

# The archaic temenos in Western Greece : a survey and two inquiries

Autor(en): **Bergquist, Birgitta**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **37 (1992)**

PDF erstellt am: **10.08.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660749>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

### III

BIRGITTA BERGQUIST

## THE ARCHAIC TEMENOS IN WESTERN GREECE A SURVEY AND TWO INQUIRIES

The exclusion of Western Greek sanctuaries from my *Temenos* book has been deplored or censured by some scholars. Having devoted some time to (re)acquainting myself with the evidence and the documentation available, I have come to realize that, even if I were willing to add a Western Greek chapter after a quarter of a century, this would not be feasible.

Only about a third of the roughly a score and a half of the Archaic Greek colonies in Southern Italy and Sicily has been preserved, excavated and published to any extent. A third of these is located in Southern Italy. The sites of many other colonies are covered by later settlements or alluvial deposits, or have been robbed or otherwise destroyed or are only sparingly excavated in connection with rescue measures. Although many sites have been identified, the argument on the Western Greek colonies is to a very large extent on the textual evidence, as some recent works testify.<sup>1</sup>

---

\* See the list of abbreviations below, p. 150.

<sup>1</sup> MALKIN; F. CORDANO, *Antiche fondazioni greche. Sicilia e Italia meridionale*, 1986; F. DE POLIGNAC, *La naissance de la cité grecque. Cultes, espace et société VIII<sup>e</sup>-VII<sup>e</sup> siècles avant J.C.*, 1984, Chap. 3.

From the point of view of method, I have noticed a regrettable dichotomy in the frequent studies of Sicilian sanctuaries, temples, architecture and *sacelli*<sup>2</sup> and Italiote architecture, temples and sanctuaries,<sup>3</sup> although it is in both areas a question of manifestations of the Greek presence due to the colonizing movement in Western Greece. And as the Sicilian instances outnumber the Italiote ones, Sicilian tends to stand for Western Greek. I suppose this deplorable state of things is to some extent due to the regional division of the themes and the excavation reports in the series of conferences at Taranto and Palermo, respectively. There are, however, exceptions.<sup>4</sup> It has also struck

<sup>2</sup> Belvedere; M.-Th. LE DINAHET, «Sanctuaires chthoniens de Sicile de l'époque archaïque à l'époque classique», in *Temples et sanctuaires. Séminaire de recherche 1981-1983* (Travaux de la Maison de l'Orient, 7), 1984, 137-152; G. GULLINI, «L'architettura templare greca in Sicilia dal primo archaismo alla fine del V secolo», *Tempio greco*, 21-42; idem, «L'architettura», in G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI *et al.* (eds.), *Sikanie. Storia e civiltà della Sicilia greca*, 1986, 415-491; I. ROMEO, «Sacelli arcaici senza peristasi nella Sicilia greca», in *Xenia* 17 (1989), 5-54; A. DI VITA, «Town planning in the Greek colonies of Sicily from the time of their foundations to the Punic wars», in J.-P. DESCŒUDRES (ed.), *Greek colonists and native populations* (Congr. Sydney, July 1985), 1990, 343-363.

<sup>3</sup> G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI, «Santuari extramurani in Magna Grecia», in *PP* 17 (1962), 241-246; D. MERTENS, «Zur archaischen Architektur der achäischen Kolonien in Unteritalien», in U. JANTZEN (ed.), *Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heiligtümern*, 1976, 167-196; idem, «Per l'urbanistica e l'architettura della Magna Grecia», in *Megale Hellas. Nome e immagine* (Atti 21 Taranto), 1982, 95-141.

<sup>4</sup> E.g. D. MERTENS, *Der Tempel von Segesta und die dorische Tempelbaukunst des griechischen Westens in klassischer Zeit* (DAI Rome, Sonderschriften 6), 1984; C. PARISI PRESICCE, «La funzione delle aree sacre nell'organizzazione urbanistica primitiva delle colonie greche (alla luce della scoperta di un nuovo santuario periferico di Selinunte)», in *ArchClass* 36 (1984), 19-132.

me that, as an outcome of the pronounced lopsidedness in the direction of urbanistics and the relationship between *apoikia* and *chora*, the non-urban, peripheral sanctuaries and their siting have apparently come into focus at the expense of the urban, colonial sanctuaries.<sup>5</sup>

It seems best to begin by taking stock of the available evidence, meagre though it is, from the Archaic Western Greek sanctuaries — not mere temples — that are as entire as possible.<sup>6</sup> First, the Chalkidian colony of **Naxos** (Fig. 1)<sup>7</sup> on Sicily, founded in the 730's. In the SW. corner of the city hillock, a slightly trapezoidal, W.-E.-extending temenos of late-7th-century date was dedicated to Aphrodite or Hera. The temenos, the E. boundary of which has not been established, was bordered in the S., W. and N. by a peribolos wall in a polygonal

<sup>5</sup> E.g. G. VALLET, «La cité et son territoire dans les colonies grecques d'Occident», in *La città e il suo territorio* (Atti 7 Taranto), 1968, 81-94; idem, «Urbanisation et organisation de la chora coloniale grecque en Grande Grèce et en Sicile», in *Modes de contacts et processus de transformation dans les sociétés anciennes* (Actes du coll. de Cortone, May 1981; Coll. EFR, 67), 1983, 937-956, *passim*; idem, «Le fait urbain en Grèce et en Sicile à l'époque archaïque», in *Kokalos* 30-31 (1984-1985), 149-151; F. DE POLIGNAC (*supra* n. 1); C. PARISI PRESICCE (*supra* n. 4).

<sup>6</sup> E.-oriented temples and E.-W.-oriented altars (more or less nominally) are not specified.

<sup>7</sup> *Bibliography. Naxos*: G.V. GENTILI, in *BdA* 41 (1956), 331; P. PELAGATTI, in *BdA* 49 (1964), 153-161, fig. 4; eadem, in *Kokalos* 14-15 (1968-1969), 352 f.; eadem, in *BdA* 57 (1972), 215-218; eadem, in *Kokalos* 18-19 (1972-1973), 181 f. (intervento); eadem, in *Kokalos* 22-23 (1976-1977), 542; eadem, *Tempio greco*, 46-48; eadem, *Insedimenti*, 136-138; eadem, in *Gli Eubei in Occidente* (Atti 18 Taranto), 1979, 154-156 (intervento); eadem, *Atti Atene* 1, 295-303; N. VALENZA MELE, «Hera ed Apollo nella colonizzazione euboica d'Occidente», in *MEFRA* 89 (1977), 504-506; M. GUARDUCCI, «Una nuova dea a Naxos in Sicilia e gli antichi legami fra la Naxos siceliota e l'omonima isola delle Cicladi», in *MEFRA* 97 (1985), 15-19.

technique of late-7th- to mid-6th-century date, which first had an entrance in the S. wall and later a propylon in the N. one. Roughly in the middle between the S. entrance and the W. peribolos wall and in the middle of the S. half, the sanctuary contained an altar and, N. of the altar, temple A, while in the third quarter of the 6th century after a submersion the temple was replaced at a higher level but on the same spot by the larger temple B.

In the Korinthian colony of **Syrakousai** (Fig. 1)<sup>8</sup> on Sicily, founded in the 730's, there is precious little in the way of sanctuaries to record. In the N. part of the island of Ortygia, a peripteral temple, dedicated to Apollon, was erected in the early/mid 6th century in a restricted, E.-W.-extending temenos, the SW. corner of the peribolos wall of which is known 8 m and 5 m, respectively, from the temple. The altar, the entrance and the rest of the sanctuary (mainly to the N.?), however, are not known.

In the S. half of the island, Orsi excavated the pitiful remains of an Archaic (6th-century?) temple, dedicated to Artemis or Athena, and, E. of it, a square altar, surrounded by a rich, sacrificial débris, dating from the late 8th or 7th century but long retained and raised in level. In the late 6th century, a peripteral Ionic temple was erected above and slightly N. of this temple and later, S. of it, a Classical Doric temple. The extension, the boundaries and the entrance of the sanctuary are completely unknown, except for Orsi's brave attempts concerning the E. side.

---

<sup>8</sup> *Bibliography. Syrakousai*: G. CULTRERA, in *MonAnt* 41 (1951), 733-760; G.V. GENTILI, in *Palladio* 16, N.S. (1967), 61-84; 61-84; P. PELAGATTI, in *DialArch* 2 (1968), 141-144 (intervento); eadem, in *Kokalos* 22-23 (1976-1977), 548 fig. 5; eadem, *Insedimenti*, 119-130; eadem, in *Kokalos* 26-27 (1980-1981), 707-711; and eadem, *Atti Atene* 2, 117-138.

Next, although it may not appear to be quite appropriate, we have **Megara Hyblaia** (Fig. 1),<sup>9</sup> the colony founded by Megara Nisaia on Sicily in the 720's. In the E. part of the N. plateau, a large, trapezoidal agora/temenos of roughly square shape was formed in the place where two sets of streets with different orientations met at an intersection. In the second half of the 7th century, two temples in a row were built in the centre of the S. half, while the adjoining quarters in the S. were curtailed, but no altars have been found, and a stoa was erected along the N. side of the agora/temenos and another one along the E. side. The W. side of the agora/temenos consisted of structures on the far side of the street that bordered this side: from about 630, a «heroon» opposite the N. stoa, from about 600, a temple c with a walled-in court (with an altar?) in front opposite the centre of the open area and, from about 530, a S.-facing, three-roomed hestiatorion with a preceding court opposite the row of temples. In the quarter opposite the N. side of the agora/temenos, a temple j with an open area in the S. towards the street and, along the street S. of the quarter S. or the agora/temenos, a temple l were erected in the second half of the 7th century.

<sup>9</sup> *Bibliography. Megara Hyblaia*: G. VALLET & F. VILLARD, in *MélRome* 81 (1969), 12-33; G. VALLET, in *Kokalos* 14-15 (1968-1969), 468-475; G. VALLET *et al.*, in *Annales* 25 (1970), 1102-1113; G. VALLET, in *Kokalos* 18-19 (1972-1973), 437-443; *idem*, «Espace privé et espace public dans une cité coloniale d'Occident (Mégara Hyblaea)», in M.I. FINLEY (ed.), *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne* (Civilisations et sociétés, 33), 1973, 83-94; *idem*, *Insedimenti*, 23-25; G. VALLET *et al.*, *Megara Hyblaea*. 1. *Le quartier de l'agora archaïque* (MélRome, Suppl. 1), 1976; G. GULLINI [rev. of prev.], in *PP* 183 (1978), 427-469; G. VALLET *et al.*, *Megara Hyblaea*. 3. *Guide des fouilles* (MélRome, Suppl. 1), 1983; G. VALLET, in *Kokalos* 26-27 (1980-1981), 796-804.

In the Achaian colony of **Metapontion** (Fig. 1)<sup>10</sup> in Southern Italy, founded in the early 7th century, a vast sanctuary extending slightly E.-W. and dating from the late 7th century was situated along the middle of the N. limit of the city plain. The original boundaries and entrance are not known, but simple stelai or cippi were raised in great numbers at an early date W. of the later temples A and B and E. of altar B. The first building was a small oikos temple and altar C I in the SW. corner of the SW. quadrant, which date from around 600. In the second quarter of the 6th century, a peripteral temple A I was begun N. of oikos C. It was never finished. Further N., temple B I, which was dedicated to Hera, was begun some decade(s) later with a different orientation. It was succeeded on the spot some decade(s) later by temple B II, repeating this orientation. About 540, temple A II, which was dedicated to Apollon Lykeios, was erected on the same spot as temple A I but with the same orientation as temple B II. Altars A and B to the E. of temples A II and B II were then erected, both with axes differing from that of the temples in the W. and approaching instead that of altar and oikos C I. Around 500, temple and altar C II replaced the earlier oikos and altar, repeating their orientation. About 470,

<sup>10</sup> *Bibliography. Metapontion*: D. ADAMESTEANU, in *RA* 1967, 5-16; idem, «ΑΠΓΟΙ ΛΙΘΟΙ a Metaponto», in *Adriatica praehistorica et antiqua. Miscellanea Gregorio Novak dicata*, 1970, 307-324; idem, in *Metaponto* (Atti 13 Taranto), 1974, 177-184; D. MERTENS, *ibid.*, 197-216; D. ADAMESTEANU, in *Metaponto I* (NSc 29 Suppl.), 1975 (pr. 1980), 15-311; D. MERTENS, *ibid.*, 313-353; D. ADAMESTEANU, in U. JANTZEN (ed.), *Neue Forschungen in griechischen Heiligtümern*, 1976, 151-166; idem, in *Thèmes de recherches sur les villes antiques d'Occident* (Coll. Strasbourg October 1971; Coll. intern. du CNRS, 542), 1977, 350-358; idem, in *PP* 34 (1979), 296-312; idem, *Atti Atene* 2, 308-313; D. MERTENS, in *BdA* 67 (1982), 1-57; idem, in *AA* 1985, 648-664.

an Ionic temple and altar D were erected in the NW. corner of the NW. quadrant of the sanctuary with an orientation similar to that of temples C I and II, which orientation was also repeated in Post-Archaic times in oikos and altar E in the NE. quadrant of the sanctuary.

Some kilometres to the NE. of the city, at present known as **Tavole Palatine**,<sup>11</sup> a large Heraion on a plain also existed from the end of the 7th century. It is reported to have contained an altar 25 m E. of a peripteral temple of about 530 and, 16 m N. of the temple, a wall and, still further N., remains of oikoi, but no plan seems to exist. Consequently, it is not possible to determine how they are situated in relation to the temple.

In the Creto-Rhodian colony of **Gela** (Fig. 1)<sup>12</sup> on Sicily, founded in the 680's, the E.-W.-extending akropolis plateau housed a sanctuary of Athena Lindia, the boundaries and entrance of which are unknown. Possibly from about the mid 7th century, the sanctuary contained a small temple A in the centre (?). The remains of what was claimed to be an altar are disputed, as being rather those of a thesauros. In the middle of the 6th century, a possibly peripteral temple B replaced temple A on the same spot. Mainly S.-facing oikoi were erected in the late 7th and the mid 6th century along the N. border (?). Around 500, these buildings and temple B were destroyed, a fortification wall was built along the N. border, inside which new oikoi were built, and in the first half of the 5th century, a possibly peripteral, Doric temple, probably also dedicated to Athena, was erected some 10 m E. of temple B.

<sup>11</sup> F.G. LO PORTO, in *Xenia* 1 (1981), 26-44.

<sup>12</sup> *Bibliography. Gela*. L. BERNABÒ BREA, in *ASAtene* 27-29, = N.S. 11-13 (1949-1951) (pr. 1952), 8-21; P. ORLANDINI, in *RivIstArch* 15, N.S. (1968), 20-30; E. DE MIRO & G. FIORENTINI, in *Kokalos* 22-23 (1976-1977), 430-437; iidem, *Insedimenti*, 91-93; G. FIORENTINI, *Tempio greco*, 105-112; eadem, *Atti Atene* 3, 55-70.



In the Achaian colony of **Lokroi Epizephyrioi** (Fig. 1)<sup>13</sup> in Southern Italy, founded in the 670's, at modern Marasà in the E. corner of the city plain, a sanctuary existed from the mid or late 7th century. It was dedicated to an unknown deity. The extension and the boundaries are unknown, except for an entrance and a section of peribolos/later fortification wall along the N. side. In the late 7th century, a simple temple was erected parallel to the peribolos wall and presumably also an altar on the same site as its successor. The temple was repeatedly rebuilt during the 6th century and finally equipped with a peripteros. Various Archaic altars and bases were to be found just S. of the temple and the altar. Around 480-470, an Ionic, peripteral temple with the same orientation as the earlier bases and altars replaced the earlier temple on the same spot, and an altar was built almost axially. It remains an open question whether the intriguing feasting complex at Centocamere (200 or 320 m!?) to the S. along the seashore had any connection with the sanctuary at Marasà. In the end of the 7th century, with a mid-6th-century addition, an U-shaped portico in front of two opposite aisles with first six and later 11, paratactic oikoi in each was erected.

<sup>13</sup> *Bibliography. Lokroi Epizephyrioi*: A. DE FRANCISCIS, in *Archaeology* 11 (1958), 206-212; E. LISSI, *Atti 7 congresso*, 109-115; G. FOTI, in *Locri Epizefirii* (Atti 16 Taranto), 1977, 348-351; M. BARRA BAGNASCO, *ibid.*, 378-380 and 398-404; eadem, in AA. VV., *Locri Epizefiri* I, 1977, 3-49; eadem, in *Quaderni de «La ricerca scientifica»* 100:2 (1978), 555-579; A. DE FRANCISCIS, *Il santuario di Marasà in Locri Epizefiri. I. Il tempio arcaico* (Centro di studi sulla Magna Grecia dell'Univ. di Napoli; Monumenti antichi della Magna Grecia, 3) [1979]; G. GULLINI, *La cultura architettonica di Locri Epizefirii. Documenti e interpretazioni* (Ist. per la storia e l'archeologia della Magna Grecia; Magna Grecia, 1), 1980; C. SABBIONE, *Atti Atene* 2, 287-288; M. BARRA BAGNASCO, in *Quaderni de «La ricerca scientifica»* 112:2 (1985), 181-194.

In the mid 6th century, a long retaining wall M/ later fortification wall with an Archaic, monumental entrance was erected behind stoa-ad-U and, further S. along the seashore, in front of which in Post-Archaic times two parallel rows of oikoi succeeded the oikoi of stoa-ad-U.

The Zanklean sub-colony of **Himera** (Fig. 2)<sup>14</sup> on Sicily, founded in the 640's, had from the outset in the NE. corner of the city plateau a trapezoidal, E.-W.-extending Athenaion, the Archaic entrance and boundaries of which in the W. and S. are unknown. An originally open-air cult is assumed to have centred around a cubic stone block («dado»). In the late 7th century, a simple temple A, dedicated to Athena, with a rich foundation deposit was erected in the centre of the sanctuary and immediately in front of the stone block. A larger temple B was erected in the mid 6th century literally around the stone block and the foundations of temple A, and, 25 m to the E., an altar on the same axis. In the third quarter of the 6th century, temple D, dedicated to Athena (?), was built S. of temple B with a

<sup>14</sup> *Bibliography. Himera*: N. BONACASA, in *Kokalos* 14-15 (1968-1969), 211-227; AA. VV., *Himera. I. Campagne di scavo 1963-1965*, 1970, 51-90; 122-133; 215-219 and 230-232; *Himera. II. Campagne di scavo 1966-1973*, 1976, 121-126 and 476-491; N. BONACASA, in AA. VV., *Quaderno Imerese* (Ist. di archeologia, Univ. di Palermo; Studi e materiali, 1), 1972, 6 f.; idem, in *Kokalos* 18-19 (1972-1973), 208-226; idem, in *Archaeology* 29 (1976), 42-51; idem, *Tempio greco*, 125-131; O. BELVEDERE, *Insedimenti*, 75 f., 78; N. BONACASA, in *Kokalos* 22-23 (1976-1977), 702-709; idem, in *Quaderni de «La ricerca scientifica»* 100:2 (1978), 609-618; idem, in *Gli Eubei in Occidente* (Atti 18 Taranto), 1979, 158-160 (intervento); idem, in *Misc. Manni I*, 1980, 257-269; idem, in *Kokalos* 26-27 (1980-1981), 854 f.; idem, in AA. VV., *Secondo quaderno imerese* (Ist. di archeologia, Univ. di Palermo; Studi e materiali, 3), 1982, 47-60; idem, *Atti Atene* 1, 319-337; idem, in *Quaderni de «La ricerca scientifica»* 112:2 (1985), 132-134.

different orientation. In the early 5th century, temple C was erected N. of temple B with a similar orientation.

In the Syrakusan military sub-colony of **Kasmenai** (Fig. 2)<sup>15</sup> on Sicily, founded in the 640's, a roughly square sanctuary (unknown deity) has been identified in the NW. corner of the city plateau. Remains of peribolos walls are reported from the E. and S. sides, but no entrance. In the first half of the 6th century, a temple was erected roughly in the centre of the sanctuary. No altar is reported. The published plans feature unknown structures in the sanctuary, which are not described in the text.

**Selinous** (Fig. 2),<sup>16</sup> the sub-colony of Megara Hyblaia, founded in the 650's/620's, is a very tricky site, owing to the

---

<sup>15</sup> *Bibliography. Kasmenai*: A. DI VITA, «La penetrazione siracusana nella Sicilia sud-orientale alla luce delle più recenti scoperte archeologiche», in *Kokalos* 2 (1956), 186-196; idem, *Atti 7 congresso*, 69-77; G. VOZA, in *Kokalos* 14-15 (1968-1969), 359 f. (intervento); idem, in *Kokalos* 22-23 (1976-1977), 561 f.

<sup>16</sup> *Bibliography. Selinous*: E. GABRICI, in *MonAnt* 32 (1927), 5-406; idem, in *MonAnt* 33 (1929), 62-111; and idem, in *MonAnt* 43 (1956), 205-408; I. MARCONI BOVIO, *Atti 7 congresso*, 11-20; A. DI VITA, in *Palladio* 16, N.S. (1967), 3-60; R. MARTIN, «Rapport sur l'urbanisme de Sélinonte», in *Kokalos* 21 (1975), 54-67; D. THEODORESCU, «Remarques préliminaires sur la topographie urbaine de Sélinonte», *ibid.*, 108-120; J. MASSENET DE LA GENIÈRE et R. MARTIN, in *SicArch* 9 (1976), 9-14; R. MARTIN, «Histoire de Sélinonte d'après les fouilles récentes», in *CRAI* 1977, 46-56; G. GULLINI, *Insedimenti*, 52-61; R. MARTIN, in *Kokalos* 26-27 (1980-1981), 1009-1016; J. DE LA GENIÈRE et D. THEODORESCU, «Contribution à l'histoire urbanistique de Sélinonte», *ibid.*, 973-988; J. DE LA GENIÈRE, in *Misc. Manni* IV, 1980, 1293-1299; A. DI VITA, «Contributi per una storia urbanistica di Selinunte», *ibid.*, III 801-829; idem, «L'urbanistica più antica delle colonie di Magna Grecia e di Sicilia: problemi e riflessioni», *Atti Atene* 1, 75-78; idem, «Selinunte fra il 650 ed il 409: un modello urbanistico coloniale», in *ASAtene* 62 (1984) (pr. 1988), 7-53.

conflicting Italian and French views. The main point of difference is urbanistic — the date of the E.-W. artery across the akropolis. Even those who do not accept an Archaic date assume a preceding passage, which presumably must have run below a retaining/peribolos wall.

Roughly in the middle of the E. half/SE. quadrant of the akropolis plateau, either several separate temene close by each other or one large sanctuary housing several cults was established from the foundation of the city. An E.-W.-extending, polygonal temenos/N. half of a sacred zone, which was bordered by a peribolos/internal border following the configuration of the ground along the E. edge of the akropolis and along the N. and S. sides E.-W. streets/passages and had an entrance in the E. part of the S. side, enclosed in the first phase at least four small temples, viz. one in the NE., dating from the late 7th century, a hypothesized one in the NW. below temple D, a hypothesized one below temple C and a «megaron» S. of temple C, dating from about 580. No altar is preserved from this phase, except maybe an altar (or naiskos) in the NW. destroyed by the later N.-S. main artery (and one in the NE. (?), de La Genière & Theodorescu, fig. 1). A four-roomed, W.-oriented, oikoi complex was situated to the right of the entrance and a two-roomed, E.-oriented one S. of the small temple in the NE.

The second phase began in the mid 6th century with the building in the centre of the S. half of the temenos/N. half of the sacred zone of a large peripteral temple C and an altar some 30 m to the E., which necessitated a great enlargement to the E. of the ground taken up by an enormous terracing supported by a stepped retaining wall. Against the S. peribolos/retaining wall, to the left of the entrance, a N.-S.-oriented altar was built. Peripherally W. and S. in the N. half of the temenos/N. half of the sacred zone, a peripteral temple D was erected around 525 with an altar slightly obliquely touching its SE. corner. The W. peribolos wall dates from the early 5th century (the N.-S. artery

along it overlaid the NW. altar or naiskos of the previous phase). Along the new E. border and a part of the S., a huge, angled, broad-room hall with a portico in front of the E. section was erected in the last quarter of the 6th century. N. of the L-shaped building, a corner of short stoas existed, according to Di Vita (1984), at an entrance in the NE.

Outside the city some 800 m to the NW. on the E. slope of the Gaggera hill, the sanctuary of **Malophoros** (Fig. 2) also existed from the outset of the colony's life. A roughly rectangular, E.-W.-extending temenos was surrounded by straight, peribolos walls. The entrance was situated somewhat off-centre on the E. side. The temenos enclosed in the first phase a small megaron dating from the late 7th century with a small court (?) in front. In the middle of the sanctuary, but somewhat off-centre, a heap of rubble stones surrounded by sacrificial deposits formed the core of the first altar. Around 580, a larger megaron without a court in front replaced the earlier one on the same spot, and a new, larger, N.-S.-extending, E.-W.-oriented altar was built above the earlier one.

Outside the city some 800 m to the NE. on the E. **Marinella** hill (Fig. 2), a peribolos wall with an entrance in the E. part of the S. wall enclosed an E.-W.-extending, rectangular temenos with a temple in antis E1 of early-6th-century date in the centre (?) on the site of the later Archaic (from about 500) and Classical, peripteral temples E. An altar some 10 m E. of the E. side of the temple is reported but not illustrated on any plan, and therefore its relation to the other elements is impossible to determine. Nothing is known, except the temple structures of the other temples further N., F of mid-6th-century date, and the colossal G, begun in the late 6th century.

In the Sybarite sub-colony of **Poseidonia** (Fig. 3),<sup>17</sup> founded

<sup>17</sup> *Bibliography. Poseidonia*: P.C. SESTIERI, in *MélRome* 65 (1955), 35-48;

in the early/mid 7th century, a huge, N.-S.-extending Heraion, the precise locations of the boundaries (except one stretch in the SW.) and of the entrance of which have not been determined, was established, quite likely since the foundation of the city, in the S. half of the middle section of the city plain. In view of the lack of exhaustive publications of the excavated material, there is precious little that can be stated about the contents of the sanctuary in different periods. In the mid 6th century, the peripteral «Basilika», which may have been preceded by some small oikos temple, and the altar to the E. were erected in the middle of the S. third of the sanctuary. In addition to a larger, Late Archaic temple in antis at the N. boundary (?), quite a number of Archaic, small oikos temples or oikoi, some with and some without an altar, (a) to the S. and NE. of the «Basilika», (b) N. of the peripteral, Classical, «Poseidon» temple, which may have been preceded by an Archaic oikos temple together with one now lost between the two peripteral temples, and (c) in the N. third, has been recovered. All minor buildings had E. orientations, varying from the SE. one of the «Basilika» (and the «Poseidon» temple) to a NE. one, and most had varying front and rear alignments. Altars also abounded, separate as well as in rows, e.g. the impressive row NE. of the «Poseidon» temple, all having, like the minor buildings, E.-W. orientations varying from SE. to NE. A broad-room hall NE. of the «Basilika», at the E. boundary (?) of the S. third forms a salutary exception, thanks to the efforts of Lauter and his group, who date it to the third

---

B. NEUTSCH, in *AA* 1956, 374-380; 383-386, fig. 115; E. GRECO & D. THEODORESCU, *Poseidonia-Paestum* I-II (Coll. EFR, 42), 1980-1983; *idem*, «Continuité et discontinuité dans l'utilisation d'un espace public: l'exemple de Poseidonia-Paestum», in *Architecture et société de l'archaïsme grec à la fin de la république romaine* (Actes du coll. organisé par le CNRS et l'EFR, December 1980), 1983, 93-104; H. LAUTER *et al.*, in *RM* 91 (1984), 23-45.

quarter of the 6th century and interpret it as a *bouleuterion/prytaneion* facing the altar and the sacrificial area. At the W. boundary (?) in the N. third, an E.-oriented broad-room with a bothros and in the NE. a stoa-like structure are reported, but we lack documentation about the buildings.

Also probably since the foundation of the city, an Athenaion, the locations of the boundaries and entrance of which are unknown, was established in the N. half of the middle section of the city. It contained in the middle (?) a peripteral, late-6th-century temple, which may have been preceded by an earlier temple, and an altar to the E. North of the altar was a thesauros and in the NW. two bases. Southeast of the temple, remains of an earlier temple (?) were found.

Some 7 km N. of Poseidonia, a Heraion at what is now **Foce del Sele** (Fig. 2)<sup>18</sup> was established on a plain in the mid/late 7th century. In the N.-S.-extending sanctuary, the entrance and boundaries of which are only partially imaginable, a S.-facing, stoa-like building was erected in the late 7th century along a section of the N. border (?). In the mid 6th century, a prostyle temple was erected in the middle of the sanctuary (?). SE. of it, not axially, an altar has been found. In the early 5th century, a peripteral temple was erected S. of the prostyle one and an altar E. of it and S. of the earlier altar (E. of a third, now lost temple?). Some 50 m to the S. of the largest altar and temple, a S.-facing, stoa-like building was erected in the mid 6th century.

In this survey, I have ordered the sanctuaries according to the foundation date of the colony from the earliest colony to the latest one. Their mutual order is different, if the temene are

<sup>18</sup> *Bibliography. Foce del Sele*: P. ZANCANI MONTUORO e U. ZANOTTI BIANCO, *Heraion alla foce del Sele* I-II, 1951-1954; P. ZANCANI MONTUORO, in *AttiMGrecia* 5, N.S. (1964), 57-95; eadem, in *AttiMGrecia* 6-7, N.S. (1965-1966), 26 fig. 1; eadem, in *AttiMGrecia* 8, N.S. (1967), 7-18.

sorted according to the dates of their major structures, usually those of the temple buildings.<sup>19</sup> The akropolis of Gela from the mid 7th century (if the date holds?!) in that case comes first, then Naxos, Megara, Lokroi, Himera, Selinous (the akropolis and the Malophoros sanctuary) and Foce del Sele from the late 7th century, then Metapont from about 600 and finally from the 6th century the Apollonion of Syrakousai, Kasmenai, Poseidonia and Tavole Palatine. In other words, sanctuaries in very old colonies, such as Naxos and Megara Hyblaia, come to stand side by side with temene in a more recently founded sub-colony, such as Selinous, simply because of the fact that sanctuaries regarded as architectural ensembles are a fairly contemporaneous phenomenon, irrespective of whether the city was a colony of long standing or a recently founded sub-colony.

This set of evidence may need some comments as to the sanctuaries excluded. With entire sanctuaries in focus, the paradox is that the most cherished, architectural monuments in Western Greece are excluded, because they constitute instances of isolated temples (even if the altars in some cases remain). The sanctuary context was lost, when they were «excavated» in the 19th century, viz. the peripteral temples on the Marinella hill E. of Selinous and the impressive row of temples in the S. at Akragas (for most practical purposes, this applies to the Poseidonia sanctuaries too, because, although excavated in the

---

<sup>19</sup> Although I am quite aware of the fact that major wars are waged about the chronology of certain structures, esp. temples, I have as a rule simply followed the stated dates. In my perspective of a kind of bird's-eye view of the Archaic Western Greek sanctuaries as entities, in which at the most different periods are of significance, the dating differences of some decades between the high and the low chronology of individual structures are usually of minor importance, albeit they may entail enormous consequences for specific sequences of ceramics, architectural terracottas, temple construction and profiles, etc.



1950's, they have not been properly published). Also several, more recently excavated temene have been excluded, because only an Archaic temple (or parts of it) have been recovered without any indication of the sanctuary context (destroyed by later constructions or not yet (sufficiently) explored).<sup>20</sup> The extra-urban sanctuaries of Kroton, the Heraion at Lakinion and the Apollonion at Krimisa, with more of the temenos areas uncovered, also preserve only Archaic temples, the other remains published being post-Archaic in date.<sup>21</sup> I have deliberately excluded very much disputed evidence, like San Biagio at Akragas, Tempio M on the W. hill of Selinous<sup>22</sup> and the notorious sanctuary of the chthonic divinities at Akragas,<sup>23</sup> as well as all the extra- and sub-urban Demeter sanctuaries, where nothing indicates that a cult with burnt-animal sacrifice took place.

In my opinion two integral parts of a study of any set of sanctuaries — in this case, Archaic temene in Western Greece — ought to be a critical review of their archaeological remains, which enables periods to be distinguished, and an analysis of a minimum of the essential elements, i.e. temenos boundary, entrance, altar and temple. However, in the first place, the state of preservation, the accessibility and the conditions of excavation and publication (substantial final publications are scarce), of the Western Greek sanctuaries surveyed above rarely allow of a

<sup>20</sup> Cf. for Sicily the material collected by I. ROMEO (*supra* n. 2).

<sup>21</sup> Lakinion: P. ORSI, in *NSc* 8 Suppl. (1911), 78-89; and F. SEILER, in *Crotone* (Atti 23 Taranto), 1984, 231-242. Krimisa: P. ORSI, in *AttiMGrecia* [4], 1932, 7-11, 15-19, 42-53.

<sup>22</sup> A. SIRACUSANO, *Il santuario rupestre di Agrigento in località S. Biagio*, 1983; C. MASSERIA, «Ipotesi sul 'tempio M' di Selinunte», in *Ann-Perugia* 16-17 (1978-1980), 61-88.

<sup>23</sup> D. PANCUCCI, «I Temenoi del santuario delle divinità ctonie ad Agrigento», in *Misc. Manni* V, 1980, 1663-1676.

true critical review of the archaeological remains. Too much of the documentation from the excavations is provisional, i.e. mainly summary, current reports of excavation activities with a deficiency of illustrations at conferences. This state of things has discouraged me from even attempting an archaeological scrutiny of the material. In the second place, the sanctuaries in question usually do not have the minimum of essential elements in one and the same period. Naxos and Selinous, both the sanctuary on the akropolis in the second phase and the Malophoros sanctuary, are the only cases that meet all my requirements as to the same phase. Too few cases are thus sufficiently complete to admit of a full, systematic analysis of the interrelations of the elements of the sanctuaries. Consequently, only a partial, restricted analysis is feasible for the rest of the sanctuaries included. I have actually tabulated the sanctuaries listed above according the categories of my *Temenos* book, but the result was a most frustrating profusion of question marks. This result has deterred me from even endeavouring to make a systematic analysis of the sanctuaries.

Belvedere has in an article applied my method of structural analysis, though without the basic descriptive analysis, to four Sicilian sanctuaries of Archaic and Classical date. It is to be regretted that his basis was so restricted, that his effort was not preceded by a critical review of the archaeological remains and that his analysis was not based on chronologically sifted evidence. I agree with him that, in so far as it is possible to establish their features, the Western Greek sanctuaries appear to conform very much with the Greek temene. To take the most often establishable feature, the relation between temple and altar, a somewhat wider grasp not only yields a confirmation that, just as in Greece, the sacrificial area tends to decrease, but also points to the intriguing existence — unlike the situation in the mother country — of vast temene with multiple sets of temple and altar, viz. Metapont and Poseidonia, in addition to

Selinous. He emphasized with great justification that the Western Greek sanctuaries were urbanistically conditioned, which rarely occurred in Greece, and to such an extent that this influenced also the orientation of the elements within the temenos. If this point is taken a bit further to include the relation to the E. cardinal point, it can be shown that the temples and altars of Western Greece tended to adhere more strictly to that point.

Instead, I have settled for presenting two inquiries into matters that have caught my interest during my (re)encounter with the Western Greek temenos material.

(a) *The first appearance and early development of the temene.* In view of the early date of the first wave of Western Greek colonization, the colonies were founded at a time when simple altar temene, i.e. an altar roughly in the middle of a roughly square, temenos area set off by a peribolos wall or fence, must have predominated at Greek cult sites. The testimony of Thukydides (VI 3, 1) of the Chalkidians' founding of Naxos and setting up of the altar of Apollon Archegetes confirms such an assumption. However, the excavators have unfortunately not yet found this altar. It is thus most surprising that there are no more instances of Western Greek altar temene, like that of Apollon Temenites outside Syrakousai remaining until Hellenistic times,<sup>24</sup> or of temple-and-altar sanctuaries having developed from original altar temene.<sup>25</sup> In the mother country, there were few precedents of Late Geometric date (Apollonion at Eretria, Heraion on Samos and at Perachora), which could have served as models for the appearance of temple-and-altar temene, i.e. for

<sup>24</sup> B. NEUTSCH, in *AA* 1954, cols. 604 f., figs. 72-76.

<sup>25</sup> R. MARTIN & G. VALLET, in E. GABBA & G. VALLET (eds.), *La Sicilia antica* I 2, 1980, 286-294, treat original altar temene and their transformation quite briefly and generally.

the interrelation of the elements as regards axes, angles, and sizes and shapes of volumes of buildings and spaces. The layout of an architectural ensemble is not so easily transmitted as mouldings by way of templates or decorative motifs by way of ceramics or textiles. A traveller to Greece in the late 7th or 6th century could, of course, have narrated what a temple-and-altar temenos looked like, but this would have lacked all visual perspicuity. To me, it is a more likely conclusion that the similarity between the Greek temene and the Western Greek temene, as far as the latter are known, is due to the basic, generic features of Greek sanctuaries, rooted in their common religion and civilization, features operative, whether in Greece or later in Western Greek colonies or sub-colonies, in the creation of fully-fledged, temple-and-altar temene.

When the cult of Athena or Artemis was established in Syrakousai (Fig. 1) on the height of Ortygia, in the late 8th century judging by the sacrificial débris, was there an altar situated in a simple temenos around the altar or in a prudently vast temenos, large enough to accommodate later in the W. the 6th-century temples and the parallel, Classical, peripteral temple? The mother city of Korinth had not yet in this period received a peripteral temple. Was the first altar at Metapont (Fig. 1) raised in an altar temenos or in a large temenos foreseeing the addition of a quadruple temple-and-altar set? In the latter case of an ample temenos area from the outset, I wonder which multiple temple-and-altar temene the Achaian colonists had seen before the early 7th century. Or were the size and layout due to basic, generic features? In the former case of an original, restricted, altar temenos, how were the temples subsequently accommodated? What was the relation between the sacred and the private area?

In the evidence surveyed initially, there seem to be three instances of sanctuaries whose appearance appears to betray the original status of a restricted, altar temenos. The sanctuary of Aphrodite or Hera in the SW. corner of Naxos (Fig. 1) is one

of them. In the first, late-7th-century phase, the W. peribolos wall bounded the temenos with the slightly NW.-SE.-oriented altar roughly in the middle of the S. half. The line of the wall was later continued in the W. fortification wall of the city. The first NE.-oriented temple A of early 6th-century date at the latest was, however, not placed axially W. of the altar but N. of it, so to say, parallel to it, if it were not for their slightly off-E. orientations. The subsequent temple B succeeded temple A on the same spot. This non-axial addition of the temple to the altar with a densely occupied, sacrificial area in the W. was probably due to the circumstance that the location of the W. peribolos, like that of the later defence wall, was very likely dictated by a road along the Santa Venera river running N.-S. nearby, which precluded a westward extension, when the temple was to be added to an original altar temenos.<sup>26</sup>

On the akropolis of Selinous (Fig. 2), a corresponding situation in the Early Archaic phase appears to have given rise, irrespective of whether or not the early akropolis housed one large temenos with altars of several cults or several, minor, altar temene close to each other, to the not parallel but extremely compressed (and yet the W. peribolos wall cut the krepidoma) and highly unorthodox relation between temple D and the slightly differently oriented altar (location derived from its predecessor?) touching its SE. corner, in front of which there was no sacrificial area, except where the altar projected S. of the temple.<sup>27</sup> The enigmatic N.-S.-oriented altar immediately W. of the S. entrance must, I am afraid, remain an enigma in view of the lack of documentation. To Gabrici, it was the first altar of

<sup>26</sup> P. PELAGATTI, in *BdA* 57 (1972), 215-218. My analysis differs from that of BELVEDERE, 129, who believes that the non-axial relation of temple and altar indicates a multiple temenos with elements dedicated to different divinities.

<sup>27</sup> *Supra* n. 16: E. GABRICI, 1956, 283 fig. 3; A. DI VITA, 1967, 38; 1984, figs. 18, 27.

temple C before the completion of the E. enlargement of the temenos. Di Vita (1967) ascribed it to a *paredros* deity (i.e. a third one), Belvedere to the second divinity of the temenos before temple D and its altar was built, and Di Vita (1984) calls it the S. altar of temple C.<sup>28</sup> To me, it looks rather as if, after the erection of temple C, there simply was no other space for a monumentalized altar, like those E. of temples C and D, E. of the so-called megaron, unless it was placed against the border with the ritually abnormal, N.-S. orientation.

In the Malophoros sanctuary (Fig. 2) on the Gaggera hill W. of Selinous, the earlier and later altars on the same site are lengthwise roughly centrally situated in the part of the sanctuary which is enclosed by straight walls, while the earlier and later megarons are located in the W. part of the temenos enclosed in the S. by a parallel wall joined at an obtuse angle. This appears to indicate that the W. «temple part» of the temenos is a secondary addition to an original altar temenos.<sup>29</sup>

One instance gives a peculiar indication, but not much more, of *not* having begun as a restricted altar temenos in the Greek sense around an original altar, viz. the Athenaion in the NE. corner of Himera (Fig. 2). I assume that the altar considered coeval with temple B just replaced an earlier, now lost predecessor dating from the last quarter of the 7th century and, like Bonacasa, I assign a similar date and a function of great cultic significance, i.e. support for something made of wood symbolizing the divinity (if covered in some perishable material, in fact, an early variety of «temple») to the «dado» carefully preserved between the back wall of temple A and a crosswall of temple B (the excavator has, however, suggested the centre of an open-air

<sup>28</sup> *Supra* n. 16: E. GABRICI, 1956, 214 n. 1, 225, 283; A. DI VITA, 1967, 40; BELVEDERE, 129; A. DI VITA, 1984, 34.

<sup>29</sup> E. GABRICI, in *MonAnt* 32 (1927), 5-406, esp. 16-73.

cult or basis of altar table).<sup>30</sup> The sanctuary would then from the beginning have had something corresponding to a «temple»-and-altar set, which may account for the E.-W. extension of the temenos, where the set is length- and crosswise centrally situated with temples D and C later «intruding» into the surrounding space in the S. and N. (no true multiple set), even though the W. and S. boundaries actually derive from the 5th-century re-orientation of the street grid. The entire temenos area may thus have been set off from the beginning.

After these cases, it is time to consider the relation between the sacred and the private area, viz. the probable addition to an original altar temenos by «expropriation» of the private area. Recent excavations at Syrakousai (Fig. 1) inform us that roads and houses have been found very close to the Apollonion and even below the Ionic temple (preceded by a small temple) near the altar and the late-8th-century débris of sacrifices to Athena or Artemis. This indicates that the sacred character of these areas was secondary and that not earlier than the early 6th century a private area was altered into sacred ground.<sup>31</sup> This history of «expropriation» may perhaps explain the narrowness, at least in the SW., of the temenos space around the Apollon temple, as witnessed by the peribolos wall in the S. (8 m distance,  $< 1/3$  temple width) and W. (5 m distance,  $> 1/5$  temple width). The

<sup>30</sup> *Supra* n. 14: N. BONACASA, 1968-1969, 220; 1970, 69-90; 1980, 261; 1982, 334. Cf. the Late Geometric, rectangular, column-encircled basis in the Artemision at Ephesos, A. BAMMER, in *ÖJhBeibl* 58 (1988), 13-17.

<sup>31</sup> *Supra* n. 8: P. PELAGATTI, 1968, 141-144; 1976-1977, 548 fig. 5; *Insedimenti*, 119-129; 1980-1981, 707-711; *Atti Atene* 2, 117-138. Incidentally, I cannot follow R. MARTIN & G. VALLET (*supra* n. 25), 289, when they put the Athenaion/Artemision at Syrakousai on a par with the akropolis of Selinous and the Malophoros sanctuary as cases showing the transformation of «recinto semplice in santuario a carattere monumentale».

peribolos wall S. and W. (< 20 m distance, > twice the temple width) of temple E1 on the Marinella hill (Fig. 2) E. of Selinous indicates a less narrow, temenos space around the temple.<sup>32</sup> On the whole, this aspect of temenos space in relation to building volume remains an unknown factor in the Western Greek sanctuaries, since the original boundaries are so rarely established.

At Kasmenai (Fig. 2) too, the temenos area seems to have come into being at the expense of the previously private area, as remains of houses are reported N. and E. of the temple, although it must be remembered that this site has been very summarily investigated and reported.<sup>33</sup>

The private area was also made use of at Megara Hyblaia (Fig. 1). In the quarter on the far side of the street along the W. side of the agora/temenos, temple c, built upon an earlier house, was added, about 600, W. of a walled-in court with an altar (?) at the border of the street. The façade of this temple formed a kind of backdrop to the altar (?) temenos in front,<sup>34</sup> i.e. the ground needed for the temple building was «expropriated», but not the ground surrounding it, so that the earlier altar temenos was not enlarged into a true temple-and-altar temenos with temenos space around the temple building. S. of the altar (?) temenos, a S.-facing, three-roomed hestiatorion with a preceding court was erected upon an earlier building in the last quarter of the 6th century.<sup>35</sup> In the third quarter of the 7th century, the E.-oriented temples g and h were built in a row in the S. half of the agora, with the consequence that the N. portion of the quarters S. of the agora/temenos was curtailed.<sup>36</sup> At Megara

<sup>32</sup> G. GULLINI (*supra* n. 2), 1986, pl. 2.

<sup>33</sup> G. VOZA (*supra* n. 15), 1976-1977, 561.

<sup>34</sup> *Supra* n. 9: G. VALLET *et al.*, 1976, 57, 204-206, 391; 1983, 62.

<sup>35</sup> *Ibid.*, 198-202, and 62-69, respectively.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, 222-229, and 48 f., 69 f., respectively.



Hyblaia previously private areas seem thus unhesitatingly to have been claimed for sacred buildings,<sup>37</sup> although an actual temenos area has not been identified, except for the altar (?) temenos in front of temple c, nor have any altars in connection with the other temples (this applies also to temple j in the N. and to temple l in the SE.).<sup>38</sup> An altar or several altars with no connection with a temenos area or a temple existed, however, since the late 7th and 6th century NW. of the agora/temenos along the W. and E. sides, respectively, of the continued W. street.<sup>39</sup>

Let us finally consider some instances of the reverse transfer of ground. Sacred ground was given up at Naxos («tempietto» C and others), when the new urban plan was laid out in the early 5th century.<sup>40</sup> At Himera, the urban sanctuaries (in the NW. and E. (the lower city); no separate plans) were, however, inserted in the new quarters, when a re-oriented, urban plan was laid out about the same time.<sup>41</sup> In the early 5th century, residential quarters in a street grid occupied the N. section of the sanctuary on the akropolis of Gela with an E.-W. plateia S. of and N.-S. stenopoi between the oikoi along the N. border.<sup>42</sup>

A couple of instances appear, however, to be vast/huge temene reserved initially. First, the vast sanctuary of Apollon

<sup>37</sup> G. VALLET (*supra* n. 9), 1973, 92 f.

<sup>38</sup> *Supra* n. 9: G. VALLET *et al.*, 1976, 230-232, 238-240; 1983, 44 f.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, 66 f. and 21, respectively.

<sup>40</sup> *Supra* n. 7: P. PELAGATTI, Tempio greco, 46-48; Insediamenti, 137-138; in *Gli Eubei in Occidente* (Atti 18 Taranto), 1979, 155; Atti Atene 1, 301 f.; E. GABBA & G. VALLET (eds.), *La Sicilia antica* I 3, 1980, 627.

<sup>41</sup> *Supra* n. 14: N. BONACASA, 1968-1969, 225 f.; 1972-1973, 213, 218 f.; 1979, 159; in *Misc. Manni* I, 1980, 267 f.; *Himera* II, 1976, 121-126, 476-491.

<sup>42</sup> *Supra* n. 12: E. DE MIRO e G. FIORENTINI, 1976-1977, 433 f.; G. FIORENTINI, Tempio greco, 110.

and Hera at Metapont (Fig. 1). It has, on the one hand, been maintained that the sanctuary, which dated from the foundation of the city in the early 7th century, was at first situated outside the original urban plan.<sup>43</sup> This opinion may, of course, be influenced by the re-orientations of temples A II, B I and B II in relation to that of an assumed street grid of mid-6th-century date. On the other hand, finds have been made in the sanctuary of sacrificial débris from the second half of the 7th century and of stelai, «argoi lithoi» and cippi, W. of temples C I, B I and II and E. of altar B. The stones probably date from around 600 and among them horoi may be included. These finds seem to indicate that a vast temenos area was set off from the outset, maybe in connection with the agora in the E., although structures were at first erected only in the SW. corner.<sup>44</sup> On the latest model and plan published, there are around the later temple E in the NE. and E. of the altars NE. of it markings similar to the stelai in the W. half.<sup>45</sup> If they indicate stelai or horos stones of early date, this would mean that the entire enormous sanctuary was originally conceived of as a set-off temenos area. Personally, I also find it very difficult to assume that the vast sanctuary (21,000 sq.m.) with four, roughly parallel, temple-and-altar sets in the W. half of it, three of which are peripteral, could have come into being by a piecemeal enlargement at the expense of private habitations from the earliest structures (temple and altar C I) in the SW. corner.

Finally, the case of Poseidonia (Fig. 3), which, in view of the deficient documentation, will probably remain an enigma.

<sup>43</sup> D. ADAMESTEANU, in *RA* 1967, 8; *Atti Atene* 2, 309; 312.

<sup>44</sup> *Supra* n. 10: D. ADAMESTEANU, 1970, 307-324; 1974, 182-184; 1975, *passim*; *Atti Atene* 2, 307-312; D. MERTENS, 1985, 649-654.

<sup>45</sup> *Supra* n. 10: D. ADAMESTEANU, 1979, 302; D. MERTENS, 1982, fig. 39; 1985, fig. 2.

Unlike the case of Metapont, where the Roman castrum was located E. of the agora and the temenos, in Poseidonia the huge Heraion and in the N. the Athenaion *plus* the agora are situated in the middle section of the Roman street grid.<sup>46</sup> If the Greek city in any way corresponded to the Roman castrum, it is so unlikely that an original, altar-temenos area was successively enlarged at the cost of private houses into the huge Heraion (35-40,000 sq.m.?) that I feel obliged to assume that also here a vast public area was originally set off, although this was done in the middle of the city. With this, we may contrast not only Metapont but also Himera with their peripheral sanctuaries and (possibly) adjoining agoras, and Naxos, Lokroi, Kasmenai, Gela and the akropolis of Selinous with peripheral sanctuaries, although the locations of their agoras are unknown. Only at Syrakousai on Ortygia, where the agora is just divined,<sup>47</sup> and at Megara Hyblaia, if my heresy below is accepted, are non-peripheral temene to be found.

It seems appropriate to raise here the issue of the original status of the large, reserved area at Megara Hyblaia (Fig. 1), on which I would like to argue along different lines. Was this area from the outset the public space specifically of an agora, and was the S. half of it after about a century given over to cult, as expressed in the two temples g and h? Or was the area from the outset a non-specific, public space serving cult and political purposes, and was the S. half of it after about a century differentiated into a temenos area in a more restricted sense with temples g and h and the hestiatorion opposite the W. street, at about the same time as temples c and j with open areas in front were erected opposite the W. and N. streets, while the N. half became the

<sup>46</sup> *Supra* n. 17: E. GRECO & D. THEODORESCU, 1980-1983; 1983.

<sup>47</sup> P. PELAGATTI, *Atti Atene* 2, 137; G. VALLET, in *Kokalos* 30-31 (1984-1985), 144.

agora proper with the «heroon» as an enlargement opposite the W. street? In other words, I would, in this line of argument, take Megara Hyblaia as an indication that in the early colonies the reserved spaces were not necessarily agoras or temenos areas specifically but rather public areas, as opposed to the private areas of the colonists, which could be used either as agora areas or as temenos areas or as both and could be altered as time passed.

The other line is more outspokenly heretical. Considering what the excavations have yielded, a large, set-off area, two temples in the middle of the S. half, a hestiatorion opposite the W. street, minor (subsidiary?) temples opposite the W. and N. streets, and stoas along the N. and E. borders, I have come to ask myself what warrants the interpretation as an agora and not as a temenos? The French excavators, conscious of the lack of parallels, have expressed the need for caution.<sup>48</sup> It seems that the location of the set-off area in a place where two sets of differently oriented streets converged at an intersection and the existence of the «heroon»-building opposite the NW. corner of the area have been decisive. A point of intersection and converging streets is, in my opinion, simply the most likely place for any set-off area, sacred or civic. The «heroon» interpretation, to which I will return below, then becomes crucial.

I submit these two alternatives concerning the original status of the reserved area at Megara Hyblaia in the hope that they may further future discussion.

In trying to summarize after this scrutiny of the evidence, my conclusion is that, as regards the first appearance and early development of the temene in the Western Greek colonies, the evidence is very contradictory. I hope future studies will bring forward more clear-cut evidence. We have, on the one hand, some instances of original altar temene and of temples or areas

---

<sup>48</sup> G. VALLET (*supra* n. 9), 1968-1969, 475.

laid out over previous, «expropriated» houses<sup>49</sup> (also cases of sacred ground altered into private area!), but, on the other hand, we also have a few probable instances of original, vast/huge, temple-and-altar temene. It is perhaps not without significance that these belong to the truly particular, vast/huge, Western Greek sanctuaries with multiple temple-and-altar sets. It is quite impossible to prove, but I have often asked myself whether the profusion of Hera (and Poseidon?) altars and temples at Poseidonia (Fig. 3) and the many altars and temples in the sanctuary of Apollon and Hera at Metapont (Fig. 1) are due to groupings among the Achaian colonists<sup>50</sup> — an expression of the wish of groups from specific but different districts to have at least an altar and perhaps a temple, however small, to their variant of the deity in the sanctuary. The SE. part of the akropolis of Selinous, if indeed it was from the outset one single temenos, also contained several sets of altars and temple buildings, but this instance appears to be different. The city ultimately derived from the single mother city of Megara Nisaia, and the inscription of temple G testifies to a multitude of deities at Selinous.<sup>51</sup>

(b) *The scarcity of non-essential buildings.* Buildings serving the needs of the worshippers are scarce, if not rare, in general, but instances exist of such buildings of a highly advanced and most ambitious character at a surprisingly early date.

I begin with the category of stoa. Being heretical and treating the agora/temenos of Megara Hyblaia (Fig. 1) as a kind of sanctuary, I start with the two long stoai from the second half of the 7th century along its N. and E. borders. The former has the

<sup>49</sup> Cf. BELVEDERE, 127 f.

<sup>50</sup> G. VALLET, in *Modes de contacts et processus de transformation dans les sociétés anciennes* (coll. EFR, 67), 1983, 947, has stressed the mixture of people among the colonists.

<sup>51</sup> R. MEIGGS & D. LEWIS, 38 (= SIG<sup>3</sup> 1122).

unusual and intriguingly advanced feature of openings in the rear wall to admit a passage from the street which was blocked by the stoa structure.<sup>52</sup>

In the Heraion at Foce del Sele outside Poseidonia (Fig. 2), a S.-facing, stoa-like building was erected in the second half of the 7th century along a section of the N. boundary, judging by the adjoining later buildings. It is oriented more strictly to the cardinal points than the later altars and temples in the SW. The building had short walls returning on the front and was rather a very long, narrow broad-room with several openings.<sup>53</sup> According to Kuhn, the adjoining, later buildings in the NE. corner of the sanctuary (?) (another, very similar, S.-facing stoa-like building (4th century successor?) and at a right angle a W.-facing, Hellenistic dining-room of broad-room shape with a hearth in the middle) enclosed a secondary festal area with facilities for spectators and feasters around a small altar.<sup>54</sup> A very similar, also S.-facing, stoa-like building, strictly oriented according to the cardinal points, was erected not later than the mid 6th century some 50 m S. of the larger altar.<sup>55</sup> It either delineated and opened towards another secondary festal area in the S. of the sanctuary or, if it was situated outside a S. boundary and entrance (?), opened towards a road along such a side of the sanctuary.

In his latest contribution about the akropolis of Selinous (Fig. 2), Di Vita presents a corner of short stoas as a columnar hall at a NE. entrance.<sup>56</sup> In the Heraion at Poseidonia (Fig. 3),

<sup>52</sup> *Supra* n. 9: G. VALLET *et al.*, 1976, 212-216 and 218-220; 1983, 24 f. and 39.

<sup>53</sup> P. ZANCANI MONTUORO & U. ZANOTTI BIANCO (*supra* n. 18), 1951, 25-28; COULTON, 30, 283.

<sup>54</sup> KUHN, 264-266; COULTON, 30, 283.

<sup>55</sup> *Supra* n. 18: P. ZANCANI MONTUORO, 1965-1966, fig. 1; 1967, 7-18.

<sup>56</sup> A. DI VITA (*supra* n. 16), 1984, 39-41, figs. 18, 27.

Neutsch listed a «griechische Hallenanlage»<sup>57</sup> along the N. part of the E. border (?), but that is absolutely all the information we have.

On the akropolis of Gela (Fig. 1), a number of small oikoi, mainly S.-facing broad-rooms or rooms joined in S.-facing broad-buildings, built in the late 7th, mid 6th and early 5th centuries along the N. limit, have been uncovered in two different excavation periods.<sup>58</sup> The line of the limit is indirectly indicated by the fortification wall, dating from about 500, and it may previously have taken the form of a fence or horos boundary. I combine Orlandini's buildings 2 and 3 of mid-6th-century date, which seem to be due to the succeeding buildings B and C, as I do not see why the four preserved, separate stretches of walls built with a similar technique and width (there is no mention of separate floors) should be partitioned into two different buildings instead of a very long, S.-facing broad-room, similar to the nearby building 1, or a stoa. Two or maybe three of Orlandini's oikoi of early-5th-century date, A-C, are S.-facing long-rooms, slightly deeper than the preceding broad-rooms. The most fragmentary oikoi of the new excavations, I (late 7th century), VI, V and VII (6th century) are probably all S.-facing broad-buildings. The two easternmost oikoi of these excavations, II (7th century, a square room (part of a broad-building?)) and VIII (6th century, a long-room), are stated to have been E.-facing. For these most distant oikoi, the view from the E. end of the akropolis may have taken precedence over the activities

<sup>57</sup> B. NEUTSCH, in *AA* 1956, 379, fig. 115, no. 11.

<sup>58</sup> *Supra* n. 12: P. ORLANDINI, 1968, 22-24 pl. 2; E. DE MIRO e G. FIORENTINI, 1976-1977, 430-434, pl. 28; G. FIORENTINI, *Tempio greco*, 105-110; I. ROMEO (*supra* n. 2), 16-20. The most ambitious plan of the latest excavations, which, however, lacks topographical indications, unfortunately does not relate the location of the new buildings to those of the previous excavations.

in the centre of the sanctuary. Because of the bases for an internal row of supports, VIII is compared with the «megaron» on the akropolis of Selinous, although the dimensions and proportions are different, and is viewed as a small temple. However, the subsequent history of the building, with early-5th-century rebuildings in the same urbanistic context as the other oikoi, and its extremely peripheral location make a temple interpretation unlikely to me. Figurines, pottery, animal bones, ashes and traces of burning have been found inside and, in particular, outside several of these buildings. Somewhat arbitrarily, they are alternately designated as «sacelli» or «thesauroi». In my opinion, we are able to follow here a long tradition of about 150 years — unique for Western Greece — of mainly broad-room oikoi situated perpendicularly at a boundary of the temenos accommodating the worshippers in connection with their feasting, which left some refuse, during the festivals in the temenos.

Gela is the only temenos site with oikoi documented. It is stated that «thesauroi» have been found in the Heraion at Tavole Palatine outside Metapont, but no plans have been presented. Among the numerous minor buildings in the Heraion at Poseidonia, some may be oikoi, but in view of the deficient documentation, we have no means of distinguishing them.

A welcome exception, which takes us over to the category of large oikoi, is formed by building 22 (Fig. 3).<sup>59</sup> It has been investigated and extensively documented by Lauter and his group. This very ambitious, oikos building with a concealed bothros constitutes a squarish, two-aisled, broad-room hall with an open, W.-front long-side, having an eschara in the middle. It is situated NE. of the altar E. of the «Basilika» at the E. boundary of the Heraion (?) (the rear wall is about as distant from

<sup>59</sup> H. LAUTER *et al.*, in *RM* 91 (1984), 23-45.



the altar as the rear side of the «Basilika» is distant from the stretch of temenos wall in the W.).<sup>60</sup> The building is dated to the third quarter of the 6th century by Lauter *et al.*, who interpret the oikos as a building where the people of some cult association had meals together, perhaps a bouleuterion/prytaneion. No. 8, described as a Greek building with a bothros,<sup>61</sup> which is a longer and narrower, E.-facing broad-room at the NW. border (?) of the temenos, could be another dining-room, but we lack documentation.

Next, I turn to oikoi complexes. The sanctuary on the akropolis of Selinous (Fig. 2) contained since the Early Archaic period two oikoi complexes.<sup>62</sup> One consists of two contiguous oikoi, adjoining and rear-aligned with the temple in the NE. The S. wall of the S. oikos adjoins a stretch of wall, which was either an internal retaining wall or, if we follow Gabrici, a part of the peribolos of an original, separate, altar temenos. It was thus located, as befits an oikoi complex, at the boundary/internal border but was parallel to it, not perpendicular, and the oikoi were E.-facing, like the temple. The other oikoi complex is similar but, so to say, its double, as it includes a room in front of each of the two contiguous oikoi. Situated immediately E. of the entrance in the S., the building adjoins the S. wall, which, whatever its date, must have been preceded by some kind of earlier boundary/retaining wall. Like the other Selinountine oikoi complex, the building was situated at the boundary/

<sup>60</sup> *FA* 6 (1951), No. 1974.

<sup>61</sup> B. NEUTSCH, in *AA* 1956, 378, fig. 115 no. 8.

<sup>62</sup> *Supra* n. 16: E. GABRICI, 1929, 81 f. pls. 2, 4; 1956, 217 figs. 2 f.; A. DI VITA, 1967, 38; 1984, 20 figs. 5, 18.

internal border and parallel, not perpendicular to it, facing W. towards the road just inside the entrance.<sup>63</sup>

Let us then consider for a while the oikoi complex at Megara Hyblaia (Figs. 1, 2), viz. the «heroon». <sup>64</sup> This building d, dating from the last quarter of the 7th century, consists of two parallel, elongated long-rooms facing the W. street along the agora/temenos with open, E., short sides. The only distinguishing features were two hearths in the S. room (one in the middle of the W. half and one (probably displaced?) somewhat off-centre in the E. half) and one hearth in the middle of the W. half of the N. room (the corresponding one in the E. half probably being lost?), a crushed SOS amphora with ashes in the SE. corner of the N. room and six pits in the threshold of the S. room (the corresponding level in the N. room being lost). These pits are compared with votive stones found at the agora of Kyrene and with pits carved in the Herakleion at Thasos. Malkin, who accepts this interpretation as probable but not certain, is worried by the scantiness of the comparative material,<sup>65</sup> and so am I, above all, because I find it incomparable. The Kyrene material consists actually of loose finds of hollowed and stuccoed, votive stones, which belong to a substantial votive deposit in a temple preceded and succeeded in the area over centuries by various altars and temples close to a long, venerated tomb (sc. that of Battos) in the E. side of the agora.<sup>66</sup> The Thasos material consists of two rows of irregular pits cut in the rock E.

<sup>63</sup> Cf. BELVEDERE, 131, who stated that the two (?) oikoi complexes adjoined the peribolos orthogonally (?).

<sup>64</sup> *Supra* n. 9: G. VALLET & F. VILLARD, 22; G. VALLET *et al.*, 1976, 208-211 («hypothèse d'un hérôon»); *idem*, 1983, 61 f.

<sup>65</sup> MALKIN, 172.

<sup>66</sup> S. STUCCHI, *L'agorà di Cirene. I. I lati nord ed est della plateia inferiore* (Monografie di archeologia libica, 7), 1965, 32-252, *passim*, esp. 44 fig. 23; see also MALKIN, 214-216.

of the rock core of a raised altar. I have previously interpreted them as bothroi intended for non-burnt offerings.<sup>67</sup> In a private letter of April 2, 1974, Homer Thompson objected, stating that, in his opinion, the pits had been taken too seriously and that they looked like holes for wooden posts «probably to be associated with some sort of canopy such as those attested for the altars at Perachora and at Halieis». I am inclined to agree that too much has been made of these pits. In my opinion, the important thing here is that neither the Kyrene material (hollowed-out, votive stones in a deposit near a tomb), nor the Thasos material (rock-cut pits near a raised altar), however these are to be interpreted (post holes or bothroi), actually gives any support to the «heroon» interpretation of building d at Megara Hyblaia. Are mere cavities an adequate ground for the Kyrene comparison? What are the criteria for a heroon?

What was the function of the building? Hearths, ashes and amphora give an immediate association with feasting. The two hearths in each half of the S. room remind me of the Archaic dining-room A near Megara Nisaia in Greece (Fig. 2) and the Hellenistic andreion at Agia Pelagia on Crete, although these are elongated broad-rooms.<sup>68</sup> In spite of the elongated long-rooms in building d, I rather fancy this building as a complex of dining-rooms, in view of its date probably not for reclining but seated banquets, accommodating two sympotic sub-groups in each room around each hearth, i.e. a kind of predecessor to the three-roomed hestiatorion-building erected further S. a century later.

<sup>67</sup> B. BERGQUIST, *Herakles on Thasos. The archaeological, literary and epigraphic evidence for his sanctuary, status and cult reconsidered* (Boreas, 5), 1973, 39-41 and 56.

<sup>68</sup> A. MÜLLER, «Megarika. X. Le sanctuaire de Zeus Aphésios», in *BCH* 107 (1983), 157-176, esp. 168-176; B. BERGQUIST, «Sympotic space. A functional aspect of Greek dining-rooms», in O. MURRAY (ed.), *Sympotica. A symposium on the Symposium* (Oxford 1990), 45 f.

The altar (?) temenos in the S. or the altar(s) in the N. along the street may be the sacrificial sites with which this hestiatorion was associated. The function of the pits is anybody's guess. The notables dining in the rooms opening in the E. short sides might have found some kind of screen or the like pleasant to have towards the street. Such a contraption could have been supported in the pits and laterally on a higher level in the long walls framing the open E. sides.

I submit this alternative interpretation of building d at Megara Hyblaia in the hope that it may further future discussion.

Finally, I shall consider the buildings which combine oikoi and porticoes. In the late 7th century, with a mid-6th-century addition, the U-shaped portico in front of two opposite aisles of first six, later 11, paratactic oikoi was erected in the Centocamere area at Lokroi (Fig. 1), enclosing a court with 371 bothroi. Their contents inform us that the oikoi served for sacred feasting.<sup>69</sup> This building was situated outside the city, later in front of a long retaining wall M along the seashore, in which an Archaic monumental entrance was erected. Considering its early date, it presents a surprisingly large scale and advanced structure of oikoi and porticoes in combination.<sup>70</sup> The building was later succeeded by two long rows of paratactic oikoi, along wall M and in a parallel row in front. It has been suggested, although it cannot be proved without extensive excavations, that this vast feasting complex by the sea outside the city had some connection with the Marasà sanctuary some hundred metres to the NW., but we do not know if this was the case or what formal expression it took.

<sup>69</sup> *Supra* n. 13: E. LISSI; M. BARRA BAGNASCO, 1977 I; 1978, 562-569; G. GULLINI, 111-127.

<sup>70</sup> KUHN, 266 and n. 628, doubts with reason the early date of the portico.

In the last third of the 6th century, a S.-facing building b consisting of three paratactic oikoi with off-centre doors preceded by a portico and a court was erected at Megara Hyblaia (Fig. 1) in the quarter on the far side of the W. street along the agora/temenos.<sup>71</sup> The building was parallel to the street and situated roughly on a line with the temples in the S. half of the agora/temenos. Because the dimensions and the off-centre doors make the rooms suitable for seven couches, the building has been interpreted as a prytaneion.<sup>72</sup> It could also be regarded just as a hestiatorion with three seven-couch dining-rooms in a sanctuary appendage to the altar (?) temenos near temple c N. of it or to the «temenos» of the «agora» or of its S. half.

On the akropolis of Selinous (Fig. 2) as the climax of the monumentalizing efforts in the last quarter of the 6th century, an L-shaped building containing a huge, extremely long, angled, broad-room hall with three + one doors and a portico in front of the long E. part was erected upon the stepped retaining wall along the E. and a part of the S. boundary/internal border, i.e. framing the festal area connected with altar C. With reference to the drain from the S. part of the long, angled room and the paving, this hall has been convincingly interpreted as a dining-hall.<sup>73</sup>

The non-essential buildings, the stoai, oikoi and oikoi complexes, in the Western Greek sanctuaries are, as in Greece,

<sup>71</sup> *Supra* n. 9: G. VALLET et F. VILLARD, 22-25; G. VALLET *et al.*, 1976, 198-202.

<sup>72</sup> G. VALLET *et al.*, 1983, 62-69. Cf. *idem*, 1976, 198-202 (interpretation of hestiatorion).

<sup>73</sup> *Supra* n. 16: A. DI VITA, 1967, 3-31; COULTON, 32 (no portico in front of S. wing); KUHN, 261-264 (portico only E. wing; dining-hall); to A. DI VITA, 1984, 17-23, the drain is only a dating argument; *idem*, 1967, 39-40, adopting my terminology, inappropriately described the building as situated in a secondary area of a composite temenos.

situated peripherally with the rear wall against the boundary, with the exception of the oikoi complexes on the akropolis of Selinous, which are parallel and of which the NE. one may, in fact, be a very simple, early, temple building. All in all, the non-essential buildings are, however, comparatively few. The rarity of stoai has been commented on previously,<sup>74</sup> but, on the other hand, the few stoas which exist include at an early date such an outstanding instance as the N. stoa at the agora/temenos of Megara Hyblaia. As the limitations on space prohibit a detailed comparison with the stock of Archaic oikoi, both small and large ones, and with the oikoi complexes in Greece, I can only give general references to studies covering this rich evidence on a broad basis.<sup>75</sup> But the few instances that exist in Western Greece include the unsurpassed, angled, broad-room dining-hall (< 700 sq.m.) at Selinous (Fig. 2) and, at the surprisingly early

<sup>74</sup> COULTON, 8, 30; KUHN, 260 with n. 607 *ad fin.*; P. PELAGATTI, in *Kokalos* 30-31 (1984-1985), 684 f.

<sup>75</sup> E.g. B. BERGQUIST, *The Archaic Greek temenos. A study of structure and function* (ActaAth-4°, 13), 1967, 57 (list 10); eadem (*supra* nn. 67 f.); eadem, «Primary or secondary temple function: the case of Halieis», in *OpAth* 18 (1990), 23-27; M.S. GOLDSTEIN, *The setting of the ritual meal in Greek sanctuaries: 600-300 B.C.*, Ph.D. diss. Berkeley 1978; Ch. BÖRKER, *Festbankett und griechische Architektur* (Xenia, 4), 1983; KUHN, *passim*; R.A. TOMLINSON, «Two buildings in sanctuaries of Asklepios», in *JHS* 89 (1969), 106-117; idem, «Perachora: The remains outside the two sanctuaries», in *BSA* 64 (1969), 164-172 and 238-240; idem, «Ancient Macedonian symposia», in B. LAOURDAS & Ch. MAKARONAS (eds.), *Ancient Macedonia* [1]. Papers read at the first international symposium, Thessaloniki 1968, Institute for Balkan studies (Thessaloniki 1970), 308-315; idem, «The upper terraces at Perachora», in *BSA* 72 (1977), 197-202; G. ROUX, «Salles de banquets à Délos», in *Etudes déliennes* (BCH, Suppl. 1), 1973, 525-544; idem, «Problèmes déliens», in *BCH* 105 (1981), 41-78; N. BOOKIDIS, «The priest's house in the Marmaria at Delphi», in *BCH* 107 (1983), 149-155; V. HEERMANN, «Banketträume im Leonidaion», in *AM* 99 (1984), 243-250.

date of the late 7th century, the advanced, U-shaped complex (six + six paratactic oikoi) at Lokroi (Fig. 1), even though Kuhn's doubts about the early date of the portico seem to be warranted, and the paratactic complex of two large, long-room dining (?) -halls at Megara Hyblaia (Fig. 1). With these, we can only compare the earliest ambitious structure in Greece, the peristylar West Building at the Argive Heraion, of late-6th-century date (but not undisputed) and the oikoi complexes of two and three rooms at the most until the late 6th century.<sup>76</sup>

The scarcity is thus hardly due to lack of competence, and we seem to be entitled to assume that there was a genuine difference from the situation in the motherland. Both stoai and small and large oikoi are to be expected in distant, extra-urban sanctuaries like the Heraion at Lakinion and the Apollonion at Krimisa, but unfortunately the only remains reported, priests' houses (*sic!*), seem to be Hellenistic or Roman, like the only ones investigated, viz. the Late Classical, dining-building complexes at some distance in Lakinion.<sup>77</sup> In distant, extra-urban sanctuaries like Tavole Palatine (oikoi but no plan), Foce del Sele (two stoai) or the E. Marinella and W. Gaggera hills at Selinous, we do not find any profusion of non-essential buildings for the comfort of the worshippers. Judging by the evidence available at present, early, non-essential buildings were more abundant (in number, size and ambition) in some urban sanctuaries. The Western Greek colonies seem simply to have spent less on the worshippers' comfort in the sanctuaries. This may be the case because attendance at sacrifices and festivals in these sanctuaries, most of which were after all urban, took place

---

<sup>76</sup> On size as a general claim to monumentality in Western Greek architecture (temples), see D. MERTENS, «Some principal features of the West Greek colonial architecture», in J.-P. DESCŒUDRES (ed.) (*supra* n. 2), 377 f.

<sup>77</sup> See n. 21.

under different circumstances than in Greece, and this may have established a tradition valid also in their extra-urban sanctuaries.

I have searched my mind to find explanations. Were there no οὐ φορὰ regulations in Western Greece, except at Megara, Gela, Lokroi and Selinous? As a matter of fact, the handbooks on Greek religion never include any instances beyond Greece. Sokolowski has given us no collection of *Lois sacrées de la Grèce de l'Ouest*. I have also considered all the sub- and extra-urban Demeter sanctuaries that have been identified. Did they house not only Thesmophorion festivals for women but also various other cults, which both sexes attended? In that case, all or the major part of the feasting and the social aspect of religion in the Western Greek colonies could have been focussed on such sanctuaries.

A possible explanation is also the circumstance that the boundaries along which the non-essential buildings were usually situated have so frequently not been found. Another explanation, which I hesitate to bring up, because I do not want any shadow to fall on the indefatigable Orsi, whom I admire greatly, is the fact that, at many early sites, afflicted by many subsequent, ancient and later constructions, excavations began a very long time (more than a hundred years) ago, when little less than peripteral temples counted as architectural remains. Is it not possible that remains of simple buildings, slight stone footings, post-holes, etc. may have escaped notice? We may just ponder upon the latest Gela excavations, which would scarcely have been feasible a century ago.



In addition to the abbreviations in *AJA* 90 (1986), 384-394, the following are used:

Atti Atene 1-3: 1 = *ASAtene* 59 (N.S. 43), 1981; 2 = 60 (N.S. 44), 1982; 3 = 61 (N.S. 45), 1983 (Atti del convegno internazionale *Grecia, Italia e Sicilia nell'VIII et VII secolo a.C.*, Athens, October 1979) (pr. 1983-1984).

*Atti 7 congresso: Atti del 7 congresso internazionale di archeologia classica* 2, 1961.

Atti 7 Taranto: Atti del 7- convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, October 1967-.

BELVEDERE: O. BELVEDERE, «I santuari urbani sicelioti: preliminari per un'analisi strutturale», in *ArchClass* 33 (1981), 122-136.

COULTON: J.J. COULTON, *The architectural development of the Greek stoa*, 1976.

Insedimenti: «Insedimenti coloniali greci in Sicilia nell'VIII e VII secolo a.C.» (Atti della 2a riunione della scuola di perfezionamento in archeologia classica dell'Università di Catania, Siracusa, November 1977), = *Chronache di archeologia* 17 (1978).

KUHN: G. KUHN, «Untersuchungen zur Funktion der Säulenhalle in archaischer und klassischer Zeit», in *Jdl* 100 (1985), 169-317.

MALKIN: I. MALKIN, *Religion and colonization in ancient Greece* (H.S. VERSNEL & F.T. VAN STRATEN (eds.), *Studies in Greek and Roman religion*, 3), 1987.

*Misc. Manni* I-V: φίλιας χάριν. *Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di E. Manni* I-V, 1980.

Tempio greco: «Il tempio greco in Sicilia. Architettura e culti» (Atti della 1a riunione scientifica della scuola di perfezionamento in archeologia classica dell'Università di Catania, Siracusa, November 1976), = *Chronache di archeologia* 16 (1977) (pr. 1985).

In view of the limitations on space, I have excluded all titles of articles amounting to excavation reports.




Fig. 1




Fig. 2




Fig. 3

The plans drawn (by Maria Elliott) in Figs. 1-3 on a scale of 1:400 approximately are based on the following illustrations:

Fig. 1. Naxos: P. PELAGATTI, in *BdA* 57 (1972), fig. 2; Syrakousai: P. PELAGATTI, *Insedimenti*, fig. 3, and *ibid.*, pl. 29, + E. GABBA & G. VALLET (eds.), *Sicilia antica* I 3, 1980, plan 15, + (*supra* n. 8), 1976-1977, fig. 5, + I. ROMEO (*supra* n. 2), pl. III 4; Megara Hyblaia: G. VALLET *et al.* (*supra* n. 9), 1983, fig. 3; Metapontion: D. MERTENS, in *AA* 1985, fig. 2; Gela: *supra* n. 12: P. ORLANDINI, 1968, pl. 2, + E. DE MIRO & G. FIORENTINI, 1976-1977, pl. 28, + A. DI VITA, in G. PUGLIESE CARRATELLI *et al.* (eds.), *Sikanie*, 1986, pl. 4; Lokroi: *supra* n. 13: A. DE FRANCISCIS, 1979, pl. 5, and M. BARRA BAGNASCO, 1985, fig. 1.

Fig. 2. Himera: N. BONACASA (*supra* n. 14), 1985, fig. 2; Kasmennai: A. DI VITA, in *Sikanie*, 1986, pl. 5; Selinous: A. DI VITA (*supra* n. 16), 1984, fig. 27; Malophoros: R. MARTIN & G. VALLET (*supra* n. 25), fig. 12; Marinella: G. GULLINI, in *Sikanie*, 1986, pl. 2; Foce del Sele: E. KIRSTEN, *Südtalienkunde* 1, 1975, fig. 58 + P. ZANCANI MONTUORO (*supra* n. 18), 1967, fig. 1; Megara Hyblaia & Nisaia: G. VALLET *et al.* (*supra* n. 9), 1976, plan 5, and D. PHILIOS, in *ArchEph* 1890, pl. 4.

Fig. 3. Poseidonia: B. NEUTSCH, in *AA* 1956, fig. 115.

## DISCUSSION

*M. Tomlinson:* We should also consider the nature, and their expectations in religious matters of the settlers in the Greek colonies, in comparing West Greek sanctuaries with those of the mainland. If we take the heyday of Greek colonisation in the West to be the hundred years from c. 730 to c. 630 B.C., it is necessary to remember that most Greek sanctuaries at that time were relatively undeveloped. In addition, it is necessary to take into account the form of the sanctuaries already in existence in the founding cities other than Corinth, which of course would have been exceptionally progressive at this time. It is also important to consider the political implications, the reasons for sending out the colonies, what sort of people were sent out, and how likely they were to have differed from the élites who not only dispatched the colonies but were also responsible for the development of the sanctuaries at home. If I can anticipate one of the points I will make about Perachora, I would argue that there the original sanctuary is simple, and it is not until well into the 7th century that we find the provision of amenity buildings (the «temple of Hera Limenia») which should be the work of the ruling élite. Secondly, there is the political development in the colonies, particularly the rise of the tyrants, who might seek to emulate the peripteral temples as prestige buildings, but may not have been so interested in the lesser structures. I think it is a good point to observe the feasting buildings in the Western sanctuaries, which also surely reflect political circumstances.

Finally, we should also take into account the generally poor quality of the stone available for building in the West Greek colonies, adequate for the massively built temples, but less so for minor structures. This may well explain the failure or early archaeologists to notice less substantial buildings.

*Mme Bergquist:* You have given us a valuable reminder about the difference between the ruling élites in the mother country, which dispatched the colonies, and the colonists, who were presumably a heterogenous bunch of social outcasts. Naturally, it would take some time before a social stratification could develop in the colonies and an élite, on which it was worth while to bestow «amenity» buildings, was formed. This is nicely complementary to all the arguing about the time needed to develop the skills and the organization of the building artisans. Both the one and the other explanation may partly account for the scarcity of non-essential or «amenity» buildings. But then it is also all the more remarkable that at Megara and Lokri we find advanced buildings at an earlier date than in the mother country.

The Western Greek tyrants are mainly a Post-Achaic phenomenon, at the most Late Archaic, which I have tried to avoid by restricting myself to the Archaic period.

I am afraid that I do not understand your remark about the quality of the stone material available in Western Greece. The complex of the problems of the stone material is frequently treated, incl. the need to import stone suitable for ashlar and mouldings for prestigious buildings like temples. The stone footing of a non-essential or «amenity» building need not have raised greater demands on the quality of the stone than those of ordinary private houses.

*M. Graf:* Das Fehlen von οὐ φερά — Geboten und von *leges sacrae* allgemein ist doch auch aus denselben Materialproblemen zu erklären: die Westgriechen hatten keine guten Steine und schrieben entsprechend vor allem auf die viel leichter zerstörbare Bronze — irgenwelche weitergehenden Schlüsse sind wohl unzulässig.

Doch dies nur am Rand. Viel wichtiger und grundlegender ist, was Sie zur Möglichkeit sagten, dass Heiligtümer über privatem Grund erweitert werden oder aber — noch aufregender — profaniert werden könnten. Wir pflegen ja doch sakralen Boden als unabänderlich und seit jeher existent anzusehen — das ist offenbar falsch. Nun gibt es Beispiele zur Sakralisierung früher privaten Raums (mir fällt das kleine Heiligtum der Kybebe im Goldarbeiterviertel von Sardis ein, das über Privathäusern errichtet wurde; cf. A. Ramage, in *BASOR* 199 [1970], 16 f.) — gibt es andere Beispiele? Und vor

allem, gibt es Informationen, wie man genau vorzugehen pflegte bei solchen Transformationen?

*M. Schachter:* The phenomenon of enlarging τεμένη at the expense of secular buildings is not unknown in Greece, an outstanding example being the expansion of the sanctuary at Delphi. The reverse — returning a temenos to secular use — is, as you point out, rare. The only possible example that comes to mind is the building complex over the Heroon at the West Gate in Eretria.

*M. Graf:* Die Heiligtümer des griechischen Westens sind weit schwieriger zum Leben zu erwecken als diejenigen des Mutterlandes oder des kleinasiatischen Griechenlands einfach schon deswegen, weil so viel weniger schriftliche Zeugnisse vorhanden sind. Versucht man beispielsweise, die grossen extraurbanen Heiligtümer aus ihrem Kult heraus zu verstehen, stösst man sehr rasch an die Grenzen der Dokumentation — Rituale sind eben vor allem durch Beschreibungen in literarischen Texten oder Inschriften überliefert; beides ist im Westen knapp. Ganz ausnahmsweise kann man präzise (und sorgfältig ausgegrabene) archäologische Befunde mit Inschriften kombinieren und durch ausgreifendes Vergleichen zu — provisorischen — Schlüssen kommen — etwa im Falle der Cippi und Stelen von Metapont und dem Malophorion, die über einer (einmaligen?) Opferstelle errichtet worden sind und deren Inschriften auf Kult junger Menschen verweisen: versuchsweise kann man das mit den Stelen der thasischen πατρίαι oder der γένη aus dem koischen Asklepieion verbinden (*Proceedings 7th Intern. Congr. Epigr.* [Athens 1987], II 242-5). Doch es ist eine weit aufwendigere Methode als für das Mutterland, mit unsicheren Resultaten — deswegen eben ist der Versuch wichtig, auf anderem Weg zu allgemeineren Strukturen zu gelangen.

*Mme Bergquist:* It is my pleasure to thank Professors Graf and Schachter for the Sardes and Delphi (I suppose this is a reference to the residential quarter «expropriated» by the Attalos stoa?) instances of private ground transformed into sacred ground both for myself and on behalf of the excavators, who generally do not seem to have paid much attention to this



phenomenon, not to speak of its reverse. Lack of time has precluded my searching for parallels outside Western Greece and for literary and epigraphical evidence that could throw light upon the procedure. The excavators, who as a rule do not appear to have recognized the religious significance of such transformations, merely report their findings without any comment. I have simply come to these conclusions by reading their unvarnished accounts of the remains from earlier and later periods. Thus, to my regret, I cannot answer the question about how such changes were brought about.

I am not quite sure that the building over the heroon at the West gate in Eretria is a true parallel to the changes in Naxos and Gela. In Eretria, it is a question of a «family tomb» precinct, not a sanctuary, and the later feasting palaces above replaced earlier feasting buildings close to the tomb precinct (P. Auberson & K. Schefold, *Führer durch Eretria* [Bern 1972], 75-90).

Unlike Professor Graf, I do not want to overplay the notorious lack of appropriate stone in order to explain the lack of ritual laws in Western Greece, in view of the number of stone inscriptions from Western Greek colonies that are after all to be found in L.H. Jeffery, *The local scripts of Archaic Greece. A study of the origin of the Greek alphabet and its development from the eighth to the fifth centuries B.C.* (Oxford 1961) and M. Guarducci, *Epigrafia greca I-IV* (Roma 1967-1978).

I do, however, agree with you that the regrettable scarcity of literary texts and inscriptions leaves us in the dark concerning Western Greek rituals. To the fascinating cases you bring up of sacrificial deposits *plus* stelai at Metapont and Selinous (Meilichios sanctuary), I would like to add the «*thysiai*», sacrificial deposits crowned by stelai, found in the sanctuary at Naxos (briefly reported in *BdA* 57 [1972], 215, and in *Kokalos* 18-19 [1972-1973], 181). This is a topic I would like to return to (see my forth-coming article, «A particular Western Greek cult practice? The significance of *stele*-crowned sacrificial deposits», in *OpAth* 19, *ActaAth*-4°, 41 [1992]).

*M. Etienne*: Les propositions de B. Bergquist concernant Mégara Hyblaea me semblent intéressantes, et je n'ai pas personnellement d'objections à opposer à la nouvelle interprétation de l'hérôon comme «hestiatorion» (il me paraît toutefois que les six *pits* apparaissant sur le seuil de la pièce Sud peuvent

difficilement servir à maintenir une fermeture). En revanche, dans le débat relatif au caractère de la place — agora ou téménos, agora et téménos —, je voudrais rappeler quelques faits et défendre l'hypothèse de l'agora, qu'ont adoptée P. Auberson, G. Vallet et F. Villard:

1. La position de cet espace dans le réseau urbain au centre géométrique de la cité est conforme à l'idée que les Grecs se faisaient d'une agora. Dès les premiers moments de l'installation (vers 750 av. J.-C.), ce lieu est réservé et laissé libre de constructions profanes ou sacrées: c'est ce que l'on attend d'une *meeting place* archaïque.
2. La configuration de cet espace à partir de 650 av. J.-C. me semble confirmer ce caractère. Les bâtiments publics ou sacrés qui sont alors construits le sont à la *périphérie*, aucun n'occupant une position dominante, comme ce devrait être le cas dans un *téménos*. Cette position périphérique est conforme à ce que l'on trouve sur l'Agora d'Athènes. Surtout, cet espace est un espace de circulation, sur lequel débouchent des rues, notamment au Sud. Sur ce point aussi, la comparaison avec Athènes, où l'Agora est un carrefour de voies, me semble être pertinente.
3. Lors de la reconstruction de Mégara Hyblaea au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle, l'«agora» est réduite au Sud, mais on ne l'aménage pas plus qu'avant en *téménos*: lorsqu'on construit un nouveau temple, on l'établit au Nord de cet espace, au-delà du portique qui borde la place.

Dans une civilisation où le sacré et le public interfèrent, il est difficile que les espaces «publics» n'aient pas un caractère «sacré». Mais, pour l'histoire de l'urbanisme, sinon même de la civilisation grecque, je crois important, quand on le peut, de reconnaître une agora.

*Mme Bergquist*: I am most pleased to find that you are prepared to accept my suggested re-interpretation of building d, i.e. the «heroon», at Megara Hyblaea as a hestiatorion. You object, however, to the second of my two alternative interpretations of the reserved space, viz. as temenos instead of agora. Personally, I find that you have taken your arguments a bit too far.

(1) The reserved area is not in the «geometric centre» of the city but of the excavated area: actually it is located in the NE. quadrant of the city (see H. Broise *et al.*, «Chronique d'une journée mégarienne», in *MEFRA* 95 [1983], fig. 14). (2) Temples g and h were in the late 7th century not erected peripherally, but rather centrally in the S. half of the area, thanks to the suppression of previous habitation in the S. (*supra* n. 36). (3) This is a circulation area, into which several streets open. That is a fact, I agree, but, just as there is no instance of an Archaic colonial agora to compare it with (*supra* n. 48), so there is no non-peripheral temenos to compare it with. As I pointed out in my lecture, most Western Greek temene are peripherally situated (probably or possibly in connection with the agora). As their original boundaries have, as a rule, not been established, we do not know to what extent the temene had entrances corresponding to the contemporaneous streets. The huge middle section with two sanctuaries and agora at Poseidonia and the Apollonion and the Athenaion/Artemision at Syrakousai are the only non-peripheral temene. As regards Poseidonia, we do not know the original street grid nor much about the boundary and, as regards the Apollonion at Syrakousai, we know only one corner of the boundary and, as regards the Athenaion/Artemision, nothing about the boundary or the entrance(s).

On second thoughts, I have myself come to favour rather the first alternative of the reserved space having been a public area serving both as agora and temenos.