PUBLIC ARCHITECTURE AND CIVIC IDENTITY IN CLASSICAL AND HELLENISTIC IONIA
THE CASES OF MILETUS AND PRIENE

SOTIRIS G. PATRONOS
MERTON COLLEGE

THESIS SUBMITTED IN FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

SCHOOL OF ARCHAEOLOGY
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD
TRINITY TERM 2002

BODLEIAN LIBRARY OXFORD
DEPOSITED THESIS
17 III 03

To my father, my greatest teacher

'All architecture proposes an effect on the human mind,
not merely a service to the human frame.'

John Ruskin
(The Seven Lamps of Architecture)

ABSTRACT

PUBLIC ARCHITECTURE AND CIVIC IDENTITY IN CLASSICAL AND HELLENISTIC IONIA. THE CASES OF MILETUS AND PRIENE

SOTIRIS G. PATRONOS
MERTON COLLEGE

Thesis submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Trinity Term 2002

The main objective of this thesis is to investigate how works of public architecture, both alone and as components of the general urban layout, were related to the self-perception and identity of the ancient Greek polis community. And further, how the gradual evolution and change of this identity affected the history and associations of the buildings and the overall appearance of the city.

The study concentrates on the Classical and Hellenistic periods with emphasis on the process of transition, and the geographical region of Ionia, which in that particular period lay at the centre of the historical developments that would bring important changes to Greek poleis and their communities. Miletus and Priene were selected as case studies because both were founded in the Classical period and continued to develop throughout the Hellenistic, are extensively excavated and published, and offer sufficient material for study. Miletus allows insight into large and influential polis communities, while Priene offers evidence for small ones with more limited means.

In the first chapter, fundamental concepts such as 'collective identity,' 'cultural community,' 'cultural memory,' 'monumentality,' etc. and also those of 'city,' 'city-state' and 'polis community' are defined and analyzed, and their relation to each other and to architecture is discussed.

In the second and third chapters, the architectural development of Miletus and Priene is examined against its historical background, in the light of the principles and associations observed in the first, theoretical part.

In the final chapter, the developments and tendencies observed in Miletus and Priene are placed into context with similar phenomena that occurred in other poleis of the region and the Greek world in general during the process of transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic era. The discussion is based around the main axes of civic life i.e. the economic-political, socio-cultural, religious etc., and around issues of particular concern at the time such as the effects of monarchy and the growing role of the individual.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS v
LIST OF PLATES vii
PREFACE xi
Chapter I: Introduction and Theoretical Background 1
1 Individual and Collective Identity 1
2 Collective/Social Identity 2
2.1 The concept of social identity 2
2.2 Driving forces of social identity 5
3 Cultural Identity 8
3.1 The identity of cultural communities 8
3.2 The encoding of collective cultural memory 14
3.3 The symbolic character of cultural identity 15
3.4 Identity and material culture 17
3.5 Identity and place 19
4 Architecture and Identity 21
4.1 Monuments of community identity 21
4.2 Public architecture and community identity 27
5 The civic community of the Greek polis 37
Chapter II: The city of Miletus 45
6 Introduction and History 45
6.1 Location and general layout 45
6.2 Historical Overview 46
7 Architectural development in its historical setting 48
7.1 Pre-Classical Miletus 48
7.2 The re-foundation in the 5th century 53
7.3 Miletus in the 4th century 60
7.4 Miletus in the 3rd century 68
7.5 Miletus in the 2nd century 78
7.6 Miletus in the 1st century 99
7.7 Synthesis and general remarks 103
Chapter III: The city of Priene 108
8 Introduction and History 108
8.1 Location and general layout 108
8.2 The history of Priene and the problems surrounding the 4th century refoundation 109
8.3 The problem of relocation 111
8.4 The date of the new foundation 115
8.5 The problem of patronage 121
9 Architectural development in its historical setting 127
9.1 Location and general layout 127
9.2 The refoundation in the 4th century 141
9.3 Priene in the 3rd century 146
9.4 Priene in the 2nd century 159
9.5 Priene in the 1st century 168
9.6 Synthesis and general remarks 169

Chapter IV: Public architecture and civic identity from the Classical to the Hellenistic. The wider historical context 173
9.7 Architecture as part of the relationship between poleis and kings 174
9.8 Polis architecture in the framework of internal structural change 193
9.8.1 The political and socio-economic sector 193
9.8.2 The socio-cultural sector 207
9.8.3 The religious sector 216
9.9 A new perception of public architecture 230
9.10 Public architecture and the private individual 238
9.11 The new meaning and character of architectural forms 244
GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY 254
PLATES 305

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The idea to study the relationship between public architecture and the identity of the Greek polis community was born in 1994, in the course of an undergraduate lecture series on Athenian architectural projects of the period 479-431 B.C. delivered by Prof. Vassilis Lambrinoudakis at the University of Athens. In the years 1995-1997, and again under the valuable guidance of Prof. Lambrinoudakis, the great potential of the subject became apparent, and the foundations for advanced research were laid in the M. Phil. Thesis titled *Monument and Polis: Prolegomenon to the Historical Investigation of the Concept of 'Monument' in Greek Antiquity* (in Greek, University of Athens, 1997). To Prof. Lambrinoudakis, and also to Prof. Eva Simantoni-Bournia of the same University, I remain grateful ever since for their continuous support and encouragement.

In 1997, I had the unique opportunity to take up doctoral research at the University of Oxford under the advice and supervision of Dr. J.J. Coulton. In the following years, Dr. Coulton assiduously guided me through the long and challenging process of defining and shaping the subject, coping with the extensive material, and putting together my ideas and arguments into a coherent thesis. My debt to him for his thorough and painstaking reading of the various drafts, his always prompt and insightful feedback, and above all his confidence in my ability, his constant encouragement and his enduring patience is really immeasurable. Naturally, for the views expressed in this study, and the remaining errors and omissions the responsibility is mine alone.

I could have never embarked on a study at Oxford, however, if Merton College and the A.G. Leventis Foundation had not done me a great honour by awarding me the Leventis Senior Scholarship. In the ideal facilities of the College and thanks to the ample financial support of the Foundation, I was able to pursue my research under the best possible conditions. I am deeply indebted to Prof. Dame Jessica Rawson, Prof. Sir John Boardman, Prof. Vassos Karageorghis, and Dr. Nicholas Richardson, members of the Scholarship Committee, for their faith in me. I would also like to express my profound gratitude to the Church of Paphos, Cyprus, and especially to His Eminence Metropolitan Chrysostom, for their generous support in the final stages of my effort.

To the generous grants of Merton College, the Committee of Archaeology's Meyerstein Fund, and the Craven Committee I owe the opportunity to make my field trip to Asia Minor, Turkey, in order to examine the sites of Miletus, Priene and other cities

cities first hand. Special thanks are also due to the Foundation of Hellenic World, and its president Hon. Lazaros Efraimoglou for their kind permission to use images from the project for the digital visual reconstruction of ancient Miletus.

My greatest debts of gratitude are of course to my family - my father George P. Patronos, Prof. of Theology at the University of Athens, my mother Thomaïs and my sister Marina, whose help in all matters over the past years has been unfailing. Without the constant encouragement, advice, and moral support of my father in particular, this thesis would have never been possible. It is, therefore, rightfully dedicated to him. Finally, deep and sincere thanks are owed to Anny, and many other friends in Oxford and Athens, who have assisted me in various ways, and have endured my 'scholarly' moods with patience.

Oxford, September 2002

LIST OF PLATES

Plate 1	**a-b**	Satellite image (LANDSAT) showing the geomorphology of Ionia in antiquity and in modern times. Photomontage for cloud-clear effect and digital editing by S. Patronos.
Plate 2		Ground plan of Miletus in the Late Roman period. After Gerkan and Rehm, 1935: Pl. 1.
Plate 3	**a**	Satellite image (IKONOS) showing the silt deposits at the Maeander delta. ©TerraServer (www.terraserver.com). Edited by S. Patronos.
	b-c	The late Archaic temple of Athena Polias in Miletus. Ground plans suggested by v. Gerkan (b) and Mallwitz (c). After Mallwitz, 1975: Figs. 1, 3.
Plate 4	**a**	The ground plan of Miletus after the refoundation of 479 according to W. Hoepfner and E.-L. Schwandner. After Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: Figs. 11, 13.
	b	The area of the Lion Harbour at the end of the 4th cent. B.C. After Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 29 (modified).
Plate 5	**a-b**	The two lions of the Lion Harbour in Miletus. (a) The east lion (image from the Perseus Project, www.perseus.tufts.edu) (b) The west lion (photo by S. Patronos.).
Plate 6		Digital reconstruction of the Delphinium in Miletus (Roman structures removed). Images courtesy of the Foundation of Hellenic World (www.fhw.gr).
Plate 7		Digital reconstruction of the theatre of Miletus. Roman phase. Images courtesy of the Foundation of Hellenic World (www.fhw.gr).
Plate 8	**a-d**	The theatre of Miletus. The four phases of the scene building. After Krauss, 1964: Figs. 1-7.
	e-f	Sanctuary and temple of Dionysus in Miletus. After Müller-Wiener, 1988: Figs. 10, 12.
Plate 9		The civic centre of Miletus. After Coulton, 1976: Fig. 86.
Plate 10	**a-b**	The sanctuary and temple of Demeter in Miletus. After Müller-Wiener, 1988: Figs. 12, 13.
	c-e	Digital reconstruction of the gymnasium at the Baths of Capito in Miletus. Images courtesy of the Foundation of Hellenic World (www.fhw.gr).
Plate 11	**a**	Miletus. The area of the West Market, the stadium and the Athena Temple. After Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 27.
	b	The stadium of Miletus. Ground plan. After Gerkan, 1929: Pl. 3.
	c-d	The propylon of the gymnasium of Eumenes. Ground plan and front view. After Gerkan, 1929: Figs. 39, 40.
Plate 12		Digital reconstruction of the stadium and the propylon of the Eumenes gymnasium in Miletus. Images courtesy of the Foundation of Hellenic World (www.fhw.gr).
Plate 13	**a**	The bouleuterion of Miletus. Reconstructed view. After Knackfuss et al., 1908: Pl. 14.
	b	The bouleuterion of Miletus. Ground plan. After Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 52.
	c-d	The propylon of the Milesian bouleuterion. Reconstructions pro-

posed by (c) Knackfuss et al., 1908: Pl. 10; (d) Krischen, 1941: Pl.3.

Plate 14 **a** The bouleuterion of Miletus. Ground plan of the meeting hall. After Krischen, 1941: Pl. 6.

b The bouleuterion of Miletus. View of the meeting hall from the courtyard. After Krischen, 1941: Pl. 4.

c The bouleuterion of Miletus. Front view of the west wall. After Krischen, 1941: Pl. 9.

d The bouleuterion of Miletus. Front view of the east wall. After Krischen, 1941: Pl. 7.

Plate 15 **a-b** The bouleuterion of Miletus. Interior views of the meeting hall. After Krischen, 1941: Pls. 11, 15.

Plate 16 **a-f** Digital reconstruction of the bouleuterion in Miletus. Images courtesy of the Foundation of Hellenic World (www.fhw.gr).

Plate 17 **a** Ground plans of known bouleuteria and similar structures. Edited by S. Patronos.

b-c The bouleuteria of Heraclea by Latmos and Termessus. Reconstructed facades. After Krischen, 1941: Pls. 24, 28.

Plate 18 **a-f** Digital reconstruction of the North Agora of Miletus. Images courtesy of the Foundation of Hellenic World (www.fhw.gr).

Plate 19 **a-c** Digital reconstruction of the Sacred Gate of Miletus. Images courtesy of the Foundation of Hellenic World (www.fhw.gr).

Plate 20 **a** The magazine hall in Miletus. South facade. After Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 88.

b The heroon west of the Athena Temple in Miletus. Ground plan. After Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 25.

c The heroon on the theatre hill. Ground plan. After Müller-Wiener, 1988: Fig. 7.

d The heroon by the Faustina Thermae. Ground plan. After Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 100.

Plate 21 **a** Aerial view of Priene from the south. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Fig. 19.

b Reconstructed view of Priene in the late Hellenistic times from the south (A. Zippelius, 1908). After Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: Fig. 216.

Plate 22 Ground plan of Priene in the late Hellenistic period. Composed by S. Patronos.

Plate 23 **a** Ground plan of Priene's grid system and street network. After Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: Fig. 180.

b Satellite image (LANDSAT) showing the alluvial deposits at the Maeander delta. Photomontage for cloud-clear effect and digital editing by S. Patronos.

c The Maeander delta. Plan showing coastline changes through time. After Marchese, 1986: Fig. 8.

Plate 24 **a-b** The sanctuary and temple of Demeter and Kore in Priene. Ground plan and front view. After Krischen, 1938: Pl. 19; Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: Fig. 119.

c The fortification wall of Priene. View of the masonry. Photo by S. Patronos.

Plate 25 The civic centre of Priene in the late 4th – early 3rd century B.C. Af-

ter Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: Fig. 187, modified by S. Patronos.

Plate 26
- **a** Athena Polias temple in Priene. Ground plan. After Pullan and Newton, 1891: Pl. 6.
- **b** Athena Polias temple in Priene. Reconstructed view of the entablature. After Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: Fig. 74.
- **c** Athena Polias temple in Priene. Column capital and base. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Fig. 104.
- **d** Athena Polias temple in Priene. Reconstructed view from the northwest. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Fig. 91.

Plate 27
- **a** Athena Polias temple in Priene. Isometric reconstruction. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Fig. 97.
- **b-c** Temple of Zeus at Labraunda. Ground plan and reconstructed front view. After Hellström, 1994: Figs. 1, 2.

Plate 28
- **a** Dedicatory inscription of Alexander on the anta of the Athena Polias temple in Priene. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Fig. 117.
- **b** Reconstructed front view of Andron B in Labraunda. After Hellström, 1994: Fig. 10.
- **c** Reconstructed view of the 'oikoi' in Labraunda. After Hellström, 1994: Fig. 23.
- **d-e** Marble heads from the Athena Polias and the Demeter and Kore sanctuaries in Priene. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Figs. 118, 139.

Plate 29
- **a-b** Schematic profile of Priene's site and detail of the stadium terrace showing the extreme steepness of the terrain. Composite image by S. Patronos.
- **c** View of one of Priene's many stepped streets. Photo by S. Patronos.

Plate 30
- **a** The terrace of the Athena Polias sanctuary in Priene. View from the south-east. Photo by S. Patronos.
- **b-c** The view of the Athena Polias temple in Priene from the point of the agora altar according to Doxiadis. After Doxiadis, 1972: Figs. 84, 85.
- **d** View of Priene and the Maeander plain from the top of the theatre cavea. Photo by S. Patronos.

Plate 31
- **a** The archive of inscriptions on the north wall of the Athena Polias temple in Priene. After Sherwin-White, 1985: Fig. 1.
- **b-c** Ground plan of the 'sacred house' in Priene, and the statuette in the likeness of Alexander. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Figs. 74, 79.
- **d-e** Ground plan and view of the prytaneion of Priene from the north. After Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: Fig. 225. Photo by S. Patronos.

Plate 32 Artistic reconstruction of Priene in the late 4th –early 3rd century B.C. After Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: Fig. 183, modified by S. Patronos.

Plate 33
- **a-b** The theatre of Priene. Reconstruction and view from above. After Gerkan, 1921b: Pl. 34,2 and 35.
- **c** The upper gymnasium of Priene. Ground plan of the Roman renovation. After Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: Fig. 282.
- **d-e** The sanctuary and temple of the Egyptian Gods in Priene. Ground

plans. After Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: Fig. 158 and Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Fig. 168.

Plate 34 **a-c** Construction stages of the south stoa complex in the agora of Priene. After Kienlin, 1998: Figs. 3-5

d North-south cross-section of the agora stoa complex. After Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: Fig. 180

e-f The south stoa of the agora. Front view and reconstruction of the interior. After Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: Fig. 184 and Krischen, 1938: Pl. 23.

g The houses immediately north of the agora. Reconstructed round plan. After Kienlin, 1998: Fig. 7.

h The agora of Priene. Ground plan of the final phase. After Coulton, 1976: Fig. 103.

Plate 35 **a** The arched gate of the Prienean agora. Reconstruction. After Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: Fig. 199.

b The agora of Magnesia on the Maeander. Ground plan. After Coulton, 1976: Fig. 81.

c The altar of Athena Polias in Priene. Reconstructed view. After Carter, 1983: Fig. 17.

Plate 36 **a-d** The bouleuterion of Priene. Ground plan, facade and reconstruction of the interior. After Krischen, 1941: Pls. 12,13, 18,19.

e-f Reconstructed views of the Sacred Stoa in Priene from the agora and the interior. After Krischen, 1938: Pl. 21 and Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 64.

Plate 37 **a** The stoa in the Athena Polias sanctuary of Priene. Ground plan. After Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 26.

b-c The temple in the sanctuary by the agora of Priene. Ground plan and reconstructed view. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Fig. 45.

d The lower gymnasium and the stadium of Priene. Ground plan. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Fig. 172.

Plate 38 **a** The lower gymnasium and the stadium of Priene. Reconstructed view. After Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 101.

b The lower gymnasium of Priene. Reconstructed view of the ephebeum. After Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: Fig. 97.

c The propylon to the Athena Polias sanctuary in Priene. Reconstructed view from Athena Street. After Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: Fig. 94.

d The heroon-tomb by the theatre of Priene. Ground plan and front view. After Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: Fig. 283.

PREFACE

The main objective of this thesis is to investigate how the works of public architecture, both alone and as components of the general urban layout, were related to the self-perception and identity of the ancient Greek polis community. And further, how the gradual evolution and change of this identity affected the history and associations of the buildings and the overall appearance of the city.

The various aspects of community identity – the awareness of belonging to a collective human entity and the feelings of self-assertion and esteem resulting from it – have been increasingly drawing the attention of scholarship, but the value of architectural evidence to their study and understanding in the context of the Greek polis has not yet been fully exploited. Architecture forms the physical setting of urban life, the space in which civic community comes into existence. Besides serving practical needs and purposes, architecture is also the field where technical achievements, aesthetic values and ideologies meet to produce an image of the city, which is also a self-image of the civic community.

The erection of public buildings in particular is a direct reflection of the citizens operating in a collective way, and the most time-, effort- and money-consuming activity, by which the monumental ambitions of the community are expressed. Aiming greatly at prestige and linked to notions of posterity, public buildings reveal not only what the civic community is, but also what it claims and desires to be. They are replete with symbolic messages and connotations, and serve as repositories and sources of communal memory.

In response to the changing historical circumstances, buildings succeed one another and form new relations and layouts, gradually altering the city's physical image. The ideas and intentions behind buildings and their novel associations reflect a new mental image of the city as well. The city's architectural history is the visible outcome of the community's efforts to find its place and adapt to an ever-changing world. As this process also affects the way in which the community perceives itself, architectural development also embodies the development of community identity.

The study concentrates on the Classical and Hellenistic periods, from which more sufficient material evidence exists, with emphasis on the transition, so that the connection between architecture and civic identity can be examined not statically, but as a con-

tinuous process. Ionia was chosen as a dynamic part of Hellenism, which in that particular period lay in the centre of the historical developments that would bring important changes to Greek poleis and their communities.

The decision to focus on specific case studies was dictated by the nature of the subject itself, and the fact that continuity and evolution could not become easily evident if material was drawn from a wide range of sources. The selected cities are, of course, not cut off from their geographical and historical environment, and reference to and comparison with others in the region and beyond are made wherever appropriate. Their selection was made on practical as well as tactical grounds. Both are extensively excavated and published, offer enough material for study and have a wide bibliographic coverage. Both were founded in the Classical period and continued to develop throughout the Hellenistic. Miletus allows insight into large and influential polis communities, while Priene offers evidence for small ones with more limited means.

The thesis is divided in four chapters. In the first, theoretical and introductory one, fundamental concepts such as 'collective identity,' 'cultural community,' 'cultural memory,' 'monumentality,' etc. and also those of 'city,' 'city-state' and 'polis' are defined and analyzed, and their relation to each other and to architecture is discussed. This chapter is presented in a relatively extensive and self-standing form, because it is also meant to be useful as a reference source for concepts interconnected but derived from different disciplines, and widely used but rarely adequately defined.

In the second and third chapters, the architectural development of Miletus and Priene is examined against its historical background, in the light of the principles and associations observed in the first, theoretical part. The reader will observe the absence of an extensive treatment of the Apollo Temple at Didyma from the Miletus chapter. This is intentional, for although the temple was undoubtedly the city's most prestigious and monumental building, by being located in a sanctuary that had regional and even wider associations, its significance exceeded the confines of a single polis. Due to space limitations, a special chapter initially intended to study this and other similar structures could not be included in the present thesis. The same applied – despite extensive preliminary work – also for a chapter on Pergamum that would allow direct comparisons with a royal capital. Both will have to await the publication of the book that will hopefully follow.

In the final chapter, the developments and tendencies observed in Miletus and Priene are placed into context with similar phenomena that occurred in other poleis of

the region and the Greek world in general during the process of transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic era. For reasons of better presentation and coherence, the discussion is based around the main axes of civic life i.e. the economic-political, socio-cultural, religious etc., and issues of particular concern at the time such as the effects of monarchy and the increasing role of the individual.

Chapter I
Introduction and Theoretical Background

1 Individual and Collective Identity

The definition and awareness of identity is an issue recurring in all times and places and in fact pertaining to human existence. The concerns residing in the pursuit of identity may be summed up in the following basic questions: who am I and what am I.[1] One way to approach the first question is by assertion of continuity in time and space through reference to lineage, current status and future anticipation. The approach of the second aims primarily at the assertion of distinctiveness, thus entailing the notions of comparison, similarity and contrast. This in turn presupposes reference to membership of and adherence to particular cultures and communities.

The inherent need for human beings to relate to each other in some sort of social conduct, as already implied above, puts the issue of identity on two levels: the individual/personal, and the collective/social. The distinction between personal and social identity has been a long-debated central problem in the theories about the self, with viewpoints ranging from the exaltation of the individual as an autonomous entity to its total submission to the social environment.[2] The question as to whether it is possible for both personal and social identity to exist beyond the level of mere theoretical definition originates from the apparent difficulty to perceive a part of the self-concept that is free of role or relationship determinants, and separate from the part derived from the individual's group memberships, interpersonal relationships, social position and status. In other words, whether it is possible to comprehend the self outside its historical context.[3]

Attempts have been made to differentiate between the two kinds of identity in terms of content. Individual identity has thus been associated with personal traits and idiosyncratic attributes, while collective identity with properties deriving from social

---

[1] Smith, 1995: 129-130.

[2] For a discussion of modern personality theories emphasizing the internal integrity of the self with minute interest in the social aspects of identification see Gleason, 1983; Deaux, 1996: 780. For theories on the social determination of the self see for example Cooley, 1902; Goffman, 1956; McCall and Simmons, 1966.

[3] Hollis, 1977; Breakwell, 1983: 6-12.

interaction.[4] It appears, however, that the contrast between personal and social identity can be more sufficiently approached on a dynamic basis, with the emphasis laid on focus of attention rather than content. From this perspective, personal identity is highlighted when thinking of the self on grounds of unique attributes, whereas social identity emerges when the individual is considered in view of its similarities with the co-members of the social formations in which it participates, and its differences from the non-members.[5] The personal and the social are aspects of the identity phenomenon that come into view depending on the standpoint of the observer – the bearer of the identity himself or someone else – and the context of the observation.

It is sometimes pointed out that personal and social identity would be more straightforwardly discerned, if one were to freeze the moment when they stand in conflict and before one of them unavoidably changes.[6] In all other instances they are rather different points in a process of development, whereby conceptions of the self are learnt, actively used and transformed through contact with new experiences, and then act to filter future impacts of the social expectations surrounding the individual.[7] The relationship between personal and social identity is continual and dialectical.

In the light of the above remarks, the present study focuses on the collective aspect of identity, and attempts to approach through the study of public architecture issues related to feelings and perceptions of self-definition and awareness shared between the members of the ancient Greek polis community.

2 Collective/Social Identity

2.1 The concept of social identity

In contemporary social psychology, social identity is defined as 'that part of the individual's self-concept, which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to

---

[4] See Brown and Turner, 1981; Hogg and Abrams, 1988.

[5] Turner, Hogg, Oakes et al., 1987; Turner, Oakes, Haslam et al., 1994. Cf. Deaux, 1996: 780-781.

[6] On the issue of conflict see Hollis, 1977; McCall, 1977.

[7] Breakwell, 1983: 11.

that membership.'[8] People participate in, interact with, and consequently identify with numerous social groups. The variety of possible collective affiliations is practically endless: from gender and age categories, familial and other forms of kinship, economic and occupational groups and classes, leisure and welfare associations, to territorial, political, ethnic or other cultural communities. A 'group,' therefore, can be any social category, any cognitive unit in which the social environment may be segmented, classified and ordered, and of which a person can see him- or herself as a member.[9]

These multiple identifications exist simultaneously under the more general umbrella of self-concept, and people move from one to the other as circumstances demand. Depending on time and situation, certain identities become salient and come into the foreground exercising priority without negating the existence of the others.[10] Not all identities are of equal importance however. Instead, they are hierarchized according to their type[11] and the degree of meaning they share in a person's self-concept.[12]

The character, function, and thus also the identity of social groups differ along several dimensions,[13] of which the most important are the following: size, lifetime, permeability of boundaries,[14] origin of membership,[15] bureaucracy and status differentiation within the structure, cohesiveness,[16] nature of communication between members, type of goals. Depending on their position along these dimensions, which tend to co-vary, groups range in a continuum from concrete to conceptual forms. Concrete groups – such as the citizen community of the Greek polis in which we are interested – have specific goals, distinct hierarchies, extensive bureaucracies, well-established

---

[8] Tajfel, 1981: 255. On the social identity theory cf. Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Hogg and Abrams, 1988; Abrams and Hogg, 1990 and 1999.

[9] On the social categorization theory see Tajfel, 1981; Turner, Hogg, Oakes et al., 1987.

[10] Deaux, 1996:. 779-780.

[11] Depending on how collectivistic (based on cooperation and interdependence) or individualistic (based on individual achievement and independence) they are, and whether they are based on comparison with out-groups or formed rather autonomously. See Hinkle and Brown, 1990; Brown, Hinkle, Ely et al., 1992.

[12] Deboeck and Rosenberg, 1988; Rosenberg and Gara, 1985; Stryker and Serpe, 1982.

[13] See Breakwell, 1983: 19-22.

[14] The ease with which people can enter and leave the group.

[15] Membership may be ascribed as a result of chance (gender, race) and circumstances (freedom, wealth) or may be achieved through the individual's decision and effort.

[16] Affinity between members and allegiance to the group.

communication between members and a sense of group history. Conceptual groups, on the other hand, exist mainly or only in the minds of the persons who recognize them and affiliate with them as members. In the course of their lives, groups may move along the continuum towards one end or the other.

Besides these dimensions, a group's substantive identity is also delineated by the rules and norms that set the standards for member conduct and the prerequisites for acceptance of newcomers and, finally, by the rituals and symbols employed to express the group's distinctiveness and spatio-temporal continuity. With the role and function of these factors in the emergence and expression of collective identity we shall deal in more detail later on. Let us now return to the principles of social identity.

As a process, identification begins with a self-statement, an application of a 'label' to oneself. More particularly, social identification involves the recognition that this characteristic 'label' is shared by a number of people and places them in the same social category or group. Knowledge of this 'label's' content constitutes knowledge of group membership. When people identify with a group they also tend to identify with its members. That is they tend to treat their co-members as similar to themselves. As a result of self-stereotyping, this perceived similarity is both a consequence and a generating force of identity, for it encourages conformity and hence actual similarity of the group members.[17]

This essentially cognitive process in the formation of social identity is, nevertheless, not without a strong affective aspect.[18] Allegiance to the group and consequent cohesiveness rest much upon the emotional bonds among its members, especially in times of crisis caused by challenge or threat to the group's identity or physical existence.[19] The emotional factor is particularly important to identities of groups that depend heavily on the collectivism of their members and on comparison with other groups. National, ethnic[20] and civic identity, which is our main concern here, are good cases in point.

Another factor that plays an essential role in groups of this kind is interdependence. Knowledge and affection may be enough to sustain group identity in the absence

---

[17] See Turner, 1984 and 1991.

[18] On the issue whether emotionality is involved in a primary way or is merely a consequence of group formation and identification see Deaux, 1996: 783-784.

[19] See Breakwell, 1986.

[20] See Ethier and Deaux, 1994; Phinney, 1990.

of actual contact among the members, as is the case with groups that verge upon the conceptual type. In concrete groups, however, the collectivism, communication and interaction of the members bring about a strong feeling of interdependence.[21] On the one hand, this pertains to the co-ordination of activities in the common pursuit of the group's goals, since all members share the outcome, success or failure. On the other hand, interdependence also denotes the sense of a common fate and destiny.[22]

2.2 Driving forces of social identity

The motivation behind the human tendency towards social contact and interaction has been interpreted in various ways. From an instrumental perspective, the pursuit of group membership serves the fundamental need for sustenance, assurance of material resources and protection. It also enables the accomplishment of goals that could not be achieved individually. From a different point of view, participation in a subset of social groups and categories is not a matter of choice. Gender, race, ethnicity are among the many categorisations that are imposed upon the individual by birth or circumstances. A great number of others, however, are not. It is also true that people often choose not to endorse an identification that has been arbitrarily ascribed to them.

Social psychology has aimed at providing a more sufficient and comprehensive explanation of the motivation for social identification. People, it is postulated, feel the need to understand and interpret their world. The evaluation of their effort is fundamentally a matter of consensus among observers in the social environment, rather than intrinsic to the world itself. Therefore, they need to seek out others to attain understanding, and relieve the tension created by uncertainty.[23] People also feel the need to evaluate themselves, to achieve, maintain and confirm a positive self-concept and a high degree of self-esteem.[24] This too can only take place within a social context. In both cases the social context must be relevant, that is, it must include similar others so that the necessary process of comparison becomes possible.[25]

---

[21] Deaux, 1996: 784-785.

[22] See Brown, 1988.

[23] On the 'drive-reduction' model see Hogg and Abrams, 1993.

[24] On the self-esteem theory see Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Tajfel, 1982.

[25] On the social comparison theory see Festinger, 1954.

On a primary level, people seek a positive personal identity by comparing themselves with others within their group or social category. At the same time, however, as communicants of the social identity shared among the members of their groups, people strive for collective self-esteem too, so that by association the group's prestige will reflect positively upon themselves. The prestige of the group emerges again through comparison and assertion of positive distinctiveness from other relevant and similar groups.[26]

In the effort to establish and maintain a positive distinctiveness for their group, people tend to evaluate it more positively than those contrasted with it, thus displaying in-group favouritism and out-group bias.[27] Members are favoured by group action and behaviour, while non-members tend to be described in stereotypic terms that justify discrimination and accentuate the differences between groups.[28] Intergroup biases are usually long-standing and highly resistant to change, especially when it comes to cultural groups such as national, ethnic and civic communities. Age-old preconceptions and enmities between Greek poleis, Dorians and Ionians,[29] Greeks and 'barbarians'[30] that will be further discussed later on are characteristic in this respect.[31] In cases of external threat to the group's identity, patterns of bias tend to intensify even further.[32]

Every group exists within a network of intergroup relations, in which it occupies its own social niche. As a result of the comparison process, the identity of one group is relative to that of the others and a product of constant negotiation with them. In this negotiation, however, groups do not participate on equal terms. Depending on their material resources, numerical strength, coalition potential, vitality of ideology and general historical circumstances, certain groups possess a higher power and prestige status than others do. Naturally, dominant groups seek to maintain their position and to promul-

---

[26] On intergroup comparison see Hogg and Abrams, 1990 and 1993.

[27] See Turner, Brown and Tajfel, 1979; Mummendey and Schreiber, 1984; Perdue, Dovidio, Gurtman et al., 1990; Khalid, 1990.

[28] Tajfel, 1981; Hogg and Abrams, 1988; Mackie and Hamilton, 1993.

[29] See Will, 1956; Alty, 1982; Lévêque, 1983.

[30] See n. 52 below.

[31] See Koomen and Baehler, 1996.

[32] See Branscombe, Wann, Noel et al, 1993.

gate, legitimate and perpetuate their own system of values and version of social order, their own identity.[33]

Less powerful groups, on the other hand, which come out of the comparison process with relative disadvantage, find it hard to achieve positive distinctiveness and consequently face an identity crisis. In general, any objective challenge to the power of a group that threatens its social prestige and status also constitutes a threat to its identity. But since the relationship is reciprocal, a challenge to the content of group identity will undermine group power and status as well.[34]

A group's response to negative self-evaluation or external threat depends on the resilience of its structure. If this is poor, the group may suffer physical damage or even eradication as its members seek to remedy the negative feelings resulting from a sense of inferior identity by abandoning the group altogether in favour of a more prestigious one.[35] Where the group remains to fight, it mobilises membership and available resources in a renegotiation of its identity. Along this process, if the group feels strong and confident enough, if the legitimacy and stability of the current state of affairs are questionable, or if power balance seems reversible, it will compete for a higher status.

On the other hand, if the status quo appears solid or the dominant group has managed to present its superiority as indisputable, then the subordinate group will try to re-evaluate its position and identity in ways that render it more positive and attractive. It may attempt to take up or imitate characteristics of the dominant group or seek new dimensions on which comparison is more favourable. It may also redefine and reinterpret the values attached to the constituents of its identity to make them appealing again, or it may shift its focus and reference to other groups of lower status than its own, so that the outcome of comparison becomes positive.[36]

Within the overall process of comparison and negotiation of status, it becomes obvious that each group does not only perceive and evaluate its own identity, but at the

---

[33] Hogg and Abrams, 1988: 14, 26-27 and 1990: 4.

[34] Breakwell, 1986: 24-25.

[35] The absorption of settlements or even poleis by more powerful neighbours, and the tendency of members of poleis élites to join the courts of Hellenistic monarchs and later to become citizens of the Roman state are occurrences of this phenomenon. On the process of social mobility and dis-identification, see Lewin, 1948; Breakwell, 1986: 25; Hogg and Abrams, 1988: 26-27, 54 and 1990: 4; Kerckhoff, 1989; Deaux, 1996: 793-794; Jackson, Sullivan, Harnish et al., 1996.

[36] On the social competition and social creativity postulates see Tajfel and Turner, 1979; Hogg and Abrams, 1988: 28-29, 54-58.

same time perceives and evaluates the identities of the others. As a result, every group has one identity in the eyes of the membership and another in the eyes of the outside world. The two can hardly coincide exactly, and the degree of discrepancy can vary from slight misalignment to absolute divergence. This may occur not only on the subjective level, which concerns the meaning and value attached to a group's attributes and characteristics, but on the objective level as well. People may be assigned a group label and identity stereotypically, without themselves recognising or accepting that they belong to this group.[37]

Since groups are in constant interaction, the two aspects of their identity, the inside and the outside – or 'emic' and 'etic' as they appear in anthropological discourse and theory[38]– also interact. In actual practice within the changing social context, notions of group identity are in fact the products of this negotiatory interaction, of the contrast, compromise and blending of the two perspectives.

3 Cultural Identity

3.1 The identity of cultural communities

So far we have dealt with the fundamental concepts, mechanisms and processes related to collective identity as these are described and studied by social psychology. This has been done in order to trace the basic agents that affect the way people think and feel themselves as parts of larger groupings, developing psychological bonds with them and a sense of inclusiveness that can even exist independently of and beyond physical contact. On this primary level, observations pertain to most or all kinds of human groups: from large ones such as nations to small ones such as a company of friends, and from general categories such as gender to artificial laboratory groupings for the sake of an experiment.

Our main concern here, however, is civic community i.e. the community composed of the citizens of the ancient Greek polis. This type of social formation, along with others such as ethnic groups, nations, religious denominations, castes etc, belongs

---

[37] See Breakwell, 1983: 23-24; Weinrich, 1983; Condor, 1990; Deaux, 1996: 788-789.

[38] The two terms are mainly used in cultural anthropology to denote the two different methods of approach and study of a culture: from within its structure and with reference to its internal characteristics (emic), or from an observation point outside and by means of cross-cultural comparison (etic). See Melas, 1989; Headland, Pike and Harris, 1992; cf. Levi-Strauss, 1953.

to the category of cultural communities. Collective identity in such communities is distinguished by the cultural character of their foundations. In other types of group, membership may rely upon a single attribute being in common among a number of persons. By contrast, cultural communities consist of people whose categorising determinant is the complex system of characteristics and relationships that shape every aspect of their behaviour and consciousness and make up their culture.

The term 'culture' has been used in many ways and has come to mean quite different things in different circumstances. In part this has been a consequence of diverse perspectives and manifold interconnections among the various disciplines.[39] These put aside, E. B. Tylor's old generic definition of culture as the knowledge, arts, beliefs, customs and morals that human beings come to acquire as members of a society still stands.[40] It is this capacity, deeply rooted in consciousness,[41] that makes humans fundamentally different from other living systems.[42]

Consciousness, which presupposes the ability to consider one's own being as an issue and to refer to one's self through the medium of language,[43] allows humans to put their behavioural instructions under the control and direction of intentional agency, and thus to constitute themselves as distinct social actors and selectors of their cultural attributes instead of being merely objects of selection.[44] The issues of culture and identity are therefore deeply connected, for it is by the means and in the context of culture that both personal and group identity are constructed.[45]

Collective cultural identity emerges out of common thought and action: the shared mental processes, beliefs, knowledge and values that act as templates for rules of conduct, rituals and religion, political and economic organisation, technology and material production, language, art and means of communication. As the community evolves and renews itself physically over time, its culture evolves and adapts to the new historical conditions and requirements as well. This is a continuous process. As culture is

---

[39] For an account of the various functionalist, structuralist and post-structuralist approaches to culture see Bodley, 1994; Thomas, 1995.

[40] Leach, 1982: 38.

[41] See Ingold, 1983.

[42] On the recurrent issue of the biological or non-biological nature of culture see Graves-Brown, 1996.

[43] See Heidegger, 1962.

[44] Ingold, 1986: 9.

[45] Thomas, 1995: 432.

passed on from one generation of community members to the next, some parts are lost, other parts acquire new meaning and new parts are added. Culture and cultural identity after it are in a constant state of change and process of negotiation with the natural and social environment. They are dynamic and contested. Being a member of the community means participating in its culture. Participation requires common ways of reference and understanding, that is, shared systems of meaning. These cannot be inherited or simply taken up. They have to be learned and practised inside the community through the mechanisms of acculturation.

Cultural types of collective identity have always exerted a special power in history, occupying high positions in the hierarchy of human self-concept.[46] Their intensity and pervasiveness rests on their strongly collectivistic and relational character,[47] as well as on the fact that the elements from which they are forged are more tenacious and binding than the shared attributes, needs and interests that characterise other kinds of collective identity.[48]

Cultural communities and their collective identities share a common ground along certain essential dimensions.[49] First of all is the members' need for and confidence in the distinctiveness of their culture as a result of difference and contrast vis-à-vis others. This confidence builds up over time, generation after generation, and is in a mutual relationship with a strong sense of continuity, which is also interpreted in terms of rootedness and integration with natural space. Confidence in spatio-temporal continuity combined with shared hopes and aspirations produce a feeling of common destiny or even mission among community members.

As already discussed,[50] positive distinctiveness is fundamental to group cohesiveness and self-esteem. The term 'community' itself, while denoting a collective entity consisting of people with common properties, at the same time implies comparative difference, as these properties distinguish the members of the particular entity in a significant way from the members of others.[51] As far as culture is concerned, on the basis of

---

[46] They have even been considered as 'primordial' aspects of human existence. See Stack, 1986. Cf. p. 3 and n. 12 above.

[47] Cf p. 3 and n. 11 above.

[48] Smith, 1995: 131.

[49] Smith, 1995: 131-2.

[50] See p. 6 above.

[51] Cf. Cohen, 1985: 115.

real or subjectively assumed and accentuated difference the part of the world that lies outside the community's recognizable cultural context is perceived and confronted as representing a counter- or even non-culture. In order to secure and defend its socio-cultural niche, each community claims exclusiveness of the ideas, values and other elements that it considers essential to its identity, and strives to fence off those that are potentially harmful. The role of the 'barbarians' in the awakening and preservation of ancient Greek cultural identity is a well-known historical example.[52] Within this context, a given culture tends either to eliminate or to integrate its counter-culture, the relationship between the two being, therefore, ambivalent.[53] The violent clash and at the same time profound interaction between Greeks and Persians, very eloquently presented by Herodotus, is yet another example.

Each community achieves awareness of its unity and positive distinctiveness through a process of self-evaluation. The knowledge and information that is required for this purpose and from which the formative and normative forces that allow present and future generations of members to reproduce their identity is preserved and bequeathed in the community's collective cultural memory.[54] It is an implicit rule that participants in any social order share a common memory. If their memories of the past diverge, they can share neither experiences nor assumptions. Experience of the present very largely depends upon knowledge of the past.[55]

Knowledge of and reference to the past invests the community's identity, and thus its claims to self-determination and autonomous existence, with the necessary legitimation. A distinct account of the past is crucial in the establishment of group 'authenticity' in the eyes of both its members and the outside world.[56] Accounts of the past, however, are not always or necessarily characterized by historicity i.e. truthfulness, objectivity and accuracy in academic historical terms.[57] On the contrary, quite of-

---

[52] The bibliography is quite extensive. Some basic studies are those of Jünthner, 1923; Schwabl, 1962; Vogt, 1967; Dorrie, 1972; Lacy, 1982; Levy, 1984; Hall, 1989; Moggi, 1992; Romilly, 1993; Cartledge, 1993.

[53] Posner, 1991: 57-60. Cf. Assmann, 1988a: 13.

[54] Assmann, 1988a: 12, calls this knowledge and information structure 'identity concrete' ('Identitätskonkret'). Cf. Assmann, 1992: 22; Fentress and Wickham, 1992: 25-26.

[55] Connerton, 1989: 2-3.

[56] See Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983; Hutchinson and Smith, 1994; Jones and Graves-Brown, 1996: 3.

[57] Certain scholars have even assumed a fundamental split between history and memory considering them to be different if not contradicting phenomena (Halbwachs, 1980: ch. 2; Nora, 1984 and 1989).

ten narratives and stories of the same community are in apparent conflict with one another.[58]

There is, nevertheless, a common logic, an underlying agenda that justifies such inconsistencies. And that is the effort to link the present with a unitary origin in the past by means of an unbroken, linear string of shared memories.[59] That memories of the past form a seemingly uninterrupted and uniform sequence is very much a necessity. Continuity of memory implies continuity of the community itself, persistence, consistency and constancy of its distinctive identity.

The past, however, extends much further than the lifespan of the current or even the immediately previous generations. Beyond the recent past, memory of which resides in oral narrative and personal recollections,[60] extends the vague territory of the distant past, far removed from the grasp of individuals. An account of this past – 'archaeology' in the original Greek sense[61]– in which lie the community's first origins, the roots of its identity and frequently a 'Golden Age,'[62] is only possible by the means of collective cultural memory. The effort of Hesiod to order, systematize and connect the distant past with the present, and to place the creation of the world, the birth of the gods and the emergence of the Greek race in direct lineage characteristically coincides with the formation of Greek cultural identity.

Collective memory is not simply an aggregate of the individuals' recollections of their own lifetimes gathered inside the community over time.[63] It is predominantly a

---

This view has, nevertheless, often been strongly challenged (e.g. Burke, 1989; Nerone, 1989; Niethammer, 1993).

[58] Characteristic in this respect is the work of the early 5th century Greek 'logographers', who wrote accounts of the founding of poleis, local histories and chronological tables, genealogies, and narratives of the customs and history of 'barbarian' peoples (cf. n. 61 below). Despite their claims, logographers attempted to rationalize and systematize Greek mythology and oral tradition by alleviating incongruities, rather than to establish historical truth (see Bux, 1926).

[59] Jones and Graves-Brown, 1996: 3.

[60] This is the so-called communicative memory, which has a limited time-horizon and is related to current or recent affairs and everyday interaction (Assmann, 1988a). Cf. the contrast between everyday-life and monumental culture ('Lebenswelt' - 'Monument') in Assmann and Harth, 1991.

[61] '*Ἀρχαιολογία*' = literally the 'discussion of the beginnings' or 'first origins.' Cf. Plato, *Hp. Maj.*, 285.d.6-e.1: '*...Περὶ τῶν γενῶν, ὦ Σώκρατες, τῶν τε ἡρώων καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, καὶ τῶν κατοικίσεων, ὡς τὸ ἀρχαῖον ἐκτίσθησαν αἱ πόλεις, καὶ συλλήβδην πάσης τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας ἥδιστα ἀκροῶνται...*'

[62] Dihle, 1988; Smith, 1986: 191. Cf. Hesiod's 'Golden Genos' (*Op.*, 109-126). See also Gatz, 1967; Kubusch, 1986.

[63] See Middleton and Edwards, 1990; Assmann, 1992: 35-37; Thomas, 1996: 52.

social phenomenon,[64] a mechanism that enables community members to make a common sense of the world and confirm their unity and singularity in time and space.[65] In this respect, memory aims less at the accurate retrieval of stored information, and more at the putting together of a claim about past states of affairs in the framework of shared cultural understanding.[66] What matters to the community is that statements about the past are convincing and meaningful in the given cultural context of the present. Consequently, the past and memories of the past are re-read, re-interpreted and re-constructed in the present. The reconstructed past may diverge from the 'actual' past, or may even be an entirely new creation meant to serve the present and the future.[67]

The interpretation and reconstruction of the past is therefore mainly instrumental to the purposes of the present. As a result, memory is closely connected with power relations inside the society and is affected by ongoing practices and prevailing patterns of beliefs. Being collectively determined, memory is unavoidably ideologically determined as well.[68] It is implicated in the current state of social, political, religious and other affairs, in the context of which ideologies function as filters that determine or strive to determine what will be remembered and how.

Collective cultural memory is thus usually complemented by series of myths and traditions. As sets of practices characterised by fixed norms and rituals, traditions inculcate values and patterns of behaviour that contribute to the integration of the members of the community, establish and preserve its cohesion, and legitimise its claims, institutions and functions. By making references to the past in a quasi-historical way, and by utilising repetition and the authority of antiquity, traditions also promote the sense of continuity. This continuity, however, is largely fictitious, as the traditions themselves and their claims to historicity and antiquity are often invented to serve the particular cause.[69]

It is, therefore, no coincidence that references to the past and invention of traditions are intensified at times of social and political change, destruction of existing so-

---

[64] Halbwachs, 1980; Halbwachs and Coser, 1992.

[65] Fentress and Wickham, 1992: 25-6; Friedman, 1992; Elsner, 1994; Shanks, 1996: 180.

[66] Cf. Bartlett, 1932.

[67] See Halbwachs, 1980; Assmann, 1988a: 13; Thomas, 1996: 52.

[68] Cf. Billig, 1990: 60-61; Thompson, 1986.

[69] See Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983: esp. 1-15. Cf. Connerton, 1989: 44.

socio-cultural patterns and shifting power relations, when identities are questioned, threatened, re-evaluated and re-formed.[70] Again Greek antiquity offers numerous examples. The birth of new poleis by synoecism or colonization, the conquest of land and incorporation of new populations, the transition from aristocracy or tyranny to democracy, the establishment of new rule or political authority were always accompanied by a convenient 'rearrangement' and reinterpretation of the past through the creation, adaptation and fusion of suitable genealogies, myths and traditions.[71]

3.2 The encoding of collective cultural memory

In order to be shared, collective cultural memory needs to be communicated and transmitted. For that it first needs to be articulated and expressed.[72] This is a process, in the context of which cultural reality is semiotically encoded.[73] The means of encoding are of three main kinds: linguistic (speech in either oral or written form), performative (patterns of behaviour) and figurative (images),[74] coinciding with '*τό λεγόμενον*,' '*τό δρώμενον*' and '*τό δεικνυόμενον*' of the Greek triad of mysteries.[75]

Collective memory is crystallized and preserved in cultural formations – texts, narratives, rites, monuments etc – and transmitted through institutionalised means of communication – recitation, performance, viewing etc. Semantic as well as sensory mechanisms are involved in this process, operating together dialectically. In the perception and experience of memory, words, images and actions blend together into a uniform entity.[76] Practically any significant entity, whether material or immaterial, can in the course of time become part of the community's cultural mnemonics,[77] constituting what has been called a 'locus memoriae,' a 'realm of memory'[78] or 'memory figure.'[79]

---

[70] Jones and Graves-Brown, 1996: 1.

[71] See Nilsson, 1951; Vernant, 1982; Leschhorn, 1984; Bremmer, 1987; Pozzi, 1991; Dowden, 1992; Sheer, 1993.

[72] Fentress and Wickham, 1992: 26.

[73] See Posner, 1991.

[74] Fentress and Wickham, 1992: 47; Connerton, 1989.

[75] Assmann, 1988a: 14.

[76] Fentress and Wickham, 1992: 28-32, 47-51.

[77] Also referred to as 'history culture' ('Geschichtskultur'). See Füssmann, Grütter and Rüsen, 1994.

[78] See Nora, 1984; Nora and Kritzman, 1996. Nora, however, considers these 'loci memoriae' to be products of the modern times only and, in a way, substitutes of a living memory of the past.

In terms of both content and forms of organization, media and institutions, cultural memory differs not only from community to community, but also from era to era.[80] The way in which the 'knowledge stock' is structured and evaluated, as well as the way in which the community views and interprets itself in social praxis, evolve and change. Shifts of emphasis, perspective and focus affect internal perception and external manifestation of identity. One society or generation attaches its self-image on a canon of sacred scriptures, another on a network of ritual activities, a third on a hieratically standardized language of forms, a sort of 'type-canon' of the visual arts and architecture etc. Even general positions towards history and the past, and consequently towards the function of remembering as a whole tend to vary.[81]

3.3 The symbolic character of cultural identity

Like all cultural elements, memories of the past and their media of expression owe their meanings to social practices of communication and consensus. Due to their different personalities and idiosyncrasies – resulting from their different status, mental capabilities, experiences, intellectual and other backgrounds – the meanings people assign to things around them are likely not to coincide exactly. Social interaction and communication are thus essentially a transaction of meanings, whereby people seek to understand one another and make sense of the world through a process of interpretation. The members of a cultural community make, or at least believe they make, the same or similar sense of the world, and that this sense is different and distinct from one made elsewhere.[82] This consensus requires that individualities and differences of interpretation and understanding within the community are somehow reconciled.

A decisive role in this process is played by the symbols of the community, whether mental constructs or products of human art and workmanship.[83] Their great significance to the creation and sharing of cultural memory, and consequently to the

---

[79] Assmann, 1988a: 12.

[80] Cf. Posner, 1991: 60-64.

[81] Assmann, 1988a: 16.

[82] Cohen, 1985: 16-17.

[83] The various approaches to the character and properties of symbols, as well as the problem of terminology in relation to 'signs' etc. constitute a vast subject that lies outside the scope of this study. Some basic works of reference among many are those of Buchler, 1940; Cassirer, 1944; Jung, Franz, Freeman et al., 1964; Barthes, 1967; Mounin, 1970; Firth, 1973; Wallis, 1975.

creation and self-awareness of the cultural community, rests in the fact that they have no definite and univocal content, but act more as repositories of meanings.[84] Symbols provide people with a selection of possible meanings and connotations on which to base their own interpretation and understanding, instead of imposing a uniform sense in an authoritative way.

Thanks to their malleable nature and dynamic semantic capabilities, symbols therefore bring about consensus by acting as elastic links and buffers that absorb differences inside the community. By sharing them people can speak a 'common language,' share common memories, and participate in the common life of the community without subordinating themselves to a tyranny of uniformity, and without at the same time compromising commonality through their own individuality.[85]

As meanings may vary, it is more in the symbols themselves that the members of the community feel their unity and perceive their common interests. And it is their attachment to this body of symbols that to a great extent gives the community cohesion and persistence.[86] This attachment is so intense that members are often unaware or unconcerned that their understanding and interpretation may differ from that of their fellows. It should be noted, however, that although differing, interpretations are not random, but tend to be made on the terms characteristic of the given community and in accordance with its cultural particularities. But neither are they immutable. Like culture and identity symbols are responsive to the needs of the community and subject to constant negotiation and evolution.[87]

The creation and sharing of symbols as a basic contributor to collective identity is again not merely a cognitive process, but has many affective aspects as well.[88] Symbols incorporate condensed meanings and values of great importance to the community in a series of complex associations and thus develop a high emotional charge. They can trigger chain reactions among community members on both conscious and subcon-

---

[84] Firth, 1973: 81.

[85] Cohen, 1985: 16-21 and 1978.

[86] Oliver, 1975: 24; Cohen, 1985: 16, 20-21.

[87] Cf. Cohen, 1985: 17.

[88] Cf. p. 4 above; Firth, 1973: 15, 72, 75.

scious or unconscious levels, powerful enough to suspend personal scepticism and instigate collective mobilization and action.[89]

Woven in a web of cognition and emotion, the associations of meaning and value contained in symbols require special keys to decipher. These are well encrypted and embedded in the community, and consequently hardly accessible to outsiders. This is also the reason why the community's boundaries that mark its limits as it interacts with the outside world and encapsulate its identity are often perceived in one way by the members of the community and in another, if at all, by non-members.[90] While certain of them are physical and geographical, statutory and enshrined in law, racial, linguistic, religious etc,[91] others are largely conceptual and exist mainly in the minds of their beholders.[92] The 'loci memoriae' of the community are such conceptual boundaries, vested with highly symbolic properties.

3.4 Identity and material culture

From all the above it becomes apparent that the emergence and awareness of a distinctive identity of both the communities as collective entities and their members as individuals are highly time-related processes. This is even more the case when it comes to the identities of cultural communities, whose lifetimes extend over several generations of members. Identity is perceived in relation and reference to a certain past, present and future. These three states of time and reality are by themselves absolute, their content on the other hand is fluid and negotiable; moreover, it is inherently to be interpreted.[93] The future, as regarded from a given present, is clearly indeterminate, a set of possibilities projected forward. Yet the past is indeterminate too. By means of personal and collective memory it provides the resources for reconstructing a coherent view of what has been from several pieces. The pieces are put together in a selective and strategic manner defined by the conditions of the present.

---

[89] Cf. Firth, 1973: 76-7.

[90] Nevertheless, this should not be considered as deriving from or leading to ideas and notions of cultural relativism.

[91] See Barth, 1969; Hannerz, 1997.

[92] Cohen, 1985: 12-13 and 1986; Lamont and Fournier, 1992.

[93] Thomas, 1996: 52.

In the engagement of individuals and communities with the world the role of material objects and artefacts is essential. They constitute structural elements of the world and co-determinants of its properties and character, they exist alongside people and act as agents of interaction with the natural and social environment. Like humans, material objects and artefacts are born, often move from place to place and change their roles and associations, fulfil their purposes, age and eventually die. Thus in a way they too have lives and life-histories, the accounts of which – as with people and their biographies – can have varying perspectives and shifts of emphasis and meaning.[94] One could, consequently, say that they also have identities, which evolve dynamically over time.

Objects and artefacts acquire their identities socially, within the community's complex system of meanings, values and associations. Once coming into existence, they do not remain passive, but participate actively in the reproduction and transformation processes of the social structure to which they belong. They are cultural agents that 'create' people and their consciousness as much as they are created by them.[95] Within the framework of social interaction and besides their functional role, objects and artefacts therefore also act as bearers and conveyers of meaning and means of communication, both among the members of the community and between the community and the outside world. In this capacity they are endowed with highly symbolic properties.

Due to their enduring nature, objects – especially monumental public buildings that are our main concern here – are able to proceed, often relatively unchanged, through the various stages of human life and, just as often, to outlive their makers by far. Thus they establish links with and bear witness to the past, they bring back to mind past lives, concepts and associations and substantiate particular narratives.[96] As components of material culture, in their sequence and succession objects reflect and display the community's evolution and progress over time, and simultaneously its continuity and perseverance. At the same time, by being engaged in human intentions and future contexts of interaction, objects are projected forward as well, and are thus futural. The world of objects is therefore the tangible record of human endeavour, both individual and social, and its role in the sustenance of collective memory and identity particularly

---

[94] See Appadurai, 1986; Kopytoff, 1986. Cf. Dittmar, 1992; Rowlands, 1993: 144; Thomas, 1996: ch. 3; Shanks, 1998; Tilley, 1999: 75-76.

[95] Tilley, 1999: 75.

[96] See Hodder, 1993 and 1995.

important.[97] The association is so tenacious, that it often renders material objects and their holding communities inalienable.

3.5 Identity and place

The lives of people both as individuals and as members of communities, their social associations and interactions, their collective memories and identities do not exist in vacuo. They come into being in space. Existence is spatial. Space, at the same time, is itself existential in that it cannot be divorced from the events and activities with which it is implicated. It is meaningfully constituted in relation to human agency and rather than being simply a container, it forms a medium and an outcome of action both constraining and enabling it.[98]

Space intertwines somatic existence and movement, mental cognition, physical interaction, encounter and emotional involvement between persons and between persons and the human and non-human environment into a unified experience. Space has no substantial and universal essence in itself. Instead, perception of it depends on who is experiencing it and how, and it is therefore relational, contextual, subjective and temporal. Bound to human interaction, it is also social.[99]

Abstract space is made physical and tangible by the particular places where people actually live their lives, where human existence and experience is localized through dwelling and social activation, and where 'lived' consciousness emerges.[100] People's experiences and memories of the past, present affinities and affiliations, intentions and expectations for the future, all are intimately linked to places; they all 'take place.' But places are not just scenes of action. As symbolic meanings, emotional values and memories of events, activities and associations are embedded in them, they acquire distinctive significant qualities. The attachment of people to places is not just physical. It is psychological as well. Place is thus an elemental existential fact, an irreducible part

---

[97] Radley, 1990: 47-48.

[98] Tilley, 1994: 10-13.

[99] Tilley, 1994: 11-12, 15-17.

[100] Tilley, 1994: 15 and 1999: 178; cf. Basso and Feld, 1996; Casey, 1996.

of human experience and self-awareness.[101] 'Place-identity' is a fundamental constituent of the self-concept.[102]

At the same time, places are also linked to cultural life-worlds. Histories, myths and narratives assume a great part of their value and relevance as they become rooted in particular places, and acquire material reference points that can be seen, visited and touched. Places become locales, where the community's shared memories of the past are revived in the present through common symbols and rituals, and are consequently transformed into agents of cultural mnemonics.[103] Finally, as they get involved in social discourses and gather together histories, meanings and associations,[104] places – like persons and elements of material culture – build their own biographies, receive their own names, and develop their own identities.[105]

Personal life histories, social identities and biographies of places are intimately connected and inscribed in the landscape. The landscape, composed of the topography and the natural features of the earth, as well as of the series of humanly created locales and relational places replete with cultural meaning and symbolism has ontological significance for individuals and communities.[106] It forms the setting, where the past is visualised and joined with the present, where the community's links with its roots and continuity are confirmed, where a distinctive identity is experienced. In this sense, the landscape becomes 'homeland,' an all-embracing symbol on which the community projects its qualities and values, and visualizes its identity. This gives rise to a sense of familiarity, and belonging, and feelings of loyalty and affection.

The compact, self-contained microcosm of the ancient Greek polis, with its urban centre, rural settlements and sanctuaries, as will be further discussed later on, is an example par excellence of a community's strong physical and psychological attachment to the land. The bond between the polis community and the land, which almost reached total identification, resulted in a topophilia and local patriotism that proved stronger

---

[101] Tilley, 1994: 15-18 and 1999: 177.

[102] On the concept of place-identity in environmental psychology see Proshansky, Fabian and Kaminoff, 1983; Sarbin, 1983.

[103] Cf. Halbwachs, 1980: 140.

[104] Casey, 1996: 24-26.

[105] Tilley, 1994: 17-20, 33 and 1999: 178.

[106] Cf. Tilley, 1994: 26.

than ethnic sentiments, and was one of the reasons that prevented ancient Greeks from uniting.

4 Architecture and Identity

4.1 Monuments of community identity[107]

Homeland extends over a landscape, whose geography and topography are made unique by distinctive natural features. These are intertwined with the material products and signs of human presence, and integrated into the complex network of meanings and associations that form the cultural memory of the community. As has been pointed out, the landscape is cultural as much as natural.[108] The natural and the cultural are the two basic factors that together form the context of human existence. In the passing of time, they both leave indelible traces in the landscape that render the past constantly visible. As past and present meet and blend in the landscape, this acquires a multi-temporal dimension.[109]

Dynamically, as we have seen, all material artefacts and products of human presence and action scattered around the landscape constitute 'loci memoriae,' in that they encapsulate meaning and can bring to mind past lives, concepts and associations.[110] However, nowhere is the fusion of the natural and the cultural, the past and the present, the human community and the land stronger and more genuinely expressed than in monuments. As the word itself denotes, monuments are products of human workmanship that serve as witnesses to and reminders of something memorable, that preserve a memory in time.[111] Monuments constitute a special category of 'loci memoriae,' because they are powerful active reminders. By providing constant stimulation, they are able to set and keep collective memory in motion, to evoke and maintain ideas and emotions in consciousness, and to instigate collective attitude and action.

---

[107] With the character and function of monuments I have previously dealt in my M.Phil. Thesis titled 'Monument and Polis: Prolegomenon to the Historical Investigation of the Concept of "Monument" in Greek Antiquity' (in Greek), University of Athens, Dept. of History and Archaeology, 1997, on which this section partly draws.

[108] See Jackson and Meinig, 1979; Evans, 1985; Penning-Rowsell and Lowenthal, 1986; Ingold, 1992.

[109] See Lynch, 1972; Ingold, 1993.

[110] Pp. 14 and 18 above.

[111] Cf. Oxford English Dictionary, s.v. 'monument.'

As reminders, monuments are not all of the same character. They differ according to the nature of their semantic content, intentionality and perspective in relation to time. There are monuments whose 'memory load' is inherent in them and derives from their form, physical qualities or history of origin and preservation as relics of the past. Monuments of this kind – e.g. excavation finds and museum exhibits – serve rather as information sources and pieces of evidence, and their value is archaeological and historical. Through the inspection and study of their type, form, style and method of construction, chronological sequence, spatial distribution etc. knowledge of an unknown or forgotten past may be regained and communicated. This, however, pertains to rediscovery rather than reminiscence.[112]

On the other hand, there are monuments the meaning and commemorative value of which is not intrinsic and inalienable, but conferred upon them conventionally and arbitrarily as a result of human intentionality, metaphorical expression or interpretation. Monuments of this sort – e.g. votive offerings, war memorials, tombs, works of art – are objects semantically charged, often during a ceremonial act of offering or foundation; they are in fact materialized symbols. As such they stand for ideas, concepts and emotional states and do not necessarily have a direct relation to or presuppose the existence, accuracy and truthfulness of the subject of commemoration. Consequently they are not necessarily in a position to offer knowledge and insight of it as well. Nevertheless, this does not mean that a 'symbolic' monument cannot be a source of historical information at the same time and vice versa.[113] Most monuments combine both qualities, though usually not in the same degree.

Monuments also differ in their intentionality and temporal perspective. Remains of the past are often invested with symbolic meaning and value and raised to monumental status in the community's cultural memory on the basis of present perceptions, interpretations and associations, although perhaps not originally conceived or intended as monuments by their creators. Alois Riegl has called these 'unintentional' monuments as opposed to 'intentional' ones, which he defined as human creations erected for the spe-

---

[112] Kulenkampff, 1991: 26.

[113] Kulenkampff, 1991: 26-27.

cific purpose of keeping single human deeds or events alive in the minds of future generations.[114]

'Unintentional' monuments are thus 'monuments from the past' that come into existence as the community sees an 'efficient cause' in them, when from a 'present' standpoint turns its eyes back in retrospective view. The house where a prominent community member was born, a building where an important event took place, a structure related to or representative of a significant historical era, are a few characteristic examples. 'Intentional' monuments are, on the other hand, 'monuments for the future,' which the community sets up to serve the 'final cause' of preserving and commemorating the present into the future and at creating memories-to-be, that is, prospective memories.[115] War memorials, structures intended to serve and at the same time celebrate the community's gods and institutions or display its wealth, power and technical achievements belong to this category.

Nevertheless, the character of monuments is not static and fixed. As the community evolves and changes in the course of time along with its natural and cultural environment, so does the meaning of monuments, though not necessarily their form.[116] Coming through the filter of the community's cultural 'present,' every monument is constantly re-evaluated. If the message embedded in an 'intentional monument' remains meaningful and acceptable, the monument survives. If not, it is 'discarded.'[117] But even when a monument remains meaningful, it is not necessarily the original message that is decoded. In fact it can never be, as the exact context of the 'cultural semiosis' in which encoding took place in the past cannot be recreated in the present. What happens instead is a new reading and interpretation,[118] a new semiosis, through which a new meaning is produced according to the community's changing intentions and

---

[114] Riegl, 1982: 21, 23. Riegl, however, was misled by the modern-oriented purposes of his study into believing that 'unintentional' monuments are a phenomenon of modern culture only, unknown in antiquity and the Middle Ages. Cf. A. Assmann, 1991: 14.

[115] Cf. Assmann, 1992: 169.

[116] Bradley, 1993: 5, 69.

[117] The Peisistratid temple of Zeus at the Atheninan Olympieum (see. Boersma, 1970: 25; Tölle-Kastenbein, 1994) is a characteristic example. The gigantic building, a work of prestige aimed by its patrons to compete with the greatest temples of Asia Minor and Sicily, was contemptuously left unfinished and its building material looted as soon as the tyranny – of which it was considered a symbol – was abolished (Vitr., 7.pr.15).

[118] Cf. Tilley, 1989; Hodder, 1989.

needs.[119] Thus, what was once erected to be an 'intentional' monument for the future, at some point becomes an 'unintentional' monument from the past.[120] Then again, a monument from the past, intentional or not, can be invested with fresh meaning and serve the community's cultural mnemonics as a new intentional monument for the present and future.[121]

All monuments possess three main qualities: high value to the community, endurance, and visibility through space. These qualities are interrelated and, in certain respects, interdependent. The value of monuments to the community derives from the multitude and importance of their functions. Monuments manifest the community's survival and perseverance, testify to its rootedness and continuous presence in the homeland, and proclaim the right to own and bequeath its territory to the following generations. They bear witness to the community's achievements and attainments, and display its power, wealth, technical and artistic accomplishments. They express and propagate the community's ideology and view of the world, its moral values, its piety, devotion and attachment to the divine and the ancestors. Monuments legitimate and support the community's claims and aspirations, display and enhance its standing and prestige.

These functions of the monuments relate to the inner life and disposition of the community itself, as well as its interaction with the outside world. They are both introversive and extroversive. Inside the community, the function of monuments is strongly symbolic.[122] Monuments act as repositories of shared values, ideas, memories and emotions, and as essential means by which all these remain visible parts of everyday life and structural components of the people's self-awareness as members of a single entity. They constantly remind community members of shared past experiences and future ex-

---

[119] Posner, 1991: 66-67. Cf. p. 13 above. The process, described and analyzed by the so-called 'reception theory,' cannot be further discussed here. On reception theory see (generally) Grimm, 1977; Suleiman and Crosman, 1980; Holub, 1984; (in art, archaeology and interpretation of monuments) Tilley, 1991; Kemp, 1992; Goldhill and Osborne, 1994.

[120] Characteristic in this respect are the remains of the Mycenaean period that remained visible or were rediscovered in Classical and Roman times. Many of them were interpreted as works of mythical creatures ('Cyclopean walls'), related to heroes of the Homeric epos (tombs of 'Agamemnon' and 'Clytemnestra') or ascribed imaginary functions ('Treasury of Atreus'). Cf. Paus., 2.16.5-6.

[121] For example, the association of earlier tombs and burial mounds with ancestors and heroes and the establishment of tomb cults aiming at the legitimation of claims to power, authority, noble descent and possession of territory (on the debated issue of tomb cult in ancient Greece see Morris, 1988; Whitley, 1988 and 1995; Alcock, 1991; Antonaccio, 1993, 1994 and 1995).

[122] Cf. pp. 15-17 above.

pectations, of the common fate or mission that ties them together and separates them from the rest of the world. Monuments are thus defenders and guardians of the community's cohesiveness and identity.[123] At the same time, monuments are signs addressed to the outside world. They proclaim the community's identity, express its dynamic participation and mark out its position and rank in the network of inter-community relations, and manifest its presence and role in the history of mankind and civilisation.

As a result of their multiple significance, the position of monuments inside the community is central. Linked with the ancestors and the past, they are treated with veneration and respect, they are protected and preserved, they are fervently defended and displayed with pride. They are also vested with the authority and the powers of an institution and are thus implicated in the social, political and ideological discourse.[124] By incorporating values, ideas and functions that represent all aspects of community life and identity and must be passed on to the following generations, monuments possess an educational and pedagogic role as well.

For the very same reasons, on the other hand, monuments are usually the first to suffer, when terms of community self-definition change. When cultural, historical or psychological links with the past or particular parts and aspects of it are breached, the rupture is also expressed in the rejection and replacement of the monuments that represent them.[125] In times of war, finally, monuments become a main target of aggression in the struggle of the opponents to break the morale of the enemy, discredit them and eradicate the signs of their presence and claims to the land.[126]

Monuments express the community's need to confirm and maintain positive distinctiveness and identity by organising its past, present and future into a meaningful and satisfactory continuum. As a result, they reflect a largely idealised image of the community, which portrays it not so much as it is, but rather as its members believe and de-

---

[123] Cf. Kulenkampff, 1991: 28.

[124] Cf. p. 13 above. A. Assmann (1991) links monuments exclusively with the 'high ceremonial language' and the institutions of power controlled by elites, and J. Assmann (1988b, 1991, 1992) further restricts them to 'high cultures.' Monuments, however, constitute a much wider anthropological phenomenon, which exceeds the limits of isolated social or cultural formations.

[125] We have already mentioned the abandonment of the Peisistratid Olympieum in Athens (n. 117 above). The destruction of communist monuments and restoration of pre-communist ones following the collapse of the Soviet regime is a typical modern example.

[126] The systematic sack of Greek sanctuaries and especially of the Athenian Acropolis by the Persians (Hdt., 8.53), and Alexander's 'retaliation' by the burning of the Persian king's palace at Persepolis (Diod. Sic., 17.72) are two well-known examples. The 'abduction' of prominent works of art of high symbolic significance to the defeated is a similar expression of the same attitude.

sire it to be, and also as they wish it to be remembered by contemporary and later generations. These later generations – of the community itself and the whole world – extend not just into the near, but into the distant future as well. The effect of monuments is perceived to last indefinitely. Thus they appear to be outside and beyond the limits and limitations of 'human time,'[127] the time-span of three or four generations in which direct connection to and remembrance of persons and events is possible. Monuments are subject to their own temporal norms,[128] they operate in 'monumental time,'[129] which is the same as the 'sacred time' of the Gods,[130] and which by human standards appears as eternity or timelessness.[131]

On the basis of this capacity, monuments are also employed to serve human metaphysical concerns and ambitions in both their private and collective manifestation. As individuals seek to transcend death and oblivion by achieving fame and preserving their names and deeds, so does the community by setting up signs intended to survive the present and keep its culture and identity alive for posterity.[132] Thus besides interpreting and legitimating the past, monuments aim at immortalising the present and prepossessing the awe of future generations. Through monuments, communities and their leaderships attempt the physical embodiment of an imperishable social order, transforming in a way 'the fear of the passage of time and anxiety about death into splendour.'[133] One could say that monuments are the means by which culture as a self-conscious and composed entity celebrates and glorifies itself.[134]

The strong connection between monuments and time makes endurance a fundamental constituent of monumentality.[135] In order to carry its message as far into poster-

---

[127] A. Assmann, 1991: 11-14; Assmann, 1988a: 10-12.

[128] Assmann, 1988a: 12.

[129] See Foxhall, 1995.

[130] See Assmann, 1992: 169-170.

[131] Plutarch's praise to the Periclean monuments of the Athenian Acropolis is very eloquent in this respect: '*ὅθεν καὶ μᾶλλον θαυμάζεται τὰ Περικλέους ἔργα, πρὸς πολὺν χρόνον ἐν ὀλίγῳ γενόμενα. κάλλει μὲν γὰρ ἕκαστον εὐθὺς ἦν τότ' ἀρχαῖον, ἀκμῇ δὲ μέχρι νῦν πρόσφατόν ἐστι καὶ νεουργόν· οὕτως ἐπανθεῖ καινότης ἀεί τις, ἄθικτον ὑπὸ τοῦ χρόνου διατηροῦσα τὴν ὄψιν, ὥσπερ ἀειθαλὲς πνεῦμα καὶ ψυχὴν ἀγήρω καταμεμειγμένην τῶν ἔργων ἐχόντων*' (*Per.*, 13.4-5).

[132] Cf. Demand, 1982: 49-50. The Athenian Acropolis again is one of the most famous examples, the character and significance of which was realized already in antiquity (see Plut., *Per.*, 12.1; 13.1-5).

[133] Parker-Pearson and Richards, 1994: 3. Cf. Lefebvre, 1991: 221.

[134] Cf. A. Assmann, 1991: 13.

[135] A. Assmann, 1991: 16; J. Assmann, 1991: 141.

ity as possible, a 'monument for the future' must be able to survive and last by withstanding the corrosive effect of time. On the same grounds, a product of human craftsmanship that was created in the distant past and has subsisted to the present meets an essential condition for becoming a 'monument from the past,' because it stands as a direct link with the community's roots and origins and symbolises its own endurance.

The other basic constituent of monumentality, complementary to that of endurance, is visibility. A monument's aim is not only to carry a message through time, but also to display and demonstrate it through space. Thus monuments seek conspicuousness. They aspire to be at the centre of attention, and in the process transform their environment and distinguish the landscape by becoming landmarks. Monuments change the entire way in which places are experienced by accentuating their spatial qualities and investing them with additional levels of symbolism.[136]

To achieve monumentality by maintaining their visibility through time and space, monuments tend to incorporate certain other qualities as well. Greatness of scale is intended to make them stand out against their surroundings, attract attention and inspire awe and admiration. Sturdiness of construction and strength of material contribute to durability, while sumptuousness and ornamentation add to splendour and grandeur.[137] The representative and prestigious character of monuments generally leads communities to invest a great deal of time, effort and material resources on their construction, and to devote the highest artistic and technical achievements to them. Very often, monuments are disproportionate to the capabilities of their creators, and their cost and magnificence generally incongruous with their practical function, which may be even lacking altogether.

4.2 Public architecture and community identity

Works of architecture, in fact, the entire built environment, are essentially social and cultural products. Buildings result from social needs and accommodate a variety of functions: economic, social, political, religious and cultural. Their size, appearance, location and form are governed not simply by physical factors – practical use, climate, materials and topography – but by a society's ideas, forms of economic and social organization, distribution of resources and authority, activities, beliefs and values that

---

[136] Cf. Bradley, 1993: 5, 45-48 and 2000: 104-110, 157-158.

[137] A. Assmann, 1991: 16; J. Assmann, 1991: 141; Bradley, 1993: 48.

prevail at any one time. As society evolves, its architecture evolves too. New building types emerge and existing ones become obsolete. Some buildings are modified, extended and take on different functions; others simply disappear. Society produces its built environment, and the latter, although not producing society directly, participates in the creation and maintenance of its structure and institutions. Therefore, as it is possible to learn about buildings and environments by examining the society to which they are related, it is also possible to understand about a society by studying its natural and built environment.[138]

One of the definitive functions of architecture is to organize empty space. It organizes this space as a whole and with respect to man in his entirety, i.e. all the components of his existence, from his general, common anthropological basis to his social and unique determination. In other words, architecture operates with respect to all the physical and psychic actions of which man is capable and of which a building can become a setting.[139] As John Ruskin has also pointed out, 'all architecture proposes an effect on the human mind, not merely a service to the human frame.'[140] In order to organize empty space, however, humans need to predetermine the parameters of organization, that is, to decide how things should be located in space and why. Therefore, architecture begins with a world-view, that is, with a culture's developed sense of how things and actions take their place in the world.

The connection of architecture and action is all-important. Architecture organizes space in order to accommodate human actions. Thus, it is permeated with a culture's views of human agendas: what one should do, where to do it, when and why. Those agendas are the result of a negotiation between the community/society, the physical/material world and the supernatural. Architecture reflects and at the same time dictates and reminds community members of the meaning of their actions in relation to the rest of the human, material and spiritual worlds.[141] As a result, it is not just the ideas and concepts of the directly involved persons and institutions – patron, architect, builders – that infiltrate the design, execution and final appearance and functionality of a building, but through them also the endless problems, taboos and hopes of society.

---

[138] King, 1984: 1.

[139] Mukařovský, 1978: 240, 242.

[140] Ruskin, 1989: 8.

[141] Hooker, 1999.

Nevertheless, as will be further discussed, the complete building is not just a receiver of influences, a social melting pot, but also a transmitter. The messages it transmits are partly conscious and partly unconscious, eluding the control and often the awareness of its makers and users.[142]

The character and functionality of architecture have several dimensions.[143] The immediate purpose, a building's practical use – or usage-context – is, of course, fundamental. How this immediate purpose is served, is determined by the fixed canon or set of norms and rules pertaining to the building's type, which is historically developed and particular to the given society. It is also determined by the society's organization, economic, material and technical capabilities and limitations, and also its needs, aims and ideology. Furthermore, architectural character and functionality are affected by the individuality of the architect and the patron. Individuals may deviate from the norms of the socio-historical context or even tend towards a more or less radical violation of them. Such deviations may lead to exceptional 'unica' or signal the beginning of new functional developments and the overall development of architecture itself. Finally, architecture is subject to the aesthetics of its makers and users,[144] expressing the idiosyncratic traits of society as a whole and of its individual members.[145]

The functional horizons of architecture are in a state of constant hierarchical interrelation. As a rule, at any given time one of them prevails, but the dominant horizon keeps changing in the process of development. The result of them all is what gives a society's architecture its distinctive character, and the prevailing horizon, what determines its special 'flavour' in a given period.

The character and functionality of architecture are expressed in both a denotative and a connotative way.[146] Denotation refers to the immediate, primary function of a building: a bouleuterion, for example, is the building that houses the assembly of the boule, and for this purpose it has the form of a hall where a large number of people can

---

[142] Cf. Bammer, 1985: 27.

[143] See Mukařovský, 1978: 241-246.

[144] Mukařovský, 1978: 244-246, treats the aesthetic function of architecture separately, defining it in fact as the dialectic negation of all the other functional horizons. He does so on the premise that the aesthetic function alienates an object from any other purpose – and practical use – making the object itself the purpose. The underlying idea is that 'pure art' is free from any practical functionality.

[145] Cf. Preziosi, 1979: 48-49.

[146] Eco, 1980: 20-25; Jencks, 1980: 76, 84.

be seated. Besides denoting its function, however, the building also has the secondary purpose to connote a certain ideology of the function: a bouleuterion symbolizes democracy, autonomy and self-determination. Very often the connotative function of an object is even stronger and more significant than the denotative: a throne is important not as a seat to sit on, but as an indicator of the special status of its user and symbol of the institution to which it is related.

In the lifetime of a building, both primary and secondary functions may change, the latter always being more susceptible to a variety of readings and interpretations.[147] The sense of the primary function may be lost while the secondary remains: the Parthenon, for example, is no longer understood as a place of worship, but it is still considered a symbol of the ancient Athenian democracy. Very often, some secondary functions are lost while new ones are added: the Parthenon now also stands as a symbol of the glorious Greek past and the highest achievement of ancient Greek architecture, a symbol of modern Greek national identity and a distinctive insignia of Greece. Finally, the primary function may remain the same, while the secondary changes: the Parthenon remained a place of worship in the Christian era, but its conversion into a church symbolized the triumph of Christianity over paganism.

It becomes apparent that the symbolic-connotative function of a building need not necessarily be deriving from the structure itself, and may be unrelated to its architectonic properties, but attached to it as a result of metaphor and association.[148] Buildings, especially those of public character that are our main concern here, serve several symbolic purposes simultaneously. Some of their meanings are traceable to the intentions of the designer, who in turn conveys the intentions of the patron – individual politician, governing body or the whole community. Other meanings are not introduced by means of a formative act when the project is conceived and designed, but arise subsequently as unintended and unacknowledged products of the acculturation process, in which the buildings engage after construction. Especially buildings housing principal public institutions are perceived as metonymic not only of the particular institutions, but of the whole regime, the state and the community itself.[149]

---

[147] Cf. Eco, 1980: 27-28.

[148] Cf. Goodman, 1988: 33, 43-44; Smith, 1977 and 1979: 188.

[149] Cf. Vale, 1990: 7.

On the symbolic level, architecture – especially public – serves several functions simultaneously.[150] The symbolism in a building's type, design, size, material, location, relation to the natural and social environment, historical context and timing of construction are further enhanced by the narrative capabilities and metaphorical qualities of sculptural or pictorial decoration. Architecture makes use of recognizable forms and accepted premises, builds upon them acceptable 'arguments' and elicits a certain type of consent or motivates a specific behaviour. Thus it acts as a repository of emotionally and intellectually important values and ideas, where community members can tend for reference, motivation and support when conduct or collective action is called into question. This makes works of architecture very effective media of public communication and mass appeal.[151] The monumental function of architecture depends much on its communicative capabilities, as important buildings become bearers of meaning, media to take statements towards the times to come.

For the same reasons, on the other hand, architecture is also en effective instrument of power and control. Those in power and authority usually attempt to influence and manipulate the symbolic content of architecture in order to control public behaviour and to justify and legitimise their status and actions. Thus public – especially monumental – architecture also serves to mask the will to power and the arbitrariness of power beneath signs and surfaces that express, or claim to express, collective will and thought.[152] As the fusion of 'permanence' and 'perfection,' monumental public architecture makes power visible and hence becomes power rather than merely a symbol of it. According to Mumford, 'what we now call "monumental architecture" is first of all the expression of power, and that power exhibits itself in the assemblage of costly building materials and of all the resources of art, as well as in a command of all manner of sacred adjuncts... with whose mighty virtues the head of state identifies his own frailer abilities. The purpose of this art was to produce respectful terror.'[153] Association with monumental architecture alludes to possession of power for the patrons and access

---

[150] Cf. Firth, 1973: 76-86.

[151] Fusco, 1967; Eco, 1980: 41-42.

[152] Lefebvre, 1991: 143.

[153] Mumford, 1961: 65.

to it for their agents.[154] The splendour of architecture proclaims and, by doing so, reinforces the status of its patrons, their gods and the community they represent.

The connection between architecture and power, however, can be explained in yet another way. It is a natural tendency both in the animal world and in human societies to conserve energy by performing tasks and producing the desired results with the least possible effort.[155] Monumental architecture, with its size and even more with the extent to which labour and raw materials are lavished on its construction and maintenance – by far exceeding the requirements of practical use – not only fails to comply with the principle of least effort, but on the contrary appears to defy it altogether. An explanation of this phenomenon has been attempted through the so-called concept of 'conspicuous consumption.'[156]

The underlying idea is that if economy of effort is the basic principle governing the production and distribution of goods essential to human subsistence, the ability to expend energy beyond practical necessity or for non-utilitarian purposes is an elementary proof of power. In this respect, by standing for huge amounts of human energy, monumental architecture symbolizes the ability of its makers to control such energy to an extraordinary degree.[157] Power generates prestige, and prestige increases self-assertion and esteem, which as we have seen are fundamental to personal and collective identities.[158] It is, therefore, not surprising that expression of power through monumental architecture appears more frequently in the early formative stages and major transitional phases in the history of civilizations, when identities are born, transformed and threatened.[159]

Conspicuous consumption can in turn have different perspectives. Excess expenditure of valuable energy, seen as an act of defiance or dare against possible shortage, may stand as a supreme manifestation of self-confidence and assurance, again resulting in high levels of self-esteem. From a different point of view, lavish consumption of energy on monumental religious architecture as an offering to supernatural powers, may

---

[154] Cf. Wilson, 1988: 148; Trigger, 1990: 122.

[155] See Zipf, 1965.

[156] Veblen, 1970.

[157] Trigger, 1990: 125.

[158] See p. 5 above.

[159] Trigger, 1990: 127.

acquire the character of sacrifice, meant to elicit divine sympathy and support, and protect from the offence of hubris and the consequent wrath and punishment. In this capacity, energy consumption becomes a safety valve that alleviates tension, anxiety and uncertainty, which pose a threat to identity.[160]

Architecture in general, and public architecture in particular, is a social and political affair par excellence,[161] to a much greater extent than other forms of art or technical creation. Public buildings are constructed by many – especially in antiquity with the active contribution of whole communities – are paid for by many, exist in service to many, and affect the lives of many, usually for several generations.[162] Public architecture raises high demands in cost, labour and coordination of labour forces, and presupposes combined action based either on consensus or coercion. It is therefore an extremely effective means for the strengthening of community bonds and the forging of common identity.[163] The finished structures stand for a set of beliefs enshrined in them in durable form by people who both had certain common ideas to convey and were capable of acting together to muster the required resources and put them to use as a united labour force.[164]

Architecture imposes order on places and at the same time orchestrates human experience of them.[165] Buildings control and formalize people's approach to and movement around places, and set different levels of access for different categories of people.[166] At the same time, they also control view by concealing or revealing certain elements to certain people, determine the order, distance and perspective of viewing, and guide the visitor's eye in a prescribed manner. The control of access and view signifies control over people's role and degree of participation in the activities carried out in that particular place. The arrangement of buildings – distribution, hierarchy of levels, alignment, axiality – imposes spatial order, which in turn reveals the social order,

---

[160] See p. 5 above.

[161] Cf. Sonne, 1993.

[162] Cf. p. 18 above.

[163] See in particular the discussion on the role of Doric temple architecture as a basic contributor to the identity of the early Greek polis in the last chapter.

[164] Cf. Bradley, 2000: 159.

[165] Bradley, 1993: 45, 49.

[166] Bradley, 2000: 104.

power relations, internal organization and prevailing ideology of a community, which are major contributors to community identity.

The relation between buildings in natural space corresponds to the relation of functions and ideas in spiritual space.[167] But beyond being a stage setting and container of action, architecture is also a dynamic contributor to it and a significant factor in the performance of ritual and ceremonial acts. Architectural undertakings visualize the conventions and rules on which social order depends, and at the same time also serve to create, change, promote or impose social order and the sense of identity resulting from it.[168] As we have seen, objects and events, monuments and ceremonies, all contribute meaningful symbols to the production and consolidation of the 'we.'[169] In this respect, architecture is one of the most effective 'cultural devices' designed to render the broad process of collective self-redefinition explicit, so that it can be described, developed, celebrated and used.[170]

As already discussed, space is existential in that it becomes tangible and acquires meaning through the localization of human action in particular places.[171] What contributes the most to the identity and special character of place and creates social space is architecture. In their arrangement and association, buildings create the stage of human life, the urban setting where the civic communities in which we are particularly interested come into existence. Buildings become intermediate links between people and places, and agents of interaction between the natural and the social environment. With their long life-histories, they are the material reference points for personalities, myths, events and narratives, and become witnesses to community history. Thus buildings take up an important part of the community's cultural memory load, which they pass on to the following generations, again contributing to the reproduction and transformation of social structure.

Social memory, as we have seen, is unstable and dynamic. Even though traditions can be transmitted over long periods, studies of oral literature show how rapidly details

---

[167] Cf. Bradley, 1993: 53.

[168] Bradley, 1993: 49. See again the discussion on the early Archaic Doric temple in the last chapter.

[169] Vale, 1990: 47.

[170] Cf. Geertz, 1973: 252.

[171] See p. 19 above.

change, both intentionally and unintentionally.[172] Although much more stable and consistent, rituals are also consciously and unconsciously manipulated to serve the changing needs of people in the present. Public architecture, as the physical container and setting of many rituals, secures the necessary feeling of continuity, as it can be adapted and change meanings without necessarily changing form.[173] In a way, architecture becomes 'ritual materialized and petrified.'[174]

Architecture is the product and sign of human presence par excellence that invests the natural landscape with cultural qualities and meanings. In this respect, it is itself culture materialized and embedded in the natural environment. Furthermore, it is one of the most important co-determinants of landscape temporality, or rather, an essential medium through which the temporality of the landscape becomes perceptible. By providing the landscape with 'timemarks'[175] as well as landmarks, architecture makes the awareness of 'past' and 'present' possible, and allows community rootedness and continuity to be experienced and verified. The emerging 'place identity'[176] binds community and land, turning the latter into 'homeland.'[177]

At this point it should be noted that of course not all members of a community perceive the symbolic meanings of architecture in exactly the same way. Besides, by nature architectural messages are to a large extent received and processed inattentively and without being immediately perceptible. Educational, social and ideological backgrounds, on the other hand, certainly affect one's experience and understanding of architecture.

Through monumental architecture, a ruler-patron or a social elite may wish to display their wealth and power, their control over the surplus of community production, their ability to deploy massive amounts of material resources and labour and their political dominance over the lower classes. Self-glorification, celebration of own success, display of fine taste and sophistication, legitimation of rule and political propaganda are all possible intentions hidden behind the wish to erect a monumental building, which

---

[172] See Finnegan, 1977.

[173] Cf. p. 18 above and Bradley, 1993: 5.

[174] Wilson, 1988: 134-135. Cf. Trigger, 1990: 122.

[175] Cf. Chapman, 1997.

[176] See p. 20 above.

[177] Cf. p. 20 above.

may otherwise be intended for public use or even for the use of the gods. Personal, class- or other group-related agendas always infiltrate public architectural undertakings.

On the other hand, low social classes may very well not share any of these agendas, and they may actually resent the fact that the surplus of social production – basically their production – is spent on display rather than social policy, that they have to provide the necessary labour force, that others receive glory and merit at their cost. Uneducated community members may not be capable of deciphering all the messages embedded in a work of architecture by the educated elite or they may be capable of interpreting them only partially and incorrectly. They may even assign to buildings meanings of their own, perhaps contrary to those assigned by the elite.

These remarks may seem to suggest that the diversity of meanings with which architecture is invested and the diversity of interests it represents prevent it from being able to directly express or even indirectly allude to a collective identity of the heterogeneous members of a social community. By accepting that, however, one would be ignoring certain crucial facts. Individuals, as we have seen, play a multitude of social roles in their everyday lives and therefore assume multiple social identities, which coexist at different levels of consciousness and become salient as the circumstances demand.[178]

To a member of a low, unprivileged social class practically deprived of any participation in political power, the parliament building is the territory of the social elite of government officials and bureaucrats whose decisions and actions are beyond his grasp and control. At the same time, however, the parliament building is the idealized symbol of the fair and democratic government in which he believes and after which he strives, and a symbol of the community's self-determination, which he no doubt endorses. In the same building, for the same person, discomforting and authoritarian civic messages engage in a kind of cognitive coexistence with hopeful and reassuring ones. The individual recognizes both of them and at different cognitive levels believes both, as logical inconsistency does not necessarily exclude psychological compatibility.[179]

The symbolic nature of the architectural message allows it to incorporate a variety of meanings. As discussed earlier, uniformity of meaning is not necessary – or possible – for symbols to act as unifying factors inside a community. It is in the sharing of the

---

[178] See p. 3 above.

[179] Cf. Edelman, 1978: 3; Vale, 1990: 7-8.

symbols rather than the sharing of uniform meanings that the community experiences unity.[180] Contradicting meanings denote challenge, development and change. Meanings fighting each other for salience actually prove the dynamic and contested character of social identity, which like society itself is in constant evolution and modification, in a continuous struggle to establish an equilibrium after extrinsic changes in the natural environment and mobility in its own structure.

5 The civic community of the Greek polis

From the remarks in the preceding sections, it becomes apparent that the built urban environment in general and the works of public architecture in particular acquire an even greater symbolic significance in the case of cultural communities, the distinguishing and main categorizing feature of which is exactly their strongly localized civic character. The present study is concerned with the interconnection between public architecture and the evolving identity of civic communities within the ancient Greek world. Not any civic communities, however, but those that the Greeks themselves called 'poleis,' which belong to the type now referred to as 'city-state.' A thorough discussion of the phenomena of cities, city-states and city-state cultures, as well as a detailed investigation into the nature and characteristics of the polis are beyond our scope, a brief overview and clarification of the concepts is, nevertheless, necessary before we proceed with our two case studies.

Many definitions – analytical or epigrammatic – of what constitutes a 'city' or 'town' as opposed to a mere village have been suggested, most taking after the considerations of Max Weber.[181] These seem to converge on the idea that a city is a nucleated settlement with a population of some size, densely settled in permanent dwellings and practicing a specialization of function and division of labour so that it acquires an essential part of its necessaries of life by trade and not by production. In relation to dispersed settlement, the nucleated one entails more institutionalized organization, which turns the latter into the social, economic, religious and military centre of its immediate

---

[180] Cf. p. 16 above.

[181] Weber, 1921. Cf. Childe, 1950; Sjöberg, 1960: 3-4; Bietak, 1979: 103; Bairoch, 1988: 8; Nippel, 1991; Meier, 1994.

hinterland.[182] When the city becomes also a political centre in control of this hinterland, then urbanization leads to state formation, producing a city-state.[183]

The city-state[184] is a highly institutionalized and highly centralized micro-state[185] consisting of one (often fortified) town with its immediate hinterland and settled with a stratified population, of whom some are citizens and some foreigners, possibly slaves. Its territory is usually so small that the urban centre lies within a day's walk or less from the borders, and the politically privileged part of its population is small enough to constitute a face-to-face society. The population is ethnically affiliated with those of neighbouring city-states, but political identity is based on differentiation from them and focused on the city-state itself. A significant fraction of the population is settled in the town, and the rest in the hinterland, either dispersed in farmsteads or nucleated in villages or both. The urban economy implies specialization of function and division of labour to such an extent that the population has to satisfy a significant part of their daily needs by purchase in the city's market. Finally, despite the desire for political independence/autonomy and economic autarky, the city-state more often possesses merely internal sovereignty/self-government and is characterized by lack of self-sufficiency and need of economic interaction.

'City state cultures'[186] develop in regions inhabited by people who speak the same language and have common cultural and ethnic characteristics, and who for lengthy historical periods remain divided into numerous small political communities of the 'city-state' type. These are located sometimes inland and communicate by land, sometimes along the coastline and interact mainly by sea, or they are of mixed character. City-state cultures emerge as urbanization and state formation concur in periods of demographic and economic upsurge and lead to the creation of city-states through a slow, piecemeal process, or as city-states are founded during waves of colonization or as a result of the disintegration of an urbanized macro-state.[187]

---

[182] Hansen, 2000b: 11-12, 25.

[183] Hansen, 2000b: 11, 14-15.

[184] Hansen, 2000b: 19. For a comparative analysis see Griffeth and Thomas, 1981; Nichols and Charlton, 1997; Hansen, 2000a.

[185] See Ehrhardt, 1970; Duursma, 1996.

[186] Hansen, 2000b: 16-17.

[187] Hansen, 2000d: 14-16, 609-611.

These city-states may vary considerably in size of territory and population, but none is powerful enough to subjugate and unify the rest into a single political entity permanently. War between them is endemic, but so is economic, religious and cultural interaction, which in time of peace leads to the formation of political and religious alliances, leagues, federations and unions. Within these, a hierarchy develops as large city-states acquire a hegemonic role, smaller ones often become dependencies, while the smallest are often absorbed. Dependent city-states remain internally self-governed, but have restricted or no external sovereignty and are usually liable to tribute and military contribution. City-state cultures come to an end following the disappearance of the urban centres as cores of political communities due to internal collapse or conquest by an external power that reduces the city-states to mere cities, either abruptly or through a gradual and often imperceptible process of transformation.

The Greek city-state culture consisted of some 1500 poleis. Roughly half of them were situated in the Greek mainland, the islands and the west coast of Asia Minor and had grown mainly spontaneously or as a result of synoecism, and the rest were mainly founded as colonies along the coasts of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea, and in Asia west of the Indus.[188] The Greeks considered themselves as a single people, the Hellenes, who shared a common descent, language, religious practices and customs.[189] The first was of course an invention,[190] but the Greek language had remarkably few dialects with small differentiations that did not hinder communication,[191] and in the Hellenistic period increasingly converged towards a single 'common' one.[192] There were also a plethora of Panhellenic competitions, oracles and sanctuaries attended by all Greeks, whose cult practices and pantheons were also very similar, as was the basis of their folklore.[193] These common elements formed the basis of Posidippus' conviction that although there were many poleis, there was only one Hellas.[194]

---

[188] Graham, 1982; Ruschenbusch, 1985; Hansen, 1994a: 14; Cohen, 1995.

[189] Hansen, 2000c: 143-145.

[190] In the disguise of the Deucalion myth (see Hall, 1997: 40-51; Fowler, 1998).

[191] Hainsworth, 1968; Morpurgo Davies, 1987; Hall, 1997: 153-181.

[192] Palmer, 1980: 174-193.

[193] Morgan, 1993; Schachter, 2000.

[194] Fr. 28.

In Classical times, Greeks considered habitation in scattered settlements (*κατὰ κώμας*) as old-fashioned or obsolete.[195] Thus, although part of the population lived in farmsteads and villages in the countryside, almost all attention was devoted to the urban centre (*ἄστυ*), and especially to that of the polis. This favouring of urban life is evident in the density of poleis, the number of which in many regions during the Classical times was considerably higher than and seemingly disproportionate to that of the villages in between.[196]

The term 'polis' (*πόλις*) was used by Greeks to indicate both a settlement and a community. In the former sense it most usually referred to a nucleated settlement, an urban centre (*ἄστυ*).[197] In the latter sense, it pointed to a political community either as a whole – in all cases where today one would use the terms 'state' and 'country' – or in part – the citizen body (*πολίται*), the assembly or other government body (*ἐκκλησία, βουλή*) – or more abstractly to the society in general (*κοινωνία*).[198] This was, nevertheless, a differentiation of context rather than content. As M. Hansen points out, the polis-town seems to have always been the core of a polis-community and vice versa, so that the urban and the political aspects of the polis could not really be separated.[199]

However, not all nucleated settlements and political communities constituted poleis. There were also mere towns (*ἄστεα*) and villages (*κῶμαι*), and other subdivisions such as municipalities (*δῆμοι*), tribes (*φυλαί*) etc. Polis was the small, self-governed and highly institutionalized community of citizens who alongside their families, free foreigners and slaves inhabited and controlled a territory consisting of a (fortified) urban centre – also called polis – and its hinterland.[200] These characteristics of the Greek polis, which will be further discussed below, complied with the definition of the 'city-state.'[201]

---

[195] Cf. Thuc., 3.94.4; Xen., *Hell.*, 5.2.7; Arist., *Pol.*, 1252b.10-30.

[196] Cherry, Davis and Mantzourani, 337-340; Hansen, 2000c: 155. This picture started to change in the Hellenistic and Roman periods, especially in the eastern Greek world (Schuler, 1998).

[197] Other rare and obsolete senses were those of fortified hilltop settlement (*ἀκρόπολις*) and territory (*γῆ, χώρα*).

[198] Hansen, 1998: 17-20, 56-73; 2000c: 152-154.

[199] Hansen, 1996: 28-34, 1997a: 34-42, and especially 2000c: 152-153 questions the possibility of a polis-community without a polis-town (contra Demand, 1996: 99) or vice versa (contra Lévy, 1990: 54).

[200] Hansen, 2000c: 146, 171.

[201] Hansen, 2000c: 153, 2000d. See contra Kolb, 1984: 59; Runciman, 1990: 348.

The normal size of the territory, urban centre and population of the Greek polis was small. Many had a territory smaller than 25 km^2 and very few over 1000 km^2 and the much larger Athens and Sparta were exceptional cases. The total population is hard to estimate. The urban population appears to have ranged between 1000-2000 and 5000-10000 in Classical times, and again larger cities like Athens, Miletus and Syracuse were few. As urbanization grew, numbers increased in Hellenistic times, when the first mega-cities with six-digit inhabitants – especially royal capitals like Alexandria and Antioch – appeared.

Providing a contemporary and thorough analysis of the phenomenon in his Politics, Aristotle described the polis as a '*κοινωνία πολιτῶν πολιτείας*,'[202] whereby '*πολιτεία*' denoted in a concrete sense the body of citizens as opposed to all non-citizens, and in an abstract sense the structure of this body, that is, the constitution or political system.[203] The polis was thus first and foremost a community of citizens participating in the organization and running of the institutions pertaining to its political government.[204] Citizenship indicated then – as indeed today – the legally defined hereditary membership of an individual in a state, which conferred political, social and economic privileges (partially) unavailable to non-members.

As a political community, the Greek polis was an exclusive male society and citizenship was hereditary. Women possessed and transmitted citizen status, but did not exercise citizenship themselves. In the political sphere citizens were strictly isolated from women, foreigners and slaves,[205] and united in political decision-making in the context of institutions such as a popular assembly (*ἐκκλησία*) and a council or senate (*βουλὴ-γερουσία*), and in community administration in the context of boards of magistrates (*ἀρχαί*) and law courts (*δικαστήρια*). Depending on the democratic or oligarchic orientation of a polis' particular constitution, political activity could be open to all citizens or those who fulfilled a census requirement. Under most systems – including tyranny – however, usually all citizens by birth could participate at least in some institutions, even if these were perhaps reduced to little more than a formality.[206]

---

[202] Arist., *Pol.*, 1276b.1.

[203] Hansen, 1994b: 95-97, 2000c: 165.

[204] Arist., *Pol.*, 1274b.32-1276b.15.

[205] Arist., *Pol.*, 1275a.7-8; 1326a.18-20.

[206] Hansen, 2000c: 155-166

Like all human groups, the poleis had an inherent tendency towards freedom and self-determination. Nevertheless, what they did possess was primarily autonomy in the restricted sense of internal self-government, and not necessarily of full independence. Especially in the Hellenistic period, in which the possibilities for independence were gradually eliminated, internal sovereignty was the best most poleis could hope to maintain. But even during the Archaic and Classical times, many poleis – in the case of Ionia all – were outright dependencies (*πόλεις ὑπήκοοι*).[207]

As war was endemic,[208] to defend its territory and pursue its interests every polis had its own army, participation in which was a principal duty and right of all citizens. Often different social groups served in different corps – the upper class in the cavalry, the middle in the phalanx and the lower in the light-armed infantry or the navy – but the hoplite phalanx constituted the main core.[209] It has been suggested that the emergence of the phalanx was strongly connected with the birth of the polis itself as a political community, since mass fighting in close formation and common decision-making by the citizen body of hoplites went hand in hand.[210] At first, in some poleis hoplite service was restricted to citizens, but from quite early alien residents could fight side by side as well, and so could sometimes the slaves.[211] In Hellenistic times, the military and the political aspect of the polis were further dissociated, as mercenary forces increasingly replaced citizen militia.

The polis was also a religious community. Gods and heroes were worshipped publicly in festivals, which were not restricted to citizens but open to all polis inhabitants including women, who participated actively in many rituals and also held official positions.[212] Cults served the purposes of the polis, were organized by the polis and were directly created by and related to the polis and its institutions.[213] Every communal activity was accompanied by religious acts such as sacrifice and prayer and was placed under the auspices of the divine. Most poleis had a patron deity, with which many of

---

[207] Hansen, 1995a, 2000c: 148, 172.

[208] Romilly, 1968.

[209] See Hanson, 1989.

[210] Raaflaub, 1997.

[211] Welwei, 1974; Whitehead, 1977: 82-86.

[212] Bruit Zaidman and Schmitt Pantel, 1992: 102-111; Kearns, 1996.

[213] Burkert, 1995: 202; Hansen, 2000c: 168.

their symbols where connected.[214] The sacred and the secular aspects of the polis were strongly connected and often overlapped, but neither identified with nor opposed one another like in Medieval times.[215]

Furthermore, the polis had a social and economic side. The popular view, however, that it was a fusion of state and society controlling all aspects of human life is only partially correct.[216] In Sparta, education, family and social life, production and trade were indeed subject to public regulation, and strict codes of morality, discipline and obedience to the state were in force.[217] In Athens and perhaps in the majority of the other poleis, on the contrary, public and private spheres were distinct, and the state was concerned with public issues of predominantly political nature. In the socioeconomic sector, the main concern of the polis was to ensure the collection of taxes and the supply and affordability of basic goods. Education, production, trade, etc. were regulated by law to a certain extent, but relied greatly on private enterprise.[218] The right to landed property was confined to citizens, but otherwise foreigners and slaves participated in economic activities side by side and often under the same conditions.

Of all the many aspects of the polis, the political was the dominant one. Political activity and participation in the decision-making process was not simply a means to the better organization and advancement of collective citizen life. It was viewed as a positive end in itself, according to Aristotle, the realization of an inherent predisposition of the human being as a political animal (*ζῶον πολιτικὸν*).[219] Political culture was the essence of the polis, to which the social, religious and other institutions were constantly adapted.[220]

Ideally, the full citizens were equals and united in the exercise of their privileges and duties as members of the polis. In reality, of course, the polis was neither a homogeneous nor a harmonious whole. In democracies and oligarchies alike, citizens were divided between rich and poor, those who had access to power and those who for vari-

---

[214] Cole, 1995.

[215] Hansen, 2000c: 168.

[216] Hansen, 1998: 84-106, 2000c: 169-170.

[217] Powell, 1988: 214-262.

[218] Musti, 1985; Hansen, 1998: 86-91, 2000c: 169-170.

[219] Arist., *Pol.*, 1253a.1-4.

[220] Cf. Murray, 1990: 18-22; Hansen, 2000c: 167.

ous reasons had not, people who had opposing beliefs agendas and interests. Civil conflict was as endemic in the Greek polis culture as war.[221] Furthermore, although the inferior orders of the population – women, free foreigners and slaves – did not participate in the polis per se as a political association, they were still members of the wider civic community with an effect on its mentality, culture and identity.

Following the analysis in the preceding sections, in the case of the ancient Greek civic community too, identity and the meaning vested in the products of material culture – especially in the collectively created and appreciated works of public architecture – were the results of a complex and dynamic process. Again, this had introversive as well as extroversive aspects.

Since all public issues in the polis were regulated by the exclusive community of citizens either as a whole or through representative bodies, ideally again, it was their collective ideology and agendas that public architecture expressed and served. Nevertheless, in reality decisions were rarely unanimous.[222] As different groups or individuals sought to promote different ideological, political or other interests, most of the materialized projects are more likely to have been the result of imposition, debate, compromise or fusion rather than consent. Consequently, their symbolic content is the resultant of the diverse, competing meanings assigned to them by the different groups within the citizen body itself on the one hand, plus those of the wider civic population on the other. To these one should, finally, add the significant effect of the contacts and associations with the other poleis in the context of the Greek polis culture, and beyond that with the world of the 'barbarians.'

---

[221] See Gehrke, 1985.

[222] On decision-making concerning architectural projects see Boersma, 1970: 3-10; Coulton, 1977: 15-29.

Chapter II

The city of Miletus

6 Introduction and History

6.1 Location and general layout

The territory of the Ionian Greek Miletus[223] in Asia Minor extended mainly over the peninsula, which in antiquity was formed between the Gulf of Akbük and the Latmian Gulf (now Bafa Gölü or 'Bastarda Thalassa'), and perhaps at times in parts of the Maeander valley[224] (**Pl. 1**). The city itself was built at the northernmost point of the Milesia peninsula that controlled the opening to the Latmian Gulf from the south.[225] To the north of the narrow entrance, on the fringes of Mount Mycale lay the city of Priene, while deeper in the gulf were Myus and Heraclea. The exact limits of Milesian territory in each period are not easy to define, and one would expect some flexibility depending on historical circumstances.[226] Myus and its land were at some point absorbed by Miletus, and certain islands of the Aegean were at times part of Milesian territory as well.[227]

As opposed to other Ionian port-cities situated at the opening of broad valleys, Miletus had a mountainous terrain at its back that made communication with the interior by land difficult.[228] The city was therefore mainly maritime in character, and depended on its four natural harbours not only for foreign trade, but also for internal transport.[229] The Lion Harbour in the northwest was the principal and most secure (**Pl. 2**). A little to the southwest opened the so-called Theatre Harbour, and further south the

---

[223] On the origin of the name, see Zgusta, 1984: 383 No. 809.

[224] See Wiegand, 1929 and map by Wilski, 1906; Also Pimouguet, 1995; Cook, 1961.

[225] On the topography and geomorphology of the region and its change through time see Voigtländer, 1985; Aksu, Piper and Konuk, 1987; Brückner, 1995 and 1998; Greaves, 2000.

[226] See Erhardt, 1983: 13-24; Müller, 1997: 596-597.

[227] See Haussoullier, 1902; Rehm, 1926a: 93; 1926b; 1929; Bean and Cook, 1957: 134-137; Manganaro, 1963/4; Erhardt, 1983: 15-20; Piérart, 1985.

[228] Wiegand, 1929; Mayer, 1932: 1624.

[229] Strabo, 14.1.6. See Mayer, 1932: 1624; Röhling, 1933: 52-55; Kleiner, 1968: 6-8; Greaves, 2000: 58, 60 and n. 16.

big Athena Harbour, which could provide anchorage to a whole fleet. All three gained additional shelter from the small island of Lade, offshore to the west. One more harbour faced the Latmian Gulf to the east. These four harbours along with the favourable geographical location on the seafaring routes of the east Aegean were responsible for the early habitation and remarkable thriving of the city, but also for its rapid decline and abandonment as soon as the Maeander blocked the entrance to the Latmian Gulf and moved the shore away with its silt deposits[230] **(Pl. 1, 3a, 23b-c)**.

6.2 Historical Overview[231]

According to Ephorus, Miletus was first founded by Cretan colonists, then came under Carian control and was later resettled by Ionians under Neleus.[232] Archaeological evidence shows that the 8th and 7th centuries were marked by a strong interaction – both peaceful and violent – between the Phrygian-Carian populations and the new inhabitants until the latter finally prevailed.[233] During this period, Miletus played a leading role in the colonization movement, especially in the Hellespont and the Black Sea, and continued to do so in the Archaic times, founding more than ninety colonies in total according to tradition.[234] In the late 7th or early 6th century the ancient sanctuary and oracle of Branchidae at Didyma also came under Milesian control and Apollo became the city's patron god.[235]

Thanks to the flourishing sea commerce[236] and advantageous treaties with the Lydians and Persians,[237] Miletus was able to become the largest and most important of the twelve cities of the Ionian League (Panionium), and thrive throughout the Archaic

---

[230] See p. 111 below.

[231] For a more extensive account of the city's history see Dunham, 1915; v. Gaertringen, 1932; Kleiner, 1968: 9-22.

[232] Quoted by Strabo, 14.1.6 (=Ephor., *FGrH*, 70 F 127). On Neleus as founder-hero of Miletus see Herda, 1998.

[233] Kleiner, 1966. Cf. Hom., *Il.*, 2.867-869; Hdt., 1.146; Paus., 7.2.5.

[234] Pliny, *NH*, 5.112. On Milesian colonies see Ehrhardt, 1983.

[235] On the relations between Miletus and Didyma in Archaic times see Ehrhardt, 1998.

[236] See Dunham, 1915: 6-27; Röhlig, 1933: 52-63.

[237] Huxley, 1966: 144; Burn, 1984: 43.

period despite recurring internal conflicts and the rise of tyrants.[238] Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes and Hecataeus incorporate the city's cultural vigour in this period. The city's prosperity came to a sudden and violent end at the unfortunate Ionian Revolt of 499. Following the defeat of Lade in 494, Miletus was altogether destroyed by the Persians and its inhabitants sold into slavery or deported to Mesopotamia, near the mouth of the Tigris.[239] The rebuilding started after the Greek victory of 479. The city became a member of the Delian League,[240] and maintained a close relationship with Athens until it revolted in 412.[241] After that, for a while it became the stronghold of the Persian satrap Tissaphernes[242] and remained under Persian control until it was besieged by Alexander in 334.[243]

Alexander's death was followed by a tyranny of Assander until 313, when democracy was restored by Antigonus of Macedonia.[244] The battle of Ipsus in 301 brought Miletus under the Seleucids. Seleucus and his son Antiochus I made generous contributions to both the city and the sanctuary of Didyma. Demetrius Poliorketes, Ptolemy I Soter and Lysimachus followed next. In 277/6 Miletus and Didyma were plundered by the Gauls.[245] The city then came under the influence of Antiochus II 'Theos.' A period of Ptolemaic influence followed. After the Peace of Apamea in 188, Miletus became autonomous and received generous donations from Eumenes II and Antiochus IV Epiphanes. From 133 on, the city was part of the Roman province of Asia. Roman favour in the following centuries was accompanied by numerous donations in the form of public buildings. In late Roman times, as Maeander's silting gradually rendered its harbours useless, Miletus steadily declined.

---

[238] Gaertingen, 1932: 1594-1595; Kleiner, 1968: 14. On tyranny in Archaic Miletus see Berve, 1967: 102-103; Libero, 1996: 355-365.

[239] Hdt., 6.19-20.

[240] See Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor, 1939: 342-343.

[241] Thuc., 8.17-28. A first unsuccessful revolt took place in 454/3 (Meritt, Wade-Gery and McGregor, 1939: 252-253).

[242] Gerkan, 1935: 122; Kleiner, 1968: 16.

[243] Arr., *Anab.*, 1.18-19.6. Cf. Romane, 1994.

[244] Diod. Sic., 19.75.

[245] *Anth. Gr.*, 7.492; Parth., 8.

7 Architectural development in its historical setting

7.1 Pre-Classical Miletus

In order to appreciate and interpret the connections between architectural development and civic consciousness in Miletus during the Classical and Hellenistic periods, a brief account of the city's urban form and appearance in earlier times is necessary. Before the Persian destruction, Miletus had achieved wealth, fame and recognition, and had reached the peak of its prestige in the Greek world as a great metropolis, cultural centre and leading political power.[246] After 494, the Milesians were faced with a great past to live up to and a great challenge: a city in ruins to be rebuilt, a status to be restored and expectations for an equally glorious future to be fulfilled. The past would inevitably affect, and in certain respects determine, how Miletus was to be reborn and develop.

The earliest evidence for settlement in the site of Miletus dates from the Chalcolithic, Early and Middle Bronze Age periods,[247] and comes from the area around the later Athena Temple near the Theatre Harbour, which in those times was a small peninsula or island as were also the hills of Kaletepe and Humeitepe.[248] In the Late Bronze Age, three building phases of a settlement in the Athena Temple area are discernible, the third also comprising a large defensive wall.[249] Contacts with Minoan Crete are attested during the first phase.[250]

Although the timing is not certain, it appears that by the Geometric period all these areas had joined together forming a larger peninsula.[251] A significant settlement existed again in the area of the Athena Temple/Theatre Harbour,[252] and, for the first

---

[246] The motto '*Ἡ πρώτη τῆς Ἰωνίας ᾠκισμένη καὶ μητρόπολις πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων πόλεων ἔν τε τῷ Πόντῳ καὶ τῇ Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ πολλαχοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης Μιλησίων πόλις*' in Milesian inscriptions of Roman imperial times – an expression of nostalgic retrospection – is very characteristic of the weight of this past on the self-definition and consciousness of the civic community (see Dessau, Hermann and Rehm, 1997: Nos 233-241. Cf also Ehrhardt, 1983: 239, 543-544 n. 119; Günther, 1998: 21 and n. 1).

[247] Voigtländer, 1982; Parzinger, 1989.

[248] Brückner, 1998; Greaves, 2000: 57, 63.

[249] Weickert, 1957; Weickert, Hommel and Kleiner, 1959/60; Sciering, 1975 and 1979; Niemeier and Niemeier, 1997. On the fortifications see Schiering, 1975; Voigtländer, 1975b.

[250] Schiering, 1984 and 1986; Gödeken, 1988.

[251] See Greaves, 2000: 64 and fig. 3.

[252] Hommel, 1959/60: 38-39; Snodgrass, 1971: 429; Coldstream, 1977: 260.

time, also a citadel on the Kalabaktepe hill.[253] Despite continuing investigations, the period of interaction with Phrygian and Carian populations and the Ionian settlement remains obscure, and the finds do not yet allow firm conclusions on the continuity, extent and form of habitation.[254]

The distribution of finds from the Archaic period shows that at that time Miletus spread over an area as large as 110 hectares,[255] and estimates raise the number of houses to as many as 1800 or even 4000.[256] As far as the layout and appearance of the city are concerned, unfortunately evidence is only available from a few areas representing only a fraction of its original extent.

On the top of the Kalabaktepe hill (**Pl. 2**), which appears to have been a fortified citadel of the mid 6th century,[257] the remains of a temenos have been found.[258] There were residential quarters on the south and west slopes – where also a sanctuary existed – occupied from the 8th century until the Persian destruction.[259] Remains of ceramic, metal and other workshops as well as houses of good construction have come to light.[260] On the east slope, what was previously considered to be a thick deposit of Archaic habitation,[261] has now been proved to be an artificial terrace of the first half of the 5th century built from earlier material.[262] During the Archaic times, a sanctuary with a temple of Artemis Cithone had existed on the north of this terrace.[263]

---

253 Gerkan, 1925a; Müller-Wiener, 1986b, 1987, 1988a; Graeve, 1990, 1991, 1992, 1995, 1997, 1999; Senff, 1995a; Kerschner, 1995; Kerschner and Schlotzhauer, 1999.

254 Kleiner, 1966, 1969/70: 113-123; Voigtländer, 1985: 82-83; Heilmeyer, 1986.

255 Müller-Wiener, 1986a: 98.

256 Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 21; Gates, 1995: 238; Graeve, 1995: 198 and n. 4, 241. Such estimates, however, assume continuous settlement across the whole peninsula area, which remains unverified (Cf. Greaves, 2000: 66-67 and n. 54).

257 Presumably the stronghold of the tyrants during this period (Kleiner, 1968: 10; Cobet, 1997: 258, 277, 279; Blum, 1999: 55).

258 This was destroyed at the end of the century. See Senff, Hürmüzlü, Songu, 1997.

259 Gerkan, 1925a: 26-27; Graeve, 1990 and 1995: 198; Senff, 1995a.

260 Graeve, 1995: 197.

261 Gerkan, 1925a: 8-16.

262 Graeve, 1986; Müller-Wiener, 1988: 32-33; Kerschner, 1995.

263 Kerschner, 1995; Kerschner, Senff and Blum, 1997; Kerschner and Schlotzhauer, 1999. The foundations of the temple to which a late Archaic terracotta sima belonged (Zimmermann, 1990: 158; Winter, 1993: 240) are different from the ones earlier attributed to it by Gerkan (1925a: 16-26). On Artemis Cithone in Miletus cf. Herda, 1998.

A defensive wall ran along the south side of the Kalabaktepe hill, built in two phases, one of the 3rd quarter of the 7th century and one late Archaic.[264] Whether the wall continued west and north-west and/or surrounded the hill remains uncertain, and is part of the long-debated issue of Miletus' Archaic fortifications. Literary sources seem to imply that the city was fortified on the land side by the end of the 7th century, and on land and sea in the second half of the 6th,[265] but despite the intensive investigations of recent years this has not yet been verified or disproved.[266]

Archaic remains have been located in many other parts of the peninsula as well, like the area of the later south cross-wall where a cult of Artemis has been identified,[267] on the theatre hill,[268] and in the city centre behind the later bouleuterion.[269] A sanctuary of Dionysus also existed west of the later prytaneion.[270] The sanctuary of Apollo Delphinius, patron of seamen and colonists, was also founded near the Lion Harbour in early times,[271] but very little is known of its Archaic phase. It comprized a temenos and altars for Apollo and other gods like Hecate, Zeus and Artemis.[272]

Occupation also continued in the area of the Athena sanctuary. The cult of the goddess was probably the oldest in the city and originally the most important. Contrary

---

[264] Gerkan, 1925a: 26-38, 116-117; Graeve, 1990: 44-50 and 1991: 127-133; Senff, 1995a; Cobet, 1997: 275, 279; Blum, 1999: 53-54. Two gates and a bastion have been located (v Gerkan, 1925a: 27, 30-31, 33-37).

[265] Gerkan (Gerkan and Rehm, 1935: 128) thought that the city was fully enclosed by walls only in the late Classical period, and that only the Kalabaktepe hill was fortified in earlier times. Cobet (1997: 276, 279-280) and Blum (1999: 53, 55) on the contrary believe that a land wall, at least in the form of a 'di-ateichisma' running from west to east coast through the Kalabaktepe would have been necessary. Traces of a wall that started from the Kalabaktepe and extended towards the north-east, past perhaps the Old Sacred Gate towards the Lion Gate and the east coast have been found (Gerkan, 1925a: 33-38 and 1935: 10-11; Müller-wiener, 1986a: 96; Stümpel et al., 1997: 130-134; Schneider, 1997), but its date is still uncertain (Cobet, 1997: 274-284; Gerkan and Rehm, 1935: 19, 120; Kleiner, 1968: 28-29).

[266] Graeve, 1997: 111-112 and 1999: 3-4; Stümpel et al., 1997: 130-134; Schneider, 1997; Cobet, 1997; Stümpel et al., 1999; Blum, 1999.

[267] Graeve and Kleiner, 1973; Graeve, 1975; Kleine, 1979.

[268] Kleiner, 1961.

[269] Müller-Wiener, 1979; Müller-wiener and Voigtländer, 1980: 29-30; Voigtländer, 1982; Müller-wiener, 1988b: 35.

[270] Müller-Wiener, 1988b: 35.

[271] Diog. Laert., 1.29 mentions an offering by Thales in the 6th century.

[272] Kleiner, 1968: 33-34; Homel, 1975: 38; Müller-Wiener, 1977/8: 93; Koenigs, 1986: 115; Niemeier, Greaves and Selesnow, 1999: 399-400.

to earlier views,[273] however, it is now questioned that it carried on from the Mycenaean times, and is believed to date from the Geometric period.[274] In the 8th and 7th centuries, a shrine with a small cult structure existed on top of the bastion of the Mycenaean wall next to the gate, possibly in retrospection to the heroic past as in the case of the Nike shrine on the Athenian Acropolis.[275]

The sanctuary was renovated and a temple with a pronaos in antis and a cella with a series of axially placed wooden supports was built for Athena at the end of the 7th or the beginning of the 6th century.[276] The use of marble in the interior, the earliest known in Asia Minor, indicates that the building was perhaps meant to be a grand thanks offering of the Milesians – and possibly the tyrant Thrasybulus – to Athena for her support in the successful fight for independence against the Lydians.[277]

This temple was earlier thought to be the one destroyed in 494.[278] Architectural members recently found sealed with material from the Persian sack in an Archaic well, however, now indicate that it was actually the monumental peripteral temple, which does not date from the 5th century, as previously believed, but replaced the old structure in the last quarter of the 6th.[279] The form of the new temple, built on a raised terrace and, this time, with a north-south orientation to conform perhaps to a change in the city plan,[280] has long been debated due to the very bad preservation of its foundations[281] (**Pl. 3b-c**).

---

[273] Weickert, Hommel and Kleiner, 1959/60: 84-85; Kleiner, 1966: 17; Mallwitz and Schiering, 1968: 117-124.

[274] Held, 2000: 5, 179.

[275] Held, 2000: 6-14, 35-45, 179-180.

[276] Mallwitz and Schiering, 1968; Niemeier, Greaves and Selesnow, 1999; Weber, 1999: 416-418; Held, 2000: 14-29, 45-66. The temple was at first thought to be a provisional structure built after the Persian destruction (Gerkan, 1925a: 70-72). A second phase or repair of the mid 6th century was also identified by Mallwitz and Schiering, 1968: 90 (cf. Weber, 1999: 417).

[277] Held, 2000: 180.

[278] Mallwitz and Schiering, 1968: 97, 111.

[279] Niemeier, Greaves and Selesnow, 1999; Weber, 1999. On the mid-5th century date in connection with the Athenian influence on Miletus see Mallwitz, 1975: 82-90 (cf. Gerkan, 1925a: 122; Mallwitz and Schiering, 1968:110-111, 122-124; Koenigs, 1980: 58), and in connection with the internal conflict in the city see Held, 2000: 179-184 (Held's book was submitted for printing in 1998 and does not take into consideration the publication of the well finds in 1999).

[280] Cf. Held, 1993.

[281] The temple was originally considered to stand on a podium with frontal steps, and was restored as an Ionic peripteros with ten columns on the sides, seven on the back and six in the front, a cella and pronaos in antis (Gerkan, 1925a: 62-63). According to Mallwitz, 1975, there were no frontal steps and the

As far as the urban development of the city in Archaic times is concerned, existing evidence is still poor. It seems, however, that in the late 6th century different arrangements coexisted in different parts of the city.[282] The area around the Athena sanctuary, which was the oldest, was basically of industrial use and characterized by structures with small rooms and village-like irregularity. On Kalabaktepe, rooms are slightly bigger and despite the absence of a general plan, the arrangement of space is more regular.[283] The district behind the later bouleuterion, on the other hand, appears to have been laid out according to a system of streets intersecting at right angles with an orientation corresponding to that of the Classical city.[284]

During the second half of the 6th century and the beginning of the 5th, the most prosperous period in the city's history, building activity in Milesian sanctuaries appears to have been intense. From architectural members discovered in various places, the existence of a series of still unidentified monumental buildings and altars in the city can be inferred.[285] This building activity, which is to be observed also in extra-urban sanctuaries of the Milesian chora that were created or renovated and embellished with temples and altars,[286] seems to have been connected to the policies of the tyrants who ruled the city in those times.[287]

This group of sanctuaries included, besides those of Athena, Apollo Delphinius and Artemis Cithone in the city,[288] also the sanctuary and temple of Aphrodite of Oecous on the nearby Zeytintepe hill to the south west,[289] the sanctuary and temple of

---

temple was a pseudodipteros with 14x8 columns in the back and sides, and a second row of columns between the front colonnade and the pronaos. A synthesis of the two suggested reconstructions has been attempted by Held, 2000: 67-85.

[282] Müller-Wiener, 1986: 102-103.

[283] It has been suggested that this area was occupied by wealthier citizens (Gerkan, 1925a: 7-8; Müller-Wiener, 1986: 102).

[284] Kleiner, 1960; Kleiner and Müller-Wiener, 1972: pp. 55-64, 1979 and 1980; Voigtländer, 1982.

[285] Koenigs, 1986.

[286] Niemeier, Greaves and Selesnow, 1999: 397 fig. 24.

[287] Thrasybulus is reported in the years around 600, possibly followed by Thoas and Damasenor. Histiaeus and Aristagoras ruled Miletus in the late 6th century and are probably the ones connected to the building projects in the Milesian sanctuaries (Niemeier, Greaves and Selesnow, 1999: 402, 404-406). On tyranny in Miletus during the Archaic period see de Libero, 1996: 355-365.

[288] See p. 49 above.

[289] Theocr., 7.115-116. See Gans, 1991; Senff, 1992; Graeve, 1995: 198-202; Heinz and Senff, 1995a; Herrmann, 1995: 282-288; Senff and Heinz, 1997.

Athena Assesia on the Mengerevtepe hill a few kilometres south-east,[290] the Poseidon Altar at cape Monodendri,[291] the reconstruction of the Sacred Road to Didyma, a temenos on the Sacred Road, the sanctuary of Artemis and most importantly the Archaic Apollo Temple itself.[292] Certain of the buildings on these sites were probably still under construction in 494.[293]

7.2 The re-foundation in the 5th century

At the exact time Miletus enjoyed its greatest prosperity ever and was considered to be the ornament of Ionia,[294] its leading role in the ill-fated Ionian Revolt resulted in total destruction by the Persians. Herodotus reports that those of the Milesians who were not killed or sold into slavery were deported to the mouth of the Tigris in Mesopotamia, their city and Didyma sanctuary plundered and razed to the ground, and their land given to Persians and Carians.[295]

The city, however, was not totally depopulated.[296] Excavations at the east slope of Kalabaktepe have brought to light habitation remains ranging from the beginning to the middle of the 5th century.[297] The destroyed quarter was systematically leveled,[298] and a large terrace was created with debris from the Archaic city,[299] upon which a new settlement was built. That the settlement extended over the desecrated ruins of the Artemis

---

[290] Graeve, 1995: 202; Senff, 1995b; Weber, 1995, 1996; Herrmann, 1995: 288-292; Lohmann, 1995.

[291] Gerkan, 1915; Koenigs, 1980: 65-66 and 1986: 115.

[292] Niemeier, Greaves and Selesnow, 1999: 396-409. Cf. Gödecken, 1986; Schneider, 1986 and 1988; Tuchelt, Schneider and Schattner, 1989 and 1996, Tuchelt, 1991.

[293] These were probably the New Athena Temple (Niemeier, Greaves and Selesnow, 1999: 407-408), the Athena Temple on the Mengerevtepe (Senff, 1995b: 228; Weber, 1995: 238) and the Apollo Temple IIB at Didyma (Naumann and Tuchelt, 1963/64: 29-30; Drerup, Naumann and Tuchelt, 1964: 383; Tuchelt, 1970: 204). The Persians destroyed the new Athena Temple (Niemeier, Greaves and Selesnow, 1999: 406), the temple of Artemis Cithone on the Kalabaktepe (Kerschner and Schlotzhauer, 1999: 8-10) the Athena Temple on the Mengerevtepe (Senff, 1995b: 228) and partially the Apollo Temple II at Didyma (Tuchelt, 1970: 45-47 and 1988: 433-438).

[294] Hdt, 5.28: '*ἡ Μίλητος αὐτή τε ἑωυτῆς μάλιστα δὴ τότε ἀκμάσασα καὶ δὴ καὶ τῆς Ἰωνίης ἦν πρόσχημα.*'

[295] Hdt., 6.19-20, 22.1.

[296] As Herodotus (6.22) maintained, later contradicting himself when saying that a Milesian force fought on the Persian side in Mycale (9.99, 104). On the exaggeration of Herodotus' statement see Meiggs, 1972: 36; Balcer, 1995: 188-189; Cobet, 1997: 262-263; Kerschner, 1995: 218.

[297] Kerschner, 1995: 216-218. Cf. p. 49 above. Early Classical remains have also been located on the stadium hill (Niemeier and Niemeier, 1997: 206-208).

[298] Graeve, 1986: 40.

[299] Graeve, 1995: 198 and n. 4.

Cithone sanctuary could indicate a Persian initiative.[300] The remaining Milesians were perhaps forced to comply,[301] but piously gathered and buried the votive offerings.[302] The regular arrangement of the housing quarter,[303] the two distinguishable phases of habitation,[304] and the chronological range of the finds show that what started perhaps as a forced settlement in the aftermath of the city's destruction became a well organized living quarter with a life prospect of decades, meant to accommodate the Milesians until their city was rebuilt.[305]

The building of the new Miletus began after the Persian threat was over in 479, probably soon or immediately afterwards rather than later in the century.[306] Classical Miletus was laid out according to the grid system, based on streets crossing at right angles. Apparently, a similar arrangement had already existed in certain parts of the Archaic city, and the new street network made use of it wherever possible.[307]

There is an interesting abnormality in the plan of the civic area, which was distinctly divided into a northern and a southern half. The two street grids that met south of the later South Agora had a ca. 3° difference in alignment, which might be due to an influence by the orientation of streets, building compounds or quarters of the old city[308] (**Pl. 4**). It has been suggested that the Athena sanctuary and the Delphinium may have set the guidelines, but that remains unclear.[309] The two districts also differed in the arrangement of the residential insulae. According to Hoepfner and Schwandner, despite the difference in orientation and external dimensions – a peculiarity perhaps related to the old city – the total area of the insulae and the individual properties in both parts of

---

[300] Kerschner, 1999: 9-10 and n. 8.

[301] Out of fear for their own lives and the lives of their deported relatives, the Milesians were also forced to fight on the Persian side at Mycale (Hdt, 9.99, 104; see Cobet, 1997: 263; Balcer, 1984a: 245).

[302] Kerschner, 1995: 219-220; Kerschner and Schlotzhauer, 1999: 9-10.

[303] Rectangular blocks were formed by a street network that complied with the points of the compass but was not laid out on the basis of a strict grid plan (Graeve, 1986: 40; Kerschner, 1995: 214-216).

[304] Graeve, 1986: 40, 42; Kerschner, 1995: 218.

[305] Kerschner, 1995: 216-218.

[306] Giuliano, 1966: 82; Kleiner, 1968: 15; Graeve and Kleiner, 1973: 63-115; Martin, 1974: 100-101; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 17. For a rebuilding later in the century see Mayer, 1932: 1632-1635; Lawrence and Tomlinson, 1996: 191.

[307] Kleiner, 1968: 25; cf. p. 52 above.

[308] Kleiner and Müller-Wiener, 1972: 71; Owens, 1991: 54.

[309] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 20.

the city was, contrary to earlier views, actually the same.[310] Uncertainty, however, remains, since some parts of the city appear to have followed different arrangements.[311] The population, based on the possible number of insulae and properties, could be estimated at 15-20 thousand.[312]

The streets had an average width of 12ft in the north and 14-15ft in the south, which seems surprisingly narrow for a city of the size and character of the new Miletus. Hoepfner and Schwandner have tried to remedy this by suggesting that two 150ft-wide zones that do not seem to fit into the regular insulae-system were in fact wide avenues.[313] One supposedly extended from the south of the Delphinium to the theatre hill in an east-west direction, and the other started from the Lion Harbour and ended at the Sacred Gate following with a direction from north to south. This second one they identified with the epigraphically attested '*πλατεία ὁδὸς*,'[314] by which the annual religious procession marched from the Delphinium to the Sacred Gate and then took the Sacred Road to Didyma.

The planning of the new Miletus was strongly influenced by the gridded street system that had already existed in certain parts of the pre-Persian city, and incorporated features that had been devised and developed during the building of Greek colonies throughout the Mediterranean. But it also introduced a new and all-important innovation: the use of the self-contained and standardized insula rather than the long strip of land formed between parallel streets as a controlling factor in the plotting of the site, and as the modulus for the proportioning of buildings, residential and civic zones.[315]

---

[310] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 20 (cf. Ward-Perkins, 1974: 116; Owens, 1991: 54; Lawrence and Tomlinson, 1996: 191). In the north part, they maintained that two of the previously supposed inulae actually formed one of 100x180ft (29.40x52.92m - a depth of 180ft preferred over the 175ft suggested by the excavators allowing six equal properties of 50x60ft with a side ratio of 5:9 to fit), while in the south they estimated insulae of 120x150ft (35.33x44.10m - with a side ratio of 4:5).

[311] E.g. the area around the Athena sanctuary, where insulae 32x44m with four instead of six properties occur (Held, 1993: 378-379).

[312] On the basis of 300 insulae with six properties each and households of ten people (Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 21). This estimate is, of course, hypothetical since it is unknown whether or how soon all the available space was occupied by houses. Nevertheless, the population of the new Miletus could still be smaller than that of the Archaic city.

[313] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 20-21 and figs. 12-13.

[314] Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 133.27.

[315] Martin, 1974: 122-123; Owens, 1991: 54.

Whether the Milesian Hippodamus, this elusive personality, should be credited with this idea has been part of a long debate concerning his life and career.[316] Hippodamus, either as a theoretician of urbanization or a city-planner or both would have undoubtedly had an interest in, and probably intimate knowledge of, the layout and rebuilding of his home city. This was certainly an on-going, long-term enterprise, in the context of which he may have studied his craft, acquired part of his knowledge and experience, and laid the foundations of his theories and ideas.[317] But no ancient source mentions or implies his active participation in it – especially as the leading mastermind[318]– and to maintain so is purely conjectural.[319]

This fact, however, by no means detracts from the importance, and especially the scale and ambitiousness that characterized the design of the new Miletus. Harbours and commercial zones, civic and residential districts were all encompassed by the integrated plan, which not only set the guidelines for the present layout of the city, but aimed even more emphatically at setting the foundations for development in the future. As an integral feature of the new city plan, the areas intended for civic purposes were reserved in advance.[320] They formed an L-shaped tract of land that occupied the central part of Miletus connecting the two main city harbours, the Lion Harbour and the Theatre Harbour.[321] The total area reserved for public purposes was exceptionally large,[322] and revealed great aspirations for the future of the city.

There is no doubt that the Milesians were planning ahead, in fact, long ahead. The project by far exceeded the resources and financial capabilities of a polis that had almost ceased to exist – as the Athenian tribute lists reveal – and had probably lost part of its territory, control over its dependencies, and business connections with its old trading

---

316 See McCredie, 1971; Burns, 1976; Haugsted, 1978; Szidat, 1980; Triebel-Schubert and Muss, 1983-4; Gehrke, 1989; Schuller, Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1989; Owens, 1991: 51-61; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994; Gorman, 1995.

317 Cf. Gehrke, 1989: 65.

318 Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 302.

319 Cf. Owens, 1991: 55.

320 Gerkan, 1925b.

321 Wycherley, 1962: 19; Martin, 1974: 55, 99; Owens, 1991: 52-53.

322 Hoepfner and Schwnandner, 1994: 21, consider this space too large to have been reserved from the beginning. They believe that the area later occupied by the South Agora was originally residential and that some 120 houses had to be demolished for its construction. There are indications, however against such a possibility (see p. 69 and n. 410 below).

partners. It must have been certain that actual building would only proceed slowly as prosperity gradually returned.[323] Likewise, the Milesian population in the aftermath of the Persian wars – even if part of the deportees actually managed to return – would have occupied only a fraction of the space allocated for residential use.

Although Miletus was in real terms a small polis at the time of the refoundation, it was not laid out like a colony about which nobody could foresee and -tell whether it was to remain small or grow big, but was designed from the very beginning on a scale that took the size and extent of its destroyed predecessor as a set-out standard.[324] It required remarkable faith in the vitality of their polis and an unbroken consciousness of their civic identity for the Milesians to believe that they would be able not only to restore their city to its past greatness, but also to provide it with modern appearance and amenities. In this respect, they went far beyond the Athenians who also returned to find their city destroyed, but only restored the status quo ante according to the old ways of town planning.[325] It took a while before the Athenians invited the Milesian Hippodamus in order to have Piraeus designed on the basis of modern standards.[326]

The glory of the more distant past was probably a great inspiration to the Milesians, who, nevertheless, did not forget the recent disaster and humiliation either. Characteristic of their conviction not to excuse those responsible could be the so-called 'blood-inscription,' one of the earliest decrees set up in a prominent position of the new city, which may have ordered the permanent persecution of all those considered guilty of causing the disaster or cooperating with the enemy both before and after.[327]

As the excavation results show, for a whole generation — from the destruction of Miletus in 494 until around the middle of the 5th century when the foundations of the new city had been laid and they could start moving in slowly – the Milesians lived pa-

---

[323] Wycherley, 1962: 19.

[324] Gerkan, 1924a: 41.

[325] Wycherley, 1962: 18-19; Boersma, 1970: 247-253; Lambrinoudakis, 1986: 20-21. Cf. Aristot., *Pol.*, 1330b.25: '*ὡς εἶχον κατὰ τὸν ἀρχαῖον χρόνον.*'

[326] Aristot., *Pol.*, 1267b.23; Hesyh., s. v. '*Ἱπποδάμου νέμησις.*'

[327] On the 'blood-inscription' see more recently Effenterre and Ruzé, 1994: 362-365 No. 103 with comments on earlier bibliography. The stele was set up at the north-west corner of the North Agora before the latter had been architecturally formed and should therefore predate it. On arguments in favour of an early dating of the inscription soon after 479 rather than in the mid-5th century see Gaertringen, 1932: 1598; Kleiner, 1968: 15, 50; Piérart, 1969; Robertson, 1987:378-384; Kawerau, 1914: 282; Meiggs, 1972: 565.

tiently on a provisional settlement on the Kalabaktepe.[328] It is from there that they worked with this remarkable self-confidence to bring back prosperity to their polis. The future would prove them successful in restoring the lost prestige of their city in terms of material wealth and architectural embellishment, but the times when Miletus held the political and cultural leadership of the Ionian Greeks had gone forever.

In the course of the 5th century, Miletus probably developed into a huge building site. Houses went up first to accommodate the recovering population. Around the middle of the century, the provisional settlement at the Kalabaktepe was abandoned never to be used again.[329] The construction of public buildings, on the other hand, probably progressed at a much slower pace. In fact, there is no evidence for monumental buildings of administrative or other character in 5th century Miletus. It is, of course, possible that their remains were completely obliterated by later structures that replaced them on the same spots. It seems more likely, however, that during this period public affairs were conducted in modest and provisional structures and in the open due to the priority of housing and the ambitiousness of the plans for civic architecture.[330]

One expects that, as in Athens, the construction or reconstruction of a fortification wall would be among the early priorities of the plan for the rebuilding of Miletus. The assumed Archaic wall, whatever its path and range may have been, was most likely razed to the ground in 494, although the Persians probably maintained some kind of stronghold.[331] When exactly the city's defenses were up again cannot be established with certainty on either archaeological or historical and literary grounds.[332] In any case, by the end of the 5th century Miletus was definitely protected from land and sea by fortification walls,[333] which also incorporated Kalabaktepe[334] (**Pl. 2**).

---

[328] See p. 53 above.

[329] Kerschner, 1995: 216-218.

[330] Cf. Gerkan, 1922: 87.

[331] Balcer, 1984b: 19; Cobet, 1997: 263. Cf. Hdt., 6.31.1.

[332] See discussion by Cobet, 1997: 264-266.

[333] Gerkan, 1935: 122; Cobet, 1997: 266. Gerkan (1935:122-123; cf. McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 165) believed that it was only after the Milesian defection from Athens in 412, but an earlier date could perhaps be as likely (see Lohmann, 1995: 318-320; Cobet, 1997: 264-266).

[334] The possibility of an early cross-wall, running parallel to the Hellenistic one to the west of the Old Sacred Gate, has also arisen following recent geophysical investigations in the area (see Graeve, 1997: 111-112; Stümpel et al., 1995: 131 and fig. 20; cf. Blum, 1999).

The plundered sanctuaries were also among the first sites to receive the attention of the city builders in the 5th century, but no major projects appear to have been carried out. The city Delphinium took the form of a rectangular court of an insula's size and was incorporated into the new grid system at that time. Two stoas probably bordered the enclosure from north and south, a rectangular altar for Apollo stood in the middle, and there were also a few smaller round altars for other gods.[335] The sanctuary also resumed its role as the state archive. The Didymaeum itself received only a few essential repairs.[336] In the sanctuary of Dionysus, a small provisional naiskos (II) with an eschara was built to serve the immediate needs of the cult, to be replaced later in the century by a somewhat larger temple (III)[337] (**Pl. 8e**). Another small sanctuary, possibly of Demeter and perhaps without any monumental structures, existed during the Classical period in the insula immediately to the east of the Athena sanctuary.[338]

The fate of the latter in the new Miletus has been debated and still remains unclear. As already mentioned, contrary to earlier beliefs the younger Athena Polias Temple appears to have been built not in the 5th century but in the late 6th and to have been destroyed by the Persians in 494.[339] Epigraphic evidence concerning the goddess is henceforth relatively scarce.[340] A. Mallwitz argued that in late Hellenistic times the cult had actually ceased in Miletus, and the temple terrace was surrendered to secular use.[341]

The seeming silence of the sources is perhaps not enough to suggest that Athena was no longer worshiped at Miletus, and W. D. Niemeier could very well be correct in assuming that her cult was moved to a different location after the Persian destruction,[342]

---

335 Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: 408; Gerkan, 1922: 88 and 1959; Kleiner, 1968: 33-34; Coulton, 1976: 169.

336 Hahland, 1964.

337 Real, 1977/8; Feld, 1977/8; Müller-Wiener, 1977/8 and 1988b: 35-36. Temple III was renewed in the course of the 4th century (Temple IV).

338 Held, 1993.

339 See p. 51 and n. 279 above.

340 Ehrhardt, 1983: 163.

341 Mallwitz, 1975, 82-90. P. Herrmann (1971) discussed the possibility that an oracle cited in a 3d cent. A.D. inscription concerning the appointment of a priestess for the Athena Polias cult, which pointed out that the Milesians were (too) late in settling the issue, could actually imply that the position had remained vacant for a long time.

342 Niemeier, Greaves and Selesnow, 1999: 408-409. The designation '*τῆς πρ[ὸ πόλε]ως Πολιάδο[ς Ἀ]θηνᾶς*' in the 3rd cent. A.D. inscription referring to the appointment of a priestess of Athena (n. 341 above), contrary to Herrmann's view (1971: 294 n. 9), appears as an unnecessary repetition if consid-

as was perhaps that of Artemis Cithone, whose sanctuary on the Kalabaktepe was also desecrated.[343] Interestingly, it has been suggested that the erection of a Demeter temple on the Humeitepe in the late 3rd century[344] might be related to the abandonment of the small temenos, possibly of the same goddess, in the insula east of the Athena Temple.[345] In any case, it is certain that the patron goddess of early Miletus lost a great part of her old luster and appeal after Apollo replaced her in that role,[346] and this appears to have had a serious impact on her cult.

7.3 Miletus in the 4th century

It appears that the architectural development of the civic centre of Miletus did not commence immediately, but only about a century after the rebuilding began, historical conditions allowed the first major public projects to be initiated in that area.[347]

The earliest known building dating from around the mid 4th century is the one usually identified as the prytaneion.[348] This occupied the space of a whole insula in the south-west corner of the North Agora, and was accessible from the side of the latter[349] (**Pls. 4a-b, 9 no. 12**). The ground plan of this building is insecure, but it probably consisted of several rooms set around a central courtyard.[350] Though, perhaps, not of particularly monumental appearance, nevertheless, the Milesian prytaneion was spacious and well constructed, and in this respect appears to diverge from the inconspicuousness of the Archaic and Classical prytaneia.[351]

---

ered an equivalent to '*Πολιὰς*' or '*πολιοῦχος*' and is perhaps indicative of location. This could speak for a sanctuary of Athena immediately outside or at the entrance of the city.

[343] See p. 54 above.

[344] See p. 77 below.

[345] Held, 1993: 375.

[346] Cf. Mallwitz, 1975: 83-84; Ehrhardt, 1983: 163.

[347] Cf. Gerkan, 1922: 87-88.

[348] The building has been only partly excavated and the identification is based on its apparent form and location. See Gerkan, 1922: 89-90; Kleiner, 1968: 51; Miller, 1978: 231; Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 121.

[349] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: fig. 13; Gerkan, 1922: 30 and Pl. 23.

[350] Gerkan, 1922: 30.

[351] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 36, 81-85.

The priority[352] and attention it enjoyed in the new Miletus is perhaps justifiable on various grounds. As the place where traditionally the eternal flame burned on the common hearth signifying the continuity and communality of polis life, the prytaneion was more than any other building the symbol and core of the city.[353] In the case of Miletus, this symbolism may have been of even greater importance, as the city had not too long ago risen from its ashes, and was still struggling to reassert its presence and vitality both to its own citizens and the outside world, and to claim back its old status and prestige. Especially for this last purpose Miletus would have hurried to resume contacts with its many colonies and its political and commercial partners in order to rebuild its trading network. As the place where foreign ambassadors and proxenoi were received and entertained, the role of the prytaneion in external affairs was central.[354]

In the same context, the first major and a really monumental building project in terms of both scale and general effect on Miletus' life and appearance was that of the architectural shaping and furnishing of the Lion Harbour, the city's smallest but closed and official one. For a maritime city like Miletus that had owed a great part of its past wealth and power to sea commerce and colonization, this should again be by no means surprising. In the second half of the 4th century,[355] the construction of a large building complex began, the main part of which was a long L-shaped stoa. Its main south wing stretched out in an east-west direction along the south side of the harbour, while the shorter west one extended northwards flanking the harbour from the west.[356] The stoa was one-aisled with a Doric colonnade, and had a series of back rooms along its south side[357] (**Pls. 4b, 9 no. 2**).

To the back of this Harbour Stoa another L-shaped Doric colonnade was added forming a stoa with rooms along the back, the ones to the north being in common with

---

[352] The possibility of a predecessor of the 2nd century bouleuterion – though perhaps not as early as the prytaneion – cannot be ruled out. Cf. p. 86 below.

[353] Miller, 1978: 13-14, 23. Due to its central position in Miletus' civic area, the prytaneion was literally as well as symbolically the core of the city (Livy, 41.20.7: 'penertrale urbis').

[354] Miller, 1978: 4.

[355] Gerkan, 1922: 91; Coulton, 1976: 63, 259; Müller-Wiener, 1986: 121.

[356] The west wing of the Harbour Stoa could be seen as a counterpart of the Delphinium, which flanked the harbour from the east (Gerkan, 1922: 91).

[357] Gerkan, 1922: 4-19.

the Harbour Stoa.[358] Part of the same complex was also the peristylar court with a series of rooms opening off its porticoes, which occupied the angle between the two L-shaped stoas.[359] Its connection with the Harbour and its proximity to – but not direct contact with – the civic centre, indicate a purely commercial use (**Pls. 4b, 9 nos. 4-5**). If this was actually the case, it could be the earliest known market court.[360] That the long Harbour Stoa, the smaller L-shaped stoa and the peristylar court were planned together as one unit, is illustrated by their elaborate incorporation into the grid system of the city plan, the use of flat roofing which allowed a convenient junction of the buildings despite the continual changes in direction, and finally the difficulty in defining the actual limits of each building.[361]

The aims that this large building project was meant to serve were apparently twofold. From a practical/functional point of view, it was supposed to shape the harbour by defining its limits, and to organize the area for the reception of ships, passengers and goods, by providing the necessary installations and facilities for the harbour authorities, the storage of merchandize, and commercial activities. Until then, harbour and civic centre had been a unified area without well-delineated and distinct boundaries and functions. The porticoes of the harbour stoas effectively 'camouflaged' the noisy harbour activities, which from then on were conducted in the back rooms and the discreetly placed market court.

Designed as part of the harbour complex, the L-shaped stoa that faced the agora was intended to play a role complementary to that of the Harbour Stoa, at the back of which it was attached. While the Harbour Stoa shaped the harbour area, the agora stoa aimed at giving form to the civic centre by defining its north-west limits. Along with the Delphinium and the prytaneion, which were aligned with its east and south wings respectively, it created the first distinguishable framework of the Milesian agora.

The purposes of these extensive building projects were nevertheless not only practical, but monumental as well. The Harbour Stoa at the same time formed an elaborate architectural setting, an impressive scenic background to the harbour, and a grandiose entrance to the city from the sea in the eyes of those approaching by ship. The L-

---

[358] Gerkan, 1922: 19-20; Coulton, 1976: 63, 259.

[359] Gerkan, 1922: 19-23; Coulton, 1976: 63, 176.

[360] Coulton, 1976: 176.

[361] Coulton, 1976: 63.

shaped stoa, along with the façade of the Delphinium that functioned as a visual counterpart to the stoa's west wing, created a Pi-shaped forecourt, a sort of vestibule to the main city, which embraced and received the merchants and pilgrims onboard approaching ships in a similar way as the Propylaea welcomed visitors to the Athenian Acropolis.[362] Furthermore, the monumental architectural elaboration of the harbour expressed in the most eloquent way the predominantly maritime character of Miletus and its civic community. This becomes even more apparent in the contrast created by the remarkable absence of any arrangement with similar intentions – with the sole exception of the Sacred Gate – at the city's approach from inland.

In general, the complexity and scale of the harbour project, the multiplicity of the functions it was aimed to serve, and its spatial alignment and conjunction with other buildings and compounds shows that it was part of a thorough and complete general plan for the arrangement of the Milesian civic centre. The only case in which an undoing of earlier construction may have occurred – and perhaps not without symbolic importance – is the possible demolition of the city's sea wall in that area, necessitated by the construction of the Harbour Stoa, and the wish to provide a free and unobstructed view of the new harbour from the sea.[363]

As part of the new harbour arrangement, from then on a chain stretching across the opening protected the bay entrance in times of crisis. At the two ends of this chain two colossal lion statues were set up,[364] the character of which was apparently symbolic, as the lions were the sacred animals of Apollo[365] (**Pl. 5a-b**). Heraldically positioned at the two sides of the harbour entrance, they were distinct landmarks that announced from afar to the approaching pilgrims that they had reached the city of Apollo. At the same time, however, they also proclaimed to all comers, friendly or hostile, that the city was under the god's auspices and protection.

---

[362] Klinkott, 1996: 181.

[363] Gerkan, 1922: 90-91 and 1935: 110-112; Graeve, 1996: 320-321. Had the sea wall of Miletus and the Harbour Stoa coexisted, the former would have extended at a distance of just about 10m from the latter and between it and the harbour bay. In this case the stoa and the whole new harbour arrangement would have been pointless. Therefore the construction of the Harbour Stoa sets a terminus ante quem for the demolition of the sea wall in this area.

[364] Gerkan, 1922: 84-85 and 1935: 112-114; Kleiner, 1968: 7; Graeve, 1996: 320-321 and n. 15.

[365] Graeve, 1996: 317-318. The symbolic significance of lions to Miletus is evident also from the fact that they were abundant in the city and along the Sacred Road to Didyma, and appear as standard emblems on the city's coins (see Deppert-Lippitz, 1984: 18-19). On the connection between lions and Apollo see Cahn, 1950.

If indeed there was a direct connection between the monumental construction of the harbour, the placement of the lions, and perhaps the demolition of the wall, this would speak for the dawning of a new era for Miletus signified by a parallel start of an intense building activity in the public sector aiming at the restoration of the city's old status and prestige. Miletus had managed to make a new beginning, and regain its vigour and self-confidence about a hundred years since it had risen from its ashes, and after another long series of adventures and mishaps. After Alexander's conquest in 334, the city had also suffered a tyranny by Assander, which was brought to an end by Antigonus of Macedonia in 313.[366] The importance attached by the Milesian community to this event when '*ἡ πόλις ἐλευθέρα καὶ αὐτόνομος ἐγένετο ὑπὸ Ἀντιγόνου καὶ ἡ δημοκρατία ἀπεδόθη*'[367] becomes evident from the fact that the year 313/2 became the starting point of a new list of stephanephoroi.[368] It was only a sign of the times that freedom and democracy now had to be granted by and depend on the will of powers mostly foreign to the polis itself.

The beginning of a new era was perhaps also symbolically connoted by the two harbour lions. V. von Graeve has distinguished a deliberately different stylistic treatment of the two sculptures which is not to be attributed to a difference in date. One of them was characterized by modern trends, while the other showed clear signs of archaism. If this divergence was intentional and not just due to the personal taste and style of two different artists, then, according to v. Graeve, it may have been meant to allude to two different historical eras. The modern lion signified the present and the revitalized self-consciousness and identity of the Milesian civic community, while the archaizing one the awareness and pride for the city's glorious past.[369] Positioned face-to-face and joined by the strong chain, they could have alluded to the strong confidence in the unbroken continuity of old and new Miletus, and its great capability for endurance, survival and revival even after the worst disaster.

---

[366] Diod. Sic., 19.75.

[367] Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 123.2-4.

[368] On the chronology see Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: 241-242.

[369] Graeve, 1996: esp. 327.

Around 340-320,[370] parallel to the works in the harbour and probably in connection to the plans for the erection of the new grand Apollo Temple[371] and the revival of the Didyma oracle in 331,[372] another project was undertaken aiming at the renovation and enlargement of the Delphinium. The 5th century enclosure was expanded eastwards to incorporate the adjoining insula and the street in between, thus acquiring more than double its original size (**Pls. 4a-b, 9 no. 3**). New two-aisled Doric stoas were built at the north, east and south sides forming a Pi-shaped complex, the west side of which was closed off with a wall[373] (**Pl. 6**).

Sacred to Apollo Delphinius, protector of seamen and colonists, the Delphinium was strongly related to the harbour. At the same time, it was the gathering place of Milesians and foreign visitors who came to participate in the annual celebrations for Apollo, and the starting point of the ritual procession to Didyma.[374] For this reason it was also an ideal place for the display of the city's public archive.[375] The architectural form of the sanctuary, as its development through time reveals,[376] was determined more by functionality and less by monumental ambitions.[377] These were to be realized in the most impressive way at the god's main sanctuary at Didyma.

It was in its key location and the accentuation of this location by means of urban design that the all-important role of the Delphinium in the religious and social life of Miletus became evident. The large L-shaped stoa and the general architectural arrangement of the Lion Harbour physically, as well as visually, directed delegates from Delphi and pilgrims from all over the Greek world arriving by ship to the Delphinium.

---

370 The date is provided by an inscription on the rear wall of the building regulating the placement of votive offerings '*εἰς τὴν στοιὴν τὴγ καινὴν*' (Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: 172 No. 32).

371 Vitr., 7.pr.16. Cf. Günther, 1971: 37-38; Voigtländer, 1975a:14-28; Tuchelt, 1976.

372 Strabo, 17.1.43; cf. Günther, 1971: 21-22.

373 Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: 125-141, 408-409; Kleiner, 1968: 33-34; Coulton, 1976: 169, 258. During the late Hellenistic period the court was to be made completely peristylar by the addition of a portico on the west side as well.

374 On the procession and the Sacred Road to Didyma see Wiegand et al., 1929; 6-10; Tuchelt, 1984: 214-225 and 1991: 38-50; Gödecken, 1986; Schneider, 1987.

375 Cf. the identical role of the Athena sanctuary at Priene.

376 As an enclosure for people to gather, the Delphinium had to offer abundant space and protection from the natural elements. Thus its architectural history is one of expansion (from the small Archaic temenos to the Classical enclosure of an insula's size and then to the Hellenistic of double that size) and of provision of stoas (first on two, then three and in the end on all four sides).

377 The same applied in other Greek sanctuaries of similar character and function, like the city Eleusinium in Athens (Paus., 1.14.1; see Travlos, 1971: 198-199; Miles, 1998).

From there, through a passageway in front of the sanctuary, they were introduced to the agora and the inner part of the city from which the Sacred Road to Didyma passed. And it was along the route of this road, as will be further discussed later on, that the main public buildings of the Milesian civic centre were erected, and with regard to which the city's architectural image was designed and materialized.[378]

From the late 4th century dates also the earliest evidence for the existence of a theatre in Miletus.[379] As in most Greek cities, the location of the Milesian theatre – on the south-west slope of the hill between the Lion and Theatre harbours – was determined mainly by topographical factors (**Pls. 2, 4**). These were also responsible for the fact that the structure was not incorporated into the grid plan of the city.[380] The economy and ease of construction allowed by the natural cavity of the ground, however, was cancelled out by the adverse orientation with regard to wind and sunlight, the difficulty of access, and the extreme shortage of available building space between the hillside and the seashore where the city's sea wall stood. Soon the growing scene building had to engulf the wall in order to fit.[381] This problem, according to F. Krauss, could indicate that the location was not initially chosen with the construction of a monumental stone theatre in mind, but had been used provisionally in the past and had become fixed with time as a result of sacredness.[382]

The few surviving remains of the theatre's early phase indicate that it was a modest and much smaller structure compared to its Roman successor (**Pl. 7**), but already possessed a stone proscenion and scene building. The traces of the former have been obliterated by later construction,[383] while the latter was a ca. 15x7m two-storeyed building with its back attached to the city wall.[384] The relation to the city wall provides the evidence for the chronology of the scene building and the early phase of the theatre.[385] In the first half of the 3rd century, perhaps not too long after the first phase, the

---

[378] Klinkott, 1996.

[379] On the theatre see Krauss, 1964, 1973, and also Gerkan, 1935: 98-109; Bieber, 1961: 218-221; Kleiner, 1968: 69-76; Bernardi Ferrero, 1966-74: II, 85-95.

[380] Krauss, 1973: 2.

[381] Krauss, 1964 and 1973: 7-34; Gerkan, 1935: 88-109.

[382] Krauss, 1973: 2-3.

[383] Krauss, 1973: 38-39.

[384] Krauss, 1964: 113-117 and 1973: 7-12, 54-59.

[385] Gerkan, 1935: 107; Krauss, 1964: 113-114.

scene building was reconstructed to double its previous length with the addition of wings at the two ends. Series of doors opened in both lower and upper storeys.[386] The proscenion also extended to the same if not greater length.[387] As part of the same expansion project, the auditorium was probably also considerably enlarged[388] (**Pl. 8a-b**).

Further significant renovations were carried out some time before the mid 2nd century, as the strong analogies with the theatre of Priene reveal.[389] The scene building was once again widened and the façade of the upper storey was opened up with wide thyromata.[390] These changes were dictated by the transfer of dramatic action from the orchestra to the roof of the proscenion, which was also modified in that period.[391] Just a few decades later, the need for an adequate logeion necessitated yet another reconstruction of the scene building, which was again further widened[392] (**Pl. 8c-d**).

As a result of these continuous modifications in the course of the Hellenistic period, the theatre of Miletus developed from a simple and modest to an ever more elaborate and monumental structure, up to date with new developments in the dramatic art. The aggrandizement pertained to its size and also its form, through the improvement of the material, building quality, architectural design and sculptural ornamentation. It would be true to say that the evolution of the theatre followed and displayed the gradual return of wealth and prosperity to the city of Miletus, as well as the conscious attachment of its civic community to the ideals and fundamental means of cultural expression of the Greek polis in the new era.

In this respect, the location of the theatre had – despite the aforementioned weaknesses – a considerable advantage, as it offered the opportunity for visually impressive landscaping. On the one hand, spectators had a panoramic view of the sea and the large Theatre Harbour, which formed an effective complement of the scene building during theatrical performances. On the other hand, the theatre was itself an exciting sight displaying a powerful image of the city to those approaching from the sea, and creating a

---

386 Krauss, 1964: 117-120 and 1973: 12-16.

387 Krauss, 1973: 39-40.

388 Krauss, 1973: 14.

389 Krauss, 1964: 124.

390 Krauss, 1964: 120-124 and 1973: 16-22.

391 Krauss, 1964: 121, 123 and 1973: 22, 40-41.

392 Gerkan, 1935: 108 n. 2 ('still before 133'); Krauss, 1964: 124-129 and 1973: 22-34, 41-42.

scenic background for the Theatre Harbour just like the L-shaped stoa did for the Lion Harbour.[393]

7.4 Miletus in the 3rd century

Right at the beginning of the 3rd century (300-298), Miletus received a significant donation from Antiochus, son of king Seleucus I, in the form of a monumental '*στοὰ σταδιαία*,'[394] the revenue from which was intended to support ongoing construction works in the sanctuary of Didyma.[395] The stoa, of almost exactly a stade's length (189.2m), extended along the side of the civic centre in a north-south direction forming its south-eastern limit[396] (**Pl. 9 no. 10**). It was Doric, single-aisled and -storeyed,[397] with a row of two-room shops opening onto the portico to the west, and another row of shops facing east, only accessible from the street at the rear of the building.[398]

As to the stoa's architectural style, there is evidence only from a couple of surviving pieces of the frieze,[399] in which J. Coulton has recognized Milesian characteristics.[400] The architect could have been Milesian,[401] although it is equally possible that the ground plan of the building was Seleucid, but carried out by Milesian craftsmen.[402]

---

393 The scene building, the parodoi and the orchestra were constructed on a terrace formed between the hill and the sea wall, at a height that made them visible from the harbour (Krauss, 1973: 1).

394 Honorary decrees for Antiochus and his mother Apame in Didyma (Laum, 1914: 117-118 No. 128; Rehm, 1958: 282-284 Nos. 479, 480; Günther, 1971: 23-35; Tuchelt, 1973: 33 No. 9; Bringmann et al., 1995: 338-343 Nos. 281[E1]-[E2]) refer to Antiochus' promise to erect the stoa in the city. Another inscription on an architrave block, found east of the bouleuterion and probably belonging to the stoa reads '*[Ἀντίοχος βασιλέως Σελ]ένκου [ὁ πρεσβύτατος υἱὸς Ἀπόλλωνι] τῶι ἐν Δ[ιδύμοις]*' (Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 43-44, 281-282 No. 193a; Bringmann et al., 1995: 343 No. 281[E3]). The stoa is mentioned in other inscriptions as well (Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 340-341 No. 270.7; Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: 326-330 No. 145.29). The date ensues from the names of the stephanephoroi and the fact that Antiochus does not yet appear with a royal title (Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: 261-262; Rehm, 1958: 281-282; Schaaf, 1992: 26-27 and nn. 149-151; Rumscheid, 1994: 29, 46 No. 155; Bringmann et al., 1995: 340 No. 281[E1]).

395 '*...δαπανᾶσθαι εἰς τὰ κατα[σκευαζόμε]να ἐν τῶι ἱερῶι τῶι ἐν Διδύμοις...*' (Rehm, 1958: No. 479.9-10) and '*...ἐπι]κοσμῆται τὸ ἱερόν...*' (No. 480.12-13). Those works did not concern the temple itself (Günther, 1971: 32 n. 34; Schaaf, 1992: 26 n. 144).

396 Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 31-47; Kleiner, 1968: 61-62; Coulton, 1976: 63, 261, Schaaf, 1992: 26-36.

397 Gerkan, 1925b: 130; Coulton, 1976: 261; Schaaf, 1992: 27; see contra Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 26-27.

398 See contra Gerkan, 1925b: 130-131.

399 Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 43-44 figs. 38-39.

400 Coulton, 1976: 145. Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 29.

The two decrees from Didyma related to the construction of the stoa stress that Antiochus' donation was motivated by his wish to follow the example of his father as a benefactor of the sanctuary,[403] and might indicate that the initiative belonged to him also. The fact, however, that not just the sanctuary but the city as well had a significant gain in the form of a monumental and highly utilitarian and profitable public building, would speak for an increased interest and perhaps also for a suggestion on behalf of Miletus that a donation of this sort would be most desirable to the city.[404] The Milesian Demodamas, close associate of the Seleucid royal house whose name appears in both decrees,[405] seems to have been the liaison with a key role in the ensuing negotiations.[406]

The location of the stoa in the city was, of course, an issue of interest to both sides. Antiochus certainly wished the building to stand at the most conspicuous spot possible so that the act of his donation could be better displayed and accentuated. The city's concern, on the other hand, was to serve its practical needs, as well as its plans and ambitions for urban development and architectural appearance. A committee consisting of the architect[407] and representatives of Antiochus[408] was actually assigned to decide the location.[409]

In the early 3rd century many parts of the city remained unbuilt, so there was potentially a variety of locations where the stoa could be erected. The spot selected was in a large free area at the heart of Miletus, where the east-west and north-south zones of the civic centre met forming an inverted L.[410] There, the extremely long building could

---

401 The Didyma decree (Rehm, 1958: No. 479.17-19, cf. n. 409 below) seems to differentiate between the architect and the Seleucid representatives (cf. Orth, 1977: 22 n. 21; Schaaf, 1992: 29; contra Heuss, 1937: 94).

402 Coulton, 1976: 56.

403 Rehm, 1958: Nos. 479.5-10: '*καλῶς ἔχον ε[ἶναι] [ὑπ]ολαμβάν[ων ἐπ]ακολουθεῖν τῆι τοῦ πατ[ρὸς προαιρ]έσε[ι ἐ]π[αγγ]έλ[λε]ται στοὰν οἰκοδο[μήσειν σταδιαίαν*' and 480.10-13: '*συμφιλοτιμῶν τῆι τοῦ πατρὸς Σ[ε]λεύ[κου περὶ τὸ ἱε]ρὸν [π]ροαιρέ[σ]ει οἰκοδομήσειν ἐπηγγ[είλατο στοὰν σταδιαίαν.*'

404 Schaaf, 1992: 33.

405 On Demodamas see Rehm, 1958: 281-282; Günther, 1971: 35; Orth, 1977: 19.

406 According to Schaaf (1992: 33 n. 209), Demodamas was perhaps behind the whole idea.

407 See below.

408 Also unknown if Milesians or foreign (cf. Schaaf, 1992: 29).

409 Rehm, 1958: No 479.16-19: '*δεδόσθαι δὲ αὐτῶι [εἰς τὴν στοὰν] τὸν τόπον, ὃν ἂν ὁ ἀρχιτέκτων [ὁ ἡιρη]μέ[νο]ς μετὰ τῶν ἀνδρῶν, οἷς προστέ[ταχεν] Ἀντίο[χο]ς, ἀποδείξηι.*'

410 Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 21, have suggested that the area may have previously been occupied by houses that had to be demolished (cf. p. 56 and n. 322 above), but this is not supported by evi-

be incorporated into the plan following the orientation of the insulae grid and without disrupting the street network. Even more, by extending along the edge of the civic centre the stoa helped shape and define its eastern limits, just as the prytaneion, the Harbour Stoa and the Delphinium had done on the northern side. On the cross point of the two main city axes, the spot secured that the stoa was in the visual field of everyone approaching the city centre, either coming from the city gates, or the Lion and Theatre Harbours.[411] In addition, the open area intensified the effect of the stoa's monumental size and dominance over its surroundings.[412]

The north-south orientation also brought the stoa to an immediate relation with the route of the Sacred Road, which started at the Delphinium and ran through the civic centre towards the Sacred Gate. With its great length, the building created an impressive architectural scenic background for the procession, the association with which further emphasized its connection to the Didyma sanctuary.[413] On that basis, there could hardly be a location in the city more favourable for the stoa of Antiochus than the one selected.[414]

A long-pending question has been whether a stoa of the size and form of that of Antiochus had been foreseen at this location in the original layout of the new city, and further, if plans also included the two L-shaped stoas that jointly formed the large South Agora. H. Knackfuss believed that the South Agora had been conceived as a whole in the manner of the 'typical Ionian agora' long before it was actually built.[415]

The stoa was, however, a gift by a foreign royal. Even if the subject of the donation and the structural specifications of the building were actually the result of negotiations or request on the city's part, the Didyma decree makes certain that the building's location was not pre-fixed, but decided at that time and with the donor's active involvement.[416] This indicates that despite any pre-existing intentions or plans for this area of the civic centre, and perhaps for a 'South Agora,' the exact form and location in

---

dence from the excavation (Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 2; cf. Hesberg, 1990: 233 n. 8; Schaaf, 1992: 30).

411 Hesberg, 1990: 233.

412 Schaaf, 1992: 29.

413 Schaaf, 1992: 30.

414 Hesberg, 1990: 233; Schaaf, 1992: 30.

415 Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 2.

416 See n. 409 above.

which the latter was actually materialized could not have predated the erection of the stoa, but necessarily followed it, perhaps even as a direct consequence.[417]

The sequence of structures in the area supports such a view. The stoa of Antiochus stood alone in the area for many decades before the first L-shaped stoa – probably the south – was built, and perhaps a century before the second came to complete the rectangle. The position of the bouleuterion, another donation, appears to have been a significant factor in the final arrangement of space as well.[418]

The remarkable size of the stoa was not only its most distinctive attribute, but clearly also a key factor that determined its location and incorporation into the city plan, as well as its effect and consequences on the architectural development of the Milesian civic centre. As has been pointed out,[419] the length of one stade (189.2m), quite pompously prescribed by the donor himself,[420] had not been very common until then and was often the result of a stoa's immediate connection with a stadium or actual use as a covered running track (*ξυστὸς*).[421]

According to H. Schaaf, functional reasons must have played an important role in determining the stoa's size,[422] but they were certainly not the only ones. The significance of the location or the function was another important factor,[423] directly related to the pursuit of monumentality and grandeur, which contrary to the Archaic and Classical periods in the Hellenistic concentrated increasingly on secular architecture.[424] Over-dimensioned public buildings, especially stoas and stoa-complexes, became a popular means of monumental expression in both poleis and royal capitals, and the favourite

---

[417] Schaaf, 1992: 31-32. Cf. pp. 76 and 97 below.

[418] See below.

[419] Hesberg, 1981: 93; Schaaf, 1992: 28.

[420] See n. 403 above.

[421] Delorme, 1960: 195; Coulton, 1976: 12. E.g. those at Olympia (Mallwitz, 1972: 284-289; Coulton, 1976: 268), Delphi (Jannoray and Ducoux, 1953: 36-40, 83; Coulton, 1976: 234, 236), Cos (Delorme, 1960: 120-121; Coulton, 1976: 248), Priene (see p. 166 below), and perhaps also the stoas of the Great Gymnasium at Pergamum (Delorme, 1960: 172; Radt, 1999: 120-124).

[422] Schaaf, 1992: 28; cf. Hesberg, 1990: 237. The more room for shops provided by the stoa, the higher the revenue and funds raised for the Didyma sanctuary. Characteristic in this respect is the fact that the shops occupied two thirds of the building's depth, for which reason Coulton, 1976: 6-7, has placed it in the category of non-'proper' stoas.

[423] Coulton, 1976: 1; Schaaf, 1992: 28 and n. 165.

[424] Lauter, 1986: 10-11; Hesberg, 1981: 82-96, esp. 86 and 1990: 231, 238-241.

subject of donations by Hellenistic monarchs.[425] In Miletus itself, the stoa of Antiochus was to set the precedent for more over-100m long buildings to follow.

As far as monumentality is concerned, the specific length of 'one stade' for stoas or other structures and complexes appears to have been of significant symbolic-psychological value as well, in the same way the 'hundred feet' had been for temples (*ἑκατόμπεδοι ναοί*) in Archaic and Classical times.[426] Without doubt, the length of one stade, consistently underlined in the Didyma decrees, was intended to distinguish the Antiochus Stoa as a building of status and prestige for Miletus, and to enhance its value and effect as a royal donation.[427] The fact that the stoa of Antiochus may have been one of the earliest, if not the earliest '*στοὰ σταδιαία*' whose length was not dependent upon a connection to a gymnasium or stadium,[428] accentuates this point even further.

During the first half of the 3rd century, Miletus found itself in constantly alternating spheres of influence.[429] At the time of the donation the city was dependent on Demetrius Poliorcetes, who had maintained power despite his father's defeat and death at Ipsus in 301.[430] Control later also passed to Ptolemy I and Lysimachus. Antiochus I managed to become stephanephorus in 280/79,[431] but longer-term Seleucid rule was only established in 259/8 by Antiochus II Theos.[432] In this period of uncertainty as to the outcome of their struggle for power, all Successors had a keen interest in maintaining good relations with the poleis of Ionia, and increasing their own influence at the expense of their adversaries. In the case of Miletus, although Demetrius was in control of the city, after Ipsus he was too weak to exercise it authoritatively. Seleucus I and his son Antiochus took advantage of the opportunity to strengthen their ties with Miletus.[433]

---

[425] Coulton, 1976: 14, 54, 56; Hesberg, 1990: 238-241.

[426] See Hesberg, 1981: 93-96; Tölle-Kastenbein, 1994: 131-133.

[427] According to Steuben, 1981, colossal buildings in general appear to have been particularly favoured by the Seleucids.

[428] Perhaps only the '*ξυστὸς*' at Delphi is earlier, dating from 334/3 (Jannoray and Ducoux, 1953: 36-40, 83; Coulton, 1976: 234, 236).

[429] On the political circumstances of the donation and the general historical setting see Schaaf, 1992: 33-35.

[430] In 295/4 he also held the office of stephanephorus (Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 123.22).

[431] Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 123.37; Kleiner, 1968: 18-19.

[432] Kleiner, 1968: 18-19; Günther, 1971: 53 and n. 18.

[433] On the relations between Miletus and the Seleucids cf. Orth, 1977: 17-32, 153-158.

After 301, the Seleucids were able to promote their political aims and royal image through a series of benefactions.[434] The return of the Apollo statue, work of Canachus, which had been abducted during the Persian Wars[435] and the support of the Temple's construction by Seleucus, as well as the indirect financing of the Didyma sanctuary by Antiochus through the donation of the stoa to Miletus were both part of this effort.[436] Seleucus wished to assert and advertise his special relationship with Apollo and his Oracle,[437] which he claimed had greeted him as King before the battle of Gaza in 312.[438] With the donation of the stoa, Antiochus skilfully presented himself a benefactor of both the sanctuary and the city at the same time. In doing so, he not only managed to give rise to pro-Seleucid sentiments, but through the long-lasting effect of his donation he also made sure that his beneficence would be constantly appreciated and remembered.[439]

Miletus, on the other hand, had every reason to rejoice as well. Long-term funding for the works at Didyma was secured, and the city itself obtained an impressive monumental building that increased its prestige while promoting financial activities. Most importantly, however, the donation testified to the high value and importance of Miletus in the power struggle of the Successors that obliged them to court the city and seek to maintain good relations with it. Within this context, Miletus was able to achieve a certain degree of much valued autonomy and self-determination.[440] Thus, in the eyes of the civic community the stoa was a monument to the high standing of Miletus among the poleis of Ionia, and beyond that of its significance to the power balance of the Hellenistic states, which allowed it to be an ally (ἑταῖρος) rather than merely a vassal of the kings.[441] The relation was reciprocal: To the kings who approached the city with be-

---

[434] Günther, 1971: 36; Schaaf, 1992: 35.

[435] Paus., 1.16.3. Cf. Günther, 1971: 39-43.

[436] Günther, 1971: 37.

[437] Cf. Günther, 1971: 71-74 on the alleged descendance of the Seleucids from Apollo.

[438] Diod. Sic., 19.90.4; cf. Günther, 1971: 70. The fact that the Oracle was supposed to have also verified Alexander's divine descendance was certainly not an unrelated precedent (see Günther, 1971: 21).

[439] Schaaf, 1992: 36.

[440] Cf. Orth, 1977: 30-32.

[441] Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 36.

neficence, this responded with the bestowment of honours.[442] The Oracle legitimized the kings' actions with its utterances, and they returned the favour with gifts.

Among the honours granted to Antiochus by the Milesian demos, as recorded in the Didyma decrees, was the premier seat in the festivities for Dionysus in Miletus and the games at Didyma.[443] It is an interesting coincidence that at about the same time,[444] a marble Ionic temple in antis[445] was erected in the Dionysus sanctuary replacing the earlier provisional structure[446] (**Pl. 8e-f**). Being much larger than its predecessors (11.5x19.5m), the new temple filled up the small temenos almost completely, indicating an increased interest and a desire for monumentality at that time that exceeded original anticipations for the sanctuary.[447] It is possible, though not attested, that the grant of '*προεδρία*' at the Dionysia was followed by a contribution towards the construction of a new temple by Antiochus.[448]

Later during the first half of the 3rd century, a certain Timarchus managed to take advantage of the unrest in the Ptolemaic royal house and the unstable influence of the contending Successors over Miletus in order to establish himself as tyrant in the city.[449] Timarchus was ousted in 259/8, but not without the intervention of Antiochus II, whose

---

[442] Rehm, 1958: Nos 479.27-31: '*ὅπως δὲ καὶ ἕτερ[οι] προαιρῶντ[αι σπουδά]ζειν περὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν Δι[δύμ]οις κ[αὶ τὸ πλήθος] τὸ Μιλησίων ὁρῶντες τοὺ[ς τοῦ ἱερ]οῦ [εὐεργέ]τας τιμωμένους ὑπὸ τοῦ δ[ήμου*', and 480.14-16: '*ὅπως εἰδῶσιν] πάντες, ὅτι ὁ δῆμ[ος ὁ Μιλησίων τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐπιμέ]λειαν ἔχ[ων διατελεῖ περὶ τοὺς εὐεργετοῦντας τὸν δῆμον].*'

[443] Rehm, 1958: No. 479.36-38. Cf. Günther, 1971: 29-35; Orth, 1977: 22-23.

[444] A terminus ante quem is provided by an inscription with regulations about offerings to the god, surviving in two pieces (Wiegand, 1908: 22; Müller-Wiener, 1977/8: 99-100 and n. 10; Müller- Wiener, Henninger and Koenigs, 1979: 166 and nn. 9-10), which on the basis of the stephanephorus' name is dated to 277/6 (Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: 259 No. 123). On the chronology of the temple cf. Pfrommer, 1989; Rumscheid, 1994: 29-30 and n. 227.

[445] Müller-Wiener, 1977/8: 99-100, 1986c: 122-123 and 1988b: 36-37; Müller-Wiener, Henninger and Koenigs, 1979; Pfrommer, 1989.

[446] See p. 59 and n. 337 above.

[447] On the sanctuary's importance see Real, 1977/8.

[448] Müller-Wiener, 1988b: 36; Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 456[A]. In any case, stylistic differences indicate that the temple's design and construction was independent from the Didyma projects (Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 123; Pfrommer, 1989).

[449] Ziegler, 1937: No. 4; Berve, 1967: 426; Günther, 1971: 51-55; Orth, 1977: 153-158.

assistance was perhaps requested by the Milesians themselves.[450] For the second time in its history, Miletus owed its autonomy to royal intervention.[451]

Half a century after Antigonus Monophthalmus,[452] Miletus once again regained '*[ἐλ]ευθερίαν καὶ δημοκρατίαν παρ[ὰ β]ασ[ιλέως Ἀντι]όχου το[ῦ] Θεοῦ*,'[453] and possibly again a new list of eponymous officials began so as to signify the beginning of a new era.[454] The inscriptions of other cities like Amyzon[455] and Priene[456] are characteristic of the epoch-making importance ascribed to the restoration of freedom and democracy as well.[457] There was, however, an important new parameter in this second liberation of Miletus: the demos exceeded the usual expressions of gratitude through the grant of civic honours and became the first to proclaim Antiochus II a god.[458]

It was probably in the same spirit[459] that a monumental building was also erected in honour of Antiochus' wife, Laodice,[460] in Miletus between 259/8 and 253.[461] Several architectural members of this building were found incorporated in the Justinian city wall in the area of the South Agora, but its exact location, as well as its type and appearance, remain uncertain. Knackfuss' initial reconstruction of a nymphaeum with a

---

[450] According to the inscription on an hydrophorus from Didyma (Rehm, 1958: No. 358), Hippomachus was among the (Seleucid-friendly) Milesisans who participated in the move (Günther, 1971: 54; Orth, 1977: 154-155).

[451] Cf. Orth, 1977: 155-156.

[452] See p. 64 and n. 367 above.

[453] Rehm, 1958: No. 358; Günther, 1971: 54.

[454] Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: 304 n. 4; Orth, 1977: 156 and n. 18.

[455] After the liberation from Rhodes in 166, the list of stephanephoroi started with the phrase '*[στ]εφανηφόροι οἱ γεγονότες ἀφ' οὗ [Κ]ᾶρες ἠλευθερώθησαν*' (Robert, 1954: 309).

[456] Where decrees began with the patriotic motto '*αὐτονόμων ἐόντων Πριηνέων*' after the liberation of the city by Alexander (see next chapter).

[457] Günther, 1971: 53.

[458] App., *Syr.*, 344. Cf. Dittenberger, 1903-5: No 226.7; Rehm, 1958: No 358; Habicht, 1970: 103-105; Günther, 1971: 62-65.

[459] Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 284; Habicht, 1970: 104-105; contra Orth, 1977: 156.

[460] The architrave inscription reads '*[Ὁ δῆμος ὁ Μι]λησίων [βασιλίσσ]ηι Λαοδίκηι*' (Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 282-284, No. 194). Cf. Bringmann et al, 1995: No. 457[A].

[461] A terminus ante quem is set by Antiochus' divorce from Laodice and marriage to Berenice in 253, after which Laodice was deprived of both the royal title and any political influence (Porph., fr. 43). A date before the expulsion of Timarchus and the restoration of democracy is also unlikely. On the chronology cf. Günther, 1971: 65 n. 97; Rumscheid, 1994: 30-31 and n. 230.

portico of Corinthian columns in the front[462] should be revised, as B. Weber has shown, but evidence is not sufficient for a safe alternative.[463] It is likely, however, that the building was part of a sanctuary created in honour of the royal couple,[464] and the possibility of a small temple should perhaps not be excluded.[465] Of particular interest is the use of the Corinthian order,[466] which as will be further discussed below in the case of the bouleuterion, might indicate an involvement of the Seleucid royal house in the construction.

Also around the middle of the 3rd century, another project was initiated at the heart of Miletus. A large L-shaped stoa, two-aisled with Doric outer and Ionic inner colonnades and a series of rooms at the back of its south wing was built opposite the stoa of Antiochus[467] (**Pl. 9 no. 11**). The position, as well as the dimensions and proportions of the new stoa appear to have been in direct relation to the stoa of Antiochus, and perhaps determined by it.[468] Nevertheless, as already discussed,[469] it is questionable whether both projects were parts of a pre-existing plan for the creation of the South Agora. It even remains unclear whether the South Agora was in view at the time of the south stoa's construction, as its northern counterpart followed at a later time and with a different design and dimensions.[470] It could be that – following the pattern already set by the stoa of Antiochus, the Harbour Stoa, the prytaneion and the Delphinium – the new stoa was originally meant to frame the civic centre as a whole on the south-west,

---

462 Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 262-278; cf. Tölle-Kastenbein, 1990: 140-141.

463 Weber, 1989.

464 Kleiner, 1968: 66-67.

465 Weber, 1989: 592.

466 On the building's order see Bauer, 1973; Weber, 1989; Voigtländer, 1975a: 110 n. 284.

467 On the remains and specifications of the stoa see Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 15-29; Coulton, 1976: 261. The original excavators (Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 47, followed by Coulton, 1976: 63) assumed that the south stoa of the South Agora came after the north one, in the same order as the stoas of the North Agora, sometime in the late 3rd or 2nd century. On the basis of recent investigations, however, an inverse building sequence appears more likely (Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 121; cf. Schaaf, 1992: 30 and n. 187).

468 See p. 71 above.

469 See p. 70-71 above.

470 See p. 97 below.

giving it shape and providing it with a distinct limit on this last remaining undefined side.[471]

The remains of a sanctuary with a monumental temple of the late 3rd century and auxiliary structures have been discovered on the top of the Humeitepe hill at the northern edge of the Milesian peninsula.[472] The temple was Ionic (11.5x22.3m) with a four-column prostasis and a deep pronaos.[473] A small structure built some time later immediately south of the temple was perhaps a treasury or estiatorion[474] (**Pl. 10a-b**). A series of miniature hydriae and fragments of kernoi and terracotta figurines indicate that the sanctuary belonged to Demeter.[475] An inscription with divinations by priestesses of Demeter Thesmophorus found on a nearby islet might also be related to this sanctuary.[476] There could also be a connection between the construction of the Humeitepe temple and the roughly contemporary abandonment of another small temenos possibly dedicated to Demeter in the insula east of the Athena Temple.[477]

At the end of the 3rd century, the need for additional commercial space probably led to extension works at the Harbour Stoa.[478] Back to back with its west wing and on uneven ground, a new west-facing stoa with rooms in the rear was built[479] (**Pl. 9 no. 1**). The new structure caused a minor disturbance to the street network in this area as the stoa with its series of back rooms extended over the space originally intended for a street, pushing the latter further west into the adjoining insula. On the remaining part of the insula an east-facing pi-shaped stoa with rooms at the back of its north and south wings was built. The resulting arrangement was very similar, though in smaller scale, to that of the agora of Priene, which by that time had reached its final form.[480]

---

[471] See pp. 62 and 70 above.

[472] Müller-Wiener, 1980: 30-38; 1981: 99-105; 1986c: 121 and 123-128; 1988: 37-41; Pfrommer, 1989: 437; Rumscheid, 1994: 44 No. 150.

[473] Müller-Wiener, 1988: 38.

[474] Müller-Wiener, 1988: 40.

[475] Müller-Wiener, 1988: 40-41; cf. Pfrommer, 1983.

[476] Rehm, 1958: No. 496.

[477] Held, 1993: 375. Cf. p. 60 above.

[478] The date of the new complex is indicated by the forms of the letters – perhaps masons' marks – inscribed on the rear wall (Gerkan, 1922: 91-92; Coulton, 1976: 259).

[479] Gerkan, 1922: 14-16; Coulton, 1976: 259; cf. Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 121.

[480] See chapter on Priene.

7.5 Miletus in the 2nd century

The earliest reference to a gymnasium in Miletus dates from the turn of the century. At first sight, this significant delay in the provision of such an essential element of every Greek polis[481] appears strange, especially if the exceptional achievements of the city in the cultural field during the Archaic times are considered. But, as already seen, the development of Milesian civic architecture in general had a late start, and concentrated first on projects that would promote the city's economy (harbour) as well as on religious structures. Gymnasia and other building programmes aimed to serve functions and activities that could also be held in provisional structures or in the open were perhaps foreseen in the original plans, but considered of lower priority.

By the end of the 3rd century the circumstances had apparently matured, and by the middle of the 2nd Miletus appears to have acquired three gymnasia. A decree of ca. 206-200[482] honoured the citizen Eudemus for his financial contribution to the education of the 'free boys' and instructed that copies of it be placed in the Delphinium and '*ἐν τῆι παιδικῆι παλαίστραι*' of a gymnasium, perhaps also his own donation,[483] where his ancestors were buried according to another decree from Didyma.[484]

Very close to the spot where the inscription was found in the city centre, a building complex known as the gymnasium at the Baths of Capito has been excavated[485] (**Pl. 9 no.13**). This was at first considered to be the Eudemus Gymnasium of the inscription,[486] but the surviving remains are later and date perhaps from the second quarter of the 2nd century.[487] Furthermore, no traces of any graves have been found inside, so the

---

[481] Cf. Paus., 10.4.1.

[482] The decree was traditionally dated to 200/199. M. Wörrle (1988: 431-437) has suggested a date in 206/5). Cf. García Teijeiro, 1986.

[483] Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 145.4,32,84. On the gymnasium of Eudemus cf. Ziebarth, 1914: 2-29.

[484] Rehm, 1958: No. 259.23-31.

[485] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: 1-21.

[486] Wiegand, 1908: 10; cf. Kleiner, 1968: 91-92; Heilmeyer and Rakob, 1973: 25 and n. 43. The complex has also been identified as the gymnasium of Eumenes (Delorme, 1960: 132-133) or even a law court (Lauter, 1986: 136).

[487] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: 20-21; Voigtländer, 1975: 104 and n. 260; Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 122 and n. 6. Cf. Kleiner, 1968: 91-92; Deorme, 1960: 131-133 (mid 2nd); Heilmeyer and Rakob, 1973: 25 and n. 43 (early 2nd).

issue remains open.[488] The original complex of this later gymnasium occupied an insula on the east side of the civic centre, between the Delphinium and the stoa of Antiochus. An Ionic propylon with a 4x2 column prostasis on a tall crepis located on the south side led into a court framed by Doric porticoes on the east, south and west. On the north side, a deep Ionic stoa gave access to the five rooms of the main building, of which the central exedra had a façade with two Corinthian columns in antis (**Pl. 10c-e**).

Epigraphic sources refer to the existence of another gymnasium in the city as well. During the first part of the 2nd century, Miletus received a donation from king Eumenes II of Pergamum consisting in 160.000 medimnoi of wheat – with an estimated value between 100 and 290 talents [489]– to be sold in order to raise the capital, and wood to be used as building material for the construction of a new gymnasium.[490] The Milesian Eirenias was honoured for his mediation with the king, and was also appointed among the curators of this gymnasium.[491]

An indication of the gymnasium's location is given by the surviving part of another decree of the Milesian boule, which refers to Eumenes' benevolence towards the Greeks in general and the Milesians in particular as expressed by the king in a letter concerning an issue presented to him by the same Eirenias, and therefore probably related to the gymnasium.[492] The decree was inscribed on the anta of an Ionic propylon with two columns in antis, the remains of which were found immediately west of the city stadium[493] (**Pls. 11, 12**). This propylon was axially positioned in relation to the stadium but not aligned with its west end, and apparently served to communicate between that and the adjoining building complex, to the peristylar court of which it probably led.[494]

---

[488] Kleiner, 1968: 91-92; cf. Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 121; Rumscheid, 1994: 32. The so-called Heroon III might perhaps be an alternative candidate provided its earliest remains date back to the very late 3rd century as indeed indicated by recent investigations (see n. 676 below).

[489] Herrmann, 1965a: 79-80; Schaaf, 1992: 64-65.

[490] Herrmann, 1965a: 71-90; Bringmann et al., 1995: 346-348 No. 284[E1]: '*δοῦναι τῆι πόλει δωρεὰν πυρῶν μεδίμνων μυριάδας δεκαὲξ εἰς κατασκευὴν γυμνασίου καὶ ξύλωσιν εἰς τὰ δεδηλωμένα τὴν ἱκανὴν.*'

[491] His name appears on a decree from Didyma concerning the celebration of Eumenes' birthday (Rehm, 1958: 288-289 No. 488.20-21; cf. Laum, 1914: No. 129b; Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 286[E]).

[492] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: 150-151 No. 307; cf. Herrmann, 1965a: 104-105; Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 284[E2].

[493] Gerkan, 1921a: 16-32; Kleine, 1986: 135-136; Schaaf, 1992: 62-63.

[494] Gerkan, 1921a: 31; Kleine, 1986: 136; Schaaf, 1992: 63 and n. 434.

The extent and ground plan of this complex are not yet known, and its reconstruction as a north-south oriented rectangular court the size of about two insulae (80x100m) – twice as big as the gymnasium of the Capito Baths – with rooms on the north and the main entrance on the south side is only hypothetical.[495] The direct connection with the stadium, however – an arrangement that finds a close parallel at Priene – makes the interpretation of the complex as a gymnasium very probable. If so, the presence of the decree is a strong indication for the identification of this gymnasium as the one related to the donation of Eumenes.[496]

The close relationship between the gymnasium and the stadium, and especially the axial placement of the propylon, would make sense if the stadium were older than the gymnasium, or perhaps much better, if the two were actually conceived and designed together.[497] The stadium itself with a 192.7m long track, a width of 29.56m (100ft), and rows of seats for about 14400 spectators in the north and south sides,[498] can also not be independently dated. Kleiner believed that its location must have been foreseen in the layout of the new Miletus, but this remains unproven.[499] Unfortunately, there is also no epigraphic reference connecting the stadium with Eumenes, unless the term 'gymnasium' could be considered to incorporate that of the stadium.[500] The high pecuniary value of the donation, which later became even higher as the king agreed to make an additional contribution,[501] could support such a theory.[502]

The date of the donation is not directly definable.[503] It appears that in 167/6 the relations between Eumenes and Miletus were so good as to allow the creation of a temenos for the king in the city, where an honorary statue was set up on decision of the

---

[495] Gerkan, 1921a: 39-40 and 1924: fig. 6. Cf. Kleine, 1986: 136.

[496] Gerkan, 1921a: 39; Herrmann, 1965a: 112; Kleine, 1986: 135; Schaaf, 1992: 62; Rumscheid, 1994: 31.

[497] Gerkan, 1921a: 39-40; Kleine, 1986: 134, 136; Schaaf, 1992: 64.

[498] Gerkan, 1921a: 3-14, 38-39.

[499] Kleiner, 1968: 110.

[500] Kleine, 1986: 137.

[501] Herrmann, 1965a: No. 1.6-7; Kleine, 1986: 130-131.

[502] Cf. Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 459[A].

[503] Rumscheid, 1994: 31.

Ionian League.[504] A pedestal probably belonging to this statue was discovered west of the Athena Temple, about 150m from the supposed site of the gymnasium, and it is in this area that the still unidentified temenos of Eumenes is believed to have been located.[505] It is possible that the temenos and the other honours granted to the king by the city were to a great extent related to the donation regarding the gymnasium,[506] which in this case may have taken place shortly before or in 167/6.[507] How long construction lasted is also uncertain. It seems that at the time of Eumenes' death in 159 the complex was not yet complete, since the body of curators continued to exist.[508]

It is very interesting that at the time of the donation Miletus does not appear to have been in immediate need of a new gymnasium. As already seen, the city had only recently obtained one, or perhaps more likely, two other gymnasia. This, according to H. Schaaf, could indicate that the subject of the donation was specified by the king himself, in agreement with the apparent trend of the Attalids and Hellenistic monarchs in general to support education in Greek cities.[509]

The amount of money, however, that could be raised from the sale of the donated wheat was not fixed but could vary considerably.[510] This would have been incongruous, had the exact size and appearance of the gymnasium been determined by Eumenes. Furthermore, the king does not seem to have exercised direct control or inspection, and there was no special arrangement for the handling of the money, which was administered by the city.[511] Neither is Eumenes known to have put any pressure for the rapid completion of the project, which perhaps went on after his death. One should also not forget that the Rhodians received an even larger quantity of cereal from Eumenes, with

---

[504] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: 144-150 No. 306; Herrmann, 1965a: 103-104; Bringmann, et al., 1995: No. 285[E].

[505] Wiegand and Kekulé v. Stradonitz, 1904: 85-86; Kleine, 1986: 139 and n. 29; Kästner, 1991: 116; Schaaf, 1992: 70. Cf. p. 102 below.

[506] Kleine, 1986: 139. Cf. p. 84 below.

[507] Herrmann, 1965a: 114-117; Kleine, 1986: 137-139; Schaaf, 1992: 66-67.

[508] Rehm, 1958: 288-289 No. 488; Herrmann, 1965a: 105-110; Kleine, 1986: 132-133, 137; Rumscheid, 1994: 31.

[509] Schaaf, 1992: 68-69.

[510] See n. 489 above.

[511] Schaaf, 1992: 66-68.

the income from which to pay the salaries of teachers.[512] In this case as well, the revenues were at the city's free disposal.[513] The fact that Miletus had a free hand could also support the assumed connection between the gymnasium and the stadium, and explain the need for additional money.[514] The Milesians may have decided at the time of construction to broaden the gymnasium project with the addition of the stadium[515] or, vice versa, during the planning of the stadium to build a new gymnasium as well.[516]

As far as the initiative for the king's donation to the city is concerned, the honorary decree for Eirenias is quite illuminating. Eirenias is reported to have induced Eumenes to this gesture acting with the permission of the demos, but on his own initiative.[517] The wording of the decree is delicate and diplomatic. It is made clear that the donation was no spontaneous act of the king, while at the same time a direct statement that the city asked Eumenes for the money is skilfully avoided. The initiative is attributed to Eirenias himself who acted as a mediator, and who had 'permission' but not direct order by the city to approach the king as if on an official state mission.[518]

Only at the second phase of the negotiations and after the king had obviously agreed to make the donation Eirenias acted officially on behalf of the demos as an envoy, conveying the city's intention to express its gratitude through the grant of honours, and request for a raise of the initial amount of the donation.[519] The wish of the city to keep the appearances and avoid a possible embarrassment and humiliation in case of an unfavourable response is evident.

Miletus was not the only city to approach a monarch with a proposition/request for a donation of this kind.[520] A similar request to Attalus II of Pergamum by Delphi

---

[512] The Rhodians were promised 280000 medimnoi (Polyb., 31.31.1-2) but at the time of the king's death 30000 of them had not yet been delivered (Diod. Sic., 31.36). Cf. Ziebarth, 1914: 46; Herrmann, 1965a: 79; Schaaf, 1992: 64-65.

[513] Schaaf, 1992: 64.

[514] See p. 80 and n. 501 above. Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 68 n. 481.

[515] Kleine, 1980: 110.

[516] Schaaf, 1992: 64.

[517] Herrmann, 1965a: No. 1.6: '*κατὰ τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ πλήθους αὐτῶι συνχώρησιν καὶ διὰ τῆς ἰδίας συστάσεως προτρεψάμενος αὐτὸν δοῦναι τῆι πόλει δωρεάν.*'

[518] Cf. Herrmann, 1965a: 78; Schaaf, 1992: 68.

[519] Herrmann, 1965a: No. 1.8-13: '*πρεσβευτὴν ἐξαποστείλαντος Εἰρηνίαν, διαλεγεὶς... καὶ παραστησάμενος αὐτὸν...*'

[520] Cf. Ziebarth, 1914: 45-47.

was remarkably less tentative and discrete.[521] Very well aware of its extraordinary character and status the city could make the first move without fear of losing face,[522] being instead confident that a donation was well deserved (*ἀξιούμενα*) as it would only bring the donor fame and glory.[523] As already mentioned, Rhodes, the leading power of the Ionian League, had no great difficulty also in securing similar donations, among which the one by Eumenes II for the payment of teachers' salaries.

Nevertheless, the results of petitions by less privileged or prominent cities were not always as favourable.[524] Priene managed to extract the promise of an unknown king to fund a new gymnasium project, but the promise was never materialized. Only with the generous and patriotic financial contribution of two Prienean individuals was a solution to the dead-end reached and the city relieved from the frustration.[525] In a similar case, Halicarnassus was probably not even successful in extracting a promise from Ptolemy II or III to support the renovation of its gymnasium.[526]

As shown above, the initiative both to construct a new gymnasium and to seek royal financial assistance for the project should in all likelihood be attributed to the city of Miletus itself. The wish for a third and much more monumental gymnasium – especially if the stadium is considered as part of the same project – only shortly after city had obtained the other two, should not be surprising. Miletus was one of many cities that possessed several gymnasia.[527] A fundamental constituent of the polis and the Greek way of life in the new era, by the 2nd century the gymnasium had become the institution par excellence that displayed and safeguarded Greek tradition and culture, and the building type that best served to express the ambitions of civic communities in monumental form.[528]

---

[521] Laum, 1914: No. 28; Delorme, 1960: 455-456; Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 94[E]: '*βασιλεὺς Ἄτταλος... ἀποστειλάντων ἁμῶν πρέσβεις... ὑπὲρ τᾶς τῶν παίδων διδασκαλίας... ἐπακούσας προθ[ύ]μως τὰ ἀξιούμενα ἀπέστειλε τᾶι πόλει.*'

[522] Schaaf, 1992: 68 and n. 488.

[523] Cf. Daux, 1936: 508-509.

[524] Cf. Quaß, 1993: 199-200.

[525] See p. 166 below.

[526] Usener, 1874: 49; Ziebarth, 1914: 47; Schaaf, 1992: 68 n. 488.

[527] E.g., at the end of the Hellenistic period Pergamum had five (Radt, 1999: 113). Cf. Delorme, 1960: 465; cf. Schaaf, 1992: 69-70.

[528] Hesberg, 1995. Cf. last chapter.

For the same reasons, financial support for the construction or renovation of gymnasia and the costly functions related to them and the educational system in general with which the cities often found it hard to cope became the favourite field for the expression of royal beneficence. By supporting the institution of the gymnasium in Miletus as well as in other Greek poleis and his own capital, Eumenes – like the other Attalids and Hellenistic monarchs[529]– presented himself not only as a patron of the letters and arts, but most importantly, as a champion and guardian of the Greek culture and way of life, and a rightful leader of the Greeks.[530]

At the time of the donation – after the peace of Apamea in 188 – Miletus was autonomous and free from tribute. The city had the rare opportunity to exercise its own foreign policy and wished to maintain balanced relations with both the Attalids and the Seleucids.[531] There was little doubt, however, that the greatest power was in the hands of Eumenes II, who led the war against the Gauls. The whole Ionian League turned to him, and Miletus had every reason to follow suit.[532] Eumenes also wished to promote his relations with the city. When the Ionian League voted a golden statue for the king,[533] he chose to have it erected in the temenos created for him in Miletus,[534] underlining his special ties with the city due to the fact that his mother Apollonis originated from Cyzicus, a Milesian colony.[535] The donation towards the construction of the gymnasium was most probably part of this policy, and the honours to the king related to it.[536]

The establishment of a state cult for Eumenes after the initial cautiousness, on the other hand, despite the 'devotion' and accord it definitely implied as a political act,[537] should not be considered as an indication of the city's subjection, but as a grant of the

---

[529] Cf. n. 1411 below.

[530] Rostovtzeff, 1953: 33, 35; Delorme, 1960: 415; Schaaf, 1992: 70.

[531] Cf. the discussion on the bouleuterion below.

[532] In 168/7 Miletus also suffered from the raids of the Gauls (Holleaux, 1938: II, 153-176; Rehm, 1958: No. 142; Habicht, 1960: 151-152).

[533] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: 144-150 No. 306.30-37. Cf. p. 81 and n. 504 above.

[534] See p. 81 and n. 505 above.

[535] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: 144-150 No. 306.60-68.

[536] Kleine, 1986: 139; Schaaf, 1992: 66-67, 70-71. The honours granted to the king followed the donation (Herrmann, 1965a: 111-112) but preceded his final victory over the Gauls (Holleaux, 1938: II,153-176).

[537] Schaaf, 1992: 71.

greatest in the rank of honours[538] in return for the king's equally benevolent policy.[539] Miletus was first to grant such exceptional honours to Eumenes[540] due to the special treatment it received among the cities of the Ionian League.[541]

The Milesian community considered its relations with the king to be bilateral, and wished to be a free ally and active partner, not merely a subordinate and passive recipient of royal benefactions.[542] Characteristic in this respect is the fact that the citizen Eirenias – the envoy who played the leading role in the negotiations – was honoured by the city with a gilded statue that appears to have been bigger than that of Eumenes.[543] This shows that Miletus wished to consider the donation not as a gift, but as the gain of its successful foreign policy. Characteristically, in the parallel case of Rhodes again, while Polybius considered the royal donation towards the payment of teachers' salaries a blow to the city's dignity and independence,[544] Diodorus praised it as a result of the provident and sagacious Rhodian policy that led monarchs to compete against each other in benefactions towards the city, and brought about many more profits than the honours granted to them.[545]

In the same spirit one should also examine the building complex of the Milesian bouleuterion, which was constructed at about the same time as the gymnasium of Eumenes, and was the subject of yet another donation. Two identical inscriptions on the architraves of the meeting hall and the propylon recorded that the bouleuterion was dedicated by the Milesian brothers Timarchus and Heracleides[546] '*ὑπὲρ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου Ἐπιφανοῦς Ἀπόλλωνι Διδυμεῖ καὶ Ἑστίαι Βουλαίαι καὶ τῶι δήμωι*'[547] (**Pl. 16f**).

---

[538] Cf. Taeger, 1957: 257.

[539] Cf. Habicht, 1970: 206-213.

[540] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: 144-150 No. 306.63-64: '*τῆς πόλεως μόνης τῶν Ἰάδων μέχρι τοῦ παρόντος τέμενος ἀναδεδειχοίας ἡμῖν.*'

[541] Schaaf, 1992: 71.

[542] Schaaf, 1992: 72.

[543] Herrmann, 1965a: 72.

[544] Polyb., 31.31.1-3.

[545] Diod. Sic., 31.36. Cf. Gauthier, 1993: 214-215.

[546] On the two brothers see Otto, 1913; Ziegler, 1937: No. 5; Olshausen, 1974: Nos. 148, 153; Herrmann, 1987: 171-173; Schaaf, 1992: 53-54; Rumscheid, 1994: 31.

[547] Knackfuss, et al., 1908: 95-100 Nos. 1-2.

The reign of Antiochus IV sets the chronological span for the dedication between 175-164.

A bouleuterion in Miletus is, nevertheless, mentioned already in an inscription dating from 182,[548] and could perhaps be implied in even earlier ones.[549] Although no further evidence for an 'old' bouleuterion survives, the possibility of a predecessor of the 2nd century building in the same or a different location exists.[550]

The (new) Milesian bouleuterion was an elaborate and monumental architectural complex consisting of a meeting hall at the west end, and a court with a propylon to the east[551] (**Pls. 13-16**) The axially designed propylon with a prostasis of four Corinthian columns on a three-step crepis, crowned by an Ionic entablature with a relief weapon frieze,[552] led through three doors and two more Corinthian columns in antis to the almost square court, which was framed by Doric porticoes on the north, east and south. Four doors, two directly from the court and two from the porticoes, gave access to the meeting hall that comprised a semicircular cavea, a small orchestra and a vestibule separated from it by tall parodus walls. Access to the top of the cavea was also possible from the street behind the building via a pair of staircases. Four Ionic columns supported the roof of the hall, whose walls were divided both inside and outside into two storeys.[553] The lower was plain, while the upper had a rich architectural ornamentation consisting of a series of semi-columns in antis and and entablature with mixed Ionic and Doric elements. In the intercolumnia there were relief shields, perhaps alternating in some way with windows.

The character and especially the date of a rectangular structure axially positioned almost in the middle of the court remain problematic (**Pl. 13b**). Relief plaques with an ox-head and garland frieze, a weapon frieze, and also figure reliefs with mythical

---

[548] Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 149.12.

[549] Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 37.f.90; Knackfuss et al., 1908: No. 12.12. Cf. Tuchelt, 1975: 98.

[550] Gerkan, 1922: 87, 90, believed that the Milesian boule met at the same spot, either in open air or perhaps in a modest structure, the traces of which may have been obliterated by the later monumental complex. Cf. Tuchelt, 1975: 98; Schaaf, 1992: 60.

[551] Knackfuss et al., 1908; Krischen, 1941: 7-12, 15; Kleiner, 1968: 77-88; Meinel, 1980: 167-169; Schaaf, 1992: 37-38; Lawrence and Tomlinson, 1996: 355-357.

[552] Doubts whether the frieze actually belonged to the propylon have been expressed by Tuchelt, 1975: 132 n. 179.

[553] Cf. Tuchelt, 1975: 109-114.

scenes probably belonged to it.[554] At first the foundations were thought to have been those of the bouleuterion altar,[555] and later of a heroon-tomb.[556] More recent examination of the remains seems to confirm the reconstruction of an altar with a sort of sacrificial table enclosed on the three sides by walls bearing architectural and sculptural decoration.[557] Dates ranging from the mid 2nd century B.C. to the mid 2nd century A.D. have been proposed for the structure on the basis of a different consideration of its incorporation into the complex and stylistic analysis of the reliefs.[558] That the altar was a later addition to the bouleuterion complex,[559] perhaps an 'Ara Augusti,'[560] appears more likely. The possibility, however, that an original – contemporary with the rest of the complex – altar may have been converted to an 'Ara Augusti' at a later time cannot be excluded.[561]

The location chosen for the new bouleuterion of Miletus was at almost the exact middle of the civic centre (**Pl. 9 no. 7**). As it is uncertain if a predecessor had existed on the same or different spot, one cannot tell whether this location had been foreseen in the original layout of the city to serve this specific purpose. The natural elevation of the ground in that particular area[562] facilitated the construction of the hall cavea and must have played a role in the selection of the site, but not necessarily a decisive one.[563]

In this key position at the heart of the city, in the midst of a spacious area and on a natural terrace that added to its conspicuousness, the bouleuterion stood pretty much isolated and independent, both from the South Agora – which had perhaps recently been formed or was formed at about the same time with the erection of the north L-

---

554 Knackfuss et al., 1908: 87-90.

555 Wiegand, 1901 and 1902.

556 Knackfuss, et al., 1908: 73-79.

557 Tuchelt, 1975: 128-136.

558 See review by Tuchelt, 1975: 121 n. 131 and also Linfert, 1976: 180-184; Köster, 1987: Chap. II.2; Günther, 1989: 175; Rumscheid, 1994: 258.

559 Schaaf, 1992: 39, considers the altar contemporary with the second building phase of the bouleuterion and associates it with the addition of a new central door to the meeting hall. Cf. Knackfuss et al., 1908: 37; Tuchelt, 1975: 96: Günther, 1989: 175.

560 Tuchelt, 1975: 136-140; Günther, 1989: 175.

561 Linfert, 1995: 139.

562 On the topography of the area see Gerkan, 1922: 87.

563 Knackfuss et al., 1908: 1-2; Tuchelt, 1975: 99.

shaped stoa[564] that completed the frame set out by its southern counterpart and the stoa of Antiochus – and the northern part of the civic centre.[565] Characteristic in this respect is the fact that on the west and south sides the complex adhered to the street network, but on the north and east it extended beyond insula limits, an indication that it was not designed with the grid system strictly in mind.[566]

The independence from grid plan and neighbouring building complexes, the central, elevated position, and also the inherent introversion and seclusiveness of the compound's design indicate that the bouleuterion was conceived – very much in agreement with its character as a donation – as a self-standing monument in the civic centre of Miletus.[567] Furthermore, it was intended to be viewed as such, especially from the square-like open area formed along the route of the great ceremonial Sacred Road in front of it, on which the contemporary and of similar design gymnasium also faced.[568]

As opposed to the modesty and often inconspicuousness that appears to have characterized civic buildings in earlier periods,[569] the desire for a demonstration of 'civil and urban quality'[570] that developed during Hellenistic times brought about a tendency towards monumental and architecturally elaborate council halls.[571] The bouleuterion of Miletus belonged to a series of monumental stone meeting halls that are known from the end of the 3rd and the beginning of the 2nd centuries onwards, nearly all of them in Asia Minor[572] (**Pl. 17**).

Within this series, the Milesian building incorporated to the highest degree all those elements of design and construction that conferred class and monumentality: size,

---

564 See below.

565 Tuchelt, 1975: 99-100; Schaaf, 1992: 51, 54.

566 Tuchelt, 1975: 99. The expansion towards the north but not the south side might indicate that the north stoa of the South Agora was already under construction or planned (cf. p. 97 and n. 631 below). Cf. the interesting parallel of the bouleuterion of Priene.

567 Gerkan, 1922: 92; Tuchelt, 1975: 100; Schaaf, 1992: 54.

568 Cf. Tuchelt, 1975: 101.

569 Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 37-44; Kockel, 1995: 30-31. Cf. last chapter.

570 Hesberg, 1990: 234; cf. Schaaf, 1992: 45.

571 Tuchelt, 1975; 102-120; Lauter, 1986: 82-84; Herman-Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 84-86; Kockel, 1995.

572 E.g. the bouleuteria of Priene, Heraclea by Latmus, Notium, Assus, Alabanda and Termessus. For a comparative discussion of the position of the Milesian building within this series and the development of the architectural type in general see Tuchelt, 1975: 102-114; Schaaf, 1992: 40-51. Cf. last chapter.

quality of material and construction, round stone cavea, two-storey height particularly emphasized both in the interior and the exterior,[573] rich architectural ornamentation with the use of mixed orders.[574] The peristylar court with the axially positioned propylon was an additional unique feature.[575] The use of façade-architecture, the axial symmetry of the composition, the unified design, the self-enclosed and self-standing character, made the bouleuterion of Miletus stand out not only from earlier, but from later examples of the type as well. In fact, the Milesian building had no successors.[576]

The uncertainty concerning the existence of an earlier bouleuterion at Miletus complicates the problem of motivation and initiative behind the act of the donation. There may have been no council house in the city prior to the 2nd century, an earlier building may have been old or damaged and in need of replacement, provisional or too small and modest to serve the needs and monumental ambitions of Miletus. Whether the city needed a bouleuterion, wanted a new and more prestigious one, was just offered one for free or all of the above one cannot tell.

Furthermore, the inclusion of the name of Antiochus IV in the dedicatory inscriptions under the somewhat ambiguous formula '*ὑπὲρ βασιλέως Ἀντιόχου Ἐπιφανοῦς*,' which besides 'in honour'[577] or 'to the well-being of'[578] could also mean 'in the name'[579] or 'on behalf'[580] of the king,[581] has for a long time caused disagreement as to the nature and extent of the king's involvement – if any – in the donation of the bouleuterion. Certain scholars have considered Antiochus to be the direct or indirect donor of

---

[573] Krischen, 1941: 20-21; Tuchelt, 1975: 109-114; Schaaf, 1992: 47-48.

[574] Tuchelt, 1975: 115-116; Schaaf, 1992: 49.

[575] Tuchelt, 1975: 114; Schaaf, 1992: 49-50.

[576] Schaaf, 1992: 51. On the possible similarities with the Seleucid bouleuterion at Antioch on the Orontes see below.

[577] Otto, 1913: 466; Ziegler, 1937: 1238; Lenschau, 1940; Herrmann, 1965a: 86 n. 49; Kneppe, 1989.

[578] Kyrieleis, 1975: 146; Quass, 1993: 105-106.

[579] Hommel, 1976: 321 n. 5; Kockel, 1995: 31 n. 12.

[580] Kneppe, 1989: 40.

[581] Schaaf (1992: 37) translates '*ὑπὲρ*' as 'for,' understood as a disguised 'in the name' or 'on behalf of.'

the building,[582] while others have instead ascribed it to the initiative of the two Milesian brothers or have been generally reluctant to take a stand.[583]

The phrasing of the inscriptions and the absence of further evidence would allow both possibilities.[584] On the one hand, the two brothers may have acted as mediators between the city and Antiochus. They could have either conveyed the king's intention to make a donation, which subsequently the city decided to direct towards the construction of the bouleuterion, or they could have passed on to the king the city's request for the donation of a bouleuterion or contribution towards the cost of the project in a way similar to that of the 'gymnasium of Eumenes.' On the other hand, the donation may have simply been a matter between the city and the two brothers, with the king's name mentioned by the dedicators for their own purposes.

The special character of the bouleuterion as a type of public building is a crucial parameter to the understanding of the donation. Irrespective of constitution, almost all Greek poleis must have had a bouleuterion for the meetings of the boule.[585] As a core of political life, one would expect the bouleuterion to be the architectural symbol par excellence of the city's self-determination.[586] In this respect, the relief shields often encountered as part of the exterior decoration of council halls could allude to the role of the boule as champion of civic autonomy.[587] The psychological value of the bouleuterion to the self-consciousness and identity of the civic community must have consequently been high, making the building a monument of civic pride.[588]

The donation of a public building by an individual, citizen or king – an act that in the Classical period had appeared offensive to the corporatism of the polis – was common practice in Hellenistic times, but usually involved stoas, market courts, gymnasia,

---

[582] Knackfuss et al., 1908; Kleiner, 1968: 19 and 1973/4: 119; Williams, 1974: 412-414; Schaaf, 1992: 37-61.

[583] For an extensive bibliography on the issue see Schaaf, 1992: 37 n. 236; Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 458[A]; Rehm and Herrmann, 1997: 155 Nos. 1-2.

[584] Rehm and Herrmann, 1997: 155 Nos. 1-2.

[585] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 37.

[586] There appears to have been no standard architectural setting for the meetings of the second pole of political life, the ecclesia of the demos, which convened in the open, in special ecclesiasteria, in theatres or gymnasia (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 44-75).

[587] Tuchelt, 1975: 112; Schaaf, 1992: 47 and n. 319. Besides Miletus, shields appear also in Heraclea (Krischen, 1941: 28) and Sagalassus (Mitchell and Waelkens, 1987: 40-42), and are reported by Pausanias (6.23.7) to have existed also at Elis.

[588] Cf. Kockel, 1995: 36.

nymphaea or other structures of practical and decorative function. Of these, as Schaaf has pointed out, a city could possess many, though only one bouleuterion.[589] Furthermore, in contrast to the rather 'neutral' character of those buildings, the bouleuterion was, as already noted, particularly 'charged.' For a citizen to donate a bouleuterion was a great patriotic act that brought about high honour,[590] but also a rather exceptional one.[591]

That the dedicators of the Milesian bouleuterion, Timarchus and Heracleides, were motivated by love and affection for their home city too, can of course not be dismissed, neither can the possibility that they just wished to promote their own status and prestige in Miletus by means of the generous donation, and in the Seleucid court by flattering the king through the mentioning of his name in the dedication.[592] One expects both cases to be true to some extent. The two brothers, however, were no ordinary wealthy individuals. Although Milesians in origin, they had been brought up together with Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Rome, and later became the king's confidants and high-ranking officials.[593] On that basis – taking also into consideration that they probably lived most of their lives away from Miletus – one would expect that they were likely to be much more loyally attached to the Seleucid court than to their home city.[594] In any case, it is very doubtful that they would have ever proceeded with an act capable of affecting the relations between the king and such an important Greek polis of Ionia as Miletus without consulting with him first and securing at least his consent.[595]

---

589 Schaaf, 1992: 59-60.

590 In Cyme Archippe received high honours and her name was inscribed on the bouleuterion she donated, because with her zeal '*τὴν πατρίδα καλλίονα καὶ ἐπιφανεστέραν καθέστακεν*' (Engelmann, 1976: No. 13.35-36; Pleket et al., 1983: Nos. 1035-1041, esp. 1036.15-18, 1037.15, 1039.30, 1040.2-6). Cf. Kockel, 1995: 36.

591 Besides Miletus, the bouleuteria of Cyme (see above) Elis ('*Λαλίχμιον*' Paus., 6.23.7) and Megalopolis ('*Θερσίλιον*' Paus., 8.32.1) are known to have been donated by individuals during the Hellenistic times, with the addition of those at Pinara (Wurster and Wörrle, 1978: 91-93) and Aegae (Bohn and Schuchardt, 1889: 33-34; McDonald, 1943: 166-167; Miller, 1978: 225-226; Kockel, 1995: 31; interestingly, the dedication by Antiphon to Zeus Boulaeus, Hestia Boulaea and the Demos seems like a copycat of that of Miletus) in Roman imperial times. Cf. McDonald, 1943: 277-278; Schaaf, 1992: 60 n. 412; Kockel, 1995: 36.

592 Cf. Günther, 1994: 481.

593 Timarchus was general governor of the eastern provinces and Heracleides minister of finances (App., *Syr.*, 45; Diod., 31.27.1). On the two brothers see n. 546 above.

594 Schaaf, 1992: 53.

595 Cf. Rostovtzeff, 1953: 669.

Regardless of who was the actual donor or to whom the initiative belonged, the mentioning alone of Antiochus' name in the dedication automatically placed the donation within the wider context of the relations between the city and the king. That the name of a monarch – by definition the greatest threat to polis autonomy and self-determination – was inscribed on the bouleuterion should normally be perceived as a direct and severe blow to the identity of the civic community.[596] And on the Milesian bouleuterion the name of Antiochus appeared not once but twice, above the entrance to both the courtyard and the meeting hall.

This would be perfectly understandable as a symbolic act confirming the king's dominance over the city, if only Miletus had been under direct Seleucid control at that time. But as already seen, after the peace of Apamea the city enjoyed a rare interval of actual autonomy and independence, being free from tribute and able to maintain good and balanced relations with both the Attalids and the Seleucids.[597] Under the circumstances, it seems unlikely that Miletus was forced to accept the content of the dedicatory inscription, but probably consented to it. This indicates that the political context and general spirit of the donation and the dedication were not considered by the Milesian demos to pose a threat to the city's autonomy or an offence to its pride and prestige.

The wording of the inscription could be illuminating in this respect. Supposing that Antiochus was the actual donor of the bouleuterion, what becomes immediately striking is the fact that dedicators of the building – and therefore apparently responsible for the act of the donation – were the two brothers and not the king himself whose name is mentioned in second place. Such reserve or restraint on Antiochus' part may have been dictated by diplomatic purposes. The peace of Apamea had confirmed as the leading figure in Asia Minor Eumenes II of Pergamum, with whom Antiochus was in good political and economic relations,[598] being also obliged to him for his support in succeeding Seleucus IV to the throne.[599] Perhaps Antiochus did not wish to appear antago-

---

[596] Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 54.

[597] Schaaf, 1992: 51-53; cf. p. 84 above.

[598] Herrmann, 1965a: 86; Schaaf, 1992: 52-53; cf. Rostovtzeff, 1939: 295-297.

[599] App., *Syr.*, 45; Fränkel, 1890: No. 160; Herrmann, 1965a: 86 n. 46; Schaaf, 1992: 52.

nizing and ungrateful to Eumenes by intervening in an area within his sphere of influence.[600]

Antiochus may have thus considered preferable to exercise a policy of discreet and considerate approach towards Miletus. According to the Eirenias decree, the king facilitated the city's trade by granting exemption from duty to Milesian products in the Seleucid kingdom.[601] By donating the bouleuterion he could again appear benevolent, displaying reassuring respect and recognition of the city's autonomy and political self-determination as well. This statement would have been further accentuated by the architectural grandeur and monumentality of the complex.[602]

At the same time, by putting himself in second place and allowing his Milesian officials to appear as dedicators, the king could also appear tactful and inoffensive to the city's pride and prestige.[603] This could also be the reason why the building was dedicated to Apollo Didymeus – an expression of reverence for the city's patron god and at the same time a hint to the strong relationship and previous benefactions of the Seleucids to both sanctuary and city – and to Hestia Boulaea – showing deference to the institution of the boule itself – before it was dedicated to the Milesian demos. Characteristically in this respect, it is known that Antiochus often preferred the apparel of a citizen to the royal one, associated himself with the citizens of his capital, and in an effort to present his rule less authoritarian he arranged to be elected to various offices.[604] He is even known to have built a bouleuterion in his capital Antioch,[605] in order to show his respect for traditional polis institutions and civic ideals.[606]

At this point it should be noted that such a display of 'humility' or restraint on Antiochus' part would be hard to explain, had it been Miletus itself that resorted to him for a donation in the first place. In this case, Antiochus would have had every reason to seize the opportunity and pompously dedicate the building himself, capitalizing on the occasion in order to underline his role as benefactor and patron of the city. Further-

---

[600] Schaaf, 1992: 53-54.

[601] Herrmann, 1965a: 73 Nos. II-III.2-3.

[602] Schaaf, 1992: 60.

[603] Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 54, 60.

[604] Polyb., 26.1; Diod. Sic., 29.32; cf. Schaaf, 1992: 60.

[605] Malalas, 205.14-16, 234.2.

[606] Cf. Hesberg, 1990: 234.

more, on the basis of what has already been said about the symbolism of the bouleuterion, it is very unlikely that Miletus would have compromised its pride and dignity with such an act in the particular circumstances.

Within this context, the manner of the dedication could indicate that Antiochus, being aware of his limited influence potential in the current framework of political relations and power equilibrium, may have attempted to win over the Milesian demos by approaching and addressing it as a friendly and willing partner and ally.[607] This reassurance would have enabled the Milesians to accept the donation as an act that did not offend their sovereignty, but on the contrary appeared to verify and confirm it. The fact that Antiochus IV – like Eumenes II in the same period – had thought necessary to court the city with benefactions instead of trying to reduce it to submission would have boosted the feeling of self-confidence and consolidated the identity of the Milesian civic community. In this respect, the fact that the bouleuterion was a royal donation would have enhanced rather than impaired its role as a monument to the city's autonomy and independence.

The same should generally apply also if the donation of the bouleuterion was actually a matter between the city and the two brothers. As already pointed out, irrespective of the personal agendas underlying the act of Timarchus and Heracleides – '*φιλοτιμία*,' patriotism, display of status and prestige, desire to be pleasing to the king – there was another side to the donation as well, that of political propaganda in the knowledge, if not under the auspices and the endorsement, of Antiochus himself.[608] Most importantly, it would have certainly appeared so to the Milesians as soon as the intention to include the king's name in the dedication was expressed, even if the two brothers had appeared to operate as private individuals and not as official agents of the king.[609]

Two further issues concerning the Milesian bouleuterion also related to the question of patronage are those of the possible connection – in terms of design and construction – with the bouleuterion reported by the chronographer Johannes Malalas (5th/6th

---

[607] Schaaf, 1992: 60.

[608] Herrmann, 1965a: 86 n. 49.

[609] Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 54.

century A.D.) to have been built by Antiochus in his capital Antioch on the Orontes,[610] and the use of the Corinthian order in the propylon.

The first issue was raised already by Wiegand in the publication of the building[611] and was later more extensively treated by Tuchelt and Schaaf.[612] According to a description by Libanius (4th century A.D.), the bouleuterion of Antioch was a roofed theatre-like hall with a peristylar forecourt, inside which there was a garden full of all sorts of fruit trees and vegetables.[613] Since this feature appears so far to have been exclusive to the Milesian building and is not known from other bouleuteria, it could indeed point towards a connection between Miletus and Antioch. As no remains of a council hall have yet been revealed in Antioch, however, this possibility remains unverifiable. One should also treat those late literary sources with caution, especially since they indicate that the Antiochean building was repeatedly damaged or destroyed and subsequently rebuilt.[614]

On the other hand, it has been pointed out[615] that of the few buildings in Asia Minor where the Corinthian order was used in the 3rd and early 2nd centuries, three in Miletus alone were in some way related to the Seleucids: the propylon of the bouleuterion, the building of Laodice,[616] and the temple of Apollo at Didyma.[617] Among other places, the Corinthian order was also used at the Olympieum of Athens,[618] dedicated by Antiochus Epiphanes himself, and the mid-2nd century temple of Zeus at Olba/Diocaesarea,[619] which at that time was perhaps under Seleucid control.[620]

---

610 See n. 605 above.

611 Knackfuss et al., 1908: 99; cf. Downey, 1961: 105-106; Kleiner, 1968: 78.

612 Tuchelt, 1975: 118-120; Schaaf, 1992: 54-59.

613 Lib., *Or.*, 22.31.On the identification see Downey, 1961: 431, 628 n. 12. A 'Psephion' with a central hypaethral court, reported in the 6th cent. A.D. by Evagrius (1.18) to have been (re)built by Memnonius, consul of Theodosius, could perhaps also be identified with the bouleuterion of Antioch (Downey, 1961: 625; Schaaf, 1992: 55-56 and n. 379).

614 Cf. Tuchelt, 1975: 118, 120; Schaaf, 1992: 56.

615 Tuchelt, 1975: 119; Schaaf, 1992: 57.

616 See pp. 75-76 above.

617 On the two columns supporting the roof of the antechamber to the adyton and the two half-columns on the east wall of the adyton.

618 See Tölle-Kastenbein, 1994.

619 On the re-dating of the temple from the early 3rd to the mid 2nd century see Börker, 1971; Bauer, 1973: 117; Tuchelt, 1975: 118 n. 114.

620 See contra Schenk, 1997: 24-28.

The Seleucids appear to have indeed contributed significantly to the spreading of the Corinthian order, and it appears that along with colossal size it became a typical characteristic of monumental Seleucid architecture.[621] But the order was also widely used and influenced by the Ptolemies as well,[622] and furthermore, typological and stylistic comparison of buildings of Corinthian order reveals notable differences in each case, which are geographical and workshop-related.[623] For the bouleuterion of Miletus in particular Kleiner has pointed out that the architectural decoration appears to be 'totally within the Milesian tradition.'[624] Finally, due to its ornamental wealth and possible early sacral use, the Corinthian order appears to have acquired an increased prestige in Hellenistic times and to have been considered an indication of luxury and status in both royal and polis architecture.[625] One could, therefore, speak of a Selucid preference for the Corinthian order but not of a Seleucid Corinthian architectural style.[626]

The use of the Corinthian order in the bouleuterion of Miletus – like the possible similarity with the bouleuterion of Antioch [627]– could, therefore, be considered only as a secondary, additional feature pointing towards the Seleucid royal house. But since Timarchus and Heracleides as members of the Seleucid court were also likely to share this preference or be influenced by contemporary trends, it could not be of particular help in further clarifying the circumstances and the political background of the donation.

As far as the development of the Milesian civic centre is concerned, the construction of the bouleuterion, and especially its transverse position in relation to the agora square, appear to have been of great significance. During the first half of the 2nd century, the civic area, which until then had remained more or less unified, was divided into two distinct parts.[628] This division was formalized by the erection of two new L-

---

621 Steuben, 1981: 9-10.

622 See Hoepfner, 1971; Schenk, 1997: 21-47.

623 See Boysal, 1957; Heilmeyer, 1970: 57 and n. 237; Börker, 1971: 53-54; Bauer, 1973: 102-108; Williams, 1974: 413-414; Schaaf, 1992: 57-59; Schenk, 1997: 21-41.

624 Kleiner, 1968: 78, 92.

625 See last chapter.

626 Schaaf, 1992: 58-59.

627 Lippstreu, 1993: 131-132.

628 Cf. Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 121.

shaped stoas that set apart the north and south sections of the civic centre as two separate agoras.[629]

In the south, a northern counterpart was added to the L-shaped stoa built already in the second half of the 3rd century opposite the stoa of Antiochus I[630] (**Pl. 9 no. 8**). The new stoa was again two-aisled with Doric outer and Ionic inner colonnades, and faced south and east, but its dimensions were slightly different and had no rooms in the back like the south stoa.[631] Framed by the new north stoa, the south stoa and the stoa of Antiochus, the south part of the civic centre turned into a self-contained and pretty much secluded area, even though the three buildings were not yet physically connected to each other and passageways allowed free access and communication. As previously discussed,[632] it still remains uncertain whether this project was part of a pre-existing plan for the creation of a South Agora.

The second L-shaped stoa was constructed north of the bouleuterion facing north and east[633] (**Pls. 9 no. 6, 18**). It was Doric, one-aisled, and stood as a counterpart to the stoa behind the great Harbour Stoa,[634] but without having the same intercolumniations or row of rooms at the back.[635] The west wing of the new stoa was built over and along the east side of the pre-existing prytaneion,[636] changing its original approach and view from the civic centre. As part of the same project, a temple-like structure was built in the narrow space between the west wing of the earlier north L-shaped stoa and the prytaneion, blocking the access to the civic area from the transverse street to the west. It consisted of a rectangular cella with a bench or pedestal running in front of the walls, an antechamber accessible from the porticoes on the north and south, and a projecting prostasis with four Ionic columns[637] (**Pl. 18a-b**).

---

629 Cf. Gerkan, 1922: 92.

630 See p. 76 above.

631 Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 3-15; Coulton, 1976: 261.

632 See pp. 70 and 76 above.

633 Gerkan, 1922: 23-30; Martin, 1951: 396-398, 530-532; Büsing, 1970: 57-58, 66-67; Coulton, 1976: 259; Rumscheid, 1994: 45.

634 See p. 61 above.

635 Coulton, 1976: 63.

636 See p. 60 above.

637 Gerkan, 1922: 30-33.

It was probably the wish for an axial-symmetrical arrangement following the erection of this building and the bisection of the city centre by the bouleuterion that led to the renovation of the prytaneion and the construction of the new stoa, not a pre-existing plan. As a result, a semi-secluded North Agora was created. The presence of the prytaneion and the naiskos-building as well as a series of monuments and altars points towards a civic-political character for this agora.[638]

The function of the temple-like structure remains obscure. The existence of the pedestal, where a series of statues could have stood, has led to the assumption that it may have been dedicated to the cult of the members of a royal family, indeed the Seleucids who on several occasions proved themselves gracious and beneficent to the city.[639] As already seen, a temenos with a statue of Eumenes II was also created in Miletus in the same period,[640] and Antiochus II had been proclaimed 'God' in the past,[641] which means that some kind of temenos arrangement had been made for him too. Still, it would have constituted a rather big step for the Milesians to honour the Seleucids in a temple dominating the very heart of their political agora, not only for reasons of civic pride, but for diplomatic purposes as well, especially at a time when they were trying to keep balanced relations with them and the Attalids. On the other hand, as has been pointed out, the building could have well served other religious functions, or it may have not been a temple at all but a secular building, perhaps an annexe of the prytaneion.[642]

Another project that could also date from the 2nd century, but its chronology remains problematic, is the southern cross-wall (*διατείχισμα*). At first dated between 200-190 by v. Gerkan on the basis of spolia used in the construction,[643] it was later considered to date from the end of the 2nd or the early 1st century on the grounds of technique and pottery.[644] However, the likelihood of restoration in whole or part in various occa-

---

638 Gerkan, 1922: 92.

639 Gerkan, 1922: 93.

640 See p. 80 and nn. 504-505 above.

641 See p. 75 above.

642 Kleiner, 1968: 44, 51, 54.

643 Gerkan and Rehm, 1935: 53-80, 124-126.

644 Kleiner, 1964: 59, 1968: 17, 1973/4: 65; cf. McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 167-170. Cobet, 1997: 280, considers the Mithridatic date too late but leaves the issue open.

sions – especially in the areas investigated –complicates the issue and allows no firm conclusions so far.[645]

In any case, in order to reduce the length of the fortification circuit and make it more defensible, this wall cut across the city peninsula taking a short, strong line from the Sacred Gate (**Pl. 19**) – which was rebuilt slightly off the old spot and architecturally decorated – to the Athena Harbour. To make up for the renunciation of the high ground of the Kalabaktepe, the cross-wall had an aggressive design comprising repeated combinations of towers, curtains and sally ports.[646] As a result of the cross-wall's construction, the total area occupied by the city was greatly reduced. The initial optimism that the new Miletus would again grow to fill the area up to Kalabaktepe or that it would possess the manpower to defend the long circuit enclosing it, was disproved in the course of the Hellenistic period, even after the influx of new inhabitants after synoecisms with other poleis such as Pidasa in the 2nd,[647] and Myus[648] in the 1st century.[649]

7.6 Miletus in the 1st century

In the later 2nd century or perhaps more likely in the early 1st, a very long stoa-like hall divided into two aisles by a series of pillars was erected in a north-south direction immediately west of the South Agora and the bouleuterion[650] (**Pl. 9 no. 9**). On its southern end, the building had a façade with a series of half-columns in antis of mixed Doric and Ionic order, an apparent influence from the neighbouring bouleuterion (**Pl. 20a**). Serving probably as a magazine for the storage of cereals, the hall extended over the length of three insulae, cutting off the remaining transverse streets that gave access to the civic centre after the construction of the north stoa of the South Agora. The deci-

---

645 Gerkan and Rehm, 1935: 125-126, considered a restoration at the time of the Mithridatic Wars possible, while Winter, 1971: 278, dated this restoration around 150. On the possibility of an earlier, perhaps even Archaic phase see p. 50 and n. 265 above.

646 Gerkan and Rehm, 1935: 53-80; Winter, 1971: 164 n. 44, 255, 276; Garlan, 1974: 345, 360; Lawrence, 1979: 317, 330-331, 339, 343, 350, 367, 380; McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 167-170.

647 Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: 350-357 No. 149.

648 Strabo, 14.1.10; Paus., 7.2.11. Cf. Demand, 1990: 141-142, 165-166, 171-173.

649 Greaves, 2000: 67-68.

650 Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 122. Cf. Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 156-177 (a little later than the bouleuterion); Kleiner, 1968: 119-121 (after the bouleuterion); Büsing, 1970: 25, 37 (mid 2nd cent.); Coulton, 1976: 259 (possibly 2nd cent.); Rumscheid, 1994: 46.

sion to build a magazine hall has been associated with the turbulence of the Mithridatic Wars, as has also the southern cross-wall, the chronology of which remains uncertain, and as pointed out, could be earlier.[651]

In this period, Miletus still remained a busy trading centre, and commercial activities apparently necessitated the construction of a new market complex in the area immediately north of the neglected Athena sanctuary, upon which it infringed[652] (**Pl. 11a**). Its distance from the civic centre and proximity to the Theatre Harbour probably indicate a purely commercial use.[653] The new market consisted of a large rectangular court oriented east-west, which on the north, west and south sides was surrounded by an one-aisled Doric portico.[654] The eastern side was closed off by a wall, in the middle of which there was an entrance propylon. Apart from its large size, architecturally the West Market seems to have been rather unambitious.[655]

In the civic centre itself, the formation of two distinct and secluded agoras was now formalized. Around the middle of the 1st century,[656] a wall connecting the east ends of the L-shaped stoas cut the North Agora off turning it into a separate enclosure. A propylon with two Ionic columns in antis provided access from the Sacred Road[657] (**Pl. 18b**). Some time later, a second storey was also added to the south L-shaped stoa.[658] The construction of a propylon – later to be replaced by a monumental Roman gate – joining the stoa of Antiochus I and the north L-shaped stoa, also came to emphasize the character of the southern part of the civic centre as an individual South Agora.[659]

Another important development concerning the character and use of public space in late Hellenistic Miletus was that of the appearance of heroa and memorial structures of private individuals and their families inside the city. The possibilities for the self-

---

[651] Kleiner, 1968: 17, 19, 30; Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 122.

[652] Gerkan, 1925a: 99-105; Kleiner, 1968: 48-50; Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 122; Rumscheid, 1994: 46.

[653] Coulton, 1976: 176.

[654] Coulton, 1976: 176, 261.

[655] Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 122.

[656] Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 122.

[657] Gerkan, 1922: 37-44, 93-94.

[658] See n. 633 above and Heilmeyer, 1970: 80; Hesberg, 1980: 56 No. f, 193.

[659] Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924: 47-51; Kleiner, 1968: 63.

assertion and promotion of individual members of a polis community – in lifetime as well as in the afterlife – had been limited during the Classical period, and remained so even in the 4th and 3rdcenturies. But in the course of the Hellenistic age, as the polis grew unable to support its functions and institutions by its own means and became more and more dependent on private enterprise and contributions of wealthy individuals, the margins of personal distinction and eminence expanded.

After acquiring the capability of taking credit for their contribution to public building projects through dedicatory inscriptions,[660] and enjoying high honours for their services to the city including the erection of honorary statues in public spaces,[661] from the end of the 3rd century onwards it became possible for some private citizens to be buried inside the city,[662] a privilege until then restricted to founding heroes[663] and monarchs.[664] The most prominent of them even possessed their own heroa. In Miletus, the philosopher Thales is the earliest person known to have received a burial inside the city, in a place that according to tradition was later to become the agora.[665] The next are the ancestors of the benefactor Eudemus, whose graves existed in the gymnasium perhaps donated by him around 200.[666]

In the late 2nd or early 1st century, a building compound was constructed in the insula immediately west of the Athena Temple[667] (**Pls. 11a, 20b**). It consisted of a court framed by Doric porticoes on the east, south and west, and a larger Ionic stoa on the north, at the back of which were three rooms. In the middle of the court stood a north-facing, temple-like structure, perhaps with a four-column prostasis. Against the back wall of this structure and facing south towards the entrance of the complex, there was a statue pedestal. At first, Wiegand thought this might have been the statue of Eumenes II

---

660 Hesberg, 1994: 38-52. Cf. last chapter.

661 See Quaß, 1993: 33-39; Hesberg, 1994: 14-19; Habicht, 1995a; Raeck, 1995.

662 Kader, 1995: 199-200.

663 Real or mythical. See examples cited by Gauthier, 1985: 60-61; Kader, 1995: 199 n. 7, 208 n. 76.

664 Cf. Lauter, 1986: 85-88. E.g. the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus, the tombs of Alexander and the Ptolemies in Alexandria, the 'heroon of the royal cult' in Pergamum.

665 Plut., *Sol.*, 12.11; Cf. Kleiner, 1968: 127, 129.

666 See p. 78 above.

667 Wiegand, 1908: 25-26; Gerkan, 1925a: 86-93; Delorme, 1960: 130-131; Kleiner, 1968: 43; Rumscheid, 1994: 44-45.

erected in his temenos,[668] but the remains actually date from a later period.[669] The interpretation of the complex as a heroon-sanctuary is probably correct, but its owner remains unknown.

From the same period dates also another complex (Heroon I) located on the eastern slopes of the theatre hill[670] (**Pl. 20c**). This consisted of two distinct room groups inside a rectangular court. The west end of the court was occupied by a series of rooms opening onto an Ionic portico that faced the inner of the court. The east end was dominated by an almost round tumulus-like structure, in the grave chamber of which there were five individual loculi and a shaft burial. Access was provided via a dromos to the east. Various rooms were asymmetrically arranged on the north, east and south of the tumulus, certain of them probably serving as banquet halls. Two had pebble mosaic floors.

The whole arrangement recalls that of the Archegesium at Delos, serving the cult of the mythical founder-hero of the city.[671] The grave of the Milesian founder-hero Neleus, however, is known to have been outside the Sacred Gate,[672] and besides that the tomb was meant to accept several persons, probably members of an important family. For this reason, and also due to its conspicuous yet peripheral location in relation to the civic centre, the complex is comparable to the Archocrateum at Lindos and the Leonteum at Calydon.[673] It seems likely that the Heroon I at Miletus belonged to a family of the Milesian elite, the leader of which wished to accentuate his role and present himself as an '*ἥρως κτίστης*.'[674]

The remains of two more heroa have survived inside the city, but their date and appearance during Hellenistic times are still unclear due to extensive Roman renovation. The first (Heroon III) was located near the so-called Faustina Thermae[675] (**Pl.**

---

668 Wiegand, 1908: 25-26. On the temenos and statue of Eumenes II cf. p. 80 above.

669 Gerkan, 1925a: 92-93; Kleiner, 1968: 43; Rumscheid, 1994: 44-45. Cf. Kleine, 1986: 139 n. 29.

670 Müller-Wiener and Weber, 1985: 16-23; Müller-Wiener, 1986c: 122 and n. 8; 1988b: 34-35; Rumscheid, 1994: 47; Kader, 1995: 209-211. At first thought to be early Hellenistic by Wiegand, 1905: 538-540; Kleiner, 1968: 120-130.

671 Bruneau, 1970: 420-430; Bruneau and Ducat, 1983: 200-201. Cf. Kader, 1995: 210.

672 Paus., 7.2.6. Cf. Herda, 1998.

673 Kader, 1995: 211.

674 Müller-Wiener, 1988b: 35; Kader, 1995: 210-211.

675 Kleiner, 1968: 132-134; Weber, 1985: esp. 36-38.

20d). It is possible that in an early phase,[676] the complex comprised a rectangular court surrounded by porticoes of Corinthian order with a series of rooms at the south end, the middle of which had the form of a gymnasium exedra with two columns in antis. In a later phase, a square structure accessible through doors on the north and west was built in the court. Inside it, the base of a sarcophagus was set close to the wall facing the entrance and niches were formed in the walls. The other heroon stood immediately north of the West Market near the sea.[677] The original tomb structure was turned during Roman times into a podium temple accessible by a flight of steps (**Pl. 11a**).

7.7 Synthesis and general remarks

The total destruction of Miletus in 494 followed by the deportation of most of its population was a dramatic event[678] and a turning point in the history of the city and the identity of the civic community. Until then, Miletus had thrived throughout the Archaic period as a major trading port and leading metropolis of the Greek colonization. Its wealth, power and cultural achievements had enabled it to claim the title not only of the most influential city of the Panionium, but of the 'ornament of Ionia' as well.[679] The Milesians returning after the catastrophe and the subsequent generations were faced with the heavy task of making a new and modern city rise from the ashes, and of overthrowing the even heavier burden of the established view that '*πάλαι ποτ' ἦσαν ἄλκιμοι Μιλήσιοι.*'[680]

The new Miletus was laid out on a grand scale with the confidence that it would grow again to be the city it had once been. The latest developments of city planning were employed, based on an improved version of the grid system with the insula as the standard unit for the allotment of land, mapping out of the street network, and proportioning of residential and civic areas and buildings. The design of the new city was determined by factors of three kinds: practical (topographical, functional, economical),

---

[676] Possibly in the very late 3rd or early 2nd century (Weber, 1985; Pfrommer, 1987: 156-158; contra Rumscheid, 1994: 47-48 - later 2nd).

[677] Kleiner, 1968: 131-132.

[678] The shocking effect was strong across the Greek world and especially in Athens, where the distress caused by Phrynichus' play '*Μιλήτου ἅλωσις*' is recorded by Herodotus (6.21).

[679] See n. 294 above.

[680] A phrase that was, however, to remain proverbial and much cited in literature: e.g. Anac., *Fr.*, 81; Timocr., *Fr.*, 7.1; Ath., 12.26.7-8; Ar., *Plut.*, 1002; Arist., *Fr.*, 8.44.557; Diod. Sic., 10.25.2; Eph., *Fr.*,2a,70,F.183.6; Philostr., *VS*, 1.526.4; Hesych., 878.1; *Suda*, 572.

historical (arrangement, character and use of specific areas inherited from the old city), and psychological (symbolic, aesthetic).

The traditional character of Miletus as a port and trading centre necessitated the provision for extensive harbour installations, storage warehouses, market places and facilities, as well as easy access and communication between the harbours and the city centre. Thus the location of the two main harbours – the protected and official Lion Harbour, and the large Theatre Harbour – dictated the L shape of the civic area with the agora in the cross point.

The Delphinium, Apollo's sanctuary in the city, was since the Archaic times located next to the Lion Harbour in order to receive the arriving pilgrims and function as a gathering place for the annual procession to Didyma. It was also the starting point of the Sacred Road, the city's stately and ceremonial avenue. Going through the agora towards the Sacred Gate to the south, the Sacred Road set the main traffic axis of Miletus and at the same time the viewpoint for the architectural setting of the civic centre.

The total area reserved for public purposes in the new Miletus was particularly large, and is indicative of a very ambitious plan for monumental architectural development and provision for future expansion. In fact, it must have been certain to the founding generation of Milesians that such a plan could not be put to practice – let alone be fully materialized – within the foreseeable future in view of the still weak financial and human resources of the regenerating city. In this respect, the whole project was largely based on the optimism and self-confidence of the Milesian civic community, which in turn had its foundations on the city's long and glorious past.

Existing evidence suggests that during the first century after the refoundation of Miletus, historical circumstances allowed perhaps only the city's defences and provisional facilities for the resumption of religious and civic life to be put up, with priority probably given to the housing of the population and the creation of the necessary infrastructure. The earliest known public building of the new Miletus – built as late as the mid-4th century – is the prytaneion, which as the symbolic core of the city was perhaps meant to signify the continuity of polis life and the dawn of a new era, along with the beginning of the city's architectural aggrandizement.

The conquests of Alexander created the conditions for the first major project, the development of the Lion Harbour, the city's face towards the outside world and basic source of income. The extensive complex of assorted porticoes, storage rooms and trading areas provided the necessary facilities for the reception of ships, passengers and

goods, and at the same time created an impressive and monumental first view of Miletus from the sea to all approaching visitors, tradesmen or pilgrims. Especially concerning the latter, the contemporary expansion and refurbishment of the Delphinium became part of the programme for the revival of the oracle and the festivities in honour of Apollo. Nevertheless, no extravagant project of religious architecture was carried out here or within the city's limits for that matter. Monumentality was to be displayed in the grandest scale at the historic sanctuary of Didyma, the significance of which exceeded the confines of the Milesian polis.

Harbour installations and Delphinium were not only architectural and visual, but semantic counterparts too, signifying Miletus' dual character as a maritime trading city and religious centre of the Greek world.[681] The construction of the theatre created another piece of impressive scenery for the second major harbour, and complemented the picture of a city in accordance with the demands of Greek culture and spiritual life.

The prytaneion, the great Harbour Stoa and the Delphinium were also the first pieces of the architectural framework of the civic centre, defining its limits on the north. On the east, the limits were set by the long stoa donated by Antiochus I at the beginning of the 3rd century. The monumental structure – perhaps the first free-standing stadion-long stoa – took full advantage of the conspicuousness of the location at the cross point of the civic area's L, and the prestige offered by the Sacred Road, to which it functioned as the architectural setting. The connection between the Sacred Road and the stoa further alluded to the character of the latter as a donation directed to the Didyma sanctuary.

The donation of the stoa, along with the sponsorship of the magnificent new Apollo Temple by Seleucus I Nicator and the revival of the Didyma oracle under the auspices of the Seleucid royal house, signified Miletus' return as one of the great cities of Asia Minor. At the same time, it verified the fact that in the new historical context of the antagonism between the Hellenistic kingdoms, Greek cities could no longer stand as independent and uninvolved spectators. A bipolar relationship was born, in which the city enjoyed various degrees of autonomy, protection, and courteous benefactions and grants by the king as long as it provided him – willingly or not – with the legitimation and support he required. It is in this spirit that in the mid-3rd century Miletus pro-

---

[681] Cf. Klinkott, 1996: 181.

claimed Antiochus II a 'God' and erected a building in honour of his wife Laodice in return for the liberation from the tyranny of Timarchus.

Further steps towards the architectural framing of the Milesian civic centre were made with the erection of an L-shaped stoa at the south-west end opposite the stoa of Antiochus in the same period, and the construction of a gymnasium on the eastern side in line with the Delphinium and the Antiochus Stoa in the early 2nd century.

During the first half of this century, several building programmes carried out in Miletus were meant to allow the city to keep up with the developments in Greek town planning, and satisfy the increasing demand for the display of urban quality through works of public architecture. In the course of the Hellenistic times, the gymnasium evolved into the new centrepiece of civic life in place of the agora, reflecting the changing social and political morals and ideals of the Greek polis. Miletus obtained three gymnasia, of which two were constructed at least partially with the financial contribution of individuals, the Milesian citizen Eudemus and king Eumenes II of Pergamum.

The building-symbol of the polis as an autonomous, self-determined and corporate organism, the bouleuterion, also became the subject of a donation. Even more, a donation not made by an ordinary member of the polis community, but by emigrant citizens committed to the service of a king or perhaps the king himself whose name was inscribed upon it. That the city may have considered this donation not only as inoffensive to its identity and pride, but possibly even as a welcome result of a successful policy, reveals the considerable changes that had taken place since Classical times.

The increasing disability of the polis as a corporate unit to support its functions and institutions on its own right, and the consequent transfer of initiative and responsibility to private citizens – which were of course to receive credit and honours in return for their services – was another sign of the times. The appearance of tombs and memorial structures inside the city celebrating the heroization of individuals from the 2nd century onwards signified a deviation from earlier ideals of strict corporatism. Four heroa of this kind have survived in Miletus.

In accordance with all these changes, the agora, which in earlier times had been the open and accessible heart of the polis symbolizing and encouraging participation in the common affairs, during the Hellenistic times gradually became physically secluded and introspective. Its architectural development reflected the distancing of the agora and its functions from the ordinary citizens, who saw their ability to influence civic affairs gradually decline.

Characteristically in Miletus, by the time the sumptuous and monumental bouleuterion was erected, the prime of the functions and institutions it was meant to serve and symbolize was already in the past. It is, perhaps, not a coincidence that with its pompous physical presence at the heart of the civic centre, the bouleuterion instead of becoming an agent of cohesion on the contrary had a splitting effect. The construction of the two L-shaped stoas on either side of it resulted in the formation of two separate and self-enclosed entities within the civic area, the access to which was further restricted.

Chapter III

The city of Priene

8 Introduction and History

8.1 Location and general layout

The city-state of Priene,[682] with a territory of ca. 400km^2, was located in the middle of Ionia south-east of Mt. Mycale, bordering Miletus, Heraclea, Magnesia and Ephesus by land and Samos by sea (**Plate 1**). Thanks to the fertile soil of the Maeander valley, the forests of Mycale and the rich fisheries of the Latmic gulf, Priene was quite self-sufficient. Nevertheless, the city remained throughout its history a small state, and although priesthood at the Panionium – the religious centre of the Ionian League – was traditionally under its control,[683] limited financial resources and political influence often made it a bone of contention among more powerful neighbours.

Priene was built on a rocky, steeply sloping spur of Mycale, at the foot of a nearly perpendicular cliff overlooking the Maeander plain to the south (**Plate 21**). The top of the cliff formed a naturally fortified acropolis, the Teloneia, 200m above the city. Protection from the northern wind, good lighting and ventilation were among the advantages of the south-facing site, which also offered overview and control of the plain,[684] defensibility, proximity to drinkable water and building material, and possibility for future expansion.[685] At the same time, however, the steepness of the terrain necessitated extensive terracing and made every building project toilsome and expensive.[686]

Fortification walls enclosed the city area at a length of ca. 2km. They were interrupted at the foot of Teloneia and continued again for another 600m on its top surrounding the acropolis (**Plate 22**). There were three gates, one to the west (West Gate) next to a small shrine of Cybele[687] leading probably to Priene's port town Naulochus, and two to the east. The south-eastern allowed access to a nearby spring (Spring Gate),

---

[682] On the name see Zgusta, 1984: 508.

[683] Strab., 8.7.2, 14.1.20.

[684] Bean and Cook, 1957: 141.

[685] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 193; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 26.

[686] Cf. Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 194.

[687] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 171-172.

while the north-eastern (East Gate) led to the valley and the city's dependent villages. This was the official and most elaborate one.

Despite the steep ground, Priene was built according to the grid system. Streets intersecting at right angles formed rectangular building blocks-insulae 120x160 Ionic feet, providing space possibly for eight house plots of 30x80ft each[688] (**Plate 23a, 25**). The population living within the city walls, based on the number of properties, could be roughly estimated at around 5000.[689] The city's most important streets were four, ran from east to west, and had a width of up to 24ft. One started from the West Gate (Main Street), ran across the northern part of the agora and continued eastwards forming an east-west traffic-axis. A street starting from the Spring Gate (Spring Gate Street) ran across the lower part of the city below the southern side of the agora. In the upper part, Athena Street led to the Athena Polias sanctuary from the east, and Theatre Street ran in front of the city theatre. North-south transverse streets were narrow and in many places reduced to flights of steps.

Water was brought to Priene from springs 2km north-east by means of underground water-pipes, and after passing through a system of settling tanks it was distributed to constantly running public fountains around the city.[690] Dirty and rainwater, on the other hand, was led away by open or covered drain channels along the streets. The steeply sloping ground made the existence of an adequate drainage system in Priene indispensable.

8.2 The history of Priene and the problems surrounding the 4th century refoundation[691]

According to tradition,[692] Priene was founded by Aepytus, grandson of Codrus, and the Theban Philotas.[693] A member of the Ionian League, the city suffered disastrously at the hands of Cimmerians, Lydians and Persians during the 7th and 6th centu-

---

688 Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 198; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 30, 32; contra Kleiner, 1962: 1191.

689 Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 190.

690 On Priene's water supply and drainage see Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 68-80; Crouch, 1996.

691 Cf. Patronos, 2000: 5-11.

692 See Kleiner, 1962: 1185-1189.

693 Paus., 7.2.10; Strab., 14.1.3.25.

ries. Around 645 it was subjugated by the Lydians under Lygdamis or Ardys.[694] In the troubled years of the 6th century, the statesman and judge Bias emerged as a leading personality in Ionian political affairs and was later included among the Seven Sages.[695] Priene was destroyed once more in 545/4 by the Persians under Tavalus,[696] and again in 494 after the unfortunate Ionian Revolution in which the city participated.[697] The city appears in the Athenian tribute lists from 453/2 onwards paying the sum of one talent until perhaps 442/1.[698] From 440/39 to 430/29 Priene's place is empty,[699] following a war between Miletus and Samos for its possession that perhaps resulted in the city being unable to pay or occupied by Miletus.[700] Literary evidence for Priene's history in the first half of the 4th century is unclear,[701] and it has even been suggested that the city lay in ruins and had lost its status as a polis.[702] As will be discussed below, at some point during this century Priene was apparently refounded and perhaps also relocated, but the date and circumstances remain uncertain.

The city was favourably treated by Alexander. It was set free, relieved from tribute and had its major temple dedicated by him.[703] After a short period of tyranny imposed by Hieron between 300/299-7,[704] Priene's autonomy and democratic constitution survived through the Hellenistic period, albeit at the discretion of monarchs and subject to their patronage. During the 3rd and 2nd centuries, the city went through several territorial disputes and wars with its neighbours, which were settled – sometimes favourably, sometimes not – after royal intervention or external arbitration.[705] At first in the

---

[694] Hdt., 1.15.

[695] Hdt., 1.170.

[696] Hdt., 1.161; Paus., 7.2.10.

[697] Hdt., 6.25.32, 6.8; Paus., 7.2.10.

[698] Gaertringen, 1906: 200, Nos. 441-443; Meritt, McGregor and Wade-Gery, 1939: 388-389, 542.

[699] Cf. Meiggs, 1972: 540-541.

[700] Thuc. 1.115; Gaertringen, 1906: 200-201, No. 444; Cf. Meritt, McGregor and Wade-Gery, 1939: 307-308; Meiggs, 1972: 428; Gehrke, 1985: 141 and n. 4; Demand, 1986: 36.

[701] Xen., *Hel.*, 3.2.17, 4.8.17; Scyl., 98; Aeschin., *De Falsa Leg.*, 116.

[702] Gaertringen, 1906: xi; Hornblower, 1982: 327; contra Demand, 1986; Schipporeit, 1998. Cf. Botermann, 1994: 164-165.

[703] See the so-called Alexander Edict (Gaertringen, 1906: No. 1; Tod, 1948: No. 185; Heisserer, 1980: 145-146; Sherwin-White, 1985).

[704] Gaertringen, 1906: 40-41 No. 37 and 207-208 Nos. 493-495; Crowther, 1996.

[705] See Sherwin-White, 1985; Crowther, 1996.

Seleucid sphere of influence, Priene fell to the Ptolemies in 246 but was won back by Antiochus III. In 188, the peace of Apamea turned the city into a free ally of Rome.

In the mid 2nd century, Priene was caught up in the rivalry between the usurper of the Cappadocian throne Orophernes and the rightful heir Ariarathes V.[706] Having perhaps special bonds with the city,[707] Orophernes deposited 400 talents in the temple of Athena Polias for safe-keeping, which Ariarathes demanded be handed over to him when he regained control of the throne. On Priene's refusal, Ariarathes and his ally Attalus II devastated its territory and laid siege to the city itself, which was only lifted after Roman intervention.[708]

Rome's favour continued after Priene came under Roman rule in 129, though nominally remaining a free city. Perhaps in the 130s and due to an unknown cause, a huge fire devastated the part of the city west of the agora.[709] Strangely, although the city was able to commission monumental building projects in other areas at the same time, the destroyed quarter was never extensively rebuilt. After the turmoil and economic depression of the Mithridatic Wars, Priene enjoyed a last period of prosperity during the reign of Augustus. In the later Imperial period the city steadily declined. During the Byzantine times it was a bishopric. The site was finally abandoned soon after the Ottoman conquest.

8.3 The problem of relocation

As the excavators could identify no structural remains or other substantial traces antedating the 4th century on the site of the city, they suggested that Priene had originally been situated elsewhere in the region, and that at some time in its history it was relocated.[710] This assumption was unanimously accepted by scholars for a long time. H. v. Gaertringen suggested that after its severe treatment by the Persians in 545 and 494 Priene never recovered and the citizens lived dispersed in villages until the city was refounded in a different location.[711]

---

[706] Diod. Sic., 31.32.1; Polyb., 33.6.1-9. Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 132-133.

[707] Possibly as an exile there (Niese, 1893-1903: 248).

[708] Magie, 1950: 117; Sherk, 1969: No. 6.

[709] Raeder, 1984: 11; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 189; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 21.

[710] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 35.

[711] Gaertringen, 1906: ix; cf. Tomlinson, 1992: 85.

However, it is mainly the notorious silting of the Maeander that has been held responsible for this assumed move. Strabo reports that the Maeander plain had a very loose and unstable ground, consisting of alluvial soil deposited by the river in its capricious and irregular course.[712] The alluvial phenomenon was so intense that the coastline along the Maeander estuary extended steadily into the sea, gradually blocking the entrance to the Latmic gulf (**Pls. 1, 3a, 23b-c**). Myus ceased to be a harbour city already in the 5th century BC, and Miletus by the 5th century AD.[713] By Strabo's time, the coast had moved 40 stadia away from the (new) city of Priene.[714] According to the supporters of the relocation theory, the 'old' Priene referred to by Herodotus lay perhaps somewhere deeper in the Maeander valley a few kilometres east or north-east, and was either a harbour city cut off from the sea[715] or a river-side city suffering from the river's unpredictable flow and mosquito-infested marshes.[716] However, no trace of this supposed earlier settlement has yet been discovered.

The relocation theory was first called into question by N. Demand, who claimed there is sufficient evidence to suggest that both the 'old' and the 'new' Priene were located on the same site.[717] In her opinion, traces of pre-4th century habitation were overlooked by the excavators. To support her view Demand cited literary sources that according to her interpretation imply an uninterrupted existence of the city on the same site,[718] and also sources she believed would normally mention the relocation, had this ever occurred, but do not.[719] The possibility of an uninterrupted existence was correctly dismissed by H. Botermann, who pointed out that this would have resulted in a gradual, additive development and not the uniform, integrated plan the city actually displays.

---

[712] 2.8.17.

[713] Schede, 1964: 2.

[714] Strab., 12.8.17.

[715] Buisson, 1917: 39-43; Rostovtzeff, 1953: 175, 178. Cf. Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 15.

[716] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 189. Cf. Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 3.

[717] Demand, 1986 and 1990: 140-146. Cf. Müller, 1997: 674-680.

[718] Demand, 1986: 36-37, 40-41. Namely Scyl., 98; Aeschin., *De Falsa Leg.*, 116.

[719] Strab., 12.8.17 and 14.1.12; Paus., 7.2.10-11. The idea is that in 14.1.12 Strabo does not seem to distinguish between the Archaic and the Hellenistic city, and in 12.8.17, where he mentions that Maeander moved the coast 40 stadia away from (new?) Priene, he should have stressed the fact that it was the second time this had happened in the city's history. Pausanias mentions the abandonment of the cities of Myus and Atarneus because of the Maeander and contrasts them with Priene, which continued to exist as a city despite Persian destruction and tyranny. According to Demand, had Priene also suffered from the Maeander, this would have made Pausanias' point even stronger.

Nevertheless, Botermann accepted the possibility that, after a period of abandonment, the new Priene was built on the same site where the old city had once existed.[720]

Recently, S. Schipporeit has further developed this hypothesis by attempting to substantiate Demand's mainly literary and historical arguments through archaeological evidence.[721] Schipporeit drew attention to certain problematic elements in the Demeter and Kore sanctuary (**Pl. 24a-b, 25**), such as the use of second-hand material for the crepis of the temple's pronaos and the remains of possibly earlier walls to the east of the pronaos and inside the cella. These, according to Schipporeit, could stand for an earlier phase of the sanctuary prior to the city's new foundation.[722] As Rumscheid and Koenigs have also noted, with its irregular L-shaped plan the small Doric temple seems indeed to allow for the offering pit, which must be earlier.[723] But there is no evidence – pottery or other finds – to suggest that the early phase should predate the new foundation or that the reused material came from the 'old' city and not from the sanctuary itself.

Schipporeit also endorsed Demand's hypothesis that the original excavators may have overlooked pre-4th century material, again citing the single sherd of a late-5th century Attic lebes gamikos found in the upper layers of the fill at the south-east corner of the Athena Polias temple[724] as a possible trace of earlier cult on the site.[725] But this is too isolated and circumstantial to demonstrate an earlier settlement, and it could have belonged to a vase rescued from the old city.

As possible reasons for the absence of any other pre-4th century remains, Schipporeit suggested the geomorphology of the site and the extensive earthworks carried out for the new city, which may have resulted in the total removal of earlier debris. He also pointed the examples of Miletus and Halicarnassus, which have also yielded little material from the periods prior to their refoundation.[726] Halicarnassus, however, has never been systematically excavated, while in the case of Miletus the debris of the Archaic

---

[720] Botermann, 1994: 164-166.

[721] Schipporeit, 1998.

[722] Schipporeit, 1998: 195-198; cf. Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 152, 154.

[723] Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 156-157.

[724] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 394-395 and fig. 526,1.

[725] Schipporeit, 1998: 201; cf. Demand, 1986: 42.

[726] Schipporeit, 1998: 202-203.

city was deposited – and found – in the immediate vicinity, where it was used for the construction of a provisional settlement.[727] Were the case of Priene alike, one would expect to find similar material discarded close by or used in the new city. Terracing in Priene involved the building of retaining walls and earth-filling, for the purposes of which an extensive use of old remains – had these been available – would be expected. And if second-hand material was indeed used at the Demeter Temple, its absence from humbler structures and especially houses becomes striking.

Even if one accepts that all traces of the old city were cleared to make way for the new one, the same could hardly apply for the adjacent necropolises, which again only contain burials from the late 4th century onwards.[728] And why at least public decrees and inscriptions were not preserved in the new city would also remain inexplicable. Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why such a total clearance of the site should have been pursued in the first place, and it is very doubtful if it could have been achieved. The disturbance of earlier strata would have rather increased chances of pre-Hellenistic material appearing in the Hellenistic fill.

Finally, there remains the question where the population of the city lived in the intermediate period, which becomes even more compelling in the case of refoundation on the same site. Based on the similarity of building blocks between the fortifications and the earliest houses, the latter could date from the late 4th century,[729] which means that the population had to wait a long time after the city's foundation before actually moving in. In this matter, Schipporeit follows Botermann's view that during the first building phase of the city most of the population resided in the port town of Naulochus.[730] Naulochus, probably the only other town of considerable size in Priene's territory, would have been the most reasonable and obvious choice, both in the case of the rebuilding of Priene at the foot of Teloneia, and in the case of the abandonment of the old city due to some 'force majeure.' In this respect, Naulochus would be – literally – the missing link between the 'old' and the 'new' Priene.

Until Naulochus is discovered or traces of the 'old' Priene can be ascertained, however, the issue of Priene's relocation or refoundation will remain unresolved. All

---

[727] See Miletus chapter.

[728] Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 37.

[729] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 327-328; cf. the discussion of the fortifications below.

[730] Schipporeit, 1998: 229; Botermann, 1994: 186-187 and n. 60.

current theories are based on arguments *ex silentio*. But as the case stands at the moment, the silence of archaeological sources is weightier than that of the literary. It is hard to believe that all traces of a pre-4th century settlement below Teloneia have completely vanished or managed to escape the attention of investigators for a hundred years. The silence of ancient sources, on the other hand, is more 'permissible.' After all, as S. Hornblower has pointed out, if it were not for epigraphic survival, Alexander's interference in Priene would never have been suspected either.[731] As a result, the relocation hypothesis remains – at least for the time being – the most convincing.

8.4 The date of the new foundation

Since no historical record survives, the question concerning the timing of Priene's new foundation rests solely upon the dating of the city's earliest material remains. One would expect the fortification walls to be an integral part of a new city in the 4th century or at least an early priority.[732] In Priene, two of the gates are perfectly aligned with two of the major streets of the city (**Pls. 22, 23a**). The third (East Gate) is not, but this could well be for defensive reasons or due to the special topography of the area.[733] On the other hand, the agora is placed at almost the exact centre of the area enclosed by the walls, leaving approximately seven insulae on each side to the east and west at the level of Main Street, and three on the north-south axis. This would indicate that city plan and wall belong to the same concept, with the latter possibly following in time.

The dates proposed for Priene's fortifications range from around 350[734] to the 330s or even later.[735] The pseudo-isodomic masonry of headers and stretchers with quarry-to-hammer face (**Pl. 24c**) and the indented trace of the city walls have been compared to the late-4th century ones of Heraclea by Latmus.[736] Priene's wall, however,

---

731 Hornblower, 1982: 327.

732 Cf. Arist., *Pol.*, 1330b.32-33.

733 The ground was much steeper at the end of Theatre and Athena Streets and would have made approach to the city more difficult. Even at the location finally selected, a long ramp had to be constructed in order to make ascend to the city more comfortable. Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 45, however, allow for the possibility that the gate was built before the city plan had been finalized.

734 Bean and Cook, 1957: 141; Bean, 1966: 198; Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 17-20; Winter, 1971a: passim; Lawrence, 1979: 345; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 201.

735 Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 45; Krischen, 1922: 51; Hornblower, 1982: 328-329; McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 48, 74; Karlsson, 1994: 147 and n. 19, 153.

736 Hornblower, 1982: 321-322, 328. On Heraclea see Krischen, 1922: 49-52; Winter, 1971b: 418; McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 75-76, 105; Karlsson, 1994: 153.

lacks the numerous large towers, advanced battlements and massive gates of Heraclea – developed in response to sophisticated torsion-powered siege weapons[737]– and could therefore be earlier, though not necessarily. According to L. Karlsson, similarities in the size of tower windows suggest that Priene's fortifications are contemporary with those of Alinda, around 334.[738]

McNicoll, on the other hand, considered Priene's walls a consequence of the autonomy granted by Alexander and roughly contemporary with those of Cnidus and Erythrae.[739] He interpreted the omission of the city from Arrian's 'Anabasis' as an indication that it was unfortified and therefore of no military significance, but he accepted that the technique does not rule out an earlier date. Alexander's edict for Priene[740] refers to a garrison, perhaps to be installed in the city, making it likely that the latter had some sort of fortification at that time. Badian has argued that the edict is a second settlement – ca 330? – after a first one in 334, which would make it possible that the fortifications were built in the meanwhile, but his theory has been convincingly dismissed by Sherwin-White.[741] The date of a dedication by a certain Philius from Cyprus to Demeter and Kore inscribed on the tower by the Spring Gate, which could perhaps provide a clue for the dating of the walls, is vague and has also not been generally agreed.[742] In any case, as long as no date within the second half of the 4th century can be safely fixed for the fortifications, these can contribute little to the accurate dating of Priene's new foundation.

The earliest building in Priene, for which literary and epigraphic evidence exists, is actually the temple of its patron goddess, Athena Polias. From the beginning, it was noticed that the orientation of the temple matches exactly that of the city's grid plan.[743]

---

[737] Winter, 1971b; Hornblower, 1982: 322; contra McNicoll, 1986: 310.

[738] Karlsson, 1994: 147 and n. 19, 153, with the exception of the Teloneia fort, whose larger towers indicate a slightly later, post-Alexander date.

[739] McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 48, 74.

[740] Gaerttingen, 1906: No. 1.

[741] Badian, 1966: 47 (cf. Heisserer, 1980: 156); Sherwin-White, 1985: 82-83.

[742] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 44-45, merely place the inscription within the 4th century. Gaertringen, 1906: No. 196 (cf. Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 17 and 21) dated it around 350 because of the seemingly archaizing spelling: *αο=αυ (Ναόλοχον=Ναύλοχον), εο=ευ (λεοκοῖς=λευκοῖς)*. Inscriptions of the later 4th century, however, also have similar 'anachronisms.' S. Hornblower, 1982: 324 n. 251 (cf. Hansen, 1989: 257-258, No. 854; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 42-43) indeed prefers a date closer to the end of the 4th century on the basis of the letter forms.

[743] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 82.

It also became evident that the axes of the corner columns of the southern pteron of the temple coincide exactly with the ideal corners of the corresponding insula[744] (**Pl. 25**). The integration of the temple in the grid plan, as well as its dominating position at the heart of the city over the agora, suggest a contemporary and unified conception. Many scholars have even assumed that the architect of the temple was actually responsible for the layout of the whole city.[745]

According to Vitruvius, the Athena Polias temple (**Pls. 26-27a**) was the work of the prominent architect Pytheus, who had also composed a treatise on its design and construction.[746] In the same passage, Pytheus is mentioned again along with Satyrus as architect and author of a book on the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus. The tradition of the name in this second instance is problematic, but the identification is probably correct.[747]

According to Pliny, the Mausoleum was initiated by Artemisia and was completed after her death,[748] but his testimony is weakened by the fact that he confuses the dates. He says that Mausolus died in the second year of the 107th Olympiad (351), which is actually the year of Artemisia's death.[749] The main structure could not have been built within the two years of Artemisia's rule and, furthermore, the Mausoleum appears to be an integral part of the layout of Halicarnassus, which means that the concept and the beginning of the project most probably go back to Mausolus himself.[750] It is currently believed that construction began in the 360s or even earlier,[751] and was well advanced or in all essentials finished by Artemisia's death in 351/0.[752] The sculptural decoration was perhaps completed later, as Pliny reports, but not much later, as the ca-

---

[744] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 203 and fig. 187; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 29 and fig. 21.

[745] See n. 868 below.

[746] Vitr., 1.1.12; 7.pr.12; cf. Coulton, 1977: 25.

[747] Riemann, 1962: 371-375, 459-461, 507-513; Hornblower, 1982: 223-244; Botermann, 1994: 172 and n. 24; Svenson-Evers, 1996: 116-150; contra Jeppesen, 1976 and 1977-8.

[748] Plin., *HN*, 36.30-31.

[749] Diod. Sic., 16.36.2; 16.45.7; cf. Hornblower, 1982, 40-41.

[750] Riemann, 1963: 373; Jeppesen, 1977-8: 206-209; Waywell, 1978: 79; Hornblower, 1982: 238; Pedersen, 1991: 95; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 230-233.

[751] Hellström, 1994: 38-39; Jeppesen, 1992.

[752] Waywell, 1978: 26 n. 82, 78 etc.; Pedersen, 1991: 95; Hellström, 1994: 38-39. The possibility of a second building phase in Alexander's time suggested by Buschor, 1950: 12-13, has not won further acceptance (see counter-arguments by Riemann, 1963: 426-427).

reers of the artists engaged suggest.[753] A date around 350 is also indicated by the architectural ornamentation.[754]

Stylistic comparison between the remains of the Mausoleum and the Athena Polias temple has revealed strong similarities, which are thought to be the result of a single architect's work, supposedly Pytheus.[755] A third building, the temple of Zeus at Labraunda (**Pl. 27b-c**), is considered to share the same architectural ideas with the Mausoleum and the Priene temple, and has tentatively been associated with Pytheus as well.[756] The Zeus temple was certainly complete by the death of its dedicator Idrieus,[757] Artemisia's successor, in 344. It is possible, however, that this was yet another of Mausolus' projects, initiated by him and completed by Idrieus.[758]

Whether works of the same architect and/or itinerant group of craftsmen or not, the three buildings do seem to belong to the same architectural tradition.[759] In chronological sequence the Athena Polias temple is the last in the line,[760] since common features appear there in their most developed form.[761] An upper limit for the beginning of construction in the early 340s, some time after the completion of the Mausoleum, would probably be the most likely.[762]

A lower limit for the beginning of construction, on the other hand, is more difficult to set. The Athena temple bears a dedicatory inscription stating that '*Βασιλεύς*

---

[753] Hornblower, 1982: 240-244, 267.

[754] Rumscheid, 1994: 18.

[755] Riemann, 1963: 509-510; Hellström and Thieme, 1982: 46-56; Carter, 1983: 26, 32-33 and ch. 2; Koenigs, 1983: 151; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 230-233.

[756] Hellström and Thieme, 1982: 46, 55-56; Hellström, 1990: 243 and 1994: 37-38; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 230-233; contra Hornblower, 1982: 310 n. 126, 323; Koenigs, 1983, 151, 163 (under certain conditions) and 1999; Carter, 1990: 134.

[757] According to the architrave inscription, Crampa, 1972: 13-14 No. 16.

[758] Hellström, 1994: 38-39. Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 230-233, even consider the temple of Zeus to be older than the Mausoleum. Koenigs, 1999a: 140, on the contrary, dates the construction of the building in the period between 351-344.

[759] Pedersen, 1994: 15, 17-18. Strong scepticism due to differences in the design and execution that also exist between the three buildings has, nevertheless, been expressed as well (Schipporeit, 1998: 219; cf. Koenigs, 1983, 151, 162-164).

[760] The later temple of Hemithea at Castabus also has similarities to that of Priene and could be a 'miniaturized' version of it (Jong, 1988).

[761] See below.

[762] Carter, 1983: 27-28; Hellström, 1994: 39.

Ἀλέξανδρος ἀνέθηκε τὸν ναὸν Ἀθηναίηι Πολιάδι'[763] (**Pl. 28a**). Alexander could have promised to support the construction of the temple anytime between 334 and 323, and this period cannot be narrowed down on epigraphic grounds. Furthermore, the date of the inscription and the date of the actual dedication need not necessarily be the same. This ambiguity allows both possibilities, that Alexander found the temple already under construction in 334, dedicated it and the dedication was inscribed at the same occasion, or that he took the initiative to erect the temple himself and had the dedication inscribed in due course.[764]

H. v. Gaertringen dated the inscription soon after Granicus.[765] Reservations or different opinions have since been expressed, but not always on a solid basis.[766] Strabo records Alexander's offer to fund and dedicate the Artemisium at Ephesus and the city's polite refusal, but makes no mention of a successful similar request to Priene.[767] It has been suggested that the Ephesus story could be merely an anecdote,[768] but it would not be too unbelievable a coincidence if two temples were actually under construction in Ionia in 334, so that Alexander could compensate for the rebuff from the first with the dedication of the second.

As Hornblower points out, the dedication of temples by individuals was not customary in the Greek world, especially before Alexander.[769] In Caria, on the contrary, all 4th century buildings in the Labraundan sanctuary of Zeus bear dedicatory inscriptions of the Hecatomnids on their front architraves[770] (**Pls. 27c, 28b-c**). During his campaign in Asia Minor in 334/3, Alexander met Ada, restored her as satrap of Caria and even accepted her as his 'adopted' mother.[771] It is possible that he also got acquainted with the Hecatomnid dedications in Labraunda and conceived the idea to

---

[763] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 156; Tod, 1948: No. 184; Heisserer, 1980: 143-144.

[764] Cf. Schipporeit, 1998: 216.

[765] Gaertringen, 1906: xii, 129 No. 156.

[766] Asboeck, 1913: passim; Berchem 1972; Heisserer, 1980: 158, 165 and n. 35; Hornblower, 1982: 329-330; Rumscheid, 1994: 42. In favour of the early date see now Crowther, 1996: 219 n. 87.

[767] Strab., 14.1.22.

[768] Botermann, 1994: 182.

[769] Hornblower, 1982: 280-288.

[770] See Crampa, 1972.

[771] Arr., *Anab.*, 1.23.7-8; cf. Hornblower, 1982: 222.

immitate them at Ephesus and Priene.[772] Nevertheless, his dedication was inscribed not on the architrave, but on the uppermost block of an anta by the entrance to the prodomus of the Athena Temple,[773] a rather awkward position allowing only poor visibility. It is rather unlikely that this was due to Alexander's modesty, as has been suggested.[774] That the anta top was the highest available spot at the time is a more convincing explanation.

As a result of compromise or haste, Alexander's move would make more sense in the period soon after his crossing to Asia. In his effort to secure the loyalty of the Ionian Greeks at his rear before advancing further into Anatolia in 333, Alexander declared the Greek cities free and autonomous.[775] The promise to contribute to the completion of the temples in Priene and Ephesus and to the construction of one at Ilium[776] could very well fit as part of this effort.[777] The regulations of the so-called 'Alexander Edict,' which as Sherwin-White has convincingly argued was issued in 334/3,[778] are also in compliance with such a scenario. It has been correctly noticed that Alexander could probably not afford to pay for the temple in 334/3,[779] in which case the dedication only signified a promise.

Based on the above remarks, the erection of the Athena Polias temple probably began soon after the refoundation of Priene, some time in the 340s. The extensive earthworks required for the construction of the sanctuary terrace must have been among the first projects of the new city. Variations in technique show that priority was probably given to the eastern side of the peristasis and the cella,[780] which was probably finished and temporarily roofed to house the cult statue within Alexander's lifetime.[781]

---

[772] Hornblower, 1982: 280-281; Carter, 1983: 26-31; Botermann, 1994: 181-182.

[773] Sherwin-White, 1985: 70-71 and fig. 1.

[774] Hornblower, 1982: 281; cf. Hesberg, 1994: 40.

[775] Arr., *Anab.*, 1.18.2.

[776] Strab., 13.1.26.

[777] Cf. Heisserer, 1980: 167; Thompson, 1982a: 180; Carter, 1983: 29-30; Crowther, 1996: 219 n. 87; Winzor, 1996: 31-34; Schipporeit, 1998: 217.

[778] Sherwin-White, 1985.

[779] Heisserer, 1980: 164-165; Rumscheid, 1994: 42. At the same time Alexander found himself obliged to dismiss his fleet due to lack of money (Arr., *Anab.*, 1.20.1-2; Diod. Sic., 17.22.5).

[780] Schede, 1934: 97-98; Rumscheid 1994: 42-43, 192.

[781] Koenigs, 1983: 160-161; Carter, 1990: 135; Rumscheid, 1994: 192.

An initiation of the temple by Alexander himself could not be definitely dismissed, but for Pytheus to have started at Priene near the end of the 330s or even later, perhaps a quarter of a century after the end of his work for the Hecatomnids, seems unlikely.[782] Available evidence thus indicates a lower limit for the beginning of construction of the Athena temple before or around 334, but since some ambiguities remain, this cannot be set with absolute certainty.

8.5 The problem of patronage

The chronology of the Athena Temple and Priene's refoundation is further connected with the question of patronage. It has been correctly pointed out, that the project for the building of the new city with its particular specifications was probably beyond the technical, coordinative and – most importantly – financial capabilities of a small polis like Priene, especially under the particular historical circumstances.[783] The 5th century had brought war, destruction, financial depression and probably also political weakness and dependency for Priene,[784] and these conditions probably did not improve – and perhaps even worsened – during the early 4th. Furthermore, if there is any truth in the theory that the need for refoundation was related to the destructive effect of the Maeander or another catastrophe, then Priene's condition during the first half of the 4th century must have been rather desperate.

Refoundations of cities in such an elaborate and comprehensive manner usually occur in cases of total destruction, synoecism or dynamic intervention of a powerful authority.[785] Priene could perhaps fall into the first category. However, when the need is immediate and the circumstances adverse, resettlement is usually piecemeal, additive, irregular and certainly with very few – if any –ambitions for monumentality and grandeur. The cases of Athens, Piraeus and Miletus are very characteristic in this respect. After the Persian destruction, immediate needs led Athenians to resettle their city in the old irregular way, virtually on top of its ruins, and to make use of every available building material. Only later, when conditions became favourable, Piraeus was laid out in a

---

[782] Cf. Hornblower, 1982: 244, 323; Carter, 1983: 31.

[783] Cf. Schipporeit, 1998: 210-211; Botermann, 1994: 169-170.

[784] Cf. p. 110 above.

[785] Schipporeit, 1998: 210, citing Rhodes, Olynth, Cassope, Halicarnassus, Piraeus and Miletus.

systematic way and according to modern technical and aesthetic standards.[786] The Milesians too, as we have seen, had to reside in a humble provisional settlement for two or more generations before moving into their new, comprehensively re-designed with monumental ambitions, city.

The building of the new Priene was an ambitious project that required a painstaking and expensive preparation of the site that involved extensive terracing, and appears to have proceeded right away with the construction of the Athena Temple by one of the most renowned architects of Ionia. When the construction of the fortifications also started, the population had perhaps not yet or only just settled in the city.[787] The total costs must have been too high for the state budget and the capabilities of ordinary Prieneans.[788] To assume that they were basically undertaken by the rich landowners, would in turn mean that these accepted to make huge contributions with the prospect that when they eventually moved into the new city, they would get a small, regular plot as everybody else. As has been pointed out, this would indicate a radical democracy[789] and an implementation of the institution of liturgy to an extent unparalleled even in Athens itself.[790]

It seems more reasonable to suppose that, in part at least if not completely, the re-foundation of Priene was financially supported and perhaps also politically instigated by a powerful external authority. The excavators of Priene considered this authority to be Alexander,[791] an idea later followed by other scholars as well.[792] The dedication of the Athena Polias temple by Alexander, the lack of epigraphic evidence from the city securely datable before his time, and the royal edict regulating Prienean affairs have formed the basis of this theory. But as mentioned already, Alexander had reasons to be interested in the cities of Ionia only in 334/3, at a time when he could spare no money

---

[786] Cf. Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 22-50.

[787] Cf. p. 114 above.

[788] On Priene's economy see Rostovtzeff, 1953: 175, 178-179; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 190.

[789] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 196, have suggested such an organization with a distribution of equal plots on which almost identical 'type-houses' were to be built for all, but this idea has been severely criticized (see p. 124 below).

[790] Schipporeit, 1998: 211; cf. Botermann, 1994: 169-170.

[791] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 45.

[792] Asboeck, 1913; Berchem, 1972; Fehr, 1980: 167; Hornblower, 1982: 323-330.

for the foundation of a city.[793] His dedication of the Athena Polias temple, probably an act of more symbolic than actual financial value, would fit better in this period. In this case, the beginning of the temple's construction before his arrival in Asia Minor would also indicate an earlier refoundation of the city as well.

A case for Athens was made by H. v. Gaertringen[794] on the grounds of ties of kinship and friendship attested between the two poleis, namely the collective grant of political rights by Priene to the Athenians,[795] and the addressing of Athens as a 'metropolis.'[796] However, the exchange of isopolity was a common phenomenon among Greek poleis,[797] and the addressing of Athens as a 'mother city' could just follow the early-established tradition, according to which Athens was the metropolis of the first Greek colonists of Ionia. Both acts should rather be seen as part of Priene's effort to secure the favour and political support of Athens.[798]

However interested Athens may have been in the east Aegean in the 350-340s, an Athenian intervention in Priene seems, nevertheless, rather implausible. As S. Hornblower and others have pointed out, after the King's Peace and the Social War, Athens probably had neither the resources nor the inclination to create such a sumptuous anti-Achaemenid bridgehead on the Asiatic mainland.[799] This would have meant no less than a violation of the King's Peace possibly leading to a military conflict, and therefore would have been strongly debated in the Athenian boule. No record of such a debate or renewed hostilities survives, however, although Athenian history is notoriously over-represented in literary sources. On the contrary, events of the period reveal a cautious policy of Athens towards Persia.[800]

---

[793] There is actually information about Alexander's intention to refound the city of Smyrna (Paus., 7.5.1-3), but it is unfortunately not known if he did so or if his promise was materialized later by Antigonus or Lysimachus. Though perhaps unfulfilled, the promise has been immortalized in the city's coinage (Klose, 1987: 28-29).

[794] Gaertringen, 1906: xi; cf. Regling and Dressel, 1927: 2; Kleiner, 1962: 1186-1187, 1193; Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 2; Kleiner, Hommel and Müller-Wiener, 1967: 50-51.

[795] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 5.

[796] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 109.

[797] Gawantka, 1975: 100 and n. 20.

[798] Cf. Botermann, 1994: 167-168; Schipporeit, 1998: 215-216.

[799] Hornblower, 1982: 324-325; Botermann, 1994: 167-168; Schipporeit, 1998: 213.

[800] Schipporeit, 1998: 211-216; cf. Diod. Sic.,16.44.1.

Nonetheless, Hoepfner and Schwandner have recently put Athens forward again on the basis of the so-called 'type-house,' which they identified as the city's standard residential unit. This, according to their interpretation, indicates statutory equality of plots and therefore democratic principles underlying the new foundation.[801] Athens seemed to be the obvious motivator. This view, however, has been widely contradicted,[802] and it is very doubtful that a uniform 'type-house' was imposed and rigorously followed, rather than that a traditional house type adapted to the local socioeconomic and environmental conditions became common in Priene.[803]

A Hecatomnid patronage was first suggested by G. Bean and J. Cook as part of a wider programme of relocations and synoecisms of cities in Caria and beyond at the time of Mausolus.[804] It is uncertain how many of these actually took place[805] and what exactly the role of the Carian satrap was.[806] But it is a fact that Mausolus and his successors in the effort to strengthen and expand their rule – at the cost not only of Athens in the west but also of the Persian King from whose direct control they cautiously, yet steadily, distanced themselves[807]– interfered with the political affairs of poleis in Asia Minor and the islands, bringing several of them under their influence and control by means of treaties, alliances and conquest.[808] They are also known to have patronized and dedicated several building projects in the sanctuaries of Sinuri, Mylasa, Amyzon and Labraunda within their own territory.[809]

Priene also lay in the Carian sphere of influence, and it is very unlikely that it remained unaffected by Hecatomnid activities.[810] As far as the city's plan and architecture is concerned, the impact of the so-called 'Ionian Renaissance,' which seems to

---

[801] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 189, 196.

[802] See C. Meier in the introduction to Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: ix-xii; Schuller, Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1989: passim; Botermann, 1994: 168-170; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 83-84.

[803] Koenigs, 1993: 383 n. 8; Botermann, 1994: 170.

[804] Bean and Cook, 1957: 141; Bean, 1966: 198.

[805] Cf. Demand, 1990.

[806] Cf. Hornblower, 1982: 78-105.

[807] On Mausolus' role in the power struggle within the Persian kingdom see Hornblower, 1982: 170-182; Weiskopf, 1989: 65-68.

[808] On the foreign policy of Mausolus towards the Greek poleis see Hornblower, 1982: 107-137.

[809] Hornblower, 1982: 107-137, 274-293.

[810] Cf. Carter, 1983: 27-31 and 1990: 130; Botermann, 1994; Schipporeit, 1998: 218-236.

have emerged and flourished under Carian patronage, is discernible and suggests at least an indirect relation,[811] although the elusive personality and career of Pytheus alone is not enough to establish an immediate connection between the Hecatomnids and the new Priene.[812]

There are, however, some further clues that could point towards the same direction: five female heads belonging to marble statues found in Priene's most important sanctuaries, three in that of Athena Polias[813] and two in that of Demeter and Kore[814] (**Pl. 28d-e**). All five heads, datable on stylistic grounds within the 3rd quarter of the 4th century, share the same characteristic hairstyle combined with a '*σάκκος*,' which in the late Classical period is only attested in the region of Caria and in connection with the Hecatomnid dynasty. As this hairstyle, which brings together archaizing Greek and oriental features, appears to vanish even from Caria after the Hecatomnids, it could be particular to them and their court as a symbol of status.[815]

The possibility that these five statues, which are the earliest found in Priene,[816] represent members of the Hecatomnid family or court is quite strong. Particularly the over life-sized statue found in the Athena Polias temple has been identified by many scholars as that of Ada, who together with Idrieus succeeded Mausolus and Artemisia in 351.[817] The only probable reason for which Ada and/or other Hecatomnids could have been honoured with statues in the sanctuaries of Priene – especially with a colossal statue in the Athena Polias temple – is as founders or major benefactors of the new city, which at that time was at the very early stages of construction. There is an interest-

---

[811] Pedersen, 1991: passim, and 1994: 15-18.

[812] Cf. Schipporeit, 1998: 219-220.

[813] Pullan and Newton, 1891: 34 Pl. 20a; Waywell, 1978: 41, 71-72; Carter, 1983: 29, 264-266, 271-278 Nos. 85-86, 311 No. 118 Pls. 39, 40, 47; also 1990: 134-135; Kreikenbom, 1992: 8 and n. 34, 46, 74, 116-117 No. I 3; Schipporeit, 1998: 221-224 Pl. 19.

[814] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 155-156 figs. 124-127; Blümel, 1966: 86-87 Nos. 104-105 figs. 138-141; Waywell, 1978: 71-72, 105; Carter, 1983: 277-278; Schipporeit, 1998: 224-228 Pls. 20-21.

[815] Schipporeit, 1998: 221-228 (221 nn. 122-124 bibliography). Other examples appear on sculptures from the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus and on coins from Cos, which have been associated with Artemisia.

[816] Schipporeit, 1998: 228.

[817] Carter, 1983: 29 and 1990: 134; Kreikenbom, 1992: 8, 34, 46, 74, 116-117; Schipporeit, 1998: 221-224; contra Rolley, 1999: 313-315. As to the chronology, Carter hesitated over a date at the beginning of the 3rd quarter of the century or at the end, namely, after the restoration of Ada in the Carian satrapy by Alexander in 334/3. On stylistic as well as historical grounds, however, the early date seems preferable (Schipporeit, 1998: 222-223; Kreikenbom, 1992: 116-117).

ing parallel from Erythrae: a decree from around 357-5 – of the oligarchic(?) boule and not the demos – hailed Mausolus as benefactor of the city and honoured him with, among other grants, a bronze statue in the agora, and Artemisia with a marble one in the temple of Athena.[818]

There is, of course, no compelling evidence, but a Hecatomnid involvement in the refoundation of Priene is possible, and of the cases proposed it is certainly the most plausible. Idrieus and Ada could have supported and perhaps also instigated the building of the new city in the 340s as part of an effort to regenerate the Ionian League and its festival, the Panionia, in which Priene traditionally played a leading role.[819] A reinvigorated Ionian League under their influence and control would be of great service to the political interests of the Hecatomnids, and the small city of Priene could be a very useful tool in the pursuit of this goal.[820]

Nevertheless, any Carian intervention in Priene was probably short-lived.[821] Idrieus died in 344/3, and in 341/0 Ada was ousted by her half-brother Pixodarus.[822] It seems very unlikely that the latter would have had any intention of continuing their project in Priene, and historical circumstances would probably have prevented him from doing so anyway. In 336/5 he himself died and was succeeded by the Persian Orontobates.[823] Works in the city and the Athena Polias temple must have been advancing very slowly, if at all, when Alexander arrived in 334. The king's consequent interest in the city might then be partly explained by his attested relationship with Ada.[824] Depending on the state of the temple, Alexander's dedication may have taken place immediately or a little later. The city's fortifications were perhaps also partially complete or were built at around that time.[825]

---

[818] Engelmann and Merkelbach, 1972: 53-56 No. 8; Schipporeit, 1998: 223.

[819] Cf. Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, 1906: 50; Kleiner, Hommel and Müller-Wiener, 1967: 15; Schipporeit, 1998: 231-232.

[820] Schipporeit, 1998: 230-236, even suggests that the Hecatomnids may have seen Priene as a means to promote their policy in mainland Greece as well, due to the city's membership in the Delphic Amphictyony.

[821] Cf. pp. 142-143 below.

[822] Arr., *Anab.*, 1.23.7; cf. Hornblower, 1982: 41-51.

[823] Arr., *Anab.*, 1.23. 8.

[824] See n. 771 above.

[825] See pp. 115-116 above.

Alexander's contribution to the building of the new Priene is difficult to assess. As already noted, in 334/3 – the only period in which he had reasons to think about Priene and the other cities of Asia Minor – Alexander had no money to spend.[826] It is very much possible that Priene's benefits from Alexander consisted mainly – perhaps even entirely[827]– in the favourable regulations of his edict that set the city free, restored control over its territory and exempted it from taxes, and the general improvement in political and economic conditions in the whole of Asia Minor. It has been widely believed that Megabyzus, the temple custodian (*νεωκόρος*) of the Ephesian Artemis who was honoured in Priene for his contribution towards the completion of the Athena Polias temple[828] had acted under Alexander's orders.[829] But if the recently revised chronology of the Megabyzus decree that lowers its date from the 330s to the 290s is correct,[830] then even the case that Alexander funded the Athena Polias temple indirectly through Ephesus becomes void.[831]

The city received some donations and even more promises for building projects from influential rulers in the future as well. It seems, however, that many of these promises were not fulfilled, and the city had to rely mainly on its own resources for architectural undertakings. And since the limited state budget was not always adequate, it was often up to the wealthier of the citizens to contribute to the expenses. The long construction periods apparent for the city's major projects are indicative of this fact.

9 Architectural development in its historical setting

9.1 Location and general layout

The selection of the site had always played a very important role in ancient Greek city building. Defensibility, accessibility, orientation, water supply, geopolitical importance, morphology of the ground were factors that affected this decision. Practicality was a main concern, but as will be shown, not always decisive. The qualities of

---

826 See pp. 120-120 above.

827 Cf. Schipporeit, 1998: 216-217.

828 Gaertringen, I906: Nos. 3 and 231.

829 Cf. Rumscheid, 1994: 43.

830 Crowther, 1996.

831 See further p. 146 below.

Priene's location have already been mentioned.[832] There were, nevertheless, considerable disadvantages as well.[833]

The Teloneia acropolis stood above all neighbouring outcrops of Mycale in the region; the elevation on which the city itself was built, on the other hand, did not. From the adjacent hills the enemy could have a very clear and detailed view of the city's military preparations, which was further facilitated by the sloping ground.[834] Again, although Teloneia was literally impregnable by the enemy, at the same time it was very much inaccessible to the citizens of Priene as well. Should the walls of the lower city fail to impede the aggressors, the population could never make a hasty ascent en masse to the acropolis via the dangerous narrow path and the flights of steps that climbed the steep rock.[835] Teloneia served more as a garrison station and observation post overlooking the Meander valley and protecting the city against a surprise attack from the rear.

Furthermore, huge rocks that often tumbled down the acropolis cliff posed a further constant threat to people and buildings in the city. The excavators assumed that a protective zone of trees and bushes was laid out at the foot of the cliff (**Pl. 21**) to prevent the rocks from reaching the inhabited area, but how effective this measure may have been one cannot tell. At the time of the excavations, when this protective zone no longer existed, the whole area down to the theatre and the temple of Athena Polias was covered with huge rocks which had to be blown up.[836]

Nevertheless, it was more the steepness and unevenness of the terrain that raised the most serious problems. In every hillside settlement, one expects the need for terracing of some extent. In the case of Priene, however, the slope of almost 20% in all directions was more than considerable (**Pl. 29a**). The construction of every single house demanded either the carving out of large quantities of rock or the building of retaining walls and earth filling or both. As a result, very often room floors in the same house were on different levels. Far more difficult than the terracing for the construction of private houses was the leveling of the ground for the street network and the foundation of public buildings. The site of the agora, which was the flattest part of the whole site,

---

[832] See p. 108 above.

[833] Cf. Fehr, 1980: 168-169.

[834] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 36 and Plate V with a characteristic panoramic view of Priene from the adjacent hill to the west.

[835] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 36; Kleiner, 1962: 1192; Fehr, 1980: 168-169.

[836] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 51.

still required the extraction of several thousand cubic meters of rock for the leveling of its surface. The same applied to the temple of Athena, the gymnasia and the stadium[837] **(Pl. 29b)**.

The Prienean territory offered alternative locations that comprised defensibility and drinkable water.[838] But even in the chosen location, at least some of the difficulties would have been much easier to overcome, had the planners of Priene been prepared to employ a more flexible scheme in the design of the street network adapted to the special features of the terrain.[839] Instead, they adopted a full and strict version of the grid system. The orthogonal layout of the streets in an exact north-to-south and east-to-west alignment intensified the need for terracing, and impeded traffic by reducing streets, especially on the north-south axis, into flights of steps (**Pl. 29c**). The difficulties caused by the combination of rigid grid planning and sloping mountainous terrain were, of course, not insuperable by Greek engineering of the period. Still, though, they turned every building project into a painful and, more important, expensive task.

The drawbacks could have certainly not escaped the attention of the city planners, and this indicates that their decision was not just practically minded or, rather, that they were prepared to partly sacrifice practicality in favour of another end. Impressiveness appears to have been that end. A main consideration of the founders of Priene, according to B. Fehr, was to build the city at a very eye-catching location. Indeed, the rock of Teloneia is the most spectacular natural element of the south Mycale region, 'a striking landmark that immediately draws the attention of even the most remote observer to the city. Without this "exclamation mark" the general visual image of the city's architecture would lose a great part of its intensity.'[840]

In Priene, the extraordinary qualities of the landscape were utilized to enhance architectural impressiveness. The effect was further intensified as the regularity and orderliness of the grid plan were juxtaposed with the dramatic scenery of the rocky slopes of Mycale. The contrast was so acute and vivid, that the relief of the street network was distinguishable from a great distance to anybody approaching by land or sea. On a clear

---

[837] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 194.

[838] Cf. Fehr, 1980: 169 and 182 n. 87.

[839] Aristotle, *Pol.*, 1330b21-31, suggested that for practical reasons a city should perhaps have a partly regular, partly irregular plan.

[840] Fehr, 1980: 169.

day the pattern was probably visible even from the busy port of the neighbouring Miletus.[841]

Priene is not a unique example of the application of rigid grid planning to an exceptionally steep site, but belongs to a greater group of cities founded or re-planned in the same way, such as Rhodes in the end of the 5th century,[842] Heraclea by Latmus, Cnidus, Astypalaea on Cos and Soluntum in Sicily in the 4th.[843] This particular combination of location and planning reflects a special conception of the ideal city and its form, characteristic of the period and the sociopolitical and ideological circumstances. The contrast with Pergamum, the site of which had many similarities with that of Priene, shows that monumental planning could also be achieved by different means in a different historical and ideological context.[844] In both cases, however, a new perception of nature and the physical landscape is evident.[845]

Architecture, engineering and city planning were to Greeks forms of art (*τέχνη*).[846] At first considered to be practically oriented and thus related to manual skills and labour, by increasingly incorporating mathematics, geometry and the emerging natural sciences they also acquired a strong intellectual basis. From the 4th century onwards, the idea evolved that with the combined power of science and knowledge, technology as systematized art could enable man first to become emancipated from the threatening, unpredictable forces of nature (*φύσις*)[847] and then to master it.[848] The contrast of harsh landscape and grid planning emphasized exactly the capacity of man's technology to defy and overcome the adversities of nature. In the case of Priene this

---

[841] Fehr, 1980: 182 n. 84.

[842] The grid plan, forced on the theatrically sloping terrain (Diod. Sic., 20.83.2), contributed greatly to the spectacular appearance of Rhodes that was so admired in antiquity (Strab., 14.2.5). Monumentality again took precedence over practicality, as the combination of theatre-like topography and grid planning put the city under the constant threat of flooding. Although an extensive drainage system was included as part of the original plan (later repeatedly improved and expanded), the city of Rhodes was seriously flooded three times (Diod. Sic., 19.45.1-8). On the plan of Rhodes see Kondis, 1954 and 1958; Hoepfner, 1988; Konstantinopoulos, 1988 and 1990; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 51-67.

[843] Cf. Fehr, 1980: 172; Owens, 1991: 64-66.

[844] See Radt, 1993.

[845] Cf. Pagenstecher, 1919; Bernert, 1935: 1840-1847; Schneider, 1967: 147-156.

[846] Cf. Pollit, 1974: 32-58.

[847] Aristotle, *Mech.*, 847a.11-14, regards *τέχνη* as a counterpoise to nature: '*παρὰ φύσιν.*'

[848] Cf. Hesberg, 1981: 81-85.

could be of even greater symbolic importance, if the abandonment of the city's old site was actually necessitated by the whims of nature.

The art of city planning, however, involved more than monumental appearance. In the 5th century, Hippodamus and his followers had set the theoretical foundations for the 'division of cities' (*διαίρεσις τῶν πόλεων*)[849] into classes and land-types, which probably also encompassed the comprehensive and systematic organization, distribution and delimitation of the individual functions of civic life and the actual design of cities.[850] During the 4th, Plato and Aristotle proposed models of the ideal state, in which they addressed not only economic, social and political issues, but made specific suggestions about the physical appearance and layout of cities on an ideological, moral and aesthetic basis as well. Despite their differences, the two models agreed in asserting rationality as the measure of propriety, value and beauty.[851]

The orthogonal grid system with the insula as the module for the dimensioning of house plots, public areas and civic buildings alike was the new element in the rationalization and systematization of urban planning first introduced in Miletus.[852] It made the logical and clear articulation of the various city parts and the assignment of specific functions to each of them possible, resulting in a balanced distribution of public and residential areas and securing that certain rules and principles would be observed in the future as the city developed. The grid pattern also facilitated, at least potentially, a commensurable and 'fair' – though not necessarily even – allocation of plots.[853]

Proportionality further contributed to the symmetry[854] of the layout, which according to Vitruvius was among the fundamental principles of architecture[855] and an essential characteristic of every well ordered, coherent and aesthetically pleasing architectural project.[856] Vitruvius wrote extensively on the training of architects and the wide

---

[849] Aristot., *Pol.*, 2.1267b.23.

[850] See also last chapter.

[851] Cf. Fehr, 1980: 172-175.

[852] See p. 55 above and last chapter.

[853] Cf. Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 27-28.

[854] On *symmetria* see Pollitt, 1974: 14-22, 256-258.

[855] Scranton, 1974; Knell, 1985: 30-32.

[856] Vitr., 1.2.1-4, 1.3.2, 2.1.7, 3.1.1-9, 6.8.9, 7.pr.12, 14); cf. Philostr., *Imag.*, 1.pr.1.

range of disciplines and skills in which they must be competent.[857] Technical knowledge should be combined with a rich cultural background: science, mathematics, astronomy, medicine, music, philosophy, literature and history. History is of particular importance, because an architect must be aware of the symbolism behind the various architectural elements and forms and use them accordingly.[858] Vitruvius' main source on this issue was Pytheus, who in his writings expressed the emphatic view that the architect ought to be pretty much a 'homo universalis,' an all-round expert who can beat the specialists in every field.[859]

The intention and effort to apply the latest ideas and developments in city planning to the design of the new Priene are apparent. Besides its rigorousness, the grid was also perfectly aligned with the points of the compass, a property with no apparent practical purpose other than displaying the astronomical knowledge of the planners, and further accentuating the regularity of the whole scheme.[860]

The sites of all the major public buildings were allocated and reserved in the original layout of the city in adherence to an overall logical concept. Their selection was made on the basis of functionality, notional proximity and ideological correlation. Around the agora, areas connected with the various functions of civic life – religious and secular, public and private – were arranged paratactically.[861] Major streets either led to or ran in front of important public buildings. A sanctuary and the marketplace framed the agora from the east and west, the bouleuterion and the prytaneion from the north. The gymnasium and the theatre were positioned consecutively on the mid north-south axis (**Pls. 22, 25**).

The Athena Polias sanctuary and the agora were the two leading features of the city plan. The manner of their incorporation into the grid could be interpreted as a combination of rationality and symbolism. The same amount of space (two full and two half insulae) was allocated to each of them. The agora was positioned at the physical centre

---

857 Vitr., 1.1; Cf. Knell, 1985: 20-30.

858 Vitr., 1.1.3-5.

859 Vitr., 1.1.11-12; cf. Coulton, 1977: 24-25; Knell, 1985: 29; Müller, 1989: 90-92; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 310.

860 Cf. Kleiner, 1962: 1190-1191; Gerkan, 1924a: 80; Martin, 1974: 42-44; Fehr, 1980: 160 and 180 n. 25.

861 Koenigs, 1993: 387.

of the city,[862] while the sanctuary occupied a high and particularly conspicuous spot. The intention of the planners to accentuate the sanctuary's dominating position is revealed by the fact that a huge terrace was constructed for it. On its raised platform, the temple appeared as if on an artificial citadel, sustained by a massive retaining wall (**Pl. 30a**).

The agora appeared as the natural centre of civic life under the auspices of the city's tutelary goddess. As the equal-sized sanctuary and agora were positioned corner to corner, they alluded to the bipolarity that characterized the Classical Greek polis, consisting in the balance between its fundamental religious and political functions. That these functions represented successive levels in the life, associations and symbolism of the polis community was in a way displayed in the climaxing physical arrangement of sanctuary and agora.

The rationality of the city plan becomes even more evident from the full integration of the Athena Polias temple in the grid system, which resulted in the axes of the corner columns of the southern pteron coinciding exactly with the ideal corners of the corresponding insula.[863] This arrangement seems to indicate the architect's strong desire for a homogeneous and rationally organized whole in pursuit of an ideal intellectual concept rather than a visual effect, since it was not perceptible to the eye. Quite the opposite, this particular position of the temple prevented any optical alignment with either the sanctuary entrance or Athena Street, which could have easily been achieved, if desired, through a placement a few meters further south.[864]

Although logical arrangement and strict compliance with the grid plan discouraged the formation of visual axes and reference points,[865] this does not mean that there were no such interests on the planners' behalf. The acropolis-like impression of the Athena Polias sanctuary, especially to someone approaching from the south-west and entering the city through the West Gate, was particularly strong and further enhanced by the steep rocky area free of streets and buildings to the west of the temple (**Pl. 25**). The view from the agora was also impressive. Doxiadis has attempted to show that seen from the point of the agora altar, the temple's front was meant to be exactly in line with

---

[862] See p. 115 above.

[863] Cf. p. 117 above.

[864] Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 119.

[865] Cf. Gerkan, 1924a: 85-86; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 32.

the ridge of Teloneia[866] (**Pl. 30b-c**). In any case, viewed from below against the massive cliff, the elegant figure of the temple was emphasized even more. On the other hand, the theatre at the centre and top of the built-up area provided a panoramic view of the temple and the whole city with the Maeander plain and the sea in the background[867] **(Pl. 30d)**.

The homogeneity and uniformity of Priene's original layout, in which the sanctuary and temple of Athena Polias appear to be organically – intellectually as well as physically – integrated, has led to the widespread assumption that Pytheus was not only the temple's architect, but also the planner of the city itself.[868]

Hoepfner and Schwandner have even argued that Priene – and perhaps Halicarnassus, which they suggested may have been designed by Pytheus too[869]– are the materialization of a whole new theory of architecture and city planning, which Pytheus developed on the basis of Hippodamean urbanism and Pythagorean philosophy.[870] According to this theory, the city is an organic, self-inclusive entity, the constituents of which are interdependent and compliant with a general set of rules. There is an all-embracing order determining at successive levels the hierarchy and the proportions of the various city sections/zones, of the individual buildings, and of the architectural members and parts that make up each particular structure. This order, which derives from nature and can be perceived and put into practice through the power of reason, is what brings harmony and cosmos to human life and the city as its material and social setting. The plan of a city should thus be the product of an overall concept, and treated by the architect as a work of art in its entirety.[871]

Existing information about Pytheus and his work, however, is very scarce[872] and does not include any mention of him being a city planner.[873] Furthermore, there is still

---

[866] Doxiadis, 1972: 136 and figs. 84-85.

[867] Scully, 1979: 198.

[868] Gaertringen, 1906: xi; Kleiner, 1962: 1193; Riemann, 1963: 459; Doxiadis, 1972: 136; Gruben, 1986: 379; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 310-312; Hellström, 1994: 39; contra Koenigs, 1983: 164; Svenson-Evers, 1996: 124-125.

[869] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 233. The city has not been systematically excavated, however, and what is known about its plan is insufficient to allow conclusions.

[870] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 310-312.

[871] Hoepfner and Schwandner's 'Gesamtkunstwerk.'

[872] See Riemann, 1963; Svenson-Evers, 1996: 116-150.

much uncertainty concerning the period of the city's foundation. The case put forward by Hoepfner and Schwandner, therefore, remains an attractive, yet unverifiable hypothesis.[874]

The sources, nevertheless, do indicate that Pytheus was not an ordinary architect, but also a theorist and a critic of architecture. His work on the Mausoleum and the Athena temple was accompanied with written commentaries,[875] in which besides presumably describing the technical details of the structures,[876] he also made critical remarks on the properties of the orders,[877] and expressed opinions on theoretical issues such as the education of architects and the subject-matter of architecture.[878] One could also assume that in his treatises Pytheus also wished to substantiate and justify his technical and aesthetic choices, to point out his personal contribution to the development of architecture and, in the long run, to set his works as didactic models to architects of the future.[879]

Pytheus' profound knowledge of the theory and history of Greek architecture and its orders is apparent in the design of the Athena Polias temple, whose basic characteristics are orderliness, rational mathematical relations and clear articulation.[880] In the ground plan, all parts were distributed strictly along the lines of a grid and proportioned according to a module, based on the size of the square column plinth (6x6 ft.). As this was equal to the inter-plinth span, the axial spacing amounted to 12 ft., producing axial dimensions of 60x120 ft. (ratio 1:2) in the 6x11 column (5x10 interaxials) peristasis of the temple. The length of 120 ft. allowed the building to be totally integrated in the city

---

[873] Cf. Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 234. Certain scholars believe that Pytheus was a sculptor as well, based on Pliny's (*N.H.*, 36.31) report that a certain Pythis created the quadriga that crowned the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus (whether it is the same or different person or the name appears erroneously in the text is unclear; cf. Jeppesen and Lutrell, 1986: 63-67), and in accordance with his ideas about the 'omnipotence' of the architect (see p. 132 above). Carter, 1979: 146; 1983: passim and 199-201; 1990: 132-133, has supported that Pytheus also designed the sculptural decoration of the Athena Polias temple and its altar.

[874] Cf. Svenson-Evers, 1996: 124-125.

[875] Vitr., 7.pr.12.

[876] Coulton, 1977: 25; Müller, 1989:66-67.

[877] Vitr., 4.3.1.

[878] Cf. p. 132 above.

[879] Fehr, 1980: 163; Pollitt, 1986: 242-243.

[880] Knell, 1980: 150-151; Gruben, 1986: 379.

plan (insula dimensions 120x160 ft.).[881] The elements of the entablature were also related to each other by an intricate mathematical system based on the same principle of proportions.[882]

The Athena Polias temple (**Pls. 26, 27a**) was very small compared to the giant Archaic temples of Ionia, and its Ionic order differed even from that appearing in the peripteroi of neighbouring cities like Myus and Miletus.[883] Certain features like the column bases and capitals, the frieze-less entablature and the ornamentation trace their origin in the Archaic tradition of Ionia,[884] but others such as the characteristic accentuation of the entrance by means of multiple colonnades and the deep double pteron are absent, and others such as the grid plan acquire a new character and importance.[885] Certain 'Doric' features like the curvature, the three-stepped crepis, the density of the pteron, the entasis of the columns, and the addition of prodomus and opisthodomus in antis are adapted and used in Priene, and some of them also in the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus and the temple of Zeus at Labraunda.[886]

As a knowledgeable master, Pytheus was in position to draw ideas and material from various sources. In the design of the Athena Polias temple – ground plan, elevation, structural and ornamental details – he made an eclectic and scholarly composition of heterogeneous elements from different architectural traditions. In this amalgamation of old and new features of both the Ionic and Doric orders,[887] and the uniting of Ionic symmetry and Doric density, a conscious effort of Pytheus to reform and rejuvenate monumental Ionic architecture or, perhaps more correctly, to create a 'canon' for a 'classica'l architectural style of Ionia has been recognized.[888]

---

[881] Cf. p. 117 above.

[882] See Riemann, 1963: 482-485; Knell, 1980: 152-155; Gruben, 1986: 380-383; Jong, 1988; Pedersen, 1989; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 203-206, 230-233; Koenigs, 1983 and 1999.

[883] Koenigs, 1999a: 142-143.

[884] Riemann, 1963: 466-475, 484-487, 509-510; Gruben, 1986: 382-384; Pedersen, 1994: 22, 27-31; Hellesträm, 1994: 48-50; Koenigs, 1983 and 1999.

[885] Cf. Martin, 1987: 193-194; Koenigs, 1999a: 145.

[886] Gruben, 1986: 380-383; Pedersen, 1994: 23-25; Hellesträm, 1994: 48; Koenigs, 1983 and 1999. On the relations with the Mausoleum and the Zeus temple cf. pp. 116-118 above.

[887] Some of these features, especially the Doric curvature and entasis, were already becoming obsolete in mainland Greece.

[888] Riemann, 1963: 512; Fehr, 1980: 163; Knell, 1980: 151-152; Gruben, 1986: 379-380, 384; Lauter, 1986: 181-182; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 133; Koenigs, 1999a: 152-153.

The result of Pytheus' effort was more a classicistic than a classical style,[889] characterized by dry academic comprehension,[890] prescriptive and dogmatic rather than inspired order, and a sort of icy intellectual elegance,[891] which did not find many followers, but did open new horizons for Ionian architects to explore.[892] Above all, however, the work of Pytheus seems to have responded to a historical need. Historical circumstances had not allowed Ionian architecture to follow the developments in mainland Greece and develop its own 'classical' style during the 5th century.[893] Only towards the end of the Classical period the conditions for a renaissance of monumental Ionian temple building occurred. Pytheus who appears to have been the leading figure of this 'Ionian Renaissance,'[894] marked the beginning but also the end of an era.[895]

Quite ironically as well, the movement appears to have emerged under the auspices of the non-Greek dynasts of Caria. As seen, the character and extent of the relationship between them and Pytheus remains unclear, but their (early) commission(s) probably offered him the initial opportunity and freedom for experimentation,[896] and his employment at Priene – possibly under their patronage again – the chance to apply his matured ideas.

No matter how inspired, intellectually elaborated, scientifically grounded and aesthetically refined the ideas of Pytheus may have been, however, the design of the major public buildings of the new Priene – let alone of the city itself should the case be proven – could never be the result of his personal taste, initiative and decision alone. In the first chapter it was stressed that the architect is primarily an interpreter of the needs, wishes and agendas of his patrons and of society as a whole.[897]

---

[889] Riemann, 1963: 512.

[890] Knell, 1980: 150-151, 153.

[891] Pollitt, 1986: 244.

[892] On the influence of Pytheus' work on later buildings see Riemann, 1963: 511; Gruben, 1986: 379, 384; Koenigs, 1983: 169-170.

[893] Riemann, 1963: 509; Gruben, 1986: 379-380; Lauter, 1986: 181-182.

[894] See Isager, 1994; cf. Lauter, 1986: 181.

[895] Cf. Koenigs, 1984: 92.

[896] Cf. Hellström and Thieme, 1981 and 1982; Pedersen, 1989 and 1994; Hellström, 1994; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 230-233

[897] See p. 28 above; cf. Fusco, 1972; Bammer, 1985: 27.

As already discussed, there is a good possibility that the refoundation of Priene was instigated and sponsored by the Hecatomnids of Caria as part of their plan to secure their influence over the Greek cities by revitalizing the Ionian League and its religious festival, the Panionia.[898] With this costly beneficence, they would not only appear to be giving Ionian Greeks their old common sanctuary back, but also to be supporting and revitalizing its custodian, Priene, in a manner worthy of its role and status. Most importantly, the refoundation according to modern principles of city planning, the embellishment with fine public buildings and the erection of a monumental temple for the tutelary goddess on the basis of an innovative and exemplary design by one of Ionia's prominent architects would invest Priene with the necessary authority and grandeur to become a useful agent of Hecatomnid interests vis-à-vis the big and powerful cities of the Dodecapolis.

On the symbolic level, the restoration of Priene may have been meant to remind of and prefigure a return to great past times, when the poleis of Ionia and their League were at their prime. In this respect, the 'Ionian Renaissance' in architecture could express the Hecatomnid vision of a political regeneration of Asia Minor under their leadership. It is perhaps in this context that the preference for indigenous architectural forms of Archaic Ionia instead of Classical Attic-Ionic in Hecatomnid buildings should also be explained. One should not forget that Athens was the main opponent of the Hecatomnids in the struggle for influence on Asia Minor.[899]

In Priene, the intention to exalt and underline the local Ionian tradition is especially apparent in the design of the Athena Polias temple,[900] but perhaps not just there. The peculiar hairstyle of the female Hecatomnid nobility attested in the Prienean statues[901] might also be indicative of an intentional archaism.[902] By reuniting the Ionians at Panionium under their auspices and presenting themselves as philhellenes and protectors of Ionian heritage, the Hecatomnids could challenge the position and influence of Athens as the ancient metropolis of Ionian Hellenism, and play down the criticism for dominating the Greek poleis of Asia Minor.

---

[898] See p. 126 above.

[899] Schipporeit, 1998: 233; cf. Pedersen, 1994: esp. 32; contra Knell, 1980: 150.

[900] Schipporeit, 1998: 233; cf. p. 136 and n. 884 above.

[901] See p. 125 above.

[902] Schipporeit, 1998: 234.

Nevertheless, the emphasis on the scientific efficiency, sophistication and up-to-dateness of the city plan, on the Ionian origin of the architectural forms, and on Ionian Greek identity in general, would be perfectly understandable even if one should consider the Hecatomnid hypothesis inadequately substantiated or unconvincing, and the refoundation of Priene a project conceived and carried out by its own demos.[903]

Irrespective, again, of Pytheus' personal motives as an individual artist and intellectual, the ambitious project could be interpreted as an effort of the Prienean civic community to prove its resilience against adversities, display its cultural achievements, technological know-how and general competitiveness, and to underline its high standing and prestige – despite its smallness – among Ionian Greeks and its more powerful neighbours.[904] The fact that Priene's most important and conspicuous monument, the temple of Athena Polias, and perhaps the plan of the whole city as well, were works of a leading Ionian architect added even more to the effectiveness of these claims, and constituted an extra reason for pride that strengthened community identity and solidarity. This would have been even greater if the period of the city's refoundation actually coincided with the liberation from the Persian rule at the time of Alexander.

As seen, the building of a prestigious new Priene was complemented by the construction of a fortification wall.[905] Continual wars, instability and intense political antagonism in the Greek world during the 4th century made defensive walls an indispensable feature of every new city. Aristotle recognized their necessity, and further emphasized that fortifications should be worthy of the city, not only in terms of their ability to withstand the latest techniques of warfare, but in aesthetic terms as well by contributing to its beauty.[906]

Builders did their best to provide Priene with effective fortifications in accordance with modern standards.[907] The walls consisted of several sections *à crémaillère* protected at intervals by small towers, and were not coordinated with the street system,

---

[903] The facts would perhaps not be significantly different even if one should believe in the refoundation of Priene by Alexander. The effort to revitalize the Ionian League and the Panionia has often been ascribed to him – in which case the motives would be basically the same – and also to Athens. Both views, however, as well as the possibility of a local Ionian initiative have not been widely accepted (cf. Schipporeit, 1998: 232 and n. 165).

[904] Cf. Fehr, 1980: 163.

[905] See pp. 115-116 above.

[906] Aristot., *Pol.*, 1330b.32-1331a.18 (*πρὸς κόσμον*); cf. Fehr, 1980: 173-174; Gros, 1992: 212.

[907] See McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 48-53.

but followed the natural features of the terrain incorporating even the almost inaccessible acropolis (**Pl. 22**). Limited financial resources, nevertheless, apparently prevented small poleis like Priene from acquiring state-of-the-art torsion artillery housed in massive towers, and from regularly updating their fortifications to follow developments in siege craft. Indeed, Prienean defences were rather passive, and faced with full-scale siege by a well-equipped army they could not hold out long.[908] But still, considerable effort and funds were allocated to making the walls part of Priene's cosmos. Fine rectangular masonry with an embossed outer face was employed throughout (**Pl. 24c**). The regularity of the stone blocks – consistent with that of the city buildings – came in strong contrast with the shapeless mass of the rocky landscape, and as the wall climbed the steep terrain, it made a strong impact from afar and intensified the effect of mastery of human technology over nature.[909]

It would perhaps not be an overstatement that the symbolic role of Priene's fortifications was of even greater importance than their actual defensive one. Besides providing psychological reassurance, their presence verified not only the city's claims as an autonomous and sovereign community,[910] but also its superiority – and therefore justified dominance – over its territory and the non-Greek native population (the pedieis) with whom friction was almost constant.[911] As parts of the city's cosmos and symbols of power and control, the fortifications were a monument aimed at maintaining a feeling of security and self-esteem within the community, and projecting a prestigious image to the outside world.[912] As the case often is, however, the history of Priene reveals that the actual capacity of the small Ionian polis fell rather short of this ideal image, in a way, just as the actual defenses of the city fell short of the looks of its walls.

---

[908] Kleiner, 1962: 1192; McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 47-48, 71-74.

[909] Fehr, 1980: 161.

[910] Cf. Gerkan, 1924a: 27; Knell, 1980: 262; Owens, 1991: 149, 151. The significance would have been even greater, if their construction actually coincided or followed the liberation of the city by Alexander (see p. 116 and n. 739 above).

[911] Gaertringen, 1906: xiii; Fehr, 1980: 161. On the pedieis and their status see Sherwin-White, 1985: 77; Briant, 1982: 82-89; cf. n. 961 below.

[912] Cf. Greco and Torelli, 1983: 248-250; Gros, 1992: 212.

9.2 The refoundation in the 4th century

Due to the scantiness of evidence concerning Priene's status as a 'polis' at the time of the refoundation – in fact only a few indirect clues exist as already discussed – one can only speculate on issues by nature as elusive and hard to grasp as civic sentiments and consciousness. It is still possible to form a hypothesis about that particular period, but this will unavoidably remain as plausible as the theories and arguments from silence on which it is largely based.

It has been suggested that Priene had ceased to exist or at least lost its 'polis' status prior to the refoundation.[913] For a while after the middle of the 4th century, Naulochus issued coins with Prienean characteristics featuring a dolphin and the legend '*NAY.*'[914] Certain scholars have considered this as an indication that Naulochus was or became autonomous at that time[915] and perhaps usurped Priene's polis status.[916] Alexander's Edict was supposed to have restored or confirmed Prienean control over the port town. One thing the decree certainly indicates is that (at least a number of) Prieneans lived in Naulochus in 334.[917] As already mentioned,[918] it is possible that Naulochus served as an intermediate settlement during the refoundation period, in which case Prienean polis authorities may have had their seats moved there as well,[919] and the issuing of coins at Naulochus could have been made on behalf of Priene. This should not have affected the overall status of Priene as a polis, nor should the alternative scenario that the separate minting was the result of a domestic political crisis caused by the up-

---

[913] Hornblower, 1982: 327; Gaertringen, 1906: ix; Tomlinson, 1992: 85; cf. counterarguments by Schipporeit, 1998: 208-209.

[914] Head and Poole, 1892: 202 Nos. 1-2, Pl. 22.14. Soon these were succeeded by coins with the same dolphin but the legend '*ΠΡ*' instead (Regling, 1927: 46-47 No. 47, Pl. 47.1).

[915] Regling, 1927: 2 and n. 14; Demand, 1986: 43 and 1990: 144-145.

[916] Berchem, 1970; Hornblower, 1982: 327. Sherwin-White, 1985: 89, thought that the '*ΠΡ*'-coins could indicate both that Naulochus briefly usurped the role of Priene and that it was absorbed by Priene, previously being independent.

[917] Sherwin-White, 1985: 80-81.

[918] See p. 114 above.

[919] This might also be an additional explanation of the appearance of Naulochus instead of Priene in the list of the 'Theorodokoi' in the 330s. On the dispute concerning the interpretation of this fact see Charneux, 1966: 167-168, 206-207; Berchem, 1970: 200-201; Heisserer, 1980: 160-164; Hornblower, 1982: 327; Sherwin-White, 1985: 88-89; Schipporeit, 1998: 208.

rising against the ruling oligarchs by Prienean democrats, who encouraged by the overthrow of Ada in 341/0 occupied Naulochus and struck their own coins.[920]

There is no information about the constitution of Priene before Alexander and whether the political regime had been democratic or not.[921] But the city had been subjected to Persian control after the King's Peace and was most probably under Hecatomnid influence afterwards, along with many other cities of Asia Minor and the Aegean islands.[922] The Hecatomnids usually allowed the cities they controlled to be self-governed, but as Hornblower points out, an examination of the history and constitutions of the individual Greek cities under the influence of Mausolus – and his successors – shows that for the most part they sponsored oligarchies and undermined or bloodily suppressed democratic revolts.[923] It is very likely that Priene too was under oligarchic rule at that time.[924] One would expect that if Idrieus and Ada actually instigated and financed the refoundation of the city, they would have certainly wished and been able to establish and support an oligarchic regime there as well to secure their grip.[925]

The total absence of any clue or reference to the event or period of the refoundation from the new city is impressive and interesting. Decrees, inscriptions and other pieces of evidence may of course have existed in the old Priene, in Naulochus or in another unknown intermediate settlement and thus remain still undiscovered.[926] It is possible however, that as far as the new Priene is concerned, this lack of references is not accidental but intentional, in the sense that when Prieneans moved into the new city, they did not want to remember or had no reason to commemorate the events and persons related to the refoundation. The female statues, perhaps of Ada and/or other members of the Hecatomnid family and court, could thus be the only direct reminders of Carian involvement in Priene, preserved due to their character as votive offerings in the sanctuaries or, in Ada's case, due to her subsequent relationship with Alexander.[927]

---

[920] Schipporeit, 1998: 209, 229; cf. Heisserer, 1980: esp. 160-164; Gehrke, 1985: 133.

[921] Cf. Schipporeit, 1998: 215, 224.

[922] Cf. p. 124 above.

[923] Hornblower, 1982: 107-137 (136: 'congenial oligarchies' in cities of the Asiatic mainland and oligarchies supported by garrisons in the islands). Cf. Schipporeit, 1998: 218, 223-224.

[924] Schipporeit, 1998: 229; cf. Botermann, 1994: 168 n. 13.

[925] Schipporeit, 1998: 224.

[926] Cf. Schipporeit, 1998: 228-229.

[927] Cf. Schipporeit, 1998: 229 and n. 154.

At first sight, this may seem paradoxical. At a time of severe decline and depression, Priene was reborn and started to be rebuilt with unprecedented monumentality and luxury, and – if the hypothesis about the Hecatomnid involvement and its motives is correct – perhaps also with the aim of regaining its long-lost prestigious role among the cities of Ionia and becoming an important factor in Ionian religious and political affairs. This should have normally been a reason for rejoicing rather than remorse. The seeming contradiction can be resolved if one takes into consideration who appears to have been 'responsible' for the expression of civic sentiments before and at the beginning, and who after Priene's refoundation. As Alexander liberated the Greek cities of Asia Minor,[928] Priene too became autonomous and democratic.[929] When the population moved in and the new Priene started to function properly as a city and polis – shortly before or, perhaps more probably, at the time of Alexander – it was in the hands of the demos. Until then, as seen, it had more likely been under oligarchic control or perhaps in '*στάσις*.'

The democrats had, of course, no reason to commemorate their old rivals, who they saw as enemies of the demos and probably – on the basis of the Hecatomnid hypothesis – also as foreign agents and traitors. The assumed Hecatomnid involvement in Priene in collaboration with a submissive or openly servile oligarchic regime, despite the immediate and potential benefits for the city, would still appear – especially in hindsight after Alexander – and correctly so, as an imperialistic intervention aimed to serve the ends of the foreign (Carian-Persian) dynasts. On the other hand, as already mentioned,[930] Hecatomnid involvement in Priene could not have lasted long, and was probably brought to an immature end by the developments in the Carian court itself (overthrow of Ada by Pixodarus in 340), at an early stage of the city's construction, and long before any plans for Priene's 'upgrade' in Ionian affairs and hopes for the restoration of the city's long lost prestige could materialize.

Very soon after the end of the Hecatomnid involvement in Priene, came the liberation and restoration of autonomy by Alexander. Although perhaps more on psychological than actual political grounds, this event created new conditions for the Greek

---

[928] Arr., *Anab.*, 1.18.2; cf. Diod. Sic., 17.24.1; Plut., *Alex.*, 34.2.

[929] According to Alexander's Edict (Gaertringen, 1906: No. 1).

[930] See p. 126 above.

poleis of Asia Minor. To Priene it meant autonomy, exemption from the 'syntaxis,'[931] power to the demos, confirmation or restoration of control over the 'chora' and Naulochus, and expression of Alexander's – the new powerful authority – goodwill towards the city by means of the Edict and the dedication of the Athena Polias temple.

All these were closely related or perhaps coincided with the Prieneans' move into their newly built city, which literally as well as symbolically signified a fresh beginning for the polis and the civic community. This atmosphere of regeneration – of the physical structure and appearance, and the mental image and perception of the polis and its community alike – and spontaneous as well as fostered sentiments of optimism, confidence in the future and renewed self-esteem, could very well have resulted in a 'shift' of the refoundation events in Prienean civic consciousness.

Psychologically detached and dissociated from the preceding 'dark' period the refoundation could have then been placed in the new 'brighter' context of Alexander. As Hornblower has pointed out, '...Priene as an ancient city may have chosen, in the years after 334, to regard its Persian <and perhaps also Hecatomnid> episode since the King's Peace as a time in abeyance and no more – not wishing to stress what low water Priene had really been in. Then, after 334, civic dignity required that the newly founded Priene should pretend to profit from the act of liberation...'[932] In this respect, the revitalized civic pride, self-esteem and confidence of the demos in the new era are very eloquently expressed in the decrees of the period, which begin with the emotional and patriotic motto 'the Prieneans being autonomous...'[933]

In the same context, the dedication of the Athena Polias temple by Alexander may have been yet another essential factor. Alexander is supposed to have been rebuffed by Ephesus, when he proposed to cover all past and future costs for the temple

---

[931] On the much disputed meaning of 'syntaxis' see Badian, 1966: esp. 51-53; Heisserer, 1980: 158; Sherwin-White, 1985: 84-86; Botermann, 1994: 183 n. 55.

[932] Hornblower, 1982: 326. Hornblower, nevertheless, considered the preceding enslavement as notional only, on the premise that Priene had been non-existent as a polis in the period before Alexander. But even without a Priene there would have still been Prieneans, who in this case would have had an extra reason to feel enslaved.

[933] The 'autonomy formula' ('*Πριηνέων αὐτονόμων ἐόντων*') appears in the inscriptions Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 2, 3, 4, 6 and 7. Gaertringen considered them a continuous group, which he dated between 335/4 (No.2) and some time after 330/29 (Nos. 6-7). Recently, however, C. V. Crowther (1996) has proposed a revised chronology of these decrees, which separates Nos. 3-7 from No. 2 (on the dating of this decree see P. Briant, 1973: 35 n. 1; Crowther, 1996: 198) and places them in a different, later context (see p. 146 below).

of Artemis on condition that his name was inscribed upon it.[934] Whether the Ephesians' polite refusal was an expression of civic pride, political cautiousness or mistrust is hard to say.[935] It may have been in return that Alexander never granted Ephesus real autonomy and privileges or that he did not remit the Persian tribute but made the city pay it to the temple of Artemis.[936]

If judged solely by Classical Greek criteria, Alexander's demand contradicted traditional practice and had a tyrannical-oriental flavour that challenged the fundamental corporatism of the polis.[937] From this point of view, by dedicating the temple of Athena Polias – the city's patron goddess – at Priene Alexander was delivering a severe blow to the identity of Prieneans as members of a sovereign civic community, and was discrediting the autonomy he himself proclaimed. At the same time, he was also getting credit for a project he had most probably not initiated, he certainly did not complete, and possibly he did not even make a direct or substantial contribution to.

In view of the state of their polis at that particular time and the possible consequences – judging perhaps also from the example of Ephesus – it was not easy or possible for Prieneans to refuse Alexander's offer. In this respect, F. Landucci Gattinoni is correct in seeing in Priene's concession a necessary and realistic compromise arising out of the city's consciousness of its own weakness.[938]

Guardianship by a king or monarch, which to the Greeks of the mainland came as a shock at the end of the Classical period and was experienced as a deadly strike against polis freedom, had, nevertheless, been a reality to Prieneans and the other Ionians long before. In fact to the founding generation of the new Priene, the conditional autonomy granted by Alexander was the most extensive if not the only one they had known. And under the circumstances, Alexander's dedicatory inscription on the temple of Priene's patron goddess – together of course with the regulations of his edict concerning the city – must have seemed as the closest thing to a guarantee of this autonomy. The need for or inevitability of such a guarantee had been experienced by Ionian Greeks before and

---

[934] Strab., 14.1.22.

[935] See Badian, 1966: 45; Hornblower, 1982: 280-281. It is even hard to say how much historical truth there actually is in Strabo's account (cf. p. 119 and n. 768 above).

[936] Arr., *Anab.*, 1.17.10; cf. Badian, 1966: 45.

[937] Cf. Hornblower, 1982: 280-293.

[938] Landucci Gattinoni, 1992: 92.

was certainly to be considered a fact in the future. Thus, Alexander's dedication may have actually been greeted by Prieneans in joy rather than tears.[939]

There could be evidence for that in Priene from the very first generation after the death of Alexander. It appears that in the aftermath of Ipsus in 301/0, a certain Hieron managed to establish himself as tyrant in the city for three years until he was expelled by an uprising of the demos.[940] To commemorate the restoration of democracy, the jubilant Prienean demos established an annual '*Σωτήρια*' festival, in fact a national holiday.[941] The regained self-esteem of the community may have also instigated the renewal of the 'autonomy formula' in the prescripts of the city's decrees at this time.[942] Such vigorous expressions of civic pride and displays of claim to restored freedom and autonomy are attested in other Greek cities as well in the same period.[943]

9.3 Priene in the 3rd century

Another decree, probably passed by the Prienean assembly shortly after the overthrow of Hieron, honoured Megabyzus, the temple custodian (*νεωκόρος*) of the Ephesian Artemis, for his concern for the completion of the Athena Polias temple.[944] The reference to completion (*συντέλεσις*) has sparked a lively debate as to whether this should be understood as an ongoing process or as an achieved state. Inconsistencies in the course of construction and the style of ornamentation were earlier interpreted as the result of two major building phases, the first of the 4th and the second of the 2nd century.[945] J. C. Carter, however, based on his dating of all the temple's coffer lids to the 4th century and

---

939 Cf. Sherwin-White, 1985: 70.

940 Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 11, 37; Paus., 7.2.10; cf. Robert, 1944: 5-9; Crowther, 1996: 209-216. Hieron was perhaps supported by Pleistarchus, brother of Cassander, who had taken advantage of the same circumstances to become tyrant of Heraclea (Crowther, 1996: 212 and n. 71).

941 Gaertringen, 1906: No. 11; cf. Crowther, 1996: 209.

942 If the revised chronology of the inscriptions Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 3, 4 and 7 proposed by C. V. Crowther is correct. Crowther, 1996: 209-229, discusses different possible timings of the assumed renewal of the 'autonomy formula' as well. Cf. p. 144 and n. 933 above.

943 E.g. Miletus (Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 122.II.101; cf. Diod. Sic., 19.75.4), Colophon (Maier, 1959-61: I, No. 69) and Eretria (*IG*, XII.9, No. 189.42-43: '*ἐλευθέρων ὄντων Ἐρετριέων καὶ εὖ πρηττόντων καὶ αὐτοκρατόρων*'; cf. Diod. Sic., 16.74.1). Cf. Crowther, 1996: 210-211.

944 Gaertringen, 1906: No. 3 was passed in the summer of 295 according to the revised chronology proposed by Crowther, 1996.

945 Schede, 1964: 25-47; Bauer, 1968: 212 and 1969; Koenigs, 1983, 170-177.

the reference to 'completion' in the re-dated Megabyzus decree argued for a second and final phase in the 290s.[946]

Comparative studies have, nevertheless, since suggested a different chronology for the coffer lids[947] and shown that the execution of decorative elements covers a very long period reaching down to the Roman Augustan times.[948] Furthermore, careful reading of the decree shows that Megabyzus was honoured for his willingness to contribute to the temple's completion, and not necessarily because he actually completed it: '*Μεγ[άβυξον]... πε[ρί] τε τὰ ἄλλα πρόθυμον ἐόν[τα]... καὶ περὶ τοῦ ναοῦ τῆς [Ἀθηνᾶς] τὴν συντέλεσιν πᾶσαν προθυμίαν π[οιησάμε]νον.*'[949]

As a result of Hieron's tyranny and the following political upheaval, the construction of the temple was almost certainly interrupted. Megabyzus' contribution was probably related to the resumption of works after the reinstatement of democracy, for which Ephesus provided the Prienean demos with substantial assistance.[950] It is uncertain whether from then on construction was carried out slowly but continuously or at intervals until final completion. It appears, however, that the southern pteron was finished first, and the western and northern ones last.[951]

The resumption of works on the temple at this time, together with the autonomy formula, could be seen as another expression of the outbreak of civic pride at Priene that followed the ending of the tyranny.[952] Already linked to the restoration of freedom and democracy through Alexander, the temple of Athena Polias was the natural means by which to commemorate the new liberation and to display public elation and gratitude towards the city's patron goddess in monumental form: '*ὅπως ἂν το[ῦ] τε γενομένο[υ ἡμῖν ὑπὲρ τῆς αὐτονομίας καὶ] ἐλευθερίας ἀγῶνος... ὑπάρχηι κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν ἀεὶ τ[οῖς τε ἐνδημοῦσι τῶμ] πολιτῶγ καὶ τοῖς παραγιγνομένοις τ[ῶν ξένων ὑπόμνημα, καὶ τὴν] πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς τοὺς σώισαντ[ας ἡμᾶς εὐσέβειαν] φαινώμεθα διατηροῦντες.*'[953] An interesting parallel comes

---

[946] Carter, 1983, 33-43, 56-103, 1990: 133-134; cf. Bottermann, 1994: 177-178.

[947] Stampolides, 1987: 293-296; Tancke, 1989: 30-41.

[948] Rumscheid, 1994: 179-193; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 130-132.

[949] See also Patronos, 2000: 22; cf. Crowther, 1996: 220-221 and n. 90.

[950] Dittenberger, 1915-24: No. 363. The phrase '*Μεγ[άβυξον]... πε[ρί] τε τὰ ἄλλα πρόθυμον ἐόν[τα καὶ] εὔνουν τῶι δήμωι*' might refer to this assistance. Cf. Crowther, 1996: 211-212, 219-221.

[951] Cf. Koenigs, 1983: 170-174; Rumscheid, 1994: 192.

[952] Crowther, 1996: 220.

[953] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 11.16-21.

from Colophon, where in the late 4th century the demos decided to construct a fortification wall linking the old city to the new, in order to show their ability to maintain the glory of the ancestors after the liberation of the city by Alexander and Antigonus.[954]

This period of excitement and increased civic pride, however, did not last too long. At the end of the 290s-early 280s, Priene faced a serious crisis in a war against the Magnesians and the pedieis, while at the same time it was in dispute with Samos over the border area of Batinetis.[955] Out of gratitude for Lysimachus' military intervention to rescue the city in the first case, and hoping for a favourable ruling in the second, Priene voted some impressive honours to the king that included a gold crown, a bronze statue and, above all, a civic cult.[956] Indicative of the strain under which the city found itself during this period is the fact that the autonomy formula dropped out of use in Prienean decrees.[957] As Priene found itself obliged to appeal to foreign jurisdiction in internal affairs and, most importantly, to rely more and more on royal intervention for protection against invaders, the pompous proclamation of autonomy probably seemed not only politically unbefitting but also psychologically distressing.[958]

The inevitable adaptation to the new historical conditions can again be detected in the civic attitude and disposition towards the Athena Polias temple. By the 3rd century, being the most conspicuous and sacred spot of the city the sanctuary of Athena had already evolved into a public showplace and 'archive,' where important civic monuments and decrees honouring benefactors and influential persons were displayed.[959] In the early 280s, however, certain documents were inscribed directly on the temple itself, starting right underneath Alexander's dedication at the top of the northern anta of the doorway to the pronaos, and expanding on the rest of the anta and the adjoining sidewall[960] (**Pl. 31a**).

---

[954] Maier, 1959-61: I, No. 69 (esp. l. 6-12); cf. Crowther, 1996: 212. There were, of course, practical (defensive and political) reasons behind this decision as well.

[955] Cf. Welles, 1934: 46-51, No. 7.

[956] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 14; Dittenberger, 1903-5: No. 11; Robert, 1937: 189-194. On the circumstances and background, see Sherwin-White, 1985: 76-80; Crowther, 1996: 222-229.

[957] Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 5, 8. The uneasy situation is apparent also in the character and content of the decrees. Cf. Crowther, 1996: 226-229.

[958] Crowther, 1996: 229.

[959] See Sherwin-White, 1985: 74-80.

[960] Gaertringen, 1906: 312 insert; Riemann, 1963: 499-507; Sherwin-White, 1985: 70-72, fig. 1.

As becomes clear from their content, which referred to civic territory and autonomy, fiscal immunity, dependent villages and the status of the pedieis, these inscriptions comprised selections of public documents of crucial political importance to the city and its 'chora' at the time of their publication.[961] The documents were selected by civic authorities with the approval of the assembly – a public act representing the policy of the civic community[962]– and were displayed with the intention of broadcasting a particular message, namely the city's claims to freedom, integrity and territorial rights. The intention for the best display possible becomes evident also from the distinct gradation in the size of lettering in relation to the height of the inscriptions' position on the wall, which was by no means the rule in similar archives, and therefore indicates special concern.[963]

This public display pertained to both internal and external affairs of the polis community. The advertisement of civic prestige strengthened unity and cohesion among the citizens, and at the same time gave warning to all potential aggressors. The history of the Prienean archive is in a real sense part of the history of the civic community,[964] and more precisely of history as the community wishes it to be recorded, since unpleasant documents were silently omitted.[965]

---

[961] The documents included were: (i) extract from Alexander's edict for Priene (334 BC- Gaertringen, 1906: No. 1) specifying the zones controlled by Priene and the zones of the native 'laoi' (pedieis and others) subject to the King, published ca. 285 when the 'laoi' were devastating the city's land; (ii) decree (No. 14) honouring Lysimachus with a crown, statue and civic cult for his intervention to end the raids of Magnesians and pedieis in 287/6, and probably requesting verification of the city's status; (iii) letter of Lysimacus (No. 15) with positive response; (iv) royal edict of Lysimachus (?) (No. 16) probably related to the same crisis; (v) favourable Rhodian arbitration (No. 37) concerning the long territorial dispute with Samos, ca. 196-192; (vi) letter-decree and senatus consultum (No. 39) concerning the dispute of Priene with Ariarathes V of Cappadocia over the money consigned by Orophernes, ca. 155; (vii)-(viii) two senatus consulta (Nos. 40-41) confirming the Rhodian arbitration, before and in 135; (ix) new arbitration (No. 42) re-affirming the Rhodian verdict, after 133. There are also some remains of perhaps a couple more inscriptions of the same character. See further Riemann, 1963: 499-501; Sherwin-White, 1985: 75-80.

[962] Sherwin-White, 1985: 74.

[963] Sherwin-White, 1985: 70 and n. 11; cf. Chandler, 1821: 13; Hicks and Newton, 1886: 6.

[964] Sherwin-White, 1985: 74.

[965] The verdict of another arbitration in the dispute between Priene and Samos over Batinetis, which was unfavourable to Priene (Kleiner, 1962: 1184-1185; Welles, 1934: 46-51, No. 7; Sherwin-White, 1985: 80; Landucci Gattinoni, 1992: 90-91) was of course never inscribed on the temple. This time it was the Samians who proudly published the decision on stone (Gaertringen, 1906: No. 500; Dittenberger, 1903-5: No. 13; Welles, 1934: 46-51, No. 7).

The genesis of similar archives[966] tends to be in events affecting the corporate life of the community in some important respect. Alexander's dedication of the Athena Polias temple and edict regulating the new city's affairs appear to have been such events for Priene.[967] It is very characteristic in this respect that the series of documents was not only inscribed directly underneath Alexander's dedication, but also began with a transcript of his edict, published there a long time after it was issued.

Among the Greeks of the Archaic and Classical periods it was a common practice to place treaties and alliances under the auspices of the gods,[968] and the temple of the tutelary deity was the most appropriate to publish documents that concerned the status of the polis and the integrity of its chora.[969] In Hellenistic times, however, as the cities depended more and more on the intentions and the rulings of kings on vital issues, the latter started to receive honours as great as a polis could bestow and even to challenge and assume the position of the gods as city patrons. The relations between cities and kings were soon articulated not just through civic, but also through religious and ceremonial practices.[970]

In Priene, Alexander had his name inscribed on the Athena Temple and enjoyed a cult at an 'Alexandreum.'[971] An attempt has been made to identify the latter with house No. 22 in the western residential area, where a cult platform with an offering-table, statuettes – one in the likeness of Alexander – and an inscription have been found[972] (**Pl. 31b-c**). Lysimachus, as we have seen, also received divine honours, and by having his letters and edicts inscribed on the temple, was becoming Athena's co-guarantor of the city's interests and safety as well. In Roman times, Augustus would even become '*σύνναος*' of Athena in her own temple.[973]

---

966 E.g. Magnesia on the Maeander (Kern, 1900: Nos. 16-64, 66-84, 87), Aphrodisias in Caria (Reynolds, 1982).

967 Sherwin-White, 1985: 74, 86.

968 Cf. Bengtson, 1974: 215-217.

969 Sherwin-White, 1985: 86; cf. Guarducci, 1969: 2-3.

970 See Habicht, 1970.

971 Mentioned in an inscription from the Sacred Stoa (Gaertringen, 1906: No. 108,75).

972 Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 172-182; cf. Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 101-107; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 93-98; contra Sherwin-White, 1985: 76 and n. 54. On the inscription see Gaertringen, 1906: No. 205 and cf. No. 206.

973 Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 157-158.

Characteristic of this development was also the fact that from ca. 130 onwards, public documents were no longer inscribed on the Athena Temple and the archive continued on the walls of the newly built Sacred Stoa of the agora, a royal gift to the city.[974] It was no coincidence that the move was marked by a change in the character of the archive as well, which from that time on consisted almost exclusively of decrees awarding honours to individuals for their services to the public.[975] As matters concerning the city's status, chora, integrity and political orientation were increasingly determined elsewhere leaving only the management of internal affairs in the hands of the polis community, the field of civic action and self-definition shifted accordingly.

But let us now return to the city's architectural development. It is very interesting that during the first decades following the city's refoundation, roughly still within the 4th century, building activity appears to have concentrated first on areas and structures of religious (terrace and temple of Athena Polias, sanctuary and temple of Demeter and Kore) and then on those of defensive character (fortification walls). As this period remains obscure, one cannot tell for sure whether this was due to the persistence of the Classical ideal about the precedence of the divine or yet another sign of Hecatomnid policy. It may very well be that the construction of the walls was the first project carried out by the city after the recovery of its freedom and autonomy.[976] In any case, it appears that in this early period much lower priority was assigned to areas and buildings related to other functions, although locations had been chosen and reserved for them from the very beginning.

A prytaneion and a theatre are mentioned in inscriptions that were earlier dated to the 4th century,[977] but according to the revised chronology proposed by C. V. Crowther, they are now considered to fall rather in the beginning of the 3rd.[978] The scanty earlier wall remains underneath the extensively renewed prytaneion of the Roman times seem to date from the first half of the 2nd century, after the bouleuterion on the eastern wall of

---

974 The latest inscription on the temple dates from 133/1 (Gaertringen, 1906: No. 42), while the earliest on the stoa walls from c. 130 (No. 107). Cf. Kleiner, 1962: 1209; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 75; Schaaf, 1992: 125.

975 See Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 107-130 and insert to p. 82.

976 See pp. 115-116 and 139-140 above.

977 Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 3, 4, 8, 12, 18, 26 (prytaneion), 4 (theatre).

978 See pp. 144 n. 933 and, 146 n. 942 above.

which they rest[979] (**Pl. 31d-e**). The fact that the outer surface of this wall was left plain – while that of the western one was embossed – and that to the west the bouleuterion extended over insula boundaries could indicate that the prytaneion was to be built next,[980] or perhaps more likely, that it already existed, in which case the walls resting on the bouleuterion could come from an intermediate phase/restoration of the early 2rd century.[981]

Similarly, on the basis of H. v. Gaertringen's early dating of the inscriptions mentioning the theatre, an orchestra with a provisional wooden stage and a cavea with wooden benches were supposed for the 4th century.[982] Contrary to some expressed views, however,[983] it seems that the main parts of the structure (**Pl. 30d, 33a-b**) were built in one go during the 3rd century rather than in several phases over a long time.[984] Along with the early 3rd century date proposed for the inscriptions by Crowther, this could strengthen the possibility that no theatre actually existed during the 4th century.

In all likelihood, therefore, the construction of permanent and monumental administrative and other public buildings did not actually commence before the early 3rd century (**Pl. 32**). The crisis Priene faced during the early part of the 3rd century does not appear to have prevented the development of an intense building activity in the whole city.[985] Besides the theatre and possibly the prytaneion, the so-called upper gymnasium was built on the insula in between during this period, but unfortunately its appearance has been altered almost beyond recognition by Roman renovation[986] (**Pl. 33c**).

Sometime after the middle of the 3rd century, the whole insula to the east of the gymnasium was occupied by a new sanctuary, which according to inscriptions was

---

979 Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 231-234; Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 63-67; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 47-51.

980 Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 50-51.

981 The prytaneion mentioned in the inscriptions. Cf. Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 200.

982 Gerkan, 1921b: 61; Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 77; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 200; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 173-174.

983 Cf. Bernardi Ferrero, 1966-74: II, 9-20; Dinsmoor, 1975: passim.

984 Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 173-174.

985 On the possibility of an interruption of work / change of craftsmen on the Athena temple ca. 270-260 see Rumscheid, 1994: 192.

986 Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 275-284; Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 81; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 181-185.

dedicated to the Egyptian deities Isis, Serapis and Anubis[987] (**Pl. 33d**).The compound consisted of a courtyard surrounded by walls and a stoa on the west side, and was accessed from Athena street on the north through a Doric propylon.[988] The large oblong foundation (7,31x14,60m) oriented from north to south in the middle of the courtyard, which was previously considered to be an altar, is now thought to have supported a podium temple[989] (**Pl. 33e**). The sudden appearance of this alien and exotic cult on such a scale in Priene is at first sight surprising, but becomes understandable in the light of the fact that following the 'Laodice War' the city came under the control of Ptolemy III Euergetes in 246.[990] Thus the new cult and sanctuary – the priest of which had to be Egyptian – as the products of royal financing, civic flattery or silent acceptance probably marked in an elaborate way the placement of Priene under the royal and divine auspices of Egypt.

Similar in dimensions and orientation to the temple of the Egyptian deities was the structure (8x12m) of as yet unspecified date located in the Athena Polias temenos, north of the altar.[991] The structure, about which little is known, has usually been interpreted as a treasury, but as Rumscheid and Koenigs point out, no treasuries of this kind are known from Asia Minor and the foundations are more likely to have belonged to a small temple in antis.[992]

A great part of the architectural elaboration of the civic centre was also carried out during the 3rd century. In its final form, the agora was framed on the west, south and east sides by a Pi-shaped complex of Doric stoas with rooms at the back – the south one divided in two aisles by an Ionic internal colonnade– and on the north side by another Doric stoa[993] (**Pl. 34**). Whether the agora was conceived and designed from the beginning as a strictly defined enclosure separated from the rest of the city or this formation – described by Pausanias as the characteristic type of Ionian agora[994]– was the result of

---

987 Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 193, 195.

988 Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 164-170; Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 68-69; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 189-193.

989 Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 192-193.

990 Cf. Steuben et al., 1995: No. 451.

991 Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 133-135.

992 Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 137-139.

993 Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 185-218.

994 Paus., 6.24.2.

a step-by-step and gradual development has been one of the main questions in the architectural history of Priene.

The sequence of buildings and the course of construction work in and around the agora have been strongly debated. A date for the whole south stoa complex in the late 4th-early 3rd century was earlier preferred,[995] while Hoepfner and Schwandner considered it a 2nd century development.[996] W. Koenigs, on the contrary suggested a piecemeal development over a long period of time,[997] a view confirmed by the recent study of the sequence of the agora monuments and on site observations conducted by A. v. Kienlin, which nevertheless indicated that the history of construction was even more complicated than Koenigs believed[998] (**Pl. 34a-c**).

Stylistic and construction details thus show that the row of rooms at the back of the west wing were built first, followed by the substructures and rooms of the south and east wings and the street stoa in one go, and the stylobate of the colonnades up to the north edge of the east wing.[999] The construction of the colonnades themselves commenced next, first the west, then the east and finally the south. Works probably slowed down during the second half of the 3rd century as priority shifted to the northern side of the agora. By 200 BC all colonnades except the northern part of the eastern wing were standing, but the final details were only finished in the second half of the 2nd century, when the new Sacred Stoa was built.

New excavation results from the stoas themselves and the adjoining insulae now seem to confirm that the complex had actually been foreseen in the original layout of the city.[1000] The construction of the stoas does not appear to have caused any change of building plans or demolition of pre-existing structures in the parts of the adjoining insulae over which they extended. Furthermore, the parts of the north-south streets that framed the agora from the east and west and were occupied by the stoas were never actually constructed. The ground there was never sloping or stepped, but leveled accordingly to receive the stoas along with the rest of the agora plateau.

---

[995] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 214-215; Kleiner, 1962: 1205-1210; Büsing, 1970: 12; Coulton, 1976: 278-279.

[996] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 222.

[997] Koenigs, 1993.

[998] Kienlin, 1998/9.

[999] Kienlin, 1998/9: esp. 254-255.

[1000] Kienlin, 1998/9: 255-256.

The history of the small sanctuary adjoining the agora to the east is less clear (**Pl. 34h**). Even the god to whom the enclosure was consecrated remains uncertain.[1001] On the basis of an inscription on an anta thought to have come from a stoa of the sanctuary,[1002] the excavators identified the latter as an Asclepieum.[1003] An inscribed altar mentioning 'Zeus Aithrios' found in the area,[1004] on the contrary, led Schede to associate the temenos with Zeus.[1005] The origin of both finds, however, is questionable.[1006]

As regards the sanctuary's architecture, the rows of rooms on its northern and southern ends seem to have been constructed along with the stoa complex as part of the same project,[1007] while the colonnade of the so called Street Stoa during the 2nd century, in connection with the new Sacred Stoa and together with the unfinished northern part of the east wing of the agora complex.[1008] That the Street Stoa as a whole (with the back rooms) could be part of the Sacred Stoa project and younger than the east wing of the agora complex[1009] is not possible. The small stoa in the sanctuary north of the younger temple[1010] is later than the rooms of the Street Stoa and the east wing of the agora complex since it rests on their back walls,[1011] but at the same time earlier than the colonnade of the east wing of the agora on grounds of the technique of architectural details.[1012]

In contrast to the southern side, the northern side of the agora appears to have originally been free, so the decision to create a stepped terrace and a stoa that preceded the Sacred Stoa in the same location (Old North Stoa) signified an important change in

---

[1001] Koenigs, 1993: 385-386; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 31; cf. Kleiner, 1962: 1199.

[1002] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 19.

[1003] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 136-146.

[1004] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 184.

[1005] Schede, 1934: 104-106.

[1006] Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 62, 67.

[1007] Kienlin, 1998/9: 244 n. 8, rejected Koenigs' (1993: 389) hypothesis of an earlier phase/building programme at the south end of the sanctuary, considering the certain inconsistencies in the retaining wall as the result of later addition or reinforcement.

[1008] Kienlin, 1998/9: 253.

[1009] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 217; Koenigs, 1993: 393-394.

[1010] The stoa was thought by Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 138-139 to have had a southern counterpart, but the foundations in that area are too weak to have supported it (Koenigs, 1993: 387, 394; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 62-63).

[1011] Koenigs, 1993: 386-387; Kienlin, 1998/9: 244.

[1012] Kienlin, 1998/9: 247 and n. 17, 248 and n. 18, 254.

the initial agora plan. This is confirmed by the fact that the central north-south street that provided access to the agora from the north was cut off, and most importantly by the fact that as the stoa extended beyond the midline of the two insulae, parts of houses had to be demolished to accommodate it[1013] **(Pl. 34g)**.

On the ground plan of this stoa, which extended at the length of the two agora insulae, only speculations can be made. J. Coulton supposed a single-aisled structure with rooms at the back similar to the stoas on the south of the agora.[1014] On the other hand, based on a possibly related inscription mentioning a 'double stoa,'[1015] the excavators suggested a building with two storeys or divided in two parts.[1016] Hoepfner and Schwandner even proposed a two-piece stoa that would have allowed the central north-south street to reach the agora.[1017] This is not possible, however, since the back wall of the stoa, later incorporated in the Sacred Stoa was continuous in its full length.[1018] The term 'double stoa' more likely indicated a two-aisled structure.[1019] As far as chronology is concerned, on the grounds of technique a date in the 2nd half of the 3rd century is the most likely, with construction initiated around the middle of the century and completed by 200 BC, as indicated by an inscription carved on an anta.[1020]

In any case, this historical reconstruction places Priene in the forefront of developments towards the formation of the so-called 'Ionian Agora' in Asia Minor. In Miletus, as we have seen, the framing of the civic centre by means of stoas and other structures was a slow and not evidently coordinated process, especially as regards the final partition into two separate agoras.[1021] The southern stoa complex of the Prienean agora, on the contrary as R. Martin has pointed out, perhaps for the first time in Ionian

---

[1013] The stoa foundations in this area rest on the remains of earlier structures (Kienlin, 1998/9: 252-253; cf. Koenigs, 1993: 389).

[1014] Coulton, 1976: 278.

[1015] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 49: '*διπλῆ στοὰ*.'

[1016] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904:215-216.

[1017] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 201 and fig. 183.

[1018] Koenigs, 1993: 388-389; Kienlin, 1998/9: 251 n. 27.

[1019] Schaaf, 1992: 122; Kienlin, 1998/9: 251; cf. Coulton, 1976: 3-4.

[1020] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 49; Kienlin, 1998/9: 252, 254, 256; cf. Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 216-217; Kleiner, 1962: 1205-1210; Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 49; Büsing, 1970: 12; Coulton, 1976: 278-279. Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 201 and fig. 183, on the other hand preferred a date in the late 4th-early 3rd century (cf. Koenigs, 1993: 388-389, 395).

[1021] Cf. Kienlin, 1998/9: 256-257.

urbanism constituted a united whole, a complete system, conceived and materialized on the basis of a precise and independent plan, en bloc, and as a single individual structure imposed on the system of surrounding streets, which had to give way in order to receive it.[1022]

In relation to the agoras of the Classical period – whose form evolved almost freely and without any specific hierarchy and orientation as the mixture of the functions they accommodated developed and buildings accumulated – that of Priene represents, in a way, an end-of-line crystallization. Buildings and functions were gathered, concentrated, ordered and articulated as parts of a rational and homogeneous whole. The Pi-shaped stoa complex embraced, contained and systematized the agora functions by unifying their architectural setting.

This containment and enclosure of the civic centre, however, occurred at the cost of free visibility and access. The agora was being separated and secluded from the rest of the city, becoming, as H. v. Hesberg has observed, more and more a 'sterilized' and 'neutralized' element of the architectural layout.[1023] In Priene, this tendency first became evident with the erection of the Pi-shaped stoa complex, then escalated with the Old North Stoa that closed off the remaining open side of the agora, and concluded with the construction of the Sacred Stoa that replaced it. The arch built later to span the opening through which Main Street crossed the upper part of the agora[1024] (**Pl. 35a**) – of mere symbolic significance and without any practical utility[1025]– finalized the new perception of the agora as a single compound seen in the peristylar agoras of Pergamum and Ephesus,[1026] and prepared the ground for the Roman fora of the imperial times accessible through elaborate and costly propyla.[1027]

This was certainly not due to developments just in the 'architectural fashion' or the aesthetic of the Hellenistic period, but went hand-in-hand with the alteration of the character and identity of the polis itself as the nature, correlations and equilibrium of its social, economic and political determinants changed. The increasing seclusion and

---

[1022] Martin, 1951: 404; cf. Hesberg, 1990: 234.

[1023] Hesberg, 1990: 233-234.

[1024] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 204-205; Dornisch, 1992: 208-211 No. 159; Kienlin, 1998/9: 254-255.

[1025] Koenigs, 1993: 396.

[1026] Kienlin, 1998/9: 256-257; cf. Martin, 1951: 508-518.

[1027] Koenigs, 1993: 394; cf. Gerkan, 1924a: 137; Hesberg, 1990: 233-234.

'neutralization' of the agora as a natural space, in this respect, reflected the ordinary citizen's diminishing access to public offices and participation in the management of civic affairs as a result of the city's increasing external political dependency, withering self-determination and internal socio-economic polarization. In other words, it was the change of the character and function of the traditional polis institutions with which the agora was bound that acquired physical form with this new architectural layout.

The changed character of the agora was also evident in the arrangement of its internal space. The concentration of a vast number of honorary monuments[1028] in the square (**Pl. 34a-c, h**) must have gradually obstructed not just political or other social and religious activities, but also the function of the agora as a marketplace. Indeed, it seems that, besides the small fish and meat market, commercial activities were carried out mainly in the surrounding stoas, the back rooms of which received priority in construction.[1029] Gradually deprived of its traditional functions, the agora was thus becoming more and more a public promenade and show-case/place. Where in Classical times the citizens collectively participated in the affairs of the polis, now stood the monuments of the decreasing number of individuals that could afford to do so and of foreign patrons. The much-frequented multifunctional Classical agora was transformed into a means for the abstract demonstration of civil and urban quality.[1030]

Finally, as far as the Prienean agora is concerned, the possible associations with the agora of the neighbouring Magnesia on the Maeander (**Pl. 35b**) in terms of chronology and development are particularly interesting.[1031] A. v. Kienlin has suggested that the axial relations between the Artemis and Zeus temples and the agora stoas indicate for the original planning of the complex a date earlier than previously believed, perhaps in the mid-3rd century.[1032] If correct, this could speak for an immediate Prienean influence on Magnesia, and possibly also for a counter-influence from the four-sided Magnesian complex on the decision to construct the Old North Stoa in Priene. The possibil-

---

[1028] See Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 206-213; Kienlin, 1998/9: 248-251.

[1029] Kienlin, 1998/9: 256. This priority was probably also dictated by the need to use the revenue from shops to fund the continuing works on the complex.

[1030] Hesberg, 1990: 234.

[1031] See Humann, Kohte and Watzinger, 1904: 107-134; Coulton, 1976: 65, 253.

[1032] Kienlin, 1998/9: 257-259.

ity of competitive imitation would be of particular importance if seen in the context of the rivalry that had led to conflict between the two cities a few decades earlier.[1033]

Competition for status and prestige may have also encouraged the construction of a monumental court altar of the Ionian type with rich architectural and figured sculptural ornamentation in the sanctuary of Athena (**Pls. 26d, 35c**). Although its chronology remains problematic, construction seems to fall in the period from the last quarter of the 3rd to the mid 2nd century.[1034] A completion by the mid 2nd century is supported by the altar's relation to the surrounding flagstone pavement and a small statue pillar.[1035] Possible connections with Ptolemy III Euergetes, Ptolemy IV Philopator or Orophernes cannot be confirmed or disproved.[1036] In any case, however, the project seems clearly to fall within a general competitive trend for the construction of monumental altars of this kind in many poleis of the Aegean and Asia Minor in this period, among which again Magnesia.[1037]

9.4 Priene in the 2nd century

As the sequence of structures to the north of the agora indicates, the construction of Priene's bouleuterion (**Pl. 36a-d**) in contact with the agora to the north began at the turn from the 3rd to the 2nd century, followed soon after by the erection or renovation of the prytaneion immediately to the east.[1038] The Prienean bouleuterion was a nearly square hall (ca. 20x21m) with a roof supported by a series of pillars positioned at a short distance from the west, north and east walls leaving the central space unobstructed.[1039] Stone seats were arranged in Pi-shaped ascending tiers along the same walls. The hall was accessed mainly through two doors on the south side leading to theatre-like parodoi, and two secondary doors at the back opening on the adjacent

---

[1033] Cf. contra Kienlin, 1998/9: 259.

[1034] Cf. Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 120-126; Gerkan, 1924b; Kleiner, 1962: 1196; Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 36-37; Linfert, 1976: 167-168; Pinkwart, 1980: 47; Carter, 1983: 38, 40-41, 44, 181-209 and 1984; Fleischer, 1985: 347-348.

[1035] Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 114-117.

[1036] Cf. Steuben et al., 1995: No. 450.

[1037] See p. 230 below.

[1038] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 229; Rumscheid, 1994: 154, 328; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 50-51; Kienlin, 1998/9: 253. Cf. p. 152 above and observations concerning the Sacred Stoa below.

[1039] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 219-231; Kleiner, 1962: 1202-1204; Gneisz, 1990: 346-347; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 50-59.

streets. At the centre of the south side between the doors there was an open-air, rectangular niche of uncertain use facing the hall through an archway.[1040]

As opposed to the modest and unpretentious earlier Greek bouleuteria,[1041] that of Priene followed the new Hellenistic tendency towards increased size and monumentality,[1042] which, as we have seen, became widespread especially in Asia Minor and reached a peak with the construction of the impressive Milesian complex. During this period, it was not uncommon for many cities to possess bouleuteria and other public buildings such as theatres and stadia, which were often bigger than their practical needs required.[1043] Characteristically in this respect, the estimated seating capacity of 500 or more persons,[1044] a number which is thought to have exceeded that of the members of the city's boule, led many scholars to identify the Prienean building as an ecclesiasterion rather than bouleuterion.[1045]

As will be more thoroughly discussed in the final chapter, the tendency towards the monumentalization of public buildings such as bouleuteria, the desire for an integrated design of the civic centre, and the increasing concern for the appearance of the urban environment in general, signified a turning point in the self-concept of polis communities. As the threat posed to the polis as a sociopolitical organism by the Hellenistic monarchy and Roman imperialism became greater and greater and could not be countered by force, civic communities instinctively tried to preserve their status and prestige and to compensate for the weakening of their internal structure and institutions through the accentuation and aggrandizement of their external urban frame.

As already pointed out, the new self-perception of the polis, and a further step in the development of ideas concerning the integration and monumentalization of the Prienean civic centre, were represented by the erection of the so-called Sacred Stoa.[1046] The

---

[1040] Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 54-55.

[1041] Herman-Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 37-44; Kockel, 1995: 30-31.

[1042] Tuchelt, 1975; 102-120; Lauter, 1986: 82-84; Herman-Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 84-86; Kockel, 1995. See further discussion in the last chapter.

[1043] Cf. Tuchelt, 1975: 115; Herman-Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 85-86.

[1044] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 72; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 56-57; as many as 640 based on a 50cm-wide seat according to Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 229.

[1045] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 229; McDonald, 1943: 88-91; Miller, 1978: 117 and n. 45; contra Kleiner, 1962: 1204; Herman-Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 72; Kockel, 1995: 34-35; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 56-57.

[1046] See p. 151 above.

The new stoa, which was two-aisled with a Doric outer and an Ionic inner colonnade and had a series of rooms at the back, came to replace the Old North Stoa along the northern side of the agora[1047] **(Pl. 34h, 36e-f)**.

A terminus post quem for the start of the project is set by the construction of the bouleuterion that commenced around 200,[1048] since this stood in the way and did not allow the row of rooms at the back of the stoa to extend at its full length. An inscription possibly from an anta of the Old North Stoa also supports this date.[1049] Some time must have intervened between the completion of the bouleuterion and the beginning of the Sacred Stoa, as the two projects were not connected: access to the bouleuterion and the prytaneion from the south was originally meant to be free and was awkwardly compensated for after the construction of the stoa by means of two doors. The Old North Stoa presumably also stood for a while before being dismantled to make room for the Sacred Stoa. The transfer of the archive from the Athena temple to the Sacred Stoa, on the other hand, sets a terminus ante quem for the beginning of works some time before 130.[1050] A more accurate time period cannot be easily determined. Based on the architectural style and the sequence of structures in the area, a date after the mid-2nd century has seemed preferable,[1051] but on historical grounds the first half of the 2nd century (188-163) has also been suggested.[1052]

From the architrave inscription only a few letters survive, indicating a connection with / donation by a member of the Cappadocian royal house: '[...]*ΕΩΣ ΑΡΙ*[...],' standing probably for '[*ΒΑΣΙΛ*]*ΕΩΣ ΑΡΙ*[*ΑΡΑΘΟΥ*].' H.v. Gaertringen at first suggested the usurper Orophernes, restoring the inscription as '*[Βασιλεὺς Ὀροφέρνης βασιλ]έως Ἀρι[αράθου],*'[1053] but later opted for Ariarathes VI, '*[Ὑπὲρ βασιλ]έως Ἀρι[αράθου Ἐπιφανοῦς καὶ Φιλοπάτορος],*' on the basis of a possible connection between the stoa and an envoy sent by Priene to the king requesting his contribution to a build-

---

1047 Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 192-203; Krischen, 1916; Schede, 1934: 106-108; Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 49-57; Coulton, 1976: 277-278; Schaaf, 1992: 121-140; Rumscheid, 1994: 46; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 70-77.

1048 And must have lasted for quite a while according to Kienlin, 1998/9: 253.

1049 See p. 156 above.

1050 See p. 151 and n. 974 above

1051 Rumscheid, 1994: 46; Kienlin, 1998/9: 253, 255-256.

1052 Schaaf, 1992: 121-140.

1053 Gaertringen, 1906: No. 204; cf. Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 213; Krischen, 1916.

ing project the city desired.[1054] If true, this connection would speak for a Prienean initiative and an initiation of the project[1055] more than a decade before the embassy was sent (ca. 120), according to the terminus ante quem mentioned above. Although not impossible, that would stretch the limits rather too much. Ariarathes IV and Ariarathes V have also been proposed as will be further discussed.[1056]

According to the established view, Priene received the funds for the stoa in connection with its dramatic involvement in the conflict between Orophernes and Ariarathes V for the Cappadocian throne (159/8-156).[1057] A donation by Orophernes, along perhaps with other benefactions,[1058] may have been intended in the early stages of the episode to secure Priene's loyal safekeeping of the money with which he had entrusted it, or as a sign of his gratitude thereafter. A letter to the city, possibly by Orophernes, requesting the city to accept and erect a statue of the demos as a token of appreciation for its loyalty and cooperation, might be related to this incident.[1059]

Otherwise, the financing of the stoa could have been meant as a sign of reconciliation and compensation on the part of Ariarathes, after he and his partner Attalus II were forced to withdraw from the siege of Priene at the instigation of Rome.[1060] In either case, the erection of the Sacred Stoa would have signified the justification of Priene's determination in regard to the dispute.[1061] This would have been much needed to alleviate the grievance caused by the unfair ravaging of the land and loss of life and

---

[1054] Gaertringen, 1906: xviii, 311 (correction to No. 204), and No. 109.103,172-175; cf. Regling, 1927: 9; Schede, 1934: 106-108; Magie, 1950: II, 1057 n. 33; Kleiner, 1962: 1209; Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 49; Walbank, 1979: III,548.

[1055] Bringmann et al., 1995: 430.

[1056] Schaaf, 1992: 121-140 (IV); Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 20, 75; cf. Dinsmoor, 1934: 106 n. 6 (V).

[1057] Cf. p. 111 above.

[1058] Schede, 1934 (cf. Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 33, 36-37) suggested that Orophernes had contributed to the construction of the Athena Polias temple and had dedicated the cult statue and the altar. Certain scholars have, nevertheless, expressed serious doubts whether Orophernes could have been able to make all or any of these donations due to the shortness of his reign and his heavy financial obligations (Carter, 1983: 235-237; Schaaf, 1992: 133-134).

[1059] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 25; cf. Welles, 1934: 255-259 No. 63.

[1060] Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 20; cf. Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 8; Raeder, 1984: 11; contra Schaaf, 1992: 135, 137 n. 1163.

[1061] As has been noted (Gaertringen, 1906: xviii; Carter, 1983: 235; Schaaf, 1992: 133-134) temples often functioned as banking institutions, in which case Priene's loyalty may have been a matter of 'professional' liability and obligation (note Polybius' wording in 33.6). That Priene may have opportunistically attempted to withhold the money for itself has also been suggested, again in view of Polybius' comment in 33.6.8-9 (Bogaert, 1968: 286-287; contra Schaaf, 1992: 134).

property.[1062] Royal apology, conciliation or gratitude in the form of a monumental public building would have undoubtedly helped to restore the confidence and self-esteem of the Prienean civic community after the unfortunate incident.

The Prienean demos must have felt very flattered also if the financing of the Sacred Stoa actually occurred earlier, at the time of Ariarathes IV (220-163), should one prefer to accept H. Schaaf's arguments for an earlier dating.[1063] According to Schaaf, Ariarathes aspired to transform his oriental kingdom into a modern, Hellenised state, and for this purpose opened up to the west and followed the example of the Pergamene kings with propagandistic benefactions towards Greek cities and manifestations of philhellenism. The donation of the Sacred Stoa could be part of this effort, and Priene could have been chosen for symbolic reasons, once again as the traditional centre of the Ionian League, and perhaps more importantly as the recipient of a dedication by Alexander himself in the past. Schaaf has even suggested that the continuation of works on the Athena temple and the donation of the cult statue – perhaps finally dedicated by Orophernes – may have also been part of Ariarathes' attempt to show himself a successor of Alexander as benefactor of Priene.[1064]

As regards the function of the stoa, this is still uncertain, but its location, its name,[1065] and the fact that its walls succeeded those of the Athena temple as an archive of public documents[1066] suggest that – at least partially – it served as a venue for public activities and housed the offices of civic authorities.[1067] Whether the site for the stoa, the dimensions, and other technical specifications were determined by the city itself or by the donor is perhaps impossible to tell in this case,[1068] but it is certain that the raised,

---

[1062] Polybius' text (33.6) reflects the sympathy with which Priene's unjust suffering was greeted by public opinion at the time.

[1063] Schaaf, 1992, 121-140.

[1064] Schaaf, 1992: 137-140. That the stoa may have been intended to provide revenues for the works on the Athena sanctuary like the Stoa of Antiochus in Miletus (hence 'sacred') has been suggested by Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 77; cf. Rumscheid, 1999: 24-25, in which case a commercial use must be assumed.

[1065] The name 'Sacred Stoa' is epigraphically attested since the time of the Mithridatic wars (Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 113.59, 120; 114.40; cf. Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 213).

[1066] See p. 151 above.

[1067] Civic banquets are reported in Gaertringen, 1906: No. 113.58-59. A religious besides administrative use has been suggested by Schede, 1934: 106-108; Coulton, 1976: 10; cf. Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 213-214; Schaaf, 1992: 124-125.

[1068] Hesberg, 1988; Schaaf, 1992: 123. Cf. the case of the stoa of Antiochus at the South agora of Miletus.

stepped platform that crowned the agora from the north and overlooked the large collection of honorary monuments was a most conspicuous spot, which served the monumental ambitions of both parties well.

The significance laid upon both building and site also become evident from the fact that the project required the Old North Stoa to be pulled down within a short period after its completion, and changes in the layout of the whole agora to be enforced in order to accommodate the new building.[1069] It is of no less importance in this respect that as a result of the stoa's length extending over three insulae the newly built monumental bouleuterion and the (newly built or renovated) prytaneion were left in the background. The Sacred Stoa provided them with a sort of unified façade, but at the same time alienated them from the agora physically and visually,[1070] and divided the latter into an upper political-administrative and a lower commercial zone.[1071]

The significance of the Sacred Stoa, however, did not originate only from the identity of the donor, the circumstances of the donation and the functions it served, but also from the architectural type itself. With the 116m-long Sacred Stoa, Priene followed a general trend, an architectural fashion, widespread in the Greek world during this period, according to which long stoas – often extremely long[1072]– either free-standing or as parts of large complexes, were considered as symbols of status and prestige.[1073] Especially stade-long stoas (*σταδιαῖαι στοαὶ* - c 180m) appear to have become the modern equivalent of hundred-foot temples (*ἑκατόμπεδοι ναοί*).[1074] To possess such stoas revealed that a city enjoyed a monarch's favour and benevolence or, even better, that its own wealth and technical capabilities allowed it to compete against royal capitals and the lavish building projects of the Hellenistic monarchs of which long stoas were characteristic.[1075]

Two more long stoas were constructed in Priene during the second half of the 2nd century, one in the Athena Polias sanctuary and one in the city's stadium. The first was

---

[1069] Schaaf, 1992: 123; Koenigs, 1993: 393-394; Kienlin, 1998/9: 253.

[1070] Schaaf, 1992: 123; Koenigs, 1993: 393.

[1071] Kienlin, 1998/9: 256.

[1072] Coulton, 1976: 54; Schaaf, 1992: 28, 143.

[1073] Cf. Hesberg, 1990.

[1074] See further discussion in final chapter.

[1075] Hesberg, 1990: 239.

built along the south side of the sanctuary,[1076] and turned its back on the temple rather than showing its front as would have been expected (**Pl. 37a**). The stoa faced south on a narrow empty terrace, apparently serving as a promenade and a giant balcony that offered a panoramic view of the city and the Maeander plain. The wish to imitate and share some of the prestige of similar arrangements in the terraced sanctuaries and the gymnasium of Pergamum was evidently strong. Not only was the south part of the sanctuary terrace and the retaining wall rebuilt much stronger in order to sustain the weight, but also the stoa was allowed to obstruct the view of the unfinished Athena Temple.[1077] The change in priorities was apparent.

Nevertheless, interest in religious architecture was not lost, as the construction of a small temple (8,50x13.50m) in the sanctuary by the agora some time in the second half of the 2nd century reveals (**Pls. 34h, 37b-c**). The chronology of the Ionic building, which was earlier reconstructed with a four-column prostasis[1078] but is now proven to have been distyle in antis,[1079] has been the subject of debate. Dates as early as the late 4th century were originally proposed,[1080] but for the most part a date in the 3rd century has seemed preferable.[1081] However, stylistic analysis and, most importantly, the sequence of structures in the area show that the temple could not have been built before the mid-2nd century.[1082] Of particular interest is the evident retrospective tendency of the building's design and architectural ornamentation, which relies heavily on that of the Athena Temple and has even led certain scholars to ascribe the plan to Pytheus himself.[1083] But such a connection is implausible. The Prienean temple was most probably another manifestation of the wider phenomenon of retrospection, classicism and nostal-

---

[1076] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 128-129; Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 47; Coulton, 1976: 79, 113; Carter, 1983: 42; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 133-136.

[1077] Cf. Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 37; Hesberg, 1990: 240; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 133-134.

[1078] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 139-146; cf. Kleiner, 1962: 1198-1199; Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 62; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 202-206.

[1079] Bankel, 1989 and 1990.

[1080] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 145-146.

[1081] Scede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 58-61; Akurgal, 1987: 86-87; Schädler, 1991b: 101.

[1082] Koenigs, 1993: 388, 394; Rumscheid, 1994: 193-198; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 63-67; Kienlin, 1998/9. The temple breaks through the rear wall of the agora's east stoa (cf. p. 155 above).

[1083] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 202-206, suggesting that construction was carried out at a later time.

gic revival of elements of a glorious past, which characterized the art and society of the Greek polis in general during this period, in an effort to defend the remainders of its status and prestige from the consequences of total Roman domination.[1084]

Perhaps in the same spirit, Priene also undertook its last grand-scale building project in the later part of the 2nd century. A large and elaborate gymnasium was constructed on a buttress-supported terrace in the lower city next to the fortification wall[1085] (**Pls. 37d, 38a-b**). A propylon with two Doric columns in antis on either side carrying an entablature of mixed Doric and Ionic elements, led to the square (c. 40x40m) Doric peristyle of the palaestra, which had rooms of various functions on its west and north sides. The most important, the ephebeum, was located in the middle of the north side behind an intermediate Doric stoa of heavier and more monumental proportions. The hall had an entrance with two Ionic columns with capitals of the Asia Minor type in antis, and a decorative series of Corinthian semi-columns with full entablature along the upper half of the interior walls.

Next to the gymnasium, the stadium was constructed at the same time or fundamentally renovated in monumental form, again on a terrace supported by a huge buttressed retaining wall to the south. Spectators' seats and a literally '*σταδιαία*' stoa behind them extended along the full length of the stadium to the north.[1086]

An inscription in the Sacred Stoa dating shortly after 129, honoured the citizen Moschion,[1087] who along with his brother Athenopolis contributed money twice towards the completion of this gymnasium. In the second occasion, the project had met with insurmountable difficulties as a result of a change of the kings who had promised to finance it. The names of the kings unfortunately do not survive.[1088] When exactly the donation took place, and whether the financial dead-end occurred at the beginning or the end of construction has been a subject of dispute, which on the basis of available

---

[1084] See also final chapter.

[1085] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 265-275; Krischen, 1923/4; Delorme, 1960: 191-195; Kleiner, 1962: 1214-1217; Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 81-89; Schaaf, 1992: 128; Rumscheid, 1994: 46-47; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 195-211.

[1086] On the stoa see Coulton, 1976: 279; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 198-199.

[1087] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 108.112: '*γ*]*υμνασίου κατὰ πό*[*λιν*]'; cf. Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 274.

[1088] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 108.113-115; Rumscheid, 1994: 46-47 and n. 404.

evidence cannot be solved.[1089] The huge project that evidently went over budget must have dragged on for quite a long time during the second half of the 2nd century, but the exact chronological limits of its construction remain uncertain.

In any case, the decision to go ahead belonged to the Prienean demos itself,[1090] and the importance laid on it was apparently great. The city desired a new, lavish and monumental gymnasium, although it was evident from the beginning and soon confirmed by the events that it was in no position to finance it out of its own resources. When royal aid failed to come, it became a matter of patriotism for wealthy citizens like Moschion to bear the cost, out of confidence that the gymnasium would be a great and glorious asset to the city forever.[1091]

The fundamental role in the life and self-definition of Greek civic communities, and consequently in the architectural layout of the cities the gymnasium acquired in Hellenistic times is apparent in Priene also.[1092] As the new polis ideals required cultural education and sophistication besides political virtues and participation in common affairs to be among the qualifications of the model citizen, gymnasium and agora became strongly associated and connected. From the 4th century onwards, this connection was not only ideological, but physical too, bringing the gymnasium at the heart of the city next to the agora,[1093] as was the case with Priene's early gymnasium.

By the 2nd century, the gymnasium had evolved into a symbol of prestige par excellence for every polis. This development resulted in the establishment of a standard architectural type with systematized arrangement of space and functions, the increase in size, elaboration and monumentality. The gymnasium could no longer be accommodated in the centre of cities – many of which possessed more than one anyway – and moved back to the outskirts of the urban area, as again happened with the new gymnasium of Priene.[1094]

Of particular interest in the case of Priene is that this intense and expensive building activity related to structures of prestige like the gymnasium and the stoas during

---

[1089] End: Gaertringen, 1906: xvii and No. 537; Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 274; Kleiner, 1962: 1215-1216. Beginning.: Schede, Kleiner and Kleiss, 1964: 87; Gauthier, 1985: 73.

[1090] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 108.111-112.

[1091] Gaertringen, 1906: No. 108.115-117: '*θεωρῶν [μέγα] τι καὶ ἔνδοξον τῆι πόλει περιεσόμενον εἰς [ἀεί.*'

[1092] Gauthier, 1995; Hesberg, 1995. See thorough discussion in the final chapter.

[1093] Hesberg, 1995: 14-16.

[1094] Hesberg, 1995: 16-20.

this period appears to have coincided with a catastrophic event. The excavations have shown that the residential area west of the agora and along the Theatre Street in the north-west were destroyed by a devastating fire, the cause of which remains a mystery. The remains of household furnishings under the debris and moneyboxes with coins that their owners were unable to rescue[1095] indicate that many people perished in this fire or fled in haste never to return. With a few exceptions, the plots were never used again.

On the basis of the coins, a date between 140-120 has been proposed for this catastrophe,[1096] which does not appear to have been accidental.[1097] Priene, however, is not known to have been involved in any disastrous military conflict during this period,[1098] the closest in time attested in sources being that related to the Orophernes episode, before the middle of the century.[1099] A connection with the Aristonicus Revolt would fit well chronologically, but is not mentioned by the sources.[1100] Hoepfner and Schwandner have proposed the Mithridatic War of 86 BC, which left many cities in ruins.[1101] This would fit the profile nicely as Priene is known to have been reduced to poverty after it, but cannot be easily reconciled with the date of the coins. Should, therefore, one stick to the period 140-120, a surprising and hardly explainable contradiction occurs, as Priene would appear to have indulged in extravagant building projects with the contribution of private citizens, at a time when a large part of the city was destroyed.

9.5 Priene in the 1st century

As already pointed out, after the Mithridatic War Priene was reduced to poverty and was consequently unable to carry out any considerable building projects. It was not before the early Imperial period, towards the end of the 1st century BC, that Priene enjoyed a certain economic resurgence, and was finally able to complete the Athena Tem-

---

[1095] See Raeder, 1984: 11.

[1096] Regling and Dressel, 1927: 169-170; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 21, 86.

[1097] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 189.

[1098] Cf. Gaertringen, 1906: xviii-xix.

[1099] A connection with this episode has been rejected by Ziebarth, 1919: 44-45 and Walbank, 1979: III,548 on the basis of Polybius' text (33.6.7) which seems to indicate that the city of Priene itself was not sacked.

[1100] Cf. Tsakos, 1994.

[1101] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 189.

Temple and add a propylon to the sanctuary[1102] (**Pl. 38c**). The latter, with a prostasis of four Ionic columns and Corinthian antae on either end, faced Athena Street without, however, being exactly aligned with it.[1103] The significance of the propylon was apparently considered great enough to allow its stepped platform to occupy almost the complete width of the narrow north-south alley. This was the last noteworthy building project of the Prienean polis. Later during the Roman times, only the thermae and an upper storey on the scene building were added to the upper gymnasium and the theatre respectively.

The architectural history of Priene thus pretty much ended at the very place it had started, the Athena Polias sanctuary. A small polis of no importance in the vastness of the Roman Empire, Priene struggled to survive, and to hold on to memories of the historic past that the temple of the patron goddess symbolized. But even Athena herself was no longer powerful enough to secure Priene's welfare and protection, for which the city now relied greatly on human authority. This was in the hands of a few exceptional locals – like the one that received a founder-hero's burial at a tomb by the theatre[1104] (**Pl. 38d**) – but predominantly of distant foreigners like Augustus, with whom Athena now had to share her temple.[1105]

9.6 Synthesis and general remarks

Priene was a small polis, but historic and respected among the members of the Ionian League as the traditional keeper of its religious centre, the Panionium. Literary sources record that during the Archaic period Priene suffered repeatedly at the hands of Lydians and Persians. Weak as it was, in the 5th century the city seems to have struggled for survival against the expansive tendencies of its more powerful neighbours, and perhaps also against the grave side effects of the irregular course and the silting activity of the river Maeander. Evidence of Priene's history in the first half of the following century is so poor that it has raised suspicions it may have actually ceased to exist as a fully functioning polis.

[1102] Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 21. Cf. p. 147 above.

[1103] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 129-133; Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 112.

[1104] Rumscheid and Koenigs, 1998: 177-180.

[1105] Cf. p. 150 above.

Then suddenly, around the middle of the 4th century, the foundations of a new Priene were laid on a steep foothill of the Mycale promontory facing south, in a physically impressive and conspicuous location dominated by the imposing presence of a precipitous acropolis. The city's plan, based on a strictly disciplined application of the rectangular grid system as dictated by urbanistic ideas of the time, was characterized by such homogeneity and integration as to be considered the work of a leading architect and theoretician. An attractive – but unverifiable on the basis of existing evidence – hypothesis identifies this person with Pytheus, who had been involved in the building of the famous Mausoleum of Halicarnassus and undertook to design the centrepiece of the new Priene, the temple of Athena Polias.

The vague chronology and the obscure historical circumstances of the foundation have given rise to various theories concerning the exact timing of the event and the identity and motives of the powerful external authority that presumably instigated and financed the project, the ambitiousness and high cost of which probably exceeded the capabilities of the polis. Arguments supporting the view that the new Priene was built on the same site as the old are shown to be feeble. An Athenian participation in the undertaking is also extremely unlikely. Alexander cannot be definitely ruled out, but his involvement with Priene and dedication of the Athena Temple that deeply marked the consciousness of the civic community probably post-dated the city's refoundation. A Hecatomnid patronage as part of Carian power politics in Asia Minor during that period is more plausible, but if true it must have been interrupted at an early stage due to the change of political conditions.

The fresh start in a modern new city after a long period of hardships, the liberation from Persian rule, and the restoration and guaranty of Priene's autonomy and status by Alexander appear to have been strongly associated in civic consciousness with the dedication of the Athena Temple, whose significance as a symbol of civic identity became profound. Some time later, when the Prienean demos managed to restore democracy after a short period of tyranny, the effort to complete the temple became a central part of the expressions of civic pride and jubilation. At the same time, the walls of the temple developed into a sort of public archive, where documents essential to the city's interests were inscribed.

With the coming of the 3rd century, works on public buildings of secular character commenced on a grand scale throughout Priene, and despite historical adversities appear to have progressed quite steadily with funds from the city's own resources. Be-

sides the theatre, the gymnasium, and possibly the prytaneion, the task of shaping and aggrandizing the civic centre by framing the south part of the agora and the adjacent sanctuary through a stoa complex also began. Recent observations seem to confirm that the project was part of an integrated plan and not the result of gradual additions. This fact places Priene in the forefront of developments in the formation of the so-called 'Ionian Agora.' An amendment to the original plan signified the addition of a stoa along the northern side of the agora, possibly in connection with the design of the new agora in the neighbouring Magnesia.

The creation of a new sanctuary – possibly with a small temple – for the Egyptian Gods in the later part of the 3rd century, probably marked the passing of Priene into the Ptolemaic sphere of influence at that time. Whether the beginning of works on Athena's monumental altar was connected to the Ptolemies as well is unclear, but the tendency to follow and imitate similar prestigious projects in other poleis of the Eastern Greek world in that period is apparent. Perhaps a similar pattern was followed in the construction of the spacious and elaborate bouleuterion and the construction or renovation of the prytaneion as well.

During the 2nd century, another major project was the erection of the Sacred Stoa – donated by an as yet unconfirmed member of the Cappadocian royal house – in place of the Old North Stoa in the agora. Again Priene appears to have been affected by the widespread fashion of the period for stoas of great length, which were considered indicative of status and prestige. The Sacred Stoa completed the unification of the agora as a monumental self-enclosed compound, by masking and in a way incorporating the bouleuterion and the prytaneion. Another long stoa was also built along the south side of the Athena sanctuary, probably as a result of the wish to create an effect similar to that of the grand Pergamene terraces, even if that meant that the view of the temple itself would be obstructed.

In a possible display of nostalgic retrospection, a small temple erected after the middle of the 2nd century in the sanctuary by the agora revived forms and ornamental details of the Athena Polias temple, works on which still remained incomplete. In the same period and wishing to provide their city with perhaps the ultimate status symbol of the times, Prieneans also ventured to construct a new and grandiose gymnasium complemented by a fully featured stadium. At some stage, the huge and extremely ambitious project run out of funds, and as royal promises for contribution were not fulfilled two wealthy citizens came to its rescue. Enigmatic remains how this audacious

building activity might have been reconciled with the effects of a fire that appears to have devastated a great part of the city at that time, if the dating of the latter is correct.

The consequences of the Mithridatic War on the other hand, were without doubt grave for the city, which never undertook a major building project again. Only in the early Imperial period and in the context of its dedication to Augustus along with Athena, was Priene able to complete the Athena Temple and build a propylon to the sanctuary.

Chapter IV

Public architecture and civic identity from the Classical to the Hellenistic. The wider historical context

In the first chapter, an attempt was made to investigate the phenomenon of social identification at a theoretical level and to point out the fundamental principles and mechanisms that determine it. It was shown that social identity emerges from a process of evaluation, comparison and negotiation of perceptions and feelings about the self and its position and role as a member of a given social group, constantly set in motion by physical renewal and social interaction among the members of the group itself and between the group as a whole and the outside world. The same process applies also to the self-definition and awareness arising in the context of larger communities defined on cultural terms, to which the civic community of the ancient Greek polis belongs. Common symbolism, memories of the past and physical locality are central to cultural identity and its reflection on the community's intellectual and material production, of which architecture is an all-round representative.

In the following two chapters, the Ionian cities of Miletus and Priene were examined as case studies and an overview of their architectural history was presented, in which the succession of public buildings and general urban development were investigated in context with the current historical conditions and the agents affecting the identity of the two civic communities following the transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic era.

In this last chapter, an attempt will be made to place the phenomena observed locally in the two examined cities within the wider framework of developments in Asia Minor and the Greek world that marked the transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic period. Of course, no thorough and exhaustive analysis of Hellenistic culture and architecture is intended or could be achieved here. The aim will be to point out the most significant aspects of change or continuity with an emphasis on the process of transition. For reasons of coherence and practicality in presentation, the discussion will be set around three main axes/viewpoints: i) the new network of external relationships and interactions imposed upon the polis by the emergence of monarchy, the consequences on the actual as well as perceived status of the civic community in the new conditions, and their reflections on architecture, ii) the evolution of the internal structure and insti-

tutions of the polis from a political and socio-cultural and religious perspective and its architectural repercussions, and iii) developments in the experience, understanding and use of the architectonic language will be made.

9.7 Architecture as part of the relationship between poleis and kings

For mainland Greeks of the Classical period monarchy had been something remote, repudiated early as an anachronistic political constitution and associated with Asia, backward and peripheral areas of the Greek world or – merely in the form of an Archaic ritual office – with Sparta. Eastern Greeks and especially the Greek poleis of Asia Minor had endured the rule of Lydians and Persians for a long time, and for geopolitical and historical reasons had become familiar with autocratic power. In this case, however, the contrast between polis and kingdom had been part of the Hellenes-barbarians juxtaposition – pertaining to the greater Greek ethno-cultural self-definition of which polis identity was a part – and concerned the polis community indirectly and not per se.[1106]

Hellenistic monarchy, on the contrary, arose from within the Greek world itself, was directly connected with the fermentations and developments inside the poleis and the interaction between them, and could thus not be dismissed as something extrinsic and irrelevant. For the corporatist polis community, monarchy represented a contradictory alternative theory and praxis of political organization and social structuralization, and an antagonistic physical entity – on the basis of the analysis made in the first chapter, a 'comparable other' – that infringed upon its real as well as conceptual boundaries, challenged its status, and thus posed a serious threat to its identity.[1107] The intercourse between poleis and kings, both as conflict and as negotiation, was to play an essential role in the reappraisal and restructuring of civic identity that took place as part of the transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic era.

Compared with the wealth, military might, resources and overall power and influence of the kings, the individual Greek poleis were in considerable disadvantage, and in no position to challenge them and secure their status.[1108] Nevertheless, the kings too were not able to assert their authority indisputably. Although in theory they were jointly

---

[1106] Cf. p. 11 and section 3.1 above.

[1107] See section 2.2 above.

[1108] According to the demands of the 'social comparison' process. See pp. 6-6 above.

successors of Alexander, in practice their individual claims to kingship were de facto based not on succession, but on personal achievement and right of conquest.[1109] And as they had to secure and legitimate their rule and work out particular relationships with their subjects for themselves, they were engaged in constant competition against one another and none of them was able to establish lasting and comprehensive control over the whole Greek world.[1110]

At the same time, although the polis was in principle alien to the nature of the monarchic state, as the historically essential framework of Greek life it could not be readily rejected,[1111] and the ideal of political independence embodied by the polis remained deeply rooted in Greek consciousness.[1112] The authorities of the old poleis were sanctioned by ancestral constitutions and tradition, and originated from the communities themselves, to which the kings remained outsiders and therefore in need of legitimation.[1113] Consequently, in the Hellenistic world monarchy was as much an indispensable reality for the Greek polis as the polis was for the monarchy. Therefore, cities and kings had to develop ways of coexisting.[1114] And coexistence meant mutual influence, compromise and change, in character, orientation and consequently self-perception and identity.

As discussed in the first chapter, the need for the maintenance of positive self-evaluation demands that when a group cannot eliminate the source of threat to its identity, then it needs to reset the 'comparison' on a different, more favourable basis or to modify the criteria of evaluation so that an appealing adapted/new identity can emerge from it.[1115] In the case of the Hellenistic Greek polis both tendencies can in fact be observed. To adapt to the reality of royal power, as F. Walbank has pointed out, the Greeks had to incorporate monarchy into their political philosophy, and to do so also in a way that would allow them to maintain their self-respect, and – as far as possible –

[1109] On the significance of spear-won land (*δορίκτητος γῆ* - cf. Diod. Sic., 18.43.1, 19.105.4, 20.76.7 etc) see Schmitthenner, 1968; Walbank, 1984: 66; Davies, 1984: 296.

[1110] Walbank, 1984: 63.

[1111] Ehrenberg, 1960: 191. Cf. Gauthier, 1984: 82-83.

[1112] Cf. Price, 1986: 330.

[1113] Shipley, 2000: 60.

[1114] Cf. Walbank, 1984: 62; Gruen, 1993a: 3; Shipley, 2000: 59.

[1115] See p. 7 above.

their traditional commitment to freedom and autonomy.[1116] The answer was to formulate an ideal – and therefore psychologically acceptable – model of kingship as the theoretical basis for a set of practical rules-conventions, against which conduct could be measured and evaluated and a *modus vivendi* between poleis and kings could be achieved.

The preparation of the ground had started already from the time of Plato, Aristotle, Xenophon and Isocrates with philosophical and political speculations on kingship in relation to the ideal form of state. In the Hellenistic period, philosophers were tireless in offering advice to kings in numerous treatises 'On Kingship' (*Περὶ Βασιλείας*).[1117] By prescribing appropriate royal behaviour, some philosophers acted as the intellectual spokesmen of the polis in its confrontation with the kings,[1118] while others attempted to justify what was there and had to be lived with.[1119] Royal and suitable to be a leader (*βασιλικὸς ἀνὴρ*), according to Plato, is the man who distinguishes himself by means of his capabilities and virtues,[1120] revealed in his benevolence towards the whole humanity.[1121] To rule by fear is proper only to tyrants.[1122] The power of the rightful leader relies on the loyalty, obedience and goodwill of his subjects,[1123] which is won by deeds of beneficence.[1124] To Aristotle euergetism is the foundation of monarchy,[1125] because no

---

[1116] Walbank, 1984: 64.

[1117] For an account of the literary and philosophical background see Walbank, 1984: 75-81; Billows, 1995: 56-70. Cf. Rostovtzeff, 1953: 1078, 1379-1380 n. 83.

[1118] This is apparent also in the many anecdotal encounters between philosophers and kings, in which the spiritual superiority of the former is contrasted to the rude absolute power of the latter (see Préaux, 1978: 226-227; Walbank, 1984: 80), as well as in portrait sculpture, where the idealization of the ruler in an image of perennial youth is contrasted with the intentional aging of philosopher statues (see Smith, 1993).

[1119] There were, of course, also treatises directly intended for exhortation and flattery and often incited by the kings themselves.

[1120] Pl., *Resp.*, 580c; cf. *Polit.*, 292e.

[1121] Pl., *Polit.*, 276b. Cf. Blümel, 1985: No. 4.46-47: '*τὸ [κα]θ' ὅλον τὸ βασιλεύειν... πρὸς εὐεργεσία[ν] [ζ]σθαι ἀνθρώπων.*'

[1122] Polyb., 5.11.6. Cf. Bringman, 1993: 7-8.

[1123] Cf. Xen., *Cyr.*, 1.6.24: '*τὸ φιλεῖσθαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἀρχομένων.*'

[1124] Cic., *Off.*, 2.21-22, 2.32 (on Cicero and his Hellenistic sources, especially Panaetius, see Pohlenz, 1934; Straaten, 1946: 276-285; Bringmann, 1971: 229-250, 268-270 and 1993: 17); Isoc., *Philip.*, 154 (on Isocrates' ideas on kingship see Sinclair, 1952: 136-137, 169-173; Bringmann, 1965: 103-108). Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 20-25.

[1125] Arist., *Pol.*, 1285b.3, 1286b.10-11, 1310b.9-10, 33-34; *EN*, 1161a.10-14.

duty is more imperative than that of proving one's gratitude, and thus the benefiting subject is bound by moral obligation of gratefulness to the benefactor king.[1126]

For the Greek polis, the concept of euergetism was to become the device, by which the practical as well as psychological consequences of its unavoidable dependency on royal power could be alleviated. The benefactor-beneficiary relationship posed considerably less threat to the status and identity of the Greek polis than that of ruler-subject. That becomes evident also in the demand for a clear-cut distinction with regard to a king's conduct towards Greeks and non-Greeks. To Greeks that have learnt to live free and not under dynastic rule a king ought to behave as a leader *primus inter pares*, treating them as allies, friends and kinsmen. To barbarians who are unable to live without it and manage their own lives he must be a master, dealing with them as with animals and plants.[1127] Barbarians are suited for benevolent despotism, the kings were told, while the Greeks will acknowledge their superiority if they are able and willing to protect and support them. In this case, one could also not fail to observe the influence of prejudice, stereotypic consideration of 'the others' and claims to exclusiveness, which – as we saw in the first chapter – are typical means for the 'entrenchment' of identity.[1128]

On that basis, of all the virtues the model Hellenistic monarch – and citizen – was required to possess and display[1129] that of 'benefactor' (*εὐεργέτης*) – where applicable manifested also as 'saviour' (*σωτὴρ*)[1130]– became the most essential.[1131] Liberation, restoration of the constitution, and the granting of and adherence to the freedom and autonomy of the cities were the greatest of all benefactions (*εὐεργεσίαι*), but whatever the king did to support, protect and improve the commonwealth of Greek poleis was

---

[1126] Arist., *EN*, 1163a.17-21; Cic., *Off.*, 147. Cf. Kloft, 1970: 10; Bringmann, 1993: 17.

[1127] Isoc., *Philip.*, 107; Arist., *Fr. Var.*, F658Rose.

[1128] See pp. 6 and 11 above.

[1129] Such as bravery (*ἀνδραγαθία*), wisdom (*σοφία*) and prudence (*φρόνησις*), clemency (*ἐπιείκεια*), fairness (*δικαιοπραγία*), self-control (*ἐγκράτεια*), affectionateness (*φιλοστοργία*), philanthropy (*φιλανθρωπία*) and magnanimity (*μεγαλοψυχία*) towards people and piety (*εὐσέβεια*) towards the gods.

[1130] Hence the divine epithets *Εὐεργέτης*, e.g. Antiochus I in Ilium, Eumenes I in Pergamum and Lysimachus in Samothrace (Dittenberger, 1903-5: Nos. 219.37-38, 267.36, and 1915-24: No. 372.24; Habicht, 1970: 39-40, 83-85, 124-125) and *Σωτὴρ*, e.g. Antiochus I in Ilium, Bargylia and Smyrna (Dittenberger, 1903-5: Nos. 219.37-38, 229.100 and 1915-24: No. 426.21-22; Habicht, 1970: 83-85, 99-103), Ptolemy I in Rhodes, the Island Confederacy and Miletus (Paus., 1.8.6; Dittenberger, 1915-24: No. 390.27,49,56; Habicht, 1970: 109-113 and n. 1229 above) Cf. Habicht, 1970: 156-159 and 1997: 164-165.

[1131] The basic work on the subject is that of Gauthier, 1985. Cf. Schaaf, 1992:12-25; Bringmann, 1993a, 1993b; Bringmann and Noeske, 2000.

appreciated as benefaction.[1132] This included protection from raids, reduction of taxes, granting of land and a wide range of privileges such as freedom from taxation (*ἀτέλεια*) and inviolability (*ἀσυλία*), exemption from garrisoning, support in cash and kind at times of crisis, endowment of education, cults and festivals, undertaking or contributing towards the cost of building projects.[1133] In each case, the form of benefaction was determined by the needs and desires of the cities and the effect the kings wished to achieve in the current historical circumstances. As will be further discussed, benefactions in the form of architectural donations – which are of particular interest to our investigation – appear to have been considered very desirable by cities and very effective by the kings for their own reasons.

Being unable to rely exclusively on garrisons and the enforcement of obedience, the kings knew well that they depended a lot on the goodwill of the Greek cities, and thus felt compelled to respond as much as possible to their expectations of benevolence.[1134] In the antagonistic environment of the Hellenistic world, politics did not allow one to lose the initiative or lag behind in relationships with the Greek poleis,[1135] and supporting the enemy of one's enemy was often by itself good enough motivation for kings to provide one city or the other with money and goods.[1136] Characteristic is the case of Rhodes in 306/5, when Ptolemy I, Lysimachus and Cassander supported the besieged city with grain and other provisions to keep a dangerous opponent, Demetrius, at bay.[1137] And again after the devastating earthquake of 227/6, all monarchs, major and minor, rushed to contribute to the rebuilding of the city in order not to be left out of the geopolitical game.[1138]

[1132] On the various forms of euergesia see Gauthier, 1985; Veyne, 1990: 131-149.

[1133] See exhaustive catalogue by Bringmann et al., 1995.

[1134] See Veyne, 1990: 102-103; Bringmann, 1993a: 18; Habicht, 1997: 163; Shipley, 2000: 106. Relations between monarchs and non-Greek native populations and their leadership were no less delicate. As royal power rested largely on a Hellenic elite and natives had little access to status and prestige, beneficence was again required to secure assent and collaboration (cf. Davies, 1984: 296-304, Gruen, 1993a: 5).

[1135] '*αἱρού[μ]εν[οι δ' ἐν οὐδε]νὶ δ[ε]ύτεροι εἶναι τῶν εὐεργετησάντων πο[τὲ τὴν πό]λιν*' (Crampa, 1969: No. 8.15-16). Cf. Laum, 1914: 35-37; Préaux, 1978: 205-207.

[1136] Bringmann, 1993ba: 15; 1993c: 93 and n. 1 (examples).

[1137] Diod. Sic., 20.96.1-3, 20.100.2-3.

[1138] Ptolemy III, Antigonus Doson, queen Chryseis, Seleucus II, Hieron II and Gelon II were the kings who responded. See thorough description by Polybius (5.88-90) with commentaries by Hollcaux, 1938: I,445-462; Walbank, 1957-79: I,616-622. Cf. p. 185 below.

Donations in cash and kind helped kings win sympathies and political alliances outside their kingdoms, often at their rivals' expense, but their effect was usually short-lived and thus they had to be renewed regularly.[1139] Architectural donations, in this respect, offered the possibility of a much longer-lasting effect. The financing of fortifications, such as those of Elaus[1140] and Chios[1141] by Attalus I during the conflict against the common enemy Philip V,[1142] was a lasting contribution to the defence and welfare of allied cities.[1143] Similarly, as we have seen, Antiochus I took advantage of Demetrius' weakness after Ipsus to promote his relationship with Miletus by donating a monumental stoa, which was to generate a regular income for works on the Didymaeum and bring various long-lasting benefits to the city.[1144]

Antiochus IV tried to win the support of the Achaean League against the Ptolemies through benefactions to Peloponnesian cities – such as the financing of Megalopolis' fortifications and Tegea's theatre[1145]– but without success in this particular instance, as the League considered the overall benefactions of the Ptolemies far superior to those of the Seleucids.[1146] Even the bouleuterion of Miletus may have been part of the same king's effort to discretely and tactfully court the city, which at that time was autonomous but under the influence of Eumenes II.[1147] And the Sacred Stoa at Priene – possibly along with further architectural and other contributions – if built in the context of the dispute for the Cappadocian throne, may have been part of the contenders' effort to secure or win back the city's allegiance by donations of long-lasting significance.[1148]

Benefactions were, of course, deemed necessary also inside the territory or the immediate sphere of influence of the kings in order to compensate for the destruction caused by war and the discontent or restlessness due to garrisons and tribute, like in the

---

[1139] Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 24-25; Winzor, 1996: 17.

[1140] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 103; Winzor, 1996: 88.

[1141] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 231; Winzor, 1996: 90.

[1142] Polyb., 4.65.6.

[1143] Cf. the contemporary decree Maier, 1959: Nos. 52-53: '*βουλόμενοι διὰ παντὸς ἐλευθέραν καὶ αὐτόνομον τὴν πατρίδα διαμένειν... ἔδωκαν εἰς τὴν ὀχύρωσιν τῶν τειχῶν.*'

[1144] See section 7.4 and esp. p. 72 above.

[1145] Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 55-56.

[1146] Polyb., 29.24.11-16. Cf. Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 63.

[1147] Cf. p. 92 above.

[1148] See p. 160 above.

case of Antiochus' III contribution to the rebuilding of Sardis following the revolt of Achaeus,[1149] and also to make a contrast with the policy of former rulers as the letter of Ptolemy II to Miletus requesting confirmation of the city's allegiance points out.[1150] But above all, they aimed at asserting the role of the king as patron and guardian of the safety and welfare of his subjects. Thus, Eumenes II strove to ease the hardships of cities in his newly acquired territories by granting favourable privileges,[1151] and to enhance the feeling of security by financing fortifications, perhaps such as those in Termessus and Oenoanda.[1152] Attalus II may have marked his role in the rebuilding of Aegae after the devastating raids of Prusias II of Bithynia with the construction of fortifications and stoas,[1153] and is known to have contributed to the construction of a new harbour mole at the dependent city of Ephesus[1154] and a stoa in Termessus.[1155] Philip V also donated a series of stoas to Beroea.[1156]

At this practical-political level, the Greek poleis were happy to negotiate their geopolitical importance and exploit the antagonism of the kings in order to maintain and promote their autonomy in exchange for allegiance,[1157] and to gain material benefits that revitalized them economically and socially or, every so often, literally rescued them from crises and helped them recover from major catastrophes.[1158] Nevertheless, royal benefactions were much more than merely a payoff for alliances or a meaningless façade screening the real authority of the kings and the dependence of the cities.[1159]

In the volatile and competitive Hellenistic environment, maintaining a high profile and fostering one's image and prestige in the wider public opinion was for kings as important as securing control by political and military means. The display of magna-

---

[1149] Cf. Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 260.

[1150] Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 139; Welles, 1934: 71-77, No. 14.

[1151] Cf. Allen, 1983: 95.

[1152] See Winzor, 1996: 94-97.

[1153] Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 439-442; Winzor, 1996: 124-126.

[1154] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 267.

[1155] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 303.

[1156] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 111.

[1157] Cf. Gauthier, 1993: 215.

[1158] On the socio-economic aspect of benefactions cf. Rostovtzeff, 1953: passim; Kloft, 1970: 18.

[1159] Gruen, 1993a: 4.

nimity in the form of benefactions, besides inciting political acceptance and support by manifesting power, wealth and control of resources, also promoted and legitimized international status on moral and psychological grounds.[1160] The advertisement of generosity provided an essential instrument for propaganda and, for that matter, to fulfil the expectations of benevolence of individual cities was not enough. It was even more important for the kings to appear doing so before the widest possible audience, that is, the commonwealth of the Greek poleis.[1161]

The objectives of advertisement and display with the greatest possible effect on the greatest possible audience can be pursued through acts of symbolic historical – although, sometimes, of limited or no actual and practical – significance, of which Alexander's proclamation of freedom, autonomy and restoration of ancestral constitutions for all Greeks is a characteristic example. But when it comes to tangible, material benefactions, issues of visibility, durability and grandeur in terms of scale and investment of money, effort, technical and artistic achievements become of particular importance. These, as we have seen in the first chapter, are all constituents of monumentality, most efficaciously embodied and exhibited by architecture.[1162]

In its symbolic-monumental capacity, architecture was employed by the kings in both their capitals and Greek cities to serve their need for self-assertion and prestige through conspicuous consumption[1163] as an instrument of power and control.[1164] And with its connotative qualities that allow it to be metonymic of the functions, institutions and the persons it serves,[1165] architecture was also a potent means of mass communication of royal ideology, and of projection of the royal image to the present and posterity.[1166] The same principles applied to the perception of royal architectural patronage by the Greek poleis, but as pointed out in the first chapter, the perspective differed and thus the meaning elicited differed as well.[1167]

[1160] Cf. Gruen, 1993a: 4; Bringmann, 1993c: 99.

[1161] Cf. Gehrke, 1990: 178.

[1162] See section 4 above.

[1163] See p. 32 above.

[1164] See p. 31 above.

[1165] Cf. p. 30 above.

[1166] See pp. 25, 26 above.

[1167] See pp. 35-37 above.

In this spirit, the expression of royal piety through generosity towards Panhellenic and local sanctuaries, the fostering of distinctive Greek traditions, the patronage of arts, sciences and education were acts of benevolence addressed to the whole Greek commonwealth, which along with protection from barbarian threat were meant to present the kings as champions and guardians of Greek culture and way of life, and promote their claims to be the rightful leaders of the Greek cities.[1168] In the same way, benefactions that sometimes appear disproportionate to the importance of a city – like the granting of freedom and autonomy without any apparent force majeure or benefit to the kings – are thus explained as propagandistic acts aimed at upgrading the royal image in Greek public opinion.[1169]

From the very outset and throughout the Hellenistic era, monarchs strove to win acceptance, assert and legitimize their status and promote their image through countless donations, the most conspicuous of which were architectural, to sanctuaries.[1170] Following after his father Philip II,[1171] Alexander first tried to appease the Greeks of Asia Minor by associating himself with local cults through dedications of temples – attempted ones (Ephesus), materialized (Priene) or intended (Ilium, Sardis and Babylon)[1172]– and later, according to his so-called *Ὑπομνήματα*, to leave a testament to his magnanimity and grandeur by bequeathing thousands of talents for the construction of temples at Amphipolis, Delos, Delphi, Dion, Dodona, Ilium and Cyrrhus.[1173] All the Successors imitated his example and made considerable architectural donations to sanctuaries of major regional and Panhellenic importance like Delos,[1174] Delphi,[1175] Dodona,[1176]

[1168] Cf. p. 84 and n. 530 above, and Schalles, 1985: 46, 148-149 and passim.

[1169] Heidemann, 1966: 82; cf. Schaaf, 1992: 23.

[1170] Greek as well as non-Greek. Native sanctuaries in Asia and Egypt were equally centres of power and influence over the local subject populations and had to be conciliated also.

[1171] On Philip's dedications see the notes below.

[1172] See p. 119 above and Strabo, 13.1.26; Arr., *Anab.*, 1.17.5-6, 3.16.4, 7.17. Cf. Winzor, 1996: 31-34.

[1173] Diod. Sic., 18.4.4-5; Plut., *De Alex. fort.*, 343.D. The authenticity of the 'Hypomnemata' is much debated, nevertheless, the intentions seem well within Alexander's character (see Hammond, 1981: 301; Hamilton, 1973: 156; Winzor, 1996: 31-32).

[1174] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 128 (Antigonus Gonatas – Stoa), 136 (Philip V – Stoa), 408 (Antigonus I?/Demetrius I? – Temple of Twelve Gods), 413-414 (Ptolemy II? – Sanctuaries), 415 (Eumenes I?/Attalus I? – South Stoa).

[1175] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 91 (Attalus I – Stoa), 93 (Eumenes II – Contrib. to Theatre).

[1176] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 402-403 (Philip V? – Reb. of Sanctuary and ren. of Theatre), 404-406 (Pyrrhus I? – Stoas, Heracles Temple?, Theatre).

Olympia,[1177] Samothrace,[1178] Epidaurus,[1179] Cos,[1180] Didyma,[1181] Isthmia,[1182] Perachora,[1183] etc. as well as local polis sanctuaries,[1184] among which those of Miletus – possible connection between Antiochus I and the latest Dionysus Temple – and Priene – possible connection between the Altar of Athena and one of the Ptolemies or Orophernes, and between the altar/temple of the Egyptian Gods and Ptolemy III – as we have seen.[1185]

Royal architectural donations to Greek poleis were, of course, not limited to the religious sector, but concerned also theatres and buildings of purely secular character like gymnasia, stoas, and utility structures. The purposes of both political propaganda and display of magnanimity and grandeur demanded that donations be made not only to big or geopolitically important cities like Athens,[1186] Rhodes,[1187] Ephesus,[1188] Mi-

---

[1177] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 329 (Philip II – 'Phileppeum'), 388 (Philip II?/Alexander?/Ptolemy II? – 'Echohalle'), 391 (? – Palaestra), 392 (Antiochus IV? – Restor. of Zeus temple and statue).

[1178] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 233 (Philip III and Alexander IV – Buildings), 236 (Arsinoe II – 'Arsinoeum'), 237 (Ptolemy II? – 'Ptolemaeum'), 428 (Philip II? – Propylum and Temenos), 429 (Philip III? – Altar and court), 430 (? – 'Hieron'), 431 (? – Fountain house), 432 (Antigonus II? – Ship and display structure).

[1179] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 387 (Ptolemy II? – North propylon).

[1180] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 422-423 (Ptolemy II? – Asclepius Temple B and Altar), 424-427 (Eumenes II?/Attalus II? – Asclepius Temple A, Stoa, Retaining wall and staircase, Dionysus Altar).

[1181] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 281 (Antiochus I – Miletus Stoa), 455 (Seleucus I?/Ptolemy II?/? – Apollo Temple).

[1182] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 383 (Philip II? and Alexander? – Stadium).

[1183] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 384-385 (Demetrius I? – Stoa and Buildings).

[1184] E.g. Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 24 (Antiochus IV – Olympian Zeus Temple, Athens), 245 (Lysimachus – Athena Temple, Ilium), 256 (Philetaerus – Meter Temple, Mamurt Kaleh), 355 (Eumenes II and Attalus II – Temple, Cyzicus), 369 (Lysimachus – Asclepieum, Troas), 378 (Attalus II? - Meter Temple, Athens), 393 (Demetrius I – Artemis Temple, Sicyon), 395 (Cassander? – Apollo Temple, Ptoon), 396 (Antiochus IV? – Temple, Lebadea), 401 (Cassander? – Zeus Temple, Stratos), 419 (Ptolemy VI? – Temple, Thera), 436 (Attalids? – Apollo Smintheus Temple, Troas), 443 (Seleucus I?/Eumenes II?/Achaeus? – Artemis Temple, Sardis), 445 (Attalids? – Dionysus Temple, Teos), 460 (Seleucus I?/Antiochus IV? – Zeus Temple, Olbe).

[1185] See pp. 74 (Dionysus Temple), 153 (sanctuary of Egyptian Gods) and 159 (altar of Athena) above.

[1186] Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 17 (Ptolemy III – 'Ptolemaeum' Gymnasium), 28 (Eumenes II – Stoa by Theatre), 29 (Attalus II – Stoa, Agora), 38 (Ariobarzanes II – Reconstr. of Periclean Odeum), 376 (Eumenes II?/Attalus II?/Ariobarzanes II?/Ariobarzanes III? – Renov. of Theatre), 379 (Attalids?/Ariarathes V?/Other? – Middle Stoa, Agora), 380 (Attalids?/Ariarathes V? – South Stoa II, Agora).

[1187] Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 199, 205, 207 (Antigonus III, Ptolemy III, Seleucus II – Building material for various structures), 213 (Eumenes II – Marble facing of Theatre).

letus,[1189] etc, but also to less powerful and smaller or more provincial cities like Larisa,[1190] Tegea,[1191] Oeniadae,[1192] Thera,[1193] Aegae in Mysia[1194] and Priene.[1195] In this context, monarchs also wished to associate themselves with cities and sites of particular symbolic and historic significance, and often grasped – or created – the opportunities to become 'founding heroes' (*ἥρωες κτίσται*) by refounding, relocating, rebuilding or synoecizing derelict and destroyed Greek cities besides creating new ones in their territories. As we have seen, the Hecatomnids may have patronized the refoundation of Priene, the historic centre of the Ionian League.[1196] Alexander ordered the rebuilding of the historic Plataeae,[1197] Cassander pursued glory by reviving Thebes and rivalling Alexander who destroyed it,[1198] and Lysimachus synoecized and renamed Antigonia in Troas into Alexandria, and erected the temple Alexander had promised.[1199]

Issues of status and prestige were, of course, of no less importance to the poleis as well. For cities trying to preserve their status and identity, and to defend their 'social niche'[1200] in the highly competitive Hellenistic environment, royal wooing and patronage that acknowledged their status and geopolitical or cultural-historic significance and showed respect for their freedom and autonomy – or appeared to do so – constituted a much-needed boost for civic self-esteem and confidence. Within this context, the subjects of donations – especially those of architectural kind – acquired particular symbolic

---

[1188] Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 265 (Lysimachus – Relocation and Fortifications), 267 (Attalus II – Harbour Mole), 447 (Lysimachus? – Theatre), 448 (Lysimachus? – Stadium).

[1189] The stoa by Antiochus I, the gymnasium by Eumenes II and possibly the bouleuterion by Antiochus IV (see sections 7.4-5).

[1190] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 106 (Philip V and Perseus – Renov. of Gymnasium).

[1191] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 56 (Antiochus IV – Theatre).

[1192] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 400 (Philip V? – Renov. of Theatre).

[1193] Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 418, 420 (Ptolemy VI? – Gymnasium and Theatre cavea).

[1194] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 357 (Attalids? – Gymnasium auditorium) and n. 1153 above.

[1195] Bringmann et al., 1995: Nos. 270 (? – South Gymnasium), 360/452 (Orophernes?/Ariarathes V?/Ariarathes VI? – Sacred Stoa).

[1196] See sections 8.3-5, 9.2 above.

[1197] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 81.

[1198] Diod. Sic., 19.53.2: '*ὑπολαβὼν κάλλιστον ἔχειν καιρὸν πόλιν διωνομασμένην καὶ διὰ τὰς πράξεις καὶ διὰ τοὺς παραδεδομένους περὶ αὐτῆς μύθους ἀναστῆσαι καὶ διὰ τὴν εὐεργεσίαν ταύτην τυχεῖν ἀθανάτου δόξης*'; Paus., 9.7.1; Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 82.

[1199] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 245. Cf. Lund, 1992: 174-177.

[1200] Cf. p. 6 above.

value. We have already discussed how the dedication of the Athena Polias temple in Priene was in all likelihood strongly associated with the liberation by Alexander and the subsequent rebirth of the city,[1201] and how later the donation of the Sacred Stoa may have been seen as a confirmation of the city's historic role in Ionia or as a symbol of moral vindication for its stance on the issue of the Cappadocian throne.[1202] And in the case of Miletus, how the possible donation of the bouleuterion by Antiochus IV may have been received as a sign of respect rather than contempt for the city's sovereignty.[1203]

However, as the cities were usually the party in need – especially in cases of emergency caused by war or natural disaster – it was they who found themselves obliged to ask for help most of the time, and in doing so put their dignity and pride in question.[1204] It has been pointed out that out of a hundred cases that allow conclusions to be drawn, in only a handful the initiative can be safely attributed to the kings.[1205] And, of course, the royal profile was much better served when the kings did not volunteer gifts, but responded to the subjects' petitions displaying their philanthropy, magnanimity and generosity. The risk that an unsolicited gift could be rebuffed was real too, and the resulting negative publicity was potentially more significant than the positive in the case of acceptance. The rebuff of Alexander's offer to finance and dedicate the Ephesian Artemision – whether historical fact or mere anecdote – has been passed on by ancient literature,[1206] while the dedication of the Athena Temple in Priene would have remained unsuspected had it not been for epigraphic testimony.[1207]

Sometimes the city's status or strategic importance allowed it to make a request not only without fear of losing face, but with the confidence that the grant of the request was well deserved, as the benefactor would himself benefit equally if not more.[1208] Polybius underlines the fact that after the earthquake of 227/6, the Rhodians did not beg

---

[1201] See section 9.2 above.

[1202] See pp. 160-163 above.

[1203] See pp. 92-94 above.

[1204] Cf. Quaß, 1993: 198-200.

[1205] Walbank, 1993: 119.

[1206] Cf. p. 119 and n. 767-768 above.

[1207] See p. 119 and n. 763 above. Cf. Hornblower, 1982: 327.

[1208] We have already seen how the Delphians deemed their requests to Attalus II as fit and rightful: *ἀξιούμενα* (see p. 83 and n. 521-523 above).

for help, but on the contrary made their request in the manner of equals, if not superiors, being well aware of their city's fundamental role in the trade and transport of grain,[1209] and of the fact that their current benefactors had much more to gain back.[1210] The same author, however, rebuked the Rhodians when in 161/0 they made a slip from their customary propriety of conduct (*τὸ πρέπον*) by requesting and receiving funds from Eumenes II in order to pay the salaries of teachers, although they were not in want.[1211]

On the other hand, kings were expected to keep appearances as well and not to injure polis dignity. Demetrius I received a founding hero's honours for relocating and rebuilding Sicyon and his name was given to the new city.[1212] But the citizens of Ephesus, which was relocated and synoecized with Colophon and Lebedus against their will and renamed after queen Arsinoe by Lysimachus following a flooding partly induced by him, upon his death demolished part of the walls, welcomed Seleucus and restored the city's old name.[1213] And the outrage caused by Eumenes' II offer to subsidize the sustenance of the council members of the Achaean League is well documented and often cited.[1214] With the issue of Aegina – a member of the League that during the First Macedonian War was handed over by the Romans to the Aetolians and then sold to Attalus I[1215]– still unsolved, the grant was considered as no less than an attempt at bribery violating every sense of decency,[1216] and was thus rejected amid fierce protests.[1217]

With the reputation of both sides at stake, benefactions had to be carefully weighed, for they would be subject to the scrutiny of public opinion both within and without. It is, therefore, no wonder that the preliminary negotiations leading to benefactions were very delicate and in the early stages tentative and inquisitive about the other side's intentions, making it usually very difficult to clarify the circumstances and trace back the initiative. We have already discussed in length the problems concerning the

---

[1209] See Casson, 1954.

[1210] Polyb., 5.88.4. Cf. Rostovtzeff, 1953: 631; Schaaf, 1992: 14; Bringmann, 1993a: 20 and 1993c: 94.

[1211] Polyb., 31.31.1-3. Cf. Bringmann, 1993a: 20-21 and 1993c: 101. For a different consideration of this case by Diodorus see p. 85 and n. 545 above.

[1212] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 72.

[1213] Bringmann et al., 1995: No. 265.

[1214] Polyb., 22.7.8-8.13; cf. Diod. Sic., 29.17.

[1215] See McShane, 1964: 107.

[1216] Cf. Cic., *Off.*, 2.21.

[1217] Cf. Walbank, 1984: 72; Schaaf, 1992: 24; Bringmann, 1993a: 21-22 and 1993c: 101

patronage of the Milesian bouleuterion.[1218] Members of the royal family, official and unofficial ambassadors and envoys of the cities and especially royal friends – preferably with an origin from or connection with the cities concerned – played an important mediating role in the operation.[1219] The Milesians Eirenias in the case of Eumenes' II donation towards the great gymnasium,[1220] and possibly Timarchus and Heracleides in that of the bouleuterion[1221] are characteristic examples.[1222]

The kings' ambition for fame and glory (*φιλοδοξία*)[1223] as a basic motive behind their benefactions went hand in hand with the pursuit of honour (*φιλοτιμία*), which according to Aristotle is the token of benevolence, the highest of all external goods and the purpose for which power and wealth are sought.[1224] Next to practical political, military or other support, the grant of worthy and appropriate honours[1225] was the means by which cities both individually and collectively[1226] expressed their gratitude to the benefactor kings in fulfilment of the moral obligation arising from the principle of reciprocity on the symbolic level as well.[1227]

Public commendation, grant of citizenship and *προεδρία* in festivals and games, maintenance in the prytaneion, crowning, erection of a statue were some of these honours, which escalated according to the significance of the benefaction.[1228] The grant

---

[1218] See pp. 85-96 above.

[1219] Herman, 1987; Bringmann, 1993a: 14 and esp. 1997; Walbank, 1993.

[1220] See pp. 78-85 above.

[1221] See pp. 85-96 above.

[1222] Some others are those of the Athenian Philipides, friend of Lysimachus (Plut., *Demetr.*, 12.8; Dittenberger, 1915-24: No. 374), Aratus of Sicyon, friend of the Ptolemies (Plut., *Arat.*, 12.1, 13.6-14.4), Eudemus of Seleucea, friend of Antiochus IV (Dittenberger, 1915-24: No.644/5), etc.

[1223] One of the usual characteristics ascribed to kings by ancient authors and honorary decrees is *φιλοδοξότατος*. E.g. Eumenes II (Polyb., 32.8.5; cf. Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: No. 307.4-5: '*φιλοδόξως διακείμενος*') and Hiero of Syracuse (Polyb., 7.8.6). Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 14-15; Bringmann, 1993a: 16.

[1224] Arist., *Rhet.*, 1361a.28-29; *EN*, 1123b.20-21, 1124a.17-19.

[1225] *Τιμαῖς ἀξίαις, πρεπούσαις* or *προσηκούσαις* (eg. Diod. Sic., 20.100.1-3). After the donation of the stadion-long stoa by Antiochus I, Miletus harried to vote honours for the king and his mother so that 'everybody can see that the demos takes appropriate care of its benefactors' (Rehm, 1958: No. 480.14-16). Cf. Habicht, 1970: 207-208.

[1226] Characteristic are the honours voted to Eumenes II by the Ionian League for proving himself a 'benefactor of the Greeks,' caring for their 'peace and prosperity,' being benevolent to 'each and all cities' (Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: No. 306; cf. Welles, 1934: No. 52).

[1227] See Habicht, 1970: 206-213 and 1997: 162.

[1228] Arist., *Rhet.*, 1361a.34-37. Cf. Henry, 1983; Leschhorn, 1993.

of a civic cult was the highest honour of all,[1229] originating as an expression of utmost civic gratitude for decisive royal intervention in severe circumstances resulting in relief from famine and distress or, as we have seen in the cases of Miletus and Priene, in preservation from the enemy, liberation and restoration of autonomy.[1230] The epoch-making importance of the events leading to the establishment of a royal cult was often signified by the initiation of a new dating era, as was possibly twice the case in Miletus.[1231] But before long, the grant of divine honours evolved into an institution – perhaps more political than religious in character[1232]– also serving the cause of reducing friction between cities and monarchs.

The whole scheme of interchange of royal beneficence and civic honours was the instrument by which an effective and mutually acceptable and reassuring equilibrium between cities and kings could be achieved. By keeping record, so to speak, of giving and receiving, a partnership based on a sense of mutual respect and moral ties could develop,[1233] which however informal and subject to the realities of power, held high significance for the self-image of both cities and kings.[1234]

That both sides considered this form of relationship effective is revealed by the fact that the succession of beneficence and honours often took the form of a chain reaction with one repeatedly triggering the other.[1235] Cities resorted to kings with petitions for donations, and the kings were so eager to be honoured by Greek cities that they were often prepared to defray the expenses of the honours.[1236] When the Ionian League voted honours for Eumenes II, the king offered to pay for the expenses '*προαιρούμενος*

[1229] Miletus honoured Ptolemy I '*ταῖς μεγίσταις καὶ καλλίσταις τιμαῖς*,' i.e divine honours (Kawerau and Rehm, 1914: No. 139.26-27; cf. Dittenberger, 1903-5: No. 472.17-18; Habicht, 1970: 114-115). Cf. Taeger, 1957: 257; Habicht, 1970: 210-211. Price, 1984: 23-40; Smith, 1988: 16-20.

[1230] Priene granted divine honours to Lysimachus for the protection against the aggression of Magnesians and the local Pedieis (p. 148 and n. 956 above), and Miletus to Antiochus II for the liberation from the tyranny of Timarchus (see p. 75 and n. 458 above). Cf. Habicht, 1970: 160-171 and 1997: 162-163; Walbank, 1984: 87-96.

[1231] At the time of Antigonus and possibly Antiochus II (see p. 64 and n. 367-368, and p. 75 and n. 454 above; cf. Habicht, 1970: 230-231). The same had also happened in the whole of Asia Minor after the liberation by Alexander (Habicht, 1970: 23-24).

[1232] Cf. Habicht, 1970: 213-221; Walbank, 1984: 95; Préaux, 1978: 251-253; Shipley, 2000: 156-163.

[1233] Cf. Firth, 1973: 376-377.

[1234] Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 24; Bringmann, 1993a: 9, 18; Gruen, 1993a: 4-5.

[1235] Bringmann, 1993c: 100

[1236] Cf. Schalles, 1985: 50, n. 319.

ἀδά[πανον πάν]τως [τὴν] χάριν εἶναι τῶι κο[ινῶι].'[1237] In Miletus, the money for the celebrations in honour of Eumenes II after his contribution to the new gymnasium again came from the king himself,[1238] and the same happened after the benefactions of Eumenes II and Attalus II in Delphi.[1239] The succession of petition, benefaction, grant of honours, paying for the expenses of honours eventually took the character of ritual.[1240] As we have seen, another such case may have been the possible contribution of Antiochus I to the construction of the new Dionysus temple at Miletus following the grant of *προεδρία* at the Dionysia as an expression of civic gratitude for the donation of the monumental stoa.[1241]

The parameters of royal euergetism were considerably affected by the rise of Rome. Increasing Roman intervention first in mainland Greece and then in Asia Minor gradually deprived the Hellenistic kings of their vital space of action, and consequently of two major contributors to their image and legitimation: power politics and war. What was left to them was the fame of the benefactor. At the same time, foreign policy was a field even less accessible to cities. They too were obliged to seek new grounds upon which to lay the foundations of their identity, and new sources of prestige and self-confidence with which to endorse it.[1242]

Within this new context, the relationship between cities and kings increasingly concentrated on their common concern for the preservation of their status.[1243] Characteristically, the coincidence of interests is even revealed by the coincidence of words. In the letter of Eumenes II to the Ionian League, it is stressed that the king receives and will go on receiving everything '*τ]ῶν εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνηκόντων*,' as long as he continues '*περιποιεῖν ἀεί τι καὶ κ[οινῆι ἅπασιν] καὶ κατὰ πόλιν ἑκάστοις τῶν πρὸς [τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν] ἀ[ν]ηκόντων.*'[1244]

[1237] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: No. 306.57-58.

[1238] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: No. 307; cf. Rehm, 1958: No. 488.

[1239] Daux and Salac, 1932: No. 239.10-12; Dittenberger, 1915-24: No. 672.

[1240] Cf. Bringmann, 1993c: 100-101.

[1241] See p. 74 above.

[1242] See pp. 7 and 175 above.

[1243] Bringmann, 1993c: 97.

[1244] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: No. 306.36-37, 43-45; cf. ll. 19-20. Cf. the similar earlier letters of Antiochus I or II to Erythrae (Engelmann and Merkelbach, 1972-3: No. 31.11-12: '*πᾶσιν τοῖς*

In comparison with the earlier part of the Hellenistic period, one observes that from the 2nd century royal beneficence to cities was oriented less towards providing support at times of war or catastrophes, and more towards responding to their wish for objects of prestige that promoted their image and standing, as well as their economic growth.[1245] As Diodorus Siculus informs us, '*τὰ συντείνοντα πρὸς αὔξησιν πόλεως καὶ δόξαν*'[1246] i.e. status symbols to which kings contributed were monumental public buildings such as gymnasia, temples, theatres and stoas, as well as education, religious festivals, athletic and artistic contests. As will be more thoroughly discussed later on, positive distinctiveness was sought in the beauty of the urban layout, the impressiveness of architecture, the cultural attractions, and the life quality of the citizens. As pointed out in the first chapter, phenomena of conspicuous consumption and pursuit of self-assertion through monumentality are particularly common in early formative stages, transitional phases and periods of threat to identity.[1247]

Antiochus IV and especially Eumenes II of Pergamum were the most prolific benefactors of this period.[1248] Their leading role as donors of prestigious public buildings to Greek cities, according to J. Lippstreu, was to a great extent a response to the new conditions and challenges created by the increasing intervention of Rome.[1249] On account of the unfavourable conditions of the Apamea Peace and the problematic circumstances of his accession to the throne,[1250] Antiochus IV had to consolidate his kingdom and reinforce the legitimacy of his rule without provoking Rome. For this purpose he associated himself closely with the Roman ally Eumenes II and adopted a policy of benefactions towards Greek cities. As the selection of recipients reveals – Athens, Megalopolis, Tegea, possibly Miletus, etc[1251]– his sumptuous architectural donations

---

ἀνήκουσι πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν συναύξειν τὰ τῆς πόλεως'), and Antiochus III to Teos (Herrmann, 1965b: 41-42 No. IV.14: '*ὅ᾽ ἂν ἀνήκῃ πρὸς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν σ[υναύξε]ιν ὑμῖν*').

[1245] Bringmann, 1993c: 94-95, 97.

[1246] Diod. Sic., 15.13.5; cf. 4.30.1, 5.15.2.

[1247] See p. 32 above.

[1248] Cf. n. 1223 above; Bringmann, 1993c: 95-96.

[1249] Lippstreu, 1993.

[1250] Antiochus IV succeeded his murdered brother Seleucus IV after the supersession of the latter's sons Demetrius (I) and Antiochus.

[1251] In Athens that continued to exert considerable influence on the public opinion of Greece and Rome Antiochus revived the project of the Peisistratid Zeus Temple at the Olympieum (see n. 1184 above), to Megalopolis and Tegea, both members of the Achaean League which was the greatest power in

were part of a well-calculated and largely successful campaign of image-making propaganda.[1252]

On the other hand, Eumenes II had benefited from the Apamea Peace, but due to his alliance with Rome and his negative stance towards polis autonomy he had initially raised antipathy among Greeks.[1253] When Roman favour turned into suspicion and mistrust, it became imperative for him to reverse his image in order to win Greek support. For this purpose Eumenes too set out on a policy of multilateral benefactions,[1254] of which architectural donations to the great centres of Greek culture and political influence became a fundamental part.[1255] The sympathetic reaction of the Greek public opinion following his vile treatment by the Roman Senate after the end of the Third Macedonian War[1256] testifies to the success of this policy.[1257] By fighting the barbarians Eumenes had become champion of the Greeks, a fact eloquently acknowledged in the resolution passed by the Ionian League, assuring him of its gratitude and goodwill.[1258]

From the middle of the 2nd century onwards, however, royal generosity gradually declined. K. Bringmann has pointed out that from the end of the Attalid dynasty down to 30 BC only fifteen pieces of testimony exist, and with one exception[1259] these deal with rather small donations. After 133, the number of beneficiaries also declines from eighty-five to four: Athens, Delos, Delphi and Miletus/Didyma.[1260] Already around 140, Polybius complained about the stinginess (*μικροδοσία*) of the kings of his age, to which the cities were entitled to respond with equally reduced goodwill and grant of

---

mainland Greece at the time, he donated the fortification walls and the theatre respectively (see p. 179 and n. 1145 above). On the case of the Milesian bouleuterion see pp. 85-96 above.

[1252] Bunge, 1974: 66-67; Gruen, 1984: 647; Lippstreu, 1993: 129-132. Cf. Gruben, 1986: 233; Lauter, 1986: 17. On the success cf. Polyb., 26.1.10-11, 29.24.13; Liv., 41.20.8.

[1253] Cf. Polyb., 21.20, 27.18, 28.7; Préaux, 1978: 410.

[1254] Cf. Bengtson, 1975: 240.

[1255] To Athens Eumenes donated the stoa by the Dionysus Theatre (see n. 1186 above), in Delphi and Rhodes he undertook the renovation of the theatres (see n. 1175, 1187 above), in Miletus he contributed to the construction of a new gymnasium (see section 7.5 above), etc (see n. 1180, 1184 above). On Attalid architectural donations see further Hansen, 1971: 284-298; Schalles, 1985; Winzor, 1996; Radt, 1999: 279-281.

[1256] Polyb., 30.19, 31.6.6.

[1257] Polyb., 32.8.2-3,5. Cf. Livy, 42.5.3.

[1258] Gerkan, Krischen and Drexel, 1928: No. 306.

[1259] The reconstruction of the Periclean Odeum in Athens by Ariobarzanes II (see n. 1186 above).

[1260] Bringmann, 1993a: 11.

honours.[1261] In an Athenian decree, Pharnaces I of Pontus is honoured for his willingness to finally fulfill old promises made to Athens, despite his inability to do so in the case of other cities.[1262] In Priene, the citizen Moschion was honoured for defraying the expenses for a new gymnasium in place of some kings also unable to keep their promises.[1263]

With the centre of political weight and power conclusively shifting to Rome, Hellenistic kings and dynasts grew progressively negligible, and became deprived of both the means and the motive to continue the policy of benefactions. After Pydna, when it became clear that Roman power was uncontestable,[1264] the loyalties of the Greek cities as well as their hopes and expectations for patronage and beneficence shifted accordingly.[1265] Romans succeeded the kings and started to become recipients of civic honours and cults both individually and in general as 'common benefactors' (*κοινοὶ εὐεργέται*),[1266] while Rome itself was honoured as 'goddess benefactress' (*θεὰ εὐεργέτις*).[1267] At first the Greeks apparently wished to base their affairs with Rome on a familiar principle: that of exchange of benefactions for obedience. But the rules of the game had now changed. The old form of euergetism worked only within a multi-polar system of power politics and now there was only one player left.[1268] The relationship was thus to become one between patron and client.

Within this context, it is no surprise that Roman patronage of the Republican period showed no concern for the image and status of the Greek poleis, and consequently for their architectural embellishment. In fact, as Ferrary has pointed out, more monuments were pillaged by the Romans and shipped to Italy to decorate their cities than donated to Greek poleis and sanctuaries.[1269] Due to its exceptional symbolic significance, only Athens received donations for building projects by the rivalling – and thus

---

[1261] Polyb., 5.90.5-8.

[1262] Dittenberger, 1903-5: No. 771b.15-20; cf. Bringmann, 1993a: 11.

[1263] See p. 166 and n. 1087-1088 above.

[1264] Polyb., 3.4.3; cf. 6.57.5, 15.10.2, 31.25.6: '*ἀδήριτος*.'

[1265] Bringmann, 1993a: 11; Habicht, 1997: 166.

[1266] See Price, 1984: 40-47; Gauthier, 1993: 215-216; Walbank, 1993: 117-118; Erskine, 1994; Ferrary, 1988: 117-132 and 1997; Habicht, 1997: 164.

[1267] E.g. Merkelbach 1976: No. 20; Roussel and Launey, 1937: No 1778, etc.

[1268] Cf. Ferrary, 1988: 131; Gauthier, 1993: 216.

[1269] Ferrary, 1997: 201.

eager for legitimation and prestige – Pompey and Caesar in the last years of the Republic.[1270] It was only from the time of Augustus onwards that Roman patronage of the Greek cities began to involve architectural projects on a wide scale.

9.8 Polis architecture in the framework of internal structural change

The writings of many ancient authors – most notably the well known passage of Pausanias on the town of Panopeis[1271]– seem to indicate that already in antiquity, public buildings related to the various civic institutions and functions were considered indispensable and definitive elements of the Greek polis. Nevertheless, thorough studies carried out under the auspices of the Copenhagen Polis Centre in recent years, have shown that their presence, role and importance were far from uniform throughout the history of the polis phenomenon.[1272] The findings of M. Hansen and T. Fischer-Hansen[1273] indicate that not all Greek poleis had their civic functions and institutions housed in particular types of buildings at all times, that not all acquired such buildings at the same time and in the same form and, even more, that the architectural prime of the buildings did not necessarily coincide with the prime of the respective institutions.

With these observations in mind, in the following pages we shall try to place the developments in civic architecture and its most representative structural types in context with the basic parameters of the change that marked the structure and identity of the polis community following the transition from the Classical to the Hellenistic era.

9.8.1 The political and socio-economic sector

Protection, political independence and military capability, it is postulated, are the three aims of fortifications,[1274] the role of which is as much psychological as practical. The feeling of security and sovereignty is equally or even more important than the actual protection and control they offer, and their value as a deterrent often greater than

---

[1270] Pompey gave 50 talents for the rebuilding of the city after the destruction by Sulla (Plut., *Pomp.*, 42.11) and Caesar the same amount towards the construction of the new (Roman) Agora (Cic., *Att.*, 6.1.25). Appius Claudius Pulcher also built a gateway in Eleusis and Cicero contemplated doing the same at the Academy (Cic., *Att.*, 6.1.26, 6.6.2).

[1271] Paus., 10.4.1. Cf. Dio Chrys., 50.1, etc.

[1272] See especially Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994; Morgan and Coulton, 1997.

[1273] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994.

[1274] Cf. Ducrey, 1986.

their real military worth. Fortifications are also symptomatic. They bear evidence of a community's power, prosperity, self-confidence and vitality or, on the contrary, of its decline, weakness, insecurity and despair.[1275] The role and significance of fortifications are also greatly symbolic. Community independence and status may be under threat and need to be defended, they may have been compromised and must be restored or they may have been newly regained and need to be upheld and propagated. The walls stand as markers – and in the sense attributed to the term in the first chapter – as monuments of the community's autonomous existence, of its status and prestige, and in the long run of its distinctive identity.

On the basis of the dialectic relationship between *securitas* and *dignitas*,[1276] fortification walls and the much-cherished ideal of polis autonomy have usually been considered as generally inalienable,[1277] the former being more or less the projection of the latter to the outside world.[1278] Indeed, walls appear to have formed part of the polis concept already from the time of Homer.[1279] The physical reality behind this concept, however, was not consistent in all periods. Available archaeological evidence appears to indicate that only a number of poleis were fortified in Archaic times, and consequently – it is now claimed – walls could not have played a decisive role in polis identity during this period.[1280]

Most poleis were fortified gradually in the course of the Classical period. Thucydides, however, still maintained that '*ἄνδρες γὰρ πόλις, καὶ οὐ τείχη*,'[1281] and Plato opted to expel walls from his ideal state on ethical grounds.[1282] But a little later, Aristotle dismissed all such notions as outdated in view of the historical conditions of his time.[1283] From the 4th century onwards, cities that remained unwalled were noted excep-

---

[1275] Cf. Camp, 2000: 43.

[1276] Gros, 1992: 211.

[1277] Cf. for example Maier, 1959-61: II, 113; Camp, 2000: 47-48.

[1278] Cf. Greco and Torelli, 1983: 248.

[1279] Hom., *Il.*,18.517-519, *Od.*, 6.9-10, 262-263. Cf. Scully, 1990: 41-53; Hansen, 1997b: 52.

[1280] See Snodgrass, 1986; Ducrey, 1995; Lang, 1996: 42-46; Hansen, 1997b: 52. Morgan and Coulton, 1997: 105-106.

[1281] Thuc., 7.77.7.

[1282] Pl., *Leg.*, 778d-779b.

[1283] Aristot., *Pol.*, 1330b.32-35.

tions.[1284] Late Classical and Hellenistic decrees show that fortifications had come to be considered as the *sine qua non* of civic freedom and autonomy,[1285] and an essential feature of every polis.[1286] The construction of the walls became the first project in the foundation of new cities, in fact in many cases the actual founding act.[1287]

The increased insecurity and threat resulting from the continual conflicts within the Greek world during the 4th century, which carried on in the Hellenistic period due to the constant antagonism between the Successors, created the practical preconditions for the increased significance of fortifications. In response, as Aristotle[1288] prescribed and Philo of Byzantium thoroughly delineated,[1289] the cities continuously strove to maintain and improve their walls in order to keep up with the rapid developments in siege craft.[1290] Nevertheless, the poleis were not faced with just an increased threat to their physical safety and sovereignty, but also – as already pointed out in the previous section – with a serious challenge to their status and identity due to the rise of monarchy and their integration into an environment far more expanded and complicated than that of the Classical Greek world, as we shall further discuss below. As a result, the symbolic significance of fortifications as a manifestation of polis autonomy and of the determination of the civic communities to maintain it became equally great.

For the Greek poleis of Asia Minor in particular, this symbolism must have been even stronger. After a long period of foreign occupation and devastating reprisals for all attempts of resistance – as in the case of Miletus – they had only just regained their freedom and autonomy, which, although often conditional or nominal, had nevertheless been of tremendous psychological importance. It is characteristic that the change of political conditions was followed and marked by a wave of wall constructions at Erythrae, Colophon, Ephesus, Cnidus, Heraclea under Latmus and, of course, Priene as we have seen.[1291] On the other hand, as already discussed in the previous section, fortifications

---

[1284] Notoriously Sparta (Xen., *Hell.*, 6.5.28) and Elis (3.2.27).

[1285] See Maier, 1959-61: Nos. 52.1-2, 69.6-12, 82.25-27.

[1286] See Gerkan, 1924a: 27; Owens, 1991: 149, 151; Ducrey, 1955: 253-255.

[1287] Cf. Maier, 1959-61: No. 57.

[1288] Aristot., *Pol.*, 1330b.37-1331a.18.

[1289] See Diels and Schramm, 1920; Garlan, 1974.

[1290] See Garlan, 1974; Lawrence, 1979; McNicoll, 1986.

[1291] See Maier, 1959-61: II, 114 and Nos. 61, 69, 71-72; Karlsson, 1994; Debord and Descat, 1994; McNicoll and Milner, 1997: esp. 71. On Priene see pp. 139-140 above.

were often instigated by the kings who wished to serve their own military purposes and at the same time legitimate themselves as patrons and protectors of the Greek cities by placing them in the context of their policy of euergetism. But as the example of Lysimachus and Ephesus shows, in such cases the walls were very likely to be seen not as symbols of freedom, but of oppression and treated accordingly.[1292]

The symbolic significance of fortifications had already been realized by Aristotle, who suggested that they should be treated as part of the city's '*κόσμος*,' namely as monuments of civic status and prestige on which polis independence relies.[1293] Indeed, it appears that all the cities that could afford to do so tried to invest their walls with the aura of monumentality.[1294]

Stone became preferred throughout construction due to the solid impression it created, although mud brick offered equal or even greater resistance to artillery.[1295] The intentionally bossed or roughly hammer-worked outer surface of the walls in many cities like Priene, Heraclea, Erythrae and especially Ephesus was meant to enhance their formidable appearance, and so were the layers of dark coloured stone in Erythrae, Side, Thasus, Larisa and elsewhere.[1296] In other cities like Sillyum, Perge, Caunus, etc., impressiveness was instead pursued through the aesthetic gracefulness conferred by the precision and elaborateness of the masonry work.[1297] The gates, the first sights of the city every visitor came across, also received particular attention. Characteristically, according to an anecdote the Myndians had made them too big for the city's size so that the philosopher Diogenes advised them to lock them up before the city escaped through them.[1298] Very often the gates were architecturally decorated, like the Sacred Gate of Miletus framed by antae bearing an arch,[1299] and the East Gate of Side that was crowned by a Doric entablature with a weapon frieze.[1300] Towers were often placed

---

[1292] See p. 186 above and also McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 103-104.

[1293] Aristot., *Pol.*, 1331a.10-13.

[1294] See Garlan, 1974: 102-103; Lauter, 1986: 73-74; McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 220-221; Camp, 2000: 43-44.

[1295] Cf. Lauter, 1986: 73; McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 213-214, 221.

[1296] McNicoll and Milner, 66 and n. 134, 103, 220-221.

[1297] McNicoll and Milner, 1997: 137, 152, 199, 220-221.

[1298] Diog. Laert., *Vit.*, 6.57.

[1299] Gerkan and Rehm, 1935: 19-30.

[1300] Mansel, 1968; Hesberg, 1994: 132-133.

symmetrically on either side of the gates, and they too could receive an entablature and decoration of symbolic character like the relief shields of Perge.[1301] Series of niches also decorated the inner courts of the gates in Perge, Side and Messene.[1302]

Extremely expensive to construct and maintain, these fortifications were often more important as sources of pride and prestige for the cities – their solid outer skin both in physical urbanistic and in symbolic psychological terms – than as means of effective defence against the rapid advances in siege techniques, as we have seen in the case of Priene.[1303] In this respect, the loss of the right to fortification and the almost ritualistic demolition of the walls that accompanied defeat in war and loss of autonomy[1304] were – as also discussed in the first chapter – often events of more symbolic than actual practical significance.[1305]

As far as the actual political practice is concerned, regardless of its form of government, every polis had a council (*βουλή*) and a board of presiding magistrates (*πρυτάνεις*), and thus – it has been generally thought – some sort of bouleuterion, where the members of the council met, and prytaneion,[1306] where the magistrates had their office, the eternal flame signifying the continuity and commonality of polis life burned on the common hearth, honoured citizens and foreign guests were entertained at public expense, and often archives as well as historic memorabilia were kept.[1307]

As a result of the total destruction of Miletus by the Persians, the assumed abandonment of Priene's original location, and the subsequent slow process of both cities' reconstruction, nothing is known about their public buildings of political or other administrative character during the Archaic and Classical periods. Unfortunately, information from the rest of the Greek world concerning contemporary buildings of this kind is very limited too. Of around seventy bouleuteria for which there is literary and/or ar-

---

[1301] Lanckoronski-Brzezie, Niemann and Petersen, 1890-2: 59-61. On the symbolism of the relief decoration and possibly of the Doric order employed cf. p. 247 below.

[1302] Winter, 1971a: 88.

[1303] See pp. 139-140 above.

[1304] E.g. the cases of Keos, Thisbe, Coronea and Elatea (Maier, 1959-61: I,32-33 and Nos. 28-30, 37, II,115; cf. Lauter, 1986: 74).

[1305] Cf. p. 25 above.

[1306] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 34, 37. Cf. Thuc., 2.15.2; Hdt., 1.170.3.

[1307] See generally Krischen, 1941; McDonald, 1943; Miller, 1978; Gneisz, 1990.

chaeological testimony,[1308] only a few can be securely traced back to the Archaic and Classical times,[1309] and the clues about prytaneia are even scantier.

In their survey of the evidence that is available, however, M. H. Hansen and T. Fischer-Hansen have been able to show that in the Archaic times and even at the prime of the polis in the Classical period, political institutions were often accommodated in premises not meant for them exclusively,[1310] and where purpose-built buildings existed, these showed very limited or no intentions of monumentality.[1311] The surviving remains of bouleuteria – like the Old and New Bouleuterion in Athens – reveal a tendency towards moderate size, modest construction and unpretentious architectural appearance.[1312] Prytaneia, too, seem to have been plain buildings without any particular architectural and sculptural embellishment[1313] or even a standard and distinct architectural type,[1314] which also accounts for the difficulties in identifying them.[1315] As can be inferred from Athens again, the same applied to other administrative buildings like law courts.[1316]

Rather exceptional were a few stoas of more elaborate construction, which as multi-functional buildings in certain cases also housed boards of city magistrates,[1317]

[1308] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 38-41.

[1309] The bouleuteria of Argos (Gneisz, 1990: 306), Athens (see below), Agia Pelagia in Crete (Gneisz, 1990: 312-313), Delos (Gneisz, 1990: 315), Delphi (Gneisz, 1990: 316), Olympia (Gneisz, 1990: 340-341), Olynthus (Gneisz, 1990: 341), Orchomenus (Gneisz, 1990: 342-343) and the late 4th cent. ones at Iaetas (Isler, 1990: 57) and Acragas (De Miro, 1984-5: 460-464 and 1985-6).

[1310] Hansen, 1997b: 16.

[1311] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994; cf. Morgan and Coulton, 1997: 114.

[1312] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 43. On the Old Bouleuterion see Thompson, 1937; McDonald, 1943: 170-179; Thompson and Wycherley, 1972: 29-35; Camp, 1998: 52-53; Schaaf, 1992: 41; Shear, 1993a and 1993b; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 42-43. For an account of the extensive bibliography and different reconstructions of the New Bouleuterion see Schaaf, 1992: 40-45 and n.276-297.

[1313] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 36-37.

[1314] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen (1994: 37) consider Miller's reference to a generic plan and form of the prytaneion (Miller, 1978: 1-3, 128-131) as 'too optimistic.'

[1315] Of the less than a hundred prytaneia of all periods on which some information exists, only a handful have been identified with a higher or lower degree of probability, mostly on the basis of the remains of a hearth and dining facilities in what appears to have been a public building due to its location and context (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 31-34).

[1316] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 76-79. On the Athenian dicasteria see Boegehold, 1995.

[1317] E.g. the Royal Stoa and the Stoa of Zeus in Athens (Camp, 1998: 53-57, 100-107).

and the ecclesiasteria that existed in Athens and a number of other cities[1318] for the meetings of the popular assembly.[1319] These theatre-like structures – the identity of which is hard to verify[1320]– were often particularly monumental, but are attested mostly in mainland Greece and Italy and are absent from Asia Minor, the area of our main concern.[1321] Historical-political conditions were perhaps responsible for this absence during the Archaic and Classical periods, and the widespread use of the structurally similar theatre as the meeting place of the assembly for the non-introduction during the Hellenistic.[1322]

From the 4th century onwards, a tendency towards an increase in the size, cost, ornamentation and overall quality and grandeur of political public buildings is evident. Meeting halls of federal assemblies like the Thersilium of Megalopolis[1323] and the bouleuterion of Sicyon[1324] followed the tradition of monumental hypostyle halls set by the Periclean Odeum and the Eleusinian Telesterium[1325] or developed more idiosyncratic designs.[1326] The bouleuteria of individual poleis also began to appear in a variety

---

[1318] The Pnyx in Athens (Travlos, 1971: 466; Thompson, 1982b; Romano, 1985; Hansen, 1989; Stanton and Forsén, 1996; Rotroff and Camp, 1996); also the ecclesiasteria of Acragas (De Miro, 1963 and 1967), Argos (Ginouvès, 1972: 17-52), Delos (Vallois, 1929; McDonald, 1943: 91-96; Bruneau and Ducat, 1983: 159), Dreros (Ginouvès, 1972: 56), Cassope (Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 139-140), Lato (Ducrey and Picard, 1971 and 1972; Kolb, 1976), Metapontum (Mertens, 1982; Mertens and De Siena, 1982), Paestum (Greco and Theodorescu, 1983: 34-49, 79-83; Pedley, 1990: 78-79), Rhegium (Orsi, 1922; Martorano, 1985) and Samothrace (McCredie, 1968: 216-220). Cf. Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 55-57, 61-67, 69-75.

[1319] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 44-45, 53-75.

[1320] Since it often relies exclusively on the combined consideration of the building type and especially its location and size. A structure is more likely to be an ecclesiasterion if it is located near or in the agora and other political buildings, and its capacity makes it too small for a theatre and too large for a bouleuterion or law court (Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 75).

[1321] Only the 4th century theatre-like structure at the Panionium of Mycale has similar characteristics, but this served as a bouleuterion of the Ionian League (Kleiner, 1959: 172-180; Kleiner, Hommel and Müller-Wiener, 1967: 28-37; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 67-69). The bouleuterion of Priene was earlier incorrectly thought to have been an ecclesiasterion (see p. 160 above).

[1322] Kolb, 1981: 88 n. 9; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 48-50.

[1323] Gardner et al., 1892: 17-23; McDonald, 1943: 200-204.

[1324] Philadelpheus, 1926; Orlandos, 1953; Lauter, 1986: 158-159; Kockel, 1995: 32.

[1325] Schaaf, 1992: 45. Cf. Travlos, 1971: 387-391; Gall, 1977 and 1979 (Odeum); Jeppesen, 1957: 103-149; Gruben, 1986: 218-230 (Telesterium).

[1326] E.g. the bouleuteria of Olympia (Gneisz, 1990: 340-341; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 86-89) and Calauria (Gneisz, 1990: 324-325).

of ever more elaborate types:[1327] from rectangular halls with rows of wooden benches at ground level arranged in right angles around the three sides of the building mainly during the 3rd century,[1328] through structures with similarly shaped seating but constructed in stone and arranged in ascending tiers – like the one we have seen in Priene – from the end of the 3rd century onwards,[1329] to bouleuteria with rounded[1330] and finally semi-circular, theatre-like auditoria like that of Miletus in the 2nd.[1331]

The lavish and conspicuous building complex of the Milesian bouleuterion made a striking contrast to the modest Classical bouleuterion of Athens.[1332] The Milesian building stood at the peak of a monumentalization process[1333] that culminated in the first part of the 2nd century leading to the construction of large and often two-storey halls – sometimes as part of greater compounds with courts, peristyles and propyla – characterized by high quality of material and workmanship, spacious interiors and stone auditoria with ascending tiers of seats, richly decorated architectural facades and surfaces at the exterior and the interior of the buildings with the use of both Doric and Ionic orders, in many cases mixed.[1334]

The size and capacity of certain of these bouleuteria appear to have exceeded the requirements of the local councils,[1335] and if not merely the result of a conspicuous extravagance, they might indicate that – as in the case of the theatres[1336]– these buildings

---

[1327] On the typology of bouleuteria see McDonald, 1943: 255-272; Gneisz, 1990; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 42; Kockel, 1995: 32.

[1328] E.g. perhaps the bouleuteria of Thasus (Gneisz, 1990: 354-355), Thermum (Gneisz, 1990: 355-356) and later of Assos (Krischen, 1941: 19-20; McDonald, 1943: 168-170; Gneisz, 1990: 308; Kockel, 1995: 32) and Messene (McDonald, 1943: 204-211; Gneisz, 1990: 333-334; Kockel, 1995: 32).

[1329] See p. 159 above (Priene), and also Notium (Schuchhardt, 1886: 422-424; Demangel and Laumonier, 1923: 354, 359-360; McDonald, 1943: 217-219; Meinel, 1980: 170-171; Gneisz, 1990: 106-107, 338; Schaaf, 1992: 46-47; Kockel, 1995: 32), Heraclea by Latmus (Krischen, 1941: 22-33; Mc Donald, 1943: 192-196; Gneisz, 1990: Schaaf, 1992: 47; 322; Kockel, 1995: 32) and Sagalassus (Mitchell and Waelkens, 1987: 40-42 and 1988: 60-62; Kockel, 1995: 32).

[1330] Termessus (Tuchelt, 1975: 110; Filgis, 1988; Schaaf, 1992: 48) and Ariassus (Filgis, 1988; Mitchell, Owens and Waelkens, 1989: 63-67; Mitchell, 1991: 160-161; Kockel, 1995: 32).

[1331] See pp. 85-96 above (Miletus) and also Alabanda (Lauter, 1971: 134-135; Naumann and Naumann, 1973: 79; Schaaf, 1992: 48-49).

[1332] Cf. Kockel, 1995: 31.

[1333] Cf. p. 88 above.

[1334] See Tuchelt, 1975: 109-114; Schaaf, 1992: 47, 49-50.

[1335] E.g. the case of the Prienean bouleuterion (see p. 159 above); cf. Kockel, 1995: 34-35.

[1336] See below.

served as prestigious venues for a variety of civic and social functions.[1337] Many of them exceeded in height and volume most, if not all, contemporary roofed structures – even temples – and dominated the city skyline, setting standards of monumentality in secular architecture on a scale unseen before.[1338] In terms of required expenditure and technical know-how alone, these bouleuteria were without doubt monuments of civic pride that made '*τὴν πατρίδα καλλίονα καὶ ἐπιφανεστέραν*,' and as rare subjects of private euergetism brought about exceptional honour and fame.[1339]

The few known Hellenistic prytaneia including that of Miletus[1340] might also be considered to show a tendency towards greater refinement and elaboration in relation to their Archaic and Classical predecessors, even though no standard architectural type was ever developed.

In the course of the Hellenistic period, political buildings of enhanced architectural quality and very often monumental character appear to have become part of the regular inventory of civic structures of large and small cities alike all over the Greek world. The momentum of the physical and psychological revitalization after the end of the long period of Persian domination may have been an important contributor to this tendency in the Greek cities of Asia Minor at the end of the 4th century and part of the 3rd – as we have seen in the case of fortifications – but could not justify the persistence of the phenomenon or account for its presence in the rest of the Greek world. In the long run, one might consider the increase in monumentality of political buildings to be at odds with the developments in political conditions both without and within the Greek polis.

In the external political scene, as we have already seen, the rise of monarchy in the first part of the Hellenistic period and the prevalence of Rome in the second narrowed down the scope for action available to the poleis. In the field of internal politics, Alexander's tactical political manoeuvre to disband tyrannies and oligarchies and to endorse democracies and the 'ancestral constitutions' of the Greeks had proved particu-

---

[1337] See Kockel, 1995: 35; e.g. for meetings of other assemblies and as odea for speeches, recitals etc. (cf. Dittenberger, 1915-24: No. 578.32-34; Paus., 6.23.7; Aristeid., 51.31-34).

[1338] Kockel, 1995: 36.

[1339] Kockel, 1995: 36-37. Cf. n. 590 above.

[1340] See p. 60 above (though only partially excavated). Other examples are known from Cassope (Dakaris, 1983; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 137-139), Magnesia on the Maeander (Miller, 1978: 112-115), Ephesus (Miller, 1978: 98-109) and Priene, although the Hellenistic structure was significantly altered by Roman renovation (see p. 152 and n. 979 above).

larly popular and effective, and had been adopted in principle by the Successors as well. Thus, in the Hellenistic period democracy came to be largely viewed as the 'natural' constitution of Greek poleis and, following the spread of Greek institutions to the conquered East, it was considered appropriate for the newly founded cities too.[1341] But Hellenistic democracies never came close to the radical Athenian democracy of the Classical times and, even more, they were increasingly threatened in practice by the decline of real popular participation in the government due to the growing monopolization of power by the rich.[1342]

In Classical times, the finances of the Greek poleis had depended considerably on the contributions of the wealthy citizens in the form of various '*ἐπιδόσεις*' and '*λειτουργίες*' as well.[1343] According to Aristotle, generosity as '*ἐλευθεριότης*' and at a higher level as '*μεγαλοπρέπεια*' is a generally fundamental virtue,[1344] but particularly pertaining to the wealthier of the citizens.[1345] Formally 'voluntary,' spending for the benefit of the public and the state was nevertheless considered a moral obligation and a civic duty[1346] appreciated and encouraged, but at the same time, also expected by the polis.[1347] The display of '*μεγαλοψυχία*' was the means by which the wealthy could distinguish themselves and acquire status and prestige.[1348] It was, of course, also a means by which they secured a leading role in the city's affairs.[1349] Nevertheless, the strong corporatism of the Classical polis made a delicate balance between the power of the people and the power of the rich possible, and created restrictions that deterred the latter from becoming too openly and explicitly differentiated from the rest of the community.

[1341] Cf. Jones, 1966: 157; Quaß, 1979; Gauthier, 1993: 217-218.

[1342] Price, 1986: 332.

[1343] Like choregy, theoria, trierarchy etc. On liturgies see Oehler, 1925; cf. Boochs, 1985: 106-108.

[1344] Arist., *EN*, 1119b.22 forward.

[1345] On the connection of generosity to aristocratic ideology see Kloft, 1970.

[1346] Cf. Xen., *Oec.*, 2.5-6 on the duties of the gentleman landowner.

[1347] Epidosis-inscriptions evoke the patriotism, '*φιλοτιμία*' and '*εὔνοια*' of the citizens, praise those being generous and call others to imitate their example, and rebuke those who fail to do so. See Kuenzi, 1923; Veyne, 1990: passim; Schaaf, 1992: 13-18.

[1348] Arist., *EN*, 1124a.16-17.

[1349] Cf. Davies, 1981.

In the Hellenistic period, however, the regular revenues of the polis[1350] proved even less adequate to cope with regular outgoings like salaries, services, festivals and maintenance of public buildings, to which payments of tribute and special contributions to monarchs were also added.[1351] As a result, cities grew considerably more dependent upon the euergetism of wealthy citizens, whose role in public affairs was strengthened and social status distinguished by special honours.[1352]

During the 3rd and early 2nd centuries, zealous citizens like Boulagoras of Samos, Protogenes of Olbia, Callias of Sphettus, Polycritus of Erythrae, the two Philippides of Athens and many others[1353] performed important duties, undertook embassies to kings and offered financial assistance to their cities. For their display of patriotism and devotion – more than financial generosity – in the context of the offices to which they were elected, they were honoured with public praise and crowns, and more rarely '*ταῖς μεγίσταις τιμαῖς*' that consisted in a statue in the agora, proedria and meals in the prytaneion.[1354]

In the course of the 2nd century, as we saw in the previous section, the prevalence of Rome diminished the ability and motivation of the Hellenistic monarchs to continue the policy of beneficence towards the Greek cities.[1355] As a result, the latter increasingly depended on the goodwill of wealthy citizens not just for their welfare but for their very survival.[1356] Influential individuals to whom we have already made frequent reference like Moschion, Herodes and Zosimus of Priene,[1357] Eirenias of Miletus[1358] and Archippe of Cyme,[1359] and others like Theopompus of Eretria,[1360] Diodorus Pasparus of Pergamum[1361] and Theophanes of Mytilene[1362] carried out crucial

[1350] On polis revenues during this period see Jones, 1966: 241-250; Rostovtzeff, 1953: 1374 n. 71, 1463-1464 n. 22; Préaux, 1978: 435-438.

[1351] Cf. Davies, 1984: 310-311; Walbank, 1992: 159-175.

[1352] Within an extensive bibliography, the basic studies are those of Veyne, 1990: 70-200; Gauthier, 1984 and 1985; Quaß, 1993; Habicht, 1995a; Migeotte, 1997.

[1353] Gauthier, 1984: 88-70 and 1985: 69-70 (Boulagoras), 70-72 (Protogenes), etc.

[1354] Gauthier, 1984: 88-70, 1985: 67-69.

[1355] See previous section.

[1356] Gauthier, 1985: 53-56.

[1357] Gaertringen, 1906: Nos. 108, 109, 112-114. Cf. p. 166 n.1087-1088 and p. 192 above.

[1358] See Miletus chapter.

[1359] See n. 590 above.

[1360] Gaertringen et al., 1895: No. 236.

rus of Pergamum[1361] and Theophanes of Mytilene[1362] carried out crucial embassies to kings and Rome, or made essential donations in cash and kind that allowed the city to sustain or resume its basic functions: e.g. provision of grain and resources for festivals, education, and the construction and maintenance of public buildings.[1363] As far as the latter domain is concerned, the initiative of private individuals grew considerably, as we shall further discuss below.

These '*μεγάλοι εὐεργέται*' were now raised to a status far above that of their fellow citizens. As the decrees of the period reveal, the benefactors were no longer thought of just as zealous and devoted citizens, but they were seen as people of special 'nature,' manifesting already from a young age exceptional virtues and moral qualities that justify the grant of exceptional honours.[1364] As the '*μέγισται τιμαί*' were more frequently and even repeatedly awarded, the agoras of the Greek cities – like that of Priene as we have seen[1365]– and other prominent spots (*ἐπιφανέστατοι τόποι*) like the theatre, the gymnasia and the main crossroads gradually became crowded with honorary statues often displayed in emphatic architectural settings.[1366] Usually representing members of the same families across several generations, these monuments symbolically confirmed the 'institutionalisation' of their central and influential role in the political and social life of the city, and revealed the resurfacing of aristocratic ideals.[1367] The grant of a civic cult and posthumous heroisation as an '*ἥρως κτίστης*' assorted with a heroon-tomb within the city were the ultimate expressions of this tendency.[1368] We have already discussed possible examples of such heroa in the case of Miletus.[1369]

In the purely political field, the growing expectation of considerable private expenditure as part of office-holding contributed to the magistracies becoming de facto a

---

[1361] Cagnat, Toutain and Jouguet, 1906: Nos. 292-294. Cf. n. 1368 below.

[1362] Robert, 1969b.

[1363] See Quaß, 1993: 81-149, 178-210, 229-252, 270-303.

[1364] Gauthier, 1984: 91-92 and 1985: 56-59; Habicht, 1995a: 88.

[1365] See p. 158 and n. 1028 above).

[1366] Cf. Quaß, 33-39; Hesberg, 1994: 14-19.

[1367] Cf. Quaß, 1993: 19-79; Raeck, 1995; Habicht, 1995a.

[1368] E.g. the case of Diodorus Pasparus at Pergamum (see Jones, 1974; Price, 1984: 47-52; Filgis et al., 1986; Radt, 1999: 125-127, 248-254). Cf. Gauthier, 1985: 59-63; Habicht, 1995a: 90-93; Kader, 1995 (on Hellenistic heroa).

[1369] See pp. 100-103 above.

preserve of the rich, increasingly establishing the latter as political patrons as well as social benefactors. In fact 'real democracy' as genuine popular control over political life probably declined in comparison to the Classical times. In the late Hellenistic period, even without any brutal transformation of institutions, democracy came indeed to signify rather broadly a 'republican regime' in contrast to monarchy and tyranny.[1370] Rome, favourable to Greek 'republics' oppressed by the kings but fundamentally hostile to the democracy of the assembly, probably contributed to this development by exerting its influence towards more oligarchic directions.[1371]

Nevertheless, the idea of a mock democracy or total 'depoliticization of the masses'[1372] in the Hellenistic period is not justified either.[1373] Participation in the assemblies appears not to have declined dramatically.[1374] Although much of the activity of councils and assemblies became ceremonial and repetitive,[1375] these did remain open to all citizens, continued to deliberate regularly, to supervise and legitimise political action.[1376] They regulated educational and religious matters, city finances,[1377] provision of grain,[1378] issues of the military and defence,[1379] legislation, jurisdiction and foreign affairs,[1380] appointment of magistracies and grant of honours.[1381]

In view of the above observations, the increased monumentality of political public buildings in the Hellenistic period could be associated with neither a strengthening of the role and influence of the polis in the external political arena nor an apparent invigoration of its internal political institutions and functions, and thus one might wrongfully consider it incongruent with the contemporary historical developments. As C.

[1370] Gauthier, 1993: 217-218, 223.

[1371] Ferrary, 1987-9.

[1372] Cf. Tarn and Griffith, 1966: 66; Préaux, 1956: 128.

[1373] Walbank, 1992: 141-142; Gruen, 1993b: 349-354; Habicht, 1995a: 92; Shipley, 2000: 101.

[1374] See Gauthier, 1990; 1993: 219; Quaß, 1993: 355-365.

[1375] Davies, 1984: 306; Price, 1986: 332.

[1376] Cf. Quaß, 1993: 353-373.

[1377] See Migeotte, 1984 and 1992.

[1378] See Migeotte, 1991.

[1379] See Maier, 1959-61; Robert, 1970.

[1380] See Schmitt, 1969.

[1381] See overview by Gauthier, 1984: 92-102; 1993: 217-225.

Morgan and J. Coulton have pointed out,[1382] however, and we have already extensively discussed in the first chapter, public buildings, the architectural arrangement of the urban environment in general and their monumentality are not always concomitants of the institutions, ideas and values they serve and represent. They are sometimes a response to, sometimes a prefiguration of the perceptions and desires on the one hand, and the needs arising from the historical circumstances on the other, which together forge community identity.

On the other hand, one should always keep in mind that actual possession of freedom and autonomy is one thing, and permanent desire for them and commitment to the task of preserving or regaining them is another. The realities of the current historical conditions do not negate the fundamental psychological and emotional role that the attachment to the ideas of political sovereignty and territorial integrity plays in community identity.[1383] The pursuit of self-determination is, after all, an intrinsic and inalienable part of the human condition. It is worth pointing out again in this context that monumentality and phenomena of conspicuous consumption in general very often occur in periods of transition and change that bring about challenge and threat to identity.[1384] It is a commonplace in symbolism that, when the symbolized entity is threatened, its semantic content becomes less clear or its connection with the symbol weakens, the symbol itself is often over-accentuated in the effort to mitigate and counterbalance the damage. In this respect, the monumentalization of political buildings from the 4th century onwards could be explained as a reaction to the challenge and threat faced by the polis as a political community from both without and within.

The Hellenistic period, however, did not just change the political setting. It brought developments that had much more extensive and far-reaching consequences for the Greek polis. And it was not only the buildings of political character that were affected. The challenge to the status of the polis as a sovereign entity and the increased possibilities for members of the civic community to conduct and differentiate themselves as individuals in the political and social arena were, nevertheless, extremely influential new factors in the development of public architecture as will be further discussed below.

[1382] Morgan and Coulton, 1997: 103-104.

[1383] Cf. Gruen, 1993b: 342-343.

[1384] See pp. 32 and 190 above.

9.8.2 The socio-cultural sector

The all-important combination of education, athletic prowess and military training in the upbringing of the ideal citizen and their strong association with the institution of the gymnasium has resulted in the latter being considered by scholars as one of the definitive elements of the Greek polis.[1385] Once again, however, available evidence suggests considerable differences in the presence and appearance of gymnasia in the various periods of polis history.

Information concerning gymnasia in the Archaic times is very limited. J. Delorme has even argued that only the existence of those in Athens can be considered beyond doubt,[1386] although as C. Morgan and J. Coulton have pointed out, the fact that at least four major athletic festivals were established by the end of the 6th century makes it inherently unlikely that Athens was the only polis to have organized provision for training.[1387] The connection between athletic and military training for the hoplite phalanx makes it also likely that more poleis had dedicated exercise grounds.

Evidence from the Classical period is more abundant. Delorme's list, though probably dated, includes not only major poleis like Athens, Corinth, Sparta, Thebes, Rhodes, Ephesus and Syracuse, and poleis connected with major festivals like Elis, Delphi and Delos, but also smaller ones like Troezen, Pherae, Thera, Ceos, Thasus, Iasus, Mylasa, and even Naucratis.[1388] The distribution of examples suggests that by the 4th century gymnasia had indeed become *de rigueur* for every self-respecting city.[1389]

But still, the actual remains indicate that only at the end of the period gymnasia acquired a distinct and coherent architectural form comprising a courtyard-palaestra with some auxiliary rooms and a terrace for running, like in the cases of Thera and especially Delphi.[1390] In general, Classical gymnasia seem to have been installations of limited, makeshift and definitely unpretentious architectural character, usually situated

---

[1385] The basic study on the subject, though now dated, remains that of Delorme, 1960. Cf. Glass, 1981.

[1386] Delorme, 1960: 10-30, 33-50.

[1387] Morgan and Coulton, 1997: 115.

[1388] Delorme, 1960: 51-92.

[1389] Morgan and Coulton, 1997: 116; cf. Hesberg, 1995: 13.

[1390] Delorme, 76-80, 84-86; Morgan and Coulton, 1997: 116.

in the periphery or outside the limits of cities.[1391] Their location and form complied with their predominantly utilitarian purpose as places where polis youths were to acquire the necessary physical fitness, military training and discipline that their role as future hoplite-citizens required.[1392]

From the late 4th century onwards, however, the picture changed significantly. The number of new gymnasia attested in the 3rd century alone, is almost double that of the whole Classical period.[1393] But most importantly, gymnasia ceased to be peripheral elements of the urban area and began to appear at the civic centre, often in close proximity and association with other public buildings as in the cases of Priene and Miletus – which we have discussed in the relevant chapters – and many other cities like Sicyon, Alexandria, Cyrene, Nicaea in Bithynia etc.[1394] That this development pointed to a new, enhanced role of the gymnasium in the Greek polis, no longer as a purely functional establishment of secondary importance but as an organic element and source of prestige, was also evident in its increasing architectural monumentality: extensive grounds, large courts and spacious peristyles with impressive – often stadion-long – stoas and a variety of auxiliary rooms arranged on the basis of a flexible design adapted to the surrounding urban setting.[1395]

The central position of the gymnasium signified the emergence of a new pole of reference in the life and consciousness of the Hellenistic Greek poleis in response to the changing historical conditions. As already discussed, first the monarchies and then Rome gradually narrowed down the margins of political self-determination available to the Greeks and thus its role as distinctive element of their identity. As a result, the Greeks had to rely more and more on their cultural attributes and traits in order to identify and distinguish themselves in a significantly enlarged and complex environment.

[1391] E.g. the Academy, Lyceum and Cynosarges in Athens, (Delorme, 1960: 51-59; Travlos, 1971: 42-51, 340-341, 345-347; Lygouri-Tolia, 2002), Craneum in Corinth (Delorme, 1960: 63-64), Heracleum in Thebes (Delorme, 1960: 74-76), the old gymnasium of Eretria (Auberson and Schefold, 1972: 99-104, 145-148).

[1392] See Delorme, 1960: 24-27, 469-474; Ridley, 1979; cf. Aristoph., *Nub.*, 1043-1054.

[1393] Again, according to Delorme's list.

[1394] On the upper gymnasium of Priene and on that of the 'Capito Baths' in Miletus see pp. 132, 152, 167 and 79 above. Cf. Strab., 17.1.10; Delorme, 1960: 137-139; Hoepfner, 1990b: 276 (Alexandria), Strab., 12.4.7; Delorme, 1960: 215-216 (Nicaea), Coulton, 1976: 283-284; Lauter, 1986: 145-146 (Sicyon), Stucchi, 1975: 124-128 (Cyrene).

[1395] Hesberg, 1995: 17-18. E.g. the gymnasia of Rhodes (Filimonos and Kontorini, 1989), Cos (Morricone, 1950), Samos (Martini, 1984: esp. 99-101), Sicyon (Coulton, 1976: 283-284) and Olympia (Mallwitz, 1972: 278-289).

These too, however, were not as clear-cut and self-evident as they used to be. Following the conquest of the East and the foundation of new cities according to the Greek standards, civic political and social institutions ceased to be exclusive Greek characteristics and the same applied to the Greek language. On the other hand, the much closer contact and interaction with a great variety of peoples and cultures unavoidably led to an increasingly cosmopolitan and universalistic outlook in all aspects of life,[1396] which affected not only the social elite but also the ordinary inhabitants of the cities, and thus became an ingredient of the current social identity.[1397]

With 'Greekness' itself showing signs of turning into a dangerously abstract concept, the maintenance and protection of Greek polis ideals and the guarantee of the authenticity of the Greek way of life was seen increasingly as an issue of proper '*παίδευσις*.'[1398] The idea of a well-rounded education put forward by Isocrates now began to take root as a universal attitude,[1399] especially since the gradual decline of the role of citizen militias placed intellectual sophistication and moral excellence ahead of athletic merit and military prowess as fundamental civic virtues at the basis of social intercourse and political action. As political activity, social intercourse and education merged together in the consciousness of the Greek polis community, the gymnasium was transformed from a venue of physical exercise, to a foundation of cultural erudition, a locus of intense social interaction and political discourse, and a public promenade complementary to the agora and closely connected with it ideologically, functionally and also topographically.[1400]

From the 2nd century, however, gymnasia once again began to appear on the city outskirts.[1401] As the educational process became increasingly formalized and divided on the basis of age groups, in place of a single gymnasium cities now frequently possessed several. The fact that gymnasia were now often linked with stadia – like that of 'Eumenes' in Miletus and the lower compound of Priene – may have contributed to this move

---

[1396] Cf. Tarn and Griffith, 1966: 2; Pollitt, 1986: 10-13.

[1397] Cf. Svencickaya, 1996: 614.

[1398] See Ziebarth, 1914; Nilsson, 1955; Marrou, 1965: 151-336.

[1399] Marrou, 1965: 131-147; Mathieu, 1925: 29-64.

[1400] Cf. Forbes, 1945; Giovannini, 1993: 271; Gauthier, 1995; Hesberg, 1995: 14-16.

[1401] Hesberg, 1995: 16-20.

as well.[1402] Typically consisting of a peristylar court with lecture and auxiliary rooms on one end and the entrance with an elaborate propylon on the opposite in axial symmetrical arrangement, and characterized by an abundance of architectural decoration and increased luxury of material and construction the gymnasia of this period[1403] displayed a new, fascinating architectural quality. But, at the same time, they tended to become increasingly autonomous, self-enclosed and standardized complexes marked by a prescribed order and strict hierarchy of spaces and functions.[1404]

These tendencies were the result of a further development in the gymnasium's role and character. As the importance of athletic and military training subsided in favour of intellectual cultivation, attendance at the gymnasium gradually turned from a civic duty into a social privilege of the freeborn citizen and progressively of the leisured class as at the time of Homer.[1405] With education evolving into a sign of status and prestige,[1406] belonging to those '*ἐκ τοῦ γυμνασίου*' became a property distinctive of the elite, which as we saw in the previous section was again able to elevate itself above the masses.[1407]

The contrast between the educated and the uneducated, the refined and the crude, the '*ἀστεῖοι*' and the '*ἄξεστοι*'[1408] also formed the new basis of the age-old qualitative distinction between 'Greek' and 'barbarian.'[1409] It was the socio-cultural sphere where the Greeks now pursued the positive distinctiveness necessary for the preservation of their identity and claimed superiority over their contrasting 'others.' The gymnasium became the symbol of this claim and this explains also why access for foreigners remained very restricted and reserved for the Hellenized elites only.[1410]

[1402] See pp. 80 and 166 above. Cf. Hesberg, 1995: 17.

[1403] E.g. the Academy of Athens (Travlos, 1971: 42-51) and the gymnasia of Delos (Audiat, 1970), Assos (Delorme, 1960: 168-169), Stratonicea (Lauter, 1986: 237-238), Miletus ('Capito Baths', see p. 79 above) and Priene (Lower, see p. 166 above).

[1404] Cf. Hesberg, 1995: 20.

[1405] See Hom., *Od.*, 8.158-164. Cf. Giovannini, 1993: 272-273.

[1406] Marrou, 1965: 151-160; Hesberg, 1995: 15.

[1407] Cf. Rostovtzeff, 1953: 1058-1060; Delorme, 1960: 424-428; Orth, 1983; Mehl, 1992; Giovannini, 1993: 272-273; Hesberg, 1995: 15-16.

[1408] Cf. Strabo, 1.4.9 (citing Eratosthenes).

[1409] Cf. Schwabl, 1962; Dorrie, 1972; Lacy, 1982; Moggi, 1992; Romilly, 1993.

[1410] Cf. Giovannini, 1993: 272-273 and n. 25.

For the Greeks themselves, on the other hand, to spend money on the construction, decoration and maintenance of the gymnasium and to finance its costly functions was among the greatest demonstrations of a king's euergetism[1411] and a citizen's patriotism, as we have seen in the cases of Eudemus in Miletus, and Moschion and Athenopolis in Priene,[1412] who provided the funds for the construction of gymnasia convinced they would contribute to their city's fame and glory.[1413] Indeed, the greater the luxury and even the number of the gymnasia a polis had, the higher its status and prestige was perceived to be, and the more veritable and authentic its 'Greekness.' This helps explain why Priene was so eager to have a new and grandiose gymnasium which it could clearly not afford – and was finally paid for by the two benefactors – and Miletus came in possession of three gymnasia within the same quarter of a century, for the latest and probably greatest of which the city had to solicit significant financial assistance from Eumenes II.[1414]

Another civic institution whose role and significance were deeply affected by the coming of the Hellenistic era was that of the theatre. The early mimed representations of myths and ritual acts as part of the religious observance in honour of Dionysus at Archaic Athens had given birth to theatrical drama and the genres of tragedy and comedy in the Classical period.

With their multiple parameters – religious, artistic, educational, socio-political and economic – dramatic performances soon evolved into events of civic character par excellence, among the rituals, spectacles and celebrations firmly embedded in the festivals of the polis. In this context, during the 5th century they acquired a key functional role in the promotion of polis ideals and social integration.[1415] Genres, subject matter, literary treatment, staging and attendance were all aimed at consolidating social structure, reinforcing community cohesion and ideology, forging and maintaining civic identity in all aspects of life and levels of consciousness. The polis community was the au-

---

[1411] On royal donations concerning gymnasia and education in general see p. 82 and n. 520-526 above and also Robert, 1937: 85 n. 2-3, 201, 451-452; Schaaf, 1992: 68-69 and n. 490-493.

[1412] See pp. 78 and n. 482-483 (Eudemus) and 166, 192 (Moschion and Athenopolis) above.

[1413] See p. 167 and n. 1091 above. There are numerous other examples such those of Polythrus at Teos (Dittenberger, 1915-24: Nos. 577-578) Diodorus Pasparus at Pergamum (Jones, 1974), Menas at Sestus (Krauss, 1980: No. 1), and many others (see Quaß, 1993: 206-207).

[1414] See pp. 78-85 above.

[1415] On the function of the theatre in the Greek polis see Winkler and Zeitlin, 1990; Sommerstein et al., 1993; Green, 1994.

dience but also the producer, formulator, ultimate judge and even a participant in the dramatic action.[1416]

Nevertheless, during this period of rapid developments in the dramatic art and great significance of theatrical performances to the formation of polis identity, the theatre itself as a venue had, comparatively, a rather late start and slow advancement.[1417] There were no structures of elaborate architectural character. Instead, a flat area for the chorus, a makeshift covered space for the actors to prepare, and temporary wooden seating or merely a natural hill slope where tiers of steps were formed at a later stage had to suffice for the plays as can be seen in the early phases of Attic theatres.[1418] With the emphasis placed on the collective participatory aspect of the drama as a socially edifying and unifying ritual, the amenity and physical appearance of the theatrical locale received limited attention.

In the course of the 4th century, as the drama spread throughout the Greek world and attendance of the performances became a practice with a privileged position in the social life of the Greeks, the theatre acquired the character of an institution distinctive of the polis. This new status resulted in remarkable vitality, evident in the enlargement of the audiences, the prolific output of the dramatists, the increasing popularity of the artisans ('*τεχνίται*') that began to form professional guilds ('*θίασοι*'),[1419] and the rise of interest in the literary theory of drama.[1420]

The increased popularity and establishment of the theatre among the basic institutions of the polis raised the need for the construction of new, larger and permanent venues.[1421] The introduction of a regular circular design for the orchestra and the auditorium – which offered the advantages of an equally good view for all spectators, improved acoustics and a unified, aesthetically pleasing appearance but required a much greater financial outlay by necessitating extensive rock-cutting, backfilling and support

---

[1416] See Longo, 1990.

[1417] On the architectural history of the Greek theatre see Fiechter, 1914; Bulle et al., 1928; Bieber, 1961; Bernardi Ferrero, 1966-74; Septis et al., 1994-6.

[1418] E.g. Dionysus Eleuthereus in Athens, Rhamnus, Thoricus, Trachones and Oropus (Septis et al., 1994-6: II,133-135, 221, 227-228, 308-309, 311-312 with full bibliography). Cf. Isler, 1994-6: 91-92; cf. Bieber, 1961: 54-73; Burmeister, 1996.

[1419] Poland, 1934, Pickard-Cambridge, 1988: 279-305.

[1420] Cf. Green, 1994: 64, 90, 95.

[1421] Cf. Green, 1994: 62, 90.

works – and full stone construction for all parts including the skene building at a later stage also indicated that the role of the theatre was turning from simply utilitarian to representative of civic ethos and standing.[1422] The theatre became established not only as an institution, but also as a physical landmark and trademark of the Greek polis. No self-respecting new city could henceforth do without one as an integral part of its plan.

Modelled apparently on the new theatre of Dionysus in Athens, from the last quarter of the 4th century the new model became standard – the versatility of the structure and its general utility as a venue for public meetings and functions like those of the ecclesia must have certainly contributed to that[1423]– and rapidly spread around the Greek world. The cities of Asia Minor – with Priene in the lead[1424]– seem to have followed suit as soon as the conditions became favourable again after the liberation by Alexander and to have pioneered in the developments.[1425]

Parallel to these developments, however, the new social needs created by the historical circumstances of the 4th century changed the expectations of the public and hence the orientation of dramatic art. The crisis of confidence in the traditional system of politics as a result of the prolonged conflicts that upset the social structure and undermined the power and influence of the polis led interest away from the ideological agendas, civic-political repertoire and moral-educational character of the 5th century drama.

Tragedy either became an increasingly stylized performance of 'classic' theatre appreciated for its own sake, or by conveying emphasis on the intricacy of the plot, technical sophistication, rhetoric pathos and sentimentality moved towards the direction of melodrama.[1426] Middle Comedy, no longer satire-oriented but concentrating on human relationships and dealing with situations and characters familiar to the audience, paved the way for the New Comedy of Menander, which was to be the leading genre in the Hellenistic period. The personal lives, concerns and experiences of ordinary contemporary individuals, and issues of current social interest and appeal to an increasingly

---

[1422] Isler, 1994-6: 88, 94-96.

[1423] Kolb, 1981; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 48-53. Cf. p. 199 above.

[1424] See p. 151 above.

[1425] Cf. Bernardi Ferrero, 1966-74: IV, 9; Isler, 1999.

[1426] Cf. Lesky, 1972: 527-538; Easterling, 1993; Kuch, 1993; Green, 1994: 49-50, 62, 104.

heterogeneous and universalized Hellenistic society became the themes of dramatic production.[1427]

In the course of the Hellenistic period, theatrical performances moved further away from their early pedagogic role as agents of civic socio-political morals and sources of religious and intellectual elation, and increasingly acquired the character of social events and recreational spectacles offering aesthetic pleasure, entertainment, escapist opportunities and reassurance towards the uncertainties of life. The participatory aspect of the drama decreased and the audience became a more passive spectator, a fact reflected also in the exaltation of the actors, and the demotion and demise of the chorus.[1428]

On the basis of these developments, with its earlier role as a modulator and fosterer of community ethics reduced in Hellenistic times, the theatre may at first sight appear to have also lost its significance to civic identity. In fact, the opposite is true. Its effect on the self-definition and perception of the Greek polis actually increased in this period, but manifested itself at a different level. As the capacity of the Greek civic communities for political self-delimitation and determination began to shrink under the pressure of monarchy and Rome and their physical boundaries became increasingly pervious and vague, inevitably the weight shifted more and more on to the cultural aspects of their identity, their common 'Greekness' and the institutions that pointed out their distinctiveness and superiority in the fusional Hellenistic environment. As already pointed out, the gymnasium was one such institution. The theatre was another.[1429] Both became of great symbolic value to the Greek polis and this was reflected in their physical appearance.

The architectural development of the theatre in the Hellenistic period was thus dictated not only by the changes in the dramatic art itself, but also – and perhaps more decisively – by the requirement for greater monumentality in response to the increased symbolic significance. The plot of the dominating New Comedy revolved around the actors, so that the decreasing interaction between them and the chorus gradually made the latter obsolete. The importance of the orchestra therefore declined and the type of skene with a proscenium and a raised stage for the dramatic action – one of the earliest

---

[1427] See Webster, 1970; Arnott, 1972; Handley, 1985; Hunter, 1985.

[1428] Cf. Longo, 1990: 17.

[1429] Cf. Green, 1994: 105-106.

examples of which is attested in Priene[1430]– prevailed over that with parascenia.[1431] The skene structure became the focus of attention and appeared in a variety of complex ground plans[1432] and facade forms[1433], displaying a growing tendency towards greater size, elaboration and embellishment.[1434]

Like gymnasia, theatres became crucial parts of a city's cosmos, asserting its true Greek – or properly Hellenized – character, and contributing greatly to its lustre and status. The frequent renovations, additions and improvements observed in most of the known examples, especially in connection with the skene building, as we have seen characteristically in the case of Miletus,[1435] show that in the course of the Hellenistic period cities strove to keep up with new trends and enhance the overall architectural quality and appearance of their theatres as much as possible.

This evolution of the theatre into a symbol of advanced civil life also came hand in hand with a further extension of its use as a venue for a variety of ceremonies and events of official civic and social character.[1436] Its use as a venue for the meetings of the popular assembly appears to have become as important as that for dramatic performances in many poleis,[1437] and evidence suggests that it may have often served as a law court as well, as perhaps in the case of Priene.[1438] According to honorary decrees, it was again at the theatre that the grants of honours and privileges expressing the city's recognition and goodwill to friends and benefactors were solemnly proclaimed on the

---

[1430] Other early examples appear at the theatres of Epidaurus, Sicyon and Thasus (Septis et al., 1994-6: II, 208-210, 291-292, 303-304).

[1431] E.g. the theatres of Dionysus in Athens (see n. 1418 above) and also Dodona, Eretria, Aegae, Iaetas, Segesta and Morgantina (Septis et al., 1994-6: II,200-202, 215-216, 317, 513-514, III,21-23, 26), etc.

[1432] E.g. with a proscenium extending over the sides (Delos, see Septis et al., 1994-6: II,192-193), with winged (Epidaurus, Sicyon, see n. 1430 above) or trapezoidal proscenium (Halicarnassus, Aphrodisias, see Septis et al., 1994-6: III,402, 429), etc.

[1433] E.g. with a simple facade (Termessus, see Septis et al., 1994-6: III, 443-444), facade with thyromata (Priene, Pinara, Ephesus, Miletus, see Septis et al., 1994-6: III,441-442, 481, 494-496, 384-387).

[1434] See Bieber, 1961: 108-128; Lauter, 1986: 168-175; Isler, 1994-6: 96-106.

[1435] See pp. 66-67 above.

[1436] Cf. Giovannini, 1993: 273.

[1437] See Kolb, 1981: esp. 88, 90, 98, who has even argued that the primary function of the theatre was political, a view rejected by Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 51-53.

[1438] Where a water clock has been found in situ. Cf. Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 48 n. 103, 78.

occasion of the Dionysia and other festivals and in the presence of citizens and foreign visitors.[1439] And the proedria at the theatre was among the highest of these honours.[1440]

The high visibility, publicity and prestige characterizing the theatre as a physical location and as an institution, presented great opportunities for self-advertisement and display that the upper classes were again eager to exploit. As in the case of the gymnasium, donations towards the construction, maintenance and architectural or sculptural embellishment of the theatre became a favourite means of asserting one's patriotism and exceptional social status, as the wealth of epigraphic material verifies.[1441]

9.8.3 The religious sector

Last, but certainly not least, we move to the developments associated with religion and the role and function of sacred architecture in the self-perception of the polis. It has been repeatedly stressed that religious expression in the Archaic and Classical polis was inherently civic, in the sense that religious and civic life were bound together inseparably: cult practice was a communal, not a private and personal matter,[1442] but structured, organized and run at all levels in the same manner as the polis, by the polis and with the polis as the reference point.[1443] The Olympian gods, to whom the principal rites referred and from among whom patrons and protectors were selected,[1444] and at a secondary level the community's particular mythical or historical 'heroes' of semi-divine status[1445] were the two safeguarding forces of the polis. The dependence of civic welfare and security on the divine made the allegiance and ritualized participation of the whole community in worship mandatory and the responsibility of the state.[1446] To

---

[1439] See Robert, 1969c: I.73 (Dionysia). Cf. Kern, 1900: No. 101.18-19 (gymnic festivals).

[1440] Cf. p. 203 and n. 1354.

[1441] E.g. the cases of Demetrius at Miletus, Malusius at Ilium, Aratocritus at Calymnus, Critolaus and Parmenion at Amorgus, etc. (see Quaß, 1993: 204-206)

[1442] Cf. Pl., *Leg.*, 909.d-910.e.

[1443] See for example Sourvinou-Inwood, 1988 and 1990; Bruit Zaidman and Schmitt Pantel, 1992: esp. 90-91, 101.

[1444] See analytically Cole, 1995.

[1445] See most recently Boehringer et al., 2001 with earlier bibliography.

[1446] Cf. Arist., *Pol.*, 1328b.11 and 1392a.27: '*ὑπὸ γὰρ τῶν πολιτῶν πρέπει τιμᾶσθαι τοὺς θεούς.*'

maintain the civic cults was to uphold civic power and safety, to maintain social order and cohesion and to strengthen collective civic identity.[1447]

Research has also stressed the particular importance of sacred places and architecture in the formation of polis identity. On the one hand, extra-urban sanctuaries located at the heart of the arable land and on the fringes of the chora – we have pointed out several of these around Archaic Miletus[1448]– were of great importance as markers of communal presence and claims on the territory against aggressive neighbours.[1449] 'Sacred roads' linking these sanctuaries with the urban centres – as again in the case of Miletus and Didyma[1450]– were often used for ritualized processions that also verified and renewed polis hold on the land.[1451] Within the cities themselves, on the other hand, the process of urbanization seems to have again focused on important sanctuaries,[1452] around which the various political and administrative functions and buildings were gathered.[1453] When gods replaced the kings as supreme leaders and protectors, temples also replaced palaces – even physically like in the case of the Athenian acropolis[1454]– as centres of reference.[1455]

Although temples were not exclusive to the polis community,[1456] Greek temple architecture and the polis emerged and evolved together as historically interconnected and interdependent phenomena.[1457] Only meant to house the god's image with no direct involvement in the cult practice, the temple had inherently little utilitarian and predominantly symbolic value.[1458] It was primarily a collective votive offering meant to

---

[1447] Cf. Nilsson, 1967-74: 708-714, 729-734; Burkert, 1985: 246-268 and 1995; Cole, 1995 and n. 1443 above.

[1448] See p. 52 above.

[1449] See Polignac, 1995: esp. 21-25, 45-60, 98-106.

[1450] See pp. 53, 55, 104 above. The sacred roads linking Athens to Eleusis, Ephesus to the Artemisium and Samos to the Heraeum are other characteristic examples.

[1451] Cf. Bruit Zaidman and Schmitt Pantel, 1992: 57.

[1452] Martin, 1983: 21-22; Lang, 1996: 68-70.

[1453] Characteristic is the case of Athens. See account by Hölscher, 1991.

[1454] Cf. Iakovides, 1962: 173-178; Travlos, 1971: 52-71.

[1455] Ehrenberg, 1960: 15; Coldstream, 1985: 68; Burkert, 1988: 42 and 1996: 22.

[1456] See Morgan and Coulton, 1997: 110-111.

[1457] See Snodgrass, 1977 and 1991; Coldstream, 1985; Burkert, 1988 and 1996; Polignac, 1995; Höcker, 1996; Fehr, 1996.

[1458] Coldstream, 1985: 68; Burkert, 1985: 88-92 and 1988: 36-39; Höcker, 1996: 55, 58.

glorify and appease the divine and offer relief from existential concerns,[1459] in fact the ultimate and most prestigious offering, in which through an act of conspicuous consumption the surplus of production or booty of war was sanctified and transformed into a durable marker of communal presence, power and pride.[1460] The temple's permanent essence[1461]corresponded to and symbolized the claims to permanence and stability of boundaries and ancestral customs on which the polis itself was based.[1462]

Next to hoplite warfare, temple-building was usually the earliest large-scale corporate enterprise of the polis.[1463] As a project requiring collective decision and action, it played a major role in the social structuration, integration and consolidation of the young polis by playing down internal conflicts, and promoting the consensus and accord needed for the development of a 'we-consciousness' as discussed in the first chapter.[1464] Participation in the realization of a temple project may have encouraged citizens to recognize and accept their place and role in the community, and to develop patterns of civil behaviour that could be applied to other fields of polis life. The finished building would thus stand as visible proof of civic harmony and concord under divine protection, and a monument of common polis identity.[1465]

Besides consolidating the identity of one polis in relation to the others, from the end of the 7th century temple architecture also played a key role in the development of a common 'ideology of the Hellenes' and a consciousness of belonging together that separated Greeks from non-Greek barbarians.[1466] Like the codified epic poetry and the unified Panhellenic mythology, temples became expressions of crystallized culture, all-embracing metaphors of a collective identity of Hellenism. This function was of great importance in the areas where the need for differentiation between Greeks and non-

---

[1459] Cf. Burkert, 1996: 25-26.

[1460] See Burkert, 1988: 43 and p. 32 above. Cf. Drerup, 1979; Martini, 1986.

[1461] Burkert, 1985: 88-92, 1988: 29-36.

[1462] Burkert, 1988: 43-44, 1996: 25;

[1463] As we have seen, in certain cases fortifications and structures/areas of administrative or other secular character may have preceded temples, but were not universal standard elements of the polis in its early stages (cf. Morgan and Coulton, 1997).

[1464] See section 4.2 above and also Coldstream, 1985: 72-73; Höcker, 1996: 55, 60; Cabanes, 1989. Cf. Nilsson, 1951 on the similar role played by myths and cults in the formation of early polis identity and also Habsbawm and Ranger, 1983.

[1465] Fehr, 1996: 179.

[1466] Cf. p. 11 and section 3.1 above.

Greeks through the erection of symbolic boundaries was most intense, that is, in the colonies founded away from home in foreign lands.

This was particularly the case in the West, where the Doric temple became the leading symbol and marker of the settlers' identity against the 'barbarous' natives.[1467] In Asia Minor and the Orient on the contrary, the Greeks had found no 'terra deserta' but lands occupied for millennia by many high cultures. Consequently, maintenance of identity there did not require seclusion, but active coming to terms with pre-existing structures, a dynamic process of acculturation aiming at the integration rather than exclusion of 'aliens.' Greekness was preserved not by preventing, but by controlling and creatively adapting the inevitable influences of the great eastern cultures to the Greek ethos in a way that the latter could benefit without being absorbed by them. The orientalizing form and character of Ionian temple architecture particularly apparent in Ephesus, Didyma and Sardis, and especially the flexibility, adaptiveness of the Ionic order – in contrast to Doric rigidity – reflected this difference of conditions.[1468] The two different styles of temple architecture also came to reflect the different mentalities of Ionian and Dorian Greeks, as we shall further discuss below.[1469]

These basic functions of temple architecture did not disappear when the Greek civic community reached maturity in the 6th and 5th centuries. In the context of the growing competition and friction between the poleis, the role of temples as symbols of status and prestige acquired a higher priority. This was reflected also in the full petrification of the structure by the early 6th century and the increasing tendency for monumentality in terms of size and/or quality of construction, material and embellishment.[1470] Miletus, as we have seen, marked its rise to wealth and power and the establishment of control over the whole of the Milesian chersonnese in the 6th century through extensive temple building: outside the city in Didyma and rural sanctuaries, and inside in various places and especially the Athena sanctuary, where two temples were built in less than a century.[1471]

[1467] See Höcker, 1996: esp. 60, 68-74.

[1468] Höcker, 1996: 68, 74-75 n. 92.

[1469] See last section.

[1470] Cf. Fehr, 1996: 179.

[1471] Cf. pp. 51-52 above.

With its semiotic and connotative capabilities further enhanced by figured sculptural decoration, the temple functioned also as an effective instrument of ideological propaganda and power politics both within and without the polis.[1472] The proliferation of tyrants as temple builders in the 6th century – perhaps also in the city of Miletus as we have seen[1473]– in pursuit of fame, prestige and legitimation,[1474] and the use of sacred architecture by the Athenian democracy as a means of self-glorification and political assertion in the 5th[1475] are characteristic cases in point. The treasuries erected by the Greek poleis in the great Panhellenic sanctuaries during this period, were another very characteristic expression of the same tendencies.[1476]

Already in the Classical period, however, historical developments began to challenge the introvert and self-centred character of the Greek civic community. From the Peloponnesian War onwards and through the turbulent 4th century, the poleis found themselves in a broadening framework of relationships and interactions that opened up their physical and symbolic boundaries considerably. Then the conquests of Alexander and the birth of the Hellenistic kingdoms set off a further increase in population mobility.[1477] Social and political unrest, economic uncertainty and fluctuation, overpopulation, forced resettlements or simply the pursuit of a better fortune and better living conditions changed the human geography and composition of the Greek poleis. The numbers of non-citizen immigrants and various other '*παρεπιδημοῦντες*' from all levels of the social scale[1478] – among which were many non-Greeks, especially in the cities of the East – grew considerably, raising serious issues of status and assimilation.[1479] In the small Priene, for example, are attested foreigners from Athens, Thebes, Rhodes, Miletus, Magnesia, Samos, Ephesus and Tralleis. In a large trading centre like Miletus the variety of origins and the numbers must have been far greater.

[1472] See section 4.2 above and also Ashmole, 1972; Knell, 1990.

[1473] See p. 52 above.

[1474] Cf. Berve, 1967: passim; Boersma, 1970: 11-41; Shear, 1978; Young, 1981; Compernole, 1989; Mieth, 1993; Mossé, 1993.

[1475] See Knell, 1979; Metzler, 1985; Zinserling, 1985; Corso, 1986; Lambrinoudakis, 1986; Rhodes, 1995. Cf. p. 245 below.

[1476] See Behrens-du Maire, 1993 and also Coste-Messelière and Miré, 1950; Mallwitz, 1972: 163-179; Yeroulanou, 2001.

[1477] Cf. Davies, 1984: 264-269; Svencickaya, 1996: 612-613.

[1478] (Gaertringen, 1906: No. 113).

[1479] Cf. Davies, 1984: 309.

These developments naturally affected the Greek polis not only as a socio-political but also as a religious community. The changes were not dramatic and the continuity from the Classical period was not broken.[1480] Olympian cults continued to be celebrated and regulated by the polis, and neither their civic significance nor popular participation in them was apparently diminished.[1481] Civic festivals as basic means of experience, display, celebration and re-assertion of communal solidarity and identity[1482] also preserved their importance and even increased in numbers.[1483] But being inherently civic and communal, they were appropriate for and effective within the confines of the polis. To people finding themselves in foreign lands away from their native community, the patron gods and local deities of their polis appeared too remote – or too foreign in their new environment – to offer sufficient emotional security.[1484]

Characteristic responses in the new era were the adoption of personal protector-gods – especially those with healing and comforting qualities like Asclepius, whose cult is attested in Priene, and Dioscuroi;[1485] the establishment of private cults and participation in small socio-religious clubs, as again the one based at the 'sacred house' in Priene;[1486] and devotion to mystic cults of Greek or non-Greek origin, like those of Dionysus that we have seen in Miletus, Sarapis, Isis and Cybele that acquired importance in Priene, the Cabeiroi, Mithras etc[1487] that offered prospects of salvation, and were more 'universalistic' and open to people of different social and ethnic origins.[1488] So were also the phenomena of the ruler cult[1489] and heroisation of common individuals

---

[1480] Cf. Stewart, 1977; Graf, 1995; Shipley, 2000: 154-176.

[1481] Cf. Shipley, 2000: 175-176.

[1482] Calame, 1982-3; Burkert, 1985: 254-260; Assmann, 1991b.

[1483] Préaux, 1978: 250; Chaniotis, 1995; Dunand, 1978: 206-209. On festivals see Nilsson, 1906; Deubner, 1966; Burkert, 1983: 135-247 and 1985: 99-109, 225-246; Simon, 1983; Cartledge, 1985.

[1484] On the issue of the increasing verticality in the relationship between worshippers and gods see Gladigow, 1979; Pleket, 1981; Veyne, 1986; Straten, 1993: 263-264.

[1485] See Holtzmann, 1984; Edelstein and Edelstein, 1998; Hart, 2000 (Asclepius), Hermary, 1986; Gury, 1986 (Dioscuroi), all with earlier bibliography.

[1486] See Poland, 1909; Nilsson, 1967-74: II, 117-119.

[1487] See Boucher, 1988; Schlesier, 1997 (Dionysus), Hemberg, 1950; Cole, 1984 (Cabeiroi), Fraser, 1960 and 1967; Stambaugh, 1972 (Sarapis), Witt, 1971 and 1997 (Isis), Vermaseren, 1977; Sfameni Gasparro, 1985; Lane, 1996 (Cybele), Clauss, 1990 (Mithras) with earlier bibliography.

[1488] See Graf, 1995: 111-114 and 2000 and also Burkert, 1987.

[1489] See p. 188 above.

attested in both Miletus and Priene,[1490] and the more extreme tendencies towards scepticism, agnosticism and atheism at one end,[1491] and superstition, magic and astrology at the other,[1492] as well as faith in destiny and worship of abstractions like 'Tyche.'[1493]

These trends have often been considered to indicate a severe crisis and decline in polis religion in Hellenistic times,[1494] but were rather the result of a process of evolution and adaptation to the new 'internationalized' environment, in which the polis no longer had the monopoly as a mediator between the individual and the divine.[1495] It was now possible – or rather necessary – for people to pursue a direct and personal contact with the divine and to adopt a plurality of religious practices, old and new, Greek and non-Greek, civic and 'cosmopolitan,' collective and individualistic, to suit their needs in a plurality of social settings and circumstances.[1496]

The developments in religious architecture reflected the new historical conditions, social needs and intellectual tendencies. Temple building remained a basic form of collective monumental expression. The celebrated Athena Temple was the first public building of the new Priene, and the Didymaeum probably among the first grand projects of Miletus, when the city was again able to afford them. But as we saw in the previous sections, following the rise in significance of the previously neglected secular architecture it was no longer the sole one. The Athena Polias temple in Priene remained unfinished for centuries while money was lavished on stoas and gymnasia. Interest in sacred architecture was, nevertheless, by no means lost. In both Miletus and Priene temples continued to be built throughout the Hellenistic period.[1497] A significant new factor, as will be further discussed below, was also the ever more active role of private

---

[1490] See p. 204 above.

[1491] See Stough, 1969: chaps. 2-3; Long, 1974: ch. 3.

[1492] Boll and Gundel, 1966; Schneider, 1969: 907-912; Nilsson, 1967-74: II, 268-281; Gager, 1992.

[1493] Schneider, 1969: 830-833; Walbank, 1972: 58-65; Nilsson, 1967-74: II, 200-210. Matheson and Pollitt: 1994; Shipley, 2000: 173-175.

[1494] Cf. Festugière, 1954: 37-67 and 1972: 114-128; Tarn and Griffith, 1966-336-360; Nilsson, 1967-74: 185-309.

[1495] Shipley, 2000: 170. Cf. Martin, 1987: 84.

[1496] Préaux, 1978: 640-641; Shipley, 2000: 170. Cf. Straten, 1993.

[1497] Cf. Koenigs, 1999b.

individuals, which meant that public architecture was no longer a field restricted to collective and civic initiative.[1498]

The symbolic role of temples was not dramatically affected by the coming of the new era, the effects were, nevertheless, not uniform throughout the Greek world. In the western colonies, the importance of the Doric temple as an all-embracing metaphor of Greekness and cultural superiority in a barbaric environment of course subsided in the Classical period, and then with the domination of Rome in the Hellenistic the autonomous Greek colonies were themselves no more. In the mainland and the islands of the Aegean, most poleis had built their monumental temples already in the Classical period. These did not cease to be representatives of civic sovereignty, power and wealth, although all three received serious blows by the constant turmoil of the 4th century. Nevertheless, even on a more modest scale and without the earlier impetus,[1499] Doric temples continued to be built in the mainland, the islands and even in Asia Minor during the Hellenistic period.

The circumstances in Asia Minor were different. The disastrous Ionian Revolt in the early 5th century had left many temples and sanctuaries in ruins, and historical circumstances through most of the Classical period had not facilitated large-scale civic building projects. Even the Athena Polias temple at Miletus, thought to be a 5th-century example of an Ionian peripteros, now appears to date from the late 6th.[1500] The next at Ephesus, Labraunda and Priene were to come only a century later – the Labraunda and perhaps also early Priene projects were not even civic ones – and favourable conditions did not actually emerge in the region until after Alexander. At that time, the Greek cities of Asia Minor found themselves in pretty much the same position as their counterparts on the mainland after the Persian Wars a century and a half earlier. Besides the direct practical need to rebuild their temples they must have experienced the psychological urge to celebrate and mark the liberation from Persian rule and the restoration – in whatever terms – of their autonomy by means of monumental architecture. We have already discussed the possible significance of the Athena Polias temple at Priene in this context.[1501]

[1498] See section 9.10 below.

[1499] See Knell, 1983; 1984b.

[1500] See pp. 51 above.

[1501] See pp. 143-147 above.

Thus, monumental temple architecture in Asia Minor acquired a new momentum.[1502] But having pretty much 'missed' the Classical period, the eastern Greeks had also missed the opportunity to develop their own 'classical' architectural style. Three sources of authority and inspiration were available during this 'Renaissance' of Ionian architecture:[1503] the region's own rich but dated tradition of the Archaic period, the celebrated, up-to-date but also alien Classical Doric style of the mainland, and the Attic version of the Ionic.[1504]

With his designs and theoretical treatises on the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus and especially the Athena Polias temple at Priene, the architect and theoretician Pytheus tried to compose a new model for Ionian architecture on the basis of an eclectic combination of features.[1505] While remaining faithful to the Ionian vocabulary and rejecting both Doric and Attic-Ionic forms for aesthetic and ideological or perhaps political reasons,[1506] he adopted certain elements design and technique that were more common in the mainland, and which he perhaps accepted as already 'classic.'[1507]

Traditionalism, local patriotism and tendencies towards retrospection to earlier times of prime, especially in great and venerable religious centres like Ephesus and Didyma where echoes of the past remained particularly strong and influential,[1508] would keep other architects of the late Classical and early Hellenistic period more attached to Ionia's own Archaic inventory of models and forms.[1509] In other cases, however, the racial background or the 'classic' aura of mainland architecture that was further accentuated by associations with the grandeur of Classical Athens would lead to the erection of peripteral Doric temples in the wider area of Asia Minor, especially by dynasts of the

---

[1502] Lauter, 1986: 182.

[1503] Cf. Isager, 1994.

[1504] Cf. Martin, 1978.

[1505] See pp. 135-137 above.

[1506] See p. 138 above and also Vitr., 4.3.1.

[1507] See p. 136 above.

[1508] See Bammer, 1972 and 1985: 70-78; Gruben, 1986: 348-359; Bammer and Muss, 1996: 45-61 (Artemisium); Fehr, 1971-2; Tuchelt, 1973: 13-16; Voigtländer, 1975a; Gruben, 1986: 359-375 (Didymaeum); cf. Gruben, 1961 and 1986: 394-400; Hoepfner, 1990a: 3-7(Artemision of Sardis).

[1509] Cf. Lauter, 1986: 180-189; Voigtländer, 1990; Knell, 1993.

early Hellenistic period so as to serve their own political agendas, as will be further discussed below.[1510]

In the Middle Hellenistic period, the architect Hermogenes followed Pytheus' path in another academic effort to put forward an up-to-date theory of temple architecture with his building projects and theoretical treatises.[1511] Hermogenes, too, tried to re-codify the indigenous Ionic order – while rejecting the Doric as alien and obsolete[1512]– on the basis of a combined use of archaizing, classicistic and innovative elements such as the pseudo-dipteral type, Attic Ionic features,[1513] a complex system of proportional relationships between the interaxials and column heights, contrast of light and shade, strong symmetry and axiality.[1514] Hermogenes' experimentation with the pseudo-dipteral type[1515] also signified an effort to give new life to the peripteral temple. But the rigidity of its canonized form left little room for further development, and its statue-like self-centred autarky and demand for all-round conspicuousness made the peripteros little compatible with the tendency towards building complexes that increasingly dominated Hellenistic architecture.[1516] Sanctuaries, like agoras and similar spaces, increasingly followed the new pattern for overall planning and integration of structures into stoa-framed compounds and conglomerates with axial layout and predefined viewpoints.[1517]

Smaller prostyle temples and temples in antis were on the contrary more easily adaptable and thus became more popular.[1518] The two 3rd-century temples known from

---

[1510] The Athena temples at Ilium and Pergamum (see pp. 184 above and 243 below and also Höcker, 1996: 76).

[1511] On Hermogenes see Hoefner and Schwandner, 1990 (with earlier bibliography) and also Alzinger, 1991; Schmaltz, 1995; Bingöl, 1996; Hoepfner, 1997.

[1512] As far as temples are concerned. See Knell, 1984b: 56.

[1513] Attic base with plinth, frieze with dentils etc. Cf. Schädler, 1991a and 1991b.

[1514] See. Akurgal, 1990.

[1515] On the Artemision of Magnesia on the Maeander followed by Menesthes on the Apollo Isotimus temple at Alabanda and also on the Apollo Smintheus temple at Troas, the Hecateum at Lagina and the re-vamped Artemisium at Sardis (see Rumscheid, 1994: 25-28, 124-139, 141-145, 198-214 and Nos. 8, 31, 122, 137, 336 with complete bibliography).

[1516] Cf. Knell, 1983: 232; Lauter, 1986: 188.

[1517] See Coulton, 1976: 168-183; Lauter, 1986: 99-113; Hesberg, 1990.

[1518] See Lauter, 1986: 189-196.

Miletus were of this kind,[1519] and so were the three 3rd- and 2nd-century ones in Priene.[1520] The fact that private individuals with more limited financial means were more and more involved in temple building as donors and patrons probably contributed to that also, although in these particular cases in Miletus and Priene royal connections are possible. In terms of monumentality the loss in 'auctoritas' conferred by peristasis[1521] and size was compensated for by the colonnades of adjoining stoas, the size and often dramatic scenic landscaping of the complex of which the temple became an organic part, and by the luxury of material that the smaller scale allowed.

Peripteral temples were nevertheless not abandoned altogether and did not lose their appeal. On the contrary, it was exactly to the enormous appeal and impressiveness of temples like that of the gigantic Didymaeum that the examples of the later Hellenistic period owed their existence, as conscious retrospective views of a great past.[1522] In contrast to the similar attitude of the 4th century, however, references and allusions to the greatness of the past during the 2nd already had the character of restorative retrogression and were permeated with nostalgic and antiquarian sentiments.[1523] The revival of the Olympieum project in Athens by Antiochus IV was a glimpse of the power and grandeur of Archaic tyranny,[1524] and the close modeling of the Asclepius temple at Cos on the one at Epidaurus – of which it was perhaps meant to be a larger scale copy – was an attempt to share the fame and prestige of the 4th century original.[1525] In Priene again, the small temple in the sanctuary by the agora imitated the decorative details of the prestigious Athena Temple, in an effort to bring back some of the old lustre.[1526]

Retrospective tendencies of this kind as well as efforts to promote civic status and prestige by all available means affected also the religious institutions and architecture of the poleis in a reflex reaction against progressive political marginalization. It is char-

---

[1519] Cf. pp. 74, 77 above.

[1520] Cf. pp. 153, 165 above.

[1521] Vitr., 3.3.9.

[1522] Cf. Höcker, 1996: 76.

[1523] See Hesberg, 1994: 51, 117-119.

[1524] Cf. p. 243 below.

[1525] Cf. Gruben, 1986: 408-410; Rust, 1993: 109; Hesberg, 1994: 89.

[1526] Cf. p. 165 above.

acteristic that most new civic festivals[1527] had strong political connotations and were often associated with contemporary historical events especially victories and liberations as we have seen in the cases of Miletus and Priene.[1528] Divine epithets denoting victory, liberation or rescue, and the worship of abstractions like 'Nike' and 'Homonoia'[1529] became very popular, and divine epiphanies were widely used as pretexts to reinvigorate old cults and sanctuaries,[1530] gain Panhellenic recognition for civic festivals and place them along with civic territory under the protective veil of the institution of '*ἀσυλία*.'[1531]

Magnificent feasts in honour of the gods were meant to confirm internal wellbeing and bring about external fame and prestige as cities competed against each other and tried to imitate the kings in extravagance and grandeur.[1532] The entire communities were mobilized in a display of religious piety, inner social harmony, power and wealth that fostered civic pride and confidence and projected an ideal image of the polis to the outside world.[1533] As part of this display, spectacular processions were carried out through the cities, in fact carefully 'staged' in pretty much a theatrical way with the cities as mise-en-scéne.[1534] Streets and bridges were repaired for the occasion,[1535] altars were constructed,[1536] statues of gods and benefactors were crowned, sanctuaries and temples were cleaned up and opened to the public.[1537]

In cities where a grand annual procession was a permanent defining part of religious and social life, these staging requirements could affect or even determine the whole urban layout. As we have seen, in Miletus the design of the civic centre and the

---

[1527] Cf. Chaniotis, 1995: 195.

[1528] See pp. 64, 75, 146 above and also Habicht, 1970; Pritchet, 1979: 168-186, 192-196; Chaniotis, 1991.

[1529] E.g. Athena Nikephoros (Pergamon), Zeus Eleutherios (Larisa), Zeus Sosipolis (Magnesia on the Maeander) etc. See Robert, 1969a: 315-322; Graf, 1985; Chaniotis, 1995: 153.

[1530] See Nilsson, 1974: II, 82-88; Nachtergael, 1977: Part II; Dunand, 1978.

[1531] See Rigsby, 1996; Chaniotis, 1996. Cf. Dunand, 1978.

[1532] Cf. Sokolowski, 1955: No. 31.32-34: '*οὕτω γὰρ ἐπὶ τὸ ἄμεινον τῆς [θεοῦ τιμωμέν]ης ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν ἐνδοξοτέρά τε καὶ εὐδ[αιμονεστέρα] εἰς τ[ὸν ἅπα]ντα διαμενεῖ χ[ρόνον].*

[1533] Burkert, 1983: 37-40 and 1985: 254-260; Calame, 1982-3; Chaniotis, 1991: 139-142 and 1995. Cf. Hesberg, 1989.

[1534] On tendencies towards theatricality in various aspects of Hellenistic life cf. Pollitt, 1986: 4-7; Hesberg, 1989: 62-80.

[1535] Cf. Bruneau, 1970: 316-319; Dittenberger, 1915-24: No. 1048.17-22.

[1536] Sokolowski, 1955: No. 33.86-89.

[1537] Cf. Blech, 1982: 278; Graf, 1985: 168-169.

placement and orientation of the public buildings were such as to provide an imposing scenery to the main central avenue followed by the annual procession to Didyma, and the greatest conspicuousness possible to the city's major monuments and landmarks.[1538]

Within this context, cult statues also acquired a new significance to the self-image of civic communities. Again the competition appears to have been strong as cities strove to match the kings and excel one another in their magnificence and display, both in the context of festive processions and their permanent display in the temples.[1539] Statues smaller than life-size and of humble material gave way to over life-size and often colossal ones made of marble or in the acrolithic technique with golden or ivory plating,[1540] which must have made many cities reach or even exceed their financial capabilities to commission them.[1541] From the 2nd century and in agreement with the retrospective attitudes of the period, efforts for the preservation and conservation of old surviving 'opera nobilia'[1542] or their imitation and copying also became popular.[1543] The statue of Athena Polias in Priene, for example, was intended to be a 1:2 copy of the Parthenos on the Athenian Acropolis.[1544]

As a result of the increasing consideration of cult statues as objects of prestige and of antiquarian historic and artistic value, the manner of their display in temples started to recall more and more that of museum exhibits, with the cella in the role of a showcase. The whole appearance of the temples with a tendency towards smaller size – sometimes almost too small to accommodate the statue comfortably – and frontal approach through a stoa-framed compound with the temple at one end on the middle axis served and enhanced this museum-like presentation of cult statues. One such example in Priene was again the temple in the sanctuary by the agora.[1545] This tendency is even

---

[1538] See pp. 66, 70, 88, 104-105 above.

[1539] Cain, 1995.

[1540] Cain, 1995: 115-116. Cf. Romano, 1980: 363-364.

[1541] E.g. the case of the statue of Athena in Lycosura commissioned from Damophon of Messene (Themelis, 1996: 166-172).

[1542] E.g. the restoration of the Zeus in Olympia by Damophon of Messene (Paus., 4.31.6).

[1543] Cf. Hesberg, 1994: 118-119; Cain, 1995.

[1544] Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 110-111; Carter, 1983: 210-237. Cf. the 1:3 copy of the same statue in the so-called 'library' at the sanctuary of Athena at Pergamum and the copy of Athena Promachus at the same sanctuary (Weber, 1993; Radt, 1999: 162, 168), etc.

[1545] See p. 165 above. Cf. the sanctuaries of Zeus at Megalopolis (Gardner et al., 1892: 52-59; Petronotes, 1973: 233-234), Agathe Tyche at Delos (Plassart, 1928: 222-228), Dionysus and Demeter

more apparent in the siting of cult as well as votive and honorary statues in niches and exedras in the interiors or exteriors of sanctuaries, gymnasia and agoras, such as that of Priene.[1546]

Another field in which cities in the Eastern Greek world seem to have competed against each other for status and prestige was that of monumental altars. These had been quite common in the region in the Archaic period as well – both in connection with temples[1547] and as autonomous structures[1548]– and during the Hellenistic period made a dynamic reappearance. From the late 3rd century, numerous examples of large and costly altars with many common features – such as a wide flight of steps leading up to a raised podium on top of which the actual sacrifice table was located within a court-like area surrounded by walls with rich architectural and figured sculptural decoration – began to appear in certain Aegean islands and Asia Minor.[1549]

The earliest of these altars in Magnesia on the Maeander,[1550] Teos,[1551] Claros,[1552] and later Tenos,[1553] which replaced smaller predecessors, were built before the erection of the new temples perhaps in connection with the establishment of new cults or the recognition of inviolability. These were soon followed by new altars in Cos,[1554] Notion, Lagina and elsewhere, for the construction of which no similar pretext is known. Itt seems likely that the main motive of the cities of the second group was to keep up with those of the first in the pursuit of status and prestige. Unfortunately the problematic chronology of the monumental altar of Athena in Priene with the rich architectural and

---

at Pergamum (Bohn, 1896; Bohtz, 1981; Schwandner, 1990: 93-102; Radt, 1999: 180-186, 188-192), etc. Cf. Lauter, 1986: 109-111; Cain, 1995: 123.

[1546] E.g. the Asclepieum of Messene (Kaltsas, 1989: 18-32; Torelli, 1998) and the 'museum' at the Athena sanctuary of Pergamum (Mielsch, 1995), the agoras of Priene (cf. pp. 158, 204 above) and of the Italians in Delos (Lapalus, 1939), the gymnasium of Pergamum (Schazmann, 1923), etc. Cf. Lauter, 1986: 149-150; Cain, 1995: 123-124.

[1547] E.g. the altars of the Samian Heraeum (Buschor and Schleif, 1933; Şahin, 1972: 44-58) and the Ephesian Artemisium (Bammer and Muss, 1996: 65-70 with bibliography).

[1548] E.g. the Poseidon altar at Cape Monodendri near Miletus (Gerkan, 1915; Şahin, 1972: 43-44).

[1549] See Linfert, 1995; cf. Lauter, 1986: 205-207.

[1550] Gerkan, 1929; Hoepfner, 1968; Şahin, 1972: 97-98.; Linfert, 1976: 28-30 and 1995: 132-134.

[1551] Linfert, 1995: 136-137.

[1552] De la Genière and Amandry, 1992; Linfert 1995: 135-136.

[1553] Étienne and Braun, 1986; Linfert, 1995: 137.

[1554] Şahin, 1972: 92-96.; Stampolidis, 1981 and 1985; Linfert, 1995: 139-140.

sculptural decoration[1555] makes it uncertain whether it belonged to the pioneering group or not. But although it has half the size of the Magnesian one, the similarities are many, and one is tempted to remember the old rivalry between the two neighbouring cities, which may have lingered on in the field of architectural monumentality. In other building projects like that of the agoras, there seem to be many influences and counter-influences between the two cities as well.[1556]

The culmination of this trend was of course to come with the Great Altar of Pergamum.[1557] Only indirectly associated with a temple,[1558] and according to one theory perhaps never meant to function as a proper altar but existing for display alone,[1559] this was the ultimate example of an altar standing autonomously as a self-sufficient monument of propaganda, self-assertion and prestige, meant to glorify the kings as powerful champions of civilization against barbarism and rightful patrons of the Greek culture and way of life.

9.9 A new perception of public architecture

From the discussion in the previous sections, it has emerged that in the early stages of the polis, representative civic architecture – in the sense of public construction perceived not merely as utilitarian but invested with the physical and notional attributes that in the first chapter we described as 'monumental' – was predominantly of religious nature. Monumental expression was directed towards the proper honour and tribute to the gods. Temples conferred prestige to the sanctuaries of the city's protective deities, and the city obtained kudos from the kudos of its gods. Temples constituted the symbols of the civic community's distinctive identity, as well as of its successful and rightful historical presence in its territory – be that in the midst of other Greek poleis or a 'barbaric' hinterland – placed under the auspices of the divine.

By comparison, secular architecture still remained underdeveloped and considerably less significant in monumental terms during this period. With few exceptions,

---

[1555] See p. 159 above.

[1556] See p. 158 above.

[1557] For the bibliography on the Pergamum Altar see Dreyfus and Schraudolph, 1996; Radt, 1999; Radt and De Luca, 1999.

[1558] See Kähler, 1948: 15-16, 126-127; Stähler, 1978.

[1559] Hoepfner, 1989: 627-634, 1996a and 1996b: 64-67. See contra Kästner, 1996 and 1998: 156-159; Radt, 1998: 22-24 and 1999: 175.

buildings of political, administrative or other civic character were rather inconspicuous and unpretentious. Furthermore, in cities like Athens and Corinth that had come into being through the gradual concentration of the rural population in an urban area, usually around a sacred nucleus, and had developed in an irregular and agglomerative way, civic space itself was largely amorphous. Clear limits between public and private areas as well as any systematic arrangement and differentiation of functions were absent, and the layout was determined by the topography, established routes of traffic or circumstances.[1560]

Already in the early Archaic period, however, the first signs of actual city-planning based on a coherent and logical arrangement of urban space also appeared. In the eastern Greek world, it was the influential contact with the great cultures and metropolises of the Orient, and the rationalism of Ionian natural philosophy that stirred up the new ideas of urbanization evident in Smyrna[1561] and parts of old Miletus,[1562] as they did also in the arts and architecture of the region.[1563] In the western Greek world, it was the wave of colonization and the requirement for rational and equitable distribution of plots among the settlers that led to the ordering of the newly founded cities in Italy and Sicily on the basis of uniform strips of land partitioned by a regular network of streets.[1564] And next to private residential land, the land intended for public use was also clearly delimited, reserved beforehand, and differentiated as 'civic space.'[1565]

The origins of the systematic layout in both West and East thus lay predominantly in practicality and functionality rather than aesthetics or 'representation.'[1566] Rational city-planning had, nevertheless, important philosophical, ideological and socio-political parameters, which became particularly manifest after the Persian Wars, as part of the wider issue of rationalization and democratization of collective polis life. The planning of the new Miletus, as we have seen, was not simply an effort to regenerate the obliter-

---

[1560] Martin, 1983: 9-14; Lang, 1996: 58-77.

[1561] See Akurgal, 1983.

[1562] See p. 52 above.

[1563] Cf. Coulton, 1977: 24.

[1564] See Métraux, 1978: 18-28; Malkin, 1987: 135-186; Schenk, 1993: 28-32; Hoepfner, 1994: 199-201; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 1-9, 299-301.

[1565] Martin, 1983: esp. 16-17.

[1566] Cf. Akurgal, 1987: 53.

ated old Ionian metropolis, but a daring and ambitious venture to create an exemplary modern city characterized by scholarly refinement and advanced functionality.[1567]

The geometric regularity of the gridded street network and the insula system that allowed the orderly proportioning and integration of civic and residential areas in a homogeneous overall plan was a pioneering new feature, which the Milesian Hippodamus subsequently took up, developed further under the influence of Pythagorean philosophy, and incorporated into his own political-philosophical theory and urbanistic model.[1568] In the planning of Piraeus and possibly Thurioi,[1569] Hippodamus' ideas on the distribution and allocation of land uses and civic functions[1570] were perhaps put into actual practice, possibly intertwined to some extent with the egalitarian ideals of the Athenian democracy.[1571]

Although city planning continued to be adapted to the local conditions and was not confined to one particular system, the principles of the 'new, Hippodamian way'[1572] were to exert significant influence on the layout of cities of the later Classical period, which witnessed a great expansion of civic life. The increasing appeal of regular urban design in the Greek world went hand in hand with the efforts to produce a systematic and scientific model for the physical and social organization of the ideal state, most comprehensively represented by the works of Plato and Aristotle.[1573] Rationality was set as the measure of the appropriateness, efficacy and beauty of the urban form, and this entailed the notion that perfection, regularity and beauty were proportional qualities.[1574]

The strong desire for regularity, uniformity and cohesion is particularly evident in cities like Rhodes, Cnidus and Priene, where rigid planning was applied to exceptionally steep sites with the intention of creating an imposing scenic effect. Public buildings were not merely integrated in the grid plan, but also located in commanding positions

---

[1567] See section 7.2 above.

[1568] Cf. p. 56 above and n. 316 for bibliography.

[1569] Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 22-50.

[1570] Cf. p. 131 above.

[1571] Cf. Schuller, Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1989. On the controversial issue of 'type-houses' cf. p. 124 above.

[1572] Aristot., *Pol.*, 1330b.23-24: '*κατὰ τὸν νεώτερον καὶ τὸν Ἱπποδάμειον τρόπον.*'

[1573] Cf. p. 131 above.

[1574] Cf. Aristot., *Pol.*, 1330b.23-24.

on successive terraces up the slope, intensifying the impression of hierarchy and interconnection, as we have seen in Priene.[1575] The harnessing of the rough terrain through the grid was also characteristic of the growing conceptual contrast between architecture and nature, the threat of the unpredictable natural forces and the order and control that man strives to enforce with the power of science and knowledge.[1576]

In the later part of the Classical period, together with the growing concern for the overall planning and appearance of the cities, signs of an increasing interest in the prestigiousness of public architecture also started to become apparent. In the 5th century, Thucydides still considered the monumentality of public buildings an unreliable and misleading indicator of polis power.[1577] And the criticism of the lavishness of the Periclean building programme[1578] indicated that the feeling for measure and restraint in the fear of hubris remained strong.[1579] But in the 4th century, Isocrates maintained that it was exactly the architectural grandeur that reflected the power and merit of Athens,[1580] and Demosthenes concluded that by spending on prestigious works of architecture, the Athenians had created eternal monuments of glory that would remain unsurpassed by future generations.[1581] And these works were no longer thought to be exclusively of religious character, but included the layout of Piraeus, stoas, dockyards and other establishments, which already Xenophon believed brought lustre as well as financial gain to a city.[1582]

Another parallel development concerned perceptions about the sphere of private life and residence. During the Archaic and most of the Classical period, houses had generally been rather modest in size and especially in appearance and quality of construction.[1583] The rich seem to have displayed their wealth in social and religious activities, and by means of clothing, furnishings, utensils and the possession of slaves and

---

[1575] See section 9.1. Cf. Owens, 1991: 59-71.

[1576] Cf. Hesberg, 1981: 81-83.

[1577] Thuc., 1.10.2.

[1578] Plut., *Per.*, 12.2.

[1579] Cf. Hoepfner, 1993: 8.

[1580] Isoc., *Areop.*, 66.

[1581] Dem., 22.76; 3.25; 23.207.

[1582] Xen., *Vect.*, 3.12-13.

[1583] The examples of grand houses from these periods cited by Kiderlen, 1995 are few and exceptional, and some are of controversial character (Athens). Cf. Lang, 1996; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994.

racing horses, but not by living in luxurious mansions. Until the late Classical period, private residences were apparently not perceived as status symbols. But in the 4th century things had started to change,[1584] and already Demosthenes expressed his fury at the provocative attitude of many of his contemporaries, who in contrast to the great figures of the past tried to elevate themselves above the majority by building private houses allegedly more grandiose than public buildings.[1585] Closer to the trend of the period and to aristocratic ideals, however, Aristotle declared that a man's house should be in accordance with his wealth.[1586] Not much is known about the houses of Miletus, but those of Priene show indeed in the course of time a tendency to break the uniformity and narrow limits of the early period, and often expand at the expense of their neighbours.[1587]

It seems very unlikely that the increase of concern for monumentality in urban appearance, secular public buildings and private dwellings coincided accidentally. As Hansen and Fischer-Hansen have pointed out,[1588] the previous attitude had presumably been the same in all cases: as it had not added to a man's status to live in a mansion, it had not added to the status of magistrates to have their seats in sumptuous civic buildings and it had not added to the city's prestige to possess such buildings. The new trend meant that the element of 'representation', so far almost exclusively characteristic of sacred architecture, was increasingly pervading the secular as well, which in the past had been predominantly utilitarian.[1589]

This was the result of a new mentality, style and perception of life,[1590] a new social identity consistent with the changing conditions and needs that marked the end of one era and the beginning of another.[1591] Two elements had a decisive impact on the internal structure and external associations of the Greek polis in this respect. The first

---

[1584] See Hoepfner, 1982; Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 314-325; Kiderlen, 1995: 43-55; Walter-Karydi, 1996, 1998.

[1585] Dem., 3.29.6-7 '*ἔνιοι δὲ τὰς ἰδίας οἰκίας τῶν δημο σίων οἰκοδομημάτων σεμνοτέρας εἰσὶ κατεσκευασμένοι*'; cf. 3.26, 13.30.7-8, 21.158, 23.206-208.

[1586] Aristot., *EN*, 1123a.6-10: '*καὶ οἶκον κατασκευάσασθαι πρεπόντως τῷ πλούτῳ...*' Cf. Hesberg, 1981: 77, 106.

[1587] Cf. Wiegand and Schrader, 1904: 285-300.

[1588] Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 85.

[1589] Cf. the internal-external space/functionality differentiation by Walter-Karydi, 1996.

[1590] Cf. Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1994: 324; Hansen and Fischer-Hansen, 1994: 84; Walter-Karydi, 1998: 83-95.

[1591] Cf. Schneider, 1967-9: I,126-131, II,3-22.

was its subsumption into an enlarged framework of multipolar relationships characterized by a much higher degree of interaction, interdependence and fusional tendencies, the consequences of which we saw in the preceding sections. The second was the emancipation of the individual personality from the restrictions of Classical corporatism that affected behaviours and relationships both within the civic community and without in connection with monarchy, the symptoms of which in architecture we shall further discuss below.

As already pointed out, monarchical self-assertion was to a great extent pursued through the architectural euergetism towards the poleis, the building of illustrious royal capitals and the founding of cities 'Greek-style.' The outburst of Hellenic or Hellenized urbanism represented the most spectacular demonstration of the ability of kings to monumentalize their power and change physical and social landscapes.[1592] In response, as the poleis sought to defend and maintain their status, the impulse towards the monumentalization of civic architecture and urban layout was intensified.

In the early Hellenistic period, however, everyday life praxis and the rituals, festivals, civic and commercial activities were still the essential determinants of public space, which remained unified and continuous. The role of architecture was supplementary and accessorial, not integral to human action, connected to it functionally.[1593] Thus, during the 4th and 3rd centuries, the layout of compounds such as sanctuaries, marketplaces, gymnasia, etc. remained as varied as the respective purposes and particular topographical and other local conditions. Buildings maintained their individuality and structural autonomy, standing in loose sequence on the periphery of the open space, as can be seen not only in traditional cities like Athens,[1594] but also in 'Hippodamean' ones like Miletus and Priene.

In the course of the 3rd century, however, the arrangement started to become tighter, and stoas began to play an increasingly important role in the shaping, delimitation and organization of space in cities and sanctuaries.[1595] First as free-standing structures and then in more and more composite formations, stoas were employed to provide the various areas and functions with a solid framework, and to contribute to the coher-

---

[1592] Cf. Owens, 1991: 74-75; Shipley, 2000: 96.

[1593] Cf. Hesberg, 1994: 121-122.

[1594] See Camp, 1998: 155.

[1595] See Martin, 1951: 392-417; Hesberg, 1990.

ent articulation, integration and monumentalization of the urban landscape. The case of the Prienean civic centre is characteristic. But in the 2nd and 1st centuries, this tendency also led to the previously uniform and open public space becoming increasingly secluded and separated from the rest of the city, and at the same time fragmented into a plethora of smaller self-contained entities.[1596] Streets, too, were also increasingly treated as architectural entities to be given their own monumental character, and were framed by porticoes that gradually lost their autonomous existence and were reduced to colonnaded facades.[1597]

These phenomena were universal. They occurred in traditional Athens,[1598] cosmopolitan Delos[1599] and monarchical Pergamum.[1600] Stoas, propyla, arches and other barriers were employed to join together pre existing structures.[1601] In Miletus we have seen how the huge civic area was gradually divided into two separate stoa-framed agoras/markets and several other smaller enclosures,[1602] and in Priene how the agora was united with the adjacent civic buildings and compounds into a large architectural complex cut off from the rest of the city through a series of stoas and colonnades.[1603] Applied as a fully planned whole in other cities such as Magnesia as well, this would become widely known as the characteristic type of 'Ionian agora,'[1604] and would prepare the ground for the totally closed peristylar agoras/markets of Pergamum, Ephesus, Heraclea etc., and later the Roman fora.[1605]

From the 2nd century onwards, the tendency to unify building complexes into thoroughly planned, all-embracing, stoa-enclosed compounds would establish the peristyle as an architectural feature to suit almost all purposes.[1606] The previous multi-

---

[1596] Cf. Coulton, 1976: 174-175; Lauter, 1986: 92-99; Hesberg, 1994: 120-122.

[1597] See Coulton, 1976: 177-180; Hesberg, 1994: 69-70, 121.

[1598] See Schalles, 1982; Camp, 1998: 168-180.

[1599] Martin, 1951: 437-446.

[1600] See Rheidt, 1992; Wulf, 1994; Radt, 1999: 87-93.

[1601] See Hesberg, 1994: 69-70, 151-160.

[1602] See sections 7.5-6.

[1603] See sections 9.3-4.

[1604] Paus., 6.24.2. Cf. Martin, 1951: 372-417, 1974: 273-275; Coulton, 1976: 62-65.

[1605] See n. 1600 and Coulton, 1976: 173-174, 237, 242. Cf. Martin, 1951: 508-541.

[1606] See Martin, 1951: 508-541; Coulton, 1976: 168-170; Lauter, 1986: 132-155.

formity of gymnasia, marketplaces, sanctuaries etc., gave way to an increasing standardization. As we have seen in Miletus, the bouleuterion compound was almost identical to that of the adjacent gymnasium and two heroa/sanctuaries.[1607]

The desire for integrated ensembles also came hand in hand with the tendency towards hierarchical and sequential arrangement. The parts of a building complex would no longer simply co-exist, but through symmetrical and axial plotting, continuous optical transition of volumes, and predetermined viewpoints and access routes would be increasingly 'staged,' so as to create a unified optical impression upon the viewer and offer a particular experience to the visitor.[1608] Architectural features such as propyla, colonnaded facades, staircases, accentuated podia and understructures, as well as ornamentation were also employed to contribute to that effect and enhance monumentality and grandeur.[1609]

These changes in the form and layout of public buildings and civic space in general were the result of a new perception of the public sphere itself.[1610] During the Classical and early Hellenistic times, the unified public space corresponded to a unified public life, in which all the members of the civic community participated and experienced their identity collectively. In the course of the Hellenistic period, civic life became richer and more diversified than ever before, but at the same time – and perhaps for that reason – lost part of their unity and integrity. In an environment of increasing external influences, intensifying differences and heterogeneity within the internal social stratification, and emancipation of the private individual, the old norms of the polis were no longer as self-evident and straightforward as before.

Diversity led to the fragmentation of civic life into smaller domains, which started to acquire their own structural orders and particular rituals and models of conduct. It was this fragmentation that was reflected in the creation of the plethora of enclosed architectural spaces, where – in contrast to the past – public rituals were lastingly fixed, and with which they became identified.[1611] Architecture also undertook the task of communicating the underlying ritual at the level of visual experience through

---

[1607] See pp. 79, 86, 101.

[1608] See Coulton, 1976: 170-173; Lauter, 1986: 232-236; Hesberg, 1994: 33-34, 60-62, 115.

[1609] See Hesberg, 1994: 54-60.

[1610] Cf. Hesberg, 1994: 78.

[1611] Hesberg, 1994: 78, 121-122.

the arrangement of space and the symbolism of forms. The hierarchy of the buildings signified the hierarchy of functions, and the regulation of the visitors' view, access and movement predisposed their perceptions and attitudes. Finally, the ornamentation of the buildings and the traditional architectural orders and forms was invested with new meanings and took on a new semantic role, as will be discussed in the last section.

9.10 Public architecture and the private individual

As already pointed out, one of the most important factors in the change of perceptions of public space and architecture, and consequently in their treatment and appearance, was the increasing involvement of the private individual. In Classical times, funding and control of building projects had been a strictly collective public issue. Decision-making – from initial proposition and approval, through determination of specifications to execution of the project and final evaluation and account rendering – followed a long debate in the assembly.[1612] The character of this debate, in which the Demos maintained a central role, was strongly and inherently political.[1613]

At the same time, the corporatism of the Classical polis had rarely allowed individuals to undertake, donate, and especially dedicate and take full credit for projects of public nature, and in doing so raise themselves above the majority. The scandals caused by the attempt of the Spartan king Pausanias to present the Plataea tripod at Delphi as a personal offering[1614] and by the private dedication of a naiskos of Artemis Aristoboule by Themistocles in Athens[1615] are well known, as is the effect of Pericles' rhetorical question to the Athenians whether he could be allowed to complete the Acropolis buildings at his own expense and inscribe his name on them if the city was not prepared to do so.[1616]

From the 4th century onwards and in the course of the Hellenistic period, as we have seen, the decreasing ability of state finances to cover the cost of public works and the consequent need for alternative sources of funding and private contributions in par-

---

[1612] For Athenian procedures concerning building projects see Boersma, 1970: 3-10.

[1613] Plutarch (*Per.*, 14) gives a colourful account of the debate surrounding the Periclean building programme in Athens.

[1614] Thuc., 1.132.

[1615] Plut., *Them.*, 22; *Mor.*, 869.C.9-D.3; On the temple and the political background see Threpsiades and Vanderpool, 1964; Lambrinoudakis, 1986: 30-32.

[1616] Plut., *Per.*, 14.1-2.

ticular,[1617] resulted in decision-making becoming gradually restricted to a narrower circle of people. The demos thus increasingly grew from an active participant to a passive receiver, a 'general public' whose role was basically to assess, approve and appreciate the functionality and aesthetic value of the finished project.[1618] The weight of the debate, to the extent this continued, also shifted from fundamental and political to secondary and aesthetic – both literally and figuratively – issues.[1619]

As a result, a growing need for the advertisement and justification of the purposefulness, qualities and utility of architectural undertakings to public opinion by means of inscriptions and epigrams arose, which had earlier been redundant.[1620] Only the control of financial administration was deemed necessary. Characteristically, in the late Hellenistic period even the rendering of financial accounts for public buildings gradually ceased, as the increasing activity of private individuals as donors of the whole or parts of the structures turned financing a matter of direct negotiation between them and the architects or craftsmen.[1621]

Inscriptions on buildings were generally rare before the 4th century, appearing usually on structures – mainly treasuries and stoas[1622]– dedicated in Panhellenic sanctuaries by poleis in their entirety,[1623] even when these were under the control of tyrants.[1624] Dedications of public buildings bearing the names of private individuals were considered to be against Greek custom and mentality, pertaining rather to oriental dynasts.[1625] But again in the course of the 4th century, the political and social developments in the Greek poleis brought about the loosening up of the restrictions imposed on

---

[1617] See p. 204 above and also Migeotte, 1995 on the finances of public constructions.

[1618] Hesberg, 1981: 78-79.

[1619] Characteristic in this respect is also the increasing participation of architects in the process either as designers of the particular buildings (e.g. Philon in the Arsenal at Piraeus) or as state-employed civil engineers (e.g. the architect responsible for the placing of Antiochus Stoa in Miletus – see p. 69 and n. 409 above).

[1620] Hesberg, 1981: 79-81.

[1621] Hesberg, 1994: 49-50.

[1622] E.g. the Stoa of the Athenians at Delphi (Pomtow, 1924: 1299; Amandry, 1953: 35-121; Coulton, 1976: 234).

[1623] Hesberg, 1981: 79-80 and 1994: 39-40; Hornblower, 1982: 280-288.

[1624] E.g. The treasury of the Cypselids of Corinth at Delphi (Bourguet, 1912).

[1625] E.g. the dedicatory inscriptions on the columns dedicated by Croesus at the Artemision of Ephesus (Hogarth et al., 1908: 294-295).

the individual.[1626] Wealth began to be displayed more freely, and architecture – in both the private and the public sphere – offered the greatest opportunities for this purpose. The initial concerns for the dangers posed to the institutions of the polis and the equality of the citizens gradually faded.[1627]

As already mentioned, in the course of the Hellenistic period an increasing luxury and expenditure in residential and funerary architecture, as well as a tendency towards seclusion and distancing of private life from the public sphere can be observed. The larger size, the influence of public buildings in the design and the use of the architectural orders, the quality of building materials and construction, the luxurious furnishings, all show that houses were becoming symbols of status and prestige. We have already mentioned the enlargement of many Prienean houses in the course of the Hellenistic period. Nevertheless, extreme cases were very rare and it appears that in the sphere of private residence traditional polis conventions continued to remain effective.[1628]

Extravagance was legitimised in the public sphere. Building ceased to be a duty and prerogative limited to large groups of people, an address made by the public to the public. A second, parallel interaction between individual and public started to emerge.[1629] From the second half of the century onwards, kings and royal friends operating outside and beyond the confines of the polis and wealthy citizens progressively disengaged from the restrictions of civic commonality began to dedicate buildings in cities and sanctuaries, while the elegant treasuries until then erected by the poleis in their competition for prestige were becoming obsolete.[1630]

Alexander – perhaps following the example of the Hecatomnids of Caria[1631]– after failing to put his name on the Artemisium of Ephesus was able to do so in the case of the Athena Polias temple in Priene,[1632] inaugurating a long tradition followed by the

---

[1626] Cf. Borbein, 1973: 84-88.

[1627] E.g. the anti-luxury laws of Demetrius of Phaleron (Gehrke, 1978; Habicht, 1995b: 762-775).

[1628] Cf. Hesberg, 1994: 34-35.

[1629] Hesberg, 1981: 80.

[1630] Hesberg, 1981: 77, 80-81. The last treasuries built at Delphi in the 4th century were those of Thebes and Cyrene.

[1631] See p. 119 and n. 772 above.

[1632] See pp. 119-120 above.

Hellenistic monarchs.[1633] In Athens structures for the display of choragic tripods increased in numbers and evolved into small buildings, monuments of personal prestige.[1634] Inscriptions began to advertise private initiative in other cities as well.[1635]

Nevertheless, during the 4th and 3rd centuries donations of buildings by private individuals continued to have some religious associations one way or another and to be invested with the character of dedication to one or more deities, as the aura of a votive offering was still largely required to make them socially acceptable.[1636] Their size and luxury as well ought not to surpass those of the city's temples. No particular case is known from Miletus or Priene, but in Syracuse, when the great hall of Agathocles – an offering to the gods but taller than the city temples – was destroyed by lightning, this was considered to be a divine punishment of his hubris.[1637] But while in the early Hellenistic period there was still a need to present a building as an offering to the divine even if its character and purpose were profane, an increasing secularisation gradually led to the opposite tendency. In the late Hellenistic period the demos would become the (co)recipient even of buildings intended for the gods.[1638]

The explanation of this partly lies in the increased association of public architecture with the phenomenon of euergetism and its development. Already Aristotle called those assuming public offices – basically the wealthy elite – '*θυσίας τε εἰσιόντας ποιεῖσθαι μεγαλοπρεπεῖς καὶ κατασκευάζειν τι τῶν κοινῶν, ἵνα τῶν περὶ τὰς ἑστιάσεις μετέχων ὁ δῆμος καὶ τὴν πόλιν ὁρῶν κοσμουμένην τὰ μὲν ἀναθήμασι τὰ δὲ οἰκοδομήμασιν ἄσμενος ὁρᾷ μένουσαν τὴν πολιτείαν· συμβήσεται δὲ καὶ τοῖς γνωρίμοις εἶναι μνημεῖα τῆς δαπάνης.*'[1639] Benefactions in the form of construction and maintenance of public buildings were, as we have seen, a basic means by which one's '*καλοκαγαθία*,' '*φιλοδοξία*,' '*εὔνοια πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα*' and '*ἐκτένεια πρὸς τὸν δῆμον*' could be manifested,[1640] and

---

[1633] See Thompson, 1982a.

[1634] See Reisch, 1905: 1694-1696; Oikonomides, 1980; Choreme-Spetsiere, 1994.

[1635] E.g. the renovation of Apollo's altar in the Agora of Cyrene by a certain Philon accompanied by an inscription emphasizing the use of expensive material (Pernier, 1935: 69; Hesberg, 1994: 40).

[1636] Hesberg, 1994: 47.

[1637] Diod. Sic., 16.83.2.

[1638] E.g. the propylon of the Artemis sanctuary in Thasus dedicated by Epie '*Ἀρτέμιδι Εἰλειθυίη[ι καὶ τῶι δ]ήμωι*' (Salviat, 1959: 363 ll. 17-18).

[1639] Aristot., *Pol.*, 1321a.35-40.

[1640] As in the decree in honour of Archippe who donated the bouleuterion of Cyme reveals (Engelmann, 1976: 32-33 ll. 25-26, 34-35). Cf. Hesberg, 1981: 74, 107-109.

monuments of one's personal merit – especially as a holder of public office – could be established.

During the 4th and 3rd centuries, inscriptions of both kings and private individuals were generally short and moderate,[1641] usually mentioning only the donor's name and the name of the deity to which the building is dedicated, as for example Alexander's dedication of the Prienean temple. In the 2nd and 1st centuries on the contrary, they became more thorough and detailed and thus more extensively formulated. Royal donations became progressively sparse and the inscriptions accompanying them maintained the traditional briefness. From then on, it was mostly wealthy citizens that appeared as donors and architectural inscriptions clearly gained increasing importance.[1642]

Although no examples from Miletus or Priene are known, in other cities dedications started to give information about the motivation, intentions and the specifics of the donation. Inscriptions would often include the patronymic, the city and the occupation of the donor as well as the office in the context of which the donation was made and the date, the object of the donation, the deity and the group of people that received it, stressing that it was made 'out of one's own financial resources.'[1643] This is explained on the one hand by the fact that the increasing private initiative combined with the decreasing possibility of actual control by the demos generated a greater demand for the justification of architectural undertakings.

On the other hand, the abundance of details in the inscriptions shows that the act of the donation increasingly concentrated on – and was consequently limited to – the current socio-political context of the city and the personal space-time of the individual. Assuming a public office, making a benefaction/donation in the context of it and receiving civic honours accounted to stature and prestige, and were thus the ultimate social desiderata.[1644] Characteristically in this respect, the right of the donors to put dedi-

---

[1641] Hesberg, 1994: 43.

[1642] E.g. the architraves of both lower and upper storeys and the friezes of the stoas in the Agora of the Italians at Delos abound with inscriptions in both Greek and Latin (Roussel and Launey, 1937: 91-93 Nos. 1683-1687; Hesberg, 1994: 43-44).

[1643] E.g. the dedication of the propylon at the Cynthion of Delos (Roussel and Launey, 1937: 139-140 No. 1817).

[1644] Hesberg, 1994: 45.

catory inscriptions on the buildings and their content were specified in the decrees issued in their honour.[1645]

The narrower scope and the personalized agendas of architectural donations by individual citizens were reflected in the actual buildings themselves. As pointed out, the royal policy of beneficence aimed on the one hand at establishing and maintaining the king's image and prestige, and on the other hand – by the display of interest and concern for the subjects in general and not just the citizens of a particular city – at legitimising the rule and fostering among the Greek cities feelings of belonging and commonality within the kingdom and under the auspices of the benefactor king.

In architectural terms, the need for broader appeal meant that the kings usually had to chose from a pre-existing, more conservative, but also more widely recognizable and acceptable types and forms – both in terms of appearance and semantic content – and seek to make an effect mainly through the large size and extent of the project, and/or the emblematic capabilities and symbolic associations of the particular motifs and forms.[1646] In this context, the erection of peripteral Doric Athena Temples at Ilium by Lysimachus[1647] and at Pergamum possibly by Philetaerus[1648] has been interpreted as a conscious effort to create associations with the glory of Classical Athens,[1649] and again the adoption of the Archaic dipteral plan at the Athenian Olympieum by Antiochus IV as an archaism intended to underline the magnificence of the building through a dense column-forest, even if that meant an obvious architectural anachronism.[1650]

The wealthy individual citizens, on the contrary, addressed the community of their cities; the field and scope of their ambitions were more limited, as were of course their financial means. Extensive contributions to or donations of large buildings like that of the Prienean gymnasium by Moschion and Athenopolis, and the bouleuterion of Cyme by Archippe were probably rare, and most concerned small structures or parts of larger buildings and renovations or maintenance. In their wish to achieve the greatest

---

[1645] E.g. the decrees for Archippe at Cyme (Engelmann, 1976: 27-42, ll.37-38) and Epie in Thasus (Salviat, 1959: 363 ll. 15-18).

[1646] Hesberg, 1994: 48.

[1647] See n. 1199 above.

[1648] On the disputed chronology of the temple see Schalles, 1985: 5-22; Gruben, 1986: 425-426; Hoepfner, 1996c: 30-34; Rheidt, 1996: 169-170; Radt, 1999: 159.

[1649] See Knell, 1983: 232; Schalles, 1985: 6-7; Rust, 1993: 108-109.

[1650] See Lippstreu, 1993; Hesberg, 1994: 89-90.

possible effect and also give a more personal 'tone,' citizen patrons placed quality of materials and construction, variety of forms and wealth of ornamentation before compliance with architectural tradition and consistence of the orders, giving architects the opportunity for experimentation with new, unique or hybrid forms.[1651]

9.11 The new meaning and character of architectural forms

During the Archaic period, the two main Greek racial groups, the Dorians in mainland Greece and the western colonies and the Ionians in the islands and Asia Minor, developed architectural traditions of their own that crystallized in the two orders named after them, the Doric and the Ionic.[1652] At first, the use of each order extended mainly over the geographical areas of their origin as a matter of local culture and tradition,[1653] with architectural forms having primarily regional associations.[1654]

Later on, however, and especially in the period following the Persian Wars, when the confrontation of the Sparta-led, predominantly Dorian alliance of the mainland and the confederacy of Athenians and Eastern Greeks escalated and led to the Peloponnesian War, perceptions changed. As the Greeks were forced to take sides on a scale never seen before and, in doing so, define and divide themselves on the basis not just of political ideology and kin, but of their entire view and way of life, the architectural orders, forms and preferences acquired new symbolic meanings and new connotations, and the racial overtones increased.

The earliest known use of Ionic as the main outer order in the southern Greek mainland – on the Stoa of the Athenians in Delphi[1655] and the Temple of Athena at Sounion[1656]– has been interpreted as a conscious, intentional act replete with political symbolism.[1657] Especially in the case of Delphi, the Athenians are thought to have exploited the dedication of the stoa – most likely after a naval victory in the campaign to liberate Ionian Greeks from Persian rule – to make a public statement about their future

---

[1651] Hesberg, 1981: 114; 1994: 50-51.

[1652] Cf. Lawrence and Tomlinson, 1996: 57-60.

[1653] Cf. Coulton, 1976: 99; Knell, 1984b: 41; Rust, 1993: 102-103.

[1654] Onians, 1988: 14.

[1655] Coulton, 1976: 39-40, 99; Gruben, 1986: 89-90; Lambrinoudakis, 1986: 38-40.

[1656] Gruben, 1986: 216-218; Lambrinoudakis, 1986: 80-81.

[1657] On the possibility of practical-technical reasons dictating the use of the Ionic order see Gruben, 1986: 217; Lambrinoudakis, 1986: 80-81.

orientations and intentions from the most prominent bema of Greece. By employing the Ionic order for the first time on an Athenian building in the very Dorian heartland, they affirmed the liberation and resurgence of Ionian Greeks as a result of their campaign, emphatically reasserted their kinship with them, and indicated their intent to become their leaders.[1658]

Nevertheless, the Doric remained the main order of Athenian monumental architecture, as the 'autochthonous' Athenians were still bound to the traditions of the mainland and did not wish to dissociate themselves from it and identify completely with the Eastern Greeks.[1659] They preferred to be seen to incorporate the positive characteristics of both sides, while avoiding the negative ones. For the Ionians wished to be distinguished by their refined culture, ample wealth and sophisticated urban lives from the 'less refined' and 'pugnacious' mainlanders, but by succumbing to Lydians and Persians they had appeared to be 'soft' and somewhat 'effeminate' in the eyes of the Dorians, who had triumphed and maintained their freedom, and praised themselves for their 'discipline' and 'masculinity.'[1660]

As Dorians and Ionians started to consider each other in terms of stereotypes, the regional associations of the two architectural orders could be transformed to racial ones. In this context, the employment of both orders in the Acropolis building programme[1661] and the combination of Doric and Ionic features in Athenian buildings of the Periclean period[1662] have been interpreted as the architectural embodiment of Pericles' panhellenic ideals on the cultural level as well as the political.[1663] The same ideals that Thucydides portrayed in the famous Funeral Oration, according to which the Athenians under the Democracy combined and balanced the cultural sophistication of the Ionians with the physical and moral qualities of the Dorians, and – in doing so – set a unifying model for all Greeks.[1664]

[1658] Onians, 1988: 15; Rust, 1993: 103.

[1659] Onians, 1988: 15.

[1660] Cf. Hdt., 1.143; Thuc., 1.6; Ar., *Pax*, 46; *Thesm.*, 163. See further Alty, 1982.

[1661] Even on the same building, such as the use of Ionic columns in the opisthodomus of the Parthenon and the interior colonnade of the Propylaea (but cf. Tomlinson, 1963: 143; Coulton, 1976: 100; Rust, 1993: 107 n. 24).

[1662] E.g. the adoption of lighter proportions, Ionic friezes and cymas on Doric structrues.

[1663] Politt, 1972: 79; Onians, 1988: 16; Rust, 1993: 106-107.

[1664] Thuc., 2.39-41.

This projection of qualitative characteristics on the two architectural orders and/or their different architectonic properties and decorative value may have also planted the seeds for a distinction of another kind. According to that, the strictly structured and austere Doric was more suitable for the outdoors and exteriors, while the graceful and ornamental Ionic more appropriate for interiors and the indoor world of intellectual refinement.[1665] Associations of the kind outdoor-'manly' and indoor-'effeminate' could perhaps also be made. But such considerations would have of course been subject to the intentions and the origin of the builders and could not have had general acceptance. It was possibly within this context, however, that the highly ornamental, so-called 'Corinthian' acanthus capital – whose exact origin and initial use are not clear[1666]– began to be used for interiors in the Peloponnese and the Dorian areas in place of the plain and heavy Doric, and as an alternative to the alien Ionic.[1667] On the other hand, the Corinthian was perhaps slow to catch on in Ionia for the same reasons.

The manifold consequences of the conquests of Alexander and the formation of the Hellenistic states had a great influence on the semantic content and the use of the architectural orders as well. Greek architecture spread throughout the vast area of the Hellenistic world, and the wealth of the monarchs and ruling classes allowed and encouraged the patronage of building projects on a scale unknown before. At the same time, however, the 'internationalization' of Greek architectural tradition and its application outside its original cultural (polis) context in the service of monarchs and Hellenized non-Greeks, in combination also with the increased mobility of architects and craftsmen – and thus increased interblending of regional styles – resulted in a growing flexibility and perhaps uncertainty concerning the proper meaning and use of the orders.

Doric and Ionic were inseparably bound to the old polis tradition, especially in the area around the Aegean, and despite new and foreign forms becoming increasingly available continued to dominate public architecture in cities and sanctuaries. Their use now was no longer restricted to temples but had become established for buildings of secular character as well. The Corinthian remained during the 4th and 3rd centuries primarily an order for interiors. Later, however, it was also employed for exteriors, per-

---

[1665] Cf. Onians, 1988: 16; Rust, 1993: 107.

[1666] See more recently Schenk, 1996 and 1997: 4-11; Wesenberg, 1999.

[1667] Onians, 1988: 20; Rust, 1993: 108.

haps first of small buildings like fountain houses and propyla and then of temples, reaching a peak with the Athenian Olympieum in the 2nd century. There seems to have been a particular preference for this order by the Seleucids and the Ptolemies.[1668]

Nevertheless, although the use of the orders remained unquestioned, in the new socio-cultural setting the architectural tradition of the old polis proved less and less adequate to provide justification for a decision in favour of one order instead of another.[1669] Vitruvius' anecdote about Hermogenes changing the order of a Dionysus temple from Doric to Ionic midway is indicative of this uncertainty.[1670] Hermogenes and Pytheus, as we have seen, were among a group of architects that denounced the use of the Doric order. But, notably, these were of Ionian origin, and despite the aesthetic/technical basis of their argument,[1671] local tradition and cultural patriotism may have been an important element of their motivation. The issue also seems to have concerned mainly temple architecture, and the use of the Doric on other types of buildings was not affected. Milesian and Prienean temples were predominantly of the Ionic order, as we have seen, but all three were used in other structures. The question became not whether to use one of the orders, but where and how. This required a clarification of their 'ethical' content.[1672]

Vitruvius maintained that Doric with its heavy proportions corresponds to the virtue of a man, Ionic to female subtleness, and Corinthian to the tenderness and grace of a young girl.[1673] To what extent these ideas had a Hellenistic or even earlier origin is uncertain,[1674] but they do seem to have taken on from the Dorian/masculine and Ionian/effeminate association. The Doric finish on the gates and towers of city fortifications – such as those of Side and Perge[1675]– could thus have been meant to underline the bravery and military prowess of the defenders. Similarly, the use of Doric forms in the exterior of bouleuteria – such as that of Miletus, although perhaps in this case patri-

---

[1668] Cf. p. 95 above.

[1669] See Hesberg, 1994: 91-95.

[1670] Vitr., 4.3.1.

[1671] I.e. the problem of the corner triglyph (Vitr., 4.3.1).

[1672] Hesberg, 1994: 93.

[1673] Vitr., 1.2.5, 4.1.6 ('virtus'); 4.1.7 ('subtilitas'); 4.1.8-9 ('teneritas'-'gracilitas').

[1674] Cf. Knell, 1984a; 1985; Onians, 1988: 33-40; Rust, 1993: 109-110.

[1675] See p. 196 above.

otism dictated an 'Ionized' form of Doric – together with the popular relief shields and weapon friezes[1676] could similarly reflect the virtus and resolve of the council and the polis community,[1677] while the Ionic interior the civil and refined character of the constitution and political functions. The co-existence of the orders could have again symbolized the merging of 'Dorian' and 'Ionian' qualities or that both races could find impartial hearing by the council.[1678] Unfortunately, the exterior of the Prienean bouleuterion cannot be reconstructed with enough certainty to allow comparisons.

The combinations of elaborate architectural forms applied to a series of large-scale and multiple-function building compounds from the late 3rd-early 2nd century onwards, indicate the development of even more complex and sophisticated associations between the orders. In the gymnasium of Miletus, from the Doric peristylar court one went through an Ionic colonnade to the Corinthian ephebeum, while in Priene the order of the intermediate colonnade was again Doric but of heavier and more monumental proportions, and that of the ephebeum Ionic and Corinthian.[1679] In the 'Heroon of the Royal Cult' at Pergamum, the Doric peristyle led to the cult room through an Ionic portico,[1680] and in the Milesian bouleuterion, the peristylar court and the exterior of the hall were again Doric and the interior Ionic.[1681] The propyla of the gymnasia were also Ionic, while of the bouleuterion Corinthian.

The common pattern that seems to emerge in Ionia from the early 2nd century – also observed in Miletus and Priene – is one of climaxing value and status of the orders, corresponding to the climaxing importance of spaces and functions. The Doric is at the lower end used for the least prominent structures and exteriors. For interiors and structures of great importance like shrines and lecture rooms or of high visibility like propyla, the Ionic and Corinthian orders are employed. The association of copious orna-

---

[1676] Cf. p. 90 above and 253 below.

[1677] Hesberg, 1994: 93.

[1678] Ridgway, 2000: 126-127 and 141 n. 76: 'I suspect that combinations such as this were intentional and meaningful, not simply a symptom of architectural decadence or lack of imagination.' Cf. Schaaf, 1992: 38; Polito, 1998: 213-214.

[1679] Cf. pp. 79 and 166 above.

[1680] See Radt, 1999:245-248.

[1681] See p. 86 above.

mentation with high status, the costly carving of elaborate forms, and the connection of the Corinthian order with interiors placed it at the top of the scale.[1682]

The same differentiation was applied also in connection with the increasing acknowledgement of the converse analogy between the nature and importance of an activity and the accessibility of its venue. The more private the nature and higher the significance of the activity held in a space, the more exclusive and further away both horizontally (interior) and vertically (upper storey) the latter is from public view and access, and the more ornate its architectural order. This can be observed in buildings and compounds of both public and private nature, and of religious, political or other character alike.[1683]

As Onians has observed,[1684] the development of this hierarchy of the orders constituted a reflection on architecture of a wider historical phenomenon: that of the increasing importance of and need for definition and differentiation of meanings and values as a result of the ever-increasing diversity in all aspects of life, and the growing complexity of relationships and associations within the society of the Greek polis in the course of the Hellenistic age. Stratification in Hellenistic society became based on differences of a much more subtle nature, and of considerably larger variety and wider scope than it had been in earlier times. The positions people occupied in the new social spectrum were more and more viewed and assessed in relation to polarities such as rich and poor, manual labourers and intellectuals, the culturally refined and the crude, and it came to be recognized that these polarities were interrelated. Wealth, intellectual pursuits and indoor activity tended to go together as did poverty, manual labour and outdoor life.

Social harmony and functionality were consequently thought to rely on the establishment of the right balance between these extremes, as the conciliation of body and mind, physical exercise and cultural erudition and sophistication, public activity and private life was crucial to the happiness of the individual. Hierarchy of functions and values and appropriateness in their treatment and expression thus became a key issue, which was also reflected on architecture in the pursuit of the appropriate orders and forms to complement the status of activities held in different types of buildings. Never-

---

[1682] Onians, 1988: 24-25. Cf. Schenk, 1997: 41-47.

[1683] Onians, 1988: 26.

[1684] Onians, 1988: 25-26.

theless, although ideas that the selection and use of architectural forms and decoration should correspond to the purpose and significance of the building are attested already in Aristotle,[1685] in Hellenistic philosophical doctrines there appears to have been no systematic treatment of a theory of 'propriety' or relevant principles like those prescribed by Vitruvius,[1686] and as v. Hesberg has pointed out practice may have preceded theory.[1687]

The growing concerns about the semantic content and proper use of the inherited architectural vocabulary in a social context increasingly differentiated and distanced from the original one, can be clearly seen also in the treatment of individual architectural motifs and forms and of the figured sculptural decoration.

Along with the orders, already from late Classical and early Hellenistic times the separate architectural forms of which these consisted started to become bearers of emblematic semantic content as well, defining the character or function of a particular building or part of it. At the same time, however, many of them had themselves to a large extent lost their original architectonic function and their organic role in the structure. As a result, the previously compulsory nature of specific combinations, sequences and positions of forms established as canons of architectural tradition loosened, allowing phenomena of eclecticism, mixing and interchange to appear. This set the conditions for individual forms to be used autonomously as decorative elements or emblematic signs.[1688]

We have seen how already in Periclean times, Ionic elements and proportions were adopted in Athenian buildings of the Doric order in the wish to create an architectural style with Panhellenic overtones. And how later Pytheus introduced Doric or mainland elements into Ionic architecture in his efforts to create an Ionian style of 'classical' character.[1689] Doric and Ionic features were mixed more boldly in Labraunda, where the pursuit of a prestigious and representative style for the Carian dynasts allowed more freedom of experimentation.[1690]

[1685] Aristot., *EN*, 1123a.6-10.

[1686] Vitr., 4.3.1.

[1687] Hesberg, 1994: 95.

[1688] Cf. Hesberg, 1994: 95-97, 115-117.

[1689] See pp. 135-137 and 224 above.

[1690] See Hellström and Thieme, 1981; Isager, 1994.

Eclectic tendencies were to become much more widespread in the course of the Hellenistic period and especially from the 2nd century onwards, when forms of different origin and different orders were manipulated and mixed – up to a certain degree according to pleasure – in order to enhance the effect of a building both in terms of aesthetically impressive and/or innovative appearance, and expressiveness of its semantic content. Characteristic and highly recognizable features, such as the Doric entablature and the Ionic cornice, were brought together to create a new motif that would combine the kudos of both orders.[1691] In Miletus and Priene this appears for example at the bouleuterion and the magazine hall, and the Sacred Stoa and the propylon of the Lower Gymnasium respectively.

Nevertheless, there appears to have been a difference of treatment between private and publicly financed and controlled building projects. As already pointed out,[1692] private structures tended to be more daring and innovative from much earlier as patrons could express their '*εὔνοια*' or '*φιλοδοξία*' by choosing architectural forms to their taste and liking. On the contrary, the criteria for the selection of architectural forms to be used in public buildings were determined by the fact that these were monuments standing for the standard values, ideals and wishful notions of the whole community,[1693] and at the same time objects of prestige meant to assert and promote the city's status within the framework of competitive relations with other cities and the kings.[1694]

As a result, public buildings would tend to be more conservative and draw on a repertoire of pre-existing and conventional, but also historically 'sanctioned' and invested with the authority of tradition architectural patterns and forms for a longer time.[1695] In this respect, conformity to the established architectural tradition signified the continuing recognition and observance of the ideas and values embedded in it, and consequently the preservation and bequest of those elements that made up the community's particular identity. Thus, in public buildings and especially temples – where tradition is further reinforced by ritual – composition was generally stricter, with limited or delayed loosening of standard structural forms, and greater purity of the architectural

---

[1691] Cf. Hesberg, 1980: 85, 117-118; Lauter, 1986: 259-265.

[1692] See p. 243 above.

[1693] Cf. section 4.2 above.

[1694] Cf. Fehr, 1981: 56-57, 62-63; Hesberg, 1994: 89.

[1695] Cf. p. 243 above.

orders.[1696] It is difficult to say whether the appearance of mixed forms on public buildings in the course of the 2nd century – also attested in Miletus and Priene – was the result of a relaxation of this tradition, of the involvement of private individuals in the projects or both.

In other cases, however, from the 2nd century onwards and as the Greek poleis began to look back to their Archaic and Classical past in a nostalgic and recuperative mood, conservatism/traditionalism was further encouraged by the growing classicistic/archaistic tendencies of the period, which we have already discussed. This retrospection was already characterized by antiquarian overtones. The return to earlier forms was instigated by their emblematic value, that is, their ability to evoke the glow and aura associated with ideas and institutions of the past, despite the fact that the original semantic content of both the signifier and the signified was by that time very vague and uncertain.[1697]

That explains the seemingly contradictory phenomena permeating the architecture of the period, that in some cases heterogeneous elements were combined to underline and distinguish the nature and character of a building, while in others the desire for truthfulness to the original models raised concerns for the purity of the orders.[1698] In certain cases, as we have seen, there were even conscious efforts to imitate or reproduce particular earlier buildings.[1699]

Within this context, a few remarks should finally be made about sculptural ornamentation. As in the case of individual architectural motifs and forms, in the course of the Hellenistic period there is an increasing use of sculptural elements in architecture for purely cosmetic purposes, on the one hand, or with an emblematic significance on the other.[1700] Besides narrative scenes or decorative patterns, more and more often appear various figured ornaments whose purpose is to help define, explain and underline the character of buildings. Garlands, sacred paraphernalia like phialae and tripods, and animal heads as abstract symbols of sacrificial offerings are carved on friezes, parapets

---

[1696] Hesberg, 1994: 52, 92.

[1697] Cf. Hesberg, 1994: 118.

[1698] Cf. Hesberg, 1994: 116.

[1699] See p. 226 above.

[1700] Hesberg, 1994: 100-109; See also Webb, 1996.

and other parts of structures defining them as temples or stressing their religious associations.[1701]

In certain cases representations of familiar attributes even point out the connection of the building with a particular deity.[1702] Similarly, weapon friezes[1703] and relief shields[1704] served as pictorial shorthand symbols of the political character and associations of buildings, alluding also – as we have already seen – to the military competence and alertness of the community and its authorities[1705] or to their character as permanent trophies financed by the spoils of war.[1706]

[1701] Cf. Hesberg, 1994: 109-112.

[1702] E.g. the deer-heads on the Magnesian Artemisium (Humann, Kohte and Watzinger, 1904: 78-79), winged lightning-bundles on the Pergamene Altar (Mercklin, 1962: 270 No. 635), griffins on the Didymaeum (Mercklin, 1962: 40ff. No. 103), masks on the Dionysian Theatre of Athens, cists on the Eleusinian Tlelesterium etc.

[1703] See Mansel, 1968; Webb, 1996: 33; Polito, 1998.

[1704] See Vermeule, 1965. Cf. p. 248 above.

[1705] See p. 248 above.

[1706] E.g. on a series of Pergamene buildings. See Hesberg, 1994: 100-101.

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abrams, D. and Hogg, M. A. (1990) *Social Identity Theory: Constructive and Critical Advances*, Harvester Wheatsheaf, New York ; London.

_____ (1999) *Social Identity and Social Cognition*, Blackwell, Oxford.

Aksu, A. E., D. J. W. Piper and T. Konuk (1987) 'Quaternary growth patterns of Büyük Menderes and Küçük Menderes deltas, western Turkey,' *Sedimentary Geology*, 52, 227-250.

Akurgal, E. (1983) *Alt-Smyrna*, Ankara.

_____ (1987) *Griechische und römische Kunst in der Türkei*, Munich.

_____ (1990) 'Grundzüge der hermogenischen Architektur,' in Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1990: 123-127.

Alcock, S. (1991) 'Tomb cult and the post-Classical polis,' *AJA*, 95, 447-467.

Allen, R. E. (1983) *The Attalid Kingdom: A Constitutional History*, Oxford.

Alty, J. H. M. (1982) 'Dorians and Ionians,' *JHS*, 102, 1-14.

Alzinger, W. (1991) 'Hermogenes. Bauglieder und Elemente,' in A. Hoffmann (ed.) *Bautechnik der Antike. Internationales Kolloquium in Berlin vom 15.-17. Februar 1990*, Mainz, 1-3.

Amandry, P. (1953) *La colonne des Naxiens et le portique des Athéniens*, Fouilles de Delphes, Vol. II, Topographie et architecture, Paris.

Antonaccio, C. (1993) 'The archaeology of ancestors,' in C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (eds.) *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece. Cult, Performance, Politics*, Cambridge, 46-70.

_____ (1994) 'Contesting the past: hero cult, tomb cult and epic in early Greece,' *AJA*, 98, 389-410.

_____ (1995) *An Archaeology of Ancestors. Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece*, London.

Appadurai, A. (1986) *The Social Life of Things: Commodities in Cultural Perspective*, Cambridge.

Arnott, W. G. (1972) 'From Aristophanes to Menander,' *Greece and Rome*, 19, 65-80.

Asboeck, A. (1913) *Das Staatswesen von Priene in hellenistischer Zeit*, Munich.

Ashmole, B. (1972) *Architect and Sculptor in Classical Greece*, New York.

Assmann, A. (1991) 'Kultur als Lebenswelt und Monument,' in Assmann and Harth, 1991, 11-25.

Assmann, A. and D. Harth (1991) *Kultur als Lebenswelt und Monument*, Frankfurt am Main.

Assmann, J. (1988a) 'Kollektives Gedächtnis und kulturelle Identität,' in Assmann and Hölscher, 1988, 9-19.

_____ (1988b) *Stein und Zeit: Das 'monumentale' Gedächtnis der altägyptischen Kultur*, Frankfurt am Main.

_____ (1991) 'Gebrauch und Gedächtnis. Die zwei Kulturen des pharaonischen Ägypten,' in Assman and Harth, 1991, 135-152.

_____ (1991b) 'Der zweidimensionale Mensch: das Fest als Medium des kollektiven Gedächtnisses,' in Assmann and Sundermeier, 1991: 13-30.

_____ (1992) *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen*, Munich.

Assmann, J. and Hölscher, T. (1988) *Kultur und Gedächtnis*, Frankfurt am Main.

Assmann, J. and T. Sundermeier (1991) *Das Fest und das Heilige: religiöse Kontrapunkte zur Alltagswelt*, Heidelberg.

Auberson, P. and K. Schefold (1972) *Führer durch Eretria*, Bern.

Audiat, J. (1970) *Le gymnase*, Délos XXVIII, Paris.

Badian, E. (1966) 'Alexander the Great and the Greeks of Asia,' in Ancient Society and Institutions. Studies Presented to V. Ehrenberg on his 75th Birthday, Oxford, 37-69.

_____ (1981) 'The deification of Alexander the Great,' in H. J. Dell (ed.) *Ancient Macedonian Studies in Honor of Charles F. Edson*, Thessaloniki, 27-71.

Bairoch, P. (1988) *Cities and Economic Development from the Dawn of History to the Present*, Chicago.

Balcer, J. M. (1984a) *Sparda by the Bitter Sea. Imperial Interaction in Western Anatolia*, Chico.

_____ (1984b) 'Miletos (IG I^2 22 [I^3, 21]) and the Structures of Alliances,' in J. M. Balcer (ed.) *Studien zum Attischen Seebund*, Konstanz, 11-30.

Bammer, A. (1972) *Die Architektur des jüngeren Artemision von Ephesos*, Wiesbaden.

_____ (1985) *Architektur und Gesellschaft in der Antike*, Wien.

Bammer, A. and Muss, U. (1996) *Das Artemision von Ephesos. Das Weltwunder Ioniens in archaischer und klassischer Zeit*, Mainz.

Bankel, H. (1989) Report in 'Jahresbericht 1988,' *AA*, 684-685.

_____ (1990) Report in 'Jahresbericht 1989,' *AA*, 599.

Barth, F. (1969) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*, London.

Barthes, R. (1967) *Elements of Semiology*, London.

Bartlett, F. C. (1932) *Remembering: A Study in Experimental and Social Psychology*, Cambridge.

Basso, K. and S. Feld (1996) *Senses of Place*, Albuquerque.

Bauer, H. (1973) *Korinthische Kapitelle des 4. und 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.*, Berlin.

_____ (1995) *The Persian Conquest of the Greeks, 545-450 B.C.*, Konstanz.

Bauer, O. (1968) 'Vorläufiger Bericht über die Neubearbeitung des Athenatempels bei Priene in den Jahren 1965-66,' *IstMitt*, 18, 212-220.

_____ (1969) 'Beobachtungen am Athenatempel in Priene bei den Bestandsaufnahmen 1965 und 1966,' in *Bericht über die 24. Tagung für Ausgrabungswissenschaft und Bauforschung vom 24.-28. Mai 1967 in Lübeck*, Bonn, 24-36.

Bean, G. E. (1966) *Aegean Turkey*, London.

Bean, G. E. and J. M. Cook (1957) 'The Carian coast,' *BSA*, 52, 58-146.

Behrens-du Maire, A. (1993) 'Zur Bedeutung griechischer Schatzhäuser,' in Hoepfner and Zimmer, 1993: 76-81.

Bengtson, H. (1974) *Kleine Schriften*, Munich.

_____ (1975) *Herrschergestalten des Hellenismus*, Munich.

Berchem, D. v. (1972) 'Alexandre et la restauration de Priène,' *MusHelv*, 27, 198-205.

Bernardi Ferrero, D. De (1966-74) *Teatri classici in Asia Minore*, Vols. I-IV, Rome.

Bernert (1935) s. v. 'Naturgefühl,' *RE*, XVI, 1811-1863.

Berve, H. (1967) *Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen*, Munich.

Bieber, M. (1961) *The History of the Greek and Roman Theatre*, Princeton NJ.

Bietak, M. (1979) 'Urban archaeology and the "town problem" in ancient Egypt,' in K. Weeks (ed.) *Egyptology and the Social Sciences*, Cairo, 97-144.

Billig, M. (1990) 'Collective memory, ideology and the British Royal Family,' in Middleton and Edwards, 1990, 60-80.

Billows, R. A. (1995) *Kings and Colonists. Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*, Leiden.

Bingöl, O. (1996) 'Zu Säule und Gebälk bei Hermogenes,' in E.-L. Schwandner (ed.) *Säule und Gebälk. Zu Struktur und Wandlungsprozess griechisch-römischer Architektur. Bauforschungskolloquium in Berlin vom 16. bis 18. Juni 1994*, Mainz, 148-152.

Blech, M. (1982) *Studien zum Kranz bei den Griechen*, Berlin-New York.

Blümel, C. (1966) *Die klassisch griechischen Skulpturen der Staatlichen Museen zu Berlin*, Berlin.

Blümel, W. (1985) *Die Inschriften von Iasos*, Bonn.

Bodley, J. H. (1994) *Cultural Anthropology: Tribes, States, and the Global System*, Mountain View CA-London.

Boegehold, A. (1995) *The Lawcourts at Athens: Sites, Buildings, Equipment, Procedure and Testimonia*, Princeton.

Boehringer, D.et al. (2001) *Heroenkulte in Griechenland von der geometrischen bis zur klassischen Zeit: Attika, Argolis, Messenien*, Berlin.

Boersma, J. S. (1970) *Athenian building policy from 561/0 to 405/4 B.C*, Groningen.

Bogaert, R. (1968) *Banques et Banquiers dans les Cités grecques*, Leyden.

Börker, C.(1971) 'Die Datierung des Zeus-Tempels von Olba-Dikaisareia in Kilikien,' *AA*, 1971, 37-53.

Bohn, R. (1896) *Die Theater-Terrasse*, Altertümer von Pergamon, IV, Berlin.

Bohtz, C. H. (1981) *Das Demeter-Heiligtum*, Altertümer von Pergamon, XIII, Berlin.

Boll, F. and W. Gundel (1966) *Sternglaube und Sterndeutung: die Geschichte und das Wesen der Astrologie*, 5th rev. ed., Darmstadt.

Boochs, W. (1985) *Die Finanzverwaltung im Altertum*, Sankt Augustin.

Borbein, A. H. (1973) 'Die griechische Statue des 4. Jhdts. v. Chr. Formanalytische Untersuchungen zur Kunst der Nachklassik,' *JdI*, 88, 43-212.

Botermann, H. (1994) 'Wer baute das neue Priene? Zur Interpretation der Inschriften von Priene Nr. 1 und 156,' *Hermes*, 122, 162-187.

Boucher, S. (1988) s. v. 'Dionysos/Bacchus,' *LIMC*, 4.1, 908-923.

Bourguet, E. (1912) 'Monuments et inscriptions de Delphes,' *BCH*, 36, 642-660.

Boysal, Y. (1957) 'Die korinthischen Kapitelle der hellenistischen Zeit Anatoliens,' *Anadolu*, 2, 123-132.

Bradley, R. (1993) *Altering the Earth: The Origins of Monuments in Britain and Continental Europe: The Rhind Lectures 1991-92*, Edinburgh.

_____ (2000) *An Archaeology of Natural Places*, New York.

Branscombe, N.-R., D.-L. Wann, J.-G. Noel et al (1993) 'In-group or out-group extremity: Importance of the threatened social identity,' *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19/4, 381-8.

Breakwell, G. M. (1983) 'Formulations and searches,' in G. M. Breakwell (ed.) *Threatened Identities*, Chichester, 3-26.

Bremmer, J. (1987) *Interpretation of Greek Mythology*, London.

Briant, P. (1973) *Antigone le Borgne et les problèmes de l'assemblée macédonienne*, Paris.

_____ (1982) *Rois, Tributs et Paysans*, Paris.

Bringmann, K. (1965) *Studien zu den politischen Ideen des Isokrates*, Göttingen.

_____ (1971) *Untersuchungen zum späten Cicero*, Göttingen.

_____ (1993a) 'The king as benefactor: some remarks on ideal kingship in the age of Hellenism,' in Bulloch et al., 1993: 7-24.

_____ (1993b) 'Der König als Wohltäter. Beobachtungen und Überlegungen zur hellenistischen Monarchie,' in J. Bleicken (ed.) *Colloquium aus Anlass des 80. Geburtstages von Alfred Heuss, [Gottingen 10.-11. November 1989]*, Kallmünz Opf, 83-95.

_____ (1993c) 'Die Ehre des Königs und der Ruhm der Stadt. Bemerkungen zu königlichen Bau- und Feststiftungen,' in Hoepfner and Zimmer, 1993: 93-102.

_____ (1997) 'Die Rolle der Königinnen, Prinzen und Vermittler,' in Christol, 1997: 169-174.

Bringmann, K., H. v. Steuben, W. Ameling and B. Schmidt-Dounas (1995) *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer*, Berlin.

Bringmann, K. and H. C. Noeske (2000) *Geben und Nehmen. Monarchische Wohltätigkeit und Selbstdarstellung im Zeitalter des Hellenismus. Mit einem numismatischen Beitrag*, Berlin.

Brown, R. (1988) *Group Processes: Dynamics within and between Groups*, Oxford.

Brown, R. J. and J. C. Turner (1981) 'Interpersonal and intergroup behavior,' in J. C. Turner and H. Giles (eds.) *Intergroup Behavior*, Oxford, 33-65.

Brown, R., S. Hinkle, P. G. Ely et al. (1992) 'Recognizing group diversity: individualist-collectivist and autonomous-relational social orientations and their implications for intergroup processes,' *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 31, 327-342.

Brückner, H. (1995) 'Geomorphologie und Paläo-environment der Milesia,' *AA*, 1995, 329-333.

_____ (1998) 'Coastal research and geoarchaeology in the Mediterranean region,' in D. H. Kelletat (ed.) *German Geographical Coastal Research: The Last Decade*, Tübingen, 235-257.

Bruit Zaidman, L. and P. Schmitt Pantel (1992) *Religion in the Ancient Greek City*, Transl. of French original [1989] by P. Cartledge, Cambridge.

Bruneau, P. (1970) *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*, Paris.

Bruneau, P. and J. Ducat (1983) *Guide de Délos*, 3rd ed., Paris.

Buchler, J. (1940) *The Philosophy of Peirce: Selected Writings*, London.

Bulle, H.et al. (1928) *Untersuchungen an griechischen Theatern*, Munich.

Bulloch, A. W., et al. (1993) *Images and Ideologies: Self-Definition in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley-London.

Bunge, J. (1974) '"Theos Epiphanes" Zu den ersten fünf Regierungsjahren Antiochos' IV. Epiphanes,' *Historia*, 23, 57-85.

Burke, P. (1989) 'History as social memory,' in T. Butler (ed.) *Memory: History, Culture and the Mind*, Oxford, 97-113.

Burkert, W. (1983) *Homo Necans: The Anthropology of Ancient Greek Sacrificial Ritual and Myth*, Berkeley-London.

_____ (1985) *Greek religion: Archaic and Classical*, Oxford.

_____ (1987) *Ancient Mystery Cults*, Cambridge MA-London.s

_____ (1988) 'The meaning and function of the temple in Classical Greece,' in M. V. Fox (ed.) *Temple in Society*, Winona Lake, 27-47.

_____ (1995) 'Greek poleis and civic cults. Some further thoughts,' in Hansen and Raaflaub, 1995: 201-210.

_____ (1996) 'Greek temple-builders. Who, where and why?,' in R. Hägg (ed.) *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis: Proceedings from the Third International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult Organized by the Swedish Institute at Athens, 16-18 October 1992*, Stockholm, 21-29.

Burmeister, E. (1996) *Antike Theater in Attika und auf der Peloponnes*, Munich.

Burn, A. R. (1984) *Persia and the Greeks. The defence of the West, c. 546 - 478 B.C.*, 2. ed., London.

Burns, A. (1976) 'Hippodamos and the planned city,' *Historia*, 25, 414-428.

Buschor, E. (1950) *Maussollos und Alexander*, Munich.

Buschor, E. and H. Schleif (1933) 'Heraion von Samos: der Altarplatz der Frühzeit,' *AM*, 58, 146-173.

Büsing, H. (1970) *Die griechische Halbsäule*, Wiesbaden.

Bux, E. (1926) s.v. 'Logographer,' *RE*, XIII: 1021-1027.

Cabanes, P. (1989) 'Cité et ethnos dans la Crèce ancienne,' in M. M. Mactoux and E. Geny (eds.), *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque, 2. Anthropologie et societe*, Besancon, 63-82.

Cagnat, R., J. Toutain and P. Jouguet (1906) *Inscriptiones Graecae ad Res Romanas Pertinentes (IGRR)*, Vol. IV, Paris.

Cahn, H. A. (1950) 'Die Löwen des Apollon,' *MusHelv*, 7, 185-199.

Cain, H.-U. (1995) 'Hellenistische Kultbilder. Religiöse Präsenz und museale Präsentation der Götter im Heiligtum und beim Fest,' in Wörrle and Zankler, 1995: 115-130.

Calame, C. (1982-3) 'Morfologia e funzione della festa nell'antichità,' *AION*, 4-5, 3-23.

Camp, J. M. (1998) *The Athenian Agora. Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens*, Reprint of updated 1992 edition, London.

_____ (2000) 'Walls and the polis,' in P. Flensted-Jensen, T. H. Nielsen and L. Rubinstein (eds.) *Polis and Politics. Studies in Ancient Greek History Presented to M. H. Hansen on his Sixtieth Birthday, August 20, 2000*, Copenhagen, 41-57.

Carter, J. C. (1979) 'The date of the sculptured coffer lids from the temple of Athena Polias at Priene,' in *Studies in Classical Art and Archaeology. A Tribute to P. H. von Blanckenhagen*, Locust Valley, 139-151.

_____ (1983) *The Sculpture of the Sanctuary of Athena Polias at Priene*, London.

_____ (1984) 'The date of the altar of Athena at Priene and its relief,' in N. Bonacasa (ed.) *Alessandria e il Mondo Ellenistico-Romano. Studi in Onore di Achille Adriani*, Vol. 1, Roma, 748-763.

_____ (1990) 'Pytheos,' in Akten des 13. Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie, Berlin 24.-30. Juli 1988, Mainz, 129-136.

Cartledge, P. (1985) 'The Greek religious festivals,' in P. E. Easterling and J. V. Muir (eds.), *Greek Religion and Society*, Cambridge, 98-127.

_____ (1993) *The Greeks. A Portrait of Self and Others*, Oxford.

Casey, E. (1996) 'How to get from space to place in a fairly short stretch of time: phenomenological prolegomena,' in Basso and Feld, 1996, 13-52.

Cassirer, E. (1944) *An Essay on Man: An Introduction to a Philosophy of Human Culture*, New Haven-London.

Casson, L. (1954) 'The grain trade of the Hellenistic world,' *TAPA*, 85, 168-187.

Chandler, R. (1821) *Antiquities of Ionia*, Vol. I, London.

Chaniotis, A. (1991) 'Gedenktage der Griechen: ihre Bedeutung für das Geschichtsbewußtsein griechischer Poleis,' in Assmann and Sundermeier, 1991: 123-145.

_____ (1995) 'Sich selbst feiern? Städtische Feste des Hellenismus im Spannungsfeld von Religion und Politik,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 147-172.

_____ (1996) 'Conflicting authorities. Asylia between secular and divine law in the Classical and Hellenistic poleis,' *Kernos*, 9, 65-86.

Chapman, J. (1997) 'Places as timemarks: the social construction of prehistoric landscapes in Eastern Hungary,' in G.Nash (ed.) *Semiotics of Landscape: Archaeology of Mind*, Oxford, 31-45.

Charneux, P. (1966) 'Liste argienne de théarodoques,' *BCH*, 90, 156-239; 710-714.

Cherry, J. F., J. L. Davis and E. Mantzourani (1991) *Landscape Archaeology as Long-Term History*, Los Angeles.

Childe, V. G. (1950) 'The urban revolution,' *The Town Planning Review*, 21, 3-17.

Choreme-Spetsiere, A. (1994) 'Η οδός Τριπόδων και τα χορηγικά μνημεία στην αρχαία Αθήνα,' in Coulson et al., 1994: 31-42.

Christol, M. (1997) *Actes du Xe Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine, Nîmes, 4-9 octobre 1992*, Paris.

Clauss, M. (1990) *Mithras: Kult und Mysterien*, Munich.

Cobet, J. (1997) 'Milet 1994-1995. Die Mauern sind die Stadt. Zur Stadtbefestigung des antiken Milet,' *AA*, 1997, 249-284.

Cohen, A. P. (1978) "The same – but different' The allocation of identity in Whalsay, Shetland' *Sociological Review*, 26/3, 449-469.

_____ (1985) *The symbolic construction of community*, Chichester.

_____ (1986). 'Of symbols and boundaries,' in: A.P. Cohen (ed.) *Symbolising Boundaries*: *Identity and Diversity in British Cultures*, Manchester, 1-19.

Cohen, G. M. (1995) *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, Berkeley - Oxford.

Coldstream, J. N. (1977) *Geometric Greece*, London.

_____ (1985) 'Greek temples: why and where?,' in P. E. Easterling and J. V. Muir (eds.), *Greek Religion and Society*, Cambridge, 67-97.

Cole, S. G. (1984) *Theoi Megaloi: The Cult of the Great Gods at Samothrace*, Leiden.

_____ (1995) 'Civic cult and civic Identity,' in Hansen, 1995b: 292-325.

Compernolle, T. v. (1989) 'Architecture et tyrannie. A propos de la datation des temples A, B, C, E et I d'Agrigente, du temple C de Gela, de l'Athenaion dorique de Syracuse et du temple dit de la Victoire a Himere,' *AntCl*, 58, 44-70.

Condor, S. (1990) 'Social stereotypes and social identity,' in Hogg and Abrams, 1990, 230-249.

Connerton, P. (1989) *How Societies Remember*, Cambridge.

Cook, J. M. (1961) 'Some sites of the Milesian territory,' *BSA*, 56, 90-101.

Cooley, C. H. (1902) *Human Nature and the Social Order*, New York.

Corso, A. (1986) *Monumenti Periclei: saggio critico sulla attività edilizia di Pericle*, Venice.

Coste-Messelière, P. de La and G. de Miré (1950) *Le trésors de Delphes*, Paris.

Coulson, W. D. E.et al. (1994) *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy: Proceedings of an International Conference Celebrating 2500 Years since the Birth of Democracy in Greece, Held at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, December 4-6, 1992*, Oxford.

Coulton, J. J. (1976) *The Architectural Development of the Greek Stoa*, Oxford.

_____ (1977) *Greek Architects at Work. Problems of Structure and Design*, London.

Crampa, J. (1969) *The Greek inscriptions*, Labraunda III.1, Lund.

_____ (1972) *The Greek Inscriptions 13-133*, Labraunda III.2, Stockholm.

Crouch, D. P. (1996) *Priene's Streets and Water Supply*, Leiden.

Crowther, C. V. (1996) 'I. Priene 8 and the history of Priene in the Early Hellenistic period,' *Chiron*, 26, 195-250.

Dakaris, S. I. (1983) 'Ανασκαφή στην Κασσώπη,' *Prakt*, 1983, 74-76.

Daux, G. (1936) Delphes aux IIe Siècle depuis l'Abaissement de l'Étolie jusqu'à la Paix Romaine 191-31 av. J.-C., Paris.

_____ (1967) *Guide de Thasos*, Paris.

Daux, G. and A. Salac (1932) *Inscriptions depuis le trésor des Athéniens jusqu'aux bases de Gélon*, Fouilles de Delphes III.3, Paris.

Davies, J. K. (1981) *Wealth and the Power of Wealth in Classical Athens*, New York.

_____ (1984) 'Cultural, social and economic features of the Hellenistic world,' in F. W. Walbank, et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History - The Hellenistic World*, VII.1, Second Edition, Cambridge, 257-320.

Deaux, K. (1996) 'Social Identification,' in E. T. Higgins and A. W. Kruglanski (eds.), *Social Psychology: Handbook of Basic Principles*, N.Y.-London, 777-798.

Deboeck, P. and S. Rosenberg (1988) 'Hierarchical classes: model and data analysis,' *Psychometrika*, 53, 361-381.

Debord, P. and R. Descat (1994) *Fortifications et défense du territoire en Asie Mineure occidental et méridionale: Table ronde CNRS, Istanbul, 20-27 mai 1993*, Bordeaux.

Delorme, J. (1960) *Gymnasion: Etude sur les Monuments Consacrés à l'Education en Grèce, des Origines à l'Empire Romain*, Paris.

Demand, N. (1986) 'The relocation of Priene reconsidered,' *Phoenix*, 40, 35-44.

_____ (1990) *Urban Relocation in Archaic and Classical Greece: Flight and Consolidation*, Bristol.

_____ (1996) *A History of Ancient Greece*, New York - London.

Demandt, A. (1982) 'Symbolfunktionen antiker Baukunst,' in Papenfuss and Strocka, 1982: 49-62.

Demangel, R. and A. Laumonier (1923) 'Fouilles de Notion (1921),' *BCH*, 47, 353-386.

Deppert-Lippitz, B. (1984) *Die Münzprägung Milets vom vierten bis ersten Jahrhundert v. Chr.*, Frankfurt.

Dessau, H., P. Herrmann and A. Rehm (1997) *Milet, 6. Inschriften von Milet, 1, A. Inschriften n. 187-406 (Nachdruck aus den Bänden I.5 –II.3). B. Nachträge und Übersetzungen zu den Inschriften n. 1-406*, Berlin.

Deubner, L. (1966) *Attische Feste*, 2nd rev. ed., Darmstadt.

Diels, H. and E. Schramm (1920) *Exzerpte aus Philons Mechanik B. vii u. viii (vulgo 5tes Buch)*, Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 1919(12), Berlin.

Dihle, A. (1988) 'Fortschritt und Goldene Urzeit,' in Assmann and Hölscher, 1988: 150-169.

Dinsmoor, W. B. (1934) 'The repair of the Athena Parthenos: a story of five dowels,' *AJA*, 38, 93-106.

_____ (1975) *The Architecture of Ancient Greece: An Account of its Historic Development*, London.

Dittenberger, W. (1903-5) *Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae*, Vols. I-II, Leipzig.

_____ (1915-24) *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*, Vols. I-IV, 3d ed., Leipzig.

Dittmar, H. (1992) *The Social Psychology of Material Possessions: To Have is to Be*, Hemel Hempstead-New York.

Dörpfeld, W. (1924) 'Das Theater von Priene und die griechische Bühne,' *AM*, 49, 50-101.

Dornisch, K. (1992) *Die griechischen Bogentore. Zur Entstehung und Verbreitung des griechischen Keilsteingewölbes*, Frankfurt.

Dorrie, H. (1972) 'Die Wertung der Barbaren im Urteil der Griechen,' in *Antike und Universalgeschichte. Festschrift H. E. Stier*, Münster, 146-175.

Dowden, K. (1992) *The Uses of Greek Mythology*, London.

Downey, G. (1961) *A History of Antioch in Syria: from Seleucus to the Arab Conquest*, Princeton.

Doxiadis, C. A. (1972) *Architectural Space in Ancient Greece*, Cambridge Mass.

Drerup, H. (1979) 'Bürgergemeinschaft und Stadtentwicklung in Griechenland,' in *Wohnungsbau im Altertum. Bericht über ein Kolloquium in Berlin vom 21.11. bis 23.11.1978*, Berlin, 87-101.

Drerup, H., R. Naumann and K. Tuchelt (1964) 'Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Didyma 1962,' *AA*, 1964, 333-384.

Dreyfus, R. and E. Schraudolph (1996) *Pergamon: the Telephos frieze from the Great Altar*, San Francisco, Calif.

Ducrey, P. (1986) 'La fortification des cités grecques: rôle, fonction et efficacité,' in Leriche and Tréziny, 1986: 133-142.

_____ (1995) 'La muraille est-elle un élément constitutif d'une cité?' in Hansen, 1995: 245-256.

Ducrey, P. and O. Picard (1971) 'Recherches à Latô IV: Le théatre,' *BCH*, 95, 515-531.

_____ (1972) 'Recherches à Latô V: Le prytanée,' *BCH*, 96, 567-592.

Dunand, F. (1978) 'Sens et fonction de la fête dans la Grèce hellénistique. Les cérémonies en l'honneur d'Artémis Leucophryéné,' *DHA*, 4, 201-215.

Dunham, A. G. (1915) *The History of Miletus down to the Anabasis of Alexander*, London.

Duursma, J. (1996) *Fragmentation and the International Relations of Micro-States: Self-Determination and Statehood*, Cambridge.

Easterling, P. E. (1993) 'The end of an era? Tragedy in the early fourth century,' in Sommerstein et al., 1993: 559-569.

Eco, U. (1980) 'Function and sign. The semiotics of architecture,' in J. Broadbent, R. Bunt and C. Jencks (eds.) *Signs, Symbols, and Architecture*, Chichester - New York, 11-69.

Edelman, M. (1978) 'Space and the social order,' *Journal of Architectural Education*, 32/2, 2-7.

Edelstein, E. J. L. and L. Edelstein (1998) *Asclepius: Collection and Interpretation of the Testimonies* [1945], Baltimore.

Effenterre, H. v. and F. Ruzé (1994) *Nomima. Recueil d'Inscriptions Politiques et Juridiques de l'Archaïsme Grec*, Vol. I, Rome.

Ehrenberg, V. (1960) *The Greek State*, Oxford.

Ehrhardt, D. (1970) *Der Begriff des Mikrostaats im Völkerrecht und in der internationalen Ordnung*, Aalen.

Ehrhardt, N. (1983) *Milet und seine Kolonien. Vergleichende Untersuchung der kultischen und politischen Einrichtungen*, Frankfurt am Main - New York.

_____ (1998) 'Didyma und Milet in archaischer Zeit,' *Chiron*, 28, 11-20.

Elsner, J. (1994) 'From the pyramids to Pausanias and Piglet: monuments, travel and writing,' in Goldhill and Osborne, 1994, 224-254.

Emlen, J.et al. (1991) *City States in Classical Antiquity and Medieval Italy: Athens and Rome, Florence and Venice*, Stuttgart.

Engelmann, H. (1976) *Die Inschriften von Kyme*, Bonn.

Engelmann, H. and R. Merkelbach (1972-3) *Die Inschriften von Erythrai und Klazomenai*, Bonn.

Erskine, A. (1990) *The Hellenistic Stoa: Political Thought and Action*, London.

_____ (1994) 'The Romans as common benefactors,' *Historia*, 93, 70-87.

Ethier, K. and K. Deaux (1994) 'Negotiating social identity in a changing context: maintaining identification and responding to threat,' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 243-251.

Étienne, R. and J.-P. Braun (1986) *Ténos I: le sanctuaire de Poséidon et d'Amphitrite*, Paris.

Evans, C. (1985) 'Tradition and the cultural landscape: an archaeology of place,' *Archaeological Review from Cambridge*, 4, 80-94.

Fehr, B. (1971-2) 'Zur Geschichte des Apollon heiligtums von Didyma,' *MarbWPr*, 1971-2, 14-59.

_____ (1980) 'Kosmos und Chreia. Der Sieg der reinen uber die praktische Vernunft in der griechischen Stadtarchitektur des 4. Jhs. v. Chr.,' *Hephaistos*, 2, 155-185.

_____ (1981) 'Zur religionspolitischen Funktion de Athena Parthenos im Rahmen des delisch-attischen Seebundes,' *Hephaistos*, 3, 55-93.

_____ (1996) 'The Greek temple in the early Archaic period: meaning, use and social context,' *Hephaistos*, 14, 165-191.

Feld, O. (1977-8) 'Milet 1973-1975. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten der Jahre 1973 und 1975, 3. Bautypus und Ausstattung der Michaelskirche,' *IstMitt*, 27-28, 117-125.

Fentress, J. and C. Wickham (1992) *Social memory*, Oxford.

Ferrary, J.-L. (1987-9) 'Les Romains de la République et les démocraties grecques,' *Opus*, 6-8, 203-216.

_____ (1988) *Philhellénisme et impérialisme: aspects idéologiques de la conquête romaine du monde hellénistique, de la seconde guerre de Macédoine à la guerre contre Mithridate*, Rome.

_____ (1997) 'De l'évergétisme hellénistique à l'évergétisme romain,' in Christol, 1997: 199-225.

Festinger, L. (1954) 'A theory of social comparison processes,' *Human Relations*, 7, 117-140.

Festugière, A. J. (1954) *Personal religion among the Greeks*, Berkeley.

_____ (1972) *Études de religion grecque et hellénistique*, Paris.

Fiechter, E. R. (1914) *Die Baugeschichtliche Entwicklung des antiken Theaters: Eine Studie*, Munich.

Filgis, M. N. (1988) 'Zur Rekonstruktion der Odeia von Ariassos und Termessos,' *Architectura*, 18, 1-6.

Filgis, M. N., et al. (1986) *Die Stadtgrabung. Das Heroon*, Altertümer von Pergamon XV.1, Berlin.

Filimonos, M. and V. Kontorini (1989) "Ενα νέο γυμνάσιο στη Ρόδο και η μαρτυρία του Διοδώρου, XX,100,3-4,' *AntCl*, 58, 128-177.

Finnegan, R. (1977) *Oral Poetry: Is Nature, Significance and Social Context*, Cambridge-New York.

Firth, W.R. (1973) *Symbols: Public and Private*, London.

Fleischer, R. (1985) Review of Carter, 1983, *Gnomon*, 57, 344-352.

Forbes, C. A. (1945) 'Expanded uses of the Greek gymnasium,' *CPh*, 40, 32-42.

Fowler, R. L. (1998) 'Genealogical thinking, Hesiod's 'catalogue' and the creation of the Hellenes,' *Proc CambPhilolSoc*, 44, 1-19.

Foxhall, L. (1995) 'Monumental ambitions: The significance of posterity in Greece,' in N. Spencer (ed.) *Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology. Bridging the 'Great Divide'*, London, 132-149.

Fränkel, M. (1890) *Die Inschriften von Pergamon*, Altertümer von Pergamon VIII.1, Berlin.

Fraser, P.M. (1960) 'Two studies on the cult of Sarapis in the Hellenistic world,' *OpAth*, 3, 1-54.

_____ (1967) 'Current problems concerning the early history of the cult of Serapis,' *OpAth*, 7, 23-45.

Friedman, J. (1992) 'The past in the future: History and the politics of identity,' *American Anthropologist*, 94/4, 837-859.

Fusco, R. de (1972) *Architektur als Massenmedium: Anmerkungen zu einer Semiotik der gebauten Formen*, Gèutersloh.

Füssmann, K., H. T. Grütter and J. Rüsen (1994) *Historische Faszination: Geschichtskultur heute*, Köln.

Gaertringen, H. v. (1906) *Die Inschriften von Priene*, Berlin.

_____ (1932) s. v. 'Miletos' (History), *RE*, XV, 1586-1622.

Gaertringen, H. v.et al. (1895) *Inscriptiones Graecae Insularum Maris Aegaei*, Inscriptiones Graecae Vol. XII (IG XII), Berlin.

Gager, J. G. (1992) *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World*, Oxford.

Gall, H. v. (1977) 'Das persische Königszelt und die Hallenarchitektur in Iran und Griechenland,' in *Festschrift für Frank Brommer*, Mainz, 119-132.

_____ (1979) 'Das Zelt des Xerxes und seine Rolle als persischer Raumtyp in Griechenland,' *Gymnasium*, 86, 444-462.

Gans, U. (1991) 'Die Grabung auf dem Zeytintepe,' *IstMitt*, 41, 137-140.

García Teijeiro, M. (1986) 'La escuela elemental en el Mileto helenístico,' in *Homenaje a Pedro Sainz Rodríguez III*, Madrid, 271-278.

Gardner, E. A. et al. (1892) *Excavations at Megalopolis 1890-1*, London.

Garlan, Y. (1974) *Recherches de poliorcétique grecque*, Athens.

Gates, M. H. (1995) 'Archaeology in Turkey,' *AJA*, 99, 207-255.

Gatz, B. (1967) *Weltalter, goldene Zeit und Sinnverwandte Vorstellungen*, Hildesheim.

Gauthier, P. (1984) 'Les cites hellénistiques:épigraphie et histoire des institutions et des régimes politiques,' in *Πρακτικά του 8ου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Ελληνικής και Λατινικής Επιγραφικής, Αθήνα, 3-9 Οκτωβρίου 1982*, Athens, 82-107.

_____ (1985) *Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs*, Athens-Paris.

_____ (1990) 'Quorum et participation civique dans les démocraties grecques,' in C. Nicolet (ed.) *Du pouvoir dans l'antiquité: mots et réalités*, Geneva, 73-99.

_____ (1993) 'Les cités hellénistiques,' in Hansen, 1993: 211-231.

_____ (1995) 'Notes sur le rôle du gymnase dans les cités hellénistiques,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 1-11.

Gawantka, W. (1975) *Isopolitie. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen in der griechischen Antike*, Munich.

Geertz, C. (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*, New York.

Gehrke, H.-J. (1978) 'Das Verhältnis von Politik und Philosophie im Wirken des Demetrios von Phaleron,' *Chiron*, 8, 149-199.

_____ (1985) *Stasis. Untersuchungen zu den inneren Kriegen in den griechischen Staaten des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts v.Chr.*, Munich.

_____ (1989) 'Bemerkungen zu Hippodamos von Milet,' in Schuller, Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1989: 58-68.

_____ (1990) *Geschichte des Hellenismus*, Munich.

Genière, J. de La (1998) 'Claros. Bilan provisoire de dix campagnes de fouilles,' *REA*, 100, 235-268.

Genière, J. de la and M. Amandry (1992) *Cahiers de Claros*, Paris.

Gerkan, A. v. (1915) *Der Poseidonaltar bei kap Monodendri*, Milet I.4, Berlin.

_____ (1921a) *Das Stadion*, Milet II.1, Berlin-Leipzig.

_____ (1921b) *Das Theater von Priene, als Einzelanlage und in seiner Bedeutung für das hellenistische Bühnenwesen*, Munich-Berlin.

_____ (1922) *Der Nordmarkt und der Hafen an der Löwenbucht*, Milet I.6, Berlin-Leipzig.

_____ (1924a) *Griechische Städteanlagen: Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung des Städtebaues im Altertum*, Berlin.

_____ (1924b) 'Der Altar des Athenatempels in Priene,' *BJb*, 129, 15-35.

_____ (1924c) 'Die Datierung der Statuenbasen vor dem Proskenion in Priene,' *AM*, 49, 225-230.

_____ (1925a) *Kalabaktepe, Athenatempel und Umgebung*, Milet I.8, Berlin.

_____ (1925b) Rev. of Knackfuss and Rehm, 1924, *Gnomon*, 1, 127-140.

_____ (1929) *Der Altar des Artemistempels in Magnesia am Mäander*, Berlin.

_____ (1959) [1950] 'Zum Heiligtum des Apollo Delphinios in Milet,' in E. Boehringer (ed.) *Von antiken Architektur und Topographie. Gesammelte Aufsätze von Armin von Gerkan*, Stuttgart, 288-290.

_____ (1959-60) 'Zum Skenegebaude des Theaters von Priene,' *IstMitt*, 9-10, 97-108.

_____ (1963-64) 'Nochmals die Skene des Theaters von Priene,' *IstMitt*, 13-14, 67-72.

Gerkan, A. v. and A. Rehm (1935) *Die Stadtmauern*, Milet II.3, Leipzig.

Gerkan, A. v., F. Krischen, and F. Drexel (1928) *Thermen und Palästren*, Milet I.9, Berlin.

Ginouvès, R. (1972) *Le théatron à gradins droits et l'odéon d'Argos*, Paris.

Giovannini, A. (1993) 'Greek cities and Greek commonwealth,' in Bulloch et al., 1993: 265-286.

_____ (1997) 'Offrnades et donations des souverains aux sanctuaires grecs,' in Christol, 1997: 175-181.

Giuliano, A. (1966) *Urbanistica delle Città Greche*, Milano.

Gladigow, B. (1979) 'Der Sinn der Götter,' in P. Eicher (ed.) *Gottesvorstellung und Gesellschaftsentwicklung*, Munich, 41-62.

Glass, S. L. (1981) *Palaistra and Gymnasium in Greek Architecture*, [Diss. Philadelphia, 1967], Ann Arbor.

Gleason, P. (1983) 'Identifying identity: A semantic history,' *Journal of American History*, 69, 910-931.

Gneisz, D. (1990) *Das antike Rathaus. Das griechische Bouleuterion und die frührömische Curia*, Wien.

Gödecken, K. B. (1986) 'Beobachtungen und Funde an der heiligen Strasse zwischen Milet und Didyma, 1984,' *ZPE*, 66, 217-253.

_____ (1988) 'A contribution to the early history of Miletus. The settlement in Mycenean times and its connections overseas,' in E. B. French and K. A. Wardle (eds.), *Problems in Greek Prehistory: Papers Presented at the Centenary Conference of the British School of Archaeology at Athens, Manchester April 1986*, Bristol, 307-315.

Goffman, E. (1956) *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, Edinburgh.

Goldhill, S. and R. Osborne (1994) *Art and Text in Ancient Greek Culture*, Cambridge.

Goodman, N. (1988) 'How buildings mean,' in N. Goodman and C. Elgin, *Reconceptions in Philosophy and Other Arts and Sciences*, London, 31-48.

Gorman, V. B. (1995) 'Aristotle's Hippodamos (Politics 2, 1267b, 22-30),' *Historia*, 44, 385-395.

Graeve, V. v. (1975) 'Milet. Vorläufiger Bericht über die Grabung im Südschnitt an der hellenistischen Stadtmauer 1966,' *IstMitt*, 25, 35-59.

_____ (1986) 'Milet 1985. Grabung auf dem Kalabaktepe,' *IstMitt*, 36, 37-51.

Graeve, V. v. (1990) 'Milet 1989. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten des Jahres 1989 und einer 1988 auf dem Kalabaktepe durchgeführten Sondierung,' *IstMitt*, 40, 37-78.

_____ (1991) 'Milet 1990. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten des Jahres 1990,' *IstMitt*, 41, 125-186.

_____ (1992) 'Milet 1991. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten des Jahres 1991,' *IstMitt*, 42, 97-134.

_____ (1995) 'Milet 1992-1993. Vorbericht über die Grabungsarbeiten und Geländeerkundungen, die Denkmälerrestaurierung und die naturwissenschaftlichen Begleitprogramme der Miletgrabung in den Jahren 1992 und 1993,' *AA*, 1995, 195-333.

_____ (1996) 'Zu den Hafenlöwen von Milet,' in J. Borchhardt and F. Blakolmer (eds.) Fremde Zeiten: Festschrift für Jürgen Borchhardt zum sechzigsten Geburtstag am 25. Februar 1996, dargebracht von Kollegen, Schülern und Freunden, Wien, 317-327.

_____ (1997) 'Milet 1994-1995. Vorbericht über die Grabungsarbeiten und Geländeerkundungen, die Denkmälerrestaurierung und die naturwissenschaftlichen

Begleitprogramme der Miletgrabung in den Jahren 1994 und 1995,' *AA*, 1997, 109-188.

_____ (1999) 'Milet 1996-1997. Vorbericht über die Grabungsarbeiten und Geländeuntersuchungen, die Denkmälerrestaurierung und die naturwissenschaftlichen Begleitprogramme der Miletgrabung in den Jahren 1996 und 1997,' *AA*, 1999, 1-5.

Graeve, V. v. and G. Kleiner (1973) 'Milet. Bericht über die Arbeiten im Südschnitt an der hellenistischen Stadtmauer 1963,' *IstMitt*, 23-24, 63-115.

Graf, F. (1985) *Nordionische Kulte: religionsgeschichtliche und epigraphische Untersuchungen zu den Kulten von Chios, Erythrai, Klazomenai und Phokaia*, Rome.

_____ (1995) 'Bemerkungen zur bürgerlichen Religiosität im Zeitalter des Hellenismus,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 103-114.

_____ (2000) s. v. 'Mysterien,' *Neue Pauly*, 8, 615-626.

Graham, A. J. (1982) 'The colonial expansion of Greece,' in J. Boardman (ed.) *The Cambridge Ancient History*^{2}, Vol. III.3, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 83-162.

Graves-Brown, P. (1996) 'All things bright and beautiful? Species, ethnicity and cultural dynamics,' in Graves-Brown, Jones and Gamble, 1996, 81-95.

Graves-Brown, P., S. Jones and C. Gamble (1996) *Cultural Identity and Archaeology*, London.

Greaves, A. M. (2000) 'The shifting focus of settlement at Miletos,' in P. Flensted-Jensen (ed.) *Further Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 5, Stuttgart, 57-72.

Greco, E. and D. Theodorescu (1983) *Poseidonia-Paestum II. L'Agora*, Rome.

Greco, E. and M. Torelli (1983) *Storia dell'Urbanistica. Il Mondo Greco*, Rome.

Green, J. R. (1990/1) 'Théâtre et société dans le monde hellénistique. Changement d'image, changement de rôles,' in P. Ghiron-Bistagne (ed.) *Realia. Mélanges sur les réalités du théâtre antique. Archéologie, Epigraphie, Anthropologie, Littérature*, Cahiers du GITA No. 6, Montpellier, 31-49.

Green, J. R. (1994) *Theatre in Ancient Greek Society*, London - N. Y.

Griffeth, R. and C. G. Thomas (1981) *The City-State in Five Cultures*, Santa Barbara, CA - Oxford.

Grimm, G. (1977) *Rezeptionsgeschichte: Grundlegung einer Theorie*, Munich.

Gros, P. (1992) 'Moenia. Aspects défensifs et aspects représentatifs des fortifications,' in S. van de Maele and J.M. Fossey, *Fortificationes antiquae. Including the papers of a Conference held at Ottawa University, October 1988*, Amsterdam, 211-225.

Gruben, G. (1961) 'Beobachtungen zum Artemis-Tempel von Sardis,' *AM*, 76, 155-196.

_____ (1986) *Die Tempel der Griechen*, Munich.

Gruen, E. S. (1984) *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*, Berkeley.

_____ (1993a) 'Introduction,' in Bulloch et al., 1993: 3-6.

_____ (1993b) 'The polis in the Hellenistic world,' in M. Ostwald, R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell (eds.), *Nomodeiktes: Greek studies in honor of Martin Ostwald*, Ann Arbor, 339-354.

Gschnitzer, F. (1974) s. v. 'Proxenos,' *RE*, Suppl. XIII, 629-730.

Guarducci, M. (1969) *Epigrafia Greca*, Vol. II, Rome.

Günther, W. (1971) *Das Orakel von Didyma in hellenistischer Zeit. Eine Interpretation von Stein-Urkunden*, Tübingen.

_____ (1989) 'Zu den Anfängen des Kaiserkults in Milet,' *IstMitt*, 39, 173-178.

_____ (1994) Review of Schaaf, 1992, *Klio*, 76, 481-482.

_____ (1998) 'Milet und Athen im zweiten Jahrhundert v. Chr.,' *Chiron*, 28, 21-34.

Gury, F. (1986) s. v. 'Dioskouroi/Castores,' *LIMC*, 3.1, 608-695.

Habicht, C. (1960) review of Rehm, 1958, *GGA*, 145-166.

_____ (1970) *Gottmenschentum und griechische Städte*, 2nd rev. ed., Munich.

_____ (1995a) 'Ist ein "Honoratiorenregime" das Kennzeichen der Stadt im späteren Hellenismus?,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 87-92.

_____ (1995b) *Athen: Die Geschichte der Stadt in hellenistischen Zeit*, Munich.

_____ (1997) 'Die Rolle der Könige gegenüber Städten und Bünden,' in Christol, 1997: 161-168.

Hahland, W. (1964) 'Didyma im 5. Jahrhundert v. Chr.,' *JdI*, 79, 142-240.

Hainsworth, J. B. (1968) 'Greek views of Greek dialectology,' *TransPhilolSoc*, 1968, 62-76.

Halbwachs, M. (1980) *The collective memory*, New York.

Halbwachs, M. and L. A. Coser (1992) *On collective memory*, Chicago-London.

Hall, E. (1989) *Inventing the Barbarian. Greek Self-definition through Tragedy*, Oxford.

Hall, J. M. (1997) *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity*, Cambridge.

Hamilton, J. R. (1973) *Alexander the Great*, London.

Hammond, N. G. L. (1981) *Alexander the Great: King, Commander and Statesman*, London.

Handley, E. W. (1985) 'Comedy,' in P. E. Easterling and B. M. Knox (eds.) *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, Vol. I, Cambridge, 355-425.

Hannerz, U. (1997) 'Borders,' *International Social Science Journal*, 49/154, 537-548.

Hansen, E. V. (1971) *The Attalids of Pergamon*, 2nd ed., revised and expanded, Ithaca-London.

Hansen, M. H. (1989) *The Athenian Ecclesia, 2. A Collection of Articles, 1983-1989*, Copenhagen.

_____ (1993) *The Ancient Greek City-State. Symposium on the Occasion of the 250th Anniversary of the Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters July, 1-4 1992*, Copenhagen.

_____ (1994a) 'Poleis and city-states, 600-323 B.C. A comprehensive research programme,' in Whitehead, 1994: 9-17.

_____ (1994b) 'Polis, politeuma and politeia. A note on Arist. Pol. 1268b6-14,' in Whitehead, 1994: 91-98.

_____ (1995a) 'The "autonomous city state." Ancient fact or modern fiction?' in Hansen and Raaflaub, 1995: 21-43.

_____ (1995b) *Sources for the Ancient Greek City-State: Symposium August, 24-27 1994*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre Vol. 2, Copenhagen.

_____ (1996) '*Πολλαχῶς πόλις λέγεται* (Arist. Pol. 1276a23). The Copenhagen inventory of poleis and the Lex Hafniensis de Civitate,' in M. H. Hansen (ed.) *Introduction to an Inventory of 'Poleis': Symposium August, 23-26 1995*, Copenhagen, 7-72.

_____ (1997a) *The Polis as an Urban Centre and as a Political Community: symposium, August, 29-31 1996*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre Vol. 4, Copenhagen.

_____ (1997b) 'The polis as an urban centre. The literary and epigraphical evidence,' in Hansen, 1997a: 9-86.

_____ (1998) *Polis and City-State: An Ancient Concept and its Modern Equivalent. Symposium, January 9, 1998*, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 5, Copenhagen.

_____ (2000a) *A Comparative Study of Thirty City-State Cultures: An Investigation Conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre*, Copenhagen.

_____ (2000b) 'Introduction. The concepts of city-state and city-state culture,' in Hansen, 2000a: 11-34.

_____ (2000c) 'The Hellenic polis,' in Hansen, 2000a: 141-187.

_____ (2000d) 'Conclusion. The impact of city-state cultures on world history,' in Hansen, 2000a: 597-623.

Hansen, M. H. and T. Fischer-Hansen (1994) 'Monumental political architecture in Archaic and Classical Greek poleis. Evidence and historical significance,' in Whitehead, 1994: 23-90.

Hansen, M. H., and K. Raaflaub (1995) *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis*, Stuttgart.

Hansen, P. A. (1989) *Carmina Epigraphica Graeca II*, Berlin.

Hanson, V. D. (1989) *The Western Way of war: Infantry Battle in Classical Greece*, London.

Hart, G. D. (2000) *Asclepius: The God of Medicine*, London.

Haugsted, I. (1978) *Hippodamos fra Milet: antikke græske byplaner fra det 5. årh. f. Kr*, Copenhagen.

Hauser, F. (1906) 'Tettix,' *ÖJh*, 9, 75-130.

Haussoullier, B. (1902) 'Les îles milésiennes. Leros, Lepsia, Patmos, Les Korsiae,' *RevPhil*, 125-143.

Head, B. V. and R. S. Poole (1892) Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum – Ionia, London.

Headland, T. N, K. L. Pike and M. Harris (1992) *Emics and Etics: The Insider Outsider Debate*, Newbury Park, CA.

Hegyi, D. (1974) 'Die ionischen Poleis vom Kalliasfrieden bis zur Zeit der makedonischen Eroberung,' in Welskopf, 1974, 1015-1040.

Heidegger, M. (1962) *Being and Time*, Oxford.

Heidemann, M.-L. (1966) *Die Freiheitsparole in der griechisch-römischen Auseinandersetzung: 200-188 v. Chr*, Bonn.

Heilmeyer, W. D. (1970) *Korinthische Normalkapitelle. Studien zur Geschichte der römischen Architekturdekoration*, Heidelberg.

_____ (1986) 'Die Einordnung Milets in die Siedlungszonen der griechischen Frühzeit,' in W. Müller-Wiener (ed.) *Milet 1899-1980 : Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung : Kolloquium Frankfurt am Main 1980*, Tübingen, 105-112.

Heilmeyer, W. D. and F. Rakob (1973) *Der Rundtempel am Tiber in Rom*, Mainz.

Heinz, M. and R. Senff (1995) 'Die Grabung auf dem Zeytintepe,' *AA*, 1995, 220-224.

Heisserer, A. J. (1980) Alexander the Great and the Greeks. The Epigraphic Evidence, Norman Okl.

Held, W. (1993) 'Heiligtum und Wohnhaus. Ein Beitrag zur Topographie des klassischen Milet,' *IstMitt*, 43, 371-380.

_____ (2000) *Das Heiligtum der Athena in Milet*, Mainz.

Hellström, P. (1990) 'Hellenistic architecture in light of late Classical Labraunda,' in *Akten des 13. Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie, Berlin 24.-30. Juli 1988*, Mainz, 243-252.

_____ (1994) 'Architecture. Characteristic building-types and particularities of style and technique. Possible implications for Hellenistic architecture,' in Isager, 1994: 36-57.

Hellström, P. and T. Thieme (1981) 'The androns at Labraunda,' *MedelhavsMusB*, 16, 59-74.

_____ (1982) *Labraunda. Swedish Excacvations and Researches, Vol. 1:3, The temple of Zeus*, Stockholm.

Hemberg, B. (1950) *Die Kabiren*, Uppsala.

Henry, A. S. (1983) *Honours and Privileges in Athenian Decrees: The Principal Formulae of Athenian Honorary Decrees*, Hildesheim-New York.

Herda, A. (1998) 'Der Kult des Gründerheroen Neileos und die Artemis Kithone in Milet,' *ÖJh*, 67, 1-48.

Herman, G. (1987) *Ritualised Friendship and the Greek City*, Cambridge.

Hermary, A. (1986) s. v. 'Dioskouroi,' *LIMC*, 3.1, 567-593.

Herrmann, P. (1965a) 'Neue Urkunden zur Geschichte von Milet im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr.,' *IstMitt*, 15, 71-117.

_____ (1965b) 'Antiochos der Grosse und Teos,' *Anadolu*, 9, 29-159.

_____ (1971) 'Athena Polias in Milet,' *Chiron*, 1, 291-298.

_____ (1987) 'Milesier am Seleukidenhof. Prosopographische Beiträge zur Geschichte Milets im 2. Jh. v.Chr,' *Chiron*, 17, 171-190.

_____ (1995) 'Inschriften,' *AA*, 1995, 282-292.

Hesberg, H. v. (1980) *Konsolengeisa des Hellenismus und der frühen Kaiserzeit*, Mainz.

_____ (1981) 'Bemerkungen zu Architekturepigrammen des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.,' *JdI*, 96, 55-119.

_____ (1989) 'Temporäre Bilder oder die Grenze der Kunst. Zur Legitimation frühhellenisticher Königsherrschaft im Fest,' *JdI*, 104, 61-82.

_____ (1990) 'Platzanlagen und Hallenbauten in der Zeit des frühen Hellenismus,' in *Akten des 13. Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie, Berlin 24.-30. Juli 1988*, Mainz, 231-244.

_____ (1994) *Formen privater Repräsentation in der Baukunst des 2. und 1. Jahrhunderts v. Chr*, Köln.

_____ (1995) 'Das griechische Gymnasion im 2. Jh. v. Chr.,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 13-27.

Heuss, A. (1937) *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus*, Leipzig.

Hicks, E. L. and C. T. Newton (1886) *The Collection of Ancient Greek Inscriptions in the British Museum: Priene and Iasos, Part III – Section I*, Oxford.

Hinkle, S. and R. Brown (1990) 'Intergroup comparisons and social identity: some links and lacunae,' in Hogg and Abrams, 1990, 48-70.

Hobsbawm, E. J. and T. O. Ranger (1983) *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge.

Hodder, I. (1989) 'This is not an article about material culture as text,' *Journal of Anthropological Archaeology*, 8, 250-269.

_____ (1993) 'The narrative and rhetoric of material culture sequences,' *World Archaeology*, 25/2, 268-282.

_____ (1995) 'Material culture in time,' in I. Hodder, M. Shanks, A. Alexandri, et al. (eds.), *Interpreting Archaeology. Finding Meaning in the Past*, London, 164-168.

Höcker, C. (1996) 'Architektur als Metapher: Überlegungen zur Bedeutung des dorischen Ringhallentempels,' *Hephaistos*, 14, 45-79.

Hölscher, T. (1991) 'The city of Athens. Space, symbol, structure,' in Emlen et al., 1991: 355-380.

Hoepfner, W. (1968) 'Zum ionischen Kapitell bei Hermogenes und Vitruv,' *AM*, 83, 213-234.

_____ (1971) *Zwei Ptolemaierbauten: das Ptolemaierweihgeschenk in Olympia und ein Bauvorhaben in Alexandria*, Berlin.

_____ (1982) 'Bürgerhäuser im klassischen Griechenland,' in Papenfuss and Strocka, 1982: 43-48.

_____ (1988) 'Der Stadtplan von Rhodos,' in S. Dietz and I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, Copenhagen, 96-97.

_____ (1989) 'Zu den grossen Altären von Magnesia und Pergamon,' *AA*, 1989, 601-634.

_____ (1990a) 'Bauten und Bedeutung des Hermogenes,' in Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1990: 1-34.

_____ (1990b) 'Von Alexandria über Pergamon nach Nikopolis. Städtebau und Stadtbilder hellenistischer Zeit,' in *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für klassische Archäologie, Berlin, 1988*, Mainz, 275-285.

_____ (1993) Introduction to Hoepfner and Zimmer, 1993: 7-10.

_____ (1994) 'Überlegungen zum Städtebau klassischer Zeit,' in E. Pöhlmann and W. Gauer (eds.), *Griechische Klassik: Vorträge bei den interdisziplinären Tagung des Deutschen Archäologenverbandes und der Mommsengesellschaft vom 24.-27.10.1991 in Blaubeuren*, Carl, Nuremberg, 199-212.

_____ (1996a) 'Der vollendete Pergamonaltar,' *AA*, 1996, 115-134.

_____ (1996b) 'Model of the Pergamon Altar (1:20),' in Dreyfus and Schraudolph, 1996: 59-67.

_____ (1996c) 'The architecture of Pergamon,' in Dreyfus and Schraudolph, 1996: 23-57.

_____ (1997) 'Hermogenes und Epigonos. Pergamon zur Zeit Attalos I,' *JdI*, 112, 109-148.

Hoepfner, W. and G. Brands (1996) *Basileia: die Paläste der hellenistischen Könige. Internationales Symposion in Berlin vom 16.12.1992 bis 20.12.1992*, Mainz.

Hoepfner, W. and E.-L. Schwandner (1986) *Haus und Stadt im klassischen Griechenland*, Munich.

_____ (1990) *Hermogenes und die hochhellenistische Architektur. Internationales Kolloquium in Berlin vom 28. bis 29. Juli 1988 im Rahmen des XIII Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie*, Mainz.

_____ (1994) *Haus und Stadt im klassischen Griechenland* [second, extensively revised edition], Munich-Berlin.

Hoepfner, W. and G. Zimmer (1993) *Die Griechische Polis: Architektur und Politik*, Tübingen.

Hogarth, D. G., et al. (1908) *Excavations at Ephesus: The Archaic Artemisia*, London.

Hogg, M. A. and D. Abrams (1988) *Social Identifications: A Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations and Group Processes*, London.

_____ (1993) 'Towards a single-process uncertainty-reduction model of social motivation in groups,' in M. Hogg and D. Abrams (eds.) *Group Motivation: Social Psychological Perspectives*, New York, 173-190.

Holleaux, M. (1938) *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques*, Vols. I-VI, Paris.

Hollis, M. (1977) *Models of Man*, Cambridge.

Holtzmann, B. (1984) s. v. 'Asklepios,' *LIMC*, 2.1, 863-897.

Holub, R. C. (1984) *Reception Theory: A Critical Introduction*, London.

Hommel, P. (1959/60) 'Der Abschnitt östlich des Athena-Tempels,' *IstMitt*, 9-10, 31-62.

_____ (1975) 'Die Grabungs-Kampagne in Milet im Herbst 1973,' *TürkAD*, 22:1, 37-39.

Hooker, R. (1999) 'Architecture,' in Washington State University, *World Civilizations. An Internet Classroom and Anthology - A Glossary of World Civilizations*, Http://www.wsu.edu:8001/~dee/glossary/archi.htm (update: 14.07.99, access: October 2000).

Hornblower, S. (1982) *Mausolus*, Oxford.

Hubbe, R. O. (1984) *Public Service in Miletus and Priene in Hellenistic and Roman Imperial Times*, Ann Arbor.

Humann, K., J. Kohte and C. Watzinger (1904) *Magnesia am Maeander: Bericht über die Ergebnisse der Aussgrabungen der Jahre 1891-1893*, Berlin.

Hunter, R. L. (1985) *The New Comedy of Greece and Rome*, Cambridge.

Hutchinson, J. and A. Smith (1994) *Nationalism*, Oxford.

Huxley, G. L. (1966) *The early Ionians*, London.

Iakovides, S. (1962) *Η Μυκηναϊκή Ακρόπολις των Αθηνών*, Athens.

Ingold, T. (1983) 'The architect and the bee: reflections on the work of animals and men,' *Man*, 18, 1-20.

_____ (1986) *The Appropriation of Nature: Essays on Human Ecology and Social Relations*, Manchester.

_____ (1992) 'Culture and the perception of the environment,' in E. Croll and D. Parkin (eds) *Bush Base: Forest Farm*, London, 39-56.

_____ (1993) 'The temporality of the landscape,' *WorldA*, 25, 152-174.

Isager, J. (1994) *Hekatomnid Caria and the Ionian Renaissance, Acts of the International Symposium at the Department of Greek and Roman Studies, Odense University, 28-29 November 1991*, Odense.

Isler, H. P. (1990) 'Grabungen auf dem Monte Iato 1989,' *AntK*, 33, 52-62.

_____ (1994-6) 'Ancient theatre architecture,' in De Septis et al., 1994-96: 86-125.

_____ (1999) 'Bemerkungen zu kleinasiatischen Theatern des Hellenismus,' in H. Friesingeret al. (eds.), *100 Jahre österreichische Forschungen in Ephesos: Akten des Symposions Wien 1995*, Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Vienna, 683-688.

Jackson, J. B. and D. W. Meinig (1979) *The Interpretation of Ordinary Landscapes: Geographical Essays*, Oxford.

Jackson, L.-A., L.-A. Sullivan, R. Harnish et al. (1996) 'Achieving Positive Social Identity: Social Mobility, Social Creativity, and Permeability of Group Boundaries,' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70/2, 241-254.

Jannoray, J. and H. Ducoux (1953) *Le gymnase*, Fouilles de Delphes, Topographie et architecture, Vol. II, Paris.

Jencks, C. (1980) 'The architectural sign,' in J. Broadbent, R. Bunt and C. Jencks (eds.) *Signs, Symbols, and Architecture*, Chichester - New York, 71-118.

Jeppesen, K. (1957) *Paradeigmata. Three Mid-four Century Main Works of Hellenic Architecture*, Aarhuus.

_____ (1976) 'Neue Ergebnisse zur Wiederherstellung des Maussolleions von Halikarnassos. 4. Vorläufiger Bericht der dänischen Halikarnassos-expedition,' *IstMitt*, 26, 47-99.

_____ (1977-8) 'Zur Gründung und Baugeschichte des Maussolleions von Halikarnassos,' *IstMitt*, 27-28, 169-211.

_____ (1992) 'Tot operum opus. Ergebnisse der dänischen Forschungen zum Maussolleion von Halikarnass seit 1966,' *JdI*, 107, 59-102.

Jeppesen, K. and A. Luttrell (1986) *The Mausolleion at Halikarnassos. Reports of the Danish Archaeological Expedition to Bodrum, Vol. II, The Written Sources and their Archaeological Background*, Aarhus.

Jones, A.H.M. (1966) *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, 2nd ed., Oxford.

Jones, C. P. (1974) 'Diodoros Pasparos and the Nikephoria of Pergamon,' *Chiron*, 4, 183-205.

Jones, S. and P. Graves-Brown (1996) 'Introduction: archaeology and cultural identity in Europe,' in Gravves-Brown, Jones and Gamble, 1996, 1-24.

Jong, J. J. de (1988) 'The temple of Athena Polias at Priene and the temple of Hemithea at Kastabos,' *BABesch*, 63, 129-137.

Jung, C. G., M. L. v. Franz, J. Freeman et al. (1964) *Man and his symbols*, London.

Jünthner, J. (1923) *Hellenen und Barbaren*, Leipzig.

Kader, I. (1995) 'Heroa und Memorialbauten,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 199-227.

Kähler, H. (1948) *Der grosse Fries von Pergamon: Untersuchungen zur Kunstgeschichte und Geschichte Pergamons*, Berlin.

Kästner, V. (1991) 'Technische Beobachtungen an einem Rundmonument für Eumenes II aus Milet im Pergamonmuseum,' in A. Hoffmann (ed.) *Bautechnik der Antike: internationales Kolloquium in Berlin vom 15.-17. Februar 1990*, Mainz, 116-122.

_____ (1996) 'The architecture of the Great Altar and the Telephos frieze,' in Dreyfus and Schraudolph, 1996: 68-82.

_____ (1998) 'The architecture of the Great Altar of Pergamon,' in H. Koester (ed.) *Pergamon, Citadel of the Gods : Archaelogical Record, Literary Description, and Religious Development*, Harrisburg, Pa., 137-161.

Kaltsas, N. E. (1989) *Das antike Messene*, Athen.

Karlsson, L. (1994) 'Thoughts about fortifications in Caria from Maussollos to Demetrios Poliokretes,' *REA*, 96/1-2, 141-153.

Kawerau, G. and A. Rehm (1914) *Das Delphinion in Milet*, Milet I.3, Berlin.

Kearns, E. (1996) 'Women in cult,' in S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds.), *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*, Oxford, 1624-1625.

Kemp, W. (1992) *Der Betrachter ist im Bild: Kunstwissenschaft und Rezeptionsästhetik*, Berlin.

Kerckhoff, A.-C. (1989) 'On the social psychology of social mobility processes,' *Social Forces*, 68/1, 17-25.

Kern, O. (1900) *Die Inschriften von Magnesia am Mäander*, Berlin.

_____ (1901) s.v. 'Demeter,' *RE*, IV, 2713-2764.

Kerschner, M. (1995) 'Die Ostterrasse des Kalabaktepe,' *AA*, 1995, 214-220.

Kerschner, M. and U. Schlotzhauer (1999) 'Das Artemisheiligtum auf der Ostterrasse des Kalabaktepe in Milet. Stratigraphie und Keramikfunde der Sondagen des Jahres 1995,' *AA*, 1999, 7-51.

Kerschner, M., R. Senff and I. Blum (1997) 'Die Ostterrasse des Kalabaktepe,' *AA*, 1997, 120-122.

Khalid, R. (1990) 'Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias,' *Journal of Behavioural Sciences*, 1/2, 33-42.

Kiderlen, M. (1995) *Megale Oikia: Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung aufwendiger griechischer Stadthausarchitektur von der Früharchaik bis ins 3. Jh. v. Chr*, Hürth.ssss

Kienlin, A. v. (1998-1999) 'Zur baulichen Entwicklung der Agora von Priene,' *Boreas*, 21-22, 241-259.

King, A. D. (1984) *Buildings and Society: Essays on the Social Development of the Built Environment*, London.

Kirchner, J. (1913-40) *Inscriptiones Atticae Euclidis Anno Posteriores*, Inscriptiones Graecae Vols. II-III 2nd ed. (IG II^2), Berlin.

Kleine, J. (1979) 'Milet. Bericht über die Arbeiten im Südschnitt an der hellenistischen Stadtmauer 1968-1973,' *IstMitt*, 29, 109-159.

_____ (1986) 'Pergamenische Stiftungen in Milet,' in W. Müller-Wiener (ed.) Milet 1899-1980: Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung. Kolloquium Frankfurt am Main 1980, Tübingen, 129-140.

Kleiner, G. (1959) 'Entdeckung und Ausgrabung des Panionion,' in *Neue deutsche Ausgrabungen im Mittelmeergebiet und Vorderen Orient*, Berlin, 172-180.

_____ (1961) 'Bericht über die Grabung in Milet im Herbst 1961,' *TürkAD*, 11, 46-48.

_____ (1962) s.v. 'Priene,' *RE*, Suppl. IX, 1181-1221.

_____ (1964) 'Die Grabung in Milet im Herbst 1963,' *TürkAD*, 13, 57-59.

_____ (1966) *Alt-Milet*, Wiesbaden.

_____ (1968) *Die Ruinen von Milet*, Berlin.

_____ (1969/70) 'Stand der Erforschung von Alt-Milet,' *IstMitt*, 19-20, 113-123.

_____ (1973/4) 'Milet 1972. Vorberichte über Grabungs- und Wiederherstellungsarbeiten (Anastylose) im Gebiet der Heiligen Strasse innerhalb Milets,' *IstMitt*, 23-24, 117-137.

Kleiner, G. and W. Müller-Wiener (1972) 'Die Grabung in Milet im Herbst 1959,' *IstMitt*, 22, 45-92.

Kleiner, G., P. Hommel and W. Müller-Wiener (1967) *Panionion und Melie*, Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts, Ergänzungsheft 23, Berlin.

Klinkott, M. (1996) 'Raster, Raum und Sichtverbindungen im Stadtensemble vom Milet,' *IstMitt*, 46, 179-186.

Kloft, H. (1970) *Liberalitas Principis: Herkunft und Bedeutung. Studien zur Prinzipatsideologie*, Köln.

Klose, D.O.A. (1987) *Die Münzprägung von Smyrna in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Berlin.

Knackfuss, H. and A. Rehm (1924) *Der Südmarkt und die benachbarten Bauanlagen*, Milet I.7, Berlin.

Knackfuss, H., C. J. Fredrich, T. Wiegand and H. Winnefeld (1908) *Das Rathaus von Milet*, Milet I.2, Berlin.

Knell, H. (1979) *Perikleische Baukunst*, Darmstadt.

_____ (1980) *Grundzüge der griechischen Architektur*, Darmstadt.

_____ (1983) 'Dorische Ringhallentempel in spat- und nachklassischer Zeit,' *JdI*, 98, 203-233.

_____ (1984a) *Vitruv-Kolloquium des Deutschen Archäologen-Verbandes, Darmstadt, 17. bis 18. Juni 1982*, Darmstadt.

_____ (1984b) 'Die Hermogenes-Anekdote und das Ende des Dorischen Ringhallentempels,' in Knell, 1984a: 41-64.

_____ (1985) *Vitruvs Architekturtheorie. Versuch einer Interpretation*, Darmstadt.

_____ (1990) *Mythos und polis: Bildprogramme griechischer Bauskulptur*, Darmstadt.

_____ (1993) *Die Anfange des Archaismus in der griechischen Architektur*, Xenia, Heft 33, Konstanz.

Kneppe, A. (1989) 'Timarchos von Milet. Ein Usurpator im Seleukidenreich, 'in Drexhage, H.-J., T. Pekáry and J. Sünskes Thompson (1989) *Migratio et commutatio: Studien zur alten Geschichte und deren Nachleben. Thomas Pekáry zum 60. Geburtstag am 13. September 1989 dargebracht von Freunden, Kollegen und Schülern*, St. Katharinen, 37-49.

Kockel, V. (1995) 'Bouleuteria. Architektonische Form und urbanistischer Kontext,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 29-37.

Koenigs, W. (1980) 'Milet 1978 - 1979. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten der Jahre 1978 und 1979, 3. Bauglieder aus Milet, 2,' *IstMitt*, 30, 56-91.

_____ (1983) 'Der Athenatempel von Priene. Bericht über die 1977-82 durchgeführten Untersuchungen,' *IstMitt*, 33, 134-175.

_____ (1984) 'Pytheos, eine mythische Figur in der Antiken Baugeschichte,' in Bauplanung und Bautheorie der Antike. Bericht über ein Kolloquium veranstaltet vom Architekturreferat des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts mit Unterstützung der Stiftung Volkswagenwerk in Berlin vom 16.11. bis 18.11. 1983, Berlin, 89-94.

_____ (1986) 'Reste archaischer Architektur in Milet,' in W. Müller-Wiener (ed.) Milet 1899-1980: Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung: Kolloquium Frankfurt am Main 1980, Tübingen, 113-119.

_____ (1993) 'Planung und Ausbau der Agora von Priene,' *IstMitt*, 43, 381-397.

_____ (1999a) 'The temple of Athena Polias at Priene: Doric architecture in the guise of Ionic?,' in L. Haselberger (ed.) *Appearance and Essence. Refinements of Classical Architecture: Curvature*, Philadelphia, 139-153.

_____ (1999b) 'Markt oder Tempel – Über die Priorität städtischer Bauten in Priene (Zusammenfassung),' in E.-L. Schwandner and K. Rheidt (eds.) *Stadt und Umland. Neue Ergebnisse der archäologischen Bau- und Siedlungsforschung.*

Bauforschungskolloquium in Berlin vom 7. bis 10. Mai 1997 veranstaltet vom Architektur-Refereat des DAI, Mainz, 101-103.

Koester, H. (1998) *Pergamon, Citadel of the Gods: Archaeological Record, Literary Description, and Religious Development*, Harrisburg, Pa.

Kohli-Kunz, A. (1973) *Erinnern und Vergessen. Das Gegenwärtigsein des Vergangenen als Grundproblem historischer Wissenschaft*, Berlin.

Kolb, F. (1976) 'Politische Versammlungslokale und Institutionen im kretischen Lato,' *Gymnasium*, 83, 294-302.

_____ (1981) *Agora und Theater: Volks- und Festversammlung*, Berlin.

_____ (1984) *Die Stadt im Altertum*, Munich.

Kondis, I. D. (1954) Συμβολή εις την Μελέτην της Ρυμοτομίας της Ρόδου, Athens.

_____ (1958) 'Zum antiken Stadtbauplan von Rhodos,' *MDAI(A)*, 73, 146-158.

Konstantinopoulos, G. (1988) 'Hippodamischer Stadtplan von Rhodos,' in S. Dietz and I. Papachristodoulou (eds.), *Archaeology in the Dodecanese*, Copenhagen, 88-95.

_____ (1990) 'Städtebau im Hellenistischen Rhodos,' in *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für Klassische Archäologie, Berlin 1988*, Mainz, 207-213.

Koomen, W. and M. Baehler (1996) 'National stereotypes: Common representations and ingroup favouritism,' *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26/2, 325-331.

Kopytoff, I. (1986) 'The cultural biography of things: commoditization as process,' in Appadurai, 1986, 64-91.

Köster, R. (1987) *Römische Bauornamentik in Milet*, (Unpubl. Thes.), Frankfurt.

Krauss, F. (1964) 'Die hellenistischen Bühnen des Theaters von Milet,' *RM*, 71, 112-129.

_____ (1973) *Das Theater von Milet*, Milet IV.1, Berlin.

Krauss, J. (1980) *Die Inschriften von Sestos und der thrakischen Chersones*, Bonn.

Kreikenbom, D. (1992) Griechische und römische Kolossalporträts bis zum späten ersten Jahrhundert nach Christus, Berlin.

Krischen, F. (1916) 'Die Orophernes-Halle in Priene,' *JdI*, 31, 306-309.

_____ (1922) *Milet, Vol. 3/2, Die Befestigungen von Herakleia am Latmos*, Berlin-Leipzig.

_____ (1923-4) 'Das hellenistische Gymnasium von Priene,' *JdI*, 38-39, 133-150.

_____ (1938) *Die griechische Stadt*, Berlin.

_____ (1941) *Antike Rathäuser*, Berlin.

Kubusch, K (1986) *Aurea Saecula, Mythos und Geschichte: Untersuchung eines Motivs in der antiken Literature bis Ovid*, Frankfurt.

Kuch, H. (1993) 'Continuity and change in Greek tragedy under postclassical conditions,' in Sommerstein et al., 1993: 545-557.

Kuenzi, A. (1923) *ΕΠΙΔΟΣΙΣ. Sammlung freiwilliger Beiträge zu Zeiten der Not in Athen*, Bern.

Kulenkampff, J. (1991) 'Notiz über die Begriffe "Monument" und "Lebenswelt",' in Assmann and Harth, 1991, 26-33.

Kyrieleis, H. (1975) *Bildnisse der Ptolemäer*, Berlin.

Lacy, C. (1982) *The Greek View of Barbarians in the Hellenistic Age as Derived from Representative Literary and Artistic Evidence from the Hellenistic Period*, Diss. Univ. Nebraska.

Lambrinoudakis, V. (1986) *Οικοδομικά Προγράμματα στην Αρχαία Αθήνα από το 479 έως το 431 π.Χ.*, Αθήνα.

Lamont and M. Fournier, M. (1992) 'Introduction,' in M. Lamont and M. Fournier (eds.) *Cultivating Differences: Symbolic Boundaries and the Making of Inequality*, Chicago-London.

Lanckoronski-Brzezie, K. G., G. Niemann and E. Petersen (1890-92) *Städte Pamphyliens und Pisidiens*, Wien.

Landucci Gattinoni, F. (1992) 'L' "immagine" di una città ellenistica: il caso di Priene,' in M. Sordi (ed.) *Autocoscienza e Rappresentazione dei Popoli nell'Antichità*, Milano, 83-92.

Lane, E. (1996) *Cybele, Attis and Related cults: Essays in Memory of M.J. Vermaseren*, New York.

Lang, F. (1996) *Archaische Siedlungen in Griechenland: Struktur und Entwicklung*, Berlin.

Langenstroer, M. (1992) 'Das Orakelheiligtum des Apollon in Klaros,' in O. Brehm and S. Klie (eds.), *Μουσικός Ανήρ: Festschrift für Max Wegner zum 90. Geburtstag*, Bonn, 243-258.

Lapalus, E. (1939) *L'Agora des Italiens*, Délos XIX, Paris.

Laum, B. (1914) *Stiftungen in der griechischen und römischen Antike: Ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte*, Leipzig.

Lauter, H. (1971) 'Reisentotizen aus Karien,' *BJb*, 171, 132-149.

_____ (1982) 'Struktur statt Typus. Zu einem hellenistischen Architekturmotiv,' *AA*, 1982, 703-724.

_____ (1986) *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*, Darmstadt.

Lawrence, A. W. (1979) *Greek Aims in Fortification*, Oxford-New York.

Lawrence, A. W. and R. A. Tomlinson (1996) *Greek Architecture*, 5th ed., New Haven-London.

Leach, E. (1982) *Social Anthropology*, London.

Lefebvre, H. and Nicholson-Smith, D. (1991) *The Production of Space*, Oxford.

Lenschau, T. (1889) *De Rebus Prienensium*, [Unknown Place].

_____ (1940) s. v. 'Timarchos,' *RE*, Suppl. VII, 1574.

Leriche, P. and H. Tréziny (1986) *La fortification dans l'histoire du monde grec: Actes du Colloque international La Fortification et sa place dans l'histoire politique, culturelle et sociale du monde grec, Valbonne, décembre 1982*, Paris.

Leschhorn, W. (1984) *Gründer der Stadt. Studien zu einem politisch-religiösen Phänomen der griechische Geschichte*, Stuttgart.

_____ (1993) *Antike Ären: Zeitrechnung, Politik und Geschichte im Schwarzmeerraum und in Kleinasien nördlich des Tauros*, Historia Einzelschriften 81, Stuttgart.

Lesky, A. (1972) *Die tragische Dichtung der Hellenen*, 3rd ed., Göttingen.

Lévêque, P. (1983) 'Doriens et monde égéen' *DialHistAnc*, 9, 341-348.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1953) 'Social structure,' in A. L. Kroeber (ed.) *Anthropology Today*, Chicago, 524-533.

Lévy, E. (1984) 'Naissance du concept de barbare'. *Ktema*, 9, 5-14.

_____ (1990) 'La cité grecque: invention moderne ou réalité antique?,' *CahGlotz*, 1, 53-67.

Lewin, K. (1948) *Resolving Social Conflicts*, New York.

Libero, L. de, (1996) *Die archaische Tyrannis*, Stuttgart.

Linfert, A. (1976) *Kunstzentren hellenistischer Zeit. Studien an weiblichen Gewandfiguren*, Wiesbaden.

_____ (1995) 'Prunkaltäre,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 131-146.

Lippstreu, J. (1993) 'Antiochos IV. von Syrien und Eumenes II. von Pergamon als Architekturstifter,' in Hoepfner and Zimmer, 1993: 126-133.

Lohmann, H. (1995) 'Survey in der Chora von Milet. Vorbericht über die Kampagnen der Jahre 1990, 1992 und 1993,' *AA*, 1995, 293-328.

Long, A. A. (1974) *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics*, London.

Longo, O. (1990) 'The theater of the polis,' in Winkler and Zeitlin, 1990: 12-19.

Lund, H. (1992) *Lysimachus: A Study in Early Hellenistic Kingship*, London.

Lygouri-Tolia, E. (2002) 'Excavating an ancient palaestra in Athens,' in M. Stamatopoulou and M. Yeroulanou (eds.) *Excavating Classical Culture: Recent Archaeological Discoveries in Greece*, Oxford, 203-212.

Lynch, K. (1972) *What Time is this Place?*, Cambridge.

Mackie, D.-M. and D.-L. Hamilton (1993) *Affect, Cognition, and Stereotyping: Interactive Processes in Group Perception*, San Diego, CA.

Magie, D. (1950) *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton.

Maier, F. G. (1959-61) *Griechische Mauerbauinschriften*, Vols. I-II, Heidelberg.

Malkin, I. (1987) *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*, Leiden.

Mallwitz, A. (1972) *Olympia und seine Bauten*, Munich.

_____ (1975) 'Gestalt und Geschichte des jüngeren Athenatempels von Milet,' *IstMitt*, 25, 67-90.

Mallwitz, A. and W. Schiering (1968) 'Der alte Athena-Tempel von Milet,' *IstMitt*, 18, 89-160.

Manganaro, G. (1963/4) 'Le iscrizioni delle isole Milesie,' *ASAtene*, 41/42, 293-349.

Mansel, A. M. (1968) 'Osttor und Waffenreliefs von Side (Pamphylien),' *AA*, 1968, 239-279.

Marchese, R. (1986) *The Lower Maeander Flood Plain: A Regional Settlement Study*, Oxford.

Marrou, H. I. (1965) *Histoire de l'education dans l'antiquité*, 6th ed. rev. and augm., Paris.

Martin, L. H. (1987) *Hellenistic Religions: An Introduction*, Oxford.

Martin, R. (1951) *Recherches sur l'agora grecque: Études d'histoire et d'architecture urbaines*, Paris.

_____ (1974) *L'urbanisme dans la Grèce antique*, 2nd ed., Paris.

_____ (1978) 'L'architecture d'époque classique en Asie Mineure,' in E. Akurgal (ed.) *The Proceedings of the Xth International Congress of Classical Archaeology, Ankara-Izmir, 23-30/IX/1973*, Türk Tarih Kurumu, Ankara, 493-505.

_____ (1983) 'L'espace civique, reliegieux et profane dans les cités greques de l'archaïsme à l'époque hellénistique,' in *Architecture et société: de l'archaïsme grec à la fin de la République romaine. Actes du colloque international organisé par le Centre national de la recherche scientifique et l'Ecole francaise de Rome, Rome 2-4 decembre 1980*, Paris-Rome, 9-35.

_____ (1987) *Architecture et Urbanisme*, Rome.

Martini, W. (1984) *Das Gymnasium von Samos*, Samos Vol. XVI, Bonn.

Martini, W. (1986) 'Vom Herdhaus zum Peripteros,' *JdI*, 101, 23-36.

Martorano, F. (1985) 'Il porto e l'ekklesiasterion di Reggio nel 344. Ricerche di topografia e di architettura antica su una polis italiota,' *RivStorCalabr*, 6, 231-257.

Matheson, S. B. and J. J. Pollitt (1994) *An Obsession with Fortune: Tyche in Greek and Roman Art*, New Haven, Conn.

Mathieu, G. (1925) *Les idées politiques d'Isocrate*, Paris.

Mayer, M. (1932) s.v. 'Miletos' (Topography), *RE*, XV, 1622-1655.

McCall, G. J. (1977) 'The social looking-glass: a sociological perspective on self-development,' in T. Mischel (ed.) *The Self: Psychological and Philosophical Issues*, Oxford.

McCall, G. J. and J. L. Simmons (1966) *Identities and Interactions*, New York.

McCredie, J. R. (1968) 'Samothrace: Prelininary report on the campaigns of 1965-1967,' *Hesperia*, 37, 200-234.

McCredie, H. R. (1971) 'Hippodamos of Miletos,' in D. G. Mitten, J. G. Pedley and J. A. Scott (eds.), *Studies Presented to George M. A. Hanfmann*, Mainz, 95-100.

McDonald, W. A. (1943) *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks*, Baltimore.

McNicoll, A. (1986) 'Developments in techniques of siegecraft and fortification in the Greek world ca. 400-100 BC,' in Leriche and Tréziny, 1986: 305-313.

McNicoll, A. and N. P. Milner (1997) Hellenistic Fortifications from the Aegean to the Euphrates, Oxford.

McShane, R. B. (1964) *The foreign policy of the Attalids of Pergamum*, Urbana.

Mehl, A. (1992) 'Erziehung zum Hellenen, Erziehung zum Weltbürger. Bemerkungen zum Gymnasion im hellenistischen Osten,' *Nikephoros*, 5, 43-73.

Meier, C. (1994) *Die Okzidentale Stadt nach Max Weber: zum Problem der Zuhörigkeit in Antike und Mittelalter*, Munich.

Meiggs, R. (1972) *The Athenian Empire*, Oxford.

Meinel, R. (1980) *Das Odeion*, Frankfurt.

Melas, E. M. (1989) 'Etics, emics and empathy in archaeological theory,' in I. Hodder (ed.) *The Meanings of Things. Material Culture and Symbolic Expression*, London, 137-155.

Mellor, R. (1975) *Θεά Ρώμη. The Worship of the Goddess Roma in the Greek World*, Göttingen.

Mercklin, E. v. (1962) *Antike Figuralkapitelle*, Berlin.

Meritt, B. D., H. T. Wade-Gery and M. F. McGregor (1939) *The Athenian Tribute Lists*, Vol. 1, Cambr. Mass.

Merkelbach, R. (1976) *Die Inschriften von Assos*, Bonn.

Mertens, D. (1982) 'Das Theater-Ekklesiasterion auf der Agora von Metapont,' *Architectura*, 1982, 93-124.

Mertens, D. and A. De Siena (1982) 'Metaponto: Il teatro-ekklesiasterion,' *BdA* Ser VI, 16, 1-60.

Métraux, G. P. R. (1978) *Western Greek Land-Use and City-Planning in the Archaic Period*, New York.

Metzler, D. (1985) 'Demokratie als Bauherr. Ideologische Aspekte der Architektur der Klassik,' in *Πρακτικά του 12ου Διεθνούς Συνεδρίου Κλασικής Αρχαιολογίας, Αθήνα 4-10 Σεπτεμβρίου 1983*, Athens, 129-133.

Middleton, D. and D. Edwards (1990) *Collective Remembering*, London.

Mielsch, H. (1995) 'Die Bibliothek und die Kunstsammlung der Könige von Pergamon,' *AA*, 1995, 765-779.

Mieth, K. (1993) 'Bauten der Tyrannen in archaischer Zeit,' in Hoepfner and Zimmer, 1993: 33-45.

Migeotte, L. (1984) *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques*, Québec-Paris.

_____ (1991) 'La pain quotidien dans les cités hellénistiques. A propos des fonds permanents pour l'approvisionnement en grain,' *CahGlotz*, 2, 19-41.

_____ (1992) *Les souscriptions publiques*, Québec-Genève.

_____ (1995) 'Finances et constructions publiques,' in Wörrle and Zancker, 1995: 79-85.

_____ (1997) 'L'évergétisme des citoyens aux périodes classique et hellénistique,' in M. Christol (ed.) *Actes du Xe Congrès international d'épigraphie grecque et latine, Nîmes, 4-9 octobre 1992*, Publications de la Sorbonne, Paris, 183-196.

Miles, M. (1998) *The City Eleusinion*, The Athenian Agora, Vol. 31, Princeton.

Miller, S. G. (1978) *The Prytaneion. Its Function and Architectural Form*, Berkeley.

Miro, B. C. E. (1963) 'I recenti scavi sul poggetto di S. Nicola in Agrigento,' *CronCatania*, 2, 57-63.

_____ (1967) 'L'ekklesiasterion in contrada S. Nicola di Agrigento,' *Palladio*, 17, 164-168.

_____ (1985-6) 'Il bouleuterion di Agrigento, aspetti topografici, archeologici e storici,' *QuadMess*, 1, 7-12.

_____ (1984-5) 'L'attività della Soprintendenza archeologica di Agrigento, anni 1980-4,' *Kokalos*, 30-31, 453-465.

Mirchell, S. (1990) 'Ariassos 1990,' *AnatSt*, 41, 159-172.

Mitchell, S and M. Waelkens (1987) 'Sagalassus and Cremna 1986,' *AnatSt*, 37, 37-47.

_____ (1988) 'Cremna and Sagalassus 1987,' *AnatSt*, 38, 53-65.

Mitchell, S, E. Owens and M. Waelkens (1989) 'Ariassos and Sagalassos 1988,' *AnatSt*, 39, 63-77.

Moggi, M. (1992) 'Greci e barbari. Uomini e no', in L. De Finis (ed.) *Civiltà Classica e Mondo dei Barbari: due Modelli a Confronto. Congr. Trento 1991*, Trento: 31-46.

Moretti, L. (1977) 'Mileto, le sue colonie e l'istituto dell'evergesia,' *RivFil*, 105, 5-11.

Morgan, C. (1993) 'The origins of Pan-Hellenism,' in N. Marinatos and R. Hägg (eds.), *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, London, 18-44.

Morgan, C. and J.J. Coulton (1997) 'The polis as a physical entity,' in Hansen, 1997: 87-144.

Morpurgo Davies, A. (1987) 'The Greek notion of dialect,' *Verbum*, 10, 7-28.

Morricone, L. (1950) 'Scavi e ricerche a Coo (1935-1943): Relazione preliminare,' *BdA*, 35, 219-246.

Morris, I. (1988) 'Tomb cult and the "Greek Renaissance": the past in the present in 8th century BC,' *Antiquity*, 62, 750-761.

Mossé, C. (1993) 'Les "polykrateia erga" a Samos. Un exemple d'architecture tyrannique?,' in J. Des Courtils and J.-C. Moretti (eds.), *Les grands ateliers d'architecture dans le monde égéen du VIe siècle av. J.-C.: Actes du Colloque d'Istanbul, 23-25 mai 1991*, Istanbul-Paris, 77-82.

Mounin, G. (1970) *Introduction a la Semiologie*, Paris.

Mukařovský, J. (1978) 'On the problem of functions in architecture,' in J. Burbank and P. Steiner (eds.) *Structure, Sign and Function. Selected Essays by Jan Mukařovský*, New Haven, 236-250.

Müller, D. (1997) *Topographischer Bildkommentar zu den Historien Herodots. Vol. 2. Kleinasien und angrenzende Gebiete mit Südostthrakien und Zypern*, Tübingen.

Müller, H. (1995) 'Bemerkungen zu Funktion und Bedeutung des Rats in den hellenistischen Städten,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 41-54.

Müller, W. (1989) *Architekten in der Welt den Antike*, Zurich and Munich.

Müller-Wiener, W. (1977/8) 'Milet 1973-1975. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten der Jahre 1973 und 1975, 1. Michaelskirche und Dionysos-Tempel. Baubefunde und Phasengliederung,' *IstMitt*, 27-28, 94-103.

_____ (1981) 'Milet 1980. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten des Jahres 1980, 1. Arbeiten im Stadtgebiet,' *IstMitt*, 31, 96-105.

_____ (1986a) 'Bemerkungen zur Topographie des archaischen Milet,' in W. Müller-Wiener (ed.) *Milet 1899-1980: Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung: Kolloquium Frankfurt am Main 1980*, Tübingen, 95-104.

_____ (1986b) 'Milet 1985. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten des Jahres 1985,' *IstMitt*, 36, 5-7.

_____ (1986c) 'Zur Erforschung der hellenistischen Monumente Milets,' in W. Müller-Wiener (ed.) *Milet 1899-1980: Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung. Kolloquium Frankfurt am Main 1980*, Tübingen, 121-128.

_____ (1987) 'Milet 1986. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten des Jahres 1986,' *IstMitt*, 37, 5-79.

_____ (1988a) 'Milet 1987. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten des Jahres 1987,' *IstMitt*, 38, 251-290.

_____ (1988b) 'Milet 1976-1986. Ergebnisse aus 10 Jahren Ausgrabungstätigkeit,' *AW*, 19 Nr.4, 31-42.

Müller-Wiener, W. and B. F. Weber (1985) 'Milet 1983-1984. Arbeiten im Stadtgebiet,' *IstMitt*, 35, 13-23.

Müller-Wiener, W. and W. Voigtländer (1980) 'Milet 1978 - 1979. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten der Jahre 1978 und 1979, 1. Arbeiten im Stadtgebiet,' *IstMitt*, 30, 24-38.

Müller-Wiener, W., F. J. Henninger and W. Koenigs (1979) 'Milet 1977. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten des Jahres 1977,' *IstMitt*, 29, 161-173.

Mumford, L. (1961) *The City in History: Its Origins, its Transformations, and its Prospects*, New York.

Mummendey, A. and H.-J. Schreiber (1984) 'Social comparison, similarity and ingroup favouritism: A replication,' *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 14/2, 231-3.

Murray, O. (1990) 'Cities of reason,' in Murray and Price, 1990: 1-25.

Murray, O. and S. Price (1990) *The Greek City from Homer to Alexander*, Oxford.

Musti, D. (1985) 'Pubblico e privato nella democrazia periclea,' *QuadUrbin*, 20, 7-17.

Nachtergael, G. (1977) *Les Galates en Grèce et les Sôtéria de Delphes: recherches d'histoire et d'épigraphie hellénistiques*, Bruxelles.

Nauhardt, W. (1940) *Das Bild des Herrschers in der griechischen Dichtung*, Berlin.

Naumann, R. and F. Naumann (1973) *Der Rundbau in Aezani mit dem Preisedikt des Diocletian und das Gebäude mit dem Edikt in Stratonikeia*, Tübingen.

Naumann, R. and K. Tuchelt (1963/64) 'Die Ausgrabung im Südwesten des Tempels von Didyma 1962,' *IstMitt*, 13/14, 15-62.

Nerone, J. (1989) 'Professional history and social memory,' *Communication*, 11, 89-104.

Nichols, D. L. and T. H. Charlton (1997) *The Archaeology of City-States: Cross-Cultural Approaches*, Washington.

Niemeier, W. D. and B. Niemeier (1997) 'Milet 1994-1995. Projekt "Minoisch-mykenisches bis protogeometrisches Milet." Zielsetzung und Grabungen auf dem Stadionhügel und am Athenatempel,' *AA*, 1997, 189-248.

Niemeier, W. D., A. M. Greaves and W. Selesnow (1999) '"Die Zierde Ioniens." Ein archaischer Brunnen, der jüngere Athenatempel und Milet vor der Perserzersörung,' *AA*, 1999, 373-413.

Niese, B. (1893-1903) *Geschichte der griechischen und makedonischen Staaten seit der Schlacht von Chaeronea*, Gotha.

Niethammer, L. (1993) 'Die postmoderne Herausforderung: Geschichte als Gedächtnis im Zeitalter der Wissenschaft,' in J. Rusen, W. Kuttler, E. Schulin et al (eds.) *Geschichtsdiskurs*, Vol. 1, Frankfurt, 31-49.

Nilsson, N. M. P. (1906) *Griechische Feste von religiöser Bedeutung mit Ausschluss der attischen*, Leipzig.

_____ (1951) *Cults, Myths, Oracles and Politics in Ancient Greece*, Lund.

_____ (1955) *Die hellenistische Schule*, Munich.

_____ (1967-74) *Geschichte der griechischen Religion*, 3rd ed., Vols. I-II Munich.

Nippel, W. (1991) 'Max Weber's "The city" revisited,' in Emlen et al., 1991: 19-30.

Nora, P. (1984) *Les Lieux de Mémoire*, Paris.

_____ (1989) 'Between memory and history: Les lieux de mémoire,' *Representations*, 26, 7-25.

Nora, P. and L. D. Kritzman (1996) *Realms of Memory: Rethinking the French Past*, New York.

Ober, J. (1985) *Fortress Attica: Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier, 404-322 B.C*, Leiden.

Oehler, J. (1925) s. v. 'Leiturgie,' *RE*, XII.2, 1871-1879.

Oikonomides, A. N. (1980) 'Attic choregic inscriptions,' *AncWorld*, 1980, 17-22.

Oliver, P. (1975) *Shelter, Sign, and Symbol*, London.

Olshausen, E. (1974) *Prosopographie der hellenistischen Königsgesandten. 1. Von Triparadeisos bis Pydna*, Louvain.

Onians, J. (1988) *Bearers of Meaning: The Classical Orders in Antiquity, the Middle Ages, and the Renaissance*, Princeton.

Orlandos, A. K. (1953) 'Ανασκαφή Σικυώνος,' *Prakt*, 1953, 184-190.

Orsi, P. (1922) 'Reggio Calabria. Scoperta di antico odeon,' *NSc*, 168-171.

Orth, W. (1977) *Königlicher Machtanspruch und städtische Freiheit. Untersuchungen zu den politischen Beziehungen zwischen den ersten Seleukidenherrschern, Seleukos I., Antiochos I., Antiochos II., und den Städten des westlichen Kleinasien*, Munich.

_____ (1983) 'Zum Gymnasium im römerzeitlichen Ägypten,' in H. Heinen (ed.) *Althistorische Studien, Hermann Bengtson zum 70. Geburtstag dargebracht von Kollegen und Schülern*, Wiesbaden, 223-232.

Otto, W., (1913) s. v. 'Herakleides (No. 32),' *RE*, VIII, 465-468.

Owens, E. J. (1991) *The City in the Greek and Roman World*, London-New York.

Pagenstecher, R. (1919) *Über das landschaftliche Relief bei den Griechen*, Heidelberg.

Palmer, L. R. (1980) *The Greek Language*, London.

Papenfuss, D. and V. M. Strocka (1982) *Palast und Hütte: Beiträge zum Bauen und Wohnen im Altertum von Archäologen, Vor- und Frühgeschichtlern : Ta-*

gungsbeiträge eines Symposiums der Alexander von Humboldt-Stiftung, Bonn-Bad Godesberg, veranstaltet vom 25.-30. November 1979 in Berlin, Mainz.

Parker-Pearson, M. and C. Richards (1994) 'Ordering the world: perceptions of architecture, space and time,' in M. Parker-Pearson and C. Richards (eds.) *Architecture and Order: Approaches to Social Space*, London, 1-37.

Parzinger, H. (1989) 'Zur frühesten Besiedlung Milets,' *IstMitt*, 39, 415-431.

Patronos, S. G. (2000) 'Overview of developments in the study of Priene,' in *Δώρημα. A Tribute to the A. G. Leventis Foundation on the Occasion of its 20th Anniversary*, Nicosia, 3-26.

Pedersen, P. (1989) 'Some general trends in architectural layout of 4th c. Caria,' in T. Linders and P. Hellstro"m (eds.), *Architecture and Society in Hecatomnid Caria, Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium, 1987*, Uppsala, 9-14.

_____ (1991) *The Maussolleion at Halikarnassos. Reports of the Danish Archaeological Expedition to Bodrum, Vol. 3/1-2, The Maussolleion Terrace and Accessory Structures*, Aarhus.

Pedersen, P. (1994) 'The Ionian Renaissance and some aspects of its origin within the field of architecture and planning,' in Isager, 1994: 11-35.

Pedley, J. G. (1990) *Paestum. Greeks and Romans in Southern Italy*, London.

Penning-Rowsell, E.and D. Lowenthal (1986) *Landscape Meanings and Values*, London.

Perdue, C.-W., J.-F. Dovidio, M.-B. Gurtman et al. (1990) 'Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias,' *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59/3, 475-486.

Pernier, L. (1935) *Il tempio e l'altare di Apollo a Cirene: Scavi e studi dal 1925 al 1934*, Bergamo.

Petronotes, A. (1973) *Η Μεγάλη Πόλις της Αρκαδίας*, Athens.

Pfrommer, M. (1983) 'Milet 1982. Zur Typologie der Miniaturhydrien vom Humeitepe,' *IstMitt*, 79-89.

_____ (1987) 'Überlegungen zur Baugeschichte des Naiskos im Apollontempel zu Didyma,' *IstMitt*, 37, 145-185.

_____ (1989) 'Zum Fries des Dionysostempels von Milet,' *IstMitt*, 39, 433-439.

Philadelpheus, A. (1926) 'Note sur le bouleutérion(?) de Sicyone,' *BCH*, 50, 174-182.

Phinney, J. S. (1990) 'Ethnic identity in adolescents and adults: review of research,' *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 499-514.

Pickard-Cambridge, A. (1988) *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*, 2nd ed. rev. by J. Gould and D. M. Lewis, Oxford.

Piérart, M. (1969) 'Les *ἐπιμήνιοι* de Milet,' *AntCl*, 38, 365-388.

_____ (1985) 'Athènes et Milet, 2. L'organisation du territoire,' *MusHelv*, 42, 276-299.

Pimouguet, I. (1995) 'Défense et territoire. L'exemple Milésien,' *DialHistAnc*, 21.1, 89-109.

Pinkwart, D. (1980) Review of Linfert, 1976, *Gnomon*, 52, 41-48.

Plassart, A. (1928) *Les sanctuaires et les cultes du Mont Cynthe*, Délos XI, Paris.

Pleket, H.W. (1981) 'Religious history as the history of mentality. The believer as servant of the deity in the Greek world,' in H. S. Versnel (ed.) *Faith, hope and worship. Aspects of religious mentality in the ancient world*, Leiden, 152-192.

Pleket, H. W. et al. (1983) *Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum*, Vol. 33, Amsterdam.

Pohlenz, M. (1934) *Antikes Führertum: Cicero De officiis und das Lebensideal des Panaitios*, Leipzig-Berlin.

Poland, F. (1909) *Geschichte des griechischen Vereinswesens*, Leipzig.

_____ (1934) s. v. 'Technitai,' *RE*, V.A, 2474-2558.

Polignac, F. d. (1995) *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State*, Transl. of French original [1984] by J. Lloyd, London.

Polito, E. (1998) *Fulgentibus Armis: Introduzione allo studio dei fregi d'armi antichi*, Rome.

Pollitt, J. J. (1972) *Art and Experience in Classical Greece*, Cambridge.

_____ (1986) *Art in the Hellenistic Age*, Cambridge.

Pomtow, H. (1924) s. v. 'Delphoi,' *RE*, Suppl. IV, 1189-1432.

Posner, R. (1991) 'Kultur als Zeichensystem. Zur semiotischen Explikation kulturwissenschaftlicher Begriffe,' in Assmann and Harth, 1991, 37-74.

Powell, A. (1988) *Athens and Sparta: Constructing Greek Political and Social History from 478 BC*, London.

Pozzi, D. C. and J. M. Wickersham (1991) *Myth and the polis*, London.

Préaux, C. (1956) *Institutions économiques et sociales des villes hellénistiques: principalement en Orient*, Bruxelles.

_____ (1978) *Le monde hellénistique: la Grèce et l'Orient de la mort d'Alexandre à la conquête romaine de la Grèce, 323-146 av. J.-C*, Paris.

Preziosi, D. (1979) *The Semiotics of the Built Environment: An Introduction to Architectonic Analysis*, Bloomington.

Price, S. (1984) *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia Minor*, Cambridge.

_____ (1986) 'The history of the Hellenistic world,' in J. Boardman, J. Griffin and O. Murray (eds.), *The Oxford History of the Classical World*, Oxford, 315-337.

Pritchett, W. K. (1979) *The Greek State at War*, Berkeley-London.

Proshansky, H.-M., A.-K. Fabian and R. Kaminoff (1983) 'Place-identity: Physical world socialization of the self,' *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3/1, 57-83.

Pullan, R. P. and C. T. Newton (1891) *Antiquities of Ionia IV*, London.

Quaß, F. (1979) 'Zur Verfassung der griechischen Städte im Hellenismus,' *Chiron*, 9, 37-52.

_____ (1993) *Die Honoratiorenschicht in den Städten des griechischen Ostens: Untersuchungen zur politischen und sozialen Entwicklung in hellenistischer und römischer Zeit*, Stuttgart.

Raaflaub, K. (1997) 'Soldiers, citizens and the evolution of the early Greek polis,' in L. G. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes (eds.), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, London, 49-59.

Radley, A. (1990) 'Artefacts, memory and a sense of the past,' in Middleton and Edwards, 1990: 46-59.

Radt, W. (1993) 'Landscape and Greek urban planning. Exemplified by Pergamon and Priene,' in M. Kristensen Thomas (ed.) *City and Nature. Changing Relations in Time and Space*, Odense, 201-209.

_____ (1998) 'Recent research in and about Pergamon,' in H. Koester (ed.) *Pergamon, Citadel of the Gods: Archaelogical Record, Literary Description, and Religious Development*, Harrisburg, Pa., 1-40.

_____ (1999) *Pergamon. Geschichte und Bauten einer antiken Metropole*, Darmstadt.

Radt, W. and J. de Luca (1999) *Sondagen im Fundament des großen Altars*, Berlin-New York.

Raeck, W. (1995) 'Der mehrfache Apollodoros. Zur präsenz des Bürgers im hellenistischen Stadtbild am Beispiel von Priene,' in Wörrle and Zanker, 1995: 233-240.

Raeder, J. (1984) *Priene. Funde aus einer griechischen Stadt im Berliner Antikenmuseum*, Berlin.

Real, W. (1977/8) 'Milet 1973-1975. Vorbericht über die Arbeiten der Jahre 1973 und 1975, 2. Ausgewählte Funde aus dem Dionysos-Tempel,' *IstMitt*, 27-28, 105-116.

Regling, K. L. and H. Dressel (1927) *Die Münzen von Priene*, Berlin.

Rehm, A. (1926a) 'Bericht über eine Reise nach den Inseln Ioniens vom 21. August bis 22. Dezember 1924,' *Sitzungsberichte der preußischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, X-XV, 90-94.

_____. (1926b) 'Untersuchungen auf den Inseln Ioniens,' *Gnomon*, 2, 123-124.

_____ (1929) 'Die milesischen Inseln,' in Wiegand et al., 1929: 19-26.

_____ (1958) *Die Inschriften*, Didyma II, Berlin.

Rehm, A. and P. Herrmann (1997) *Inschriften von Milet*, Milet VI.1, Berlin-New York.

Reisch, E. (1905) s. v. 'Dreifuss,' *RE*, V, 1669-1696.

Reynolds, J. (1982) *Aphrodisias and Rome: Documents from the Excavation of the Theatre at Aphrodisias conducted by Professor Kenan T. Erim, together with some Related Texts*, London.

Rheidt, K. (1992) 'Die Obere Agora. Zur Entwicklung des hellenistischen Stadtzentrums von Pergamon,' *IstMitt*, 42, 235-285.

_____ (1996) 'Pergamenische Ordnungen. Der Zeustempel und seine Bedeutung für die Architektur der Attaliden,' in E.-L. Schwandner (ed.) *Säule und Gebälk: zu Struktur und Wandlungsprozess griechisch-römischer Architektur. Bauforschungskolloquium in Berlin vom 16. bis 18. Juni 1994*, Mainz, 162-180.

Rhodes, R. F. (1995) *Architecture and meaning on the Athenian Acropolis*, Cambridge.

Ridgway, B. S. (2000) *Hellenistic Sculpture II – The Styles of ca. 200-100 B.C.*, Madison Wisconsin.

Ridley, R. T. (1979) 'The hoplite as citizen,' *AC*, 48, 508-548.

Riegl, A. (1982) 'The modern cult of monuments: its character and its origin [1903],' *Oppositions*, 25.

Riemann, H. (1963) s.v. 'Pytheos,' *RE*, XXIV, 371-513.

Rigsby, K. J. (1996) *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*, Berkeley-London.

Robert, L. (1937) *Études anatoliennes: recherches sur les inscriptions grecques de l'Asie mineure*, Paris.

_____ (1939) 'Inscriptions grecques d'Asie Mineure,' in W. M. Calder and J. Keil (eds.) *Anatolian Studies Presented to W. H. Buclker*, Manchester, 227-248.

_____ (1940) *Hellenica: recueil d'épigraphie de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*, Vol. 1, Limoges.

_____ (1944) 'Hellenica: XX. Décrets de Priène,' *RPh*, 18, 5-10.

_____ (1954) *La Carie. Histoire et Géographie Historique avec le Recueil des Inscriptions Antiques. Tome II. Le Plateau de Tabai et ses Environs*, Paris.

Robert, L. (1967) 'Sur des inscriptions d'Éphèse: fêtes, athlètes, empereurs, épigrammes,'*RevPhil*, 93/41, 7-84.

_____ (1969a) 'Les inscriptions,' in J. Des Gagniers (ed.) *Laodicée du Lycos: le nymphée; campagnes 1961-1963*, Québec-Paris, 247-389.

_____ (1969b) 'Thèophane de Mytilène à Constantinople,' *CRAI*, 1969, 42-64.

_____ (1969c) *Opera Minora Selecta: épigraphie et antiquités grecques*, Vol. I, Amsterdam.

_____ (1970) Rev. of Maier, 1959-61, *Gnomon*, 42, 579-603.

Robertson, N. (1987) 'Government and society at Miletus, 525-442 B.C,' *Phoenix*, 41, 356-398.

Röhlig, J. (1933) *Der Handel von Milet*, Hamburg.

Rolley, C. (1999) *La sculpture grecque, 2, La période classique*, Paris.

Romane, J. P., (1994) 'Alexander's sieges of Miletus and Halicarnassus,' *AncWorld*, 25, 61-76.

Romano, D. G. (1985) 'The Panathenaic stadium and the theater of Lykourgos. A re-examination of the facilities on the Pnyx hill,' *AJA*, 89, 441-454.

Romano, I. B. (1980) *Early Greek Cult Images*, Ann Arbor, Mich.

Romilly, J. d. (1968) 'Guerre et paix entre cités,' in J. P. Vernant (ed.) *Problèmes de la guerre en Grèce ancienne*, Paris, 207-220.

_____ (1993) 'Les Barbares dans la pensée de la Grèce classique'. *Phoenix*, 47: 283-292.

Rosenberg, S. and M. Gara (1985) 'The multiplicity of personality identity,' *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 6, 87-113.

Rostovtzeff, M. (1939) 'Some remarks on the monetary and commercial policy of the Seleucids and the Attalids,' in W. Calder and J. Keil (eds.) *Anatolian Studies Presented to William Hepburn Buckler*, Manchester, 277-298.

_____ (1953) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Vols. I-III, Oxford.

Rotroff, S. I. and J. M. (1996) 'The date of the third period of the Pnyx,' *Hesperia*, 65, 263-294.

Roussel, P. and M. Launey (1937) *Inscriptions de Délos: Décrets postérieurs a 166 av. J.C., nos. 1497-1524 - Dédicaces postérieurs a 166 av. J.C., nos. 1525-2219*, Paris.

Rowlands, M. (1993) 'The role of memory in the transmission of culture,' *World Archaeology*, 25, 141-151.

Rumscheid, F. (1994) *Untersuchungen zur kleinasiatischen Bauornamentik des Hellenismus*, Mainz.

_____ (1999) 'Vom Wachsen antiker Säulenwälder. Zu Projektierung und Finanzierung antiker Bauten in Westkleinasien und anderswo,' *JdI*, 114, 19-63.

Rumscheid, F. and W. Koenigs (1998) *Priene: A Guide to the 'Pompeii of Asia Minor*,' Istanbul.

Runciman, W. G. (1990) 'Doomed to extinction: the polis as an evolutionary dead-end,' in Murray and Price, 1990: 347-367.

Ruschenbusch, E. (1985) 'Die Zahl der griechischen Staaten und Arealgrösse und Bürgerzahl der Normalpolis,' *ZPE*, 59, 233-237.

Ruskin, J. (1989) *The Seven Lamps of Architecture* [1880], New York.

Rust, E. (1993) 'Dorisch, ionisch, korinthisch,' in Hoepfner and Zimmer, 1993: 102-110.

Ruzicka, S. (1997) 'The eastern Greek world,' in L. A. Tritle (ed.) *The Greek World in the Fourth Century: From the Fall of the Athenian Empire to the Successors of Alexander*, London, 107-136.

Rykwert, J. (1966) 'The Corinthian order,' *Arena*, 1966, 7-10.

Şahin, M. Ç. (1972) *Die Entwicklung der griechischen Monumentalaltäre*, Bonn.

Salviat, F. (1959) 'Décrets pour Épié fille de Dionysios: déesses et sanctuaires thasiens,' *BCH*, 83, 362-397.

Sarbin, T.-R. (1983) 'Place identity as a component of self: An addendum,' *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 3/4, 337-342.

Schaaf, H. (1992) *Untersuchungen zu Gebäudestiftungen in Hellenistischer Zeit*, Köln.

Schachter, A. (2000) 'Greek deities: local and Panhellenic identities,' in *Hansen, 1998:* 9-17.

Schädler, U. (1991a) 'Attizismen an ionischen Tempeln Kleinasiens,' *IstMitt*, 41, 265-324.

_____ (1991b) 'Zur Entstehung der attischen Basis und ihrer Verwendung im kleinasiatischen Tempelbau,' in *Studien zum antiken Kleinasien. Friedrich Karl Dörner zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet*, Bonn, 91-110.

Schalles, H. J. (1982) 'Die hellenistische Umgestalltung der Athener Agora im 2. Jh. v. Chr. Asudruck von Rationalität oder entpolitisierung?' *Hephaistos*, 4, 97-116.

_____ (1985) *Untersuchungen zur Kulturpolitik der pergamenischen Herrscher im 3. Jdt. v. Chr.*, Tübingen.

Schazmann, P. (1923) *Das Gymnasion. Der Tempelbezirk der Hera Basileia*, Altertümer von Pergamon, VI, Berlin.

Schede, M. (1934) 'Heiligtümer in Priene,' *JdI*, 49, 97-108.

Schede, M., G. Kleiner and W. Kleiss (1964) *Die Ruinen von Priene: Kurze Beschreibung*, Zweite Auflage durchgesehen und verbessert von G. Kleiner und W. Kleiss, Berlin.

Scheer, T. S. (1993) *Mythische Vorvater: zur Bedeutung griechischer Heroenmythen im Selbstverständnis kleinasiatischer Städte*, Munich.

Schenk, G. (1993) 'Stadtentwicklung und Stadtbegrenzung,' in Hoepfner and Zimmer, 1993: 17-32.

Schenk, R. (1996) 'Zur Bezeichnung "korinthisches Kapitell",' *AA*, 1996, 53-59.

_____ (1997) *Der korinthische Tempel bis zum Ende des Prinzipats des Augustus*, Leidorf.

Schiering, W. (1975) 'Die minoisch-mykenische Siedlung in Milet vor dem Bau der grossen Mauer,' *IstMitt*, 25, 9-15.

_____ (1979) 'Milet. Eine Erweiterung der Grabung östlich des Athenatempels,' *IstMitt*, 29, 77-108.

_____ (1984) 'The connections between the oldest settlement at Miletus and Crete,' in The Minoan Thalassocracy. Myth and Reality. Proceedings of the 3rd International Symposium at the Swedish Institute in Athens, 31 May - 5 June, 1982, Stockholm, 187-188.

_____ (1986) 'Zu den Beziehungen zwischen der ältesten Siedlung von Milet und Kreta,' in W. Müller-Wiener (ed.) *Milet 1899-1980 : Ergebnisse, Probleme und Perspektiven einer Ausgrabung: Kolloquium Frankfurt am Main 1980*, Tübingen, 11-15.

Schipporeit, S. T. (1998) 'Das alte und das neue Priene. Das Heiligtum der Demeter und die Gründungen Prienes,' *IstMitt*, 48, 193-236.

Schlesier, R. (1997) s. v. 'Dionysos,' *Neue Pauly*, 3, 651-662.

Schmaltz, B. (1995) '"Aspectus" und "effectus," Hermogenes und Vituv,' *RM*, 102, 133-140.

Schmitt, H. H. (1969) *Die Staatsverträge des Altertums*, Vol. 3, *Die Verträge der griechisch-römischen Welt von 338 bis 200 v. Chr.*, Munich.

Schmitthenner, W. (1968) 'Über eine Formveränderung der Monarchie seit Alexander dem Grossen,' *Saeculum*, 19, 31-46.

Schneider, C. (1997) 'Grabung and der Stadtmauer 1995,' *AA*, 1997, 134-136.

Schneider, P. (1987) 'Zur Topographie der Heiligen Strasse von Milet nach Didyma,' *AA*, 1987, 101-129.

_____ (1988) 'Aus einem archaischen Bezirk an der Heiligen Strasse von Milet nach Didyma. Das Tonziegeldach des Ostbaues,' in *Bericht über die 34. Tagung für Ausgrabungswissenschaft und Bauforschung*, Karlsruhe, 16-19.

Schubart, W. (1937a) 'Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri,' *APF*, 12, 1-26.

_____ (1937b) 'Das Königsbild des Hellenismus,' *Die Antike*, 13, 272-288.

Schuchhardt, C. (1886) 'Kolophon, Notion und Klaros,' *AM*, 12, 398-434.

Schuller, W., W. Hoepfner and E. L. Schwandner (1989) *Demokratie und Architektur: der hippodamische Städtebau und die Entstehung der Demokratie. Konstanzer Symposion vom 17. bis 19. Juli 1989*, Munich.

Schwabl, H. (1962) *Grecs et Barbares: Six Exposés et Discussions, Vandoeuvre s- Genève, 4-9 septembre 1961*, Fondation Hardt Entretiens 8, Geneva.

Schwandner, E. L. (1990) 'Beobachtungen zur hellenistischen Tempelarchitektur von Pergamon,' in Hoepfner and Schwandner, 1990: 85-102.

Scranton, R. (1974) 'Vitruvius' arts of architecture,' *Hesperia*, 43, 494-499.

Scully, S. (1990) *Homer and the Sacred City*, Ithaca-London.

Scully, V. (1979) *The Earth, the Temple and the Gods. Greek Sacred Architecture*, New Haven and London.

Senff, R. (1992) 'Die Grabung auf dem Zeytintepe,' *IstMitt*, 42, 105-108.

_____ (1995a) 'Die Grabung am Kalabaktepe,' *AA*, 1995, 208-213.

_____ (1995b) 'Sondierungen am Südhang des Mengerevtepe ('Assesos'),' *AA*, 1995, 224-228.

Senff, R. and M. Heinz (1997) 'Arbeiten am Zeytintepe im Jahre 1994,' *AA*, 1997, 114-118.

Senff, R., B. Hürmüzlü and F. Songu (1997) 'Die Grabung auf dem Gipfelplateau des Kalabaktepe 1995,' *AA*, 1997, 122-124.

Septis, F. De, M. Scaparro, P. Ciancio Rosetto et. al. (1994-6) *Teatri greci e romani: alle origini del linguaggio rappresentato*, Rome.

Sfameni Gasparro, G. (1985) *Soteriology and Mystic Aspects in the Cult of Cybele and Attis*, Leiden.

Shanks, M. (1996) *Classical Archaeology of Greece: Experiences of the Discipline*, London.

_____ (1998) 'The life of an artifact in an interpretive archaeology,' *Fennoscandia Archaeologica*, 15, 15-30.

Shear Jr., T. L. (1978) 'Tyrants and buildings in Archaic Athens,' in W. A. P. Childs (ed.) *Athens Comes of Age: From Solon to Salamis. Papers of a Symposium Sponsored by the Archaeological Institute of America, Princeton Society and the Department of Art and Archaeology, Princeton University*, Princeton, N.J., 1-15.

Shear, L. T. (1993a) 'Public buildings for the Cleisthenic democracy,' Paper read at the APA/AJA conference at Washington D.C. 28 December 1993.

_____ (1993b) 'The Persian destruction of Athens. Evidence from Agora deposits,' *Hesperia*, 62, 418-429.

Sherk, P. K. (1969) *Roman Documents from the Greek East. Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus*, Baltimore.

Sherwin-White, S. M. (1985) 'Ancient Archives. The Edict of Alexander to Priene. A Reappraisal,' *JHS*, 105, 69-89.

Sherwin-White, S. and A. Kuhrt (1993) *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*, London.

Shipley, G. (2000) *The Greek World after Alexander, 323-30 BC*, London.

Simon, E. (1983) *Festivals of Attica: An Archeological Commentary*, Madison.

Sinclair, T. A. (1952) *A History of Greek Political Thought*, London.

Sjoberg, G. (1960) *The Preindustrial City, Past and Present*, Glencoe.

Smith, A. D. (1986) *The Ethnic Origins of Nations*, Blackwell, Oxford.

_____ (1995) 'The formation of national identity,' in H. Harris (ed.) *Identity: Essays based on Herbert Spencer lectures given in the University of Oxford*, Oxford, 129-153.

Smith, P. F. (1977) *The Syntax of Cities*, London.

_____ (1979) *Architecture and the Human Dimension*, London.

Smith, R. R. R. (1988) *Hellenistic Royal Portraits*, Oxford.

_____. (1993) 'Kings and philosophers,' in Bulloch et al., 1993: 202-211.

Snodgrass, A. M. (1971) *The Dark Age of Greece*, Edinborough.

_____ (1977) *Archaeology and the Rise of the Greek State: An Inaugural Lecture*, Cambridge.

_____ (1991) 'Archaeology and the study of the Greek city,' in J. Rich and A. Wallace-Hadrill (eds.), *City and Country in the Ancient World*, Routledge, London, 1-23.

_____ (1986) 'The historical significance of fortification in Archaic Greece,' in Leriche and Tréziny, 1986: 125-131.

Sokolowski, F. (1955) *Lois sacrées de l'Asie Mineure*, Paris.

Sommerstein, A. H., S. Halliwell, J. Henderson and B. Zimmermann (1993) *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis. Papers from the Greek Drama Conference, Nottingham 18-20 July 1990*, Bari.

Sonne, W. (1993) 'Der politische Aspekt von Architektur,' in Hoepfner and Zimmer, 1993: 11-16.

Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (1988) 'Further aspects of polis religion,' *AnnAStorAnt*, 10, 259-274.

_____ (1990) 'What is polis religion?,' in Murray and Price, 1990: 295-322.

Stack, J. F. (1986) *The Primordial Challenge: Ethnicity in the Contemporary World*, New York.

Stähler, K. (1978) 'Überlegungen zur architektonischen Gestalt des Pergamonaltares,' in S. Sahin, E. Schwertheim and J. Wagner (eds.), *Studien zur Religion und Kultur Kleinasiens: Festschrift für Friedrich Karl Dörner zum 65. Geburtstag am 28. Februar 1976*, Leiden, 838-867.

Stambaugh, J. E. (1972) *Sarapis under the early Ptolemies*, Leiden.

Stampolides, N. (1985) 'Βωμοί-θρόνοι(;) Τυπολογική κατάταξη μιας ομάδας βωμών σχήματος Π με παραστάδες και συνεχόμενο θρανίο από τη γεωμετρική περίοδο ώς τα χρόνια του Αυγούστου και η πιθανή καταγωγή του αρχικού τύπου της,' *AAA*, 18, 231-245.

_____ (1987) *Ο Βωμός του Διονύσου στην Κω: Συμβολή στη μελέτη της Ελληνιστικής Πλαστικής και Αρχιτεκτονικής*, Athens.

Stanton, G. and B. Forsén (1996) *The Pnyx in the History of Athens. Proceedings of an International Colloquium at Athens, 7-9 October 1994*, Helsinki.

Steuben, H. v. (1981) 'Seleukidische Kolossaltempel,' *AntW*, 12/3, 3-12.

Stewart, Z. (1977) 'La religione,' in R. Bianchi Bandinelli (ed.) *Storia e civiltà dei Greci*, Vol. 8, *La società ellenistica. Economia, diritto, religione*, Milano, 503-616.

Stough, C. L. (1969) *Greek Skepticism: A Study in Epistemology*, Berkeley.

Straaten, M. v. (1946) *Panétius: sa vie, ses écrits et sa doctrine avec une édition des fragments*, Amsterdam.

Straten, F. v. (1993) 'Images of gods and men in a changing society: self-identity in Hellenistic religion,' in Bulloch et al., 1993: 248-264.

Stryker S. and R. Serpe (1982) 'Commitment, identity salience and role behavior: theory and research example,' in W. Ickes and E. Knowles (eds.) *Personality, Roles and Social Behavior*, New York, 199-218.

Stucchi, S. (1975) *Architettura cirenaica*, Roma.

Stümpel, H., C. Bruhn, F. Demirel, et al. (1997) 'Stand der geophysikalischen Messungen im Umfeld von Milet,' *AA*, 1997, 124-134.

Stümpel, H., F. Demirel, W. Rabbel and e. al. (1999) 'Geophysikalische Prospektion im Umfeld von Milet 1996-1997,' *AA*, 1999, 89-98.

Suleiman, S. R. and I. K. Crosman (1980) *The Reader in the Text: Essays on Audience and Interpretation*, Princeton.

Svencickaya, I. (1996) 'Der Stadtmensch der hellenistischen Zeit: Erscheinungsbild und Lebensweise,' in B. Funck (ed.) *Hellenismus. Beitrage zur Erforschung von Akkulturation und politischer Ordnung in den Staaten des hellenistischen Zeitalters. Akten des Internationalen Hellenismus-Kolloquiums, 9.-14. Marz 1994 in Berlin*, Tübingen, 611-627.

Svenson-Evers, H. (1996) *Die griechischen Architekten archaischer und klassischer Zeit*, Frankfurt.

Szidat, J. (1980) 'Hippodamos von Milet. Seine Rolle in Theorie und Praxis der griechischen Stadtplannung,' *BJb*, 180, 31-44.

Taeger, F. (1957) *Charisma; Studien zur Geschichte des antiken Herrscherkultes*, Stuttgart.

Tajfel, H. (1978) *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the SocialPsychology of Intergroup Relations*, London-New York.

_____ (1981) *Human Groups and Social Categories: Studies in Social Psychology*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

_____ (1982) *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations*, Cambridge.

Tajfel, H. and J. Turner (1979) 'An integrative theory of intergroup conflict,' in W. Austin and S. Worchel (eds.) *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Monterey CA, 33-47.

Talamo, C. (1969) 'Istieo ed Erodoto. Per la storia della tirannide a Mileto,' *RendNap*, 44, 173-203.

Tancke, K. (1989) *Figuralkassetten griechischer und römischer Steindecken*, Frankfurt.

Tarn, W. W. and G. T. Griffith (1966) *Hellenistic Civilisation*, 3rd ed., London.

Themelis, P. (1996) 'Damophon,' *YaleClSt*, 30, 154-185.

Thomas, J. (1995) 'Culture and identity,' in G. Barker (ed.) *Companion Encyclopedia of Archaeology*, Vol. 1, London-New York, 431-469.

_____ (1996) *Time, Culture and Identity: An Interpretive Archaeology*, London.

Thompson, H. A. (1937) 'Buildings at the west side of the Agora,' *Hesperia*, 6, 1-226.

_____ (1982a) 'Architecture as a medium of public relations among the successors of Alexander,' in B. Barr-Sharrar and N. Borza (eds.) *Macedonia and Greece in Late Classical and Early Hellenistic Times*, Washington, 173-189.

_____ (1982b) 'The Pnyx in models,' in *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool*, Princeton, 133-147.

Thompson, H. A. and R. E. Wycherley (1972) *The Athenian* Agora, Vol. XIV, *The Agora of Athens*, Princeton.

Thompson, K. (1986) *Beliefs and Ideology*, Chichester.

Threpsiades, I. and E. Vanderpool (1964) 'Themistokles' sanctuary of Artemis Aristoboule,' *ADelt*, 19, 26-36.

Tilley, C. Y. (1989) 'Interpreting material culture,' in I. Hodder (ed.) *The Meanings of Things. Material Culture and Symbolic Expression*, London: 185-194.

_____ (1991) *Material Culture and Text: The Art of Ambiguity*, London.

_____ (1994) *A Phenomenology of Landscape: Places, Paths and Monuments*, Oxford.

_____ (1999) *Metaphor and Material Culture*, Oxford.

Tod, M.N. (1948) *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, Vol. 2, Oxford.

Tölle-Kastenbein, R. (1990) *Antike Wasserkultur*, Munich.

_____ (1994) *Das Olympieion in Athen*, Köln.

Tomlinson, R. A. (1963) 'The Doric order. Hellenistic critics and criticism,' *JHS*, 83, 133-145.

_____ (1992) *From Mycenae to Constantinople. The Evolution of the Ancient City*, London.

Torelli, M. (1998) 'L'Asklepieion di Messene, lo scultore Damofonte e Pausania,' in G. Capecchi (ed.) *In memoria di Enrico Paribeni*, G. Bretschneider, Roma, 465-483.

Travlos, J. (1971) *Pictorial Dictionary of Ancient Athens*, London.

Triebel-Schubert, C. and U. Muss (1983-4) 'Hippodamos von Milet. Staatstheoretiker oder Stadtplaner?,' *Hephaistos*, 5-6, 37-59.

Trigger, B. G. (1990) 'Monumental architecture: a thermodynamic explanation of symbolic behaviour,' *World Archaeology*, 22/2, 119-132.

Tsakos, K. (1994) 'Κεραμική από ένα σαμιακό αποθέτη της ύστερης ελληνιστικής περιόδου,' in L. Kypraiou (ed.) *Ελληνιστική κεραμική από το Αιγαίο*, Mytilene, 146-163.

Tuan Y.-F. (1977) *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*, Minneapolis.

Tuchelt, K. (1970) *Die archaischen Skulpturen von Didyma. Beiträge zur frühgriechischen Plastik in Kleinasien*, Berlin.

_____ (1973) *Vorarbeiten zu einer Topographie von Didyma: eine Untersuchung der inschriftlichen und archäologischen Zeugnisse*, Tübingen.

_____ (1975) 'Buleuterion und Ara Augusti. Bemerkungen zur Rathausanlage von Milet,' *IstMitt*, 25, 91-140.

_____ (1976) s. v. 'Didyma,' in W. L. McDonald, M. H. McAllister and R. Stillwell (eds.) *The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites*, Princeton, 272-273.

_____ (1984) 'Didyma. Bericht über die Arbeiten der Jahre 1980-1983,' *IstMitt*, 34, 193-344.

_____ (1988) 'Die Perserzerstφrung von Branchidai-Didyma und ihre Folgen archäologisch betrachtet,' *AA*, 1988, 427-438.

_____ (1991) 'Branchidai-Didyma: Geschichte, Ausgrabung und Wiederentdeckung eines antiken Heiligtums, 1765 bis 1990,' *AW*, Sondernummer 1991.

Tuchelt, K., P. Schneider and T. Schattner (1989) 'Didyma. Bericht über die Ausgrabungen 1985 und 1986 an der heiligen Strasse von Milet nach Didyma,' *AA*, 1989, 143-217.

_____ (1996) *Didyma, 3, 1. Ein Kultbezirk an der Heiligen Strasse von Milet nach Didyma*, Mainz.

Turner, J. C. (1984) 'Social identification and psychological group formation,' in H. Tajfel (ed.) *The Social Dimension: European Developments in Social Psychology*, vol. 2, Cambridge, 518-538.

_____ (1991) *Social Influence*, Buckingham.

Turner, J. C., M. A. Hogg, P. J. Oakes et al. (1987) *Rediscovering the Social Group: A Self-Categorization Theory*, Oxford.

Turner, J. C., P. J. Oakes, S. A Haslam et al. (1994) 'Self and collective: Cognition and social context,' *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20, 454-463.

Turner, J. C., R. J. Brown and H. Tajfel (1979) 'Social comparison and group interest in ingroup favouritism,' *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 9/2, 187-204.

Usener, H. (1874) 'Ein Epigramm von Knidos,' *RhM*, 29, 25-50.

Vale, L. J. (1992) *Architecture, Power, and National Identity*, New Haven-London.

Vallois, R. (1929) 'L'ekklèsiasterion et l'*οἶκος ὁ πρὸς τῶι ἐκκλησιαστηρίωι*,' *BCH*, 53, 278-312.

Vansina, J. (1985) *Oral Tradition as History*, London.

Veblen, T. (1970) *The Theory of the Leisure Class: An Economic Study of Institutions* [1899], London.

Vermaseren, M. J. (1977) *Cybele and Attis: The Myth and the Cult*, Transl. from Dutch by A. M. H. Lemmers, London.

Vermeule III, C. C. (1965) 'A Greek theme and its survivals. The ruler's shield (tondo image) in tomb and temple,' *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society*, 109, 361-397.

Vernant, J. P. (1982) *Myth and Society in Ancient Greece*, London.

Veyne, P. (1986) 'Une évolution du paganisme gréco-romain. Injustice et piété des dieux, leurs ordres ou "oracles",' *Latomus*, 45, 259-283.

_____ (1990) *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*, English abridged edition of French original [1976] with translation by B. Pearce and introduction by O. Murray, London.

Vogt, J. (1967) *Kulturwelt und Barbaren. Zum Menschheitsbild der spätantiken Gesellschaft*, Wiesbaden.

Voigtländer, W. (1975a) Der jüngste Apollontempel von Didyma: Geschichte seines Baudekors, Tübingen.

_____ (1975b) 'Die mykenische Stadtmauer in Milet und einzelne Wehranlagen der späten Bronzezeit,' *IstMitt*, 25, 17-34.

_____ (1982) 'Funde aus der Insula westlich des Buleuterion in Milet,' *IstMitt*, 32, 30-173.

_____ (1985) 'Zur Topographie Milets. Ein neues Modell zur antiken Stadt,' *AA*, 1985, 77-91.

_____ (1990) 'Vorklassische Baugedanken in spät- und nachklassischer Architektur Kleinasiens,' in *Akten des XIII. Internationalen Kongresses für klassische Archäologie, Berlin, 1988*, Zabern, Mainz, 414-416.

Walbank, F. W. (1972) *Polybius*, Berkeley-London.

_____ (1979) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, Vols. I-III, Oxford.

_____ (1984) 'Monarchies and monarchic ideas,' in F. W. Walbank, et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge Ancient History - The Hellenistic World*, Vol. VII.1, Second Edition, Cambridge, 62-100.

_____ (1992) *The Hellenistic World*, 3rd revised ed., London.

_____ (1993) 'Response [to part one],' in Bulloch et al., 1993: 116-124.

Wallis, M. (1975) *Arts and Signs*, Bloomington.

Walter-Karydi, E. (1996) 'Die Nobilitierung des griechischen Wohnhauses in der spätklassischen Zeit,' in Hoepfner and Brand, 1996: 56-61.

_____ (1998) *The Greek house: The Rise of Noble Houses in Late Classical Times*, The Archaeological Society at Athens library ; no 171, Athens.

Ward-Perkins, J. B. (1974) *Cities of Ancient Greece and Italy: Planning in Classical Antiquity*, London.

Waywell, G. B. (1978) *The Free-standing Sculptures of the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus*, London.

Webb, P. A. (1996) *Hellenistic Architectural Sculpture: Fugural Motifs in Western Anatolia and the Aegean Islands*, Madison.

Weber, B. F. (1985) 'Milet 1983-1984. Die Grabung im Heroon III,' *IstMitt*, 35, 24-38.

_____ (1989) 'Zum Laodikebau in Milet,' *IstMitt*, 39, 585-592.

_____ (1995) 'Ein spätarchaischer Tempel auf dem Mengerevtepe bei Milet,' *AA*, 1995, 228-238.

_____ (1996) 'Zum spätarchaischen Tempel auf dem Mengerevtepe bei Milet,' in Säule und Gebälk. Zu Struktur und Wandlungsprozess griechisch-römischer Architektur. Bauforscungskolloquium in Berlin vom 16. bis 18. Juni 1994, Mainz, 84-89.

Weber, B. F. (1999) 'Die Bauteile des Athenatempels in Milet,' *AA*, 1999, 415-438.

Weber, M. (1921) 'Die Stadt. Eine soziologische Untersuchung,' *Archiv von Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik*, 47, 621-772.

_____ (1993) 'Zur Überlieferung der Goldelfenbeinstatue des Phidias im Parthenon,' *JdI*, 108, 83-122.

Webster, T. B. L. (1970) *Studies in Later Greek Comedy*, 2nd ed., Manchester.

Weickert, C. (1957) 'Die Ausgrabung beim Athena-Tempel in Milet 1955,' *IstMitt*, 7, 102-132.

Weickert, C., P. Hommel and G. Kleiner (1959/60) 'Die Ausgrabung beim Athena-Tempel in Milet 1957,' *IstMitt*, 9-10, 1-96.

Weinrich, P. (1983) 'Psychodynamics of personal and social identity,' in A. Jacobson-Widding (ed.) *Identity, Personal and Socio-Cultural*, Stockholm, 159-185.

Welles, C. B. (1934) *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, New Haven.

Welskopf, E. C. (1974) *Hellenische Poleis; Krise, Wandlung, Wirkung*, Berlin.

Welwei, K. W. (1963) *Könige und Königtum im Urteil des Polybios*, Herbede.

_____ (1974) *Unfreie im antiken Kriegsdienst*, Stuttgart.

Wesenberg, B. (1999) 'Virginis peculia. Zu Vitruvs Aitiologie des korinthischen Kapitells,' *AA*, 1999, 313-315.

Whitehead, D. (1977) *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*, Cambridge.

Whitehead, D. (1994) *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius: Sources for the Ancient Greek Polis*, Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre 1, Stuttgart.

Whitley, J. (1988) 'Early states and hero cults: a re-appraisal,' *JHS*, 58, 173-182.

_____ (1995) 'Tomb cult and hero cult. The uses of the past in Archaic Greece,' in N. Spencer (ed.) *Time, Tradition and Society in Greek Archaeology. Bridging the 'Great Divide'*, London – N.Y., 43-63.

Wiegand, T. (1901) 'Ausgrabungen zu Milet,' *AA*, 1901, 191-199.

_____ (1902) 'Zweiter vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen der Königlichen Museen zu Milet,' *AA*, 1902, 147-155.

_____ (1905) *Vierter vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen der Königlichen Museen zu Milet*, Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 25, Berlin.

_____ (1908) *Sechster vorläufiger Bericht über die von den Königlichen Museen in Milet und Didyma unternommenen Ausgrabungen*, Berlin.

Wiegand, T. and H. Schrader (1904) *Priene. Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen und Untersuchungen in den Jahren 1895-1898*, Berlin.

Wiegand, T. and R. Kekulé v. Stradonitz (1904) *Dritter vorläufiger Bericht über die von den Königlichen Museen begonnenen Ausgrabungen in Milet*, Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Berlin.

Wiegand, T., K. Krause, A. Rehm and P. Wilski (1929) *Die milesische Landschaft*, Milet II.2, Berlin.

Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, U. v. (1906) 'Panionion,' in Sitzungsberichte der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Berlin, 38-57.

Wilhelm, A. (1914) 'Urkunden aus Messene,' *ÖJh*, 17, 1-120.

_____ (1942) 'Proxenie und Euergesie,' in *Attische Urkunden*, Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien. Philosophisch-Historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte 220. Bd., 5. Abh., Wien, 11-86.

Will, E. (1956) *Doriens et Ioniens. Essai sur la valeur du critère ethnique appliqué à l'étude de l'histoire et de la civilisation greques*, Paris.

Williams, C. (1974) 'The Corinthian Temple of Zeus Olbios at Uzuncaburç. A Reconsideration of the Date,' *AJA*, 78, 405-414.

Wilski, P. (1906) *Karte der Milesischen Halbinsel (1:50000) mit erläuterndem Text, Milet I.1*, Berlin.

Wilson, P. J. (1988) *The Domestication of the Human Species*, New Haven - London.

Winkler, J. and F. I. Zeitlin (1990) *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in its Social Context*, Princeton N. J.

Winter, F. E. (1971a) *Greek Fortifications*, London.

_____ (1971b) 'The indented trace in later Greek fortifications,' *AJA*, 75, 413-426.

Winter, N. A. (1993) *Greek Architectural Terracottas from the Prehistoric to the End of the Archaic Period*, Oxford.

Winzor, C. E. (1996) *The Architectural Patronage of the Attalids and Ptolemies*, unpubl. D.Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford.

Witt, R. E. (1971) *Isis in the Graeco-Roman world*, London.

_____ (1997) *Isis in the Ancient World*, Baltimore-London.

Wörrle, M. (1988) 'Inschriften von Herakleia am Latmos, 1. Antiochos III., Zeuxis und Herakleia,' *Chiron*, 421-470.

Wörrle, M. and P. Zanker (1995) *Stadtbild und Bürgerbild im Hellenismus. Kolloquium, München, 24. bis 26. Juni 1993*, Munich.

Wulf, U. (1994) 'Der Stadtplan von Pergamon. Zu Entwicklung und Stadtstruktur von der Neugründung unter Philetairos bis in spätantike Zeit,' *IstMitt*, 44, 135-175.

Wurster, W.W. and M. Wörrle (1978) 'Die Stadt Pinara,' *AA*, 1978, 74-101.

Wycherley, R. E. (1962) *How the Greeks Built Cities*, 2nd ed., London.

Yeroulanou, M. (2001) *The Architecture of Greek Treasures and Other Foreign Dedications: Stylistic Developments and the Role of Dedicating States and Workshops*, Unpublished D. Phil. Thesis, University of Oxford.

Young, P. H. (1981) *Building Projects and Archaic Greek Tyrants*, Ann Arbor.

Zgusta, L. (1984) *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen*, Heidelberg.

Ziebarth, E. (1914) *Aus dem griechischen Schulwesen. Eudemos von Milet und Verwandtes*, Berlin.

_____ (1919), *Kulturbilder aus griechischen Städten*, I[3], Leipzig.

Ziegler, K. (1937) s. v. 'Timarchos,' *RE*, VI A, 1236-1238.

Zimmermann, K. (1990) 'Zu den Dachterrakotten griechischer Zeit aus Histria,' in P. Alexandrescu and W. Schuller (eds.) *Histria. Eine Griechenstadt an der rumänischen Schwarzmeerküste*, Konstanz.

Zinserling, G. (1985) 'Das Akropolisbauprogramm des Perikles. Politische Voraussetzungen und ideologischer Kontext,' in E. Kluwe (ed.) *Kultur und Fortschritt in der Blütezeit der griechischen Polis. Internationales Kolloquium, Tbilissi 22.10.1980*, Berlin, 206-246.

Zipf, G. K. (1965) *Human Behavior and the Principle of Least Effort: An Introduction to Human Ecology*, New York.

PLATES