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ABSTRACT

The Hellenistic Period was a time of great cultural change for the Middle East. New peoples and ideas were introduced into the region, interacting with local cultures. In the process, new ideas and traditions were produced and defined. Such phenomena were well represented in the temples which were built in the Middle East after the death of Alexander the Great. These structures, in their construction and use, benefitted from the influences of a variety of sources with the result of producing forms of structure and cult which had previously not been seen.

This thesis examines the religious structures at three sites, spaced widely across the Middle East: Ai Khanum in modern day Afghanistan, the island of Failaka off the coast of Kuwait, and Dura-Europos in Syria. Each of these three sites was a new foundation by the incoming Greeks, and each possessed multiple religious structures which have been relatively well documented archaeologically. For each temple in this study, the structure and, where possible, the the evidence for cult is described and examined in order to identify the cultural heritages of the various elements and how the elements work together. Some of the possible cultural heritages of the temples to be examined may include the Mesopotamian tradition with its courtyards and massive mudbrick constructions or the Greek tradition with its Doric or Ionic orders. This thesis also analyses the resulting information so that any patterns and processes, which emerge from this complex picture, might then be identified and explained.
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Chapter 1
Introduction

Temples, and the traditions surrounding their design and use, offer an important opportunity to examine and better understand the complexity and creativity of cosmopolitanism in the Hellenistic Period. In the Ancient Middle East, temples and their cults formed an integral part of the region’s cultures. During the Achaemenid Period, a variety of cultural groups, each with its own religious practices and architectural traditions, existed between the eastern shores of the Mediterranean and the Indus River. The conquest of Alexander the Great altered this picture by introducing a new population to the region for the first time in large numbers. This new population, consisting of Greco-Macedonian settlers and rulers, radically changed the political and military landscape. They introduced new customs, ideas, rituals and traditions into many different cultural spheres, including the sphere of religion. This new Greek population also caused the construction of new settlements wherein they could live and worship. These new cities, however, were not completely isolated from the varied cultural strata which had existed in the region previously. Instead, the various cultures commingled, influencing each other and combining together in complex ways to produce new forms which had been previously unknown.

This thesis will examine the temples and sanctuaries which have been found inside
some of these new foundations of the Hellenistic Period in order to observe the various
cultural traditions of temple and cult as well as the interplay between them. This work will
study the religious structures of the period at three sites where Hellenistic Temples have been
found and relatively well documented: Ai Khanum in modern Afghanistan, the island of
Failaka, which lies off the coast of Kuwait, and Dura-Europos in modern Syria (figure 1.1).
Each of these settlements was also founded by one of the new Greek dynasts, usually a
member of the Seleucid dynasty. Considering this fact, one might assume that the temples
and cults at these three sites would be Greek in nature. The temples at these sites, however,
seem to have been influenced to a greater or lesser degree from a wide range of cultural
sources other than strictly Hellenic. For example, some scholars, such as Downey, have
pointed out instances of Babylonian influence in several sanctuaries of the Hellenistic Middle
East, some of which are represented in this study.¹ In fact, the temples of this study and their
cults might display a number of simultaneous influences from several regions and cultural
traditions.

Discernible cultural influences might present themselves in a variety of fashions. For
example, ornamental elements specific to a certain culture may or may not be present in the
construction of a given temple. Thus the fact that a temple possessed either a Greek-style
antefix or a Mesopotamian-style crenelated cornice might indicate an influence from one of
those regions. Certain temples may also possess a form derived from a specific tradition,

¹ S. Downey, *Mesopotamian Religious Architecture: Alexander through the Parthians*. Princeton,
such as the Greek tradition with its columns and rooms laid out along their long axes. Some of the more prominent of these traditions will be discussed at length further on in this chapter. In some cases, aspects of the rituals and cults associated with some temples may also bear elements with identifiable cultural heritages which predate the Hellenistic Period. In examining such elements, the use of epigraphy where available will be of notable importance, especially in determining the identities of the deities worshipped. It may also be the case that some of the physical elements of a temple or its cult were fabricated using techniques which were culturally specific. This thesis will examine the temples at Ai Khanum, Failaka and Dura-Europos and will identify these elements in order to study how they all interacted with one another and were themselves mutated to produce the end result of the temples themselves.

At the very heart of this matter lies the question of the "Hellenisation" of the Middle East after the death of Alexander. In examining the various cult sites at each of the three settlements, this thesis will be examining material intricately linked to specific cultural contexts. In some ways, the temples thus reflect how the inhabitants of the settlements interacted culturally with the world around them. In general, there are two basic divergent views regarding the impact of "Hellenisation" in the Middle East. The first view, often seen in older scholarship, emphasises those elements which are Greek.\(^2\) More recently, however,

\(^2\) See T. Fyfe, *Hellenistic Architecture: An Introductory Study*. Chicago, 1936. His examination concentrates almost solely on those elements of architecture which are demonstrably Hellenic, while de-emphasising non-Greek elements. He even states (p.18)" In the architectural forms, the oriental strain is mostly perceptible in the treatment of carved decoration."
scholars including Downey, as noted above, as well as Hannestad and Potts\(^3\) have promoted a second view, in which elements from Middle Eastern cultures were emphasised instead. At their extremes, both views run the danger of ignoring and oversimplifying the reality of the situation.

The term "Hellenization" is perhaps a bit too blunt or clumsy for use under the present circumstances. The term is too simple for the complexity of the situation and implies a process wherein non-Greek elements were increasingly altered, with an ultimate goal of homogeneity. Nor is it necessarily a question of the reverse being true, where Greek elements were assimilated into a single Oriental whole. The reality may be more chaotic and complex. It may, instead, be best to view the temples of this thesis in light of the cosmopolitan nature of the Hellenistic Period. Indeed, the temples and their cults may not represent an imposition of one cultural tradition upon one or more others, but a mixing, in which the different traditions interacted in complex ways to produce heterogeneous novelty. In its examination of the temples, this study will, therefore, identify these interactions and attempt to discern the possible causes which underlie the resulting patterns.

These causes may theoretically come in a number of forms. Some possibilities include the mixture of culturally divergent groups, or the effects of decisions taken by an individual, such as a king, or by a corporate body, such as the local inhabitants of a site in general. These phenomena could also have been affected by different factors. For instance,

the geographical or historical context of a site may have made it more likely to have accepted
the influences from certain traditions than from others. The malleability of the different
cultural religious traditions may also have played a part in how they were used, allowing
them to be altered or mixed with each other within the different temples. Such possible
concepts will all be explored in this study.

This thesis will be divided into five chapters, including the introduction and
conclusion. In the introduction, the historical and geographical contexts of the three sites will
be examined, along with each culture’s own temple tradition, in order to provide a
background for further study. Each one of the three settlements will then form the focus of
its own separate chapter in which the temples of that site will be described with special
attention paid to the cultural origins of and influences on the different aspects of the temples
and their cults. However, since one of the goals of this project is to examine the interplay of
influences from various cultures upon the temples at these sites, comparisons will often be
made between them. Temples at other sites will also be introduced for their comparative
value. A final, concluding, chapter will synthesise and analyse the information generated in
order to identify any patterns which may emerge and any possible causal phenomena which
might explain them.

The nature of much of the evidence regarding the religious structures at Ai Khanum,
Ai Failaka and Dura-Europos is, of course, architectural. It consists of the remains of the
temples themselves, their sanctuaries and other large constructions, such as monumental
altars, which cannot be moved easily. However, certain temples and sanctuaries at these sites
also possess well-documented small finds. These items include, but are not limited to, terracotta figurines, weapons, items of precious metal or sculptures in stone. These pieces can give further knowledge of the cults which were practised at these temples. Such artifacts also demonstrate the effects which various cultures had upon these religious institutions of the Hellenistic Middle East. In certain cases, inscriptions may also be present, which may help in providing clues to the nature of the cult and the possible identity of the deity worshipped. This epigraphic evidence will also be presented and used where applicable.

The Geographical Contexts and Excavation Histories of the Sites

The three main sites of this thesis are separated by vast distances and are located in very different areas of the Middle East. Therefore, they each represent a different aspect of the religion and temples of the Hellenistic Period, and were influenced differently by various cultures and localities. These settlements thus represent a sampling of a wide swath of the larger region of the Middle East during the Hellenistic Period.

The first site, Ai Khanum, was dug by a French team of archaeologists under the direction of Paul Bernard during the 1960s and 1970s. The city is located in modern-day Afghanistan and lies on the Amu Darya river, which was called the Oxus in ancient times. Ai Khanum was a major urban centre in the region during the Hellenistic Period. The site consisted of a lower town, measuring some one and a half kilometres along its long north-south axis by one kilometre along the east-west axis, and a steep acropolis which is known
locally as Bālā Hissar.⁴ The city was physically remote from the cultural centres of Greece and closer to those of Iran and India. Examining the effect that such a placement had on the form and function of the temples within the city will be one of the goals of this study.

On the other hand, the island of Ai Failaka, which was called Ikaros by the Greeks, lies 20 kilometres off the coast of modern Kuwait. It was not precisely an urban centre as are the other two sites in this thesis, but instead served as a stopover point in the Hellenistic Period for ships travelling between the cities of Mesopotamia and regions such as India and the southern Arabian peninsula.⁵ Thus, this site was also physically removed from the heart of Greek culture and closer to regions such as Babylonia and Iran. The site was originally excavated by a Danish Expedition between 1958 and 1963 under Kristian Jeppesen.⁶ More recently (1983-1984), a French team under Jean-François Salles also undertook archaeological excavations on the island.

Finally, the site of Dura-Europos sits beside the Euphrates river in the modern state of Syria. It is the closest of the three to the Greek heartland but is also located in an area which was permeable to influences from areas farther east. The excavation history of this site is somewhat more extensive than the other two sites. Early excavations were undertaken in the 1920s by the French, who were shortly thereafter joined by a team from Yale University who excavated into the thirties. Within the past twelve years, another French team has begun

---


⁶ Salles, 1985, 574.
excavating the site once again with the specific goal of clarifying and expanding the knowledge available for the Hellenistic Period.⁷

The Use History of the Sites

Not only are the geographical positions of the three settlements which form the focus of this thesis different, but so are their histories. The historical context of each city influences how the various cultural elements could interact, thereby influencing the way that the religious structures developed. Each of these sites was founded at different times within the Hellenistic Period. Each site served a purpose particular to itself and existed for a different span of time.

For example, the ancient Syrian city of Dura was founded by the Seleucid general Nicanor in 303 B.C. under the name of Europos.⁸ For more than the first century of its existence, there is little evidence that Dura-Europos was very large or significant. Instead, real growth appears only to have happened around the middle of the second century when the city saw a surge in new construction. During this period, the city was given a set of heavy defensive walls and new streets set into a Hippodamian plan.⁹ The political situation of the

---


⁹ Leriche & al Mahmoud, 1994, 401. Leriche and al Mahmoud have proposed this plan for the chronological development of Dura based upon the relative dearth of recovered Early Hellenistic material found by the French team during its excavations at different places within the city.
time may be some explanation for this phenomenon, since the Parthian empire, emerging originally from Iran and Central Asia, was pushing the Seleucid dynasty progressively westwards during this time. The city thus grew in strategic importance as the retreating eastern boundary of the empire gradually approached. Presumably, it would be at this time that the first major Hellenistic temple would have been built in the city. The Seleucid control of the city did not last long, however, and the city was captured and occupied by the Parthians in the last decades of the second century. The Parthian occupation of the city lasted from 113 B.C. until A.D.165, when the city was captured by the Romans.\textsuperscript{10} The Parthian occupation brought the city into contact with cultural ideas from the Iranian plateau which had an effect on the temples and sanctuaries of the settlement.

The settlement on the island of Failaka, known as Ikaros to the Hellenistic Greeks, was also affected by the politics of the second century B.C. Its driving force, however, was economic. The island, unlike the other two sites, had a rather long history of settlement by the time of the death of Alexander in 323 B.C.E. Some have identified the island with the land of Dilmun, which appears in ancient Mesopotamian sources. Others posit that ancient Dilmun was the island of Bahrain and have identified Failaka with the island Agarum, which itself lay within Dilmun's sphere of influence.\textsuperscript{11} In the third century, a settlement was placed upon an unused portion of the island. The evidence indicates that this settlement was military

\textsuperscript{10} Leriche & al Mahmoud, 1994, 405.

\textsuperscript{11} Salles, 1985, 590.


In addition to these primary site reports, there has also been other scholarship. For instance, S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt’s From Samarkand to Sardis: a New Approach to the Seleucid Empire (Berkeley, 1993) examines the history of the sites within a discussion of the history of the Seleucid Empire in general. Downey, in her Mesopotamian Religious
Architecture: Alexander through the Parthians (Princeton, 1988), examines, with an emphasis on Mesopotamian elements, various Hellenistic Period temples throughout the Middle East, including those of Ai Khanum and Dura. She, however, fails to include certain material, including the finds from the island of Failaka and the civic funereal cult sites at Ai Khanum. Interestingly, many of the structures in this group of omissions tend to resemble Hellenic-style buildings. M. Boyce and F. Crenet, in their A History of Zoroastrianism, Volume 3: Zoroastrianism under Macedonian and Roman Rule (Leiden, 1991), study the religious context, including the temples, of Hellenistic Iran and Central Asia. Salles, for his part, has published a number of works interpreting the finds of Failaka, including his article with Gachet: 'Iconographie et Cultes à Failaka, Koweit' (Mesopotamia 25, 1990). These publications, among others, are very useful in contextualising the temples at Ai Khanum, Failaka, and Dura.

Earlier Temple Traditions

In order to examine properly the temples at the focal sites of this study, it will be helpful first to examine the traditions of religious architecture which existed prior to the Hellenistic Period. A multitude of cultures and religious traditions existed in the Middle East during the preceding period of Achaemenid Empire. However, for the purposes of this work, it would be best to detail the salient points of the broad, regional traditions most relevant for the temples in this study: the Greek, the Babylonian, and the Iranian.

First, the Greek temple tradition has been extremely well documented, studied, and
classified. To go into detail on the intricacies of the Doric and Ionic orders is unnecessary. It is important, however, to review the basic characteristics of a traditional Greek temple, regardless of the order, so that there may be a basis of comparison with the other temple traditions. A Greek temple stood within a delineated area known as a temenos, which was marked off either by boundary stones (horoi) or by a continuous wall (peribolos). Within this temenos, there was a sacrificial altar which was ritually indispensable. This structure was always placed outside the temple building itself, which was not strictly required for rituals and which served basically as the home of the cult statue. The preferred plan for the actual temple structure was the so-called Megaron plan, which resulted in a rectangular oblong of varying dimensions with the entrance on the short side. The Megaron plan consisted of at least one room, known as the naos, which was entered through a porch or vestibule, called the pronaos. At the rear of the structure, there was often a second porch called the opisthodomos. Additionally, there might be another room between the naos and the opisthodomos known as an adyton. The temple was usually fronted or surrounded by columns, the forms of which are the basis of the different Greek orders. The temple and its columns rested on top of a platform which often consisted of three steps (crepis) around the

---


22 Zaidman & Schmidt-Pantel, 1992, 235.
periphery of the building. The columns supported a pitched roof which could be highly ornamented, including by acroteria and antefixes.23 The preferred building material, wherever possible, was stone such as limestone or marble.24

Babylonia, on the other hand, had a tradition, dating back thousands of years, of building in mudbrick. In some cases, especially in prestige buildings such as temples, the Babylonians used glazed bricks as ornamentation.25 The weaknesses inherent in mud brick meant that the walls of any monumental structure were invariably thick. Therefore, most Babylonian temples were contained within thick outer walls.26 Height was also an important factor in temple construction, and sometimes the temples walls would either be extremely tall or footed on a terrace. The ultimate expression of this quest for height lay in a type of temple, known as a Ziggurat, which supported a shrine on its summit. Examples of these Ziggurats, dating from the third millennium B.C. onwards, have been found at the Mesopotamian sites of Babylon, Nippur, and Borsippa among others.27 Unlike Greek temples and sanctuaries, Babylonian sanctuaries almost always had at least one courtyard built within the thick outer walls, and often the temple and sanctuary were built as one structural unit.

23 Zaidman & Schmidt-Pantel, 1992, 239.
25 Downey, 1988, 38.
26 Downey, 1988, 22.
27 M. Jastrow, *The Religion of Babylonia and Assyria*. New York, 1898, 615-622. The ziggurat as a monumental type possessed an extremely long history within Mesopotamian architecture. Indeed, work was done on the ziggurat of Uruk during the Seleucid Period itself. See Downey, 1988, 16-20.
Besides the temple unit, the courtyards of a sanctuary were surrounded by rooms of various functions including subsidiary temples or chapels. The temple portion itself consisted of a rectangular pronaos and naos which were entered from a courtyard by doorways on their long sides. Within the naos, there was usually a niche in the rear wall, fronted by a pedestal in order to hold the cult statue of the god. The cult statues were an important part of the temple in the Mesopotamian tradition. They were seen as representing the divinity directly and, as such, were fed and clothed as part of the temple's rituals. They could be moved, either as part of a ritual, such as the case of the Babylonian New Year's festival where all the cult statues would be brought in procession to a temple named the Bit Akitu, or be seized and brought back home with the forces who had sacked a particular city. The prominence of the cult statue in ritual meant that the most important ritual construction in Mesopotamian temples tended to be the offering tables which were built inside the naos in order to hold the gifts and food offerings of which the god, through his statue, was supposed to partake. Finally, the exterior of the complex was characterized by decorative sets of complicated vertical projections and niches. This temple scheme has been found at many Mesopotamian

---

28 Downey, 1988, 38.
29 Downey, 1988, 40.
33 Downey, 1988, 35.
sites, including Babylon and Uruk.\textsuperscript{34}

On the other hand, very few religious structures have been identified from the lands to the east of the Zagros mountains prior to Alexander. In fact, only ten possible sites have been identified for the Achaemenid Period. Thus, there is a certain amount of debate over what actually constitutes an Achaemenid temple.\textsuperscript{35} Generally, however, two classifications of religious structures have been recognized: the open air sanctuary and the enclosed temple, which tends to appear rather late.\textsuperscript{36} The first category, that of the open air sanctuary, was delineated by an enclosure wall and contained one or more bases or podia.\textsuperscript{37} Such a complex fits in well with the writings of Herodotus who claimed that the Persians had no temples but, instead, made sacrifices in the open air, on top of mountains.\textsuperscript{38} In this case, the podium would be a ritual replacement for the high place of the mountain. Examples of such open air sanctuaries have been found both at Pasargadae and Dahan-i-Gulaman.\textsuperscript{39}

Towards the end of the Achaemenid Period, however, structures which may be called actual temples began to appear. These structures varied widely but are characterized by the

\textsuperscript{34} Downey, 1988, 3-4.


\textsuperscript{36} Boucharlat, 1984, 133.


\textsuperscript{38} Herodotus, 1.131.

\textsuperscript{39} Rapin, 1992, 106.
presence of a square naos with four internal columns laid out in a square, which was flanked on three sides by narrow, corridor-like rooms. In front, on the fourth side of this tetrastyle naos, there was usually an entrance portico. This style of temple continued to develop throughout the Hellenistic Period at various sites in Central Asia, mainly located in modern-day Afghanistan and Tajikistan. For instance, in certain Hellenistic Period examples in Bactria, notably at the temples of Takt-i-Sangin (figure 1.2) and Dilberdjin (figure 1.3), the temple also had projecting wings which flanked the entrance. The complexity of these projecting wings varied extensively. At Takt-i-Sangin, each wing contained several rooms, while at Dilberdjin each wing housed only a small chapel. The theory has been advanced by Rapin that the appearance of this new type of temple, with its subsequent development during the Hellenistic Period, indicates a fundamental mutation of cult practices in Central Asia towards the end of the Achaemenid Period. This change may, in addition, be linked to the adoption of iconic representation of divinities, through the use of cult statues.

These regional traditions form, to a large extent, the basis from which the inspirations for the temples at Ai Khanum, Failaka, and Dura were drawn. Indeed, the temples of this study were heavily influenced by the interaction of these traditions. Thus, these temples offer an excellent opportunity to examine the mechanisms underlying the kind of cultural interplay

---

41 Bouchart, 1984, 133.
43 Rapin, 1992, 117.
which is one of the Hellenistic Period’s most distinctive and enduring hallmarks.

In the following chapters, this work will track the interplay of forces which resulted in the temples and other cultic structures of Ai Khanum, Failaka and Dura-Europos. On one level, it will examine the interaction of cultural religious traditions. And, on another level, it will highlight the ways in which local factors of the history of individual sites shaped the temples’ formation and use within the broader traditions.
Chapter 2

Ai Khanum

This chapter will focus on the various temples and sanctuaries of the Bactrian city of Ai Khanum. This site was an important urban centre during the Hellenistic Period. Its position along the banks of the Kokcha and Amu Darya (Oxus) rivers meant that it could control the surrounding plains strategically and economically. The city (Figure 2.1) was certainly prosperous and open to a variety of goods and ideas. Commensurate with this prosperity, the city was able to support several major religious structures. In all, there are remains of five cult centres in the city and its immediate environs. These can be classified in one of two categories: those centres which served a purely religious role, and those which had a role in the cultic life of the city but which also served a funereal purpose. Thus, on the one hand, there are structures which served as regular sanctuaries, such as the Temple à Redans, the Extramural Temple and the acropolis sanctuary. On the other hand, there are also funerary-religious monuments, namely the Heroon of Kineas and the Mausoleum. This chapter will examine each one of these structures, describing them and examining the various pieces of evidence, where appropriate, of ritual and cult. This chapter will also discuss what information these religious structures reveal about the interplay of cultural influences during

---

Rapin. 1992, 103.
the Hellenistic Period.

The Temple à Redans

Physical Description of the Temple and Its Sanctuary

The Temple à Redans, so-named by its excavators, was the main temple of the city. It has yielded evidence of religious practices both in the form of architecture and in the form of small finds. The temple lies along the main North-South road of Ai Khanum on the shoulder of the precipitous acropolis hill. It originally stood towards the back of a sanctuary, which enclosed it on three sides, and which opened directly onto the main road. The back of the sanctuary was an open terrace and the ground level dropped abruptly a short distance behind the temple. The temple itself is oriented somewhat towards the south east, due, in part, to the local topography and the route of the main road. Excavators have counted five phases of occupation for the temple, of which four saw it used as a religious structure, while the temple had been converted for domestic use by the latest phase.

The original temple building (Figure 2.2) was a roughly rectangular structure of mud brick measuring some 24.5 metres on its east-west axis and 23.5 on its north-south axis. Its outer mud brick walls were extremely thick: between 5.75 and 6 metres. Such a great thickness has been taken by the excavators to indicate that the building might have once

---


possessed a feature found in the later structure, specifically a stepped crepis, the evidence of whose existence has since disappeared into the thickness of the wall.\textsuperscript{47}

The interior of this earliest temple consisted of two more or less identical rectangular rooms: a naos and a pronaos, which measured 12.10 metres in width and 4.6 metres in length each. The interior floors were of beaten earth about one metre above the exterior, contemporary ground level. The temple may have been entered by means of stairs for which no remains have been found. On top of the floor of the naos, a mud brick altar with ash on its upper surface, which measured 60 centimetres on a side, was found in the centre of the room 5.4 metres from the north wall. This altar enclosed an older and smaller mud brick altar in the same spot within the room.\textsuperscript{48} The outer walls of this earlier building were apparently smooth, which distinguishes this phase from the later phases where the temple wall was indented.\textsuperscript{49} However, if the temple had indeed possessed a stepped crepis, any decorations on the walls would have disappeared into the combined thickness of the wall and the crepis. At some point in time, this earliest temple was partially destroyed. It was upon these remnants that the later Temple à Redans, with its multiple phases, was built.\textsuperscript{50}

The later temple (Figure 2.3) was built using different techniques than the earlier building. For example, larger mud bricks and lime mortar, instead of simple mud mortar,

\textsuperscript{47} Bernard, 1971, 415.

\textsuperscript{48} Bernard, 1971, 415.

\textsuperscript{49} Downey, 1988, 67.

\textsuperscript{50} Bernard, 1971, 414.
were used in its construction.\textsuperscript{51} The structure was roughly square and smaller than the preceding one, measuring only 19 metres on a side. The interior layout differed somewhat from that of the previous structure. The pronaos was still a wide rectangle, but the naos itself was smaller and square in shape. Flanking the naos on either side, there were two L-shaped sacristies which communicated with the naos by means of two lateral doorways in the naos, set towards the front of the room. The naos also held a shallow niche, which measured some 75 centimetres deep, in the back wall. In front of this niche was a bench with a somewhat complicated chronology to be discussed later.\textsuperscript{52} The interior floor was laid on a layer of pebbles and stood 1.70 metres above the outer courtyard level. The doorways of both the naos and the pronaos were monumental, each measuring over 3 metres in width and possessing stone thresholds, and were centred along the width of the temple.\textsuperscript{53} The outer mud brick walls of the temple were thick, but measured only about half the thickness of the earlier structure's walls. These outer walls were decorated with sets of parallel, vertical triple indentations from which the temple got its name. The facade of the temple had two of these triple indentations, while the other three walls each had four.\textsuperscript{54} The temple was originally surrounded by a crepis with three steps made of mud brick which were covered with a layer of lime whitewash. The interior of the temple was originally approached by a five metre wide

\textsuperscript{51} Bernard, 1971, 425.

\textsuperscript{52} Bernard, 1969, 335.

\textsuperscript{53} Bernard, 1969, 329.

\textsuperscript{54} Bernard, 1969, 333.
staircase, which consisted of ten stone steps laid on a mud brick substructure.\textsuperscript{55} The excavators also found fragments of crenelated baked brick cornice and believe that these fragments belonged to the roof.\textsuperscript{56}

This structure had a number of chronological phases, as previously mentioned, each possessing a variety of modifications in the form of the temple. This (the second) phase of the temple and the subsequent two phases offer the most extensive evidence for the religious use of the structure. For example, the bench of the naos, which held both votives and the cult statues, consisted originally of only a mud brick bench along the back wall in the second phase. This bench was later encased in baked brick with a reinforced depression to support a large cult statue. Finally, in the fourth phase of the complex, benches along either side of the room were added. The substructure of the temple also changed over time. The original whitewashed crepis of three mud brick steps was encased in the fourth period by a platform \textbf{(Figure 2.4)} which surrounded the entire periphery of the temple structure. \textsuperscript{57} This platform, which had a level height equal to the interior floor, measured 2 metres wide along the facade and 1.50 metres around the other sides. This platform was constructed mostly out of an earth and brick fragment fill which was held in place by a retaining wall made out of a single vertical layer of mud brick. The outer surface of the platform was covered in a thick layer of lime whitewash for protection, and there were numerous signs of repair. There was no

\textsuperscript{55} Bernard, 1971, 425.

\textsuperscript{56} Bernard, 1969, 344.

evidence that the platform held any sort of superstructure, like a colonnade. At the same time that this platform was added to the outside of the temple, a set of two columns was added to the inside of the naos. Their presence was supported by the discovery of an Attic/Ionic stone base and a wooden Ionic capital, which were both found within the naos but not in situ. From this evidence, the excavator has reconstructed a set of two columns, placed so that they would visually flank the niche in the rear wall from the point of view of an observer standing in the entranceway.

A chronology has been set up for the various phases with the help of the numismatic evidence recovered from the site. The original temple structure has been dated to the first quarter of the third century B.C. The first phase of the second structure lasted until roughly the middle of the same century. The last Greek coins have been linked to the final phase of the temple, when the pair of columns were introduced in the naos. These coins date to the reign of the Greco-Bactrian Eucratides, during whose reign, circa 145 B.C., the city was conquered. The temple was then converted to domestic use. Indeed, the other finds seem to back up this chronology, since most of the other items could well fall between the dates of 280 and 145 B.C. set out by the coins. These finds will be discussed in more detail in a following section.

59 Downey, 1988, 71.
60 Bernard, 1971, 430.
61 Francfort, 1984, 2.
The temple’s sanctuary (Figure 2.5) bordered the main road for some sixty metres. Like the temple building, the sanctuary underwent a number of phases and modifications, which do not necessarily correlate with those of the temple itself, although there are points of correspondence. For example, the earliest remains of the sanctuary that were found were a series of north-south walls in baked brick near the south-east corner of the sanctuary, measuring 7.40 metres long by 1.60 metres wide and preserved to a height of two courses.\textsuperscript{62} The next stage was characterized by two walls which covered the oldest walls but which were made out of mud brick. During the third phase, a portico along the southern half of the eastern wall was built, covering the remnants of the previous two phases.\textsuperscript{63}

Two large mud brick installations, which have been dated before the third phase of the sanctuary, were found within the courtyard, five metres from the entrance and to the north east of the temple itself. The larger one measured 2.50 by 2.15 metres, while the smaller measured only 1.30 by 0.95 metres in area. Both of them appear to have once been large altars or offering tables. Both of these structures were also razed down to their bases during later construction, before being eventually covered by an augmentation of the courtyard floor level during the third sanctuary phase.\textsuperscript{64} Indeed, on several occasions, the floor level of the sanctuary and its courtyard were altered. At the time of the construction of the eastern portico, during the third phase, the courtyard level was raised as much as half a metre in front

\textsuperscript{62} Bernard, 1971, 430.

\textsuperscript{63} Bernard, 1971, 431.

\textsuperscript{64} Bernard, 1970, 337.
a large acrolithic cult statue (Figure 2.7), which were found on the bench at the rear of the naos. These fragments were once attached to a several times life-sized statue which once stood in that room. The remainder of the sculpture, which was made out of clay, wood or plaster, did not survive. The marble fragments which remain consist of pieces of both hands and the left foot. The left hand is apparently grasping some cylindrical object, which cannot be identified with certainty but may be a sceptre. The foot piece, on the other hand, is in much better condition. It wears a thick-soled sandal with crisscrossed laces and a strap across the toes. This sandal’s strap is decorated with rosettes, a palmette in a heart-shaped piece and a pair of Greek-style winged thunderbolts. The sandal fits a type of Greek footwear known as a crepis, which is often found on Greek sculpture in the Mediterranean basin during the Hellenistic Period.\(^70\) The form of the sandals resembles the footwear found on the Apollo Belvedere in the Vatican Museums, which may be a copy of a fourth century B.C. original.\(^71\) The same type of sandal is also found on a third century B.C. statue of a Hermaphrodite from Pergamon. The decoration on both sets of sandals, however, differs markedly, notably in the presence of the winged lightning bolts on the example from Ai Khanum.\(^72\) The example from Ai Khanum may possibly date sometime after 200 B.C. Such a date would work well with


\(^{71}\) B. Ridgway, *Hellenistic Sculpture I: The Styles of ca. 331-200 B.C*. Madison, 1990, 92-93. See also Dothan-Morrow, 1985, 114. Dothan Morrow, however, believes that the form of the sandal may represent a later, possibly Roman style. A Roman origin is manifestly not possible regarding the Ai Khanum foot. A somewhat later date than the fourth century for the original of the Apollo Belvedere would not, however, be necessarily problematic for the purposes of dating the Ai Khanum foot.

the remainder of the evidence from the temple, considering that the bench in the naos of the temple was specifically modified to support the weight of the statue only in the later phases of its existence.

Three mud brick statue bases stood in the pronaos, flanking the door to the naos, two on the right-hand side and one on the left (Figure 2.4).73 Fragments of the raw clay statues which these bases once held have also been found. These include fragments of a woman’s face done in the Greek style and two masculine faces, one being characterized by Bernard as idealized and the other as energetic. These statuettes were supported not only by their own individual bases but also by the rear wall of the pronaos onto which the raw clay backs of the sculptures were glued. Remnants of gold leaf upon these fragments indicate that the statues may have once been gilded.74

In addition, an Ionic capital in wood (Figure 2.8), which was carbonised in the fire that ultimately destroyed the temple, was found in the entrance to the south sacristy. It has been attributed by the excavators to one of the columns which were placed in the naos in the final religious phase of the temple. Its form, most notably in the deep curve of the *canalis*, resembles Ionic capitals which have been found at other Oriental Hellenistic Period sites, such as Nysa and Ikaros (FAILA).75

Certain of the finds bear evidence of the rituals performed at the temple. For example,


74 Bernard, 1969, 344.

75 Bernard, 1969, 349-352; Ikaros will be discussed fully in the next chapter of this work.
at the rear of the exterior of the temple proper, some 32 ceramic vessels (Figure 2.9) with locally inspired forms were discovered buried individually face down along the base of the lowest step of the crepis. In certain cases, similar vessels were also found interred in the peripheral platform, thus indicating a continuation over time. Many of these vessels, which included high rimmed bowls, and wide-bellied pots, contained traces of their original liquid contents. Excavators, therefore, attributed them to the performance of libations, with their subsequent burial indicating that the ritual was dedicated to some chthonic deity.\textsuperscript{76} The vessels which were buried along the base of the crepis have been dated by means of their forms to the first half of the third century. However, those vessels which were buried in the platform and must perforce be much later are also very similar in style, testifying to a certain conservatism in ritual ceramics at Ai Khanum.\textsuperscript{77}

In another example, six small mud brick installations were found on the top step of the second phase crepis against the outer walls of the temple. They were later covered by the addition of the peripheral platform. These bases were in the shape of truncated pyramids, averaging half a metre for each basal dimension and having traces of ash upon their tops. The excavators have identified these as incense burners, small altars or thymiateria.\textsuperscript{78} This same function may be shared by some thirty limestone bases which mostly resembled Achaemenid plinth-and-torus column bases, measuring 10-15 centimetres on a side, and which were

\textsuperscript{76} Bernard, 1970, 329.

\textsuperscript{77} Bernard, 1971, 429.

\textsuperscript{78} Bernard, 1971, 426.
mostly found in the levels of the last phase, clustered in the pronaos of the temple and in the regions directly adjoining the later northern chapel of the sanctuary. The appearance of the truncated pyramids in the second phase and limestone bases in numbers towards the later phases of the temple and its sanctuary may indicate on one hand a continuity of ritual in the burning of incense. On the other hand, there was apparently also a shift in ritual at some point away from the set pyramidal bases around the outer wall of the temple towards the use of miniature socles clustered near the pronaoi of the temple and auxiliary chapel.

Along with these ritual items, numerous other items were found. Often these could be quite luxurious, such as ivory feet for a Greek style klinē or ivory plaques which were originally assembled into ornate chests. A gilded silver plaque (Figure 2.10), measuring 0.25 metres in diameter, was also discovered in one of the sacristies of the temple. This plaque displays a scene containing the goddess Cybele being pulled in a lion drawn chariot driven by the goddess Nike. There are two priests in eastern dress, one following the chariot with a parasol and the other sacrificing at an altar on a mountain on the right. Above the scene, the god Helios with a radiate crown looks downwards and is flanked by the moon and two stars. This scene thus demonstrates a mixture of Hellenistic (the three gods) and Mesopotamian iconography (the mountain and the priests). Along with the luxuries, the
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79 Francfort, 1984, 81-84. The plinth-and-torus style of column base can be found used in the columns of the Achaemenid palace at Persepolis. See A. B. Tilia, Studies and Restorations at Persepolis and other sites of Fars. Rome, 1972, pl. XXXIX, fig. 89.

80 Francfort, 1984, 9, 12.

temple and its sanctuary contained many other finds of less exalted status, ranging from iron blades to the grindstones of the last phase of occupation.

The Extramural Temple

Unlike the Temple à Redans, the second major temple at Ai Khanum did not possess a large corpus of small finds. Instead, all of the evidence from this temple comes from its architecture. The Extramural Temple was found some 100 metres to the north of the city and was located near to the same north-south road on which the other temple was sited.82 The temple was apparently situated within some sort of sanctuary, the remains of which have been found to the south of the temple proper. Unfortunately, these remains consist of only vestigial traces of the walls of the original structure, and very little has thus far been gleaned about the layout.83

There were two distinct building phases, though individual occupation phases could not be determined, unlike at the Temple à Redans. The earlier phase of the Extramural Temple (Figure 2.11) was rectangular and measured 15.80 metres in length and 22.50 metres in width. This temple opened roughly to the north, with the main road running along its flank, a rather unusual orientation for a temple. Like the Temple à Redans, this early version of the Extramural temple was footed on a three-stepped mud brick crepis which stood 1.80 metres high. The exterior mud brick walls were also decorated with a set of parallel vertical

82 Bernard, 1976, 303.
83 Bernard, 1976, 304.
niches. These niches, however, were simple rectangular indentations, unlike the more complicated triple depressions which graced the walls of the other temple. Internally, the layout was also somewhat different. In the northern half of the building, there was a room which ran the width of the structure and which was entered by a very wide entrance to the north. This room was not a roofed pronaos, as in the other temple, but rather an interior courtyard open to the sky, as the extremely wide entranceway would seem to indicate. At the back of this structure, there was a row of three square naoi whose floors were half a metre higher than the floor of the courtyard. Each of these rooms faced the courtyard and was reached from it by a separate set of stairs.84

Sometime later, the old temple was demolished, and a new, larger temple was built. This temple (Figure 2.12) was built directly over the base of the earlier structure. In fact, part of the south side of the stepped crepis was reused in the later temple.85 The new structure continued to possess the same broad, rectangular shape of the earlier structure, but it had been expanded and measured 35.75 metres in width by 20 metres in length. The temple continued to face north and to sit upon a three-stepped, mud brick base which stood as tall as in the previous phase.86 The major alterations, however, came in the form of the internal layout of the new temple. In the new temple structure, there continued to be a wide
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rectangular courtyard with an extremely large opening in the north. However, instead of the simple set of three rooms at the back of the courtyard, there were several more rooms in a more complicated arrangement. The central naos remained more or less unchanged, but it was now flanked by a pair of rooms on either side. Two more pairs of rooms stood on the east and west sides of the courtyard. Thus, the rooms of the temple were laid out somewhat like the Greek letter Pi (Π). 87 Each pair of rooms had only one entrance into the courtyard. In the case of the east and west suites, the northern room had the entrance. 88 A series of steps down to the outer ground level were placed on the north side of the structure so that the top of the high crepis could be reached. 89 The exterior of the temple continued to be decorated with a simple set of parallel, rectangular, vertical niches. These are analogous to the more complicated niches of the Temple à Redans. 90 The significance of the variation in niche complexity between the two temples is unknown and may be just be normal variations on a decorative element. In general, however, the niches of the Extramural Temple tend to be simpler than most temples decorated in this manner during the Hellenistic Period. 91 Like the Temple à Redans, the later Extramural Temple, and quite possibly the earlier as well, also had a crenelated cornice of baked brick, fragments of which were found in the surrounding

87 Bernard, 1975, 289.

88 Downey, 1988, 74.

89 Downey, 1988, 73.

90 Bernard, 1974, 289.

91 See Downey, 1988, 15-38. Here, she discusses the traditional Mesopotamian temples of Hellenistic Uruk, whose niche decorations tend to be rather complex.
Like the Temple à Redans, the crepis of the Extramural Temple was, at some point, covered over with bricks to form a sort of flat-sided platform or podium.93

As noted above, no objects of a cultic nature have been found in relation to the extramural building. The excavators, therefore, have based their identification on the many similarities between this structure and the Temple à Redans, whose attribution is more certain. Both buildings had similar substructures and crenelated cornices in baked brick. The presence of niches in the outer wall also links the Extramural Temple to other cultic buildings. In addition, there was a certain amount of similarity in their layout, in that the wide courtyard and central naos of the Extramural Temple bear a resemblance to the wide pronaos and naos of the Temple à Redans. Of course, the layout of the earlier Extramural Temple bears a much closer resemblance to the city's other temple than does the later version. Indeed, the presence of three similar naoi has led the excavators to theorize that three separate deities were worshipped at the temple. Unfortunately, the lack of small finds means that the identities of these gods remain unknown.94

The Acropolis Sanctuary

One other non-funerary religious structure was discovered at Ai Khanum. This sanctuary was found on top of the city’s precipitous acropolis hill, towards the hill’s south-
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west edge.\textsuperscript{95} Upon its seventy metre high perch, the sanctuary consisted of an open square courtyard which contained a square podium. This podium measured sixteen by sixteen metres at the base and rose in six steps to a total height of three metres.\textsuperscript{96} There was apparently no structure constructed on the top of this podium.\textsuperscript{97} Instead, rituals were performed upon the five metre square platform, whose sides formed the uppermost step or tier. This platform was approached by a set of stairs which ran down the centre of the west side.\textsuperscript{98}

The Funerary Sanctuaries: The Heroon of Kineas and the Mausoleum

Two more ritual sites have been discovered at Ai Khanum. These differ from those detailed above in that, while they served a ritual or cultic purpose and had many features of form in common with other sanctuaries elsewhere, they also served a funerary purpose and had installations for the storage of corpses. They do, on the whole, present a different character from the other religious buildings at Ai Khanum. Nevertheless, their architectural styles are part of the same general context of the adaptation of the ritual life of the city.

\textsuperscript{95} Bernard, 1976, 306.


\textsuperscript{97} Bernard, 1976, 307.

\textsuperscript{98} Boyce & Crenet, 1991, 182.
The Heroon of Kineas

The Heroon of Kineas (Figure 2.13) was discovered to the north of the monumental propylon, some forty metres away from the north wall of the large court which forms part of the administrative quarter of the city.\(^99\) It was built on top of a large terrace which also supported the Mausoleum discussed below.\(^100\) Over the span of its existence, the heroon underwent numerous changes which radically altered its appearance and which have been grouped into four distinct phases. The first three of these phases constituted the span of the ritual life of the structure, while in the fourth and latest phase the structure was characterized by domestic occupation, like the city's main temple; this final phase will not be discussed here. The excavators, using ceramic evidence in the form of recovered sherds, have dated the phases of the heroon as follows: the original phase has been dated from 325 to 300 B.C., making it one of the earliest structures of the city; the second phase started in the first quarter of the third century. The latest religious period was harder to date, but the excavators have placed its beginning circa 200 B.C., with extreme reservations. This date has been based upon the smaller size of the mud bricks which were used and which were roughly the same size as those of the administrative quarter of the city, which was itself dated to around this time.\(^101\)


\(^{100}\) Hannestad & Potts, 1990, 98.

Originally, the heroon had a layout which was later copied by the northern subsidiary chapel in the sanctuary of the city's main temple. The naos was roughly square, with an exterior length of 7.60 metres and a width of 7.55 metres. The heroon, like the subsidiary chapel, was preceded by a wider distyle-in-antis pronaos, forming a sort of inverted 'T' shape. The walls of the structure were made of mud brick and were 1.20 metres thick.\textsuperscript{102} Unlike the chapel, however, the Heroon of Kineas, being an independent structure, was also footed on a three-stepped crepis like the ones from the Temple à Redans and the Extramural Temple. This substructure stood 0.75 metres high and was 1.10 metres in width around the periphery of the temple. It was made with mud brick with the addition of an outer baked brick layer, which had a white plaster coating. The interior of the naos also seems to have been covered in a layer of lime plaster over another layer of pisé. Buried within the floor of the naos there was a sarcophagus which, though robbed and emptied, was more or less intact and was made from the local limestone favoured by the artists of Ai Khanum.\textsuperscript{103} There was a small circular hole through both the floor and the lid of this sarcophagus. This probably served as a conduit for libations.\textsuperscript{104}

The second phase of the structure appears to have happened in response to heavy wear and tear on the original structure. The remains of the first phase were encased in a large terrace, which measured 17.40 metres in width, 48.20 metres in length, and 1.30 metres high.

\textsuperscript{102} Bernard, Le Berre & Stucki, 1973, 86.
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The whole terrace was surrounded by a 1.50 metre thick mud brick retaining wall which held the fill together. Above the fill level, the remains of the old heroon were razed and a new heroon was built. Instead of the earlier inverted 'T' plan, the pronaos and naos were now both of equal width, forming a long rectangle 16.55 by 10.00 metres. It was still, however, a distyle-in-antis structure. Within the naos, a second tomb was constructed during this period. This tomb consisted of a long and narrow pit, which was dug into the floor of the terrace and was lined with baked bricks.\textsuperscript{105} Part of this pit encroached upon the original limestone sarcophagus.\textsuperscript{106}

At some point, the second phase structure was also torn down for reasons unknown. The terrace and floor of the phase 2 structure continued to be used, but a new superstructure was created. This structure (\textbf{Figure 2.14}), which measured 15.45 metres in length, continued to follow the same pattern: a naos with a distyle-in-antis pronaos, all made in mud brick. The interior dimensions, however, of the third period naos were once again diminished to 7.15 by 6.25 metres. This diminishment was, in part, to accommodate two inset benches or shelves which ran the exterior lengths of the north and west walls.\textsuperscript{107} The pronaos, which measured 5.35 by 7.00 metres, continued to use the same stylobates for its columns as had the phase 2 structure, though the building as a whole had a slight shift of axis towards the north. Since the walls of the heroon were mud brick, the average wall thickness continued


to be around a metre and a half.\textsuperscript{108} Two more burials were found within the naos and attributed to this period. One of these consisted of a second limestone sarcophagus in a pit lined with mud brick, while the second tomb was only a pit lined with bricks and containing the remains of a wooden coffin.\textsuperscript{109}

Various fragments from the roof of the structure have also been found. For example, a great number of fragments of terracotta antefixes have been found. For the most part, these fragments fit into a type consisting of central bulbs one half metre high which were flanked by two stylized up-turned leaves. In other cases, the antefix was in the form of a palmette some 35 centimetres in height. This last type was usually found by excavators towards the south of the structure. Terracotta roof tiles were also found, albeit in limited quantities. This dearth has led the excavator to theorize that there were terracotta tiles around only the outer edge of the structure’s roof.\textsuperscript{110}

One object of note which was recovered from the structure was a stone base with a stele bearing an inscription. This stele was found in use as a socle for a wooden post in the stage four domestic phase of the heroon. The text of the inscription has been reproduced in Appendix 2\textsuperscript{(see Inscription 2.1)}. The text commemorates the actions of one Clearchus, who copied down some axioms in Delphi and transported them a great distance to set them up in

\textsuperscript{108} Bernard, Le Berre & Stucki, 1973, 93.
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\textsuperscript{110} Bernard, Le Berre & Stucki, 1973, 93.
the Temenos of Kineas. At the bottom of the stele, some five inscribed lines (Inscription 2.2) appear to be part of the list of sayings which Clearchus transcribed. Louis Robert has identified these axioms as part of a collection of sayings attributed to the Seven Sages of Greece which was attributed to Sosiades and which was later copied down several centuries later by Stobaeus. Indeed, five of the sayings in Stobaeus’ work match those on the stele almost word for word. The sayings on the stele were apparently only the tail end of a longer list, inscribed on the stele base when there was no more room on another stele which held the longer list, and of which only a tiny fragment has been found. These sayings were part of a long Greek tradition of folk wisdom, and were thus an integral part of the Greek mindset and culture. Another similar collection of such sayings was discovered inscribed on a stele at Miletopolis in Mysia. Robert also identified the Clearchus of the inscription with a Clearchus, known from written fragments and mentions in Athenaeus and Josephus, who was a disciple of Aristotle’s and a moral philosopher interested both in Greek and non-Greek customs.

The inscribed stele has allowed the heroon to be identified as belonging to Kineas, since the monument strongly resembles the temenos mentioned therein. Indeed, the field has

---
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been further narrowed so that the tomb of Kineas has been identified as the limestone sarcophagus with the hole for libations, within the baked brick pit of the first phase of the structure, since this was the original burial contained within the structure. Considering the monumentality of the structure and its honoured position near the administrative centre at Ai Khanum, the person of Kineas has also further been identified as a possible candidate for the founder of the city.\textsuperscript{115} Thus, the heroon may have been consecrated to the civic founder cult following the Greek tradition.\textsuperscript{116}

The Mausoleum With Crypt:

One more cultic structure has been found at Ai Khanum. This structure was a large mausoleum with a stone crypt (Figure 2.15), which has unfortunately been badly damaged by looters at the site. This structure was discovered as an isolated mound some 150 metres to the north of the Heroon of Kineas, upon whose terrace it was also built, near the city’s administrative quarter.\textsuperscript{117} Unlike the Heroon of Kineas, no inscription was found which could identify the structure. Thus, like most of the religious buildings at Ai Khanum, the mausoleum remains anonymous. Chronologically, the mausoleum is hard to place. Evidence from the ceramic sherds which were recovered from the immediate area, however, seems to suggest a date within the third century, but it is not possible to place the structure with any


\textsuperscript{116} Bernard, Le Berre & Stucki, 1973, 97.
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greater precision. There is evidence that the mausoleum which was found was preceded by an earlier building upon the same site, but too little remains of this earlier structure.\textsuperscript{118} Thus, perforce, this section will deal with the second structure.

The mausoleum building measured 21.50 metres long by 11.75 metres wide. Its internal layout consisted of three rooms, one after another along its long axis. In the east, the first room was a pronaos/vestibule with two \textit{in-antis} columns. This vestibule communicated with a rectangular naos by means of a doorway with a stone threshold. At the rear of the naos, another doorway with a stone threshold led to an \textit{adyton}, under which a narrow staircase of 12 steps led down into a crypt. This crypt, unlike much of the architecture at Ai Khanum, was not constructed in mud brick, but, instead, it was constructed of worked stone laid in lime mortar. This crypt, which measured 4.50 by 2.30 metres, was originally covered by a stone vault which was broken by the looters who also damaged much of the rest of the structure. At one time, this subterranean room held multiple interments which have since also been looted. All that remained of the original contents of the crypt were a pair of undecorated stone sarcophagi and the skeletal remains of five individuals. Outside the crypt, to the north of the stairs, a funeral trench, like the ones from the Heroon of Kineas, was dug into the floor and lined with baked brick.\textsuperscript{119} This trench, which was also pillaged, was apparently created when there was no room left in the crypt itself for more bodies.\textsuperscript{120}

\textsuperscript{118} Bernard, 1975, 188.
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Like most of the other religious structures of the city, the mausoleum was also footed on a three-stepped crepis made, for the most part, out of mud brick and resembling that of the Temple à Redans. This substructure was itself quite large, measuring 29.75 metres along the east-west axis and 20.00 metres along the north-south. In height, the substructure stood about one and a half metres. The building on top faced east, and there was a narrow staircase on that side of the substructure which allowed access. This substructure had been thoroughly damaged, but certain hypotheses about its reconstruction could be made. Along the top of the crepis, three stone blocks, which may have acted as the supports for wooden columns, were found with an interaxial spacing of 2.80 metres. These have allowed excavators to theorize that the mausoleum once possessed a peripteral colonnade of 6 columns along the shorter east and west sides and ten columns along the longer north and south sides.

Unfortunately, nothing remains of these columns and it is believed that they could have been made out of wood. Another possibility was that the columns were constructed out of terracotta, since some terracotta column elements, such as capitals, were found reused in the repairs of the substructure. Indeed, two Ionic capitals have been reconstructed from numerous fragments found in the ruins. These capitals may have originally come from the pronaos, where stone socles have also indicated the presence of columns. By their style and
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shape, these two capitals, which have excessively curved canals and heavily reduced echini, cannot be placed into any Greek series of Ionic capitals from the Mediterranean region. However, the previously mentioned wooden Ionic capital from the naos of the Temple à Redans bears a certain resemblance to these two capitals from the Mausoleum. All three also resemble examples of capitals found on the island of Failaka.\textsuperscript{124}

\textbf{Discussion:}

Certain scholars, such as Downey, have identified several cultural influences for the temples and other religious structures at Ai Khanum, including both Mesopotamian and Achaemenid Period Iranian.\textsuperscript{125} The religious structures at Ai Khanum evidently represent a complex and fluctuating mixture of cultural inspirations. The exact mixture not only varied between the different temples but could be changed over time as the emphasis placed on the different temple traditions was altered.

The prime example of this phenomenon can be found at the Temple à Redans, where the cultural influences which are displayed are many and vary over the history of the structure. For instance, there are certain affinities between this temple and temples of the Babylonian tradition.\textsuperscript{126} The original structure had a rather Mesopotamian layout, with its wide rooms. The presence of an internal brick altar, which lasted long enough for at least one
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modification of its design, also fits well into the Mesopotamian tradition. Of course, the smooth walls may have lacked the niches and projections which were typical of Mesopotamian religious architecture and which were found on the later temple. Indeed, this first phase of the temple may have possessed a Greek style stepped crepis, such as later phases possessed. Thus, from the beginning, the temple did not necessarily follow all of the patterns of any single tradition. The second temple building, with its naos flanked by two sacristies, also had a layout which could easily have been drawn from the Neo-Babylonian temple tradition.¹²⁷ The presence of the crenelated cornice and the presence of vertical niches along the outer walls as well as the walls of the sanctuary facade also seem to hearken back to Mesopotamian forms. The niche in the rear wall of the naos and the benches which stood in front of it have also been found in Mesopotamian temples, such as the Hellenistic Period temples at Uruk, which were constructed totally in the Mesopotamian fashion.¹²⁸ Thus, although the presence of Mesopotamian influence is constant throughout the life of the temple, the precise forms of this influence seem to change over time.

Other influences are not wanting. The second temple structure originally stood on top of a whitewashed base which resembled the three-stepped peripteral stone crepis of traditional Greek temples. At some point, there was also an exterior altar of sizeable dimensions in the courtyard. The presence of a large, external altar would also accord with Greek religious ideals, since the courtyard would be the logical place for Greeks to put an

¹²⁷ Boyce & Creten, 1991, 166.

¹²⁸ Downey, 1988, 15-38.
Commagene. Another hypothesis, advocated by Crenet, is that the statue represented a combination of Zeus and Mithra, who was a much more popular deity in the Bactrian pantheon than Ahura Mazda in later periods. In this case, the identification is supported by the presence of the canal and the chthonic burial of libation vessels which took place in the sanctuary, since water played an important part in the cult of Mithra and since Mithra was also the judge of hell. In any case, the statue seems to have been a late addition, since the modifications made in the bench at the rear of the naos for its installation have been dated to the next to last phase of the religious function of the temple. The installation of the cult statue also corresponds to the addition of the two Ionic wooden columns in the naos. Francfort has grouped these additions together with the addition of the porticoes of the sanctuary. Thus, there seems to have been an addition of a number of Greek elements at a rather late point in the temple's history. Indeed, Francfort identifies these modifications with the reign of Eucratides, who was the last Bactrian king to hold the city before its destruction in the mid-second century and who apparently made the city one of his capitals. These late modifications, therefore, can perhaps be seen as the results of the Hellenising attentions of the last Hellenistic monarch of the city.

Compared to the main temple, the picture garnered from the other cult sites of the city
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143 Francfort, 1984, 122.
is nowhere near as detailed. Still, certain information can still be gathered from the remains. In the case of the Extramural temple, no ritual objects have been found, leaving the architectural evidence as the only information on which to base an examination. This architectural evidence, however, gives a rather distinctive picture. Although in some ways it resembles the other large temple at Ai Khanum, the Extramural Temple has notable differences in its layout. Indeed, the layout of the Extramural temple also resembles the layout of the Temple Zeus Megistos, in the distant Syrian city of Dura-Europos. This resemblance will be discussed in depth in the chapter on the temples of Dura. The Extramural Temple itself has numerous Mesopotamian features, most notably the cornice of baked bricks and the vertical niches along the wall. In a way, it appears even more Mesopotamian than the other large temple, since it has several rooms, including naoi, spread around the interior of a courtyard, instead of having the actual naos in a separate building in the middle of the courtyard, like the Temple à Redans. Thus, in this fashion, it would bear a resemblance to the purely Mesopotamian temples of Hellenistic Uruk, which also had naoi arranged around the periphery of interior courtyards, albeit on a much grander scale. On the other hand, the Extramural temple did not have the same kinds of complex projection and niche decoration which were normal for Mesopotamian temples and which could be found on the Temple à Redans. Instead, it was decorated with a rather simple set of parallel rectangular indentations. Of course, even within Mesopotamia, the exact form which these
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144 Downey, 1988, 74.

145 Downey, 1988, 17-40
indentations took varied from one temple to another. The temple was also footed, at one point, on a base whose three steps resemble the crepis found on Greek temples. This type of base is not found in traditional Mesopotamian style temples. Thus, this cult site does not entirely fit into the Mesopotamian tradition, but shows some slight hints of Greek influence.

The acropolis sanctuary, unlike both of the large temples, seems to have belonged to a single tradition, namely the Iranian. The presence of a large, stepped podium accessed by stairs within the confines of an open courtyard, and the absence of any temple structure, fit well with the earlier Iranian tradition. Scholars such as Boyce and Grenet have pointed out the similarities between the nature of this sanctuary and the comments of Herodotus on the nature of Persian worship.\textsuperscript{146} Indeed, the positioning of the sanctuary on top of the precipitous acropolis hill at Ai Khanum also recalls Herodotus, who claimed that the Persians worshipped their gods on the tops of mountains.\textsuperscript{147} Archaeological parallels for the sanctuary also exist. At Pacmak-tepe, there exists a similar stepped podium which dates back to the Achaemenid Period. There also exist later examples of stepped podia at the ritual site of Nemrud Dagh in Commagene.\textsuperscript{148}

The remaining two sanctuaries, the Heroon of Kineas and the Mausoleum, present a different aspect from that of the other religious structures at Ai Khanum. They are much

\textsuperscript{146} Boyce & Grenet, 1991, 182.

\textsuperscript{147} Herodotus, 1.131.

more apparently Greek in their design. For one thing, they are both laid out lengthwise, while both of the main temples of the city have their longest axes laid perpendicular to their entrance axes. Their layouts, for the most part, are akin to those of traditional temples from the Greek homelands or to Hellenic funeral architecture. The influences of at least one phase of the Heroon of Kineas can be localized even more closely within the Greek world. The heroon’s reversed ‘T’ shape in its original layout, with its wider pronaos, closely resembles the layouts of roughly contemporary Macedonian chamber tombs, such as at the site of Leucadia.\(^{149}\) As such, the shape may have originated in the area of northern Greece, whence it migrated with the influx of Greek and Macedonian colonists into Bactria. Even though in the Heroon of Kineas the layout was eventually changed so that the sidewalls of the structure were straightened, the reversed ‘T’ shape continued at Ai Khanum. The latter phase of the subsidiary chapel in the sanctuary of the Temple à Redans also bore this shape, after it had been moved from the south side of the peribolos to the north.

The Heroon of Kineas also underwent a modification in its structure, which distanced it from traditional Greek style religious structures. The addition of a large, straight sided platform over the original stepped crepis-type base seems to be a recurring theme in the religious structures of Ai Khanum. The Extramural Temple and the Temple à Redans both also had similar structures built over their own three-stepped peripheral bases. The reasons behind these modifications are difficult to ascertain. In the case of the Heroon, repairs may

actually have been required to the base, which resulted in the platform.\textsuperscript{150} However, this was not the case for the city’s main temple.\textsuperscript{151} Boyce and Crenet, among others, have pointed out that the three stepped bases of the Ai Khanum religious structures not only could fit into the Greek tradition but also into the Iranian traditions of stepped podia, such as seen in the Acropolis sanctuary.\textsuperscript{152} If this were the case, then the addition of the platforms may have been an extension of the tradition. At Pasargadae, for instance, there existed a sanctuary in the Achaemenid Period which contained two large cubic podia inside a rectangular temenos wall. These podia had smooth sides and were accessed by a single flight of steps.\textsuperscript{153} Thus, the appearance of these platforms may be seen as a change towards a different Iranian style. The first substructures may still have been of Greek inspiration originally. At some point, however, they were equated with similar Iranian forms. Thus to the inhabitants of Ai Khanum, it could have become appropriate to replace the three-stepped substructures, which had started out as Greek but were not alien to Iranian minds, with the distinctly non-Hellenising straight walled terraces or platforms.

The Mausoleum, on the other hand, appears from all the evidence to have followed

\textsuperscript{150} Bernard, 1973, 88.

\textsuperscript{151} Bernard, 1971, 425.

\textsuperscript{152} Boyce & Crenet, 1991, 166.

\textsuperscript{153} Boucharat, 1984, 126. It is interesting to note that parallels to this phenomenon exist in areas where Greek and Persian influences interacted prior to the Hellenistic Period. For instance, some monumental tombs in Achaemenid Lycia, specifically at Xanthos and Limyra, possess a Persian-style straight sided substructure and a superstructure in the form of a Greek temple. See J. Fedak, \textit{Monumental Tombs of the Hellenistic Age: A Study of Selected Tombs from the Pre-Classical to the Early Imperial Era}. Toronto, 1990, 66-71.
the Hellenic canon the most studiously of all the religious structures at Ai Khanum. The presence of a peristyle, if true, would indicate a building similar to a traditional Greek peripteral temple.\textsuperscript{154} The presence of stone masonry and vaulting for the crypt, where many of the other religious structures at Ai Khanum were constructed out of mud brick, also sets it apart from the others.

In general, therefore, both the funerary sanctuaries at Ai Khanum garner much of their cultural parentage from the Greek homelands. This is not altogether surprising. Whereas each culture had its own deities and methods for worshipping them, the idea of instituting cults for mortal people was a particular phenomenon, which was popular in regions such as Greece, Anatolia, and Egypt, but which was relatively unknown in the regions east of the Zagros range prior to the Hellenistic Period.\textsuperscript{155} The presence of these structures within the city demonstrates the Hellenistic tradition of intramural burials for founders, presumably Kineas in this case, and benefactors.\textsuperscript{156} Other structures of similar function are known from sites throughout the Eastern Mediterranean, including Halicarnassus, Belevi and Calydon.\textsuperscript{157} Rapin goes as far as to say that, because these structures did not act as focal points for the worship of orientalising gods, such as has been theorized for the Temple à Redans, they were

\textsuperscript{154} Bernard, 1975, 188.
\textsuperscript{155} Bernard, 1973, 97.
\textsuperscript{156} Bernard, 1975, 188.
\textsuperscript{157} Bernard, 1973, 97.
not required to adopt as many features from various oriental traditions.\textsuperscript{158} The absence of non-Greek forms may have continued into the realm of the ritual surrounding these structures as well. Certainly, there is an absence of evidence for the buried-pot libations such as were found at the city’s main temple. This is somewhat odd, considering that the regular place to find such evidence is in funerary contexts. Two possible reasons for this absence present themselves. First, both the Heroon of Kineas and the Mausoleum may have already had more specialized facilities for libations. The Heroon of Kineas, at least, had direct evidence of this in the hole through the lid of the first sarcophagus. The excavators have also theorized that the \textit{adyton} of the Mausoleum may have served as a space for depositing offerings and for making libations down into the crypt immediately below.\textsuperscript{159} Thus, further libation rituals may have been superfluous. Second, locals may not have participated in any distinct fashion in the ritual set of something so Greek. In all probability, the real reason may have encompassed aspects of both of these.

\textbf{Summary}

The urban site of Ai Khanum has revealed five structures of a religious nature. They are heterogeneous as a group, displaying a variety of different influences in their layouts and rituals. In the case of the main temple, the Temple à Redans, enough evidence has been recovered to illustrate the shifting patterns of influences over time. Around the rather

\textsuperscript{158} Rapin, 1992, 117.

\textsuperscript{159} Bernard, 1975, 189.
Mesopotamian core of the temple with its wide rooms, Iranian and Greek influences competed with one another, with one becoming predominant at some points, and the second at others. The evidence also allows a glimpse of the shifting nature of the rituals performed within the temple. Ritual installations such as cult statues and/or altars appeared, were modified, or disappeared from the temple during the century and a half of its existence.

In the case of the Extramural temple, this bounty of evidence was lacking. Its architecture, however, displayed many of the same traits as the other temple, including the substructure and the decorations of the outer walls. Its layout also bears some resemblance to other temples, both within the city and elsewhere. The later stages, however, resemble nothing yet found.

The other three religious structures all seem to borrow more heavily from a single tradition. The Acropolis sanctuary, with its podium and courtyard, seems very Iranian. At the same time, the two funerary sanctuaries borrow heavily, but not entirely, from the Greek. In part, these last two seem to have been Greek because the ideas that they represented, civic cults for important mortal men, were foreign to both the Mesopotamian and Central Asian traditions.

Thus, the religious structures at Ai Khanum demonstrate a complex cultural interplay in their creation which is not only influenced by geographical proximity to various oriental temple traditions, but also apparently by a chronological aspect, which is dependent upon the history of the city, and by the nature of the structure itself and where it fit within the various traditions. As such Ai Khanum represents a unique picture of the religious life of a
Hellenistic city, which, in turn, may usefully be compared to other Hellenistic Period sites.
Chapter 3

Ikaros/ The Island of Failaka

The island of Failaka, which the Hellenistic Greeks called Ikaros, had a very different character from Ai Khanum. Whereas Ai Khanum was a large, land-locked urban centre in Bactria, Failaka was an island in the Persian gulf which was not nearly as extensively built up. Both sites, however, were of strategic importance and controlled the ways of communication in their respective areas. Failaka, like Ai Khanum, also possessed several cultic structures, revealing to scholars a rich body of architectural, epigraphic and artifactual evidence which can help illuminate some aspects of the religious life of the region during the Hellenistic Period.

The island of Failaka (Figure 3.1) lies some twenty kilometres off the coast of modern day Kuwait. It is situated almost directly in front of the mouth of the Bay of Kuwait, one of the region’s best harbours. From the north, the island is battered by the current and effluvium coming from the combination of the Tigris and Euphrates rivers through the Shat el-Arab. This position means that the island has long been an obligatory step in the navigation of the local waters. In form, the island is a low, roughly triangular tongue of land, measuring some 14 kilometres long east-west and 5 kilometres wide north-south. The island also has an abundant source of fresh water and currently supports a population of 1500
people who live off fishing, pasturage, and the cultivation of barley and date palms.\textsuperscript{160} The island was first visited by the Greeks towards the end of the fourth century B.C., when Alexander's admiral Nearchus stopped there on his way back from India. After the death of Alexander, the island soon came under the control of the Seleucid dynasty who used it as a military strong point in order to guard the trade routes eastward to India and southward, along the coast, to Arabia. When Seleucid power declined in the area starting in the middle of the second century B.C., the settlement on the island also started to decline.\textsuperscript{161} Indeed, part of the archaeological importance of this island originates from the fact that the Hellenistic Period layers have not been obscured by extensive later occupation, allowing for truly systematic excavation.\textsuperscript{162}

The importance of Failaka in the local trade routes of the Hellenistic Period meant that the island was well placed to be heavily influenced by nearby trading centres in Mesopotamia and southern Iran as well as by the incoming Greek settlers.\textsuperscript{163} In addition, items from peripheral regions, such as Arabia, may have found their way along the trade route and into the cult centres of the island.

This chapter will examine the group of religious structures which have been...

\textsuperscript{160} Salles, 1985, 572.

\textsuperscript{161} Salles, 1985, 579-582.


discovered by excavation and which date to the Hellenistic Period (Figure 3.2). The island possesses several different Hellenistic sites, several of which were cultic in nature, grouped around the south-west corner of the island. For example, a block of houses, designated F4, was uncovered along with a fortified enclosure designated F5. Within this fortified enclosure, which has been named the Sacred Fortress or Enclosure by its excavators, two temples were discovered. Another temple, named simply the Hellenistic Sanctuary, named B6, was discovered a short distance away from the Sacred Fortress, along the beach. To the north, the final cult centre, found at a site on the island known as Tell Khazneh, originated at a time previous to the death of Alexander, though it continued in use into the Hellenistic Period. It will also be briefly discussed in this chapter.

The Sacred Fortress

The remains of the Sacred Fortress (Figure 3.3) stand isolated from other archaeological sites. The fortress is situated in the south-west promontory of the island, some 150 metres from the southern coast, upon a very slight rise. The nearby beach was well sheltered from the prevailing north wind and thus excellent for shipping in Antiquity.\(^{164}\) The Sacred Fortress consisted of a square precinct, measuring 60 metres on a side, which was enclosed by a substantial fortification wall studded with towers at the corners.\(^{165}\) Within the
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\(^{165}\) Jeppesen, 1989, 40.
walls, only the eastern half has been extensively excavated, the western portion remaining relatively untouched except for a couple of trenches. In the eastern half of the enclosure, two temples, labelled A and B, were discovered along with their altars and other facilities. These temples and their auxiliary structures share many features in common with Greek-pattern temples, but the artifacts and inscriptions seem to indicate a much more complicated mixture of traditions. Originally, these temples and their auxiliary structures were apparently the main structures within the enclosure but, over time, this relationship changed. The fortress itself will be examined in more detail in its own section subsequent to the discussion of the temples themselves. The chronology of both the fortress and the temples will likewise be discussed in that section.

**Temple A**

Temple A (Figure 3.4) was the better preserved of the two temples within the enclosure, on whose east-west centerline it lies. According to Jeppesen, this position indicates that the temple was part of the original plan of the enclosure.\textsuperscript{166} The temple walls were roughly 0.90 metres thick and were constructed of an inner and an outer face of limestone ashlar blocks which were irregularly sized and fitted somewhat haphazardly together with clay mortar. The core of the wall was filled with a mixture of stone chips and clay. These walls formed a rectangular temple whose front was on the short side facing east.

\textsuperscript{166} Jeppesen, 1989, 72.
The internal layout of the temple consisted of a naos which was entered from a pronaos porch. The naos was square, measuring 5.58 metres to a side. It was entered through a central door in the transverse wall which divided it from the pronaos. The pronaos itself was the same width as the naos but measured 3.29 metres in depth. At the front of the pronaos, there were two columns which stood on a stylobate of stone blocks between two antae. There was also a crepis consisting of two steps, each measuring 0.25 metres high by 0.25-0.35 metres wide, which completely surrounded the temple. These steps were created using a facing of limestone ashlar blocks on the outside. These blocks were not wide enough to fill out the entire tread of the step, so the resulting space was filled with more stone chips and clay. The top of the second step stood flush with the stylobate at the front of the structure.  

The floors of the two rooms differed somewhat from each other. The floor of the pronaos was mostly stamped mud with some blocks of local beach-stone from the foundations of the walls along the edges. The threshold of the doorway was made from a single large beach-stone block. The naos, on the other hand, was paved with many finely worked stone slabs except for a square space in the middle-rear of the room, which was reserved and which was surrounded by a stone step 13 centimetres high by 16 broad. This step formed a rectangle 1.96 metres east-west by 1.79 metres north-south. The excavators have identified this area as part of a podium for a cult statue. Indeed, the remains of facing

---


stones, which ran around the outside of the podium, were also discovered.  

The top of the podium was edged with a moulded cornice, several pieces of which were discovered within the temple. Reconstructed, these blocks formed a rough square 1.40 by 1.50 metres, indicating that the podium narrowed slightly towards the top. It would be upon the surface edged by this cornice that the cult statue would have been placed.

The walls of Temple A were only partly preserved up to three courses of limestone ashlar, which had a measured height of 1.2 metres. A variety of other stone blocks suitable for use in the temple were also found scattered around nearby, but their numbers were not enough to account for any greater height to the walls. It seems likely, therefore, that the stone portion of the wall only served as a socle for a mud brick wall which made up the rest of the height. The limestone used in the walls must have originally been quarried on the mainland and then transported to the island, since the nearest deposit lies to the south of Kuwait city. The pronaos columns give a clue to the height of the temple when it was complete. Both limestone column bases were found in situ. These took the shape of Persian-style

\[169\] Jeppesen, 1989, 32-34.

\[170\] Jeppesen, 1989, 58-61. The area encompassed by the cornice indicates that the podium could have held a substantial cult statue, of which nothing unfortunately remains. The reconstructed height of the temple, see below, however, would also limit the height of this statue. Jeppesen theorizes that the statue may have been either a seated figure, which he dismisses because the proportions of the podium are improper for this type, or a group of statues, including a quadriga group. Jeppesen favours the quadriga option because the podium resembles the pillar-like bases normally associated with similar statues. Indeed, Jeppesen places a quadriga upon the podium in his reconstruction drawings of Temple A.


campaniform plinth and torus column bases, measuring about half a metre in diameter.\textsuperscript{173} These bases have a similar form to a style of column base used in Achaemenid architecture, notably in the Apadana at Persepolis.\textsuperscript{174} The use of this type of base is known from a variety of Hellenistic sites. For example, at Ai Khanum, similar bases are used in the second phase of the auxiliary chapel of the Temple à Redans.\textsuperscript{175} The Failaka bases may have been scavenged from an earlier structure, such as Tell Khazneh, which had phases dating to the Achaemenid period.\textsuperscript{176} A single stone Ionic capital (\textbf{Figure 3.5}) was also discovered within Temple A’s pronaos and linked to this temple’s columns, since it would be the best fit with the other column elements associated with the temple and since the Persian style bases can be used as variants on normal Ionic bases.\textsuperscript{177} This Ionic capital possessed a rather simplified form which is similar to a wooden example from Ai Khanum.\textsuperscript{178} One of the unfluted stone drums from Temple A’s columns was also recovered, the others having disappeared. These various elements have allowed the excavators to reconstruct the height of the column at
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\textsuperscript{178} Bernard, 1969, 349-352. Compare the Failaka capital to Fig. 2.8.
around 3.90 metres.\textsuperscript{179}

Certain decorative elements, which may have belonged to Temple A’s roof, have also been discovered by the excavators. These elements consist of three stone acroteria, similarly sized at around 0.60 metres in height, which were carved in shallow relief into the form of palmettes. Two of these were found within the pronaos of Temple A, while the third, matched to the other two by size, lay some distance in front of the temple. One acroterion had a shallow notch cut into its base in order to accommodate the apex of a pitched roof. The other two, which were shaped to fit into corners, had their bottoms cut at an angle in order to fit onto the lateral edges of the same roof.\textsuperscript{180} The excavators discovered no evidence for terracotta roof tile anywhere in the general vicinity of the temple. Instead, they have theorized that the temple was roofed with a flat wood beam and mud roof in the local fashion. In this theory, the three acroteria themselves would have been positioned on a sort of false sloping pediment (Figures 3.6 & 3.7), probably also of wood, which served to give the illusion of a temple with a typically Greek pitched roof from the front of the building.\textsuperscript{181}

The altar of Temple A was positioned 5 metres to the east of the temple, along the

\textsuperscript{179} Jeppesen, 1989, 53. Here Jeppesen used the taper of the drum to calculate the height of the column in the equation \((d/t=x/s)\) where \(d\) is the height of the drum in cm, \(t\) is the difference between the upper and lower diameters of the drum in mm, \(x\) is the height of the column shaft, and \(s\) is the difference between the upper and lower diameters of the column. Considering the uncertainty of the measurement of the taper of the shaft which could lead to extremely different answers, Jeppesen settled on an intermediate value of 3.15 metres for the height of the column shaft. This number, added to the height of the base and the capital, give the resulting total of 3.90 metres.

\textsuperscript{180} Jeppesen, 1989, 42-44.

\textsuperscript{181} Jeppesen, 1989, 55.
temple's centerline and between the temple and the eastern fortification wall of the enclosure. The remains of the altar consisted of a rectangular foundation of stone, measuring 4.58 metres north-south by 2.48 metres east-west. This foundation took the form of two steps, each measuring 0.23-0.35 metres high by 0.24-0.27 metres wide. These steps surrounded a compact core of clay, stone chips and rubble, which was faced by limestone slabs.\(^1\) Many of the square limestone facing slabs were found in the environs of the altar, all measuring 0.55-0.59 metres on a side. The compact core itself extended to a relatively level height of 55 centimetres.\(^2\) Two stone pediments (Figure 3.8) were recovered from the area around the temples. These two pieces were each carved from a single piece of rock and were decorated each with an apical acroterion in the shape of a palmette and a triangular recessed panel beneath a raised band in order to accentuate the impression of being a pediment. Each pediment measured some 1.14 metres long and 0.62 high. Their size indicates that they could only have been set on Temple A's altar, along the two short ends.\(^3\) Both pediments are asymmetrical, being cut short on what would have been their eastern sides, which has led the excavators to theorize that the altar had a raised windbreak on that side.\(^4\)

Temple A also yielded an inscription base, consisting of a rectangular stone with a

\(^1\) Jeppesen, 1989, 37.


\(^3\) Jeppesen, 1989, 49.

have made their use awkward on Temple A's wide column bases. Therefore, the excavators have attributed both of these capitals to Temple B instead, where their size was more appropriate. Two carved lateral acroteria, smaller than the ones previously mentioned, were also discovered, near the southern anta and within the porch of Temple A. These smaller lateral acroteria, which were carved in low relief palmettes, measured 35 centimetres tall and were designed to fit onto corners. They did not, however have bottoms which were canted at an angle in order to allow for the pitch of a roof. These lateral acroteria have been attributed to Temple B by the excavators, since they did not seem likely to have been included in the decorative elements of the Temple A.

Along with these remains, the excavators also came across the remains of a structure which was directly associated with Temple B. These remains consisted of two parallel walls which ran north-south between the pronaos of Temple A and Temple B, joining the two temples together. These walls were 0.55 metres thick and preserved to a height of 1.30 metres. They were constructed from broken stone laid in clay mortar, thus differentiating the masonry of these walls from that of either temple. The resulting room formed a sort of annex between the temples. This annex was paved with large flags of beach-rock and the walls bore traces of a white lime coating. Since there was no break in either of the parallel walls, or in the southern wall of Temple A's pronaos, the excavators believed that the room was entered
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from Temple B and may have acted like a sacristy for the temple.\textsuperscript{190} The joint where the walls of the annex would have joined the wall of the temple proper, were they still extant, indicates that Temple B apparently had a second step in its crepis which measured 0.15 metres high by 0.30 deep, since a space of these dimensions was found below the ends of both annex walls. Thus the annex seems to have been built some time after the crepis and walls of Temple B had been erected.\textsuperscript{191}

The altar of Temple B was smaller and differed in form from that of Temple A. The altar of temple B was formed by a circular podium of stone. At the bottom, the altar was surrounded by a circular stone step which was 0.24 metres wide, 1.60 in diameter and 0.15-0.20 in height. Above this step, the excavators originally discovered a single circular course 0.22 metres high and 1.10 in diameter.\textsuperscript{192} From the finds of crescent-shaped stones found loose, the excavators reconstructed another course for the altar which had the same 1.10 metre diameter. The altar thus had a single step around the bottom and a cylindrical body whose top formed the sacrificial surface.\textsuperscript{193}

When it was complete, the primary structure of Temple B (Figure 3.10) would have been a square structure roughly 5.50 metres on a side which was footed onto a two-stepped crepis. The walls of the annex would have abutted onto the north of the structure, with the

\textsuperscript{190} Jeppesen, 1989, 39-40.
\textsuperscript{191} Jeppesen, 1989, 38.
\textsuperscript{192} Jeppesen, 1989, 38.
\textsuperscript{193} Jeppesen, 1989, 67.
west wall of the annex running flush with the rear wall of the temple.\textsuperscript{194} The walls of the temple proper would have been made from valuable materials such as stone ashlars, whose value caused them later to be robbed out completely. Considering the limited number of loose blocks found by the excavators, the upper portions of the walls of both the temple and the somewhat later annex were probably made from mud brick with wood reinforcements. The walls of the temple would probably been about half a metre thick, or roughly the same width as the stylobate. The stone slab in the stylobate, which may have supported a column, was off centre. The excavators posited another such block equally off centre in the opposite direction. Given the presence of the two Doric capitals, the temple would thus have had two Doric columns, whose shafts would probably have been made out of wood, with an intercolumnar distance of 1.36 metres. This distance would have allowed a great deal of room flanking the columns, but not enough for there to be extra columns. Instead, the antae of the temple would have been made into pilasters which were topped by square moulded stones. Indeed, four moulded stones were discovered which could be combined into two capitals suitable for Doric pilasters. Using the reconstructed diameters of the column capitals, the excavators calculated that the shafts of the columns stood around 2.80 metres tall. Nothing of the interior layout has been ascertained, but the excavators felt confident enough to give Temple B a similar layout to Temple A: a porch-style pronaos, as indicated by the stylobate and the various capitals, to the east, with a naos behind it to the west, through

\textsuperscript{194} Jeppesen, 1989, 54.
which the annex to the north could be entered. The roof of Temple B would probably have been quite flat, constructed of timber and mud, without even the illusion of a pitched roof such as Temple A possessed. The roof of Temple B proper would have been decorated with the pair of smaller palmette acroteria. The roof of the annex would perhaps have been decorated with a pair of lateral stone acroteria which were found by the excavators, and which took the form of plain triangles. The altar outside the temple to the east, along the centerline, indicates that the Temple probably had some sort of cult image. Indeed, a curved stone block was uncovered lying south of Temple B by itself, similar to those used the altar. The arc of this loose block was the same as that of the blocks of the complete lower step of Temple B' altar. The stone could not, therefore, be part of the altar, and the excavators have identified it as the possible remains of the cult podium of Temple B.195

Sacrificial Pit

There was one more installation within the Sacred Fortress which was associated with both of the temples. Between the altars of the two temples, roughly in line with the annex which joined the temples together, there was a sacrificial pit. This pit was delineated by a single course of unworked beach-rocks which were laid out in a rectangle measuring 3.60 by 2.20 metres. Within this rectangular area, there was a very thick layer of ash representing the remains of many sacrifices. Since the annex, which sits directly to the west of the pit, had

---

no evidence for a door facing the pit, the excavators concluded that the pit was not likely to have been used for some special cult inside the annex. Instead, it probably held the detritus from the other altars.\textsuperscript{196}

**The Sacred Fortress and its Precinct**

Both Temple A and Temple B, as well as their associated installations, stood within the large enclosure known as the Sacred Fortress. Over the period in which it was used, the Fortress changed considerably. Indeed, most of the information regarding the relative chronology of this site comes not from the temples but from the Fortress.

In the beginning, there was a fortification wall, built almost entirely out of beach-rocks, which took the form of a square measuring 60 metres on a side (Figure 3.3). This wall measured two metres thick and consisted of a base of large unworked rocks laid directly on the sand and a superstructure of mud brick which has since disappeared. The corners of the fortified enclosure were reinforced with projecting square towers. The main entrance was from the south, by means of a double gate which was set into a rectangular tower just to the east of the centre of the southern wall. There was another gate in the northern wall which was flanked by two square towers. The parapet of the walls was reached by means of a staircase in the north-west corner. Its also possible that there was a matching staircase in the south-east corner, but this has not been verified. A rectangular tower was found in the centre of the

\textsuperscript{196} Jeppesen, 1989, 40.
western wall, but no identifiable remains of a similar tower were discovered in the east.\textsuperscript{197} Inside the enclosure, there were a couple of structures and installations, but the space surrounding the temples was apparently left empty. Along the southern wall between the gate and the eastern tower, for instance, there were a set of chambers accessible from the north. The largest of these rooms measured 5.5 metres square on the inside with 1.2 metre thick walls which were bonded to the fortification wall. The smallest southern chamber measured 2.75 by 3.4 metres.\textsuperscript{198} In the northeastern quarter of the Fortress, a fire pit was found from this level which was apparently used for domestic purposes.\textsuperscript{199} This first phase of the enclosure also saw the construction of both temples and their associated structures. Temple A was constructed first, followed by B, whose remains are some 0.10 metres higher than those of A, and the annex was added as a final addition, covering the crepides of both temples.\textsuperscript{200} The general ceramic evidence seems to indicate that this first phase of the enclosure started during the first half of the second century, possibly as early as 300 B.C.\textsuperscript{201} Jeppesen, however, gives somewhat later and more precise dates for the construction of the temples within the Sacred Fortress. Specifically, he dates Temple A to ca. 260 B.C. and

\textsuperscript{197} Salles, 1985, 578.

\textsuperscript{198} Jeppesen, 1989, 13, 19.


\textsuperscript{200} Jeppesen, 1989, 73.

\textsuperscript{201} Salles, 1985, 580; J. Gachet & J.-F. Salles, "Iconographie et Culte à Failaka, Koweit." \textit{Mesopotamia} XXV, 1990, 195. Gachet and Salles date the first phase of the enclosure between 300 and 240/30 B.C.
Temple B to ca. 240 B.C.\textsuperscript{202} If he is correct, then the construction of the fortified enclosure may be somewhat later than the reign of Seleucus I. In either case, since the chronological evidence comes from the enclosure and not the temples, the relationship between the temples and the enclosure must remain fixed. If Salles is correct and the enclosure dates somewhat earlier, the temples must also date somewhat earlier than Jeppesen’s calculations.

In the following period, the rampart of the enclosure was repaired or rebuilt. New rooms were formed in the north-east which functioned as part of the defences. A few more homes also appeared within the fortress. In this period, the concentration of these buildings was still sparse.\textsuperscript{203} This second period seems to date roughly from 240/230 B.C. to 205 B.C.\textsuperscript{204} The primary purpose of the enclosure, during the first two periods, appears to have been the protection of the two temples and the cults which they housed.\textsuperscript{205}

The beginning of the third period has been dated to around 205 B.C., when Antiochus III was focusing his military attentions in the area.\textsuperscript{206} During this third period of occupation,

\textsuperscript{202} Jeppesen, 1989, 73-76. Jeppesen also dates Temple A to the late reign of Antiochus I/early reign of Antiochus II based, in part, on ceramic evidence. He specifically notes the presence of imported Attic sherds which were found in the lowest stratigraphic levels of the enclosure and which date from 285 to 250 B.C. Postulating a date for Temple A around 260 B.C., he then notes that Temple B is located between the levels of Temple A and the level of two coin hoards dated 210-200 B.C. (see the section dedicated to the finds of the enclosure below). Procuring an annual average accumulation between these two levels, Jeppesen calculated that Temple B was at a level corresponding to 240 B.C. This date is equivalent to Jeppesen’s date for the Ikadion Stele, see below, which stood in front of Temple A. Therefore, he has attributed the stele to Temple B.

\textsuperscript{203} Gachet & Salles, 1986, 317.

\textsuperscript{204} Gachet & Salles, 1990, 195.

\textsuperscript{205} Gachet & Salles, 1986, 320.

\textsuperscript{206} Salles, 1985, 580.
the fort changed considerably. More houses were built within the enclosure, and the defences were once again strengthened. A sloped glacis was added along the outside of the wall. A new northern rampart, forming an irregularly shaped extension of the enclosure, was also added in order to make room to accommodate more domestic structures.\textsuperscript{207} This wall was characterized by horizontal bands of unworked stone and differed somewhat from the construction of the rest of the rampart. A long passage was added to the northern gate as a result of this extension of the ramparts. This passage was further constricted by a gate 1.40 metres wide at the north end.\textsuperscript{208}

The end of the third occupation period seems to date towards the middle of the second century B.C.\textsuperscript{209} At that time, Temple A seems to have gone out of use as a ritual centre. The inscribed stele which had stood on the base in front of the temple, and whose inscription will be discussed below, was removed and incorporated into another wall.\textsuperscript{210} The cult in Temple B had already disappeared sometime previously. A domestic wall of the third period was found built over the remains \textit{in situ} which must have been already deserted long enough for the architectural remains of the temple to all but disappear, probably through the scavenging of building materials by the inhabitants.\textsuperscript{211} Thus, during the third period of

\textsuperscript{207} Gachet & Salles, 1986, 318.
\textsuperscript{208} Jeppesen, 1989, 22-23.
\textsuperscript{209} Gachet & Salles, 1990, 195.
\textsuperscript{210} Gachet & Salles, 1986, 319.
\textsuperscript{211} Jeppesen, 1989, 9.
occupation, the importance of the cults appears to have gradually declined while the domestic use of the enclosure grew correspondingly in importance.\textsuperscript{212}

In the subsequent periods, phases four and five, the interior of the fortress was given over entirely to domestic use. In the fourth phase, for instance, the inhabitation of the enclosure became quite dense and the original northern rampart was dismantled in order to create more room. The end of this phase has been dated to somewhere in the later half of the second century. After the fourth phase, the site was largely abandoned, and the fifth phase was characterized by a much sparser domestic occupation which gradually petered out towards the end of the second century.\textsuperscript{213}

**Finds From the Sacred Fortress**

Numerous items have been uncovered within the fortress which may have some bearing on the nature of the cults which were practised in the two temples. Notably, a great many small terracotta figurines were found, having once been used as votive offerings for the cults. The excavators have divided these figures into two rough stylistic groups: those of Oriental inspiration and those of Greek.\textsuperscript{214} Among the first group there are numerous types, including Nude Females, Horsemen and Model boats. For example, some twenty four

\textsuperscript{212} Gachet & Salles, 1986, 320.


examples of the Nude Female type, which measured roughly 0.10-0.12 metres in height when complete, were found, either with their arms at their sides (Figure 3.11) or holding their breasts. This type of figurine is most often found in association with cults to various goddesses who have some connection to the sphere of fertility, and the type has been taken as a possible indicator of the presence of a fertility cult.\textsuperscript{215} The Nude Female figurines of Ikaros bore a strong resemblance to similar figurines found in Hellenistic Babylon, Seleucia, and Uruk, and also Parthian Susa. The ones at Ikaros had moulded fronts and handmade backs.\textsuperscript{216}

The pieces of some 22 horses with riders (Figure 3.12) were also found near the temples within the enclosure. The various horsemen fragments varied in height between 0.037 and 0.095 metres. These figurines were rather crudely made by hand and come in several variants. The riders generally had conical bodies, and some had flat headdresses which might represent the Macedonian \textit{kausia}. Their use in a cult at Failaka may be indicated by the fact that, though often crudely made, none of the horseman figurines were fabricated on the island but, rather, were imported from elsewhere. This type of figurine has a wide dispersal, being found in sites from Iran to Syria, and areas beyond. The figurines of Failaka specifically resemble horseman figurines recovered from southern Iranian sites, such as


Masjid-i-Solaiman, and Mesopotamian sites, such as Uruk and Babylon. The final type of orientalising dedication found at Ikaros, that of the model boats (Figure 3.13), the most complete model measuring 0.187 metres in length, seems to have been less popular than the previous two types. Numerous fragments of simple, hand made boats, which might have rowlocks and benches or bulkheads, were discovered but these apparently came from a small number of examples. The boat models from Failaka are quite similar both to examples from Seleucia, which date after 150 B.C., and to some earlier examples which have been recovered from Hellenistic Babylonian graves, which have been dated to 300 B.C.

The figurines of Greek type seem to have fared less well than their Oriental cousins and are often much more fragmentary, partly due to the fact that many were cast hollow in moulds. Several notable fragments have survived, however. For instance, a head from a youthful Herakles has been found which has been dated stylistically to the mid second century. Two Greek-style female heads wearing kalathoi (Figure 3.14) were also found. These two heads were apparently used as incense burners and have been dated to c. 200 B.C. based on parallels elsewhere. Similar representations of kalathoi have been found at Dur-

Europos and at Ai Khanum, while similar looking female heads without the kalathoi have been found in Egypt.\textsuperscript{221} Finally, the fragments of several figurines wearing Greek-style clothing were also uncovered, most of which represented women.\textsuperscript{222} Considering the nature of the other terracottas in the Fortress, these figurines may have served a similar purpose.

In a different but related category, a stone statuette of a dolphin (\textbf{Figure 3.15}) was found in fill of the third phase, within the northern extension of the fortress.\textsuperscript{223} The dolphin was carved somewhat crudely from the limestone preferred by local builders and seems not to have been finished. It measures approximately half a metre in length and has a blunt, flattened nose with triangular fins. Its form is crude, and yet, along with the lack of markings on its flanks, it suggests that the inspiration for the dolphin may not have come not from the Mediterranean species of dolphin which was regularly part of Greek iconography, but rather from the species of bottle-nosed dolphin which can be found in the waters around the island itself.\textsuperscript{224}

Along with the items of cultic significance, a variety of more mundane objects were found. For instance, a large corpus of ceramic vessels, encompassing many varieties of shape and finish as well as date, was also recovered from the Sacred Fortress. Within this corpus,

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{221} Mathiesen, 1982, 41-42; Bernard, 1970, fig. 31 (the Cybele medallion); P. Perdrizet, \textit{Les Terres Cuites Grecques d'Égypte de la Collection Fouquet, I-II}. Paris, 1921, pl. LXXVII.
\item \textsuperscript{222} Mathiesen, 1982,45-46.
\item \textsuperscript{223} Gachet & Salles, 1990, 196.
\item \textsuperscript{224} Gachet & Salles, 1990, 198.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
Mesopotamian style Glazed Ware was the most abundant fine ware from the Fortress. This ware was used in an assortment of different bowl shapes, fish plates, bottles, and amphorae. Sherds from deep bowls and beakers of Eggshell Ware were also recovered and may have been produced in southern Mesopotamian cities, such as Nippur. Other fine wares recovered from Failaka include examples of Arabian Red- and Black-Washed Ware, which tended to be concentrated in the earlier phases of the Fortress, and a total of five sherds of Greek Black-Glazed Ware, probably Attic in origin. These five fragments were mostly found in the lowest stratigraphical level and apparently came from one or more plates which date ca. 285-250 B.C. In addition, there was a large number of coarseware sherds, including the remains of several Greek wine amphorae, which tended to cluster in the earlier levels. One amphora handle sherd from a later level bore a stamp with the eponym ‘Mytion’ and has been dated to 222 B.C. Other handle sherds, bearing the eponym ‘Xenophantos’, which may represent more than one person, have been dated between 240-210 B.C. and have been found in multiple stratigraphic levels.

The ceramic corpus from the Sacred Fortress gains importance as comparative material for the finds of the Hellenistic Sanctuary, which will be discussed below.

---


226 Hannestad, 1983, 45; The material from Nippur can be found in D. E. McCown & R. C. Haines, Nippur I: The Temple of Enlil, the Scribal Quarter, and Surroundings. Chicago, 1967, pl. 103, 13-14.

227 Hannestad, 1983, 53.

228 Hannestad, 1983, 71-72.
In addition to the evidence already discussed, two coin hoards were recovered from the Sacred Fortress which help greatly in determining the chronology of the enclosure. The coins also indicate some of the trading connections of the island’s inhabitants. The two coin hoards were deposited during the transition between the second and third period.\textsuperscript{229} One of these hoards, found to the west of temple B, consisted of 16 silver coins. Four of these coins were tetradrachms from the Seleucid mint at Susa, one of which dated to the reign of Seleucus II (246-226 B.C.), while the other three were from the reign of Antiochus III (223-187 B.C.). The other twelve coins, all of which displayed the popular Hellenistic Greek type of a head of Herakles on the obverse and a seated Zeus on the reverse, were from different Arabian sources (Figure 3.16). Four of these coins came from the Arabic city state of Gerrha and have been dated between 220 and 210 B.C. The other eight coins, which have been dated to roughly 210 B.C., bear the name Abyatha written in Arabic on the reverse, which has been taken as the name of a nearby ruler or king. The coins of Antiochus III in the hoard were relatively new and unworn, indicating that they were deposited shortly after minting. The beginning of the third phase, therefore, has been dated to 210-200 B.C. The second hoard also had coins from Gerrha and similar Seleucid cities, with similar dates to the first hoard.\textsuperscript{230} A number of loose coins, some 3 silver and 22 bronze, have also been found. Eleven of the bronze coins come from the mint at Seleucia on the Tigris while two come from Susa. At the same time, fifteen of the bronze coins belong to the reigns of Antiochus III, Seleucus IV, and

\textsuperscript{229} Gachet & Salles, 1986, 318.

Antiochus IV, indicating a possible upsurge in the Persian Gulf-Babylon trade axis at this time.\textsuperscript{231}

The Inscriptions of Ikaros

Several Greek inscriptions have been recovered from Failaka (see Appendix 2 for texts). These inscriptions often give the names of specific gods, or at least the names the Greeks equated with each divinity, and thus offer a special level of information regarding the various cults which existed on the island. Some of the more important ones were recovered from within the Sacred Fortress. Thus a discussion on the inscribed material may be helpful at this point.

A stele inscribed in Greek, sometimes known as the Ikadion Stele (Inscription 3.1), was found in secondary use within the enclosure. The base for the stele was found in front of Temple A, which must have been its original position.\textsuperscript{232} When the cult of Temple A fell into disuse at the end of the Sacred Fortress’s third period, the stele was disturbed from its original location and reused for a different purpose.\textsuperscript{233} The stele bears a long inscription, parts of which have been unfortunately damaged by abrasive contact with the sand.\textsuperscript{234} Enough

\textsuperscript{231} Mørkholm, 1979, 232-233.

\textsuperscript{232} Jeppesen, 1989, 35.

\textsuperscript{233} Gachet & Salles, 1986, 319.

remains, however, to create a reasonably consistent reading of the text. The inscribed text takes the form of a letter to the inhabitants of the island from one Anaxarchos. Within the letter, a second longer letter, from a person named Ikadion, is transcribed. The letter of Ikadion describes the concern of the king for the welfare of the island's inhabitants and the steps which the king ordered so that their condition might improve, including the establishment or confirmation of certain rights, such as freedom from taxation and the conferral of hereditary land grants. Among these points, the letter also makes reference to a relocation of the cult or sanctuary, called simply a hieron, of a goddess called Soteira and the establishment of a sporting and cultural agon. According to Roueché and Sherwin-White, this relocation would have probably been into the Sacred Fortress, and possibly into Temple A itself, since the inscribed stele was originally located there.\textsuperscript{235} Along with Soteira, another divinity may also be referenced by the text, through the epithet Soter (line 23).\textsuperscript{236} Indeed, the names of Artemis Soteira and Zeus Soter both appear together in another inscription from the island (see inscription 3.3 below). Unfortunately the epithet of Soter is in one of the more heavily damaged sections of the inscription so that its nature is not certain. Jeppesen, for instance, believes that Soter refers not to a god but to a king, since the ancestors of the king are mentioned on two separate occasions within the text.\textsuperscript{237} A possible variant of the meaning of the stele might also exist. If the Greek words [ποτέ οὐ] are substituted into the

\textsuperscript{235} Roueché & Sherwin-White, 1985, 32.

\textsuperscript{236} Roueché & Sherwin-White, 1985, 16.

\textsuperscript{237} Jeppesen, 1989, 83-88.
lacuna on the sixteenth line, the whole flavour of the message changes. The rest of the
inscription would then become a question asking why the various measures mentioned had
not been carried out by that point in time. The stele would, therefore, refer to steps which had
not already been taken but could still potentially take place at the time that the letter was
written.\textsuperscript{238}

Unfortunately, the dating of the stele is also somewhat problematic. Several scholars
each read the Seleucid date formula in a different way. For example, Jeppesen reads the year
formula (line 43) on the stele as $OL$, giving a date of around 239 B.C.$^239$ Piejko, instead,
reads the date differently, seeing it as $\Theta \Xi$, so that it would date to 243 B.C.$^240$ Again,
Roueché and Sherwin-White read the formula as $\Theta P$, dating the stele to the 109\textsuperscript{th} year of the
Seleucid Era, or roughly 205 B.C., which would date it to the reign of Antiochus III.$^241$
Hannestad and Potts, however, look on this date with scepticism, since it would be much too
late for either temple within the Sacred Fortress.$^242$ In addition, the identities of both Ikadion
and Anaxarchos remain somewhat unclear. Neither man can be undeniably associated with

\textsuperscript{238} I would like to thank Dr. W. J. Slater for suggesting this possible reconstruction to me.
\textsuperscript{239} Jeppesen, 1989, 110.
\textsuperscript{240} F. Piejko, "The Inscriptions of Icarus-Failaka." \textit{Classica et Medievalia} XXXIX, 1988, 114.
\textsuperscript{241} Roueché & Sherwin-White, 1985, 29.
\textsuperscript{242} Hannestad & Potts, 1990, 103. Indeed, it would be unlikely that the stele could refer to either
temple of the Sacred Fortress, since they had to have been built several years prior to the deposition of the
coin hoards around 210 B.C. If the date is correct, however, the stele might refer to the Hellenistic
Sanctuary, which shall be discussed below. This possibility is made more probable if the alternate reading
of line 16 is considered, since the construction of the Hellenistic Sanctuary is the only religious structure
whose construction could post date 205 B.C.
any other source. Presumably, from the text, they were Seleucid officials with Anaxarchos being subordinate to Ikadion, who communicated with the king directly. It is possible that Ikadion was the satrap of the area which contained Failaka, either Susiana or ‘The Districts of the Red Sea’, which was itself created in 222 B.C. In this case, Anaxarchos may have been the official, or epistates, who was directly in charge of the island.243

A fragment of local limestone inscribed in Greek (Inscription 3.2) was also found within the fortress, lying within third and fourth phase levels. It was deposited in one of the later domestic structures which existed to the north of the temples. The inscription, which itself dates to the third century, is a dedication by one Soteles to Poseidon Asphaleios.244

This Soteles is known from another inscribed limestone dedication stele (Inscription 3.3), whose find spot is uncertain, dated to the third century by the lettering style. This stele bears a dedication by Soteles and "the soldiers" to Zeus Soter, Poseidon and Artemis Soteira. Soteles was himself apparently the leader of a group of soldiers who were stationed on the island in the late fourth-early third centuries to guard the trade routes.245

Finally, an inscribed limestone altar (Inscription 3.4), which was heavily damaged on its upper and right-hand surfaces, was recovered from the threshold of Temple A. This slab measures roughly 0.26 metres by 0.20 metres with a thickness of 0.09 metres. Only

about twenty letters remain undamaged upon the field of the inscription.\textsuperscript{246} In reconstructing the text, there are a number of possibilities. The first, one which Jeppesen himself proposed, names the dedicators as the people from India (οὶ ἐξ Ἰνδίων) and leaves the identity of the divinities to whom the altar was dedicated unreconstructed (Inscription 3.4a).\textsuperscript{247} Second, he also puts forth the proposal of Roueché and Sherwin-White which makes the altar a dedication to the gods (τῶν θεῶν) in general by the people of Ikaros (οἱ ἐξ Ἰκάρου) (Inscription 3.4b).\textsuperscript{248} The one problem Jeppesen notes with this reconstruction is that it would be rather unusual for the local people to refer to themselves as 'those from Ikaros'.\textsuperscript{249}

This fashion, however, is similar to how they are named by Anaxarchos in the Ikadion stele (line 1).\textsuperscript{250} Piejko, on the other hand, has proposed a more elaborate reconstruction which would make the altar a dedication to Apollo, Artemis, and Leto by the soldiers stationed on the island (οἱ ἐξ Ἰκάρου στρατιῶται) (Inscription 3.4c).\textsuperscript{251} However, in this case, the indentation of the first line, which Roueché & Sherwin White take as an indication of the start of the inscription, would be out of place.\textsuperscript{252}

\textsuperscript{246} Roueché & Sherwin-White, 1985, 10.
\textsuperscript{247} Jeppesen, 1989, 116.
\textsuperscript{248} Roueché & Shwerin-White, 1985, 10.
\textsuperscript{249} Jeppesen, 1989, 116. \textit{Also see} Roueché & Sherwin White, 1985, 10-13.
\textsuperscript{250} Roueché & Sherwin-White, 1985, 12.
\textsuperscript{251} Piejko, 1988, 94.
\textsuperscript{252} Roueché & Sherwin-White, 1985, 12.
The Hellenistic Sanctuary

Another religious structure, which contained ritual and cultic paraphernalia and which was apparently originally constructed during the Hellenistic Period, has been found on the island of Failaka. This structure, named the Hellenistic Sanctuary (Figures 3.2, 3.17 & 3.18), is located some 120 metres to the south-east of the Sacred Fortress, along the beach of the island’s south coast.\textsuperscript{253} The remains of the structure were situated on a two metre high cliff overlooking the beach. Over the years, erosion has destroyed the southern part of the structure, yet enough remains for the original layout to be reconstructed fairly accurately.\textsuperscript{254} The structure was roughly rectangular and faced north-east. Three periods of occupation have been identified by the excavators, the first two being given over to religious use and the final third phase being characterized by the addition of domestic kilns after a period of abandonment.\textsuperscript{255}

During the first period, the structure had two rectangular but unequally wide rooms, which were separated by a sort of half wall or raling. The outer walls of the structure, measuring 70-80 centimetres thick, were constructed from irregularly shaped stones, which were laid directly on the beach in roughly horizontal layers with earth mortar. There is no evidence for the original height of the building, and it is highly probable that the stone walls served merely as a socle for an earth or mud brick superstructure similar to those in the two

\textsuperscript{253} Salles, 1985, 583.

\textsuperscript{254} Caubet & Salles, 1983, 73.

\textsuperscript{255} Caubet & Salles, 1983, 76.
temples of the Sacred Fortress. The floors of both of the temple’s rooms were made from packed sand hardened with added clay in the first phase. The western room of the temple, identified as the naos, measured 3.50 metres long by 4.50 metres wide. The naos was separated from the pronaos to the east by a wall whose insubstantial remains have led the excavators to believe that it was only a short partition wall. This half-wall had a doorway off-centre to the north. The naos would have been visible from the pronaos over the half-wall, even though the actual entrance was off axis. Towards the centre rear of the naos, the remains of a one metre square stone platform were discovered, which may have served as a pedestal, an altar or even a fireplace. In front of this room stood the wider pronaos, the southern part of which has been destroyed by erosion. From the remains, the excavators have reconstructed a rectangular room measuring 3.70 metres long, similar to the naos, and around 8.00 metres wide. The entrance to the pronaos was on the eastern side and was originally flanked by two wooden columns set 1.20 metres apart, of which only the two flat stone bases with shallow circular depressions remain. These columns apparently formed a kind of colonnaded porch, since no substantial remains of the eastern wall of the pronaos were recovered from the first period. These columns would have given the temple an aspect similar to the Heroon of Kineas, which seems to have been inspired by Hellenic examples. Oddly, a stone platform was found to the west of the temple, a couple of metres behind the naos. This platform measured 1.20 by 2.00 metres and had a slight prominence along the northern edge which may once have been a step. The function of this platform is unclear, but it is possible that it
served as an altar of some sort.256

In the second phase of occupation, the sanctuary was enlarged and modified. The exterior of the temple itself was scarcely touched, but the interior was altered and structural additions were made. Inside the temple, at least three new rooms were built within the pronaos, two to the north of the entrance and one to the south. These rooms were indicated by thin walls consisting of a single course of rubble. The two northern rooms measured 2.50 by 1.50 metres and 2.00 by 1.50 metres respectively. The layout of the southern room is uncertain due to the destruction caused by erosion. These rooms probably served as recesses or ‘cupboards’ for storage, due to the relative fragility of their construction. The entrance to the pronaos also underwent a modification. The exterior entrance was narrowed. The columns were removed, and new, substantial walls, which covered the bases of the columns, were built on the east side of the pronaos. The pronaos was now entered through a door to which some upright rocks, forming part of the doorframe, testify. The western stone platform and the stone pedestal within the naos were both abandoned and unused during this period. Instead, the focus of the cult seems to have shifted to the pronaos, where the excavators found a bitumen-covered stone step which may be the only remains of a cultic pedestal for a cult statue within the temple at this period. The rest of the pedestal would have been apparently built of light materials. The top of the step was also covered in ash, thereby giving some indication of its ritual use.257 The floor of the temple was discovered by the excavators


in several places and consisted of hard-packed dirt covered with a layer of bitumen, a common building material of the region. In front of the temple, and incorporating the facade of the temple, an enclosed courtyard was built during the second phase, measuring 13.50 metres long. This courtyard was enclosed in a wall roughly 0.70 metres thick, of which only the walls to the north and east are preserved. This enclosure wall was constructed of two rubble faces bonded with earth mortar which sandwiched a core of pebbles and earth. No entrance into the courtyard has been preserved along either of these remaining walls, and it is theorized that the courtyard was entered through the south wall, which has been destroyed by erosive forces.  

258 Inside the courtyard, another wall, consisting of a single course of stones laid directly on the sand, ran parallel to the north wall, at an approximate distance of 2.50 metres. Between this wall and the northern courtyard wall, the excavators uncovered a thick layer of ash, leading them to postulate the presence of a canopy of wood or other light materials in that spot. Finally, in the centre of the courtyard, the excavators uncovered a stone platform, measuring 1.50 by 1.00 metres, which was covered in pisé and which probably served as the base for an altar. The floors of both the temple and the courtyard indicate that this phase lasted only a relatively short span of time.  

259 However, the walls bore the traces of several repairs in both mud brick and pisé. In its totality, Salles notes that the second phase of the Hellenistic Sanctuary is comparable to the form of the Temple of Herakles at the western Iranian site Masjid-i-Solaiman (Figure 3.19), which lies near Susa in the Zagros

258 Caubet & Salles, 1983, 89.

259 Caubet & Salles, 1983, 89.
range. Closer parallels to the layout of the Hellenistic Sanctuary, however, seem to exist in various later temples. Among others, many of the smaller shrines at the Parthian city of Hatra (Figure 3.20 & 3.21) in northern Mesopotamia have the same type of ‘Reversed-T’ layout, with a wide pronaos and a narrower naos. Several of these small shrines were built facing courtyards or open squares on the street, and they sometimes possessed buttresses or pillasters flanking the main doorway, perhaps reminiscent of the two pillars which flanked the entrance of the first phase of the Hellenistic Sanctuary, which may have actually possessed a more Hellenising character. Downey sees the shrines at Hatra as simplified versions of a style of an Assyrian, or northern Mesopotamian, temple type. Thus the second phase of the Hellenistic Sanctuary on Failaka may be part of the same continuum of temple forms. It would seem, therefore, that the Hellenistic Sanctuary may have shifted from one cultural source of influence to another at the beginning of the second phase.

260 Salles, 1985, 584; Salles notes Ghirshman, 1976, 188, when he makes the comparison. The comparisson, however, is not too clear. According to this reference, it would seem that the similarities between the two temples are very generalized. For example, Ghirshman, at that spot, notes the wide room layout of the Temple of Herakles and its construction using mud. It may be these comments to which Salles refers. In total, the two temples do not seem to be especially similar. The use of a wide room layout, however, does seem to suggest influence from an Oriental source.

261 S. Downey, "Regional Variations in Parthian Religious Architecture." Mesopotamia XXII, 1987, 43. It must be noted, however, that the first phase of the Hellenistic Sanctuary, with its colonaded porch, may hearken back to the Heroon of Kineas and the later auxiliary chapel of the Temple à Redans at Ai Khanum (see chapter 2). Like these monuments, the Hellenistic Sanctuary might have benefitted from Hellenic sources of inspiration, such as Macedonian Chamber Tombs (Hannestad & Potts, 1990, 100). The relationship of these various uses of the ‘Reversed-T’ layout will be discussed in depth in the conclusion of this thesis.

262 Downey, 1987, 45. This Assyrian plan first appears in the Sin-Shamash temple constructed by Assurnirari (1516-1491 B.C.), wherein two ‘Reversed-T’ units flanked a courtyard. This temple was published in A. Haller & W. Andrae, Die Heiligtümer des Gottes Assur und der Sin-Samaš Tempel in Assur. Berlin, 1955, 82-86 (n.v.).
Finds from the Hellenistic Sanctuary

The Hellenistic Sanctuary on Failaka held many artifacts which have helped both to date the different phases of the structure and to identify its function. In the first phase, for example, the finds consisted mostly of ceramics and were not as rich or as diversified as those of the second phase. Indeed, one third of the entire corpus of finds for the period consisted of sherds of the glazed ware commonly found in the nearby Sacred Fortress. Fishplates, pilgrim flasks, carinated bowls and large storage vessels with internal coatings of bitumen were all represented in the finds. These shapes are all similar to the shapes recovered from the Sacred Fortress. A few sherds of Eggshell ware and Arab Red Ware were also recovered. The pottery corpus from the first phase of the sanctuary has been dated to around 200 B.C. This date has largely been supported by the associated numismatic finds.

263 A total of 10 bronze coins from around the same time period were found within the cella. A small ram carved in steatite was also found within the cella along with a fragment of a terracotta figurine which consisted of the head of a woman bearing a kalathos. Within the pronaos, the excavators uncovered two small, trapezoidal stone altars each standing about 33 centimetres high (Figure 3.22). 264 These altars were found lying against the partition wall which separated the pronaos from the naos. One of these altars was decorated with a crudely rendered human figure in relief holding something long in its hand. The other altar had a

---

263 Caubet & Salles, 1983, 86.

264 Caubet & Salles, 1983, 80-82.
hollowed top.  

The items recovered from the second occupation phase of the temple were much richer and more varied. Many of the cultic finds of this period were found lying next to the partition wall, as the altars from the previous phase, which were now covered by the floor, had done. This rich variety has strengthened the identification of the structure as a temple. One item of interest is a miniature altar 16.5 centimetres high, which bore a painted dedication to Artemis and which was discovered in the pronaos (Figure 3.23). This was, however, only one example of some six or seven miniature sandstone altars, or fragments thereof, which were meant for burning incense. These miniature altars seems to have been the main cult objects in the temple. Numerous terracotta figurines were also recovered from the temple, including several examples of female heads bearing kalathoi which were themselves used for incense burning. Other figurine types which were found include the model boat and nude female types which were so prevalent in the Sacred Fortress. Two stone heads, measuring roughly 0.06 metres on a side, were also recovered from the pronaos and its associated cupboards. These were both carved from local sandstone in the likeness of a bearded man, who has been identified by the excavators as Herakles. Along with these various cultic items, there were many other offerings derived from everyday life. There were many iron and bronze objects recovered from the temple and courtyard, ranging from arrowheads to rings. Many of these metal objects, especially the rings, were similar in style

---


266 Salles, 1985, 583.
to ones which have been recovered from the Seleucid layers at Susa.\textsuperscript{267} In addition, a large corpus of pottery was also recovered. Overall, the shapes and glazing of this pottery indicate descent from regional traditions, either Mesopotamian or Iranian, just like the pottery of the first phase. All of the lamps, for example, were Mesopotamian in form. There was also a quantity of Eastern Arabian Ware with a polished or red slip, indicating extensive connections, probably through trade, between the island and that region. The shapes of the second phase pottery seem to have varied only slightly from the pottery shapes of the first phase. The excavators have therefore dated the pottery to the first half of the second century B.C.\textsuperscript{268} Once again, this date is borne out by the numismatic evidence. The bronze coins which were found, most of which were in the naos, come from the reigns of Antiochus III, Seleucus IV and Antiochus IV, thereby indicating a date of the early to mid second century. It is unclear how long this second phase may have lasted before the subsequent abandonment and the construction of the domestic kilns of the last phase, which cannot be dated accurately.\textsuperscript{269}

**Tell Khazneh**

The final cult centre which has been uncovered on the island lies about 450 metres to the north of the Sacred Fortress. This site, now named Tell Khazneh, had a long history.

\textsuperscript{267} Caubet & Salles, 1983, 92-125.

\textsuperscript{268} Caubet & Salles, 1983, 126.

\textsuperscript{269} Caubet & Salles, 1983, 126-127.
and its earliest layers predate the Hellenistic Period. Unfortunately, the site has been so extensively pillaged by the island’s inhabitants, starting in Antiquity, that any structural remains have been destroyed beyond any possibility of a coherent reconstruction. However, enough stratigraphical information remained for the excavators to divide the site into four chronological phases, numbered in reverse chronological order. The fourth and earliest phase ended prior to 300 B.C., having started possibly several centuries earlier. The third phase includes all material which falls into the third century. Both the second and first phases are dated to the second century B.C., and the site appears to have gone out of use sometime in the latter half of that century.

The cultic nature of the site is confirmed by the nature of the remaining artifacts, notably the figurines. A total of 280 figurines or fragments thereof were uncovered at Tell Khazneh, forming 28% of the total artifact corpus. In general, the figurines of Tell Khazneh were comparable but not exactly the same as the finds from the Sacred Fortress. Rider figurines were quite numerous at the site, but the type of rider found at the fortress wearing a Macedonian kausia was absent from Tell Khazneh. Instead, some riders possessed a protruding head dress, which could be taken as a Persian Kyrbasia, denoting an earlier


variant.\textsuperscript{273} Other male figurines included a bearded male with his hands across his chest, a type which was common during the first millennium B.C. in Mesopotamia and which has been found specifically at Nippur.\textsuperscript{274} Female figurines, on the other hand, seem to have been much less popular on the whole. Female figurines accounted for only 15\% of the total figurines at Tell Khazneh, while they accounted for 37\% at the Sacred Fortress.\textsuperscript{275} They seem, however, to have become more popular during the Hellenistic Period.\textsuperscript{276} Among the female figurines recovered, there were five examples of nude females with their arms at their sides similar to those from the Sacred Fortress.\textsuperscript{277}

Among the other artifacts, a number of incense altars were also recovered from Tell Khazneh. In addition, a pottery sherd inscribed in Greek was also discovered, which bore a list of sacrifices executed by a local \textit{hegemon} and which has been dated to the second century B.C.\textsuperscript{278} Finally, a hoard of some twenty-seven silver tetradrachms was also recovered from the site. These coins mostly date from the later fourth century and came from a great diversity of mints located all over Alexander's empire. The hoard was probably deposited


\textsuperscript{275} Salles, "Les Figurines en Terre Cuite." 1986, 149.

\textsuperscript{276} Salles, "Les Figurines en Terre Cuite." 1986, 177.


\textsuperscript{278} Salles, 1985, 586-588.
around the year 290 B.C.\textsuperscript{279}

**Discussion**

At Failaka, as at Ai Khanum, the observer is once again confronted with several religious structures which were in use during the Hellenistic Period and which seem to show a mixture of cultural influences both in themselves and their cults. The temples and cults of Failaka reflect to a large extent the influences of those areas, such as Southern Mesopotamia and Iran, which lie in the island’s immediate vicinity. At the same time, the influence of Greece is also expressed in a very concrete way.

On the one hand, both Temples A and B within the Sacred Fortress were very Greek in design. Their layouts, with their lengthwise orientation of naos and pronaos, were Greek, as were their Doric or Ionic columns, their *crepides* and their acroteria. Their *disytle in antis* plans were popular in many other parts of the Greek world in the Hellenistic Period. Indeed the layout of Temple A is comparable to that of the Asklepeion on the island of Kos, albeit on a more modest scale.\textsuperscript{280} The presence of altars directly in front of the temples also follows the Greek pattern. In addition, Greek-style burnt sacrifice was apparently performed on these altars, as the thick remains of ash from both the altar of Temple A and the sacrificial pit


attest. Indeed, the presence of actual Greek-speaking people at the temples is attested by both of the dedicatory inscriptions which were discovered within. The fortification walls served as a sort of reinforced *peribolos* which demarcated the limits of the *temenos* which contained both temples at the same time. Indeed, Temple A, with its position on the enclosure’s centerline, seems to have been part of the original plan of the enclosure.\(^{281}\) Certainly, considering the extreme scarcity of constructions within the enclosure in its original phase, it may be postulated that the Sacred Fortress was built at least in part to protect the temples, which were built at roughly the same time, from harm. However, considering that the temples took up only a small portion of the mostly empty original fortress, the enclosure may have had other functions as well, perhaps a purely military one. It is possible that other structures, serving different functions, remain to be discovered within the unexcavated portions of the enclosures. It is also probable that this combination of fort and sanctuary served as an *asylon*, providing the local inhabitants with protection in case of an emergency.\(^{282}\) Over time, the inhabitants of the island progressively capitalized on the ready-made defensive system represented by the sanctuary’s walls. Thus, the number of domestic structures within the walls gradually grew and their density increased over the span of several occupation periods. Eventually, the need for space caused the construction of a new expansion for the enclosure, and a progressive encroachment on the temples within the enclosure, starting with B and followed in the end by A, in order to garner more room for

\(^{281}\) Jeppesen, 1989, 72.

\(^{282}\) Jeppesen, 1989, 73.
housing.

While the temples of the Sacred Fortress did indeed borrow much from the Greek world, they were not entirely Greek in structure. One example of this phenomenon would be the roofs of the temples, which were apparently flat, unlike the pitched roofs of canonical Greek temples. The reasons behind this may have been practically based, since the dearth of rainfall on the island may not have required the extra effort nor the extra materials necessary in building a pitched roof with terracotta tiles. The builders of Temple A, but not apparently B, tried to compensate by installing a false pediment on which they placed the large palmette acroteria whose bottoms had been specially carved for the task. This false pediment would only be effective when viewed from directly in front of the temple. Indeed, neither of the temples had many three dimensional effects; instead, they were highly frontal in their presentations.\(^{283}\) The second unorthodox structural aspect of the temples would be the construction of the annex which joined the two temples together. Its association with Temple B and its apparent late construction, after the two temples had themselves both been built, would seem to indicate a change in practices regarding the later temple within the enclosure. Whether the annex represents a change in the ritual practices of Temple B, or whether it served a more mundane function such as storage for cultic gifts, remains unclear.

In addition, the Ionic order used in Temple A was also somewhat unorthodox. The Ionic capital which was recovered, possessed a simplified form more similar to examples

\(^{283}\) Jeppesen, 1989, 78.
further to the east, notably at Ai Khanum. The columns were also set on reused Persian-style bases, and similar bases were found used at Ai Khanum. Thus it appears that it was appropriate in the Hellenistic Orient for the normally well-defined Greek architectural orders to be modified by incorporating non-Greek forms or by simplifying the Greek-ones.

Influences other than Greek are more clearly indicated and identifiable in the evidence for the cults of the temples, namely the inscriptions and the figurines. Certainly, on the one hand, the Greek inscriptions attest the worship of well-known Greek gods, such as Artemis, Zeus and Poseidon. The appearance of Greek style figurines also indicates the presence of deities identified as Greek. On the other hand, many of the other figurines were not Greek and indicate the influences from other regions. Specifically, many of the non-Greek figurines, notably the horsemen and the nude females, bear similarities to figurines recovered from sites in Susiana, such as Masjid-i-Solaiman.284 Other sites with similar figurines can be found in Babylonia, including Tello, Nippur and Seleucia-on-the-Tigris.285 These parallels are not surprising, since both Seleucia and Susa were important trade centres in the region during the Hellenistic Period. Thus, the island seems to have been part of a sort of trade triangle consisting of itself, Susiana, and Babylonia, the influence of which can be seen in some of the material remnants of the cults.286

The Hellenistic Sanctuary also seems to display a heterogeneous mixture of regional

284 Ghirshman, 1976, 80-81.


286 Caubet & Salles, 1983, 126.
influences. In the first phase, the temple’s form is unusual. Salles has suggested that the temple displays an Oriental layout, not a Greek one.\textsuperscript{287} On the other hand, the narrower naos and the wider pronaos with the two columns flanking the entryway might represent a corrupted version of that type of structure which originated in the funerary architecture of Macedonia and which can be found in the Heroon of Kineas and the subsidiary chapel of the Temple à Redans at Ai Khanum. Thus, the first phase of the Hellenistic Sanctuary may actually display Greek trends. In the second phase, the wider pronaos and the disposition of the naos of the Hellenistic Sanctuary have some parallels with the disposition of rooms in the Temple of Herakles at Masjid-i-Solaiman. The Hellenistic Sanctuary may also be a part of a temple tradition centred in the region of Assyria, since temples with similar dispositions of naos and proanais appear in that region both before and after the Hellenistic Sanctuary at sites such as Assur and Hatra. Thus, there may also be a connection between the Sanctuary and southern Iran or northern Mesopotamia.

The strongest links between the Hellenistic Sanctuary and sites in nearby regions come from the small finds. The figurines which linked the temples of the Sacred Fortress to Masjid-i-Solaiman and Seleucia-on-the Tigris were also present within the Hellenistic Sanctuary. The two stone heads of Herakles were locally made from sandstone and were very similar in style to another Herakles head which was recovered from Temple of Herakles at Masjid-i-Solaiman.\textsuperscript{288} Even the more mundane items, such as bronze and iron rings, have

\textsuperscript{287} Salles, 1985, 584.

\textsuperscript{288} Salles, 1985, 584.
parallels in Southern Iran. On the other hand, the shapes of the many miniature altars demonstrate a wide variety of cultural inspiration. Indeed, some of these incense altars have close parallels in shape with similar finds from Delos, thus indicating another Greek connection.\textsuperscript{289}

The site of Tell Khazneh has unfortunately been too badly damaged for an architectural comparison to the various cultural traditions of the Hellenistic Period and to its earlier incarnation. However, similar, if sometimes somewhat earlier, types and styles of cultic material, such as the horsemen and female figurines, appear at Tell Khazneh as at the other cultic centres on the island. Thus, it may be appropriate to postulate a similarity of regional influences which was reflected in a similarity of cults.

\textbf{Aspects of Ritual}

The temples and their various associated finds seem to indicate a mixture on a physical level which may reflect a mixture in ritual as well. On the one hand, the Sacred Fortress Temples were well equipped with relatively large altars for Greek-style sacrifices. Indeed, The Ikadion Stele, in mentioning the institution of athletic games (\textit{dehyvce}) (\textbf{line 17}), makes reference to very Greek rituals centred around a cult.\textsuperscript{290} Regarding the Hellenistic Sanctuary, the podium inside the courtyard of the second phase could also fulfill a ritual role commensurate with traditional Greek sacrifice.

\textsuperscript{289} Caubet & Salles, 1983, 125.

\textsuperscript{290} Sherwin-White & Kuhrt, 1993, 175.
On the other hand, the first phase of the Hellenistic Sanctuary possessed a podium which was unusually located behind the temple. The function of the podium is uncertain but its shape and the presence of a step on its northern side may indicate that it served a ritual function. In its position, the podium, which was large enough to form a sizeable altar, could not be seen from the naos, an effect which does not conform to the Greek canon. This placement would also be highly unusual from the point of view of Mesopotamian religious architecture. One explanation would be that the podium served a ritual function separate from that of the cult of the temple. However, considering the proximity between the two, this does not seem likely. Another possibility is that the podium did not serve a ritual purpose at all, but this would leave questions of its use and of the reason behind its placement entirely open. Thus, the rationale behind the platform remains unclear. One possible parallel to this platform, however, exists in the Temple à Redans at Ai Khanum. There, evidence for ritual was also discovered behind the temple, with no apparent line of sight between the naos and the ritual. Of course, in the case of the Temple à Redans, the ritual involved the burial of libation vessels and not the use of any sort of sacred podium. Yet, this ritual from Ai Khanum might still indicate an eastern origin for the unusual podium of the Hellenistic Sanctuary.

Another aspect of ritual seems to indicate the integration of many cultural heritages. The various items used for the burning of incense, for example, have parallels in a wide variety of contexts. Both the Hellenistic Sanctuary and the Sacred Fortress contained terracotta examples of female heads bearing kalathoi upon which incense was burnt. The
Hellenistic Sanctuary also had multiple miniature altars which served the same purpose, many of which had parallels at Delos. There was, however, at least one altar which had the cubic form of a traditional Mesopotamian incense altar.291 Most of these altars were found clustered around the half-wall which separated the naos from the pronaos. Thus, one aspect of the ritual life of the cult of the Hellenistic Sanctuary involved the burning of incense in front of this barrier. The importance of this ritual is underlined by the number of devices for the burning of incense, which made these devices the main items of ritual equipment within that temple.292 Several incense altars of various forms were also found at Tell Khazneh. Considering the fact that Failaka sits astride a major ancient trade route to Arabia, an area known for its sources of aromatic fuels, this abundance of incense burners at the various sites may not be surprising.

The Gods of the Sanctuaries

The influences from several regions, including the Aegean, southern Mesopotamia and southern Iran, may have spread into the theological as well as the physical and ritual realms. Therefore, just as it is possible with the Temple à Redans at Ai Khanum, the gods from the Sacred Fortress’s temples and the Hellenistic Sanctuary may have been a combination of both Greek and Middle Eastern religious traditions. Even Tell Khazneh appears to have housed one or more Oriental divinities which the Greek elements of the

291 Salles, 1985, 584.

292 Caubet & Salles, 1983, 125.
island's population linked with Greek gods. The presence of figurines and other finds may aid in identifying which gods were actually worshipped in these temples. Each of the three sites on the island, however, possessed similar corpora of cultic material, including figurines. It would seem, therefore, that the various cults may have been related in some way, perhaps being dedicated to similar deities.

The figurines of horses and riders present an interesting possibility. The type first appeared in Achaemenid times. Many of the ones on Failaka, however, bear a flat headdress which is new in the Hellenistic Period and which can be possibly identified as a Macedonian military beret or Kausia. Thus, the figurines themselves display a certain amount of cultural intermixing. Similar figurines have been found throughout the ancient Middle East, and in parts of Europe. The use and importance of these horseman figurines in ritual seem to be indicated by the fact that, at Failaka, these figurines, though most of them were rather crudely fabricated by hand, were imported, probably from the area of southern Iran whence many similar figurines have been recovered. It is uncertain what exactly these horsemen represent. However, starting in the seventh century B.C., horses and horsemen are linked to solar gods in Mesopotamian and Levantine iconography. Indeed, a number of terracotta horseman figurines have been found at temples dedicated to solar gods in Mesopotamia, notably at Babylon, and in Elam (Susiana). Later, during the Hellenistic and Roman Periods, the combination of a horse and rider in relation to the sun is well known from Middle Eastern

293 Ackerman, 1938, 219.
iconography. The same solar horseman iconography can also be found associated with iconography of the Great Mother Goddess. There is thus possible a link between the horseman figurines and the nude female figurines which have been linked to a fertility cult.\textsuperscript{294} Another possibility is that the horseman figurines represent a generic deity, not necessarily a solar one, who had taken on some of the aspects of the ruling elite: horses and Macedonian \textit{kausia}.\textsuperscript{295} Indeed, at Masjid-i Solaiman, numerous rider figurines were recovered from the temple which the excavators have attributed to Athena Hippia but none were recovered from the contemporary Temple of Herakles nearby.\textsuperscript{296} Therefore, it seems possible that the deity to which these figurines were dedicated need not necessarily even be male. It might also be possible that the horsemen represented the worshippers themselves. This theory might explain the appearance of those horsemen who sport the Macedonian \textit{kausia} during the Hellenistic Period, since Hellenic and Macedonian population groups were being introduced into the area in some numbers. The problem with this theory is the question of why the people of the island, whose livelihood depended on the sea, would chose to represent themselves as horsemen. Certainly, the wide historical and geographical dispersion of the

\textsuperscript{294} Mathiesen, 1982, 22. In certain cases, a nude female figurine can sometimes be found ensconced in a shrine or litter upon a horse figurine, thereby combining the two types. See Ackerman, 1938, 219.


\textsuperscript{296} Ghirshman, 1976, 76. This combination of rider and fertility goddess iconography can be found elsewhere, even in areas outside the Middle East. In Roman Thrace, for example, are several reliefs featuring the great mother goddess with a horseman, an iconographic element which is itself prominent in Thracian art and possesses a long history. See M. Tacheva-Hitova, \textit{Études Préliminaires aux Religions Orientales dans l'Empire Romain, 95: Eastern Cults in Moesia Inferior and Tracia (5th Century B.C.-4th Century A.D.)}, Leiden, 1983, 140.
horseman figurines may argue for a plurality of interpretations for different contexts.

The presence of the stone dolphin may also shed some light on this issue. The similarity of the statue to local dolphins, as opposed to those of the Mediterranean, indicate that it was carved locally, and its size indicated that it was probably meant as some kind of votive offering. In Classical and Hellenistic Art, the dolphin was a common element of Greek iconography. It could be associated with a variety of gods. Often, the god Apollo, specifically Apollo Delphinios, was depicted in the company of dolphins. By the end of the Classical Period, Apollo could sometimes equal the sun god in Greek art. Thus, the dolphin may itself be indirectly related to the solar cult, through its relationship to Apollo, and, thus, to one possible interpretation of the horseman figurines. Apollo, however, is not a name often mentioned in the Greek inscriptions from the island. Yet Strabo does relate the presence of a temple to a god which the Greeks identified with Apollo:

...λέγειν δέ μ' ἄριστον περιπλεκόντων

Τερηθόνος ἔξης ἐν δεξιᾷ ἔχοντι τὴν ἡπειρον ὁ παράπλους ἔχει προκειμένην νῆσον Ἰκαρον, καὶ ιερὸν Ἀπόλλωνος ἄγιον ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ μαντεῖον Ταυροπόλου.

... and Eratosthenes says that Androstenes, who sailed round the gulf with a fleet, states that in making the coasting voyage, with the continent on the right, one sees next after Teredon the island of Icarus and a temple sacred to

---

Apollo in it and an oracle of Tauropolos.²⁹⁸

This passage may, perhaps, indicate the presence of cults to at least two local divinities, on the island generally and perhaps within the Sacred Fortress specifically. One of these deities was female and identified with Artemis, suggested by Strabo’s use of her well-known epithet Tauropolos.²⁹⁹ The presence of an Artemis cult seems to be confirmed by several epigraphical references. The other was a male god, whom Strabo identifies with (the epigraphically unattested) Apollo. Zeus, however, does appear in the inscriptions and may represent an alternative identification for the same local god. Indeed, some of the numismatic finds from the two coin hoards may indicate that Zeus and Apollo fulfilled analogous roles in certain contexts. Specifically, some the Arabic coins in the hoard display, in reproduction of Greek types, a reverse which shows a seated Zeus and often an Arabic monogram (Sh). Similar coins from Bahrain have the actual god’s name spelled out as: Shms (or Shams). This god was the Arabic equivalent of Shamash, a Babylonian solar god.³⁰⁰ Shamash was a very important figure in the Babylonian as well as the Arabic pantheons.³⁰¹ It seems, therefore, that some iconography existed around Failaka wherein Zeus was associated with a solar deity, normally an Apollonian association in the Greek world. Furthermore, by the


²⁹⁹ Jeppesen, 1989, 77. Jeppesen is actually of the opinion that there were two cults to Artemis on the island since two different epithets for Artemis are found in the literary and epigraphic evidence.

³⁰⁰ Mørkholm, 1961, 231.

³⁰¹ Gachet & Salles, 1990, 211.
Hellenistic Period, the Mesopotamian lunar god Sin of Neo-Babylonian times was, at times, coopted into the identity of the goddess Nannaia, who also had aspects of the Great Mother Goddess. Artemis, whose name is also found in the inscriptions, is known to have been linked to this goddess. Indeed, there was a temple dedicated to Artemis-Nannaia at Dura Europos, which will be discussed in the next chapter.\textsuperscript{302}

Shamash is not the only possibility among Mesopotamian divinities with which to equate the Apollo of Strabo’s text. An Aramaic inscription of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} millennium B.C. which makes reference to ‘Nabu, the Lord of the E-kara’ has been uncovered in the pre-Hellenistic layers of Tell Khazneh. The cult of Nabu, who was the son of the chief Babylonian god Marduk, was extremely popular in the Neo-Babylonian Empire, of which Failaka was a part.\textsuperscript{303} In another part of his work, Strabo himself clearly assimilates Apollo with Nabu when he mentions that the Greek god was the chief god of the city of Borsippa, which was actually the one of the major centres for the cult of Nabu.\textsuperscript{304} Thus it would seem reasonable to assume that there may indeed have been a cult to Nabu at the pre-Hellenistic sanctuary of Tell Khazneh.\textsuperscript{305} A Nabu cult may also have existed within the Sacred Fortress. Indeed, if Nabu had become identifiable with Apollo by the inhabitants of the island, the dolphin statuette, with its links to Apollo, would not be out of place. Nabu was also normally

\textsuperscript{302} Mathiesen, 1982, 26.


\textsuperscript{304} Strabo, \textit{Geo.} XVI, 1,7.

\textsuperscript{305} Gachet & Salles, 1990, 211.
considered the consort or husband of Nanai, the Near Eastern identity of the possible Artemis
cult within the Fortress.\textsuperscript{306} However, there are problems with this identification. First, the
identification of Nabu with Apollo appears to be a late phenomenon, possibly post-
Seleucid.\textsuperscript{307} In addition, the link between Nabu and the finds from the Fortress, such as the
horsemen figurines, remains unclear. If, however, the horseman figurines had lost their solar
connection for the people of Ikaros and had come to represent simply a god with the generic
attributes of the elite, then the figurines could equally represent Nabu. Therefore, a Nabu cult
within the Fortress is possible but still uncertain.

Indeed, the presence of an Apollo-like god within the Sacred Fortress is not
mandatory. Certainly, Apollo’s name does not appear definitely in any of the contemporary
inscriptions. The dolphin statue may instead be linked with a Poseidon cult. After all,
dolphins are commonly found associated with Poseidon in Greek iconography, often under
his feet or accompanying his chariot. This last possibility, if Jeppesen’s reconstruction of a
chariot group on Temple A’s podium is correct, is even more compelling. Poseidon’s name
is also found twice in the inscriptions. Considering the fact that Failaka is an island, a cult
to the patron god of the sea, navigation and fishing would not be unusual. However, the
presence of Poseidon does not seem indicated by the various terracotta figurines, and the
relationship between Poseidon and a fertility goddess cult, whose presence appears more
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certain from the figurines, is unclear. Of course, links between Poseidon and the figurines may exist through the presence of both the model boats and the horsemen, since Poseidon, as a god associated with the sea and with horses, may have had conceptual links with both. This possibility is weakened by two problems. First, the association of Poseidon with horses and boats is a Greek idea, yet the figurines in question display Oriental, not Greek, characteristics. In addition, the model boats may just as easily, and with about as much certainty, refer back to Artemis in her guise as a moon goddess. Thus, the identity of at least one of the deities which were worshipped in the Sacred Fortress remains highly speculative. At most, it is possible to claim with a certain amount of certainty that the Sacred Fortress held the cult of some male god with Near Eastern characteristics or one honoured in a Near-Eastern fashion who was identified with some Greek god or gods.

It is more certain, however, that the Sacred Fortress held a cult to Artemis. Her name is often found within the inscriptions. The numerous examples of eastern nude female figurines also support the presence of her cult in association with a local fertility goddess. If the horseman figurines are not directly associated with a sun-god, they would not be out of place in the cult of a goddess. Certainly, at Masjid-i-Solaiman, horseman figurines were
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found in the Temple of Athena Hippia.\textsuperscript{310} Indeed, it is quite possible that a syncretic Artemis cult was the primary cult within the Fortress.\textsuperscript{311} As a result, her temple may be identified with Temple A which was larger and more centrally located within the enclosure and which outlasted the later Temple B as a ritual structure. The Ikadion stele, which was originally placed in front of Temple A and which mentions the movement of the hieron of Soteira, also seems to indicate Temple A as a possible location for her cult.\textsuperscript{312} In this case, Temple B would have housed another cult, probably to a male consort, identified with a number of possible Greek and Near Eastern deities.

The ceramic and stratigraphical evidence, however, would seem to indicate that Temple A could predate the earliest date for Ikadion Stele by twenty years or more, depending on how the sanctuary and the stele are dated. Temple A could probably not, therefore, have been constructed for the purpose of housing the relocated hieron mentioned in that inscription. It is possible that a cult from elsewhere was brought in and amalgamated with the cult of the original inhabitant of the temple, the two divinities then becoming synnaoi.\textsuperscript{313} Jeppesen, however, whose dating of the stele is roughly contemporary with his dating of Temple B, favours that temple for the destination of the hieron. In this case, the

\textsuperscript{310} Ghirshman, 1976, 80-81. Three nude-female figurines were also found within the same layers of the Grand Temple along with the horsemen at Masjid-i-Solaiman, illustrating a direct parallel between the cults of the two sites.
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relocation of the cult would be physically represented in the evidence, since Temple B would have been expressly constructed to hold it. The one problem with this theory is that the stele was originally set up in front of Temple A. According to Jeppesen, however, the order at the end of the letter to install the stele in the hieron refers not to the temple but to the sanctuary as a whole, since the Greeks could use the words interchangeably. Thus the Ikadion stele might have been set up near Temple A because it was the most prominent spot in which to set it up. Jeppesen also indicates another possibility. According to him, the cult of Artemis may have moved from Temple A to Temple B originally, but then moved back again. Thus Temple A may have actually been the most correct location in which to set up the stele.\textsuperscript{314}

This theory unfortunately leaves open the question of what purpose did the more prominent Temple A serve during the time that its cult was in Temple B, potentially for a space of some years. If Temple A originally held two synnadoi cults, then a possible scenario can be postulated wherein the two cults were divided up when Temple B was originally built but brought back together later as the gradually increasing need for habitation space caused Temple B to be abandoned.

An Artemis cult seems also to be indicated in the Hellenistic Sanctuary which stood outside the confines of the fortification wall. Certainly, the miniature altar with a painted dedication to the goddess would indicate the presence of her cult. In addition, the presence of similar ritual finds, most notably the nude female figurines and the terracotta female heads

\textsuperscript{314} Jeppesen, 1989, 73.
bearing *kalathoi* which were used as censers, may indicate a correspondence between the two cults. Of course, the construction of Hellenistic Sanctuary dates perhaps as much as a century later than the construction of the Sacred Fortress, if the dates proposed by Salles are correct. Indeed the Hellenistic Sanctuary may have continued in use at a period when the religious structures of the Sacred Fortress were gradually being overcrowded by domestic structures. By contrast, the Hellenistic Sanctuary underwent a reconstruction which both enlarged the size of the sanctuary and also saw an increase in the wealth and variety of offerings. Thus, it may be that the Artemis cult within the Sacred Fortress was gradually eclipsed as a similar cult at the Hellenistic Sanctuary became locally preeminent for whatever reason, possibly because of royal fiat.

Certainly, if Roueché and Sherwin-White’s date for the Ikadion stele (ca. 205 B.C.) is correct, then the relocation of the *hieron* of Soteira would be roughly contemporaneous with the date given by Salles for the construction of the first phase of the Hellenistic Sanctuary. This possibility is especially attractive if the possibility that [νῶς οὖ] should be inserted in the sixteenth line of the stele is taken into account. Under such circumstances, the stele would represent political pressure from above to construct a new *hieron*, with which the roughly contemporary or marginally later construction of the Hellenistic Sanctuary would dovetail rather nicely. A cult of Artemis, therefore may have been transferred, possibly from Temple B which went out of use earlier than Temple A, to the newly constructed Hellenistic Sanctuary. In addition, Jeppesen’s argument on why the Ikadion stele was placed in front of Temple A would work equally well here, since the Sacred Fortress would still be the most
prominent location in the south-west corner of the island.

The expansion of the second phase of the Hellenistic Sanctuary, in such a scenario, may indicate the relocation of another cult, one representing a male deity, from the Sacred Fortress to the Hellenistic Sanctuary. The two divinities would thus have become synnaoi. Certainly, both the altar bearing the dedication to Artemis and the heads of Herakles which were found in the second phase layers, seem to indicate this possibility. The addition of an extra cult might explain not only the increase in size of the structure, through the addition of the enclosed courtyard, but also the increase in wealth of small finds, which occurred in the later religious period of the building. Unfortunately, there are certain problems with such a theory. First, the Ikadion stele would not mention this second relocation. Second, the dates for the final religious abandonment of both Temple A and the Hellenistic Sanctuary are roughly the same. Indeed, Rouéché and Sherwin-White posit that the Hellenistic Sanctuary was abandoned marginally earlier.\textsuperscript{315} The cult of Temple A may not have, therefore, moved at all. Instead, the expansion of the Hellenistic Sanctuary may represent the institution of an additional cult similar to the one remaining at Temple A.

The origin of the cults of the Sacred Fortress or the Hellenistic Sanctuary may also have perhaps been the nearby Tell Khazneh, which had roots in earlier periods. The one problem with the theory of Tell Khazneh as a point of origin for any cult located elsewhere is the presence of the sherd which lists in Greek a number of sacrifices performed and their

\textsuperscript{315} Rouéché & Sherwin-White, 1985, 2.
dates into the second century, seems to indicate a continuance of ritual at Tell Khazneh long after the Ikadion stele was itself carved. Indeed, the cult sites discussed in this chapter have chronologies that overlap so that, during the early part of the second century, the island might have had all three cult centres functioning at differing capacities at the same time. This would not be an insurmountable obstacle if Tell Khazneh housed multiple cults in the Mesopotamian fashion. It may also be the case that the various cults on the island did not always run in succession to one another, with various cults being moved from one sanctuary to another in a progression, as indicated by the Ikadion stele. Instead, some related cults may have ran in parallel to one another, with a certain amount of chronological overlap. Still, Salles notes that the relationship between all three cult centres is still indeterminate, so nothing can be said conclusively.

Summary

The temples which were built during the Hellenistic Period of Failaka demonstrate multiple cultural heritages in many of their aspects. On the one hand, the two temples within the Sacred Fortress physically appeared mostly, but not entirely, Greek in derivation. Each one had Greek-style columns, altars, ornaments and layouts. On the other hand, items, such as some of the figurines, were found at these same two temples which suggest that the cults benefited from influences other than strictly Greek. Instead, in an example of Hellenistic syncretism, the temples housed deities which combined the attributes and qualities of a
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number of possible gods, both Greek and apparently Mesopotamian.

The nearby Hellenistic Sanctuary presents a similar, but not altogether identical, picture. The layout of the temple did not resemble traditional Greek temple plans, though there may have been points of correspondence in the sanctuary’s first phase to other types of structures from the Aegean world. Indeed there are definite similarities to the layouts of temples in southern Iran. However, a variety of items indicates the mixture of traditions which characterized the cult housed within the temple. For example, at least during the second period, the temple possessed a sacred podium in the proper place for Greek-style sacrifices. The small finds themselves came from a variety of cultural traditions, including Babylonian and Susianan. The older site of Tell Khazneh is much less well preserved, but its artifacts also seem to indicate regional influences from the same areas.

Indeed, in regard to these Hellenistic Period cult centres on Failaka, there are several main focal points of inspiration: the Aegean whence came the original soldiers who guarded the island, as well as Babylonia and Susiana, both of which were important trading partners with the island. Other regions, linked to the island through trade, may have had a lesser influence, specifically on the types of artifacts recovered from the sites. Arabic ceramics and the coinage of Arabic city states were recovered from these temples. Even incense, which played an important role in the cult of the Hellenistic Sanctuary, may be a result of the Gulf trade. Thus, the island of Failaka drew its inspiration not only from the somewhat distant Greek homelands but also from regions lying close at hand, whose influence was reinforced by the trade which was the island’s reason for being.
Chapter 4

Dura-Europos

Introduction

This chapter will examine the temples which were built during the Hellenistic Period in the city of Dura-Europos. In many ways, the city and the temples which it held form a part of a highly complex situation. The site is the westernmost of the three examined in this thesis, lying in the modern state of Syria. It would thus be the closest of the sites to the geographical heartland of the Greek culture. At the same time, however, the city was located extremely near to the ancient cultural centre of Babylonia. The city was thus immersed in at least two different sets of traditions.

The city itself (Figure 4.1) is located on a sheer-sided plateau above the Euphrates River. During the Seleucid Period, this area was known as Parapotamia, and it controlled an important land route between the coast and Mesopotamia proper. On the eastern side of the settlement, steep cliffs lead down to the alluvial land of the river valley. This alluvial land narrows considerably near Dura-Europos, to the point where the cliffs border the river itself. In addition, a large upthrust of rock on the eastern side served as the city’s citadel or acropolis. On the north and south sides, the city was guarded by steep wadis or ravines. Only the western side of the city, which bordered the desert, was easily approachable. This western
approach was guarded by a massive defensive wall inset with towers and gates. The city was thus a perfect stronghold from which the routes along the city’s side of the Euphrates could be actively controlled. Indeed, an ancient traveller travelling along the land route on that side of the Euphrates would actually have to climb the plateau and detour the city in order to continue.\textsuperscript{318}

The history of Dura was quite complex and bears directly on the evidence for temple and cult during the Hellenistic Period. The city was founded under the name of Europos in 303 B.C. by the Seleucid general Nicanor.\textsuperscript{319} The site then remained in Seleucid hands for almost two centuries until 114/113 B.C. when Parthian forces captured it.\textsuperscript{320} Unlike either Ai Khanum or Failaka, which did not long survive the absence of Greek political control in their regions, Dura thrived under the Parthians, and later under the Romans. It was not until the Sassanid Persians captured the city in A.D. 256 that Dura ceased to be populated.\textsuperscript{321} The period of Parthian control caused the city to be more susceptible to influences from traditions originating further east: from Iran and Central Asia.

The long span of history at Dura-Europos, much longer than either Ai Khanum or Failaka, may present certain problems in researching Hellenistic Period temples within the city, since much of the evidence was covered by the much more extensive, and more readily
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available for study, remains from later periods. This challenge is exacerbated by the fact that some of what archaeological evidence was recovered about the temples of the Hellenistic settlement has been left unpublished and difficult of access. The information on this material must, therefore, be gleaned through a variety of secondary sources.

Despite this challenge, Dura-Europos does possess a good deal of information on the nature of Hellenistic religion in Greek foundations as well as the effect which the Parthians had upon it. Due to a variety of circumstances, most of this information comes from the architectural evidence of the various temples. Many temples have been uncovered in the city, but only two have been identified as dating from the period of Seleucid control. These temples are the Temple of Artemis-Nanaia, sometimes simply called the Temple of Artemis, and the Temple of Zeus Megistos. Both will be examined within this chapter. The focus of this examination will be the phases of these structures that fall within the Hellenistic Period. This chapter will not only include those phases of the temples which date to the period of Seleucid control, but will also include, for reasons of comparison and continuity, those structures dating to that early period of Parthian control which falls before the date of the battle of Actium in 31 B.C.

The Sanctuary of Artemis-Nanaia

The Temple of Artemis-Nanaia is located in the central portion of the city of Dura-Europos, lying a couple blocks south of the main east-west road of the city (H4 in Figure 4.1). Evidence indicates that this temple had a long use-life. Indeed, the temple may have
been built quite early, perhaps shortly after the foundation of the colony itself. The temple continued in use well into the later Parthian and Roman Periods. During its lifetime, the Temple of Artemis underwent numerous phases in which the forms of the Temple and its layout varied radically. The first three of these phases are the ones of interest for this study.

The remains of the first phase of this cult site (Figure 4.2) consist mostly of some foundation walls which were recovered from underneath later remains. These walls were constructed of rubble and measured 0.60-0.75 metres in thickness. Given the area occupied by the remains of the first phase, these walls were not very substantial. It, therefore, appears that, during the first phase of this cult centre, there was nothing so massive as an actual temple building. Instead, the sanctuary apparently consisted of an altar within a rectangular open court which ran north-south. The evidence of the interior layout of this court consists of material which was found reused in the later construction phases of the temple. Namely, several reused Doric column elements and the plinth for a monumental altar were discovered. A total of four Doric capitals in stone as well as thirty columns drums were recovered. Many of these elements were found reused in later altars and in the mud brick masonry of the later temple itself. The altar plinth was, for its part, used as the base of a smaller altar of later date which stood on the same spot. This position indicates that the altar stood roughly in the centre of the courtyard outlined by the foundation walls. Indeed, the altar
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plinth had an orientation which was slightly more suitable for the earlier structure than for later phases.\textsuperscript{324} Along the outer walls, there stood a Doric colonnade with columns which measured 0.51 metres in lower diameter and with a reconstructed height of 3.25 metres.\textsuperscript{325} However, due to the fragmentary nature of the evidence, no stylobate was uncovered and the exact positioning of the columns remains unknown. Attached to the southeastern corner of this sanctuary courtyard, there stood a square room, measuring 4.50 metres on a side. This room possessed, in turn, two narrow ‘L’ shaped foundation walls on the side opposite the courtyard. This portion of the construction has been identified by Brown as a vestibule for the sanctuary with the two ‘L’ shaped walls serving as antae and column supports for the entrance to the sanctuary.\textsuperscript{326} This room would have served as a monumental propylon for the complex. The chronological evidence for the period hints at a rather early date for this structure. The coins and pottery sherds which were recovered from the first phase date to around the founding of the colony in 303 B.C.\textsuperscript{327} In addition, the recovered column drums formed columns which had flutes only on the upper surfaces, while the lower portions were left roughly polygonal in section. This style was popular throughout the Hellenistic Period, with a peak the second century B.C. Brown has, therefore, dated this phase to the very early
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Hellenistic Period, without being able to give greater precision.\textsuperscript{328}

Towards the middle of the first century, the sanctuary was altered, signalling a new occupation phase (Figure 4.3). The base of the previous phase’s altar was kept but a new superstructure was added to it. The new altar, measuring 2.30 metres long and 1.29 metres wide, was constructed out of the reused column drums of the older sanctuary with the spaces packed with mud. The top of the altar consisted of a gypsum slab laid in quantities of mortar. To the north of this altar, a second altar was created with a similar superstructure on a rubble foundation. This northern altar measured 2.05 metres in length and 1.20 in width. Both altars were oriented with their long axes running east-west and stood originally between 0.40 and 0.60 metres high.\textsuperscript{329} Portions of an associated structure were also discovered with these altars. These remains were covered by the floor level of the subsequent phase of the temple. Among the remains, the beds of gypsum rubble for four column bases, running in a line east-west, were recovered. The interaxial distance between these bases was roughly 1.95 metres. This line of columns ran parallel to the remnants of the southern wall of a structure which sat to the south-east of the altars. Unfortunately, the totality of these remnants consist of parts of the wall’s plaster coating since the actual mud brick wall was razed down to a height of 0.10 metres and then covered by the packed earth of the next phase’s floor. And yet, a vague outline of one side of the structure remained. From the plaster remnants, it appears that the eastern wall measured around 0.87 metres thick and was preceded by a separate mud brick
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bench 0.53 metres thick. The south wall was 0.65 metres thick and stood about half a metre away from the column bases. Only the inner facing of the western wall was detected, but along with it there were two corners set 0.82 metres apart, representing the interior southwester corner of a room and the corner of a doorway. From these remains, Brown has reconstructed a small symmetrical naïskos which was oriented towards both of the altars, as opposed to one individually. The naïskos structure and its altars were surrounded by a Doric peristyle eight columns long by four wide. Brown has also reconstructed an entrance on both the east and west sides of the naïskos. The presence of an entrance on the eastern side is based on the evidence from the interior wall, while the western entrance has been inferred by the necessity of having a slightly wider than normal intercolumnar distance, measuring 2.20 metres in order for the building to be symmetrical, on that side. The wall evidence indicates that the internal layout of the naïskos would have consisted of a single, squarish room which measured roughly 3.50 metres on a side. A great number of gypsum column drums which have been attributed to this phase were discovered built into the walls of one of the succeeding phase’s rooms. Many of these drums were left only roughly finished. Thus, there is evidence that this second phase had not yet reached completion before it was destroyed and the later phase built.330

The third phase of the Artemis Temple (Figure 4.4) dates to the very end of the Hellenistic Period, being dated by inscription to between 40 and 32 B.C. During this Third
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Phase, a substantial temple edifice was constructed for the first time in the sanctuary. The basic outline of this structure and its surrounding sanctuary were incorporated into the plan of the succeeding temple phases, although with growing elaboration of layout, during the later periods of Parthian and Roman control of the city. In the third phase, the entire sanctuary was surrounded by a mud brick wall, forming a square enclosure which measured roughly 36.00 metres north-south and east-west. The orientation of this enclosure diverged significantly from the orientations of both the first phase peribolos and the second phase naïskos. The third phase enclosure wall surrounded a courtyard in the centre of which stood the independent temple building already mentioned. The courtyard was entered from outside by means of a vestibule along its eastern wall whose doorways were each flanked on either side by buttresses. This entrance vestibule was placed along the central axis of the temple building. Within the courtyard, the two column-drumaltars of the unfinished naïskos remained visible and usable until much later when they were covered by succeeding floor levels during the Roman Period. The main axis of the sanctuary, however, now lay to the south, so that the altars faced the front wall of the new temple, rather than the temple door. Another monumental altar was built on the line between the vestibule and the temple structure. The remains of this altar, consisting mostly of its rubble foundation, were covered by a later Roman floor.331 These remains, which stood 6.80 metres from the entrance to the temple, measured 1.80 by 1.48 metres horizontally and were preserved to a height of 0.34
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metres. Along the side facing the temple, there was a smaller rubble foundation, measuring 0.97 metres long and 0.84 metres across, indicating the presence of steps for mounting the top of the altar. Thus, the altar faced east; towards the entrance vestibule and away from the temple. Traces of a plaster coating were also uncovered.\textsuperscript{332} The rectangular temple structure was oriented at right angles to the entrance axis. The internal layout consisted of a wide rectangular pronaos which led to a narrower naos. This naos was, in turn, flanked by two smaller sacristies whose doorways opened directly onto the naos.\textsuperscript{333} Directly against the front of the temple, to the south of the pronaos entrance, more construction was uncovered which was dated to this third phase. This was the original version of another naïskos or chapel whose later versions were dedicated to a goddess identified as Aphrodite. In the third phase of the temple, this naïskos consisted of a colonnaded porch whose front and sides were open. At each of the four corners, there were square gypsum piers, measuring 0.55 metres on a side, on unmoulded square bases. The two rear piers were built into the wall, one of them forming a buttress which flanked the entrance to the pronaos. The two front piers were freestanding. Between the two front piers, there were two Doric columns on square stone bases, which were set about one and a half metres distant from each other and from the gypsum piers. Along the wall of the temple, there were two corresponding columns which, unlike their flanking piers, were not engaged with the wall. These rear columns would
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subsidiary chapels to the temple proper. In addition, some rooms possessed both benches and cult niches, indicating that they could fulfill the functions of both types of rooms. The two rooms of this early phase of the Temple of Artemis were apparently oikoi and thus may have existed for the purpose of ritual banqueting within the sanctuary.

A few finds of note were also recovered from this third stage of the Temple of Artemis. For example, a large reddish jar was discovered in a slightly later layer of fill within the pronaos. This large jar was, in turn, filled with several smaller pots which were filled with the bones and ashy remains of small animals mingled with beads and small bronze ornaments, representing individual sacrifices. Also of note, a dedicatory column inscribed in Greek was found next to the entrance to the pronaos, along the north side. This column stood upon the first floor layer of the third period temple. The inscription upon the column bore the name of one Seleucus, son of Lysias, who was the strategos and genearches of the city (Inscription 4.1). This inscription also bore a date, located above the text itself, which used the Seleucid dating scheme and which translates into the year 33–32 B.C. Since the column stood on the first floor level associated with the use of the temple, it must have been dedicated not long after the temple was completed. The excavators have, therefore, concluded that the third phase temple must have been built in the years immediately
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preceding the inscription, or roughly 40-32 B.C.\textsuperscript{340}

The Temple of Zeus Megistos

One other temple has been uncovered at Dura-Europos which may have building phases dating back to the Hellenistic Period. This temple was dedicated, according to a much later inscription of A.D. 169-170, to Zeus Megistos, although it may have originally been dedicated to another form of Zeus. Although the chronology of the temple is problematic and will be discussed fully within its own section later, the earliest phase of the Zeus Megistos Temple was perhaps built within the first half of the second century B.C., during the reign of Antiochus IV.\textsuperscript{341} Antiochus IV was known for heavily promoting the cult of the Greek Zeus Olympios. It is, therefore, possible that the temple originally housed a Zeus Olympios cult, which was later altered.\textsuperscript{342} The name of Zeus Megistos, which appeared in the later inscription, may itself represent an oriental adaptation, since it is roughly equivalent to the nomenclature of the Syrian storm god Ba'alshamin.\textsuperscript{343} The name given in the later inscription would, therefore, seem to indicate a certain level of non-Greek influence.

The temple itself was located on the acropolis hill in the eastern part of the city, next
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to the Hellenistic Period palace known as the *Strategeion* (C4 in Figure 4.1). Like the Temple of Artemis-Nanaia, the Temple of Zeus Megistos was rebuilt many times, of which the earliest couple of phases are of interest to this study.\(^{345}\)

The earliest temple (Figure 4.5) was perhaps the first real temple structure to be constructed at Dura, as opposed to the sacred *peribolos* of the Artemis-Nanaia Sanctuary. Certainly the temple remains for this period, of which the evidence is admittedly still somewhat sketchy, were much more massive than the remains of the first phase of the other sanctuary. The Temple of Zeus Megistos itself was an almost square structure which measured 22.90 metres broad by 24.65 metres long, to judge from its ashlair foundations. The eastern two thirds of the square was filled with heavy stone paving which ended in the remains of a cross wall which ran north-south. Two more masonry cross walls, running east-west, subdivided the western third of the structure into three, with the greater portion being in the centre. Along the outer eastern wall, part of the foundation projected outwards a short distance.\(^{346}\) The main north-south wall which divided the temple into two was also noticeably thicker than the other walls, measuring some 3.00 metres across, thus indicating a potentially more substantial superstructure. In the centre of the eastern portion of the temple, the excavators also uncovered a heavy foundation for some sort of substantial superstructure. This foundation was set in an area of the eastern portion which was higher than the sections
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either to the north or to the south. Indeed, the remains of steps running east-west were recovered which delineated the raised central section. Considering the fact that the later phases of the temple had a monumental altar, the excavators identified the substructure in the raised central area as belonging to one. In addition, numerous elements of a Doric colonnade were recovered, including forty-three column drums, four capitals and one fragment of the cornice. Some of the drums were only fluted on one side, indicating that they stood against a wall, but were not incorporated into it.\textsuperscript{347}

From these remains, Brown reconstructed a temple which had an enclosed courtyard on the east and three naoi occupying the western third of the structure (Figure 4.6). The courtyard was entered from the east by means of a projecting propylon which was set atop the protruding foundation in the centre of the outer eastern wall. This propylon consisted of a central staircase flanked by Doric columns with extra columns positioned out in front of the wall (Figure 4.7). Inside the courtyard, there was the monumental altar on a raised central section which ran the length of the courtyard to where the naoi began. Brown also reconstructed the naoi as being roofed in perishable wood but possessing arched openings, thus resembling a triple iwan, a type of arched hall popular in later Near-Eastern architecture.\textsuperscript{348} This reconstruction of the naoi entrances was based, in part, on the more substantial north-south wall, which could have supported the heavier arched superstructure, and, in part, on analogies to later Parthian religious buildings at the sites of Masjid-I-
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Solaiman and Bard-e-Neshandeh as well as the Parthian Temple of Shamash at Hatra. All of these examples, however, are later than the Temple of Zeus Megistos at Dura. In addition, Downey disputes some aspects of Brown's reconstruction, namely the presence of arched openings for the three naoi. According to her, it would be unlikely for the Greek architects of Dura-Europos to have invented a type of architecture which became popular among the later Parthians and Persians.\textsuperscript{349} In any case, the evidence from the physical remains can not prove or disprove either theory. Certainly, the temples of Ai Khanum, which are the closest in form to the Zeus Megistos temple and which will be discussed later in this chapter, do not show any evidence for having arched entrances.

This first phase of the Zeus Megistos Temple was eventually destroyed by fire, possibly as a result of the events surrounding the Parthian conquest of 114-113, and was rebuilt some time later, probably in the second quarter of the first century B.C. according to the excavators.\textsuperscript{350} The chronology of this temple, however, is somewhat problematic and will be discussed more fully below. In its second phase, the temple possessed a significantly different layout, although some of the walls continued along the earlier foundation lines. In this later period, the temple (Figure 4.8) consisted of a smaller independent temple structure which was surrounded by a separate enclosure wall and peripheral rooms. The temple

\textsuperscript{349} Downey, 1985, 121-122. Brown's manuscript on the temple was never published and is unavailable for reference. Downey herself uses more recent works for her information and dating: Ghirshman, 1976, 14-18, 26-28, 55-70, Plans I, III, Pls. XLVI-XLVII; M. Colledge, Parthian Art. Ithaca, 1977, 47f., fig. 18; Andrac, Die Partherstadt Assur. Osnabrück, 1967, 78-88.

\textsuperscript{350} Downey, 1987, 30.
building, which faced east, was roughly square and divided into a broad pronaos and a slightly narrower naos. The placement of the naos was somewhat off-centre, leaving room for a set of stairs in the north which ran from the pronaos to the roof of the building. This temple was set within a courtyard delimited by an outer wall which reused the foundations of the earlier outer wall. Indeed, the main entrance into the sanctuary was set in the east wall, at roughly the same spot where the first temple’s propylon would have been. In the case of this later temple, however, the temple structure was itself off the axis of the sanctuary’s entrance and was, instead, located further south. A new monumental altar was built directly in front of the temple building, on line with its entrance. Brown has postulated that the main sanctuary entrance was not shifted south along with the temple because, according to him, the monumental altar of the preceding period was still intact and remained used. Downey, on the other hand, has theorized that this bent axis was an attempt to emulate certain Neo-Babylonian temples which also had a bent-axis approach between the entrance of the sanctuary and the temple unit. \(^{35}\) Along the southern side of the courtyard, the sanctuary was expanded past the original line of the earlier temple and a total of four rooms were built. These rooms alternated between wide and narrow, but were all of equal length. The wide rooms were reconstructed as having arched entrances. They would thus have looked like iwans. The other peripheral structures of the sanctuary were built along the northern side. In the western portion of the north side there was a single room, entered from the south. This
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\(^{35}\) Downey, 1988, 92.
room was lined with benches along three of its walls, presumably for dining, like the oikoi of the Temple of Artemis-Nanaia. In the eastern part of the north side of the sanctuary, there was a colonnaded portico which stretched between the outer wall of the sanctuary and the east wall of the room.  

Chronology of the Temple of Zeus Megistos

The chronology associated with both of these two earlier phases is not absolutely certain. The first phase was dated originally to the first half of the second century B.C. by the excavators. If Antiochus IV was responsible in some way for the early temple and its cult, this date would certainly be appropriate. The date itself was suggested by the sherds recovered from a section of undisturbed fill. The style of the Doric order used in the first phase as well as the construction techniques of the temple in general also point to a date within the early second century. In addition, the use of a foot of 0.35 metres as a unit of measurement in the construction indicates a Hellenistic date. The date which the excavators gave the second phase of the temple was the second quarter of the first century, during the early period of Parthian control in the city. This date would fall just prior to the similarly radical changes which the Temple of Artemis underwent in its third phase.

Recently, however, the date of the first phase has come into question. During recent excavations at the site of the Temple of Zeus Megistos, excavators uncovered a relatively

352 Downey, 1988, 93.

353 Downey, 1985, 121.
thick layer of abandonment debris which overlay a hard-packed surface identified as a road. Part of the foundation of the first phase of the temple was footed on top of this abandonment layer. Thus the temple would have had to have been built after whatever structures had been there originally had disappeared. The precise date of these earlier structures is unknown, but they must presumably date after 303 B.C. According to Downey, this stratigraphy indicates that the original phase of the temple might be a good deal younger than previously thought. In addition, if the early phases of the Temple of Zeus Megistos do date from a later period, it may also put the dates of the Temple of Artemis Nanaia into question. After all, the first truly solid pieces of evidence for this temple’s date come from the inscribed column which appeared only in the third building phase. The findings from the new excavations at the Temple of Zeus Megistos, therefore, put the current picture of the early religious life of Dura-Europos into a state of nebulous uncertainty.\footnote{S. Downey, "Excavations in the Temple of Zeus Megistos at Dura-Europos, 1994." \textit{Mesopotamia} XXX, 1995, 244-249. Downey does not, however, provide any specific alternative to the date given by Brown.}

This new evidence need not, however, necessarily indicate that the first couple of phases of the Temple of Zeus were younger than first imagined. The evidence which provided the original date of the first phase of the temple, although not unimpeachable, still stands. One possible explanation for both sets of findings may be found in the work of Leriche and al Mahmoud. During their recent excavations, these two scholars noted a dearth of substantial early-Hellenistic structures within the city. From their findings, they determined that the city underwent a significant program of urbanization just prior to the mid
second century. This program included the construction of the city’s defences along the course subsequently used during the remainder of the life of the city, the foundations of which yielded datable ceramic evidence, as well as a Hippodamian street layout and a substantial increase in the density of the urban occupation. This period of urbanization, according to Leriche and Mahmoud, may have come about as a result of the growing Parthian presence in the east. Before this period of urban growth, the city’s population seems to have been centred around the eastern citadel.\textsuperscript{355} If this theory is true, it would not be hard to imagine that the early inhabitation and access ways of Dura-Europos might have been more chaotic than later periods, shifting around the focal point of the citadel and subject to sporadically centred periods of abandonment. When the second century urbanization project was undertaken, it may have been started by the construction of a new temple, which was built upon a layer of abandonment fill which, in turn, overlay an older road surface, in order to accommodate the demands of an increased population. The temple was, after all, built some one hundred or more years after the settlement was originally founded. Thus, there may have been enough time for a local abandonment layer to accumulate. In this theory, the eldest remains of the Temple of Artemis-Nanaia, whose orientation was skewed from that of later phases, could still have been the first cult centre of the city, serving the original settlement. Thus, the various findings of the excavations need not present contradictory pictures of early Dura-Europos.

\textsuperscript{355} Leriche & al Mahmoud. 1994, 397-405.
Discussion

These two temples from Dura-Europos, given the postulate that they both possess some phase dating to the Hellenistic Period, offer interesting examples of cultural influences. In Ai Khanum, the easternmost settlement considered in this study, the ritual centres demonstrated an eastward progression of influences from the centres of Greece and Mesopotamia. Meanwhile, in Dura-Europos, the two temples demonstrate the opposite. The temples display forms which migrated westward both from local sources such as the southern Mesopotamian heartland, and from quite distant sources, such as from Central Asia. Of course, the influence of Greece was once again not absent from the temples. The interplay of these influences at Dura may have been affected, sometimes in a subtle fashion, by alteration in the political sphere, especially through notable events such as the Parthian conquest. Thus changes in the political context of the city may have led to changes in the religious life of the city, especially in the physical forms of the temples.

The Temple of Artemis-Nanaia, for example, seems to reflect, on the level of its cultural inspirations, the political context of the city. In its original phase, dating soon after the settlement, the Temple of Artemis apparently borrowed most heavily from traditionally Greek sources. The many decorative and structural elements in the Doric order which were found reused in later period construction testify that the ornamentation of the first phase was highly Greek. In form, the first phase apparently resembled a normal Hellenic sanctuary type: an enclosed peribolos containing an altar, with the possibility of a colonnaded propylon and
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a portico running along the inside walls. Brown draws a parallel between this phase of the sanctuary and another Greek sanctuary: the Delphinium of Miletus, to which the Temple of Artemis bore some similarities in layout. In addition, according to Brown, this early phase of the temple may have been dedicated to both Artemis, the one to whom the temple was dedicated in later periods, and Apollo, who probably had a subsidiary altar within the enclosure which was not detected during the excavations. This theory was based on the fact that the next phase of the sanctuary had two separate altars. Indeed, during this early phase, Apollo and Artemis may have been worshipped at Dura under their guise as archegoi or founders, since Apollo was the patron deity of the Seleucid dynasty. Thus, both in its layout and in its cult, the early sanctuary which would later become the Temple of Artemis was seemingly well suited for a small Greek settlement which centred around a military outpost.

The early state of the city did not last. During the early part of the second century, Dura-Europos apparently underwent a spurt of growth. The population of the city increased and new groups were perhaps introduced. With the Parthian conquest of 114/3 B.C., the whole cultural dynamic was rearranged. On the whole, it does not appear that the Greek elements of the city were suppressed in any way. The second phase of the sanctuary, which was built after the Parthian conquest, may perhaps illustrate this phenomenon. The naiskos
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of the second phase with its two altars, which were possibly dedicated to Apollo and Artemis, its longitudinal layout and its peripteros, all bespeak continued Greek influence in the city. However, at the same time, new influences were gaining prominence. This second Greek phase of the sanctuary was never completed. Instead, the beginnings of the naiskos were all demolished, save for the two altars, and a new structure, with a quite different layout was constructed.

This third structure, the first actual temple structure on the site, drew its influences heavily from the architectural developments from the region of Iran and Central Asia, many of which had occurred within the chronological bounds of the Hellenistic Period. For example, the layout of the Temple of Artemis-Nanaia bore a resemblance to some of the temples from Ai Khanum, particularly the Temple à Redans (Figure 2.3). Both temples were divided internally in half across their widths. The first half of each temple was given over to a single wide room identified as the pronaos. The rear half of each temple was further subdivided into three: a central naos, entered from the pronaos, and two flanking sacristies which could themselves only be entered from the naos. A monumental altar was also found standing between the temple entrances and the entrance to each one’s respective sanctuary.

The Temple of Artemis-Nanaia also bears characteristics in common with Central Asian temples in places other than Ai Khanum. Here, it is the installations which flanked the entranceway of the Temple of Artemis-Nanaia that are of interest. On either side of the

359 Downey, 1988, 79.
entrance of the temple, there was a ritual emplacement. On the north side, the two altars of the previous period were left uncovered and undisturbed. Their ritual function could have thus continued after the temple of 40-32 B.C. was constructed. On the south side of the temple’s entrance, the excavators identified the beginnings of what would later become the chapel, or naiskos, of Aphrodite. Indeed, in later phases of the temple, the two locations would both house chapels.\textsuperscript{360} In certain Hellenistic Period temples from Central Asia, the main body of the temple had two projecting wings which flanked the entrance. For instance, a temple at Takht-i-Sangin (\textbf{Figure 1.2}), which lies in Bactria on the ancient Oxus river, had two projecting wings flanking the entrance. These wings contained a number of rooms, including installations, known as ateshgahs, for the keeping of the perpetual fire which was necessary for the temple’s rituals. A similar, if simpler, example comes from the site of Dilberdjin, also located in Bactria. The temple at this site (\textbf{Figure 1.3}), which dated to the mid second century B.C., had projecting wings consisting of one room each.\textsuperscript{361} Fragments of frescoes showing the Dioscuri, done in the Greek style, were found around the entrance to the naos of the temple and have thereby given the structure the name of the Temple of the Dioscuri.\textsuperscript{362} The rooms of the projecting wings at Dilberdjin were quite possibly chapels in


\textsuperscript{361} Rapin, 1992, 113.

which these two Greek gods were worshipped. Thus, the third phase of the Temple of Artemis at Dura-Europos seems to have borrowed its inspiration from the architectural forms found in Bactria, which had themselves developed since the death of Alexander.

A similar trend can be seen when examining the Temple of Zeus Megistos. With this temple, however, the Parthian occupation of the city was not seemingly required as an impetus for the borrowing of ideas from regions on the other side of Mesopotamia. Indeed, from the beginning, the Temple of Zeus Megistos apparently mixed both Greek and Central Asian architectural forms together. The first phase of the temple, dated provisionally to the first half of the second century, did have its Greek elements. The monumental propylon with its Doric columns displays the presence of Hellenic influence in the ornamentation of the temple, notably the face it first presented to those who approached it. On the other hand, the layout of the temple was not traditionally Greek. Instead, once again, the closest parallels to the temple’s layout seem to come from the site of Ai Khanum in Bactria. The closest parallel, in this case, would be the first phase of the Extramural Temple located just outside of that city. Both the Zeus Megistos and the Extramural temples were divided between an open courtyard at the front of the buildings and a row of three rooms, identified in both cases as naoi, which ran along the back. The Doric propylon of the Temple of Zeus would thus
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have taken the place of the extra-wide entranceway which allowed access to the naoi of the Extramural Temple. The dates of the Extramural Temple are not certain. Considering, however, that the city of Ai Khanum did not exist much past the middle of the second century B.C., the odds are good that the first phase of the Extramural Temple was older than or contemporary with the Temple of Zeus Megistos. The internal division of the Temple of Zeus at Dura also bears a certain resemblance to the Temple à Redans. Indeed, the overall shape of the Temple of Zeus is closer to that of the main temple of Ai Khanum, which is square, than to the rectangular form of the Extramural Temple. Of course, the Temple of Zeus at Dura lacked the roofed pronaos of the Temple à Redans and possessed a different proportion between the front and rear section as well as a different method of gaining access to the rear rooms which flanked the central naos. In addition, the Temple of Zeus Megistos, like the Temple of Artemis, did not possess either a three-stepped crepis or an elevated podium which were found underneath both of the Ai Khanum temples. Nor did either of the Dura temples possess the vertical niche decoration of the Ai Khanum temples, which had originally been borrowed from Mesopotamian religious architecture.\textsuperscript{366} On the whole, however, there is a definite resemblance between the first phase of the Temple of Zeus Megistos and the temples of Ai Khanum.

The reason behind this resemblance is not altogether clear. Prior to her work which put the chronology of the temple into question, Downey theorized that this style of temple

\textsuperscript{366} Downey, 1985, 128.
might be the result of a deliberate creation of new religious architectural types in the Seleucid Empire. Should the original chronology of the temple be correct, then this theory might remain potentially viable. Certainly, if Antiochus IV was the one responsible for building the Temple of Zeus Megistos, this theory would make sense. The similarities would, then, be the result of the king using the forms of temples built during the reigns of his predecessors from regions to the east. His motivations for doing so are not entirely clear. Perhaps, the mixture of styles in the Temple of Zeus Megistos may have been acceptable to the possibly mixed population of the expanded city. Any attempt to explain the motivations behind such a decision would be mere speculation.

Another possible theory to explain the similarities between the temples at Ai Khanum and Dura is that the temples represented not a deliberate creation of new forms but a habitual one. Dura, after all, was located relatively near to both Greece and Mesopotamia. It was thus well placed physically to draw from both the Greek and Mesopotamian traditions which were also manifestly present in the development of the Ai Khanum temples. Similar conditions may have allowed the use of a similar type of temple, whose mixture of Greek and Mesopotamian elements would have suited the social and geographic contexts of the city. The layouts of the Ai Khanum temples may have, thus, represented simply a fashionable type or one of several acceptable temple types to chose from, which were palatable to a greater range of population elements. The adoption of this type, therefore, would be less of a
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conscious and concerted effort to create new types than the creation of a new type by happenstance.

In any case, during the first century B.C., the Temple of Zeus, like the Temple of Artemis-Nanaia, had its layout greatly altered. In this new phase, the courtyard was much bigger and more prominent than it had been earlier. Instead of merely fronting the temple structure, it now surrounded a much smaller temple. The new temple lost its tripartite division of the rear section. Instead, the naos was made nearly the same width as the wide pronaos, excepting the space needed for the stairs to the roof. This wide room style temple unit, like the original phase of the Temple à Redans, derives itself originally from Mesopotamian precedents. The shift of the temple unit, with its associated altar, to the south of the surrounding sanctuary's entrance axis may also be seen as Mesopotamian, resembling the layout of certain Neo-Babylonian temples. At the same time, the Doric columns which decorated the exterior of the first temple's propylon were removed, although a portico was then placed along the inside of the courtyard's northern face. The exterior face of the temple was thus made to look less Greek. The presence of rooms along the inner face of the sanctuary enclosure would also not have been out of place within a temple of the Mesopotamian traditions. Indeed, the second phase of the Temple of Zeus Megistos at Dura seems to indicate a certain revival of Babylonian traditional architectural forms. This revival may be paralleled to a certain degree by the some of the slightly later alterations of the Temple of Artemis, namely the construction for the first time of peripheral rooms along the
enclosure wall.\textsuperscript{368} Since the city was a notable caravan city under the Parthians, intimately connected through trade with Mesopotamia, this revival may not be altogether surprising. Certainly, Babylonian influences might have been reinforced by the caravans which enriched Dura during the Parthian Period.\textsuperscript{369}

The Gods and Cults of the Sanctuaries

The physical layout of the temples of Dura-Europos were not the only parts of these sanctuaries which displayed a mixture of cultures. The gods and rituals of the sanctuaries may also derive from a variety of sources. For example, the Temple of Zeus Megistos, which was identified by a much later inscription of A.D. 169-170, may have originally been dedicated to a different deity. The first temple was quite probably built as part of the religious building program of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV.\textsuperscript{370} As such, it has been theorized that the building was originally dedicated to Zeus Olympios, a Greek god whose cult is known to have been heavily promoted by that king.\textsuperscript{371} At some point after the first temple was constructed, therefore, the name of the god was changed to that of Zeus Megistos. This titulature, although still totally Greek in form, may indicate the rising influence of local culture. Indeed the name of Zeus Megistos can be taken as equivalent to
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an important Syrian sky god called Ba’alshamin.\textsuperscript{372} This would not be an unusual phenomenon. Zeus, within Hellenistic and Roman times, was often identified with a variety of great Western-Semitic gods, including the local Bel (Ba’al), as well as Ba’alshamin, and Hadad.\textsuperscript{373} Thus, it would seem that the cult could reflect not only a Greek god, but also possibly a local one at the same time. Unfortunately, due to the absence of evidence, it is extremely difficult to determine the exact point when the theoretically original, Hellenistic cult was altered to fit its later syncretistic form, or if indeed it did not start out in this fashion, and any attempt to pinpoint this date would be highly speculative. Certainly, a number of opportunities existed, some of which fall into the period examined in this work. For instance, the transformation may have started shortly after the cult was originally founded, since the roughly contemporary urban expansion of the early second century may have attracted an influx of a Syrian population. On the other hand, the local segment of the population may have made its influence felt when the second phase of the temple was constructed in the second quarter of the first century. At that time, the original phase of the temple, representing perhaps the original cult, had been destroyed possibly during the Parthian conquest (114-3 B.C.), decades prior to the construction of the second phase. Thus there existed the
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\textsuperscript{373} J. Teixidor, "Sur Quelques Aspects de la Vie Religieuse dans la Syrie à l’Époque Hellenistique et Romaine." Archéologie et Histoire de la Syrie II: La Syrie de l’Époque Achéménide à l’Avènement de l’Islam. Saarbrücken, 1989, 83-84. It should be noted that the term Ba’al is not a name but a title meaning ‘lord’. This title could in fact be given to a variety of deities, usually one of the chief gods of any particular city. Thus Arrian refers to Marduk, the chief god of Babylon, as Belos (Ba’ali), see Arrian, Anabasis. VII, 17. Hadad may also have been known under that title at Ugarit, see Caquot & Szmyner, Iconography of Religions XV, 8: Ugaritic Religions. Leiden, 1980, 12.
possibility of modifying the cult. The city was, at that time, also benefiting from the political and economic attentions from non-Mediterranean sources. There was, therefore, the cultural opportunity and the economic potential both to rebuild the temple and to alter its cult. All that is certain, however, is that, by the time of the inscription in the late second century A.D., the cult had assumed its final form.

The history of the cult of Artemis-Nanaia may have followed roughly the same developmental lines. Since the sanctuary was originally built while the settlement was still a small Greek military colony, it is a distinct possibility that the cult or cults which it housed were purely or mostly Greek in nature. With the expansion of the city, both during the early second century and under the early Parthian administration, new population elements or outside influences may have had their effect on the cult. Artemis was apparently always the main deity worshipped at the sanctuary, and dedicatory inscriptions, albeit from a later date, found within the temple bear evidence of this. One of these inscriptions (Inscription 4.3) dates to the Roman Period at Dura and was found carved into a large stone base in one of the later oikoi. However, an undated moulded stone in the form of an entablature was also discovered which bore two inscriptions, one of which was a dedication to both the goddess Nanaia and the god Hadad (Inscription 4.2).\(^{374}\) The cult of Nanaia, originally called Nanai, had its origins in southern Mesopotamia in the third millennium B.C., and was possibly centred around the city of Uruk. Her cult spread from there into many other regions of the

\(^{374}\) Cumont, 1923, 411.
Middle East, starting with Susa. By the first century A.D., her cult could be found in such places as Armenia, Alexandria and even Athens.\(^{375}\) In these cults, the goddess possessed a very complex character. She was one of the great goddesses of the Mesopotamian pantheon. Indeed, she was sometimes assimilated with other great Mesopotamian goddesses, including the goddess Ishtar. As with Ishtar, Nanaia had aspects of both fertility and war. Nanaia was identified with a number of Greek goddesses, including Athena.\(^{376}\) However, her identification with the Greek Artemis seems to have been the most common.\(^{377}\) As noted in the previous chapter, the consort of Nanaia, Nabu, was sometimes, in post Seleucid times, identified with the Greek god Apollo.\(^{378}\) Thus, the presence of the Apollo cult within the sanctuary, as indicated by the presence of the two altars during the second phase, could work well within the syncretism of Artemis and Nanaia. The cult of Apollo would simply have been identified with the cult of the goddess' consort. However, the exact identity of the consort is not altogether certain. The inscription previously mentioned bore the name of the Syro-Mesopotamian god Hadad, who was normally the consort of the goddess Atargatis in western Syria. Atargatis was herself a great fertility goddess in Phoenicia and, in many ways, similar to Nanaia. Cumont has speculated that, at Dura-Europos, which lay roughly halfway between the Phoenician coast and the centres of southern Mesopotamia, the consort figure

\(^{375}\) Cumont, 1923, 196-197.

\(^{376}\) Cumont, 1923, 198.

\(^{377}\) Cumont, 1923, 196.

\(^{378}\) Gachet & Salles, 1990, 213.
of Nanaia was not Nabu as usual, but Hadad instead.\textsuperscript{379} 

The presence of the subsidiary chapel, which was in later times dedicated to Aphrodite, would also fit with the extremely complex nature of the Mesopotamian goddess. At Dura, the subsidiary chapels which were located in the various temples were often dedicated to divinities associated with the primary god or goddess.\textsuperscript{380} Thus, the chapel of Aphrodite may simply be an installation dedicated to the same eastern goddess but in her guise as a fertility deity.\textsuperscript{381}

\textbf{Aspects of Ritual}

Both Hellenistic Period temples at Dura present an interesting, if somewhat nebulous, body of evidence concerning the rituals which were practised within their walls. This evidence is notably problematic when dealing with the cultural antecedents, since many of the rituals for which there is evidence could fit well into several different cultural traditions. For example, both the Temple of Artemis-Nanaia and the Temple of Zeus Megistos possessed altars for their early phases. For the most part, these altars were monumental in scale. They certainly could have served as installations for the Greek style sacrifice of large animals. However, similar style sacrifices took place within other traditions, including within the traditions of the Levantine peoples. Here, the altar acted as a sort of ‘high place’ so that
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the slaughter would be visible to more people.

The presence of ‘high places’ within western Semitic and Mesopotamian cult practice may also have had ramifications in other aspects of ritual. For example, the second phase of the Temple of Zeus Megistos possessed stairs which gave access for ritual functions to the temple roof. Indeed, other, later Dura temples, such as the temple of Aphlad, were built up against towers which were incorporated into the city’s defences, but which could also serve a ritual purpose. Of course, it would be difficult to sacrifice large animals upon the tops of these elevations, nor would any sacrifice be likely seen from the courtyards below. However, the sacrifice of incense and smaller animals could be performed in non-public rituals.\textsuperscript{382}

Certainly, the remains of small animals which were recovered from the Temple of Artemis-Nanaia suggest that a large variety of sacrifices were performed at each temple. In addition, the appearance of features for gaining added height, starting with the stairs to the roof of the second phase of the Zeus Megistos Temple, may indicate the growing importance of the various Syro-Mesopotamian elements of the population in the ritual life of the city.

Another interesting aspect of the ritual life of the two Hellenistic temples at Dura is the presence of rooms outfitted for banqueting. Both the Temples of Artemis-Nanaia and Zeus Megistos possessed at least one room prior to the end of the Hellenistic Period which was outfitted with dining benches.\textsuperscript{383} Their use in later periods is attested by inscriptions, by the wear of the benches and by the presence of drains in the floor. Similar installations have
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been found in most of the Dura temples as well as in temples in Palmyra and Petra. Banquet rites have also been identified in various Greek temples. For example, the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Corinth possessed a number of dining rooms starting from the late sixth century B.C., some of which possessed benches of stone and earth which ran along the walls, such as those of Dura. The idea of sacred dining rooms in the Dura-Europos temples could, therefore, have originated from the Greek tradition. Considering, however, that the first appearance of rooms specifically set aside in Dura temples for ritual banquets appeared well after the Parthian conquest of the city, it does not seem likely that the impetus for the creation of such rooms was wholly Greek. Certainly, the number of oikoi in Dura temples tended to increase as time went on, long after the period of Greek political control of the city.

Summary

The city of Dura-Europos, unlike the other sites studied in this work, possessed a history which spanned many centuries and lasted well into the present era. Over time, the city changed hands several times and underwent many changes. Some of these changes were reflected in the city’s temples, two of which had phases which might date to the period of interest for this study.
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In the beginning, while the settlement was relatively small, the earliest sanctuary of Artemis was also relatively simple, consisting of a Greek-style *peribolos* without an actual temple building. Later, when the city grew during the early second century, the Temple of Zeus Megistos, the first actual temple at Dura, was added. The form of this new temple resembled temple forms which had appeared somewhat earlier in regions of Central Asia, most notably in Ai Khanum, the first site examined in this work. This similarity may be either the result of a deliberate choice to create new types or a step in a nearly accidental process, based on fashion or the acceptability of forms, which resulted in new types of religious architecture. Thus, it would seem that developments in the extreme eastern part of the Hellenistic world were moving westwards.

After the Parthian conquest of 114-113 B.C., Mesopotamian and local influences, possibly as a result of increased trade and prosperity, gained more importance in both the forms of the temples and the cults associated with them. The gods themselves may have been altered to suit local tastes: Artemis was associated with Nanaia, and Zeus Olympios may have been changed to Zeus Megistos who could be equated more easily with a powerful local divinity. The influences of Greece and Central Asia did not disappear altogether. For example, the Sanctuary of Artemis of the Early Parthian Period, just after the middle of the first century B.C., consisted first of a Greek style naiskos and then of a temple with Bactrian style projecting chapels along the front.

It would seem, therefore, that the early temples of Dura-Europos changed over time as a result of the changes in political preeminency of various powers as well as from the
changes in the tastes of the evolving local population.
Chapter 5

Conclusion

The Hellenistic Period was a time of mutation and innovation in many spheres of life in the Middle Eastern and Mediterranean Worlds, not the least of which was the religious sphere. The temples and other cult centres located at the new settlements founded by the incoming Greeks, namely those of Ai Khanum, Ikaros (Failaka) and Dura-Europos, were often dissimilar from those temples and ritual sites which existed in the Middle East prior to the Hellenistic Period. Nor were many of these temples very similar to Greek precedents. There were differences in the form and layout of the temples as well as evidence for variations in ritual, in certain cases. At the same time, the temples at these three sites were not newly created from whole cloth but, instead, grew out of the myriad of previously existing traditions. The exact form and function of any one of the temples at these three sites was engendered by complex sets of shifting circumstances unique to each of the sites in particular. In this chapter, the mechanics of these circumstances will be examined.

The Geographical and Historical Contexts

Each of the three settlements of Ai Khanum, Failaka, or Dura-Europos was situated in its own unique geographical and historical context. These contexts inevitably affected the
formation of the temples at the settlement. The most obvious effect, in the case of geography, would be the type and availability of building supplies for the temples. Ai Khanum, for instance, lacked good building stone in its immediate environment, thus indicating a strong reason why all of the temples were constructed in mud brick.\textsuperscript{387} Failaka, on the other hand, had a somewhat different situation. The temples within the Sacred Fortress were constructed using oolitic limestone for which the nearest deposit was several kilometres down the coast.\textsuperscript{388} This material was thus relatively easy to retrieve and use, but not as easily accessible as the beach-rocks from the local shoreline or as mud brick, a material which the local inhabitants had a long tradition of using. This phenomenon may help explain why the temples of the Sacred Fortress tended only to use limestone as socle and as ornamentation with the superstructures being made of mud brick or why beach-rock was preferred in the walls of both the domestic structures and fortification walls. The temples of Failaka were also possibly affected by the climate of their location, since all of them apparently possessed flat roofs suitable for a region with a relative dearth of rainfall. A flat roof would also require less lumber than a pitched roof covering the same area, useful in a region with few trees. An effort, however, was made to create the illusion that the roof of Temple A was pitched in the normal Greek fashion. The geographical context also positioned each site in regard to the cultural influences to which it was most susceptible. At Ai Khanum the buried libation vessels, whose forms were of local derivation, were indicative of a local ritual, with roots
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dating back centuries in the region. The ritual emplacements of the Dura temples would also have fit well with the worship of the local Syrian gods, some of whose names were found inscribed nearby. In addition, the two nearby regions of Babylonia and Susiana had their own impact upon the equipment of the cult centres of the island of Ikaros.

On the other hand, the historical context of each site also affected the development of its religious structures. For instance, Dura-Europos started out as a relatively small military outpost and it originally had a single known sanctuary consisting of a simple peribolos with an altar. Later, in the second century, the city apparently underwent a massive expansion and acquired a second religious structure in the form of an actual temple building. After the city was conquered by the Parthians, there is evidence that increased trade with southern Mesopotamia led to the adoption of certain Babylonian characteristics by the temples.

At Ai Khanum, and in Bactria in general, the geographical and historical contexts are particularly interesting. Prior to the Hellenistic Period, the evidence for temples was very slight in this and in neighbouring regions, due in part, perhaps, to local religious preference for open-air sanctuaries. After the death of Alexander the Great, however, temples and other ritual centres became much more frequent. Within Ai Khanum itself there were five ritual centres, including two full-fledged temple structures. Hellenistic temples also appeared at the Bactrian sites of Takht-i-Sangin and Dilberdjin. These temples possessed many peculiarities of design which had been unknown before. Some of these new Bactrian religious features were later found elsewhere, such as in the temples of Dura-Europos, lying far on the opposite
side of Mesopotamia from Bactria. For example, both of the Dura temples at some point
incorporated, among other things, an internal division similar to the temples of Ai Khanum,
with a broad front area and a tripartite division of the rear. Thus, it seems that the entire
region acted as a sort of generator of new religious architectural forms.

Some of the mechanics behind this particular phenomenon might be discernible at
Ai Khanum. The religious structures of the city borrowed eclectically from a number of
cultural antecedents. The temples borrowed heavily from Babylonian ornamentation and
design with their broad arrangement of rooms and their vertical niche exterior ornamentation.
On the top of the acropolis, there was an open-air sanctuary which followed an Iranian
tradition. Meanwhile, the two civic mausoleums borrowed most heavily from the Greeks.
Almost every one of these structures, however, incorporated various aspects of design from
the other traditions, such as Greek-style crepides or porticoes. The exact mixture was
evolving continuously over the century and a half in which the city existed. This occurrence
of the evolution and mixture of ideas from a variety of different sources can be seen as both
the direct result and cause of quantum leaps in the development of the religious sphere in
Bactria. This developmental leap was certainly aided by the fact that Bactria was, for all
intents and purposes, a virgin field regarding religious structures. The region itself, unlike
Mesopotamia, had no extensive tradition dating back millennia from which the temples of
the new foundation could draw. Any new temple which was constructed would have to draw
its inspiration from distant sources. Such a temple would be judged appropriate by itself or
in comparison with only a few examples, instead of being compared to a long line of
similarly built temples. Thus, the temples within the city of Ai Khanum and at the sites of Dilberdjin and Takht-i-Sangin could very easily display a certain heterogeneity while maintaining some similarities where it would be deemed most appropriate. On the other hand, in the case of a region, such as Mesopotamia, with a strongly entrenched temple tradition, there would be an expectation of more homogeneity and less spontaneous creation of new forms. Indeed, both of the ancient Mesopotamian cities of Babylon and Uruk exhibited temples which closely followed the tradition of the region.389

Thus the historical context of each site, along with the geographical context, allowed differences to appear in the forms and functions of the temples through their own variability. In effect, these contexts acted as the matrices through which the creative forces behind the temples of the three sites could act.

The Traditions and the Question of Emphasis

Although the geographical and historical context of each site helps to explain some of the influences at work on the temples of Ai Khanum, Failaka and Dura-Europos, other factors played a role as well. The question of why certain cultural temple traditions were used or emphasised in certain temples while not at others needs to be explored more deeply in order to examine the mechanics and meaning behind the choices of form for each temple.

First, most of the eleven cult or ritual centres from the three sites examined in this
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thesis seem to borrow most heavily from one of two sources. Either the structure partook of
the long layout of the Greek model, such as the civic mausoleums at Ai Khanum and the two
temples of the Sacred Fortress at Failaka, or they possess the broad-room layout common
in Mesopotamian structures. While the influence of other traditions was occasionally felt in
features such as the Iranian style podium and terraces of Ai Khanum and in certain Syrian
elements at Dura-Europos, these elements are less often seen or only developed during the
Hellenistic Period. Instead, the most commonly seen and most readily identifiable borrowed
elements of the temples seem to come from either Greece or Babylonia. This is not altogether
surprising. It would be natural to have Greek style religious buildings in settlements founded
by the incoming Greeks. On the other hand, Babylonia itself possessed cultural importance
for a number of reasons. It possessed a strongly founded cultic tradition which, by the
beginning of the Hellenistic Period had already had a great influence on the religious spheres
of nearby regions such as Susiana, with which there had been contact for millennia, during
the Elamite Periods. Indeed, according to Boyce and Crenet, the religion of Susiana, at sites
like Masjid-i-Solaiman, was more heavily influenced by Babylonian ideology than by the
religious traditions of the Iranian plateau. The religions of the plateau, such as
Zoroastrianism, still had some effect upon the region, but to a lesser extent.390 Babylonia also
possessed a pride of place which started with Alexander himself, who displayed a certain
amount of benevolence towards the region, and continued with Seleucus, who started out as

the satrap of the area, after the former’s death.\textsuperscript{391} Thus, the area was well positioned to influence the religious development in neighbouring territories from the start of the Hellenistic Period.

Upon the basics of these two main traditions, other traditions would be added or used as a filter to modify the existing tradition in order to create individually different structures, in effect creating a hierarchy of cultural influences. In the case of the sites located in Central Asia, the process led to the development of new forms, such as temples with wide front and tripartite rear and temples possessing projecting front chapels, whose effect would later be felt further west, namely in the two temples at Dura, which were thus a sort of cultural grandchild of earlier temple influences. The question of why certain temples or ritual sites would represent specific traditions in form or in ritual to be modified in different ways, however, is still quite enigmatic, as is the question of why structures heavily inspired from different traditions would show up at the same site. One possibility to consider is the effect that a culturally mixed population would have upon a settlement’s rituals and architecture.

In the case of the three settlements of this study, the presence of a Greek speaking element of each of their populations is attested, among other things, by a varying number of inscriptions written in the Greek language, some of which have been discussed in this work. Thus, the presence of Greek style religious buildings or objects would not be out of place.

\textsuperscript{391} Sherwin-White & Kuhrt, 1993, 9-11. For his part, Alexander, upon entering Babylon, is reported to have made a sacrifice to the god Baal (a title of Marduk) according to the instructions of the local priesthood. He also made a start on reconstructing the god’s massive temple. Babylon is also connected intimately to Alexander as the place of the man’s death after his return from India. Arrian, 3.16, 7.16-24.
nor would the presence of Greek style ornamentation on cult structures which did not intrinsically follow the Hellenic fashion, such as in the case of the Doric columns of the first temple of Zeus Megistos. This Greek element, however, was probably not the totality of the population at any of the sites. Instead, there is a certain amount of evidence that different Middle Eastern groups, either from the area of the specific settlement or from elsewhere, were part of the general population of each city. Ai Khanum, for instance, with its two temples bearing the very Mesopotamian vertical niche decorations, may have had a sizeable population of people from that region.\textsuperscript{392} The presence of Iranian and local forms of ritual and structure almost certainly indicate the presence of other people as well. At Failaka, the pre-Hellenistic sanctuary of Tell Khazneh continued to be used well after the death of Alexander. In addition, the Greek and non-Greek materials were not found separated one from the other but were mixed together. The possibility exists, therefore, that the island boasted a mixed population.\textsuperscript{393} The sanctuaries of the island were also possibly used and influenced by a variety of itinerant travellers, including Arab merchants from further down the gulf, as indicated by the finds of Arab coins and pottery. The evidence for a mixed population at Dura-Europos has been already discussed in the preceding chapter.

The effect of several distinct cultural groups within a city upon the religious centres therein may have been profound and wide ranging. One quite noticeable effect might lie in the syncretism between deities of different cultural heritages at each centre. In most of the
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cases examined in this thesis where the possibility of identification of a divinity existed, it seems that the god in question never possessed a single cultural heritage. The Greek names: Artemis, Zeus, Apollo, were certainly present, appearing in the inscriptions or identified through some specific item of iconography, as in the case of the winged lightning bolt carved on the sandal of the acrolithic cult statue of the Temple à Redans. These gods may not have been, however, simply the Greek Artemis, Zeus or Apollo. On one hand, the Greek names may have been applied to divinities who already existed in the area, such as the Zeus Oromasdes (Ahura-Mazda) or Zeus-Mithra of Ai Khanum and the possible Apollo/Zeus-Shamash/Nabu and Artemis-Nanaia of Failaka. The reverse of this situation, however, might also exist. At Dura-Europos, it would seem that traits from the religion of the local Western Semitic peoples were added to cults which were originally more traditionally Greek. Thus, the cult of Zeus Megistos may have been changed from its earlier incarnation of Zeus Olympios in order to be more compatible with the Syrian sky god Ba‘alshamin.\footnote{Teixidor, 1989, 83-84.} Either way, the end results were similar.

Along with the combination of culturally diverse gods, a mixed population would also probably be reflected in the physical heterogeneity of the cult centres themselves. For example, the overall form and equipment of a temple may have been influenced by the availability of craftsmen whose training was culturally specific. At Ai Khanum, the small items found within the Temple à Redans displayed many aspects of Greek fabrication
its later phases, possessed both a non-Greek style substructure and an odd shelf for holding offerings.

The actual combination of several religious traditions may have been aided by certain factors. First, the various pre-Hellenistic cultural traditions were in themselves neither monolithic nor static. Each tradition encompasses a spectrum of forms with varying degrees of internal consistency. Even within the Greek tradition, which, with its highly developed architectural orders, was one of the more tightly self-defined traditions of the Hellenistic Period, there could be a great deal of physical difference between religious structures, ranging from the peribolos of the Delphinium at Miletus to the grand temples of Athens or Olympia. Furthermore, as each new temple of a single tradition was constructed, the overall fashion would continue to change and evolve. This shifting character may have allowed for relatively easy incorporations of culturally diverse elements of form or ritual, since they might still be reminiscent of well-known concepts. For example, at Failaka Persian-style column bases were judged appropriate to incorporate with Ionic columns. In addition, both the Greek and Syrian elements of the population at Dura used monumental altars for the sacrifice of large animals. Another, albeit less certain, example may exist at Ai Khanum. In their early phases, the two large temples of the city both possessed the broad layouts and niches characteristic of Mesopotamian temples as well as the stepped crepides common to Greek temples. These two factors need not necessarily be incongruous, since there existed among Mesopotamian temples, albeit on a different scale, a form with which the Greek substructure could be identified, notably the ziggurat. Mesopotamian ziggurats often took the
form of tiered towers topped by a small temple. In the case of Ai Khanum, the tiers of the tower were replaced with the shorter, and less labour intensive, steps of the Greek-style substructure and the proportionate increase in the size of the temples. Thus, the same features may have been appropriate to two different segments of the population for different reasons.

Another factor to consider is the pantheistic nature of many of the religions in the region during the Hellenistic Period. From the Greek perspective, each specific cult of a god could have its own specific peculiarities and rituals associated with it. Thus, with the creation of new cult sites during the Hellenistic Period, in areas previously uninhabited by the Greeks, and with the increased identification of Greek gods with Oriental ones, there may have been no major problems in adopting strange new elements of cult. These elements would have simply been seen as the results of the peculiarities of the new cults and their new locations. Such peculiarities may indeed have served to enhance the prestige cult by removing it further from the mundane. On the other hand, the oddness of a cult created by a mixed population to any one element of that population may not have been all that necessarily notable and may have simply been ignored for the most part. Perhaps only under certain circumstances, such as the apparently deliberate attempt of the last Greco-Bactrian King, Eucratides, to Hellenise the Temple à Redans, would there be a separation of traditions in order to emphasise one over the other.

The "Reversed-T" and Convergent Evolution

An inherent ambiguity or flexibility in the perception and use of cultural heritages
may also have allowed the simultaneous adoption of similar aspects from different traditions in order to appeal to a wider group of people than aspects common to only one tradition. Thus, a single temple element or form may be the direct product of a convergence of similar aspects from two different cultural traditions, as opposed to each tradition contributing completely dissimilar elements to form a new and distinct whole. The form produced by such a convergence would then continue evolving onwards depending on the fashions and constraints of its environment. In essence, this convergent form of evolution would be the opposite of the trend wherein variations are developed over time from a single older form. An example of this convergent evolution may exist in the type of temple layout often referred to as a "Reversed-T", characterized basically by a wide pronaos with an entrance on one long side and a much narrower naos roughly centred on the other.

This sort of layout is not unknown among the temples and other religious structures studied in this work. The "Reversed-T" shape was used in one of the phases of the Heroon of Kineas at Ai Khanum (Figure 2.14). It also appeared in the second phase subsidiary chapel of the sanctuary of the Temple à Redans (Figure 2.4). Both of these structures have a certain Greek quality to them, with their open distyle pronai. Indeed, they appear similar in shape to Macedonian chamber tombs and to another Hellenistic Period heroon located at Calydon. The use of a layout mainly seen in funerary architecture for a heroon upon which centred a civic cult would not be terribly surprising. However, the use of the same layout for

---
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the subsidiary chapel, a structure with no apparent funerary connection, would seem a little unusual. The reason behind its use may come from another direction. The two main temples of Ai Khanum (Figures 2.4 & 2.11), whose heavy Mesopotamian influence has already been mentioned, have, in their own fashion, a variation upon the "Reversed-T" layout. Both of these temples can be thought of as possessing a "Reversed-T" layout but with additional constructions flanking the vertical stroke formed by the naos itself. This effect is most clear in the Temple à Redans where the two sacristies were both much smaller than the naos and attached directly to it. In the case of the first phase of the Extramural Temple, the two additional rooms simply opened directly onto the courtyard which itself took the place of the wide rectangular pronaos. Thus, actual religious buildings, and not simply funerary ones, with a general similarity of layout existed near the subsidiary chapel in Ai Khanum. Thus, a certain form derived from one tradition in an unusual context, such as the subsidiary chapel whose form was inspired from Greek funerary architecture but which was not used for any funerary purpose, may have been found more acceptable because of the presence of a similar form from another tradition which was more acceptable in that context, namely the Mesopotamian layout of the main temple itself.

The next step in the evolutionary process of convergence may be seen at Failaka with the presence of the Hellenistic Sanctuary. In the beginning, the evidence indicates that the sanctuary possessed a simple "Reversed-T" layout in which the front wall of the pronaos was apparently left open save for the presence of two columns which flanked the entranceway. Although not as well executed physically, this structure thus bore a resemblance to the
Hellenistic "Reversed-T" structures of Ai Khanum. The same factors which allowed the use of previously funerary architecture types in a religious role at Ai Khanum may also have played a part at Failaka, located much nearer to Southern Mesopotamia. During the second phase, the Hellenistic Sanctuary (Figure 3.18) had its open front and columns replaced by a solid wall with a door. A court was also built directly onto the front of the temple. These traits emphasise the influence, possibly through Southern Iranian agency, of the Mesopotamian-inspired version of the type. Thus, in one structure, there is almost a shift over time from the inspiration of one cultural heritage to another.

The final product of the convergence can be seen a few centuries after the end of the Hellenistic Period in the northern Mesopotamian city of Hatra during the early second century A.D., when the Parthians controlled the area. There, several small temples or shrines were uncovered which all possessed the "Reversed-T" layout of a wider pronaos and narrower naos. These temples bore other resemblances of layout to the Hellenistic Sanctuary of Failaka. Namely, many of the Hatra temples were set in Mesopotamian style, either inside or at the back of an enclosed courtyard. Others were set onto squares or places where the street broadened (Figure 3.20). The main entrances of the shrines were usually flanked on either side by pilasters or buttresses (Figure 3.21).\textsuperscript{400} Downey indicates that these buttresses may be the vestiges of the towers which flanked the entrances of traditional Babylonian and Assyrian temples.\textsuperscript{401} It must be pointed out, however, that the buttresses
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flanking a central entranceway also echo the positioning of the two columns in more Greek designs using a "Reversed-T" layout. Neither explanation, however, need exclude the other one. Both, in fact may be correct. The two culturally distinct versions which had started off with the Heroon of Kineas and the Temple à REDans at Ai Khanum in the Hellenistic Period could have first become equated with one another. Thus funerary architecture became more appropriate for use in purely religious roles. Later, at Failaka, it was also appropriate for a temple to undergo a transition from one cultural style to the other. Then these two styles were conflated together to form a single type which appeared in the later Parthian period at Hatra. In this case, both the Greek and the Mesopotamian cultural heritages may be seen, without the preclusion of the other, as having some part in the ancestry of this group of religious structures growing out of the Hellenistic Period.

The Effect of Agency

In all this discussion of the influences of geographical contexts, population, and cultural traditions upon the construction and use of the temples at the three Hellenistic Period sites of this study, it would be beneficial to remember that these influences were second-order factors. The temple tradition of Mesopotamia, for example, did not directly mandate how a certain temple would look or operate. Instead, these influences were filtered through the agency of the people who built, or ordered the building of the temples and who made conscious choices about how they wanted a structure to look and what rituals they wished to perform therein. Thus, it was not the presence of trade routes which directly affected the
finds and forms of the temples at Failaka and Dura, but, instead, it was the presence of the merchants who plied those routes, spent their money and sold their goods in those two settlements, and perhaps attended the rituals of the affected temples.

The island of Failaka bears some examples of the effect of the individual or corporate choices of a group of people regarding the religious centres of the island. For instance, the Ikadion inscription records an order from a king that a cult be physically moved and that new rituals, specifically athletic contests (agones), be instituted. 402 On a more concretely physical level, the cults of the Sacred Fortress' two temples seem to have been forced out of the enclosure by the gradually increasing encroachment of domestic structures, including houses. This encroachment over a long period of time was the direct effect of choices taken by a group of people, either in a series of hierarchic decisions by individuals in power or in a series of corporate decisions by the local inhabitants. For example, it is possible that the domestic encroachment was motivated by the desire of the local inhabitants to avail themselves of the ready protection of the fortification walls which delimited the temenos of the temples. 403

How a temple was built would depend a great deal on what the people who built it thought was appropriate, an ideal which the people could both learn and transmit. Thus, there could be traditions associated with groups of people. The decision on how closely to follow any one tradition, however, was up to the builders. As groups of people mixed together and
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fashions changed, the idea of appropriateness would also change and be reflected by the choices of elements within a temple. At Ai Khanum, the extra wide pronaos of the first phase of the Heroon of Kineas was eventually changed so that it was the same width as the naos, better conforming to the style of Hellenic religious structures.

As time progressed, certain fashions may have gained enough coherence and become popular or appropriate enough in themselves to be chosen repeatedly, forming in effect a new tradition, which might then be transported deliberately, such as through the agency of a particular king, or unintentionally, by means of fashion, over some distance. Thus, the form of the Extramural Temple of Ai Khanum could be found repeated in the Temple of Zeus Megistos at Dura-Europos. Likewise, the presence of two projecting chapels has been found at the Bactrian sites of Dilberdjin and Takt-I-Sangin and also in the early Parthian Temple of Artemis-Nanaia at Dura.

It should, therefore, be remembered that it was by the very people who commissioned and built the temples that the various threads of geography, history, and tradition were interwoven to form the tapestries which were the temples of the Hellenistic Middle East. It was through their agency that variability and homogeneity were both introduced into the temples.

Summary

As examples of Hellenistic Period Middle Eastern temples, the cultic structures of Ai Khanum, Failaka (Ikaros) and Dura-Europos were the product of a complex plurality of
phenomena, which combined and recombined with one another in a myriad of different ways. Indeed the mechanics guiding this interplay were themselves also highly complex. As a result, temple and ritual forms might appear because of the presence, by chance or design, of several possibly related factors which do not exclude one another but work in tandem. For example, the introduction and movement of peoples within the region as a whole allowed the movement and recombination of different cultural religious heritages, which were in turn altered by the ever changing historical contexts, by the edicts of fashion or by the evolving ideologies of appropriateness. In certain cases, the flexible nature of the various cultural temple traditions allowed some aspects of each to converge in order to end up, perhaps at some time after the Hellenistic Period, in a single type of form. In some other cases, the mixture of different tradition elements allowed the definition of new forms within the Hellenistic Period. At the same time, temples appeared which might be seen to more closely follow one of these cultural traditions.

In effect, the temples and other cult centres at these three sites are reflections of the Hellenistic Period itself with its turbulent mix of cultures and politics. This period was not one known for its stability nor for its homogeneity, and its temples were correspondingly always changing and ever different.
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Figure 3.12: A Horseman Figurine.
(Mathiesen, 1982, Fig.13)
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Figure 3.14: A Female Head with a Kalathos.
(Mathiesen, 1982, Fig.26)
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(Caubet & Salles, 1983, Fig.34)
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Figure 3.20: A Plan of Shrine IX at Hatra.  
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Figure 3.21: A Plan of Shrine XI at Hatra:  
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Figure 3.22: Altars from Phase 1 of the Hellenistic Sanctuary.  
(Caubet & Salles, 1983, Fig.39)
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(Brown, 1936, Fig.25)
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(Downey, 1988, Fig.32)
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(Downey, 1988, Fig.33)

Figure 4.7: A Reconstruction of the First Zeus Megistos Temple.
(Downey, 1988, Fig.34)
Figure 4.8: A Plan of the Zeus Megístos Temple, Second Phase.
(Downey, 1988, Fig.41)
Appendix 2
Inscriptions

Inscription 2.1. (Robert, 1968, 422):

'Ανδρῶν τοι σοφά ταῦτα παλαιοτέρων ἀνάκει[tα]:
βόηματα ἀριγνώτων Πυθού ἐν ἡγαθεί:
ἐνθὲν ταῦτ[α] Κλέαρχος ἐπιφραθέως ἀναγράψας
εἰσάκτο τηλαυγή Κινέου ἐν τεμένει.

Inscription 2.2. (Robert, 1968, 424):

Παῖς ὁμ τὸν κόσμιος γίνοι,
ἡβὰν ἐγκρατῆς,
μέσος δικαιος,
4 πρεσβύτης εὔβουλος,
teleutων ἀλπος.
Inscription 3.1 (Roueche & Sherer-White, 1985, 15-16):

Inscription 3.2 (Marcillet-Jaubert, 1986, 194):

[Σοτ]έλης
[Άθη]ναίσος
[Ποσ]ειδώ-
[νι Ασφαλ-
[είφ]
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Inscription 3.3, (Roueché & Sherwin-White, 1985, 4):

Σωτέλ[ης]
'Aθηναιο[ν] (ορ 'Aθηναιο[ς])
kai oi stra[twta]
Δi Σωτήρι
5 Ποσειδώνι
'Αρτέμιδι
Σωτείραι

Inscription 3.4, (Roueché & Sherwin-White, 1985, pl.2):
Inscription 3.4a, (Jeppesen, 1989, 116):

\[\text{ΤΟ .......}
\text{ΟΙ ΕΞ ΙΝ[ΔΟΥ]}
\text{ΙΔΡΥΣΑΝ[ΤΟ]}
\text{ΤΟΝ ΒΩΜ[ΟΝ]}\]

Inscription 3.4b, (Roueché & Sherwin-White, 1985, 10):

\[\text{το[ΙΣ ΘΕΟΪΣ]}
\text{οι ΕΞ ΊΚΩ[ΡΟΥ]}
\text{ΙΔΡΥΣΑΝ[ΤΟ]}
\text{ΤΟΝ ΒΟΜ[ΩΝ]}
\text{vacat.}\]

Inscription 3.4c, (Piejko, 1988, 94):

\[\text{["ΑΠΟΛΛΩΝΙ, ΑΡΤΕΜΙΔΙ, ΛΗ-]}
\text{τοι [ΟΔΕΙΝΑ ΊΣΤΗΜΩΝ ΚΑΙ]}
\text{οι ΕΞ ΊΣ[ΑΡΟΥ ΣΤΡΑΤΙΩΤΑΙ]}
\text{ΙΔΡΥΣΑΝ[ΤΟ]}
\text{ΤΟΝ ΒΟΜ[ΩΝ].}\]

Inscription 4.1, (Cumont, 1926, no.52):

\[\text{ΣΕΛΕΥΚΟΣ ΛΥΣΙΟΥ | ΣΤΡΑΤΗΓΟΣ ΠΟΛΕΩΣ | ΓΕΝΕΑΡΧΗΣ.}\]
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