

**Architectural Acts:**  
architect-figures in Athenian drama and their prefigurations

LISA LANDRUM

School of Architecture  
McGill University, Montreal, Canada  
August 2010

A thesis submitted to McGill University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy  
© Lisa Landrum 2010



Library and Archives  
Canada

Published Heritage  
Branch

395 Wellington Street  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

Bibliothèque et  
Archives Canada

Direction du  
Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington  
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4  
Canada

Your file Votre référence  
ISBN: 978-0-494-74547-2

Our file Notre référence  
ISBN: 978-0-494-74547-2

#### NOTICE:

The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

---

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

#### AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

---

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada



*we shall search out... a real architect—even if he be a figure of speech*

Louis Sullivan,  
*Kindergarten Chats*  
(1918), p.33



In the fifth century BCE, two Greek dramatists brought “architects” into their plays—and into performance—at the Great Dionysia festival in Athens. For Euripides, “architect” named a protagonist (Odysseus) scheming to overcome the Cyclops; for Aristophanes, “architect” qualified a comic hero (Trygaeus) daring to restore Peace. Although remarkable for being among the earliest extant “architects” to appear in Greek literature, these architect-protagonists are also surprising because architecture (as it tends to be objectified) is not their target of attention. Rather, transformative and restorative schemes are their foremost concern. While such peculiarities already commend these figures for study there are further grounds for considering their deeds: by their exemplary performances in particular situations these “architects” offer mimetic demonstrations of primary architectural acts; acts that, being subtle and ephemeral, are otherwise difficult to perceive.

This dissertation interprets the actions of the “architects” in Euripides’ satyr play *Cyclops* and Aristophanes’ comedy *Peace*, specifically by asking: What motivated the dramatic poets to qualify their protagonists as architects? What is implied about architects and architectural acts by the manners in which they did? And, what do the dramatic plots and their mythic models suggest about the peculiar situations that architects figure into and struggle to transform? Beyond probing the plays through such questions, this dissertation also has two theoretical aims: to uncover the earliest examples of a *topos*, one that posits dramatic protagonists (and dramatic poets) *as* architects; and, correspondingly, to draw-out the performative aspects of *architecting* that this *topos* suggests. As this study unfolds, I intend to show that what at first might seem like a casual metaphor opens more profoundly onto an intricate web of mythic, ritual and metaphoric associations that are as telling as they are troubling about the representative deeds and ethical dilemmas that architects perennially enact. Furthermore, in treating Greek sources from the fifth century BCE—from a time when architects were only just beginning to gain that title and so appear as figures of cultural significance—this dissertation argues for a reconsideration of how *architektons* can be most fundamentally understood; that is, less hierarchically as *master*-builders, and more poetically and dramatically as agents of *archai*—as individuals who knowingly initiate, make and make apparent *for others* auspicious beginnings, originating conditions and exemplary restorative schemes.

Au cinquième siècle avant notre ère, deux dramaturges firent apparaître des “architectes” dans leurs pièces et leur représentation, aux fêtes Dionysiaques d’Athènes. Dans le cas d’Euripide, “architecte” désigne un personnage (Odysée) complotant pour neutraliser le Cyclope. Pour Aristophane, “l’architecte” est un comédien audacieux (Trygaeus) cherchant à rétablir la paix. Ces architectes-protagonistes étonnent parce qu’ils sont parmi les tous premiers architectes à paraître en littérature grecque, mais aussi, de part le fait que l’architecture (telle qu’on tend à l’objectiver aujourd’hui) n’est pas au cœur de leurs préoccupations. Ils s’affairent plutôt à des enjeux transformatoires et reconstituants. Alors que ces particularités seules sont dignes d’intérêt, il y a encore d’autres raisons pour se pencher sur les actions de ces “architectes”.

Cette thèse interprète les figures de l’architecte dans *Cyclope*, pièce satirique d’Euripide, et *Paix*, une comédie d’Aristophane, en demandant: qu’est ce qui a motivé ces auteurs à qualifier leurs protagonistes d’architectes? Et que suggère ce choix sur les architectes et les actions architecturales? Enfin, que disent ces intrigues et les modèles mythiques qui leurs correspondent, sur les situations curieuses dans lesquelles se retrouvent les architectes et que ces derniers s’acharnent à transformer? Au delà de servir d’outils exploratoires pour ces pièces, ces questions guideront une étude théorique à deux buts: découvrir les premiers exemples d’un *topos* qui pose en principe le protagoniste dramatique (et poète dramatique) en “architecte”; et dessiner les aspects performatifs de *l’architecturant* suggérés par ce *topos*. Au fil de ce questionnement, j’entends démontrer que ce qui paraît au premier regard être de simples métaphores ouvrent plus profondément sur un entrelacs d’associations tout aussi révélatrices que troublantes sur les actions représentatives de l’architecte et les dilemmes étiques que ceux-ci mettent en jeu et en scène. Plus encore, en traitant des textes grecques du cinquième siècle avant notre ère, une époque à laquelle les architectes commençaient à peine à être ainsi nommés et connus dans la sphère publique, cette thèse est aussi un appel à reconsidérer le sens de *l’architekton*: non plus dans la hiérarchie de maître d’oeuvre mais dans le sens poétique et dramatique d’agents de *l’archai* – figures initiatiques, des faiseurs qui dans leurs constructions rendent apparents les départs de bonne augure, les conditions d’origine et les actions exemplaires.

I would like to thank Renaud Gagné and Robert Mellin for their incisive questions and sustained commitment as advisors on my dissertation committee. I am also grateful to Renaud for allowing me to sit in on his provocative Greek religion and translation classes at McGill University. My sincerest thanks go to my primary advisor Alberto Pérez-Gómez for his prudent advice, keen questions and kind support. Alberto's teaching and writing have also continually reminded me of the joy and mystery in both architecture and life.

I would like to thank Marco Frascari for giving me early encouragement in my suspicion that architects really do mime, and David Leatherbarrow for asking me such exacting questions and providing invaluable bibliographic leads in the early stages of my research. I am also indebted to the published writing of both Marco and David; their work has helped me to describe, interpret and wonder about architecture and architectural acts. While attending the History and Theory seminars at McGill I also benefited from the insights of Martin Bressani, Louis Brillant, Gregory Caicco, Ricardo Castro, Stephen Parcell, Louise Pelletier and *all* my colleagues in the PhD program, whose accomplishments and struggles helped me with my own. In recent years I have especially benefited from the generous friendship of Negin Djavaheerian and Gül Kale. The questions and encouragements from a number of academic colleagues also helped sustain the spirit of the project over the last seven years, notably Brenda Brown, Susan Close, Marcella Eaton, Terri Fuglem, Manuela Antoniu, Indra Kagis McEwen, Tracey Eve Winton, Wendy Cox, Joanna Belajac, Barbara Kucy, Jennifer Carter, Mia Vaerman, Lily Chi, Lucie Fontein and Janine Debanné—who has also kindly translated my abstract into French.

I am grateful to Professor Maggie Kilgour and Professor Paul Yachnin in the English Department at McGill University for deepening my appreciation of commonplaces and for encouraging me to attempt an interdisciplinary study. Professors Mark Golden and Rory Egan in the Classics Department at the University of Winnipeg and Manitoba, respectively, lent me their ears, their wisdom and their encouragement in the later stages of the project, for which I am very grateful. Thanks also go to Professor Josh Beer, who allowed me to audit his Greek class at Carleton University when I was beginning this project. I am also appreciative of those classical scholars who generously responded to my questions: James Tatum, David Kovacs and Edith Hall. And I would like to extend my gratitude to all those named in my bibliography, whose care in treating



and translating the ancient texts has helped me to interpret them in ways that I hope do justice to the primary sources.

I have benefited from the work of many librarians (especially those in the inter-library loan department) at the various institutions where my research and writing was conducted, including McGill University in Montreal, Carleton University in Ottawa, Norwich University in Vermont, the University of Manitoba in Winnipeg, and the Warburg Institute at the University of London. A Graduate Studies Fellowship from McGill helped me initiate this research, and the Faculty of Architecture at the University of Manitoba has been supportive of my research travel over the last two years.

On another note, I would like to thank three extraordinary acting and movement instructors, John Charles Murphy, Thomas Leabhart and Clive Mendus, who each welcomed me into their acting workshops in New York, Paris and London, respectively. It was in these workshops that my early intuitions about the dramatic agency of architects and architecture were attempted, expanded and challenged before I turned my attention to ancient dramatic sources. The serious drama of architectural work was also reinforced for me by those architects with whom I was privileged to practice in New York City before commencing postgraduate studies. The professionalism and wit of Gaetano Pesce, Buck Moorhead, Joe Levine and Kevin Bone were at times on my mind when thinking about the exemplary acts of architects.

I must also thank Theodore Landrum, my tolerant husband and avid supporter, with whom many details of this dissertation were discussed, and without whom the work of writing would have been far less fun.

Finally, I dedicate this dissertation to my parents, Eleanor (née Dibsfall) and Gerald Hill, who taught me to laugh long before I learned of Aristophanes and to wonder about the world before I studied architecture.

## Architectural Acts: architect-figures in Athenian drama and their pre-figurations

Introduction . . . . .	1
Prologue: architectural acts between the lines of Vitruvius and Alberti	
Enduring Properties: Vitruvius’ tale of Aristippus . . . . .	5
Animate Ornaments: Alberti’s rhetorical aside . . . . .	10

## Repairing Prosperity: daring *to architect* in Aristophanes’ *Peace*

1. The dramatic action of <i>Peace</i> and the “architect’s” leading role in it . . . . .	17
2. <i>Architecting</i> in view of Architectural Activity . . . . .	23
3. Comparable Agents and Agencies of Old Comedy . . . . .	37
4. <i>Architecting</i> : Dramatic Modes of Representation and Transformation . . . . .	53
Political Representation . . . . .	57
Allegorical Demonstrations . . . . .	77
Metaphoric Bases . . . . .	92
5. Giving, Taking and Discerning Directions (activities integral to <i>architecting</i> ) . . . . .	109
6. <i>Architecting</i> beyond <i>Peace</i> : instances of the verb in other ancient literature . . . . .	115

## Telling Figures: *the architects* in Euripides’ *Cyclops*

7. The dramatic plot, the epic model, and the anomalous “architects” . . . . .	131
8. Prefigurations: the figure of Odysseus and some problems of his fame . . . . .	141
Reassessing Odysseus’ Crafty Clout . . . . .	142
Divine Associations and Crafty Relations— <i>with Hephaestus</i> . . . . .	149
— <i>with Athena</i> . . . . .	164
Limited Qualifications: naming contingently and <i>in situ</i> . . . . .	205
9. Dramatic Adjustments: Requalifying Odysseus Athenian Drama . . . . .	209
10. Architectural Acts in the land of the Cyclops	
Commanding Acts and Appeals to Order . . . . .	223
Persuasive Acts and Appeals to Agreement . . . . .	245
11. Analogous Acts and Figurative Speech: a manifold scheme and its various schemas . . . . .	267
12. Enthusing Inventions and Poetic Adjustments (what “architects” make) . . . . .	319
13. Dramatic Properties: influential attributes of architect-figures . . . . .	323
An adaptive and decisive doubled-edged sword . . . . .	327
An over-flowing flask of potent wine . . . . .	342
A diversely appealing cup . . . . .	349

## Conclusion: metaphoric potential and dramatic understandings . . . . . 367

BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	379
------------------------	-----

## Repairing Prosperity: daring *to architect* in Aristophanes’ *Peace*

1. INTRODUCTION	
1.1 The dramatic action of <i>Peace</i> and the “architect’s” leading role in it . . . . .	17
2. THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL MODES OF <i>ARCHITECTING</i>	
2.1 <i>Architecting</i> in view of architectural activity . . . . .	23
2.2 Suggestive Peculiarities in the hoisting scene . . . . .	25
2.3 Pheidias’ Trouble and Trygaeus’ Reparation: a mimetic interpretation of Hermes’ aside . . . . .	31
2.4 Architectural acts upon the Acropolis and within the Orchestra . . . . .	35
3. MATTERS OF GENRE:	
3.1 Comparable Agents and Agencies of Old Comedy . . . . .	37
3.2 Comparable Peace-Seekers in the comedies of Aristophanes . . . . .	39
— a) Dikaeopolis in <i>Acharnians</i> — b) Lysistrata in <i>Lysistrata</i>	
— c) Praxagora in <i>Assembly Women</i> — d) Peisetairos in <i>Birds</i>	
3.3 Architectural Conditions and Situational Transformation in the Comic Orchestra . . . . .	46
3.4 A Detour in “Cloudcuckooland”	
— an <i>archōn</i> who is not architecting and a <i>technē</i> that is as dramatic as it is tectonic . . . . .	48
4. <i>ARCHITECTING</i> : DRAMATIC MODES OF REPRESENTATION AND TRANSFORMATION	
4.0 A Basic Plot—elaborately represented and profoundly enacted . . . . .	53
4.1 Political Representation	
— a) Political Misconduct, contemporaneous trouble and productive seasons of discontent . . . . .	57
— b) <i>A</i> -political Inclinations: pursuing hare-brained schemes . . . . .	60
— c) <i>Hyper</i> -political Ambitions: seeking exemplary counsel ( <i>boulē</i> ) . . . . .	62
— d) <i>Pre</i> -political Basis: acting for and with “the [founding] people” ( <i>laoi</i> ) . . . . .	66
— e) <i>Meta</i> -theatrical Restitution: restoring pre-requisites for peace ( <i>philia</i> and <i>Theōria</i> ) . . . . .	71
— f) <i>Arche</i> -tectural Action: appealing directly and profoundly to Council . . . . .	75
4.2 Allegorical Demonstrations	
— a) Bearing Witness to Dramatic Interludes Staged in the Heavens . . . . .	77
— b) Turning a “martial mortar” into a sacred “bowl of friendship” . . . . .	81
— c) Performing (and personifying) Transformation . . . . .	85
— d) Paradigmatic Shows: War and Peace in the orchestra and on exemplary artifacts . . . . .	89
4.3 Metaphoric Bases	
— a) Preliminary Descent into Dung (the opening act of <i>Peace</i> ) . . . . .	92
— b) Fertile Grounds: drawing up Peace (together with her earthy benefits) . . . . .	99
— c) Poetic Grounds: drawing up Peace (together with her originating imagery) . . . . .	101
— d) Drawing Counsel from the Dregs: <i>architecting</i> and the reach for <i>archai</i> . . . . .	105
5. GIVING, TAKING AND DISCERNING DIRECTIONS	
5.1 ( <i>phrazein</i> ) Activities Integral to <i>architecting</i> . . . . .	109
6. <i>ARCHITECTING</i> BEYOND <i>PEACE</i> : INSTANCES OF THE VERB IN OTHER ANCIENT LITERATURE	
6.1 Distributing Justice: Aeschylus’ fragmentary “Dikē Play” . . . . .	115
6.2 Leading amid Ambiguities and Ironies: Euripides’ fragmentary tragedy <i>Telephus</i> . . . . .	121
6.3 “To architect” in Aristophanes’ fragmentary comedy <i>Daidalos</i> . . . . .	123
6.4 <i>Architecting</i> in the service of “Flatterers”: a line from Theophrastus’ <i>Characters</i> . . . . .	125
6.5 <i>Architecting</i> : among the arts of sophisticated cooks in Middle and New Comedy . . . . .	127
6.6 Inventing, Inaugurating and Perpetuating Civic and Sacred Settings (in historical prose) . . . . .	128
6.7 <i>Architecting</i> : intrinsic to the capabilities of Wisdom and the Art of Memory, as well as to the power of Nature and the art of adjusting (in Latin prose) . . . . .	129

## Telling Figures: *the architects* in Euripides' *Cyclops*

7. THE DRAMATIC PLOT, THE EPIC MODEL AND THE ANOMALOUS “ARCHITECTS”	
7.1 “Architects” in the land of the Cyclops . . . . .	131
7.2 The Epic Situation: the Cyclops tale within the <i>Odyssey</i> . . . . .	136
7.3 <i>Kyklōpes</i> : mythic figures of significance beyond Home . . . . .	138
8. PRE-FIGURATIONS: THE FIGURE OF ODYSSEUS AND SOME PROBLEMS OF HIS FAME	
8.1 Reassessing Odysseus’ Crafty Clout . . . . .	141
8.2 Divine Associations and Crafty Relations—with Hephaestus	
— a) Hephaestus’ Performative arts in Homeric poetry . . . . .	149
— b) Making in the diversely motivated and dramatically effective mode of <i>polyphrōn</i> . . . . .	152
— c) Flagrant Strife and Tacit Counsels: performing with <i>polymētis</i> . . . . .	156
8.3 Divine Associations and Crafty Relations—with Athena	
— a) Manifold Modes of Craft Influence . . . . .	164
— b) Primary Inventions and Mediating Devices . . . . .	167
— c) Embedded Directions (in and around the Trojan Horse) . . . . .	168
— d) Guiding Figures (around and about painted vessels) . . . . .	172
— e) Persuasive Arrangements (of influential temples) . . . . .	176
— f) Buoyant and Nested Members (as conveyed by Argo) . . . . .	178
— g) Finishing charms (incorporated by Odysseus) . . . . .	179
— h) <i>Polymētis</i> and its discursive situations . . . . .	182
— i) <i>Polymētis</i> in action in the cave of the Cyclops . . . . .	186
— j) In the City <i>as</i> in Cave: kindred conflicts and comparable modes of crafting <i>mētis</i> . . . . .	190
— k) Weaving <i>mētis</i> : advancing reconciliatory schemes (in the <i>Iliad</i> ) . . . . .	192
— l) Fabricating <i>mētis</i> : pursuing representative displays (in the <i>Iliad</i> ) . . . . .	195
— m) <i>Para</i> -fabricating stories: making alongside and in the midst of exemplary makers . . . . .	199
8.4 Limited Qualifications: naming contingently and <i>in situ</i> . . . . .	205
9. DRAMATIC ADJUSTMENTS: REQUALIFYING ODYSSEUS IN ATHENIAN DRAMA	
9.1 Qualifying Odysseus in Euripides’ <i>Cyclops</i> . . . . .	209
9.2 Tragic Infamy: Odysseus’ <i>poly</i> -capabilities turn to <i>pan</i> . . . . .	213
9.3 Self-Representation: Odysseus qualifies himself— a) individually . . . . .	217
— b) pluralistically . . . . .	219
10.1 COMMANDING ACTS AND APPEALS TO ORDER	
— a) Propitious and Conciliatory: paradigmatic biddings of gods . . . . .	223
— b) Limited Authority: Odysseus commands the unruly satyrs . . . . .	229
— c) Efficacious and Disturbing: Silenus damns the oppressive Cyclops . . . . .	234
— d) Anarchic Dismissals: the Cyclops bids farewell to sacred sites and human customs (while the “architects” command vigilance) . . . . .	236
— e) Musical and Magical Modes of Urging: the satyrs move the scheme along . . . . .	240
10.2 PERSUASIVE ACTS AND APPEALS TO AGREEMENT	
— a) Reciprocal Activities: Commanding and Persuading . . . . .	245
— b) Manifold and Middling Modes of Persuasion . . . . .	247
The Architects’ Diverse Appeals . . . . .	252
— c) <i>to</i> common grounds, shared suffering and friendly dispositions . . . . .	253
— d) <i>to</i> particular desires, customary practices and Bacchic Halls . . . . .	254
— e) <i>to</i> dwelling in relative harmony . . . . .	259
— f) <i>to</i> basic conditions, ancient traditions, and “first” friends . . . . .	262
— g) <i>to</i> justice . . . . .	264

11. ANALOGOUS ACTS AND FIGURATIVE SPEECH: A MANIFOLD SCHEME AND ITS VARIOUS SCHEMAS . . .	267
(a mixed analogy and its model similes)	
11.1 Fastening, Fettering and Fixing ‘Ships’ . . . . .	272
11.2 ‘Fitting’ actions: harmonizing in the midst of discord . . . . .	276
11.3 ‘Rowing’ double-oared ships, winged vessels and animate ensembles . . . . .	280
11.4 Double-bridling (and related modes of restraining dangerous thresholds) . . . . .	285
11.5 Tunneling in, back out and through—as an ‘auger’ . . . . .	290
11.6 ‘Circling’: a mimetic, marvelous and menacing act . . . . .	292
11.7 A ‘branch’ transformed: incendiary, rejuvenating and inaugurating agencies . . . . .	295
11.8 ‘Withering-together’: attempting elemental adjustments . . . . .	306
11.9 Symmetrical Corrections: dimming Cyclopean vision . . . . .	314
12. ENTHUSING INVENTIONS AND POETIC ADJUSTMENTS	
(what “architects” make) . . . . .	319
13. DRAMATIC PROPERTIES: INFLUENTIAL ATTRIBUTES OF ARCHITECT-FIGURES . . . . .	323
13.1 An Adaptive and Decisive doubled-edged Sword . . . . .	327
— a) Epic Swordplay: Odysseus’ peculiar relation to swords . . . . .	328
— b) Crafting Justice: architect-figures and obligations to strife . . . . .	334
— c) Poetic Measures: swords as tragic, comic and satyric devices . . . . .	337
13.2 An Ever-flowing Flask of Potent Wine . . . . .	342
— a) Temperamental and Situational Transformations . . . . .	343
13.3 A Diversely Appealing Cup . . . . .	349
— a) A single vessel with diverse appeals . . . . .	351
— b) Propitious Vessels: consensual schemes and the schema of <i>spondē</i> . . . . .	354
— c) Performative vessels, magical sips and sacred properties . . . . .	357
— d) A bowl of storied provenance and architectural potentiality . . . . .	361
Conclusion: metaphoric potential and dramatic understandings . . . . .	367
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	379

In the late fifth century BCE, two Greek dramatists brought “architects” into their plays—and into performance—at the Great Dionysia festival in Athens. For Euripides, “architect” named a protagonist (Odysseus) scheming to overcome the Cyclops; for Aristophanes, “architect” qualified a comic hero (Trygaeus) daring to restore Peace. Later (circa 200 BCE), the Latin dramatist Plautus also featured “architects” in his comic plays. For Plautus, *architectus* entitled a variety of cunning slaves who, devising and directing elaborate ruses, succeed in outwitting diverse adversaries for the common good. Although remarkable for being among the earliest extant “architects” to appear in Greek and Latin literature,<sup>1</sup> these architect-protagonists are also surprising, in part, because architecture (as it tends to be objectified) is not their target of attention. Rather, transformative and restorative schemes are their foremost concern. While such peculiarities already commend these figures for study there are further grounds for considering their deeds: by their exemplary performances in particular situations these “architects” offer mimetic demonstrations of primary architectural acts—situated, mediated, decisive and influential acts that, being subtle and ephemeral, are otherwise difficult to perceive. In other words, these plays and protagonists provide vivid (if oblique) dramatizations of *architecting*, and invite basic questions concerning what architects *do*.

This dissertation interprets the actions of the “architects” in Euripides’ satyr play *Cyclops* and Aristophanes’ comedy *Peace*. The later performances of “architects” in the Latin plays of Plautus serve only as occasional points of reference; and a few other “architects” found in the fragments of Athenian drama and in other ancient Greek literature will be summarily treated. Although the primary plays (*Cyclops* and *Peace*) and their protagonists (Odysseus and Trygaeus) have been studied from a variety of perspectives within the discipline of Classics, the figurative “architects” in these plays have rarely been commented upon and, where they have, the implications they raise for architects have not been considered.<sup>2</sup> Neither have these figures played any part in

---

<sup>1</sup> The “architects” in Aristophanes’ *Peace* (line 305) and Euripides’ *Cyclops* (line 477) are roughly synchronic with the “architects” anecdotally mentioned in Herodotus’ *Histories*. See below, p. 36, n. 71. The *architectus*-figures in Plautus (in *Miles Gloriosus* 903-03, 915-21; *Poenulus* 1110; *Mostellaria* 760; *Truculentus* 3; and *Amphitruo* 45) provide the earliest appearances of the term in extant Latin literature—nearly two centuries before Vitruvius.

<sup>2</sup> A few classical scholars note the suggestive oddity of the “architect” trope in *Cyclops* and *Peace*, as in Seaford (1984), 193-94; Graves (1911), 83-4; Slater (2002), 121; and Arnott (1996), 450-51. Others note, in passing, the metaphor’s relation to normative building trades, as in Olson (1998), 133; Olcott (1973); Sharples (1905), 86; and Merry (1900), 24. The Latin *architectus* trope in Plautus, although considered “obscure” in one instance by Christenson

architectural discourse.<sup>3</sup> Thus, a basic intent of this study is to introduce these dramatic architect-figures to architects and to their interpreters. Yet, the intent is also, more probingly, to ascertain what these poetic agents have to offer our understanding of architects. And so, although this dissertation makes extensive use of classical scholarship, the line of inquiry is mainly architectural. The primary questions guiding this study are these: What motivated the dramatic poets to qualify their protagonists as architects? What is implied about architects and architectural acts by the manner in which they did? And, what do the dramatic plots and their mythic models suggest about the peculiar situations that architects figure into and struggle to transform?

Beyond probing the particular plays through such questions, this dissertation also has two more theoretical aims: to uncover the earliest examples of a *topos*, one that posits dramatic protagonists (and dramatic poets) *as* architects,<sup>4</sup> and, more importantly, to draw-out the performative aspects of *architecting* that this *topos* suggests. As this study unfolds, I intend to show that what at first might seem like a casual metaphor cast onto clever heroes, opens more profoundly onto an intricate web of mythic, ritual and metaphoric associations that are as telling as they are troubling about the representative deeds and ethical dilemmas that architects perennially enact. The corpus of Athenian drama and Homeric epic, as well as select historical writings and inscriptions from the

---

(2000), 146, has been considered by other scholars as a significant metaphor not only for the cunning slave (*servus callidus*) leading the ruse within the play, but also for the knowing dramatist leading and adapting the play's plot, as in Sharrock (2009), esp. 17; Slater (1985), 172; Duckworth (1994), 160-67; and Frangoulidis (1994), esp. 80. The relevant observations of these and other scholars will be introduced at appropriate instances throughout this study.

- <sup>3</sup> I have not found these Greek architect-figures to be mentioned, even anecdotally, in architectural discourse, although other details from Athenian drama (such as the use of vocabulary for temple parts; references to craftsmen and tools; and descriptive imagery of gods, temple settings and religious rites) are cited and discussed, as in Rykwert (1976), 87, and (1996) esp. 128-29, 186; Hersey (1988), 30, 62, 74-4, 111; Coulton (1976), 1, 11, 44; Burford (1972), 53, 99, 135; Bundgaard (1957), 136; Onians (1988), 8; and Scully (1969). Certain architectural historians have also noted the fact that the Latin word "*architectus*" appears for the first time in Plautus, as in Pevsner (1942), 549; and Clarke (1963), 17.
- <sup>4</sup> The *topos* of the poet *as tekton* (fitting-together verses like a craftsman) is as old as poetry itself and widely discussed in classical scholarship and related disciplines (see below, p. 51, n. 104). However, the "architects" under study here have *not*, to my knowledge, been a part of this discussion, even though they arguably participate as a variation on this *topos*. As such, the figures in *Peace* and *Cyclops* provide the earliest examples of this "architect" variation, which then persists not only in the Latin plays of Plautus, but in later drama, notably in the English Renaissance (see below, p. 204, n. 466). The related *topos* of God *as* architect, which becomes influential in Judeo-Christian imagery, is beyond the scope of this study. On the significance of this figure in architectural discourse (which was influenced, in part, by a key proverb in the Old Testament, 8.27-30, by the *demiourgos*-figure in Plato's *Timeaus*, and by the writings of Philo of Alexandria), see Pérez-Gómez (1999), and Smith (2000).

fifth century BCE, comprise the primary limits for investigating this web of architecturally telling associations. My premise in focusing on dramatic sources and in drawing out the actions and agencies of architects is that drama may be understood as a mode of representation that—like drawing, modeling and writing—is proper to architects. Although other interpreters have recently discussed such a mode of representation (through other examples) in terms of “ephemeral”, “gestural”, “demonstrative”, “mimetic”, “prophetic”, “verbal”, “rhetorical” and “ethical” acts,<sup>5</sup> the dramas under study here provide especially appropriate material to speak theoretically about such performances and to inquire, with precision, into the *modus operandi* of architects.

Finally, in treating Greek literary sources from the fifth century BCE—from a time when architects were only just beginning to gain that title and so appear as figures of cultural significance—this dissertation argues for a reconsideration of how *architektons* can be most fundamentally understood; that is, less hierarchically as *master*-builders, and more poetically and dramatically as agents of *archai*—as individuals who knowingly initiate, make and make apparent *for others* auspicious beginnings, originating conditions and exemplary restorative schemes. Put differently, this study aims to uncover and recover certain metaphoric, ritual and mythic meanings that underlie architectural acts and, although largely obscured today by literal, popular, and narrowly practical definitions, nevertheless remain latent both in the “architect” title, and in certain acts performed with earnest architectural intent.

It is also appropriate to say a few words about the overall layout of this dissertation. Following a prologue, through which I establish the primary topics to be elaborated, the study moves to interpret, in detail, the architect-figures in each play, first in *Peace* and then in *Cyclops*. Although certain architectural acts found in *Cyclops* are anticipated through my initial discussion of *Peace*, and a number of arguments concerning the figure in *Peace* are recalled in the subsequent analysis of the “architects” in *Cyclops*, the relative complexity of each drama has made it best to keep my interpretation of the two plays and their protagonists apart. Thus, chapters one through

---

<sup>5</sup> For example, Frascari (1991), esp. 95; Leatherbarrow (2001), esp. 90; Bruzina (1990), esp. 205; Pérez-Gómez (2006), and with Pellitier (1997), esp. 7-9; Rykwert (1982), esp. 68, 71; Harries (1997); and Veseley (2004), esp. 44, 70-5. I mention here those disciplinary studies that regard the architect’s performative role historically, philosophically, poetically and/or mythically. Other studies, more marginally relevant to the general question of this dissertation, include: those that study the performance of architects in the context of professional practice, such as Kostof (1977), Schön (1983) and Cuff (1992); those that study the “image” of the architect in culture, art and literature, such as Saint (1983), Wittkower (1969) and Kris and Otto (1979); and those that study “incorporated knowledge” and cultural performances, in general, in related theatrical and anthropological disciplines, such as Barba (1991); Hastrup (1995) and (2004); de Certeau (1984); Bruner (1990); Geertz (1973); and Bourdieu (1977).



six focus on *Peace*, and chapters seven through thirteen on *Cyclops*. Given the difference of genre—Comedy and Satyr play (an afterpiece to Tragedy)—as well as the different status of the two protagonists—an otherwise unknown farmer (Trygaeus) and a well-known Homeric hero (Odysseus)—the interpretive strategy varies for each play accordingly. Whereas Trygaeus’ architectural acts are interpreted mainly in relation to the contemporaneous situation in Athens and to comparable protagonists in Aristophanes’ other plays, Odysseus’ acts are interpreted mainly in relation to Homeric poetry and to certain Euripidean tragedies.

The treatment of each architect-figure begins by paraphrasing the dramatic plot in which they are implicated and subsequently lead (chapters one and seven); then proceeds to lay out the relevant grounds for interpretation (chapters two to three and eight to nine); then moves on to selectively interpret the language, imagery, situation and actions (motives, manners and effects) that are presented in each play and that are closely associated with the protagonist’s role as “architect”. Whereas Trygaeus’ role primarily involves directing the collaborative recovery of Peace, in part by dramatically representing Peace’s absence and re-emergent presence (chapters four and five); Odysseus’ acts as “architect” primarily involve commanding, persuasive and figurative modes of speech (chapters ten to twelve), which, being at times supplemented with influential props (chapter thirteen), together make known and bring about a transformative scheme of liberation, restoration and retribution. This focused interpretation of the “architects” and their actions within each play is intertwined with an analysis of the larger cultural and poetic contexts in which these figures bore meaning. In other words, the interpretive strategy involves, on the one hand, delving into the figure of the architect as dramatized; and, on the other hand, reaching through and beyond that figure to their pre-figurations (their poetic and dramatic models), in an attempt to grasp the mythic, ritual and rhetorical milieu that these “architects” performed in the midst of.

Although architectural acts are the focus of this study, the interpretive work does not proceed by overlaying a predetermined understanding of what architects do onto these protagonists. Rather, this inquiry pursues an understanding of architectural acts as an open question, aiming as much as possible to let the dramas, the protagonists and their complex situations speak for, and show, themselves. I do, however, proceed with certain architectural topics and questions in mind. These I will now sketch in the prologue, with some help from Vitruvius and Alberti.

*Architectural Acts between the lines of Vitruvius and Alberti*

Before embarking on this investigation of architectural acts in the eccentric context of Athenian drama, it is helpful to first draw-out the significance of such acts within the context of architectural discourse. The treatises of Vitruvius and Alberti provide relevant material for this preliminary rehearsal. Conferring with these disciplinary treatises will also assist in articulating the primary architectural topics that will then be taken up through an interpretation of dramatic poetry.

**ENDURING PROPERTIES: VITRUVIUS' TALE OF ARISTIPPUS**

As he did for many of his ten books, Vitruvius began his sixth book on architecture with a story:

It is related of the Socratic philosopher Aristippus, that, being shipwrecked and cast ashore on the coast of the Rhodians, he observed geometrical figures drawn thereon, and cried out to his companions: 'Let us be of good cheer, for I see *vestiges of man*.'<sup>6</sup>

(*de architectura* 6.pref.1)

This much of the story has been valuably interpreted in recent architectural discourse.<sup>7</sup> Vitruvius, however, did not end his story with an impression of auspicious figures on the shore. Rather, he goes on to tell us that Aristippus' discovery on the coast of the Rhodians prompted him to *actively* seek out the city, find its citizens and engage them in philosophical disputations. Those disputations, indeed, must have been engaging since Aristippus, we are told, chose to remain in Rhodes while his companions prepared to sail

---

<sup>6</sup> My emphasis. Morgan, Trans. "*Vestiges*" retains the Latin term, which is otherwise translated as "traces" (Morgan), or "footprints" (Granger).

<sup>7</sup> These "geometrical figures" (*geometrica schemata*) have been interpreted as orienting and civilizing marks, in Leatherbarrow (2000), 228-9, 239; as prompting "transcendental revelation" in Pérez-Gómez (1983), 43; as establishing the geometrical foundation of architectural drawing, in Oechslin (1981); and, as evidence and "emblem" of men's learning, in McEwen (2003), 135-154.

back to their own country. When these companions asked Aristippus what message he wished them to relay home, Vitruvius tells us that he bade them relay this: “‘that children ought to be provided with property and resources of a kind that could swim with them even out of a shipwreck.’ These”—Vitruvius adds for emphasis—“are indeed the true supports of life, and neither Fortune’s adverse gale, nor political revolution, nor ravages of war can do them any harm” (6.pref.1-2).

As the geometrical figures did for Aristippus, and as the story of Aristippus did for Vitruvius, so this Vitruvian anecdote prefigures topics of relevance for this study. These topics concern the vital “properties and resources” of architects and the persistent support they offer. Prior to engaging these topics in the context of ancient drama, it is helpful to recall more fully Vitruvius’ presentation of them.

In telling this story of Aristippus in the way that he does Vitruvius makes at least two provocative suggestions: that the “properties and resources” (*possessiones et viatica*) of a shipwrecked philosopher are analogous to those of an architect; and that such possessions are the “true supports (*praesidia*) of life.” With these suggestions, Vitruvius also shifts his discourse, as he intermittently does throughout his treatise, from architecture to architects (a shift of emphasis this dissertation sustains); and this turn of attention is aimed *not* biographically at an individual architect, but rather comparatively and discerningly at the actions of an exemplary figure (Aristippus). By accepting Vitruvius’ suggestions and shift we are thus obliged to ask: in what ways are Aristippus’ “properties and resources” *like* those of an architect; and in a hypothetical shipwreck which of these remain animate while others go down with the ship? Moreover, of those possessions that will not sink, how is it that they not only endure but truly support life?

For Vitruvius, possessions of an intellectual sort remain afloat, while material riches and the benefits of chance sink. In his subsequent commentary to the Aristippus story, Vitruvius insists that trust is best placed not in material treasures or luck, but rather in “learning” (*doctos*) and in the “[directed] thinking power of the mind” (6.pref.3).<sup>8</sup> His valuation here, in the preface of book six, recasts what he had earlier set forth in book one, where a capability for “reasoning” (*rationatione*) and an encyclopaedic range of “knowledge” (*scientia*)—drawing, geometry, history, philosophy, music, medicine, jurisprudence, astronomy and astrology—were upheld as proper intellectual possessions

---

<sup>8</sup> *animi mentisque cogitationibus gubernari*. *Gubernari* suggests that this animate thinking power is “directed” or “steered”, as by a ship’s “pilot” or *gubernātor* (Lewis and Short).

of architects.<sup>9</sup> Yet, does Vitruvius’ encyclopædia sufficiently encompass and convey the peculiar “properties and resources” with which Aristippus swam to shore? If, as Vitruvius suggests, this philosopher swam away with buoyant “learning” and animate “thinking power”, we should be able to recognize these through the acts he performs upon landing ashore. What are Aristippus’ acts in the story? They are manifold: *interpretive* of the schemata in the sand; *social* in seeking out the citizens; *discursive* by engaging others in disputations; *decisive* in opting to remain with the Rhodians; and *pedagogical*, as well as *anagogical*, through the advice he bids his companions to relay. These diverse acts of Aristippus not only dramatize his “thinking power” and modes of “learning” but also demonstrate his avid, even meddling, curiosity. Moreover, these acts show his resilient capability to modulate and adapt his own plans and performance in unfamiliar and conflicted circumstances. Vigorous adaptability, then, would seem to be a kind of knowledge that Aristippus swam away with and that Vitruvius, by choosing to tell the tale, likewise upholds.<sup>10</sup>

Vitruvius was not alone in deeming Aristippus’ performance of adaptability remarkable, for a number of other ancient authors also made note of it. Some considered Aristippus’ adaptability as a cause for suspicion—an indication of unprincipled indulgence and loose morals.<sup>11</sup> Others, in apparent admiration of his malleable manner, speculated on how he had learned it. In *The Lives of Eminent Philosophers*, for instance,

---

<sup>9</sup> “Let [the architect] be educated, skillful with the pencil, instructed in geometry, know much history, have followed the philosophers with attention, understand music, have some knowledge of medicine, know the opinions of the jurists, and be acquainted with astronomy and the theory of the heavens.” (1.1.3). Vitruvius elaborates on these kinds of knowledge in book one (1.1.1-17).

<sup>10</sup> This active/adaptable kind of knowledge demonstrated by Aristippus and promoted by Vitruvius could be put in terms of *phronēsis* “practical intelligence”. Aristotle posits *phronēsis* as a kind of ethical knowledge complementary to *technē* and *epistemē*—technical and philosophical understanding (*Nicomachean Ethics*, 1141b). For a discussion of these kinds of knowledge in relation to contemporary architectural pedagogy, see Leatherbarrow (2001), esp. 85-7. As much as this dissertation concerns dramatic demonstrations of *phronēsis*, I am resisting the appropriation of this epistemological/philosophical category, which was not commonplace at the time of the dramas under study. Where the concept does appear in Athenian drama, it is usually as a verb, *phroneō*, ‘to have understanding’ (*LSJ*). On the single occasion where it arises as an abstract noun in a Euripidean drama it is mimetic of divine wisdom and ambiguously problematized, for Theseus (the legendary King of Athens) surmises, “*phronēsis* [human understanding] tries to be mightier than the gods. With our vainglorious minds we think we are wiser (*sophōteroi*) than the powers divine” (*Suppliant Women* 216-18).

<sup>11</sup> Aristippus was portrayed as a hedonist as early as the fifth century BCE, in Xenophon’s *Memorabilia* (2.1.8-9). On this topic, see: Gosling and Taylor (1982), 40-43.