

“just” Athenian of Plutarch’s Life is also presented, but I found this less striking because I have long been familiar with the arguments for distrusting the idealised portrait of later tradition (but I was surprised to see no reference to the hostile ostraka, quoted by Hornblower in his entry on Aristides in the Oxford Classical Dictionary). The account of Mardonios, by Wiesehöfer, is short, revealing how little we know of him.

The main part of the book concerns various issues relevant to the battle itself. “The Face of Battle at Plataiai” by Konijnendijk and Bardunias, which discusses the actual method by which the hoplite phalanx was managed in battle, is of particular interest. I have to confess that I was unaware that this was a focus of considerable controversy, but this is clearly the case; the demonstration, with the aid of experiments with suitably prepared volunteers, of what seems the only way that a body of hoplites could manoeuvre coordinatedly and fight effectively, seemed conclusive (pp. 222-226, with illustrations in figs. 1-5), and their general discussion of what happened in the battle, and Konecny’s separate discussion of the topography and its unavoidable effects on tactics used by both sides (provided with many illustrations and plans), seemed perfectly sensible. Sekunda discusses the vital but rarely noted problem of how both sides were supplied with food and water, and makes many interesting comments on how this must have affected decisions made by the commanders on either side. I cannot help feeling uneasy that he seems to be ignoring Herodotus’s counting the large light-armed contingent (psiloi) in the Greeks’ army; though many may have been primarily shield and baggage-carriers for the hoplites, the Spartans would not have needed more than one or two of the seven that, according to Herodotus, accompanied each man to fulfil these duties (it seems highly likely from Herodotus IX.61 that the psiloi with the Lacedaemonian and Tegean forces fought in the main conflict). Finally, the account by Gaebel of the Boeotian, especially Theban, cavalry underlines how valiantly they fought on the Persian side, even trying to protect the Persian forces when the battle was clearly lost and they were fleeing, and inflicting notable casualties on some of the smaller Greek contingents, which emphasises how useful Greek cavalry could be against hoplite infantry if these were in disorder.

Two final papers concern the various attempts to commemorate the victory. Patay-Horváth is concerned largely with the Delphic monument, its actual appearance, and the likely false story that Pausanias had an extra inscription added to

the base, while Jung, in the only paper in German, discusses the failure of the little city-state of Plataea to get itself generally recognised by all Greeks as effectively sacrosanct, as its treatment at the beginning of the Peloponnesian War was to demonstrate.

Overall, a collection of generally interesting and thought-provoking papers.

OLIVER DICKINSON
DURHAM UNIVERSITY, UK
otpkdickinson@googlemail.com

Malcolm Bell III, *The City Plan and Political Agora* (Morgantina Studies VII). pp. 444. Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2022. ISBN 978-3-7520-0021-4 (Print), ISBN 978-3-7520-0131-0 (eBook), hardcover €129.

We have been waiting for many decades for the full edition of the agora of Morgantina, a site of extreme interest both from an urban and architectural point of view, so this volume is welcome. It presents the results of many years of excavations in which numerous archaeologists have engaged, and it is the work of the man who has represented the American “side” of research for forty years. As is well known, a wide debate has arisen in recent years concerning the chronology of both the town-planning and the public monuments of the city (and also the private houses near the agora), for which a chronology in the Hellenistic age, both earlier and later to the period of the *basileia* of Hieron II, have been proposed.¹ Malcom Bell in fact does not return to the subject, but lets the excavation data speak for themselves, which were already exposed (at least in part) in the preliminary reports of the field campaigns, twelve from 1957 to 1988, but are now published in full in this volume, both for the urban plan, and for the monuments of the agora.

The first three chapters are dedicated to the discussion of topographical and urban problems. Bell first discusses the geo-morphological and topographical setting of the site, the water supply, the exposure to the winds and the sources of building material, emphasizing that in various points of the Serra Orlando hill it was possible to quarry the limestone used for the construction of the buildings. He then moves on to the heart of

¹ The discussion about chronology is exposed by Mége 2021: 27; 208-212 for the House of Ganimedes.

this part, the discussion of the town planning and its chronology. The plan of the city is conditioned by the morphology of the narrow and long hill. Two *plateiai* of different widths divide the Serra into three parts and are intersected at right angles by *stenopoi* (side-streets), delimiting the *insulae*, whose theoretical size can be recovered in the sector between the two *plateiai*. The average of the measurements allows Bell to identify the unit used, a foot of 0.322 m, slightly smaller than the standard one of 0.326 m. Thus, *insulae* of 330x120 feet are obtained with a ratio slightly under 1:3 (1:2.75). The *insulae* consist of twelve 60-foot lots, divided into two rows by a central division (*ambitus*) of 3 feet ($58^{1/2} \times 2 + 3$). In the sectors to the north and south of the two *plateiai*, conditioned by the course of the city walls, the blocks can also reach the length of 8, 10 and even 14 or 16 lots.

It should be noted that there is a hierarchy between the two *plateiai*: the northern *plateia* A has a width of 36 feet, while the southern one B, a width of 20/21 feet, with a ratio slightly less than 1:2. The first street runs along the upper agora to the north, while the south *plateia* intentionally separates the two agoras, the upper and the lower, which theoretically occupy the space of three blocks each. Thus, a fundamental characteristic of the plan of Morgantina is captured: the double agora, arranged on both sides of a *plateia*, exactly as in Naples, whose urban plan dates back to around 475 BC. The morphology of the Serra Orlando hill means that the hierarchically superior *plateia* is the northern one that runs alongside the upper agora and not the southern one between the two agoras, as in Naples. As I have pointed out several times,² the double agora, also attested in Camarina, is a very important new and interesting aspect of these colonial urban plans of the fifth century BC, because it presupposes a differentiation of the functions of the square, evident in Camarina and also in Morgantina, where the upper agora is destined for political functions, while the lower square is reserved for commercial ones (and later also for other uses). It should be noted that the stretch of *plateia* A which runs alongside the agora is absorbed into the square, since the public buildings (starting from the Northeast Building of Classical age) are arranged on the northern edge of the street, allowing for a perfect alignment of the buildings, an expedient already used in the Archaic period in the agora of Megara Hyblaea and in the Classical period in the agora of Camarina, where the West stoa is aligned to the west side of the *stenopos*.

Overall, Morgantina's plan fits perfectly into the colonial modular urban planning of Classical age, which includes the town plans of Naxos, Camarina, Naples. A series of planning principles emerged, that I think were probably elaborated in Syracuse at the beginning of the 5th century. BC, in the age of the tyrants, for the urbanization of Acradina and Neapolis. The plan probably envisaged in theory a module (block) with a ratio of 1:3, and again one of 1:3 between the short side of the block and the main *plateia* and 1:2 (theoretically) between the main and minor *plateiai*. A width of 15 feet was foreseen for the *stenopoi*, but some, deliberately, are wider (even 17/20 feet in the case of E1 and W1 which run along the sides of the agora). The theoretical plan was effectively adapted to the elongated morphology of the hill, as demonstrated by the 7.4° adjustment in the orientation of the *plateia* B in the S. Agnese district. The altars placed at the intersection between *stenopoi* and *plateiai* are an interesting feature of the plan; they are very similar to those known in Naxos, interpreted as an indication of an organization of the civic body by neighbourhoods and of the family and religious ties that linked the members of the major *oikoi* of the city, as was also proposed for Naxos and other Greek colonies. Their function as markers in the layout of the urban plan is therefore to be excluded, or in any case it is secondary. I find very interesting the remark of Bell that the altars were intended to demonstrate that the city's layout had a religious dimension, well perceived by the citizens.

Let's come to the chronology of the system. The starting point is the publication of the finds from seven deposits (two from the agora and five from the western hill), formed during the fifth century. Certainly, the most important are the data from the excavation of the Northeast Building, probably a stoa, the remains of which were found under the North Stoa of Hellenistic age. The most recent finds excavated in the earthen fill below the beaten earth floors (pottery and coins) can be dated to the last quarter of the fifth century, therefore Bell proposes a dating slightly earlier than 400 BC for the building. Since it is perfectly inserted into the urban plan, it follows that the plan too must be dated in the 5th century. The deposits unearthed in the *insulae*, below the structures of the Hellenistic houses, present a good quantity of finds datable between 475 and 450. Among them we point out deposit D (layer 4) with materials datable between 480 and 450 and deposit F with materials of the same period and the last quarter of the century. Both layers are characterized by the presence of burning evidence. Bell believes that they testify to an event of destruction attributable to the capture of Morgantina by

² Belvedere 2022.

Dionysios of Syracuse in the early 4th century, but obviously there is no proof of this. In some cases (E, F) structures aligned with the urban layout are associated. Unfortunately, stratigraphic sections (if any survive) are not published, which could have allowed us to understand the relationship between walls and archaeological layers.

In conclusion, it is not possible in the current state of knowledge to pronounce on a precise dating of the urban plan, whether to attribute it to the years immediately prior to 450 BC (the moment of Douketios) or at the moment Morgantina passed under the rule of Camarina after the congress of Gela in 424. Bell is inclined towards the most ancient chronology, considering the quantity of finds datable to the second quarter of the fifth century, but theoretically, nothing prevents the finds of this period from already being in the possession of the inhabitants when they moved to the new city. The findings in the destruction layer of Himera in 409 BC show that most objects are datable between 450/440 and 410, therefore they testify to a potential use (for domestic pottery and tableware) of 30/40 years. It would be interesting to compare the finds in the foundation layers of the second urban plan of Camarina (datable around 460, because Diodorus places the division of the political *chora* by the new citizens from Gela and the old Camarineans under the year 461) and from the corresponding strata of Morgantina, both in terms of the typologies of the finds and as associations between pottery shapes. This analysis could lead to a more precise dating of the foundation of Morgantina. At present, the preference for the high date is based on a series of historical and urbanistic considerations well expressed by Bell in paragraph III. 3 (Douketios, Syracuse, and Kamarina). The issue of a silver *litra* with the head of a deity on the obverse, which can be interpreted as *Zeus Eleutherios*, could also be dated to the period immediately after 459.

The fourth chapter is dedicated to the agora as a whole. The square is located in a median position with respect to the length of the Serra Orlando hill, in a wide valley, open to the south-east, between the two main hills. It occupies the space of six *insulae*, consciously divided by the *plateia* B. On the upper agora, the Northeast Building was placed to the north in the Classical period, followed by the North Stoa in the Hellenistic period, while on the sides, again in the Hellenistic period, the North-West Stoa and the West Stoa were located to the west, and the East Stoa with the Public Office to the east. The Bouleuterion was placed on the northern side of *plateia* A, but beyond the *stenopos* W1. It

is therefore clear that the upper agora has been conceived as a political agora since the Classical age, given that the oldest *prytaneum* can be recognized inside the Northeast Building. The lower agora had a utilitarian character right from the beginning, as shown by the furnaces of the Classical age placed on the southern side, while the first cults can be recognized on the border between the two agoras, ideally in the area of *plateia* B (the cult of Zeus, the earliest altar attributable to the beginning of the 4th century), and a little further south (the cult of Demeter and Kore). The commercial character of the southern square is most clearly defined in the Late Classical period with the construction of the Central and South Shops, and of the West Granary at the beginning of the third century.

As mentioned, the best parallel for this configuration of the public space into two agoras, upper and lower, is the double agora of Naples, but we cannot fail to mention the double agora of Camarina, although in this case the two squares are placed side by side. The public character of the eastern agora and the commercial one of the western agora in Camarina have been well highlighted by the excavators.

The monumentalization of the agora took place around the middle of the third century BC with the construction of the North Stoa and the Northwest Stoa. The position of the latter, as well as that of the Fountain House on the opposite side, demonstrates that the plan initially envisaged strict observance of the limits of the space intended for the agora, as the building strictly aligns with *stenopos* W1, although the morphology (but not the geology) of this side of the hill is no different from that of the opposite side. The simple excavation of the hillside was planned to make room for the building. This choice was corrected after it had been decided to start the construction of a large stoa 300 feet long on the east side, which was placed diagonally, sacrificing the area intended for *stenopos* E1 and above all that of block E1/2c. This choice, which involved an impressive excavation of the rocky side of the hill, was due to the desire to widen the view of the agora towards the south-east. It is due, as Bell appropriately underlines, to an impressive architectural project conceived by one or more architects-urbanists well aware of the geomorphology of Serra Orlando and of the most recent scenographic solutions. Their presence may be reflected in the use of a standard unit of 0.326 or 0.328 m in the large stoas, with the exception of the East Stoa. It is therefore possible to think of a direct involvement of the royal administration of Syracuse in the project, even if, as was usual, a financial contribution was requested from local *euergetes* (wealthy donors), as demonstrated by the

inscription of Archelas, son of Eukleidas, dedicated to Dionysus on the steps of the *cavea* of the theatre.

The will to open the agora to a wide panoramic view over the country is even more evident in the position of the East Granary, while the construction of the theatre in the Lower Agora gave a more important and monumental character to the southern square, now connected to the northern one by the monumental steps. The West Stoa, a two-storey building which deviates from the axis of *stenopos* W1, occupying part of the roadway, but respecting the block W1/2c, can be considered the ideal conclusion of the program on this side and probably, given that it was not yet finished in 211 BC, was the last building to be built. The study of the spatial and visual relationships of the buildings highlights the unity of the project of monumentalization of the agora. This chapter is completed by the discussion of water supply systems and political institutions and cults, as defined by archaeological research, based on a careful examination of the functionality of the various buildings.

As is well known, a possible monumentalization of the agora prior to 211 has been discussed by several scholars in recent years, in parallel with the discussion on the chronology of the urban layout.³ Although the representation of a settlement in total decline after 211 should be rejected in principle (and we also wonder how much it is linked to a prejudice: the delivery of the city to the “barbarians”, the Hispanic mercenaries), the contraction of the urbanized area in the second century BC is archaeologically attested. One of the merits of this volume is to make all these data available to the reader, in order to understand the appearance of the city in the 2nd and 1st centuries BC, and the impression one gets after a careful reading, is that the town undoubtedly underwent a profound transformation in the second century BC, but also, at least in the central area around the agora, it maintained acceptable living standards for a settlement of minor importance as Morgantina undoubtedly was in this period. In this sense it is evident that the urban appearance of the city was manifestly weakened after the Roman conquest, and for this reason we can speak of “decadence” only if one accepts the vision of the Classical world as an eminently urban civilization (which is not true).

On the other hand, the idea that scenographic and monumental architectures, such as those attested at Morgantina, depend, in the cities of the western Mediterranean always and only, on

examples of the Eastern Mediterranean, mainly from the 2nd century BC, is a perspective that has been questioned in recent years. The role of cities like Taranto and Syracuse in the building of Hellenistic culture cannot be underestimated,⁴ nor can they be seen as mere “receptors” of cultural and architectural experiences to be transmitted to the dependent city communities. Furthermore, the upward chronological revision currently underway and fully applicable to Italy⁵ should not be overlooked. Finally, we must not forget (just looking at the plans) that the architecture of the buildings at Morgantina is rather modest (in stark contrast to the grandeur of the urban project), both from a decorative point of view and in terms of building techniques (modest use of ashlar masonry, always poorly finished, rubble walls, reuse of materials, wooden columns or columns of anular bricks in the stoas).⁶ It is therefore evident that, whereas the project was conceived by architects from Syracuse, the construction was the work of local workers with city funding. Exceptions are the West Stoa (partially), the Doric Stoa (limestone columns) and above all the Bouleuterion, whose porch has limestone entablature and columns and imported Ionic-Italic capitals of non-local white limestone. These are buildings of particular importance (Bouleuterion) or built in the last quarter of the third century BC.

Chapters V to XIV are devoted to the presentation of individual buildings: Ekklesiasterion, Northeast Building, North Stoa, East Stoa, Public Office, Fountain House, Northwest Stoa, West Stoa, Bouleuterion and Doric Stoa. For each of them, the history of the excavations, siting, description, architecture, chronological and stratigraphic data, transformation and reuse after 211, and a catalogue of the finds are presented. It is not possible here to discuss each building. Suffice it to say that it is a detailed and exhaustive examination, which provides the reader with all the data necessary to form his/her own opinion, including the stratigraphic data, with reference to detailed stratigraphic sections for the buildings excavated or sampled in more recent years. I highlight the important analysis of the architecture and functionality of the Fountain House, with the calculation of the capacity of the tank over time and the discussion of the water pipe system, and the study of the Bouleuterion - which presents a

³ E.g. Campagna 2006, Mancini 2008.

⁴ See Portale 2017 and the conference “L’architettura greca in occidente nel iii secolo a.C.” (Pompeii, Naples 2015), Roma 2017. and the conference “Taranto e Siracusa due capitali del mondo ellenistico a confronto” (61° Congresso di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto 2022).

⁵ Terrenato 2021.

⁶ On building techniques, see Appendix 3.

valuable restored virtual model of the building, the work of E. Thorkildsen, to whom we owe most of the architectural drawings in this volume.

This book offers many other points worthy of attention. Not being able to list them all, we point out the discussion of the demographic aspects (in paragraph III. 3), treated by Bell with precision and with convincing results, despite the uncertainty that these calculations generally arouse.

Five appendices complete the book. We have already mentioned Appendix 3 (Wall construction). Appendix 4 (Geology and geography of Morgantina) is by Sheldon Judson, whose fundamental study on fluvial terraces published in *AJA* 1963 we all remember. It is a comprehensive and illuminating study on the geomorphology of Serra Orlando and the relationship between topography of the city, human community and territory. The other appendices are: The draped female sculpture from the East Stoa (Appendix 1, the statue is attributed to a Syracusan workshop of the early Hellenistic period), the architecture of wood and stone (Appendix 2) and the human skeletal remains from the North stoa (Appendix 5).

Eight plans and drawings accompany the volume. The general plan of Morgantina is published at a scale of 1:4000; a plan on a larger scale would have been difficult to manage. Plans of individual buildings are published at a scale of 1:200 (optimum) or at a reduced scale. Overall, the documentation appears sufficient; however, the plan of the Bouleuterion within the text has an anomalous scale, while sections of the valley at selected points would have been useful for understanding elevation relationships among the buildings. Indexes (of Ancient Authors and General Index) and an extensive bibliography complete the work.

From an editorial point of view, the volume appears to be a high-quality product. Even the oldest excavation photographs have excellent resolution. However, the text is printed in a font size that is too small, whereas the optimal size would have been 11 or 12 pt. The footnotes, even smaller, are difficult to read. The elegant light grey print does not make reading easier. I understand the publishing house's reasons to limit the size of a volume which actually reaches 440 pages, but the needs of its readers should also be taken into account. Perhaps, this is just the needs of an elderly reviewer.

We all must be grateful to Malcolm Bell for the immense effort he has made in publishing the results of excavations that have been going on for decades and in part not directed by him. We will not be able to do without this book, whenever we talk about the

town planning, the Hellenistic architecture and the history of ancient Sicily.

OSCAR BELVEDERE
UNIVERSITY OF PALERMO
oscar.belvedere@unipa.it

AA. VV. In press. *Taranto e Siracusa: due capitali del Mediterraneo a confronto (IV e III sec. a. C.)*. 61° Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia 2022. Taranto: Istituto per la Storia e l'Archeologia della Magna Grecia.

Belvedere, O. 2022. Per una storia dell'urbanistica modulare siciliana. *Mare Internum* 14: 79-92.

Campagna, L. 2006, L'architettura di età ellenistica in Sicilia: per una rilettura del quadro generale, in M. Osanna, M. Torelli (eds) *Sicilia ellenistica, consuetudo italica. Alle origini dell'architettura ellenistica d'Occidente*: 15-34. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Mancini, A. 2006. *Architettura domestica a Morgantina*, in M. Osanna, M. Torelli (eds) *Sicilia ellenistica, consuetudo italica. Alle origini dell'architettura ellenistica d'Occidente*: 167-176. Roma: Edizioni dell'Ateneo.

Mége, F. 2021. *Le fait urbain en Sicile hellénistique*. Naples: Centre Jean Bérard.

Portale, E.C. 2017. *Siracusa e la Sicilia nel III secolo a.C.: problemi conoscitivi e proposte di lettura dei fenomeni urbanistici e architettonici*, in L.M. Calì, J. de Courtils (eds) *L'architettura greca in occidente nel iii secolo a.C.*: 133-177. Roma: Edizioni Quasar.

Terrenato, N. 2021. The Romanization of Rome. Cultural dynamics in the architecture of Hellenistic Italy, in O. Belvedere, J. Bergemann (eds) *Imperium Romanum: Romanization between Colonization and Globalization*: 77-88. Palermo: Palermo University Press.

Angelika Kellner, *Die griechische Archaik. Konstruktion einer Chronologie im Wechselspiel schriftlicher und archäologischer Quellen*. pp. 466, 7 plates, 7 maps, 2 drawings, 36 tables. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2022. ISBN: 978-3-447-11780-7 (hard cover) 978-3-447-39265-5 (pdf) €12.

In this publication, Angelika Kellner presents her dissertation on a reassessment of the chronology