in conjunction with other building materials, which in the long run proved harmful to the monuments.⁴⁶

Apart from the ongoing work on the Acropolis,⁴⁷ smaller-scale projects by the Archaeological Service included the restoration of the eleventh-century Agia Ekaterini's dome in 1927, the conservation of the frescoes of Agios Georgios church in Galatsi in 1935, the repair of the dome of the katholikon of Agios Ioannis Theologos monastery⁴⁸ in 1937, the structural repair of the sixteenth-century Asteriou monastery⁴⁹ in 1937, the restoration of the refectory and the dome of the eleventh-century Kaisariani monastery⁵⁰ in 1937.

At the dawn of the Second World War, Athens' Byzantine and post-Byzantine Christian heritage had been thoroughly studied and indexed, most of its surviving examples had received heritage status, while a few conservation projects were already underway. Hellenism's medieval phase began to be promoted, hesitantly asserting its place in the heritage space of the city. The increasing concern for the city's Byzantine and post-Byzantine Christian heritage is evident in *Αι εκκλησΐαι των Παλαιών Αθηνών* (1940)⁵¹, an important publication which brings forward the degree of destruction and physical loss inflicted in this heritage typology as a result of the purification of the city's archaeological heritage during the nineteenth century.⁵² By highlighting the significance of the surviving historical churches, the author argued for their protection and restoration.

The new national law 'Περί αρχαιοτήτων' addressed almost all aspects of heritage protection posed by the 1931 Athens Charter – the first international document on heritage protection – and re-affirmed Greek heritage as all works of art and architecture originating from a period spanning from antiquity to the time of medieval Hellenism.⁵³ By replacing law 2646 of 1899, it became the main statutory tool for heritage protection.

46 See T. Tanoulas, 'Η αναστήλωση των εν ξηρώ δομημένων κτισμάτων της κλασικής αρχαιότητας. Θεωρία και πρακτική', in Ch. Bouras and P. Tournikiotis (eds.), *Συντήρηση, Αναστήλωση και Αποκατάσταση Μνημείων στην Ελλάδα 1950–2000* (Athens 2010) 122–5.

47 During the interwar, restoration work was focused on the Parthenon's north and south colonnades (1922–30 and 1932–3, respectively), the demolition of post-classical building additions at its *opisthodomos* (1926–8), as well as the Temple of Athena Nike (1935–9).

48 Agios Ioannis Theologos is included in the *Ευρετήριο των μνημείων της Ελλάδος (Ευρετήριο μνημείων)* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτών*, 168–9).

49 Asteriou monastery appears in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτών*, 165–7).

50 Kaisariani monastery appears in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτών*, 158–63).

51 K. Biris, *Αι εκκλησΐαι των Παλαιών Αθηνών* (Athens 1940).

52 In this study, Biris – then director of the Athens' Municipality city planning department – used nineteenth century urban plans to locate 78 demolished historical churches. The totality of surviving and lost historical temples were presented to a diagram that placed late Ottoman urban plans on top of contemporary city plans.

53 Law 5351, GGI no.275 (24/08/1932).

As for Hellenism's modern phase, represented mostly by post-Independence neoclassical heritage, Kostas Biris' three volumes of *Αθηναϊκαί Μελέται* can be seen as the first stage in a long process towards the legal protection and restoration of Athenian neoclassicism. Published between 1938 and 1940,⁵⁴ this work describes in great detail Greek neoclassicism's representative examples, main typologies, and variations, advocating the style's suitability for the nation's capital city. There, the author argued that 'it was only natural for the architects that came to build their works "under the shadow of the monuments of classical antiquity", to feel and believe with fervour in this ideology', believing that neoclassicism fitted Athens more than any other post-classical style of architecture.⁵⁵ What came to be called 'neoclassical' in popular discourse embraced all nineteenth and early twentieth-century historicist and eclectic architectural styles and was until the 1940s a living present, amounting for over 70% of the 30,000 new residences built during the interwar within city limits.⁵⁶ Such buildings would be acknowledged as heritage only after the 1950s when a large part of them would be demolished *en masse* to make room for the multi-storey reinforced-concrete frame apartment buildings.

It is important to note that by the 1930s, new perceptions on heritage started challenging its pre-eminent ideological content. Its relevance to tourism and tourism development, already apparent in the touring guides of the previous decade, was publicly discussed on occasions such as the 1934 yearly general assembly of the Archaeological Society, where its general secretary argued that, if Greece was to become a leading tourist destination, then the Society ought to support the state's archaeological and restoration initiatives.⁵⁷

Resuming action after the Second World War (1946–52)

During the months between the declaration of the Greek-Italian war (October 1940) and the Occupation (April 1941), the Archaeological Service ceased restoration activities and focused on shielding museums against air raids and safeguarding their exhibits from looting.⁵⁸ Throughout the Axis occupation it existed only in a rudimentary form. Surprisingly, the small church of Agios Elissaios and the adjacent Ottoman gate of the

54 K. Biris, *Αθηναϊκαί Μελέται* (Athens 1938, 1939, 1940).

55 K. Biris, *Αθηναϊκαί Μελέται* (Athens 1939) 3.

56 M. Kardamitsi-Adami and M. Biris, 'Διατήρηση και αποκατάσταση κτηρίων του κλασικισμού στην μεταπολεμική Ελλάδα', in Ch. Bouras and P. Tournikiotis (eds.), *Συντήρηση, Αναστήλωση και Αποκατάσταση Μνημείων στην Ελλάδα 1950–2000* (Athens 2010) 247.

57 *ΠΑΕ* (1934) 25–6.

58 The circular distributed on 11 November 1940 by the Ministry of Education gave detailed instructions on the protection of ancient artefacts and the establishment of relevant committees on hiding and safeguarding museum exhibits. Coordination of these committees was assigned to professor of Archaeology and secretary of the Archaeological Society at Athens Georgios Oikonomos [V. Petrakos, 'Αφιέρωμα στη 12 Οκτωβρίου 1944 επέτειο της Απελευθέρωσης και στην ιστορία της αρχαιολογικής Υπηρεσίας κατά τα έτη 1940–1944', *Ο Μέντορ* 31 (1994) 81].

Logothetis- Chomatianos residence in Monastiraki,⁵⁹ were placed under statutory protection by the only piece of legislation on the subject issued during this dark period.

After the war, the age-old demand for the full revelation of the ancient city would be imprinted in Kostas Biris' plan for the reconstruction of Athens (1946), where he proposed the expropriation of extensive urban areas around the Acropolis, Kerameikos, and Plato's Academy. He noted that the full uncovering of ancient sites was a universal demand, an issue of utmost national importance and should go on even if external contribution was needed.⁶⁰ Within this area, ancient streets and urban layouts would be restored to their ancient levels, Byzantine churches would be brought back to their original form 'after we relieve them from later historical additions and beautifications by contemporaries'⁶¹ and a limited number of significant nineteenth-century neoclassical public buildings would be kept and repaired. Biris' plan imprinted the dominant vision of Athens' heritage space, composing of heritage vessels of all three phases of Hellenism.⁶²

During the early years after the war, the Archaeological Service would not resume or initiate a single restoration project due to its meagre funding capability, constraints in its internal organization, and the general political instability. Its main activity involved the adoption of measures and the realization of urgent repairs in war-torn monuments and artefacts,⁶³ as several archaeological sites had been turned into military compounds or theatres of military operations during the Second World War and the Civil War.⁶⁴ Political instability also affected the Archaeological Society at Athens, which resumed its archaeological activity as late as 1948 in a mere four locations throughout the whole national territory.⁶⁵ Between 1946 and 1947 foreign schools of archaeology were not allowed to carry out excavations.⁶⁶

59 Ministerial Decision (MD) 30147/1004. GGI no. 126 (10/8/1943).

60 K. Biris, *Σχέδιον ανασυγκροτήσεως της Πρωτευούσης: Συνοπτική έκθεσις- Γενικά Διαγράμματα* (Athens 1946) 24–5.

61 Biris, *Σχέδιον ανασυγκροτήσεως Πρωτευούσης*, 25

62 By the 1950s, representation of the tripartite narrative of cultural continuity had prevailed as an indisputable vision of the national past. See G. Karatzas, 'On the physical and discursive articulation of the heritage space of the city of Rhodes (1912–1967)', *Journal of Mediterranean Studies*, 28.1 (2019) 41–6.

63 T.J. Dunbabin, *Archaeology in Greece, 1939–1945* (Athens 1946) 31.

64 During the *Dekemvriana*, the right-wing paramilitary organization X barricaded itself at Agoraios Kolonos within the Ancient Agora by using marbles from the Temple of Hephaestus. Heavy damage was reported at the ancient ruins after clashes with EAM units. See H. Thompson, 'The Excavation of the Athenian Agora, 1940–46', *Hesperia* 16.3 (1947) 193–5.

65 The Archaeological Society had ceased its archaeological activity since 1942. Between 1942 and 1944, its meagre revenues went in sustaining its staff [*ΙΑΕ* (1942) 88–9; *ΙΑΕ* (1943) 116; *ΙΑΕ* (1944) 148]. Between 1948 and 1949, the Society resumed its activity by excavating in Athens the foundations of an early Christian basilica in Ilissos, a site first excavated by Professor Georgios Sotiriou between 1918 and 1919. See *ΙΑΕ* (1948) 58–60, 69–80; *ΙΑΕ* (1949) 11, 44.

66 Dunbabin, *Archaeology in Greece*, 10.

Law 1469, issued in 1950,⁶⁷ expanded the protective framework of law 5351 on antiquities (1932) to works of art and architecture from after 1830, covering Greek variations of neoclassicism and Greek vernacular architecture, and thus becoming an additional legal tool for listing monuments, now embracing modern Hellenism's built forms.

Although a ministerial decision in 1945 added the Kleanthis residence to the heritage register,⁶⁸ listing of historic monuments would in essence resume only after 1950, when between 1950 and 1952 another six statutes would elevate seventeen building structures to the status of heritage monument. These were mostly neoclassical buildings and other monuments associated with the early period of the Greek capital, such as the lavish Iliou Melathron,⁶⁹ Georgios Karaiskakis' tomb in Neo Faliro,⁷⁰ the mansion of the Duchess of Plaisance in Penteli,⁷¹ and the restored Panathenaic Stadium.⁷² Most notably, ministerial decision 21980/250⁷³ elevated to heritage status in 1952 iconic nineteenth-century public buildings, including:⁷⁴ the Old Royal Palace (1843), the National Observatory (1846), the Arsakeion school (1846), the University of Athens (1864), the National Technical University of Athens (1878), the Academy of Athens (1885), the National Library (1888), the Archaeological Museum (1889), and the National Theatre (1891). In a time when the Greek capital city saw its lower and middle-class neoclassical building heritage demolished to make room for modern block of flats,⁷⁵ these additions to the heritage list were exceptions to the rule that saw neoclassicism as an urban anachronism. Still functional although listed,⁷⁶ many of the above heritage buildings were repaired, converted and altered during the following decades in non-reversible ways with building materials and construction methods unfit for architectural preservation purposes, or worse, similar to the original – thus making differentiation between authentic tissue and restoration intervention an impossible task.⁷⁷

67 Law 1469, GGI no. 169 (7/08/1950).

68 MD 61549/3033/1017. GGI no. 7 (12/1/1946). The Kleanthis residence was an Ottoman-era dwelling that housed the University of Athens in its early days.

69 MD 87811/670. GGI no. 174 (9/10/1950).

70 MD 70167/2489. GGI no. 151 (23/8/1951).

71 MD 9718/304. GGI no. 42 (7/3/1951).

72 MD 27176/300. GGI no. 59 (13/3/1952).

73 MD 21980/250. GGI no. 54 (5/3/1952).

74 Building completion date in brackets.

75 For the extent of the physical loss and the broader context, see E. Marmaras, *Η αστική πολυκατοικία της μεσοπολεμικής Αθήνας: Η αρχή της εντατικής εκμετάλλευσης του αστικού εδάφους* (Athens 1991); L. Leontidou, *The Mediterranean City in Transition: social change and urban development* (Cambridge 1990).

76 In contrast to ancient and Byzantine heritage, modern monuments remained sometimes at risk even after gaining heritage status. This uncertainty is picked up as early as in 1957, when the journalist Freddy Germanos wrote against the positive approval by the Council of State for the demolition of the Eye Clinic, a mid-nineteenth century neo-Byzantine building that had been listed in 1952. Germanos strongly argued that the decision was in breach of law 1469 and in essence suspended legal protection from all modern monuments. See F. Germanos, 'Τα μνημεία της Αθήνας κινδυνεύουν', *Ζυγός* 17 (1957) 11.

77 Kardamitsi-Adami and Biris, *Διατήρηση και αποκατάσταση κλασικισμού*, 249.

In Athens, increasing interest in nationally conditioned vernacular typologies was expressed in the low-level, pre-modern, courtyard-houses once dominant in the urban landscape. Seeing through a romantic lens, *Ta παλαιά Αθηναϊκά σπίτια* (1950) described this by-now obsolete urban typology through surviving case studies, hailing it as the place where ‘the ethnological riches of Hellenism were kept in safety’.⁷⁸ The author highlighted similarities with ancient Greek, Byzantine and Ottoman-era vernacular architecture and arguing against neoclassicism as intrinsically foreign to the local built environment, he advocated that these pre-modern dwelling types were the only true carriers of ‘a legitimate and truthful memory’.⁷⁹

Identification of monuments during the post-war period (1952–74)

The period between 1952 and 1974 saw the influx of domestic migrants and the rapid urbanization of Athens, the persecution of the defeated of the Civil war, the perseverance of the Left through *Eniaia Dēmokratikē Aristera*, the consolidation of right wing governments (1952–63), social change brought by the short period of the centrist *Enōsis Kentrou* in power (1963–5), political instability (1965–7), and the establishment of a military junta (1967–74). New entries in the heritage register embrace monuments from antiquity, Byzantine Christianity, and the history of the modern nation-state, thus solidifying the tripartite periodization of national history into the urban history of the city.

Between 1952 and 1963, a period of conservative rule, a large number of heritage protection statutes listed a still larger number of buildings and sites. Overall, thirty ministerial decisions concerned forty-nine buildings and sites, the majority of which related to the city’s ancient past, either by defining new archaeological spaces or by expanding the boundaries of existing sites. For instance, Ministerial Decision 125350,⁸⁰ issued in 1956, designated several new archaeological sites, such as the Roman Stoa in the churchyard of Agia Ekaterini, the Roman villa within the grounds of the Zappeion Hall, the temple of Aphrodite on the south slope of the Ardittos hill, and Dontas cave. The same statute expanded the boundaries of established archaeological sites, such as Kerameikos, Olympieion, or the south and the west slopes of the Acropolis. Similar ministerial decisions identified new archaeological sites around important remnants of the ancient urban topography, such as parts of the defensive wall,⁸¹ Kolonos hill,⁸² Plato’s Academy,⁸³ and the Ilissos river bed.⁸⁴

78 Kampouroglou, *Παλαιά Αθήναι*, 462–3.

79 A. Konstantinidis, *Ta παλαιά Αθηναϊκά σπίτια* (Athens 1950/1983) 21.

80 MD 125350/5591. GGI no.268 (12/12/1956).

81 MD 65720/2728. GGI no.179 (28/6/1957).

82 MD 50849/2067. GGI no.219 (9/8/1958).

83 MD 117354/4853. GGI no.279 (17/10/1957).

84 MD 17558/973. GGI no.94 (27/2/1960).

Similar statutes elevated a small number of Christian temples and nineteenth-century public buildings into heritage status. Notable examples included the thirteenth-century temple of Asomatoi Taxiarches in Petraki monastery,⁸⁵ the nineteenth-century Hellenic-Byzantine Zoodohos Pigi in Akadimias Street, the neo-Byzantine Panagia Chrysospiliotissa in Aioulou Street,⁸⁶ as well as the neo-Byzantine Athens Eye Clinic.⁸⁷

It has been argued that during this time a monument's touristic value came to acquire equal weight to its national value, becoming an additional criterion when considering a heritage building for restoration.⁸⁸ The tourism parameter was stressed by Anastasios Orlandos in his 1954 account of the Archaeological Society's activities, highlighting the educational value of archaeology and its contribution to the national economy. Like his predecessor in 1934, he argued that engagement with monuments should be approached through the double prism of both cultural improvement and tourism.⁸⁹

This boost in repair and restoration projects would not be limited to the already popular ancient heritage but would be expanded across all expressions of the three phases of Hellenism. The five-year tourist plan announced by secretary of state Konstantinos Tsatsos in May 1959, set explicit priorities of which two are relevant here. They concerned the development of established archaeological sites – as their further growth was guaranteed and easier – and the promotion of new tourist destinations, which would showcase Byzantine and modern Greek (neoclassical and vernacular) built heritage.

The third hierarchical aim is the establishment of new tourist sites of international interest, in places where this can be achieved in a quick and least costly manner. At that point every conscious effort will be made so that parallel to the development of the country's classical monuments, which are already internationally renowned, to turn tourist attention to Byzantine monuments and all other manifestations of neohellenic culture.⁹⁰

Mainstream urban historiography echoed the dominant post-war discourse and followed established historiographical models. For instance, victimization of the nation and suffering under its many foreign rulers, a common perspective of national history at the time, set the narrative framework for the tale of late Byzantine and Ottoman Athens in the first part of *Παλαιά και Νέα Αθήνα*.⁹¹ A small number of publications,

85 MD 92. GGI no.32 (28-1-1963).

86 MD 124786/1455. GGI no.239 (30/12/1955).

87 MD 1794. GGI no.75 (5-3-1962).

88 P. Tournikiotis, 'Ιδεολογικά και θεωρητικά προβλήματα αναστήλωσης αρχιτεκτονικών μνημείων στην Ελλάδα στο δεύτερο μισό του 20ου αιώνα', in Ch. Bouras and P. Tournikiotis (eds.), *Συντήρηση, Αναστήλωση και Αποκατάσταση Μνημείων στην Ελλάδα 1950–2000* (Athens 2010) 15–16.

89 *ΠΑΕ* (1954) 40.

90 In K. Svolopoulos, *Κωνσταντίνος Καραμανλής, Αρχείο, Γεγονότα και Κείμενα* (Athens 1994) 78–9, vol.4.

91 D. Sisilianos, *Παλαιά και Νέα Αθήνα* (Athens 1953–5).

however, posed new research questions and sought new interpretations of old themes. *Τα Αττικά του Εβλιά Τσελεμπί* was a translation of the section of Evliya Çelebi's seventeenth-century *Seyahatname* on Athens and its neighbouring areas. Ottoman-era Athens is described in the words of an Ottoman eye-witness, documenting the dominant worldview and offering at the same time an insight into the Athenians' perception of their city and its monuments. Like Kampouroglou's *Αι Παλαιαί Αθήναι*, this book documented nowadays unfamiliar and rather alien significations of the city's major monuments, which as the author pointed out in his introductory remarks were not due to Evliya Çelebi's rich imagination but stemmed from a long gone socio-political context.⁹² A year later, John Travlos' highly acclaimed⁹³ and well-illustrated *Πολοδομική εξέλιξις των Αθηνών*⁹⁴ narrated the development of the city, from the first recorded prehistoric settlement to the nineteenth-century planned neoclassical capital, based on bibliography and archaeological data from excavations, in many cases supervised by him. The book's material was presented in twelve historical periods, following a novel narrative that reflected changes in urban form rather than the nation's three historical phases, each time describing the city's topography and representative monuments. Athens' transformation from a small Oriental town to a contemporary capital city of a nation state emerging into modernity is the subject of *Αι Αθήναι: Από του 19^{ου} εις τον 20^{ον} αιώνα*.⁹⁵ Published in 1966, it became an essential reference point for students of the modern city due to the rich variety of architecture and town planning issues it deals with, brilliantly describing the rise and fall of the neoclassical phase of the Greek capital, a paradise lost, which by the 1960s could already be seen with a romantic gaze.

The establishment of the Ephorate of Modern Monuments in 1963,⁹⁶ thirteen years after the publication of law 1469 on the protection of modern monuments, marks the official recognition of the distinctive challenges of the study, protection and preservation of monuments and sites belonging to the modern period of the nation. In its early years, its jurisdiction covered the entire national territory and its focus was centred on the vernacular heritage of the rural mainland and the Cycladic islands.

92 K. Biris *Τα Αττικά του Εβλιά Τσελεμπί*, *Αι Αθήναι και τα Περίχωρά των κατά τον 17ον αιώνα* (Athens 1959) 14. Interestingly, ancient ruins were interpreted through folk tales, legends and superstitions, whereas ancient history was interwoven with heroes and myths of the Old Testament. For instance, the princess of Princess' Gate, as Hadrian's Arch was then known, was the daughter of the King of Sheba and wife of Solomon, the founder of Athens (Biris, *Αττικά Εβλιά Τσελεμπί*, 14, 22).

93 In his review, Konstantinos Biris gave *Πολοδομική εξέλιξις των Αθηνών* a place next to the emblematic *Topography of Athens* by Leake (1821) and *Topographie von Athen* by Judeich (1905,1931) for its accuracy and insightfulness. See K. Biris 'Αι Αθήναι δια μέσου των αιώνων. Σύγγραμμα του κ. Ι. Τραυλού περί της πολοδομικής εξέλιξέως των', *Αρχιτεκτονική* 21 (1960) 24–5.

94 J. Travlos, *Πολοδομική εξέλιξις των Αθηνών: Από των προϊστορικών χρόνων μέχρι των αρχών του 19ου αιώνας* (Athens 1960).

95 K. Biris, *Αι Αθήναι: Από του 19ου εις τον 20ον αιώνα* (Athens 1966).

96 RD 687, GGI no. 203 (15/11/1963).

Decades later, it would also cover buildings and sites of the post-revolutionary period, including the neoclassical variations of the capital city.

During the time of the Centre Union in power and the years of political instability, between 1963 and 1967, there were few new additions for Athens in the built heritage register, compared to a great number for surrounding areas.⁹⁷ A mere three ministerial decisions concerned the seventeenth-century Agios Dimitrios Oplon in Patissia, the seventeenth-century Agia Zoni in Treis Gefyres, and the redefinition of the boundaries of the archaeological site of Plato's Academy.

After the suspension of parliament and the establishment of a military dictatorship between 1967 and 1974, sixteen ministerial decisions identified fifty new heritage buildings and sites.⁹⁸ Notable examples included:⁹⁹ the Benizelos mansion (early eighteenth-century),¹⁰⁰ the administration building of the Greek Army academy at Pedion tou Areos (1904),¹⁰¹ the Dekozis-Vouros mansion at Klafthmonos Square (1834),¹⁰² the Sarogleio building (1932),¹⁰³ and the military hospital of Makrygiannis Street (1836).¹⁰⁴ However, two ministerial decisions stand out as containing the largest number of entries. The first, Ministerial Decision 2290 (1972),¹⁰⁵ was concerned with the registration of eighteen churches of the Byzantine and the Ottoman era,¹⁰⁶ the Ottoman Tzistarakis mosque, and the ruins of the Ottoman madrasa, as well as the Roman-era Tower of the Winds. The second, Ministerial Decision 41004 (1972),¹⁰⁷ was concerned with the statutory protection of sixteen buildings of the post-Independence period, such as: the Crown Prince's palace (1897), Benaki mansion (1895), St Denis Catholic Cathedral (1865), Agia Eirini on Aioulou Street (1850), the Metropolitan Cathedral of Athens (1862), and the Stathatos mansion (1895).

The trend of registering high-profile nineteenth century architecture began in the early 1950s and continued throughout the examined timespan. By contrast, innumerable humbler neoclassical buildings were demolished during post-war reconstruction, despite a general outcry and the demands for documentation before they were gone for ever.¹⁰⁸ As for Byzantine and post-Byzantine Christian heritage, the

97 See Karatzas, *Ιστορία και Χώρος*, 109.

98 For a complete list, see Karatzas, *Ιστορία και Χώρος*, 411.

99 Building completion date in brackets.

100 MD 23185. GGI no.635 (30/09/1969).

101 MD 15849. GGI no.886 (08/12/1970).

102 MD 16515. GGI no.653 (30/08/1972).

103 GGI no.30 (16/01/1974).

104 GGI no. 1499 (31/12/1973) and GGI no.503 (14/05/1974).

105 GGI no. 134 (15/02/1972).

106 Entries included the eleventh-century churches of Agia Sotira Kottaki, Agios Nikolaos Ragavas, Agia Ekaterini in Plaka, and Agioi Asomatoi in Thiseio, the sixteenth-century Agios Nikolaos Chostos, and the late Ottoman Agios Georgios on Lycabettus.

107 GGI no.1112 (21/12/1972).

108 Preservation of the memory of the 'old capital that lived the first national and cultural fulfilment of Neohellenism', for instance, inspired the sculptor Vassos Kapandais to argue for a mandatory mural,

few inner city small churches that were not already registered during 1921 and 1923 received heritage status in 1972, echoing the dictatorship's *Ελλάς Ελλήνων Χριστιανών* (Greece of Christian Greeks) slogan.

Depicting the narrative of national continuity. Preservation and restoration of ancient and Byzantine heritage (1952–74)

Between 1952 and 1974, the relevant subdivisions of the Archaeological Service¹⁰⁹ organized and supervised projects on monuments in Athens and its outskirts, ranging from structural repair and consolidation of crumbling ruins to stylistic reconstruction of the original form. They also oversaw landscaping and site embellishment projects aiming to enhance visitor access and maximize appeal.

By 1974, the pre-war network of monuments comprising mostly classical and Roman structures had already expanded to include a further eighteen historic buildings, mostly chapels, churches and monasteries of the Byzantine and Ottoman era, which exemplified Hellenism's medieval phase and served post-war *ελληνοχριστιανισμός*.¹¹⁰ The additional monuments included:¹¹¹ Agioi Asomatoi in Thisseion (1959–60), the early twelfth-century Agios Ioannis Kynigos (1960, 1963, 1966), Petraki monastery (1960),¹¹² (1967, 1971–3),¹¹³ Agios Ioannis Prodromos (1961),¹¹⁴ the sixteenth-century Agia Dynami (1962, 1965),¹¹⁵ the tenth-century

bas-relief, or mosaic of the heritage building demolished on the front of every new one in its place, giving Greek artists the opportunity for artistic expression and turning Athens in an vast open-air picture gallery. Acknowledging the impracticalities, he argued at least for mandatory photographic documentation as a prerequisite of new building permits [V. Kapandais, 'Σεβασμός προς το Παρελθόν', *Ζυγός* 14 (1956) 20].

109 In 1960, the Archaeological Service was re-established as the Antiquities and Restoration Service and placed under the ministry of Presidency of the Government [RD 634, GGI no. 143 (17/09/1960)]. During the military dictatorship, it would come under the ministry of Culture and Sciences, founded in 1971 [Legislative Decree 957, GGI no.166 (25/08/1971)].

110 *Ελληνοχριστιανισμός* is a construct that derives from the narrative of cultural continuity. Although it first appeared as a term in Zampelios' *Άσματα Δημοτικά της Ελλάδας* in 1852, it became a socio-political stereotype only after the early twentieth century. See R. Stavridi- Patrikiou, 'Αντιπαράθεσεις των κυρίαρχων ρευμάτων κατά τον 20^ο αιώνα. Η αποτύπωση του ελληνοχριστιανικού ιδεολογήματος', in P.M. Kitromilides and T.E. Sklavenitis (eds.), *Πρακτικά, Δ' Διεθνές Συνέδριο Ιστορίας: Ιστοριογραφία της νεότερης και σύγχρονης Ελλάδας 1833–2002* (Athens 2004) 70. Under the Greek Constitution of 1952, 'In all secondary and elementary schools teaching targets at the moral and spiritual guidance as well as the development of national conscience on the basis of the ideological directions of Christian-Hellenism.' It was removed from the Constitution after the fall of the military regime.

111 Dates of consolidation, repair, restoration, site embellishment, or landscaping works in brackets.

112 *Χρονικά* 16 (1960) 65–6.

113 *Χρονικά* 23 (1968) 114; *Χρονικά* 27 (1972) 185–6; *Χρονικά* 28 (1973) 53; *Χρονικά* 29 (1973–4) 182. Petraki monastery appears in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτύων*, 125).

114 *Χρονικά* 16 (1960) 154; *Χρονικά* 17 (1961–2) 51. Agios Ioannis Prodromos appears in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτύων*, 164–5).

115 *Χρονικά* 18 (1963) 54; *Χρονικά* 21 (1966) 112–13.

Agios Spyridon and Agios Nikolaos in the Davelis cave (1962),¹¹⁶ (1971–3),¹¹⁷ Agios Kosmas at Helliniko (1963),¹¹⁸ the sixteenth-century Agios Ioannis Karea (1963–4, 1968–9, 1973–4), the eleventh-century Metamorphosē tou Sotēros on the Acropolis' northern slope (1965), the seventeenth-century Panagia Romvi (1965),¹¹⁹ the early Christian basilica at Illissos (1965),¹²⁰ the eighteenth-century Agios Georgios on Lycabettus (1965),¹²¹ the eighteenth-century Agios Athanasios Kourkouris at Thiseio (1966),¹²² the eleventh-century Agioi Theodoroi at Klauthmonos (1966, 1969),¹²³ the sixteenth-century Agios Nikolaos Chostos (1966),¹²⁴ Agios Ioannis at Vouliagmenis Avenue (1969),¹²⁵ the seventeenth-century Agioi Anargyroi of the Holy Sepulchre (1972–4),¹²⁶ and the fifteenth-century Agios Ioannis Theologos at Menidi (1972–4).¹²⁷

Work also continued at: Daphni monastery (1955–60),¹²⁸ (1967, 1971–4),¹²⁹ the eleventh-century Kaisariani monastery (1952, 1958–60),¹³⁰ the sixteenth-century Asteriou monastery (1959, 1969, 1970, 1972),¹³¹ Agios Ioannis Theologos (1963–4),¹³²

116 *Χρονικά* 18 (1963) 54–5. Agios Spyridon and Agios Nikolaos are described in the *Ημερολόγιον της Μεγάλης Ελλάδος* [G. Sotiriou, 'Η σπηλιὰ της Πεντέλης', *Ημερολόγιον της Μεγάλης Ελλάδος* 6.6 (1927) 45–59] and in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτών*, 196–7).

117 *Χρονικά* 27 (1972) 188; *Χρονικά* 28 (1973) 61–71; *Χρονικά* 29 (1973–4) 182.

118 *Χρονικά* 19 (1964) 99. Agios Kosmas is described in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτών*, 153).

119 *Χρονικά* 21 (1966) 113. Panagia Romvi is described in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Χυγγοπούλος, *Μεσαιωνικά Μνημεία*, 96).

120 The international fair on Byzantine art Η Βυζαντινή Τέχνη, Τέχνη Ευρωπαϊκή (Byzantine art, a European art) at the nearby Zappeion Hall in June 1964 brought about extensive landscaping in and around the ruins of the early Christian basilica. See *Χρονικά* 20 (1965) 132.

121 *Χρονικά* 21 (1966) 112. Agios Georgios appears in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτών*, 131).

122 *Χρονικά* 22 (1967) 154. Agios Athanasios Kourkouris appears in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Χυγγοπούλος, *Μεσαιωνικά Μνημεία*, 103).

123 *Χρονικά* 25 (1970) 143.

124 *Χρονικά* 22 (1967) 152–3. Agios Nikolaos Chostos church is described in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτών*, 143).

125 *Χρονικά* 25 (1970) 142–3. Agios Ioannis church is described in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτών*, 151).

126 *Χρονικά* 28 (1973) 58; *Χρονικά* 29 (1973–4) 182, 184; *Χρονικά* 30 (1975) 54. Agioi Anargyroi church appears in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Χυγγοπούλος, *Μεσαιωνικά Μνημεία*, 96).

127 *Χρονικά* 28 (1973) 58; *Χρονικά* 29 (1973–4) 182–3.

128 *Το Έργον της Εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* (Έργον) (1955) 115; *Έργον* (1956) 128; *Έργον* (1957) 101; *Έργον* (1958) 182; *Έργον* (1960) 230; *Χρονικά* 16 (1960) 68–9.

129 *Χρονικά* 23 (1968) 119; *Χρονικά* 27 (1972) 186; *Χρονικά* 28 (1973) 60–1; *Χρονικά* 29 (1973–4) 183, 192–3.

130 *Χρονικά* 16 (1960) 66.

131 *Χρονικά* 16 (1960) 66; *Χρονικά* 25 (1970) 144; *Χρονικά* 26 (1971) 63; *Χρονικά* 28 (1973) 58.

132 *Χρονικά* 16 (1960) 69; *Χρονικά* 19 (1964) 98; *Χρονικά* 20 (1965) 132.

Taxiarhes church at Marousi (1967),¹³³ the early eleventh-century Sotera Lykodemos church (1967–9),¹³⁴ as well as the second-century AD Odeon of Herodes Atticus (1952–3, 1961–2, 1964–7), the first-century BC Roman Agora (1964–5),¹³⁵ the fourth-century BC Theatre of Dionysus (1967)¹³⁶ and the second-century AD Hadrian's Library (1967–9)¹³⁷.

Major landscaping and site embellishment together with archaeological survey and minor restoration work took place on the slopes of the Acropolis, concerning for instance the area between the sanctuary of Dionysus Eleuthereus¹³⁸ and the Asclepieion¹³⁹ (1962, 1963–6), and the Acropolis' northern (1965–6, 1969)¹⁴⁰ and western slopes (1965–6), which by then had been inscribed as archaeological sites.

The brief description of representative preservation projects that follows helps to portray the particularities of the post-war era. The examples come from the breadth of the geographical scope of the essay and show the extent and the kind of physical interventions which were allowed, many of them unacceptable today.

Restoration of the second-century AD Odeon of Herodes Atticus, for example, was overseen by the Directorate of Restoration and on-site works between 1952–3 and 1961–2¹⁴¹ aimed at the completion of the *koilon* by reconstruction of the missing sections. In the archaeological reports of the works, which received additional funds from the Archaeological Society at Athens during the first stage, one finds that although great effort was made to keep as much original material in place as possible, insufficient knowledge of the theatre's architectural details necessitated the construction of whole new sections in reference to the theatres of Epidaurus, Delos, and Oropos,¹⁴² a strategy that undoubtedly led to a fantasized ideal form.¹⁴³

At the north foot of the Acropolis, the restoration of the eleventh-century *Metamorphosē tou Sotēros* (Fig. 2), a monument described in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων*,¹⁴⁴ took place in 1965 and was jointly overseen by the Ephorate of Byzantine

133 *Χρονικά* 20 (1965) 140; *Χρονικά* 23 (1968) 115–6. Taxiarhes church is described in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων* (Orlandos, *Μνημεία παιδείας και κλιτύων*, 202).

134 *Χρονικά* 23 (1968) 114; *Χρονικά* 24 (1969) 95; *Χρονικά* 25 (1970) 138.

135 *Χρονικά* 20 (1965) 34–7 and *Χρονικά* 21 (1966) 44–8.

136 *Χρονικά* 23 (1968) 17–18.

137 *Χρονικά* 23 (1968) 18–19; *Χρονικά* 25 (1970) 28–30.

138 *Χρονικά* 18 (1963) 12–18.

139 *Χρονικά* 18 (1963) 18–22.

140 *Χρονικά* 21 (1966) 43; *Χρονικά* 25 (1970) 25–8.

141 *Χρονικά* 17 (1961–2) 3; *Χρονικά* 18 (1963) 3.

142 *ΠΑΕ* (1952) 651–3; *ΠΑΕ* (1953) 309.

143 For a thorough and well-illustrated account of the on-site works, see F. Mallouchou-Tufano, 'Νέες επιστημονικές απαιτήσεις versus καθιερωμένες πρακτικές. Οι περιπτώσεις της αναστήλωσης του Ιερού της Σαμοθράκης και του Ωδείου του Ηρόδου του Αττικού', in Ch. Bouras and P. Tournikiotis (eds), *Συντήρηση, Αναστήλωση και Αποκατάσταση Μνημείων στην Ελλάδα 1950–2000* (Athens 2010) 136–49.

144 *Χυγοπούλος, Μεσαιωνικά Μνημεία*, 74–5.



Fig. 2. The eleventh-century *Metamorphosē tou Sotēros* at the north foot of the Acropolis as seen today. Photograph by the author.

Antiquities and the Directorate of Restoration. Major on-site works included replacement of interior plasterwork, roof re-tiling, strengthening of the masonry and substitution of a reinforced beam from an earlier consolidation intervention, as well as placement of new floor tiles in front of the crypt and conservation of wall paintings.¹⁴⁵ A new building survey compiled during works generated new data on the building's history and architectural features and helped restorers deliver this small Byzantine church to its original historic form and architectural detailing.

In the city centre, works at *Agiōi Asomatoi* in *Thisseion* (Fig. 3) between 1959 and 1960 aimed to reconstitute the original form after an 1842 depiction by André Couchaud,¹⁴⁶ a French architect who lived in Athens for short periods during the late 1830s and early 1840s. The project was funded by the Archaeological Society at Athens and carried out under the guidance of the architect Eustathios Stikas, head of the Directorate of Restoration. After demolishing late nineteenth-century additions, the landscaping of the exterior space that followed included even the relocation of various city functions, so as not to disturb the overall appreciation of

145 *Χρονικά* 21 (1966) 113–6.

146 *Χρονικά* 17 (1961–2) 51.



Fig. 3. The eleventh century Agioi Asomatoi at Thiseio as seen today. In the late nineteenth century it was greatly enlarged and an elaborate bell tower was added at its west side. Between 1959 and 1960, restoration projects by the Directorate of Restoration reinstated the monument to its original Byzantine size and form. Photograph by the author.

the building. The resulting monument was praised as a true jewel,¹⁴⁷ despite the controversy it raised.

On Hymettus, work at Agios Ioannis Kynigos¹⁴⁸ resumed during 1960, 1963 and 1966. Demolition of recent building additions revealed the iconic arches of the portico, which were then carefully rebuilt, adding to the monument's picturesque appeal. On-site works included rebuilding of the original window openings and the belfry, removal of exterior plasters, and repointing of the masonry. In the interior, plaster was removed to reveal eighteenth-century wall paintings on top of a thinner layer which was dated between the late thirteenth and early fourteenth century. In the courtyard, recent buildings were demolished and the original floor slabs were revealed and new added where missing.¹⁴⁹

147 *ΠΑΕ* (1960) 243–4.

148 The monastery of Agios Ioannis Kynigos is described in the *Ενρεπτήριο μνημείων*. See Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτύων*, 170–5.

149 *Χρονικά* 16 (1960) 66–8; *Χρονικά* 19 (1964) 98–9; *Χρονικά* 22 (1967) 154.

Likewise, work at the sixteenth-century Agios Ioannis Karea¹⁵⁰ was initially carried out between 1963 and 1964, based on a building programme submitted in 1961. Recent additions were demolished, while the ruins of the south cells and the arched quarters of the north side were revealed and fully reconstituted. In parallel, the external courtyard was paved, whereas the stone stairway north of the temple and the south defensive wall were carefully reconstructed.¹⁵¹ During works between 1968 and 1969 and from 1973 to 1974, interventions concentrated on the perimeter walls and the south and east cells, including structural consolidation, extensive earth removal and reconstitution of the original floor levels, complete reconstruction of the first floor cells and the construction of a uniform single pitched roof.¹⁵²

Restoration practices during this period remained unchanged from before the Second World War¹⁵³ and were defined by potentially conflicting parameters: vague national laws, strong personal views, the increasing self-confidence of the institutions involved, alongside international charters and guidance.¹⁵⁴ Careful treatment of and respect for all historic phases of a monument, for instance, was an important resolution of the Venice Charter – then the main international preservation document – and was not unknown to people setting building programmes and restoration aims. Eustathios Stikas, head of the directorate of Restoration, was one of the Charter's key signatories. Yet the demolition of historic building additions was a common practice, which together with frequent full-scale reconstructions, led to idealized 'original' forms that can potentially give the impression that restored monuments come to our present in their conditioned form and that later building layers and additions – and thus their whole epoch – never existed.

Restored monuments such as these made up the expanded heritage space of Athens. The city, which up to the early 1950s had sought mostly to display its ancient heritage, was enriched with churches and monasteries of its Byzantine and Ottoman past. Two pivotal projects, however, would have a lasting effect and double Athens' heritage space: Philopappou hill and the Ancient Agora.

150 The monastery of Agios Ioannis Karea is described in the *Ευρετήριο μνημείων*. See Orlandos, *Μνημεία πεδιάδος και κλιτών*, 157–8.

151 *Χρονικά* 17 (1961–2) 51; *Χρονικά* 19 (1964) 97–8; *Χρονικά* 20 (1965) 132.

152 *Χρονικά* 24 (1969) 96; *Χρονικά* 25 (1970) 143–4; *Χρονικά* 29 (1973–4) 183, 193.

153 In essence, Anastasios Orlandos first and Eustathios Stikas later – heads of the Directorate of Restoration – continued to apply the same principles and practices as Nikolaos Balanos thirty years earlier. F. Mallouchou, *Η αναστήλωση των αρχαίων μνημείων στην νεότερη Ελλάδα, 1834–1939* (Athens 1998) 277.

154 It is argued that during this period there were no real policies for built heritage conservation and restoration. Priorities and strategies were decided by the head of the Directorate of Restoration under the pressure of tourism development, local officials and powerful politicians. There were no technical studies, no theoretical discourse and no critical appraisal after project completion. See Ch. Bouras, 'Η αποκατάσταση των αρχιτεκτονικών μνημείων στην Ελλάδα. Χρονικό πενήντα ετών, 1950–2000', in Ch. Bouras and P. Tournikiotis (eds.), *Συντήρηση, Αναστήλωση και Αποκατάσταση Μνημείων στην Ελλάδα 1950–2000* (Athens 2010) 31, 42.

Work at the Acropolis and Philopappou hill (1951–7) was highly praised.¹⁵⁵ It was initiated by order of the head of the government, approved by the Archaeological Service and executed by the ministry of Public Works.¹⁵⁶ Landscaping of the Acropolis' south slope and Philopappou (1954–7) included also the reconstruction of the sixteenth-century Agios Demetrios Loumbardiariis church from foundations, in which the architect Dimitris Pikionis incorporated elements from Greek traditional architecture.¹⁵⁷

As for the unearthing of the Ancient Agora by the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, the site's central location, the scale of works and the significance of the monuments in the ancient urban topography, placed it in the forefront of all heritage intervention in the capital city. Individual projects included the site's landscaping (1954–5), the reconstruction of the mid-second-century BC Stoa of Attalos (1953–6) as the Ancient Agora's museum, and the reconstruction of the tenth-century Agioi Apostoloi Solaki (1954–6). Landscaping of the Ancient Agora followed landscape architect Ralph E. Griswold's proposal, aiming at the reconstitution of the ancient scenery through planting species known to have existed there during antiquity. However, it was the complete reconstruction of the Hellenistic Stoa from scratch, a rare example in the history of building restoration practice, which attracted most of the attention, taking on a Cold War symbolism. At the opening ceremony, Ward M. Canaday – president of the American School's Board of Trustees and President Eisenhower's special envoy – stated that the restored Stoa of Attalos was a living monument and a tribute to freedom, one of the shared ideals between Greece and America.¹⁵⁸ At the same event, minister Konstantinos Tsatsos argued that the archaeological spade was one of the many weapons of the United States in the battle for liberty, adding that the unearthing of democracy's birthplace helped to promote the great ideals of freedom, justice and solidarity.¹⁵⁹ The director of the Agora excavation Homer Thompson believed in the restored building's educational value, arguing that it would generate a multisensory experience and encourage a deeper understanding of everyday life in ancient times.¹⁶⁰ In an article to *Αρχιτεκτονική*, he explained that it would also help visitors comprehend the size and form of this particular Hellenistic

155 See A. Provelengios, 'Αθήνα- Ακρόπολη', *Ζυγός* 5 (1956) 17; D. Vasileiades, 'Μια δημιουργία υψηλού αισθητικού ήθους: η διαμόρφωση των λόφων γύρω από την Ακρόπολη', *Αρχιτεκτονική* 36 (1962) 31–41. However, the landscaping of Philopappou hill received negative criticism too. For instance, see A. Salmas, 'Παραποίηση και προβολή του αρχαιολογικού χώρου', *Αρχιτεκτονική* 9 (1958) 7–9.

156 Ministry of Public Works, 'Η διαμόρφωσις του χώρου περι την Ακρόπολιν', *Αρχιτεκτονική* 4 (1957) 22–4.

157 See Philippides, *Νεοελληνική Αρχιτεκτονική*, 295–300.

158 Newspaper *Eleutheria* 4/9/1956.

159 Newspaper *To Bēma*, 2/9/1956.

160 See N. Sakka 'A Debt to Ancient Wisdom and Beauty: The Reconstruction of the Stoa of Attalos in the Ancient Agora of Athens', *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 82.1 (2013) 208.

civic typology, experience the beauty of the colonnade and the interplay of light and shadow, and imagine the shape and size of the rest of the Agora's buildings.¹⁶¹

In some quarters, the restored Stoa raised fierce criticism. Architect Patroklos Karantinos, for instance, described the building as a bleak and empty reproduction, a pointless stage set, a dissonant cry without soul or spirit, and a foreign monument among the ancient ruins, arguing that restoration should never proceed to reconstruction.¹⁶² Anastasios Orlandos, head of the Directorate of Restoration, was particularly sceptical, and openly expressed his reservations even during the opening ceremony.¹⁶³

Controversy, resentment and change of paradigm

Controversy was not limited to the reconstruction of the ancient Stoa. The general resentment over the scale and speed of interventions to heritage buildings is testified to by articles in literary journals and the daily press. In *Αι ψευδαναστηλώσεις των μνημείων μας* and in *Η «αναστύλωση» του ναού των Αγίων Ασωματων*, for example, Kostas Biris took as an example the recent restoration of the eleventh-century Agioi Asomatoi in Thisseion (Fig.3) and criticized the inadequate building analysis, the lack of sufficient documentation and the uninformed character of the final design, even arguing that on-site works lacked scientific method and in many cases did not follow archaeological protocols.¹⁶⁴ For him, such restoration projects were harmful to the monuments, shameful to the Archaeological Service, and ultimately worthless to Greek tourism.¹⁶⁵

Resentment over the drastic interventions in ancient monuments led to a crisis within the Archaeological Service. After the establishment of the military dictatorship in 1967, political persecutions and staff dismissals led to animosity towards the Service's new administration and reluctance for cooperation with the new authorities.¹⁶⁶ In this, almost idle¹⁶⁷ period only some ongoing repair and restoration took place.

Change came with the fall of the military regime in 1974. Article 24 of the new Constitution of 1975 guaranteed the protection of the natural and cultural environment as a state responsibility. New channels of communication – especially after joining the European Economic Community in 1981– facilitated the flow of ideas and knowledge on built heritage preservation. In contrast to earlier periods, the field became increasingly scientific, with a growing number of inter-disciplinary studies and

161 H. Thompson, 'Η ανακατασκευή της Στοάς του Αττάλου', *Αρχιτεκτονική* 8 (1958) 75, 128.

162 P. Karantinos 'Αναστηλώσεις και ανακατασκευές των αρχαίων μνημείων', *Αρχιτεκτονική* 7 (1958) 9.

163 A. Orlandos, 'Το "μήνυμα" του ακαδημαϊκού κ. Α. Ορλάνδου δια την αναστήλωσιν της στοάς του Αττάλου', *Νέα Εστία* 60:702 (1956) 1314–5.

164 Biris argued that post-Byzantine layers had been discarded from Agioi Asomatoi overnight, with no supervision, and with no prior building survey or documentation of the historic material and the sections removed [K. Biris, 'Η "αναστύλωση" του ναού των Αγίων Ασωματων', *Νέα Εστία* 68:795 (1960) 1050].

165 K. Biris, *Αι ψευδαναστηλώσεις των μνημείων μας* (Athens 1960) 6.

166 Ch. Bouras, 'Η αποκατάσταση των αρχιτεκτονικών μνημείων' 42–3.

167 Ibid. 43.

documentation preceding on-site works.¹⁶⁸ Extensive articles in journals such as the Archaeological Service's *Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον*, as well as the establishment of specialized institutions such as the Directorate for archives and publications, show the changing practices. Increasing multi-disciplinarity in heritage preservation and management meant that monuments began to lose their quintessential national connotations and were studied and preserved each for its own historical and cultural merit. Reappraisal of history in the last quarter of the twentieth century brought forward new heritage signifiers, such as the shooting range of Kaisariani – an important site in the history of the Left – or the Gasworks Complex on Peiraios Avenue – a landmark of the city's industrial heritage – listed in 1984 and 1986 respectively.¹⁶⁹ EEC accession also meant that international documents, such as the Amsterdam declaration in 1975, a major international text in the protection and preservation of urban heritage, were incorporated into national legislation.

This paradigm shift could not be more evident than in Professor Dionysios Zivas' *Μελέτη παλαιάς πόλεως Αθηνών*, a pioneering study compiled between 1973 and 1975, which provided for the first time a rigorous social and urban analysis of the factors behind Plaka's urban degradation. Plaka, a historic neighbourhood at the foot of the Acropolis, had become one of Athens' most run-down areas, yet contained a large number of nineteenth-century built typologies that had survived post-war reconstruction due to the area's then impracticability for profitable real estate development. The second part of the study, entitled *Μελέτη Αντιμετώπισης Προβλημάτων Πλάκας*, was compiled between 1978 and 1981 as a road map for the area's urban and social regeneration, giving high priority to the repair and re-use of its heritage buildings (Fig. 4). Based on a set of strict principles, these proposals treated Plaka as a single entity, retained its existing form and residential character and banned incompatible uses. Measures were also proposed against increasing land values and gentrification, new private and public amenities were prescribed in an attempt to modernize living conditions, and the overall image was buffered by restrictions regarding shop fronts and aerial cables.¹⁷⁰

Conclusions

At the outset, heritage management in Athens aimed to identify and restore the city's ancient past. During the nineteenth century, the heritage space of Athens was centred on and around the Acropolis and comprised mostly Classical and Roman monuments that had been stripped of later historical layers. Before 1922, Athens' neoclassical present framed its restored ancient past beautifully, in an evident reciprocity.

168 Ibid. 45–8.

169 For the new directions in urban heritage preservation at the end of the twentieth century, see G. Karatzas, 'Athens: The image of modern Hellenism', in M. Rampley (ed.), *Heritage, Ideology, and Identity in Central and Eastern Europe. Contested Pasts, Contested Presents* (Woodbridge 2012) 168–71.

170 D. Zivas, *Πλάκα 1973–2003. Το Χρονικό της επέμβασης για την προστασία της Παλαιάς Πόλεως Αθηνών* (Athens 2006).



Fig. 4. Aspect of Tripodon street in Plaka as seen today. Nearly forty years after the implementation of the *Μελέτη Αντιμετώπισης Προβλημάτων Πλάκας* the overall image of the area has been tamed, whereas private and public nineteenth and early twentieth-century heritage buildings have been repaired and restored almost in their entirety. Photograph by the author.

In a process accelerated by social and political developments, including the rise of Greek irredentism and the state's territorial expansion, Greek history-writing would adopt by the end of the nineteenth century the narrative of cultural continuity, which equally emphasized each of the three main cultural phases of Hellenism. As a result, newer visions for the capital city's heritage landscape embraced the city's Byzantine and neoclassical heritage. Between the wars, the city's surviving historic churches and monasteries were identified and indexed, many received heritage status, while a few accommodated preservation projects. After the war, most of the Byzantine monuments in the city centre would be preserved and presented in an idealized form, expanding the scope of the heritage space of Athens. The extensive application of standardized, in many cases unscientific, on-site practices eventually led to a uniformity of easily recognizable features, creating stereotypes easily read by all.

At the same time, post-war laws facilitated the legal protection of modern monuments and thus the registration of the city's high-profile post-revolutionary neoclassical typologies. This did not apply, however, to the less impressive

middle-class examples of this architectural style, which were demolished and replaced by the apartment buildings of post-war reconstruction. The remaining few would be listed and preserved after 1974, during the cultural regeneration that followed the collapse of the military junta. Conditioning the heritage space of the capital city to showcase the three phases of Hellenism was a cultural project that extended over most of the twentieth century, irrespective of government or political context. Despite becoming ever more entangled in tourism development, built heritage management maintained its nation-building agenda throughout the period, drawing the attention of wider audiences, and inspiring in many cases heated debates over a monument's final form and the on-site practices involved. After the fall of the military regime in 1974, radically new cultural directions led to new preservation principles and practices, in tune with the increasingly scientific character of the field.

Over the twentieth century, the heritage space of Athens was constructed to reflect the narrative of cultural continuity, comprising a collection of staged glimpses of ancient, Byzantine and modern monuments, and thus depicting the established view of the national past, which involved the exclusion or even eradication of dissonant pasts and heritage typologies. What would the heritage landscape have looked like, had the narrative of cultural continuity not prevailed, or even had monument preservation aimed to illustrate the history of the place and its people and not that of the nation? The contingency shaping the historical landscape is not unique to Athens, it is rather innate to heritage management. Examples such as this are case studies in modernity's appropriation of the past and highlight the fact that heritage buildings do not stand independently but are imbued with the significance bestowed by a dominant present.

Georgios Karatzas is a practising architect, registered in Greece and the United Kingdom. He studied at the University of Dundee and the Glasgow School of Art and completed postgraduate programmes in architectural conservation and in town and regional planning. His PhD thesis at the Technical University of Athens investigated aspects of built heritage management in nineteenth and twentieth-century Greece. He has collaborated with architectural practices in Athens and Edinburgh. Since 2013, he has been project architect on various heritage building restoration projects at the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports.