

# Zooarchaeology of Ancient Greek Sanctuaries in Southwestern Sicily





# Zooarchaeology of Ancient Greek Sanctuaries in Southwestern Sicily

*Faunal Analysis from Selinus and Akragas as Evidence of Differences in the Treatment of Animals for Ritual Purposes*

Roberto Micciché



*“Lu sceccu zoppu si godi la via  
e l’omu minchiuni si godi lu munnu”*

*Nino*



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD

13-14 Market Square

Bicester

Oxfordshire OX26 6AD

United Kingdom

[www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

ISBN 978-1-80583-247-8

ISBN 978-1-80583-248-5 (e-Pdf)

© Roberto Micciché and Archaeopress 2026

Cover: Dog cranium from the Sanctuary of the Malophoros, Selinus (Sicily).

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website [www.archaeopress.com](http://www.archaeopress.com)

# Contents

<b>List of Figures</b> .....	iii
<b>List of Tables</b> .....	vii
<b>Acknowledgements</b> .....	ix
<b>A Sicilian Prelude: Introducing Ancient Greek Sacrificial Practice</b> .....	1
Animals, rituals, and society: integrating zooarchaeology into the study of ancient Greek sanctuaries .....	1
Short History of the Greeks of Sicily .....	3
Animal sacrifice in ancient Greek religion.....	9
Fire in the hole! Burned, cooked, and raw .....	10
Holocaust and moirocaust.....	14
Olympian vs. chthonic.....	17
To each his own? Gods and heroes' choices .....	18
Zooarchaeology in classical archaeology in Sicily: An unsolved (never faced) debate.....	18
<b>Methodology</b> .....	25
Sampling strategies and recording protocol.....	25
Taxonomic identification.....	26
Faunal assemblage quantification .....	28
Body parts quantification .....	31
Ageing and sexing animals .....	31
Biometry .....	34
Beyond the zoo: Interpreting the taphonomy of a faunal assemblage.....	35
<b>The Urban Sanctuary of Selinus</b> .....	38
A brief history of Selinus and its sacred topography .....	38
The investigated area.....	39
The faunal assemblage .....	41
Taxonomic abundance .....	41
Age and sex distribution.....	50
Biometry.....	53
Paleopathology.....	55
Animal processing and consumption .....	56
Sample fragmentation .....	56
Body parts distribution.....	56
Butchery patterns.....	62
Surface alteration and gnawing marks .....	65
Alterations induced by prolonged exposure to fire .....	66
<b>The Peri-Urban Sanctuary of Malophoros</b> .....	68
The Gaggera Sanctuaries.....	68
The sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros.....	70

The investigated area.....	72
The faunal assemblage .....	72
Taxonomic abundance.....	75
Age and sex distribution.....	78
Biometry.....	81
Paleopathology.....	84
Animal processing and consumption.....	84
Sample fragmentation .....	84
Body parts distribution.....	84
Butchery patterns.....	89
Surface alteration and gnawing marks .....	93
Alterations induced by prolonged exposure to fire .....	96
<b>The Peri-Urban Sanctuary of S. Anna.....</b>	<b>98</b>
A brief note on Akragas history and sacred topography between 6th and 4th c. BCE.....	98
The investigated area.....	100
The faunal assemblage .....	102
Taxonomic abundance.....	105
Age and sex distribution.....	107
Paleopathology.....	110
Animal processing and consumption .....	110
Sample fragmentation .....	111
Body parts distribution.....	111
Butchery patterns.....	114
Alterations induced by prolonged exposure to fire .....	115
<b>Discussion on Rituals and Remains .....</b>	<b>116</b>
Human/animal interactions in the ritual trajectories of the three investigated sanctuaries .....	116
Mollusks and fishes .....	118
The main domestic species .....	122
Ordinary sacrificial practices.....	125
Extraordinary sacrificial practice .....	132
Broadening the point of view. A Mediterranean perspective .....	138
Leaving Old MacDonald farm – The ritual role of other species.....	147
Dog .....	147
Small game and wild boar .....	149
Red deer.....	149
Beyond the Sacred.....	157
Ecology and economy of a sanctuary .....	157
Animal resources exploitation.....	159
Of Mice and Men. The role of microfauna in the structural interpretation of Temple R .....	163
<b>Concluding Insights .....</b>	<b>167</b>
<b>Bibliography .....</b>	<b>171</b>
<b>Link to Online Appendices.....</b>	<b>190</b>

## List of Figures

### A Sicilian Prelude: Introducing Ancient Greek Sacrificial Practice

Figure 1	The principal Sicilian <i>apoikiai</i> (circle), Carthaginians (square), and indigenous (triangle) settlements between the 8th–4th centuries.....	4
Figure 2	Most-commonly used animal body parts in <i>thysia</i> practice (modified from Barone 1976) .....	11
Figure 3	Sacrificial scene where both objects discussed are present. The naked ephebus holds a spit with an amorphous lump (1), while a curved object has been placed on the altar (2). Red-Figure stamnos by Polygnotos (© The Trustees of the British Museum, CC BY-NC-SA 4.0; 1839,0214.68) .....	13
Figure 4	(Left) Thigh bones of a sheep wrapped in the abdominal fat of the animal. (Right) The same anatomical elements of the sheep tightly wrapped in fat and held up by a hand (Courtesy of Gerhard Forstenpointner, photo by G. Weissengruber from G. Forstenpointner 2013, fig. 7 and 8, p. 238) .....	13

### The Urban Sanctuary of Selinus

Figure 1	Selinus. Urban layout and the main public sacred areas in the archaic period (modified from Mertens 2003, 2006).....	39
Figure 2	Selinus, south sector of the main urban sanctuary on the Acropolis. Schematic view of the investigated area by the IFA-NYU archaeological mission .....	40
Figure 3	Selinus acropolis, NISP percentage distribution of the main taxa identified per period.....	44
Figure 4	Selinus acropolis, calcined spur of <i>Gallus gallus</i> . Scale bar: 1 cm .....	45
Figure 5	Selinus acropolis, main domestic taxa relative distribution per period.....	49
Figure 6	Selinus acropolis, percentage distribution of faunal sample aggregated according to origin.....	50
Figure 7	Selinus acropolis, mortality profiles and survivorship curves of caprines for the three periods sanctuary frequentation .....	51
Figure 8	Selinus acropolis, mortality profiles and survivorship curves of suids for the three periods of sanctuary frequentation .....	51
Figure 9	Selinus acropolis, mortality profiles of cattle based on the degree of skeletal element fusion (from Silver 1969) .....	52
Figure 10	Selinus acropolis, caprine LSI biometrical comparisons between the three periods. The log-ratio box plot accounts for width/depth measurements. The standard used (red dotted line) is the average of measurements from a sample of unimproved Shetland ewes (Davis 1996) .....	54
Figure 11	Selinus acropolis, measurements of the astragalus (GLM and GLL) of suids belonging to Period 2 (amaranth dot) and Period 3 (golden dot); in the circle is the largest specimen.....	55
Figure 12	Selinus acropolis, depression on the left horncore of a goat. Frontal view .....	55
Figure 13	Selinus acropolis, values of ratio between the number of recovered specimens (NRSP) and the number of identified specimens (NISP) per period.....	57
Figure 14	Selinus acropolis, average weight in grams of identified specimens (square) and for domestic identified specimens (triangle) per period .....	57
Figure 15	Selinus acropolis, caprine body part distribution in the three periods (following O'Connor 2003). The central red line represents the normal distribution of the skeletal elements in an individual animal. Thus, the elements right-positioned to the red line are more present, while those to the left are less present. The pink band represents the magnitude of the standard deviation of O/E. Elements outside this range can be defined as over or under-represented.....	58
Figure 16	Selinus acropolis, perforated caprine astragalus in posterior (A) and anterior (B) view. Scale bar 3 cm .....	59
Figure 17	Selinus acropolis, suid body part distribution in the three periods (following O'Connor 2003). The central red line represents the normal distribution of the skeletal elements in an individual animal. Thus, the elements right-positioned to the red line are more present, while those to the left are less present. The pink band represents the magnitude of the standard deviation of O/E. Elements outside this range can be defined as over or under-represented.....	60
Figure 18	Selinus acropolis, cattle body part distribution in the three periods (following O'Connor 2003). The central red line represents the normal distribution of the skeletal elements in an individual animal. Thus, the elements right-positioned to the red line are more present, while those to the left are less present. The pink band represents the magnitude of the standard deviation of O/E. Elements outside this range can be defined as over or under-represented.....	61
Figure 19	Selinus acropolis, selection of butchery marks recorded. (A) Caprine epistropheus with fine cut mark (black arrow) on the ventral part probably resulting from killing by throat cutting; hack mark (red arrow) for longitudinal splitting. (B) Caprine hyoid bone with fine cut marks (black arrows) for tongue	

	removal. (C) First phalanx of cattle showing fine cut marks (black arrows) due to skinning activity. All the scale bars are equal to 1 cm .....	62
Figure 20	Selinus acropolis, percentage distribution of tool marks recorded on caprine skeletal elements throughout the three periods. The square in the upper right corner shows the ratio between the hack marks and cut marks on the bones bearing tool marks.....	63
Figure 21	Selinus acropolis, percentage distribution of tool marks recorded on suid skeletal elements throughout the three periods. The square in the upper right corner shows the ratio between the hack marks and cut marks on the bones bearing tool marks.....	64
Figure 22	Selinus acropolis, percentage distribution of tool marks recorded on cattle skeletal elements throughout the three periods. The square in the upper right corner shows the ratio between the hack marks and cut marks on the total of elements bearing tool marks.....	64
Figure 23	Selinus acropolis, dog remains with butchery marks. (A) Atlas with hack marks (red arrows). (B) Right temporal bone with fine cut mark (black arrow) .....	65
Figure 24	Selinus acropolis, tortoise ( <i>Testudo hermanni</i> ) hyoplastron with butchery mark (red arrow) .....	65
Figure 25	Selinus acropolis, percentage distribution of gnawing marks on bone per period.....	66
Figure 26	Selinus acropolis, percentage distribution between charred/calced and unburnt specimens per period.....	67

### The Peri-Urban Sanctuary of Malophoros

Figure 1	Selinus, sanctuaries of the Gaggera. Topography of the sacred areas. 1) Temple M; 2) Temenos of Zeus Meilichios; 3) Sanctuary of Demeter Malophoros; 4) Temple Triolo Nord.....	69
Figure 2	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, Schematic view of the investigated area during 2014/2015 campaigns. 1) Megaron of Demeter; 2) Great altar; 3) Precinct of Hecate; 4) Propylon; 5) Sanctuary of Zeus Meilichios .....	71
Figure 3	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, NISP percentage distribution of the main taxa identified arranged according to different areas of the sanctuary.....	75
Figure 4	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, overall distribution of the main taxa identified according to NISP and MNI.....	76
Figure 5	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, main domestic taxa relative distribution in the different areas of the sanctuary.....	77
Figure 6	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, NISP percentage distribution of the main mollusk taxa identified in the Great Altar trenches and in the rest of the sanctuary.....	77
Figure 7	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, cowry ( <i>Monetaria annulus</i> ) showing traces of working by grinding. A) Dorsal view, B) apertural view .....	78
Figure 8	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, mortality profiles and survivorship curves of caprines (the curves resulting from meat, milk, and wool production originate from Payne 1973).....	79
Figure 9	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, mortality profiles and survivorship curves of suids .....	80
Figure 10	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, (above) foetal pig ulna compared with a 30-day-old piglet ulna (below) from the reference skeletal collection.....	80
Figure 11	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, mortality profiles of cattle based on the degree of skeletal element fusion (after Silver 1969) .....	81
Figure 12	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, dog skull in superior, left lateral, and inferior view.....	82
Figure 13	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, principal component analysis (PCA) on raw cranium measurements between the Malophoros specimen (red dot in the circle) and several contemporary dog breeds (PC1 accounts for 95.4% of variance, PC2 for 3.2%). In the lower right-hand frame, an individual of a dog belonging to the Podenco Ibiceno breed .....	83
Figure 14	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, values of ratio between the number of recovered specimens (NRSP) and the number of identified specimens (NISP).....	85
Figure 15	Selinus, sanctuary of Malophoros, average weight in grams of identified specimens (square) and for domestic identified specimens (triangle) .....	85
Figure 16	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, distribution (O/E) of caprine body parts. The central red line indicates the normal distribution of the skeletal elements in a complete single individual. Thus, the elements right-positioned to the red line are more represented, while those to the left are less represented. The pink band indicates the magnitude of the standard deviation of O/E. Elements outside this range can be defined as over or under-represented.....	86
Figure 17	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, distribution (O/E) of suid body parts. The central red line represents the normal distribution of the skeletal elements in a complete single individual. Thus, the elements right-positioned to the red line are more represented, while those to the left are less represented. The pink band indicates the magnitude of the standard deviation of O/E. Elements outside this range can be defined as over or under-represented.....	88
Figure 18	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, distribution (O/E) of suid body parts that showed evidence of prolonged exposure to fire (calced remains).....	89

Figure 19	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, distribution (O/E) of cattle body parts. The central red line indicates the normal distribution of the skeletal elements in a complete single individual. Thus, the elements right-positioned to the red line are more represented, while those to the left are less represented. The pink band indicates the magnitude of the standard deviation of O/E. Elements outside this range can be defined as over or under-represented (the red dot indicates skeletal elements represented only by burnt remains) .....	90
Figure 20	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, charred cattle caudal vertebra in dorsal view .....	91
Figure 21	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, percentage distribution of tool marks recorded on caprine skeletal elements. The square in the upper right corner shows the ratio between the hack marks and cut marks .....	91
Figure 22	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, goat horncore showing unfinished cutting activity along its circumference; A) medial view, B) lateral view .....	92
Figure 23	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, caprine left coxa. The red arrows point to butchery marks involving the acetabular region.....	92
Figure 24	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, caprine atlas in ventral view with the presence of at least three cut marks (red arrows) due to the action of a thin, sharp blade.....	93
Figure 25	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, percentage distribution of tool marks recorded on suid skeletal elements. The square in the upper right corner shows the ratio between the hack marks and cut marks .....	94
Figure 26	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, percentage distribution of tool marks recorded on cattle skeletal elements. The square in the upper right corner shows the ratio between the hack marks and cut marks .....	94
Figure 27	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, fragment of cattle stylohyoid bone bearing cut marks (red arrows) on its posterior surface .....	95
Figure 28	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, detail of a pig mandible showing the scattered presence of concretions on its surface .....	95
Figure 29	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, percentage distribution of gnawing marks on bone.....	96
Figure 30	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, percentage distribution between charred/calced and unburnt specimens.....	97

### The Peri-Urban Sanctuary of S. Anna

Figure 1	Akragas, urban layout and public sacred areas in the Archaic-Classical periods (modified from Schmiedt and Griffo 1958).....	99
Figure 2	Akragas, topographical relationships between the sanctuary of S. Anna, the sanctuary of the Chthonic divinities, and Gate V (modified from De Miro 2000 and Sojc 2017) .....	101
Figure 3	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, plan of the new excavation campaigns between 2014 and 2019 (modified from Sojc 2020).....	102
Figure 4	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, common pandora ( <i>Pagellus erythrinus</i> ) otolith (mesial surface). Scale bar = 1 mm (Photo by Barbara Zach) .....	104
Figure 5	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, red deer astragalus showing evidence of workmanship by abrasion. (A) anterior view, (B) posterior view, (C) lateral view. Scale bar = 5 cm .....	104
Figure 6	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, NISP and MNI percentage distributions of the main taxa identified in the faunal assemblage .....	105
Figure 7	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, NISP percentage distributions of mollusks.....	106
Figure 8	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, mortality profiles (above) and survivorship curves (below) of caprines. The curves for meat, milk, and wool production originate from Payne 1973 .....	108
Figure 9	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, mortality profiles (above) and survivorship curves (below) of suids.....	109
Figure 10	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, (A) pig metacarpal with proliferative exostosis (white arrows), (B) pig tibia with periostitis and fistula (black arrow). Scale bar = 5 cm .....	110
Figure 11	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, (A) caprines body part distribution based on %MAU and relative skeletal frequencies O/E (A'). The central red line represents the normal distribution of the skeletal elements in an individual animal. Thus, the elements right-positioned to the red line are more present, while those to the left are less present. The pink band represents the magnitude of the standard deviation. Elements outside this range can be defined as over or under-represented. (B) Calcined femur lateral condyle .....	111
Figure 12	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, unburnt vs. burnt remains of piglets (A) and pigs (B). Body part distribution based on relative skeletal frequencies O/E. The central red line represents the normal distribution of the skeletal elements in a single animal. Thus, the elements right-positioned to the red line are more present, while those to the left are less present. The pink band represents the magnitude of the standard deviation. Elements outside this range can be defined as over or under-represented .....	113
Figure 13	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, (A) percentage distribution of tool marks recorded on suid skeletal elements. (A') Ratio between hack marks and cut marks. (B) Pig humerus bearing several hack marks (black arrows).....	114
Figure 14	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, percentage distribution between charred/calced and unburnt specimens.....	115

## Discussion on Rituals and Remains

Figure 1	Map of the east-central Mediterranean region showing the sacred areas discussed in the chapter (for the site names, see Table 1) .....	119
Figure 2	NISP percentage distributions of the main taxa identified in the three faunal assemblages (micromammals and invertebrates are excluded) .....	119
Figure 3	NISP percentage distributions of the main mollusk taxa identified in the three faunal assemblages .....	120
Figure 4	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, Ritual deposition of various objects within a context (US 103) bounded by roof tiles. The white arrow points to a <i>Glycimeris</i> sp. valve (Photo by Alina Bell) .....	121
Figure 5	Caprine mortality profiles for the three investigated sanctuaries .....	123
Figure 6	Suid mortality profiles for the three investigated sanctuaries .....	124
Figure 7	Body part distribution of caprine remains recovered in the layers correlated to the Temple B altar activity. The left silhouette reflects unburned remains, while the right silhouette shows the distribution of calcined and charred remains, mainly composed of patellae (A), femur fragments (B), and caudal vertebrae (C) .....	126
Figure 8	Overall caprine body part distribution (%MAU) for the three sanctuaries investigated. Bordered in red are those skeletal districts within which charred and calcined remains were also associated .....	127
Figure 9	Overall suid body part distribution (%MAU) for the three sanctuaries investigated. Bordered in red are those skeletal districts within which charred and calcined remains were also associated .....	128
Figure 10	Overall cattle body part distribution (%MAU) for the three sanctuaries investigated. Bordered in red are those skeletal districts within which charred and calcined remains were also associated .....	130
Figure 11	Degree of fragmentation of the remains in the three investigated sanctuaries. (A) Average weight in grams of identified specimens (square) and for domestic identified specimens (triangle). (B) Values of ratio between the number of recovered specimens (NRSP) and number of identified specimens (NISP) .....	131
Figure 12	Frequency and anatomical distribution of butchery marks recorded on the remains of main domestic species .....	133
Figure 13	Selinus acropolis, location of depositions with horncore remains in the layers associated with the construction of Temple R .....	135
Figure 14	Selinus acropolis, sexing cattle horncores on a biometric basis. The remains associated with the early construction phases of Temple R fall within the variability expressed by males according to the distribution of Sykes and Symmons 2007 .....	137
Figure 15	Map of the Sicilian sacred areas discussed in the chapter (for the site names, see Table 1) .....	140
Figure 16	Chronological timeline and distribution according to conventional Greek periodization of the sites discussed in the chapter .....	141
Figure 17	Ternary graphs on the relative frequency of caprines (sheep/goats), suids (pigs), and bovines (cattle) concerning the sacred sites under comparative analysis. Includes only those faunal assemblages where the NISP of the three taxa was equal or greater than 100 .....	143
Figure 18	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, (A) fragments of mandible and (B) scapula of a puppy dog .....	147
Figure 19	Graphic elaboration of the decoration of an attic red-figure lekythos exposed in the National Archaeological Museum of Athens. Drawing by Fillippo Pisciotta .....	148
Figure 20	Selinus acropolis, in red the location of the red deer antler deposition .....	150
Figure 21	Main morphological features of the deer antler. Burr (1), brow tine (2), trez tine (3), beam (4), and crown (5). Drawing by Filippo Pisciotta .....	151
Figure 22	The deer antler after the restoration (a). Detail of the trez tine (b) and 3D reconstruction of the drilled trez tine tip (c). The scale bars = 20 cm .....	152
Figure 23	Reconstructive proposals regarding the exposure of the deer antler, both vertically (a) and horizontally (b) .....	153
Figure 24	Selinus acropolis, Period 3, red deer body part distribution (A) and ratios (B) .....	155
Figure 25	Ternary plot of main domestic distributions in Sicilian samples. The density map shows the average elevations (above sea level) of the territories including the sites. The site names are the same as those in the numeration proposed in Table 8.2 .....	158
Figure 26	Caprine survival curve comparison for Selinus and Akragas, according to the system proposed by Payne 1973 .....	160
Figure 27	Ternary plot of Sicilian and south Italian faunal assemblages according to their productive origins. The site names are the same as those in the numeration proposed in Table 2 .....	162
Figure 28	Selinus acropolis, distribution of microfauna remains recovered in the stratigraphy of the trench O .....	165
Figure 29	Selinus acropolis, remains attributed to tawny owl ( <i>Strix aluco</i> ) recovered inside Temple R .....	166

# List of Tables

## A Sicilian Prelude: Introducing Ancient Greek Sacrificial Practice

Table 1	Synoptic table concerning the associations between the main deities of the Greek pantheon and the sacrificial animals that were generally offered, according to ancient sources. Highlighted in light grey are the sacrificial choices that some sources report as preferred, in dark grey those that are prohibited.....	19
---------	---	----

## Methodology

Table 1	List of skeletal elements considered in the body-parts distribution analysis for the four principal domestic animals.....	30
Table 2	Pig age classes according to the three classificatory systems proposed by Lemoine <i>et al.</i> 2014 .....	32
Table 3	Age in months at the epiphyseal fusion of postcranial bones for pig, cattle, goat, and sheep (after Silver 1969).....	33

## The Urban Sanctuary of Selinus

Table 1	Selinus acropolis, list of all mammal taxa recorded.....	43
Table 2	Selinus acropolis, list of birds, reptiles, and amphibian taxa recorded .....	46
Table 3	Selinus acropolis, list of all fish taxa recorded.....	47
Table 4	Selinus acropolis, list of all mollusks and other taxa recorded .....	48

## The Peri-Urban Sanctuary of Malophoros

Table 1	Selinus sanctuary of Malophoros, list of all taxa recorded .....	73
---------	--	----

## The Peri-Urban Sanctuary of S. Anna

Table 1	Akragas, sanctuary of S. Anna, list of all taxa recorded.....	103
---------	---	-----

## Discussion on Rituals and Remains

Table 1	List of faunal assemblages discussed in this chapter .....	117
Table 2	List of faunal assemblages used in the comparative analysis of the relative distribution of the three main groups of sacrificed animals (caprines, suids, and cattle) occurring in each sacred area .....	139
Table 3	Selinus acropolis and sanctuary of Malophoros, cattle age-at-death distribution .....	162



## Acknowledgements

This book stems from my doctoral research conducted at the University of Augsburg. Like any research, in its most intimate and authentic form, it expresses the sum of countless experiences that extend well beyond the years required to produce the final publication of the results. It involves many people with whom I have interacted and to whom I am immensely grateful.

First, I want to thank Natascha Sojc; none of this would have been possible without her. I thank her for involving me in her extraordinary research in Agrigento and for the constant support she provided during these years. Also, immense gratitude goes to Professor Gregor Weber for his valuable advice regarding the history of ancient Sicily and for the patience and kindness he showed me. Special thanks go to Clemente Marconi, who first trusted me several years ago. Immeasurable gratitude also goes to Luca Sineo and Giuseppe Carotenuto, who profoundly influenced my scientific growth and whom I can describe as true mentors who continue to honor me today with their friendship.

Thanks are also extended to the staff of the archaeological parks of Selinunte and Agrigento for granting me access to the faunal assemblages. Special thanks go to Caterina Greco and Enrico Caruso, former directors at Selinunte, for their continual support of my research. Likewise, heartfelt gratitude is directed to Valentina Caminneci, Maria Concetta Parello, and Maria Serena Rizzo, archaeologists of Agrigento archaeological park, whose professional support and enriching dialogue have been invaluable.

Much of the questions addressed in this research, certainly the most interesting ones, are the result of continuous dialogue and interaction with the many colleagues and friends who have been involved with me in the several outstanding archaeological adventures that this monograph in part recounts. It is not possible to name them all; there are hundreds!

I would also like to thank David Reese, who, after having been an unreachable scientific reference, one fine day manifested himself in a more tangible way by donating to me numerous (some yet-unpublished) materials concerning his fundamental studies on the zooarchaeology of the Greek world.

Last but not least, I would like to thank those who, although not directly involved in this research, played an indispensable role, as they were more deeply involved in my life. A special mention goes to my family, who have always supported me throughout these years and my life in general. Thank you, Mom, for enduring my childhood eccentricities. Thank you, Laura, dearest sister, for tolerating your brother's intemperance for years due to his restless personality. I would also like to remember the two people whose examples contributed most to making me what I am today. Although they are not physically among us today, for me they continue to be a constant presence and an unattainable model to strive for. Thank you Dad Ciccio, and thank you Grandpa Giovanni. Wherever you are, I know for sure that you are smiling now!

However, the most substantial thanks go to my wife, Palma, for continuously supporting me and contributing decisively to my professional growth, and, most of all, for honoring me by being by my side in the continuous and sometimes tormented journey of life—a journey that, without her, I could not even imagine, let alone walk!