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INTRODUCTION

The Second Greek colonization and the Greek cities established around the shores of the Black Sea undoubtedly attracted the interest of numerous scholars. Several articles and books were written about the culprit that led the Greeks leave their homeland and move to such distant places. The excavations conducted in the Greek cities and their necropolises all over the Euxine, offer us valuable information about the social, political and economic situation of the inhabitants. However, their significance grows even more, when we realize that in their majority, the Greek colonies have a continuation through time. This means that we are able to examine their historic outline and see the way everyday life, religion and institutions affected by several events and changed from time to time.

In this context, my paper will examine the evolution of the Greek domestic architecture, shedding light on various aspects of the private life of the Greek settlers. My aim is to present the formation of the first Greek settlements with the earthen dug-out constructions, and their development until the Hellenistic cities and the appearance of luxurious private residences. Therefore, I will examine the gradual architectural changes in the lay-out of the Greek houses, during the three major periods: Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic, in an effort to understand the social and political reasons that affected the contemporary ideology. The aim is to present aspects of domestic life, the morals and the beliefs the Greeks had from time to time and place to place, through the architectural style of their residences.

Secondly, additional information will derive from the urban organization of the Greek cities and we will be able to make a comparison between the urban ideology in the Black Sea colonies and the similarities or differences with the major Greek cities in Asia Minor and Greece. However, it must be mentioned here, that my paper will be based on the architectural remains found in the Greek cities and not in their rural territories. Moreover, it is necessary to note that the main bulk of information came from the Northern and Western Black Sea littoral, since the limited excavations and
the intense overbuilding in the southern coast of the Euxine, hinders the further examination of domestic architecture in these areas.

As a result, my paper will be structured in four main chapters, following a chronological lay-out. In the first chapter I will present the archaic pit-shelter (dugout) dwelling. This was the oldest type of house, met in great numbers especially in the Northern and Western Black Sea regions, from the end of the 7th - last quarter of the 6th century BC. It seems that this was the very first residence for the Greek colonists, and probably a habit adopted by the local, indigenous populations.

In the second chapter, the characteristics of the typical Greek oikos will be presented. From the 6th – mid 4th century BC, a new type of house emerged in the Helladic world, with the greatest examples coming from Athens, Delos and Olynthus. The main architectural type was a house with a central courtyard, around which the rooms were constructed, symbolizing this way the first ground-stone houses that appeared in the Black Sea. As a consequence, the classical house gradually replaced the former dugouts.

The Hellenistic residence will be described in the following chapter. During this period (mid-4th – 1st century BC), the Greek colonies flourished economically and reached the peak of their development. New temples, altars, fortification walls and imposing public buildings were erected. Furthermore, several secondary colonies were already established, such as Mesambria, Tanais, and others. The luxurious and multi-stored houses were an additional indication of this prosperity. The average house is now a construction larger in size, with many stores and rooms richly decorated. The peristyle courtyard and the pastas type houses are the most popular residential types, throughout the Northern and Western colonies of the region.

Since religion was of fundamental importance for the ancients, in the fourth chapter I will present the private cultic places, as they were discovered in the Greek dwellings of the Classical and Hellenistic times. Examples of home sanctuaries and private cult objects (altars, small votive figurines, dedicated to a PanHellenic or local God, till the
appearance of the first Christian symbols) will be presented in this chapter, offering us valuable information about the gods worshiped at home, and how they affected the domestic life and beliefs of the house owners.
CHAPTER 1
ARCHAIC PERIOD
700-480 BC
1.1. EARLY (610-575 BC) & MIDDLE ARCHAIC PERIOD (575-530 BC): ARCHITECTURE OF DUGOUTS AND SEMI DUGOUTS

Having taken Apollo’s consensus, the Greek colonists embarked their journey towards the new, fertile and rich in metals territories in the Black Sea. Although, the first Greek colonies founded in the Euxine are dated to the late 8th century BC – as it derived from the ancient sources, there is not enough material evidence so as to testify their existence in such an early period\(^1\). On the contrary, the situation is quite different in the Northern parts of the Black Sea.

There, the earliest evidence we have about the Greek permanent and organized settlement in the region - apart from pottery fragments-, comes from the domestic architecture of the Western and Northern parts\(^2\), shedding light on various and important aspects of the then everyday life. This evidence is the so called “pit-shelter” or “dugout” dwelling. The pit-shelter houses are an unprecedented type of dwelling, met for the first time in the Black Sea region. The greatest examples of this new architectural type come from Berezan\(^3\) and Olbia, but they were also met in places all around the Black Sea (in Histria, Kerkinitis, Nikonion, Orgame, Apollonia Pontika and elsewhere).

The most impressive and distinctive characteristic of these archaic houses is the fact that they were structures dug into the ground, in such a depth so as the roof cornice reach the level of the ground surface (or being a little higher of it); this means that the lower part was lying almost 2 meters below the ground surface. Besides the underground shelters there were also “semi-dugouts” or “semi pit-shelter” dwellings. The latter, were partially underground structures, of which the half part was built above the ground level and the rest of it below.

---

\(^1\) It is a fact that the intense overbuilding hindered the archaeologists from reaching and examining the earliest cultural layers and consequently the total absence of any archaic evidence coming from those two colonies raised a hot debate among the scholars, with many of them doubting the date of their foundation.

\(^2\) From the Northern Black Sea, dugouts were unearthed in Nikonion, Berezan, Olbia and Kerkinitis, while in the Western part in Odessos, Tomis and Histria. C. O. Rogobete underlines that in the western shore of the Pontus and in particular in Apollonia Pontica, Histria and Orgame, the above-ground houses prevailed. C. O. Rogobete, 2012.

\(^3\) The first Greek colony in the Northern Black Sea, dated in the third quarter of the 7th century BC. V. D. Kuznetsov, 2001, p. 319.
Dugouts and semi-dugouts were in use from the end of the 7th century BC till the last quarter of the 6th century BC, leading this way a great number of scholars (S. D. Kryzhitsky, L. V. Kopeikina, Y. A. Vinogradov, K. K. Marchenko, S. N. Mazarati and V. M. Otreshko, and others) suggest that these were the first residences the Greek colonists constructed right after their arrival in the distant territories. From the 5th century BC onwards, the pit-shelter houses were gradually replaced by the Classical and later the Hellenistic ones, without this meaning that they were totally extinct. We have traces of dugouts and semi-dugouts even in the Classical Period.

Fig. 1. Pit-shelter and semi pit-shelter houses of Olbia (plans and reconstructions after S. D. Kryzhitsky)

Pit-shelters and semi pit-shelters, were modest structures, with many differences and similarities with each other. The majority of the dugouts were circular or oval in shape, while semi-dugouts had mainly a square or rectangular/trapezoid shape. As far as

---

5 For instance, in Myrmekion, and according to Y. A. Vinogradov, the replacement of dugouts by ground-houses took place during the 5th century BC, while in some cases they existed simultaneously with ground-level houses, such as in Olbia, Nikonion, Panticapaeum, Myrmekion, Phanagoria, Hermonassa and elsewhere too. V. D. Kuznetsov, 1999, p. 533-535 and G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 230-244.
their masonry is concerned, the semi-dugouts were built either of raw bricks, wood or stone (rarely), while the dugouts were merely mud-brick constructions⁶. Although their shape varies, their interior has a specific, homogenized layout, met in every similar construction: it was a single, humble and small chamber⁷, covering an average area between 6-15m².⁸

The walls were vertical, covered with wattle or daub. In the dugouts, the trench sides constituted the side walls of the dwelling, braced in some cases by timber joins, such as the dugouts found in Odessos and Tomis⁹. The semi-pit-shelter houses, reinforced their foundations with stone walls, built underground, right next to the earthen walls of the trench; above them the rest of the house was constructed of any kind of material. The roofs were certainly a little higher of the ground level, and in both structures were made of reed, adobe or gable¹⁰.

It is estimated that in the middle of the roof there was a hole, allowing this way the light come inside the house and facilitating the room’s ventilation¹¹. According to the residential remains, it seems that the circular dugout constructions had a conical roof, with a central column, sunk into a pit in the floor, supporting it¹², while the rest dwellings

---

⁷ S.D. Kryzhitsky, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V Nazarov, 2003, p. 428
⁸ There are many variations in the size of those dwellings, with some bigger or even smaller constructions, as we will see some below. S.D. Kryzhitsky, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V Nazarov, 2003, p. 429; G. R. Tsetskhladze, 1998, p. 20
¹⁰ S.D. Kryzhitsky, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V Nazarov, 2003, p. 429
¹¹ M. Manoledakis, 2014, lecture presentation-my personal notes
¹² S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 35.
had a “*simple slopping roof*”, with an inclination of 40-50°. The floors consisted either of packed earth or clay and certainly needed constant repair or frequent cleaning.

Our knowledge is much more limited in the case of the entrances of these archaic houses. Taking into consideration the fact that the roof cornice projected only a few centimeters above the ground surface, it was impossible to allow the presence of a doorway at the average humans’ height. It seems though that the entrances were cut out to the soil, and a wooden or earthen ladder was leading inside the house. Made probably of a non-durable material, a few traces of doorways and semi-destroyed thresholds have been found.

The finds coming from the interior of the dwellings, offer us a better understanding of the archaic residences and their function. As a rule, all the early pit-shelter and semi-pit-shelter constructions had only one room, separated according to its function usually into the kitchen and the living area. Furnaces, hearths and braziers were discovered inside the pit-shelters, while the most interesting were some samples of archaic furniture, such as the “couches” or “benches” adjusted to the wall, which were used probably for sleeping or cooking; and a few, small tables used for the household. It must be noticed here that such tables were commonly found in the Lower Bug Region, and seems to be unknown in the Northern Black Sea.

The examples from the Greek cities around the Euxine will give us a more complete image (in geographical order):

---

13 S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 35.
14 S. D. Kryzhitsky, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 429; C. O. Rogobete, 2012.
16 S. D. Kryzhitsky, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 429.
17 Stove benches or sleeping couches were 1m wide and 0.20-0.30m high. S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 37-38.
19 The tables were usually made of clay and straw, with 0.7-1m length and 0.5-0.9m width, while they were short constructions, with a height between 0.2-0.5m, usually faced with smooth stones. These tables were situated in the southern part of the dwelling, right next to the earthen trenches; next to them there were frequently one or two pits where amphorae and hand-made clay pots were found. S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 38.
Nikonion: Although the cultural layer of the 6th and early 5th centuries BC was severely destroyed, the archaeological research in Nikonion unearthed 20 underground dwellings\textsuperscript{22}. Nevertheless, the constructions were badly damaged, preventing this way the archaeologists from determining their actual depth and their structure (whether they were dugouts or semi-dugouts). Despite the difficulties, we are able to draw some safe conclusions about the domestic architecture of the Archaic Period in this Greek colony\textsuperscript{23}. The dugouts seem to be the only type of residence in the city, in the initial phase of its existence. The underground structures were all rectangular in shape, covering an area between 11-25m\textsuperscript{2}.\textsuperscript{24} Similar constructions of a smaller scale\textsuperscript{25} were also discovered in the rural area of Nikonion. These constructions were circular and rectangular in shape, in a depth between 0.4-1.4m\textsuperscript{26}. And in this case, their existence lasted until the mid-5th century BC.

Olbia: Similar was the situation in Olbia, where more than 40 dugouts were excavated in the city of the 6th century BC\textsuperscript{27}. They were all single-chambered constructions with a rectangular shape\textsuperscript{28}. Their size ranged from 6-15m\textsuperscript{2} and their depth from 0.3-1.6m. The dugout architecture ceased to exist in Olbia and its Chora in the early Classical Period and the first half of the 5th century BC.

\textsuperscript{22} N. M. Sekerskaya, 2001, p. 68
\textsuperscript{23} N. M. Sekerskaya, 2001, p. 68
\textsuperscript{24} G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 236
\textsuperscript{25} The archaic dugouts covered an area of 8-19m\textsuperscript{2}, while the classical ones 9-39m\textsuperscript{2}. G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 236
\textsuperscript{26} G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 236
\textsuperscript{27} G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 230
\textsuperscript{28} S.D. Kryzhitsky, N. A. Lejpunskaja, 2010, p. 30
➢ Berezan: More than 200 dugout constructions have been excavated\(^\text{29}\) in the Berezan settlement. The earliest ones are dated back to the late 7\(^{th}\) century BC, with the overwhelming majority of them looking identical in their layout\(^\text{30}\). Their size varied from 5-12 m\(^2\), so as their depth, from 0.5-1m below the ground surface. The majority of them were oval in shape and located next to the coast\(^\text{31}\).

![Fig. 4. Late Archaic Dugout 69. Berezan (NW Sector)](image)

![Fig. 5. Late Archaic Dugout 71. Berezan (NW Sector)](image)

➢ Kerkinitis: Much less are known for the Greek colony of Kerkinitis. A few dugouts have been discovered in the earliest layers of the city, and they are all incompletely examined\(^\text{32}\). The only information we have is that they were dug into the soil into a depth of 0.7-1m and seemed to be the only type of dwellings until the first third of the 5\(^{th}\) century BC\(^\text{33}\). The mud-huts –as Kutaisov named them- were 9-12m\(^2\) and a lot of local Taurian pottery were found in their interior\(^\text{34}\).

➢ Chersonesus: Valuable information come also from the colony of Chersonesus. Although, the city was founded in the 6\(^{th}\) century BC, the only domestic architectural traces come from the late 5\(^{th}\) century and 422/21 BC, when

---


\(^{30}\) G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 230

\(^{31}\) S. L. Solovyov, 2001, p. 120

\(^{32}\) G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 236


\(^{34}\) V. D. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 575-576.
colonists from Heraclea Pontica re-established the city. As far as the archaeological finds indicate, in this second phase of its existence, Chersonesus’ residents lived in pit-shelter houses. They were all cut into the rock, measuring an area between 4-10m², in a depth of 0.60-0.90m\textsuperscript{35}. The constructions were of an “elliptical or round shape”\textsuperscript{36}. The floors were made of clay, while some steps were found leading in the interior. Traces of hearths and roof-supporting columns were also discovered. Additional information were offered by the pottery and the ceramics found inside the dwellings. The majority of them were Attic-vases, with a few samples of Tauric hand-made pottery. The pots and the vases help us date the houses to the end of the 5\textsuperscript{th} – early 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC. After 25-30 years of function, all the pit-shelter houses were replaced by above-ground constructions.

- **Panticapaeum:** Six circular dugout constructions were discovered in Panticapaeum, dated in the middle of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century BC. The pit-shelters were sunk into the soil, 1.4m under the ground surface\textsuperscript{37}. Semi-dugouts were found in the peripheral settlements of Panticapaeum, like in “Hospital” settlement, with many Greek ceramic fragments (from Chios, Thasos, Heraclea, Sinope, etc.)\textsuperscript{38}. All the constructions were destroyed by fire\textsuperscript{39}.

- **Nymphaeum:** Underground houses have been unearthed also in Nymphaeum, but they are only partially excavated. They seem to have been built before the 550s BC and they were abandoned in the last quarter of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century; this means that they were in function only for a few (25-30) years. Similar structures were discovered also in its Chora\textsuperscript{40}.

\textsuperscript{35} M. I. Zolotarev, 2003, p. 608.
\textsuperscript{38} V. N. Zinko, 2001, p. 297-298.
\textsuperscript{39} Dugouts and ground-level houses existed simultaneously, from the late 5th - early 3rd centuries BC, like it happened in all the Bosporan Chora and Chersonesus V. N. Zinko, 2001, p. 299.
\textsuperscript{40} G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 240.
Myrmekion: Ten pit-houses were excavated in Myrmekion. The three of them had a circular shape and were constructed earlier than the rest ones, somewhere in the mid-6th century BC. The other seven dugouts were built in the early 5th century and had a rectangular plan. At the same time the first above-ground houses appeared⁴¹.

---

Tyramba: According to the scholars this site is located on the southern coast of the Azov Sea, in an area 20km away from Phanagoria. Very little are known for this settlement, since it is incompletely studied. The only thing we can say with certainty is that there are traces of dugouts and stone-buildings, with the oldest ones dated back to the 6th century BC.

Gorgippia: More illuminating are the finds coming from Gorgippia. There, oval-dugout constructions were found, measuring 6-14m² and having 1-1.4m depth. The walls were reinforced with stone, while it is estimated that their roofs were conical in shape, made of poles or reeds. In some cases, the lack of hearths allow the scholars support their non-residential function. During the Late Archaic Period, all the pit-shelter houses were replaced by surface stone-buildings.

Similar houses have been discovered in other places of the Black sea, like in Hermonassa, Kepoi, Patraeus, Toricos, Histria (Western Pontos), Gynenos (Eastern Pontos).

However, it must be noticed here that not all the dugouts were inhabited. For instance, in Olbia we see dugouts larger than 6m² and smaller than 15m², but in Myrmekion and Gorgippia there were even smaller ones, of 3.4m² and 4.3m² in each case. As a result, it becomes obvious that many of the underground constructions were used for household keeping, since it is definitely impossible for a family to live in

---

54 V. D. Kuznetsov, 2001, p. 338
such a small, single-chamber dwelling. Furthermore, it is quite possible that a family possessed more than one dugouts, one for living and the other for storage and household equipment.

Consequently, the main residence (either partially above or completely below the ground surface), the additional dugouts and the storage pits around the houses, constitute the residential complexes of the Archaic Period in the Northern and Western Black Sea region. A few years later, the dugouts were developed and gradually changed their interior layout. This development was expressed with the passage from the primitive, single-chambered constructions of the late 7th and first half of the 6th century BC to the more complex, multi-chambered dugouts during the last third of the 6th century BC. A change that would contribute very soon to the appearance of the first above-ground houses.

Such an example, showing the differentiation and development between the very first and the later dugout and semi-dugout dwellings, comes from Berezan. It is the No. 47 semi-dugout, which distinguishes for its large dimensions and the most careful construction. It was a rectangular construction, occupying an area of 38m² with 1m depth into the soil. S. L. Solovyov describes:

“One of the most notable features of this building is the arrangement around its perimeter of a pit; to the full height of its sides are masonry walls 0.5m wide, the above-ground parts of which were constructed of mud bricks. The lower row of the masonry, to a height 0.55m, consisted of large polygonal slabs placed sideways, above which lay four rows of flat stones. The entrance to the building was set into the south wall, and from there four steps, built of stone slabs, led inside. The building was single-roomed; however, its interior (about 28m²) was divided into two halves with separate functions: living and food preparation. The latter part occupied the north-western section of the building, where stoves and hearths of unusual construction were located. Owing to the frequent reconstruction of the pisé (clay and straw) floor, these were built

---

55 S.D. Kryzhtsky, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 429
56 S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 38
57 S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 39
at different times. [...] The floors were constructed of flat stones on a bed of sea sand and were clay coated\(^{58}\).

Stoves, hearths (six in number), portable braziers and floor-pits, where vessels were put in, were also unearthed. As it becomes obvious from the placement of the pits tended to hold the roof-supporting columns, an unbraced type of gabled roof (two-sloped) had been used\(^{59}\). Lastly, judging from the height of the doorway and the depth of the trench (1m.) we assume that the total height of the semi dugout dwelling was up to 3.8m, while the 2.7m were above the ground level\(^{60}\).

**Fig. 9. Oven found in a Late Dugout of Berezan.**

**Fig. 8. Brazier found inside a Late Archaic Dugout (B. 87.290).**

\(^{58}\) S. L. Solovyov, 2001, p. 126  
\(^{60}\) S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 63
On the other hand, a similar construction, indicative of the inner differentiation of the more developed dugouts, was No. 41 dugout, discovered also in Berezan settlement. It was a mud-brick work, built 0.8 m below the ground surface, occupying an area of 19m². Its interior included one chamber, partitioned into two rooms by a fence put into the floor. This fenced-partition divided the room into two halves of different functions: the living area and the kitchen (food preparation). In its northern part, where the living room was situated, the archaeologists discovered two clay stove-couches placed alongside the wall and traces of wooden furniture, like small tables. In the opposite side, there was a hearth, four depressions for holding storage-vessels and an entrance with two earthen steps.

What is also noticeable, is the fact that in both cases, dugouts No. 41 and 47, there was a large amount of fragments of Greek vessels and amphorae (in a percentage of 80-90% of the total ceramic finds), coming from the East Aegean (Samos, Lesbos, 

---

61 S. L. Solovyov, 2001, p. 127
Clazomenae, Chios and Thasos), while only a few traces from Attic and Corinthian pottery were discovered\textsuperscript{64}.

As it derived from the precedent two examples, it is true to say that although the pit-shelters had only one chamber, they had a multifunctional use, which gradually created the need for more than one rooms, and the appearance of the two-chamber dugouts (or the multi-chamber ones), as it was the case in Histria\textsuperscript{65} and Berezan.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{Fig_11.png}
\caption{Plan of Dugout 41 at Berezan (after Solovyov).}
\end{figure}

\section*{1.1.1. DUGOUTS AND SEMI-DUGOUTS: DWELLINGS OR BASEMENTS?}

As it was mentioned above, many scholars\textsuperscript{66} “interpreted” these archaic constructions as the very first residential places of the Greek colonists. However, this suggestion is still under discussion, since a rather not negligible number of scholars declare that there are not enough evidence in order to draw a safe conclusion and testify these constructions as "houses".

First of all, although their small size made them impossible for residence, there are actually some archaeological finds that made the scholars believe in the ‘residential function’ of those constructions. For instance, the clay coating found on the walls and the floors, was a common practice, used both in the pit-shelters and semi pit-shelters, offering (water) insulation and making the room habitable\textsuperscript{67}. Moreover, the furnaces,

\textsuperscript{64} S. L. Solovyov, 2001, p. 127
\textsuperscript{65} C. O. Rogobete, 2012.
\textsuperscript{66} See above, Chapter 1.1, p. 7.
\textsuperscript{67} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 36
the braziers and the depressions on the floor where the storage vessels were put, could be related with the household and everyday chores; and in accordance with the tables and the couches that were described above, the room seems to have a residential-living character. On the other hand, these finds allow us another interpretation too. The partially or totally underground construction could also be used as a place for cooking preparation (kitchen) and a food storage room. In this case, the couches would be used not for sleeping, but probably as auxiliary kitchen-tables (stove-benches).

Secondly, there are evidence showing us that not all the dugouts were created for housing families. Some constructions were made in order to serve cult and religion purposes (such as the cultic complex dedicated to Achilles in Olbia)68, while others were used as working rooms. The large amount of iron and remains of metallic slag, in conjunction with the lack of household and tableware objects, indicate that such places functioned as metal workshops. Four such complexes, partially or totally beneath the ground surface, have been found in the Eastern part of Berezan.

The most distinctive example of a dugout workshop was an oval building, dug 0.75m into the ground. The workshop occupied an area of 6.4 x 4.8m. The entrance was placed in the northern wall, while an open hearth, made of straw and clay, was unearthed in the exact opposite side (southern wall)69. Both in the center and in the side-walls were traces of pits where the roof-supporting columns were placed. The interior (2.8m in diameter) was full of rust and iron slag, while the existence of a fire-pit used for forging the iron, reinforces the assumption that this was a local workshop70.

Thirdly and most importantly, the Greeks in their metropolises had an already well-developed architecture, based on advanced technological knowledge and skills.
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69 S. V. Solovyov, 1999, p. 36. Many scholars tend to identify the hearths with the domestic function of the building, but we should not forget that heating equipment was necessary in the workshops too. V. D. Kuznetsov, 1999, p. 537.
70 S. V. Solovyov, 1999, p. 36
Therefore, for what reason would they ‘deny’ their knowledge and prefer to live in such modest and primitive constructions? Moreover, it is reasonable to wonder why the Greeks kept living in the dugouts for decades, since it is estimated that the building of a typical above-ground house, like the ones the Greeks already constructed in their city-states, lasted only a few days.

These questions led many academics (like N. I. Sokolskii, V. D. Kuznetsov, J. Driessen, Blavatsky, A. S. Rusyaeva etc.) to the conclusion that the underground constructions were probably used as food-storage rooms and cellars and not as dwellings or residential places, as was initially believed. Accordingly, this theory presupposes the existence of ground-level houses with basements, something which is strongly supported only by the archaeological finds of the late Archaic Period and not earlier than the third quarter of the 6th century BC. Traces of above-ground houses have been discovered all around the Black Sea, in Berezan, Olbia, Nikonion, Kerkinitis, Panticapaeum, Tiritake, Myrmekion, Kimerik, Nymphaeum, Hermonasa, Gorgippia, Kepoi, Patraues, and Phanagoria, all of them dated in the third quarter of the 6th century BC onwards.

However, we still cannot be certain whether the dugout constructions functioned solely as basements or storage rooms. If we take for granted that every dugout was beneath a typical archaic house, made of bricks or stones, then we would expect to find traces of this above-ground structure; something that rarely happens. On the other hand, we should bear in mind that usually the ground level constructions were much more vulnerable to destructions (fire, earthquakes, invasions, plunge, etc.) than the underground ones, while we should not forget that it was a common practice for the ancients to use the architectural members of the collapsed buildings in order to build new ones. Thus in many cases it looks impossible to find traces of such early constructions.

\[71\] V. D. Kuznetsov, 2003, p. 918.
\[72\] V. D. Kuznetsov, 1999, p. 552
\[73\] V. D. Kuznetsov, 1999, p. 549
1.1.2. DUGOUTS: LOCAL OR GREEK INVENTIONS?

Another issue that needs to be thoroughly examined is the ethnic origin of the dugout constructions. As it was mentioned above, the Greeks in their metropolises lived in above-ground, stone and multi-chamber houses; making this way the scholars attribute those ‘primitive’ constructions to the local populations. According to V. D. Kuznetsov, the Greek settlers “had neither the opportunity nor the time to build ordinary houses”74. They needed to find a shelter immediately, in order to protect themselves from the weather (and the extremely cold winters) and from the animals. Thus they adopted the dugout constructions, which were already used by the local tribes75.

This phenomenon intrigued the scholars, who wanted to state their own theories and give their own explanations. S. D. Kryzhitsky, L.V. Kopeikina and V. V. Lapin agree that the Greek settlers had neither the economic nor the technical means in order to create their advanced houses from the very beginning. As a result their only choice was to adopt the local habits. On the contrary, it is still under discussion whether the Greeks were totally unaware of the so-called dugout architecture and if they were indeed unprepared for such an important issue – where to live and how to survive.

In some cases, the pottery fragments shed additional light on the ‘ethnic’ origin of the dugout dwelling. It is a fact that a lot of similar underground dwellings have been unearthed in the steppes and the forests of the Northern and Western Black Sea inland, in sites initially inhabited by local tribes, such as the Thracians and the Scythians. For this reason, many of the dugouts discovered in those lands were attributed to those tribes. Additionally, even chronologically, these structures are dated before the Greek colonization of the Black Sea, testifying this way their non-Greek origin. To be more specific, the scholars divided the dugouts into two main categories: The first one, included the round dugouts (oval and circular), where the archaeologists unearthed mainly – if not only- Thracian hand-made ceramics, tools and
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74 V. D. Kuznetsov, 2001, p. 332
75 V. D. Kuznetsov, 2001, p. 332
jewels\textsuperscript{76}, leading this way to the conclusion that their residents were Thracians\textsuperscript{77}. Following the same way of thinking, the second category included the rectangular constructions and in combination with the objects of Scythian style that were found in their interior, the scholars suggested that these dwellings belonged to the Scythians\textsuperscript{78}.

As a natural outcome, and since those populations inhabited the Black Sea region much earlier than the arrival of the Greek colonists, the archaeologists talk about a local culture that was adopted by the new settlers (the Greeks). This suggestion seems reasonable enough and well-grounded, if we consider that the first residence the Greek settlers met in the distant Black Sea, were the sunk into the ground Thracian or Scythian dwellings; the dugouts. The local populations of Thracian and Scythian origin, were certainly familiar with the local climate and the geographical peculiarities. In other words, they had organized their lives in accordance with the local landscape. Hence, for the Greeks the adoption of the local architecture was a safe solution in the initial stage of their arrival.

On the other hand, the Greeks needed to be acquainted with the new place, and search the region in order to find the timber and the stones\textsuperscript{79} they needed for their first ‘civilized’ constructions. Undoubtedly, this would have been a time consuming process and a not so immediate need; on the contrary the need for protection and a place to house them was direct and number one priority to them. But still raises the question, why not to live for a while in tents or on their ships, search the place (for

\textsuperscript{76} S. V. Solovyov, 2001, p.125
\textsuperscript{77} This suggestion is in a way testified by the beehive dugouts that were found in Karabournaki in Thessaloniki, and look alike the archaic dwellings of the Euxine and seems to have the same functions (husbandry and living). The dugouts are dated before the formation of the Greek settlement, in the late 8\textsuperscript{th}-early 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC and are attributed to the Thracians, who inhabited the region until the end of the Late Archaic Period. D. Tsiafakis, 2009, p. 61-63. For a more detailed description of the finds in Karabournaki see D. Tsiafakis, 2010, p. 279.
\textsuperscript{78} S. V. Solovyov, 2001, p.122-123 and G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 251. Tsetskhladze also describes the archaeological data and the local domestic architecture from the whole Dnieper Region, in p. 247-256
\textsuperscript{79} Clay was another necessary material needed for the house-building, since it was used in the mud-brick production and the everyday objects and utensils; however it is not mentioned above because it was a material that could easily be found almost in every place around the Black Sea.
material resources) and then build their final stone- or mud brick-houses\textsuperscript{80}\textsuperscript{80}? V. D. Kuznetsov in his article “Greek dwellings in the North Black Sea”, analyzes the process and the time the Greeks would need in order to build a typical archaic house, based on an example coming from a ground house in Phanagoria\textsuperscript{81}. According to his research and calculations, the whole process of building a ground level house at that period of time, including the digging of the foundation trench, the production of the bricks and the construction of the walls and the roof, would last only a few weeks\textsuperscript{82}.

It is certainly a paradox why the Greeks preferred to live in underground dwellings, and probably it is indicative of the strong influence and cultural exchange that took place between the indigenous and the new settlers. Moreover, one possible explanation would be the fact that the dugout constructions were on the one hand, so simple in their layout that anyone could built them; they would be ready for residence in not time, while at the same time they looked as the perfect solution, which will offer a good protection from the climatic changes. Following this suggestion, one could say that the Greeks came to those underground dwellings, based on their instinct and their need for survival.

\textbf{1.1.3. CONCLUSION}

It is a fact that the pit-shelter and semi pit-shelter houses look strange to the Greek culture, since there are no similar examples in the whole Greek world. This is enough for some scholars to identify this specific type of domestic architecture with the local populations, who lived in the Black Sea and by whom the Greek colonists were probably influenced. Besides, the archaeological data indeed underline the strong similarities between the local and the Greek dugouts, especially in the Lower Dnieper region.

All the above, resulted in the conclusion that the pit-shelter dwellings were non-Greek inventions, which adjusted to the Greek culture as products of the cultural interaction

\textsuperscript{80} V. D. Kuznetsov, 1999, p. 543
\textsuperscript{81} V. D. Kuznetsov, 1999, p. 543-544, 550-551
\textsuperscript{82} V. D. Kuznetsov, 1999, p. 543
between the ‘barbarians’ and the Greeks. We must bear in mind that the first Greek settlements, were inhabited by a mixed population, where local tribes and the “new comers” lived harmonically. This peaceful (in many cases) co-existence and the trade relations that were gradually formed, had a strong influence in both cultures and civilizations.

But this does not mean that the Greeks show the dugout structures for the first time in the 6th century BC. According to G. R. Tsetskhladze, the mixed population was not a phenomenon met only in the Euxine, but in Ionia as well. The Milesians, for instance, could have been familiar with the dugout constructions many years before the second Greek colonization, thanks to the foreigners, who lived in their city. Traces of pit-shelter houses are met in Anatolia already from the Bronze Age, separated according to their function into domestic rooms, husbandry and storage places or workshops. Dugout constructions were discovered also in Lycia, Pamphylia and Cilicia during the Iron Age (Karatas, Gordion, etc.). This means that the Milesian colonists (the ones who founded the majority of the Greek colonies around the Black Sea), knew already this kind of dwellings before they embark their journey and come in contact with the Thracians or the Scythians.

On the other hand, what we can say with certainty is the fact that the earliest Greek cities had not an urban planning, according to which the streets, the residential squares or even the public buildings will be oriented. This planning came in the second phase of their existence, during the late 6th-early 5th century BC. In this term, the earlier constructions suffered a severe damage, with many of them being rebuilt in a totally new type, and others being demolished and their architectural members used for the erection of new buildings. As a consequence, the re-planning of the Greek colonies resulted in the total destruction of the earliest cultural level of the Archaic Period, hindering this way a further archaeological research and leaving the ground

---

86 V. D. Kuznetsov, 1999, p. 548, 558;
free for many individual theories, estimations and suggestions as far as the very first
domestic architecture in the Black Sea region is concerned.

1.2. LATE ARCHAIC PERIOD (530-490/80 BC): ABOVE-GROUND HOUSES

At the end of the 6th century BC, and specifically from the 545-500 BC, the very early
Greek settlements around the Black Sea changed fundamentally in their appearance.
The chaotic organization of the 7th century BC, gave its place to a complete urban
planning, including the careful orientation of the public places (the Agora, the
sanctuaries, the first stone temples, etc.), the residential quarters, the streets and the
first fortification lines for every colony. From the Late Archaic Period, the cities all
over the Euxine had a blatant Greek character, following the typical features of the
cities-metropolises in continental Greece, with almost a complete political, social and
economic organization.

One of the major changes that took place in the third quarter of the 6th century BC,
was in domestic architecture. The former underground, primitive constructions
were abandoned and new above-ground houses appeared. The first houses were
one-storeyed constructions, with two or three rooms, roof with tiles and stone walls
mainly. As far as their size is concerned, it is estimated that the ‘small’ houses covered
an area between 80-200m², while the large ones were of 200-600m². Drain systems,
wells, (semi-)cellars and streets paved with stones or pebbles were present in every
city. It is true to say that the Greek colonists tended and managed to create the new
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87 During the turn of the 6th to the 5th century BC, a series of Scythian invasions took place in the Crimea Peninsula, forcing this way the Greek residents fortify their cities in order to protect themselves. V. N. Zinko, 2007, p. 828.
88 G. R. Tsetskhladze, 2004, p. 265. The Hippodamean system (invented by Hippodamus from Miletus in the 6th century BC) became very soon the prevailed urban system and was adopted by almost every city. Even in cases where the local landscape was not suitable for it, the residents terraced the surface in order to apply the Hippodamean system.
90 In some cases, and mainly in the rural settlements around the Greek colonies, the dugout architecture was still in use (until the early 5th century BC), although in a smaller proportion. S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 64
cities in accordance with their metropolises, following the same political and architectural organization, as well as the same practices.

Two houses from Berezan will help us have a complete and explicit image of the development of the late archaic houses in Black Sea region. The first is the so called “House 2”, dated at the end of the 6th century BC and is characterized by the academics as the typical example of the early surface archaic residences. The house undergone two construction-phases. The initial house was built in the final years of the 3rd quarter of the 6th century BC (550-525 BC), while at the end of the same century it had been already reconstructed. The house was totally abandoned in the first third of the 5th century BC.

The external walls of the house were 0.45-0.60m wide and their remains were only 0.20-0.60m high. The internal walls were thinner with 0.10-0.15m width. “As a rule, the walls were built of local limestone in a one- or two-layer single-row embedded arrangement [...]. The faces of the stones were poorly cut. In some circumstances a three-layer, single-row embedded layering system, in which the middle layer was filled with small stones and clay, was utilized. The mud-brick parts of the walls were probably built using a single layer embedded system”.

In its first phase, the residential area occupied 132m², having two rooms and a courtyard in the east. In the southern wall of the court was the entrance of the house (1-1.2m wide), and right next to it, on its left side, a well was built. The mouth of the well had 1m diameter and was oriented with stones. Westwards of the well, the archaeologists discovered a
bell-shaped storage pit, with a 0.90m diameter. The most important find though, was a rectangular altar, made of stones and clay, situated in the north-western part of the courtyard. The altar was 0.85 x 0.90m and 0.20m high\(^97\). To its north and south there were two small pits, with the first including pottery fragments (114 in number) and the second remains of 38 phalanxes and “hoofed mammals”\(^98\).

The house was a double-room construction. The southern room (No. 1), slightly smaller than the northern room, measured an area of 18m\(^2\). Its floor was made of straw and clay (pisé) and was constructed 0.65m below the surface of the courtyard\(^99\). Traces of a portable brazier and the doorway have been found in its interior, but the archaeologists could not indicate their actual position with certainty. Probably this room served domestic needs and functioned as a kitchen.

The room No. 2, looks really identical to the first one. It was in the northern and western part of the complex, occupying an area of 19m\(^2\). And in this case, the room was dug into the ground, at the same depth with the previous chamber. To its southern wall a pisé (straw and clay) stove was unearthed. The placement of the doorway it is difficult to be identified, but judging from the orientation of the rooms it seems that both rooms No.1 and No.2 had their entrances in the eastern wall. Finally, it must be mentioned that the house was probably covered by a one-sided roof, made of abode\(^100\).

This new architectural type of “House 2”, is one of the most distinctive examples of the first above-ground houses built in the Euxine and indicates the strong influence that the Greek culture had towards the locals. The Greeks transferred in the new lands not only their spiritual heritage, but also their practical knowledge. Such houses were typical of the Greek culture, since they were constructed many years ago in continental Greece and were very popular.

\(^{97}\) A more detailed description of the altar in S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 70.
\(^{98}\) S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 68.
\(^{100}\) S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 70.
As we saw in the previous chapter, the Greeks, in the very beginning, adopted the local habits and the residential dwellings, but through the years they managed to adapt themselves to the local landscape, reconcile with the harsh climate and create their typical city-states. As it was natural, the typical Greek houses could not be missing. Thus, it is estimated that the Greeks were the ones who initiated the above-ground constructions in the Black Sea, imitating the building techniques they knew from their homeland. Moreover, it is not a coincidence that the surface buildings became equally popular in the Black Sea region, and were inhabited not only from the Greek settlers, but also from the local tribes who were incorporated in the archaic cities.

1.2.1 DEVELOPMENT OF THE ABOVE-GROUND HOUSES

It is widely accepted that the first above-ground houses developed and changed in appearance from the end of the 6th century BC onwards, having a strong differentiation of the very early surface buildings. It is a fact that the need for more spaces and rooms with different functions became greater. This tendency was expressed with the multi-stored constructions and the increase of the number of the rooms, as the archaeological research testified. The above described “House 2”, was re-constructed during the last years of the 6th century BC\(^ {101}\), showing exactly this new tendency and the new needs that were created.

The first changes appeared in the courtyard, where the northern wall was dismantled and two additional rooms were built\(^ {102}\). Consequently the total area of the house increased from 132m\(^2\) to 236m\(^2\), and a second small courtyard was formed in the north-eastern part of the complex, next to the room No. 4. Despite these substantial changes in the initial phase of the residential area, some parts of the former buildings were untouched and retained their function. For instance, the entrance of the courtyard, the well and the cellar were still in use, while the southern room (No. 1)

\(^{101}\) S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 70.  
\(^{102}\) S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 70.
kept its economic character, functioning either as an auxiliary domestic and household room or even as an inner courtyard. What changed fundamentally is the interior of the northern room (No. 2). In the site where initially the stoves had been placed, now an open hearth was situated, alongside the western wall. The most interesting though, seems to be an air-circulating system, which was constructed in the eastern wall of the same room and served either heating or ventilation purposes. The construction constituted of a channel, 0.40m wide, with an increasing depth of 0.40-0.50m into the floor. The channel was formed of flat stones, put in a sideway position, and was contained of mud-brick walls. To the north, the channel was leading to a small stove, made of straw and clay (pisé). Although, similar constructions were known to the archaeologists from the residential complexes in Olynthus (in Macedonia), in the Black Sea this air-circulating system was the first one found in the whole region. In the classical houses, such systems were met mainly in the kitchens of the houses, leading this way the scholars to the suggestion that they functioned as ventilation systems; used to transfer the smoke outside the room. However, in the two-stored buildings of Olynthus, the smoke-channels could have been also used in order to provide warm air to the upper floor.
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103 S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 70, 72.
104 The hearth was built of amphora fragments, mainly their upper parts, covered with clay. S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 70.
105 S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 70.
106 S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 70.
109 In the Classical times the smoke-channel was a commonly used construction, next to which usually situated the bathroom of the house. This position served clearly practical purposes, since the hot air and the water could be easily transferred from one room to the other. See below Chapter 1.2.1, p. 31-33.
The same could be assumed also for the houses in Berezan. Judging from the largeness of the external walls\textsuperscript{111}, the “House 2” could support a second floor, although there are not enough evidence neither to support nor to exclude this scenario. If we assume that the house was a single-stored building, then it is most probable that the construction we examine served merely as a system to vent the smoke outside the room. Otherwise—in case the house had a second floor—the construction would have a double function: firstly to ventilate the room and secondly to provide heat in the upper parts\textsuperscript{112}. It must be noticed here that the construction of this ventilation-heating system, entailed the displacement of the room’s entrance, moving it from the eastern wall to the northern one. This means that the room was now isolated from the central courtyard. In any case it is obvious that the room No. 2 functioned as a kitchen, where the food preparation and other domestic uses took place\textsuperscript{113}.

Since the need for more rooms was a typical feature of the late 6\textsuperscript{th} century-houses, a block of rooms added to the initial premises of “House 2”. To the northwestern corner of the complex and opposite of the room No. 2, another chamber was built; room No. 3. Between the two rooms a small passage of about 0.90m width separated them and at the same time connected the room No. 2 with the central courtyard\textsuperscript{114}. The room No. 3 occupied an area of 12m\textsuperscript{2}, and according to some details it seems that it was built in a more careful and meticulous way than all the other rooms of the house. For instance, the parts of the floor alongside the walls consisted of limestone pebbles, while the rest of the floor was filled with pottery fragments\textsuperscript{115}. The eastern wall, which was common with the next room (No. 4) was a little bit thinner than the other ones (0.20m) and was constructed by “well-dressed stones”\textsuperscript{116}, put in a single layer embedded system\textsuperscript{117}.

\textsuperscript{111} Their thickness was 0.45-0.60m. S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 67.
\textsuperscript{112} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 71.
\textsuperscript{113} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{114} We saw that the entrance of the room No. 2, moved from the eastern to the northern wall, blocking this way the room out of the courtyard.
\textsuperscript{115} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{116} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{117} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 72.
The elaborate and carefully organized construction of the room indicates its eminent role. We could relate it with the “andron”, the room where the male owners welcomed their guests and where the symposia took place. The “andron” was a room used merely by the men of the house, known to us already from the Homeric era\textsuperscript{118}. The position of the doorway was impossible to be found in this room too. However, it looks possible that the entrance was on the western wall and only passing through the room No. 4 could someone enter the room No. 3. This assumption underlines even more the special function of the room. It is obvious that it was meant to be used only by a few specific persons and was not a room related with the everyday-economic character of the house. All the above, reinforce its special use and relate it, in my opinion, with the ancient “andron”\textsuperscript{119}.

Right next to the room No. 3, the room No. 4 was erected, sharing this way a common wall. This room was much larger than all the other premises, measuring an area of 34.5m\textsuperscript{2}.\textsuperscript{120} From the first glimpse one could understand that chamber No. 4 was a much poorer construction than the western-adjoining and contemporary room (No. 3). All the walls –apart from the western, the common one- were made of mud-bricks, with only a few exceptions on a number of points that were partially built of stone\textsuperscript{121}. The pisé floor (straw and clay) was slightly higher (0.10m) than the western-room’s floor, although at the same level with the courtyard. In the eastern part of the room a pisé stove (made of straw and clay) of 1.5 x 2m was discovered. Contrary to all the other rooms, in this one the archaeologists found traces of the doorway and its threshold (consisted of three stone slabs), which was opening the room to a small separated courtyard. This additional yard occupied an area of 10m\textsuperscript{2} and was leading to another room (No. 5), of 12m\textsuperscript{2} size; used probably for the household chores\textsuperscript{122}.

What is also noticeable, is one last room (No. 6), built in the southeast corner. The room was a small construction of 10.5m\textsuperscript{2}, accessible only from the street. The fact that

\textsuperscript{118} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 153.
\textsuperscript{119} The function and role of andron will be explained in chapter 1.2.2 and in 2.1.1
\textsuperscript{120} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{121} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{122} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 72.
the doorway was opened to the street and not to the courtyard, led the scholars to compare it again with the houses in Olynthus, where such constructions served as shops\textsuperscript{123}. However, the lack of archaeological finds from this room leave it unidentified and open for a further study. Finally, ending the description of “House 2”, it must be mentioned that the western and eastern rooms had a gabled (two-sided) roof, while the southern rooms had an ungabled (one-sloped) roof, made also from the same material\textsuperscript{124}. In both cases the roof was made of adobe, and the height of the rooms reached the 2\textsuperscript{m}\textsuperscript{125}.

\textsuperscript{123} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 73.
\textsuperscript{124} S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 72.
\textsuperscript{125} The estimated height of the 2\textsuperscript{m} refers to the interior of these rooms, measuring from the floor till the ceiling. From outside the total height is estimated in about 2,8m. S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 73.
Another characteristic feature of this period is that the houses were built one next to the other, and in many cases they shared the same walls. This means that the first residential blocks were formed, with the streets separating the one from the other. Again, I will use the “House 2” as example. The below image will offer us valuable information about the formation and appearance of these residential blocks. For instance, we see that the rooms No. 1 and No. 2 shared the same (western) wall with the remains of another building, the “House No. 1”. On the opposite side, the eastern side-wall of the rooms No. 5, No. 6 and the small, courtyard was at the same time the western wall of the “House 4”. In other words, it becomes obvious that a new house erected right next to the “House 2”, and abutted to it.

![Fig. 15. Plan of Late Archaic houses in Berezan settlement.](image)

This was the “House 4”, a building dated to the end of the 6th century BC and one of the several other houses that were built all around the “House 2” (as the above image indicates). The “House 4” was a one-storeyed construction, covering an area of 181m² and being divided in five L-shaped rooms, with a gabled roof (17-21° inclination)\(^\text{127}\).

\(^{126}\) Actually the domestic areas measured 127m² and the courtyard 54m² (almost the 30% of the total area). S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 73.

\(^{127}\) S. L. Solovyov, 2001, p. 129.
The walls were made of stone blocks but in their upper part there were mud-bricks\textsuperscript{128}. They were almost half a meter wide and high (0.45-0.50 x 0.60m)\textsuperscript{129}. Beneath the poorly preserved walls, there were the foundations of the house, made of limestone slabs (0.6m width x 0.1m height)\textsuperscript{130}. “The blocks themselves were laid out in a two-front, one-row, two-layer embedded arrangement, mirroring the pattern outside”\textsuperscript{131}.

\textsuperscript{128} S. L. Solovyov, 2001, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{130} S. L. Solovyov, 2001, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{131} S. L. Solovyov, 2001, p. 129.
As far as the interior is concerned, the house was divided in five rooms\textsuperscript{132}, all erected around the main courtyard. The lack of finds in the interior of the rooms does not allow us to clarify their function with accuracy. However, it is possible that the rooms 1 and 2 served domestic needs (kitchen, husbandry, etc) and rooms 3 and 4 related probably with “andron” and “men’s places”\textsuperscript{133}.

Residences similar to “House 2” and “House 4” were found also in the archaic city of Izmir (Smirni) in Ionia (already from the late 7\textsuperscript{th} century BC)\textsuperscript{134}, in Athens (from the 640 BC)\textsuperscript{135} and in the Cyclades, like Andros and Tenos\textsuperscript{136}. In the Black Sea region similar houses were attested in Olbia\textsuperscript{137}, Berezan\textsuperscript{138}, Myrmekion\textsuperscript{139}, Tyritake\textsuperscript{140}, Porthmion,

---

\textsuperscript{132} Two rooms were eastwards of the courtyard, of 13 and 27m\textsuperscript{2} each and two in the northern part – the eastern room was 24m\textsuperscript{2} and the western 32m\textsuperscript{2}. The latter room later was divided into two smaller rooms. S. L. Soloviov, 2001, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{133} S. L. Soloviov, 2001, p. 130.
\textsuperscript{134} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 156.
\textsuperscript{135} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 157.
\textsuperscript{136} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 157.
\textsuperscript{137} S. D. Kryzhitskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 429.
\textsuperscript{138} S. D. Kryzhitskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 467-468.
\textsuperscript{140} V. N. Zinko, 2007, p. 828-829.
Kepoi\textsuperscript{141}, Phanagoria\textsuperscript{142}, Gorgippia\textsuperscript{143}; all of them representing the Greek (Ionian) domestic architecture in Pontus.

1.2.2. CONCLUSION

The Late Archaic Period was marked by great changes and the total transformation of the first Greek settlements around the Black Sea. These changes expressed both in architecture and in local organization. As we examined above, in the beginning, the Greek settlers followed the habits and the building techniques of the local populations, constructing their (semi) pit-shelter houses in a spontaneous way and without having a specific urban plan.

The situation changed radically during the second half of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century BC. The initial settlements gave their place to the first organized and carefully constructed cities-states, with a blatant Greek character. Although, small in size, the Greek colonies had the same formation and appearance with their metropolises, following in many cases the widespread Hippodemean system, which appeared for the first time in Miletus in the late 6\textsuperscript{th} century BC. One of the most characteristic elements of the ‘new’ cities were the residential blocks; the first that were ever formed in the Black Sea- and the introduction of the Greek typical house.

The earthen, humble and inconvenient dugout dwellings were gradually replaced by ground-level houses, of one or two rooms. These houses were built above stone-foundations, dug almost half a meter below the earth surface. This was a common practice in the Greek world, used in order to ensure the stability and resilience of the house. The Greek-type houses were rectangular constructions, with a central courtyard\textsuperscript{144}. The courtyard was one of the vital places of the house, with the rooms being built all around its three sides, and an altar situated in its center. Certainly, the

\textsuperscript{141} V. D. Kuznetsov, 2003, p. 920.
\textsuperscript{142} V. D. Kuznetsov, 2003, p. 911-914.
\textsuperscript{143} Y. M. Alekseeva, 2003, p. 958-959.
\textsuperscript{144} C. O. Rogobete, 2012.
first above-ground houses were single-storeyed constructions, with a pervasive simplicity; obvious both in the exterior and the interior of the building.

However, the everyday demands raised and houses of larger dimensions, with more rooms, became necessary. Such constructions appear in the very late years of the 6th century BC, symbolizing a transition point, which will soon lead to the typical Greek oikos of the Classical Period. Gradually, multi-storeyed constructions erected, and houses with three, five or even ten rooms were built. It is also noticeable the fact that the houses were built too close one to the other, so as to share a common detached wall. This new architectural type was much more convenient from the pit-shelter and semi pit-shelter dwellings, which were now distinctively diminished — even in the rural settlements — and finally ceased to exist in the middle of the 5th century BC. To be more specific, the houses became larger, occupying an area between 100-260m². All the rooms were accessible through the central courtyard, underlying this way the significance of the court and the fact that it was directly connected with the everyday life of the house.

What is the innovative of the late 6th century BC, is the emergence of andron. Andron was the place where the symposia took place; where the men ate and drank wine, discussing political and business subjects, or welcomed their guests. Access to the room had only the men of the house (by whom the room took its name) and their servants; the women were not allowed to enter and sit along with the men. For this reason, andron was totally isolated from the rest of the house, even from the courtyard.

Due to its role, andron was the most richly decorated room of the house, pointing out its unique importance. It was a rectangular-shaped room, with “couches” (clines) alongside its walls. These couches could not be related with the ancient beds, or

---

146 “Andron” or «ἀνδρών» derives from the Greek word «ἀνδρας» (man), pointing out that it was meant to be used only by the men.
147 W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 155.
considered as places for sleeping, since they had a totally different shape and function\textsuperscript{149}. They were an Anatolian habit, used merely in the symposia\textsuperscript{150}. Each couch was able to serve up to two men\textsuperscript{151}. Usually in front of the clines there was a small table. More enlightening are the depictions of androns on the ancient vases\textsuperscript{152}, where we see men lying on their couches, holding in many cases cups of wine, eating grapes, and usually a servant taking care of the wine.

![Fig. 18. Symposion. Mural painting found in a tomb at Poseidonia (S. Italy). About 480 BC.](image)

Rooms with a function similar to the archaic andron were described also in the Odyssey, allowing us to assume their existence already from the late 8\textsuperscript{th} century BC onwards\textsuperscript{153}. However, the word andron was not met in Odyssey, and seems to appear for the first time a century later, in the mid-7\textsuperscript{th} century BC. The earliest sample of such a room in Ionia, comes from the ancient Izmir and a house of 640 BC. One of the rooms, excavated by Ekrem Akurgal, was identified as andron due to the nine couches that were found in the interior, while the great oinochoe that was found in the same room, reinforced Akurgal’s suggestion that the room was used as a place for the men’s

\textsuperscript{149} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 161.
\textsuperscript{150} Initially the Greeks ate sited around the table, and certainly until the Homeric Age. From the 700 BC, however, the first «ανάκλιντρα» ("couches") appeared in Ionia, stressing that the men preferred now eat lying. This shift of the Greek habits indicated the great influence the Eastern civilization had upon them. The earliest ‘couches’ appeared in Syria and were a habit introduced by the Assyrians. From there, they expanded to Egypt, Mesopotamia and Asia Minor. Since they reached Ionia, it was easy to be spread also in the continental Greek world. W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 160-162.
\textsuperscript{152} Vases used in the symposia: Oinochoae, hydriae, kraters, psykters and several types of cups were. In general, every vessel that had to do with the wine and its mixture with water.
\textsuperscript{153} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 152-154
symposia (andron). The vessel (5 x 7.5m) was vividly decorated, baring depictions of wild animals, like the boar or the lion, and due to its use it was directly related with the andron.

Great examples of androns were found also in Athens, the Cyclades (Andros, Tenos, Delos, Thera (Santorini)), Chios, Eretria, Olynthus (oikos) and elsewhere. During the Classical Period the significance of andron will grow and will become a room found in every Greek house.

---

CHAPTER 2
CLASSICAL PERIOD
490/480 – 323 BC

[42]
2.1. EARLY CLASSICAL PERIOD (490/80-450 BC):

During the early Classical Period and the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BC a great development and prosperity was observed in the majority of the Greek apoikiai of the Black Sea region. The cities expanded their limits and re-planned themselves. The rural territories were reduced, since the agrarian populations moved to the cities. This resulted in a demographic increase, but also offered additional laboring-hands in the towns\textsuperscript{158}. The Greek cities were now protected by strong fortification walls, while new buildings, private and public, were erected. A general tendency for ornamentation and luxury is implied by the decorations of the monumental structures, while in the vase painting the Black- and Red-figure technique reached their peak. The economy flourished, mainly due to the exports of grain (especially to Athens and the islands of North Aegean) and the coins minted in large quantities now.

Culturally this evolution was marked by the advent of democracy. One of the main ideals of democracy was the equality between the citizens; they were all equal towards the law and they all had the right to express their opinion in the Ecclesia. Gradually, the Greeks - and mainly the Athenians - felt the need to express this equality in every aspect of their life. As a result, the Hippodamean system, the division of the city into equal square blocks, where houses of same dimensions would be built, became the prevalent urban plan, applied not only in continental Greece and Asia Minor, but in the Black Sea colonies and in Magna Graecia too\textsuperscript{159}. The impact of democracy and its diffusion to the whole Greek world becomes obvious from the great similarities observed in the domestic architecture of the Black Sea houses and the residences in Greece.

It is a fact that during the Classical Age, the above-ground rectangular houses were the unique residential type in all the Pontic cities, with the dugout dwellings have been

\textsuperscript{158} M. Manoledakis, 2014, lecture presentation-my personal notes

\textsuperscript{159} Some of the cities formed according to the Hippodamean system are: Olynthus (Macedonia, 432 BC), Priene (Asia Minor, 350 BC), Peraeus (Attiki, 350 BC), Miletus (Asia Minor 479 BC), Himera (Sicily, 476 BC), and others. W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 216-218.
totally abandoned\textsuperscript{160}. The houses were organized in square blocks, forming this way numerous small roads throughout the city. Each block could include up to 17 houses\textsuperscript{161}, situated one next to the other and sharing again –like in the Late Archaic Period- common walls\textsuperscript{162}.

What is more interesting is the fact that the houses in the Black Sea and the ones in Greece look extremely similar to each other. Although, the geographical peculiarities from place to place presuppose a special urban planning and division of the city (always in accordance with the Hippodamean system), the internal layout of the houses indicates a remarkable homogeneity in the domestic architecture. But, let us take a closer examination of the excavated houses in the Black Sea and compare them with the rest of the Greek world.

\subsection*{2.1.1. THE CLASSICAL HOUSE IN THE MAJOR GREEK CITIES OF THE BLACK SEA (5\textsuperscript{TH} - 4\textsuperscript{TH} c. BC)}

During the Classical Period a widespread homogeneity is obvious in the domestic architecture of the Greek cities in the Black Sea region. It is not a coincidence that the same house-type and domestic configuration is observed in Apollonia, Olbia, Odessos, Histria, Kerkinitis, Chersonesus, Theodosia, Phanagoria, Kalos Limen, Gorgippia, Myrmekion and Panticapaeum. And in this epoch, the most characteristic element of the Greek-type houses was the central courtyard, around which the rooms were erected. Apart from the fact that the court was the center of the life in every dwelling, it was the only way to let the fresh air (ventilation) and the light come into the rooms\textsuperscript{163}; hence all the rooms were opened to it.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item The only exception seems to be the city of Chersonesus, where 13 dugouts were discovered, dated to the late 5\textsuperscript{th} – the first quarter of the 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC. These underground houses were built following the construction techniques of the archaic structures. They will be in use only for two or three decades and these last archaic-type dwellings in Chersonesus will be definitely abandoned in the final years of the first third of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC. C. O. Rogobete, 2012 and in M. I. Zolotarev, 2003, p. 607-608. \textsuperscript{160}
\item The number of the houses per residential block differed from place to place, since the city and its formation followed the geographical peculiarities of each site. For example, in Piraeus we have 8 houses per block while in Kerkinitis 17 houses per block. W. Hoepfner, 2005, p.228 and in V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 576 \textsuperscript{161}
\item S. D. Kryzhitskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 429 \textsuperscript{162}
\item S. D. Kryzhitskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 430 \textsuperscript{163}
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
Furthermore, the division of the house into two main parts maintained in the Classical Period too. First comes the andron, which appeared in the Late Archaic Period, but its role increased during the following years. It was a rectangular room, where the symposia and the gatherings of men took place. Due to its function, andron was usually situated near the entrance of the house, so as to be isolated from the rest of the rooms; protecting this way the private life of the owner and his family. The visitors did not need to walk through the whole house in order to reach the andron and thus the women could do the everyday chores without being disturbed. After all, the political conversations and the kind of amusement that was taking place in the andron were not appropriate for them. This was the most luxurious room of the house, with vivid mural paintings on the walls and mosaics with decorative motives made of colorful pebbles on its floor. The androns of the Classical era, obtained a greater importance and became integral parts of every Greek-type house. Even the smallest houses had a triclinium, while the wealthier owners could have androns with five, six, seven or even eleven Clines per room. In many cases, in front of the andron, there was a small anteroom.

The second most important room of the classical dwellings was the oikos. It was the largest room of the house, where the women prepared the food and the family dining. A rectangular open hearth was situated in the middle of the room and a channel was built in order to ventilate the place. As it was natural, the place around the hearth was full of ashes and in many cases the floor-surface raised. According to A. S. Rusyaeva, these hearths were directly connected with cultic purposes as well. One of the main goddesses worshiped in the houses was Hestia. Hestia was a domestic deity, ensuring prosperity, food and heat for the family. The travelers and the voyagers dedicated and sacrificed to her, showing their gratitude for their safe return.

---

164 More details about the emergence and the function of the andron were given in the previous chapter, so I will not repeat myself since its role did not change. See above, p. 32-33
165 S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 430
166 W. Hoepfnr, 2005, p. 252. The number of the couches in each andron is indicative of the number of the men that the room could host.
167 S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 430
168 W. Hoepfnr, 2005, p. 231
back in home. In this way, the open hearth of the oikos was also used as an altar, and the oikos was not a simple kitchen but a sacral place; a domestic sanctuary dedicated to Hestia, the patroness of the house\textsuperscript{171}.

Right next to oikos, usually two smaller rooms were built. The one functioned as bathroom, and its position next to oikos served practical purposes; warm air and hot water could be easily provided from the kitchen to the bathroom\textsuperscript{172}. The other chamber was an auxiliary room, used for the household.

Some of the best excavated houses, which serve as a model of the Classical residences in the Euxine, come from the city of Olbia. However, it must be mentioned here that our information is based mainly in the Hellenistic Olbian residences, which seems to have no differences from the Classical ones. As a result, it is assumed that the average classical house occupied an area of 200-250m\textsuperscript{2}.\textsuperscript{173} The floors in the courtyard were either paved with stones or with ceramic fragments. In the everyday rooms and the cellars a wooden floor was preferred\textsuperscript{174}. As far as the roof is concerned, along with the former adobe roof, we see in many cases roofs with Laconic or Corinthian tiles\textsuperscript{175}. Cellars were commonly used for food storage, while a well or a deep tank for the concentration of the water were also necessary. Moreover, in many houses the archaeologists unearthed traces of sewage channels\textsuperscript{176}. Finally, it is noticeable that only in one Olbian house a separate room, intended for bathing purposes and sand toilets was found, but certainly such premises existed in all the rich houses\textsuperscript{177}. In cases

\textsuperscript{171} Her suggestion refers mainly to the oikos’es found in Kerkinitis, but it is widely accepted that there were home sanctuaries in every Greek Classical house in the Black Sea region. After all he domestic sanctuaries occupied only a small place in one of the corners of the house. In V. A Kutaisov, 2003, p. 580 and V. V. Krapivina, 2003, p. 127.
\textsuperscript{172} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 231.
\textsuperscript{173} We should bear in mind that in such a house lived not only the owner with his wife and their children, but also the slaves and the servants of the house; almost 8 or 10 persons in total. S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 429.
\textsuperscript{174} S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 430
\textsuperscript{175} S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 430
\textsuperscript{176} S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 430
\textsuperscript{177} S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 430
where there was not a separate bathroom, we should assume that the kitchen had probably a double function, serving both utilitarian and sanitary needs\textsuperscript{178}. 

Similar constructions have been also discovered in Kerkinitis. There, the city was divided also in squares of almost equal dimensions, with the houses being arranged into two parallel zones\textsuperscript{179}. This orientation reminds us a lot the zone-organization of Olynthus, as we will see below. Each block accommodated approximately 16-17 residences, although of different configuration\textsuperscript{180}. The houses in Kerkinitis were of 85-115m\textsuperscript{2}, with the courtyards occupying the 11-35\% of their total area. The rooms of the houses were erected around the court in a \(\Gamma\) or \(\Pi\)-form\textsuperscript{181}. And in this case too, the biggest room of every house was the oikos, a square chamber of 20-23m\textsuperscript{2}.

Houses typical of the Classical era have been discovered also in:

- **Odessos:** There the houses were square in shape, built by rectangular limestone stones -smaller or bigger- or by sun-dried bricks, and had tiled roofs\textsuperscript{182}. Underground cellars were present in all the examined houses, while wooden or stone staircases connected the basements with the upper floor\textsuperscript{183}. As floor inside the rooms served either the original ground (well-leveled) or a layer of clay\textsuperscript{184}.

- **Nikonion:** The construction of the first above-ground residences in Nikonion began in the first half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BC. It is a fact that the fragmentarily preserved ground houses do not offer us enlightening information. The only thing we can say with certainty is that the dwellings were all mud-brick constructions, based on a stone foundation, plastered with clay and covered by a tiled roof\textsuperscript{185}. On the other hand, the best excavated parts of the Nikonion

\textsuperscript{178} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p.  
\textsuperscript{179} V. A Kutaisov, 2003, p. 578.  
\textsuperscript{180} V. A Kutaisov, 2003, p. 578  
\textsuperscript{181} V. A Kutaisov, 2003, p. 579  
\textsuperscript{182} The roofs were built by Ionian (imported) tiles. A. Minchev, 2003, p. 246  
\textsuperscript{183} A. Minchev, 2003, p. 246  
\textsuperscript{184} A. Minchev, 2003, p. 246  
\textsuperscript{185} N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 492.
houses were their basements. In the Greek colony of the 5th century BC, along with the surface dwellings, there were also (semi) dugout structures (basements), used either as storage or living rooms (especially during the harsh winters)\(^{186}\). In total 15 such underground areas have been excavated in Nikonion\(^{187}\). The remains of the underground walls were from 0.6 up to 2.65m high. They were built by yellow-shell rocks of local or foreign origin (imported)\(^{188}\). In addition, many openings have been discovered, mainly on the eastern and western walls, functioned probably as windows (ventilation)\(^{189}\).

- **Berezan:** The classical houses in Berezan have more or less the same appearance with the first surface dwellings of the Late Archaic Period\(^{190}\). The most characteristic example, is a building dated to the 5th century BC. The house occupied an area of almost 70m\(^2\), with a central, open-air courtyard, surrounded by rooms. One of the rooms functioned as a semi-cellar, while two other had lower floors\(^{191}\).

- **Kerkinitis:** A house dated to the third quarter of the 4th century BC was discovered in Kerkinitis\(^{192}\). The so called house No. 1 occupied an area of about 108m\(^2\), with its layout following the main norms of the Classical era. There was an open air courtyard in the center of the complex and along its perimeter the premises of the house were arranged in a Γ-shape. The entrance to the courtyard was afforded through a narrow corridor, which led from the street towards to the yard. The andron (24m\(^2\)) was situated on the northern corner of the residential complex. It was easily identified, thanks to its pebble-paved floor and the presence of a panel (0.82-0.93m) along the walls, slightly raised\(^{193}\). The walls were plastered in red color, reminding a lot the Classical

\(^{186}\) N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 492, 493.
\(^{188}\) The walls built of local yellow limestone blocks reach the 79.8% of the total underground masonry
\(^{189}\) N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 491.
\(^{190}\) S. D. Kryzhyskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunska, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 472.
\(^{191}\) S. L. Solovyov, 1999, p. 100.
androns found at Olynthus\textsuperscript{194}. Apart from the andron, the archaeologists were able to identify also the oikos, a room situated in the eastern side of the complex, covering an area of 24.5m\textsuperscript{2}, with a circular hearth in its center. As far as the western inner chamber is concerned, it was probably a living room\textsuperscript{195}.

What is also noteworthy about the residences in Kerkinitis, is the appearance of cellars, as auxiliary rooms for the storage of goods. Their first traces appeared in the late 5\textsuperscript{th} century BC, but the systematic use of basements began not earlier than the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC\textsuperscript{196}. Such basements appeared almost simultaneously in Berezan and later on in Olbia, and seems to be a feature attributed, at first, to the Ionian colonies of the Northern and Western side of Pontos\textsuperscript{197}.

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textbf{Theodosia:} Although many remains of residential buildings in Theodosia were revealed and dated from the 5\textsuperscript{th} through the 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries B.C. as well as material from the 1\textsuperscript{st} through 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries AD\textsuperscript{198}, the great majority of them are severely damaged. However the archaeologists were able to draw some safe conclusions about the local architectural habits. In this case too, we see houses with adobe walls based on a stone socle\textsuperscript{199}, and roofs with tiles\textsuperscript{200}. In many buildings of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BC, the inner walls were plastered in red or yellow\textsuperscript{201}. The floor of the yards was either strewn with sandstone gravel or paved with limestone or pebbles\textsuperscript{202}. Gutters, wells and cisterns were also found in the yards\textsuperscript{203}.
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{194} V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 580.
\textsuperscript{195} V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 580.
\textsuperscript{196} V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 581.
\textsuperscript{197} V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 581.
\textsuperscript{198} A. V. Gavrilov, 2006, p. 251.
\textsuperscript{199} A. V. Gavrilov, 2006, p. 251
\textsuperscript{201} A. V. Gavrilov, 2006, p. 251.
\textsuperscript{202} A. V. Gavrilov, 2006, p. 251.
\textsuperscript{203} A. V. Gavrilov, 2006, p. 251.
Panticapaeum: The houses dated to the late 6th – first half of 5th centuries BC, in Panticapaeum, were organized into two series of parallel zones and not in residential blocks. The most interesting find from the 5th century BC is the building of andron -the first revealed in Panticapaeum. The walls of the andron were built of hewed blocks based upon stone foundations. As in every such room, the andron had a vividly decorated floor, constructed of multicolored pebbles upon white mortar. What is also noteworthy, is the 0.85 meter-wide piping of wine-colored plaster, running along the eastern, northern and western walls of the room, testifying with its presence the festive character of the place. Throughout the 4th century BC the peristyle courtyard and the andron became very popular in the contemporary domestic architecture.

Myrmekion: The square shape and the paved courtyard prevailed also in the Greek city of Myrmekion. As happened in all the Greek colonies during the Classical Period, the houses were in here too made of stone foundations upon which the mud-brick walls were erected. Their roofs were constructed of tiles. Wells and cisterns were commonly found in the courtyards.

Phanagoria: Several residences have been discovered also in Phanagoria. And in this case the principal material in the domestic architecture was again the mud-bricks. The houses were probably single storeyed constructions, square in shape, with daub floors. In many of them semi-cellars have been discovered next to the ground rooms. In one such cellar two fragments of marble statues have been found, allowing us to suggest that the owner of the house was probably a sculptor. Additionally, one of the most interesting house-
remains in the city was a house dated in the mid-5th century BC. The house was built of mud-bricks and had two rooms (23.5m² and 20.9m² each), from which the one served probably as a storage room\textsuperscript{213}. In this room the floor was constructed of a layer of yellow sand, above which a layer of clay was applied right after\textsuperscript{214}. A corridor of 1.12m was stretching southwards of the rooms, connecting probably these premises with the rest of the house, which remains unstudied\textsuperscript{215}.

- **Hermonassa**: A little bit different were the houses in Hermonassa, where the lack of stones lead to exclusively brickwork constructions\textsuperscript{216}. On the other hand, the big courtyards and the underground cellars were the basic characteristics of Hermonassa’s Classical houses\textsuperscript{217}. A distinctive example comes from a late 5th-century residence. It was a house with a cellar and a courtyard of 50m², paved with ceramic fragments\textsuperscript{218}. The cellar, which is the best preserved part of the house, occupied an area of 14.7m². Along its western wall there was a gutter, which passed through the courtyard and ended up to a cistern\textsuperscript{219}.

- **Gorgippia**: Houses with stone foundations and tiled roofs have been uncovered also in Gorgippia. In many cases there were cellars, dug into the ground in 1.5m depth, with walls made of big stones. It is estimated that each house, dated to the 4th century BC, had from one up to three such rooms dug into the soil\textsuperscript{220}. A seven-step stone staircase led from the yard to the underground cellars. Almost in every courtyard traces of wells have been

\textsuperscript{213} V. D. Kuznetsov, 2003, p. 916.
\textsuperscript{214} Thanks to this floor the grains were well-preserved until today. V. D. Kuznetsov, 2003, p. 916.
\textsuperscript{215} V. D. Kuznetsov, 2003, p. 916.
\textsuperscript{216} Mud-bricks became the main material in domestic architecture. The use of stone was distinctively limited in comparison with the Western and Northern parts of the Euxine. S. I. Finogenova, 2003, p. 1014.
\textsuperscript{217} S. I. Finogenova, 2003, p. 1013.
\textsuperscript{218} S. I. Finogenova, 2003, p. 1022.
\textsuperscript{219} S. I. Finogenova, 2003, p. 1022.
\textsuperscript{220} Y. M. Alekseeva, 2003, p. 971.
unearthed. Moreover, the houses were situated one next to the other, a typical feature of the Classical domestic architecture.\textsuperscript{221}

As we move towards the end of the Classical Period, it seems that the houses became bigger or at least acquired more storeys. In the previous years, the dwellings were mainly one-storeyed constructions, and only some parts of the house had a second floor. In the 5\textsuperscript{th} and 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC, the residence changed and developed into a multi-storeyed building\textsuperscript{222}. The following images show the evolutionary stage from the one-storeyed apartment of the 6\textsuperscript{th} century BC to the multi-storeyed dwellings of the late 5\textsuperscript{th}-early 4\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC.

\textbf{Fig. 20. House-reconstruction from the 6\textsuperscript{th} century BC.}

\textbf{Fig. 21. House-plan from the 5\textsuperscript{th}-4\textsuperscript{th} centuries BC.}

\textsuperscript{221} Y. M. Alekseeva, 2003, p. 971.
\textsuperscript{222} Without this meaning that the previous type ceased to exist. In Athens, for instance, there were mainly one-storeyed constructions but there must be also residential blocks with more than one floors. B. C. Rider, 1916, p. 212
Since new rooms and floors were added, the differentiation of the internal distribution of the rooms was unavoidable. However, it is impressive the fact that the main conception (the sexual division of the rooms) and the practical character of the houses were preserved. The house was again separated between the males’ and female’s quarters. The upper floors, apart from the bedrooms\textsuperscript{223}, included the women’s apartments (gynekonitis). There was a room where the women worked on the weaving and spinning (ιστώνας) and a place where they raised their children\textsuperscript{224}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{vase.png}
\caption{Vase depicting women weaving and spinning at home.}
\end{figure}

In the ground floor were the storage rooms, the kitchen (oikos), the andron, along with the men’s apartments (andronitis), and of course the inner courtyard. Some small chambers were used as slaves’ bedrooms. Another small room functioned as bathroom. The wealthier owners had their own bath tubs in their residences. For their bath, the water was collected from the well or the public fountains; and after being warmed in the fire, it was ready for use\textsuperscript{225}. In many cases the bathroom was deliberately situated next to the kitchen or the smoke-channel, from which the warm air or the hot water could be easily transferred to it\textsuperscript{226}. In the ground floor there were also storage rooms and cellars, where the food (olive oil, wine, grain, etc.) was kept, stored in amphorae or large pithoi. Finally, it must be mentioned that it was a common

\textsuperscript{223} The bedrooms were simple rooms, decorated only with a few furniture. Apart from the beds, in the rooms were some wooden chests, which were used for storing clothing and several items. Ancient Greece, Daily Life, The British Museum, URL: http://www.ancientgreece.co.uk/dailylife/challenge/cha_set.html

\textsuperscript{224} B. C. Rider, 1916, p. 234.

\textsuperscript{225} Ancient Greece, Daily Life, The British Museum, URL: http://www.ancientgreece.co.uk/dailylife/challenge/cha_set.html

\textsuperscript{226} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 288.
practice, a workshop being built, adjusted to the house. Crafts, like shoe- or jewelry-making, often took place in those workshops\(^\text{227}\).

### 2.1.2. THE COURTYARD AS THE CENTER OF DOMESTIC LIFE AND ACTIVITY

Before we move on to the Hellenistic Period and see the development of the above-mentioned residential types, it is essential to give a further description of the courtyard and clarify its role in the domestic life. The courtyard was the essential part of the house. Its significance lies in the fact that all the rooms of the house were built around the court and it was very important to communicate with it. Usually, the courtyard was located in the southern part of the house, so as to be exposed to the sun and protected from the winds during the cold winters and offer shade during the hot summers («ἐν ταῖς πρόσ μεσημβρίας βλεπούσαις ὁ ἔλιος εἰς τὰς παστάδας ὑπολάμπει, τοῦ δὲ δέρους ύπέρ ἡμῶν αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν στεγῶν πορεύόμενος σκιάν παρέχει\(^\text{228}\)»).

What is noticeable, is that its function had simultaneously a symbolic and a practical role. First of all, its open-air space was useful not only for the light and the ventilation of the rooms (since the houses had very few windows\(^\text{229}\)), but at the same time offered a pleasant space where various domestic activities could take place. Altars, hearths, millstones, esharas (portable braziers) and numerous other finds, indicate that several everyday chores could be done in the court, like libations (cult/religious character), the preparation of the food (cooking), the weaving and the laundry\(^\text{230}\). When the house had a second story, the staircases leading to the upper parts were also situated in the courtyard\(^\text{231}\).

\(^{228}\) Xenophon, Memorabilia, III, 8, 8-10.
\(^{229}\) The windows were always put in the upper parts of the walls, hindering this way the family see what happens outside the house, and at the same time the passengers to see what happens inside the house. The windows were used merely for the ventilation and light of the room. Again the private and introvert character of the house is pointed out. E. Walter-Karydi, 1996, p. 16.
\(^{230}\) B. A. Ault, 2005, p. 574.
\(^{231}\) B. A. Ault, 2005, p. 573.
Secondly, the central yard symbolized the transition from the public space to the private one. Initially, the houses were characterized by an introvert atmosphere. This means that the private life of the citizens was well-secured thanks to the courtyard. The absence of windows and the high, adobe banked-walls all around the court, hindered everyone of having access or see what is going on inside the dwelling. For the same reason, the entrance to the residential area was succeeded through a narrow and short corridor, the so called “prothyron”, which led from the street inside the house. Before the prothyron there was a roofed – probably- recess, which served as a shelter for the passengers in case of bad weather\textsuperscript{232}, which ended up to a rectangular or square courtyard of prostas type\textsuperscript{233}. This deep recess ended in one or two double-winged doors\textsuperscript{234}, with the in-between space being called “thyroron”. It has been observed also, that in many houses the entrances were wide enough in order to allow animals and carriages enter or leave the house\textsuperscript{235}.

The floor in the courtyard was made of various materials; it could be a clay-packed floor, or paved with stone slabs or ceramics. An integral feature of every courtyard were the wells and the drainage systems. Each house had its own well, where the water was stored. The wells were usually of 1m diameter and up to 15m depth\textsuperscript{236}. They were used for the concentration of clean, drinking water. From the 4\textsuperscript{th} century

\textsuperscript{232} Exactly the same shelter was discovered in the Late Classical houses at Olynthus. W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 287.
\textsuperscript{235} Mainly in the rural dwellings, near the entrance of the house there was a stable for the animals. B. A. Ault, 2005, p. 573.
\textsuperscript{236} B. A. Ault, 2005, p. 575.
BC onwards though, a lot of cisterns were constructed along with the wells, but they were intended to collect the rain-water, used mainly for the laundry\textsuperscript{237}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig24.png}
\caption{Well in the courtyard of “House 3”. Berezan.}
\end{figure}

Another typical feature of the courtyard were the waste pits. They are known as “koprones”. From the already unearthed pits, it is estimated that the “kopron” was up to 1.50m deep and had capacity up to 5m\textsuperscript{2}. These pits intended for the collection of the household garbage, which through the days would be composed into fertilizers\textsuperscript{238}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig25.png}
\caption{Kopron in a courtyard.}
\end{figure}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig26.png}
\caption{Cistern in a courtyard. Berezan.}
\end{figure}

As we move towards the Hellenistic period, the courtyard change in appearance, since stoas (pastas or prostras), colonnades and exedrae are added to the initial structure. A lot of the houses rebuilt in larger dimensions and as a natural outcome they obtained larger courtyards too. The porches formed by the stoas had colorful decorations on

\textsuperscript{237} In some cases, like in Athens for instance, a lot of amphorae have been found in the bottom, indicating that the cisterns functioned also as place suitable for storage. B. A. Ault, 2005, p. 575-576.

\textsuperscript{238} B. A. Ault, 2000, p. 486.
their walls, while the columns distinguished for the well-designed capitals. In addition, we see the first samples of mosaic floors decorate these semi-open spaces.

It is noteworthy also that at the same period, we see the first houses with a double courtyard\textsuperscript{239}. In this case too, each courtyard was in the middle of the complex, surrounded by various rooms of different function. The two courtyards indicate also two different functions, according to which the house was divided into living and household areas. Therefore the one courtyard was directly connected with the oikos of the house –which means that it served as an additional space for the household and the everyday needs (private character)– and the second one with the andron/s and the exedrae (public character). The latter courtyards were usually decorated with mosaic floors and peristyles, indicating their eminent role and the social status of the owner. The richest constructions however, had both courtyards surrounded by colonnades (peristyle), of which the “formal” one was distinctively larger and luxurious than the “private” one.

What was the same in all the courtyards, is the total absence of trees and plants, underlying this way its practical and domestic character. The rooms would be deprived of light due to the trees and the latter would certainly limit the space available for domestic activities. It is a fact that the ancient courtyard was not a garden, but just an open-air room of the house.

\textit{Fig. 27. Imaginary house of 5\textsuperscript{th} c. BC.}

\textsuperscript{239} L. Nevett, 1999, p. 107.
2.2. NEW HOUSE TYPES OF THE LATE CLASSICAL PERIOD (400/380 - 323 BC.)

Although, the masonry and the building methods of the Late Archaic Period were maintained in the Classical era, with the houses being built of stone solely or of a combination of a stone basis and a mud-brick construction in the upper parts, there is an innovation in the residential constructions, indicative of the advanced skills and technological development of the Greeks during the early 4th century BC. The main part of the house, the courtyard, changed its appearance in such a degree, leading this way to the emergence of several new house-types. Based on the style of the court, the houses could be categorized into four groups: a) the pastas type houses, b) the prostas type houses, c) the houses with a peristyle courtyard and d) the “Herdraumhaus”. However, it is necessary to note that the inner, open-air courtyard remained the most distinctive feature of the Greek-type houses.

These new residential styles appeared in the Late Classical Period, but they were in use also in the 4th and 3rd centuries BC. Their traces appeared in Priene, Kolophon, Delos, Olynthus, Rhodes, Athens and Piraeus, Pella, Goritsa and elsewhere. The diffusion of the new architectural types begun from Asia Minor and in no time prevailed in major cities of mainland Greece. In the Black Sea region the earliest evidence of these types are dated in the mid-4th century BC, while it is noteworthy that they developed and dominated mainly during the Hellenistic times. For this reason, a further presentation of the new house-types will follow in the next chapter.

Nevertheless, it must be mentioned here that the great majority of them are impossible to be totally reconstructed, due to the intense overbuilding from the ancient times up to the modern years. However, there are no evidences to indicate that the houses of the Classical times had a different layout from the Hellenistic ones. The fact that the Classical and Hellenistic house seem to be the same, allow us to have

an almost complete image about the domestic architecture in the Greek cities of the Black Sea during the 5th and 4th centuries BC.
CHAPTER 3
HELLENISTIC PERIOD
(323-31 BC)
3.1. CULTURAL CHANGES DURING THE HELLENISTIC PERIOD (323 - 31 BC)

During the Hellenistic period fundamental changes took place influencing directly the institution of the city-state and the citizens themselves. First of all, the “isonomia” (equality towards the law) and freedom of the previous era, were replaced –already from the second half of the 4th century BC- by totalitarian regimes (monarchy), with the power being concentrated in one single person. The civilians’ role in the city’s subjects was severely limited, and all the decisions were taken by the king. In addition, a new caste created and dominated in social life, the aristocrats. The members of this new aristocracy were wealthy citizens, who possessed the highest official posts and lived in luxurious residences.

From an architectural point of view, the Hellenistic monarchy affected radically the appearance of the city. Palaces and public buildings erected, while all the old ones were renovated. The constructions distinguished for their dimensions and their design. In art, apart from the mythological scenes and the renaissance of the ancient past, the ruler himself became the dominant figure -especially in sculpture. Portraits and statues glorifying him decorated every city. In religion and temple-architecture the contact with Middle East and Egypt led to the adoption of foreign deities, worshiped in imposing temples along with the Greek pantheon.

In domestic architecture, the changes were expressed through monumental structures, increased in size, luxurious and richly ornamented residences, indicative of the wealth and social status of their owners. In the previous years, the city’s prosperity was merely reflected in the public buildings (temples, the agora, theaters, administration buildings etc.) since the private houses were humble and low-cost constructions, all similar to each other (all citizens were equal). On the contrary, during the Hellenistic period, the wealthy owners transformed the Classical houses into luxurious and impressive constructions; distinctively distinguished from the poorer ones, which obviously belonged to citizens of lower classes²⁴².

Although in many cities the Hippodamean division of the land was maintained, the houses differed a lot in size. The Classical urban planning presupposed the equal division of the city into residential blocks, which consisted of equal in size houses (based on the ideals of democracy). Now, since the houses increased their dimensions, the aristocrats possessed the biggest part of the block and were able to build bigger houses. Hence, the residential blocks from place to place differ in size and in the number of the houses they include\(^{243}\). For the first time, the social hierarchy of the city is blatant in domestic architecture. The aristocratic families expanded their properties, forcing this way the citizens of the middle and lower classes to reduce their own residences.

The four house-types of the Classical period, remained popular during the whole Hellenistic era, but they were now vividly decorated and of bigger proportions. Undoubtedly, the Late Classical and Hellenistic house reflected the wealth and the social status of the owner, transforming itself from an introvert to an extrovert construction.

3.1.1. THE PROSTAS TYPE HOUSE

Due to the lack of finds, the scholars focused their attention on the ancient writers. Seeking for detailed descriptions, valuable information were drawn from theatrical plays (Aristophane’s “Wealth”), literary works (Xenophon’s “Oikonomikos”) and architectural handbooks (Vitruvius’ “De Architectura”). Although the remains of the Late Classical constructions are severely damaged, the few Hellenistic houses offer us adequate information, which in combination with the written testimonies, help us reconstruct the Greek house of the late 5\(^{\text{th}}\), 4\(^{\text{th}}\), 3\(^{\text{rd}}\) and 2\(^{\text{nd}}\) centuries BC\(^{244}\).

\(^{243}\) W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 463.
\(^{244}\) B. C. Rider, 1916, p. 239.
In my effort to describe the prostas type house, I will base my descriptions on the Priene’s residences, which are considered as the best preserved and studied houses of this type. The material evidences coming from the Ionian city are dated in the 4th century BC. The city was organized according to the Hippodamean system in residential blocks of equal size. Each block measured 47.2 x 35.4m and consisted of eight houses.

All the houses unearthed in the city had the following structure: the entrance of the house (prothyron) formed a deep recess which ended in one or two double-winged doors, which in turn led to a rectangular or square courtyard of prostas type. This means that in the one side of the court there was a porch with two columns standing between antae. This porch functioned as a vestibule in front of the oikos. Due to its depth (3 meters) the porch afforded access not only to the oikos, but also to the andron, which was situated next to the main room. All the androns in Priene were typical triklinia, distinguishing for their plastered walls and the expensive furniture. As it was the case in all the Classical houses, adjacent to oikos was a rectangular chamber, served probably as bathroom. Inside the oikos traces of staircases were found, leading this way to the suggestion that some houses had a second floor. Thus, it is assumed that in the upper part, a narrow stoa gave access to women’s apartments (thalamos, gynaikonitis, bedrooms).

---

From the residences in Priene becomes explicit that the prostas type houses, were nothing more than dwellings with a central, open air courtyard. The only innovation was the porch, with one or two columns between antae, creating this way two or three openings, which led either to the oikos\textsuperscript{250}. In many cases in the vestibule several objects of household tableware have been found, such as handmills, marble basins, pithoi and remains of hearths, allowing us the assumption that these anterooms were used also as kitchens\textsuperscript{251}. Finally, it must be mentioned here that although the houses in Priene were different in size, and in many cases the courtyards were smaller or irregular in shape\textsuperscript{252}, they shared the same configuration and layout with the above-described residence.

For many scholars (among them N. Kulözü, M. Açmaz, I. W. Graham, H. Drerup and others) the prostas type was a continuation of the “megaron” type, which existed in Anatolia already from the Bronze Age\textsuperscript{253} and became widespread from the Homeric years and the 7\textsuperscript{th} century BC onwards\textsuperscript{254}. Typical of the “megaron” type was the front gallery with the hearth, and the distinctive open porch supported by columns\textsuperscript{255}. From the 6\textsuperscript{th} century though, it was replaced by the typical Greek-type residence, in which the rooms of the house surrounded an inner courtyard\textsuperscript{256}. The prostas and pastas type houses appeared again in the beginning of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC and continued through the whole Hellenistic period\textsuperscript{257}.

\textsuperscript{252} B. C. Rider, 1916, p. 244.
\textsuperscript{253} N. Kulözü, M. Açmaz, 2006, p. 646.
\textsuperscript{255} The “Megaron” was one of the earliest architectural types, met in Middle East and Greece. The Anatolian megaron differentiated from the Greek one, since the latter consisted of an open columned-porch. ”Megaron”, Encyclopaedia Britannica Inc., URL: http://www.britannica.com/technology/megaron
Although the prostas house was considered as a rare type\textsuperscript{258}, such dwellings have been recorded in mainland Greece (Maroneia, Abdera\textsuperscript{259}, Piraeus, Halieis, Orraon) and in Ionian cities of Asia Minor (Kolophon, Priene, Teos, Kklazomenae, Miletus) as the below images testify. Since the prevalent house type along the Ionian area of the Aegean, was the prostas type, we could consequently suggest that its diffusion to the Northern and Western Black Sea regions was reinforced due to the second Greek colonizzazione\textsuperscript{260}. For this reason, traces of prostas houses were discovered in Apollonia Pontica, Olbia\textsuperscript{261}, Tanais\textsuperscript{262}, Kerkinitis\textsuperscript{263}.

\textsuperscript{258} M. C. Hellmann, 2010, p. 11
\textsuperscript{259} L. Nevett, 1999, p. 101-103.
\textsuperscript{261} C. O. Rogobete, 2012.
\textsuperscript{262} T. M. Arsenyeva, 2003, p. 1056-58.
\textsuperscript{263} V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 579-580.
Fig. 31. Plan of houses. Kolophon. (5th c. BC.)

Fig. 32. Plan of houses. Olynthus (4th c BC.)
A very interesting discovery was made by I. B. Zeest during the late 1960s and later was completed by A. K. Korovina. It was a private house of prostas type, built probably during the last years of the 4th century BC. In the center of the complex there was the courtyard, around which numerous rooms were erected. Two annexes, separated by a wall, were situated on the eastern part of the yard. The floor of the yard was covered by limestone crumb. From the remains of the walls we see that the dwelling was built by mud-bricks in the upper parts and stones in the lower (stone socle). Traces of red and yellow plaster coat were found sparsely on some walls. The house seem to be a rich private construction, which occupied an area larger than 425m². The house perished a fire in the 3rd century BC and many architectural parts were taken from its ruins in order to be used in the erection of a new building (spolia).

### 3.1.2. THE PASTAS TYPE HOUSE

Secondly, there were the “pastas” type houses. The word ‘pastas’ was mentioned by Herodotus, and later was met also in Xenophon’s and Vitruvius’ descriptions; while the first archaeological find bearing the term was an inscription dated to the 4th century BC.

---

266 S. I. Finogenova, 2003, p. 1024.
268 However, Korovina supported that this was probably a public building (e.g. Pretaneum) and not a private residence, but still its function remains a riddle. S. I. Finogenova, 2003, p. 1024.
century BC, referring to a degree about the Amphictyones and the Delphic administration\textsuperscript{271}.

For some scholars (e.g. Tsakirgis) the pastas is not a separate type, but a variation of the prostas house. However, the majority of the academics tend to refer to them as being two different categories. In this case, the pastas is considered as the development of the prostas anteroom. They indeed look similar to each other, since they are both stoas, but with a different size. The pastas is a long portico, situated in the Northern side of the court, and in front of the main rooms of the house, the andron and the oikos\textsuperscript{272}. Since the prostas was a one- or two-columned porch with the maximum three openings, the pastas was prolonged, with three or four columns and as a result, four and five openings.

The houses in Olynthus serve as the greatest sample of pastas type houses; a type very popular especially in Northern Greece\textsuperscript{273}. The prolonged portico is totally integrated to the architecture of the house as a whole\textsuperscript{274}. The pastas was facing the South, so as to be protected from the cold winds during the winter and the hot sun during the summer\textsuperscript{275}. The portico offered access to several rooms. Like the prostas, the pastas had also 3 meters width, forming this way a semi-open-air place, where several household activities could take place\textsuperscript{276}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{fig33.png}
\caption{House of Pastas type.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{271} B. C. Rider, 1916, p. 230.
\textsuperscript{274} L. C. Nevett, 1999, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{275} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 287.
\textsuperscript{276} The archaeological research in Olynthus brought in surface traces of loom. W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 288.
One of the main features in domestic architecture of the Hellenistic Period, was the tendency for rich ornamentations. This feature becomes obvious in the porticos, with the walls being decorated with plastering mortar and the columns bearing stone capitals with many ornamentations\textsuperscript{277}.

Pastas type houses were met also in Pella (only in the smaller houses) Halieis\textsuperscript{278}, Attica\textsuperscript{279} and Delos\textsuperscript{280} and belonged probably in the middle-class citizens\textsuperscript{281}. In the Black Sea several houses with a pastas layout have been found throughout the Greek colonies, some of which are described below:

\textsuperscript{277} W. Hoepfner, 2005, p. 288.
\textsuperscript{279} L. Nevett, 1999, p. 95-97.
\textsuperscript{280} L. Nevett, 1999, p. 97-98.
\textsuperscript{281} M. Siganidou, 1982, p. 36.
Apollonia Pontica: The houses in Apollonia were mainly of pastas and peristyle type, built in a small scale. Here, the rooms were arranged according to the inner courtyard and were incorporated in the bedrock. The stone foundations supported the adobe walls, which in many cases were coated with clay. A pastas type house was found in the parcel at No.48 “Milet” street, but unfortunately I could not find any further description of the dwelling. As a rule the houses in Apollonia followed a block organization and had tiled roofs.

Olbia: A pastas type house was discovered, covering an area of about 250-270m². The house was dated from the second half of the 6th century BC onwards, and after several reconstructions it was inhabited until the 2nd century BC. The entrance of the house led to a stone paved courtyard, around which the rooms of the house were built. To the north-western axis of the rooms there was a small portico; a pastas. Among the ground rooms (six or eight in number) there was a ground cellar, which walls were decorated with colored plaster. Of pastas type were also some of the houses excavated in sector NGF-1. This was a private residence with at least twelve rooms and five basements. Its courtyard was decorated with two porticoes, one to its north and another to its eastern side. The floor of the central courtyard was covered with plates in second use (spolia, taken possibly from another house), while a stone staircase next to the northern pastas led to the upper floor.

Kerkinitis: The house No. 7 discovered in Kerkinitis, belonged also to the pastas type. It was erected during the first third of the 3rd century BC, in the northern corner of the residential block. The total area of the house measured about

---

284 D. Nedev, K. Panayotova, 2003, p. 106
285 S.D. Kryzhnyts’kyj, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 435.
286 S.D. Kryzhnyts’kyj, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 435.
287 S.D. Kryzhnyts’kyj, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 440.
288 S.D. Kryzhnyts’kyj, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 440.
93m². A narrow corridor, paved with pebbles, led from the street to the courtyard; around which the four rooms of the house were erected in a Γ-shape⁹⁰. These premises were built on an axis running from north-west to north-east⁹¹. In the northern side of the yard and in front of the long axis with the three rooms, there was a pastas, an anteroom open to the courtyard⁹². The fourth room, the one which was not directly connected with the pastas, functioned probably as a private sanctuary, dedicated to Demeter and Kore. Of similar type were also the houses No. 2, 9, 10, 19 and 22⁹³.

3.1.3 HOUSES WITH PERISTYLE

In 400 BC, we see the first traces of a new architectural type; the house with the peristyle courtyard. In a period when the exaggeration and the big size prevailed in art, in domestic architecture the need for luxury and ornamentation was constantly escalating. The peristyle was initially used in temple-architecture and in public buildings, like the Pompeion at Athens⁹⁴. The round colonnade made the building look more imposing and luxurious. In domestic architecture the peristyle courtyards became very popular among the aristocrats and the citizens of the upper classes. In these houses the open court was surrounded by colonnades usually on the three or all the four sides⁹⁵.

It is still under discussion whether the peristyle was a variant of the prostas and pastas type houses or not⁹⁶. However, what is unanimously agreed is that the peristyle house was the most luxurious type of all the styles introduced in the Late Classical Period and was perceived as the most important evolution in domestic architecture. The private and modest character of the Classical houses was replaced by

⁹⁴ E. Walter-Karydi, 1996, p. 5.
⁹⁶ L. C. Nevett, 1999, p. 22
monumental constructions with intense decorations. Now the wealthy citizens try to impress with their houses and demonstrate their high social status. Consequently, the houses became larger and their courtyards more elaborate.

During the Hellenistic period, not only the newly erected houses had a peristyle courtyard, but also the oldest ones, which were now reconstructed and adjusted to the new residential type. Such was the case in Olynthus, Delos, Priene, Athens where many of the previous buildings were demolished and gave their place to new rich and large Hellenistic residences. The below image is indicative of the re-planning which took place in the 4th century BC.

The transition from a prostas or pastas courtyard to a peristyle one is explicitly described through the residential plans from Olynthus and Priene:
Greek houses with peristyle courtyards around the Black Sea, were found in:

- **Mesambria**: Traces of peristyle courtyards were visible in Mesambria’s houses as well. As a rule, the houses were rectangular in shape, with the rooms surrounding the central courtyard. Cellars and double staircases of stone were also located in the yard. The houses were built of mud-brick walls based on stone foundations. Sometimes the walls were plastered with grout, upon which mural paintings were applied. One of the most impressive features of the Hellenistic Mesambrian residences, is the roof decoration, met only in rich constructions.

---

297 H. Preshlenov, 2003, p. 164
298 It is a fact that traces of roof decoration were observed in Egypt and belong to the first third of the 3rd century BC. However, Plato also mentions «ὄροφής ποικίλματα» (Πλάτων, Πολιτεία, 529B) when he refers to the Athenian houses. Moreover, this feature could be combined with the decoration met in

[73]
ornamented tiles, a feature met in private dwellings from the 5th century BC till the 2nd century AD.

Olbia: Additional information derived also from the Hellenistic Houses in Olbia. All the contemporary houses there, had stone foundations above which mud-brick walls were erected, covered by tiled roofs (Corinthian or Laconic tiles)\(^{299}\). From the excavations it becomes obvious that the residences in Olbia varied in size, with the smallest ones occupying an area of 100m\(^2\) and the biggest ones extended up to 600m\(^2\) (along with the courtyard)\(^{300}\). However, the average residence measured an area between 200-250m\(^2\). Such was the case of a house excavated in the north part of sector NGF-1. An entrance corridor led from the street to a large peristyle courtyard, surrounded by Doric order columns and paved carefully with stone slabs\(^{301}\). In the center of the court, a stone altar was revealed. The rooms of the house were extended to the three sides of the yard, along with the inhabited cellar\(^{302}\). From all the premises, the most impressive room was the andron. Its floor was decorated with mosaics, depicting colorful meanders, sea waves and crosses. Noteworthy is the fact that on the three sides of the room, there were special flutes, used probably during the cleaning of the room in order to lead the water outside the andron\(^{303}\). Lastly, sewage channels were also found in some houses, while rooms that served as toilets and bathrooms were discovered only in the richest constructions\(^{304}\).

---

the tombs and temples of the Hellenistic era, indicating that the domestic (private) architecture was influenced by the public architectural trends. Finally, it must be mentioned that is a habit met especially in the Western Black Sea Littoral, like in Odessos and Tyras. H. Preshlenov, 2003, p. 164; E. Walter-Karydi, p. 54-55; H. Preshlenov, 2003, p. 164.

\(^{299}\) S.D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 440.

\(^{300}\) S.D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 429.

\(^{301}\) S.D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 440.

\(^{302}\) The inhabited basements was a feature met frequently in the Olbian residences. They were used both for household and for domestic purposes, reminding this way the initial dugout structures of the very first settlers. S.D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 440 and in S.D. Kryzhytskyy, N. A. Lejpunskaia, 2010, p. 41.

\(^{303}\) S.D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 440.

\(^{304}\) S.D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaia, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 430.
Panticapaeum: It is a fact that from the last quarter of the 5th century BC onwards, the pillar halls and the peristyle courtyards were adopted and testified also in the residents unearthed in the capital of the Bosporan Kingdom. The most impressive building though was the Spartocid Palace, located in the Acropolis of Panticapeum. This royal residence reflects in the best way the Hellenistic residential type of Panticapaeum—although in a bigger scale. The whole complex was arranged around a peristyle courtyard, of a rectangular shape (9.7 x 16.2m)\textsuperscript{305}. Traces of a \textit{stylobate} and the drum of a column seem to have survived \textit{in situ}\textsuperscript{306}, helping this way the archaeologists have a complete image of the peristyle courtyard and the building as a whole.

Tyras: The Hellenistic houses at Tyras were spacious structures, covering up to 360m\textsuperscript{2} (House No. 2)\textsuperscript{307}. Again the rooms were arranged around a central courtyard, which was usually paved by stone slabs\textsuperscript{308}. However, many of the houses had two courtyards: one used mainly as an auxiliary household space, and the other serve a more “formal” function as I mentioned in the previous chapters. The walls of the houses were made of mud-bricks in the upper part, based upon stone foundations. In many cases they were covered with plaster, mainly of red, yellow and blue colors\textsuperscript{309}. Valuable information for the domestic architecture of Tyras, derived also from the local cellars. They were underground constructions, sunk up to 2.5m into the soil. The floors, both in the basement and in the surface rooms, were pise-walled, but in some cases the archaeologists suggested the presence of a wooden or a stone pavement\textsuperscript{310}. These cellars were separated from the above-ground structures by wooden blocks. These blocks served a double purpose: they were used both as a ceiling for the basement and at the same time as a floor of the rooms.

\textsuperscript{305} V. P. Tolstikov, 2003, p. 727-728.
\textsuperscript{306} V. P. Tolstikov, 2003, p. 727.
\textsuperscript{307} T. L. Samoulova, 2003, p. 441.
\textsuperscript{308} T. L. Samoulova, 2003, p. 441.
\textsuperscript{309} T. L. Samoulova, 2003, p. 441.
\textsuperscript{310} T. L. Samoulova, 2003, p. 441.
erected above them\textsuperscript{311}. Like in Mesambria, in Tyras the roofs were also decorated, either with ornamented tiles, or with antefixes\textsuperscript{312}. All the above made the scholars suggest that such houses belonged probably to wealthy citizens; the only ones who could afford them.

- Toricos: A. A. Malysev describes in detail the peristyle courtyard of a Hellenistic house at Toricos. Although a few remains were preserved, the archaeologists were able to reconstruct the appearance of the peristyle yard. There was a portico, with its columns being on a two-meter distance one from the other, while some of them had pillar bases\textsuperscript{313}. Traces of painted plaster were found along its walls.

Houses of peristyle type existed also in Kallatis\textsuperscript{314}, possibly in Histria, Chersonesus\textsuperscript{315}, Kyta\textsuperscript{316}, Apollonia Pontica\textsuperscript{317}, Hermonassa\textsuperscript{318}, rural territory of Cimmerian Bosporus\textsuperscript{319},

3.1.3.1. TYPICAL EXAMPLES OF PERISTYLE HOUSES IN PELLA

Some of the most thoroughly excavated Hellenistic houses were the ones discovered in the ancient city of Pella. The capital of the Macedonian Kingdom enjoyed great prosperity during the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC. The city flourished economically (something which is reflected in the agora, the palace, the private houses and the numerous workshops\textsuperscript{320}) and demographically\textsuperscript{321}.

\textsuperscript{311} T. L. Samoulova, 2003, p. 441.
\textsuperscript{312} T. L. Samoulova, 2003, p. 441
\textsuperscript{313} A. A. Malysev, 2007, p. 933.
\textsuperscript{314} C. O. Rogobete, 2012.
\textsuperscript{315} C. O. Rogobete, 2012.
\textsuperscript{316} Y. A. Molev, 2003, p. 858-861, 866-867.
\textsuperscript{317} D. Nedev, K. Panayotova, 2003, p. 106.
\textsuperscript{318} S. I. Finogenova, 2003, p. 1023-1024.
\textsuperscript{319} A. A. Maslenikov, 2003, p. 1166-1167.
\textsuperscript{320} M. Lilimbaki-Akamatis, 2009, p. 27.
\textsuperscript{321} M. Siganidou, 1982, p. 32
All the houses found in Pella followed a block organization, with two up to eight houses per residential block (depending on their size)\textsuperscript{322}. A blatant discrimination between the wealthier and the poorer owners was observed. The richest houses covered an area between 1000-3160m\(^2\), while the smaller ones extended from 200 up to 500m\(^2\).\textsuperscript{323} Bearing in mind the climate of Macedonia, the ancients built their houses following a southwards orientation\textsuperscript{324}. They all had tiled roofs\textsuperscript{325} and walls built of stone in the lower part and mud-bricks in the upper\textsuperscript{326}. As far as the remains of staircases and architectural members indicate, the houses in Pella were multi-storeyed constructions.

The entrance to the house was succeeded through a prothyron and gave access to the open courtyard. There wells, altars, cisterns and fountains (only in the rich houses) were situated, while the most luxurious constructions had sometimes two courtyards\textsuperscript{327}. They all followed the peristyle type, according to which colonnades (of Doric or Ionic order) stretched along the three or four sides of the courtyard\textsuperscript{328}. All the houses had storage rooms, kitchens, domestic sanctuaries and places with bathtubs and toilets\textsuperscript{329}. The latter rooms where situated usually close to the street, so as their sewage systems be connected with the city’s pipes.

In the interior, the walls were richly decorated with stucco of excellent design and the floors with mosaics made of colorful pebbles\textsuperscript{330}. Likewise, colorful details were met also in the columns of the courtyard and the stoas. The latter were cool and bright, offering this way an appropriate place where the family or the guests could spend their time pleasantly, by walking or discussing.

\textsuperscript{322} M. Lilimbaki-Akamatis, 2009, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{323} M. Lilimbaki-Akamatis, 2009, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{324} M. Lilimbaki-Akamatis, 2009, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{325} M. Lilimbaki-Akamatis, 2009, p. 29.
\textsuperscript{326} M. Lilimbaki-Akamatis, 2009, p. 31.
\textsuperscript{327} M. Lilimbaki-Akamatis, 2009, p. 30.
\textsuperscript{328} M. Siganidou, 1982, p. 32
\textsuperscript{330} M. Lilimbaki-Akamatis, 2009, p. 31
What is noteworthy is that in the “House of Mortar” («Οικία των Κονιαμάτων»), one of the excavated houses in Pella, to the North of the stoa, an unprecedented construction was found. Next to the courtyard a square room (7 x 7m) was erected, having its one side totally open to the court. This room was called exedra. The exedra is an innovation of the domestic architecture during the Late Hellenistic Age, met only in some structures, especially from the 2nd century BC onwards. It is supposed that the exedra was used merely during the hot summers, when its open-air place could offer shade and protection from the sun and allow the owner or his family relax and enjoy the fresh air. The exedra found in Pella had two columns of Doric order on its frontal side, while the rest of the walls were vividly decorated with unique plasticity.

The floors in the androns and their anterooms were also decorated, with mosaics formed by original pebbles of white, black, brown, grey and red colors. Narrative scenes were depicted in the mosaic floors of the androns, while geometrical motives are met in all the anterooms.

Fig. 39. Peristyle with mosaic in the andron’s floor. Kassope.
As it was mentioned above, the greatest information about the size, luxury, wealth and rich ornamentation that characterize the houses of eminent and rich families in the Hellenistic world, come from the residences in Pella. Such an example is the “House of Dionysus”. It was a monumental construction, which extended in 3160m². The entrance of the house was in the middle of the complex, where there was an anteroom (10 x 10m) with two Ionic columns in antae. From there, a door in the north wall of the corridor led to the private part of the house, the oikos, and in the opposite wall another door led to the andron. As a result the house was divided into two big parts, the private to the North and the public to the South. In the Northern part, there was the square room of oikos, with the sacred hearth in the middle. Adjacent to oikos were two small chambers which probably functioned as bathrooms, while it is supposed that a separate cooking place (μαγείρειο) was situated in the northern side of the main room. Noteworthy is the fact that a courtyard surrounded by Ionic-order columns was situated in the middle of the northern part. In each side there were six standing columns. However, in the Northern part of the court two more columns were added, allowing this way the formation of a stoa, above which a second floor was erected.

---

In the southern part of the house, there were all the rooms intended for the parties and the symposia of the owner. In the middle there was a courtyard, bigger from the previous one, surrounded by columns. The peristyle courtyard was 16.50m wide and in each side there were eight Doric columns. Around the courtyard the rooms of the androns were arranged. To the Western side there was a pair of androns, separated by a common anteroom. The androns were equal in size with a capacity of 15 clines. From this complex remarkable mosaics came to surface. In the northern andron two mosaics were found; the one represented a griffin devouring a dear, and the second and most impressive was in the middle of the room, depicting Dionysus riding a panther. Of exceptional design was also the mosaic floor of the intermediate anteroom, with the black and white squares.

Northwards of the court there is an exedra, which in turn led to another twelve-kline andron. The floor in the exedra was also decorate with black and white pebbles, forming small lozenges. All the stoas and the exedra were appropriate places for shade and the fresh air, where the owner and his friends could walk, rest and chat with each other.

---

339 After this mosaic the house was named “House of Dionysus”.
3.1.4. THE HERDRAUM TYPE

Another variation of the Late Classical and Hellenistic houses, was the so called “Herdraumhaus”\textsuperscript{341}; a term used for the first time by W. Hoepfner and E. L. Schwandner. Their research was based on the houses excavated at Kassope. There, the dwellings seem to have a slightly different configuration, both in their interior and their exterior layout. To be more specific, the Herdraum house was a square complex, with a small courtyard and a large oikos, around which all the rooms of the house were arranged. In other words, the function of the former central courtyard was replaced by a large dining room (oikos), while the courtyard was essentially decreased in size and connected only with one room, the andron. This means that the residential complex was separated into two main parts: a) an outer area, including the andron, the storage rooms and the courtyard; and b) an inner area, with the large oikos in the middle and the living rooms around it.

The following example from Kassope, will help us understand better the Herdraum house-type. One of the best excavated houses in the region was “House No. 5”. Built in the middle of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC, the house occupied an area of 225m\textsuperscript{2}.\textsuperscript{342} The entrance of the house was a single door, situated in the western side of the complex, leading directly to a small courtyard\textsuperscript{343}. In the opposite side of the street door – although not in the same position with it- there was another door, which gave access to the large room of oikos. The two doors were not aligned to each other deliberately, prohibiting this way everyone from seeing what happens inside the oikos. To the south of the court was the andron, while directly opposite the stables of the house\textsuperscript{344}.

Although this house-type was popular enough in the northern Greece, in the Black Sea region, traces of the Herdraumhaus type have been found only in the Greek city of Kerkinitis\textsuperscript{345}. Although, I could not have access to any more information about these

\textsuperscript{341} W. Hoepfner, E. L. Schwandner, 1994, p. 146-150.
\textsuperscript{343} This means that there was neither the corridor, nor the thyroron of the above-described houses. L. Nevett, 1999, p. 103-104.
\textsuperscript{344} L. Nevett, 1999, p. 104.
\textsuperscript{345} C. O. Rogobete, 2012.
specific residences in Kerkinitis, due to the lack of publications, I suppose that such dwellings were probably used in other areas too, especially in the Northern Black Sea littoral. But still, I cannot take it for granted and thus no conclusions about the Herdraum houses in the Euxine could be drawn.

Fig. 43. House No. 5. Kassope.

3.1.5. CONCLUSION

The model of a house with an open air courtyard prevailed during the whole Hellenistic period. The rooms of the house were erected all around the central court, but the way the latter was arranged led to the emergence of four main house-types.

The prostas, pastas, peristyle and herdraumhaus types\textsuperscript{346}, which appeared for the first time during the Late Classical period (400 BC onwards), developed and reached their stylistic peak in the Hellenistic Age.

The houses of prostas and pastas types were similar to each other, since the portico along the courtyard has the same function in both cases\textsuperscript{347}. From the archaeological finds derived that in these stoas (smaller or larger) several domestic activities were

\textsuperscript{346} I omitted the Herdraumhaus type on purpose, since the lack of information is such that no conclusions can be drawn about the appearance and development of this residential type.

\textsuperscript{347} L. Nevett, 1999, p. 123.
conducted, like the weaving or the cooking. Thus, due to this household function of the porticoes and the modest construction of the houses (always in comparison with the peristyle residences) it is estimated that the prostas- or pastas-type houses belonged to citizens of the middle classes.

However, of a totally different function were the peristyle courtyards, which are met only in luxurious and rich private houses. There, the nobles’ greedy led to the construction of monumental structures, decorated not only with stoas, but also with exedras, columns, capitals, nieres, mural or stucco paintings, mosaics etc. of magnificent design. As a result the house with a peristyle courtyard, undoubtedly became the symbol of aristocracy and underlined the general tendency for luxury.

In the terms of this richness and decorative atmosphere, many contemporary residences have a double courtyard or more than one androns; a feature which led the scholars to the conclusion that perhaps the women were allowed to participate in the formal dinners and conversations of these gala rooms. There is a blatant tendency also to create luxurious rooms, of large dimensions in order to host as many guests as possible.
Finally, of exceptional importance was also the Herdraum type; a variation which has nothing in common with the above three residential types. The pastas, prostas and peristyle houses were all arranged around a central courtyard, which was the center of domestic life. In the Herdraumhaus, this courtyard was severely decreased in size, looking actually as a small room, while the main room of oikos acquired the biggest part of the house; a feature that only the courtyards had until then. One could say that in the Herdraum houses the role of the courtyard was replaced by the large oikos, which was not only a place for the preparation of the food, but also served as an activity area – a role that previously belonged to the courtyard. As a natural outcome, the yard lost its significance and reduced its dimensions.

In general, what characterizes the houses of the examined period (apart from the Herdraumhaus probably) is the fact that the private and introvert character of the Classical times, was gradually replaced by a more extrovert atmosphere of the Hellenistic period. It is a fact that the political changes – the swift from democracy to

348 The area of the courtyard measured up to 35% of the total residential complex. I have explained the role of the yard in the homonymous chapter, which explains the need for the yards of large dimensions. See Chapter 2.1.2, p. 45-48.
monarchy- influenced radically the social life in all the Greek cities. Thus, it is true to say that during the Late Hellenistic period, the luxurious residences were created in accordance with the Hellenistic (Macedonian) palaces\textsuperscript{349}. The private residences were considered as micrographics of the palaces, since the long porch in the entrance, the two courtyards, the exedras, the additional androns and the decorative motives, indicate the close relation between the private dwellings and the royal anaktora.

The gap between the upper and the lower classes was obvious not only in the public character and rights of citizenship, but mainly in the private life. The wealthy owners expanded their land ownership and built their magnificent homes, forcing this way the poor populations live in smaller houses of limited space\textsuperscript{350}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{fig47.png}
\caption{Wall decoration. Pergamos. 2\textsuperscript{nd} c. BC.}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{349} W. Müller-Wiener, 1995, p. 193.
Fig. 48. Wall decoration. Delos.

Fig. 49. Wall decoration. Panticapaeum.

Fig. 50. Wall decoration. Athens. Late 2nd–early 1st c. BC.

Fig. 51. Wall decoration. Pella. Late 3rd c. BC.
CHAPTER 4
Domestic Sanctuaries
4.1. HOME SANCTUARIES

It is widely accepted that the ancient Greeks were very religious people, who honored their gods not only in the great feasts, but on a daily basis. This means that the religion was one of the most important parts of their everyday life, and presupposes the existence of special places where it was conducted. As a result, apart from the imposing public temples and temene, we have private sanctuaries, situated inside the dwellings.

Unfortunately, although domestic cults and religious practices are supposed to shed light on various aspects of the ancients’ private life and beliefs, the scholars showed less interest to them and as a consequence our information about the private sanctuaries and the domestic worship are extremely limited. However, judging from the finds coming from the Euxine and Greece (which are essentially more illuminating than the ones from the Black Sea cities) and based on the close relationship between the colonies and their metropolises, I will try to present -as far as possible- the so called home sanctuaries and reconstruct their layout according to the architectural remains.

First of all, despite the scant archaeological material, it is impossible to believe that the Greek settlers stopped conducting their religion in the new territories. The Greeks embarked their journey having the divine consensus and protection of Apollo; thus, it is beyond any dispute that they kept worshiping their gods even when they inhabited the primitive earth constructions (the dugouts and semi dugouts), in the very beginning of their arrival in the new lands. Traces of such an archaic construction were unearthed in the Chora of Olbia. It was a cultic complex, dedicated to Achilles, dug into the soil. With the scholars date this structure to the end of the 6th– first half of the 5th century BC, this is the earliest sanctuary found in Pontos Euxeinos.

But before start analyzing the domestic sanctuaries and their finds place by place, it is necessary to clarify the criteria according to which a place is characterized as a private sanctuary. First of all it is necessary to note that by the word “sanctuary” we mean a
small place, usually a corner of the house, where there was an altar. As a result, the altar is the greatest indication that allows us to characterize a place as a divine space. The altars were the core of the ritual practices; a totally necessary construction, around which all the members of the family were gathered for the libations and the offerings to the gods. They were rectangular or square structures, made of various materials, such as stone, limestone, marble, shingle or clay, and could be both stationary and portable. On their four sides there were decorative scenes, depicting mainly mythological heroes or scenes from sacrificial rituals.

Although the altar underlines the sacredness of the place, the terracotta figurines demonstrate the gods worshipped there. The votive figurines found along with the altar, testify the religious character of the place, and offer us valuable information regarding the cult of specific deities. Usually, the terracotta figurines were placed on niches; another installation connected directly with the domestic religious practices.

![Fig. 52. Late Archaic terracotta figurines from Berezan.](image)

---

351 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 111.
353 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 112.
354 Many such altars were found in Olbia, Chersonesus and in sites of Bosporos, all dated between 4th and 3rd centuries BC. S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunska, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 454.
Of course, in terms of a private cult conducted at home, we must include the open hearth situated in the middle of the oikos. The hearth apart from its practical use, served also religious purposes, since it was directly connected with the primary domestic deity, Hestia. She was considered as the protector of the house, who brings prosperity, fertility and health to the house owners. However, apart from Hestia, various gods were honored in the same altar, turning automatically the room into a domestic sanctuary.

Compared to the public religious practices and rituals, the domestic ones are essentially less examined. Undoubtedly, much more are expected to be discovered during the next years, leading us to safe interpretations and conclusions. On the other hand, it is true to say that some basic information regarding the domestic cults and their accompanying installations are known to us, and these data will be presented in the following chapter.

**4.1.1. THE VERY FIRST ARCAEOLOGICAL FINDS FROM THE BLACK SEA**

The majority of the information regarding the private sanctuaries and the sacred places at home, come from the Northern and Western regions of the Black Sea. The private worship developed mainly during the Classical and Hellenistic times, but its origins are dated back to the Archaic period. The very first years of their arrival, the Greek settlers conducted their religion at home, since not many temples and public altars were built up yet. The nieces and the nooks found inside the earliest Greek dwellings reinforce the above suggestion and prove that the Greeks venerated initially their deities at home.

The earliest cult buildings—probably of public worship—were discovered in the Lower Dniester region, and in particular at Nikonion. These were two semi-dugout constructions. The one, “semi-dugout No. 6”, was constructed in the mid-6th

---

356 N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495, 496.
century BC and occupied an area of more than 30m². The construction was separated by a partition into two rooms (one of 25.48m² and the other of 8m²)\(^{357}\). In the south-eastern corner of the room, a rectangular platform was found (0.95 x 1m) raised 0.21m above the floor and fenced with mud-bricks placed on ribs\(^{358}\). Pieces of coal and ashes were found all over the platform, while in its center there were explicit traces of fire and a few pieces of burnt wood. Slightly above the platform, a clay-niche was positioned, having 0.6m height, 0.45m width and 0.45m length\(^{359}\). In front of the platform, there was a small pit (0.07-0.11m), which included fragments of glass beads (like very thin rings as Sekerskaya notices\(^{360}\). Finally, it must be mentioned that in the south-western and north-eastern sides of the semi dugout No. 6, square and rectangular platforms were found, raised 0.05-0.08m above the ground\(^{361}\).

The second semi dugout, was the so called room No. 9, constructed later than the first one, at the end of the 6th-beginning of the 5th century BC\(^{362}\). It had a pisé floor, covered with six layers of coating. The central part of the floor was covered with small stones. Ceramic fragments, like amphorae from Chios, Lesbos and Thasos, or Ionian bowls, were found in its interior along with ashes.

The above finds indicate that these two premises were used as cultic complexes. In fact, the platform around the room No. 6 reminds a lot the antique altars, which were usually surrounded by mud-brick or stone fences\(^{363}\). As far as the semi dugout No. 9 is concerned, its great damage do not allow us to have a more complete idea of its layout. In this case, perhaps the most enlightening find was the skeleton of a tortoise that was found in its interior; only because it is known that snakes, tortoises and horses were related to the Greek chthonic deities and were frequently found in

\(^{357}\) N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495.
\(^{358}\) N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495.
\(^{359}\) N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495.
\(^{360}\) N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495.
\(^{361}\) N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495.
\(^{362}\) N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495.
\(^{363}\) N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495.
sanctuaries\textsuperscript{364}. Both structures ceased to function in the second half of the 5\textsuperscript{th} century BC, when they were filled with earth and covered by new buildings\textsuperscript{365}.

The fact that these sacred places were partially dug into the ground, is an indication that chthonic deities were worshiped there. Similar archaic sanctuaries have been discovered also in Olbia, and were again connected with a chthonic cult\textsuperscript{366}. In Olbia, additional information derived from the terracotta figurines, the majority of which were dedicated to deities related directly with nature, fertility and agriculture\textsuperscript{367}. In general, the study of the terracotta statuettes from Nikonion, indicate that the worshipping of Demeter and Kore, Cybele, Aphrodite, Artemis, Zeus, Dionysus, and heroes, were very popular in the city from the 5\textsuperscript{th} until the 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries BC\textsuperscript{368}.

A clear example of private worship comes from Tyritake. The finds were unearthed in a house built between 550-500 BC. A central open hearth was found in one of the rooms, attributed to the worship and veneration of Hestia\textsuperscript{369}. However, the most important finds were the remains of a clay-altar, the four terracotta figurines, the ritual vessels and a female protome that were unearthed in situ, right next to the hearth\textsuperscript{370}. From the above finds, it becomes obvious that a female deity was worshiped there, and according to the scholars (V. F. Gajdukevich), this could be either Demeter, Aphrodite, Cybele, or Artemis. V. I. Pruglo, suggested that this sanctuary was dedicated to Demeter, the goddess of agriculture. As he suggested, the figurines were put on the altar during the harvest or the sowing, in order to propitiate the deity.

\textsuperscript{364} N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495.
\textsuperscript{365} N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495-496.
\textsuperscript{366} N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 495.
\textsuperscript{367} In Nikonion for example, the majority of the terracotta figurines from the Archaic Period, seem to represent Demeter, a chthonic deity related to agriculture. N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 499.
\textsuperscript{368} N. M. Sekerskaya, 2007, p. 502.
\textsuperscript{369} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{370} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 128.
4.1.2. HOME SANCTUARIES FOUND IN THE GREEK COLONIES

The main bulk of information comes from the Late Classical and Hellenistic domestic sanctuaries (from 4\textsuperscript{th} till 2\textsuperscript{nd} centuries BC) found in the Northern and Western Black Sea colonies\textsuperscript{371}. The majority of them were situated in the basements of the houses, underlying this way their connection with chthonic deities, such as Demeter, Persephone (Kore), Pluto and Cybele. On the contrary, the above-ground sanctuaries were related with the worship of Ahrodite (Urania, Pontia), Artemis, Apollo and others. As a result, remains of private shrines and sanctuaries were revealed at:

- Odessos: Since the Late Classical and Hellenistic houses in Odessos had all their own basements and cellars, many information can be drawn about the religious practices which conducted there. For this reason a great abundance of terracotta figurines from such home sanctuaries were collected\textsuperscript{372}. From them, we are able to know that the Great God of Odessos or Darzalas (of

\textsuperscript{371} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{372} A. Minchev, 2003, p. 246.
Thracian origin\textsuperscript{373}, goddess Demeter, Hermes, the Thracian Horseman, Heracles and Eros were worshipping by the Odessians in private sanctuaries.

\begin{itemize}
  \item Tyras: Six partly excavated houses were unearthed at Tyras. Two of them included enough finds so as to identify their home sanctuaries. The first interesting finds, however, came from the basement of House I-F. The basement occupied an area of 5.50 x 3.15m, and its walls were built of carefully trimmed stones\textsuperscript{374}. There, the remains of two sacrificial altars were found\textsuperscript{375}. To become more specific, they were two platforms made of clay, semi-circular in shape, enclosed by stones\textsuperscript{376}. The one was 1.10 x 0.83m, while from the other only some fragments were preserved. The altars belonged to the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC, and the initial construction period of the building. The religious character of the room was reinforced also by the niche found in the eastern wall\textsuperscript{377}.

  A similar layout was also found in the private sanctuary of House II-F. And in this case, the sanctuary was situated in the basement of the house. The walls of the room were built by carefully cut blocks, around an area of 15m\textsuperscript{2}. The niche found in the southern wall, the partially preserved terracotta figurines, the pig-head vessel, and part of a marble griffin indicate that the room served as a domestic sanctuary\textsuperscript{378}.

  \item Olbia: In Olbia the strong links that connected the Greek colonists with their religion were obvious almost in every house. Minor cult plastics have been found in great amounts. Terracotta figurines of Apollo, Zeus, Aphrodite, Artemis, Cybele, statuettes of animals etc. were found in abundance. However, the main female goddess seems to be Demeter – a deity directly connected
\end{itemize}

\textsuperscript{373} The Thracian influence was really strong in Odessos, and as a result a lot of their beliefs and deities were adopted by the Greek settlers.
\textsuperscript{374} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{375} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{376} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{377} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 129.
\textsuperscript{378} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 129.
with agriculture\textsuperscript{379}. A lot of the figurines had traces of red, brown, yellow and blue paint, while they were products of either local or foreign workshops\textsuperscript{380}.

Perhaps the most representative example of domestic sanctuary was discovered in House II-5, in NGS Sector. The house was inhabited probably from the late 5\textsuperscript{th} till the 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries BC, and was repeatedly reconstructed. The archaeologists unearthed two basements; the one, Basement 20, served as a living or store room, while the second, Basement 390, had probably a religious character. Bellow the floor of the Basement 390, a structure of the 4\textsuperscript{th} century BC was unearthed; the Room 451. It was a rectangular room, with dimensions 3.9 x 3m\textsuperscript{381}. S. D. Kryzhytskyy and N. A. Lejpunskaja describe: “Two levels of floors were revealed. In the upper of the floors, threes small pits were preserved, two cone-shaped in section for the installation of vessels and one of a post. Of the lower level of the floor, […] only a small section was preserved”\textsuperscript{382}. Several finds came to surface from the different cultural layers of the room, which actually led us date the basement to the 4\textsuperscript{th}-early 3\textsuperscript{rd} centuries BC\textsuperscript{383}. Many of the terracotta figurines belong to this period: a goddess sitting on her throne (P-17, P-18)\textsuperscript{384}, two fragmentary statuettes of standing women (P-71, P-80), a figurine of a dancing woman (P-86), one of a piglet (P-155) and a turtle (P-156)\textsuperscript{385}. A few more terracotta figurines dated to the third quarter of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BC were also found. These were: a figurine of a horse (P-145) and probably a lion (P-151) and two standing draped males and females (P-93, P-94, P-75, P-76)\textsuperscript{386}. The latter figurines have a further

\textsuperscript{379} This is not a coincidence, since it is assumed that in Olbia the deities related to nature, fertility and agriculture were very popular. S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 454.
\textsuperscript{380} S. D. Kryzhytskyy, V. V. Krapivina, N. A. Lejpunskaja, V. V. Nazarov, 2003, p. 459.
\textsuperscript{381} S. D. Kryzhytskyy, N. A. Lejpunskaja, 2010, p. 32.
\textsuperscript{382} S. D. Kryzhytskyy, N. A. Lejpunskaja, 2010, p. 32
\textsuperscript{383} S. D. Kryzhytskyy, N. A. Lejpunskaja, 2010, p. 32
\textsuperscript{384} P. G. Bilde, 2010, p. 440.
\textsuperscript{385} P. G. Bilde, 2010, p. 440.
\textsuperscript{386} P. G. Bilde, 2010, p. 440.
importance, since for the first time the archaeologists had in their hands secure representations of the Phrygian deity, Cybele.\textsuperscript{387}

Apart from the terracotta statuettes found in the basement of House II-5, another find connected the place directly with religious practices. This was a stone altar, discovered in the northern part of the room. It was a rectangular structure, built by carefully cut slabs and limestone blocks. \textit{“In the upper plane there was a large slab with a low ridge (4 x 2cm) along the northern edge and one of the blocks had a mortise (measuring 17 x 6cm; depth 3cm)”}. From all the above (the terracotta figurines and the altar) we can safely define the room as a private cultic complex.

House E-10 possessed also a home sanctuary in its basement. The niche on the wall, the remains of two (sacrificial) altars, decorated with relief ornaments, the terracotta head of Demeter and a marble relief of Cybele, testify with certainty its function.\textsuperscript{388} Inside the basements of House E-10, several cult objects and statuettes were revealed, leading this way to the suggestion that each basement was related with the worship of a specific deity.\textsuperscript{389}

Kerkinitis: Some of the best preserved and well-studied home sanctuaries were revealed at Kerkinitis. There, the primary deity worshiped at home was Hestia. This is attested by the open hearths that were found in all the excavated houses of the city. All of them were situated in the northern room of the complex (the coldest place), and had access to the courtyard.\textsuperscript{390} The hearths were rectangular in shape, looking like the archaic escharas (primitive altars).\textsuperscript{391} Certainly, the most probable is that except for Hestia, other deities were also venerated in the local houses; however, the lack of accompanying

\textsuperscript{387} Meter, Matar, Cybele, Mother of the Gods, Ma etc., are some of the names attributed to the Phrygian deity. Cybele, was a divine figure of exceptional importance, related directly with fertility, and power. P. G. Bilde, 2010, p. 440.
\textsuperscript{388} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 129-130.
\textsuperscript{389} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 130.
\textsuperscript{390} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 128.
\textsuperscript{391} V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 128.
founds, hindered a further research and understanding of the domestic cults in Kerkinitis as a whole.

Only one house of the excavated ones, included enough finds, in order to relate it with a home sanctuary dedicated to Demeter and Kore. This was the so-called House No.7. The house occupied an area of 93m², and constituted of four premises around a central courtyard of pastas type. The rooms were arranged in a Γ-form, with the portico running along the longest axis. The room that had no access neither to the pastas nor to the courtyard, served as a home sanctuary. Its function and cultic character was testified by six foreparts, a limestone altar and a lamp. The protomes of Demeter and Kore found in its interior helped the scholars associate it with these two chthonic deities.

Chersonesus: Slightly different were the home sanctuaries found at Chersonesus. Their uniqueness lies in the fact that they situated in separate rooms. Rectangular altars, built by stone plates and decorated with relief ornaments, were found in their interior. A distinctive example of such a home sanctuary, was discovered in a house of the 4th-2nd century BC. The sanctuary was situated in a semi-basement, with walls made of limestone plates and plastered in the Pompeian style. In the north-eastern corner of the room, a platform of 3.0 x 2.0m was revealed, with blatant burning traces. From the limestone altar, only the lower part survived, as well as fragments of Hellenistic (3rd-2nd centuries BC) pottery. The most interesting finds though, were the broken terracotta figurines. One of them represented a sited goddess; another a standing woman dressed with a chiton and three of them depicted female heads. On one of them, the letter A was inscribed with graffiti. This letter was connected with the graffiti found on the above mentioned vases, which had the letters: AAA, AP, Λ, Α. Based on them the

---

393 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 129.
394 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 132.
395 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 132.
396 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 132.
397 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 132.
archaeologists related the sanctuary with the domestic cult of Apollo, Artemis and Latone398.

From other private sanctuaries excavated at Chersonesus, we learn that at home worshiped also Heracles, Dionysos, Sabazios and Athena399.

- **Myrmekion:** An additional home sanctuary was discovered in a Hellenistic house (3rd-1st centuries BC) at Myrmekion. Although the dwelling was reconstructed several times, the only part that remained untouched was the sanctuary400. In its interior, a rectangular altar was discovered, made of limestone slabs. It was positioned in the center of the room and its dimensions were 0.80 x 0.97 x 0.30m401. The terracotta figurines of Demeter and the graffito indicate that the cult of Demeter prevailed at home, without excluding the worship of other chthonic deities as well402.

- **Tanais:** Worth mentioning is one of the houses excavated at Tanais. The house consisted of one room with a cellar and a courtyard with a small hearth. The most impressive was the position of the hearth, which was built between the cellar and the courtyard403. Numerous ritual finds discovered inside the cellar, lamps and vessels, with the most characteristic of all being the square altar, carved by yellow limestone, with concave upper edges404. Right next to it, seven clay stamps were unearthed; used for imprinting ornaments on the “cult

---

398 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 132.
399 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 132.
400 It is known that the demolition of a house and its private sanctuary incurred the greatest punishment of all, which hunted the whole genos: the members of the family, as well as the descendants and the ancestors. Perhaps in the case of the house in Myrmekion, this was the reason it remained untouched. I. Elliott, 2011.
401 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 134.
402 V. V. Krapivina, 2010, p. 134.
breads". From the above we can suggest that the cellar functioned as a private sanctuary, dedicated to a chthonic god related with the underworld, as was the case with the similar sanctuaries found in Chersonesus. However, due to the lack of further evidence, we are unable to declare with certainty the worship of a specific deity.

- Hermonassa: A private sanctuary dedicated to Demeter was found in a house of the Hellenistic period. The house existed already from the late 5th century BC, but at the end of the 4th-beginning of the 3rd century BC it was fundamentally reconstructed. After the renovation, additional rooms were erected, all around a central courtyard. One of the newly erected rooms seems to function as a home sanctuary. Inside the room, on the height of the socle, a square stone altar was discovered. Traces of burnt animals (birds and cattle), as well as a flat tile on the top of the altar were found in its interior. The most important find though, was a terracotta protome of Demeter. On the top of her head there was a small conical bowl. It seems that vegetables were put inside the bowl as offerings to the goddess. A similar find of the goddess was discovered also in Olbia. Judging from the quality of clay and the differences observed on this statuette in comparison to the Greek ones, the scholars suggested that the protome was product of a local manufacture.

### 4.1.3. DOMESTIC DEITIES FOUND IN EVERY GREEK HOUSE

HESTIA:
The oldest and most important deity worshiped at home, was Hestia. Her cult was directly connected with the house and the family life. The core of her cult was the

---

405 A feature related mainly with the worship of the “God the Highest”. A god which derived from the syncretism between Greek, non-Greek and Egyptian deities, borrowing qualities mainly from Zeus, Sabazius and even the Christian God. T. M. Arsenyeva, 2003, p. 1078-1079.
open hearth, found in the main room (oikos) of every Greek house. There, special rituals took place, with the family gathered around the holly fire during the birth, the marriage and the death of a person\textsuperscript{410}, or during the (daily) sacrifices to the goddess\textsuperscript{411}.

A distinctive example of an oikos with a hearth dedicated to Hestia comes from Kerkinitis\textsuperscript{412}. The majority of the houses excavated in the city had the same feature: in a room of 20-23m\textsuperscript{2}, an open hearth built by carefully trimmed stones was found\textsuperscript{413}. An observant researcher would notice from the first glimpse that hearth, was always put in the center of the northern and biggest room of the complex. This position had a double meaning: First of all, it underlined the connection of the hearth with Hestia, and secondly, it symbolized actually another quality of the goddess; the protection from cold she offered\textsuperscript{414}. In all the oikoi, around the hearth, the assemblage of the ashes coming from the open fire, formed an additional layer which penetrated to the initial floor and raised its level\textsuperscript{415}. This was a natural outcome, if we consider that the fire never stopped burning, since one of the main duties of the women of the family, was to keep the holy fire in the hearth constantly light on. Such a room served certainly as a home sanctuary.

What is also noteworthy, is the fact that the cult of Hestia, was not limited inside the house, but had a public importance as well. Hestia, was worshiped also in the Prytaneio of the Agora (Hestia Prytania)\textsuperscript{416}. This way, the city reflected the image of a large house, where every member honored the goddess, and at the same time she protected and blossomed the city (exactly as happened in the private residences).

\textsuperscript{410} D. Boedeker, 2012, p. 234.
\textsuperscript{411} It is suggested that the first pieces of every sacrifice conducted at home were offered to her, while the same seems to happen also with the everyday (main) meal of the family. I. Elliott, 2011.
\textsuperscript{412} The hearths found at Kerkinitis are of unique importance, since no other oikoi with their hearths are so impeccably presented in the Northern Black Sea region. As far as the rest of the Hellenic world is concerned, similar oikoi and monumental hearths were excavated in Olynthus. V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 580.
\textsuperscript{413} V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 579.
\textsuperscript{414} V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 579-580.
\textsuperscript{415} V. A. Kutaisov, 2003, p. 580.
\textsuperscript{416} D. Boedeker, 2012, p. 234.
Another deity worshiped within the house was Zeus. Two epithets are attributed to Zeus, both indicative of the role and the qualities he had. Most important was the worship of Zeus Ktesios. His role was to protect the household, the property and all the «κτήματα» (apo-“ktemata”) of the family. Since the family “goods” were kept at the store rooms, Zeus’ cult was conducted in the same place, aiming this way to increase the provisions and ensure the wealth of the house. Although there was not a separate altar for Zeus Ktesios, his domestic worship is attested by the “kadiskos”. This was a small plain vase, with two handles. The 3rd-century BC historian, Antikleides, fives us a more elaborate description of the kadiskos:

The passage mentions that it was necessary to establish the cult of Zeus Ktesios. This would be succeeded by making a new kadisko, with two handles, wreathed with white wool and yellow (saffron) thread, and pour in ambrosia; that is pure water, olive oil and a variety of fruits.

417 I. Elliott, 2011.
Finally it must be mentioned that Zeus Ktesios was usually depicted as a snake, who guards the stores and frightens the thieves. According to this tradition, the contents of kadiskos would be served to the snake as a sacred meal (offer).

Another divine form of Zeus worshiped at home was Zeus Herkeios. The epithet comes from the Greek word «Ἓρκος» (herkos) and means the fence. It symbolised the boundaries of the house and Zeus was the only and one protector of it. According to Homer, the sacrifices and the libations offered to him, were conducted in an altar situated in the courtyard. Several descriptions of such rituals are known to us from the literary sources. Remains of Zeus’ altars were found at Olympia and Athens, but it seems that both qualities of Zeus (Ktesios and Herkeios) were venerated all around the Greek world.

---

419 Derived from the Greek verb «ἐἵργω», which means fence, block.
420 Neoptolemus for instance killed the old Priamus upon the altar of Zeus Herkeios, while Demaretos sacrificed an ox to the altar of Zeus Herkeios and gave an oath to the god. Similar descriptions were found also in Sophocle’s Antigone and even in Odyssey. D. Boedeker, 2012, p. 232.
Apart from the deities worshiped inside the house, there were some others worshiped outside of it, but directly connected to the residence. Such was the case of Hermes, Apollo Agyieus ("Apollo of the streets")\footnote{I. Elliott, 2011 and M. Manoledakis, 2012, p. 292.} and Hekate. These three gods were not selected at random. They all represent the protectors of the pathways, the city’s streets and the travelling, or the guardians of the house, who prohibit the illnesses, misfortune, enemies and evil spirits reach the house owners and harm the family.
HERMES:
The private worship of Hermes is attested by the Hermaikes steles. The well-known “Hermae”, were square pillars, on the top of which there was the bust of Hermes, and lower of it the phallic symbol. Such structures were found on the city’s streets, as signs showing boundaries and geographical distances between the city and the rural settlements, but also outside private residences. In the latter case, these stele were put next to the entrance of the house, underlying their cultic character. Most indicative is the Attic red figure vase (loutrophoros), which depicts a procession returning home\textsuperscript{422}. We can see the house’s entrance door, in front of which there is an altar and a Herm\textsuperscript{423}.

HEKATE:
Another deity worshiped at home, was Hekate. In the entrance of the house there was an altar (“hekateion”\textsuperscript{424}), where the family venerated the goddess. Due to her position in the entrance of the house, she was usually called Hekate Prothyraia or Kleidouchos\textsuperscript{425}. Her role was to repel the evil spirits away from the family and for the same reason, an apotropaic image (e.g. gorgon) was put in the entrance door. As the “mistress of the spirits”, she was related with magic and chthonic qualities.

\textsuperscript{422} I. Elliott, 2011.
\textsuperscript{423} I. Elliott, 2011.
\textsuperscript{424} C. A. Faraone, 2012, p. 211 and in L. R. Farnell, 1896, p. 517.
\textsuperscript{425} The one who guards the gates of the city, the gates of the house and the gates of the underworld. L. R. Farnell, 1896, p. 513, 556.
Hekate, was worshiped also in public; thus, her statues were situated on the roads, and especially at the points where three different streets incised. This explains why we see the goddess as a three-faced deity, looking to all three directions. Her greatest symbol was the torch

APOLLO AGIEUS:
The epithet comes from the doric word «ἀγγεῖαί» which means “streets”. He was the protector of the house, who did not let anything evil or bad enter the residence. For this reason it was a common practice to put small, cylindrical and point–edge stele in the courtyards or next to the entrance of the house. Along with Zeus Herkeios, these were the two most important deities worshiped at home, hence, sanctuaries dedicated to them were expected to be found in every house. This suggestion was supported also by the fact that the Athenians when examined a newly elected archon, used to ask whether he owned an Apollo Patroos and a Zeus Herkeios and where these sanctuaries were426. As in the case of Hekate, Apollo Agieus was venerated also in public, as the ancient sources and the inscriptions all over the Hellenic world testify. Moreover, in many cases he was worshiped or depicted along with Hekate, underlying this way the close relations and common attributed between the two deities427.

CONCLUSION

The present paper examined not only the architectural development of the ancient Greek house in the Black Sea colonies, but also underlined the ideological role it played for the city and the residents as a whole. From the archaeological remains and the literary texts, I tried to describe the construction techniques, the lay-out, and the main equipment of the ancient Greek urban house, in an effort to shed light on the private lifestyle, the sexual division of the house labor and how the private cult rituals affected the domestic life.

In particular, the comparison between the finds coming from the residential remains in Greece and in the Black Sea, helped us understand the significance of the ancient Greek house, the common meaning and the role it played for the citizens of the two regions. Despite the local geographical peculiarities, and as far as the archaeological excavations indicate, the urban Greek house developed in the same way, all over the then Greek world, and during the same periods. This was succeeded mainly due to the close relationships, which were maintained during the whole Antiquity, between the Greek colonies in the Euxine and their metropolises, and helped the Greek ideology evolve based on common morals and ideals.

On the one hand, the political institutions -the Athenian democracy and the Hellenistic oligarchy-, influenced in a great degree the Greek way of thinking and living. These two totally different policies, affected drastically the urban architecture and in a degree resulted in a wide homogeneity between Greece and the Black Sea littoral. Moreover, it is a fact that the two regions were in close contact, which means that in many cases they were affected by the same historical events. First of all, the archons in Greece (like Pericles, Phillip II, and the Romans) tried to expand their political influence and authority to the Greek cities around the Black Sea, binding this way the two places in a common history.

Furthermore, the intense trade relations, developed already from the Archaic epoch, between the local populations and the new settlers, and later on between the Black
sea colonies and the major Greek cities in Asia Minor and Greece, turned the Black sea into a place where ideas, cultures and civilizations exchanged and interacted with each other. Perhaps, the greatest indication of such a cultural interaction were the dugout and semi dugout constructions of the late 7th and 6th centuries BC. The fact that such earthen dwellings were never used in Greece, and their unique appearance in the Black Sea, led us to the conclusion that these dwellings were used for the first time by indigenous tribes; while later adopted by the first new comers.

Undoubtedly, there are much more left to be found regarding the Greek colonies in the Black Sea, since the excavations in the region are extremely limited, and especially in its Southern part. The lack of information made the written sources and the ancient texts the most valuable source of our study. However, this raised a hot debate among the scholars, regarding how objective and accurate the literary texts are. The archaeologists argue that the material finds have much more importance than a written source, since it is not a coincidence that plenty of inaccuracies have been observed between the texts and the archaeological evidence428. In addition, the lack of publications and the fact that many of them are written in local languages, hinters dramatically the complete and spherical examination of the local history.

Consequently, the domestic life and the use of the interior rooms is difficult to access429. The fact that the majority of the architectural structures were destroyed even from the ancient times (due to invasions, raids, wars or deliberately, in order to build a new house above the old ruins), along with the intense overbuilding, prevent us from reconstruct and interpret the past completely. Hence, a lot of the artefacts we find “in situ”, are not probably in their appropriate position and it is quite possible to mislead us and our conclusions.

Taking into consideration the above difficulties, my research was based on the most distinctive examples, coming from the Black Sea basin and the written sources. When the ground plans and the preserved structures were not efficient, examples from

Greece and Asia Minor (mainly for the Archaic and Classical residences) were also used; trying to present the domestic architecture and its evolution, generated by both internal and external factors in the Greek cities of the Black Sea region.
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