

Constanze Graml

The Sanctuary of Artemis Soteira  
in the Kerameikos of Athens

PHILIPPIKA

Altertumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen

Contributions to the Study of Ancient World Cultures 136

Harrassowitz Verlag



PHILIPPIKA  
Altertumswissenschaftliche Abhandlungen  
Contributions to the Study  
of Ancient World Cultures

Herausgegeben von/Edited by  
Joachim Hengstl, Elizabeth Irwin,  
Andrea Jördens, Torsten Mattern,  
Robert Rollinger, Kai Ruffing, Orell Witthuhn

136

2020

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Constanze Graml

# The Sanctuary of Artemis Soteira in the Kerameikos of Athens

2020

Harrassowitz Verlag · Wiesbaden

Bis Band 60: Philippika. Marburger altertumskundliche Abhandlungen.

This book is a revised and translated version of my dissertation, which was submitted to Department 07 History and Cultural Studies at the Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz under the title “Das sogenannte Hekateion im Athener Kerameikos” and defended on July 9, 2014.

Bibliografische Information der Deutschen Nationalbibliothek  
Die Deutsche Nationalbibliothek verzeichnet diese Publikation in der Deutschen Nationalbibliografie; detaillierte bibliografische Daten sind im Internet über <https://dnb.de/> abrufbar.

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek  
The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie; detailed bibliographic data are available in the internet at <https://dnb.de/>.

For further information about our publishing program consult our website <https://www.harrassowitz-verlag.de/>

© Otto Harrassowitz GmbH & Co. KG, Wiesbaden 2020  
This work, including all of its parts, is protected by copyright.  
Any use beyond the limits of copyright law without the permission of the publisher is forbidden and subject to penalty. This applies particularly to reproductions, translations, microfilms and storage and processing in electronic systems.  
Printed on permanent/durable paper.  
Printing and binding: Hubert & Co., Göttingen  
Printed in Germany  
ISSN 1613-5628  
ISBN 978-3-447-11286-4  
e-ISBN 978-3-447-19910-0

## Contents

Foreword.....	IX
Preliminaries.....	XIII
1 Introduction.....	1
1.1 The So-Called Hekateion – a Detective Story About the History of Research and Its Consequences .....	1
1.1.1 Discovery and First Excavation of the Sanctuary by Kyriakos Mylonas in 1890 .....	4
1.1.2 Excavation Campaigns from 1907 to 1915 by Alfred Brueckner and the Sondage of Camillo Praschniker and Konstantinos Rhomaios in 1910 .....	5
1.1.3 The First Restoration Works Carried Out by Alfred Brueckner and Hubert Knackfuß in 1914/1915 .....	8
1.1.4 Post-Second-World-War Restoration Carried Out by Dieter Ohly.....	9
1.1.5 Work Conducted During the Era of Franz Willemsen (1961–1975).....	10
1.1.6 Work Conducted During the Directorship of Ursula Knigge (1975–1995).....	11
1.1.7 The Cleaning Campaigns in 2012 and 2013 and the Following Restoration Work Under the Auspices of Jutta Stroszeck .....	11
1.1.8 The Excavation Campaign 2015 Under the Directorship of Jutta Stroszeck – a Sanctuary Within the Sanctuary.....	12
1.1.9 History of Research on the <i>temenos</i> and Certain Finds With Provenance in the Sanctuary.....	13
1.2 Approaching What Is Already Known? Methodology of the Investigation At Hand .....	14
2 Back to the Beginning: Reconstructing the Archaeological Evidence at the Time of the Discovery.....	17
2.1 The Enclosing Walls .....	18
2.2 Built Structures Used for Ritual Practice.....	21
2.2.1 The Rectangular Block-Shaped Altar and the Adjacent Table.....	21
2.2.2 The Basis With the Prismatic Recess.....	24
2.2.3 The Omphaloid Monument and Its Substructure .....	25

2.3	Further Built Structures Within the <i>temenos</i> . . . . .	25
2.3.1	Well B 18 and Its Phases of Use . . . . .	25
2.3.2	The Cylindrical Lime Stone Block: a Possible Sundial . . . . .	29
3	Finds From the <i>temenos</i> Area and Their Critical Evaluation . . . . .	31
3.1	Potential Biases of the Small Finds . . . . .	31
3.2	Analysis of the Finds – Chronology, Original Provenance of the Artefacts, and Function in the Sanctuary . . . . .	32
4	The Spatial and Temporal Setting of the <i>temenos</i> : the Development of the Area South to the Street of the Tombs . . . . .	37
4.1	Geological, Economical and Historical Factors . . . . .	37
4.2	The Earliest Archaeologically Attested Structures Along the Street of the Tombs . .	40
4.3	The Late 5 <sup>th</sup> Century BCE . . . . .	41
4.4	The Conception of the Necropolis Along the Street of the Tombs from 394/3 BCE until the Restriction of Funerary Expenses by Demetrios of Phaleron . . . . .	42
4.5	The Area Behind the First Row of Grave Precincts and Its Use After Demetrios of Phaleron . . . . .	44
4.6	The Establishment of the Sanctuary in the Early Hellenistic Period . . . . .	45
4.7	The Sanctuary and the Surrounding Necropolis During the Hellenistic Period . . .	46
4.8	The Sanctuary and Necropolis During the Roman Period . . . . .	47
4.9	The Area's Last Phase of Use and the End of the Sanctuary . . . . .	49
5	The Cult Recipients . . . . .	53
5.1	Presupposing Hekate: the Arguments of the First Researchers and Their Refutation . . . . .	53
5.2	The Attribution of the Sanctuary to Artemis Soteira . . . . .	56
5.2.1	Who Was Artemis Soteira to the Athenians? . . . . .	56
5.2.2	Iconography of Artemis Soteira . . . . .	58
5.3	Another Possible Cult Recipient? The Votive Relief for Bendis . . . . .	59
5.4	A 3 <sup>rd</sup> Century CE Addition: the <i>manteion</i> of Paian . . . . .	61
6	Cult Organisation and Retraceable Ritual Practice in the Sanctuary of Artemis Soteira . . . . .	63
6.1	Cult Administration . . . . .	63
6.1.1	The Founding and Administration of the Cult . . . . .	63
6.1.2	The 1 <sup>st</sup> Century BCE: the Cult Association of the Soteriasts . . . . .	65
6.1.3	The Sanctuary of Artemis Soteira: the Cult Precinct of a Funerary Association? . . .	66
6.2	Indications for Cult Practice Within the <i>temenos</i> . . . . .	68
6.2.1	Founding a Sanctuary . . . . .	69
6.2.2	Cleansing Rituals Along the Boundaries of the <i>temenos</i> . . . . .	70
6.2.3	Cleansing Rituals Within the <i>temenos</i> . . . . .	71
6.2.4	Sacrificial Rituals . . . . .	72
6.2.5	Dedicatory Rituals . . . . .	74
6.2.6	Mantic Rituals . . . . .	76
6.2.7	Purely Performative Rituals . . . . .	78

7	Artemis Soteira and Attica's Cult Topography .....	81
7.1	Ancient Greek Religion in Context .....	81
7.1.1	Athenian Religion .....	82
7.1.2	Religious Networks and Spatial Entanglements .....	85
7.1.3	The Relevance of Cults to Community/ies and the Establishment of Cult Centres ..	86
7.1.4	Religious Life at the Kerameikos Site .....	87
7.2	Artemis Soteira, Bendis and Their Role Within the Athenian Religion .....	90
7.2.1	The Attic Cult Topography of Artemis Soteira and Bendis .....	91
7.2.2	Diachronic Aspects of the Cults and the Cult Topography of Artemis Soteira and Bendis .....	92
7.2.3	Hindered Religious Practice – Substitute Sanctuaries? A Proposal .....	94
8	Summary and Outlook .....	99
9	Summaries in German and Modern Greek .....	101
9.1	Zusammenfassung .....	101
9.2	Περίληψη .....	103
10	Catalogue .....	105
10.1	Construction Survey of the Walls in the Area of the <i>temenos</i> .....	105
10.2	Finds from the <i>temenos</i> .....	118
	Inscriptions (Cat. 1–Cat. 15) .....	122
	Sculpture (Cat. 16–Cat. 25) .....	141
	Statuary (Cat. 16 and Cat. 17) .....	141
	Relief (Cat. 18–Cat. 21) .....	143
	Furnishings (Cat. 22–Cat. 25) .....	149
	Pottery (Cat. 26–Cat. 86) .....	151
	Debris of Pottery Production (Cat. 26–Cat. 50) .....	151
	Others (Cat. 51–Cat. 79) .....	174
	Terracotta (Cat. 80–Cat. 84) .....	188
	Lamps (Cat. 85 and Cat. 86) .....	191
	Architecture (Cat. 87 and Cat. 88) .....	193
	Various (Cat. 89 and Cat. 90) .....	194
	Illustration Credits .....	197
	Bibliography .....	205
	Indices .....	223
	Plates	



## FOREWORD

An excavation site like the Kerameikos, with a history spanning more than 150 years, might seem to an outsider like a “well-grazed field”. After all, every stone has already been turned over, not once, but many times. New insights into old excavations are accordingly often regarded with scepticism as later researchers will never have the same insight into the archaeological record as the original discoverer and first excavators did. Regarding the study at hand, which focusses on the newly identified sanctuary of Artemis Soteira in the Kerameikos of Athens, this simple fact results in a number of biases, which might seem obvious, but cannot be stressed enough. First, the original and untouched archaeological record is naturally destroyed while excavating. Second, the successors of the first generation of researchers will gain only filtered information, i. e. an already interpreted and maybe even altered/changed archaeological record, the interpretation of which is clearly influenced by the excavators’ own perception. This perception is shaped by their environment, cultural imprint, social status, moral concepts, religious beliefs, political ideas and countless other factors. Contradictory archival data regarding the archaeological record or other seemingly inconsistent information may thus be due to the varying views and expectations of excavators, scholars and others brought to bear on archaeological records and finds. Sometimes, the source of these different views was the personal sphere where sympathies or antipathies between researchers – known from personal correspondence in letters or marginal notes in archival material – found their way into scientific publications. And finally, the succeeding researchers themselves become the next perceptual filter. Their reading of archival data or analysis of old hand-drawn plans or artefacts is shaped by their own cultural imprint. One of the highly regarded research ideals, namely objectivity, is thereby rendered an unattainable ideal. Regardless, abandoning research on intricate subjects is no solution. The attempt to crawl into the mind of a 19<sup>th</sup> century white male classicist remains challenging in every imaginable matter, especially for a 21<sup>st</sup> century female academic with a markedly different education. Besides, also the perception of the readers of this study may already have been shaped by expectations acquired on the modern excavation site of the Kerameikos.

The human factor of modern research, however, is not the only complication one has to address in approaching such a project. The complexity of the object of research, which also comprises humans and human activity of the ancient past taking place in a historical geography naturally also comes into play. The modern archaeological park with the name Kerameikos, measuring approximately 3,5 hectares, had a multitude of uses in antiquity. The modern area is i. a. commonly known as the site of one of the most famous necropoleis of the *polis* Athens and of the highly prominent potters’ quarter where masterpieces of Athenian pottery were crafted. Since the term Kerameikos was used with varying meanings already in antiquity and also referred to spaces lying

outside the excavation area, not all information taken from written testimonies can be related to the modern site. Other parts of it, such as those along the Street of the Tombs and the Sacred Way, were likely not included in the ancient understanding of the Kerameikos. For example, the discussion of the terminology on the Inner and the Outer Kerameikos, relating to the separation of two areas by the city walls, demonstrates the difficulties of determining boundaries with regard to the chronology.

Besides the terrain, the things related to the archaeological record are embedded in their own social life'. Regarding their modern find spot, one has to expect that not all of these artefacts were fabricated for their final use. This fact becomes even more obvious when considering the material aspects of religious practice, since the act of placing a thing into a sanctuary can be due to a multitude of motivations: it can provide infrastructure necessary for ritual practice, be an object given due to its personal relevance, or be related to time-, gender-, socially bound norms etc. Some things may have been moved from other contexts and their initial setting and the number of steps their journeys had generally remains obscure. Others were placed/erected prior to the establishment of a cult place and thus, initially had no use within the sanctuary. Due to their spatial setting, however, they were then included at a later stage. Regarding their function after the inclusion, a new intention of use for such things/objects/installations can thus be expected. If this use is only a performative act, the archaeological record remains silent on the change and it depends on the perception and intention of the researcher to put forward a plausible interpretation. Therefore, the research biases are manifold and the careful reader will notice the abundant use of a cautious subjunctive.

In emphasising these various potential biases based on the multitude of perceptions, I am well aware of the irony that it presents results of my very own perception. And moreover, it should certainly not be taken as an accusation of the preceding generations of researchers for relying on the methods of their time. By comparison with current excavation reports using up-to-date methods, such as geophysical prospections or approaches taken from the digital humanities, this study of an excavation carried out over 100 years ago may seem a little antiquarian, as it is based on a cautious study of the accessible archival data, which luckily survived so many decades in the archives of the Kerameikos excavation, the Stadtmuseum Kassel and in the archive of the German Archaeological Institute. Other archival materials unfortunately proved irretraceable. This fragmentary initial situation obviously leads to fragmentary results. Given these preconditions, the work on the one hand aims to be seen as a contribution to the understanding of the research history of one of the most prominent, oldest, and still active excavation sites of Greece, where countless individuals contributed to its exploration. On the other hand, the study wants to make the still retraceable archaeological record of a fascinating but long neglected sanctuary accessible to the research community. And even if this step of interpreting the sanctuary and embedding it into the context of the Athenian *polis* may seem hazardous to some, as it is based on the fragment of a fragment of a fragment, this step has to be made and was attempted, clearly with my very own personal cultural imprint. The potentially controversial impact of this study made it seem well suited for the Philippika series and I sincerely thank the editors, especially Torsten Mattern for accepting my work. The study has been revised and literature on certain aspects of the site included up to 2019. I hope that by publishing my study in English, the supposedly already well-known Hekateion sanctuary, which has to be attributed to Artemis Soteira instead, will get the attention it deserves.

This work would not have been possible without Jutta Stroszeck, head of the Kerameikos excavation, who pointed me towards this special sanctuary and generously granted me permission to study and publish the archaeological record. She also made the archival data accessible. The study

---

<sup>1</sup> Moyer 2016 relating to Appadurai's work (2010) on the social life of things.

was undertaken under the supervision of Heide Frielinghaus (University of Mainz). I thank both for their invaluable input and support.

Moreover, I would like to thank Helga Bumke (University of Halle), Detlev Kreikenbom (University of Mainz), Marietta Horster (University of Mainz), and Klaus Junker (University of Mainz) for their assistance and for their participation in the examination board.

The work on the sanctuary of Artemis Soteira, specifically the drawing and digitalisation of the construction survey as well as travelling costs were generously financed by a grant of the Sibylle Kalkhof-Rose Foundation and the Kerameikos excavation. The establishment of the maps and drawings was carried out with the help of Yannis Nakas and Stefan Globig. Hans Birk retrieved believed to be lost measurement data and skilfully embedded those into AutoCAD. Klaus-Valtin von Eickstedt photographed the manifold movable finds for the publication. During my years of working on this study, the German Archaeological Institute at Athens and its always friendly and helpful staff provided advice, accommodation and a splendid library, photo archive, and place to work. Other institutions at Athens, namely the Archaeological Society of Athens with its library and archive, Leonidas Bournias of the Greek Ephorate and his team, as well as the National Archaeological Museum of Athens with its director Maria Lagogianni and the National Epigraphical Museum of Athens with its director Athanassios Themis offered invaluable support and help in solving the “detective story” of the archival records and the finds, which had been dispersed across several museums. For discussing the very different aspects of this work, the theoretical approach, the religious aspects, the epigraphic finds or the technical specifics of the built structures, I express my deepest gratitude to the always listening and challenging Alexander Herda, to Klaus Hallof, Christof Schuler, Irene Berti, Ralf Krumeich, Ludwig Meier, Karlheinz Schaldach, Guy Meyer, Katharina Brandt, Andreas Hoffschmidt, Torben Keßler, and the Unlocking Sacred Landscapes network, namely Christine Morris, Giorgos Papantoniou and Athanassios Vionis.

Rudolf Stichel, who worked in the Kerameikos for many decades, helped me to diminish doubts on the establishment of the sanctuary by sharing his deep insight into the evolution of the area and the interaction of the necropolis with the sanctuary. Ingeborg Scheibler, who studied the lamps found at the Kerameikos, graciously let me plumb her memories of the era Willemsen and Knigge, where archival data was untraceable. Christina Mitsopoulou freely shared her profound knowledge on pottery, especially on the Eleusinian *kernoi* and on the *kernos* fragments from the Kerameikos, particularly the ones from the “Hekateion” area. Melanie Spiegelhalter, former research assistant at the Kerameikos and dear friend, who “shared the same fate” of working on an old Kerameikos excavation deserves special thanks for her open ears and eyes regarding the endless talks on archival data with the resulting intricate excavation history and for her precious comments.

The final steps of preparing the manuscript for publication were only possible with the encouraging help of Ruth Bielfeldt, Rolf Michael Schneider (both University of Munich), Elisavet Sioumpara (Y.S.M.A./University of Munich) and Elena Partida (Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports/University of Patras). Additional support in manifold and highly inspiring ways came from Irene Götz (University of Munich) and the LMUMentoring program, which provided the translation of this work into English by Henry Heitmann-Gordon, Samuel Holzman, Marisol Lang Navarro, and Elise Tacconi-Garman. The Greek summary was translated by Elena Partida and Elli Papazoi. Moreover, Katharina Vukadin and Ulrich Hofstätter gave the illustrations and plans the finishing aesthetic touches. The text was proofread by Annika Busching and layouted by Ulrike Melzow. Both must be thanked for the spontaneity and patience.

Last, and certainly not least, I thank my family for giving me the possibility to pick my field of study guided by my interests and not by the field’s employment prospects. My patient and encouraging family members and friends Stephanie and Markus Linkenheil, Felix Hutmacher, Esther Widmann, Carolin Himmler, Katharina Bolle, Tobias Krefß, Robert Arndt, Beate Hellvoigt y Junkert, Maciej Paprocki, Konstantin Klein, Kristine Iara and Melanie Maier were always there,

helped to retrieve lost data, did the layout of the first version, read countless pages and listened to summaries of the knotty 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century scholars' network or the complex religious system of an ancient, polytheistic society. The book is dedicated to Andreas Kinadeter, who bravely endures having a Classical archaeologist at his side.

Munich, May 2020  
Constanze Graml

## PRELIMINARIES

### Abbreviations and Citation

The study largely follows the text and image guidelines as well as the abbreviation system of the German Archaeological Institute and uses the author-year-system. The full citation is given in the bibliography.

Additionally, the following abbreviations are used in the text:

AE	American English
BCE	Before Common Era
CE	Common Era
l.; ll.	line; lines
col.	column
W	width
D	depth
H	height
th	thickness
diam	diameter
Tgb.	Tagebuch = diary

### Images and Attachments

With the exception of small-scale images of the catalogue entries, all images and drawings are grouped at the end of this volume. The different site maps are added as folded attachments to simplify the comparison between the different states of documentation. In order to facilitate the reader's orientation on the archival excavation photographs that lack a north arrow and scale, the images illustrating the construction survey (Plates 7–51) have been furnished with an outline drawing tagging the visible built structures and a small scale plan of the *temenos* of Artemis Soteira indicating the position and viewing direction of the photographer.

## Remarks on the Used Nomenclature

Greek names have been transliterated for this volume. However, as topographic denominations have been transliterated in different ways, terms such as Hagia Triada might appear inconsistent due to the cited references in the text.

The archival material is quoted in its particular original language, mainly German with sporadic *katharevousa* terms. These texts have been translated into English with remarks on specific terminology.

The term *temenos* was used in antiquity for areas of a sanctuary which were used for cult, as well as for a sanctuary's property that was used for cultivation and therefore, a sanctuary's income<sup>1</sup>. In this study, the term *temenos* will be used for a hypaethral sanctuary with installations for ritual practice, which is enclosed by walls. Considerations on the administration of the sanctuary and its economic situation can only partially be substantiated and will be analysed in chapter 6.

As already stated, the denomination "Kerameikos" has multiple meanings. In antiquity, it initially referred to the road connecting the Athenian Agora below the Areopagus to what was to become Plato's Academy, as is indicated by the inscribed Classical boundary stones along both sides. With the erection of the Themistoklean city wall in 479 BCE, the road and the adjacent areas were divided into the Inner and Outer Kerameikos. Subsequently, the name "Kerameikos" was also used for the neighbouring areas. However, the term was never used for a political entity of the *polis*; the Athenian *deme* was referred to as "ek Kerameon"<sup>2</sup>. From the 18<sup>th</sup> century onwards, cartographers interested in the ancient topography of Athens tried to locate the Kerameikos, a place vividly described in ancient texts (e. g. the fictitious plans of Jean Denis Barbié de Bocage: Plates 2 and 3)<sup>3</sup>. With the first archaeological excavation in Athens, the term was used for many modern locations along the modern Piraeus Road, such as the modern Plateia Eleftherias, which was named "exo Kerameikos"<sup>4</sup>, a denomination that was certainly influenced by ancient literary sources<sup>5</sup>. In this study, the denomination mainly refers to the modern archaeological park and excavation site. In cases where it is used differently, the intended meaning will be specified.

The *temenos* (Attachments D–G, Plate 4) under examination has already been dealt with in several scientific publications. As such, most of these scholars defined their own independent nomenclature. For purposes of clarification, a synoptic concordance of all nomenclatures published so far follows below.

In this study, the denomination of the walls follows a numerical order (Attachments F–H). In his publication from 1909, Alfred Brueckner named only the edges of the walls with small Greek letters ( $\alpha$  to  $\rho$ ) and then referred to the walls by giving both ends (cf. Attachment E). In the 1960s, Dieter Ohly did not use a specific nomenclature for the *temenos* walls since he was mainly concerned with the façades of the Classical precincts facing the Street of the Tombs (see below).

<sup>1</sup> Papazarkadas 2011, 3.

<sup>2</sup> e.g. IG II<sup>2</sup> 41, l. 17: "ἐκ Κεραμείων". Stroszeck 2003, passim; Steffelbauer 2007, passim; Ruggeri et al. 2007, 19–34; Ruggeri 2013, 29–40.

<sup>3</sup> Collected in Ruggeri et al. 2007 and Ruggeri 2013. Inscription IG II<sup>2</sup> 789 was erroneously related to the so-called Hekateion (Ruggeri 2013, 43 based on the Mylonas' personal and doubtful information mentioned Brueckner 1909a, 55. Earlier Wilhelm 1905, 220–223.). Since the inscriptions were emphasised in the report of 1890, it seems very unlikely that Mylonas left the only substantial proof for his idea of *spolia* from the Kalliste sanctuary aside.

<sup>4</sup> e.g. Phintiklis – Koumanoudis 1884, 17.

<sup>5</sup> The shift of the spatial meaning of the term Kerameikos is analysed by Stroszeck 2003, passim.

Table 1: Nomenclature of the *temenos* walls

Nomenclature adopted here	Nomenclature of Alfred Brueckner (1909) (cf. Attachment E) <sup>6</sup>
Wall 1	Mauer $\theta$ - $\kappa$
Wall 2	Mauer $\varepsilon$ - $\theta$
Wall 3	Mauer $\delta$ - $\varepsilon$
Wall 4	Mauer $\alpha$ - $\delta$
Wall 5	Mauer $\rho$ - $\alpha$
Wall 6	Mauer $\sigma$ - $\rho$
Wall 7	Mauer $\xi$ - $\sigma$
Wall 8	Mauer $\mu$ - $\xi$
Wall 9	Mauer $\lambda$ - $\mu$
Wall 10	Mauer $\kappa$ - $\lambda$
Wall 1a	Mauer a <sup>1</sup> and b
Wall 2a	Mauer a <sup>2</sup> and a <sup>3</sup>
Wall 3a	Mauer a <sup>4</sup>

The built structures inside the *temenos* comprise Well B 18 (as kept in the current Kerameikos inventory<sup>7</sup>, initially named by Brueckner Well A), the altar structures of a *trapeza* and a *bomos*, the base of a statue inside a niche, and the omphaloid structure of the *manteion* of Paian (kept in the Kerameikos inventory of wells as B 35)<sup>8</sup>. The well in the north-eastern part of the *temenos* is Brueckner's Well B and nowadays denominated as B 19.

Table 2: Nomenclature of the built structures

Nomenclature adopted here	Nomenclature of Alfred Brueckner (1909) (cf. Attachment E)
Well B 18	Brunnen A
Well B 19	Brunnen B
<i>manteion</i> /Well B 35	31 (in the text: <i>omphalos/eschara</i> )
<i>trapeza</i> and <i>bomos</i>	32 (in the text: Altar/Podium)

Regarding the surrounding grave precincts, Brueckner published a nomenclature that follows a consecutive numbering in his 1909 monograph<sup>9</sup>. In the 1960s under the direction of Ohly, a new numerical nomenclature was published in the excavation report in 1965<sup>10</sup>. The most recent publication, the Kerameikos guidebook by Jutta Stroszcek, refers to the grave precincts using the personal names of the buried individuals<sup>11</sup>. The denomination of the surrounding grave precincts, which was adopted here, also follows the names of the known buried individuals (cf. Attachment F).

6 The Walls 1a, 2a, and 3a are mentioned in the excavation diaries of Alfred Brueckner, Brueckner Tgb. 2 (1909–1910), 27.

7 This numerical nomenclature derives from an unpublished Magister thesis by Thomas Teufel (University of Würzburg).

8 See in detail chapter 2, 21–28.

9 Brueckner 1909a, general plan (see Attachment E).

10 Ohly 1965, 334.

11 Stroszcek 2014, 9 f.

Table 3: Nomenclature of the surrounding grave precincts

Nomenclature of Stroszeck (2014) in translation	Nomenclature of Brueckner (1909) (cf. Attachment E)	Nomenclature of Ohly (1965)
38 Grave precinct of the Thorikians	Bezirk I	Bezirk VIII
39 Grave precinct of a family from Herkleia in the Pontos	Bezirk II	Bezirk IX
40 Grave precinct of Dionysios of Kollytos	Bezirk III	Bezirk X
41 Grave precinct of Lysimachides	Bezirk IV	Bezirk XI
42 Grave precinct of Kephisodoros	Bezirk V	Bezirk XII
43 Grave precinct of a “Persian”	Bezirk VI	Bezirk XIII
35 Grave precinct of Stratonides and Eudemos	Bezirk VII	Bezirk III
36 Grave precinct of a young woman	Bezirk VIII	Bezirk IV
37 Grave precinct of Makareus	Bezirk IX	Bezirk V
	Bezirk X	Bezirk VI
	Bezirk XI	Bezirk VII
33 Grave precinct of Demetria and Pamphile	Bezirk XII	Bezirk II
32 Grave precinct of the Messenians	Bezirk XIII	Bezirk I
45b Grave precinct of Arche	Bezirk XIV	Bezirk XIV
45a Grave precinct of Philinna <sup>12</sup>	Bezirk XV	Bezirk XV

Besides the grave precincts of Arche<sup>13</sup> and Philinna with Iatrokles<sup>14</sup> in the second row behind the Street of the Tombs, a potential third grave precinct, framed by the Walls 1a, 2a, and 3a, was identified during the research on the *temenos*. Due to its later deconstruction in the course of the establishment of the sanctuary, the grave markers of the still retraceable burials must have been removed. Without any grave markers or burial remains, an attribution to individuals was thus impossible and the precinct was therefore named South 3, based on the Brueckner denomination of the South Terrace (Südterrasse).

Additionally, the naming of the roads and transport axes within the excavation site has to be specified. The road to the north of the Classical grave precincts appears in recent research literature as the “Street of the Tombs” (Gräberstraße). In antiquity, the road was most likely referred to as the road leading from the river Eridanos to the harbour of Mounichia<sup>15</sup>. The topographical situation predestines this area as an ideal route, even fit for carriages, for linking the city and the harbour zone of the Piraeus. Due to the terrain profile – the Kerameikos is the lowest point above sea level in the area of the ancient city – carriages were able to avoid the steeper inclines at the Hill of the Nymphs and at Museion Hill. In the earliest publications and plans, the Street of the Tombs

12 There seems to be a confusion in the numbering of 45a and 45b in Stroszeck 2014, general plan at the end of the volume.

13 IG II<sup>2</sup> 10871: “Ἀρχή.” with two *stelai*, IG II<sup>2</sup> 12955: “Φιλοκράτης.” and IG II<sup>2</sup> 12954: “Φιλοκράτεια.”

14 IG II<sup>2</sup> 5645: “Ἰατροκλῆς Ἀριστοκρίτου Ἀνακαεύς. / Φίλινα.”

15 See the inscription coming from the excavation area and dating to the second quarter of the 5<sup>th</sup> century BCE, SEG 41, 13: “[hó]ρος [ho]/[ðð] ἄχρι [τ]/[εσ]δε Ερε/[ðαν]ο εἰς Μ/[ου]νιχία/[ε] ἐστὶν λ/[ιμένα(?)];” von Freytag gen. Löringhoff 1991, 386–388; Costaki 2006, 46. 98–99. 501–504. Not mentioned in Ficuciello 2008.

is called Old Street of the Tombs (Alte Gräberstrasse, see Attachment B)<sup>16</sup> or Main Passageway (Hauptweg, see Attachment E)<sup>17</sup>. The passageway ascending to the south in the area of the Corner Terrace (Eckterrasse) is referred to as South Path (Südweg), possibly because one was imagining a clearly defined cemetery, as depicted in the first reconstruction drawings of ancient Athens (Plates 2 and 3). This entire concept is reflected in the chosen nomenclature. Along a central road, terraces with grave monuments were erected. The term “terrace” (Terrasse) was also used for the Classical grave *periboloi* along the Street of the Tombs. The contemporaneous 19<sup>th</sup> century burial culture<sup>18</sup> most likely led to an already interpretative perception of the archaeological record<sup>19</sup>. This view of the entire site comprised and compromised the interpretation of the sanctuary.

---

16 Curtius 1872, Taf. 42.

17 Brueckner 1909a, general plan.

18 A good comparison could for example be the First Cemetery at Athens, which was founded only a few years before the excavation activities in the Kerameikos started. Opened in 1837, the cemetery was remodelled along a central road alluding to the Kerameikos Road leaving the Dipylon Gate, Kardamitsi-Adami – Daniel 2017, 21.

19 Brueckner 1908, 196 suggests a central administration of the cemetery, probably by the sanctuary: “Die verwaltende Stelle, welche dies ins Werk gesetzt hat, ist in der Spätzeit sicher das Hieron der Artemis Soteira gewesen, das bei der von Herrn Mylonas 1890 geleiteten Ausgrabung südlich der Hauptstrasse aufgedeckt worden ist (Πρακτικά 1890, 19 Taf. 2; Ad. Wilhelm, Έφ. ἀρχ. 1905, 215. 239); dass von ihm aus auch die früheren Anlagen gegründet worden sind, ist möglich, aber noch zu untersuchen.”



## I INTRODUCTION

### 1.1 The So-Called Hekateion – a Detective Story About the History of Research and Its Consequences

The reason for opening this analysis with the long history of research on this site and not with an introduction on the methodological approach is to raise awareness of the limited basis for further interpretation. To investigate the research on the so-called Hekateion, a sanctuary in the Kerameikos of Athens, means to start with the discovery of the site of the Kerameikos itself, which is now an archaeological park of the same name. Due to the many parallel excavation projects starting immediately after the discovery of the first monumental grave markers along the modern Piraeus Road in the 1860s<sup>1</sup>, the early research is difficult to retrace as the documentation techniques of this era were rather superficial and much archival data has certainly been lost. The digs concentrated on the Athenian topography in order to understand the city boundaries and were also particularly interested in finding elaborate monuments. However, the early research contains some observations on the area surrounding the sanctuary, which prove highly valuable for understanding the now lost stratigraphy and the development of the necropolis framing the sanctuary over the centuries. For example, the few publications that focus on the immediate surrounding area show graves or report on grave markers in the upper levels of the now largely lost Roman strata. A short overview of the relevant researchers and their conclusions on the necropolis at the foot of the Hagia Triada church is therefore indispensable.

Interest in the topography of Athens and of course, the Kerameikos was significant already before the first excavations<sup>2</sup>. Due to the enormous density of written sources with references to the place and the buildings within<sup>3</sup>, it was always known that the Kerameikos lay in the north-western part of the ancient city. It was also clear that the area comprised the ancient fortification walls and several gates leaving the city. The most prominent scholarly work on the topography of ancient Athens, the four volumes comprising “The Antiquities of Athens” by James Stuart and Nicholas Revett, strongly influenced the subsequent research and moreover, the initial identification of the modern excavation site. In their third volume, Stuart and Revett examine the ancient fortifications and gates

---

1 Summarised in Stroszeck 2014, 13 f.

2 e. g. the works of James Stuart and Nicolas Revett as well as other travelling scholars.

3 Compiled in Ruggeri et al. 2007 and Ruggeri 2013.

of Athens. The Dipylon Gate, lying in the Kerameikos, was located in the northwest of the city although the exact course of the city walls was clearly not visible at this time<sup>4</sup>. According to Stuart and Revett's plan from 1752 (Plate 1), the Dipylon Gate is placed in the very west of the city, in vicinity to the churches of the Hagia Triada (see *Ecclesia Sanctae Trinitatis*) and Hagios Athanasios (see *Ecclesia Sancti Athanasii*) at the foot of the Hill of the Nymphs. Monuments known from written testimonies, most prominently the *demosion sema* (public cemetery, state burials<sup>5</sup>) where the fallen warriors were buried at state expense every year, were expected in close proximity to the Dipylon Gate<sup>6</sup>.

Before the major excavation activities, early topographers therefore reconstructed and illustrated ancient Athens based on the textual knowledge<sup>7</sup>. An eye-catching example is the reconstruction of the topography of Athens for the fictitious historical novel on the journey of the Skythian Anacharsis<sup>8</sup>, where the Kerameikos is laid out between the city walls and the Academy of Plato (Plates 2 and 3). The Outer Kerameikos (see *C eramique exterieur*) is shown as an area, where burials are loosely spread along the road to the Academy (Plate 3).

When in the 1860s construction work began on the Modern Piraeus Road (Attachment A and Plate 4.1: see *ΟΔΟΣ ΠΕΙΡΑΙΩΣ*, Attachment B: see *Neue Piraeus Strasse*), the first monumental grave reliefs were discovered<sup>9</sup>, such as the grave relief of the warrior Aristonauates<sup>10</sup>. Due to their remarkable aesthetics, these finds immediately caught the attention of international researchers<sup>11</sup>. In 1863, the first trenches were opened on the south side of the small church of the Hagia Triada (Attachments A–E; Plate 4.1). Within, the still upright grave stele of Agathon and Sosikles (Plate 20: palmetto stele left of the bull of Dionysios; Plate 62.1: palmetto stele in precinct II) came to light. Due to the spectacular finds, the excavation was soon expanded as more land was bought and annual excavation campaigns were carried out<sup>12</sup>. Family grave precincts of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BCE, amongst them the grave relief of the riding warrior Dexileos (Attachments A–E; Plates 6.1 and 20), bearing a datable inscription, were unearthed and euphoria spread among scholars and the broader public<sup>13</sup>. Thanks to close personal relations, news about the discoveries made by Athanasios S. Rhousopoulos, assigned excavator by the Archaeological Society of Athens (*Η  ν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογική Εταιρεία*), soon reached Germany. Ernst Curtius, one of the recipients of these bulletins, reported on them with great excitement in various journals<sup>14</sup> and fuelled the discussion on the placement of the state burials<sup>15</sup>. During the following years, the entire south side of the Street of the Tombs was discovered

4 Stuart – Revett 1827, 20–23.

5 Discussion summarised in Arrington 2010, *passim*. Archaeological evidence at Odos Salaminos 35 summarised by Rose 2000, *passim*.

6 Literary sources on the state burials: Plut. *Mor.* 852 a–e and Diog. *Laert.* 7, 9–12; 7, 15 and 29. The burial of the fallen soldiers in the Kerameikos is mentioned in Aristoph. *Av.* 395.

7 A summary on the suggested denominations of places in Athens during the 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> century is published in Zambon 2014, 106.

8 Barth lemy 1798/99, with fictitious maps drawn by J. D. Barbi  de Bocage (see Plates 2 and 3).

9 Stroszeck 2014, 14.

10 Athens, National Archaeological Museum inv. 738.

11 First reports by Pittakis 1862, Rhousopoulos 1862, 1863 and 1864. First report in Italian by Salinas – Seveso 1863. First report in German by Curtius 1863. First report in French by Wescher 1863a and 1863b. Immediate English reports seem to be missing. A first overview is given in Dyer 1873, 92–94 on the location of the Dipylon Gate in reference to Hagia Triada.

12 Compare Attachments A and B showing the state in 1870 to Attachment C with the state of 1880 and to Attachment D and Plate 4.1 with the state in 1890.

13 Salinas – Seveso 1863, *passim*; Curtius 1863, *passim*; Rhousopoulos 1863, *passim*; Koumanoudis 1870, *passim*; Curtius 1872, *passim*; Brueckner 1909a, 1. The excavations of this period were limited to the monuments of the Street of the Tombs.

14 e. g. Curtius 1863.

15 In his research prior to the discoveries, he focuses on the placement of graves in relation to passageways (Curtius 1855, 59–61).

and partially excavated by Rhousopoulos<sup>16</sup> and later on by Stephanos Koumanoudis<sup>17</sup>. These earliest activities to the south of the Hagia Triada church (Attachment A: see ΑΓΙΑ ΤΡΙΑΣ<sup>18</sup>) – then regarded as closely linked to the Dipylon Gate<sup>19</sup> and the nearby *demosion sema*<sup>20</sup> – concentrated on the clarification of the Athenian topography through discovering the city gate and the city walls<sup>21</sup>.

In the 1870s, the philologist Carl Curtius became interested in the Dipylon excavations. He published the state of excavation of the year 1871 in a detailed plan drawn by Theodor von Heldreich (Attachment B)<sup>22</sup> based on the Koumanoudis plan. At this stage, the entire south front of the Street of the Tombs with several grave reliefs, such as the Charon relief (Attachment A: unnamed; Attachment B: no. 17), was already known. Additionally, some later destroyed Roman grave monuments were discovered<sup>23</sup> and also Hellenistic and Classical grave markers were documented within the plan, such as the *columellae* of Methe and Opora (Attachment A: named; Attachment B: nos. 26 and 27) on the southwest corner of the Lysimachides precinct (cf. Attachment F). Koumanoudis, head of the excavation, would continue to report on the progress of the excavation and publish updated plans of the state of the site in the annual journal *Praktika* (Πρακτικά της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας). The focus of the on-site works lay on the 1872 discovered Dipylon Gate and the Kerameikos Road<sup>24</sup>.

A later state of the excavation in the area south of the Street of the Tombs – from approximately 1880 – is documented in the so-called Soursos plan (Attachment C). Panagiotis Soursos copied this plan, which was probably kept at the archive of the Archaeological Society, for the Kerameikos archive<sup>25</sup>. Nearly the entire area of the modern archaeological park was excavated, though the area to the north, where the modern church of Hagia Triada was erected in 1955<sup>26</sup>, and the continuation of the Kerameikos Road to the north were still untouched (Attachment C: north of Eridanos). The result of this enthusiasm was that in only a few decades, the area at the Street of the Tombs was fully excavated down to its natural ground, i. e. the walking level of the 5<sup>th</sup>/4<sup>th</sup> century BCE (cf. Plate 62.1<sup>27</sup>).

Although all the campaigns were conducted under the auspices of the Archaeological Society, the researchers occupied with the Kerameikos were numerous and international; therefore, the work was not limited to one area only. Many of the scholars, who had been present on site, most

16 Rhousopoulos 1862, passim; Rhousopoulos 1863, passim; Rhousopoulos 1864, passim; Rhousopoulos 1870 passim.

17 Koumanoudis 1871–72, passim; Koumanoudis 1872–73, passim; Koumanoudis 1873–74, passim; Koumanoudis 1874–75, passim; Koumanoudis 1876–77, passim; Koumanoudis 1879, passim; Koumanoudis 1879–80, passim; Koumanoudis 1880–81, passim; Phintiklis – Koumanoudis 1884, passim.

18 Drawn by Ioannis Papadakis, published by Koumanoudis in the *Praktika*, the annual journal of the Archaeological Society of Athens, summarising the results of the year 1870. Note on Papadakis in Koumanoudis 1871–72, 11.

19 The denomination of the ancient roads was still under discussion, Curtius 1872. Already since the beginning of the 19<sup>th</sup> century, the Dipylon was connected to the Hagia Triada, Ross 1843, 39.

20 This expectation arose from the descriptions of the Kerameikos, the area close to the Dipylon Gate and the road leading to the Academy of Plato, amongst other things by Paus. 1, 29, 2–15, Cic. Fin. 5, 1–5; Liv. 31, 24, 6. These authors mention several important graves, sanctuaries and the city wall.

21 On this point: Koumanoudis 1872–73, 15.

22 Curtius 1872, 12 f. The plan is denominated as “Der Attische Friedhof vor dem Dipylon”.

23 Delbrück 1900, 299–303.

24 Koumanoudis’ campaigns summarised in Hoepfner 1970, 287. Only in 1876, a shift of the excavation activities became necessary with the erection of the modern Piraeus Road. The works were carried out from 1879 on, Koumanoudis 1879–80, 7.

25 Published in Hoepfner 1970, Beilage 4. On Soursos’ engagement at the German Archaeological Institute at Athens from 1897 to 1921, see Apergis – Brandt (forthcoming).

26 Stroszeck 2014, 279.

27 The drawing from 1907 shows the estimated level in 1863. The sewer openings are already marked in the plans of 1870/71 (Attachments A and B).

certainly kept records of the works, but neither a complete list of all people involved nor a list of the established documentation exists. Despite conscientious archival research, no guarantee can be given that the archival data on these early campaigns is complete, and the same is true even for some later campaigns under the auspices of the German Archaeological Institute<sup>28</sup>. The overview of the campaigns conducted within and in close proximity to the *temenos* of Artemis Soteira is thus the result of the accessible archival data available until 2018<sup>29</sup>.

### 1.1.1 Discovery and First Excavation of the Sanctuary by Kyriakos Mylonas in 1890

Research on the *temenos* began a few decades after the coincidental discovery of the Street of the Tombs<sup>30</sup>. In the year 1890, the area behind the front row of Classical grave precincts was excavated by Kyriakos Mylonas on behalf of the Archaeological Society of Athens (Attachment D) and led to a brief excavation report, published already in the *Praktika* of the same year (Plate 4)<sup>31</sup>. Mylonas, who claimed to have excavated down to solid ground<sup>32</sup>, seemed disappointed with the discoveries, as the built structures were largely erected with *spolia*, which led him towards a late dating<sup>33</sup>. Besides the relief of the *Hydrophoros* (Cat. 19), no monumental sculpture was found. Except for one single inscription, the decree of the cult association of Soteriasts, dating to 37/36 or 36/35 BCE (Cat. 9)<sup>34</sup>, no finds of this first campaign were published. All finds of the campaign in the *temenos* seem to have been brought to the National Archaeological Museum, as was the customary procedure before the establishment of a permanent excavation site and the archaeological park<sup>35</sup>. However, at the National Archaeological Museum no findings can be attributed to the *temenos* due to imprecise documentation<sup>36</sup>. The early and often not exactly documented off-site transfer of unmarked finds makes it impossible to re-attribute them unambiguously to the *temenos* or even the Kerameikos area. This fact becomes obvious in the catalogue<sup>37</sup>. From the era Mylonas, only the published in-

28 For archival data, the following archives have been contacted: archive of the Kerameikos excavation at the German Archaeological Institute at Athens, archive of the German Archaeological Institute at Athens, archive of the German Archaeological Institute at Berlin, archive of the Archaeological Society of Athens, archive of the National Archaeological Museum of Athens, archive of the SMPK Antikensammlung Berlin, and archive of the Stadtmuseum Kassel. Since not all of the archives were completely accessible at the time, when this study was conducted, new material is likely to appear despite my requests. Moreover, it cannot be excluded that personal documents were handed to other archives than those listed above due to personal preferences.

29 For the potentially biased approach to these data, see note 28 and Forward, p. IX–X.

30 Already a few years before, tombs were found in this area, but these were removed during the construction of the Piraeus Road (Brueckner 1909a, 1).

31 Mylonas 1890, passim.

32 Brueckner Tgb. 1 (1907), 235: “[...] daher hat hier Hr. Mylonas bei seinen Grabungen, die er versichert, bis auf das gewachsene Erdreich ausgedehnt zu haben, keine Gräber gefunden.”

33 Mylonas 1890, 23 f.

34 Mylonas 1893, passim.

35 Only the successor of Mylonas, Brueckner, established an on-site depot including a small exhibition room in order to show the finds of the Kerameikos site, which was publicly accessible (DNP 13 [1999] 312–322 s. v. Athen IV. Kerameikos [J. Stroszeck], 317). Stroszeck 2014, 274.

36 The National Archaeological Museum houses the following finds with the reference “Agia Trias, excavation of Archaeologike Etairia conducted by Kyriakos Mylonas”: A 23315. Hellenistic mould-made bowl; A 3196, A 3345, A 3333, A 3192, A 3132: Terracotta Lamps; A 9538–A 9540: Amulets. This information is not sufficient to establish an unambiguous relation to the *temenos*.

37 See in detail chapter 10, 118–195. Only a small percentage of the catalogued finds might have a hypothetical relation to practiced cult. The overwhelming majority of the artefacts comes from strata below the walking level of the sanctuary and derives from a late Classical pottery production site in vicinity to the *temenos*. Although the artefacts show no ritual function, they were included in the catalogue due to Brueckner’s early attribution and in order to make the development of the entire area and the here proposed dating of the cult site comprehensible.

scriptions, the decree of the Soteriasts (Cat. 9), the dedicatory inscription of the *trapeza* (Cat. 4) and the sculpture in secondary use (Cat. 19 and 20) have been included<sup>38</sup>.

Leaving small finds undocumented and ignoring the epigraphic testimonies found on-site, Mylonas argued in his report that the sanctuary had been dedicated to the goddess Hekate – an interpretation that came to be commonly accepted. His interpretation was based upon the assumption that a statue base with a triangular bedding on the top, set in a niche to the north of the altar (Plates 4.2, 56, and 57), was used as a statue base for a three-sided image<sup>39</sup>. A prismatic pillar, commonly identified as a statue type of Hekate (cf. Plate 6.2), would fit this recess<sup>40</sup>. All inscriptions found in the *temenos* that referred to Artemis Soteira and the Soteriasts (Cat. 4 and 9) Mylonas regarded as *spolia* from the sanctuary of Artemis Ariste kai Kalliste and therefore considered them irrelevant to the interpretation of the archaeological record. With this assumption, he demonstrated his profound, yet also biasing knowledge of written sources. According to the description by Pausanias<sup>41</sup>, the Ariste kai Kalliste sanctuary was situated in the Kerameikos along the road leading from the centre to the Academy of Plato in the northwest<sup>42</sup>. The lexicographer Hesychius intertwines Kalliste with Hekate<sup>43</sup>, a testimony that attests Hekate in the Kerameikos and may well have influenced Mylonas. At the time of Mylonas' report, the sanctuary of Ariste kai Kalliste had not yet been located. Remains of this sanctuary were first claimed to have been detected in 1896<sup>44</sup> and identified with certainty in 1922 on modern Plataion Street<sup>45</sup>, several hundred meters from the *temenos* under examination. Inscriptions found at the Plataion Street site proved the use of the *epiclesis* Kalliste<sup>46</sup>, just as mentioned by Pausanias and Hesychius. Even though this meant that the inscriptions from the *temenos* in the area of the Street of the Tombs had to belong to a sanctuary of Artemis Soteira, Mylonas' initial assumption that they were *spolia* from the sanctuary of Artemis Ariste kai Kalliste remained unrevised, as did his attribution of the *temenos* to Hekate<sup>47</sup>.

### 1.1.2 Excavation Campaigns from 1907 to 1915 by Alfred Brueckner and the Sondage of Camillo Praschniker and Konstantinos Rhomaïos in 1910

From 1907 on, the German scholar Alfred Brueckner was put in charge of the excavation of the area beside the church of the Hagia Triada by the Archaeological Society of Athens<sup>48</sup>. Brueckner had first come to Athens in 1893 with Alexander Conze to support his research on the Attic grave reliefs<sup>49</sup>, by documenting the new finds on a general plan. In this capacity, he certainly attended the excavation campaigns in the Kerameikos<sup>50</sup>. The current state of the excavation led to the conclusion

38 Mylonas 1890, 23 f.

39 Mylonas 1890, 24.

40 On the prismatic statue type: Chrysostomou 2000. On the polyvalence of this image type see chapter 5.1, 54 f.

41 Paus. 1, 29, 2: “Ἀθηναίους δὲ καὶ ἔξω πόλεως ἐν τοῖς δήμοις καὶ κατὰ τὰς ὁδοὺς θεῶν ἐστὶν ἱερά καὶ ἡρώων καὶ ἀνδρῶν τάφοι· ἐγγυτάτω δὲ Ἀκαδημία, χωρίον ποτὲ ἀνδρὸς ἰδιώτου, γυμνάσιον δὲ ἐπ’ ἐμοῦ. κατιούσι δ’ ἐς αὐτὴν περιβολὸς ἐστὶν Ἀρτέμιδος καὶ ξόανα Ἀρίστης καὶ Καλλίστης· ὡς μὲν ἐγὼ δοκῶ καὶ ὁμολογεῖ τὰ ἔπη τὰ Πάμφω, τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος εἰσὶν ἐπικλήσεις αὐταί, λεγόμενον δὲ καὶ ἄλλον ἐς αὐτὰς λόγον εἰδῶς ὑπερβήσομαι.”

42 It is also marked in the fictitious map by Barbié de Bocage, see Plate 3: “Enceinte consacrée à Diane”.

43 Hsch. s. v. Καλλίστη: “[...] καὶ ἡ ἐν τῷ Κεραμεικῷ ἰδρυμένη Ἐκάτη, ἣν ἔνιοι Ἄρτεμιν λέγουσιν”.

Translation by the author: “[...] and in the Kerameikos a statue set up for Hekate, whom some call Artemis”.

44 Oikonomos 1896, passim. Objection by Dörpfeld 1896, 463, summarised in Vanden Broeck-Parant 2015, 156 f.

45 Philadelphus 1927, 161 allegedly identified a *temenos* wall.

46 IG II<sup>2</sup> 4665; IG II<sup>2</sup> 4667, IG II<sup>2</sup> 4668, dating to the 4<sup>th</sup>/3<sup>rd</sup> century BCE.

47 See in detail Graml 2014, 119 f. on the amalgamation of the two sanctuaries in epigraphic research. cf. Eckhardt 2017 with further epigraphic analysis. Preliminary reports: Graml 2016b and 2018.

48 Brueckner 1908, 193.

49 Conze's enthusiasm for the reliefs is well visible in his early report, Conze 1871, passim.

50 Brueckner – Pernice 1893, passim; Stroszeck 2007, 60.

that no strata earlier than the 4<sup>th</sup> century BCE had been excavated by the Archaeological Society so far, which suggested that there might be undiscovered monuments of the Classical period still to be found<sup>51</sup>. But Brueckner's original intention to establish a general plan of the Kerameikos was devised in faraway Berlin; on-site, he soon noticed that the excavations had not progressed very far, so his first activities grew into several excavation campaigns in the grave precincts to the south of the Hagia Triada church<sup>52</sup>. In the course of preparing the publication of the area, Brueckner corresponded with his predecessor Mylonas and was able to use Mylonas' plan (Attachment D)<sup>53</sup>. Yet the full documentation of the excavation activities, namely the excavation diaries, were not at Brueckner's disposal. In fact, the whereabouts of these important documents as well as other sketches and drawings have been unknown since Mylonas' death in 1914. Already in the 1930s, these documents were untraceable, as Brueckner's correspondence with other members of the German Archaeological Institute at Athens proves<sup>54</sup>. For the publication of further projected volumes on the Kerameikos excavation, Brueckner also intended to study documents of the Greek archaeologist Valerios Staïs. Yet, he did not complete a second monograph. Following Brueckner's idea, the documents of Staïs were analysed for this study. However, his extant and well-studied documents<sup>55</sup> contain no information on the so-called sanctuary of Hekate, since he had worked solely in the area of the "Outer Kerameikos"<sup>56</sup>.

In 1909, Brueckner published his only monograph on the excavation "Der Friedhof am Eridanos bei der Hagia Triada zu Athen" in collaboration with Adolf Hermann Struck<sup>57</sup>. In this volume Brueckner, who had expressed doubts as to Mylonas' interpretation of the sanctuary as a Hekateion in earlier reports by referring to it as a sanctuary of Artemis Soteira<sup>58</sup>, no longer seems to have any second thoughts on Mylonas' identification (cf. Attachment E: *temenos* der Hekate). This might be routed in the fact that the sanctuary of Artemis Ariste kai Kalliste at Plataion Street had not been located yet<sup>59</sup>. Brueckner, who as an epigraphist and philology teacher was certainly aware of the written sources in the same way as Mylonas was, may have been convinced by Hesychius' men-

51 Brueckner – Skias 1907, 100.

52 Brueckner – Skias 1907, 99; Brueckner 1909a, 1.

53 Brueckner Tgb. 2 (1909–1910), 2, notes that he needs to prove Mylonas' statement that there are no burials within the *temenos*, because he intends to transfer dug-out material there. Brueckner 1909a, 2. The original plan with Mylonas' request for its prompt return after study is kept in the Kerameikos archive.

54 Letter, dating to the 07.08.1930 from Brueckner to the head of the German Archaeological Institute at Athens Hubert Knackfuß (kept at the Stadtmuseum Kassel, inventoried under "03/0163, Mapped 11" with the correspondence concerning the Kerameikos excavation campaign in 1916: "Überdies wäre Mylonas' und Staïs' Nachlass zu prüfen."). Brueckner considers that all Greek handwritten records are kept at the archive of the Archaeological Society in Athens. But today, no documents of Mylonas concerning the Kerameikos are traceable at the archive. The written estate of Mylonas has not been kept within the family either, as his descendant Konstantinos P. Mylonas, architect at Athens, assured me. Several archives were contacted in the course of this study, unfortunately with no new traces as to the whereabouts of these documents.

55 Ioannis Petrocheilos sifted through the written estate and published on Staïs' life and work (Petrocheilos 1992). He assured me that there is no trace of further thoughts on the sanctuary under examination.

56 Staïs 1888, passim. Staïs speaks in his publications of the Kerameikos Road, which lies to the north of the modern Piraeus road. This territory does not belong to the modern Kerameikos excavation site.

57 Struck worked as a librarian at the German Archaeological Institute at Athens and drew the plans of the entire excavation area. He also drew all the reconstructions and views for "Der Friedhof am Eridanos". Struck's excavation diary is kept at the Kerameikos archive and contains measuring data and preliminary works. His in-depth knowledge on measuring derived from his prior employment at the Oriental Railway, Graml 2016a, 431 f.

58 Brueckner Tgb. 1 (1907), 237: "für den Kultraum hat ein Heiligtum der Artemis Soteira beigesteuert." In 1908 and 1909, Brueckner gave several talks referring to a sanctuary of Artemis Soteira within the necropolis (Sitzungsbericht vom 5. Mai 1908, AA 1908, 521; Resumee in the Wochenschrift für Klassische Philologie 17, 1909, 475 f.). In the monograph of 1909, Brueckner only discusses the sanctuary of Hekate (Brueckner 1909a, 42–55).

59 Brueckner 1909a, 4 fig. 1 assumes its location close to the Hagia Triada church.

tioning of Hekate in the Kerameikos<sup>60</sup>. His collaborator Struck, however, published in 1911 a short paragraph on the Kerameikos and refers in the text as well as in the additional plan to a sanctuary of Artemis (Plate 6.1: Artemision), which was transformed in Roman times into a sanctuary of Hekate<sup>61</sup>. In Brueckner's eyes, the entire territory of the sanctuary seemed fully explored already in 1909: no burials within the sanctuary boundaries had been detected, so the *temenos* was available for use as a temporary storage facility for earth excavated in future campaigns<sup>62</sup>.

In his publication, Brueckner focuses mainly on the visible structures of the sanctuary; a detailed analysis of the establishment and development of the cult site is missing. Observations in the stratigraphy concerning the enclosing walls, water conduits or the numerous small artefacts are completely neglected in his study. However, information on these important observations is preserved in Brueckner's excavation diaries, which are kept in the Kerameikos archive. Brueckner's documentation consists of descriptions, drawings of excavation trenches, sketches of small finds and photographical documentation of the excavation process as well as the inventory lists of the Kerameikos-Photo-Archive<sup>63</sup>. It thus permits the reconstruction of large parts of the activities of the years 1907, 1909–1910 as well as 1913–1915<sup>64</sup>. Moreover, it proves that intensive research on the sanctuary did not start until after the 1909 publication.

In 1910, Camillo Praschniker and Konstantinos Rhomaios worked in the area of the *temenos* at the same time as Brueckner. Praschniker and Rhomaios supervised the installation of a modern conduit for carrying water from the Hill of the Nymphs to the Piraeus Road area. The necessary trench crossed the southern part of the *temenos*, running parallel to Wall 10 and then turning north in line with Wall 9 (cf. Attachments F–G). The conduit continues north to the altar structures and then exits the *temenos* area to the west. In the course of the sondage, three graves were detected within the *temenos*<sup>65</sup>, which disproved Brueckner's initial idea of an untouched sacred precinct<sup>66</sup>.

In 1910, Brueckner himself excavated further burials in the western part of the *temenos*<sup>67</sup> and opened the so-called “*bothros*”, a rectangular fusion of several excavation trenches and uncovered the buried Walls 1a, 2a, and 3a (Plates 32–37; Attachments F–G). He dated the material coming from the *bothros* trenches to the 4<sup>th</sup> century BCE, but was unable to identify the function of the structure<sup>68</sup>. Among other things, the *bothros* contained vast amounts of pottery debris originating from a late Classical workshop (Cat. 26, Cat. 30–35, Cat. 42–50)<sup>69</sup>. The complete broaching of the *bothros* was documented in the diaries and excavation photographs and Brueckner compiled three small and unpublished manuscripts on the finds, named “Fehlbrände” (waster pottery), “Grube im Hekateion” (pit in the Hekateion), and “Übersicht Bothros” (synopsis Bothros)<sup>70</sup>. The excavation activities in Brueckner's later years at the Kerameikos were moved to the Pompeion area and the *dromos* (cf. Attachment C). In the diaries of this period, when the excavation activity was carried

60 Hsch. s. v. Καλλίστη, see note 43. Brueckner hypothesised that the identified sanctuary of the Tritopatores also contained a cult for Hekate, Brueckner 1910, 104.

61 Struck 1911, 128–135 and fig. 151, where the sanctuary is named “Artemision”.

62 Brueckner Tgb. 2 (1909–1910), 2.

63 The currently maintained inventories of the finds were established in the 1960s by Ohly, see chapter I.1.4, 10 and note 90.

64 The documents are the basis for the identification of the catalogued small finds and the localisation of their depository. In contrast to some of the finds of the Mylonas campaigns, the finds discovered by Brueckner remained on-site in the Kerameikos, either in the site museum or in the on-site depots.

65 Erroneously published by Ursula Knigge in the context of the Tritopatreion and the Street of the Tombs. I thank Rudolf Stichel for this clarification, Stichel (forthcoming).

66 Brueckner Tgb. 1 (1907), 235 based on Mylonas' information.

67 Brueckner Tgb. 2 (1909–1910), 68.

68 Brueckner 1910, 110.

69 Monaco 1999; Monaco 2000, 71–73. Mapped in Eschbach 2014, fig. 1.

70 I thank Volker Scheunert for pointing me towards these documents.

out in other parts of the site away of the Street of the Tombs, Brueckner still sporadically refers to the *temenos* and the relations to its stratigraphy and the different walking levels as a comparison for the development of the entire excavation area. Finds coming from layers of the so-called *bothros*, analysed typologically and not according to their context, are sometimes summarised in the later excavation diaries<sup>71</sup>. In his 1931 internal report with the title “Memorandum”, Brueckner mainly focused on planning the subsequent publication of “Der Friedhof am Eridanos” and offered a sketchy general résumé on the areas of the Kerameikos, which had been excavated after 1909<sup>72</sup>. Unfortunately, he never fully published his works, which is the root of many obscurities today, since his observation-based lines of argument remain abstract. In the decades after the excavations, he was still occupied with systematising and synchronising the finds and the archival data. In this process, errors regarding the time frames of certain activities occurred<sup>73</sup>. Ultimately, the second volume remained uncompleted. In sum, an approach to the material record of the sanctuary was undertaken neither by Mylonas nor by Brueckner.

### 1.1.3 The First Restoration Works Carried Out by Alfred Brueckner and Hubert Knackfuß in 1914/1915

After emptying the *bothros* down to bedrock, Brueckner aimed to follow and empty a water conduit running through the *temenos* from Well B 18 to Wall 2 (cf. Attachments F–G), which had been detected in the *bothros*<sup>74</sup> and certainly continued outside the sanctuary. Inside the *temenos*, no further trenches were opened. But in Brueckner’s diary, a short note is devoted to a small-scale cleaning and restoration campaign carried out under the special direction of Hubert Knackfuß<sup>75</sup>: as the necropolis area was considered to have been fully investigated, measures to prepare the excavation as an open-air site accessible for visitors were to be completed. In the same year, the entire Street of the Tombs was excavated down to the walking level of the 4<sup>th</sup> century BCE and the grave precinct façades were partially repaired<sup>76</sup>. Besides Brueckner’s diaries, no documentation is preserved of the concept and scientific approach behind the measures, of the techniques used on site for the restoration works or of the intended appearance of the area, meaning which chronological phase was to be shown. Therefore, the actual extent of this first identifiable restoration<sup>77</sup> can only be deduced from the modern state of the walls<sup>78</sup>.

In the following years, the general interest shifted to understanding the necropolis’ development and concentrated on the northern side of the Street of the Tombs. After the demolition of the small

71 In later years, Brueckner could have been accompanied by the epigraphist Johannes Kirchner, who was assigned by the Prussian Academy to the corpus of the Attic inscriptions and visited Athens several times. Kirchner is often mentioned in Brueckner’s diaries as a cross reference. His diaries are currently kept at the archive of the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften. I thank Klaus Hallof for the information on Kirchner.

72 Brueckner Memorandum (1931), 5.

73 See chapter 10.1, 118 note 65: wrong order of the archive photographs relating to the buried Walls 1a, 2a, and 3a.

74 Brueckner Tgb. 5 (1913–1915), 163. Brueckner Tgb. 7 (1928–1930), 155–157.

75 Brueckner Tgb. 5 (1913–1915), 62. 131. These measures of Knackfuß seem to cohere with repairs on the walls of the cemetery (Brueckner 1915b, 1). In detail chapter 10.1, 106. In the written estate of Knackfuß, which is kept at the Stadtmuseum Kassel, no references are made. Therefore, the exact extent of the repair measures is unclear.

76 Brueckner 1915a, 114: “Endziel der Arbeiten am Platze, seine klare und gesicherte Herstellung [...]” (Final goal of the on-site works, its clear and secured reconstruction [...]). It is not clear if the works were already finished before the interruption by the First World War in 1916, Stroszeck 2014, 17.

77 No traces of any measures undertaken by Mylonas were detected during the construction survey in 2013.

78 Brueckner’s and Knackfuß’s original intentions remain unclear and thus, all deductions drawn from the construction survey in 2013 can only be regarded as my personal attempts to embed the measures of Brueckner and Knackfuß into the contemporaneous, early 20<sup>th</sup> century ideas of ancient Athens.

Hagia Triada church on top of an Archaic tumulus in 1932<sup>79</sup>, the new head of the excavation Karl Kübler unearthed this area to the deepest strata, identified the different phases of the necropolis and published several reports and monographs on the burials. The already perfunctorily examined precincts on the south side of the Street of the Tombs were partially excavated down to bedrock. The grave precincts north of the *temenos*, namely the precincts of Lysimachides and Kephisodoros were not excavated by Kübler himself. Instead, he gave permission for deep excavation to two grantees of the German Archaeological Institute, who were present at Athens at this time<sup>80</sup>. Siegfried Lauffer was put in charge of the excavations inside the Lysimachides precinct northeast of the *temenos*, while Lothar Hahl supervised the works within the Kephisodoros precinct northwest of the *temenos*<sup>81</sup>. Both excavations could have clarified certain aspects of the establishment of the *temenos* from a stratigraphic perspective. Unfortunately, both these young scholars seem to have lacked experience and guidance, since the archival data kept in the Kerameikos archive is rather opaque and mainly contains incomprehensible observations<sup>82</sup>.

#### 1.1.4 Post-Second-World-War Restoration Carried Out by Dieter Ohly

After Brueckner's excavation and the short intermezzo of Lauffer and Hahl, the area south of the Street of the Tombs remained – as far as one can discern from the written records and the construction survey<sup>83</sup> – untouched for many years. The Second World War significantly interrupted research on the Kerameikos; from 1943 to 1955, the German Archaeological Institute was closed and in consequence, the whole excavation site was secured in the face of the approaching acts of war. The most prominent monuments, e. g. the Dexileos relief, were buried in the ground in order to protect them<sup>84</sup>. Until 1955, the monuments and walls were neither maintained nor repaired. When Dieter Ohly became head of the Kerameikos excavation after 13 years of neglect and subsequent decay, he was forced to take immediate measures. Unfortunately, the researchers that were most acquainted with the area of the Street of the Tombs, were already deceased: Brueckner had died in 1936 and Knackfuß in 1948.

In his progress report for the years 1956 to 1961, Ohly gives an account of the severely damaged state of the ancient remains and notes that his goal was the restoration of both the ancient ruins and the modern museum and storage buildings<sup>85</sup>. Ohly was well aware that the site had already been excavated, but as most of the research results were not published at the time and in order to guarantee a proper reconstruction of the visible structures, he aimed for partial re-excavation. This approach is only documented in his published report for the famous Classical grave precincts along the Street of the Tombs<sup>86</sup>; as no internal data on his measures are known<sup>87</sup>, it is only possible to deduce from the construction survey that the terrain behind the southern burial precincts was not re-investigated. As a result of Ohly's measures, all built additions to the ancient walls, which had been executed during the first restoration campaign by Brueckner and Knackfuß and had not

79 Stichel 1990, 40.

80 I thank Rudolf Stichel for bringing these campaigns and the archival documents to my knowledge.

81 Kübler 1938, 606.

82 Stichel (forthcoming).

83 See chapter 10.1, 105–118.

84 Ohly 1965, 277.

85 Ohly 1965, 277–281.

86 Ohly 1965, 331–360.

87 Technique and extent of the measures are only partially retraceable through the 2013 construction survey. Raimund Wünsche, who was personally acquainted with Ohly and had worked with him on Aigina, assured me that he kept diaries meticulously. None of these diaries are kept in any of the DAI archives.

been documented in written records then, were secured in the same manner as the original ancient walls<sup>88</sup>. The knowledge of the already remodelled archaeological record had died with Brueckner and Knackfuß and was now buried under another modern addition planned by Ohly, the documentation of which is also lost today.

Besides the built structures in the open air, which had been damaged due to being neglected during the War years, Brueckner's inventory of finds seems to have massively suffered. Brueckner had stored the finds of the campaigns in wooden boxes grouped according to their find context and kept together with additional notes<sup>89</sup>. The inventory system used consisted in the abbreviated forms of εὕρημα (find) with numbers and references to the dates of discovery. Brueckner wrote these references on the objects in black ink, but sometimes he seems to have used paper labels. Inventory books with reference to this system are not kept at the archives of the German Archaeological Institute<sup>90</sup>. The boxes and notes seem to have decayed during the site's years of closure. In 1957, Judith Perlzweig-Binder was entrusted with the arrangement of the storage rooms. She also worked at the Agora excavation of the American School at Athens and seems to have adapted the inventory system according to material groups. Based on the still detectable notes, Perlzweig-Binder established new inventory lists, the so-called "Binder-Listen"<sup>91</sup>, in which she included the still retraceable information on the artefacts and attributed new inventory numbers to the artefacts (cf. entries of Cat. 34 and 55 with references to Binder). Those were inscribed on the artefacts in pencil. Due to the Post-War re-arrangement of the finds less accurately documented contexts were dissolved. Therefore, the number of finds unambiguously ascribable to the *temenos* area is low<sup>92</sup>.

### 1.1.5 Work Conducted During the Era of Franz Willemsen (1961–1975)

After Ohly, Franz Willemsen became head of the Kerameikos excavation in 1961<sup>93</sup>. The excavation activities during this era are documented in the published reports<sup>94</sup>. Willemsen especially encouraged research on old excavation material; however, researchers active at the time, such as Gerhild Hübner, Karin Braun, Günter Kopcke or Ingeborg Scheibler<sup>95</sup>, state that in most cases the archival data was neglected and an immediate, art historical or typological approach was established for analysing the material. Kopcke emphasised that with regard to the excavation history, the researchers relied on the vast knowledge of Willemsen himself and of Ursula Knigge, who succeeded Willemsen in 1975<sup>96</sup>. Scheibler highlighted that Willemsen was very much occupied with the discovered ostraka hoard and its study. Therefore, the researchers were looked after by Knigge, who was a research assistant at the time<sup>97</sup>. Archival studies were not considered necessary or rather, the researchers were not made aware that there was existing archival material.

88 See chapter 10.1, 106 f.

89 See Brueckner 1915a, 124, where he explains this system for the Dipylon area.

90 The artefacts are listed in inventory books, which had been established by Ohly. He consequently introduced a new numbering system that ignored Brueckner's system. The whereabouts of the original inventory books are not known.

91 First entry: 6 November 1957. Last entry 2 November 1959.

92 See chapter 10.2, 118–121.

93 Fittschen 2000, 15; Knigge 2000, 207. Stroszeck 2014, 19 dates the beginning of his superintendence in 1965, in Stroszeck 2007, 68 it is 1966.

94 e. g. Willemsen – Knigge 1964; Willemsen – Knigge 1966.

95 I thank Gerhild Hübner, Karin Braun, Günter Kopcke and Ingeborg Scheibler for sharing information on their research activities.

96 Niemeier 2010, p. IX. Willemsen had brought Knigge to the Kerameikos already in the 1960s.

97 The hoard of over 9000 ostraka was discovered in 1966–1969, but only published in 2018 (Kerameikos 20).

Apart from the published excavation reports, no written records remain in the Kerameikos archive that could offer deeper insight into the measures undertaken in the area of the so-called Hekateion. Only the personal notes of Jürgen Trumpf, who worked in the Kerameikos in the summer of 1956, reveal a stray find with relation to the sanctuary of Artemis Soteira (Cat. 15). Regarding the material from the storerooms, Hübner was assigned to reprocess and inventory the artefacts, especially the finds coming from the *bothros* (Cat. 26 and 83) known from the small manuscripts written by Brueckner; additionally, some of the artefacts were marked with the provenance “Hekateion” (Cat. 26). Later, she published parts of the material<sup>98</sup>. Other finds, especially the late Classical fine ware fragments coming from the pottery debris (Cat. 34, 46, 47, and 56) were analysed and published with a purely art historical approach by Kopcke<sup>99</sup>.

### 1.1.6 Work Conducted During the Directorship of Ursula Knigge (1975–1995)

During the era of Ursula Knigge, Rudolf Stichel was entrusted with publishing the Classical and Hellenistic burials in this area<sup>100</sup>. In 1982, he was put in charge of the excavation of the precinct of Dionysios of Kollytos<sup>101</sup> and was able to clarify some stratigraphic observations concerning the development of the area and the movement axes<sup>102</sup>. Due to the immediate spatial relation between the grave precincts and the *temenos*, some of these results also shed light on the development of the *temenos* area, previously used as a burial site, and the later establishment of the sanctuary<sup>103</sup>.

### 1.1.7 The Cleaning Campaigns in 2012 and 2013 and the Following Restoration Work Under the Auspices of Jutta Stroszeck

After many decades without new research on the sanctuary, a re-examination of the *temenos* began in 2011 under the directorship of Jutta Stroszeck. In the meantime, the walls enclosing the *temenos* had been partially removed in 2003 for the construction of a handicap-accessible footpath (cf. Attachments F–G). The need to establish a secure basis for a planned restoration campaign prompted not only a fundamental documentation of the *status quo*, but also the attempt to clarify the original archaeological record of 1890 and to offer possible reconstructions of different phases of the *temenos*. The poor state of knowledge and the lack of archival data made it necessary to re-examine already excavated structures. To this end, a cleaning campaign focusing on the area of the altars (Plates 54 and 55) as well as a thorough investigation of the substructures of Well B 18 were carried out in March 2012 (Plates 58 and 59). In March 2013, the construction survey was undertaken and followed by cleaning campaigns at carefully selected sections of the enclosing walls. The aim was to clarify the state of all modern alterations and additions (cf. Attachments F–H; Plates 40–51, 60 and 61)<sup>104</sup>. In many parts, the deep ground excavation trenches of Brueckner were recognisable and helped to understand the formerly undertaken measures.

<sup>98</sup> Hübner 1973, passim.

<sup>99</sup> Kopcke 1964, passim.

<sup>100</sup> The volume is currently under preparation, Stichel (forthcoming).

<sup>101</sup> Stichel 1984, passim.

<sup>102</sup> Stichel 1984, 60 f.

<sup>103</sup> See chapter 4, 42–46.

<sup>104</sup> See chapter 10.1, 105–118 for the detailed analysis.

### 1.1.8 The Excavation Campaign 2015 Under the Directorship of Jutta Stroszeck – a Sanctuary Within the Sanctuary

The most recent excavation campaign inside the *temenos* was undertaken in May 2015. The focus of the work was on the water supply of the area, which led to the examination of three wells. Well B 18 inside the *temenos* was excavated as far as possible. It is one of the earliest rock-cut wells in the Kerameikos site and was already partially excavated by Brueckner, but later filled with debris<sup>105</sup>. It is therefore relevant for retracing the development of the area<sup>106</sup>. Well B 19 located immediately to the north of the sanctuary was emptied completely<sup>107</sup>. Based on the measures of the framing tiles, a dating to the Roman period seems plausible<sup>108</sup>. The results not only fundamentally altered Brueckner's statements concerning the chronology and the attribution of the sanctuary and confirmed parts of my thesis submitted in 2014<sup>109</sup>. The campaign also revealed that there were and still are structures within the *temenos*, which are not fully excavated and barely comprehensible. With the opening of the *manteion* of Paian, kept in the inventory as Well B 35 (Plate 5.2)<sup>110</sup>, the interpretation of this omphaloid structure in-between the altar and the cult statue base (Plates 56 and 57) had to be revised completely. The outcome of the research on the *manteion* focussing on the documentation and interpretation of the oracular structure will be published independently by Stroszeck<sup>111</sup>.

Regarding the opening of the structure, inscribed as a *manteion* of Paian, Brueckner's 1909 publication offers a surprise: in a footnote, Brueckner refers to a squeeze taken by Struck from a well. Due to the bad quality of the squeeze, the trained epigraphist Brueckner was not able to decipher the inscription for the 1909 publication, but offers a sketch of the visible letters<sup>112</sup>. With the knowledge of the inscription "ΕΛΘΕ ΜΟΙ Ω ΠΑΙΑΝ ΦΕΡΩΝ ΤΟ ΜΑΝΤΕΙΟΝ ΑΛΗΘΕΣ"<sup>113</sup> revealed in the excavation of 2015 and its comparison to the published sketch (Plate 5.1: ΦΕΡΩΝ ΤΟ is clearly visible), it becomes probable that Brueckner and Struck had opened the omphaloid structure already in their first seasons<sup>114</sup>, but had not paid any further attention to it<sup>115</sup>.

The new results of the excavation carried out after the submission of my thesis have been taken into account for this publication. Regarding the research history, missing or not conducted documentation of measures once more became unambiguously evident, since the *manteion* had most likely been opened already by Brueckner. Moreover, based on the more profound examination of the *manteion*, the structure turns out to be the latest attestation for the existence of the sanctuary, i. e. the 3<sup>rd</sup> century CE<sup>116</sup>. The focus of the study at hand, however, lies on the establishment of the cult site as a sanctuary of Artemis Soteira and its initial role within the sacred landscape of Attica.

105 Stroszeck 2017b, 63.

106 See chapter 4.3, 41.

107 The filling comprised pottery debris and sculpture fragments. The highly fragmentary head of an animal, possibly a bear, might derive from the sanctuary of Artemis. The find of a 19<sup>th</sup> century coin proves that the well shaft had already been excavated in the first campaigns by Rousopoulos. It will be published by Stroszeck (forthcoming) 2.

108 Stroszeck 2017b, 51.

109 C. Graml, Das sogenannte Hekateion im Athener Kerameikos (Inauguraldissertation, Mainz 2014).

110 Stroszeck 2016, 30–35; Stroszeck 2017b, 60.

111 The publication is currently under preparation and scheduled for 2020.

112 Brueckner 1909a, 27 f. note 1.

113 Stroszeck 2017a, 122. For the variation of the inscription: Stroszeck (forthcoming) 2.

114 It seems plausible that Brueckner and Struck only lifted the *omphalos* stone. The round opening below the *omphalos* was only 40 cm wide for taking squeezes from the well tiles (cf. Plates 56 and 57). In 2015, the entire plaque including the *omphalos* was lifted in order to open up the entire shaft, cf. Plate 5.2.

115 Klaus Hallof, who generously provided me with information on the epigraphical finds, made me aware of this published footnote.

116 Stroszeck (forthcoming) 2. In my submitted version, I proposed an earlier dating due to the unknown archaeological record.

### 1.1.9 History of Research on the *temenos* and Certain Finds With Provenance in the Sanctuary

The general results of the analysis of the intricate history of the sanctuary's discovery and investigation so far are observable in the publications relating to the *temenos*. Nearly all the studies have in common that they directly or indirectly rely on the 1890s report by Mylonas<sup>117</sup>. His interpretation however, is cautiously phrased<sup>118</sup>. Brueckner published a more detailed report of Mylonas' arguments but did not offer any new insights on the sanctuary, since he published prior to the completion of the excavation and the subsequent restoration. In the following research, the *temenos* appears only in brief passing mentions. In summary literature, e. g. on the Kerameikos excavation, like Knigge's guidebook through the excavation site<sup>119</sup> or Claudia Ruggeri's collection of written sources on the Kerameikos<sup>120</sup> or in volumes focussing on the topography of Athens and Attica, like those by Walter Judeich<sup>121</sup>, John Travlos<sup>122</sup>, Richard Ernest Wycherley<sup>123</sup>, Evgenia Vikela<sup>124</sup>, or Elisa Bazzechi<sup>125</sup> the *temenos* is mentioned primarily because of the fascinating nature of the goddess Hekate. Therefore, it is usually highlighted as a peculiarity, but thoughts exceeding Mylonas' interpretation on the *temenos* or its significance are missing due to the very limited published knowledge on the archaeological record. In scholarly works on ancient Greek religion, the sanctuary is usually listed as an unambiguously identified place of worship of the chthonic goddess Hekate, situated within a necropolis – a location that seems more than suitable in view of the literary sources on the goddess' traits<sup>126</sup>. More recently, Romina Carboni<sup>127</sup> and Nicola Serafini<sup>128</sup> also referred to the *temenos* in their publications on Hekate. Carboni mainly focuses on how Hekate spread across the Mediterranean. According to Carboni, Hekate had a long tradition in the *polis* of Athens, of which the presumably Roman *temenos* from the Kerameikos<sup>129</sup> could possibly have been part<sup>130</sup>. Serafini's approach also comprises a topographical chapter, but is generally focused more on Hekate's duties and spheres of power.

Looking beyond these brief mentions of the entire sanctuary, a number of individual finds from the *temenos* have been published without any connection to their original find context as part of

117 Mylonas 1890, 22–24 with explicit focus on the sanctuary. Mylonas also describes the measures in the other parts of the excavation site.

118 Mylonas 1890, 24: “[...] εἰς τὴν Ἐκάτην πιθανώτατα, [...]” Translation by the author: “very probable to Hekate, [...]” Only exception: Parker 2005b, 57.

119 Knigge 1988, 129 f. The current guidebooks in German and Greek by Stroszeck already incorporate the results of my PhD thesis, Stroszeck 2014, 108–110 and Stroszeck 2017a, 120–123. In the German version, Stroszeck still mentions Hekate. In the Greek version, the later phase of the *manteion* is emphasised. Also in Banou – Bournias 2014.

120 Ruggeri 2013, 48 f.

121 Judeich 1931, 411 f.

122 Travlos 1971, 302 f.

123 Wycherley 1978, 259.

124 Vikela 2011, 150.

125 Bazzechi 2014, 346–348.

126 Eitrem 1915, 42; Karouzou 1972, 72; Akimova 1983, 87 with reference to a *temenos* in the Black Sea region; most recently Parker 2005b, 57 who for the first time expresses doubts about Mylonas' attribution. Not mentioned in Simon 1985.

127 Carboni 2007, 47–60; Carboni 2015, 170.

128 Serafini 2015, 126.

129 Brueckner 1909, 42–55.

130 Carboni 2007, 50. Carboni heavily refers to the statue of Hekate Epipyrgidia on the Athenian Acropolis and therefore follows the established line of research, which identifies this statue as the beginning of the cultic veneration of Hekate in Athens. For the Hekate Epipyrgidia and the problematic connection to a tripartite statue type, see Graml (forthcoming).