Abstract

This paper focuses on the physical landmarks of the Athenian past that dominate the historic environment around the Acropolis in order to examine the factors which prevented the construction of an integrated historic environment in Athens. It mainly focuses on how shifting ideologies from the early nineteenth century to the present have resulted in a gradual change from the focus on a monumental heritage to one concerned with the living historic city. It demonstrates that these ideologies have been influenced by the contradicting international, national and local desires that developed independently of one another; yet they have contributed to the contemporary diverse historic urban fabric.

Introduction

The area surrounding the Acropolis has a dense and diverse built environment that constitutes the historic centre of Athens. It ranges from ancient, Hellenistic and Roman monuments to Byzantine churches, Ottoman mosques, baths, hamams, neoclassical buildings and constructions influenced by the Modernist Movement; these different remains are all part of and to varying extent still visible within the built-up areas around the Acropolis. These monuments collectively make up the historic environment around the Acropolis, but they are also a lived environment in which contemporary social activities take place. These different layers of history embedded within the architectural heritage around the Acropolis are a result of changing ideologies beginning in the early nineteenth century and continuing in the present, each of which influences the selections and priorities in the reconstruction of the Greek past.

The Greek state legitimised its existence through the preservation of the ancient monuments of the past (Καββαδίως 1900; Κόκκου 1977; Σκοπέτα 1988: 21-40; Πετράκος 2004). The classical antiquity that was selected as the appropriate past was strongly influenced by western European notions about the importance and value of this period (Herzfeld 1982; 1987). The scholars and local fighters even in the pre-revolutionary years identified themselves as the descendants of the classical period (Δημαράς 1977; Κυριακίδης 2000: 83-124). The strong connection of the Greek scholars in the early years of the creation of the Greek state to Philhellenes and foreign scholars (Δημαράς 1977; Πετράκος 1987: 234-39) evoked the protection of the classical monuments and the glorious past of Greece. Athens and its classical past became the focal point; while this primarily met international expectations, it clashed with the national and local expectations and interests. Athenians have ventured to redefine their identity on numerous occasions in the last two centuries through the contradiction between Hellas and Greece (Δημαράς 1977: 82-86; Herzfeld 1982; Πλούτης 1998). The programme of the Unification of the Archaeological Sites of Athens (Μπελογιάννη-Αργυροπούλου 2003; Γκλάνη 2004; Papageorgiou-Venetas 2004) implemented in 1997 is yet another effort to represent and redefine what should be the cultural heritage of the area.

This paper focuses on the physical landmarks of the past that dominate the historic environment around the Acropolis in order to examine what factors prevented the construction of an integrated historic environment in Athens. It focuses on how shifting ideologies from the early nineteenth century to the present have resulted in a gradual change from the focus on a monumental heritage to one concerned with the living historic city. It further demonstrates that these ideologies have been influenced by the contradicting international, national and local desires that developed independently of one another; yet they have contributed to the contemporary diverse historic urban fabric.

The focus is placed upon the hill of Acropolis and its surrounding area which constitutes part of the area covered by the programme of the Unification of the Archaeological Sites of Athens (Γκλάνη 2004; Papageorgiou-Venetas 2004), the programme of the Rehabilitation of the District of Plaka (Ζήβας 1977; Ζήβας et al. 1979; Ζήβας 2006), and the Acropolis Restoration Service (Μπούρας 2001: 1-3; Ιωαννίδου 2001: 4-7; Μαλλούχου-Τυφάκου 2001: 8-11; Mallouchou-Tufano 2002). In order to examine how the diverse architectural environment of Athens was created, the paper outlines the characteristics of Athens in terms of five distinct stages: travellers on the ‘Grand Tour’ in Athens: the creation of monumental heritage; Athens in the nineteenth century: the construction of monumental heritage; Athens between the World Wars: monumental heritage versus the living city; post-war Athens until the 1970s: reconstructing the past through ‘tradition’; and Athens from the 1980s to the present: the creation of the historic environment.

Travellers on the ‘Grand Tour’ in Athens: the creation of monumental heritage

In the Renaissance period, the revival of philosophy and art stemmed from ancient Greek civilization and mainly from the classical era. Historic buildings and the monuments representative of the classical concepts became significant and worth preservation (Lowenthal 1985: 74-96). Monumental heritage was strengthened in the age of enlightenment by the Western travellers on the ‘Grand Tour’ (Tsagakos 1981, 1985, 2003; Kreeb 2003), wherein travellers in Athens documented and drew the distinct monuments of the classical period. A number of well-known volumes contain drawings and measurements (Stuart & Revett 1762; Bowie & Thimme 1971). The focus was placed upon the architectural elements of the monuments and their artistic perfection. At the same time, the influence of the ‘Picturesque Movement’ (Jokilehto 1999: 50-53, 178-180) was evident in paintings depicting the monuments in an idealised setting in which the contemporary
medieval settlement was hardly acknowledged (De Vere 1850). Some of the travellers praised the classical monuments by contrasting them with the contemporary dwellings and life under the Ottoman conquest. Father Jacques-Paul Babin wrote in 1672: ‘Instead of the superb buildings, the glorious monuments, and the rich temples which were once the ornaments of this city, you can see narrow unpaved streets, poor houses built from the ruins of ancient buildings, decorated with marble columns’ (Tomkinson 2006: 209). Interest in the aesthetic and architectural elements of the monumental heritage by Western Europeans dissociated the monuments from internal socio-cultural processes and ‘marked an increasing awareness of the universal value of important works of art and historic monuments’ (Jokilehto 1999: 49). Both Europeans and Greeks attempted to portray the Acropolis and its environment as depicted in the illustrations and paintings of the antiquarians and travellers. This resulted in a strong interest in the reconstruction and restoration of the architectural classical monuments.

**Athens in the nineteenth century: the construction of monumental heritage**

In the emergence of the New Greek state (1830), the Acropolis and the surrounding area became the focal point of a historic environment that would legitimize the Greek identity and express the national heritage. The state was faced with the challenge of reconstructing the national heritage (Κόκκου 1977; Herzfeld 1987; Σκοπετέα 1988; Clogg 1988; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994) within a living historic town in which international, national and local interests had to be considered (Figure 1).
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*Town Plan of Athens, 1868 Curtius, E. 1868, Sieben Karten zur Topographie von Athen: mit erläuterndem Text von Ernst Curtius, Gotha, J. Perthes. Reproduced by kind permission of the Syndics of Cambridge University Library.*

The foreigners favored the imagined reconstruction of Acropolis within a ‘picturesque’ landscape as shaped by the preceding European travellers’ accounts. The plan of Kleanthes and Schaubert (Μάρης 1933: 11-15; Τραυλός 1960: 235-238; Papageorgiou-Venetas 1994; Παπαγεωργίου-Βενετάς 2001α) which was the first attempt at an overall plan for the area shows the influence of this idealized image clearly. Their plan marked the monuments of Acropolis, the north and south slopes and the immediate area around the hill as an archaeological zone for future excavations. The new town would be placed to the north of Acropolis, while the south side would be replanted. The proximity of the new town to the archaeological area was deliberate as it was considered desirable to the past and the present in a living town designed in the model of contemporary European capitals. The monumental heritage of the Acropolis was chosen as the central focus for the location of the administrative and commercial centre as well as the private sector with the latter linked through wide boulevards radiating around the northeast side of the historical area. The plan embodied the classical image of Acropolis in an idealised environment, in which the natural features were harmoniously linked with the living town and the monumental architectural heritage.

The proposed regeneration of Athens clashed with the reality and needs of the newborn state. The state was concerned both with the creation of the national identity and the reinvention of the Greek past. This enforced the distinction between the monumental heritage that would form the Greek identity and the development of the living town. This issue is obvious in the first Law 10/22 May 1834 Περί τῶν ἐκστημονικῶν καὶ τεχνολογικῶν συλλόγων, περὶ ἀνακαίνεσιν καὶ διασφάλισιν τῶν ἀρχαίων καὶ τῆς χρήσεως αὐτῶν and the foundation of the Archaeological Society at Athens in 1837. This became the main administrative body for the protection of antiquities and demonstrates the strong interest in the physical landmarks and artifacts of the classical period on and around Acropolis (Καββαδίας 1900: 20-28; Μπίρης 1998: 13-55). As a result, the state ‘ceased the use of Acropolis with the implementation of the Royal Decree on 18 August 1834’ (Κόκκου 1977: 76; Klenze 1838: 304, 727-729) and initiated restoration works (Klenze 1838: 304-309) in order to recreate the historic site of Acropolis by demolishing buildings and constructions of post classical and historical phases that altered the immediate landscape. The only building to be constructed on the hill from then until the present day was the Old Acropolis Museum, built between 1865-1874 (Καββαδίας & Κωνσταντίνακος 1906: 15; Κόκκου 1977: 195-201).

Around the hill of Acropolis, where future excavations for classical remains were planned (Μάρης 1933), the buildings and monuments of other historic periods were not considered worth protection and most of them were demolished while others became part of the living town. The outcome of this practice was the demolition of a great number of Byzantine, Frankish, Ottoman and post-medieval buildings which were evidence of the multi-faceted history of the town (Μάρης 1940α: 12-17; Κόκκου 1985: 30-31). The few historical buildings that remained intact were mixed in with the contemporary constructions. For example, in the area of the Horologion of Andronicos with its Hellenistic monuments there are also the Lassani residence (built in the 1830s) and the Ottoman Mendreso (Μάρης 1966: 49; Κόκκου 1982: 55-56) showing the incorporation of different historic periods in the contemporary living town. The state lacked the funds to expropriate the properties required for the proposed city plan (Μάρης 1933: 9); it used the limited funds for the reconstruction of the monumental heritage of Acropolis and for...
the construction of public buildings in the imported neoclassical style. On the south side, the Weiler building, serving first as military hospital and later as gendarmes’ barracks and the Observatory (1842), is typical of this kind of neoclassical constructions around Acropolis. Many major developments were due to the initiatives of the private sector, and were not fully integrated in the overall plan although they usually followed the neoclassical style. For instance, the construction of the first gas factory in Athens influenced by contemporary European industrial architecture (Μαχαίρας 1986: 26) and the Thiseio (1868) and Monastiraki (1889-1895) train stations in the west side of Acropolis and in the close connection of the Kerameikos and the Ancient Agora were financed by private enterprising (ibid: 16).

In the turbulent years of the creation of the new state in the nineteenth century, local people who had fought for the independence of the Greek state and possessed fields and houses around the hill of the Acropolis in the medieval town were reluctant either to accept an imported western life alien to their reality or for ‘their land to be expropriated with minimal compensation’ (Μπίρης 1933: 9) for the needs of the national heritage practice. For the people who lived there, Athens was a living town in which they were determined to keep their traditions and house their lives and dreams. Their influence on the reconstruction of the area around Acropolis is evident in their effort to stay in the immediate surrounding area. In addition, the workers who migrated from Anafi, an Aegean island, lived on the northeast slope of Acropolis, which is known as the Anafoitia district. Despite strong requests and orders to evacuate the area, they refused to move (Μπίρης 1966:172; Λεοντίδου 1990: 65; Καουτσουζέλιος 2001; Caftanzoglu 2001: 25). Many of the people who came from other parts of Greece, mainly from the Peloponese, resided in the Psirri district (Ξυγγόπουλος 2003), which is near the Kerameikos and the Ancient Agora archaeological areas. The new town, known as Plaka, followed the post-medieval structure with narrow streets favoured by the topography of the area. Some of the residences such as those in Thrasyvoulos Street, constructed in the Otto reign, followed the old pattern of residential architecture and remained uninfluenced by the neoclassicist style.

European, national and local interests influenced the diverse character of the living town; the image of Athens was completed through the reconstruction of the monumental classical heritage on Acropolis and the neoclassical architectural style on the monumental public buildings and private dwellings of the nineteenth century. A reconstruction of the imagined ancient Athens with the selected and fragmented monumental history was superimposed over the living town, in which constructions of the Byzantine and Frankish periods were still visible; the Ottoman past was implying the biography of a non-desired past which would gradually be forgotten.

**Athens between the World Wars: monumental heritage versus the living city**

In the first half of the twentieth century, the notion of the historic environment re-emerged in the effort to redefine Greek identity. The distinction between the classical monumental heritage and the living city was reinforced by national practices, whereas local and European influences were central to how contemporary life developed around the monumental heritage. In this period, Athens was transformed from a small town into a major metropolis city due largely to the influx of refugees from the defeat in Asia Minor in 1922 (Figure 2).
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The demolition of the post-medieval and contemporary monuments of the northwest side of the old town of Plaka for the excavation works of the Ancient Agora by the American School of Classical Studies in Athens (Greek Governmental Gazette 113A/1929; Greek Governmental Gazette 240A/1929; Camp 1986; Mauzy 2006) fostered the preservation of the classical past over the present (Μαυζ 1940: 12-17). The archaeological excavations aimed to unravel the classical monumental heritage, but at the same time documented the successive phases of the monuments emphasizing the continuing inhabitation of the place. The buildings dated after 1830 were not considered as part of the continuing history of the place.

European influence contributed to this diverse historic environment of the living town through the architects who studied in European cities, mainly Munich. They attempted to redefine the identity of the built environment of the living town by implementing different architectural styles that embodied the trends of the Modernist Movement (Mumford 2000). A number of public buildings for the welfare of the citizens and private residences were added, scattered within the existing diverse historic setting. Dionyssiou Areopagitou Street, which was unbuilt until the early twentieth century (Μαυζ 2003: 27), offers a good example of this trend. The architects experimented with Art Nouveau, Beaux Arts and Neo-Baroque styles (Biris 1999: 15-26), and in so doing disregarded the heritage of the remaining neoclassical architecture of the nineteenth century found on a small number of buildings. For instance, a large courthouse designed by A. Nikoloudis was proposed to replace the early neoclassical military hospital, the Weiler building, but its construction was cancelled due to its proximity to the Acropolis (Μαυζ 1986: 306-308; Φιλιππίδης 1984: 167). The residence of Parthenis in R. Galli Street and Dionyssiou Areopagitou Street (Παπαγεωργίου-Βενετάς 1997: 87; Γαλάνη 1999: 80) erected in 1925 in the Bauhaus style suffered a different fate, being demolished after World War II. The demolition or the preservation of the building on 17 Dionyssiou Areopagitou Street which was designed by Vassilakos Kouremenos and ‘combined the local classicism with the Modernism of the period around 1930s’ (Greek Governmental Gazette 357B /1988; Biris 1999: 133) was recently questioned because of the New Acropolis Museum.

The strong interest of the state in the classical monumental heritage and the construction of the modern city by local people, the private sector and landowners, allowed the implementation of different architectural styles that furthered the diversity of the existing multi-layered setting. The implementation of the heritage practice respected the preservation of the ‘picturesque perspective treatment’ and in principle ‘the historic and artistic work of the past without excluding the style of any given period’ (Athens Charter 1931). However, the focus on the monumental resulted in the preservation of the ‘aesthetic enhancement’ (ibid.) and the conservation of the building materials of the historic monuments. The respect for the ‘styles of all periods’ therefore emphasised aesthetic enhancement over the intangible elements that contributed to the continuity of the monument, and prioritised monuments from periods which satisfied traditional expectations. The monument was perceived as an ‘object’ as opposed to a ‘living monument’ in which the different historic phases emphasise the intangible cultural processes of the past societies.

Post-war Athens until the 1970s: reconstructing the past through ‘tradition’

In the beginning of the post-war era, the reinvention of Greek identity emerged through the return to tradition (Φιλιππίδης 1984: 251-316). Tradition was defined through the connection of the neoclassical movement of the previous century and the diverse architectural trends of the 1930s, a concept that was applied to the diverse architectural environment of Athens (Figure 3).

For the first time, Pikiones¹ connected the monumental heritage of the south slope of Acropolis with the historic buildings along Dionyssiou Areopagitou Street, part of the living city, showing the continuity of history from ancient times to the present. The stone pavement placed at the joining of the Dionyssiou Areopagitou and Apostolou Pavlou streets physically connected the Byzantine church of Hagios Dimitrios Lumbardis, the neoclassical building of the Observatory, and the dwellings of the early twentieth century (Φιλιππίδης 1984: 295-300).

The proposed reconstruction of the Peripatos, the circular path which connected the monuments of Acropolis with the archaeological areas around the hill of Acropolis and linked with the Panathenaic Street in the northwest, indicates the shift in perception. Despite the efforts to present the history of the Athenian built environment through the connection of its tangible landmarks, the neglect of its intangible characteristics and certain kinds of remains (especially unexcavated) undermined the attempt to integrate different practices and periods.

Legal measurements, such as the implementation of the Law 1469/1950 (Greek Governmental Gazette 169A/1950) that protects the buildings dated after 1830, were a decisive step towards the integration of the different historic periods in the environment. The discussions over the preservation of the Plaka district or its demolition for excavations reflect the debates of this period. The demolition of the district of Plaka for archaeological excavations had been designated with the implementation of the Law 4212/1929 (Greek Governmental Gazette 240A/1929); this reflected the perception of the previous period in which the excavations in the Ancient Agora had been conducted by the American School of Classical

---

¹ Pikiones: A street in Athens located between Dionysiou Areopagitou Street and Panepistimiou Street.
Studies in Athens. In the 1960s the protection of the monuments and buildings of all the historic periods including those constructed in the nineteenth century were legally protected. The implementation of the Ministerial Edict in 1962 (Greek Governmental Gazette 35B/2.2.1962) that suspended the interventions in the district of Plaka demonstrates the shift in perception; moreover, the preservation and the functional integration of the contemporary built environment into the historic landscape enclosed the regulations that were adopted later in the European Year of Architectural Heritage in 1975.

The Declaration of Amsterdam in 1975 reflects European perceptions over the preservation of historic places. ‘Architectural heritage has been gradually extended from individual buildings to urban architectural complexes and to the built testimonies of recent periods’. The legal protection of the district of Plaka in the 1980s resolved the debate and the demolition of a significant number of buildings of different historic periods.

Planning interventions that respected the diversity of the urban fabric and the environment according to the European ideologies were successfully implemented in small-scale. Organised town planning schemes were partially implemented with alterations, while private building practice undertaken by local residents contributed largely to the multi-faceted Athenian landscape (Philippides 1999). In this period, the urban landscape of Athens was largely altered due to the antiparochial building practice that gave the right to local residents to demolish houses and build apartment blocks.

**Athens from the 1980s to the present: the creation of historic environment**

Since the 1980s a number of programmes for the preservation of the historic environment of Athens were implemented by the Greek Ministry of Culture. These programmes demonstrate the shift from the monumental buildings to the built environment following the international shift from the ‘monuments’ (UNESCO 1972) to the ‘landscape’ (ICOMOS 1982) and finally to the integrated conservation of ‘historic towns’ (Declaration of Amsterdam 1975) and the ‘historic centres’ (ICOMOS 1987).

The Committee for the Conservation of the Acropolis Monuments (ESMA) was founded in 1975 in order to implement a scientific programme of interventions for the restoration of the monuments of Acropolis (Casanaki & Mallouchou 1983; Bouras & Zambas 2002). The principle of reversibility with regard to the interventions and the respect for the original structural function of the architectural elements were in the spirit of the Venice Charter (1964). This programme was probably central to the use to Acropolis later being inscribed on the World Heritage List (1987).

In 1999, the Acropolis Restoration Service (YSMA) replaced the ESMA in order to overcome bureaucratic, structural, and institutional difficulties (Presidential Edict 97/1999, Greek Governmental Gazette 104A/ 26.5.1999; Mallouchou-Tufano 2002). Under the new organization, funding from the European Community Framework Support was secured. The administrative body in charge of the Acropolis collaborates with the 1st Ephorate of Prehistoric & Classical Antiquities which supervises the Acropolis and its surrounding area.

The two studies implemented for the **Rehabilitation of the old town of Plaka** in 1973-74 (phase one) and in 1978-1981 (phase two) demonstrate the shift of preservation focus from a ‘landscape-monument’ into a ‘living neighborhood’ (Kizis 2004: 6-17; Ziņķs 2006). In the first study, the monuments of all historic periods were documented and evaluated according to their condition, age, and significance. A sociological study was further conducted and legal regulations evaluated. The second phase was the implementation of the first study in the area of Plaka. The implementation of the second plan therefore aimed at the regeneration of the living neighborhood of Plaka. Emphasis was placed upon the return of residents to Plaka and benefits were given to the residents (funding to restore buildings and parking lots among other initiatives). In 2001-2002, a number of interventions were initiated under the **Programme of the Unification of the Archaeological Sites of Athens**. The interventions aimed at the rehabilitation of buildings’ facades in the district of Plaka.

In 1997 the Programme of the **Unification of the Archaeological Sites of Athens** was implemented by the Company of the Unification of the Archaeological Sites of Athens S.A. owned by the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Environment, Planning and Public Works (Greek Government Gazette 909/15/10/1997). Its main aim was ‘the creation of a continuous fabric of public spaces, parks, and facilities for culture and recreation, which will incorporate and link all the significant cultural landmarks of Athens, including its principal monuments and archaeological sites’. The objectives include the ‘harmonious coexistence of various elements of the city associated with the cultural history and the modern growth in an upgraded environment’ (Γαλάνη 2004).

The unification programme included the remodeling of Dionysioi Areopagitou and Apostolou Pavlou streets through which the six archaeological sites were physically connected (The six sites are: Olympieio Archaeological Site, the Northern and Southern Slopes of Acropolis, the Kerameikos Archaeological Site, the Philopappos Archaeological Site, the Ancient Agora Archaeological Site and the Roman Agora and Hadrian Library). Within this area, a great number of interventions in the form of streets, public squares and restoration of building facades, including those in the Plaka, took place.

The programme’s aims included the unification of the archaeological sites and the recreation of the ancient topography of the environment at different periods in order to reveal different aspects of the socio-cultural life of past periods. The enhancement of the architectural monuments that were physically linked through the pedestrian pavements of Dionyssoi and Apostolou Pavlou streets was further implemented. This programme has contributed to a large extent to the contemporary cultural regeneration; Dionyssoi Areopagitou and Apostolou Pavlou streets have provided an open space for both Athenians and visitors of the historic centre of Athens, and have hosted exhibitions and cultural recreation. In terms of archaeological and architectural heritage, however, the monuments have remained distanced to some extent from the modern social activities and from an interactive communication with their environment and the people.

An important issue is that the Acropolis Restoration Service (YSMA), the Rehabilitation of the old town of Plaka, and the Unification of the Archaeological Sites of Athens were initiated in different times and implemented by different administrative bodies. For example, the Rehabilitation of the old town of Plaka is implemented by the Ministry of Environment, Planning and
Public Works, while the Unification of the Archaeological Sites of Athens is implemented by the Company of the Unification of the Archaeological Sites of Athens S.A. administered jointly by the Ministry of Culture and the Ministry of Environment, Planning and Public Works. In contrast, the Acropolis Restoration Service is supervised by the Ministry of Culture. This fragmented administrative structure results in a fragmented view of the built environment and not in a holistic approach in which all parts are part of a whole. Under this context, the dialogue among the environment and the historic buildings becomes to some extent unclear. Such an example is the historic building on 17 Dionysiou Areopagitou Street. The debate as to whether the demolition of the building would allow a clearer view from the New Acropolis Museum towards the Parthenon demonstrates that the historic buildings are not fully integrated in their environment.

The New Acropolis Museum, the last building constructed alongside Dionysiou Areopagitou Street integrates the historic continuity of its location within the building itself. It is built primarily to house the Parthenon sculptures, but the artefacts of the museum dating from the geometric period to the Roman phase complete the continuity of history. The building is placed on the excavated area of Hellenistic and Byzantine remains, thus incorporating the history of the site in its structure and visualising the multilayered history of the site. At the same time, the glass walls that open the museum to the environment indicate its position in contemporary society. The integrated policy of the historical periods within and around the museum demonstrates the continuity of the Athenian environment comprehensively.

Conclusion

The shifting ideologies from the early nineteenth century to the present have significantly altered the historic environment. Buildings of different historic phases are preserved by the policies implemented by the Archaeological Service, and others are added by planning practices done both by experimentations of architects and by local people. The urban fabric around Acropolis with historic buildings and monuments of the successive lives of the area demonstrates the biography of the area. Yet, buildings that are preserved and protected more than others show which memories the people have chosen to remember and treasure.
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End Notes

1. Whereas this paper only discusses the area around the Acropolis, it should be noted that the historic centre of Athens includes the neoclassical planning proposed by Klenthes and Schaubert.
2. There are therefore many examples of districts and streets in which different historic phases coexist throughout Athens. For an extensive outline of modern urban planning see also Travlos, Ι.Ν., 1980, Poleidomikes exekias ton Athenon: apo ton proostokion chronon mechi ton arxhon ton 19ou aiwnos, Athenai; Papageorgiou-Venetas, Α., 1995, ‘Athens: Modern Planning in an Historic Context: planning initiatives and their impact on the gradual creation of the cultural-archaeological park of the city’, Thetis, Mannheimer Beiträge zur klassischen Archäologie und Geschichte Griechenlands und Zyperns, vol. 5-6, pp.265-300.
3. Due to the architectural remains of the classical past a number of town planning schemes were proposed for their best integration in the new capital town. For the town planning schemes see Περιφερειακής Βιομηχανίας, Α., 2001, Αθήνα: ένα στέκι της κλασικιστικής, Αθήνα, Καστόρ.
5. Reversibility refers to being able to return any restored monument to its state prior to the interventions, if desired.
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**LAW S – RO YAL DECREES - PRESIDENTIAL DECREES – LEGISLATIVE DECREES**

Law 10/22 May 1834 (Greek Governmental Gazette 22/16.6.1834) 'Περί τῶν ἐπιστημονικῶν καί τεχνολογικῶν συλλογῶν, περί ἀνακαλύψεως καί διατηρήσεως τῶν ἀρχαιοτήτων καί τῆς χρήσεως αὐτῶν'.

Legislative Decree 17.7/16.8 1923, Greek Governmental Gazette 228A/1923 'Περί σχεδίων πόλεων, κωμών καί συνοικισμών του κράτους καί οικοδομής αὐτῶν'.

Presidential Decree 3/22.4.1929 (Greek Governmental Gazette 155A/1929) 'Περί γενικού οικοδομικού κανονισμού του κράτους'.

Legislative Decree 23.3.1929 (Greek Governmental Gazette 113A/1929) 'Περί χαρακτηρισμού ως αρχαιολογικού χώρου τμήματος της πόλεως Αθηνών'.

Law 4212/1929 23.7.1929 (Greek Governmental Gazette 240A/1929) 'Περί χαρακτηρισμού ως αρχαιολογικού χώρου τμήματος της πόλεως Αθηνών'.

Law 1469/1950 7.8.1950 (Greek Governmental Gazette 169A/1950) 'Περί προστασίας ειδικής κατηγορίας οικοδομήματος και έργων τέχνης μεταγενέστερων του 1830'.

Ministerial Edict 15794/19.12.1961 (Greek Governmental Gazette 35B/2.2.1962) 'Περί χαρακτηρισμού ως ιστορικών διατηρητέων μνημείων και αρχαιολογικών χώρων'.

Ministerial Edict ΥΠΠΟ/ΔΙΛΑΠ/Γ/1164/19744 (Greek Governmental Gazette 357B/7.6.1988) 'Χαρακτηρισμός ως έργων τέχνης 9 κτηρίων στο κέντρο της Αθήνας'.

Ministerial Edict 45810/1997 (Greek Governmental Gazette 909B/15.10.1997) 'Ενοποίηση Αρχαιολογικών Χώρων Αθήνας'.

Presidential Edict 97/1999 (Greek Governmental Gazette 104A/26.5.1999) 'Έργα συντήρησης και αναστήλωσης των μνημείων της Ακρόπολης'.