CHAPTER TWO

EARLY TEGEA, SPARTA, AND THE SANCTUARY OF ATHENA ALEA

ERIK ØSTBY

INTRODUCTION: ARCADIA AND THE PELOPONNESE

Arcadia is a part of Peloponnese, and could never be anything else – in ancient times this landscape did not even have a coastline for easy communication with other, non-Peloponnesian parts of the Greek world. (FIG. 1) But even within the Peloponnesian context, Arcadia was considered, and probably felt like, something by itself: an isolated district in the core of the peninsula, with a dialect clearly different from the form of Greek spoken in the surrounding districts,[1] and with old-fashioned and peculiar religious and cultural traditions. These are well laid out for us by Pausanias, who found here precisely that sort of material which he looked for and appreciated.[2] There is some question whether ordinary people in the remote valley townships, even in his days, would consider themselves as Peloponnesians, or even Arcadians, in the general sense rather than just inhabitants of their own remote and politically insignificant local units. But at least one element of the local traditions was probably prevalent more or less everywhere in Arcadia, and must have strongly contributed to a sense of cultural and ethnical unity that set them apart from other Peloponnesians: the tradition that the Arcadians were autochthonous, born from that soil, and had never been replaced or infiltrated by foreign invasions such as those Doric migrations which had so strongly marked the ethnic and linguistic pattern elsewhere in classical Peloponnese.[3] In that pattern the position of the Arcadian dialect and culture was certainly special and requires an explanation, and this explanation is actually most easily provided by the old and generally admitted supposition that the Arcadians were a remnant of the pre-Iron Age population of the Peloponnese which had for some reason not been much involved in the upheavals, whatever their character, which elsewhere in the Peloponnese marked the transition from the Bronze to the Iron Age. The close analogies which can be seen between Arcadian dialect in

[1] On the Arcadian dialect the principal work is Dubois 1986. See Hall 1997, 153-70, for historical implications.

[2] Paus. 8; recent commented editions by Casewitz, Jost and Marcadé 1998, and by Moggi and Osanna 2003. See for the cults Jost 1985, based on literary as well as archaeological evidence.

[3] This tradition of Arcadian autochthony is thoroughly discussed by Burelli Bergese 1995, 61-89. No position is taken here concerning the real historical character of those migrations; in the classical period they were considered as true events.

historical times and the kind of Greek which now emerges from the Linear B tablets go far to support this picture.[4]

TEGEA AND ARCADIA

There were, however, some parts of Arcadia which were involved with the rest of the Peloponnese more than others, and principal among those was Tegea. Tegea was safely within the borders of Arcadia, located in its south-eastern corner where a plain surrounded by low hills at almost 700 m above sea level offered acceptable conditions not only for that pastoral economy which dominated the rest of Arcadia, but also for some agriculture. The possibilities for a reasonable livelihood were consequently better here than ~~most everwhere~~ else in Arcadia. Moreover, the plain of Tegea was located precisely on the easiest route of communication between Laconia to the south and the northeastern ~~Peloponnese – the~~ Argolid, ~~Corinthia – and~~ the rest of Greece beyond the isthmos.[5] These two factors may have given Tegea some importance and international status from a very early time. This is demonstrated not only by the mention of Tegea in the Catalogue of Ships, an honour it shares with other Arcadian communities;[6] but it has also, and in my opinion with good reason, been identified among those Aegean place-names which appear in a famous Egyptian inscription from Kom-el-Hettan, from the 14th century BC.[7] There is also archaeological evidence for a Mycenaean presence at Tegea, and while certainly not at the level of the residences and fortresses of the Argolid, the tholos tombs at Analipsis, and the probably-Mycenaean, ambitious dike construction which until recently was partially preserved at Lake Takka, indicate that this presence was of some quality.[8] It has even been suggested that these monuments indicate the existence of a Mycenaean kingdom in Arcadia, based in Tegea; this, however, must for the moment remain hypothetical.[9]

---

[4] See note 1 above.

[5] For these routes the old paper by Loring 1895, 47-60 and the map pl. i, is still useful. For the stretch from Tegea to Hysiai, see also Pritchett 1980, 78-101, and id. 1989, 107-12; Pikoulas 1999, 258-60; and Petronotis 2005. The more difficult routes through the Thyreatis, avoiding Tegea, are well described by Frazer 1898, 305-9.

[6] Il. 2.603-11. See Visser 1997 for a thorough, recent work on this text, 532-54 on the part concerning the Arcadian contingent; also Burelli Bergese 1995, 38-43.

[7] See Burelli Bergese 1995, 13 n. 16, for the literature on this inscription. In spite of doubts concerning this particular identification (Haider 1988, 4 with n. 11), the general context requires an Aegean, preferably Peloponnesian name and supports it. It is accepted by Helck 1979, 31.

[8] Kalogeropoulos 1998 on the tholos tombs, Knauss 1988 for the Takka dike. See Salavoura 2005 for a recent, general survey of Mycenaean remains in the district; and Burelli Bergese 1995, 10-17, for a general discussion of Mycenaean Arcadia.

[9] This was argued by Sergent 1980; see Burelli Bergese 1995, 14-16, for a critical discussion.

TEGEA IN ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESEARCH

Pausanias saw and described Tegea as an organized, normal Greek city, with a large territory and an urban centre in the plain, surrounded by walls and adorned with sanctuaries and official monuments.[10] (FIG. 2) The general identification of the site was achieved early in the 19th century, but archaeological exploration has until recently been rather erratic, and only a few of the monuments mentioned by Pausanias have been identified to date – one of them being the large theatre, whose walls were later used as the foundations of a Byzantine church, and which should, according to Pausanias' text, be located near the agora.[11] But the principal monument of the city, to which he devotes most of his attention, was the sanctuary for Athena Alea on the outskirts of the town.[12] (FIG. 3) The site of the large and impressive Doric temple of late classical date which he described quite thoroughly was identified by European travellers in 1806[13] and became an obvious goal for archaeological research; such research was first taken up by German scholars in the 1870s,[14] was then carried on in the early 20th century by French archaeologists,[15] and, after a long pause, investigations in the sanctuary have from 1990 to 1996 been pursued by an international team under the direction of the Norwegian institute at Athens.[16] (FIG. 4) The results have been important, not only for the wealth of surprisingly rich and early archaeological material, but also for the conclusions it allows in understanding both the origin and early development of the sanctuary, as well as the political and urbanistic growth of the community and the city of Tegea, and her shifting relations in early times with her non-Arcadian, Peloponnesian neighbours.

---

[10] Pausanias on Tegea: 8.45-53 (including a long excursus about Philopoemen, 49-52). See the commented editions cited note 2 above, for a summary also Moggi and Osanna 2003, xlvi-xlviii.

[11] For activity at the site in the 19th and early 20th century, see Dugas *et al.* 1924, ix-xi, and Voyatzis 1990, 10-28, for an updated account and the general topography of the site; also Jost 1985, 144-56. See note 49 below for the theatre.

[12] Pausanias on the sanctuary, mostly on the temple and its decoration: 8.45.4-47.4. The name Athena Alea occurs only here and in some epigraphical evidence, otherwise she is either Alea Athena or only Alea: Jost 1985, 368-70.

[13] First by E. Dodwell in 1806: Dodwell 1819, 418-20.

[14] Publications: Milchhöfer 1880; Treu 1881; Dörpfeld 1883.

[15] Publications: Dugas 1921 (archaic material), and Dugas *et al.* 1924 (the classical temple and its sculptural decoration). Note also the important preliminary notice by Mendel 1901.

[16] Preliminary notes and reports from these investigations: Østby *et al.* 1994; Nordquist 2002; Tarditi 2005; Østby 2006a. For later survey investigations in the Tegean territory there is a preliminary note by Ødegård 2005. The final publication in the series *Monographs from the Norwegian Institute at Athens* is in preparation.

Already the earlier, French excavations had discovered at the site of the temple some material of Mycenaean and Sub-Mycenaean date, and concluded that the sanctuary had been in function from very early times.[17] This is now amply confirmed by the contents of a votive pit found underneath the pronaos area of the classical temple, which contains material going back to the late 10th century BC; consequently, the ~~sancutary~~ sanctuary must have been established by this ~~eary~~ early date.[18] Some earlier, Mycenaean and even pre-Mycenaean material has also been found, but in later contexts, and thus it does not admit any conclusion concerning the possible existence of a sanctuary here in the Bronze Age: this remains an open question for further investigations at the site.[19] The decorated pottery from the votive pit shows heavy influences from the Argolid, but there is also a considerable amount of pottery of a distinct Laconian type, the so-called Laconian Dark Age fabric (FIG. 5), whose Laconian origin has now been confirmed by a chemical analysis of the clay. It is mixed with more normal, Argive-influenced Protogeometric and Early Geometric pottery, mostly dating from the 9th century.[20] From its first beginning the sanctuary thus defines itself as a crossroads between those two important cultural provinces, and ~~it may not have been a casual choice for the site~~, since it is so close to the traditional route of communication between those two poles.[21] Nothing more is known about the structure of the sanctuary in this early period, but it is likely to have been simple; ample finds of burnt bones suggest that there was a makeshift altar somewhere nearby, and hardly a cult building, although that possibility cannot be excluded until those early layers are properly excavated and studied. We know from preliminary drilling tests that such levels exist to a considerable depth underneath the surface that we have so far been able to reach.

In the second half or toward the end of the 8th century there seems to be some sort of break in the sanctuary. The votive pit was sealed, above the last pottery thrown into it, which is precisely of that date, and instead a simple, metallurgical workshop for the production of small, votive objects of iron and

---

[17] After Dugas 1921 (335-40 for an outdated attempt to sketch the origin and early development of the sanctuary), this material has been restudied by Voyatzis 1990, 64-5 and 82-3 (pottery), 210 (fibulae), 240 (a terracotta figurine) and 158-60 (a bronze figurine); ibid. 270-1 for reflections on the origin of the sanctuary.

[18] Preliminary notices by Østby 2006a, 117; Voyatzis 2005, 469-71. The very modest amounts of Mycenaean material cannot be taken as evidence for cult activity so early.

[19] Preliminary notices on this material: Voyatzis in Østby et al. 1994, 117-19 and 134, and Østby 2006a, 117. The possibility of a Mycenaean origin for the sanctuary has been cautiously approached by Voyatzis 1990, 270-1.

[20] Preliminary notices on this pottery, including the chemical analysis: Voyatzis 2005, 468-72. On the Laconian Dark Age pottery, see Coulson 1985.

[21] See note 5 above.

bronze was set up immediately above it.[22] This activity took place in front of two, possibly three, successive and very simple cult buildings which have been identified underneath the remains of the later, monumental temples, in the period when they existed. These earliest known Arcadian temples had an apsidal shape, about three times as long as they were wide, (FIG. 6) and were constructed in the very simple and ancient wattle-and-daub technique with walls of intertwined branches covered by amorphous clay on the inside and outside, without a stone socle underneath; in the excavation they are best observed by the holes from the posts which supported them from within. The floor surfaces have holes after some sort of installations which cannot be more clearly defined.[23] (FIGS. 7,8)

It is easier to find parallels for this building technique in early Neolithic than in Geometric architecture, and the question emerges whether this implies a conscious return to very early architectural models.[24] The material of votive objects found inside the buildings demonstrates clearly that they date from the late 8th and the early 7th century; an MPC aryballos found in a post-hole from the later of these two buildings, where it had fallen after the post had been removed and before the hole was filled up, (FIG. 9) gives a quite precise date of about 680-70 for the destruction or dismantling of that later structure.[25] Such buildings should have an altar, but no such thing was found, either inside or in front of them, where instead the metal workshop was discovered; and the position of the classical altar is too far removed to be a likely place for an altar connected with these small buildings of the late 8th and early 7th century BC. A more likely place is at the north-east corner of the later stone temples, where the French archaeologists found votive material of the 8th and 7th centuries which probably comes from a votive pit.[26] If an early altar existed at that point and was destroyed by the later foundations, it would be close to the spring which was mentioned by Pausanias and always remained an important landmark in the sanctuary.[27]

THE SANCTUARY IN THE 7TH CENTURY BC

About twenty years ago it proved possible to identify among the foundations for the classical temple the remains of that early archaic temple

[22] Nordquist in Østby et al. 1994, 103-7; Nordquist 2002, 155-8; Østby 2006a, 116.
[23] Nordquist in Østby et al. 1994, 98-103; Nordquist 2002, 149-55; Østby 2005, 496-7, and 2006a, 114-16.
[24] Wattle-and-daub architecture in the Neolithic period: Perlès 2001, 180-93; and Sinos 1971, 10-13, for some later, but still prehistorical examples. In early Iron Age Greece the technique is attested at Kastanas in Macedonia: Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 124-5; otherwise only in very hypothetical cases. According to Pausanias, the Arcadian ancestor Pelasgos had first taught mankind how to build huts: Paus. 8.1.5.
[25] Voyatzis 2002, 164 FIG. 13; Østby 2006a, 114.
[26] Dugas 1921, 337-9 ("Couche B"); Voyatzis 1990, 23 (but arguing for an early altar at the site of the classical one, 27); Østby 2006a, 116.
[27] Paus. 8.47.4; and the description Dugas et al. 1924, 69-71.

whose existence Pausanias still knew about, and which had, according to him, been destroyed by a fire in 395 BC to be replaced later by the large, late classical temple built by Skopas. (FIG. 10) It was also possible to propose a fairly precise reconstruction of its plan.[28] (FIG. 11) Although there has been some discussion about this result, the reconstruction with a peristasis of 6 x 18 columns and external dimensions about 16-18 x 48-49 m seems to stand, as does the date in the last quarter of the 7th century BC.[29] This was not, however, the immediate successor of the early, apsidal cult buildings: there is in the rear part of the cella an approximately rectangular platform of rough field-stones which lies below the foundations for the inner colonnades in the archaic temple, but it has cut the apsidal ends of the two early buildings.[30] (FIG. 12) Consequently it must be evidence of an intermediate phase between the earlier, simple buildings and the later, truly monumental temples, and this is to some degree confirmed by the traces of a transverse trench which can be seen in the trench walls near the fronts of the early cult buildings, ~~which are above them,~~ under the archaic foundations.[31] That is probably what remains of the foundation trench for the front of an intermediate temple covering the interval between the destruction of the second apsidal building (680-70) and the construction of the large temple (625-600). The trench indicates that blocks of stone were now used for the foundation, and there are also some fragments of proper mud-bricks in this context; the positions of the trench and of the platform, which ~~was probably~~ located inside that temple, suggest that the building was somewhat larger than the earlier buildings, but nothing like the huge, early archaic temple which came later. It may, by dimensions and by construction, have been something like the better known, early temple of Artemis Orthia at Sparta, which should be about contemporary;[32] if so, it was just large enough to have its walls totally destroyed by the foundations for the next temple.

We have seen some evidence for a break in the development of the sanctuary by the mid-8th century, but that cannot be compared with the impressive leap of quality introduced by this new, large temple. If the proposed reconstruction of its plan and dimensions is correct, it covered an

---

[28] See Østby 1986 on the remains, the reconstruction and the date of the archaic temple, slightly updated id. 2005, 494-6, and 2006a, 113-14: the same conclusion was also proposed by Norman 1984, 171, in less precise terms. The notice in Pausanias: 8.45.4.

[29] See Østby et al. 1994, 95 n. 30, for some early reactions. Add Gruben 1996, 409, who accepts the peristasis and the date about 600, but reconstructs the temple with an improbable opisthodome instead of the adyton; and Winter 1991, 199-200, who argues for a shorter peristasis with 6 x 16 columns, added later. These remarks are addressed in Østby 2005, 494-5.

[30] The French excavators understood it as a foundation for the cult images and their basis in the classical temple (Dugas et al. 1924, 11), which is obviously impossible since the archaic foundations pass over it. See Østby 1986, 76-7 and 85; Nordquist 2002, 149-50 and 155; and Østby 2006a, 114.

[31] See for this evidence, which is admittedly modest, Nordquist 2002, 149-50; Østby 2006a, 114.

[32] See for the temple of Artemis Orthia e.g. Mazarakis Ainian 1997, 166-7. The date in the early 7th century was established by Boardman 1963.

area only marginally smaller than the classical temple which succeeded it; this is to some extent confirmed by the deposit at the north-eastern corner, which contains material going down to the late 7th century, but no later.[33] It was followed by another deposit with 6th century and later material near the church and the site of the classical altar, where it is then reasonable to presume that the altar for the archaic temple was also located; as a rather exceptional measure, the reorganization of the sanctuary which now took place involved not only the new temple, but also a radical relocation of the altar.[34] Clearly it was for some reason important in this sanctuary to maintain the position of the temple, rather than that of the altar. But the clearest evidence for the break is the temple itself, constructed in the tradition of the early Doric temple in the Heraion of ~~Argos where~~ Λ the Doric order as such was probably created early in the 7th century[35]– and preceding the famous temple of Hera at Olympia, of the early 6th century, which seems to have used the temple at Tegea as a model to be surpassed.[36] As those, the temple was built mostly of traditional, simple materials, wood for the columns, mud-brick for the ~~walls but~~ Λ with stone in the socle level, blocks of local marble in the stylobate and toichobate, and also some evidence for a tiled roof, which the Heraion at Argos did not have.[37] There is nothing provincial about this temple in the epoch when it was constructed: it was fully abreast with the development of monumental Doric architecture as it had started slightly earlier in the Argolid. And the Argolid continues in this period, as before, to provide most of the inspiration for the styles of pottery and other votive material, although Laconian elements are not completely absent.[38]

It seems evident that behind such an initiative, and the impressive break in the development of the sanctuary which it represents, there must have been an important decision at a political level involving heavy demands on the community's economic resources. In order to understand that decision, it is necessary to turn to our modest knowledge of the early history and political development of Tegea.

---

[33] See Dugas 1921, 337-9, and Voyatzis 1990, 23; Østby 2006a, 114.

[34] Dugas 1921, 338 and 340 ("Couche C"); Østby 2006a, 116. Such relocations of altars are rare, but not unheard of: see Bergquist 1967, 88-9, for some such cases.

[35] As argued by Østby 2006b, 29-34. See for the classical altar Dugas et al. 1924, 66-9, and Norman 1984, 190-1; no traces of earlier structures have ever been reported here.

[36] See for the links with the temples at Argos and Olympia Østby 1986, 97-102, and again id. 2005, 494-6.

[37] Preliminary remarks on this material by Østby 2005, 496, and id. 2006a, 114.

[38] See Voyatzis 1990, 82-4, for this assessment of the material from the French excavations, and ead. 2005, 472, for a preliminary remark to this effect based on recently discovered material.

WHEN, HOW AND WHY DID TEGEA BECOME A POLIS?

There is no doubt that in the classical period and later Tegea acted as, and was considered as, a normal polis-state.[39] While in much of Arcadia the political organization seems to have remained until quite late at the level of tribal or *ethnos* states,[40] Tegea appears in the classical period as an organized, urban centre with an agora, a theatre, and walls for which, in ~~additional~~ to the archaeological evidence, there is a written documentation from the early 4th, perhaps already the late 5th century.[41] By that time Tegea must have passed through the process called *synoikismos*, a term which can be understood in different ways; it normally implies either the creation of an organized state of polis-type from previously scattered, more or less independent local units, or the creation of an organized, urban centre, or both. Our sources use the term with an inherent ambiguity that easily creates confusion.[42] A politically unified polis-state could certainly be established without the contemporary creation of a common, urban ~~centre Sparta~~ is the obvious ~~example but~~ such a centre could hardly be created unless it was based on a political synoikism, either contemporary or previous to its creation. These two aspects of the synoikism might ~~coincide 4th~~ century Megalopolis is a good example of such a situation.[43] But essentially, archaeological evidence for an urbanized centre provides nothing more precise than a *terminus post quem non* for the political process which it presupposes, and which may well in many cases be earlier.

The synoikism of Tegea is mentioned by two sources, Strabo and Pausanias,[44] who agree that it involved a unification of nine demes which covered the quite extensive Tegean territory; there is no mention in either source of any urbanistic initiative in this context. Strabo mentions this event in a context which has been assumed to indicate a moment after the Persian

---

[39] The evidence for this is conveniently presented by Th. Heine Nielsen *s.v.* Tegea, in Hansen and Heine Nielsen (eds.) 2004, 530-3. See id. 2002, 159-228, for the development of polis-states in Arcadia in the archaic period.

[40] See Heine Nielsen 2002, 271-307, for such state formations in Arcadia; generally on the phenomenon Snodgrass 1981, 42-7 (who connects it particularly with pastoral economies, relevant in Arcadia) and Morgan 2003 (38-44 on Arcadia).

[41] See for Pausanias' description note 10 above. The 4th century walls were identified and their course to a large extent reconstructed by Bérard 1892, 547-9, pl. xiii; see also e.g. Voyatzis 1990, 12-13, and updated information with some adjustments Ødegård 2005, 211-14. They are first mentioned Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.8 and 7.4.36-7, implying that they existed in 370, but text passages concerning a siege about 418 imply that walls already existed then: Heine Nielsen in Hansen and Heine Nielsen (eds.) 2004, 522 (Diod. Sic. 12.79.3; Thuc. 5.62.2).

[42] See for this slippery concept sound remarks by Snodgrass 1981, 34-5, and the unusually clear discussion by Moggi 1991, 545-51. Following the strictly urbanistic understanding of the term by M. H. Hansen in Hansen and Heine Nielsen (eds.) 2004, 115-20 and 138-44, Heine Nielsen's discussion of Arcadian synoikisms (2002, 171-5) concentrates on this aspect.

[43] On this event Moggi 1976, 293-325; recently Heine Nielsen 2002, 414-42, and Roy 2005.

[44] Strabo 8.3.2; Paus. 8.45.1, where the demes are named, but where the term *συνοικισμός* is not used.

wars, since it is included in a list of examples of this process along with the Elean *synoikismos* of about 470;[45] but Strabo's interest in this passage was purely typological, not chronological, and there is nothing in it to indicate that those Arcadian synoikisms which he mentions there were to be considered as contemporaneous with the Elean one. Pausanias' information is of a different nature: he pulls the foundation of Tegea back to mythical times by ascribing the creation of a unified state out of nine demes to a king Aleos who was supposed to have ruled Tegea three generations before the Trojan war.[46] This synoikism seems to be a purely mythical one, but clearly Pausanias too had in mind a process based on those nine demes which he, and only he, names, and to some extent helps to locate, and which clearly still existed as local units in his time.[47]

We have now proved that the narrowly chronological reading of Strabo's text is misguided, with the results of ~~recent survey investigations~~ supplemented by geomagnetic investigations, carried out by the Norwegian institute at Athens.[48] It is now clear that about 1-1.2 km north-east of the sanctuary, where remains of the theatre can still be seen and where also, according to Pausanias' statements, the agora must have been located,[49] there existed an urban centre planned and organized on the *per strigas* system, for which surprisingly early evidence is also forthcoming from other Arcadian settlements.[50] Datable material from the surface survey, and from a recent Greek excavation near the theatre, carries the activity in this area back to the mid-6th century BC, but there is no indication of any human settlement or activity before this.[51] That there was no such earlier settlement in the plain is a conclusion *ex silentio*, with all the inherent risks of such conclusions as long as they lack the confirmation of a controlled, focused excavation. But it does imply that an urban centre was apparently created by the mid-6th century, more or less coinciding with the end of those hostilities with Sparta which

---

[45] So e.g. Moggi 1976, 131-9, with a useful review of the different opinions; also Burelli Bergese 1995, 93-4, and Heine Nielsen 2002, 171-5. An earlier date (late 7th century) has been proposed with good arguments by Callmer 1943, 67-70; see below (with note 59).

[46] Paus. 8.45.1. See below (with note 69) for other accomplishments ascribed to this person.

[47] For the ~~convenient~~ distribution of demes, see Voyatzis 1990, 11 and ~~FIG~~. 2, also Callmer 1943, 128-31, and Jost 1985, 157.

[48] For a preliminary account of the survey see Ødegård ~~2005. A more extensive and updated report including the geomagnetical investigations is about to appear in the 2007 issue of *Archaeological Reports*.~~

[49] The theatre and the agora were close to one another: Paus. 8.49.1. The agora was probably located in front of the theatre, as at near-by Mantineia, and not where recent (unpublished) Greek excavations claim to have located ~~it.~~ See Voyatzis 1990, 13-14, and for the theatre still best the old publication by Vallois 1926.

[50] See, for one such instance near Kyparissia, Karapanagiotou 2005 (336-7 for similar cases elsewhere in Greece). As at Tegea, the plan at Kyparissia seems to go back to the late 6th century (ibid. 340).

[51] See Ødegård 2005, 216-17, for a preliminary account, including the only available information from the Greek excavation.

seem to have ~~dominated~~ the first half of the 6th century.[52] This implies that a political synoikism of those nine demes later than this can safely be ruled out, and it might even be earlier. The question immediately arises if such an event may be connected with any of those two clear breaks which have been archaeologically identified in the sanctuary of the local, purely Arcadian goddess Alea.

We are admittedly speaking here in terms of probabilities, not of certainties. But it seems clear that the first, quite modest reorganization of the sanctuary, in the late 8th century, can hardly be considered a likely occasion for a general *synoikismos,* understood as the reorganization of the Tegean demes into a state of polis-type; this was the period when the polis was finding its form,[53] and there is no reason to believe that this process saw Arcadia or Tegea in the forefront. If this reorganization reflects any political development at all, it is more likely to have concerned those demes to the south and the west of the plain whose people may from time immemorial have used the place with its convenient spring for watering their flocks, developing it over time into a sort of natural meeting place which also received a religious function.[54] Since the plain itself was swamped and ~~marshy – it~~ still was until quite ~~recently~~ – and exposed to floodings from the unruly Sarantapotamos river running nearby,[55] it is not likely that people lived there or used it much. Located at the northern margin of the hilly countryside to the south and west which would be perfect for early pastoralists, the sanctuary would for them have the qualities of a border sanctuary at the limit between useful and useless landscape. It may be an open question whether it would initially be of any use or interest to the Tegean tribes living north of the plain, since the marsh was between. They probably had access to another early sanctuary, for Athena Poliatis, which also had very ancient traditions connected with it: it was said to be founded by Kepheus, son of Aleos, and to hide as a gift from Athena a lock of Medusa's hair as a talisman guaranteeing the divine protection of the city.[56] Pausanias saw the sanctuary, unfortunately without telling us where it was located; but it seems likely that such a sanctuary would be located on some sort of acropolis, on one of the low hills north of the ~~town – perhaps~~ on the highest one, where we now see the village of Hagios Sostis.[57] There is no

[52] See below (with note 63).

[53] For good discussions on the origin and defition of the polis-state, see Snodgrass 1981, 28-42, and M. H. Hansen in Hansen and Heine Nielsen (eds.) 2004, 16-19 and 39-46.

[54] It is also close to the ancient highway between Argos and Sparta, and there seems to be a general tendency for very early sanctuaries to be located near important routes or natural focal points of communication: see Morgan 1996, esp. 57.

[55] For the various hypotheses concerning the changing course of the ~~Sarantopotamos~~, see Voyatzis 1990, 18-20, and Ødegård 2005, 214, for updated information from recent survey investigation.

[56] For this sanctuary and its cult, see Jost 1985, 146-7 and 364-8. The principal source is Paus. 8.47.5; for the legend, in a slightly different version, also Apollod. *Bibl.* 2.7.3.

[57] For the acropolis, see Voyatzis 1990, 16-17, and for the location of the sanctuary a general, but inconclusive ~~discussion, see~~ Jost 1985, 156; also Voyatzis 1990, 14 and 272. The location at Hagios Sostis

archaeological trace of it, and Pausanias' description of it implies that its physical shape was modest; but its status is indicated by the fact that its priest was eponymous in the local calendar.[58]

The second break in the Alea sanctuary in the late 7th century, with the construction of the first large temple and the reorganization of the sanctuary itself, is both more impressive and more interesting in our context. This enterprise is on a scale which must have involved the resources of the entire Tegean community, and could hardly have been carried out without a decision within a political structure of polis type. That structure must now have been created, and was perhaps even celebrated in a monumental fashion, visible to everybody, by the extensive and ambitious reorganization of the sanctuary which now took place. If this is correct, the political *synoikismos* must be dated no later than the late 7th century BC. This date has also been proposed by others,[59] and falls at least half a century earlier than the creation of the urban centre. If the preliminary date for the centre turns out to be correct, those two events did not coincide.

THE SANCTUARY AND THE POLIS

Some important and far from obvious decisions must have been made at this point: first of all, the choice of the sanctuary of the modest, local Arcadian goddess Alea for this monumental expression of common identity.[60] Other choices would have been possible and might even have seemed more natural, such as the sanctuary for Athena as divine protectress of the city, or the open-air sanctuary for a typically Arcadian cult of Zeus which Pausanias still saw on one of the hills north of the city.[61] At least one of these is likely to have been a conventional, acropolitan sanctuary, such as early polis states normally used as focus for their religious identity; Athena, who had ancient legends connected with her sanctuary and whose priest was eponymous in the local calendar still in classical times, would seem to be the more likely candidate.[62] Nevertheless, Alea was preferred. The abundance of good votive material from the earlier periods shows that her sanctuary had been well frequented and probably considered important from quite early times, but the physical aspect of the modest, early cult buildings, and the not very impressive

was argued particularly by Callmer 1943, 122-4, with sound arguments, but it is not to date supported by archaeological evidence.

[58] According to epigraphical evidence (3rd century BC). The interpretation has been discussed; see Jost 1985, 365.

[59] Particularly discussed by Callmer 1943, 67-70, with arguments aligned with the reasoning applied here: after the end of the Messenian wars, but before the defense against Spartan aggression.

[60] For the cult of Alea, see Jost 1985, 369-78 and Voyatzis 1990, 269-73, and Pretzler 1999 for this and other expressions of Tegean identity.

[61] The Zeus sanctuary: Paus. 8.53.9; Jost 1985, 271. Its position recalls the ancient sanctuary of Zeus on Mount Lykaion, for which see Jost 1985, 180-5 and 249-69.

[62] See notes 56 and 57 above.

position near the marsh and the ~~river certainly~~ nothing remotely like an acropolis ~~site do~~ not mark it out as an obvious choice for the principal sanctuary of the recently established polis community. But there can be no doubt that this was precisely what the sanctuary had from then on become, maintaining this position for the rest of Tegea's history; nothing else was ever built at Tegea that might compete with it. This is as clear from Pausanias' description of Tegea in his days as it is from the archaeological evidence.

Looking for some driving force behind these developments, one can hardly be overlooked: the menace from Sparta, which by the late 7th century had concluded the second Messenian war and was now directing its attention precisely toward Arcadia and Tegea. The stories about the repeated attacks during the early 6th century and the resourceful and successful resistance put up by the Tegeates, best known from Herodotos' accounts, written not very long after these events,[63] are well known and contribute toward the conclusion that the city must now have possessed a quite efficient, political structure. As an ideological rallying point for that resistance, the purely local Alea may have been considered more appropriate than the more obvious polis-protectress Athena, who had an important cult at Sparta as well.[64] Alea could be used instead not only because she was closely and exclusively connected with local identity, but also because there was a martial aspect of defence and protection in her character; this is demonstrated not only by her assimilation with Athena, which is not safely attested before the 5th century (although possibly a good deal earlier),[65] but also by small models and items of weapons and armour among the early votive material from the sanctuary.[66] And the challenge to Sparta is expressed very clearly by the temple itself, which stands squarely in the tradition of the early temple in the Heraion at Argos, Sparta's mortal enemy in those years.[67] As the focus of national pride and identity this was also the place where the trophies from the victories

[63] 1.66-8. See Callmer 1943, 72-7; Jeffery 1976, 121; Voyatzis 1990, 267-9; Burelli Bergese 1995, 50-3, with extensive references n. 47; Cartledge ~~2002~~ 18-20; and Pretzler 1999, 95-6 and 114-18, for the importance of these events for Tegean sense of identity.

[64] A connection between the construction of the temple, a political process and the aggression from Sparta has also been touched on by Voyatzis 1990, 11-12 and 271. See ead. 1999, and Heine Nielsen 2002, 176-84, for general discussions of the connections between temple building and political developments in early Arcadia. Athena Poliouchos (also called Chalkioikos) on the acropolis of Sparta: Paus. 3.17.2.

[65] See Jost 1985, 368-70 and 378-85; the first evidence is from Hdt. 1.66 and 9.70. The assimilation may go back to archaic times if a small votive bronze from the sanctuary in the shape of Athena Promachos, of the early 6th century, can be taken as evidence: Dugas 1921, 359-63; Jost 1985, 379-80 (pl. 37.4). It might consequently even be part of the reorganization of the late 7th century.

[66] See for this material, and this aspect of her character, Voyatzis 1990, 198-201 and 270 and ead. 2002, 165. Jost 1985, 378-81, discusses this only for the amalgamation with Athena.

[67] On the conflicts between Argos and Sparta before the 6th century see Cartledge ~~2002~~, 107-10 and 121-3; Tomlinson 1972, 79-84, who tends to see the attacks against Tegea as part of the same conflict; and Kelly 1976, 49-50, 73-7 and 86-8, who does not accept the battle of Hysiai as historical and tends to dismiss their importance. See note 28 above for the archaic temple, and Østby 1986, 102, for some tentative considerations on the link between Tegea and Argos in the late 7th century, as demonstrated by that building. There is nothing to suggest that temples of this type were ever built at Sparta.

against the Spartans, such as the famous fetters brought by the invading Spartans and which they were themselves forced to wear after their defeat, were dedicated and exposed. Herodotos saw them in this temple, when they were still ~~monuments~~ of fairly recent history, and they were still shown to Pausanias in the new temple, six centuries later.[68]

WHOSE MERIT?

Pausanias indirectly connects the foundation of the city from the nine demes with the foundation of the sanctuary by ascribing both to the mythical king Aleos, who was supposed to have ruled over all Arcadia, choosing Tegea as his ~~residence~~ three generations before the Trojan War.[69] It seems that the connection of the synoikism of the nine demes with the foundation of the sanctuary can be maintained if the "foundation" is understood not as the first establishment of a cult at this place, but as that ambitious reorganization, which may well have been understood as a re-foundation on a new and larger scale. If this is how his text is to be understood, he or his sources make the mistake of pushing events of the late 7th century back into the period before the Trojan War. But in the historical situation of the late 7th century, under the looming threat from Sparta, these two processes, the unification of the demes concreticized by the reorganization and amplification (rather than foundation) of the sanctuary, make sense. It also makes sense to connect these developments with the initiative of a strong, local personality in a situation which called for forceful action.

Pausanias even provides a possible name for such a man when he claims the mythical king Aleos as the mind behind both events. He is a figure of some importance in Greek mythology: father of the princess Auge, who was to be the first priestess in the sanctuary of Alea, and bore the son Telephos after being seduced or raped by the visiting hero Heracles. There is evidence for these traditions already in a fragment of Hesiod; later they were used in Attic tragedy, and by the Pergamene monarchs who promoted Telephos as a mythical ancestor.[70] But in spite of these mythological trappings, it may be worth while to consider the possibility that a man with this name, a name directly derived from the name of the goddess whose image he so effectively promoted, may have created both the Tegean political system and her

---

[68] Hdt. 1.67.1; Paus. 8.47.2.

[69] Paus. 8.4.8 (kingship and residence), 8.45.1 (the city) and 8.45.4 (the sanctuary). Pausanias even claims to have seen his house at Tegea: 8.53.10. His date results from 8.5.2, where Agapenor, the leader of the Arcadian contingent against Troy, emerges as great-grandson of Aleos. See note 9 above for the hypothesis of a Mycenaean kingdom in Arcadia, based on Tegea.

[70] For these traditions, see Jost 1985, 372-3 and 376-8; Pretzler 1999, 91-2 and 113-14. The fullest narratives are in Apollod. *Bibl.* (2.7.4 and 3.9.1), but there is an allusion to the story of Auge already in the Hesiodean fragment published by Merkelbach and West 1967, 80-1 no. 165, and Pausanias twice cites Hekataios as his source for it (8.4.9; 8.47.4).

religious and ideological identity, thus facing the critical situation of the late 7th century in a way not entirely unlike the way the Spartans had shaped their identity in what was for them a critical situation earlier in the same century.[71] If this is his correct, historical context, there may be a place for a king Aleos along with other semi-mythical figures of this foggy period of early Peloponnesian history, such as Lykourgos of Sparta and king Pheidon of ~~Argos both~~ are, as he is, almost certainly figures of the 7th century if they are anything else than purely mythical fictions.[72] But ~~Pausanias' correct chronological context~~ has in this case been more violently distorted than it has been for those, and this may even be the reason why Aleos was not also connected with the resistance against Sparta in later traditions; his name does not to our knowledge appear among those known to local tradition for that part of Tegean glory.[73]

Whoever was the driving force behind the initiative of organizing the defence, even at an ideological level, against the dangerous neighbour in the south, he was to a large extent successful: the Tegeans, and the Arcadians, did not share the fate of the helotizised Messenians as the Spartan intentions originally must have been, but became the first link in that network of political and military alliances which the Spartans now started constructing in the Peloponnese. They could thus become Peloponnesian with their political and social structures intact, and free now, at last, to carry on their own process of unification by the creation of a common, urban centre.[74] This success had consequences far beyond Tegea herself: by blocking Sparta's initial ambitions, and securing for themselves reasonable terms, they had set an acceptable model which also other Peloponnesian states could claim when they had to join the Spartan network and accept the Peloponnesian identity.[75] In this success, those modest stone foundations in the sanctuary, which can still be seen today, might also have a share.

REFERENCES

Bérard, V. 1892. Tégée et la Tégéatide, I. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 17: 529-49.

[71] See e.g. Jeffery 1976, 111-20, or Cartledge 2002, 113-17, for general surveys of Sparta's political development in this period.

[72] For Lykourgos, see the excellent survey of previous opinions by Oliva 1971, 63-70, and the substantial defense for his position as a true protagonist in Spartan history of the early 7th century by Forrest 1963. On Pheidon the question seems more to concern his date than his real existence; see the recent summary by Hall 2007, 141-54.

[73] This lore is conveniently assembled and discussed by Pretzler 1999.

[74] See Ødegård 2005, 216-17, for a slightly different reading of the connection ~~beetween~~ the urbanization and the relations with Sparta.

[75] See for this poorly documented process e.g. the summary Jeffery 1976, 121-3, or Cartledge 2002², 119-27; but observe Heine Nielsen 2002, 188-92, for the uncertainties involved in this reconstruction.

Bergquist, B. 1967. *The Archaic Greek Temenos* (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen 4°, 13). Lund: CWK Gleerup.

Boardman, J. 1963. Artemis Orthia and chronology. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 58: 1-7.

Burelli Bergese, L. 1995. *Tra ethne e poleis. Pagine di storia arcade.* Pisa: Scuola Normale Superiore.

Callmer, C. 1943. *Studien zur Geschichte Arkadiens.* Lund: AB Gleerupska Universitetsbokhandeln.

Cartledge, P. 2002. *Sparta and Laconia. A regional history 1300 to 362 BC.* London and New York: Routledge.

Casewitz, M., M. Jost and J. Marcadé. 1998. *Pausanias, Description de la Grèce, Livre VIII.* Paris: Les belles lettres.

Coulson, W.D.E. 1985. The Dark Age pottery from Sparta. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 80:29-84.

Dodwell, E. 1819. *A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece during 1801, 1805 and 1806.* London: Rodwell.

Dörpfeld, W. 1883. Der Tempel der Athena Alea in Tegea. *Athenische Mitteilungen* 8: 274-85.

Dubois, L. 1986. *Recherches sur le dialect arcadien* (Bibliothèque de l'Institut de Linguistique de Louvain 23-5). Louvain-le-neuve: Cabay.

Dugas, C. 1921. Le sanctuaire d'Aléa ~~Athéna avant~~ Athéna le IVe siècle. *Bulletin de correspondance hellénique* 45: 335-435.

Dugas, C., J. Berchmans and M. Clemmensen. 1924. *Le sanctuaire d'Aléa Athéna à Tégée au IVe siècle.* Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.

Felten, F. 1987. *Arkadien. Antike Welt* Sondernummer 16.

Forrest, W.G. 1963. The date of the Lykourgan reforms in Sparta. *Phoenix* 17 (3): 157-79.

Frazer, J.G. 1898. *Pausanias' Description of Greece* III. London and New York: Macmillan and Co. Limited.

Gruben, G. 1996. Il tempio. In *I Greci* II.1: *La formazione,* edited by S. Settis: 381-434. Torino: Einaudi.

Haider, P.W. 1988. *Griechenland – Nordafrika. Ihre Beziehungen zwischen 1500 und 600 v. Chr.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Hall, J.M. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

———. 2002. *A History of the Archaic Greek World.* Malden, Oxford and Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.

Hansen, M.H., and T. Heine Nielsen (eds.) 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Heine Nielsen, T. 2002. *Arkadia and Its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (*Hypomnemata* 140). Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Helck, W. 1979. *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens und Vorderasiens zur Ägäis bis ins 7. Jhs. v. Chr.* Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Jeffery, L. 1976. *Archaic Greece, The city-states c. 700-500 BC.* London and Tonbridge: Ernest Benn Limited.

Jost, M. 1985. *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie* (Etudes péloponnesiennes 9). Paris: Libraire Philosophique J. Vrin.

Karapanagiotou, A.V. 2005. Preliminary notices on the discovery of a planned, classical town near Kyparissia, Gortynia. In *Ancient Arcadia. Papers from the third international seminar on ancient Arcadia, held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7-10 May 2002* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 8), edited by E. Østby: 331-50. Athens.

Kalogeropoulos, K. 1998. *Die frühmykenischen Grabfunde von Analipsis (südöstliches Arkadien)* (*Βιβλιοθήκη της εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικής Εταιρείας* 175). Athens.

Kelly, T. 1976. *A History of Argos to 500 BC.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Knauss, J. 1988. Der Damm der Takka-See beim alten Tegea (Arkadien, Peloponnes). *Athenische Mitteilungen* 103:25-36.

Loring, W. 1895. Some ancient routes in the Peloponnese. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 15:25-89.

Mazarakis Ainian, A. 1997. *From Rulers' Dwellings to Temples. Architecture, religion and society in Early Iron Age Greece* (Studies in Mediterranean archaeology 121). Jonsered: Paul Åströms förlag.

Moggi, M. 1976. *I sinecismi interstatali greci* I: *Dalle origini al 338 a.C.* Pisa: Edizioni Marlin

———. 1991. Strabone interprete di Omero. *Annuario della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* S. III.21: 537-51.

Moggi, M., and M. Osanna. 2003. *Pausania, Guida della Grecia, Libro VIII, Arcadia.* Milan: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla / Arnaldo Mondadori editore.

Morgan, C. 2003. *Early Greek States Beyond the Polis.* London and New York: Routledge.

Mendel, G. 1901. Fouilles de Tégée. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 25: 241-81.

Merkelbach, R., and M. West. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodea.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Milchhöfer, A. 1880. Untersuchungsausgrabungen in Tegea. *Athenische Mitteilungen* 5: 52-69.

Morgan, C. 1996. From palace to polis? Religious developments on the Greek mainland during the Bronze Age/Iron Age transition. In *Religion and Power in the Ancient Greek World* (Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis *Boreas* 24), edited by P. Hellström and B. Alroth: 41-57. Uppsala.

Morgan, C. 2003. *Early Greek States beyond the Polis.* London and New York: Routledge.

Nordquist, G.C. 2002. Evidence for Iron Age cult activity below Athena Alea's temple at Tegea. In *Peloponnesian Sanctuaries and Cults, Proceedings of the ninth international symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 11-13 June 1994* (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen 4°, 48), edited by R. Hägg: 149-58. Stockholm.

Norman, N. 1984. The temple of Athena Alea at Tegea. *American Journal of Archaeology* 88:169-94.

Ødegård, K. 2005. The topography of ancient Tegea: New discoveries and old problems. In *Ancient Arcadia. Papers from the third international seminar on ancient Arcadia, held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7-10 May 2002* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 8), edited by E. Østby: 209-21. Athens.

Oliva, P. 1971. *Sparta and her social problems.* Prague: Academia.

Østby, E. 1986. The archaic temple of Athena Alea at Tegea. *Opuscula Atheniensia* 16:75-102.

———. 2005. Archaic temple architecture in Arcadia. In *Ancient Arcadia. Papers from the third international seminar on ancient Arcadia, held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7-10 May 2002* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 8), edited by E. Østby: 493-503. Athens.

———. 2006a. Recent archaeological investigations at Tegea. *Polis, Studi interdisciplinari sul mondo antico* 2:111-26.

———. 2006b. *Continuatio, Renovatio* and *Innovatio:* The birth of the Doric temple. *Acta ad archaeologiam et artium historiam pertinentia* 20:9-38.

Østby, E., J.-M. Luce, G.C. Nordquist, C. Tarditi and M.E. Voyatzis. 1994. The sanctuary of Athena Alea at Tegea: First preliminary report (1990-1992). *Opuscula Atheniensia* 20:89-141.

Perlès, L. 2003. *The Early Neolithic in Greece.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Petronotis, A. *'Η ~~επιτηδειοτάτη~~ λεωφόρος* (Pausanias 8.54.5) in Arkadia. In *Ancient Arcadia. Papers from the third international seminar on ancient Arcadia, held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7-10 May 2002* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 8), edited by E. Østby: 185-96. Athens.

Pikoulas, Y.A. 1999. The road-network of Arkadia. In *Defining Ancient Arcadia* (Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 6), edited by T. Heine Nielsen and J. Roy: 248-319. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters.

Pretzler. M. 1999. Myth and history at ~~Tegea—Local~~ tradition and community identity. In *Defining Ancient Arcadia* (Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 6), edited by T. Heine Nielsen and J. Roy: 89-129. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters.

Pritchett, W.K. 1980 and 1989. *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography, Part III (Roads),* and *Part VI* (University of California publications in Classical studies, 22 and 33). Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.

Roy, J. 2002. Synoikizing Megalopolis: The scope of the synoikism and the interests of local Arcadian communities. In *Ancient Arcadia. Papers from the third international seminar on ancient Arcadia, held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7-10 May 2002* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 8), edited by E. Østby: 261-70. Athens.

Salavoura, E. 2005. *Μυκηναϊκή Αρκαδία, αποτίμηση των γνώσεών μας*. In *Ancient Arcadia. Papers from the third international seminar on ancient Arcadia, held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7-10 May 2002* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 8), edited by E. Østby: 35-48. Athens.

Sergent, B. 1980. Le royaume d'Arcadie à l'époque mycénienne. *Index* 9 :77-97.

Sinos, S. 1971. *Die vorklassischen Hausformen in der Ägäis.* Mainz: Philipp von Zabern.

Snodgrass, A. 1981. *Archaic Greece.* London, Melbourne and Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd.

Tarditi, C. 2005. The sanctuary of Athena Alea: Recent excavation in the northern area. Results and problems. In *Ancient Arcadia. Papers from the third international seminar on ancient Arcadia, held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7-10 May 2002* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 8), edited by E. Østby: 197-208. Athens.

Tomlinson, R.A. 1972. *Argos and the Argolid.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Treu, G. 1881. Fragmente aus den tegeatischen Giebelgruppen des Skopas. *Athenische Mitteilungen* 6: 393-23.

Vallois, R. 1926. Le théâtre de Tégée. *Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique* 50:135-73.

Visser, E. 1997. *Homers Katalog der Schiffe.* Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner.

Voyatzis, M.E. 1990. *The Early Sanctuary of Athena Alea at Tegea and Other Archaic Sanctuaries in Arcadia* (Studies in Mediterranean archaeology and literature, Pocket-book 97). Göteborg: Paul Åströms förlag.

———. 1999. The role of temple building in consolidating Arcadian communities. In *Defining Ancient Arcadia* (Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre 6), edited by Th. Heine Nielsen and J. Roy: 130-68. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Sciences and Letters.

———. 2002. An analysis of votive types recently found at Tegea. In *Peloponnesian Sanctuaries and Cults, Proceedings of the ninth international symposium at the Swedish Institute at Athens, 11-13 June*

1994 (Skrifter utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Athen 4°, 48), edited by R. Hägg: 159-69. Stockholm.

———. 2005. Pottery at the cross-roads: Ceramic trends in southeast Arcadia. In *Ancient Arcadia. Papers from the third international seminar on ancient Arcadia, held at the Norwegian Institute at Athens, 7-10 May 2002* (Papers from the Norwegian Institute at Athens 8), edited by E. Østby: 467-82. Athens.

Winter, F.E. 1991. Early Doric temples in Arcadia. *Échos du monde classique / Classical Views* n.s. 10: 193-220.