whether Matala, a much more convenient port than Lebena, remained for long in the hands of the Gortynians after this event, but the armed rivalry between Phaistos and Gortyn was in any case terminated when Phaistos was destroyed by Gortyn after ca. 183 B.C.93 Perhaps Phaistos continued to serve as an administrative center.94 Rule of the western Mesara coastline, in any case, must have passed on to Gortyn. It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that Kommos and any other neighboring communities or centers, including modern Kalamaki to the north (Hope Simpson 1995: 369–72, site no. 5) and Matala to the south, were at least by then under direct Gortynian control. The flourishing of the sanctuary during the LH period, including the construction of Room A1 and Buildings B and E, was, therefore, presumably under Gortyn’s aegis and probably with its active encouragement and involvement. The spread of intense activity during the Hellenistic period and later in the Matala area becomes especially noticeable, as reported by Richard Hope Simpson (1995: 397–400).

The next major political event in local history came when Gortyn sided with Rome in its struggle with the opposing alliance of independent Cretan states (Guarducci 1950: 26–27). Although the army led by the first general sent by Rome, Mark Antony (the father of the better-known son), was completely defeated, five years later (in 69 B.C.) forces under Quintus Caecilius Metellus invaded Crete near Kydonia (modern Chania) and, after initial victories there, set about eliminating resistance on the entire island. In the process Knossos and other centers were occupied. Gortyn, however, was honored as early as 27 B.C. for its loyalty to the Romans, when it was established as the chief city of Crete and at the same time the center of a Roman provincial administration that included Cyrenaica in North Africa. This arrangement brought increasing wealth and prestige to Gortyn, which henceforth became the largest city in Crete, prospering until ca. A.D. 824, when it was captured and partially destroyed by Saracen pirates.

DESTRUCTION AND DESERTION95

While speculation about the destruction at Kommos is perilous, some possible causes can still be examined briefly. For instance, it is possible that the buildings were looted and then burned during a piratical raid, even though in the period concerned piracy was at a low ebb owing to the Romans’ vigilance in keeping the sea lanes open.96 There may also have been a raid by a rival territorial group (e.g., Gortyn) in Phaistian land.97 If the time of destruction has been correctly ascertained, however, Gortyn had conquered Phaistos a century earlier. Moreover, after the Roman conquest of Crete, armed rivalries on the island were probably all but eliminated. Possibly a series of unrelated single events, separated by time gaps of a generation or two, destroyed the buildings. Such gaps cannot be discerned given the present state of stylistic analysis of LH pottery in Crete, although in the future evidence from a site rich in coins may provide the necessary control.

Another possibility is an earthquake, which can in its various manifestations collapse walls, cause roofs to fall in, and be accompanied by fire. For Building E to fit this pattern,
even without evidence for collapsed walls in or around it, we must imagine that E was destroyed while a fire or lamp was lit in one of the rooms, and that the fire was not stifled by falling material but, somehow, spread to the roof structure. Lightning might have had a similar effect. If the destruction of E, however, is contemporary with that of Building B, Room A1, and Temple C, then it seems unlikely that lightning would have struck all the buildings at about the same time. Earthquake would, therefore, seem more likely as a cause, assuming that it occurred when a source of fire could spread within the three contiguous buildings northwest of E.

One possible earthquake candidate is the one that apparently leveled the city walls at Gortyn, some 18 km away, at a time when the pottery forms closely approximated those in use at Kommos. Twelve associated coins date to the period 36–30 B.C., and the earthquake probably falls within the period 36–25 B.C. (Allegro and Picciardi 1988: 12–113). However, aside from the fallen segment of wall within the eastern room of Building B at Kommos, there is no other evidence for the sudden collapse and displacement of walls in the Kommos sanctuary, and so this suggestion can be only tentative.

After the damage to the buildings occurred came the “squatter” phase (J. W. Shaw, Chap. 1, Section 5). Room A1 remained unused, Building E was deserted save for its northern annex, and Building B was used on an upper level. It is curious that no attempt was made on the part of Gortyn or some other local authority to rebuild the sanctuary during a time of affluence and peace, and an explanation must be sought.

When Gortyn became capital of Crete and Cyrenaica in 27 B.C., it also became the residence of an imperial procurator in whose person all real authority resided. In other words, the city ceased to conform to the strict polis model. It thus no longer needed to integrate _sity_ (town) and _chora_ (countryside) within a network of important state sanctuaries of a type best described by François de Polignac (1995: 32–41, especially p. 39). The contemporary establishment of a Roman _colonia_ at Knossos had similar drastic effects on religious practices. The only evidence is from the urban shrines, but the pattern of disruption is clear. The shrine of Glaukos and the so-called Temple of Rhea fell into disuse, and religious observances at the Temple of Demeter were transformed.

Even without the imposition of direct Roman rule, loss of political independence could lead to the dilapidation of monumental rural sanctuaries. The Menelaion near Sparta fell into virtual disuse and disrepair as the city’s fortunes declined. In Attica the picture was even more dramatic. Several important temples from Acharnai, Sounion, and elsewhere were transferred in whole or part into the center of Athens during the Augustan period (Camp 1986: 184–87). There is good evidence that the Temple of Ares, at least, was partly ruined at the time of its translation into the city.

Concerning settlement during the Hellenistic and ER periods in the western Mesara, the Kommos survey (see Hope Simpson 1995: 398–99) determined that there was a dramatic shift of population during the transition from one period to the next. North of Kommos some
thirteen Hellenistic sites were replaced by only two Roman ones. South of Kommos the population concentrated at Vígles and Matala, the port of the latter probably providing enough livelihood to encourage people to move there and to desert the countryside. It is likely that religious centers were established or expanded at both of those sites. Concerning religious sites outside Vígles and Matala (and aside from Kommos), the small Hellenistic shrine of Demeter at Kamili may have gone into decline (Platon 1957: 335; Egglezou 1988–89, for the figurines; Cucuzza 1997: 64–66). At Aghida Triada recent work by Vincenzo La Rosa has determined that the small shrine in the Piazzale dei Sacelli was built during the fourth century B.C. (La Rosa 1989), but worship there, as well as at the Shrine of Zeus Velkanos, seems to have ended before the Roman period (Banti 1941–43: 69; Sanders 1976: 137; La Rosa 1988–89: 268; Cucuzza 1997: 80). At Evangelistria near Kalamaki, however, it is possible that the Temple to Artemis may have been built during ER times, although only excavation could establish the actual date (Hope Simpson 1995: 369–72).

It is little wonder, given the tendency toward centralization at the beginning of the Roman period in the western Mesara, that there was neither the need nor the desire to rebuild the damaged buildings at Kommos. Worship was to continue there, however, but only sporadically and without substantial sponsorship until ca. A.D. 160–170, after which the site was deserted. Vígles was deserted at about the same time, with the result that, outside the Matala valley and with the possible exception of Kalamaki, the entire countryside became virtually empty.

Notes

1. For a short review of types of offerings and those who may have brought them, see J. W. Shaw in press b.
2. Constantine Yavis (1949: 128–30, 203, 237, 251) lists six “Hollow Ceremonial Altars” from the pre-Classical period, all in Magna Graecia, and three from the Classical and post-Classical periods. Most were set outside temples, but one was set within a temple; one contained layers of burnt bone. All, according to Yavis, were connected with worship of the chthonic gods. To be added now is the square altar in front of the Hekatompedon at Eretria (Rupp 1983: 106). Something similar is an almost square enclosure (3.95 \times 3.65 m) found in the Athenian Agora, with a variety of ceramic offerings and some jewellery (Shear 1973: 360–69), although there is no immediate connection with the temple. For other characterizations of altars, see also Cassimatis et al. 1991: 273; Rupp 1991: 57.
3. Whereas Altar U at Kommos contained thousands of bits of burnt bone and much ash, that at Kato Syme presented a different situation. This altar (2.70 \times 2.20 m) was apparently not immediately connected with a temple and enclosed a pit (0.55 \times 0.73 m and 0.50 m deep; Lembessi 1972: 193–203). Unusually deep layers of burning and bone remains indicate animal sacrifice outside the pit. The pit itself, however, was almost free of bone, leading the excavator to believe that the enclosure was intended for liquid offerings, as in the temple at Locri cited by Constantine Yavis (1949: 128), perhaps for the victims’ blood.

The Kato Syme and Kommos altars were built above ground and outdoors. To this extent they contrast with the deep pits lined with ashlar masonry found at Gortyn and Lebena. At Gortyn one of the pits is placed in the center of the cella of the temple on the acropolis (Pl. 8.7; Rizza and...
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Santa Maria Scrinari 1968: 43, 44, 48, 57); the other was off-axiss within the cells of the Archaic Temple of Apollo itself (Savignoni et al. 1907: 227; Pernier and Banti 1947: 21; Colini 1974: passim). At Lebena the so-called treasury in the floor of a room adjacent to the cells of the Temple of Asklepios is also of this type (Halbherr 1901: 306; Pernier and Banti 1947: 72).

The function of these pits remains unknown since they were found empty of identifying remains, but storage of money and precious items (the pits in the Temples of Apollo and Asklepios were probably closed with capping stones) and/or the pouring of liquid offerings are the most likely possibilities. Some scholars refer to the pits as 

Estia and eschara can be used as synonyms (Banti 1947: 21; Colini 1974: passim). At Lebena the so-called treasury in the floor of a room may have quite different meanings in different contexts (D. M. Robinson and Graham 1946: 458–adjacent to the cella of the Temple of Asklepios is also of this type (Halbherr 1901: 306; Pernier 59; Amyx 1958: 129). “Hearth,” usually a rather neutral word in English, simply meaning the floor or area of a place where a fire is lit, is used here to avoid the varied connotations of either of the two Greek terms.

The significance of the hearth within the (the pits in the Temples of Apollo and Asklepios were probably closed with capping stones) and/or the pouring of liquid offerings are the most likely possibilities. Some scholars refer to the pits as 

Estia and eschara can be used as synonyms (Banti 1947: 21; Colini 1974: passim). At Lebena the so-called treasury in the floor of a room may have quite different meanings in different contexts (D. M. Robinson and Graham 1946: 458–adjacent to the cella of the Temple of Asklepios is also of this type (Halbherr 1901: 306; Pernier 59; Amyx 1958: 129). “Hearth,” usually a rather neutral word in English, simply meaning the floor or area of a place where a fire is lit, is used here to avoid the varied connotations of either of the two Greek terms.

The question of the hearth-altar as it appeared in various temples has also been dealt with at some length by Constantine Yavis (1949: 59–70), who cited some seven actual examples of which those from Crete at the time of his writing (Rizza and Santa Maria Scrinari 1968: 99–142). It is thought to have been used from the eighth century B.C.

6. The most elaborate altars in Crete are stepped, a Roman one (Pl. 8.6) with five steps around it in front of the Temple of Apollo at Gortyn (4.62 × 3.73 m and 1.09 m high; Yavis 1949: Group 71; Sanders 1982: 79) and the stepped altar north of the Dictynnaion (Welter and Jantzén 1951: 112).

7. Interior altars are rare in Crete. One of the best known is the Geometric keraton altar from Dero, a rough enclosure of slabs built up next to the platform on which the three famous sphyl-erelon bronze figures were apparently discovered. Within the enclosure were many horns of young goats, no doubt the horns of the sacrificed victims (S. Marinatos 1936: 242–44, fig. 18). No evidence of a similar custom was found at Kommos, although some horn cores were recovered in various parts of the sanctuary (Reese, Chap. 6, Table 6.1).

8. Estia and eschara can be used as synonyms or may have quite different meanings in different contexts (D. M. Robinson and Graham 1946: 458–459; Amyx 1958: 229; Sparkes 1962: 129). “Hearth,” usually a rather neutral word in English, simply meaning the floor or area of a place where a fire is lit, is used here to avoid the varied connotations of either of the two Greek terms.

9. The significance of the hearth within the early Greek temples has been investigated by various scholars, especially Martin Nilsson (1937) and Margherita Guarducci (1937). Guarducci emphasized that the interior hearth was the result of earlier Mycenaean influence from the Mainland. Nilsson concluded that in Early Iron Age temples the hearth on which the sacrificial meat was cooked was first within the temple, but that later the tendency was to move it outside. His view could agree with our evidence from Temples A and B. Perhaps, as cited by Nilsson (1937: 46–47) from a later inscription pertaining to sacrifice at Kos, the larger sacrifices were made outdoors with only a small part being burned in the interior of the temple. This could be the case when we consider late Temple B and Temple C, which feature both interior hearths and exterior altars.

Birgitta Bergquist, however, believes (1973: 61; personal correspondence) that the term “hearth-altar” is not an accurate one, since, basically, she questions the temple function of certain buildings, such as Temple C at Kommos, where banqueting took place and which “had not been erected primarily as the house of (the image of) the god but as a house to accommodate banquet-ing worshippers, and the hearth had not been
arranged primarily for sacrifices but for lighting and heating purposes." Her argument, however, is weakened by the evidence from Kommos, where the interior hearths had a clear (but not exclusive) use as places for burnt offerings and/or sacrifice, by the presence of Altar U just east of Temple B (massive indication of sacrifice), and, for the Temple C period, the cult statue on its base within the building as well as the altars in the court east of the temple.

10. The same feature within a building can be referred to as a base, platform, bench, or a similar term, depending upon one’s interpretation of the function of a particular structure.

11. Wooden plank benches are known from the Mainland (Goldstein 1982: 299 f.; see also Tomlinsen 1980: 227). That wooden planks were used to span the gaps between the supports placed around the room in Phase 4 of Temple C is, I think, proven by the relative position of the supports.

12. For general references to comparative material on Crete and on the Mainland (much of it earlier), see Drerup 1969; especially pp. 5 ff., with discussions of the Dreros and Kavousi temples as well as the Temple of Hera Limenia at Perachora and that of Apollo Pythaeus at Asine. See also Mazarakis-Ainian 1997: passim, and the text following.

13. Luisa Banti studied later structures, similar to the Late Minoan shrine discovered at Agia Triada (Banti 1941–43: esp. pp. 40–48, fig. 27). Constantine Yavis (1949: 58) believed that the Mycenaean tradition of hearths continued into later times. Barbara Hayden (1981: 152–53) sees in the Geometric/Archaic temples at Dreros and Prinias a reflection of the earlier bench sanctuary known from LM IIIA–B times, a conclusion strengthened by the recent discoveries at Kephala Vasilikis (Ellopoulos 1998). For the variety and development of such buildings, see Mazarakis-Ainian 1997: 381–92.

14. For room plans in houses in some ways comparable to that of Temple C and Room A1 at Kommos, see Smari as well as the “house” in the northwestern court at Phaistos (n. 17). Also at Phaistos, but further south, is a Hellenistic house (6.20 × 8.00 m) with a column on either side of a rectangular hearth (as at Kommos) and a very narrow wall bench (D. Levi 1965–66: 381, fig. 77, pl. IV; see as well 1969: 153–76). See also the Hellenistic houses with hearths at Lato (Hadjimichalis 1971: 167–222, especially p. 178, fig. 9 [House D], p. 180, fig. 11 [House E], and p. 182, fig. 12 [hearths in the two Prytaneion houses]). See also the impluvium (actually a hearth?) in a house at Praisos (Bosanquet 1901–2: pl. XI). The Cretan hearths are quite similar to Greek hearths on the Mainland (D. M. Robinson and Graham 1946: 186–88); at Olynthus they were located invariably in the kitchens.

15. Two buildings on Crete have been identified as prytaneia. That excavated by Stylianos Alexiou is at Aghia Pelagia, a large Hellenistic building (ca. 15 m long and 6.30 m wide) without an interior bench (there may, however, have been wooden benches that have left no trace) but with four hearths. Another there, of the Archaic period, is set axially (Alexiou 1972a: 235 f.; 1972b: 620; 1973: 472–73, 1973–74: 883–85), and the possibility is raised that the prytaneion may have served as well as a dining hall (andron) for the common meals. For the Prytaneion at Lato, see the discussion in the text following.

16. The temple at Dreros (Pl. 8.13; S. Marinatos 1936; Beyer 1976) and Temple A from Prinias (Pl. 8.15; Perrier and Banti 1947; Stucchi 1974; Beyer 1976), to be dealt with in more detail later (under “Temple C and the Dreros Temple Type”) are the best known. Both temples have fine central hearths of the slab-on-edge variety, but only that at Prinias can be shown to have had a possible bench (a stand?), a short one at the center of a side wall (a large couch 6.80 m × 1.20 m) or a longer one (0.85 m wide and 0.45 m high) encircling most of the interior, was found by Angeliki Lembessi at Afrati (1969: 415–18; 1970: 455–60).

17. Perrier 1904: 349, fig. 14; 1933–34: 480, fig. 16; Perrier and Banti 1947: 64; Di Vita et al. 1984: fig. 91. (The hearth is not indicated on some of the plans.) See also Viviers 1994: fig. 5.

18. For the Prytaneion at Lato, see Demargne 1903: 206–31, pls. IV–V (plan). For a detailed re-consideration of the building, with an updated bibliography and new plans and photographs, see Ducrey and Picard 1972. See also Miller 1978.

19. Ducrey and Picard 1972: 579, n. 19. Stephen G. Miller, however, would restore eleven smaller couches (0.85 × 1.85 m; 1978: 82, fig. 5).

20. This section dealing with faunal evidence for animal sacrifice, based on David S. Reese’s work (Chap. 6), has been thoroughly reviewed and partly rewritten by him and should be con-
sidered a joint enterprise of the two of us. For a general bibliography in scholarly literature dealing with Greek sacrifice, see Svenbro 1989.  
21. It is with the idea of making this new source available that the analyses by David S. Reese in Chapter 6 are so detailed, and they are provided so that some of our own material sources can be used by others who can both check some of our findings and also notice nuances in ritual activity that may have escaped us as we concentrated more upon general appearances and development. Tables 6.1 and 6.2 and Pls. 6.1–6.6 have been provided to indicate the relative frequency of various species and the location and numbers of the body parts identified.  
22. Specifications concerning the timing of sacrifice on the religious calendar, the sex of the animals, as well as the gods to which the various animals were to be sacrificed were at times extremely complex in the Greek world. See, for example, information on the religious calendar inscription from Erchia in Attica (Daux 1963; Dow 1965; Jameson 1965).  
23. At Gela a set of knives, presumably used for slaughtering, were actually dedicated in a sanctuary (Orlandini 1966: 28, pl. 25.3). For the magería, or cook, see now Berthiaume 1982: passim.  
24. Recent studies, especially by Maurice Detienne (1979: 74) but also Jean-Louis Durand (Vernant 1989a: especially p. 103) bring out the importance of the boiling of meat.  
25. On the Mainland, cauldrons were apparently held up by large terra-cotta feet that supported the pots above a fire without being permanently attached to them (C. H. Morgan 1937: 549). I am much indebted to Dr. Nancy Bookidis, who is studying the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore on Acrocorinth, for this information, as well as for her advice on many other aspects of Greek ritual.  
26. David Gill (1974: 135) has proposed that at Déreros trepazomata or unburnt food offerings were offered to the god (in this case, probably Apollo), and that here in Crete is the first indication of a table set in front of the cult statue within a temple in Iron Age Greece. This custom did exist in certain later Mainland temples. If he is correct about Déreros, then at Kommos one of the flatter basins (e.g., J. W. Shaw, Chap. 5, Section 6, 11) set upon a stand may also have been set in front of the cult statue.  
27. For Cretan caves, see Boardman 1961; Faure 1964; Rutkowski and Nowicki 1996; Watzour 1996.  
28. For Crete in general, see Demargne 1947: 348–53; P. D. Dunbabin 1952: 195–96. For the cave sanctuaries, see Faure 1964: 104. For Kato Syme, see Lembessi 1972: 202. For Knossos, see Coldstream 1973a: 182. Rather than explaining this as a result of natural and/or cultural phenomena, Sarah Morris (1992: 170) has suggested that Babylon’s defeat of Assyria and siege of Tyre, combined with other events, had a drastic effect on the Cretan economy. It seems doubtful, however, that Crete’s welfare so depended on external events. Local phenomena remain the more likely cause.  
29. Kanastra (for which, see Schelp 1975: passim) were part of the ritual equipment in Crete, where they appear in the inventory of equipment from Lebena (Sokolowski 1969: no. 144). For a description and interpretation of the complete scene in the Caere hydria, see Detienne and Vernant 1989, especially Durand 1989a. For the Pítsa plaque, see Orlandos 1965: passim.  
30. To this extent one might contrast it with the Kato Syme shrine, where religious functions characterized both Bronze and Iron Age contexts (Lembessi and Muhly 1987; Gesell 1985: 66).  
31. Establishment and state promotion of a sanctuary at the extremes of territorial boundaries, in this case a natural boundary formed by the sea, may have also have played a role, as suggested by de Polignac (1995: passim and especially pp. 33, 38). Perhaps of some significance from the point of regional dynamics, reflecting local social and economic changes, is that the small open-air shrine in the Piazzale dei Sacelli at Agia Triada was abandoned during the eleventh–early tenth century B.C. (D’Agata 1993: 10; 1985: 125; see also 1998:19), about the same time that Temple A was constructed.  
32. Here it is assumed, perhaps incorrectly, that, aside from the hypothetical hearth, there was no other special focus, such as a tripod shrine or cult image, within Temple A. Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian (1985: 22), however, believes that the precedent for the Tripillar Shrine lies in the Minoan tripartite shrine rather than in an Eastern derivation (for the latter, see the text, following). If so, the case for continuity between the BA and the IA sanctuaries is strengthened. Also, it would support the argument that the
The shrine was first used in Temple A and then was led into the first room, which may have been open or, more likely, partially closed. The building faced southeast. Significant deposits of bone within the building suggest dining, if not ritual dining.

Since specifically religious objects were not found in connection with the building (Hatzi-Vallianou 1984: 24), it does not seem to have had a ritual character, despite its similarity to the temples being discussed. Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian believes it may have been a chieftain’s dwelling that combined both secular and religious activities (1988: 109; 1990: 194; 1997: 220). If so, then it may be of a type that was transformed into a temple elsewhere. This may be analogous to the transformation of dwelling to oikos-type temple suggested by Angeliki Lembessi in connection with the axial buildings known from LM III Karphi (Lembessi 1987: 144–45).

The date for the building is ca. 725–700 B.C. is accepted by Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian (1985: 38) and 675–650 by Antonino Di Vita (Di Vita et al. 1984: 111).

Some of the following is based on research done in preparation for a talk at the annual Archaeological Institute of America conference of 1988 (J. W. Shaw 1989a). This work in turn was partly based on graduate work done at the University of Toronto by Douglas Orr (Department of Classics) and Deirdre Gardner (Graduate Department of History of Art).

Of special interest in this regard is the group of seven LM IB/SM rooms in Building Epsilon at Kephala Vasilikis (Eliopoulos 1998). One of them (Room 6) is rectangular, with two column bases on-axis and a hearth between them. There was an entrance at each end. Here is a clear earlier precedent for the column-hearth placement in the Dreros-type plan (for other references to similar phenomena elsewhere [Karphi, Vronda], see Eliopoulos 1998: n. 6). Although there are wall benches and ritual equipment in other rooms of the complex, none were found within this specific room.

Also important is an LG/Orientalizing building at Smari, the foundation date of which is not yet fixed (Hatzi-Vallianou 1980; 1984). It consisted of three rooms, the northwestern end room of which appears attached, almost as if it were a later annex. The central rectangular room had the proportions of the temple type being described here, with a broad bench on all sides, a hearth, and perhaps a column-on-axis. A central doorway led into the first room, which may have been open or, more likely, partially closed. The building faced southeast. Significant deposits of bone within the building suggest dining, if not ritual dining.

Since specifically religious objects were not found in connection with the building (Hatzi-Vallianou 1984: 24), it does not seem to have had a ritual character, despite its similarity to the temples being discussed. Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian believes it may have been a chieftain’s dwelling that combined both secular and religious activities (1988: 109; 1990: 194; 1997: 220). If so, then it may be of a type that was transformed into a temple elsewhere. This may be analogous to the transformation of dwelling to oikos-type temple suggested by Angeliki Lembessi in connection with the axial buildings known from LM III Karphi (Lembessi 1987: 144–45).

33. Rizza and Santa Maria Scrinari 1968; Mazarakis-Ainian 1985: 38. The date for the building is unsure, but ca. 725/700 B.C. is accepted by Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian (1985: 38) and 675–650 by Antonino Di Vita (Di Vita et al. 1984: 111).

34. However, there is a definite pattern in the orientation of the Minoan palaces. Their general orientation seems to have been determined by the positioning of the courts in terms of the light and shade therein during various times of the day. The frequent location of rooms devoted to religious activities in the northeastern part of the western wings may have been planned in order for the rays of the sun to enter them early in the day (J. W. Shaw 1973).

35. Some of the following is based on research done in preparation for a talk at the annual Archaeological Institute of America conference of 1988 (J. W. Shaw 1989a). This work in turn was partly based on graduate work done at the University of Toronto by Douglas Orr (Department of Classics) and Deirdre Gardner (Graduate Department of History of Art).

36. Of special interest in this regard is the group of seven LM IB/SM rooms in Building Epsilon at Kephala Vasilikis (Eliopoulos 1998). One of them (Room 6) is rectangular, with two column bases on-axis and a hearth between them. There was an entrance at each end. Here is a clear earlier precedent for the column-hearth placement in the Dreros-type plan (for other references to similar phenomena elsewhere [Karphi, Vronda], see Eliopoulos 1998: n. 6). Although there are wall benches and ritual equipment in other rooms of the complex, none were found within this specific room.

Also important is an LG/Orientalizing building at Smari, the foundation date of which is not yet fixed (Hatzi-Vallianou 1980; 1984). It consisted of three rooms, the northwestern end room of which appears attached, almost as if it were a later annex. The central rectangular room had the proportions of the temple type being described here, with a broad bench on all sides, a hearth, and perhaps a column-on-axis. A central doorway led into the first room, which may have been open or, more likely, partially closed. The building faced southeast. Significant deposits of bone within the building suggest dining, if not ritual dining.

Since specifically religious objects were not found in connection with the building (Hatzi-Vallianou 1984: 24), it does not seem to have had a ritual character, despite its similarity to the temples being discussed. Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian believes it may have been a chieftain’s dwelling that combined both secular and religious activities (1988: 109; 1990: 194; 1997: 220). If so, then it may be of a type that was transformed into a temple elsewhere. This may be analogous to the transformation of dwelling to oikos-type temple suggested by Angeliki Lembessi in connection with the axial buildings known from LM III Karphi (Lembessi 1987: 144–45).

37. The position of the southern column base at Dreros is made more certain by that of the bases at Kommos, which were set solidly into the floor.

38. It is possible that the placement of the cult statue along the back wall was an early custom in some temples in Crete, if the example at Dreros is considered. However, there are numerous examples of Cretan temples that in date fall between Dreros and Kommos Temple C (e.g., Axos, Prinias Temples A and B, the Gortyn temples of Apollo, and the temple on the acropolis at Gortyn) where there is no evidence for installations along the back wall.

Here we should also consider in a preliminary way the visibility of the statue of the god(s). At Dreros, for instance, the sculpture could have easily been seen by anyone entering the cella, for it was set off-axis on the altar or platform against the rear wall. At Kommos, however, and assuming that two figures were set into the plinth on-axis, the two intervening columns would certainly have blocked much of the view of the sculpture for someone entering the building. It is difficult to explain why this was done. It seems unlikely that those who commissioned the temple would intentionally have done this. Possibly, they wished to maintain the hearth-with-column arrangement that they knew of from elsewhere along with the idea of the statue of the god, also known from elsewhere. The result, in any case, seems to show a preference for the hearth, rather than the statue, as the primary focus.
One might also ask whether the columns were structurally necessary. Could they have been removed, so that there would be an unobstructed view of the image, or were they made necessary by the width of the building and/or a lantern (of which there is no trace, however) that would allow smoke to escape? The span between side walls was about 7.45 m, which probably necessitated central supports. Still, much of the weight of the tiled, and hence gabled roof, would have been transferred onto the side walls. With a flat roof, such as the one Drios probably had, internal supports would probably have been required. Of some interest is that later, with the founding of the Lissos temple (for which, see the following example), central supports were not installed, and the images of the gods could be seen clearly when one entered the building.

39. Prinias Temple A, however, was preceded by a hypaethral ash altar connected with two successive elliptical enclosures (Mazarakis-Ainian 1997: 226, table IX; Pernier 1914: 25 f., 34 f., 75).

40. So far, however, the temples known from those sites do not appear to be likely candidates, although the Classical temple at Phaistos, bordering the Minoan palace on the southwest, is a related type, for which, see “Other Cretan Temple Types.”

41. Platon 1958: 465–67; 1959: 376–78; Platon and Davaras 1960: 516; see also Sanders 1982: 84, p. 46, fig. 25 (pl. 41); 47. I am very grateful to Professor Nikolaos Platon, who made it possible for me to inspect the building carefully in 1981 and to make some of the drawings and observations herein.

42. The proportions of the room are similar to those at Polyrrhenia in western Crete (Savignoni 1903: 314 f.), which differs, however, in interior features. In the latter a continuous platform is set along the back wall, and spur walls mark the transition between cela and adyton.

43. The Hellenistic addition to the Temple of Apollo (see “Other Cretan Temple Types”) might be considered an exception to the rule. Still, its Doric hexastyle facade has engaged columns set upon high steps that are pierced by the entrance. Perhaps the columnar facade was adopted in imitation of prostyle and peristylar temples outside Crete, but the pronao nevertheless remains largely closed to the outside by the exterior wall. The earliest use of the formal peristylar form seems to have been introduced after the Roman conquest, as at the Dictytmnion in northeastern Crete (Welter and Jantzen 1951: 106 f., pls. 1–2; Sanders 1982: 84–87). A Roman podium temple with prostyle columns is to be found in the Praetorium at Gortyn (Di Vita et al. 1984: 90–93 [with earlier bibliography], fig. 64).

44. A small room, probably connected with temple use, adjoins the Drios temple on the west. At Kommos, Room A1 was a later addition north of Temple C, although as already mentioned (J. W. Shaw, Chap. 1, Section 5), there is some evidence to show that A1 may have been contemplated earlier but never built. At Lissos a simple stoa, perhaps later than the temple, adjoined it along the southern side, and there was a small room to the west.

45. For some of the latest attempts to place the sculpted pieces in appropriate places, see Stucchi 1974; Beyer 1976; Lembessi 1987: 145, figs. 10–11; Waitous 1998.

46. Alexander Mazarakis-Ainian (1997: 225) has recently argued, however, that Prinias Temple B is much earlier in date than is usually thought and may not, after all, be a temple but rather may have served some other important communal function.

47. In the same tradition is, most likely, the bunched temple at Aphrati (Lembessi 1969) and, perhaps, that on the acropolis at Axos (D. Levi 1930–31), although the latter may reflect the original desire for an open pronao. The broad cela was also preferred in the first stage of the temple at Archaic Olous (Bousquet 1938), although that arrangement was later modified when Ares and Apodrise came to be worshipped in separate interior cellas. The double cela arrangement is also reported from Aptera (Deerup 1951: 99–105).

48. The temple on the acropolis at Gortyn (Rizza and Santa Maria Scuranni 1968) and the Temple of Asklepios at Leda (Halbherr 1901: 300–306, Di Vita et al. 1984: 120, for recent bibliography)

49. Temple B’s entrance only from the east is clear. Since Temple A was open to the east, one can probably assume that this was the chief if not only access to the temple, even though we do not know its entire plan.
of observations of the rising sun at the summer solstice at 6:48 a.m. on 22 June 1993. The sun rose then about 15° north (minus one or two solar diameters) of a string line stretched along the longitudinal axis of Temple C and bisecting Altar C in its first, fourth-century-b.c. phase. On this basis, he calculated, the sun would rise along the temple-altar axis on approximately 4 August, as the sun descended to the south after the summer solstice, exactly at midpoint (45 days) between the summer solstice and the autumnal equinox (22 September). It would rise along the same line about 4 May, as it ascended toward the north after the spring (vernal) equinox (21 March). By the same token, the sun would set in the opposite direction—and over Temple C as seen from Altar C—at 256° on about 4 February, the middate between the winter solstice (22 December) and the vernal equinox, and again on 4 November, the halfway date between the autumnal equinox and the winter solstice. Perhaps further study will reveal more than this general, casual relationship between Temple C’s orientation and the sun, for sometimes ancient festivals were scheduled so as to coincide with events in the solar calendar. In some areas of Greece, for instance, there was a festival to Poseidon celebrated at the winter solstice (Robertson 1984: 1–16), about 22 December in our calendar. Following W. B. Dinsmoor’s suggestion (1939: 35–173, especially p. 96), this might have been a time when an axis line for a temple dedicated to Poseidon was set in.

51. This was done, for instance, in the case of the Archaic/Classical Temple at Phaistos (Perrier 1907: 259f., Di Vita et al. 1984: fig. 139), where the temple southwest of the palace was set quite independently of the Minoan walls, many of which must have been visible at the time. 52. Birgitta Bergquist (1990: passim) has also proposed that Kommos Temples A, B, and C were simply “dining rooms” (see in this regard also Cooper and Morris 1998: 68–69; Bookidis and Stroud 1997: 397, n. 28). Although dining did go on within them, there is little doubt concerning their religious character, and her term is simplistic in this case. Similarly, Didier Viviers has suggested (1994: 245) that C and Room A1 to the north are to be identified as andreion (a space for communal meals for men) and kometerion (for visitors to be accommodated). He claims that no discoveries connected with C indicate sacral use.

In the process he ignores, among other things, (1) the permanent, original statue base within Temple C, (2) the written and pictorial references to various deities found within or near it (Athena, Pan, Poseidon, and Zeus), and (3) the four altars to the east.

Further to the same issue, Robert B. Koehl (1997: 143) has proposed that Temples C and A1 were andreia, while Building B was a kometerion. During the discussion period after Koehl’s presentation at the conference, Philip P. Betancourt (Koehl 1997: 148) asked him specifically about the statue base in Temple C, to which Koehl replied that “the cult base . . . belongs to the temple’s latest [Hellenistic] phase” and as such represented a later shifting of function. As is clear in our architectural description (J. W. Shaw, Chap. 1), however, the base belongs to the temple’s first phase. Also, Koehl makes the point (1997: 138) that andreia were located within towns. But at Kommos there is little evidence to show that there was a settlement of sufficient size to be called a “town” at any point during the first millennium B.C.

53. J. W. Shaw 1979a: 172–73. At that time, when the relative isolation of the sanctuary was still unclear, the possibility that here might also be a hestiatorion of the local magistrates, or kosmoi, was also introduced.

54. For the Prytaneion at Lato, see Demargne 1903: 206–31, pls. IV–V (plan). For a detailed reconsideration of the building, with an updated bibliography and new plans and photographs, see Ducrey and Picard 1972; Ducrey 1980. For typology and comparanda, see also Miller 1978: passim.

55. The building is ca. 15 m long and 6 m wide without an interior bench but with three hearths (one of an earlier period) set axially. See Alexiou 1972a: 235 f.; 1972b: 620; 1973–74: 883–85.

56. To the west the area is about 15 m wide, from the temples to the sea scarp. To the north we have detected no Greek buildings from Room A1 to the property line over 100 m away, an area densely settled during the Minoan period.

57. Although ancient wells were found at Kommos, there is no evidence yet for a spring or any attendant facilities. At Lissos or Kato Syme, the perennial springs were no doubt crucial for the sanctuary during all periods of use.

58. At Kommos there is no temenos wall to
the north (east of Round Building D), to the east, or to the west. The wall bordering the sanctuary along the south should probably be considered a retaining wall more than a temenos wall. At Lissos, however, the artificial platform constructed on the southern side of the hill for the placement of the buildings was an effective enclosure on that side. The broad steps leading up to the sanctuary at that point ended at an opening blocked by a double door leading into the supposed temenos. On entering one would have first seen the small stoa built against the side of the temple. For the practice in temenoi outside Crete, see Bergquist 1967, Lavas 1974. 59. At Lebena the area east of the temple is largely destroyed; at Lissos excavation may not have continued sufficiently to the east. 60. The stepped altar outside the Gortyn temple is thought to date to the Roman period (Di Vita et al. 1984: fig. 55).

63. For the possible derivation of the modern toponym Kommos, see J. W. Shaw 1995: 27 n. 1. 62. Stephanos of Byzantium, s.v., Ἀμυκλαιον—inscribed to πόλις Ἀμυκλαίου ἐν Κρήτη κατὰ λίμασα. Cf. Eustathius, ad Homerii Iliadem 2.584. The former was basing his account, apparently, on an earlier catalogue by Xenion, a Hellenistic author (Faure 1960a: 229, 236). Another toponym, Lisse or Lissés, has also been suggested. Kenneth Kitchell (1979/1980), however, has argued convincingly that such a town did not exist. I would like to thank him for his interest in helping with the possible identification of Amyklaion. 63. For Amyklae in Lacedaemon and Amyklaion and the Amyklaians in the Mesara in Crete, see Guarducci 1950: 172; Willetts 1962: 260–61. 64. Guarducci 1950: 172. The inscription was actually found at Apeokari, not Gortyn. 65. Although he placed Amyklaion on his map at the site of Kokkinos Pyrgos, Paul Faure noted at the same time that his identification was hypothetical, stating in the text that Amyklaion was probably a small anchorage under the control of Gortyn, probably between Matala and Kokkinos Pyrgos (1968b: 197, n. 2, fig. 2).

66. Paul Faure, personal communication, 8 October 1978. He noted that the toponym Mercchia on the 1629 map by Francesco Basilicata occurs at the approximate point of present-day Kommos. He suggests that Mercchia is a corrup-
inscribed on a clay basin or bowl fragment from within Building B, might possibly refer to Apollo, which could strengthen the argument that the Amyklaion site was at Kommos (Csapo et al., Chap. 2, 83; see also 11, a graffiti on a seventh-century B.C. cup).

69. The specific trio was suggested by Lawrence Stager in conversation with the author. Ba’al was often a storm god, Ashera a goddess of the sea, and Astarte a goddess of love and war; Tanit was a goddess of love and fertility.

70. For a recent treatment of the complicated issue of the three, see Carter 1987: 378; Maier 1986.


72. For their advice concerning bases and the possible positioning of sculpture upon them, the author is indebted to Professor John Camp; Dr. Dina Peppas-Delmouso, Director of the Epigraphical Museum in Athens; Dr. Laura Gadbery; Professor Olga Palagia, University of Athens; Stergios Tzanekas, technician in the Epigraphical Museum in Athens; and, especially, Giuliana Bianco, our excavation architect.

73. Although few cult bases are preserved to serve as comparative material for this estimate, that of the Mainland sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Kallion is complete. The base is 1.20 m long, with two roughly circular plinth cuttings. Between the centers of the two cuttings the distance is ca. 0.60 m.

74. As shown in Plate I.102, there is a separate, deeper cutting within the northern plinth shared by the two limestone blocks found loose in the sand (J. W. Shaw, Chap. 1, Section 6, 8 and 6). The bottom of it is about 0.13 m below the level of the top of the base. Perhaps the deeper cutting was made to accommodate a projection in the plinth.

75. The cutting, however, is some distance in front of the plinth setting of the statue. Usually the additional emblem is set next to the feet of the god and is part of the same plinth (e.g., Hermes). The latter interpretation, as “bearer of good tidings” is parallel to that of the Hermes citations and is to be preferred. A second possibility, an inscription on a shallow clay basin or bowl fragment from Building B (Csapo et al., Chap. 2, 83), reads “[POL]” and could refer to Apollo, a possibility also raised, although cautiously, by Alan W. Johnston in connection with a graffito incised on a seventh-century black-glazed cup from near Building F (Csapo et al., Chap. 2, 11).

76. The arrangement might have been like that proposed for the cult statue in the Aphaia temple at Aegina or the Altar of the Twelve Gods at Athens (respectively, Adolf Furtwängler 1906: pls. 32, 37; Travlos 1971: pl. 582). In both cases, however, the fenced enclosure would not have obscured the statue, since the supports were set at ground or floor level, even with the bottom of the cult platform. At Kommos such a grill would have obscured at least the legs of the figures.

77. See, for instance, the suggestion by Carl A. Roebuck for the cult statues in the Asklepieion at Corinth (1951: fig.3); also the red-figure depictions of a seated Hermes within such a columned enclosure in de Visscher 1962: pl. 81, nos. 20–22.

78. Such as the fourth-century B.C. votive reliefs from the Shrine of Hermes Pankratios (Travlos 1971: 279, pls. 356, 358). The thickness of the slab for Pan is 15.0 cm. The maximum depth of 0.04 m for the cutting in the Kommos base, however, seems shallow for the purpose.

79. Gifts are also known to have been hung from the walls or even the slanting beams lying immediately under the roof decking at the Asklepieion in Athens during the third century B.C. (Aleshire 1987: 40, 229).

80. Three other possibilities should also be mentioned. One is raised by Daniel Geagan, that “euangelos” in the Zeus and Athena inscription (Csapo et al., Chap. 2, 76) is a noun referring to a deity, although hitherto unattested, whereas the adjectival form is known as an epithet of a god (Hermes). The latter interpretation, as “bearer of good tidings” is parallel to that of the Hermes citations and is to be preferred. A second possibility, an inscription on a shallow clay basin or bowl fragment from Building B (Csapo et al., Chap. 2, 83), reads “[POL]” and could refer to Apollo, a possibility also raised, although cautiously, by Alan W. Johnston in connection with a graffito incised on a seventh-century black-glazed cup from near Building F (Csapo et al., Chap. 2, 11).

81. Daniel Geagan (Csapo et al., Chap. 2, 77) entertains the possibility, however, that the Telemmastos inscription may be a grave marker,
although no graves have been found in the sanctuary area.

82. It is likely that each of the two slabs mentioned in the text commemorates some special event, such as the addition of an altar or building to the sanctuary or a renovation of some structure, although these are not specifically mentioned. Similar inscribed slabs seem rare in Crete. A rectangular slab of the Roman period from the sanctuary at Kato Syme, however, records that Nicanor, the son of Theomnastos, dedicated a temple to Hermes Kedritis (Hermes of the cedars; Lambessi and Muhly 1987: 106, fig. 4). The slab was found above the northeast corner of the Hellenistic shrine, perhaps having been set near or in the Roman temple which seems to have been largely destroyed.

83. For the former (Evangelistria), see Hope Simpson 1995: 369–72, site no. 5. For the latter, see Guarlucci 1959: nos. 4–25.

84. At the Dodekatheon on Delos, for instance, one altar was dedicated to Zeus, Athena, and Hera (Will 1955: 178). At the Sanctuary of Athena Pronaia at Delphi, two small altars in the same sanctuary were dedicated separately to Athena Ergane and Athena Zosteria (Demangel 1926: 49–50; I am indebted to John Camp for this observation). Pausanias’s description of the some seventy separate altars at Olympia (5.14.4 ff.) and other sites indicates some of the variety possible.

85. The Temple of Aphrodite at Axos, however, had two unequal size set parallel to each other in front of the temple and within a small court enclosed on three sides (D. Levi 1980–31).

86. Will 1955. I am grateful to Professor David W. Rupp, who originally pointed out the similarity to me.

87. The contemporaneous deposits are Callaghan and Johnston, Chap. 4, Section 1, Deposit 48, Phase 4 (Temple C); Deposit 41 (Room A1); Deposits 42–44 (Building B), and Deposits 45 and 46 (Building E). The complete absence of Arretine Ware or any local forms, save the lanx, exhibiting signs of morphological influence from Roman shapes, would tend to indicate a date early within this period.

88. Later, the “squatters” were to build a rough floor above the tile level (J. W. Shaw, Chap. 1, Section 5, “Building B, Secondary Use”).

89. In the northern annex a curving wall built above the tile fall suggests that the room was used during the later “squatter” period (J. W. Shaw, Chap. 1, Section 5).

90. Polyrrhenia, a flourishing city in western Crete, is indicated in the same source as being associated with Phaistos (Van Effenterre 1948: 152) and was probably, like Matala, a dependency (Eric Casp, personal communication). For a different view, see Cucuzza 1997: n. 115.

91. On the other hand, it would seem logical that if Matala, south of Kommos, was the harbor of Phaistos (as Polybius 4.55.6) and was thereby controlled by it, that the lands between Phaistos and Matala, including those along the shore (e.g., Kommos and Kalamaki), were controlled by Phaistos as well. Recently, however, Nicola Cucuzza (1997) and L. Vance Watrous (forthcoming) have proposed that because of an arrangement of sympoliteia, in which it can be argued that Gortyn and Phaistos joined, the two city-states probably shared access to and control of the Kommos Sanctuary. Cucuzza thinks that from at least the Archaic period on, Gortyn controlled the coastline of the western Mesara as far south as Kommos and the Nisos peninsula. His case is partly based on Gortyn’s various associations with Amyklaios, known elsewhere among Cretan cities, as in the fifth-century B.C. treaty between Knossos and Tylos (Meiggs and Lewis 1969: 99–105).

92. According to Strabo (10.478 f.), Matala and Lebena were the two harbors of Gortyn. Matala was closer to Phaistos and was associated with the city, so it is logical to assume that the “Phaistian habourtown” referred to by Polybius (4.55) was Matala rather than Lebena.

93. We know from Strabo (10.479) that the people of Gortyn destroyed Phaistos. It seems unlikely that this could have happened before 183 B.C., when Phaistos and thirty other Cretan cities signed a treaty with King Eumenes II of Pergamon (for the treaty, see Guarlucci 1956: 26–27). Cucuzza 1997 suggests ca. 150 B.C. for the destruction.

94. Sanders 1982: 12, where it is suggested that Rhyton (modern Rotasi), a major town controlled by Gortyn in the eastern Mesara, may have served an analogous purpose. See also Sanders 1976: 135.
This section is by Joseph W. Shaw and Peter J. Callaghan.

For the effect of the decline in piracy, see Sanders 1976: 137.

When excavation first revealed the sanctuary, we speculated that armed rivalry had caused its destruction (J. W. Shaw et al. 1978: 152).

Rigsby 1976: 329. For the dispositions regarding part of the Knossia after the conquest of 67 B.C., see Rigsby 1976: 318–27. The loss of territory had little effect on the cult centers; the establishment of the colony had considerable.

For the shrine of Glaukos, see Callaghan 1978: 28–29. For the Temple of Rhea, see Popham 1978: 185–87. For the Demeter sanctuary, see Coldstream 1973a: 10. The votive material from an unknown sanctuary on the acropolis hill (Hood and Smyth 1981: 44, Knossos survey site no. 136) goes down only to the first century B.C.

Catling 1976–77: 42. Hector Catling believes the cult may have been transferred to the city of Sparta itself.

Camp 1986: 186. The original gutter was replaced by one from Sounion.