



The Temple of Aphaia on Aegina: Further Thoughts on the Date of the Reconstruction

Author(s): David W. J. Gill

Source: *The Annual of the British School at Athens*, 1993, Vol. 88 (1993), pp. 173-181

Published by: British School at Athens

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/30064364>

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

https://www.jstor.org/stable/30064364?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



British School at Athens is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Annual of the British School at Athens*

JSTOR

THE TEMPLE OF APHAIA ON AEGINA: FURTHER THOUGHTS ON THE DATE OF THE RECONSTRUCTION¹

THE publication of the black-figured pottery from the terrace system around the temple of Aphaia on Aegina required a reassessment of the traditional date given to the reconstruction. It became clear that a significant body of material, dated according to the orthodox chronology developed by Studniczka-Langlotz, was later than 510 or 500, the dates assigned to the reconstruction of the temple by the excavators.² Now that further bodies of relevant material from the terrace systems have been published, it is right to examine the issue again.³ This discussion will first look at the new bodies of material and consider the interpretation offered in the official excavation publications. It will then turn to the Agora excavations at Athens and consider appropriate contemporary deposits which have a bearing on the dating of the Aphaia terrace fills.

RED-FIGURED POTTERY

The red-figured, black-glossed, and hellenistic pottery recently published by Williams is claimed to be 'associated' with the temple built to replace the one burnt down 'some time around 500 BC'.⁴ Despite this, the reader is presented with relatively few contexts, and none is securely connected with the rebuilding of the temple and the fill of the terrace system.⁵ Indeed, of the sixty-one pieces catalogued, only eight are given

¹ I am grateful to Alain Pasquier and Angelika Waiblinger for their help with the material from Elaious, and to Hugh Bowden, John Camp, Paul Cartledge, and Michael Vickers for their comments on earlier drafts of this paper. Abbreviations in addition to those in standard use:

Agora iv = R. H. Howland, *Greek Lamps and their Survivals* (Princeton, 1958)

Agora xii = B. A. Sparkes and L. Talcott, *Black and Plain Pottery of the 6th, 5th and 4th Centuries BC* (Princeton, 1970)

Agora xiv = H. A. Thompson and R. E. Wycherley, *The Agora of Athens: The History, Shape and Uses of an Ancient City Center* (Princeton, 1972)

Agora xxiii = M. B. Moore and M. Z. Pease Philippides, *Attic Black-figured Pottery* (Princeton, 1986)

Agora xxv = M. Lang, *Ostraka* (Princeton, 1990)

Aphaia ii = D. Ohly, 'Aegina, Aphaia-Tempel ii: Untersuchungen in der spätarchaisches Temenosterrasse', *AA* 1971, 505–26

Aphaia iv = D. Williams, 'Aegina, Aphaia-Tempel iv: the inscription commemorating the construction of the first limestone temple and other features of the sixth century temenos', *AA* 1982, 55–68

Aphaia viii = M. B. Moore, 'Aegina, Aphaia-Tempel viii: the Attic black-figured pottery', *AA* 1986, 51–93

Aphaia xi = D. Williams, 'Aegina, Aphaia-Tempel xi: the pottery from the second limestone temple and the later history of the sanctuary', *AA* 1987, 629–80

Aphaia xiii = A. W. Johnston, 'Aegina, Aphaia-Tempel xiii: the storage amphorae', *AA* 1990, 37–64

Aphaia xiv = D. M. Bailey, 'Aegina, Aphaia-Tempel xiv: the lamps', *AA* 1991, 31–68

Francis-Vickers, 'Agora' = E. D. Francis and M. Vickers, 'The Agora revisited: Athenian chronology c.500–450 BC', *BSA* 83 (1988), 143–67

Gill, *ABP* = D. W. J. Gill, *Attic Black-glazed Pottery in the Fifth Century BC: Workshops and Export* (D.Phil. diss., Oxford, 1986)

Gill, 'Aphaia' = D. W. J. Gill, 'The temple of Aphaia on Aegina: the date of the reconstruction', *BSA* 83 (1988), 169–77

Roberts, 'Well' = S. R. Roberts, 'The Stoa Gutter Well: a late archaic deposit in the Athenian Agora', *Hesp.* 55 (1986), 1–74

² Gill, 'Aphaia'; this was based on the publication of the black-figured pottery in Aphaia viii.

³ Aphaia xi; xiii; xiv.

⁴ Aphaia xi. 629.

⁵ The contexts for the red-figured pottery are 'Found on the offerings table in the rear room of the temple' (nos. A 6, A 26); 'Found in fill behind outer terrace wall south of Propylon' (A 8, A 28, A 41); 'South of Propylon' (A 28); 'Found south of Terrace wall in the neighbourhood of the sanctuary of Pan' (A 9, A 45); 'Found under latest altar' (A 60).

findspots. Only two pieces of pottery are deemed to be chronologically significant by Williams. The first (no. A 1) is a burnt and fragmentary red-figured cup (type C) attributed to 'Epiktetos' and dated 'c.510 BC'. Because this was found by Furtwängler 'outside the terrace in the north-east corner but among other debris from the sixth century temenos', and because the sherd showed 'clear signs of burning', Williams suggests that 'this cup . . . was most probably damaged in the fire that engulfed the sixth century temple'.⁶ Leaving aside questions arising from the Studniczka-Langlotz chronology, the presence of a cup in debris from the sixth-century temple merely provides a *terminus post quem*, not a fixed date for the destruction. Moreover, the cup need not have been damaged in the fire that destroyed the earlier temple.

The second piece (no. A 26) is a fragmentary red-figured amphora of Panathenaic shape attributed to 'the Nikoxenos painter'. The amphora is said to have been found by Cockerell on 'the offerings table in the rear room of the temple in 1811'.⁷ Since the piece is dated by Williams to 'the first decade of the fifth century', he hypothesizes from the context that the amphora 'represents one of the earliest dedications in the new temple, one perhaps made by a victorious jumper in a recent Panathenaic Games as a memento of his achievement'.⁸ In fairness, he offers the possibility that 'our amphora was rescued from the flames of the older temple, even though it shows no signs of burning, or that it was only given to Aphaia some time after it was made'.⁹ Even if we accept Cockerell's report as true, the fragmentary amphora may or may not have been dedicated in the temenos of the earlier temple, and there is no knowing at what point in time it was placed on the offerings table. No more than the 'Epiktetos' fragment can it be accepted as a secure archaeological datum.

BLACK-GLOSSED POTTERY

Most of the black-glossed material published by Williams 'was certainly dedicated after the building of the temple and the reorganization of its temenos'.¹⁰ However, the report did include 'some pieces that may belong to the last years of the earlier temple';¹¹ in particular, the stemless cups with disc feet 'must by reason of their context go with the earlier temple'. Five of these stemless cups, the so-called Elaious cups,¹² come from the West Terrace fill and are dated to the 'beginning of fifth century BC' or 'early fifth century BC'. A further one comes from the North Terrace fill.

Williams gives as a parallel for one of the Elaious cups from the West Terrace fill (no. B 23) a cup from the Stoa Gutter Well in the Athenian Agora which is dated to '500–480 BC'; he prefers to assign a date of the 'beginning of fifth century BC' to the Aphaia example.¹³ Leaving the dating of the Agora deposits to one side (below, pp. 178–9), further close parallels may be found in examples from tomb groups in the Fikellura cemetery at Kameiros on Rhodes, and at Elaious.¹⁴ Unfortunately, the one from

⁶ Aphaia xi. 669.

⁷ Aphaia xi. 670.

⁸ Aphaia xi. 671.

⁹ Aphaia xi. 671.

¹⁰ Aphaia xi. 647.

¹¹ Aphaia xi. 647.

¹² Gill, *ABP* 97–8. They are named after three examples found at Elaious, now in the Louvre. The type of base is also found on one-handlers such as the banded example in Amsterdam (Gill, *ABP*, no. O 1).

¹³ The same phenomenon of not assigning Agora dates

to Aphaia objects is also found with the black-figured pottery; see Gill, 'Aphaia', 173 n. 11. Sparkes and Talcott (*Agora* xii. 99) assigned dates 'from the end of the 6th century to 480 BC' to this type of cup.

¹⁴ Parallels for no. B 23: London 64.10-7.2117, from Kameiros, Fikellura cemetery, grave 3 (Gill, *ABP* no. J 9, pl. 49). For B 24: Paris, Louvre R II 142 (CA 3885/Ele 142), from Elaious, S-29 (Gill, *ABP* no. J 2, pl. 48). For B 27: Paris, Louvre CA 3884, from Elaious, sarc. 9 (Gill, *ABP* no. J 3, pl. 48).

Kameiros was found with an alabastron and a much later red-figured squat lekythos, and thus the context is not useful for dating.¹⁵ However, one of the stemless cups from Elaious (S-29) was found with black-figured lekythoi and a cup-skyphos, black-glossed cup-skyphoi and cups, and a post-Aphrodite Group terracotta.¹⁶ The contents would support a date of c.480 BC on the conventional chronology. Given our present knowledge of black-glossed pottery—and I would agree with Williams that ‘the chronology of this small class is far from precise’—it might be safer to say that this type of cup should be dated on the conventional chronology to at least as late as 480 BC.¹⁷ A further relevant black-glossed piece is a lid fragment from a thymiaterion (no. B 72) found in the East Terrace fill. Williams dates it to the early fifth century BC, although the parallels he cites are assigned dates of ‘ca. 500 BC’ and ‘ca. 480 BC’.¹⁸

AMPHORAE

Although it has been well said (for the Roman period) that ‘amphorae will never compete with fine wares in the closeness with which they can be dated or used for dating’,¹⁹ it is a recurrent theme of A. W. Johnston’s study of the amphorae from the Aphaia sanctuary that the material is contemporary with deposits at Athens which may be ‘associated with the Persian destruction of 480 BC’.²⁰ Most of the amphorae studied by Johnston were ‘recovered in the loose terrace fills, and so should be roughly contemporary with the building period of the second limestone temple’.²¹ The deposits for the amphorae are as follows:

South-west Terrace Fill

Chiot	nos. 2, 11, 21, 23, 29, 30–4, 36
Lesbian	nos. 37, 40–1, 47, 50, 52–3
‘Klazomenian’	nos. 55–7, 59, 66–7
Corinthian	nos. 71, 74, 79–80, 88, 94
‘Samo-Milesian’	nos. 99–101, 104
East Greek	nos. 105, 107–9, 119–20, 125
East Greek, probably	nos. 110, 112–13
East Greek, perhaps	no. 149
others	nos. 130, 133–7, 139, 142, 144, 146
later	no. 154 (‘after the building period’)

South Terrace (72/3, 75/1)

Chiot	nos. 3–7, 9, 13–14, 16–20, 22, 25
Lesbian	nos. 45, 48
Corinthian	nos. 77–8, 85, 91–2
East Greek	nos. 117–18
others	nos. 128, 138

¹⁵ Alabastron: London 64.10-7.1167. Squat lekythos: London E 662.

¹⁶ Details of the excavation may be found in [E. Pottier], ‘Fouilles archéologiques sur l’emplacement de la nécropole d’Eléonte de Thrace (juillet–décembre 1915)’, *BCH* 39 (1915), 135–240; A. Waiblinger, ‘La ville grecque d’Eléonte en Chersonèse de Thrace et sa nécropole’, *CRAI* 1978, 843–57. I am grateful to Alain Pasquier and Angelika Waiblinger for granting me access to the material in the Louvre.

¹⁷ Aphaia xi. 66g. Williams was probably unaware of the

Elaious grave-groups. Further Elaious cups have been found at the Thesmophorion, Eretria: I. R. Metzger, *Das Thesmophorion von Eretria: Funde und Befunde eines Heiligtums* (Eretria, vii; Bern, 1985), 13, figs. 3–5, nos. 105–72.

¹⁸ *Agora* xii, nos. 1345, 1347.

¹⁹ D. P. S. Peacock and D. F. Williams, *Amphorae and the Roman Economy: An Introductory Guide* (London, 1986), 16.

²⁰ Aphaia xiii. 37–8; 39; 60.

²¹ Aphaia xiii. 37.

<i>West Terrace</i> (78/4, 78/5, 78)	
Chiot	nos. 1, 24, 27
Lesbian	nos. 42–3, 49
Corinthian	nos. 72 (type A), 76
'Samo-Milesian'	nos. 102–3
others	no. 143

This range of amphorae finds parallels from excavations in the Athenian Agora (below, p. 179). 'Samo-Milesian' amphorae are said to have been found in the destruction levels of Kalabaktepe at Miletus, which date to 494, and Roberts dates the example from the Stoa Gutter Well to 'ca. 500 BC'.²² Despite this there is a possibility that, although some amphorae may have been found in a destruction layer of 494 BC, they continued to be made after this date. One unassigned amphora (no. 154) from the South-west Terrace fill is said to be 'after the building period', although the reasoning for this is not made clear.

LAMPS

Bailey has provided a detailed study of the lamps, and in many cases has assigned Howland type numbers.²³ The key deposits for ascertaining the date of the reconstruction are as follows (with Howland type parallels):

South-west Terrace Fill (contexts A and B): nos. 58 (type 12 B), 61, 63 (probably type 16 B), 67 (type 16 variant), 170 (type 11), 173 (type 19 A), 177 (type 19 A), 178 (type 19 A), 186 (near type 21 B)

West Terrace Fill (contexts C and D): nos. 2, 7, 64

North Terrace Fill (context E): nos. 57 (type 12 B), 174 (type 19 A)

'Goes with Context E' (context 72/2): nos. 165 (type 16 A), 182 (near type 21), 183 (near type 21)

These three fills are dated by Bailey to 'earlier than c.480 BC'.²⁴ Some of the lamps do not help with providing a *terminus post quem* for the terrace fills, as they are quite early.²⁵ However, some of the lamps may be dated after 500 BC, the date now accepted by the excavators for the destruction of the sixth-century temple.²⁶ In particular, Howland type 12 B lamps can be dated on the conventional chronology 'perhaps into the early years of the 5th century',²⁷ and types 16 B, 16 variant, and 19 A 'down to ca. 480'.²⁸ Of note are the lamps near Howland type 21 B (and 21) which were found in the South-west Terrace fill and context 72/2 (associated with the North Terrace fill), since these are normally dated 'between 480 BC and ca. 415 BC'.²⁹

Although several lamps from the terrace fills may be dated as late as 480 BC (and some

²² Roberts, 'Well', nos. 412–13. Johnston (Aphaia 13, 47) notes material from Kalabaktepe without giving specific details. He refers to P. Dupont, 'Amphores commerciales archaïques de la Grèce de l'est', *PP* 37 (1982), 203–6. The Kalabaktepe context is not straightforward; see A. von Gerkan, *Kalabaktepe, Athenatempel und Umgebung* (Milet, i. 8; 1925), 12–13. See also E. D. Francis and M. Vickers, 'Leagros kalos', *PCPS* 207 (1981), 113.

²³ Aphaia xiv.

²⁴ Aphaia xiv. 65. It should also be noted that Bailey considers that the East Terrace fill can no longer be used

as evidence for dating the temple, since it contains material which 'can be as late as the mid-fourth century BC' (p. 65).

²⁵ e.g. no. 170 of Howland type 11, from the South-west Terrace fill, should normally be dated to the 'late 7th century BC and well into the 6th' (*Agora* iv. 23).

²⁶ Aphaia xi. 629; cf. Aphaia xiv. 67.

²⁷ *Agora* iv. 26.

²⁸ *Agora* iv. 31, 33.

²⁹ *Agora* iv. 46. Bailey (Aphaia xiv. 67) notes that, since these type 21 lamps are not Athenian, caution should be used when trying to assign dates.

possibly later)—and it is accepted that the fills could be as late as c.480 BC³⁰—Bailey does ‘not believe that the lamps described here can be used to support either the excavators’ view of a c.500 BC destruction by fire of the sixth-century Aphaia-Temple, followed by a rebuild over at least ten years, or the revisionist views of D. W. J. Gill that the rebuild occurred after the Persian Wars of 480–479 BC’.³¹ Yet there is an inconsistency in Bailey’s logic, since if he accepts that the temple was burnt down in c.500 BC and took ‘at least’ (my italics) ten years to rebuild, the reconstruction must have taken place in the 480s. The later the lamps and the other pottery may be dated, the later the reconstruction must be.

PARALLELS WITH AGORA CONTEXTS

Many parallels for the pottery from the terrace fills around the temple of Aphaia may be found in the excavations in the Athenian Agora. Three key Agora contexts stand out.

G 6:3, THE RECTANGULAR ROCK-CUT SHAFT

This shaft on the east slope of the Kolonos Agoraios contained a mass of pottery. Although Vanderpool has claimed that the upper fill was ‘not thrown in all at one time but gathered over a period of years’,³² this does not take account of the fact that 106 of the pots have fragments in more than one level, sometimes with parts of one pot separated by up to three metres.³³ Traditionally the deposit has been dated to ‘ca. 510–480 BC’;³⁴ but if it is a homogeneous deposit, as the archaeology would seem to indicate, it seems that it belongs to a clean-up in the Agora sometime after c.480 BC on the conventional chronology. The contents of the shaft also included a number of ostraka with the names of the ‘candidates’ traditionally thought to have been ostracized in the 480s.³⁵ However, if the great deposit of ostraka from the Kerameikos, which contains ostraka of Megakles, is placed in the 470s rather than the 480s,³⁶ this would provide additional support for a later date. This is the position taken in the most recent interpretation, which has suggested that the pottery found in the fill was ‘made . . . in the period between the late sixth century and c.475’, and that ‘the upper fill . . . was added after the ostracisms of the 470s’.³⁷ The Rectangular Rock-cut Shaft has two implications for the fill of the Aphaia temple terraces, depending on whether or not the revision is accepted. (1) The Aphaia fill contains material which can be as late as 480, and thus the temple is likely to have been built in the late 480s or the early 470s. (2) The Aphaia fill may be as late as 475, and thus the temple is likely to have been built in the 470s.

(a) *Black-figured*.³⁸ Moore³⁹ has shown that three skyphoi of the ‘CHC Group’ from the north and east terraces may be compared with ones from the Rectangular Rock-cut Shaft,⁴⁰ and that three skyphoi of Ure’s ‘Class of Skyphoi K 2’ from the North and West Terraces have parallels from the same Agora deposit (two from the lowest levels).⁴¹ It

³⁰ Aphaia xiv. 65: the contexts are noted as being ‘earlier than c.480 BC’ and the lamps can be dated ‘down to about 480 BC’.

³¹ Aphaia xiv. 67. This is a response to Gill, ‘Aphaia’.

³² E. Vanderpool, ‘The rectangular rock-cut shaft: the upper fill’, *Hesp.* 15 (1946), 266.

³³ As demonstrated by Francis–Vickers, ‘Agora’.

³⁴ e.g. *Agora* xii. 390; *Agora* xxiii. 331. This date continues to be accepted: Roberts ‘Well’, 4: ‘early 5th century’ and contemporary with the Stoa Gutter Well.

³⁵ *Agora* xxv. 25, Deposit E 8.

³⁶ As has been argued by D. M. Lewis, ‘The Kerameikos ostraka’, *ZPE* 14 (1974), 1–4, and reportedly supported by Willemsen (cf. H. R. Immerwahr, ‘An inscribed cup by the Ambrosios painter’, *AK* 27 (1984), 12). *Contra*, *Agora* xxv. 5. Lewis (p. 4) realizes that the Shaft is linked to the argument.

³⁷ Francis–Vickers, ‘Agora’, 151.

³⁸ Gill, ‘Aphaia’, 172–3.

³⁹ Aphaia viii.

⁴⁰ *Agora* xxiii, nos. 1580, 1584.

⁴¹ *Agora* xxiii, nos. 1506–11.

seems unnecessary for Williams to suggest that 'such pieces would normally be placed in the first decade or so of the fifth century, but the absolute chronology of the late black-figure workshops is not well understood'.⁴² Why should pottery which is normally placed 'in the first decade or so of the fifth century' (i.e. the 490s and 480s) be confined to 'the early fifth century' and thus leave the temple's reconstruction dated to c.500 BC?

(b) *Black-glossed*. The dating used for the black-glossed pottery from the terrace fills follows that adopted for the Athenian Agora.⁴³ It should be noted that Sparkes and Talcott viewed the Rectangular Rock-cut Shaft as an accumulation of debris rather than as a homogeneous deposit, and this in itself throws doubt on the validity of their chronological framework. The shaft provides parallels for the Elaious cups from the West and North Terraces as well as the lid for the thymiaterion.

(c) *Lamps*. Howland types 16 B, 16 variant, and 19 A.

G 11:3, THE WELL SERVING THE PREDECESSOR OF THE THOLOS

This well which served building F, the predecessor of the Tholos, contained a fill which was sealed by an 'Upper dumped filling mostly of earth and field stones, probably thrown in at the time of the construction of the Tholos'.⁴⁴ The main filling has been dated from the 'last years of 6th century to ca. 480 BC'.⁴⁵ It is of note that this well shows remarkably little evidence of the Persian destruction. There are at present three views that need to be considered. The first, that of the present Agora excavators, is that building F 'was destroyed by the Persians in 480' and the Tholos built '470–460 BC'.⁴⁶ The second view, that of Homer Thompson, the original excavator, is that the Tholos belongs to the post-Ephialtic building programme of the late 460s.⁴⁷ The third view, to accommodate Thompson's view of the Tholos being part of a post-Ephialtic building programme, is that 'building F was only begun after the Persians left to be demolished some time later on, probably around 460'.⁴⁸ Parallels from the well of building F have a *terminus ante quem* of the building of the Tholos, and thus the material should be placed either in the 470s or even as late as the 460s.

(a) *Black-figured*. A skyphos of Ure's 'Class of Skyphoi K2'.⁴⁹

(b) *Lamps*. Howland types 16 B, 16 variant, and 19 A.

Q 12:3, THE STOA GUTTER WELL

This well, beneath the gutter of the Stoa of Attalos, contained a large deposit of pottery which 'most probably represents the stock of a potter's shop near the edge of the square, damaged in the Persian sack and discarded by the owner immediately afterwards'.⁵⁰ Although the deposit has been dated to '520–490 BC' and it has been claimed that 'none of the figured pieces is later than 490 BC',⁵¹ the most recent study by Roberts has

⁴² Aphaia xi. 669.

⁴³ Agora xii.

⁴⁴ Agora xii. 390.

⁴⁵ Agora iv. 239; cf. Agora xii. 390–1, POU: c.500–480 BC (?); U: c.480–470 BC or soon after; Agora xxiii. 332, POU: c.500–480 BC; U: c.480–470 BC or soon after.

⁴⁶ J. M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora: Excavations in the Heart of Classical Athens* (London, 1986), 44, 77; see also id., *The Athenian Agora: A Guide to the Excavations and Museum* (4th edn; Athens, 1990), 47–54. This follows the original views of Thompson and Wycherley (Agora xiv. 42).

⁴⁷ H. A. Thompson, *Archaeology*, 31.5 (1978), 63; id., 'The Pnyx in models', in *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography Presented to Eugene Vanderpool* (Hesperia supp. 19, 1982), 136; id., 'Athens faces adversity', *Hesp.* 50 (1981), 345.

⁴⁸ Francis-Vickers, 'Agora', 154.

⁴⁹ Agora xxiii, no. 1542, 'ca. 480–470 BC'. This skyphos is noted in Agora xii. 391 as 'probably to be dated ca. 475–465 BC'.

⁵⁰ Agora xii. 397. See also Roberts, 'Well'.

⁵¹ Agora xii. 397; Agora xxiii. 335.

assigned a date of 'ca. 520–480 BC'. Roberts recognizes the similarity of the material from the well to that found in the Rectangular Rock-cut Shaft, which she still considers to have been interpreted correctly by Vanderpool, since 'the date is made mandatory by the ostraka'.⁵² Since there is no independent dating for the well, then, if the date of the Rectangular Rock-cut Shaft is lowered, so, by implication, must be that of the well.

(a) *Black-figured*. A skyphos of the 'CHC Group'.⁵³

(b) *Black-glossed*. Elaious cups.

(c) *Amphorae*. Johnston notes 'much similarity with Chiot material from the Persian destruction deposits in the Athenian Agora', and cites examples from the well.⁵⁴ The 'standard' red variety of Lesbian,⁵⁵ 'Klazomenian',⁵⁶ Corinthian,⁵⁷ and 'Samo-Milesian'⁵⁸ amphorae have all been found in the well. Roberts has dated most of the amphorae to the period '520–480 BC'.

(d) *Lamps*. Howland types 16 B and 19 A; all have been assigned a date of 520–480 BC.⁵⁹

CONCLUSION

It has been noted that the date of the reconstruction 'is given by the latest pottery discarded in the terrace fill around the new temple and by the sculpture which decorated its new pediments'.⁶⁰ Using the conventional chronology, Moore has dated the latest black-figured pottery to the 'early 5th century', and has noted that it was of a type 'mass-produced during the time of the Persian Wars'.⁶¹ A similar date of the 'early 5th century' is assigned to the black-glossed stemless cups, and the lamps may be dated as late as 480. The amphorae are compared specifically with parallels which are thought to have a *terminus ante quem* of 480 BC. Looking to the Athenian Agora, each of these groups may find parallels in one or more contexts which, on the conventional chronology, may be dated as late as 480 BC, and thus the pottery from these Aphaia fills should provide the temple with a *terminus post quem* of c.480. However if the revision of the Agora contexts (as well as of the deposit of ostraka in the Kerameikos) is accepted, then the lower limit for the pottery from the terrace fills should lie in the 470s (or perhaps even the early 460s), and the construction of the temple of Aphaia must certainly fall after the Persian wars. Presuming that the pottery so far published from the temple does indeed come from secure archaeological contexts (as their publication indeed suggests),⁶² it no longer seems possible, in my view, to date the reconstruction before the 470s. I would agree with Williams that a firm conclusion on the date of the

⁵² Roberts, 'Well', 4, cf. 2.

⁵³ *Agora* xxiii, no. 1582.

⁵⁴ Aphaia xiii. 39; Roberts, 'Well', nos. 419–20.

⁵⁵ Roberts, 'Well', nos. 408–11.

⁵⁶ Roberts, 'Well', nos. 421–2.

⁵⁷ Roberts, 'Well', nos. 414 (A), 415–417 (B). Aphaia xiii, no. 85, is a type which Johnston (p. 44) compares with Roberts, 'Well', no. 417.

⁵⁸ Roberts, 'Well', nos. 412–13.

⁵⁹ Roberts, 'Well', nos. 395–401, 404. Other types in the Well are 5, 16 B variant, and 17 A.

⁶⁰ Aphaia xi. 669.

⁶¹ Aphaia viii, esp. 53.

⁶² See the published stratigraphic cross-sections published in Aphaia ii. 512, figs. 4–5. The importance of

these sections is discussed in Gill, 'Aphaia', 169–70. The apparent sequence for the North Terrace is: (i) Bedrock. (ii) Layer of soil and humus, sealed by (iii) burnt debris in thin layer. (iv) Terrace wall built (as both the natural and burnt layers were cut back). (v) Area behind terrace walls filled with debris from clearing of site; this included material from the temple and the pottery fragments. (vi) Foundations for the new temple prepared and cut through the layers of fill and burnt debris; the stone foundations packed with sand and earth fill. (vii) Layer of poros chippings from the work on the temple; this seals the fill behind the terrace wall. (viii) The poros chippings were packed with sand and earth; sealed by (ix) a layer of red clay in which there were small pockets of poros chippings. (x) Some further poros chippings. (xi) Site levelled with earth.

reconstruction cannot be obtained from the black-figured pottery alone;⁶³ but the cumulative effect of black-figured and black-glossed pottery, lamps, and amphorae would point to a later date.

Any conclusion about the reconstruction should not ignore the pediments, and indeed Williams sees them as the 'main guide to a terminus ante quem for the fire'.⁶⁴ Archaeologically speaking, the temple cannot be earlier than the pottery buried and sealed in the terrace systems underneath it. If we accept that the pediments were prepared for the new temple (and not started for insertion on the earlier one), then they must be subsequent to the fire. What we do not know is whether the pediments were started immediately or when the construction of the temple was well under way. Williams resorts to stylistic arguments to date the pediments. In particular, he draws a parallel with the pedimental sculpture from the temple of Apollo Daphnephoros at Eretria.⁶⁵ He accepts the reasoning that the Aegina west pediment is earlier than Eretria, which is dated to '500–490 BC'. However, it has been suggested that the Eretria sculptures belong to a phase after the Persian destruction of the city in 490, in which case the temple of Aphaia could be dated later.⁶⁶ Indeed, if the Aphaia pediment is earlier than Eretria, then surely the archaeological implications of the pottery from the terrace fills would help to confirm a date of the 470s or later for Eretria. Williams also cites stylistic parallels with the Athenian treasury at Delphi.⁶⁷ He rejects Pausanias' testimony that the building was constructed from the spoils of Marathon; but such a position is not now widely held, at least among classical archaeologists.⁶⁸ There are also important architectural parallels, left undiscussed by Williams: namely, the group of Saronic temples, viz. the temple of Apollo in Aegina town, the temples of Poseidon at Kalauraia and Hermione, and the old temple of Athena on the Athenian acropolis.⁶⁹

Given the problems with the stylistic parallels, it should be encouraging to read that 'in the light of the material from the terrace fill and the dates now assignable to sculptures roughly contemporary to the second west pediment, . . . Ohly's published dates might be brought down a little'.⁷⁰ Ohly originally dated the pedimental sculpture as follows:⁷¹

earliest pediments	510–500
second west	500
second east	495–490

According to the revision offered by Williams, 'one could quite comfortably set both the burning of the older temple and the building of the new one within the first decade of the fifth century'.⁷² Such a statement does not seem to take account of the fact that pottery at least as late as 480, on the conventional chronology, has been discovered in

⁶³ Aphaia xi. 669.

⁶⁴ Aphaia xi. 669.

⁶⁵ Aphaia xi. 670.

⁶⁶ E. D. Francis and M. Vickers, 'Signae priscae artis: Eretria and Siphnos', *JHS* 103 (1983), 49–67; E. D. Francis, *Image and Idea in Fifth-century Greece: Art and Literature after the Persian Wars* (London, 1990), 8–15; contra, J. Boardman, 'Signa tabulae priscae artis', *JHS* 104 (1984), 161–3; R. M. Cook, 'The Francis–Vickers chronology', *JHS* 109 (1989), 168.

⁶⁷ Aphaia xi. 670.

⁶⁸ J. Boardman (*CAH* iv², plates vol., 100, text to pl. 117 b) now dates the building after the battle of Marathon ('this is generally accepted now although for some time scholars preferred an earlier date, on stylistic grounds'). See also Cook (n. 66), 168.

⁶⁹ Gill, 'Aphaia', 176.

⁷⁰ Aphaia xi. 671.

⁷¹ After Aphaia xi. 670.

⁷² Aphaia xi. 671. This is a change from his earlier position in Aphaia iv. 65.

stratified contexts which should predate the construction of the temple. As a result, I think, his proposal to see the change of pedimental sculpture as reflecting the rivalry between Athens and Aegina in the 490s,⁷³ especially as it requires (in Williams' own words) a 'slight adjustment' to the historical text of Herodotus,⁷⁴ need not detain us.

Sparkes has rightly observed that the continuing excavations at the temple of Aphaia are 'raising questions of date that will need resolution'.⁷⁵ The official excavation publications of pottery from the terrace fills have merely served to raise doubts about the chronological framework being presented by the excavators. It is hoped that this paper will serve to encourage the team either to present further evidence to support their position or to accept a later date for the reconstruction.

University College of Swansea

DAVID W. J. GILL

⁷³ Aphaia xi. 672–3.

⁷⁴ Aphaia xi. 673.

⁷⁵ B. A. Sparkes, *Greek Art* (G&R New Surveys in the Classics, 22; Oxford, 1991), 26. It should be noted that he considers that 'there are valid criticisms of the [conventional chronological] system that have still not been answered' (p. 7). For further discussion of

chronological matters by a historian, see H. Bowden, 'The chronology of Greek painted pottery: some observations', *Hephaistos*, 10 (1991), 49–59. For a more recent consideration of the chronological problems, see W. R. Biers, *Art, Artefacts, and Chronology in Classical Archaeology* (London, 1992), 82–5.