

Signs of Sublimity in *The Antiquities of Athens*

John Tzortzakakis

ARISTOTLE UNIVERSITY OF THESSALONIKI

itzortzak@arch.auth.gr

Abstract

Scope of this study is to explore, at a semiotic level, narrative-making mechanisms within the framework of eighteenth-century travel literature. Employing the example of the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates, as included in the first volume of The Antiquities of Athens (1762) by James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, aim of this paper is to demonstrate that two different and distinct semiotic sign systems contribute to the production of a single narrative. Reading the description of the monument, one can notice a linguistic and a pictorial narrative, since the monument is discussed both linguistically and pictorially. Therefore, the objectives of this study are to read the linguistic part of the above narrative closely, to observe the diverse semiotic sign systems which are active in its portrayal, and to attempt to identify semiotic signs as ones which could connect semiotic sign systems (the linguistic and the pictorial one, in this case), acting as an ever-standing bridge for the reader to continue their reading of the narrative of the monument from one semiotic sign system to the other. Taking this into consideration, the narrative of The Antiquities of Athens is thus better understood as the resulting force of that specific combination of narratives.

Keywords

18th century, reception of antiquity, travel literature, intermediality,

intersemiotic translation, Sublime

Introduction

This study consists of five parts. In the first part, entitled *The Choragic Monument of Lysicrates*, the modern history of the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates is traced, after a short description of the monument in question: from its early modern discovery to its incorporation in the Capuchin monastery, to the pyrrhic victory of its freedom, and to its final current restoration. In other words, what will be traced is its regeneration process. The study is conducted by means of a textual approach, based on literal responses to the monument itself. The second part, entitled *The Antiquities of Athens*¹ is an attempt at a close reading of the description of the same monument, provided in the volume of the same name. Coming as a result of the findings above, the next two parts seem to abide by a natural sequence of events. This includes examining, in the third part entitled *Aesthetic taxonomy*, the distinct vocabulary used, from the perspective of the dominant aesthetic theory throughout the 18th century, and examining, in the fourth part entitled *Intermediality*, the combination of words and images in the realms of a single narrative. The final part, before drawing to a conclusion, is the fifth part entitled *Intersemiotic translation*, and it is an effort to illuminate findings and observations noted in the previous part. It should be stressed, though, that it remains an undeniable fact that the same monument may induce different observations and interpretations.

The Choragic Monument of Lysicrates

A concise description of this monument follows. The description cited below is provided by the Topos Text project (Aikaterini Laskaridis Foundation):

The monument of Lysikrates is the most famous of all choregic monuments. Still in situ at the end of the "Street of the Tripods" and commemorating a victory in the boys' dithyramb at the City Dionysia in 335/4 [...]. It is a roofed cylindrical structure, ca. 12 m. high, set on a rectangular base, decorated with six Corinthian columns (the earliest use of such columns anywhere on the exterior of a building). Above the columns is an epistyle, inscribed on its eastern side, and decorated with a relief frieze depicting Etruscan pirates being harried by Dionysos and his satyrs and turned into dolphins. This will have reflected the subject matter of the dithyramb. It also had contemporary resonance. There was an expedition against pirates by the general Diotimos supported by Lykourgos in this same year, [...] the colonising expedition to the Adriatic of 325/4, explicitly to protect against Etruscan pirates, [...]. The tripod will have been on the top of the monument, its feet set either on the crowning akantchos decoration at the very top of the monument or on the roof below.²

In an illustrative selection of milestones of the monument's afterlife, presented in chronological order from the 17th century to the 20th century, one might pinpoint at least four:

namely, (a) the point in time when the monument was annexed to a monasterial building complex, (b) its opening to the public, represented here by the visit of Lord Byron as the most prominent among numerous travellers, (c) the demolition of the surrounding monastery during the Greek War of Independence, and, finally, (d) the restoration of the monument to its primary free-standing state under the Greek sun. Each of the above will be further discussed.

The French Capuchin monastery³ was founded in Athens in 1658, and in 1669 the monument was literally incorporated into the architectural corpus of the monastery, serving as a reading room and a library. A partial historical response to the question why the monument had not been demolished completely in the first place by the monks could be traced back to the *Constitutions* of the Capuchin Order of 1608, from which the following text derives. The text indicates the crucial role of Reverend Father General (Chapter 6, §82): «To avoid all disturbance, we order that no place shall be accepted or abandoned, built or destroyed without the consent of the provincial Chapter and the permission of the Reverend Father General».⁴

For an insight into the early modern rediscovery of the monument, let us remember, one should look into the study of the important archaeologist and epigraphy scholar Mr. Herbert Fletcher De Cou (1868-1911).⁵ The study was sent from Berlin, dated August 19, 1892, and was published in the *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* (1897) by The American School of Classical Studies at Athens:⁶

The Monument of Lysicrates first became an object of antiquarian interest in 1669, when it was purchased by the Capuchin monks, whose mission had succeeded that of the Jesuits in 1658, and it was partially enclosed in their hospitium. The first attempt to explain its purpose and meaning was made by a Prussian soldier, Johann Georg Transfeldt, who, after escaping from slavery in the latter part of 1674, fled to Athens, where he lived for more than a year. Transfeldt deciphered the inscription but was unable to decide whether the building was a “*templum Demosthcnis*” [*Demosthenes’ temple*] or a “*Gymnasium a Lysicrate*” [*Gymnasium of Lysicrates*] * * * “*exstructum propter juventutem Atheniensem ex tribu Acamantia [erected for a young Athenian from the Acamantis tribe]*”.⁷

During the opening of the monument to the public, in 1803, a report was published in French regarding the condition of the monument, signed by L.G. – plausibly written by the French architect, critic, and architectural historian Jacques-Guillaume Legrand (1753-1807).⁸ It referred to the same monument as “sans contredit un des plus curieux monument de l’art des Grecs”⁹ [without doubt one of the most strange monuments of the art of the Greeks]. A few years later, on August 23, 1810, Lord Byron, who was living in the French monastery while in Athens, wrote a comment on the monument in an

epistle to his friend, the politician Sir John Cam Hobhouse (1786-1869). An extract from that letter follows:

The Roman Catholic service is performed for the Franks in the Capuchin convent. The present Padre is an intelligent man, who, besides the duties of his holy office, is occupied in instructing from twenty to twenty-five or thirty of the sons belonging to the Frank families; he has fitted up the circular chamber formed by the monument of Lysicrates, with shelves that contain a few volumes of choice books. [...] The good Padre has divided it into two stories; and the upper one, just capable of holding one student at his desk, serves as a small circular recess to a chamber at the left wing of the convent, from which it is separated by a curtain of green cloth.¹⁰

That would probably have been the state of the monument when James Stuart and Nicholas Revett visited it, about fifty years earlier, in 1751. These two travellers-authors published their verbal descriptions and pictorial representations, along with their architectural drawings and measurements of its existing state in *The Antiquities of Athens*. The monastery, however, was demolished during the Greek War of Independence in 1821, during the invasion of Pasha Omer Vrioni in Athens. Yet, De Cou noted that “the convent was accidentally burned down and its most precious treasure was liberated”.¹¹ The Monument of Lysicrates survived, though not without a scratch. The following extract is from the account of the *Anonymous Eyewitness*:

In the middle of the day arrived the Pasha himself, and took his quarters in the house of the Austrian Consul: there he received the chiefs of the Turks of Athens, and there also the heads of the Greeks were brought, that had been killed, for every one of which he paid twenty-five piastres. Some neighbouring villages were plundered, and the churches destroyed everywhere, since the Greeks on their side had not spared the mosques. Even the church of the Catholics in the hospice of the Capuchins was burnt down, and the beautiful monument of Lysicrates (called the Lantern) damaged by the fire.¹²

Nearly half a century later, in 1845, the architects François-Louis-Florimond Boulanger (1807-1875) and Edouard Benoît Loviot (1849-1921)¹³ supervised the restoration of the monument of Lysicrates under the patronage of the École Française d’Athènes [French School (of Archaeology) at Athens],¹⁴ leaving the monument a free-standing structure as it had been originally built, and as it can be seen today. As De Cou notes in his study:

[a]side from some slight repairs and the clearing away of rubbish, the monument remained in this condition until 1867, when the French Minister at Athens, [Joseph Arthur, Comte] M. de Gobineau, acting on behalf of

his government, into whose possession the site of the former monastery had fallen, employed the architect Boulanger to make such restorations as were necessary to save the monument from falling to pieces. At the same time the last remains of the old convent were removed, and some measures were taken to prevent further injury to the ruin. Repairs were again being made under the direction of the French School at Athens, when I left Greece, in April, 1892.¹⁵

The Antiquities of Athens

The main aim of the architects James Stuart (1713-1788) and Nicholas Revett (1720-1804) was to record and measure the original architectural antiquities located, primarily, in the city of Athens. Yet, their work also includes descriptions, drawings, and measurements from the original Greek and Roman architectural monuments in Korinthos, Sparta, Thessaloniki, Delos, and Pola, along with several ancient statues and medals found in British private collections. It should be stated that the word 'Athens' is here used as a metonymy for 'Greece', connoting the Western area of the Ottoman Empire around 1750, upon which literate men and women had been projecting their understanding of Ancient Greece.¹⁶ The site in case here, the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates (400/380-323 BC.), a monument of the late classical period of Greece, is included in the fourth chapter of the first of the four volumes of the series.¹⁷ The volume was published by John Haberkorn in London, in 1762.

Stuart and Revett started their exposition of the narrative of the monument of Lysicrates by referring to the way it was perceived by local community at the time:

The moderns Athenians call this Edifice *To Phanati tou Demostheneos*, or the Lanthorn of Demosthenes, and the vulgar Story which says, it was built by that great Orator, for a place of retirement and study, is still current at Athens as it was the time of Wheler and Spon; but like many other popular Traditions, it is too absurd to deserve a serious refutation.¹⁸

The narrative continues with a detailed description of its architectural features, its iconographical program in the frieze, and includes elaborate comments on the accompanying plates and figures. Their comments could also be indicative of the appreciation of antiquities in general, on behalf of locals. The passage in question reads:

An Entrance however has been since forced into it, by breaking through one of the Panels; probably in Expectation of finding Treasures here. For in these Countries such barbarism reigns at present, every ancient Building which is beautiful, or great, beyond the Conception of the present Inhabitants; is always supposed by them to be the Work of Magic, and the Repository of hidden

Treasures. At present three of the Marble Panels are destroyed; their places are supplied by a Door, and two Brick-Walls, and it is converted into a Closet.¹⁹

In addition, their description of an architectural element, a cupola for instance, continues as follows:

The outside of the Cupola is wrought with much Delicacy; it imitates a Thatch or Covering of Laurel Leaves; this is likewise edged with a Vitruvian Scroll, and enriched with other Ornaments. The Flower on the Top of the Cupola, which is a very graceful Composition of Foliage, is exactly represented in Plate IX. of this Chapter; and is described in the Explanation of that Plate. It will be necessary however, at present, to point out to the Reader, certain Cavities which are on its upper Surface [See Plate IX. Fig. 2,] in which some Ornament that is now lost, was originally placed. This Ornament appears to have been a Tripod.²⁰

Stuart and Revett were among the first to recognize the depicted sculptural narrative as that of Dionysus transforming Tyrrhenian pirates into dolphins, indicating also that its textual sources were the *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (III.572-596). In one of the reliefs decorating the frieze, Stuart and Revett noticed the Figure of Bacchus with his Tyger. In the extract in question, they stated: "The first of these, Plate X. is the Figure of Bacchus with his Tyger. His Form is beautiful and delicate, and his Countenance is exactly that which Ovid has given to this Divinity".²¹

Moreover, in the third volume of *The Antiquities of Athens* series, Willey Reveley (1760-1799), architect and editor of the same volume, made an additional reference to the same monument, commenting on the fact that its roof consisted of a single piece of marble:

Even so small a temple as the Choragic monument of Lysicrates is now entire, a circumstance arising chiefly from the great judgement shewn in its construction, by erecting it with large blocks, and consolidating the whole with a roof wisely made of one single piece of marble.²²

Aesthetic taxonomy

If one reads the narrative of this architectural monument of the Late Classical Period of Greek Antiquity meticulously, and pays attention to the vocabulary used, one will be able to notice the use of certain vocabulary, such as the phrases 'every ancient Building which is beautiful, or great, beyond the Conception', 'with much Delicacy', 'graceful Composition', 'beautiful and delicate', from the extract cited above. These words – adjectives and phrases – prompt one to read this description under the prism of its chronologically contemporary, and dominant at that time aesthetic theory of Sublime, as expressed by

Edmund Burke (1729-1797) in his *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*, published in London in 1757.²³ Dora Louise Wiebenson paved the way for such a reading in her pivotal book *Sources of Greek Revival Architecture*, published in 1969.²⁴ Vocabulary items, such as 'graceful', 'Delicacy' or 'beautiful' are manifestations of the aesthetic category of the *Beautiful*.²⁵ However, the phrase 'great, beyond the Conception' may be pointing towards the notion of the Sublime as its aesthetic category.²⁶ According to Burke, *Beautiful* can be described as "that quality or those qualities in bodies by which they cause love, or some passion similar to it",²⁷ while *Sublime* "is the Astonishment, which is the effect of the sublime in its highest degree; the inferior effects are admiration, reverence and respect".²⁸ One may thus deduce from the above cited vocabulary that this architectural monument of the Late Classical Period of the Greek Antiquity may have been connected in the 18th century to both the aesthetic taxonomies of the *Beautiful* and the *Sublime*, according to Stuart and Revett. In support of this claim, one could also quote Burke asserting that the union of these two distinct aesthetic qualities is possible:

If the qualities of the sublime and beautiful are sometimes found united, does this prove, that they are the same, does it prove, that they are in any way allied, does it prove even that they are not opposite and contradictory? Black and white may soften, may blend, but they are not therefore the same.²⁹

Following this union of Sublime and Beautiful, Panagiotis Michelis worked on the same conception of the *Beautiful* and the *Sublime*, yet referring to Byzantine art, concluding that there is no opposition nor contradiction between these two terms, but an interdependence in terms of meaning.³⁰ Furthermore, after examining the vocabulary used, and by placing this seemingly natural binary opposition in Algirdas Greimas' semiotic square, for example the Sublime as S1 and Beautiful as S2, one might confirm the existence of a narrative that provides a framework for meaning, and one could also validate, in this way, the finding that Ancient Greek Architecture embodies both of these concepts at the same time.³¹ However, how could one perceive this single narrative, since it derives from two distinct semiotic sign systems?

Intermediality

The Antiquities of Athens series does not only contain verbal narrations and descriptions, nor merely iconographic ones, but a combination of linguistic and pictorial elements. Noting this, the series acquires the conceptual form of a syncretic, or polysemiotic text. Thus, the existence of two different sign systems, the linguistic and the pictorial one, suggests a theory that discusses multimodal communication or the synergy of two, or more, semiotic sign systems.³² Given that the media is perceived, here, as semi-

otic sign systems, the theory of intermediality – as this was described in literary studies, and originally introduced by Irina Rajewsky – may be employed, at this point. Rajewsky started testing this theory on emblem books of the sixteenth century, posing the simple question of how narrative is produced in that literary genre with the combination of images and words. A current, yet working definition of intermediality is that of Werner Wolf's: "a flexible generic term [...] that can be applied, in a broad sense, to any phenomenon involving more than one medium".³³ Rajewsky's and Wolf's approaches to intermediality³⁴ are applied here to illustrate that a single narrative can indeed be formulated from a combination of different media. In Stuart and Revett's *The Antiquities of Athens*, via the presented example of the Choragic Monument of Lysicrates, one can identify the notion of multi-mediality. According to Rajewsky, multi-mediality is the term indicating that a narrative can be produced when employing two or more different and distinct media. In the case discussed in this paper, multi-mediality refers to written verbal narrative text and written verbal descriptive text (linguistic narrative), and iconographic narratives (*i.e.* see below the discussion regarding the 'Plate 1' engraving), along with rigorously detailed and measured architectural drawings (pictorial narrative). Or, in other words, it refers to the linguistic and the pictorial semiotic system. The unified product of these two media, which remain distinct, bears the envisioned, by their authors, narrative of this monument in the 18th century. This single narrative would be that this architectural monument of the Late Classical Period of Greek Antiquity combines the aesthetic taxonomies of both the *Beautiful* and the *Sublime* which the authors experienced before it, as it can be deduced by the linguistic narrative, and reinforced, in this case, by the pictorial narrative.

Intersemiotic translation

The above description of the theory of intermediality includes another challenge: since these two different and distinct semiotic sign systems are used to communicate a single narrative, how are these two semiotic systems connected to each other? How do readers transfer themselves from one semiotic system to the other, and still producing one single narrative? The answer to this question may lie in the theoretical framework of *intersemiosis*. According to Roman Jakobson, a definition of intersemiotic translation or transmutation is "an interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems".³⁵ This is, of course, its fundamental definition, as research in this field has made great progress since that definition was put forward.³⁶ In addition, regarding the translation process, one should also highlight that translation is not understood here as an act of transferring linguist signs or words from one spoken or written language to another. According to Mona Baker, and her seminal work on translation theory, translation is here defined as the decoding of the meaning of a word from the source language, and then encoding it for another specific target audience.³⁷ The existence of both a gen-

eral and a more specialised audience in *The Antiquities of Athens* becomes evident when one pays attention to its pictorial narrative. The narrative engravings depict the monuments in their contemporary human-made and/or natural architectural context, along with contemporary human activities. They aim to appeal to a learned, yet not specialised audience. On the other hand, the exquisite architectural drawings may seem to appeal to more knowledgeable artists and architects.

How should the gap be bridged between the linguistic and the pictorial semiotic system, beyond a mere juxtaposition in the polysemiotic text? How can narrative transposition be defined?³⁸ If one returns to the quoted passage from the description of the choragic monument of Lysicrates in *The Antiquities of Athens*, one might notice linguistic signs which correlate directly to particular iconographic elements of the narrative. An indicative example of the latter may be observed the phrase 'See Plate IX. Fig. 2' or the reference 'Plate X', besides phrases and words acting as accompanying directing guidelines to the reader, such as 'is exactly represented', and 'See'. These guidelines – directly addressing the reader – were common practice in eighteenth-century literature.³⁹ These linguistic signs could be explained as verbal references to the pictorial sign system; the latter taking the form of a particular architectural drawing or of a specific engraving, in this case, and understood as such only in the context of the text itself. Likewise, when we look at the drawings of the volume, we locate a similar reference, directing us to the main narrative text. For example, in its bottom right-hand corner, 'Plate 1' bears the abbreviation 'Chap:IV. PL.1.', indicating, in this way, that this image refers to the text found in Chapter 4 in the paragraph entitled 'Plate 1'.⁴⁰ One could thus support that these linguistic signs are the first level of signs of intersemiotic translation, upon which later art criticism would be based.⁴¹ The above mentioned phrases play the role of reference points which connect either the linguistic narrative to its pictorial supplement or the pictorial narrative to its linguistic context. In the first case, the pictorial visualizes the adjoining phrases mostly in the left-hand side of the linguistic sign/text, while in the second case the linguistic signs place the pictorial narrative within its appropriate linguistic narrative.⁴²

Conclusion

To sum up, having read *The Antiquities of Athens* through the example of *The Choragic Monument of Lysicrates*, its perception in the 18th century seems to combine both the *Beautiful* and the *Sublime*, as understood with the help of its contemporary philosophical theory propounded by Edmund Burke. This narrative is produced by the authors employing both linguistic and pictorial semiotic sign systems. Moreover, these two different and distinct semiotic sign systems – two imaginary countries with borders and spaces⁴³ – are linked to each other through a kind of intersemiotic translation that will set the tone, and will later prevail as the main method of speaking about artwork.

Endnotes

1. The *Antiquities of Athens* series and its full content hold a prominent place for Classical Archaeologists, Architects, as well as Art Historians, Historians, and Philologists. On the other hand, in Greek art literature, we find the seminal study of Associate Professor Emeritus of European Art History Dr Stelios Lydakakis (Department of Archaeology and History of Art, Faculty of History and Archaeology, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece). In the above-mentioned study, Professor Dr Lydakakis (1966) elaborated on the diverse depictions of the Choragic Monument of Lysikrates from the 15th to the 19th century. Furthermore, it was during his lecture at the Acropolis Museum, Athens (2017) that I was presented with examples of the architectural reception of the monument in question, validating before my own eyes the monumental character of the same Ancient Greek architectural monument up until the 21st century. See Lydakakis (1966, 2017). See also: Mitsi et al. (2019). Furthermore, I would wish to express my most sincere gratitude and respect to Professor Emerita of History of Art and Museology Dr Malamatenia Scaltsa (School of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece), and to Associate Professor of History and Theory of Modern Art and Culture Dr Charikleia Yoka (School of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece), for bringing to my attention both the book and the monument in question.
2. "The monument of Lysikrates", *Topos Text*, Aikaterini Laskaridis Foundation. Available at: <https://topostext.org/place/380237ALys> (accessed 3 January 2020). The inscription reads as follows: "Λυσικράτης Λυσιθείδου Κικυννεύς ἐχορήγει / Ἄκαμαντῖς παίδων ἐνίκα, Θέωνν ὕλει / Λυσιάδης Ἀθηναῖος ἐδίδασκει, Εὐαίνετος ἦρχε." ["Lysikrates, son of Lysitheides, of Kikynna, was the producer. (The tribe) Akamantis won in the boys' competition. Theon was the flute-player. / Lysiadēs the Athenian was the trainer. Euainetos was the archon"]. See *Inscriptiones Graecae*, 'IG II/III³ 4, 460', Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3fo95ms> (accessed 3 January 2020). English translation: Stephen Lambert, 'IG II/III³ 4, 460', *Attic Inscriptions Online*. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3xSvEX3> [accessed 03 January 2020]. See also Umholtz (2002: 285), Mylonopoulos (2018: 231-274) and Ebeling (1924: 75-81).
3. The Capuchin Franciscan Order was introduced in 1528 as a revival of the Order of Friars Minor (Capuchin Franciscans). The latter was founded in 1209 by St. Francis of Assisi.
4. *The Capuchin Constitutions of 1536*, trans. by Br Paul Hanbridge OFM Cap, North American Pacific Capuchin Conference. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3r8nh5V> (accessed 22 July 2021).
5. For his memorial, see C. L. Meader, 'Herbert Fletcher DeCou, The Michigan Alumnus', *Faculty History Project*, University of Michigan. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3LliBgg> (accessed 11 December 2020). Also, 'The Mystery of DeCou's Assassination', *Archaeology Magazine, a Publication of the Archaeological Institute of America* (January 13, 2006). Available at: <https://bit.ly/3xOSBKv> (accessed 11 December 2020).
6. The same study was previously published in *The American Journal of Archaeology and of the History of the Fine Arts*, published by Archaeological Institute of America. See De Cou (1893).
7. See De Cou (1897: 317). His sources for this passage are: Spon and Wheler (1678: 244), Michaelis (1876: 103), Marquis de Laborde (1838: 75).
8. The following could also be highlighted from the work of Legrand. See Colonna (1804), Legrand (1806).
9. See L. G. (1803: 51); The digital copy was used, kindly provided by Oxford University Libraries via Google Books. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3dHpa6x> (accessed 27 September 2022); See also Braham (1989: 110-111).
10. See Hobhouse (1813: 327-328), Eliot (1975: 409-425).
11. See De Cou (1897).
12. "The Siege of the Acropolis of Athens, in the Years 1821-22 by an Eye-Witness", *The London Magazine, New Series*, 4 (1826: 197). I took notice of the reference through Vara (2019: 197).

13. See Hanoune (1979: 427-437).
14. See Korka, Xanthopoulou, and Konstantinidi-Syvrid (2005).
15. See De Cou (1897: 317-318).
16. See Palioura (2011), Ataç (2006), Moore, Morris, and Bayliss (2009).
17. See Stuart and Revett (1762).
18. See Stuart and Nicholas Revett (1762: 27). The seventeenth-century description by Sir George Wheeler (1650-1723) and Jacob Spon (1647-1685) states: 'The *Capuchins* have a little *Hospitium*, or Cell here, adjoining to the *Lantern of Demosthenes*; where a Missionary or two of that Order, do reside' (Cademan, Kettlewell and Churchill, 1682: 352), Early English Books Online Text Creation Partnership, 2011. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3rc4y9s> (accessed 02 June 2020): "Towards the South-West end of the Castle, as one goes out of Town to go to *Hadrian's Pillars*, at the little Convent of *Capuchin Missionaries*, is a curious piece of Antiquity. They call it *To Phanari Tou Demosthenis*, or *The Lantern of Demosthenes*. They tell you, that this was the Place, where he shut himself up, to follow the Studies of Eloquence with greater privacy; having, the more to engage himself not to appear in Publick, cut off one half of his Beard" (Cademan, Kettlewell and Churchill, 1682: 397).
19. See Stuart and Revett (1762).
20. See Stuart and Revett (1762: 29). For 'Plate IX', see 'Choregic monument of Lysicrates in Athens: Fig. 1. The flower on the top of the tholus or cupola. Fig. 2. The plan of the upper surface of the flower. Fig. 3. A perpendicular section of the top of the flower, made through the line A, B, C of the preceding figure', *Travelogues*, Aikaterini Laskaridis Foundation. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3fkEbeT> (accessed 24 July 2021).
21. See Stuart and Revett (1762: 33). For 'Plate X', see 'Choragic monument of Lysicrates in Athens: Sculpture on the frieze of this building, which represents the story of Bacchus and the Tyrrhenian Pirates: Figure of Bacchus with his tiger', *Travelogues*, Aikaterini Laskaridis Foundation. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3dK5EGm> (accessed 24 July 2021).
22. See Stuart and Revett (1794: ix [9]).
23. See Burke (1757). Other authors discussing the notion of the Sublime are Longinus (*On the Sublime*), Thomas Weiskel (*The Romantic Sublime: Studies in the Structure and Psychology of Transcendence*), Mario Costa (*Il sublime tecnologico*), David E. Nye (*American Technological Sublime*), and Jos de Mul ['The (Bio)Technological Sublime'].
24. See Wiebenson (1969). Professor of Architectural History Dora Louise Wiebenson (1926-2019) (School of Architecture, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, United States) was one of the first female full professors in her discipline.
25. The characteristics of *Beautiful* according to Burke are (in alphabetical order): 'Delicacy', 'Elegance', 'Fitness', 'Grace', 'Gradual variation', 'Proportion', 'Smoothness', and 'Speciousness'.
26. The characteristics of the *Sublime*, according to the same author are (in alphabetical order): 'Darkness', 'Difficulty', 'Magnificence', 'Obscurity', 'Silence', 'Terror', 'Unexpected', and 'Vastness'.
27. See Burke (1757: 74).
28. See Burke (1757: 39).
29. See Burke (1757: 114).
30. See Michelis (2015: 273).
31. See Greimas (1983), Lagopoulos and Boklund-Lagopoulou (2016).
32. See Royce (2002), Zantides, Kourdis and Yoka (2016), Kourdis (2020: 86-87).
33. See Wolf (1999: 40).
34. Transmediality is another English translation of the German term *Intermedialität*. See Rajewsky (2002), Elleström (2010), Rajewsky (2005).
35. See Jakobson (1959: 233).
36. For a history of the term "Intersemiotic translation", see Dusi (2015). For a discussion of the same term, see Kourdis (2021).

37. See Baker (1992).
38. See Fontanille, Sonzogni and Troqe (2016: 14–20).
39. See Iser (1974).
40. 'Plate 1' depicts the famous watercolour – originally engraved – by James Stuart of the internal view of the garden of the Capuchin Monastery with the incorporated Monument of Lysicrates. For the watercolour, see Julius Bryant, 'James 'Athenian' Stuart: The Architect as Landscape Painter', *V&A Online Journal*, 1. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3SuHI9n> (accessed 24 July 2021). For the engraving, see 'A View of the Choregic Monument of Lysicrates in its Present Condition.', *Travelogues*, Aikaterini Laskaridis Foundation. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3RclJBs> (accessed 24 July 2021).
41. See, for instance, Kourdis (2014).
42. This study has explored only the route from the linguistic towards the pictorial sign system. The reverse route, from the pictorial sign system towards the linguistic one, is amply discussed, to the best of my knowledge, in iconological studies in art history. See, for instance, the following basic studies: Warburg (1999), Panofsky (1939), Prevelakis (1975).
43. See Lagopoulos & Boklund-Lagopoulou (2015).

References

- Ataç, Cemile Akça. 2006. 'Imperial lessons from Athens and Sparta: Eighteenth-century British histories of Ancient Greece'. *History of Political Thought*, 27(4): 642–660.
- Baker, Mona. 1992. *In other words. A Coursebook on Translation*. London & New York: Routledge.
- Braham, Allan. 1989. *The Architecture of the French Enlightenment*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burke, Edmund. 1757. *A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and Beautiful*. London: R. and J. Dodsley.
- Cademan, William, Robert Kettlewell and Awnsham Churchill. 1682. *A journey into Greece by George Wheler, Esq., in company of Dr. Spon of Lyons in six books*. London, Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Library.
- Colonna, Francesco. 1804. *Songe de Poliphile*, 2 tomes, trad. J.G. Legrand. Paris: P. Didot l'Aîné.
- De Cou, Herbert Fletcher. 1893. 'The Frieze of the Choragic Monument of Lysikrates at Athens'. *The American Journal of Archaeology and of the History of the Fine Arts*, 8(1): 42–55.
- De Cou, Herbert Fletcher. 1897. 'The frieze of the choragic monument of Lysicrates at Athens'. *Papers of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 6: 317.
- Dusi, Nicola. 2015. 'Intersemiotic translation: Theories, problems, analysis'. *Semiotica*, 206: 181–205.
- Ebeling, Herman L. 1924. 'The Origin of the Corinthian Capital'. *The Art Bulletin*, 6(3): 75–81.
- Eliot, Charles William John. 1975. 'Gennadeion Notes, IV: Lord Byron, Father Paul, and the Artist William Page'. *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 44(4): 409–425.
- Elleström, Lars, ed. 2010. *Media Borders, Multimodality and Intermediality*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fontanille, Jacques, Marco Sonzogni and Rovena Troqe. 2016. 'Translating: Signs, Texts, Practices'. *Signata*, 7: 14–20.
- Greimas, Algirdas Julien, 1983. *Structural Semantics: An Attempt at a Method*. Nebraska: University of Nebraska Press.
- Hanoune, Roger. 1979. 'De Douai à Rome et Athènes: un architecte oublié, Florimond Boulanger (1807-1875)'. *Revue du Nord*, 241: 427–437.
- Hobhouse, John Cam. 1813. *A Journey Through Albania: And Other Provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia, to Constantinople, During the Years 1809 and 1810*. London: James Cawthorn.

- Iser, Wolfgang. 1974. *The Implied Reader: Patterns of Communication in Prose Fiction from Bunyan to Beckett*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Jakobson, Roman. 1959. 'On Linguistic Aspects of Translation', trans. by Achilles Fang, in *On translation*, Reuben A. Brower, ed. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 231–239.
- Korka, Elena, Maria Xanthopoulou, and Eleni Konstantinidi-Syvrid, eds. 2005. *Foreign Archaeological Schools in Greece, 160 Years*. Athens: Hellenic Ministry of Culture.
- Kourdis, Evangelos. 2014. 'Diepistimonikes proseggiseis sti metafrastiki diadikasia: I simiotiki tis metafraseis' [Interdisciplinary Approaches to Translation: Semiotics of Translation]. *ITI - Intercultural Translation Intersemiotic*, 3(1). Available at: <https://bit.ly/3LNmfFZ> (accessed 19 March 2019).
- Kourdis, Evangelos. 2020. 'Towards a Typology in Intersemiotic Translation from Verbal to Nonverbal and Polysemiotic Signs', in *Conceptual Readings in Language, Literature and Translation*, Mesut Kuleli and Didem Tuna, eds. Ankara: Nobel, 79–99.
- Kourdis, Evangelos. 2021. 'Le concept d'intersémiotité: une approche critique'. *Degrés*, 184–185: 1–16.
- L. G. 1803. 'Notice sur le modèle du monument choragique de Lysicrates, connu sous le nom de Lanterne de Démosthène, à Athènes'. *La Décade Philosophique, Littéraire et Politique: par une société de gens de lettres*, 1: 51–54.
- Lagopoulos, Alexandros Ph. and Karin Boklund-Lagopoulos. 2015. *Meaning and Geography: The Social Conception of the Region in Northern Greece*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co.
- Lagopoulos, Alexandros Ph. and Karin Boklund-Lagopoulos. 2016. *Theoria Seiotikis*. Athina: Patakis.
- Legrand, Jacques-Guillaume. 1806. *Collection des chefs-d'oeuvre de l'architecture des différents peuples: Exécutés en modèles, sous la direction de Louis François Cassas, auteur des voyages d'Is-trie, Dalmatie, Syrie, Phoenicie, Palestine, Basse-Egypte, etc.; Décrite et analysée par, architecte des Monumens Publics, membre de plusieurs sociétés savantes et littéraires*. Paris: Leblanc.
- Lydakis, Stelios. 1966. 'I eikonografia tou mnimeiou tou Lysikratous'. *Archaiologiko Deltio*, 21A: 163–183.
- Lydakis, Stelios. 2017. 'Choregiko Mnimeio tou Lysikratous: Kritiki – Aisthitektiki Analsysi – Eikonografia – Antigrafa kai Parallages'. Athens: Museum of Acropolis. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3ScQsk4> (accessed 28 September 2019).
- Marquis de Laborde, Simon Joseph Léon Emmanuel. 1838. *Voyage de l'Asie Mineure par Alexandre de Laborde*. Paris: Firmin Didot.
- Michaelis, Adolf. 1876. 'J.G. Transfeldts Examen reliquiarumantiquitatum Atheniensium Athen: In Commission bei Karl Wilberg'. *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Athenische Abteilung*, 1.
- Michelis, Panayotis. 2015 [1946¹]. *Aisthitektiki Theorisi tis Byzantinis Texnis*. Athina: Panayotis & Effie Michelis Foundation.
- Mitsi, Efterpi, Anna Despotopoulou, Stamatina Dimakopoulou and Emmanouil Aretoulakis, eds. 2019. *Ruins in the Literary and Cultural Imagination*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Moore, James, Ian Morris and Andrew J. Bayliss, eds. 2009. *Reinventing History. The Enlightenment Origins of Ancient History*. London: Centre for Metropolitan History.
- Mylonopoulos, Ioannis. 2018. 'The Power of the Absent Text: Dedicatory Inscriptions on Greek Sacred Architecture and Altars', in *The Materiality of Text – Placement, Perception, and Presence of Inscribed Texts in Classical Antiquity*, Andrej Petrovic, Ivana Petrovic and Edmund Thomas, eds. Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 231–274.
- Palioura, Mirka. 2011. 'Gynaikes periegitries sta Chania kata ton 19o aiona', in *Pepragmena 10ou Di-ethnous Kritologikou Synedrioy*. Chania: Xrysostomos, 521–546.

- Panofsky, Erwin. 1939. *Studies in Iconology. Humanistic Themes in the Art of the Renaissance*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Prevelakis, Pantelis. 1975. *Archaia themata stin Italiki Zografiki tis Anagennisis*. Athina: Emporiki Trapeza tis Ellados.
- Rajewsky, Irina O. 2002. *Intermedialität*. Stuttgart: Uni-Taschenbücher.
- Rajewsky, Irina O. 2005. 'Intermediality, Intertextuality, and Remediation: A Literary Perspective on Intermediality'. *Intermedialités: Histoire et théorie des arts, des lettres et des techniques*, 6: 43–64.
- Royce, Terry. 2002. 'Multimodality in the TESOL Classroom: Exploring Visual-Verbal Synergy'. *TESOL Quarterly*, 36(2): 191–205.
- Spon, Jacob and George Wheler (1678). *Voyage d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce, et du Levant, fait aux années 1675 et 1676*. Lyon: Antoine Cellier le fils.
- Stewart, Susan. 2020. *The Ruins Lesson: Meaning and Material in Western Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Stuart, James and Nicholas Revett. 1762. *The Antiquities of Athens*, 1. London: John Haberkorn.
- Stuart, James and Nicholas Revett. 1794. *The Antiquities of Athens*, 3. Willey Reveley, ed. London: Printed by John Nichols.
- Umholtz, Gretchen. 2002. 'Architraval Arrogance? Dedicatory Inscriptions in Greek Architecture of the Classical Period'. *Hesperia*, 71(3): 261–293.
- Vara, Maria. 2019. 'Amongst the Ruins of a European Gothic Phantasmagoria in Athens', in *Ruins in the Literary and Cultural Imagination*, Efterpi Mitsi, Anna Despotopoulou, Stamatina Dimakopoulou and Emmanouil Aretoulakis, eds. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 23–46.
- Warburg, Aby. 1999. 'Italian Art and International Astrology in the Palazzo Schifanoia, Ferrara', in *The Renewal of Pagan Antiquity*, Kurt W. Forster, intro., David Britt, trans. Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 563–569.
- Wiebenson, Dora. 1969. *Sources of Greek Revival Architecture*. University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- William John Eliot, Charles. 19745. 'Gennadeion Notes, IV: Lord Byron, Father Paul, and the Artist William Page'. *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens*, 44(4): 409–425.
- Wolf, Werner. 1999. *The Musicalization of Fiction: A Study in the Theory and History of Intermediality*. Amsterdam: Rodopi Press.
- Zantides, Eviropides, ed. 2017. *Semiotics and Visual Communication II: Culture of Seduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Zantides, Eviropides, Evangelos Kourdis and Charikleia Yoka. 2016. 'Semiotic Landscapes in Commercial Communication: A Preliminary Reading of Greek-Cypriot Shop Signs'. *International Journal of Signs and Semiotic Systems*, 5(2): 1–26.