We know very little of what took place inside a Greek temple. Sacrifice, the focal act of communal religious observance, was enacted outside, on an open-air altar usually opposite the main, east, facade of the temple, while the interior contained objects dedicated to the deity, including a cult statue. In form most Greek temples had a single main interior room, or cella; some had an additional small room behind it, accessible only from the cella. Such a subdivision of interior space suggests that the inner chamber served a special function. This study is designed to ascertain why some temples had inner rooms and how these chambers were used, questions that shed light on the nature of the temple itself. Examination of terminology used for temple interiors and of archaeological remains of temples with inner rooms, together with literary and epigraphical references to activities that occurred in temples, indicates a larger economic role for many temples and less secret ritual than has been assumed.

Nomenclature is a central issue here, as naming incorporates a set of assumptions and a specific interpretation. Since the 19th century, the inner room has been called ἀδύτον (adyton, “not to be entered”), a term known from ancient sources. The usage of “adyton” in literary and epigraphical testimonia led scholars to consider the inner room a locus of cult ritual of a chthonian or oracular nature, mysterious rites conducted within the temple. However, the variety of places referred to as “adyton” makes it clear that the term did not denote a particular architectural structure, and so is not appropriate as a standard designation for a part of the Greek temple, a concept first demonstrated by Susan Thalmann. In some temples, the inner room may have been described spatially, in relation to the cella, as ὀπίσθιον (opisthodomos, “place behind”; see p. 210 below). “Opisthodomos,” too, brings its own set of associations, derived from the structure of that name, widely known as a repository of valuables on the Athenian Akropolis. Although ancient sources suggest that “opisthodomos” may have been applied to an inner room on occasion, the term was also used for the back porch of a temple, also located behind the cella. Faced with the choice of “adyton” and its linkage to cult and ritual, or “opisthodomos” and its association with treasure, we are prudent to avoid any one term. In antiquity there may have been no single universal label for an inner room.
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Physical remains of inner rooms have been identified in temples throughout the Greek world, dating from Archaic through Hellenistic times. These temples vary in size and proportion, and they were dedicated to many different divinities. Although the interior arrangements of temples at one site, Selinous, demonstrate consistency of form, overall there is little archaeological evidence for associating the inner room with a particular type of temple, a geographic region, or a specific deity.

Written texts and inscriptions yield a more complete understanding of human behavior than tumbled blocks of ruined temples. Since interpretation of such testimonia depends on clear understanding of what words such as “adyton” and “opisthodomos” meant in ancient usage, we will begin with a brief review of how the term “adyton” has been applied. After a survey of archaeological remains of temples with inner rooms, we will assess written evidence of what happened inside temples, and then proceed to a discussion of “opisthodomos” and its applications. Insofar as is possible, sources closest in time to a temple’s construction and primary use will be emphasized. By combining analyses of terminology, physical remains, and written sources, we come to recognize the substantial economic role of the Greek temple.

Among the prolific scholarship on Greek cult and religion, and that on Greek temples, several works have been especially useful for understanding the function of temples. In 1970 Corbett addressed questions about what occurred inside Greek temples, combining literary, epigraphical, and architectural evidence. Since then, Roux has raised important issues regarding both architectural terminology and the purpose of the Greek temple. In a study of three temples of Artemis, I began to question the role of the inner room as a focus of ritual. Much of our understanding of activities in and around temples has come from studies of inscribed inventories: Linders’ commentary on temple inventories has provided insight into religious activities at Brauron and Delos; Aleshire has done likewise for the Asklepieion at Athens; and Harris has recently brought together the various inventories from the Athenian Akropolis in a comprehensive study. Van Straten’s work on the personal behavior of visitors to Greek sanctuaries has helped to define both individual practice and universal attitudes regarding Greek temples and sanctuaries. New questions concerning what constitutes a cult statue promise continuing reassessment of our vision of how Greeks perceived temples and their interiors.

TERMINOLOGY: “ADYTON”

In his landmark account of Sicilian temple architecture, Robert Koldewey was the first to name the inner room “adyton,” citing architectural parallels and passages from two Roman authors. He compared the organization of interior space in the temples at Selinous with that of Solomon’s temple, the ancient Egyptian temple, and the Christian basilican church. In each of these comparanda, a religious structure is experienced as a longitudinal progression from secular to sacred. The visitor moves along a linear axis to a small holy place where events and rituals of a transcendent and spiritual

nature occur. This behavior is not an appropriate parallel for ancient Greek cult practice, yet the label “adyton” has encouraged subsequent scholars to consider the inner room a special place for secret rites. Koldewey referred to passages in Caesar and Servius as evidence for calling the inner room of south Italian and Sicilian temples an “adyton.” Caesar, in his account of strange phenomena at a Pergamene temple and elsewhere before the battle at Pharsalus, defined “adyton” in an aside: in occultis ac reconditis templis, quo praeter sacerdotes adire fas non est, quae Graeci adyta appellant (Civ. 3.105.5). Servius was explicating Vergil’s reference to the oracle of Apollo at Delphi: adytum est locus templi secretior, ad quem nulli est aditus nisi sacerdoti (commentary on Vergil’s Aeneid 2.115). More recently, scholars defining architectural terminology have continued to use the term “adyton” as a label for the inner room of a temple. Among ancient literary testimonia (the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae lists 380 citations), however, sources closer in time to the construction date of Greek temples are most likely to describe the original relationship, if any, between the term “adyton” and the inner room. Because most of the Greek temples with inner rooms were begun before 300 B.C., I will discuss pre-Hellenistic sources in detail. Later sources such as Diodorus Siculus, Strabo, Plutarch, and Pausanias deserve attention for their greater numbers and clearer content, but they also require caution, as they reflect temple use in a different era.

The earliest known references to adyta, in the Iliad and in the Homeric hymns to Apollo and to Hermes, reveal the three general meanings consistently associated with the term: (1) some kind of religious structure or enclosure, including temples or parts of temples, shrines, designated precincts, crevices, and caves; (2) the place in which oracular inspiration occurs, most often in the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, but at other oracular sites as well; (3) a remote chamber, usually domestic in nature, removed from view or everyday experience. In this last case there is no connotation of cult, but sometimes that of a storage function.

In Book 5 of the Iliad, Apollo transports Aeneas from the perils of combat with Diomedes to Pegamas, to the temple (vqo6) where Leto and Artemis tend the wounded warrior (vqo6) abu'TC (5.448). Likewise, Apollo returns Aeneas to battle rriovo, ?E a (5.512). In this context, “adyton” seems to be the temple interior, restricted of access, large (therefore probably not a small inner chamber), and richly appointed.

In Book 5 of the Iliad, Apollo transports Aeneas from the peril of combat with Diomedes to Pegamas, to the temple (vqo6) where Leto and Artemis tend the wounded warrior (5.448). Likewise, Apollo returns Aeneas to battle rriovo, ?E a (5.512). In this context, “adyton” seems to be the temple interior, restricted of access, large (therefore probably not a small inner chamber), and richly appointed.

The Homeric Hymn to Pythian Apollo (7th century B.C.) provides the earliest explicit use of “adyton” for Apollo’s shrine at Delphi; the choice of verb in ες ἀδυτον κατέδωκε (line 443) suggests that the adyton is below ground. In a subsequent reference to Apollo showing the Cretans ἀδυτον γίνεται και πόνος νησίν (line 523), the adyton and the temple could be separate structures, but the phrasing may also represent redundant me”

Domestic adyta are described in the Homeric Hymn to Hermes (6th century B.C.), lines 246–248, in which Apollo uses a key to open three adyta containing nectar and ambrosia, gold, silver, and fine purple and silver garments. In this context, the adyta unequivocally serve as storage...
chambers or closets. They hold rare and precious objects and have no religious function.

These few early testimonia establish a breadth of application for "adyton" that continues in subsequent eras. In 5th-century B.C. sources we encounter the same general categories of meaning: religious enclosure, oracular seat, and remote domestic chamber. Four passages in Herodotus and Euripides allude to adyta as temples (or parts thereof), shrines, or sanctuaries. Herodotus describes how Kleomenes entered εἰς τὸ ἄδυτον τῆς θεοῦ (5.72.3) on the Athenian Akropolis despite the priestess's warning. Entrance to the adyton was restricted, first by the priestess stationed on a throne and then by doors, but no further architectural information is given. Herodotus identifies another adyton at Elaeus in the Chersonesos as the scene of the Persian satrap Artaxerxes' worst offense: ἐν τῷ ἄδυτῳ γυναικῶν ἐμίσγετο (9.116.4). Here "adyton" refers to the previously mentioned tomb of Protesilaos surrounded by a temenos containing many riches—gold, silver, and bronze phialai, garments, and other dedications (9.116.2). No temple per se is noted in this sanctuary, nor is the form of the adyton described.

In Euripides' Ion (line 938) there is passing reference to altars and adyta of Pan near the cave where Apollo raped Creusa. These adyta must be the caves of the shrine of Pan on the north slope of the Athenian Akropolis, identified earlier in line 283 and especially lines 492–494, where Euripides refers to "haunts of Pan/ The rock flanking/ The caves of the Long Cliffs." Throughout Iphigeneia in Tauris there is significant, perhaps intentional, ambiguity between the temple (ναός) housing the cult statue (the famous wooden Tauric image) and the place where Orestes and Pylades will actually be slain, usually characterized as δώμοι or δώματα, occasionally as the ἀνάκτορον (line 41) (δώματα is also used for ναός, but ναός is never used for the site of the human sacrifice). Iphigeneia clearly distinguishes between her role as a priestess who begins the ceremony in the ναός and the role of others who perform the act of killing in the goddess's ἀνάκτορον (lines 34–41). Elsewhere (lines 623–626) she notes that others in the δώματα do the killing, and that burial consists of "a sacred fire inside, and a great cleft in the rock." Thus, when King Thoas asks if the foreigners' bodies are burning ἅδυτοις ἐν ἀγγείοις (line 1155), he must mean a place separate from the temple proper.

"Adyton" is consistently used for the exact place where oracular inspiration and prophecy occur, or from which a deity communicates. Pindar refers to the fragrant (εὐωδεὸς) adyton from which Apollo speaks (O. 7.59), and elsewhere (P. 11.6) to the ἄδυτον . . . θησαυρόν, with gold tripods, of the Theban shrine of Ismenian Apollo, which he identifies as a site for mantic events. Herodotus' more discursive approach locates an adyton within the great oracular Temple of Apollo at Didyma. When Aristodikos, dissatisfied with the oracle's response, went around the temple removing all the birds' nests, the voice of the angry god issued ἐκ τοῦ ἄδυτου (1.159.3). In this case, "adyton" must refer to some part of the interior of the temple.

The seat of the oracle of Apollo at Delphi is called "adyton" more...
often than any other site mentioned in ancient testimonia. Unfortunately, the architectural nature or even the topographical location of the Delphic adyton is not always clear and varies from one ancient author to the next. Herodotus’ account of the Athenian embassy to Delphi notes their entry into the megaron, where they sit down (7.140.3). The priestess delivered first one and then, at their supplication, a second prophecy. After she directed them \( \gamma \tau \nu \varepsilon \, \alpha \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \iota \) in her first dark message, they departed briefly but soon returned, vowing not to leave the adyton unless they heard better news, whereupon she pronounced the famous oracle of the wooden walls. This adyton was located within a megaron and had a seating capacity sufficient for a delegation of visitors.17

In the Andromache (line 111), Neoptolemos’ violent death takes place at Delphi, at the altar outside the \( \alpha \nu \alpha \kappa \tau \theta \omicron \rho \omicron \tau \omicron \nu \) in which Apollo’s oracle was consulted. His final combat is doomed when a terrible hair-raising voice issues from the midst of the adyton (\( \alpha \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omega \nu \ \varepsilon \mu \varepsilon \sigma \omega \nu \), line 1147). In the Ion, which takes place in front of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, Euripides uses the term “adyton” in reference to Delphi only twice. Xuthus consults the oracle, which lies inside a closed door (lines 510–515), and meets Ion, whom he subsequently describes as his first encounter \( \delta \delta \theta \nu \varepsilon \kappa \ \alpha \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \ \varepsilon \xi \iota \omicron \nu \tau \iota \mu \iota \iota \mu \iota \iota \). The adyton unequivocally represents the locus of oracular pronouncement within a built structure, presumably the Temple of Apollo. Likewise, as Ion is about to kill his mother, Creusa, she occupies the altar and challenges him as to whether he wants to kill her \( \varepsilon \nu \tau \omicron \zeta \ \alpha \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \ \tau \omicron \omega \nu \delta \epsilon \) (line 1309), clearly an act of grievous pollution. While we can speculate about the altar in question lying in front of the east façade of the temple, the text itself does not furnish information this specific.

Other Euripidean allusions confirm that the adyton was the place of consultation with the oracle at Delphi, but they provide nothing more about the adyton itself.18 Among other late-5th- and 4th-century sources, Aristophanes’ mockery of oracles in the Knights clearly refers to Delphi, where “Apollo shouts from the adyton amid priceless tripods” (\( \iota \chi \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \, \alpha \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \ \delta \iota \alpha \ \tau \rho \iota \pi \omicron \delta \omicron \omicron \ \varepsilon \rho \iota \tau \iota \mu \iota \omega \nu \), line 1016). A fragment from Antiphon mentions an adyton and an oracle together.19 In Plato’s Theaetetus (162a), Socrates jests metaphorically about oracles pronounced \( \varepsilon \kappa \ \tau \omicron \ \alpha \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \ \tau \iota \zeta \ \beta \iota \beta \lambda \omicron \). From the 6th century B.C. onward, “adyton” was used for the place of special significance from which oracles were uttered, especially Apollo’s oracle at Delphi.

A less common usage for “adyton” is that of a remote inner room with no religious connotation. In Euripides’ Andromache the chorus tells of Orestes’ killing of his mother \( \alpha \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omega \ \varepsilon \pi \iota \beta \omicron \zeta \ \kappa \tau \epsilon \alpha \nu \omicron \nu \) (line 1034), presumably upstairs in an inner chamber of her dwelling.20 Few inscriptions mention an adyton. The most revealing, from Didyma, make clear that the adyton referred to is the great hypaethral court of that oracular temple. A late-3rd-century B.C. letter to the Milesians from Seleukos II, and a 2nd-century B.C. building account (from after 172/1 B.C.), both mention \( \eta \ \alpha \nu \alpha \beta \omicron \sigma \iota \varsigma \ \varepsilon \ \tau \omicron \ \omega \ \alpha \delta \upsilon \tau \omicron \omicron \ ).21

To summarize, in pre-Hellenistic usage “adyton” is usually, but not always, applied to a sacred place. It is most often the term for the seat of an
oracle, especially that at Delphi. “Adyton,” “not to be entered,” prescribes behavior in relation to a place, like “abaton,” “not to be stepped on.” While the proscriptive nature of the term “adyton” implies some sort of enclosure, no specific structure can be inferred, whether man-made or natural, roofed or unroofed. Literal translation, confirmed by contextual information, indicates that the defining characteristic of any adyton is restricted access. From our earliest knowledge of the term, and continuing through later usage, “adyton” was applied to a variety of places—oracles, hero shrines, caves, subterranean structures, and only occasionally temples or parts of temples. To limit an application of the term, that is, to specify inner rooms of Greek temples, leads to erroneous interpretation of what transpired in such rooms. We should not assume that oracles, incubation, or secret rites took place within all temples with inner rooms. In seeking to ascertain what did occur within such temples, we must review the extant remains of inner rooms in Greek temples, which reveal that this one architectural component appears in many different physical contexts.

Physical Remains

Greek temples that had inner rooms range in date from the 7th to the 2nd century B.C. They are found from Egypt and Libya to Asia Minor and the Aegean, from the Greek mainland to the Ionian islands, southern Italy, and Sicily. Table 1, arranged in broad geographical categories, includes archaeological information organized to help clarify (1) whether inner rooms reflect regional architectural traditions, (2) whether they indicate cult practice peculiar to a specific deity, and (3) whether they provide evidence of certain behaviors or rituals within the temple. In addition to location, dedication, and date, data regarding architectural form are included: whether a temple is peripteral, and whether it had three rooms (pronaos, cela, and inner room) or two (the presence of cela and inner room is assumed; see below). When possible, I have also noted if an altar can be associated, by alignment or proximity, with a given temple on its exterior, and whether features such as interior altars, offering tables, or statue bases (designated A, OT, and B) have been identified within either the cela or the inner room of a particular temple.

Any such table necessarily reduces complex issues to apparent simplicity. On the basis of extant physical remains, every structure listed can be reasonably interpreted to be a temple and to have an inner room behind the cela. Some well-known structures have been omitted, however. For instance, Bergquist has asked, with good reason, whether Prinias Temple B is a “hestiatorion.” I have also omitted the oikos in the sanctuary of Hekates on Thasos and the “Temple” of Apollo at Halieis on the basis of her challenge. Tomlinson’s reassessment of Perachora’s “Temple” of Hera Limenia as a dining place rather than a temple has removed it from the list. Questions of reconstructed form as well as function have emerged from Papapostolou’s studies of Megaron B at Thermon, in which he has dissociated the rectangular core of the structure from any sort of peristyle; he and other scholars have also raised questions about the date of Megaron B and its status as a temple. Although the large 10th-century B.C. heroon at

22. Thalmann 1975. In later sources ‘adyton’ continues to be used for oracular chambers in general, and that at Delphi in particular (e.g., D.S. 7.12.6, 16.26.2; Plut. 92.437c; Paus. 10.24.7; for other oracles: Paus. 4.16.7, 9.39.11–13). It also may refer to shrines, which need not be temples (e.g., D.H. 67.4; Str. 14.1.20; Paus. 2.2.1, 5.1.5, 10.32.13–18, 10.33.11), as well as temples or rooms within temples (e.g., D.H. 67.4, 69.1–2; Str. 14.6.3). Occasionally “adyton” is used like “abaton,” as a place where incubation or healing occurs (e.g., Str. 14.1.44). Some, but not all, adyta are caves, cavern-like, or subterranean (e.g., Paus. 2.2.1, 4.16.7, 7.27.2, 9.39.11–13, 10.32.13–18).

Lefkandi had a small room in its apse for storage, it was not a temple, but a funerary structure. In the final analysis, the North Building at Samos may not be a temple, but its form is so templelike that it is included in the table, and it is also discussed below, page 214.

Several structures included here fit the broad definition of an enclosed chamber at the rear of a temple cella, but they express it in idiosyncratic ways. Neither the 5th-century Temple of Apollo at Bassai nor the 4th-century Temple of Zeus at Nemea had a crosswall at the west end of the cella. However, each reveals a clear architectural articulation of a main cella and a separate space at its rear. At Bassai, a screen of three columns separates the “inner space” from the cella, while at Nemea the space at the west end of the cella is set apart by being sunk ca. 2 meters below the adjacent paving. Such evident physical distinction between cella and space to the west of it makes these two temples eligible for inclusion in the table. The Temple of Apollo at Didyma and Temple GT at Selinous were both enormous hypaethral temples with small naïskoslike structures set symmetrically on axis within the courtyardlike enclosure of the cella. In both temples the inner chambers are within the cella, not behind it, constituting a subdivision of space similar, but not exactly comparable, to the inner room; they have been included on the basis of this similarity. I have also included the 3rd-century B.C. Temple of Apollo at Klaros, since it had an inner room in the cella as well as a subterranean oracular chamber. Because this temple, whose remains await final publication, underwent several revisions in antiquity, its value to the more general interpretation of how temples functioned is limited.

The chronic difficulty of fragmentary remains and poorly preserved walls means that some examples are included on the basis of foundations or minimal traces of superstructure (e.g., Brauron, Halai Araphenides [Loutsa]). At the end of Table 1 I have appended a list of temples that may have had inner rooms, but for which there are insufficient physical remains to verify the reconstructed ground plan. Bearing in mind these caveats, one may condense useful information in such a table.

**REGION**

The inner room is not a characteristic of only one region. There are fewer examples known from Asia Minor than elsewhere—but there are also fewer temples known from that region. Temples throughout the Greek mainland, the Aegean and Ionian islands, and in southern Italy and Sicily have inner rooms, but there is only one significant concentration of examples, at Selinous. If Selinous is considered to be a special case, then Sicily does not have an unusual number of temples with inner rooms. Possible explanations for the frequency of inner rooms among Selinuntine temples, together with that site’s idiosyncratic use of the inner chamber, are discussed below, pages 206–207.

**DEITY**

There is no consistent pattern that can justify linking any one god or goddess with temples that have inner rooms. Theories that associate worship
### Table 1: Greek Temples with Identified or Possible Inner Rooms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Date B.C.</th>
<th>Peristyle</th>
<th>Pronaos</th>
<th>Altar</th>
<th>Features*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mainland Greece</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aigina II</td>
<td>Aphaia</td>
<td>late 6th</td>
<td>6 x 12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>OT, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antikyra, Phokis</td>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>1st half 6th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>A inside east end</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td>Pythian Apollo</td>
<td>late 7th/early 6th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>Zeus Olympios</td>
<td>515</td>
<td>8 x 20(?)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aulis</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>5th?</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>As, OT, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassai</td>
<td>Apollo?</td>
<td>625–600</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bassai</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>late 5th</td>
<td>6 x 15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brauron</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>2nd quarter 5th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dodona</td>
<td>Zeus?</td>
<td>last quarter 3rd</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halai Aixonides</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>500/mid 4th</td>
<td>added</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>OT, Bs, throne in cella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halai Araphenides</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>6th–4th</td>
<td>6 x 11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ikarion, Attica</td>
<td>Python</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>A, B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalapodi NI</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>457–426</td>
<td>6 x 14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalapodi NII</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>426–late 4th</td>
<td>6 x 14</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kombothekra</td>
<td>Artemis</td>
<td>6th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Longa, Messenia</td>
<td>(Building G)</td>
<td>last quarter 6th</td>
<td>6 x 12(?)</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemea</td>
<td>Zeus</td>
<td>3rd quarter 4th</td>
<td>6 x 12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oropos</td>
<td>Amphiaroos</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>OT, B in cella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paralimni, Boiotia</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perachora</td>
<td>Hera Akraia</td>
<td>3rd quarter 6th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>B in inner room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stymphalos</td>
<td>Artemis? Hera?</td>
<td>Hellenistic</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td>B at back of cella</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tegea</td>
<td>Athena Alea</td>
<td>late 7th</td>
<td>6 x 16</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cyclades</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iria, Naxos</td>
<td>Dionysos</td>
<td>570</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>prostyle x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Africa</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrene I</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>mid 6th</td>
<td>6 x 11 (added)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyrene</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>mid 4th</td>
<td>6 x 11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naukratis I</td>
<td>Aphrodite</td>
<td>7th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naukratis II</td>
<td>Aphrodite</td>
<td>late 5th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asia Minor</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didyma</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>8/9 x 17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>naiskos over spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didyma</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>10 x 21</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>naiskos over spring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Klaros</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>6 x 11</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyme</td>
<td>Aphrodite?</td>
<td>4th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samos</td>
<td>(North Building)</td>
<td>mid 6th/late 6th</td>
<td>- / 5 x 13</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>peristyle added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Magna Graecia</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimisa (Ciro)</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>2nd half 6th</td>
<td>7 x 15(?)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td>finds in inner room</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crimisa (Ciro)</td>
<td>Apollo</td>
<td>1st quarter 3rd</td>
<td>8 x 19</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foce del Sele</td>
<td>Hera</td>
<td>510–500</td>
<td>8 x 17</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>OT or B in cella</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 1, CONTINUED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Dedication</th>
<th>Date B.C.</th>
<th>Peristyle</th>
<th>Pronaos</th>
<th>Altar</th>
<th>Features*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Francavilla, Marittima</td>
<td>(Building II)</td>
<td>2nd half 6th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipponion</td>
<td>(Belvedere Temple)</td>
<td>ca. 500</td>
<td>6 x ?</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locri Epizephyrii</td>
<td>Athena</td>
<td>early 5th</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontum</td>
<td>Hera (Temple B)</td>
<td>560/540</td>
<td>9 x 17/7 x 15</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>B in cella?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metapontum</td>
<td>Hera</td>
<td>520–510</td>
<td>6 x 12</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Tavole Palatine)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paestum</td>
<td>Hera (“Basilica”)</td>
<td>(560) 530</td>
<td>9 x 18</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>B(?) at cella rear?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SICILY

| Agrigento                   | (East of Gate 5)    | 3rd quarter 6th | - | x | - | - |
| Camarina                    | Athena?             | early 5th       | - | x | ? | - |
| Gela                        | (Building VI)       | 6th             | - | - | ? | - |
| Himera A                    | Athena?             | 625             | - | - | x | B in inner room |
| Himera B                    | Herakles?           | 575             | - | - | x | - |
| Monte Adranone              | Demeter and         | early 4th       | - | - | x | round B in cella: A? |
|                             | Persephone          |                 |   |   |   |   |
| Monte Iato                  | Aphrodite           | 3rd quarter 6th | - | - | ? | deposits in inner room |
| Morgantina                  | ?                   | 3rd quarter 6th | - | - | ? | - |
| Selinous, Acropolis         | (Megaron)           | early 6th/5th   | - | x | ? | - |
| Selinous, Acropolis         | (Temple C)          | ca. 550         | 6 x 17 | x | x | area for OT or B in cella? |
| Selinous, Acropolis         | (Temple D)          | 535             | 6 x 13  | x | x | B(?) cuttings in inner room |
| Selinous, Acropolis         | (Temple A)          | mid 5th         | 6 x 14  | x | ? | B cuttings in inner room |
| Selinous, Acropolis         | (Temple O)          | last quarter 5th | 6 x 14 | x | ? | - |
| Selinous, East Hill          | Hera (Temple E¹)    | 2nd quarter 5th | 6 x 15 | x | x | - |
| Selinous, East Hill          | (Temple GT)         | 2nd half 6th    | 8 x 17  | x | - | - |
| Selinous, Gaggara           | Demeter             | 580             | -       | x | x | - |
|                             | Malophoros          |                 |   |   |   |   |
| Selinous, Triolo N          | Hera                | 1st quarter 6th | - | - | ? | As, B in cella, inner room |
| Syracuse                    | Apollo              | early 6th       | 6 x 17  | x | ? | - |

POSSIBLE INNER ROOMS, REMAINS INSUFFICIENT

| Aigina I                    | Aphaia              |       |         |       |       | A         |
| Corfu                       | Artemis             |       |         |       |       |          |
| Corfu, Roda                 | ?                   |       |         |       |       |          |
| Delphi                      | Apollo              |       |         |       |       |          |
| Ephesos                     | Artemis             |       |         |       |       |          |
| Kephallenia, Skala          | ?                   |       |         |       |       |          |
| Longa                       | ?                   |       |         |       |       |          |
| Plateae                     | Hera                |       |         |       |       |          |
| Selinous, East Hill         | Hera (Temple E¹)    |       |         |       |       |          |
| Selinous, East Hill         | (Temple F)          |       |         |       |       |          |
| Sikyon                      | ?                   |       |         |       |       |          |
| Tegea                       | Artemis Knakeatis   |       |         |       |       |          |

*A = altar, OT = offering table, B = base*
of specific goddesses, such as Demeter and Kore or Artemis, with the presence of inner rooms in temples have been based on the assumption that the dark, inaccessible, cavelike nature of inner rooms suggests ties to the underworld and chthonian deities, a premise supported by labeling such rooms “adyta.” Presumably, private and mysterious rites took place in this sanctum sanctorum of the temple. Such an interpretation may be questioned on both general and specific grounds. Several scholars have challenged the strict categorization of gods as chthonian or Olympian. Van Straten cites Rudhardt’s work demonstrating that “it is not possible to single out one particular sort of sacrifice that is typical of chthonian deities.” 30 Scullion and Schlesier have explored the validity of these distinctions even further. 31

Nevertheless, scholars have considered sanctuaries dedicated to Demeter and Persephone, or even just to Demeter, as potentially chthonian in the character of ritual. 32 A statement by Cicero (Ver. II, 4.48.106), *vetus est haec opinio . . . insulam Siciliam totam esse Cereri et Liberae consecratam,* and Diodorus’ account locating Persephone’s abduction at Enna (5.3–5, 68–69) have suggested that worship of the mother-daughter pair was characteristically Sicilian. Citing Cicero and Diodorus, Langlotz, Gruben, and others have supposed that the frequent occurrence of inner rooms in Sicilian temples reflects the chthonian nature of Demeter and Persephone, and of their worship. 33 In fact, Table 1 demonstrates that worship of Demeter does not show significant association with temples with inner rooms in Sicily or elsewhere. Only three temples dedicated to Demeter have inner rooms. Sanctuaries (few of them with temples) dedicated to Demeter and Persephone have been identified in Sicily at Agrigento, Camarina (Fig. 1), Eloro, Enna, Gela, Megara Hyblaea, Morgantina, Selinous, Syracuse, and Vassallaggi. 34 However, only one Sicilian temple, dedicated to Malophoros


On the blurred distinctions between Olympian and chthonian, see Nock 1944, 1962. For recent work on altars, see Étienne 1992 and Le Dinahet 1991.


32. On the other hand, in his fundamental study of Persephone, Zuntz (1971, pp. 399–400) points out that Demeter is a goddess of the fertile earth (χώρων), while only Persephone is a deity of the netherworld. The phrase χώρων θεοί applies to both deities, but their natures are distinct.


34. White 1984, pp. 29, 123. There are few extant temples of Demeter, and none are characterized by inner rooms. For worship of Demeter elsewhere in the Greek world, see Cole 1994; in Arkadia alone, see Jost 1985, pp. 297–355.
ADYTON, OPISTHODOMOS, AND THE INNER ROOM

Figure 1. Camarina, Temple of Athena.
After Pelagatti 1962, p. 253, fig. 4, and Mertens 1984, pl. 25:39

35. Gabrici 1927; Parisi Presicce 1984. Most of the temples at Selinous remain designated by letter, as there is too little information to attribute them to specific deities; see below, p. 206.


38. Schwandner 1985, pp. 108, 111. Tegea is Schwandner’s own revision (p. 102, notes 110, 111) of Rhomaios’s reconstructed amphiprostyle temple; see Rhomaios 1952. In opposition to Schwandner, Lambrinoudakis (1991, p. 188, note 40) states that “the distinction of types of buildings for use in mystic or regular cult was not very strict in antiquity.”


(presumably Demeter) at Selinous, has an inner room, and a contemporary temple nearby of similar architectural form, also with an inner room, was probably dedicated to Hera.35 The architectural and archaeological remains of other Sicilian sanctuaries of Demeter and Persephone vary in form, without much consistency among them.36 In Sicily and elsewhere, temples with inner rooms are dedicated to Hera, Aphrodite, Dionysos, Athena, Apollo, and Artemis.

Travlos and Schwandner have linked worship of Artemis with inner rooms. Travlos has proposed that the chthonian aspects of Artemis associated with Iphigeneia were expressed by the presence of inner rooms in the temples at Brauron, Halai Araphenides, and Aulis.37 Without specifying the nature of the cult, Schwandner adds temples of Artemis at Tegea and Kombaethra, as well as the older Temple of Aphaia on Aigina, to Travlos’s three examples. He bases his grouping on architectural form, especially the prostyle facade and the oikos form with inner room.38 The temple at Halai Araphenides is peripteral, however, and the proportions of the different temples vary widely. The nature of Artemis herself varies enough to cause skepticism that she would be honored in the same way (requiring an inner room) at different sites. What we know of rites for Artemis at Brauron, for example, involving women and childbirth, and a rite of passage for young girls, the arkteia, suggests a fundamentally different behavior than that prescribed for the nearby (4 miles north) sanctuary of Artemis Tauropolos at Halai Araphenides, where Euripides describes a ritual in which a priest draws a knife across a man’s throat (IT, lines 1456–1458).39 Artemis especially among Greek deities is a complex figure who was worshiped along with such ancillary figures as the nymph Aphaia or Iphigeneia.40 Without consistency in the goddess’s own persona, it seems unlikely that Artemis was celebrated with the same rites requiring the same architectural configuration at six different temples.
Peristyle

Many temples with inner rooms do not have peristyles. The oikos type of temple design (one to three successive rooms with a simple doorway in the middle of the facade) and the megaron type (one to three successive rooms whose first chamber is a porch with columns in antis) reflect an older, simpler building tradition in which interior space was added by extending the length of the flank walls, in preference to the structurally difficult alternative of increasing the roof span. Increased interior length provided opportunity for subdivision into an additional back room, a construction strategy that persisted in small-scale temples even when peripteral temples had become the norm at wealthy sites. To be sure, several of the nonperipteral temples listed in Table 1 (at Aulis, Iria on Naxos, Brauron, Tegea, and Cyrene I) achieved such breadth that interior supports were included in the cela. Some nonperipteral 6th-century temples, such as Temple E at Selinous, the Temple of Apollo at Bassai, the Temple of Apollo at Cyrene, and possibly the Temple of Aphaia on Aigina, were later succeeded by peripteral temples whose interior arrangements, with an inner room, seem to reflect those of the predecessors. Other 6th-century temples at, for example, Metapontum (Tavole Palatine and Temple B), Selinous (Temple C), and Foce del Sele, as well as several of the 5th century, were peripteral from the beginning (Figs. 2, 3). The inner room clearly evolved from practical considerations of oikos design (a tradition perpetuated in temples in lesser sanctuaries), but overall it does not appear to be tied predictably to the presence or absence of a peristyle.

Altars

The inner rooms themselves are, for the most part, very small, especially compared to the area of the cela. The inner chamber of the Temple of Dionysos at Iria, Naxos, for example, was only 2.24 m deep (by 10.59 m wide) behind a cela 18.45 m deep (Fig. 4). At Halai Araphenides the interior of the inner room was ca. 3.5 m deep while the cela was ca. 7.5 m deep (Fig. 5). Economy of space, rather than monumentality, seems to have been important for most inner rooms. In terms of function, such rooms could accommodate very few people at any one time. If special rituals took place here, there were not many witnesses. Whatever occurred behind the cela was too restricted and too private to justify fully the temple’s role in religious life.

The central act of Greek religious observance was sacrifice, of animal or grain, cakes or liquids, at an open-air altar. It was a communal celebration. At many sanctuaries, altars existed before the first temples. The presence of an altar formally related to a temple (i.e., opposite the east facade) or in close proximity (see Table 1) would seem to indicate that the primary religious enactment took place outside the temple. It seems improbable that the inner room of a temple with an external altar would also house an important private ritual. At Selinous’s sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros, for example, quantities of terracotta votives were found outside the temple, around the altar, furnishing strong evidence of ritual behavior centered on the altar, not the inner room. For other sites (de-
Figure 2. Metapontum, Tavole Palatine, Temple of Hera.
After LoPorto 1981, p. 29, fig. 7, and Mertens 1973, pl. XLVIII

Figure 3. Foce del Sele, Temple of Hera.
After Krauss 1951, pl. XXVI
noted in the table with a question mark) such as Syracuse, where the Temple of Apollo is surrounded by dense modern occupation, limitations on excavation have made it impossible to determine whether an external altar existed.

**Physical Form**

What information can we glean from the inner rooms themselves? When the doorway to an inner room lies off the longitudinal axis of the temple, as at Ikarion and Stymphalos, the inner room appears to be less important in the architectural scheme of the temple, and less of a focus for a visitor's attention. The doorway is displaced so far to one side as to suggest intentional de-emphasis of access to the inner room. Comparable irregularities of alignment in the temples at Naukratis (Aphrodite II), Cape Zoster (ancient Halai Aixonides), and in the Late Archaic Temple of Aphaia on Aigina can be attributed to later remodeling of the respective cellas.

Temples that show signs of architectural modification to create inner chambers are more likely to demonstrate a belated recognition of a practical need for security than new kinds of cult behavior.\(^{43}\) The late-6th-century Temple A at Himera, for example, has a crosswall whose masonry

\(^{43}\) On the other hand, Mertens has shown that the interior arrangement of the Temple of Hera I at Paestum was modified in the course of its construction, a change he attributes to requirements of the cult (Mertens 1993, p. 92, and pl. XVIII). Without more evidence I am reluctant to agree that the change reflects religious behavior.
differs from that of the adjacent flank walls, and so may have been added (Fig. 6). Discrepancies in building-stone indicate that the 6th-century megaron south of Temple C at Selinous may have been given its inner room considerably later, in the 5th century. In the Late Archaic Temple of Aphaia (II) on Aigina, an off-center doorway was later opened in the back wall of the cela and the back porch was closed with grilles to form an inner chamber. Cuttings between the antae and the columns attest the adding of grilles to create a secured, fenced-off porch. (Grilles across the pronaos also made a chamber of the front porch, a common occurrence in many temples.) The modest Temple of Apollo at Cape Zoster of ca. 500 B.C. was also given an inner room after its initial construction, with the addition of a crosswall in the 4th century B.C. (Fig. 7). The tiny (2.0 x 2.5 m interior) inner room was appended to the Amphiaraios at Oropos in the later 4th century (Fig. 8).

If the inner chambers at these five temples were intended to accommodate special cult practices, we might reasonably suppose they would be incorporated into the original plan and construction of the temple. Ritual is rarely a late development in religious behavior. On the other hand, es-

44. Bonacasa 1970. This difference in masonry techniques, with smaller stones used in the crosswall, may simply reflect differences in the construction of interior and exterior walls.
tablished cult centers did grow wealthy over time, and known repositories of treasure became vulnerable to thievery. A small enclosure might be added to or created within an existing temple to ensure the safety of valuable votives or other deposits. Even the fencing of the cult statue, indicated by cuttings in the paving and walls such as are found in the Temples of Zeus at Olympia, Athena at Sounion, and Athena at Priene, might be considered a comparable change intended to protect the statue and the dedications around it.45

Features

The chance nature of archaeological preservation and discovery presents problems in interpreting temple function from features and furnishings excavated within cellas or inner rooms. Altars, offering tables, and statue bases (not always distinct classifications) can provide diagnostic information as to how a space was used, provided that they are contemporary with primary temple use.46 Small cylindrical or rectilinear blocks, often with cuttings on their upper surfaces, have been identified as interior altars at Antikyra (at the east end), Aulis (two small cylinders in the inner room), Ikarion (in the cella), Monte Adranone (a round block in the cella, possibly a statue base), and at Selinous in the temple to Hera at Triolo North (Fig. 9), which accommodated three altars in the cella and three in the inner room. Such multiple small altars asymmetrically placed in various rooms within temples do not give the impression of major cult foci when compared with exterior altars.

Only four secure examples of offering tables are known. In the Late Archaic Temple of Aphaia (II) on Aigina, the large block in the back porch converted to an inner room is considered an offering table; a 4th-century example was found in the cella of the Temple of Apollo at Cape Zoster; there is an offering table, also mentioned in an inscription, in the cella of the 4th-century Temple of Amphiarao at Oropos; the fourth is from the inner room of the Temple of Artemis at Aulis. Some scholars interpret the group of blocks at the rear of the cella of the Temple of Hera at Foce del Sele as an offering table, while others consider it a statue base.47

There is much more evidence for statue bases within temples.48 Since several temples also had more than one base in the cella (e.g., at Cape Zoster and Ikarion), we cannot assume that every base supported a cult statue. Indeed, some have recently questioned whether every temple had a cult statue.49 Three temples (Hera Akraia at Perachora, A at Himera, and E3 at Selinous) have bases, presumably for statues, inside inner rooms. There are also cuttings in the paving of the inner room of Temple A and possibly in Temple D, both at Selinous.

Seven temples with inner rooms have possible or certain statue bases in the cella: Metapontum Temple B, the Temple of Hera at Paestum, the Heraion at Foce del Sele, those at Ikarion, Stymphalos, and Aulis, and the Temple of Apollo at Cape Zoster, which has three bases and a throne in the cella. In addition, an unpaved area (6.1 x 4.9 m) of the cella of Temple C at Selinous may indicate the former presence of a statue base, offering table, or some other furnishing. Cuttings in the paving blocks of the Late


49. Donohue 1997; Miller 1996.
Archaic Temple of Aphaia on Aigina (II) imply that a statue base or comparable object was once placed there.

One must interpret the presence of bases with caution, however, since furnishings in situ at the time of excavation represent the latest use of a temple. At Aulis, for instance, a variety of bases were found in situ in the cela, and three statues of Hellenistic and Roman date came from the fill of the temple, which obviously had a long floruit, since it received a new prostyle porch in the 2nd century A.C. It is scarcely appropriate to reconstruct religious practice of the 5th or 4th century B.C., when the temple was built, on the basis of furnishings from the 2nd century A.C. Likewise, the three large cult statues from the inner room of the 3rd-century B.C. Temple of Apollo at Klaros have been dated to the 2nd century A.C., when the temple and its surroundings underwent a major remodeling. We do not know what constituted the interior furnishings contemporary with the temple’s initial Hellenistic construction and use.50

Equally difficult to assess as furnishings are the objects found within temples. How are we to interpret dense concentrations of small finds from inner rooms at, for example, Kombothekra (Fig. 10) or Crimisa? Does this evidence guarantee that ritual took place within, or simply that votives were placed there for storage? Two votive deposits, one Archaic, the other Hellenistic in date, were excavated in the inner room of the Temple of Aphrodite at Monte Iato (Fig. 11).51 The temple attributed to Hera at Triolo North, Selinous, had ash mixed with animal bones in the soil of its inner room. Does this sole example mean that burning took place within the confines of the inner room? Or is it a deposit of debris from a sacrifice performed elsewhere?52 A round, clay-filled installation in the cela of the 6th-century Temple of Apollo at Cyrene is the lone example of a hearth in situ among temples with inner rooms.53 At present, we cannot formulate a secure interpretation of the inner room from the sparse number of small finds found in situ.

52. Alroth (1988, p. 203) cites deposits at several sites of ash mixed with bones and figurines. See also White 1967, discussing a stratum of ash and bones (which he dates to 409–250 B.C.) in the Malophoros temple.  
Selinous

The remarkable site of Selinous, with three clusters of temples, merits special consideration in any discussion of inner rooms. Omit Selinous, and Sicily does not boast an unusual proportion of temples with inner rooms. The nine Selinuntine temples (six of them peripteral) with inner rooms demonstrate enough consistency of form to indicate a local tradition of temple design. Unfortunately, there is insufficient evidence to attribute most of these temples to specific deities; aside from the temple to Malophoros and its nearby counterpart dedicated to Hera, only Temple E has been associated securely with a divinity (Hera). None of the temples on either the acropolis or the Marinella Plateau had closable doors between the cela and the inner room. Indeed the openings between the chambers in Temples C, A, and E are unusually wide, negating any impression of restricted access. Control of entry to these temples undoubtedly would have been exercised at the front of the building, where Temple C had a closed pronaos with a door or grille, Temples D and E had cuttings for doors or grilles between columns of the pronaos, and Temple GT shows evidence for doors in the wall between pronaos and cela. These temples could be made secure, but such measures had nothing to do with the inner room.

The wide doorways in crosswalls between cela and inner room, the presence of a base for a statue on axis at the back of the innermost room in Temple E, and the small size of the inner rooms, as well as the progressive elevation in floor levels of these Selinuntine temples—from stylobate of pronaos up to cela up to inner room—all suggest that at this site the inner room served primarily as an architectural frame for a special object, probably the cult statue. The inner room would articulate and define the space around the statue so as to enhance its visual impact.

As suggested above, the logical explanation for the recurrence of one aspect of temple design at a single site is local tradition, and the inner room is but one element of a Selinuntine concept of temple form. Together with the rise in floor levels along the longitudinal axis, the inner room would have given focus and emphasis to a culminating point, presumably a statue. Protection of the dedications and the statue was accomplished at the pronaos door, and so the inner room was not needed for security purposes. Such a singular localized use of the inner room could have been developed at Selinous, where quantities of temples were built in the 6th and 5th centuries B.C., and should be considered a special case.

To summarize, much of the information in Table 1 negates common assumptions about inner rooms. These chambers are widely distributed, from the Aegean to western Sicily, and cannot be securely associated with worship of a particular deity. Finds and furnishings from temples with inner rooms are so sporadic and chronologically varied as to be of little value to this broad survey. Architectural form is also variable, but more informative. At Selinous we can isolate a marked consistency of temple design, with a closable pronaos one level above the stylobate, leading up another step to a long narrow cela with a still higher inner room reached through a broad doorway. Elsewhere, significant numbers of inner rooms convey

54. Tusa 1966 with bibliography; Manni 1975; Bejor 1977. For plans and discussion of the temples of Selinous, see Mertens 1984.
55. It is likely, but not certain, that Temple E, the 8th(?)-century B.C. predecessor to Temple E, was similarly organized: Gullini 1977, 1978, 1981, 1985; Romeo 1989, p. 43, no. 68.
the opposite message, of architectural de-emphasis, as indicated by placement of the doorway off the temple's central axis, or by the appearance of the inner room as secondary construction. The inner rooms of Selinous appear to have been designed for display, while those elsewhere seem to have served a more practical need, perhaps that of secure storage.

**Discussion**

These surveys of nomenclature and temple remains make it clear that terminology was used with great flexibility in antiquity. “Hieron” and “naos” are most commonly, but not exclusively, used for temples. “Adyton” refers to a location for a mysterious religious event, such as an oracular pronouncement or a healing experience, but only in exceptional cases (e.g., at Delphi and Didyma) is the adyton described as part of a temple. The convention of calling the inner room of any temple an adyton is erroneous and misleading, in that “adyton” does not denote a specific form, and it does suggest functions for which there is often little or no supporting evidence. The presence of an inner space (labeled adyton) ca. 2 meters lower than the adjacent paving of the Temple of Zeus at Nemea has been taken by one scholar as confirmation that the temple housed an oracle. At Perachora, Payne considered the inner room of the 6th-century B.C. Temple of Hera Akraia to be the seat of an oracle mentioned only by Strabo (8.380), though Tomlinson is skeptical. Comparable expectations arising from the connotations of “adyton,” together with architectural form, have also led to interpretation of inner rooms as sites for secret rituals for chthonian deities.

Ancient literary sources and inscriptions provide the most useful information about how temple interiors were experienced. The paucity of early testimonia, however, leads us to rely on accounts that postdate the construction and primary use of most temples; all such information therefore requires circumspect interpretation. Herodas’ 4th Mime, of the 3rd century B.C., provides the most complete narrative of a visit to a temple. After sacrificing a cock, two women enter a temple of Asklepios (perhaps at the famous sanctuary on Kos), dedicate a pinax, and look around, admiring five statues and then a painting. No one sculpture is explicitly identified as a cult statue, though the first-mentioned could be. It is characterized only as resting on a base inscribed with the names of Praxiteles’ sons and the donor. The subjects of the other statues (a girl looking up at an apple, an old man, a child choking a goose, and a statue of Batale, daughter of Myttos) make them improbable candidates for the cult statue. After noting these objects, one woman remarks, in literal usage, τὰ χαλέυς "Tapa kalvetai o παιδίς (lines 55–56). In literal usage, παιδίς refers to a bridal chamber or its curtain; in Herodas it indicates the innermost part of the temple or a curtain partitioning off such an inner sector. Whether chamber or curtain, the bridal metaphor implies that special treasures were kept safe within, not that secret rituals were about to take place. Once the inner temple has been opened, the women exclaim over a painting by Apelles. Security for special possessions is clearly emphasized more than secrecy or mystery.

A 4th-century B.C. inventory from Samos also records a curtain hanging in front of “the goddess.” Irene B. Romano suggests that this curtain might have served to limit viewing of the cult statue. While some temples,
like Herodas’ Asklepieion, were apparently open to visitors, who might pray before the cult statue, offer gifts to the deity, or simply look around at the dedications and decorations, others were more restricted. Recognizing that such discretionary conditions are susceptible to change over time, and are not reliable as indicators of pre-Hellenistic behavior, we may note that Pausanias cites twelve examples of access to temple interiors limited according to gender, priestly status, or calendar.64 He notes in his account (2.10.2.4) of sanctuaries of Asklepios and of Aphrodite at Sikyon that in the former, the inner room (τὸ ἐνδοτέρω), dedicated to Apollo, housed a chryselephantine statue of the god and was restricted to priests (for reasons of piety, or security?). In the sanctuary of Aphrodite, Pausanias points out that visitors had to view the chryselephantine statue ἀπὸ τῆς ἐσόδου... καὶ οὐτὸθεν προσεκεχώθαι. Only two female attendants were permitted in this sanctuary. The two structures in question, for which Pausanias uses the general term “hieron,” not “naos” (though his context strongly implies temple structures), have not been securely associated with excavated archaeological remains. Nevertheless, his description makes it clear that access to some temples or parts of temples was specifically limited and controlled. What is not clear is whether such restrictions were based on religious concerns, or if they reflect the value of the respective gold and ivory statues. Perhaps both were factors. There is no report of special rites performed for those fortunate enough to approach a statue or view it in a temple with limited access.

Written testimonia attest that there was cause to worry about the safety of some cult statues. From traditional tales and legends surrounding special images we may extract the Greeks’ concern for their security. Images such as the statue of Athena Polias in the Erechtheion in Athens and the Tauric figure at Halai Araphenides were described as old, wooden, and portable venerated symbols.65 Others, such as the statue of Apollo that Pausanias noted (10.24.5) in the inner room of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, were of gold or precious materials. Herodotus (5.82–86) recounts a tale of political plundering, the Aiginetans stealing special olive wood images of Damia and Auxesia from Epidaurus, and the Athenians subsequently trying (in vain) to dislodge the two statues for purposes of removal. Diodorus (10.28.1–3) reports how Hippocrates of Gela thwarted the sacrilegious theft of gold from the statue of Zeus in his temple at Syracuse. Another tale, of Argives bribing Tyrrenians to steal the image of Samian Hera, reported by Menodotos of Samos, is repeated by Athenaios (15.672). Patently aetiological, this story includes an architectural detail: ἄθρου δὲ ἄντος τότε τοῦ νεῶ ταχέως ἀνέλεσθαι τὸ βρέτας. By noting the absence of a door in the temple, the author implies that it was an unusual circumstance. For reasons political, pecuniary, and perhaps magical, it was important to secure cult images.

Statues were not the only treasures to be protected. Temples and sanctuaries were filled with votive gifts ranging from modest terracotta figurines to inlaid chests, from garments to gold crowns. In addition to their religious purpose, these dedications constituted portable wealth. Van Straten has gathered both written and archaeological evidence in analyzing why and how Greeks gave gifts to their deities. Citing Pausanias (2.11.6 and 3.20.1), he states emphatically that “[Greek temples] were sometimes so

full that the cult-image could hardly ever be seen. All the walls were decked with votive tablets, festoons, wreaths, and it was only with the greatest difficulty that the believer made his way past the votive offerings standing all over the place."66

Extensive inscribed inventories record in detail consecrated objects stored in temples on the Athenian Akropolis, in the Asklepieion at Athens, in the Temple of Artemis at Brauron, and in the sanctuary of Apollo at Delos.67 The gifts in the Akropolis temples were especially grand, including gold and silver, bronze vessels, and elaborate inlaid furniture. Thucydides, in his account (2.15.2–4) of Perikles’ assessment of the resources available to Athens at the outbreak of the Peloponnesian War, refers to gold and silver offerings, sacred vessels, and temple treasures, even the gold on the chryselephantine statue of Athena Parthenos, if it were needed. Although the Athenians, in desperation, did melt down the golden Nikai for coin in the acute crisis in 407/6 B.C., they took care to restore them under Lykourgos in the 4th century. This was certainly an exceptional use of temple treasures, for usually what was given to a deity stayed in the god’s possession.68

Elsewhere, gold and silver were less common than objects of bronze or wood, or linen garments, described as located within the temple at, for example, Brauron or the Athenian Asklepieion. Thucydides (6.46) mentions silver vessels as offerings in the Temple of Aphrodite at Eryx in Sicily, in his account of the deception of Nikias and his colleagues by Segesta. At a much later date, the valuable contents of Greek temples in Sicily are amply enumerated by Cicero (Ver. 2, passim) as he describes their despoliation. He recounts, for example, Verres’ removal of at least twenty-eight paintings from the Temple of Minerva at Syracuse (Ver. 2, 4.55).

In addition to dedications kept for a god, some temples stored money. Inscribed accounts from several sites record financial transactions of temple administrators, including rental of real estate properties owned by the cult, loaning temple funds at interest, and payments for operation and maintenance of the respective sanctuaries.69 Indeed, cult-based activities represented a substantial segment of the ancient Greek economy.70 IG I 386–387, a 5th-century B.C. inventory from Eleusis, lists large amounts of building materials on hand (wood, roof tiles, marble in various forms), presumably for ongoing maintenance and construction in the sanctuary, as well as a large assortment of tools and hardware.71 Accounts from the 3rd and 2nd centuries B.C. on Delos record expenditures for firewood, torches, wages for employees (e.g., braiders of garlands, a flute player), and mundane maintenance such as cleaning.72 At Delos there was a “sacred chest” for sanctuary funds, while public funds were kept in the “public chest.” The two funds were sometimes held in the Temple of Artemis, sometimes in the Temple of Apollo, and sometimes in both.73 According to my interpretation of the Opisthodomos on the Akropolis (below, pp. 210–213), the treasures of the Athenian state were kept in the rear chamber of the Periklean Parthenon in Athens. Most Greek temples would have housed a cult statue and votives. Operating funds for the cult also must have been kept in many temples, and sometimes public monies as well.

For most communities, the temple was the largest and most solidly built structure and probably the most secure, a logical place of deposit for the resources of both cult and state. Thievery from sanctuaries was thus a
continuing concern. In addition to the political abduction of cult images, temples were commonly looted by enemies and conquerors. Everyday larceny of consecrated gifts by ἵπποσύλως was a more immediate problem. IG 13 45 provides for Kallikrates’ 5th-century b.c. repair of the enclosure wall of the Athenian Akropolis, for the explicit purpose of keeping out any runaway slave (who might find asylum there) and any λωποδύτης, thief (garment thief, but a term equivalent to “thief”). At the Athenian Asklepieion some votives were placed “in the keeping of the priest,” indicating that special precautions were taken for their security. Aleshire observes that “certain dedications which seem to have been especially valuable were stored in special places or places which were somewhat more difficult of access than were the walls of the temple.”

The consistent theme among these testimonia, that of concern for the treasures of a sanctuary, is reinforced by evidence of doors and grilles—and perhaps inner rooms—in extant temple remains.

**TERMINOLOGY: “OPISTHODOMOS”**

The archaeological evidence for inner rooms and associated objects, together with literary accounts of activities in and around temples, suggests that these inner chambers served as secure storage areas. Their function may be compared to that of the Opisthodomos on the Athenian Akropolis. In its broadest sense, the term “opisthodomos” (ἑπιστ.widget, “behind,” “in back of,” and δωμος, “house,” “room of a house,” “temple,” or “room of a temple”) refers to a structural element located behind something, to which it is also subordinate. The earliest known use of the term “opisthodomos” occurs in the decrees of Kallias (IG 1 52A, B) of 434/3 B.C., which refer to treasures kept in a structure consistently identified as the Opisthodomos on the Akropolis, and assign responsibility for them to the Treasurers of the Other Gods. In the ensuing inventory lists, the Opisthodomos on the Akropolis is mentioned as the present or former repository of specific inventoried valuables in more than a dozen inscriptions dating from early in the 4th century B.C. through its last decades. Vases of gold and silver, gilded baskets, incense burners, boxes and chests of wood and bronze, some covered with gold and silver, gems, seals, jewelry, items of ivory, fragments of precious metal, coins, tools for coining money, and boxes of arrowheads were among the objects in the Opisthodomos at one time or another.

Decree A of the Kallias decrees specifies (lines 17–18) that the Treasurers of the Other Gods, together with the Treasurers of Athena, were to open, close, and seal the doors of the Opisthodomos. Decree B (lines 23–25) states that the treasures of Athena were kept on the right side of the Opisthodomos, while those of the Other Gods were kept on the left. Such
83. Ferguson 1932, pp. 131–132, 138; Linders 1975, pp. 46–47. Harris (1995, p. 61) observes that "most of the objects inventoried in the Opisthodomos are made of gold and silver. These were valuable for their material and would have been useful in case an emergency minting was required."
84. Dübner 1969, p. 386.
85. Dilts 1986, p. 361, on Or. 24.136; also Dinsmoor 1932.
86. IG I2 207, of the 420s B.C., mentions (lines 16–17) a column erected behind the Opisthodomos, but we remain ignorant of what the Opisthodomos itself lay behind. Some have assumed that such a topographical reference means that the Opisthodomos was a freestanding structure; in fact, it could simply have been a well-known place.
87. Harris 1995, pp. 201–202; Ridgway 1992, esp. pp. 125–127; Roux 1984a; Paton 1927. Jeppesen (1987, which includes 1979 and 1983) accepts we remain ignorant of what the Opisthodomos itself lay behind. Some have assumed that such a topographical reference means that the Opisthodomos was a freestanding structure; in fact, it could simply have been a well-known place.

is the only epigraphic evidence regarding the physical aspects of the Opisthodomos—it had closable, sealable doors and enough interior volume for two categories of treasures kept physically separate.

Contemporary literary sources make it clear that the Opisthodomos in the latter 5th and the 4th century B.C. was considered a repository of substantial wealth, and probably held the state bank. Aristophanes’ Ploutos, performed in 388 B.C., simply mentions the return of Wealth to his abode on the Akropolis: τὸν ὀπισθόδομον ἀεὶ φυλάττων τῆς θεοῦ (line 1193). Demosthenes (On Organization 14) reports the Athenians’ distress when the Opisthodomos was found open, which implies a break-in. He also refers (Against Timocrates 136) to the pretrial detention of the Tamiai of Athena and of the Other Gods, under whose tenure the Opisthodomos was set on fire. The scholia on the Ploutos reiterate that χρήματα were kept in the Opisthodomos, a θησαυροφυλάκιον located by this source behind the naos of Athena Polias. The scholia on Demosthenes’ allusion to indicted Tamiai offer more titillating information, that certain Treasurers burned the Opisthodomos to cover up their own financial malfeasance, whether outright theft or secretly contracted bad loans. The function of the Athenian Opisthodomos, as safe storage for treasures, is thus well documented, even though we lack secure evidence for what this Opisthodomos was or where it was located.

Structures called the Old Temple, Proneos, Parthenon, Hekatompedon, and Opisthodomos all housed votives, according to 5th- and 4th-century inventories. The Old Temple is generally accepted as the building customarily called the Erechtheion, on the north side of the Akropolis, and the Proneos is assumed to be the front porch of the temple all now call the Parthenon. Attribution of the three other terms to structures on the Akropolis is problematical. The Parthenon and the Hekatompedon are usually assigned to chambers of Perikles’ great Doric temple, while the Opisthodomos has been given a theoretical home. Dörpfeld, followed by Dinsmoor, proposed that the Opisthodomos was the last standing remnant of the Peisistratid temple on the north side of the Akropolis. The extant foundations of this 6th-century temple suggest the original presence of two rooms behind the cela reached from a westward-facing chamber. In the absence of three chambers in the Periklean Doric temple (on the south) to suit the place-names in the inscriptions, Dörpfeld essentially created a hypothetical Opisthodomos that has achieved credibility through sheer longevity. But why would an old utilitarian structure be retained for so long while aesthetically sophisticated buildings were constructed all around it? If it were still standing, why was the Porch of the Maidens built so close to such an old relic of a building?

Among the physical remains on the Akropolis, the west-facing chamber of Iktinos and Kallikrates’ Doric temple had ample space for treasures and was secured by large, heavy doors. To reconcile epigraphical and archaeological evidence, Roux has argued for greater flexibility in the interpretation of “Parthenon” and “Hekatompedon” in the inventories. Citing “l’imprécision du vocabulary, dont on trouve tant d’autres exemples dans les comptes et inventaires,” he suggests that both terms may be used for the cela with the chryselephantine Athena. “Opisthodomos” must therefore mean the chamber behind it, certainly a logical attribution in light of
the function described and the physical evidence of a structure well suited to being a repository of valuables and wealth. Such an attribution, to an ample closed space, also suits Plutarch’s account (Demetr. 23.3) of Demetrius Poliorketes inhabiting the opisthodomos of the Parthenon. For the Athenians, then, the term “opisthodomos” meant a particular structure with special financial associations. Among testimonia from elsewhere, there are sometimes pecuniary overtones accompanying the term “opisthodomos,” which probably reflects the reputation of the Athenian treasure house.

Inscriptions from the Athenian Akropolis mention what seems to be another opisthodomos, in the Chalkotheke. Despite close scrutiny by La Follette, who questions the existence of any opisthodomos here, and Downey, who proposes an opisthodomos at the west end of an arsenal-like building facing north and east, the epigraphical and archaeological evidence is too meager to make a convincing case either for or against a built structure identifiable as an opisthodomos in the Chalkotheke. A few items of ivory, gold, and silver recorded as being in this opisthodomos are overtly valuable and different in character from the military and ceremonial equipment in the rest of the Chalkotheke, so that a special storage arrangement would be appropriate. If we do not assume that an opisthodomos had only one canonical form, we can accept the possibility, presented by the inventories, of an opisthodomos in the Chalkotheke. An inscription from Delos dated just after 166 B.C. records items in the Temples of Apollo and Artemis, including τῶν ἐν τοῖς ὀπισθοῦσιν χαλκωμάτων, an ambiguous phrase that may indicate an opisthodomos of a chalkotheke, or of the Temple of Apollo.

Most often, “opisthodomos” is the term for the formal element that forms the counterpart to the pronaos or the prodomos, the porch or antechamber in front of the cella; ordinarily it refers to the back porch of a Greek temple, behind the cella. In accounts of the rebuilding of the Temple of Apollo at Delphi, a 4th-century B.C. inscription pairs πρόδομος and ὀπισθοῦσιν as areas from which water is to be diverted. A late-4th-century B.C. contract for adding a colonnade to the Temple of Asklepios on Lesbos includes work on (the extending of foundations to?) both πρόδομον καὶ τὸν ὀπισθοῦσιν. Among ancient authors, Varro (L. 5.33.160) explains the organization of a Greek temple as having a prodomos in front of the cella and an opisthodomos behind. Diodorus (14.41.6) notes arms manufacture as ubiquitous in Dionysius’ Syracuse, ἐν τοῖς προναοῖς καὶ τοῖς ὀπισθοῦσιν τῶν ἑρωῶν as well as in gymnasia and stoas of the agora. Such pairing of “prodomos” (or “pronaos”) and “opisthodomos” does not mean that their forms were identical, however. If in fact it simply indicates symmetrical location, at either end of the cella, then “opisthodomos” could indicate either a room or a porch. Nonetheless, etymology and parallel usage strongly suggest closely comparable parts of the temple.

More specific information is furnished by another 4th-century building inscription from Delphi, which lists two corner triglyphs of the opisthodomos porch, τὰς προστάσιας τὰς ἐν τῶι ὀπισθοῦσιν. Polybius (12.11.2) links τὰς ὀπισθοῦσιν στήλαις (a rare adjectival use) with lists of proxeni on temple doorposts (ἐν ταῖς φλιαῖσ τῶι νεῶν), also implying an externally visible porch.

Ancient literary testimonia, albeit from after the time of temple construction and primary use, support the convention of calling a back porch...
behind the cella an opisthodomos. Achilles Tatius (3.6.2–3) refers to a painting in an opisthodomos seen by those who had walked around the temple (περίηγεμεν τὸν νεών), which implies that the opisthodomos was at the back of the building. Dio Chrysostom (11.163.15) reports seeing the chest of Kypselos in the opisthodomos of the Temple of Hera at Olympia, and Pausanias notes that the opisthodomos column is of oak (5.16.1). The opisthodomos of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia is well attested by ancient sources. Pausanias identifies the subjects of the six metopes on the front of the temple, and then the six υπὲρ δὲ τοῦ ὁπισθόδωμου (5.10.9); elsewhere (5.13.1) he makes it clear that the opisthodomos is at the rear of the temple. Passages in Lucian refer to Herodotus reading his Histories from the opisthodomos of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia (Herod. 62.1), to Cynics filling the opisthodomos with noise (Fug. 7), and to the same opisthodomos full of vocal, angry people (Peregr. 32).

However common, this application is not universal. Four ancient authors use “opisthodomos” to indicate a back room, not a porch, and not always in a temple. Several inscriptions also suggest that a structure other than a temple could have an opisthodomos. Appian (BC 1.3.20) refers to rumors of murderous strangers brought into Scipio’s house at night via the opisthodomos (δι’ ὁπισθόδωμου), and Themistius (16.191a) mentions an image dedicated near the opisthodomos of the bouleuterion (πρὸς τῶν ὁπισθόδωμων τοῦ βουλευτηρίου). In each of these instances the opisthodomos is a back chamber of a building, but not the back porch of a temple.

We may conclude from this survey of the use of “opisthodomos” that (1) the Opisthodomos on the Athenian Akropolis was a well-known structure that housed the Athenian state treasury; it was probably the west-facing chamber behind the cella of the great Doric Temple of Athena (later called the Parthenon); (2) 4th-century B.C. inscriptions and later literary sources confirm that “opisthodomos” often refers to a rear counterpart to the pronaos, usually the back porch of a Greek temple; (3) “opisthodomos” is occasionally used for structures that are not temples.

The various functions of an opisthodomos could include storage, public recitation, arms manufacture, and perhaps habitation. No single architectural form can be inferred from available testimonia, only location behind something of greater architectural presence. Unlike “adyton,” the nature of which is defined by human behavior, “opisthodomos” indicates physical location. I would therefore propose broadening our interpretation of “opisthodomos” to apply to any chamber behind the cella in a Greek temple. In most cases, the back porch is indeed the opisthodomos, but in those less common temples with an enclosed room behind the cella, “opisthodomos” could have been an appropriate name for that inner chamber as well.

101. Two late inscriptions mention the term “opisthodomos,” but without sufficient context for useful interpretation. One is an inscription of Roman date from Balbura in Lycia: SEG XVII 710; Bean 1956, p. 141, no. 20; I am grateful to J. J. Coulton for bringing this example to my attention. The second is a funerary inscription of A.D. 241 from Palmyra: SEG XXXV 1506, line 1.

102. Two modern scholars have referred to an inner room as an opisthodomos. Gardner (1888, p. 36) applied it to the inner room of the Temple of Aphrodite at Naukratis before Koldewey used “adyton” for such chambers. For more recent use, see Burkert 1988, p. 40.

CONCLUSION

As we have seen, substantial value was invested in the contents of temples, whether symbolically, in a cult statue and consecrated votives, or materially, in funds kept within the building. Roux has distinguished between temples that accommodated important cult rituals and those whose pri-
mary function was more treasurylike, to protect a sanctuary’s assets. His “temple-sanctuaire” includes oracular temples at Delphi, Didyma, and Klaros, the Erechtheion, and temples at Delos (to Pythian Apollo), Bassai, and Nemea. He interprets the irregular form of these temples or their interiors as a shelter for a revered topographical locus. Roux’s “temple-trésor” (also called “temple coffre-fort” or “temple musée”) encompasses temples of more regular plan whose main purpose was to shelter a cult statue and associated dedications; temples in this second category differ from treasuries only in scale. The difficulty of distinguishing temple from treasury is exemplified by the North Building at Samos, a 6th-century B.C. Ionic templelike structure second only to Rhoikos’s Temple of Hera in size. Along with ten nearby buildings, it faces the altar of Hera, like a temple, yet the grouping of these lesser structures adjacent to a major temple recalls the treasuries of Olympia and Delphi. Similar ambiguity of purpose characterizes “Tempietto 1” south of the Temple of Hera at Paestum and multiple smaller structures within that sanctuary. Because many of them have external altars, they have been considered temples, but they may have served more like treasuries.

Among temples with extant inner rooms, only that at Didyma can be corroborated by texts and inscriptions as an oracular seat. Odd spatial configurations at Bassai and Nemea may suggest unusual religious behavior, but lack supporting evidence. Ancient sources attest to oracles at Dodona, Oropos, and Perachora without specifying where mantic events occurred. Extrapolating from Roux’s classification, only a “temple-sanctuaire” could have a true adyton, but a “temple-trésor” might have an inner room partitioned off as secure storage. In most Greek temples the presence of inner rooms is best explained by the need for storing and safeguarding temple treasures. Small nonperipteral temples would have protected the modest contents of small sanctuaries, just as larger temples guarded grander possessions.

Even in the case of a cult statue set up in an inner room as a focal point, as I have proposed for temples at Selinous, I believe the tradition of its placement there must have grown out of an initial practice of keeping temple holdings safe in a small remote chamber. Perhaps cult statues located in cellas were larger and less portable, or else fenced as noted above (p. 204), but in general the statue was a secondary focal point, not the center of religious ritual.

Separated from its traditional association with the adyton, the inner room is no longer by definition the site of religious rites. In an inner room containing precious votives and funds, temple personnel would engage in repeated formulaic acts of arranging, counting, and securing gifts, treasures, and implements of the cult, as is suggested for the Athenian Opisthodomos. Such activities are reflected in inscribed inventories from a few sites. Although the attendants were working with dedicated objects in a religious building, the import of their duties was not comparable to the cultic weight of oracular pronouncement or sacrifice on an external altar. Most often the most important enactment occurred outside the temple, at the altar. The cella housed a cult image and votive gifts, while the inner room kept safe the treasures of the deity, the cult, and sometimes even the polis.

104. The Temple of Apollo at Klaros may require a more complex interpretation, since its oracular function seems to postdate the construction of the 3rd-century B.C. temple. See de la Genière 1990, 1992, 1993, 1996.
107. Neutsch 1956, including fig. 115; the structure is described as “Antentempel . . . Wohl Thesauros.” See also van Buren 1953, p. 213; Trendall 1956, p. 54. Pedley (1990, p. 53) refers to it as “a small temple to the southwest [of the basilica], or more likely a Treasury.”
108. Aleshire (1992, p. 92) concludes that “stone offerings were more expensive than many dedications of precious metal.” Perhaps their permanence and immobility gave them extra value in a setting in which metal votives could be melted down and refabricated—or stolen.
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