SAMOTHRACE: SUPPLEMENTARY INVESTIGATIONS, 1968-1977

(Plates 1-16)

In successive summer campaigns, the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University has continued investigations for the American School of Classical Studies in the Sanctuary of the Great Gods in Samothrace (Pl. 1). Along with preparation for final publication of earlier results, supplementary excavation was carried out in five areas of the Sanctuary: the Propylon of Ptolemy II (Fig. 1:26), the Eastern Hill (24-25), the periphery of the great Hellenistic Stoa (11) and the slopes east of it (7-10), the northern terrace of the Western Hill (1-4), and the Anaktoron and Rotunda of Arsinoe II (20-23), together with the hillside directly above them (28).

Abbreviations:

S, II A. Conze, A. Hauser, O. Benndorf, Neue archäologische Untersuchungen auf Samothrake, Vienna 1880.


The Charles and Rosanna Batchelor Memorial Program in Mediterranean Archaeology continued to provide welcome support for our work, supplemented, in 1968-1971, by student grants from the Ford Foundation Program in Archaeological Traineeships. The writer served as Director and Phyllis Williams Lehmann as Advisory Director. Mrs. Haido Koukouli-Chrysanthaki and Messrs. Evangelos Tsimpidi-Pentazos, Diamantis Triandaphyllos, and Pantos Pantos have represented the Greek Archaeological Service. Architectural work was undertaken by Marshall Audin, Charles Belson, Thomas Cullins, Alfred Frazer, William C. Henderson, John Kurtich, Nicholas D. Ohly,
Results are varied, adding details in some areas, correcting earlier views in others, and elsewhere revealing whole structures whose existence was hitherto unsuspected.

The Propylon of Ptolemy II

Continued excavation at the periphery of the unique Propylon which Ptolemy II Philadelphos built, early in the 3rd century B.C., to connect the Sanctuary with the main route from the ancient city (Fig. 1: 26), produced more detailed information on the surrounding topography, as well as additional members of the building itself. Although not all the area has been cleared to bedrock, and the remaining debris undoubtedly contains some fragments from the building, further excavation seems unlikely to be rewarding.

To the north of the Propylon’s foundations, most of the slope and the river bed has been cleared to bedrock (Pl. 2: a). Over it lay unstratified debris, churned if not originally deposited by floods and landslides of modern times. Such disturbances have destroyed with considerable thoroughness the walls which, as at the south, will have channeled the waters of the torrent which flowed through the vaulted passage in the foundations of the building. Scattered boulders must, however, belong to such walls, and a few show the line of the channel, leading northward, in extension of the vaulted passage. The channel will, thus, have turned westward to rejoin the natural bed of the torrent only at some distance from the building. Fragmentary as the evidence is, it reinforces the impression that the builders of the Propylon deliberately diverted
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Excavation was carried out from June 17 to August 6, 1968; from July 11 to August 14, 1969; from June 22 to August 14, 1970; from July 1 to August 12, 1971; from July 6 to July 13, 1972; from July 1 to August 13, 1974; and from July 11 to August 22, 1975.

The drawings accompanying this article were made by John Kurtich, assisted by Charles Belson for Figures 7 and 8.


The discovery of a few clearly modern objects, cartridge casings, nails, etc., at the very deepest levels demands this conclusion.
Fig. 1 Sketch Plan of the Sanctuary of the Great Gods.

1-3. Unidentified late Hellenistic buildings, “treasuries.”
4. Building A.
5. Byzantine fortification.
6. Building M.
7. Dining rooms.
8, 10. Unidentified Hellenistic rooms.
9. “Cenotaph of Iasion-Aetion.”
11. Stoa.
12. Nike Fountain.
13. Theater.
15. Hieron.
17. Temenos.
18. Altar.
20. Rotunda of Arsinoe II.
22. Sacristy.
23. Anaktoron.
24. Dedication of Philip III and Alexander IV.
26. Propylon of Ptolemy II.
27. Southern Nekropolis.
the torrent and forced it to pass through the foundations, at least in part, no doubt, to bring this boundary of the Sanctuary into close physical relation with the door of the Propylon above it.

In an effort to clarify the access to the Sanctuary from the ancient city, a number of trenches were cut east of the eastern forecourt of the Propylon, as far as ca. 20 meters east of the building itself. There is no trace of a road, ramp, or stair immediately adjoining the marble-paved forecourt, and that area was probably flat, level with the forecourt. Further east, however, very ruinous remains of terrace walls and paving appeared, which must represent the link between the Propylon and a road from the ancient city (Fig. 2, Pl. 2: c). This approach lies opposite only the northern half of the forecourt; at the south, a retaining wall of boulders and re-used limestone blocks supported a low terrace.

The excavated portion consists of a paved area, which slopes westward toward the Propylon and is bounded at the east and south by retaining walls, at the north by steps leading to it from a higher terrace, and at the west by three steps which lead down to the level of the forecourt. The paving has largely disintegrated, owing, it seems, to the unusually destructive quality of the earth in this part of the island. It was composed of various limestones and porphyry, much, perhaps all, re-used from other structures. The blocks are roughly rectangular in shape; those in the northwestern half of the paving are set with joints parallel to the Propylon, but those in the southeastern half follow an oblique orientation, presumably that of the road. This orientation suggests that the road led from a point in the city wall rather west of "Gate A", where a gap in the curtain may show the position of a Sacred Gate. No undisturbed fill was discovered that could establish the date of the paving; its general resemblance to the paving on the Eastern Hill (p. 7 below) may, however, indicate a late 4th-century B.C. date, perhaps, therefore, even earlier than the Propylon itself.

Newly recovered fragments of the Propylon's superstructure have radically altered earlier views of its reconstruction, primarily in the greater height of its elevation and in the fact that, unlike the Ionic east porch, its west porch was supported by Corinthian columns, the earliest example of their structural use on the exterior of a full-scale Greek building.

That the two porches of the Propylon received different treatment is shown by the sofa-capital decorated with griffins, discovered there in the 19th century and now in the Samothrace museum. Its dimensions show that it crowned an anta of the building, and fragments both of it and of another similar capital have been recovered.

---

5 S, I, pp. 29-30; S, II, pp. 45-46; cf. H. Seyrig, "Sur l'antiquité des remparts de Samothrace," BCH 51, 1927, pp. 353-368. As Seyrig saw, "Gate A" is, in reality, a tower. As T. Boyd noted in 1974, it was provided with an arched entrance on the city side.


7 S, II, pl. XLIX; Guide, p. 106, fig. 48.
Fig. 2 Propylon of Ptolemy II. Plan of east approach.
among the fallen members of the Propylon's west porch. In contrast, the eastern antae were crowned by Ionic capitals, of which a nearly complete example, now lost, was recorded by the Austrian excavators. The sofa-capitals must have answered to Corinthian columns in the west porch, just as the Ionic anta-capitals answered to the Ionic columns of the east porch, and fragments of Corinthian shafts, identical in scale with the Ionic shafts of the east porch, were recovered in the western debris.

Sufficient fragments of the six Corinthian capitals of the west façade have been recovered to allow a detailed restoration, and a plaster reconstruction by Mr. Triandaphyllos Kontogeorgis has been installed in the Samothrace museum (Pl. 2: b). Boldly designed and skilfully carved, it is a worthy experiment in the early Hellenistic development of Corinthian style and provides another testimony to the innovative power of the architect of this remarkable building.

**Eastern Hill**

Across the eastern torrent, on the Eastern Hill (Fig. 1: 24-25), additional work was limited to further exploration of the route which, in antiquity, led between the Propylon of Ptolemy II and the heart of the Sanctuary. As part of this effort, the east and north slopes of the hill descending toward the torrent, were stripped to bedrock. The entire accumulation there, as on the opposite bank (p. 2 above), was unstratified, late debris, washed down after the destruction of the monuments above, and no substantial trace remains of the path which must have been retained there to lead from the ramp joining the Propylon and the Eastern Hill (Pl. 3: a) around the rocky edge of the hill to the paved, stepped ramp behind the Doric building dedicated by Philip III and Alexander IV (Fig. 1: 24, Pl. 3: b).

That the path did, however, follow this somewhat circuitous route is to be inferred from indirect evidence. Most important is the fact that there can have been no passage through the Doric building and the Ionic porch behind it which would allow access to the ramp, nor is there room for a passage south of the building, where, in the original state of the adjoining round structure, there had once been access. The existence of a route north of the building is, moreover, implied by cuttings for stelai and bases long visible at its northwest corner. These monuments were so placed that they could be seen only from the north, since they stand against the solid wall of the building, and, even earlier, the rough surface of the rock shows there was no ac-

---

8 S, II, p. 39, pls. XXVIII, XXIX, XXX.
9 The capitals showed some slight variation in dimension and carving. Our restoration, based as it is on the whole body of material, ignores these variations and represents a combined model rather than any single capital.
10 For earlier work on the Eastern Hill, see Hesperia 37, 1968, pp. 216-234.
11 Although the preservation is such that a door in the back wall of the Doric building cannot be excluded, the levels would demand stairs to descend to the ramp, of which there is no trace and for which there is no room.
12 Hesperia 37, 1968, p. 218.
cess to their site from the south. Finally, further cleaning of the road surface at this corner revealed one preserved block of its paving, which, by its position, demands a northward continuation.

It appears, therefore, that an ancient visitor to the Sanctuary, once he had passed through the Propylon of Ptolemy II and crossed by its ramp to the Eastern Hill, could either enter the complex of structures immediately before him, the round structure, the Doric building, and their associated monuments, or, turning right, he could follow the edge of the hill around them, to join the paved ramp which led to the heart of the Sanctuary; even if he chose the first course, as most, we assume, did, he must still have returned to his point of entry in order to proceed to the rest of the Sanctuary.

The entire length of the stepped ramp which led southwestward from the Eastern Hill to the central part of the Sanctuary has now been exposed. Its paving, in roughly rectangular blocks of a variety of stones, is well preserved only on the upper part of the slope (Pl. 3:c), where it had been partly uncovered in earlier seasons, but scattered fragments in its lower course show that the lack of paving there is due to pillage.14 Even the fieldstone retaining walls, which supported the higher level at each side of the ramp, are in fragmentary condition, but enough remains to show that the line followed a gentle S-curve; it leaves the top of the hill in a southwesterly direction, bends westward, then, after crossing the line of the modern path, turns southwest again to arrive beside the Rotunda of Arsinoe II, on a rocky cliff directly opposite the northern terrace of the Temenos (see Fig. 1). There a few blocks of paving are again preserved, but the greater part of the road, ca. 4 meters broad, has been completely obliterated by a lime kiln, dug into the rock and fed, to judge from incompletely burned fragments, with remains of the Rotunda, of the Temenos, and of the buildings on the Eastern Hill (Pl. 3:d).

In Hellenistic times, after the formerly low area between the Rotunda and the Temenos had been filled to the level of the Rotunda's euthynteria, the road will, at this point, have brought the visitor to a broad open square, from which he could proceed north or south to the centers of initiation and their neighbors, or westward, across the central torrent of the Sanctuary, to the buildings on the Western Hill (see p. 22 below). Whether, in earlier times, the route there turned southward to follow a winding course to the same, then lower, area, has not yet been determined.

These fragmentary remains of the road offered no new evidence for its date, and our previous suggestion that, judging by the materials available for re-use in its paving, it may be contemporary with the dedication of Philip III and Alexander IV, in the last quarter of the 4th century B.C., remains only a hypothesis. Alterations to the retaining walls, and especially the addition, near the middle of the route at its north edge, of a base of re-used material set in mortar, show that this area continued to be of interest to later builders, but these later remains, too, are so fragmentary that they can offer no detailed information.

In the course of stripping the slopes of their debris, additional fragments were recovered which add information for the reconstruction of the hexastyle Doric building dedicated by Philip III and Alexander IV.\textsuperscript{15} Another fragment of the inscribed epistyle preserves only a single alpha, but it can be located at the left end of a block and demands a revision of the previously suggested restoration. The revised text,

\textit{Basilē|īs Φίλιππος|'Δ[λέξανδρο]φ|[ς Θεός Μεγ]|ά[λως],}

is complete, and hope that the formula might eventually yield the name of the building must be abandoned.\textsuperscript{16}

Among other recovered elements of the building are several wall blocks, orthostates, binders, and stretchers. Although the binders are all of Thasian marble, stretchers occur both in marble and in porous sandstone. The last must have served as backers on the interior face of the wall, an economical construction, given the fact that all marble was imported, and one used also in the nearly contemporary Hieron.\textsuperscript{17} It clearly implies that the interior of the building, like that of its predecessor, was stuccoed, though no fragment of the plaster has survived.\textsuperscript{18}

**Stoa**

Investigations were continued in the filling of the broad terrace which stood along the eastern façade of the great Hellenistic Stoa (Fig. 1: 11, Pl. 4: a), both to test the previous results and to recover more of the fine pottery which it contained.\textsuperscript{19} As before, rubble walls of modest structures were encountered, but evidence was lacking both of the date of their construction and of their purpose; at present, it seems most likely that they served some temporary, practical purpose, perhaps as shelters or workshops during the construction of the Stoa. Of principal interest was their filling, subsequent, as the stratification clearly shows, to the construction of the neighboring foundation of the Stoa, in which a distinct stratum of burned material could be observed, apparently brought from another part of the Sanctuary. This stratum contained a large quantity of fine Attic mixing vessels of the 6th and 5th centuries B.C., drinking vessels, mostly local, as late as the end of the 4th or beginning of the 3rd century, and the remnants of a pebble-mosaic floor. To judge from these contents, the burned material may well be the debris from destroyed dining rooms, to which both the vessels and the floor would be appropriate, but the original location of such

\textsuperscript{15} See \textit{Hesperia} 37, 1968, pp. 222-230.

\textsuperscript{16} 70.103. The earlier text (\textit{Hesperia} 37, 1968, p. 222) read as a dotted kappa the trace of a vertical at the right end of T 102, which appears, on further study, to be the result of damage rather than an intentional stroke. 64.955, preserving the apex of a pointed letter to the right of a joint, is now read as a dotted alpha and placed in the third block. 65.826 is transferred to the right end of the same block, and 70.103 is assigned to the left end of the fifth block. T 69, which preserves the upper part of a lambda or delta, could belong, in the present text, to the third or fifth block, but it adds nothing and is not indicated in the text.

\textsuperscript{17} See \textit{Samothrace}, 3, Text I, p. 42.

\textsuperscript{18} For the stucco of the earlier building, see \textit{Hesperia} 37, 1968, pp. 221-222.

\textsuperscript{19} For previous work, see \textit{Hesperia} 37, 1968, pp. 203-204.
structures cannot now be determined. Because of the inherent interest of the Attic pottery, it is the subject of separate studies, some already published.

Earlier structures and burned fill alike were completely buried, largely with sterile fill, apparently the soft bedrock dug away to make room for the southern end of the Stoa. In the fill were set the foundations for monuments that lined the façade of the building, one more of which appeared in these trenches, as well as a curious foundation whose purpose remains unclear (Pl. 4: a). Ca. 1.40-1.50 m. wide, parallel to the façade of the Stoa and six meters from it, the foundation appears to run the entire length of the building. It is built of only one to three courses of dark green fieldstones, which, though set on bedrock at the south, where the bedrock formed the surface, rest simply on the terrace fill at the north, construction too unstable for the foundation of any very massive superstructure. In spite of its somewhat excessive width for the purpose, it may have supported a low parapet, limiting access to the Stoa and protecting the monuments which stood between it and the building, while at the same time it preserved the integrity of the esplanade, some six to seven meters wide, which extended between it and the edge of the terrace.

The terrace itself was variously supported: at the south by the Theater, then, successively, by the wall of a room below, by the great central terrace wall, and, at the north, by a terrace wall of natural boulders.

The central terrace wall, 21.30 m. long, was constructed parallel to the Stoa and founded some 9.30 m. below its euthynteria (Pl. 4: d). Built primarily of local light-green fieldstone laid in a polygonal scheme, it was divided into panels, horizontally by binding courses of porous sandstone ashlars and vertically by four irregularly spaced buttresses of the same material, bonded in alternate courses into the face of the wall. It is preserved only to half its original height, to the top of the second binding course, but a single fieldstone still in place on that course attests to a similar continuation, and there were probably two additional layers of panels, four in all, to bring the wall level with the Stoa's euthynteria. At the north, this wall terminated against natural soil, where the hillside emerges in an eastward salient and an oblique retaining wall of the Roman period now marks the line of a Hellenistic predecessor;
Fig. 3  Plan of Stoa and Western Hill.
Fig. 4. Stoa. Central Terrace Wall and adjacent area, actual state plan.
the line of the terrace wall was continued northward at a higher level by a simpler wall of dark green boulders. At the south, the hillside again emerges eastward, but more sharply, to form a high intermediate terrace. The wall turned eastward, too, to support this terrace, and here it consisted entirely of fieldstone with occasional sandstone fragments, set in polygonal style and adjusted to protruding native boulders (Pl. 4: c).

An exceptional feature of this last section is an opening at its western end, where it joins the main wall (Pl. 5: a). Six courses of worked fieldstone support the eastern end of a huge fieldstone lintel whose western end is set in the main terrace wall. Above the lintel, two porous sandstone blocks are set to form a "relieving triangle". The opening, ca. 1.15 m. wide and 2.00 m. high, is otherwise unadorned. Within it, the two jambs continue some two meters, where they end against stony natural soil, and a few remaining blocks show that the opening was there terminated by a wall. This puzzling structure has already been discussed at greater length elsewhere and the suggestion put forward that the Hellenistic builders imitated the façade of a Mycenaean or "heroic" tomb to represent a cenotaph for the hero-founder of the mysteries, Iasion-Aëtion.

Evidence for the date of these terrace walls comes from the filling of their foundation ditch, which has been tested at several points. Though sparse and largely undistinguished, its pottery appears to be later in character than that of the Stoa itself, and the walls probably belong to a separate phase of building, toward the end of the 3rd century or early in the 2nd century B.C.

The area in front of these terrace walls, between them and the central torrent of the Sanctuary, far from being the simple, shady walk that we had imagined, was almost completely occupied by buildings, the remains of which had been obscured by the thick debris which came down with the collapse of the upper parts of the terrace walls (Figs. 3 and 4).

Room A

At the south, adjacent to the Theater, a room ca. 9.50 m. square stands on the eastward salient of bedrock, at an intermediate level, above the "cenotaph of Iasion-

---

26 This construction is common in the Sanctuary in Classical and Hellenistic times, and possibly even earlier; cf. the "Cyclopean" wall within the Orthostate Structure (p. 31 below) and the massive wall south of the Stoa, Hesperia 34, 1965, p. 113. The terrace-wall continuation is founded on bedrock and preserved no evidence for its date, though the presumption, from its orientation, is that it is contemporary with the Stoa or later.

27 The styles of masonry discouraged firm bonding between the main wall and its eastward extension, but there is no physical evidence that they belong to separate projects, and the sherds from the eastern extension, though too few to give a precise date, confirm that the two are at least very nearly contemporary. The extension was radically rebuilt in Roman times, and only the portion around the doorway retains its Hellenistic masonry intact; see p. 15 below.


29 For the now destroyed Theater, see F. Chapoutier, A. Salač, F. Salviat, BCH 80, 1956, pp. 118-146; cf. Samothrace, 4, II, pp. 135-139.
Aëtion" but below the Stoa (Pl. 5 : b). Only the south and west walls are preserved. Built of porous sandstone in pseudo-isodomic style, they faced and bonded with the rubble which retained the hillside behind them. The north and east walls, which were freestanding, evidently collapsed and have vanished completely, their material re-used in the later structures below; their lines are indicated by the fieldstone retaining walls on which they stood. Access must have been from below, and there is suitable space for a stairway at the southeast corner, though no sure trace of it remains.

The room was richly decorated with painted stucco. Red plaster is preserved at the bottom of both south and west walls, and many fragments in red, black, yellow, green and white, some drafted or molded, were found fallen in the room. The floor had been completely destroyed by falling blocks from the walls and washed out by ensuing rains, implying that it was earth or, less probably, plaster. No evidence for the date of the room was recovered, but, from its intimate connection with the great terrace wall and its eastward extension, it is probable that, like them, the room was constructed late in the 3rd century or early in the 2nd century B.C.

Room B

Just below, to the east, are the fragmentary walls of another, smaller room; the entire length of its west wall, 5.70 m., is preserved, but only stumps of its north and south walls, so that it is impossible to determine whether it, like the room above, was square (Pl. 5 : c). The walls are built of blocks of porous sandstone, laid in a polygonal scheme; the visible faces are well dressed, but the backs of the blocks, laid against rubble which retains the hillside, are rough. Slightly oblique to its neighbor, the room appears to have been added later, but, to judge from the few sherds in its foundation ditch, only slightly later, perhaps in the 2nd century B.C.

Rooms C-H

In contrast to the simple, if sparse, evidence of these rooms, the area north of them, directly east of the main terrace wall, presents a complex profusion of walls which range in date from Classical to Late Roman times (Fig. 4, Pl. 5 : d). Since, in most of the area, the floor levels varied only slightly from first to last, the stratification, too, is complex, often telescoped. A complete record is preserved only in the northwest room, where there seem to be five major phases represented: Late Classi-

---

80 Both walls were in precarious state when excavated, and it was necessary, in 1968 and 1969, to dismantle them, repair broken blocks with cement, and reset both the facing and the rubble behind. Curiously, this radical operation produced not one sherd that might date the walls.

81 Bonding with the terrace wall is ambiguous. The structural scheme employed in the walls of the room, whereby two high courses alternate with a low binding course, first used in the second half of the 4th century B.C., was retained throughout the Hellenistic period; for a discussion of this system see Samothrace, 3, Text I, pp. 162-164.

82 A final phase, in which a maze of rough walls built of ancient materials covered the surface as elsewhere in the Sanctuary (Hesperia 37, 1968, pp. 207-208), is omitted from the discussion; the walls appear to belong to agricultural or pastoral activity of Late Byzantine or Turkish times.
cal, Early Hellenistic, Middle Hellenistic, Early Imperial, and Late Roman. Elsewhere it is disturbed or incomplete, and it is not always clear to which phase each fragment belongs.

The main lines, as now preserved, belong to the Late Roman period, perhaps in the 3rd or in the 4th century after Christ.\textsuperscript{33} At that time, the area was divided into at least seven rooms or courts (Figs. 3 and 4: C-J). Except where they incorporated earlier masonry, the walls are built of dry rubble using fieldstone, ancient debris, and tiles, with little consistency of technique.\textsuperscript{34} All had earth floors and were undecorated, so far as can be determined.\textsuperscript{35}

The rooms preserve very little character, and they contain nothing to indicate their use. Rooms C and D, at least, were roofed, for they were buried under a thick layer of tiles, many apparently re-used from the Stoa, and a less dense accumulation of tiles in room H suggests a similar conclusion. A pair of inverted Doric capitals above the western corners of the earlier tile floor in room J held supports, presumably for a complete or partial roof over that area. Room F, in contrast, was probably an open court, to judge from the crude drain, made of a reworked stele base and set in the west wall of room G, which there emptied into a marble trough, also a reworked ancient block. The only furnishings are shallow pits with rough stone curbs in the northwest corners of rooms E and H, the former of which contained the bottom of an amphora. The principal earlier feature of the area, the "cenotaph of Iasion-Aëtion," was walled up and forgotten, and, as a whole, the complex has a vaguely domestic flavor, but whether it nonetheless continued to serve, for a time, the needs of cult, before, like the rest of the Sanctuary, it was deprived by law of its religious function and left to mundane use, the evidence is too slim to decide.\textsuperscript{36}

The Early Imperial phase which preceded has left only scattered evidence, sufficient to suggest a more ample plan but insufficient to form a complete picture of it. The characteristic masonry, like that of its successors, makes use of a variety of re-used material and tiles, but it combines them with greater care and with the aid of strong mortar. To this phase belong the long retaining wall at the north side of the area, the tile floor (J), and its surrounding stone border (Pl. 6: a), the tile floor in area E (Pl. 6: d), and massive piers which surrounded the then combined areas F and G, as well as the repairs to the eastward extension of the terrace wall, at the south of this area.\textsuperscript{37}

\textsuperscript{33} The local, coarse pottery, which provides the principal evidence, cannot, at present, offer a closer chronology.

\textsuperscript{34} They are thus related in structure to roughly contemporary buildings near the Stoa (\textit{Hesperia} 34, 1965, p. 114) and the Sacristy (\textit{AJA} 44, 1940, pp. 348-349).

\textsuperscript{35} The walls of rooms C and D bear traces of stucco, but, since it never covers a joint, it appears to belong to the original use of the blocks, doubtless in the Hellenistic room A above, rather than to their present re-use.

\textsuperscript{36} For the late history of the Sanctuary, cf. \textit{Samothrace}, 3, Text II, pp. 126-129, where even the Hieron seems to have been used for a domestic or agricultural purpose.

\textsuperscript{37} The stratigraphy was badly confused by later building, and, except for the first of these structures, we lack clear evidence of date; but it is clear that the rest belong to one, earlier Roman
A reconstruction from these fragmentary remains is speculative. A large courtyard (F-G) may have formed the center of the structure, upon which opened a roofed area (D, C, E) and the tile-paved room (J), perhaps a dining room. The "cenotaph of Iasion-Aëtion" appears still to have been visible at this period, and whatever ceremonies were practiced there probably continued substantially unchanged.

Excepting the great terrace wall, already described, and the rooms at the south (A, B), the Hellenistic remains are also too fragmentary to recover the plan. A principal feature of it, however, was an area paved with smooth fist-size beach stones, surrounded by a limestone border (Pl. 6: d, center). It extended 4.45 m. from east to west within the border, and it may have been slightly larger from north to south. The pavement was thickly covered by a layer of ash, probably the burned remains of roof timbers, so that it probably belonged to a room rather than an open court. The central paving and surrounding border suggest a dining room, but the evidence is far too little to be conclusive.

The earliest remains in the area, again fragmentary and obscured by late building, belong to the second half of the 4th century B.C. At that time, the area was divided in two by a strong boulder retaining wall, just west of the tile floor (J), and following approximately the line of the stone border of that floor, oblique to the great Hellenistic terrace wall. It continues southward under the east wall of room E and northward where it passes under the Roman retaining wall and continues, now standing to a greater height, to support the hillside behind rooms L and M (Fig. 3). No structural remains of this period have been discovered west of this wall, between it and the later great terrace wall, and it seems to have retained only a low terrace, with an irregular surface through which occasional natural boulders protruded.

Immediately in front of the retaining wall, however, stood a large building. Its north wall, ca. 0.50 m. wide, is preserved under the northern stone border of the tile floor (J), built of well-fitted pieces of light-green fieldstone, dressed to a smooth surface on both faces. It abuts the boulder retaining wall, which seems to have acted as the west wall of the building, for, on that side, the inner face is formed simply of small but well-fitted fragments of the same material, added to line the retaining wall. This facing stops against the stones of another wall fragment, now buried under the northern wall of room F, and it appears that this fragment represents the south wall of the building. The eastern part of the room has been entirely eroded, but it may have extended as far as the line established by a strong boulder wall, 1.00-1.10 m. wide, of phase, and it is reasonable to assume that it is contemporary with other Early Imperial activity in this and other areas.

The paving is visible in room F, and the border continues in room G. The southern line of blocks in the southern limestone border of the later tile floor, J, is, unlike the northern line, also Hellenistic in date, and it is tempting to associate it with the same structure.

The northern limit, even accepting the ascription of the limestone course noted above (footnote 38), is unclear, since the rubble foundation of that course suggests that it may originally have had another line of blocks at its south; if so, the paved area would have extended some 4.65 m. to it.
which a part is preserved at the east of room G. The same line also marks the probable eastern extent of the contemporary rooms further north (rooms L-N, p. 18 below). If so, the building will have measured internally ca. 6.40 m. from north to south and just under seven meters from east to west; a two-course base of limestone, apparently of the same period, lies midway along the line of the south wall and may be connected with an entrance.

The interior of the room is now obscured by the later tile floor which overlies it, but tests beneath that floor have shown part of its arrangement (Pl. 6: b). A single course of limestone, ca. 0.35 m. wide, runs across the room from north to south, creating a step or platform ca. 1.43 m. wide along its west side, and a drain, lined with tiles set on small stones and covered with tiles, ran from the southwest corner of the room along the west wall, then turned to cross the middle of the room from west to east, apparently to drain the room through holes both in the platform and in the floor, though it may, somehow, also have collected water from the low terrace behind the building.

Nothing remains to give a clear picture of the use and history of this area, which, repeatedly rebuilt, seems to have maintained an important rôle in the Sanctuary for some seven centuries. Finds from the area are almost entirely those fallen or brought from other parts of the Sanctuary, principally, of course, from the region of the Stoa, directly above. Of particular interest among such finds is a monument of Philip V, which consists of the inscribed marble base of a heroic bronze statue, set atop a single marble Doric column, 6.20 m. tall (Pl. 8: a). The inscription

Βασιλέα Φίλιππου
Βασιλέως Δημητρίου
Μακεδώνες
Θεοίς Μεγάλοις

provides the first concrete connection between that ruler and Samothrace, a relationship which has otherwise been only a matter of speculation. The monument undoubtedly stood on one of the bases in front of the Stoa, above whose columns it towered, and of them Base E seems most suitable in size. Other sculptures, both bronze (Pl. 8: c) and marble (Pl. 8: f), must have a similar provenance. Several

40 Though constructed in a manner similar to Late Classical walls in this area, this boulder wall, founded as it is on bedrock and preserving no fill, cannot be dated.
41 Base: 68.1, crowned by a cyma reversa between two fillets, the top preserves cuttings for feet and, in front of them, an object, probably the butt of a spear; H. 0.539 m., W. (at bottom) 0.752 m. Capital: Block 42, H. 0.298 m., W. 0.890 m. Drums: Blocks 14 (H. 1.641 m.), 15 (H. 1.149 m.), 16 (H. 1.553 m.), 59 (pres. H. 1.556 m.). The base and capital, partly completed in plaster, have been installed in the epigraphical courtyard of the Samothrace Museum (Guide*, p. 134).
44 The illustrated fragments belong to a cache of 17 pieces, apparently from more than one monument (71.740). The beard (71.740A) and finger (71.740B) are life-size. A fragment of
fragmentary inscriptions record lists of initiates, both in Greek and Latin, and they, too, are suitable to the same area. The best preserved is illustrated (Pl. 8: b): 46

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Κνιδίων} & \text{μύσται καὶ ὑπόπται} \\
\text{εὔσεβεῖς} & \\
\text{ναύαρχος Εὔβοιλος} & \\
\text{Ἀρχισύλιος} & \\
\text{τρυῆραρχοι Ἀγάθιος Εὔβ[ο]λου} & \\
\text{Ἱππόδαμος Ἀναξάνδριδ[ος]} & \\
\text{καὶ ἐπίπλοι τρυῆραρχοι Κλευ[---]} & \\
\text{Νικασίβουλος Σωσθένης Θεν[---]} & \\
\text{γραμματεύς Ἄσκληπιαδῆ[ς]} & \\
\text{Διοκλέους} & \\
\text{καὶ τοῖς συμπλεύσαντες} & \\
\text{καὶ μυηθέντες} & \\
\text{καὶ ὑποσεύσαντες} & \\
\text{vacat} & \\
\text{ἐπὶ βασιλέως Μνησυσ [τράτου]} & \\
\text{τοῦ Κλεοβουλοῦ} & \\
\text{ός ἐν Κνιδίων ἐπὶ Δαμιρ[ύρ]} & \\
\text{γοῦ ἐν Πιθονίκου} & \\
\text{mystae · piei} & \\
\text{20} & \\
\text{Qu M · Cn · Lentul[us---]} & \\
\text{venere · initiatei · A · D [---]} & \\
\text{P · Aninius · P · ! Sai[---]} &
\end{align*}\]

The entire area is badly burned, and in room H, where the stratification is better preserved, there were at least three major fires, in the Late Classical period, in the Early Hellenistic period, and early in the Imperial age. Although these layers contained nothing to characterize the activities carried out in the area, the repeated destruction by fire, rare in the Sanctuary, suggests that there was some unusual hazard. That fact, taken together with the prevalence of square or nearly square rooms with special floor construction, may imply that some, at least, of these structures were used for dining or the preparation of ritual meals.

thin bronze sheet (71.740F, Pl. 8: f, top right), provided with four drilled holes for attachment, preserves traces of gilding.

45 71.793. Two joining fragments of a marble statue or high relief. Pres. H. 0.265 m., pres. W. 0.033 m., pres. Th. 0.317 m.

46 71.962. Stele of Thasian marble, broken at top, right and bottom. Pres. H. 0.55 m., pres. W. 0.27 m., Th. 0.079 m. Back preserves anathyrosis. The βασιλέως is new, as is the mason, who seems to misspell ἐταπτης (lines 2 and 14) through confusion with ἐταπτος. The date is probably Late Hellenistic.
Rooms L-N

Whatever its purpose, the earliest building in this area was contemporary with the original version of a three-room structure which, separated by a narrow corridor, adjoined it at the north. Unlike rooms C-H, both the date of the three-room structure, in the second half of the 4th century B.C., and its use, as a dining complex, are reasonably certain (Fig. 3: L-N).

As it stands, the complex is built of concrete, a variety of fieldstones, fragments of earlier structures, and tiles, set in strong cement (Pl. 6: c). The lowest courses, however, at the southwest exterior corner where they are visible, belong to an earlier building, made of light-green fieldstone, well set and dressed to a smooth surface (Pl. 7: a). A portion of the foundation trench for this masonry was preserved, and its filling provides sufficient material to date the construction in the middle or second half of the 4th century B.C. (Pl. 7: f). Similar masonry is visible in other places along the base of the west wall, at the northwest corner, and in the crosswalls, and it appears that the concrete structure accurately reproduced the plan of its Late Classical predecessor.

The building is ca. 22 meters long, divided into three similar rooms by crosswalls which, like the outer walls, are ca. 0.50 m. thick. The east wall is completely destroyed, and even the bedding for its foundation eroded, but the northern crosswall appears, from the treatment of its last stones, to have preserved virtually its entire length, and the east wall may be restored there with some probability to produce three rooms, each about 6.5 m. square on the interior.

Portions of the floor are preserved in all the rooms. In each case, a subfloor of fieldstones, fist-size or smaller, was set in earth to provide a firm, level base. On that base, the middle room (M) preserves patches of a mosaic made of smooth beach pebbles, both white and black, set at random in cement (Pl. 7: c). In contrast, the floors of the north and south rooms (L, N) were paved with a mosaic of white marble chips set in cement (Pl. 7: b). In those two rooms, moreover, the mosaic floor was set off from the walls by a border or platform, ca. 1.00 m. wide, edged with low marble blocks ca. 0.10 m. wide. The border is, at present, filled with packed earth, but there are signs of disturbance, and it may once have been of another material.

The flooring of these two rooms, with its meter-wide platform around the walls,

47 69.823: One-handler, lacking handle and part of wall; ring-foot with concave molding underneath; carelessly dipped. H. 0.041 m., D. 0.113 m. Cf. B. Sparkes, L. Talcott, Agora, XII, Black and Plain Pottery, Princeton 1970, p. 290, no. 756, "Ca. 375 B.C." 69.798: Bowl with shallow wall and convex-concave profile; palmette stamps and incised circles on interior. H. 0.345 m. Cf. ibid., p. 295, no. 822, "Ca. 375 B.C." 69.824: Similar to 69.798. H. 0.034 m.

48 This line for the restored east wall, it may be noted, is very close to that of the boulder wall south of room G, and it suggests that these various structures may have presented a unified façade.

49 The floors described seem to belong to the original phase of the building, and they were covered by earth floors in later periods. The situation in the middle room, M, is somewhat less clear, however, and it is barely possible that the pebble floor is a replacement.
is that characteristic of Greek dining rooms. This fact, together with the nearly square plan of the rooms and the off-center door in the adjacent, later addition (see p. 21 below), makes it virtually certain that these structures were, in fact, dining rooms. They provide welcome architectural evidence for the ritual meals which must have formed a part of the ceremonies, and the history of their development shows that, like the other rites, this activity, while expanding to accommodate ever increasing numbers of initiates, remained fixed to its own part of the Sanctuary from Classical through Imperial times.

The loss of superstructure and nearly complete erosion of the area on which the rooms faced make it impossible now to recover the architectural details of this building. Whatever its original appearance, it was undoubtedly much altered by two radical repairs. To the first, in the Early Imperial period, belong most of the present concrete walls, similar in style and, in fact, bonded with the retaining wall which divided this area from that already described at the south. The material re-used in these walls, though chiefly architectural, also included a remarkable Hellenistic sundial, marked with at least seven day-lines as well as the usual hour lines (Pl. 8: d, e). At a later time, which cannot be closely dated, further changes were introduced in room L: the room was extended to the west, so that it used the retaining wall behind the building as its new back wall, and the former back wall now supported a platform, packed with debris from several buildings of the Sanctuary. The construction is similar to that of the Late Roman rooms to the south, and it may well belong to the same, possibly secular phase of the Sanctuary’s history.

When they were constructed in the 4th century B.C., the dining rooms were set back into the natural hillside, probably necessitating considerable excavation. To retain that hillside, a terrace wall was built, originally, it appears, of dark green fieldstone boulders; in the course of repairs to the building, the retaining wall was also repaired, and it now contains an admixture of re-used stones, some tile, and cement (Pl. 6: c). It runs the entire length of the building, ca. 1.20 m. behind it, continuing southward to form the west wall of room J and, at the north, turning around the north wall of the building in a strong bastion. The open space between it and the building could drain in both directions, at the south through the narrow corridor between the

51 Although the fact that ritual dining formed a part of the Samothracian religion had been inferred (cf. Guide, pp. 30-31, Guide², pp. 30-31, Guide³, pp. 30-31), its location in the Sanctuary had been hitherto unknown. On the equipment for dining, see Samothrace, 2, II, pp. 26-36.
52 70.894. Transposed hemispherical sundial. Preserves part of two concave dials. Pres. L. 0.24 m., pres. W. 0.20 m., pres. H. 0.15 m. See S. Gibbs, Greek and Roman Sundials, New Haven and London 1976, p. 193, no. 1075.
53 This debris included the coffer lid, 70.848, now attributed to the Propylon of the Temenos (see P. W. Lehmann, Skopas in Samothrace, Northampton, Mass. 1973, p. 10, notes 56, 60, fig. 36) and a sima from the Altar Court. The coffer lid, 66.611, from the Eastern Hill (Hesperia 37, 1968, p. 230) surely belongs to the same series and should be attributed to the same building.
54 The form of this bastion must have been dictated, in a way not now clear, by the shape of the hillside, somehow avoiding unnecessary excavation. Its north face is on a line reasonable
building and room J and at the north through a gap 0.60 m. wide between the building and the bastion; in later construction, however, both openings were closed, and the space must have been filled in.

In Classical and Hellenistic times, the hillside seems to have risen in several terraces behind the dining rooms and their retaining wall. In the area excavated, there appeared fragments of two retaining walls intermediate between these structures and the boulder terrace wall of the Stoa and, east of the lower one, remains of a flight of steps (K) which allowed communication between the hillside and the space west of room J (Pl. 7: d). Both walls are built of light-green fieldstone fragments set in a polygonal scheme, rather more carefully in the upper wall than in the lower, to follow lines oblique both to the Stoa and to the buildings below. The upper wall retains natural soil, while the lower faces a stone packing between the walls. Both must have ended against another retaining wall on the site of at least the western portion of the Roman retaining wall at their south, since the stratification beyond it shows that, already in Classical times, there was an abrupt change in level along that line, but all trace of the actual wall was removed by its Roman replacement. The steps, exposed to a width of about a meter, have treads ca. 0.35 m. deep and risers of ca. 0.17 m., built of limestone and sandstone slabs on a rubble foundation. No material was recovered to date these constructions, but, both from their relation to other structures and from their technique, they may be assigned to the Late Classical and Hellenistic phases of building. They went out of use with the Early Imperial phase, as is clear from the fill over them, which, in addition to quantities of local pottery, contained "thorn ware" and "Pergamene" of the 1st century (Pl. 7: g), and from the blocking of the stairway by the Early Imperial retaining wall at its south. From that time on, the hillside seems to have formed a single terrace; if it held any monuments, they have not survived.

Terracing was necessary, too, between the dining rooms and the central torrent of the Sanctuary toward which the bedrock slopes sharply. As on the opposite bank, large fragments remain of a heavy concrete wall, evidently of Early Imperial date, which channeled the torrent and retained its banks at a high level, the same here on the west bank as on the east where the level was established by the euthynteria of the Rotunda of Arsinoe II. That a similar arrangement existed already in earlier

for a major terrace wall to retain the Stoa hill on that side, but no clear remnants of such a wall have yet been discovered further west.

55 The slabs were missing from two of the six steps, and, owing to danger of collapse, the eastern edge of the flight was not exposed.


57 Although most of these walls collapsed, the suitable level is reached or very nearly reached at one point on each side of the river, and it seems sufficient to establish the principle. The broad bridge which we restore, Guide, plan III, is entirely hypothetical, but some such scheme must have existed, and it is even possible that a large part of the river was covered over.
times is suggested by a fragment of boulder retaining wall exposed just behind the northern section of Roman wall (Fig. 3). Although small, the fragment is sufficient to show that the western bank had been retained on the same level and line, and there is nothing to indicate that there was ever any radically different arrangement.58

A second line of terracing was required to reach the level of the dining rooms and their neighboring structures, and a trace of it is preserved ca. 3.5 m. west of the earlier river retaining wall, parallel to it. Likewise built of dark green fieldstone boulders, it would appear to belong to the same system.59 An extension of their line would provide the necessary terrace in front of the dining rooms and, at the same time, outline a path 3.5 m. broad along the river, leading toward the rooms at the south and onward to the Theater, while to the north, it connected with the system of routes presently to be discussed (p. 22 below).60

Room O

The Late Classical plan just described was later expanded to the north. A smaller room (O), ca. 4.5 m. square, was added to the north wall of the dining rooms (Pl. 7: e). Its west wall incorporated the face of the retaining wall’s bastion, and the gap between the latter and the north wall of room N was filled with well-laid light-green fieldstone, while similar masonry continued northward to complete the room. Only the foundations of the east wall are preserved, of fieldstone except for the sandstone foundation of its threshold.61 That threshold lay off center, two meters from the north wall but only one from the south, an arrangement surely adopted to accommodate dining couches. The floor here, too, was laid on a base of small stones in earth, but the surface was of roughly cut, square tessarae set in cement, rather than of pebbles or chips like the earlier floors (Pl. 7: h); not enough is preserved to determine whether or not there were raised platforms along the walls.62 To judge from the style of the pavement, this room was added to the complex in later Hellenistic times, perhaps in the 2nd century B.C., a date with which the few associated sherds are not in conflict.

Room P

Another, much larger room (P), ca. 10 meters square, was added at the north in Roman times, extending the west wall of room O and replacing its north wall (Pl. 7: g). It occupied the entire width of the dining room terrace, and its east wall, now

58 The collapse of the earlier scheme allowed whole portions of the bank to wash away, and it is natural that the filling behind the Roman retaining walls is largely Roman restoration of the presumed earlier fill.

59 Since both walls have survived only where they were built against firm natural soil, there is no fill by which to date them.

60 This line has been restored in a modern dry wall on the site, both to retain the hillside and to make the area more intelligible to the visitor.

61 Nothing remains of the original north wall, which was built over in constructing room P.

62 This floor was formerly thought to be the pavement of an early road; correct Guide, pp. 40, 70; Guide2, pp. 40, 73; Guide3, pp. 40-41, 73.
entirely destroyed, must have stood on the retaining wall of the terrace. It was constructed, to judge from the pottery and a countermarked Samothracian coin found in its foundation ditch, late in the 1st century after Christ or possibly later, with walls of fieldstone set with mortar. The inner face of the walls was thickly covered with white stucco, of which some parts remain in place. No trace remains of its entrance, but, since the floor of the room is some 0.65 m. lower than the terrace to the south, it cannot have stood on that side, nor does the east wall, standing as it does on the earlier terrace wall, offer convenient access; in all probability a doorway stood in the now missing portion of the north wall. Although positive evidence is lacking, it is reasonable to assume that this room, like its neighbors to the south, served for dining, a major addition to accommodate the increasing number of initiates in the Roman period.  

**Intermediate Terrace**

The area immediately north of these rooms seems always to have been free of buildings and to have formed an open square, on which routes leading to the various parts of the Western Hill converged (Fig. 3, Pl. 9: a). A major crossing of the central torrent of the Sanctuary must have brought the ancient visitor here from the terrace west of the Rotunda of Arsinoe II. The broad path that follows the river hence toward the Theater has already been described (p. 21 above). Directly to the west, a flight of steps mounts to an intermediate terrace (Pl. 9: b), behind and above the latest of the dining rooms, and north of that terrace, between it and Building M, a road led both to Building M and toward the monuments west of it (Pl. 9: e).  

Only a part of the edge of the intermediate terrace has been explored (Pl. 9: c). On both its east and north sides, it was supported by a retaining wall of boulders, faced with well-dressed sandstone blocks laid in alternating courses of binders and stretchers. The flight of steps from the open square, some three meters wide, stands at its northeast corner. Only a part of three treads survives in place, but the stone packing for five more is partly preserved. The northern line of the terrace first follows the stair, then steps five meters further north, and on this new line continues opposite the western part of Building M and the eastern part of Building A to a point ca. 36 m. to the west, where it turns again sharply southward, either to end or to pursue yet another line. The east wall runs from the stair, behind and slightly oblique to room P, to end against the bastion of the Late Classical retaining wall at the south.  

In the area excavated, only a small patch of the floor of the terrace has been

---

63 This room might accommodate 19 couches, while rooms L-N would have had 11 each, and room O would hold 7. On the identification of dining rooms and the determination of their arrangement, see S. Miller, *The Prytaneion*, Berkeley, Los Angeles and London 1978, pp. 219-224.

64 The fill of the area was eroded and disturbed after the collapse of the river retaining walls, but one might expect any substantial structure to have left traces on the bedrock.

65 For Building M, see *Hesperia* 37, 1968, pp. 208-209.

66 The scheme resembles that of the walls of room A (p. 13 above), but too little is preserved to determine whether, as there, two courses of high stretchers regularly alternate with one binding course.
exposed (Pl. 9: d). A marble course like that in the dining rooms marks off a border, through which two lines of inverted marble tiles formed drains, while the surface itself was paved with a mosaic of fieldstone chips, set like the marble-chip mosaics of rooms L and N. The style, both of the wall and of the floor, suggest a date in the Hellenistic period, but, lacking any uncontaminated fill, greater precision is not, at present, possible.

Without further excavation, nothing can be said of the monuments which stood on this terrace, to which some of the materials re-used in the nearby Byzantine fortification must belong. As a part of the main route to the Stoa, above it and to the south, it will have borne considerable traffic, whatever its primary purpose. Such traffic made the steps and adjacent open square a conspicuous site for monuments, and the bases of several show that this advantage was not unappreciated.

A prominent and long-known foundation nearly abutting the corner of Building M is the largest of these monuments, and a newly discovered foundation abutting the northeast corner of the steps supported another hardly less imposing (Pl. 9: b), while the remains of smaller bases line the south side of the stairway. Adjacent to the last were found fragments of an inscribed stele recording a copy of a treaty of the Skamandroi, which must have stood in this area, but whether other such documents were published there it is impossible to determine.

Between the two largest monuments, a road, its surface strewn with marble and limestone chips, led both to Building M and, further west, along the podium of Building A (Pl. 9: e). Whether or not another followed the river northward can no longer be determined.

**Western Hill**

Additional work on the lower, northern terrace of the Western Hill (Pl. 10: a) was carried out in the area of the Byzantine fortification and the four ancient buildings which it overlay (Fig. 5).

*Byzantine Fortification*

Excavation at the southwest corner of the fortification yielded more evidence of the eventful later history of this area. Immediately within that corner stood a

---

67 The Stoa could presumably have been approached through the Theater, but it must also have been accessible from the north, perhaps along a route similar to the modern path, as indicated on our restored plan, *Guide*, plan III.

68 Cf. *BCH* 84, 1962, p. 286. There is no reason to see this foundation as that of an altar rather than a monument, and its orientation is governed by the adjacent square, not by structures across the river, to which it corresponds, in any case, only approximately.

69 The superstructure of this monument is entirely lacking, and the upper courses of the foundation itself were pillaged; its foundation ditch was filled with sterile earth, and there is no indication of its date, save the fact that it stood together with the adjacent Hellenistic terrace.

70 This document will be published by D. R. Jordan. The Sanctuary, like other sanctuaries, was often used for the exposition of such documents; see *Samothrace*, 2, I, pp. 7, 12, note 49.

71 For earlier work in this area, see *Hesperia* 37, 1968, pp. 204-212.
room which belonged to the original phase of the 10th-century fortification (Pl. 10: b), its walls built, like the fort, largely of re-used sandstone blocks. Its floor, of white cement, was well preserved, and immediately over it lay a thick layer of debris, evidently from the destruction of the fortification. The contents of the debris, particularly a fine polychrome bowl (Pl. 12: a),\textsuperscript{72} show that the fort had a relatively short life, perhaps less than a century. Destruction of the fort did not, however, cause the site to be abandoned, and there are many signs of later domestic activity. Rooms or houses were rebuilt, and two large, round storage bins were constructed against the outer wall of the now disused tower (Pl. 10: b). A series of gaming pieces show that, even then, life still retained its lighter aspects (Pl. 12: b).\textsuperscript{73} Still later, materials from the fort were again re-used for informal domestic and agricultural structures.\textsuperscript{74}

Tests outside the same corner showed at least three phases of building earlier than the fortification, belonging to the Late Hellenistic, Roman, and Early Byzantine periods. Of them, only the Hellenistic structure preserves an intelligible plan, one of a series of buildings which occupied the western edge of this terrace, above the steeply descending bank of the western torrent bed, which formed the boundary of the Sanctuary on this side.

Three rectangular buildings with prostyle or in antis porches ranged along the west side of Building A, between it and the torrent (Fig. 5).\textsuperscript{74} Their west walls are strictly aligned, slightly oblique to the line of Building A; both line and orientation must have been determined by some already existing feature at the west, perhaps a road.\textsuperscript{75} The sizes of the buildings seem to have been conditioned by the space available between that feature and the west foundation of Building A, so that the northernmost is nearly 12.5 m. wide, the second ca. 9 meters, and the southernmost only 7 meters wide. The central building faced north, while those at each end of the series faced south.

**Northern Hellenistic Building**

The foundations of the northernmost building are largely preserved, though the superstructure has been entirely pillaged (Pl. 11: a). For the corners, the columns of the porch, and the jambs of the door, coursed foundations were laid of re-used

\textsuperscript{72} 70.767. 26 fragments of a bowl with high ring foot. Clay white and slightly coarse. Decorated in green and ochre, with brown outlines; on lip, guilloche; in center, a large bird. For Polychrome Ware I, see C. H. Morgan, *Corinth, XI, The Byzantine Pottery*, Cambridge, Mass. 1942, pp. 64-67.

\textsuperscript{73} For rebuilding, see *Hesperia* 37, 1968, p. 207. Bone pegs: 70.603, 70.712. Bone tokens: 70.687 A-C. For similar counters, see G. Davidson, *Corinth, XII, The Minor Objects*, Princeton 1952, pp. 218-219.

\textsuperscript{74} *Hesperia* 37, 1968, p. 207.

\textsuperscript{75} *Hesperia* 37, 1968, pp. 210-211.

\textsuperscript{76} The west wall of the Byzantine fortification thoroughly disturbed the area immediately west of the buildings, and no trace of a road surface has been preserved. Nonetheless, in the absence of any other feature, a road seems the most likely explanation.
Fig. 5 Western Hill, plan.
blocks, but elsewhere boulders or rubble sufficed. The euthynteria, preserved in 1927, was of better masonry, and a tiny limekiln, specially made to burn the threshold block on the site, shows that it was of marble. In spite of such late activity, construction fill remained undisturbed in several places, and fragments of imported wares (Pl. 12: c), as well as quantities of local pottery, suggest a date no earlier than the 2nd century B.C.

Central and Southern Hellenistic Buildings

The two buildings to the south, disturbed by Byzantine and later construction, are poorly preserved within the fortification (Pl. 11: b). A section between them clearly showed that the central building is the later of the two, but the fills of the foundation ditches were entirely sterile and offered nothing to support the natural hypothesis that both are roughly contemporary with their northern neighbor. The porch of the southernmost building, which lay partly under, partly outside the south wall of the Byzantine fortification, is much better preserved (Pl. 11: c). The single limestone step of its façade is nearly complete; on it stood two piers between the antae in which the building's lateral walls terminated. One block of a marble base, set along the western anta wall, remains in place on the stylobate, as does the lowest course of the wall itself. The marble threshold for the door lies very near its original location, shifted only slightly by the Byzantine builders to incorporate it in the fortification wall, and the white plaster floor of the porch survives in spots.

In plan, the buildings resemble the treasuries of other international sanctuaries, but there is nothing here to confirm or deny such an identification. The dedications which stood in the area, to judge from two inscribed bases for small-scale marble sculpture, were modest, but perhaps no more modest than the buildings themselves.

70.456. Base of a marble statuette. White marble.

H. 0.04 m., pres. L. 0.13 m. Broken at right and behind. Pl. 12: d.

Παρίων θεωροί Ἐ[---]  
Δεξίθεος Δημοστρά[τον ---]  
ἐπὶ βασιλέως Ἀντιφάν[ον ---]

70.348. Base of a marble statuette. White marble.

H. 0.08 m., pres. L. 0.10 m. Broken at left and behind. Pl. 12: e.

[---] Βασιλισσ[--- 8]  
[---] οὐ Δῆλος  
[---] ζ υακατ

77 I am grateful to Jiri Frel for supplying unpublished photographs and drawing from the excavations of A. Salač.

78 West Slope fragments, 68.954, 68.950; incised neck, 68.955; molded bowl, 68.733+68.751.

79 For the central building, see Hesperia 37, 1968, p. 211.
Building A

The foundation of Building A, a large Late Classical or Early Hellenistic structure within the mediaeval walls, has now been completely freed of the debris which again covered it after the French-Czech excavations of 1927 (Pl. 11: d). It has suffered little damage in the intervening years, and it is generally preserved to the top foundation course, on which part of the marble euthynteria still stands at the south, though the north foundation and the crosswalls have been pillaged of that course. Marble blocks of the superstructure, built into the mediaeval walls or removed in earlier excavations, can be distinguished from those of Building M by their characteristic unfinished faces. A preliminary survey of them shows that, excepting an unfinished Ionic anta base (Pl. 12: f), all belong to the euthynteria or steps; there is no fragment which can be assigned either to its walls or to the order of its façade.

There appear to have been three steps, two with single rebates at the bottom of their faces, which ended in a vertical cyma-reversa molding at the corners of the building, and a stylobate-toichobate with two such rebates. All of the last are unfinished on their upper surfaces, among them the large, L-shaped block which stood at the southwest corner of the building, where it was surely designed to support a wall (Pl. 12: g). The unfinished upper surface of this block shows that the wall was not, in fact, laid, and it is clear, therefore, that construction of the building was interrupted at the top of the crepidoma and never carried further. Building A must have stood throughout antiquity as a simple, open platform, surrounded by its steps. Since the area of its interior has not yet been fully excavated, it is not known whether any monuments or smaller structures stood there in the open air.

The Anaktoron and its Predecessors

Tests of the fillings of the Anaktoron and the Rotunda of Arsinoe II and their immediate periphery provided new evidence for the chronology and form of three large, rectangular structures which successively occupied this northern quarter of the central part of the Sanctuary (Fig. 6).

Within the foundation of the Rotunda of Arsinoe II, eight trenches were sunk

---

81 Doric fragments mentioned in this connection, Hesperia 37, 1968, p. 209, surely do not belong, since, from the anta base, it is clear that the façades were intended to be Ionic; likewise, porous limestone (actually sandstone) drums of columns re-used in the Byzantine fortification lie near the Hellenistic “treasuries” and must belong to them rather than to Building A.
82 Other blocks of this course could conceivably all have stood between columns on the façades, where the unfinished upper surface would not have had structural significance, but the corner block cannot be so dismissed.
to investigate the relation of the foundations of the Orthostate Structure to those of the Rotunda and to the associated earth fillings (Pl. 13: a), and other cuts, both within the Anaktoron and between it and the Rotunda, served a similar purpose. A considerable depth of earth remained undisturbed, particularly in the western half of the Rotunda, against the west foundation of the Orthostate Structure (Figs. 6, 8).

**Orthostate Structure**

Owing to the sharp downward slope of bedrock toward the west, that foundation had been set very deeply, 5.12-5.71 m. below the top of the euthynteria of the Rotunda and almost three meters below its own uppermost preserved surface (Pl. 13: b). Strongly built of large, dark green, local fieldstones and boulders, laid in a roughly polygonal scheme, it attained a width of 1.30-1.40 m. at its base and was no doubt intended to stabilize the earth fill to its east as well as to support the yellow tufa superstructure, of which working chips are still found among the stones of the level upper surface of the foundation. That surface lies ca. 0.55 m. below the top of the abutting foundation of the structure’s crosswall, and it will have required one or, more likely, two additional courses of tufa, just as the crosswall itself required two courses more than the east wall to make good a similar difference in level.

Although much is lost, enough remains to determine the main features of the plan of the Orthostate Structure (Fig. 6). Within the Anaktoron, the lowest courses of the west foundation are preserved where the latter joins that part of the north foundation not destroyed by the radical excavation which construction of the Anaktoron itself demanded (Pl. 13: d). The southern limit was obliterated by the Rotunda, but the large, well-set blocks visible on the exterior of the Rotunda would be suitable near a corner, and the structure probably extended very little further. Its east wall is represented by a simple line of yellow tufa blocks laid on bedrock within the Rotunda and, to the north, by a stretch of orthostates discovered within the fill of the Sacristsy.

These remains outline a rectangle ca. 30.5 m. long and 12 m. wide, divided, it now appears, into three parts by two crosswalls. The southern crosswall has been visible since 1939, built of yellow tufa orthostates and binders on a rubble foundation (Pl. 13: a), while the northern crosswall is represented only by a fragment of rubble foundation which appeared deep in a trench between the Anaktoron and the Rotunda (Pl. 13: c). The divisions are nearly symmetrical, producing a roughly square central area, ca. 10 by 12 meters, and a shallower area, ca. 10 by 7.75 meters, at each end. Still another division, this time longitudinal, is formed by the "Cyclopaean Terrace" which runs parallel to the east wall and ca. 2.5 meters from it, some half meter above the foundation of the southern crosswall.

---

84 Since "Double Precinct," the name used for this structure in most recent literature (e.g. Guide, pp. 58-60 and passim), now appears to be inaccurate, I revert to K. Lehmann's earlier designation.

85 This terrace is preserved only in the central and southern divisions of the Orthostate Structure, though it may, originally, have extended to the northern division as well, where it would have
Fig. 6 Rotunda of Arsinoe II, Anaktoron, and adjacent structures, actual state plan.
Figs. 7, 8  Rotunda of Arsinoe II, Anaktoron, and adjacent structures, sections.
Although the elements of the plan of the Orthostate Structure are thus relatively clear, neither its external appearance, as a roofed building or an open precinct, nor its internal disposition, divided into rooms or only into separate levels, can be recovered with any certainty. Its date is, however, established by stratification. Everywhere that it was not disturbed by later builders, the earth directly over bedrock, both within the Rotunda and within the Anaktoron, was deposited in the second half of the 5th century B.C.; no earlier stratum has been discovered.

Both the west and north foundations of the Orthostate Structure were set into this earth in narrow but clear foundation trenches. The very limited amount of pottery from the filling of these trenches was also largely of the late 5th century, but a few sherds belong to the 4th century, and they provide sufficient evidence to date the construction within the first half of the 4th century B.C., probably about the middle of that period, substantially later than the Archaic date which we had previously assigned to it.

Proto-Anaktoron

The same tests allowed further investigation of the Proto-Anaktoron, whose existence was demonstrated in 1961. It, too, appears to have been a large, rectangular building but its features are even less well preserved than those of the Orthostate Structure. Although its west foundation can be traced for the entire 31 meters of its length (Pl. 14: a), except where it was interrupted by the northwest corner of the Anaktoron, its south wall is now represented only by the short, oblique line of boulders upon which the western section of the Anaktoron's south wall rests, and the north and east foundations have entirely disappeared (Pl. 14: d), so that it is impossible to gauge its width. The building must have stood at a higher level than the Anaktoron, perhaps considerably higher, where it would more nearly correspond to the Rotunda; in no case is the top of the foundation preserved to indicate the actual level. In spite of these uncertainties, there seems little doubt that the Proto-Anaktoron resembled, at least in a general way, the Anaktoron, in size, disposition and function. Its date can no longer be accurately determined, but at one point, near the south end of its been obliterated by later building. Built hard against bedrock, it produced no material by which it might be dated, and structurally it can equally well be contemporary with the Orthostate Structure or earlier.

There is no indication of the height of the walls and no sure element of a roof. The floor was completely destroyed, presumably in the construction of the Rotunda, and it is even possible that it stood at a level high enough to conceal the "Cyclopean Terrace," though the good finish of the southern crosswall suggests that the orthostates were meant to be exposed.

Where separate layers were observed, they had no chronological significance. They incline sharply downward to the west, following the slope of the bedrock, and they could represent either wash or intentional filling, but no trace of contemporary architecture has been found.

It is likely that the boulders immediately north of the north wall of the Anaktoron, on a higher level than that wall, once belonged to the north foundation of the Proto-Anaktoron, but they are too disturbed to give good evidence. The west foundation must have been completely obliterated by the deep cutting required to construct the western part of the Anaktoron.
west foundation, a section shows that it was set into the fill connected with the construction of the Rotunda of Arsinoe II, and it must be at least procedurally later than that building. Strata of the first half of the 3rd century B.C. were encountered in various parts of the Anaktoron, and it is likely, though not demonstrable, that they belong to the fill of the Proto-Anaktoron. If so, the construction of the Proto-Anaktoron followed directly upon that of the Rotunda of Arsinoe II, and they may even belong to the same project.

Anaktoron

The tests which investigated these earlier structures, together with others within and around the building, also revealed new information about the construction and date of the Anaktoron, whose principal features have been familiar since it was discovered in 1938.

The Anaktoron was constructed on an artificially leveled site, cut boldly into the hillside on the east and south, where the natural slope rose sharply, and deeply founded in earlier fills on the west (Pl. 14: c). Excavation by the builders removed all earlier material in the eastern quarter of the area, including much of the north foundation of the Orthostate Structure, and produced a broad, flat shelf of bedrock, on the eastern and southern edges of which the respective walls of the Anaktoron were laid. The work was enormous: nearly three meters of rock was cut away for the southeast corner, and it is not surprising that the walls were set as close to the edge of the platform as possible, apparently built entirely from the inside. Such radical revision of the landscape must have been undertaken in response to a now obscure but then compelling reason, and one can only speculate that the builders hoped, by setting their building thus, to avoid the disaster, probably an earthquake, that had destroyed the Proto-Anaktoron.

The walls are constructed of irregularly shaped blocks of sandstone, laid with mortar to form two faces, the space between which was filled with small stones and earth. They were strengthened with piers, four each along the inner face of the east and west walls; built of squared, sandstone blocks around a core of stones and earth, in some courses the piers are shallowly bonded into the face of the wall. The whole

90 Although the 3rd-century deposits within the Anaktoron might be connected with the Rotunda, they are the only deposits possible in date for the Proto-Anaktoron, later than the Rotunda and earlier than the Anaktoron, and it is unlikely that the filling of that large building should have vanished without a trace.

91 The foundation ditch outside the south wall is only ca. 0.20 m. wide, much too narrow for work and even too narrow to excavate deeply. Curiously, the same method of construction seems to have been followed at the west, where the wall was set at the western edge of its foundation ditch.

92 In 1976, the southernmost pier of the west wall, which was in danger of collapse from the pressure of earth and water behind the wall, was completely dismantled and rebuilt with a core of reinforced concrete, in order to strengthen this section of the wall. At the same time, earth was removed from the core of the west wall and replaced by cement mortar to seal the wall. Blocks from the top course which had slipped from their original location were also reset at this time.
interior was, it seems, stuccoed, to judge from traces of backing plaster still preserved near the southeast corner and from some fragments of finer plaster found fallen along the south wall. On the west, the exterior face of the wall is also roughly coated with plaster, perhaps in an effort to seal it against dampness.

Previous excavations had left ample undisturbed stratigraphy to fix the date of construction of the Anaktoron. Particularly clear evidence came from the foundation ditch outside the south wall, as investigated both at the southeast corner (Pl. 14: b) where, as already noted, it was cut into bedrock, and in the triangle formed by the Anaktoron, the Sacristy, and the Rotunda of Arsinoe II, where it was cut into the 3rd-century B.C. fill against the Rotunda. In both these areas, the ditch had been filled with earth containing a substantial quantity of local and imported pottery characteristic of the late 1st century B.C. and the early 1st century after Christ. Within the building, similar pottery appeared everywhere in the upper levels, often overlying material of the 3rd century B.C. (probably connected with the Proto-Anaktoron), and, on bedrock in the western part of the building, where it had not been leveled for the construction of the Anaktoron, a deposit of the second half of the 5th century B.C.

This material, together with reconsideration of that recovered in the tests of 1961,95 leaves no doubt that the Anaktoron was constructed early in the Imperial age.94 The occasion was, in all probability, the destruction of its immediate predecessor, the Proto-Anaktoron, in the same earthquake which caused such widespread damage in other quarters of the Sanctuary.95 Preserved stratigraphy shows no major later revisions to the building and the Anaktoron may well have contained all of its principal features from the time of its construction.96

The Anaktoron, Proto-Anaktoron, and Orthostate Structure not only succeed one another in this quarter of the Sanctuary, but they share, in a striking way, similar features: all three are very nearly the same size and shape so far as can be determined, and the earliest and latest, at least, are similarly divided into three areas (Fig. 6).97 Everything suggests that these buildings successively served an identical purpose, the μνήσις or first stage of initiation into the Mysteries.98 The location of this rite before the construction of the Orthostate Structure in the first half of the 4th century B.C.

93 BCH 86, 1962, p. 845.
94 In this respect, but only in this respect, all earlier accounts of the building, in which a much earlier date had been proposed, based on the preliminary indications of the polygonal masonry, on historical considerations, and on an initial estimate of pottery then poorly known, require correction.
95 For this earthquake, see Samothrace, 3, Text II, pp. 123-124, note 158; Guide*, p. 57.
96 The lex sacra, Samothrace, 2, I, no. 63, which denied to the uninitiated access to the adyton, is dated by P. M. Fraser in the 1st or early 2nd century after Christ, and it, too, may have formed part of the original equipment of the Anaktoron.
97 For the divisions of the Anaktoron, see AJA 44, 1940, p. 332; for the Orthostate Structure, see p. 28 above. Since only the lower part of the foundations of the Proto-Anaktoron are preserved, its interior arrangement cannot be determined.
98 Our present investigations add nothing to Professor Lehmann's persuasive reconstruction of this rite, for which see Guide*, pp. 35-36.
remains, however, unknown. Either all trace of a predecessor and of its attendant fills in this quarter of the Sanctuary was destroyed and dispersed by later building, or it stood on another site, of which evidence may yet be found.\footnote{The literature leaves no doubt that the rite was earlier than the 4th century, e.g. Herodotos, 2.51, and there is ample evidence of activity in the Sanctuary in Archaic times.}

**Round Doric Building**

In the course of testing the slopes above and to the west of the Anaktoron and the Rotunda of Arsinoe II remains of a hitherto unknown, Early Hellenistic round structure appeared (Fig. 1: 28, Pl. 15: a, b, d).\footnote{The tests, undertaken to determine if any Classical or Archaic deposits remained in this area, which might be connected with an earlier hall of initiation, were generally disappointing, since surface wash, containing little pottery and that mostly late, lay immediately over bedrock.} Though it is poorly preserved, owing both to ancient destruction and pillage and to the extremely friable character of the material, enough survives (Fig. 9) to determine the general features of the structure and to permit a tentative restoration. Its foundation is a circle, ca. 4.10 m. in diameter, from which a rectangle, ca. 2.70 m. wide, extends toward the northwest, probably for a ramp.

The base of the circle is a roughly round platform of large flattened fieldstones, fitted together in a scheme polygonal in plan; it forms not only the foundation for the wall of the structure but, at the center, its interior floor as well. Upon this platform stand two courses of hard, gray, crystalline stone, from which rose the wall, built, like all of the superstructure, of gray-brown marine limestone.\footnote{The material is identical to that used in the foundations of the Altar Court, cf. Samothrace, 4, II, p. 17. Because of the very fragile nature of the stone, the foundation has been reburied, and it is thus shown only in dotted lines on the sketch plan of the Sanctuary (Fig. 1).} Two finely finished rings of this material abut the inner face of the two foundation courses and form steps surrounding the central stone floor. The upper step has been roughly cut down to receive three courses of wedge-shaped tiles or bricks, which, together with it, now form one high step (Pl. 15: d);\footnote{There is no evidence for the date at which these bricks were added, though the rough workmanship of their bed makes it clear that they were not original. They are carefully formed to fit the circle, with radial joints and curved inner and outer edges, and they must have been manufactured for the purpose. The course on which they lie has been erroneously separated from its backer in the restored section (Fig. 15); they form one block.} originally, another course of limestone may have been placed on it to produce three steps of identical dimensions, a condition which must, even later, have existed at the doorway, if access to the interior was intended. That such access was, in fact, intended is suggested not only by the fine finish of the interior but also by the rectangular foundation against the circle, which must have supported a ramp.

The euthynteria is still partly in place on the south side of the structure (Pl. 15: b), its exterior face roughly picked, but its upper surface smooth and provided with at least two dowel cuttings to fix the once superposed course. Of that, however, and
Fig. 9  Round Doric Building, actual state plan.
of the remaining superstructure, only fragments, rejected or overlooked by stone-roobers, survive.\textsuperscript{103} Nevertheless, few as they are, these fragments are sufficient to indicate the general character of this delicate structure, which a very tentative and in many respects hypothetical reconstruction may illustrate (Figs. 13-15).

A boldly molded course, 0.254 m. high, with a large torus surmounted by a cyma reversa and an astragal, doubtless formed the toichobate (Fig. 10).\textsuperscript{104} Upon it will have risen the drum of the lower wall.\textsuperscript{105} That drum was capped by a simply molded crown, upon which stood the upper drum, decorated with an engaged Doric order.\textsuperscript{106}

From the order there remain several fragments of fluting, one preserving a bit of the wall block of which it was a part, one fragment of capital (Fig. 11), a fragment of epistyle-frieze preserving a half-regula with a bit of the triglyph above (Pl. 15: c), several fragments of geison-sima (Fig. 12, Pl. 15: e), several fragments of Corinthian cover-tiles, and one fragment from the apex of the roof. Although they are plainly inadequate to determine details of proportion or style, these scanty fragments can be combined to produce a structure of the sort illustrated (Figs. 13-15); \textsuperscript{107} it cannot have been basically different.\textsuperscript{108}

Its few characteristic details, base molding, capital, and sima, suggest a date for the construction of this tiny building in the second half, perhaps the fourth quarter,

\textsuperscript{103} Some 170 fragments, mostly very small, preserved a dimension, molding, or other feature and are catalogued in the museum storerooms; 30 larger fragments, preserving one or more dimensions, are catalogued as blocks on the site, and small fragments with only one flat worked surface are collected in a stone pile near them. All earth from the excavation was sifted, and it is unlikely that any fragment escaped attention.

\textsuperscript{104} No block preserves the complete height of the course, but fragments preserve portions of the molding with sufficient overlap to make the reconstruction certain. The molding is related to other base moldings of the second half of the 4th century B.C., e.g. the Altar of Zeus Agoraioi (?), the statue base within the Philippeion at Olympia (ibid., pl. XXXVIII: 12), the statue base within the Philippeion at Olympia (ibid., pl. XXXVIII: 7) and, less closely, the toichobate of the temple of Athena Alea at Tegea (ibid., pl. XXXVIII: 7).

\textsuperscript{105} We have restored it in courses 0.23 m. high, since measurable fragments show this height and no other. It is possible, however, that all the fragments belong rather to the interior steps of that height and that no wall blocks survive. The height of the lower drum is arbitrary, based on the necessity of including a doorway.

\textsuperscript{106} Two fragments of the crown are preserved, both lacking their small molding, for which we restore a cyma reversa.

\textsuperscript{107} No course preserves its full height, and we have simply applied what seemed appropriate proportions. The frieze unit was derived from the preserved half-regula, and from it, in combination with the diameter, the number of engaged columns, 20, was calculated. The roof may have terminated either in an opening, as illustrated, or in the base for an akroterion; the apex fragment is not decisive on this point. The woodwork probably consisted of a cone of rafters, in the fashion suggested by J. J. Coulton (The Greek Stoa, Oxford 1976, p. 296) for the Rotunda of Arsinoe II.

\textsuperscript{108} Marian McAllister has suggested to me an alternative restoration, in which the order stands on a substantially lower drum, rather like a parapet. This solution, while not impossible, would demand the removal of a column for the doorway, interrupting the regularity of the order. Such details as the threshold, door-frame, and grill are, of course, entirely hypothetical, restored only according to practical considerations.
Fig. 10  Round Doric Building, profile of toichobate.
FIG. 11 Round Doric Building, capital, 75.311B.

FIG. 12 Round Doric Building, geison-sima, 75.643.
of the 4th century B.C.,\textsuperscript{109} and the material from its foundation ditch, of which a nearly complete kantharos (Pl. 15: f) is the most telling example,\textsuperscript{110} confirms this date. Although the upper part of the building may have been destroyed earlier, the lowest courses of its wall seem to have remained in place until well into the Roman period, when they, too, were removed, probably for re-use, and some of the stones of the floor were pulled up, perhaps in search of treasure.\textsuperscript{111}

Although the remains of this building are sufficient to indicate its architectural form, they offer nothing but that form to suggest its purpose. The type, in which a colonnade surmounts a high, hollow podium, recalls the monumental tombs of Late Classical and Hellenistic Asia Minor, of which the Nereid Monument at Xanthos provides the earliest example.\textsuperscript{112} Closer parallels with connections to the Samothracian cult, are provided by the neighboring Rotunda of Arsinoe II and by a series of depictions of round buildings on reliefs of Kyzikos,\textsuperscript{113} but their function, too, remains uncertain. With its solid stone floor and limited space, our building offered the necessities neither for sacrifice to chthonic deities nor for burial. It could, if its funereal associations are real, have served as a cenotaph, but, if it did, we cannot guess for what person, king or hero.\textsuperscript{114} The site itself has no more evidence to yield, and a solution to the question is likely only with the firm identification of another similar monument elsewhere.

Museum

In addition to investigations on the site, revisions of the exhibition in the museum have been undertaken, partly to reflect new discoveries, partly to improve the arrangement in connection with the preparation of the 4th edition of the \textit{Guide}. Some major additions have already been noted (pp. 6, 16 above), and further study has allowed the installation, on the reconstruction of the Rotunda of Arsinoe II, of an accurate res-

\textsuperscript{109} For the base molding, see footnote 104, above. The capital is related to that of the Doric building on the Eastern Hill, dedicated by Phillip III and Alexander IV; cf. \textit{Hesperia} 37, 1968, p. 226, fig. 4. The lion's-head waterspouts, with their two rows of locks, vertical furrow in the forehead, and beetling brows, are related to those of the Hieron; cf. \textit{Samothrace}, 3, Text I, pp. 174-176.

\textsuperscript{110} 75.561. Kantharos, mended from many fragments. H. 0.101 m., D. of rim 0.086 m.; cf. \textit{Agora} XII (footnote 47 above), no. 713, "325 B.C."

\textsuperscript{111} Strata probably connected with the destruction preserved a clear line where they had rested against the building's wall. After the removal of the wall, the area was filled with Roman debris. For a similar search beneath the floor of the round structure on the Eastern Hill, perhaps conducted at the same time, see \textit{Hesperia} 37, 1968, p. 219.


\textsuperscript{113} On these monuments, see P. W. Lehmann, K. Lehmann, \textit{Samothracian Reflections}, \textit{Aspects of the Revival of the Antique}, Princeton 1973, pp. 30-45. The round building of which a model is shown on the funerary stele of Attalos, son of Asklepiodoros (\textit{ibid.}, pp. 42-45, figs. 27, 28), offers a particularly close parallel to our building.

\textsuperscript{114} It is curious that the building may have gone out of use at about the time when the "cenotaph of Iasion-Aëtion" was constructed below the Stoa (p. 12 above and \textit{Hesperia} 43, 1974, pp. 454-459), but the significance of such a coincidence remains obscure.
FIG. 13. Round Doric Building, restored plan.
FIG. 14  Round Doric Building, restored elevation.
FIG. 15 Round Doric Building, restored section.
toration of its Corinthian capitals (Pl. 16: a-c). These capitals, so different from those created only a few years later, also under Ptolemaic patronage, for the Propylon of Ptolemy II (p. 6 above), are remarkable for their squat proportions. This design, apparently a conscious effort by the architect to exaggerate the effect of the very sharp angle at which, high in the interior, they would be viewed, provides further evidence of his originality.

This brief account has summarized not firm conclusions but work in progress. Along with new facts, continued investigation has, in many cases, raised new and basic questions about the history and nature of the religion of the Great Gods, which demand thorough consideration. To some, continued study of the excavated material will provide an answer; others may require additional excavation; but all show clearly that the Sanctuary will repay continued work with important new information for its better understanding.

JAMES R. McCREDIE

INSTITUTE OF FINE ARTS,
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

\[115\] They have been restored in plaster by Triandaphyllos Kontogeorgis in collaboration with the writer. Sufficient fragments remain to determine accurately all details except the flower which, attached to the bell, overlapped the abacus; we have restored it from a flower on the Corinthian anta capital of the Propylon of Ptolemy II.
Samothrace. Ancient city and Sanctuary, from northeast. Courtesy of the Hellenic Air Force

a. North side of foundation, from northwest

b. Corinthian column, restored by Triandaphyllos Kontogeorgis. Samothrace Museum

c. Approach to east forecourt, from west

Propylon of Ptolemy II
a. Propylon of Ptolemy II and round structure, from west

b. Uppermost part of road, from northeast

c. Central part of road, from west

d. Lowest part of road and limekiln, from west

Eastern Hill

a. Trenches in Stoa terrace, from south

b. Stoa and terrace walls, from east
d. Central terrace wall from west

c. Eastward extension of terrace wall, from north

a. "Cenotaph of Iasion-Aëtion" from north

b. Room A, south wall reconstructed, from north

c. Room B from northeast

d. Rooms C-J from south

Stoa Area

a. Room J from west

b. Room J, wall and drain beneath tile floor, from west

c. Rooms L-N from north

d. Rooms E and F, from west

Stoa Area

a. Room L, southwest corner, from south

b. Room L, floor, from south

c. Room M, floor, from east

d. Stairs K from north

e. Rooms O and P, from southwest

f. Pottery from room L, 69.823, 69.798, 69.824

g. Pottery from terrace fill, 69.193, 69.72

h. Room O, floor

Stoa Area

Stoa Area

a. North end of lower terrace, from east

b. Stairs to intermediate terrace, from east

c. East edge of intermediate terrace, from south

d. Floor of intermediate terrace, from west

e. Road to Buildings M and A, from east

Stoa Area

Western Hill

a. Western Hill from south

b. Byzantine fort, southwest corner, from north

c. Byzantine fort, southwest corner, from south

d. Southern Hellenistic building from south

Western Hill

a. Northern Hellenistic building from south

c. Southern Hellenistic building, porch, from southeast

b. Central Hellenistic building from north

d. Building A, west foundation, from south

Western Hill

a. Polychrome bowl, 70.767

b. Byzantine gaming pieces, 70.603, 70.712, 70.687 a-c

d. Statuette base, 70.456

c. Pottery from northern Hellenistic building

e. Statuette base, 70.348

f. Building A, anta base

g. Building A, southwest corner toichobate

Western Hill

a. Orthostate Structure under Rotunda, from southwest

b. Orthostate Structure, west foundation, from east

c. Anaktoron, south foundation, and crosswall of Orthostate Structure, from south

d. Orthostate Structure, north foundation under Anaktoron, from east

Anaktoron

a. Proto-Anaktoron, west foundation, from southeast

b. Anaktoron, foundation ditch at southwest corner, from east

c. Anaktoron from southeast

d. Proto-Anaktoron, northwest corner, from north

Anaktoron

a. Foundation from southeast

c. Fragment of epistyle-frieze, 75.483

d. Foundation from north

e. Lion's-head waterspout, 75.623

f. Kantharos, 75.561

Round Doric Building

a. Rotunda of Arsinoe II, interior elevation, restored

b, c. Rotunda of Arsinoe II, Corinthian capital, restored by Triandaphyllos Kontogeorgis

Museum