



Fortified Military Camps in Attica

Author(s): James R. McCredie

Source: *Hesperia Supplements*, 1966, Vol. 11, Fortified Military Camps in Attica (1966), pp. i-x+1-125+127-147

Published by: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1353931>

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

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



The American School of Classical Studies at Athens is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Hesperia Supplements*

JSTOR

HESPERIA: SUPPLEMENT XI

FORTIFIED MILITARY CAMPS
IN ATTICA



BY

JAMES R. MCCREDIE

AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS
PRINCETON, NEW JERSEY

1966

**PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BY J. H. FURST COMPANY, BALTIMORE, MARYLAND**

PREFACE

This study of military camps in Attica was presented in slightly different form as a doctoral thesis to the Department of Classics of Harvard University and was accepted for the degree in Classical Archaeology in February 1963. It grew directly from the writer's concern with the excavation and publication of Koroni. Before the Koroni excavation few camps, including Koroni itself, had been recognized as camps, and positive, detailed information about such sites was entirely lacking. Once the evidence from Koroni was available, however, the similarity of this site to a number of other Attic sites became apparent, and the desirability of studying them as a group became evident.

The preliminary task of collecting evidence was a long one; for few of the sites had been published, and fewer still properly published. Since the sites are of little artistic interest, they have not enjoyed the generally watchful care of the Greek Antiquities Service, so that some sites have already suffered severe damage from quarrying, new building, and vandalism, while others are in imminent danger. The writer has tried, through descriptions, plans, and photographs, to record pertinent features of every site, but the result, unaided as it was by the essential work of excavation, is far from final. With no immediate prospect of excavation, however, it was thought useful to present what facts could now be collected. The reader should, then, bear in mind that many, perhaps most, of the conclusions here presented must be tentative, and their confirmation or modification will depend on further evidence.

The major part of the work for this study was carried out while the writer was a member of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens as the Charles Eliot Norton Fellow of Harvard University. To the director of the former institution and to the Department of Classics of the latter he owes a debt of gratitude. The courteous cooperation of the Greek Antiquities Service made field work possible.

The names of all those who helped the writer and gave him the benefit of their special talents are too numerous to list, but the following, who deserve special thanks, must be mentioned:

Ronald Stroud, then Secretary of the American School of Classical Studies; Homer A. Thompson, director, and Lucy Talcott, Virginia Grace, and Spyro Spyropoulos of the Athenian Agora Excavations; Eirene Varoucha-Christodouloupoulou, then Director of the Numismatic Museum in Athens; Ero Athanassiadou, who drew the profiles of sherds.

Margaret Thompson, Colin N. Edmonson, G. Roger Edwards, C. W. J. Eliot, Wallace E. McLeod, George C. Miles, Fordyce W. Mitchel, and finally Arthur Steinberg, with whom the writer first became interested in fortifications. Some of these

scholars disagree radically with the conclusions presented in this paper, but all have given generously of their time and energy.

George M. A. Hanfmann and Sterling Dow of Harvard University offered encouragement and constructive criticism at every stage of the work; the former also performed the burdensome task of reading the first draft of this study.

The largest share of credit for whatever value this study has must go to Eugene Vanderpool, who suggested the topic to the writer and gave him the benefit of his unequalled knowledge of Attic topography and things Greek in almost daily expeditions or conversations. Needless to say the shortcomings of the result are the fault of the writer.

The writer is grateful to the members of the Publications Committee of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens for undertaking the publication of this paper, and especially to Lucy T. Shoe and Benjamin D. Meritt for their help and constructive suggestions.

Finally, without the constant help, encouragement, and devotion of the writer's wife, Marian Miles McCredie, the study could never have been completed.

JAMES R. McCREDIE

INSTITUTE OF FINE ARTS, NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
MAY 10, 1964

CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE	iii
ABBREVIATIONS AND SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY	vii
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS	ix
CHAPTER	
I. KORONI: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF FORTIFIED CAMPS.....	1
II. A PROVISIONAL CORPUS OF FORTIFIED MILITARY CAMPS IN ATTICA...	17
COASTAL SITES (WEST COAST)	
PATROKLOU CHARAX	18
ATENE FORT	25
VARI-ANAGYROUS	28
VOULIAGMENI	30
BOUDORON	32
COASTAL SITES (EAST COAST)	
THORIKOS	33
MT. AGRIELIKI	35
MANDRA TIS GRAIAS	35
TAMBURI GURA	37
TRIKORYNTHOS	37
KYNOSOURA	41
THE PLAIN OF ATHENS AND ITS BORDERS	
HELIOUPOLIS	46
MT. HYMETTOS CAMP	48
KAISARIANI	50
GUR-I-KORAKUT	52
KASTRAKI	52
DEKELEIA AND KATSIMIDI	56
"LEIPSYDRION"	58
YEROVOUNO	61

THE THRIASIAN PLAIN AND THE AIGALEOS-PARNES GAP	
THE DEMA	63
THRIASIAN "LAGER"	66
KAMATERO WALL	71
PLAKOTO	72
PALAIOKASTRO	74
ISOLATED SITES	
BESA	75
MT. MERENDA	77
ETOSI	79
APHIDNA	81
KORYNOS	83
"ERENEIA"	85
III. CHARACTERISTICS OF ATTIC FORTIFICATIONS	88
IV. MILITARY CAMPS AND ATHENIAN HISTORY	101
CONCLUSION	116
APPENDIX: SOME ATTIC TOWERS	117
INDEX	121

ABBREVIATIONS AND SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arvanitopoulou, Th. A., *Δεκέλεια. Πολέμων, παράρτημα*, Athens, 1958.
- Beloch, K. J., *Griechische Geschichte*²: IV, 1, Berlin and Leipzig, 1925. IV, 2, Berlin and Leipzig, 1927.
- Chandler, L., "The North-west Frontier of Attica," *J.H.S.*, XLVI, 1926, pp. 1-21.
- "Dema" = Jones, J. E., Sackett, L. H., and Eliot, C. W. J., "Τὸ Δέμα: A Survey of the Aigaleos-Parnes Wall," *B.S.A.*, LII, 1957, pp. 152-189.
- Dodwell, Edward, *A Classical and Topographical Tour through Greece*, London, 1819.
- Droysen, H., *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen*, Hermann, K. F. (ed.), *Lehrbuch der Griechischen Antiquitäten*, II, 2, Freiburg, 1889.
- Eliot = Eliot, C. W. J., *Coastal Demes of Attika, A Study of the Policy of Kleisthenes*, Phoenix, Supplement V, Toronto, 1962.
- Edwards, G. R., "Koroni: The Hellenistic Pottery," *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 109-111.
- Ferguson, William S., *Hellenistic Athens*, London, 1911.
- Frazer, *Pausanias*, II = Frazer, J. G., *Pausanias's Description of Greece*, II, London, 1913.
- Grace, V. R., "Notes on the Amphoras from the Koroni Peninsula," *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 319-334.
- Kahrstedt, Ulrich, "Die Landgrenzen Athens," *Ath. Mitt.*, LVII, 1932, pp. 8-28.
- Karten von Attika* = Curtius, E. and Kaupert, J. A., *Karten von Attika*, Berlin, 1881-1891.
- Kirsten, E., "Der gegenwärtige Stand der attischen Demeuforschung," *Atti del terzo congresso internazionale di epigrafia greca e latina* (Roma, 4-8 Settembre 1957), Rome, 1959, pp. 155-171.
- "Koroni" = Vanderpool, Eugene, McCredie, James R., and Steinberg, Arthur, "Koroni: A Ptolemaic Camp on the East Coast of Attica," *Hesperia*, XXXI, 1962, pp. 26-61.
- Lapp, Paul W., *Palestinian Ceramic Chronology, 200 B.C.-A.D. 70*, New Haven, 1961.
- Launey, M., "Études d'histoire hellénistique, II, L'exécution de Sotadès et l'expédition de Patroklos dans la mer Égée (266 av. J.-C.)," *Rev. Et. Anc.*, XLVII, 1945, pp. 33-45.
- Leake, W. M., *The Topography of Athens and The Demi*², London, 1841, I, *The Topography of Athens*, II, *The Demi of Attica*.
- Lolling, H. G., "Prasiä," *Ath. Mitt.*, IV, 1879, pp. 351-355.
- Lolling, H. G., "Zur Topographie von Marathon," *Ath. Mitt.*, I, 1876, pp. 67-94.
- McLeod, W. E., "Boudoron, An Athenian Fort on Salamis," *Hesperia*, XXIX, 1960, pp. 316-323.
- Meritt, B. D., *The Athenian Year*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961.
- A. Milchhöfer, Text = Milchhöfer, A., *Erläuternder Text* to Curtius, E. and Kaupert, J. A., *Karten von Attika*, Berlin, 1881-1891.
- Mussche, H. F., "La forteresse maritime de Thorikos," *B.C.H.*, LXXXV, 1961, pp. 176-205.
- Philippson, Alfred, *Die griechischen Landschaften*, I, *Der Nordosten der griechischen Halbinsel, 3, Attika und Megaris* (with appendix and notes by Ernst Kirsten), Frankfurt, 1952.
- Pouilloux = Pouilloux, Jean, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*, Paris, 1954.
- Sarres, I., "Ἐρένεια," *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1910, pp. 151-158.
- Sarres, I., *Τὸ Κάστρον τοῦ Κορυνοῦ*, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1927-1928, pp. 112-119.
- Scranton, R. L., *Greek Walls*, Cambridge, Mass., 1941.
- Soteriades, G., *Ἀνασκαφαὶ καὶ ἔρευναι ἐν Μαραθῶνι*, *Πρακτικά*, 1935, pp. 84-158.

- Svoronos, *Ptolemies* = Svoronos, I. N., *Tà Νομίματα τοῦ κράτους τῶν Πτολεμαίων*, Athens, 1904-1908.
- Svoronos, *Trésor* = Svoronos, J. N., *Trésor de la numismatique grecque ancienne, Les monnaies d'Athènes*, Munich, 1923-1926.
- Tarn, W. W., *Antigonos Gonatas*, Oxford, 1913.
- Tarn, W. W., "The New Dating of the Chremonidean War," *J.H.S.*, LIV, 1934, pp. 26-39.
- Thompson = Thompson, H. A., "Two Centuries of Hellenistic Pottery," *Hesperia*, III, 1934, pp. 311-480.
- Vanderpool, Eugene, McCredie, James R., and Steinberg, Arthur, "Koroni: The Date of the Camp and the Pottery," *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 69-75.
- Varoucha = Varoucha-Christodouloupoulou, Eirene, *Συμβολή εἰς τὸν Χρεμωνίδειον Πόλεμον, 266/5-263/2 π. Χ.*, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1953-1954 (*Ἐἰς μνήμην Γ. Π. Οἰκονόμου*), III, Athens, 1961, pp. 321-349.
- Wrede = Wrede, W., *Attische Mauern*, Athens, 1933.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

FIGURES

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1 Plan of Koroni | 10 Plan of Kastraki |
| 2 Plan of Patroklos Island | 11 Plan of "Leipsydriion" |
| 3 Plan of Patroklos Island Buildings | 12 Plan of "Lager" |
| 4 Plan of Patroklou Charax | 13 Plan of Plakoto |
| 5 Plan of Atene Fort | 14 Plan of Besa |
| 6 Plan of Vari-Anagyrous | 15 Plan of Mount Merenda |
| 7 Plan of Trikorinthos | 16 Plan of Etosi |
| 8 Plan of Kynosoura | 17 Plan of Korynos |
| 9 Plan of Hymettos Camp | 18 Plan of St. Demetrios Tower |

PLATES

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1 Map of Attica Showing Location of Sites | 10 a Tambouri Gura |
| 2 Plan of Kaisariani | b Trikorinthos: Acropolis Wall |
| 3 Profiles of Sherds | c Kynosoura from Trikorinthos |
| 4 Profiles of Sherds | d Kynosoura: Wall A |
| 5 Koroni | 11 a Hymettos Camp |
| a View looking Southeast | b Hymettos Camp: East Wall |
| b North Acropolis Wall, looking East | c Kaisariani: Wall (On Kaisariani Berg) |
| c North Acropolis Wall, Outer Face | d Kaisariani: Wall (On Kaisariani Berg) |
| d Gate E and Storerooms | e Kaisariani Berg from East |
| 6 Koroni | 12 a Kastraki: Looking North |
| a Building G | b Kastraki: Wall |
| b Bronze Coin of Ptolemy II (No. 72) | c Katsimidi |
| c Kantharoi | d "Leipsydriion" |
| d Fish plates | 13 a Thriasian "Lager" |
| 7 Patroklos Island | b Thriasian "Lager" |
| a From Shore | c Plakoto: Outer Circuit |
| b North Long Wall | d Thriasian "Lager" |
| c Cistern | e Plakoto: Inner Circuit |
| d Outer Wall of Building | 14 a Plakoto: Tower |
| e Inner Wall of Building | b Palaiokastro: from Outside |
| 8 a Mainland from Patroklos Island | c Palaiokastro: Inner Face |
| b Koundoura Valley from "Erenea," looking North and East | d Palaiokastro: Gate and Stairs |
| 9 Vari-Anagyrous | 15 a Besa |
| a Wall, Outer Face | b Besa |
| b Gateway | c Mandra tis Graias |
| c Altar (?) | d Aphidna |
| d Building Wall | e Aphidna: Wall |
| e Agrielikiki | 16 a Mount Merenda |
| | b Mount Merenda |

- c Mount Merenda
- d Mount Merenda: Gate
- e Korynos
- 17 a Korynos
- b "Erenea" Fort: South Wall
- c "Erenea" Fort: North Wall
- d "Erenea" Fort: South Wall
- 18 a "Erenea" Fort: Retaining Wall
- b "Erenea" Fort: Field Wall
- c Aigaleos Tower
- d Hymettos Tower
- 19 a St. Demetrios Tower
- b Wall in Cleft Way
- c Wall in Cleft Way
- 20 Patroklos Island
- a Lamps
- b Sherds
- c Kantharos Bases
- d Lekane
- e Amphora Toe
- f Kynosoura: Sherds
- g "Leipsydriion": Kantharos
- 21 Kastraki
- a Kantharos
- b Kantharos Base
- c Standed Basin
- d Broad-based Bowl
- e Small Bowl
- f Spouted Mortar
- g Hymettos Tower: Mug
- h Hymettos Tower: Kernos
- i Hymettos Tower: Cup

CHAPTER I

KORONI: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF FORTIFIED CAMPS

HISTORY OF EXPLORATION

Ancient remains have long been known on the Koroni peninsula, a bold headland which closes the south side of Porto Raphti bay, and brief descriptions of these remains had been published.¹ It had generally been assumed that the fortification walls and other remains on Koroni had some connection with the deme of Prasiai, and some topographers were of the opinion that Koroni was itself the deme-center.²

During a visit to the site by members of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens in December 1958, it became clear that the remains on Koroni, though in poor condition and badly obscured by thick brush, were far more extensive than indicated in earlier descriptions or by the basic archaeological and topographical map of the area, *Karten von Attika*, Blatt XI.³ In order, therefore, to obtain a clearer picture of the actual extent and character of the site, Arthur Steinberg and the present writer undertook a survey of the visible remains in the early months of 1959. We produced, with the help of Martin R. Jones, a sketch plan of the promontory at a scale of 1:1500 indicating the then visible antique remains⁴ as well as a preliminary report on the results of our survey.⁵

In this preliminary report, following the fallacious reasoning that the deme-center of an area must be connected with the most conspicuous remains in that area, we concluded that the deme-center of Prasiai probably lay on the Koroni peninsula.

¹ H. G. Lolling, "Prasiä," *Ath. Mitt.*, IV, 1879, pp. 351-365, esp. pp. 362-365, gives the best description of the remains previous to the recent excavations. See also Frazer, *Pausanias*, II, pp. 403-405, which contains an abstract of Lolling's description as well as references to the early travellers and other literature. The most recent account (1954) is by Ernst Meyer in *R.E.*, s.v. *Prasiai* 2.

² Philippson and Kirsten, *Die griechischen Landschaften*, I, 3, p. 820 and note 2, and p. 1066, no. 63. See also E. Kirsten, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der attischen Demenforschung," p. 168.

³ This map is inaccurate not only in the contours of Koroni, which are wholly misleading, but also in the omission of the small island Raptopoula and another small island on the seaward side of the promontory.

⁴ The observations for the map were made primarily with thirty-meter tape and surveyor's compass, though a transit was used to locate base points in the main area of buildings and to check the orientation of the main walls. The plan thus obtained was superimposed upon an enlargement of the British Admiralty chart of the harbor, which appears to be the most accurate available map. The contours are done by eye with the aid of a few critical measurements and are spaced at approximately 25 foot intervals.

⁵ This unpublished paper, Martin R. Jones, James R. McCredie, Arthur Steinberg, "Prasiai: A Survey of the Koroni Peninsula," is among the *American School of Classical Studies at Athens, School Papers*, 1959, available only in the library of the American School along with a print of the original map at a scale of 1:1500.

Since the site was at once so accessible and so neglected, it seemed desirable to carry out trial excavations in the hope of learning more about the organization and plan of a deme-center and perhaps clarifying some topographical questions.⁶

Accordingly, under the auspices of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens and with the generous permission of the Archaeological Service of the Greek government, we undertook trial excavations on Koroni in July 1960.⁷ The results of these excavations were given preliminary publication in 1960 and 1961,⁸ and the final report was published in 1962.⁹ The results of these excavations not only conclusively showed that Koroni was *not* the site of the deme-center of Prasiai,¹⁰ but provided solid evidence for a little-studied and almost unknown kind of site—a foreign military camp in Attica, and one whose construction could be dated to within a few years.

THE SITE ¹¹ (Fig. 1)

Porto Raphti is reputedly one of the best harbors of Greece.¹² It lies at the end of the “Steirian Way” (Plato, *Hipparchus*, 229a), one of two relatively level routes from the Mesogeia to the east coast of Attica, some 36 kilometers from Athens. The bay, almost two kilometers wide at its mouth and three kilometers long (east-west), provides sufficient anchorage for a large number of vessels.

Koroni (Pl. 5, a), the headland closing the south side of the bay, preserves almost unchanged the ancient name of Koroneia, which Stephanus Byzantius tells

⁶ Prasiai had sanctuaries of Apollo (Pausanias, I, 31, 2), Athena Pronoia (Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, I, 299) and the Herakleidai (*I.G.*, II², 4977) as well as the tomb of the hero Erysichthon (Pausanias, I, 31, 2); none of these has yet been located.

⁷ The excavations were under the direction of Eugene Vanderpool with the assistance of the writer and Arthur Steinberg. Marian Miles McCredie served as recorder, and Constantine Davaras, Epimelete of Antiquities, represented the Greek Archaeological Service. Three anonymous donors generously supplied the necessary funds. Various members and friends of the American School, too numerous to mention, generously donated their services as consultants.

⁸ *A.J.A.*, LXV, 1961, p. 191; *Archaeological Reports, 1960-61*, London, 1961, pp. 6-7; *B.C.H.*, LXXXV, 1961, pp. 635-638; *Klio*, XXXIX, 1961, pp. 271-275.

⁹ Eugene Vanderpool, James R. McCredie, Arthur Steinberg, “Koroni: A Ptolemaic Camp on the East Coast of Attica,” *Hesperia*, XXXI, 1962, pp. 26-61.

¹⁰ Aside from other considerations, a deme site should show a long period of occupancy, while the excavations show that the remains on the peninsula were all of one period. The deme-center is to be sought elsewhere, perhaps in the Prasad plain or in the neighboring foothills, but no certain traces of it have been recognized.

¹¹ The following description of Koroni, the excavations, and the finds depends heavily on the published report (note 9, *supra*). It is not, however, identical with that report, and where additional information is here given it is based on excavation notes and personal observation.

¹² Frazer, *Pausanias*, II, p. 404. It was much used in the middle ages and later as an approach to Athens, and, for this reason, there are many antiquarian accounts of the bay; see C. C. Vermeule, “The Colossus of Porto Raphti in Attica,” *Hesperia*, XXXI, 1962, pp. 62-81. The bay is less admired by more recent authorities on Aegean navigation because of its unsuitable bottom and its relative openness.




FIG. 1. Plan of Koroni

us (*σ. ν. Κορώνεια*) was a peninsula in Attica. It was in the territory of the deme of Prasiai, which is known to have been located on the bay of Porto Raphti,¹⁸ and the name Prasad, clearly the deme-name only slightly altered, is still applied to the well-watered, fertile plain on the south side of the bay.

The peninsula is connected with the mainland by a low, sandy isthmus, and extends about a kilometer towards the north; its east to west width is also about a kilometer. Towards the center it rises to a height of about 120 m., and from this height it falls off in steep uninhabitable slopes to the northwest, the north, and the east. To the southwest is a valley separated from the mainland and the isthmus by a broad east-west ridge which is joined to the heights by a broad saddle on the east.

That part of the peninsula which is occupied by ancient remains falls naturally into four major areas: the Acropolis, or highest part of the peninsula; a broad Saddle to the southeast of the acropolis; a Ridge, running westward from the south end of the saddle; and a Valley bounded by these three rises.

Natural accesses to the peninsula are: (1) from the mainland, across the sandy isthmus, and either over the relatively easy ridge or around its western end, and (2) by sea, to the broad open beach at the western end of the valley. There is no other access from the mainland, and the other shores of the peninsula are too abrupt and rocky to permit landing. That these were the routes envisioned by the occupants is shown by the plan of fortification.

THE WALLS (Pl. 5, b-c)

Koroni was equipped by its occupants with two lines of defense, both of which make use of thick walls.

The highest part of the peninsula is a relatively level, oval area which forms a sort of natural acropolis. It is surrounded by a wall which averages 1.50 m. in thickness and is roughly built of unworked stones laid without mortar or other binder. At several places, particularly along the north side, it stands to a height of over two meters, and since here there is little fallen stone, nor anywhere a trace of mud-brick superstructure, the original height of the wall was probably little greater.

There are six gates in the circuit, all simple openings through the wall (Fig. 1, A, E, and the unexcavated examples marked P). The three in the north side of the circuit are about one meter wide and evidently served as posterns, while the three in the south are wider and probably were principal entrances, lying, as they do, at the end of natural routes from the lower part of the peninsula to the acropolis.

Two gates were excavated. Gate A is 1.50 m. wide and 2.40 m. deep, since the

¹⁸ Principally on the evidence of Strabo, IX, 1, 22. Cf. Thucydides, VIII, 95, 1; *I.G.*, II², 2497; "Koroni," no. 138.

wall at this point was thickened on its inner face by antae. The jambs are built more carefully than the rest of the wall, with larger, well-fitted blocks at the corners. The front 0.70 m. of the bedrock floor of the gate is levelled; behind this the hardpan rises gently, forming a natural ramp into the acropolis. Above the hardpan was a black layer about 0.05 m. deep which contained many fragments of iron nails and straps, probably the decomposed remains of the wooden door; there were, however, no traces of a socket for the doorpost, and this may have been let into a wooden frame. Above the blackened layer were broken roof tiles. Gate E was similar to Gate A but less elaborate and both narrower (1.00 to 1.10 m. wide) and shallower (1.80 m. deep) since there were no antae. Again a layer of tiles appeared in the fill. It is not clear whether these indicate that the gate was roofed in some manner or whether they belonged to the series of rooms which run along the inner face of the acropolis wall next to each gate.

The acropolis circuit has a single apsidal tower, D (L. 6.80 m.; W. 6.65 m.) which commands a view over most of the southern half of Koroni and over the sea-lanes to Keos. It has a small room (2.50 m. in either direction) within its northeast corner, on the earth floor of which were found tile and nail fragments showing that it, unlike the rest of the tower, was roofed. The tower wall has a uniform thickness of about one meter and is built of rubble consisting of two faces with a fill of smaller stones; it does not bond with the acropolis circuit. Judging from its location the tower must have served as a watch-post rather than a tactical purpose.

The acropolis wall, then, served as an inner line of defense and enclosed an area large enough for a considerable force. A second, outer line of defense was formed by long walls on either side of the valley.

The southern wall, which defended the peninsula on its landward side, runs along the entire length of the ridge to the south of the valley (Long Wall on Fig. 1). From the bay at the west it climbs the slope, passes around a small peak, and follows the ridge to the south end of the saddle, ending where the saddle drops steeply to the sea. The wall is about 950 m. long and 2.25 m. thick; although it is continuous, divisions can be seen where separate sections, perhaps built by different gangs of workmen, meet in a clear face.

There are nine towers along the lower, western end of the wall, where it was most vulnerable to attack. These towers are apsidal or square in plan, except for Tower 8, a round tower placed where the line turns below the small peak. They are of rubble construction, but they exhibit the best workmanship on the site. Most of the towers abut the main wall and have no trace of an entrance through the wall into the tower, but Tower 7 bonds with the wall and has a doorway into it. A doorway also leads into Tower 8, the round tower, and from it a postern or sally port opens to the west. This postern is the only passage through the wall. A careful examination of all possible places along the wall revealed no gates. We examined with particular

care the low point of the ridge between Towers 4 and 5 and the point between Tower 9 and the shore where a cart-road now passes on its way around to the valley.

A wall, which protected the northern side of the valley as the Long Wall protected the south, ran from the western end of the acropolis to the sea. This is now only poorly preserved, and the lower stretches are no longer visible on the surface. There is no evident trace of either tower or entrance in this wall, which, moreover, was much less necessary than the southern wall for the protection of the peninsula, since access from the north is naturally difficult if not impossible.

THE BUILDINGS

There are extensive remains of rubble house walls over the entire area enclosed by the defenses of Koroni. On the acropolis there are both numerous rooms built along the inner face of the wall and several free-standing buildings. The saddle is covered with buildings ranging from small one- or two-room structures to complexes of more than twenty rooms. Although the floor of the valley, which is now under cultivation, preserves no ancient walls on its surface, the outline of a large building is visible at its southeast side, and the slopes to the north, south, and east have many remains of rubble walls like those on the acropolis and saddle.

ACROPOLIS

The buildings on the acropolis fall into two categories: those built along the inner face of the fortification wall, and those that are free-standing. One series of rooms along the wall immediately west of Gate E was cleared, and two rooms nearest the gate were fully excavated (Pl. 5, d).¹⁴ The planning is irregular with little thought to straight lines or right angles, and the rubble walls are not all of the same thickness, though they must all have been built at the same time.¹⁵ Since the walls are preserved as high as 1.30 m. and there is a considerable amount of fallen stone in the area, it may be assumed that they were entirely of rubble with no mud-brick superstructure. Room 1, which opened onto the gateway, was probably a guard-room; the others were storerooms, a fact supported by the discovery of three large wine amphoras on the floor of room 2. Other similar series of small rooms line the inner face of the wall both near the other gates and in other scattered places. Though none of these has been excavated, and the details of their plans are, therefore, not entirely certain, it may be assumed that their character and purpose were the same as those of the excavated rooms.

Two of the free-standing buildings on the acropolis have been examined. The

¹⁴ "Koroni," p. 32 and plan, fig. 4.

¹⁵ The walls average 0.70 m. in thickness, but the east and north walls of room 1 are only 0.50 m. thick.

larger (B)¹⁶ is a complex of five rooms and a corridor (overall dimensions, 10.20 m. by 9.90 m.) standing near the center of the acropolis. It has an irregular plan and walls of loose rubble construction, similar to, but more carefully built than, those of the storerooms. Only one room (4.85 m. by 4.00 m.) was excavated; it contained a number of eating and drinking vessels as well as the upper half of a hopper-type grain mill, and these finds may well suggest that the building was used as a mess hall. A smaller building (C)¹⁷ (7.25 m. by 6.00 m.) about 25 meters east of Building B was even more poorly built, though with thicker (0.70-1.50 m.) walls; it had only two rooms, a small anteroom and a large main room. The contents consisted mainly of drinking vessels and cooking pots, and a burned area near the center of the main room may have been a hearth. It has been suggested that this small building, located in an open area near the center of the acropolis, might have been the headquarters of the officer of the watch.

Several other free-standing buildings existed on the acropolis, particularly toward its western end, where there is at least one of considerable size. None of these has been closely examined, and, indeed, trips to the site after the general map was made have shown that not all the house remains are indicated on it; but the nature of these buildings may be inferred from that of the excavated examples.

SADDLE

The broad saddle which runs southward from the eastern end of the acropolis preserves remains of buildings over almost its entire area. It is difficult, because of the poor condition of the walls and the heavy covering of brush, to make out accurately the plans of these buildings, but the preliminary survey indicated that the buildings were not only more numerous but also individually larger than those on the acropolis.

One large building (G)¹⁸ was carefully measured and partially excavated. The complex lies on the crest of the saddle toward its southern end, not far from the Long Wall. In an area of thirty-six by twenty-three meters there are over twenty rooms of various sizes and shapes built to no regular plan. This lack of order, as well as the duplication of the southern wall of rooms 1 and 2 ("Koroni," fig. 11), suggests the work of more than one gang of inexperienced workmen. The walls of poorly constructed dry rubble are similar to those in the buildings already described, and in the four excavated rooms (Pl. 6, a) at the northern side of the complex they stand to a height of about one meter. The most interesting architectural feature of these rooms is the rubble benches, 0.30 m. high, of which there are two on the south and one on the northern side of room 1. A single course of large stones set on end forms the border of these benches, and the center is filled with a packing of small stones and

¹⁶ "Koroni," pp. 34-36, fig. 5.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 36-37, fig. 6.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 44-45, figs. 10-11.

earth. They vary in length from 1.60 to 1.80 m. and average 1.15 m. in width. Similar benches remain along the west and south walls of room 3; the rubble at either end of room 2 was so anomalous that we could not determine whether it belonged to structures of this sort. These benches, with the addition of some padding, undoubtedly served as beds, and the number of these in this agglomeration of small rooms indicates that the building was a barrack.

VALLEY

Although the floor of the valley is now under cultivation and preserves on its surface no ancient walls, we were informed that when the fields were plowed with a tractor-drawn plow in 1952 much stone and many tile fragments were brought to the surface. Most of this was later carted off for use as building material, but some still remains piled in the fields. The surface is now strewn with many sherds and fragments of tile, and there are a few blocks of brown, sandy stone as well as many unworked stones. All this made it reasonable to assume that, on a site where even the steep, uninviting slopes were built on, the relatively level area of the valley would have been utilized.

Four test trenches sunk in the field which lies 60 to 80 meters back from the shore proved this to be the case.¹⁹ The corner of a building similar to those described above appeared in the northwest corner of trench I (Fig. 1), and in trench III other fragments of such walls as well as what appeared to be rock-cut beddings for more solid walls were found. Time did not permit further exploration of these buildings, and the trenches were refilled, but the objects found indicated that the walls were contemporary with the higher buildings, and they probably resembled them.

At the foot of the valley, in the sea and about two meters from the shore, a wall bedding cut in the rock may be seen. It runs parallel to the shore for about 27 meters and is 0.60 m. wide. It perhaps formed a quay.

All the buildings on Koroni were poorly planned and poorly constructed of unworked stone. They were roofed, since in all cases a layer of tiles was found over the floor; these were mostly tiles of Laconian type, but an occasional Corinthian cover tile was found, which seems to indicate that at least some were re-used tiles from elsewhere. Particularly noteworthy was the lack of accumulated habitation debris in all excavated buildings. The earth floors were soft and lay immediately above hardpan. In no case could two separate floors or habitation levels be distinguished, and so far as it was possible to observe all excavated finds belonged together.

¹⁹ Permission to excavate in other parts of the valley could not be obtained from the owners.

THE FINDS ²⁰

COINS

Of the 23 excavated coins 13 may be assigned to Ptolemy II Philadelphos ("Koroni," nos. 10, 34, 57, 61, 65, 70-72, 77, 79, 80, 92, 100) (Pl. 6, b), one to Ptolemy I Soter ("Koroni," no. 101), and two to either Ptolemy I or Ptolemy II ("Koroni," nos. 66, 74); there were three or four Athenian coins ("Koroni," nos. 56, 85, 86, 94?), and one each of "Eleusis" ("Koroni," no. 93), Megara ("Koroni," no. 73) and Aigina ("Koroni," no. 102). This overwhelming majority of coins belonging to Ptolemy II is extended when the surface finds are considered. Of these additional coins 14 could be assigned to Ptolemy II ("Koroni," nos. 130-134; Varoucha,²¹ nos. 4, 6-11, 13, 14), four can be classified more generally as Ptolemaic ("Koroni," nos. 135, 136; Varoucha, nos. 1, 2), and only five are from other sources: 2 of Athens (Varoucha, nos. 20, 21), one each of Demetrios Poliorketes (Varoucha, no. 17),²² Megara ("Koroni," no. 128) and Chalkis (Varoucha, no. 18).²³ It is immediately evident that principal concern over the numismatic evidence must be directed toward the coins of Ptolemy II.

The coins of Ptolemy II were not only the most common of those found, but they were found in every building excavated. This fact, combined with the complete lack of any trace of re-occupation in any building, makes it clear that the coins are to be connected with the construction of the buildings and walls on Koroni.

The majority of the Ptolemaic coins from Koroni belong to a series of Ptolemy II that was minted in Cyprus; this series bears letters which have been interpreted as dates beginning in the first year of Ptolemy II's reign, 285 B.C., and continuing to 267/6 or 265/4 B.C.²⁴ An analysis of the Koroni examples is here given in tabular form:²⁵

²⁰ The finds from the Koroni excavations have been fully published, arranged according to their places of finding, in "Koroni." A significant addendum to these excavation finds is provided by chance finds published by E. Varoucha-Christodoulou, *Συμβολή εις τὸν Χερμωνίδειον Πόλεμον*, Ἀρχ. Ἐφ., 1953-1954, III, Athens, 1961, pp. 321-349.

²¹ These refer to the listing, *ibid.*, pp. 326-327.

²² Listed *ibid.*, p. 327, as type of H. Gaebler, *Die antiken Münzen von Makedonia und Paionia*, Berlin, 1906, pl. XXXIII, 16, which is assigned by E. T. Newell, *Coinages of Demetrius Poliorketes*, London, 1925, p. 25, no. 20, to the mint of Salamis in Cyprus and dated ca. 300-295 B.C.

²³ The following coins, listed by Varoucha, *loc. cit.*, have not been considered here because of lack of specific information: Varoucha no. 3 (Ptolemy I); nos. 5, 12, 19, 22 (Ptolemy II); no. 19 (Chalkis); no. 22 (Athens); no. 23 (uncertain, Athens?).

²⁴ Svoronos, *Ptolemies*, II, pp. 82-88, his Class Z, Series B. Cf. D. H. Cox, *Coins from the Excavations at Curium, 1932-1953*, *Amer. Num. Soc. N. Mon.*, No. 145, New York, 1959, pp. 97-99.

²⁵ In the table a question mark after an example indicates that the traces on the coin are consonant with this reading but could be read differently. The dates represented by the letters are those given by D. H. Cox, *loc. cit.* (note 24, *supra*).

LETTER	DATE	EXAMPLES
A	285/4	"Koroni," nos. 61?, 72, 80, 129?, 132.
Δ	282/1	"Koroni," no. 129?
E	281/0	Varoucha, no. 14.
Θ	278/7	"Koroni," no. 34?
I	277/6	Varoucha, no. 8.
Λ	275/4	"Koroni," no. 130; Varoucha, no. 7.
M	274/3	"Koroni," no. 71.
O	272/1	"Koroni," no. 34?; Varoucha, nos. 9, 11.
Φ, Α,	267/6	
↑	or	"Koroni," no. 57; Varoucha, nos. 4?, 10, 13?
	265/4	

If this series has been correctly interpreted, as it probably has, the date *post quem* which the coins offer for the site is considerably limited from the long reign of Ptolemy II, 285-247 B.C., to the much shorter period 267-264 B.C. Even if details of this interpretation should be wrong, it is notable that the multiplicity of issues in the series indicates a date well along in Ptolemy II's reign, and it would be difficult to justify a date much nearer to the beginning of his reign than that suggested.

Unfortunately the other bronze coins are not well enough dated to provide a control on the Ptolemaic evidence; all that can be said is that they do not refute it.²⁶ The single silver coin of Ptolemy I ("Koroni," no. 101) is not out of place in this group; it is considerably worn and the large number of punch marks suggests that it had been in circulation for some time. Contemporary with it is the coin of Demetrios Poliorketes (Varoucha, no. 17), and the fact that this was minted in Cyprus suggests that it came from there with the Ptolemy II bronzes.

Whatever controversy may arise over the precise dating of these coins, there can be no doubt that the very presence of such a large and homogeneous group of Ptolemaic coins, distributed over the whole site, offers eloquent testimony of Koroni's Ptolemaic connections. It is the proof of these connections that is the most important service of the numismatic evidence toward an understanding of the nature of the site.

POTTERY

The household wares found on Koroni proved to be a fairly consistent lot made up of a normal assortment of utilitarian vessels; no basic difference in character could be discerned between the pottery from one location on the site and that from another. This, combined with the already stated fact that there is no archaeological evidence for more than one occupation of the site, indicates that all the pottery must be con-

²⁶ On the two Megarian coins ("Koroni," nos. 73, 128) see "Koroni," p. 45, no. 73, and *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, p. 71.

sidered as evidence in dating the site and, conversely, it must all be dated by the fixed point which the site provides.²⁷

When considered typologically, however, the pottery as a whole and within various classes presents certain problems. Several types of vessel are well enough represented to warrant comment: kantharoi (Pl. 6, c; "Koroni," nos. 15, 35-38), fish plates (Pl. 6, d; "Koroni," nos. 18-22), plates and bowls ("Koroni," nos. 12, 13, 24-26, 43). Of these, those which have published and dated parallels find them mainly among the objects of H. A. Thompson's Groups A and B, dated respectively to the turn of the fourth and third centuries B.C. and to the first half or first quarter of the third century B.C.²⁸ The greater number of Koroni examples resemble objects from Thompson's Group A, and the date thus suggested by the pottery, not far from 300 B.C., is considerably earlier than that suggested by the coins.

A related problem has arisen from the typological study of the individual shapes. The fish plates (18-22) and the rolled rim plates (12, 13, 58) show a progression of shape that allows them to be arranged in a series,²⁹ as do the rilled rim saucers (23-25). These have been taken to indicate a long period of occupation, or at least of sporadic activity, on the site extending over a period of almost 200 years.³⁰ The archaeological contexts in which the vessels were found, however, clearly seem to indicate that they all were in use at the same time.³¹ It is notable, furthermore, that not all show such a development. The kantharoi, for example, are reasonably uniform (as can be seen from the photographs, "Koroni," pl. 20) and much more uniform than those from other closed groups such as Thompson's Group A.³² The two bowls with out-turned rims (26, 43) are also very similar to one another.

The homogeneity of shape in some types of vessel and the contexts in which other types were found point to a general consistency among the pots, as might have been expected from the evidence of the excavation and the evidence of the coins. The connection of this pottery with that of Thompson's Group A is inescapable, and on

²⁷ This conclusion has been disputed by G. R. Edwards, "Koroni: The Hellenistic Pottery," *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 109-111; V. R. Grace, "Notes on the Amphoras from the Koroni Peninsula," *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 319-334 accepts the single occupation of the site but prefers a date earlier than that suggested by the excavators. Both articles are answered in E. Vanderpool, J. R. McCredie, A. Steinberg, "Koroni: The Date of the Camp and the Pottery," *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 69-75.

²⁸ Thompson, pp. 311-480.

²⁹ See G. R. Edwards, *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, p. 109.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 110-111.

³¹ *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 69-71. The three rilled rim saucers were not again discussed in this article since they had not been questioned by Edwards. They do, however, all come from the same floor of Building B ("Koroni," pp. 34-35).

³² The kantharoi, A 27, A 28, and A 29, in *Hesperia*, III, 1934, p. 320, fig. 5 differ greatly among themselves, the first being hardly more developed than kantharoi from Olynthos, while the last is very close to the Koroni kantharoi.

the chronology of that group, the Koroni pottery would have been dated in the years around 300 B.C.

WINE AMPHORAS

An unusual quantity of fragments of wine amphoras has been found on Koroni, and stamped handles from such amphoras formed by far the largest class of finds in the excavation publication.

It was at first thought possible that the amphoras, which were much more numerous on the surface of the valley than elsewhere, might belong to a period in the history of Koroni separate from that of the walls and houses—that Koroni might at some time have enjoyed prominence as an important port in the wine trade, and that the broken jars resulted from breakage in the transit of wine. That this hypothesis was erroneous, however, was proved by the discovery in the rooms of buildings on the acropolis not only of wine jars of similar shape but also of stamps which duplicate some found elsewhere (for instance the early Rhodian ΧΡΥ, of which an entire jar was found in room 2 of the storerooms at E). The amphoras, like the other pottery and coins, must, therefore, be associated with the houses and walls.

So many amphoras with a fairly narrow range of date would, if they were used for wine, suggest considerable intemperance on the part of Koroni's inhabitants. A more attractive alternative would be, as has been suggested ("Koroni," p. 38, note 7), to assume that they were used to carry and store water for the numerous occupants of the peninsula. No other provision for fresh water such as wells or cisterns was found, and even now no water exists on Koroni; supplies for the local café and for summer residents are brought by truck from a well in the Prasas plain about a kilometer away.

The majority of the amphoras is of Rhodian, Thasian, and Koan origins, and examples of all of these groups are found in Attica. But while Rhodian amphoras are common in Athens, those from Koroni are all of a type which might be called proto-Rhodian, and very few pieces of such jars have turned up in Athens; they have been found, outside Rhodes, largely in Egypt.³³ In this connection it is interesting to note that of the 46 stamped handles found on Koroni, 30 do not find parallels among the many thousands from the Athenian Agora, while, of these 30, 21 do find parallels in handles in Alexandria.³⁴ This evidence is not overwhelming, but a connection with Egypt is suggested which may be compared with the certain Egyptian connection of the coins.

As in the household wares, a typological study of the amphoras has revealed

³³ V. Grace, *per litt.*, February 11, 1961. The writer is indebted to Miss Grace for generously putting her information about wine amphoras at his disposal despite her disagreement with the conclusions to which he has come.

³⁴ See "Koroni," p. 58, note 20, where the stamps in question are listed with references to the handles in Egypt, principally in the collection of Mr. Lucas Benachi.

problems of dating. The place of the Koroni amphoras in the development of their respective types has been examined with care by V. Grace. Her study has led to the conclusion that these amphoras form a fairly close chronological group, related to amphoras associated with Thompson's Groups A and B, and therefore belonging in the last years of the fourth century or the early years of the third century B.C.⁸⁵

As a class, therefore, the amphoras agree with the coins in supporting the general consistency of the material from Koroni and even in suggesting a connection of it with Egypt; on the other hand, the date seemingly suggested by the amphoras agrees with that of the household pottery and is considerably earlier than that of the coins.

CHARACTER OF THE SITE

The rough nature of the fortifications and the shabby construction and evident lack of planning seen in the houses show that all the structures on Koroni were built in haste, probably by unskilled masons. The site was occupied for only a short time as is shown by the uniformity of the pottery and other finds from all areas and by the lack of successive layers of habitation debris. The site cannot, therefore, have been the site of a deme or of a permanent fort built for the protection of a strategic position; these might be expected to show remains from various periods, and also to have more deliberately planned and solidly built houses. It is rather something which was hurriedly built to meet a special need and abandoned as soon as the need passed. It might conceivably have been a place of refuge for the people of the surrounding countryside, built in a grave moment of danger. Everything goes to show, however, that it was a fort, or better a fortified camp, built by an army, and, in its utilization of the natural advantages of the terrain as well as its lack of systematic planning, it agrees well with the description of a Greek camp given by Polybios (VI, 42).

Since the camp apparently lacked any proper gate on the landward side (see p. 5, *supra*), the army which occupied it will not have been an Athenian one defending the homeland but an invading force, coming from overseas, depending on ships for its supplies, and expecting an attack from the land. The coins give the needed clue as to whose camp it was; for considering the rarity of Ptolemaic coins in Athens,⁸⁶ the conclusion that Koroni, with its preponderance of Ptolemaic coins, belonged to a Ptolemaic army is inescapable, and this conclusion is reinforced by the Egyptian connotations of many of the wine amphoras.

⁸⁵ V. Grace, *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 319-334. The arguments for this dating are answered in *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 72-75.

⁸⁶ Of many thousands of Greek coins found in the excavations of the Athenian Agora, only four or five are even possibly Ptolemaic and none is surely of Ptolemy II.

THE DATE OF KORONI

As has been seen, all the material from Koroni, pottery, coins and wine amphoras alike, points to a date between the last years of the fourth century and the middle of the third century B.C. Within this half century, however, there is a considerable discrepancy between the early date, about 300 B.C., indicated by the small pots and wine amphoras and the late date, after 267/6 B.C. (or at least well along in the reign of Ptolemy II), supported by the coins. Since the archaeological evidence demands that the three classes of objects be contemporary, the discrepancy must be resolved.

The history of the period under consideration fortunately allows a decision to be made between the suggested dates; for the only time during the first half of the third century when Ptolemaic forces are known to have been active in Attica³⁷ is during the Chremonidean War (265-261 B.C.).³⁸ Koroni, which was occupied by a Ptolemaic army, must belong to that war.

If this date is accepted, it is notable that it agrees precisely with the numismatic evidence, that is the camp was built and occupied in the year (or at least within a year or two) given by the latest coins. No better correspondence could be sought. The pottery, however, is disturbing.

Any re-examination of the pottery must begin with the fact that the whole group, small pots and amphoras alike, moves together as a group. They are, that is, dated by one another, and all belong to Thompson's Group A, or, infrequently, Group B.

The absolute dates for Thompson's Group A, as well in the Agora, are based upon a comparison of the material from it with the material from the Chatby cemetery of Alexandria, which is assumed to begin with the foundation of the city. The lower date, however, is derived wholly from comparative chronology, on the assumption that because the material has a limited range of shapes it also must have an equally limited duration.³⁹ This assumption, valid as it may be in a given instance, nevertheless dangerously equates schematic development with actual development.⁴⁰

³⁷ An occasion in the early 280's is thought a possible alternative by V. Grace, *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 330-332; there is, however, no evidence of a large military operation at this time (see *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 72-75 for this and other objections to the theory).

³⁸ This date for the Chremonidean War is that published by B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961, pp. 223-226. The dates of the war depend largely on the date of the archonship of Peithidemos, when the decree of Chremonides was passed. Koroni adds no new evidence to this discussion. See now, B. D. Meritt, "The Year of Kydenor," *Χαριστήριον εις 'Αναστάσιον Κ. 'Ορλάνδον*, I, Athens, 1964, pp. 196-197.

³⁹ Thompson, pp. 313-315.

⁴⁰ A severe criticism of the Agora methodology in dating pottery of the Hellenistic and Roman periods has been presented by Paul W. Lapp, *Palestinian Ceramic Chronology, 200 B.C.-A.D. 70*, American Schools of Oriental Research, New Haven, 1961, pp. 71-89. He argues that in Thompson's chronology too much reliance has been put on the homogeneous nature of the deposits, that development has been considered assured on the basis of too little evidence, and that developments have been proposed which derive primarily from a priori subjective considerations (pp. 71-72).

The lower date of Group B, a complicated cistern, is based on numismatic evidence: one coin is Athenian assigned by Svoronos (*Trésor*, pl. 22.76) to the period 297-255 B.C., another an "Eleusinian" coin (Svoronos, *Trésor*, pl. 103.27). Both these coins are close to types represented on Koroni (respectively nos. 85-86 and no. 93), but they have not been convincingly and closely dated. The placing of the lower limit of the cistern at the point selected was again done according to the time which seemed necessary for the development seen in the relative classes.

It appears, therefore, that some flexibility can be allowed in assigning absolute dates to such material. The Koroni material agrees with that from Thompson's Groups A and B not only in the pottery, but also in some of its coins. It also has, however, in the Chremonidean War, a known historical event to date the context, and, in the Ptolemaic coins, exactly datable material which corroborates this historical date. It thus provides one of the solid fixed points for the other material in a period sadly lacking in such points.

It must be emphasized that this fixed point offers no explicit information about the date at which the pottery was manufactured; it only demonstrates that the pottery was in use during the Chremonidean War. The implications which this fact has for the date of manufacture depend upon the circumstances by which the pottery came to Koroni, the character of the places from which it came, the useful life of such pots, etc. Answers to these questions are not determined by the Koroni evidence.

The fixed point is, however, of considerable archaeological importance. If pottery like that of Thompson's Group A was still in use at Koroni in the time of the Chremonidean War, such pottery can have been in use elsewhere at that time. Contexts dated solely by pottery like Thompson's Group A have, therefore, at least the possibility of being as late as the Chremonidean War.

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF KORONI

In the Chremonidean War Ptolemy II was allied with Athens and Sparta against the Macedonians under Antigonos Gonatas. We have no connected account of the war and so know little of the operations, especially those in Attica. Ptolemy sent a fleet under his general Patroklos to aid Athens. Operating from a base in Keos, Patroklos occupied and fortified a small island near Sounion which later bore his name and where remains of his fort are still to be seen (see below, pp. 18-25).⁴¹ As far as we know from the literary sources, this is all he did, and since Pausanias tells us (III, 6, 4-6) that he was afraid to pit his Egyptian forces against the Macedonians, it has always been assumed that he never landed his troops on the mainland of Attica. It is now clear, however, that he not only landed but he established a large camp on the rugged peninsula on the bay of Porto Raphti which would easily be supplied by his

⁴¹ Pausanias, I, 1, 1.

fleet from his base in Keos. Thus, although he did not ultimately succeed in relieving Athens, he evidently made a much stronger bid than has hitherto been supposed.

The excavation of Koroni has provided the first concrete example of a foreign military camp in Attica, and one that is both accurately dated and preserved to its full extent with its fortifications, its barracks, and its storerooms. It has provided new information about the operations in the Chremonidean War.

Perhaps more important than these specific details, however, is the new study which, with Koroni as a basis, can now be undertaken. Rough rubble fortifications in Attica have in the past casually interested travellers and topographers; they have been variously interpreted as Attic forts, as acropoleis of demes, and as refuges for the country-dwellers. Now that Koroni provides a fixed point of comparison, a study of these sites should be able to develop new and important information.

CHAPTER II

A PROVISIONAL CORPUS OF FORTIFIED MILITARY CAMPS IN ATTICA

PREFACE

The purpose of this chapter is to make available useful descriptions of all those sites in Attica known to the writer that might be interpreted as ancient fortified military camps. Those sites, such as Sounion, Rhamnous, Gyphtokastro, Myoupolis, Phyle, Mounichia, Mouseion, and Eleusis, which, though military, are distinguished from this more humble sort of camp both by their appearance and their purpose attested in ancient literature, have here been excluded; they are available to one degree or another in other publications.

No really satisfactory arrangement of the sites is possible. The names by which they are here called have been given to them for various reasons, not all generally accepted nor all of equal validity; alphabetical arrangement might, therefore, have been confusing. A geographical scheme has been adopted: coastal sites (west coast), coastal sites (east coast), the plain of Athens and its borders, the Thriasian plain, and isolated sites.

In the absence of a published plan of a site, and provided that making a plan was feasible, the writer made one. These plans are based on measurements made with a thirty-meter steel tape and a surveyor's compass (accurate to one-half degree); the accuracy thus obtained, while not absolute, is of a high order and seems to the writer to be sufficient for the uses to which such plans may be put. All plans were drawn by the writer to a scale of 1:1000, and from these the reductions presented here were made. Contour lines are based on the *Karten von Attika* unless these appeared to be misleading; in that case they were added by eye. All plans are to some extent restored plans; a wall is drawn as if it were fully preserved as long as definite evidence exists that the wall did once stand as it is shown. The considerable additional effort that would have been required to make accurate actual-state plans was thought unnecessary for the purposes to which they might be put in a study of this sort.

The sherds which are used in dating the sites were compared with material from the excavations of the Athenian Agora; the writer received much assistance from members of the Agora staff, in particular from Miss Lucy Talcott, in establishing the dates which such comparisons suggested. The dates given in each entry are based on the Agora system; they, therefore, should be considered relative, indicating the group into which each piece would be considered to fall if it were discovered in the Agora. The writer has argued that the absolute dates attached to these groups may need to be modified (pp. 14-15, *supra*).

COASTAL SITES (WEST COAST)

PATROKLOU CHARAX (Figs. 2-4)

The small island, Gaidouronisi, lying just off the west coast of Attica about three kilometers north of Sounion (Pl. 7, a), has long been recognized as the site of the camp built by Patroklos, the commander of Ptolemy II's naval expedition to relieve Athens during the Chremonidean War. Wheler, who saw it from Sounion in 1676, remarks that it was still called Patroklea by some; his researches were, however, hampered, he writes, because, "I could get no Barque to go over."¹ By chance E. D. Clarke found himself on the island in late October 1802, but though of the early travellers he seems to have spent the most time on the island, he confines his remarks to the flora and to the identification of the spot, giving no indication of antique remains.² Credit for the discovery of the fortification on Gaidouronisi apparently belongs to Leake, who notes "some remains of a Hellenic fortress on the island."³ The remains are indicated on the *Karten von Attika*,⁴ but have never been fully described.⁵

Gaidouronisi is a small, rocky, and barren island extending about 2.5 kilometers from east to west and 1.5 kilometers from north to south (Fig. 2).⁶ A long, high ridge runs the length of the island from east to west; on the south it falls in steep cliffs to the sea, offering little hospitable or even habitable area, but on the north the slopes are more gradual, and near the sea there are several nearly flat areas. It is on this side that ancient habitation is to be sought.

The island is now deserted except for shepherds who pasture small flocks there. A few buildings and a sheepfold belonging to them lie near the coast on a broad ridge (height 44 on the *Karten von Attika*). Water for the animals must come from a well

¹ G. Wheler, *A Journey into Greece*, London, 1682, p. 424.

² E. D. Clarke, *Travels in Various Countries of Europe, Asia and Africa*, VI, 4, London, 1818, pp. 183-188.

³ W. M. Leake, *Demi of Attica*², London, 1841, p. 275. J. Schmidt in *R.E.*, s.v. Patroklu Nesos, wrongly attributes the discovery to Ludwig Ross, whose notice of it does appear as a footnote in the reprint of his *Inselreisen*, I, Halle, 1912, p. 90, note 3a, but not in the original edition (*Reisen auf den griechischen Inseln des ägäischen Meeres*, I, Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1840, pp. 105-106) where he merely speculates on the position of the camp. Presumably he got the reference from Leake.

⁴ *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XIV, cf. A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, III, p. 31.

⁵ The fortifications are again mentioned by O. Walter, *Klio*, XXXI, 1938, p. 225, note 3, where it is suggested that they date from the time of Andreas Dandolo, who engaged in fortifying small harbors and building towers against pirates after the islands were ceded to him by Venice in 1330. This is demonstrably wrong.

⁶ Observations and descriptions are based on three visits to the island in 1961 and 1962. The writer was accompanied by his wife on all these occasions and by George Miles, Margaret Thompson, R. S. Stroud, C. W. J. Eliot, and Eugene Vanderpool on one or another of them. Thanks are due all of these scholars for their helpful observations. The map is revised and adapted from the *Karten von Attika*; the plan is based on measurements made by the writer, his wife, and R. S. Stroud.

PATROKLOS ISLAND

SCALE IN METERS: 0 100 200





Fig. 2. Plan of Patroklos Island

which is located very near the sea to the west of this ridge; in June 1962 it contained little water, and that at sea level, so that it is probably somewhat brackish.

Ancient remains seem to be concentrated in the northern coastal area toward its eastern side (Pl. 8, a).⁷ The ridge upon which the shepherds' buildings stand is strewn with sherds which seem to be of a consistent late Roman date, and, though no house walls are now visible, there must have been a small settlement on this ridge in late Roman times.⁸

Northeast of ridge 44, where a spit of land that now bears a navigation marker juts out from the coast, sherds of prehistoric date have been found both by us and earlier by Professor John H. Young. The area over which these sherds, which appear to be from the Early Helladic period, are found is small, and it probably represents only a small station of this time. There were no remains of walls visible.

The vicinity of the shepherds' buildings on ridge 44 and that of the Early Helladic remains are separated from the ridge (66.8) to the east by a wide and deep torrent bed. This torrent bed seems to have formed a natural division for earlier settlers; for the infrequent occurrence of late Roman sherds to the east of it implies that this settlement did not cross the torrent, just as the infrequent occurrence of Classical and Hellenistic sherds to the west of it indicates that the settlements of these periods were confined to the eastern side.

Just southeast of the torrent bed, on the cliffs above the sea, are the remains of walls belonging to a building or group of buildings (Fig. 3). Although the original plan of the structure(s) is not clear, the walls of two rooms, 5.50 m. by 5.20 m. and 5.10 m. by 5.40 m., are preserved. The south wall of the northern room preserves near its base some white wall plaster. Sherds from near these rooms suggest a late Classical or Hellenistic date for them, and it is possible that they should be connected with the fortification to the south.

The most notable remains on the island are those of a small fortification which includes a rocky height (66.8 on the *Karten von Attika*) and the area between this height and the shore (Fig. 4). The main defense of the site (area ca. 300 m. by 200 m.) is provided by two walls running from the small rocky height eastward to the cliffs above the sea. The northern of these walls is about 300 m. long (Pl. 7, b); it is strengthened by at least four towers facing north. The southern wall, only about 150 m. long, has only one tower facing south. Both walls are built of rubble consisting of larger, but irregular blocks of the brown stone native to the rocky height and smaller stones of the gray limestone that is prevalent on the island. The

⁷ The writer has, however, not visited the western part of the island nor the ruins indicated on the *Karten von Attika* to the southwest of ridge 44.

⁸ It is not surprising to find no early Roman settlement; for Pausanias calls the island a *νησος ἔρημος* (I, 1, 1) in the second century after Christ.

wall is seldom preserved to as high as a meter, and it varies slightly here and there from the average thickness of 2.50 m., the extremes being 2.20 m. and 2.90 m.

A second line of defense was, perhaps, provided by the small rocky height itself. The only convenient approach to this hill is from the north, where within the fortified area a narrow but comparatively gradual slope leads up to it; outside the fortified area, on the hill's northwestern side, a rubble wall protected the height (this wall

PATROKLOS ISLAND BUILDINGS




FIG. 3. Plan of Patroklos Island Buildings

is slightly erroneously shown on Fig. 4; it should continue to intersect the long northern fortification wall). On all other sides there is a sheer drop of several meters.

A small building (8.50 m. by 9.90 m.) stands on this rocky height. It has two rooms, a larger one at the northeast and a smaller one at the southwest. Its lowest visible wall course is constructed of large (average 1 m. long and 0.30 m. high) limestone blocks fitted to make a level course (Pl. 7, d); there appears to be another such course below the present ground level. Above these blocks, and on the inner faces of the walls (Pl. 7, e), there is rubble construction of small stones. A gap at the northern

end of the northeast wall (facing the sea) corresponds exactly in width (1.44 m.) to a threshold block of limestone lying some distance from the building; this appears to have been the only door. In the southwest corner of the northeast room is a cement-lined cistern, 3.70 m. deep (Pl. 7, c); the cistern is still intact, as shown by




FIG. 4. Plan of Patrokloou Charax

the water found standing in it even in early summer.⁹ The purpose and date of this building are not entirely clear. Its superiority of construction might indicate that it stood in some form before the fortification was built, and that the rubble work in its walls is part of a reconstruction undertaken when the fortification was located here; no difference that might support this theory was found, however, between the sherds

⁹ The cistern has been excavated by illicit diggers in recent times.

found near the building and those from the lower fortified area. In connection with the fortification it might have served as a command post (like Building C on Koroni) or as a lookout.

There are also traces of buildings in the lower fortified area. These are, however, in a very ruined condition, and without excavation it was impossible to recover their original plans. There seem to have been a number of free-standing buildings with rough rubble walls about 0.50 m. thick located in the western part of the enclosure, at the foot of the rocky height, as well as a series of rooms, 4 m. to 5 m. deep, along the inner face of the northern defense wall. More scattered traces of buildings occur farther to the east, and some of the walls appear to be retaining or terrace walls. All have the same character, built of small field stones laid without mortar.

The occupants of this barren island must have been supplied by sea, and the fortified area has relatively easy access through a gully to the narrow but flat beach which lies to the southeast of it. But, while the gully affords access to the beach, elsewhere there are steep cliffs, so that the fortified area was not open to attack from this quarter. The beach is of considerable length, and a good sized fleet could have been drawn up there.

FINDS FROM PATROKLOS ISLAND¹⁰ (from within the fortification unless otherwise stated):

1. Unglazed lamp fragment (from rhevma to north of fortification). Pl. 3, no. 16; Pl. 20, a.
Broken at nozzle. Yellowish fabric. No exact parallel, but it would seem to belong stylistically to the later fourth century, or to the early third. Mr. Lucas Benachi has kindly informed the writer that in his opinion the fabric might be Syrian or Egyptian.
2. Fragment of the nozzle of a semi-glazed lamp. Pl. 20, b, 1.
Glazed on interior only. Fine red clay. From a lamp of Howland type 25 (details not certain). Later fourth or early third century.
3. Fragment of a black-glazed fish plate. Pl. 20, b, 2.
D. of central depression *ca.* 0.05 m.; D. of foot *ca.* 0.08 m. Only part of floor and center depression preserved. Incised ring around central depression. Resembles "Koroni," no. 19. Later fourth century (?).
4. Fragment of a black-glazed bowl. Pl. 3, no. 13; Pl. 20, b, 3.
D. of ring base *ca.* 0.08 m. Incised line on foot and between base and body. Fourth century.
5. Fragment of a semi-glazed rilled-rim saucer. Pl. 3, no. 9; Pl. 20, b, 4.
D. *ca.* 0.13 m. Red glaze on interior only. Last quarter of fourth century.
6. Base fragment of a glazed kantharos. Pl. 3, no. 15; Pl. 20, c, 2.
D. of base *ca.* 0.05 m. Groove around bottom of foot. Red glaze on inside and outside.
7. Similar. Pl. 20, c, 1.
D. of base *ca.* 0.06 m.

¹⁰ The dates here given are those that would be indicated by comparison with the material from the Athenian Agora. Miss Lucy Talcott has kindly given her opinion about all the pieces.

8. Handle fragment of a spur-handled kantharos. Pl. 20, b, 5.
Black glaze much flaked. D. (excluding handle) *ca.* 0.10 m. Appears to have had thickened rim.
9. Body fragments of two black-glazed kantharoi. Pl. 20, b, 6-7.
Profiles and thin fabric suggest a type somewhat more developed than the kantharoi from Olynthos. Close to type found on Koroni.
10. Rim fragment of a black-glazed globular lekythos. Pl. 3, no. 10; Pl. 20, b, 8.
Rim D. *ca.* 0.07 m. Glazed on interior and exterior. Cf. Agora P 3992. Fourth century.
11. Rim fragment of a semi-glazed lekane. Pl. 20, d.
D. *ca.* 0.32 m. Red glaze on rim and interior. Broad, almost horizontal rim has three incised lines. Cf. Thompson, no. A 61. Late fourth century.
12. Base of a wine amphora. Pl. 4, no. 25; Pl. 20, e.
P. H. 0.22 m. Cf. Agora P 20509, P 24761, P 25945, P 25946. Late fourth century.
13. Fragment of the foot of a black-glazed skyphos. Pl. 3, no. 14; Pl. 20, b, 10.
D. *ca.* 0.12 m. Thick rounded ring base. Glaze black on outside, red beneath.
14. Fragment of the foot of a black-glazed skyphos. Pl. 20, b, 11.
D. *ca.* 0.11 m. Similar but rather thinner fabric than no. 13.
15. Rim fragment of kylix like Little Master Cup. Pl. 20, b, 12.
Black glaze, reserved at lip.
16. Fragment of a black-glazed mug. Pl. 20, b, 9.
Shoulder fragment with beaded necking preserved. Fairly high rim. Late fifth or fourth century.
17. Sinopean stamped amphora handle (ASCS cat. ASP 78). Not illustrated. In rectangular stamp:

ΕΤΤΙΕΛΤΟΥ	
ΑΣΤΥΝΟ(ΜΟΥ)	grape-cluster
ΤΕΥΘΡΑ	ear of grain

V. Grace compares E. M. Pridik, *Inventory of Stamps in the Hermitage*, p. 89, no. 559. She cites B. N. Grakov, *Ancient Pottery Stamps with the Names of Astynomoi* (Moscow, 1929, in Russian), p. 124, his Group II. Grakov's absolute date for his Group II is about 270-230 B.C., but another example of this Group, SS 11354, comes from an Agora deposit considered to date in the third quarter of the fourth century. From this, and from the fact that she would prefer to put the end of his series, Group VI, almost 100 years earlier than he suggests, Miss Grace feels that the handle should be dated *ca.* 350-310 B.C. (information furnished by V. Grace, *per litt.* Dec. 6, 1961). The handle was found by an earlier visitor to Patroklos Island, not by the writer.

If, then, the sherds are dated by Agora parallels, there is no evidence for any considerable activity on Patroklos Island during the second quarter of the third century B.C. Rather there is a considerable group of sherds from the late fourth century B.C. (nos. 1-12, 17) and a few pieces that appear to be rather earlier (13-16).

It is, however, explicitly stated by Pausanias (I, 1, 1) that Patroklos fortified the island and established a camp on it when he came to relieve Athens (during the Chremonidean War, in or about 265 B.C.), and this is supported by Strabo (IX, 398). There can be no doubt that both ancient authors are talking about Gaidouronisi, and

the margin of error for the date is only two or three years.¹¹ That the fortification just described is the one built by Patroklos on this occasion is the inescapable conclusion.

The contradiction between the date suggested by the pottery and that demanded by other evidence has important implications. It is the same contradiction which was found at Koroni, and it is notable that the pottery from Patroklos Island bears a marked resemblance to that from Koroni. This is especially noticeable in the kantharoi, the fish plates, and the rilled rim dishes. But even when the pottery from Patroklos Island does not represent the same types that have been found at Koroni, it does come from the same chronological group as established in other sites. The conclusions are evident: it is the pottery of "fourth century type" that should be associated with the Chremonidean camp on Patroklos Island, and, as has already been shown by Koroni, this pottery did not, as previously thought, end at the close of the fourth century, but rather it continued in use at least as late as the Chremonidean War.

The evidence from sherds found on the island thus shows a considerable amount of activity in the time of the Chremonidean War, clearly connected with Patroklos's fortification of the island, and more restricted activity at an earlier time. Whether this latter activity is to be connected with an earlier use of the small building on the rocky height, perhaps as a lookout, cannot be decided without further evidence from excavation.

ATENE FORT (Fig. 5).

On the mainland, almost directly opposite Patroklos Island, is an unpublished fortified site. It lies at the head of a valley called Charaka, presumably taking its name from Patroklou Charax which lies opposite it. The site itself, at the north-western end of the valley, lies on the crest of the ridge which divides this valley from the coastal plain to the north.¹² The remains were discovered by C. W. J. Eliot and Eugene Vanderpool and are mentioned by Eliot in his study of the coastal demes.¹³ A sketch plan for Eliot's use was made in 1958 by W. E. McLeod.¹⁴ The site lies in the deme of Atene, whence the name assigned to it.¹⁵

The fortification occupies a site which must have been chosen more for its view than for actual defense of the area. Placed at the northern end of the valley, it is


¹¹ The historical implications of the site, as well as the date of the Chremonidean War, will be discussed at greater length in Chapter IV. All that is important here is to establish the fact that the fortification on Patroklos Island is, in fact, that of Patroklos, and that it was therefore built during the Chremonidean War.

¹² *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XIV, height 101; a few ruins are shown, but they do not correspond to the actual remains and Milchhöfer has no comment.

¹³ Eliot, pp. 129-130 and map showing the location of the site, p. 128.

¹⁴ The plan presented here is a revision, based on personal observation, of McLeod's sketch.

¹⁵ Eliot, *loc. cit.* Varoucha, p. 347, note 1, refers to the site but calls it Azenia; this is an old and erroneous identification of the area. She also claims to have found sherds of the fifth, fourth, and third centuries B.C., but the dating of them may, perhaps, be doubted.



ATENE FORT

scale : 0 10 20 30 M.

FIG. 5. Plan of Atene Fort

off normal routes of communication; before the new coastal road was built it was nearly impossible to reach the valley from the north and the only access was from Sounion at the south. The view commanded by the highest part of the fort is, however, excellent, including, as it does, Sounion to the southeast and Vari to the northwest. The view of Patroklos Island is, however, completely blocked by the intervening mountain.

The site is very ruined, and only the general features of it can be determined without excavation.¹⁶ That a fortification wall existed is undeniable, but its exact course is questionable. It is clear, with both faces preserved, to the east and south of the round tower B, and here it has a thickness of *ca.* 1.17-1.25 m.; it is built of rubble with two carefully built faces and a packing of smaller stones. From this point it appears to run to the round enclosure C, but in places its traces are very faint. To the west of C there are two walls, and, without excavation, it is impossible to tell which was for defense and which a retaining wall. No traces have been found on the north and northeast. An area D to the south, which is surrounded by a curved wall, appears to have been some sort of terrace.

The outlines of two buildings are clear. One, lying at the highest point in the area (A), is a large rectangular structure with three rooms. Its walls are of rubble, *ca.* 0.65-0.70 m. thick. At its eastern end are traces of the curved wall of a round construction, probably a tower. Tentatively Building A might be interpreted as a watchtower with living quarters for those who manned it (*cf.* the tower on Mt. Aigaleos). A second large building, similar to A in construction but lacking the round tower, lies on the lower slopes to the northeast. There is no present indication of its purpose. The round tower B, *ca.* 6 m. in diameter, is solidly constructed of well-fitted field stones. It consists of a solid drum, made by filling the hollow circle formed by this well-built wall (*ca.* 0.75 m. thick) with small stones and earth. It perhaps served as a lookout toward Sounion. The circular structure C is enigmatic. It is too large to have served simply as a tower, and it is hollow; yet its construction is close to that of the other walls, and it is probably not, therefore, merely a modern sheepfold. There are numerous additional remains of isolated walls within the fortified area, but these are now too fragmentary to be reconstructed into buildings on the plan.

Sherds found on the site, both by us and by members of the American School in earlier years, seem to belong consistently to the fifth century B.C.; they include red-figured fragments as well as black-glazed wares.

The lack of evidence for a long period of habitation makes it probable that this was not a deme-center or other permanent settlement, but rather something built to fulfill a specific need. Eliot has suggested that it, together with Vari-Anagyrous

¹⁶ These observations are based on the writer's two visits to the site, once with his wife and R. S. Stroud, once with Sterling Dow.

(*q.v.*), served as part of an Athenian signaling system between Sounion and Piraeus.¹⁷ This fits the situation, and until more evidence is found it is the most attractive working hypothesis.¹⁸

VARI-ANAGYROUS (Fig. 6)

To the west of the modern town of Vari rises a low hill, the peak of which is encircled by a rubble fortification wall.¹⁹ This fortified hill lies in close proximity to other ancient remains—a group of cult buildings on the ridge which runs downward from the peak toward the southeast, a small temple on the ridge to the northeast, house walls near the eastern foot of the hill, and the Vari necropolis. All these remains have been connected with the deme of Anagyrous.²⁰

The fortified area is only some forty-five meters in diameter, protected on the north by steep cliffs and on the east, south, and west by a rubble wall some 106 m. long. On the east a square tower 6.40 m. long projects 3.10 m. to 3.30 m. from the curtain. A single gateway at the south, 1.65 m. wide, seems to have been the only entrance. The wall is constructed of carefully laid rubble (Pl. 9, a), with larger stones used as jambs at the gateway (Pl. 9, b). The wall itself is less than 1.00 m. thick, though because of its fallen condition and because of walls abutting it on its inner side, it now appears to be considerably thicker.

Along the inner face of the wall, particularly eastward from the gate, fragmentary walls some 0.50 m. thick can be traced running perpendicular to the fortification wall (Pl. 9, d); these seem to belong to a structure or series of structures lining the wall, one or two rooms deep. Near the highest part of the fortified area is a free-standing building composed of two rooms, or two buildings sharing a party wall. In front of this building, between the two rooms, is a small structure, 2.00 m. by 1.30 m., built of well-worked blocks, perhaps an altar (Pl. 9, c).

The hill commands an excellent view. From it Piraeus can be seen to the north, though Athens itself is hidden by Hymettos, and to the south much of the Attic coast is visible as far as the Atene fort (see p. 27, *supra*). This advantage of position probably indicates that the fort was used as a signaling station or lookout, a conclusion already arrived at by C. W. J. Eliot.²¹

¹⁷ Eliot, pp. 131-135.

¹⁸ Varoucha, p. 347, note 1, lists many sites under the suggestion that they may belong to the Chremonidean War; in her enthusiasm for this theory she has been less than critical of the evidence, adducing in one place pottery of Koroni type, in another Megarian bowls, as evidence for this chronology. It may be noted that this site, whatever its purpose and date, lacks the features of a Chremonidean camp as they are understood from Koroni and Patroklos Island, e.g. pottery of "fourth-century type" or heavy (2.50 m. thick) fortification walls.

¹⁹ *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VIII, height 132.5. The walls are not indicated.

²⁰ Eliot, pp. 35-46. On the cult buildings see the brief report of G. Oikonomos's excavations *Arch. Anz.*, LV, 1940, pp. 177-178, and Eliot, pp. 39-41.

²¹ Eliot, pp. 41-42.

Although few sherds are now visible on the surface of the fort (at least in March 1962 when the writer visited the site), a sufficient number of early Classical




FIG. 6. Plan of Vari-Anagyrous

sherds have been found by other members of the American School of Classical Studies to show that the wall and principal occupation belong to the fifth century B.C. Nothing was found which might belong to the late Classical or Hellenistic periods.

VOULIAGMENI

Chance finds of coins and other objects have led Mrs. Varoucha to identify Cape Zoster (Mikro Kavouri peninsula) as the site of a Ptolemaic establishment during the Chremonidean War.²² She publishes nine bronze coins of Ptolemy II,²³ one bronze coin of the Euboean League,²⁴ an arrowhead (p. 332), and a miscellany of pottery fragments, largely of wine amphoras.²⁵

The peninsula which is now called Mikro Kavouri protects the modern yacht harbor and bathing beaches of Vouliagmeni. Near its base is the "laimos," the low, sandy neck of land on which stood the temple of Apollo Zoster and other near-by ancient buildings.²⁶ From the "laimos" southward the peninsula rises to form rocky peaks.²⁷ Immediately south of the "laimos" and the temple of Apollo is a wooded hill²⁸ now belonging to the Astir beach and resort which has grown up on the "laimos." In 1958 and 1959, when development work was being done for the touristic establishments now found on the peninsula, the Superintendent of Antiquities, Mr. E. Mastrokostas, made emergency excavations and uncovered a number of antique remains including those of a "prehistoric fort" on this wooded hill. Unfortunately no official report of this work has been published, but a popular account by M. Paraskevaides based on what information was released by Mr. Mastrokostas attributes most of the finds to a prehistoric period, probably the third millenium B.C.²⁹ Since Mr.

²² Varoucha, pp. 321-349.

²³ The following issues are represented: (Svoronos, *Ptolemies*, Class Z, series B, size A; cf. p. 9, note 24, *supra*) (numbers are those under which the coins are listed, Varoucha, pp. 327-328):

Θ (Svor. 572)	1, 5 ?	(278/7)
Λ (Svor. 581)	2 ?	(275/4)
Ο (Svor. 587)	5 ?	(272/1)
Τ (Svor. 594)	9	(268/7)
Α (Svor. 553)	6, 7	(267/6 or 265/4)
Ϝ (Svor. 557)	4	

²⁴ An example of the bronzes of medium size, obv.: veiled head r.; rev.: cow or bull butting r., ΕΥΒΟΙ above, ΕΩΝ below. Cf. W. P. Wallace, *The Euboean League and its Coinage*, *Amer. Num. Soc. N. Mon.*, No. 134, New York, 1956, pp. 129-135. The date is currently thought to be second century B.C.

²⁵ The majority of these is neither described nor illustrated well enough to permit accurate comparisons and chronological conclusions. Mrs. Varoucha does, however, mention, p. 338, that some fragments of bases are of the "Spanish" type which she found in Helioupolis and on Koroni. Koroni no. 44 and many toes in the stored context pottery from Koroni are of this apparently rare type.

²⁶ For the temple see Kourouniotes, *Δελτ.*, XI, 1927-1928, pp. 9-53; for the "priest's house," Stavropoulos, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1938, pp. 1-31.

²⁷ Cf. *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VIII.

²⁸ *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VIII, height 22.5.

²⁹ M. Paraskevaides, *Βουλιαγμένη* [*Ἀρχ.-Ἰστ.*] in *Μεγάλη Ἑλληνικὴ Ἐγκυκλοπαίδεια, συμπλήρωμα*, LXIX, pp. 131-133.

Paraskevaides's report is the only one available, and since that is almost inaccessible to those not in Greece, I give a translation of the relevant portion:⁸⁰

The prehistoric fort has a line of walls which we are able to follow from the cliff of the southeast shore of Mikro Kavouri. From the cliff at the shore its line follows a northwesterly course south of the peak of the hill for a distance of 55 meters; it proceeds northward for 40 meters, then continues in a northeasterly direction for 35 meters to a point where a rectangular tower, 7 by 6 meters, juts forward. The line of the prehistoric fort continues in the same direction for 32 meters to the point where stands the northern tower, 7 by 7 meters large. Turning almost 90 degrees, the line of the walls continues in a southeastern direction from the northern tower 95 meters, up to the steep southeast shore, where, for 65 meters, there are no walls, since it is naturally inaccessible from the sea. The western side of this wall continues to the southwest in a separate leg which is easy to follow for 7 meters. It is likely that this leg, which would have ended at the western shore of the "laimos," would have constituted a strong barrier for all of the southern part of the peninsula.

A road has now been opened on the eastern side of the hill, and its northern slopes are now the site of bungalows belonging to the Astir resort. It is unlikely that further investigations can be carried out. The western portions of the walls are, however, still visible, especially the section between the two towers. This is of rubble construction, with two faces of moderate sized stones and a packing of smaller stones; it has a uniform thickness of 1.90 m.

The prehistoric date for the fort seems to be based on pottery found within four houses, foundations of which were found on the south slope of the hill, between the peak and the fortification wall.

Mrs. Varoucha argues that the fortification walls might as well date from the Chremonidean War, and that they should be associated with her coins and other objects.⁸¹ She says that Mr. Mastrokostas reported in 1958 not only obsidian, but fragments of pottery of the Hellenistic and Roman periods and remains especially of Classical times. She suggests that a stone in the northwest corner of the outer wall of the western (northern ?) tower, which appears to have been worked with a point and probably came from a well-built building, supports her date.

We do not now have the necessary information to judge the date of the fortifications; we can only hope that there will eventually be a publication of the material from Mr. Mastrokostas's excavations. Until it is known what, if any, material was found associated with the fortification walls, it is mere conjecture to associate one or another group of finds with it.

While the present material does not, then, allow a final decision on the date of the walls, the presence of nine coins of Ptolemy II certainly connects the site with Ptolemaic activity during this reign, and the discovery of what must be contemporary pottery indicates that the site was occupied at that time. The small number of pre-

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 132-133; a plan of the peninsula by G. Peschke is published on p. 131, and a photograph of the walls on p. 132.

⁸¹ Varoucha, pp. 341-342.

historic buildings found within the walls does not necessarily indicate that the walls are also prehistoric and that there was a fortified settlement here in the Early Helladic period.³² It is possible either that walls were built in the Hellenistic period around the hill, which had had a small unfortified settlement in prehistoric times, or that the walls of a fortified prehistoric settlement were rebuilt for use during the Hellenistic period.

BOUDORON

On Perama, the northwestern promontory of Salamis, where stands the monastery of Panayia Phaneromeni, are the remains of a rubble fortification wall some 1800 meters long.³³ The promontory is divided by a ridge running east and west; it rises from the sea at the west in a series of progressively higher rounded hills, culminating in a summit southeast of the convent at a height of 146.1 m., east of which the ridge gradually subsides. The fortification wall runs just to the north of the crest of this ridge, beginning about 400 meters from the western tip of the promontory and continuing to a point about 250 meters short of the highest summit. At either end part of the return running southward toward the coast is preserved, only about 30 m. long on the west but some 350 m. long on the east. The wall thus defends an area some 1500 m. long and 200 to 500 m. wide on the south coast of the promontory. The enclosed area consists mainly of steep slopes, but there is level ground near the crest of the ridge and small beaches near the western end of the fortifications.³⁴

The wall is built of moderate-sized field stones laid without mortar to form a roughly perpendicular outer face, preserved in the best sections to as high as 1.20 m. There does not seem to have been a proper inner face, and rubble is merely piled behind the face to form a sort of ramp averaging 1.60 m. thick.

The wall has often been identified with Boudoron, an Athenian fort built to blockade the Megarian harbors, probably constructed as early as the beginning of the Peloponnesian War and perhaps abandoned about 427 B.C.³⁵ From Thucydides's account, the requirements for a site to be identified with Boudoron are that it have a harbor for three triremes, that it command the ports of Megara, and that it communicate with Piraeus. The fort on Salamis has beaches sufficient for the triremes, has, from its highest point, a view of Megara if not of its harbors themselves, and can, from the summit of the ridge, 250 meters beyond the walls, communicate with

³² For Early Bronze Age fortified settlements see J. L. Caskey, *Hesperia*, XXVII, 1958, pp. 132-136 (Lerna), with reference to others (pp. 135-136).

³³ The wall was discovered by Edward Dodwell in 1805, *Tour through Greece*, I, pp. 579-580; the fullest study is by W. E. McLeod, *Hesperia*, XXIX, 1960, pp. 316-323.

³⁴ See sketch plan by McLeod, *op. cit.*, p. 320, fig. 2, and photographs, pl. 72.

³⁵ Thucydides, II, 93-94; first identified by Dodwell. The fullest exposition of this theory is by W. McLeod, *op. cit.*

Piraeus. It can thus fulfill, though not perfectly, the conditions demanded, and, in the absence of another candidate for Boudoron, the identification should probably be accepted.³⁶ There is no material known to the writer that might help in dating the site.

An indication that Boudoron was, in fact, such a rubble camp, which could not be defended against great odds, is that it was so easily and quickly taken, and an indication that it was so placed that it did not command a view of the actual harbors of Megara is the fact that the large expedition of the Peloponnesians came as a surprise to the Athenians.

COASTAL SITES (EAST COAST)

THORIKOS

Fortifications on the peninsula of Agios Nikolaos at Thorikos³⁷ were indicated on the *Karten von Attika* and briefly described by Milchhöfer in his text,³⁸ but detailed investigations have only recently been made by Herman F. Mussche.³⁹

The site of Thorikos consists of three parts: the plain of Thorikos, in which the Society of the Dilettanti discovered a portico;⁴⁰ the peak of Velatouri, upon which stand the remains of the theater and Mycenaean tombs, and, to the east of Velatouri, the peninsula of Agios Nikolaos. The peninsula is attached to the mainland by a broad, low, sandy neck (now the site of an American chemical plant); it extends outward from the mainland curving toward the southeast about one kilometer, and has a breadth averaging *ca.* 300 m. It divides the bay at Thorikos into two parts, Frankolimani, a well protected anchorage of 5 to 20 m. depth, and Mandri on the south, which, though it is less well protected from southern winds, has the advantage of a spring of fresh water in the sea.

The western wall passes around the first hill of the peninsula. From the shore at the north it climbs the gentle slope toward the summit. It is 2.60 m. thick; one postern, 1.40 m. wide, allows communication between the fort and the mainland, and there is one square tower. At the top of the hill this wall meets a second defensive line, a small acropolis. On the west the acropolis wall continues the line of the outer defense wall, while a separate wall, running eastward, defends the acropolis on the north. This

³⁶ Eliot, p. 132, note 1, has similar reservations about the identification, but he offers no better alternative.

³⁷ No symbol has been placed with the name Thorikos on the site map (Pl. 1), since the character of the fortifications was not immediately evident. While in use it was probably associated with the permanent forts and garrisons; in construction it is midway between those and the rubble camps.

³⁸ *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XVI; Milchhöfer, Text, III, p. 26.

³⁹ H. F. Mussche, "La forteresse maritime de Thorikos," *B.C.H.*, LXXXV, 1961, pp. 176-205.

⁴⁰ *Unedited Antiquities of Attica*, Ch. 9, Pl. I. This building has apparently completely disappeared again, though it exists in photographs in the German Institute collection in Athens.

wall is thinner (1.95 m. thick) but more carefully constructed than the outer defense wall. Two series of rooms along the inner face of the acropolis wall in its northwest corner are sketchily indicated in Mr. Mussche's plan.

From the acropolis, following the line of the west acropolis wall, a second outer defense wall runs southward, corresponding to the wall on the north. About half way down the hill it turns eastward and continues, with two towers and a gate, to the sea. Thence it runs northeast, and runs up the slopes of the second, higher hill, on which stands the chapel of Agios Nikolaos, again with two gates and a tower; and finally, from there, it runs northwest down to the sea. It appears possible that there were walls protecting the fort from the sea at the south, but none have appeared at the north.⁴¹

Though the walls are technically of rubble (that is, built of apparently unworked field stones without mortar) as in the other sites here described, they are much more carefully constructed with much more attention to the careful fitting of stones, so that the faces of the walls are smooth. With the exception of Plakoto, this sort of masonry appears nowhere else in this group. It is a sort of compromise between the rude rubble exhibited by most of these sites and the massive and beautiful stonework in the permanent forts such as Gyphtokastro, Phyle, and Rhamnous. Along with this better masonry, Thorikos also has some features not generally found elsewhere: stairways leading to the top of the wall (cf. Palaiokastro), regularly shaped square towers, and regular gateways.

The material recovered in the excavations all comes from the end of the fifth century or from the fourth century B.C. It is notably less developed than the Koroni material and has many parallels among the finds from Olynthos. It is, however, published by Mr. Mussche without profiles and with scanty photographs; provenances are also lacking, so that it is difficult to determine the implications of the material. Perhaps further study of the material and its contexts can furnish additional information.

The fort has always been considered Athenian, and this conclusion is supported by Xenophon's mention of a fort being built at Thorikos (*Hellenica*, I, 2, 1) and the statement of Pseudo-Xenophon that one was in existence later (*De Vect.*, IV, 43). Wrede, relying on Xenophon's statement in the *Hellenica*, suggested that this maritime fort was built in 410/9 B.C.⁴² Mussche, however, considering that the same conditions which necessitated the fortification of Sounion and of Rhamnous probably caused the construction of the fort at Thorikos, prefers to assign it to 412 B.C. For this study such a small margin of error is not critical, but it seems to the writer that, in the absence of epigraphical or literary support, it is dangerous to reject the explicit and well dated statement of Xenophon.

⁴¹ For all this see *B.C.H.*, LXXXV, 1961, fig. 3 facing p. 180.

⁴² *R.E.*, s.v. Thorikos, cols. 339-340.

KORONI

For the discussion of this site, see pp. 1-16.

MARATHON AREA

1. MT. AGRIELIKI (Pl. 9, e).

In 1926 Professor Soteriades located and excavated a previously unknown fortification on the northernmost of the eastern ridges of Mt. Agrieliki.⁴³ The site is a rocky cliff (height 209 on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XIX) clearly visible from the modern road (directly above the "Exposition d'Art de Stavros"). The enclosed area has a circumference of about 300 meters. On the northwest, west, south, and southeast the area is fortified with a rubble wall, measured by Soteriades as two meters thick. It is now in a very ruined state, appearing as a broad line of rubble in which it is difficult to measure the original thickness of the wall (Pl. 9, e). On the north, where it is somewhat better preserved, the construction can be seen to be rather more careless than usual among similar Attic fortifications. The wall does not seem to have had towers, and no gateway is now visible. The northeast side, where there are sheer cliffs, was not strengthened with a wall.

The interior of the enclosure is very rocky and uneven, and there are no traces of buildings. At the southeast side there is, however, a cleft in the rock which forms a sort of cave. From this cave Soteriades collected a number of sherds which were said by him to include prehistoric, geometric, archaic, and classical examples.⁴⁴

Soteriades identified the site with the acropolis of the deme of Marathon. This identification as well as the ceramic evidence for dating the walls has been doubted,⁴⁵ and, considering the scarcity of demes with fortified acropoleis, it may well be that this fortification was rather a small temporary outpost in the Marathonian area. There is, unfortunately, no evidence now on the site to determine its date,⁴⁶ and while it should probably be classed as a small fortified camp with the other sites here reported, nothing more specific can, therefore, be said about it.

2. MANDRA TIS GRAIAS (Pl. 15, c).

A rubble enclosure lying on the western foothills of Mt. Kotroni, where the path leads between the valley of Avlona and that of Oinoe, bears the local name of *μάνδρα τῆς γραιῆς*, sheepfold of the old woman.⁴⁷ The wall, about 3300 m. long, follows a

⁴³ Reported briefly in *C.W.*, XX, 1926/7, p. 84; *J.H.S.*, XLVII, 1927, p. 254; and again in *Πρακτικά*, 1935, pp. 156-158.

⁴⁴ *Πρακτικά*, 1935, p. 156, p. 158, note 1.

⁴⁵ W. K. Pritchett, *Marathon* (*University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology*), IV, no. 2, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1960, pp. 150-151.

⁴⁶ The writer found no sherds in the area of the fortification except a very few rough and shapeless pieces which defy dating; similar results have been obtained by a number of scholars who have visited the site, e.g. E. Vanderpool, W. K. Pritchett, F. W. Mitchel, R. S. Stroud, *et al.*

⁴⁷ For the origin of the name see R. Chandler, *Travels in Asia Minor and Greece* (ed. N.

roughly circular course, and runs along the slopes of the hills enclosing the valley below.⁴⁸ The course of the wall is very erratic, and it was apparently not dictated by the contours of the land. The wall itself is built of field stones, with two relatively vertical faces of moderate sized stones and a packing of smaller stones. It is preserved in places to a height of about one meter, and its thickness varies from 1.40 m. to 1.80 m.

On the southern side of the enclosure are the remains of a monumental gateway, and it is these remains that attracted the attention of the early travellers. On one side of the arch of the gate was inscribed:⁴⁹

‘Ομονοίας ἀθανάτ[ου]
 πύλη
 ‘Ηρώδου ὁ χῶρος
 εἰς ὃν εἰσέρχε[ι]

It has more recently been discovered that the other side bears an identical inscription, save that ‘Ηρώδου is replaced by ‘Ρηγίλλης.⁵⁰ Remains of two or three statues of seated figures found in the area have been taken as adornments of the gateway, though their identification is not sure.⁵¹

Whether the gateway belongs with the rubble enclosure is not entirely sure. The wall is now destroyed in the immediate vicinity of the gateway, and earlier opinions have varied.⁵² Two things are, however, sure. The gate and the enclosure were connected before the first recorded opinion, and the enclosure was never a fortification. The name of the site, combining *μάνδρα* from the appearance of the enclosure and *γραιά* from the gate, assures the former conclusion and makes a modern date for the wall very unlikely. That it was not a fortification can be inferred from its location. On the west and east, where it is built on rising hillsides, it would have been open to attack from above, and even on the north, where it could have been built in a commanding position just north of the crest of the ridge, it was not invariably so built. Nor,

Revet), II, Oxford, 1823, pp. 207-208 (a journey made in 1765-1766 and thus a rather early reference to the structure).

⁴⁸ See *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XIX.

⁴⁹ *I.G.*, II², 5189 recorded in 1792 by Fauvel; cf. W. M. Leake, *Demi of Attica*², pp. 80-81.

⁵⁰ G. Soteriades, *Πρακτικά*, 1935, p. 150; cf. *I.G.*, II², 5189.

⁵¹ A reconstructed drawing of the gate was attempted by P. Le Bas, see S. Reinach, *Voyage archéologique en Grèce et en Asie Mineure sous la direction de M. Philippe Le Bas (1842-1844)*, Paris, 1888, pl. 90, text, pp. 90-91. On the remains of the statues see W. M. Leake, *Demi of Attica*², pp. 80-81; A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, III, p. 43. The significance of the gateway is discussed by P. Graindor, *Hérodote Atticus*, Cairo, 1930, pp. 185-186.

⁵² H. Lolling, *Ath. Mitt.*, I, 1876, p. 83, considers that the *mandra* must be a fortification and does not accept the connection of it with the gate. Milchhöfer, *Text*, III, p. 43, considers the connection sure and suggests that the enclosure can as easily have been a sheepfold or goatfold as a fortification. Soteriades, *Πρακτικά*, 1935, p. 150, sees it as a country estate with olive groves.

in fact, is the area itself a likely one for a fortification; for it controls nothing but its own area, and from it there is no good view of other parts of the Marathonian plain.

That the enclosed area once contained buildings is still evident. To the east of the path between Avlona and Oinoe, not far within the northern limit of the enclosure, are the remains of several buildings. These are all now very ruined and hardly more than piles of stones, but the ground around them is littered with sherds and fragments of roof tiles as well as baked bricks of Roman date. Nothing there would be inconsistent with a date in the second century after Christ.

The most natural solution is that both the wall and the gate were built by Herodes. Not only is the gate proof that Herodes's land was near by, but there is no evidence that might argue for a different date for the wall. Moreover, though the wall has no distinctive character and is not so elegant as are most of Herodes's projects, still it is one of the longest rubble walls in Attica (surpassed only by τὸ Δέμα) and thus a considerable undertaking. If it was a private enclosure, as all signs seem to show, and not built for either a religious or military purpose, it must have been built by a man of considerable means; Herodes seems the likely candidate.

3. TAMBURI GURA (Pl. 10, a).

In the district of Oinoe (or Ninioi) about two kilometers west of the modern town of Marathon and almost directly north of the *mandra tis graias*, rises an isolated hill often referred to as the Pan Mountain (Pans Berg on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XIX) from the location there of a cave of Pan mentioned by Pausanias.⁵³ At its peak is a small area enclosed by a rubble wall which was noted by Milchhöfer and, following Hauptmann Eschenberg, assigned to the War of Independence. According to Milchhöfer and the *Karten* it is called Tamburi Gura.⁵⁴ Milchhöfer compares certain other sites like Etosi and Kastraki with it.

The wall is today indistinguishable from a field wall, and, in fact, it serves that purpose, dividing a field of grain which lies inside it from the surrounding pasture of the slopes. Considering this, and the total absence of evidence for habitation within the enclosure, it would be dangerous to claim historical significance for it.

4. TRIKORYNTHOS (Fig. 7).

The bare mountain of Stravrokoraki, lying at the northern side of the plain of Marathon, terminates on the east in a rounded hill above the village of Kato-Souli.

⁵³ Pausanias, I, 32, 7; a cave on this hill has long been identified with that seen by Pausanias (cf. Frazer, *Pausanias*, II, p. 439), though no antiquities have ever been found in it. Another cave has recently been discovered higher up on the same hill and this has been investigated by I. Papademetriou; the evidence for habitation there in prehistoric times as well as classical times makes it a much better candidate. See E. Vanderpool, *A.J.A.*, LXII, 1958, pp. 321-322; *B.C.H.*, LXXXII, 1958, pp. 681-686; **Εργον*, 1958, pp. 15-22.

⁵⁴ Text, III, p. 48.

Remains of fortifications have long been noted on this hill, though no plan or pictures of them have, to the writer's knowledge, been published.⁵⁵




FIG. 7. Plan of Trikorynthos

⁵⁵ The earliest description and still the most detailed is given by H. G. Lolling, *Ath. Mitt.*, I, 1876, pp. 81-82. Most other accounts draw on this, though A. Milchhöfer, Text, III, p. 49, reports details from autopsy.

Another small "ancient acropolis," also on Mt. Stavrokoraki, was noted by G. Soteriades, *Πρακτικά*, 1935, pp. 141-147, 149, fig. 18. The site stands on the southern end of the low spur (Repki, height 116 on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XIX) which extends toward the Marathonian plain at the southwest of the main mass of Mt. Stavrokoraki.

The south and west sides of the level peak area (ca. 30 m. north-south and ca. 40 m. east-west) are enclosed by a well built rubble wall, ca. 1.50 m. thick. The wall is built like a terrace wall against

The walls ⁵⁶ follow a complicated plan, more complex, it seems, than had been realized by earlier investigators. Both Lolling and Milchhöfer reported two circuits, the inner being 460 paces in circumference and 1.5 m. thick, the outer 2.5 m. thick and following a course not concentric with the other, so that while on the western side it approached the inner circuit and ran parallel to it, on the east and south it diverged and followed an entirely independent course.

Today the remains indicate that there was a ring-wall 343.5 m. long around the peak, which, where measurable, is 2.40-2.60 m. thick (Pl. 10, b). From the southern corner a rather narrower (*ca.* 2.00 m. wide) wall runs for some 95 m. downhill to the southeast. From a point just outside the circuit at its northern edge, a second outer wall runs first down the hill to the northeast, then turns toward the south to encircle the hill at a level about half way up the hill; it finally turns toward the plain again and vanishes. This wall, where measurable, is 1.90 m. thick, relatively close in size to the southern long wall. How these two arms of the outer enclosure were linked at the west side of the central enclosure is not entirely clear. It does not, however, appear that there was merely a second wall parallel to the inner circuit on this side; for at least two other lines of wall roughly parallel to the two noticed by Lolling can now be followed, so that the following walls are seen to lie on this side of the hill:

1. The inner circuit, 2.60 m. thick.
2. A southern long wall forming part of the outer defense. 2.00 m. thick. Runs southeast from the south corner of (1).
3. A northern long wall, 1.90 m. thick.
4. A western wall, running parallel to the inner circuit (1) for most of its length and *ca.* 6 m. from it. *Ca.* 1.60 m. thick. Runs into the intersection of (1) and (2) and connects at the north with (3).
5. A second western wall, outside (4) and 2 to 3 m. from it. 1.30-1.50 m. thick. Appears to merge at the south with (1), (2), and (4).

the higher ground behind it, so that while its front face rises to a height of *ca.* 1.40 m., at the rear its top is at ground level. A free-standing wall, *ca.* 1.30 m. thick and preserved to a height of *ca.* 1.00 m., runs along the eastern side of the peak area; a similar, but less well preserved wall runs along the north; and another bisects the area from east to west. These walls, though also of rubble, contain a considerable quantity of tile fragments as well as fieldstone; in this they differ markedly from the other walls described in this study.

At the northwest of the peak area traces of the rubble foundations of a rectangular building are visible, and elsewhere piles of stone may show the locations of other structures. A marble stele with two rosettes (noted by Soteriades, pp. 143-144) and a marble basin lie on the surface, and sherds attest occupation in Classical and Roman times.

Though the site itself is perhaps suited to military purposes, commanding, as it does, a view of much of the Marathonian plain (but not of Trikorynthos or the area northeast of it), the walls are unlike the fortifications included in this study both in their construction and in their placement, and the remains appear to the writer more like those of a small temenos or shrine.

⁵⁶ The site was surveyed by the writer and his wife on 31 March 1962.

6. Begins from the northern long wall (3) and runs counter-clockwise around the hill 25-30 m. from the inner circuit (1). Roughly concentric with the other walls on western side of hill. *Ca.* 0.90 m. thick. Poorly preserved. Becomes impossible to trace.

All these walls are clearly distinguishable on the western side of the hill, and (6) is clearly distinguishable on the north, but the course of the other walls on this side is questionable. The whole area is covered with fallen rubble, and it is only with the greatest difficulty that a wall face can be distinguished. The plan shows the walls as they were traced after a careful examination, but their courses are so erratic as shown that it is possible that some mistake was made.⁵⁷

Without the benefit of excavation it is now impossible to determine accurately the relationship of these various walls, and without this knowledge one can only guess at their intended purpose. The basic plan seems to have been that of a fortified acropolis protected by the inner circuit and a lower area protected by the north and south long walls.⁵⁸ The subsidiary walls on the north and west sides are puzzling. It is conceivable that some, particularly the narrow wall (6) and a short, narrow wall linking the north wall (3) to the western walls (4, 5) were terrace walls, but why should these be located outside the fortified area? Likewise it is difficult to imagine the purpose of the three lines of walls on the western side of the circuit which lie so close to one another. It is possible that these represent different stages in the development of the fortification and that they go back to a time when only the acropolis was fortified, but in this case one wonders why their lines, so close to that adopted for the 2.60 m. circuit, were abandoned.

There seems to have been no system of towers or other elaboration of the fortifications, and only possible traces of one entrance were found; on the southeastern side of the inner circuit there is a 2.80 m. gap in the wall which may have been a gateway. A wall runs inward from its north side, and immediately north of this, on the circuit wall and behind it, is a pile of rubble both larger and higher than is generally associated with the wall. This could be the remnants of a tower or platform belonging to the entrance. At the southwest corner (presumably of the "outer circuit") both Lolling and Milchhöfer noted a gateway *ca.* 1.30 m. wide, of which the

⁵⁷ While the plan may not, then, give a completely accurate picture, it should be emphasized that it is in no way built on fantasy; all the walls shown do exist. It is rather in completeness that the plan may be deficient.

⁵⁸ Whether the outer circuit was ever closed on the southeast is not now evident; Milchhöfer and Lolling both seem to assume so, but they do not describe the completion of the circuit in detail. We could find no remains of any such closing section, and the direction of both arms of the outer walls at the points where they now vanish seems to support the opposite view, that the walls merely continued to the bottom of the hill. If this were true, one wonders whether the walls would have continued across the ancient road up to the limits of the swamp, so that the road would have passed through the lower fortifications.

stones were larger and more regularly cut than those of the rest of the wall; Lolling compares it with the postern at Phyle.⁵⁹ We were, however, unable to locate this gate or the towers also mentioned by Milchhöfer on this side.

The remains on this hill have almost invariably been connected with the Attic deme of Trikorynthos.⁶⁰ Not only does the site fit well with the topographical information in the authors,⁶¹ but Trikorysian gravestones have been found near Kato-Souli.⁶² The deme was a member of the Attic tetrapolis, and the walls have therefore been dated in Mycenaean times.⁶³ There does not, however, seem to be much archaeological evidence to support this date, though it cannot currently be disproved.⁶⁴ Mycenaean sherds do not appear to be very numerous on the site. There is some obsidian, and the pottery ranges from later Geometric times (latter part of the eighth century B.C.) to Classical.⁶⁵

The evidence is not conclusive. The dating is based on a handful of sherds from various periods, and the connection of the site with the deme-center of Trikorynthos assumes that the deme-center should be identical with the most prominent remains in the area of the deme. If the fortification is to be identified with the deme-center, it is an almost unique example of the "fortified deme," that is, an acropolis which served a single deme rather than a garrison of the Athenian army.

5. KYNOSOURA (Fig. 8)

The long narrow peninsula of Stomi which closes the bay of Marathon on the east has long been identified with the Kynosoura known from the lexicographers to have been part of the topography of Marathon (Pl. 10, c).⁶⁶ The Peninsula is a continuation of the range of Mt. Drakonera; it extends some 2300 m. in a north-south direction and is up to 400 m. wide. The terrain is still very difficult; although the draining of the swamp and the construction of roads now makes it easy to reach

⁵⁹ For which see W. Wrede, *Ath. Mitt.*, XLIX, 1924, pp. 183-187.

⁶⁰ Since Lolling drew notice to the site in 1874. Leake, *Demi of Attica*², p. 87 and *Travels in Northern Greece*, II, London, 1835, p. 433, puts the deme on a hill somewhat northeast of Kato-Souli, at the place marked "Gräber, Fundamente, und Baustücke" on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XVIII; Milchhöfer, *Text*, III, pp. 49-50, thinks these to be only a necropolis.

⁶¹ Principally Strabo. For the collected references see G. Radke, *R.E.*, s.v. Trikory(n)thos (1939), who, however, uses them in connection with only earlier 19th century topographical literature.

⁶² *I.G.*, II², 7551, 7553, and, from near Grammatiko, 7549.

⁶³ So listed by G. Karo, *R.E.*, Supplement, VI, 1935, col. 608; cf. Stubbings, *B.S.A.*, XLII, 1947, p. 8.

⁶⁴ Professor Soteriades does not seem to have made the archaeological investigations promised in his article, *Πρακτικά*, 1935, p. 148.

⁶⁵ These remarks are based on sherds which the writer picked up at the site together with those found in the sherd collection of the American School of Classical Studies.

⁶⁶ Hesychios, s.v. Kynosoura: "a point at Marathon extending towards Euboea"; cf. Photius, s.v. Cf. W. M. Leake, *Demi of Attica*², p. 78.




FIG. 8. Plan of Kynosoura

the base of the peninsula, the route to the promontory is still pathless, very steep, and very rocky, so that the two kilometer trip takes well over one hour.

The southern tip of the peninsula is low and rises gradually toward the north in two rocky hills. The northern two-thirds is occupied by a steep ridge which rises to 93 m., the highest point of the peninsula, at its southern end; it has two minor peaks of 76 m. and one of 81 m. at its northern end. The peninsula then becomes lower where it joins the mainland, but northward from this point the ground again rises into the high mountain of Drakonera.⁶⁷

The site is even now made unpleasant by the odors and insects which come from the imperfectly drained Great Marsh. In antiquity, when the marsh had not been drained at all, it must have been a still less desirable spot.

The remains on the peninsula have been little discussed; the *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XVIII, indicates a "Ringmauer" running north of peak 81 (wall A on Fig. 8) to the sea on the west as antique, though it is not mentioned by Milchhöfer in the text. Prof. Soteriades described some of the remains in the area in connection with his investigations in the Marathon area.⁶⁸ In addition to the above noted wall A, he notes an acropolis, presumably the hill 62 to the north, on the slopes of which are parts of three walls (here B on the south slope and C and D on the north). Little description is given and most of Prof. Soteriades' attention is devoted to assigning the walls to a refuge used by herdsmen and farmers during the Peloponnesian War, when Athens controlled the sea but not the land. He sees it as a safe refuge which could easily be supplied from the sea.

Remains are visible on and near Kynosoura in several places. They will be described in order as indicated on the plan (Fig. 8).

A. A wall cutting the peninsula off from the land (Pl. 10, d). This wall is the same as that indicated on the *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XVIII and described by Soteriades.⁶⁹ By the former it is, however, incorrectly described as a "Ringmauer," while Soteriades incorrectly states that it extends from sea to sea. In fact the wall runs only about three-quarters of the distance across the peninsula. It is built on the northern slopes of the northernmost peak of Kynosoura (peak 81), beginning at the sea on the east and running almost directly westward up the slopes to a point slightly west of the peak; its total length is 211 m. Here the hill descends in steep cliffs to the sea at the west, and no trace of the wall remains; it is probable that it was carried no further, since it would have served no useful purpose in this already inaccessible terrain.

The wall is well built of undressed local stones—apparently the sole product of this inhospitable peninsula. They are laid without mortar to form a wall 2.60-2.90 m.

⁶⁷ Cf. *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XVIII and here Fig. 8, inset.

⁶⁸ G. Soteriades, *Πρακτικά*, 1935, pp. 150-154.

⁶⁹ *Loc. cit.*

thick; in places the wall is preserved to a height of 2.00 m. There are now two openings through the wall, where modern goat tracks cross it, the western one being 2.60 m. wide, the eastern 2.00 m. wide; no jambs are now preserved, and it is unsure whether either or both of these represent ancient gateways. If not, there was no passage through the wall.⁷⁰

The purpose of the wall must have been, as Soteriades has said, to defend the peninsula from attack on the landward side and to effectively divide it from the land.

B. The hill to the north of the base of the peninsula (height 62 on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XVIII) is protected on its southern side by a rubble wall. The wall begins at the coast on the east and climbs westward up the southern slopes of the hill. Following the contours of the hill, it turns northward, continuing to a point on the western side of the hill where it suddenly turns to the west and starts down the hill. Soon after this corner it disappears, and, if more ever existed, there is now no trace of it.

This wall, whose total preserved length is 202 m., is built of unworked stones of moderate size. It is very poorly preserved, being seldom more than one or two courses high; the rear face is difficult to find in most places, and it may be that only the outer face was built with any care. Where the rear face is preserved, the wall has a thickness of 1.40 m.

C. On the north side of the same hill is another stretch of rubble wall analogous to that on the south side. A stretch of only 158 m. is preserved, running in a generally east-west direction, all at nearly the same height on the hill. It is now impossible to determine whether the wall originally continued from either of the ends which are preserved. The hill falls quite steeply to the sea on the east, and perhaps no additional defense was thought necessary on this side. At its western end this wall, like the south wall (B), simply fades out.

Again the wall is built of unworked stones of moderate size, and, like the south wall, it is very poorly preserved, seldom to a height of more than 0.50 m. Near the center, however, a good stretch of wall preserves both faces, and there it averages 2.50 m. in thickness. In scale, therefore, it is nearer to wall A than to wall B.

D. Just behind wall C is a 23-meter stretch of another, earlier wall. While technically rubble, it is built of much larger stones and with a good deal more care. It has a constant thickness of 2.00 m. and is preserved to a height of 2.20 m. at its highest point. The line of this wall runs under that of wall C at both ends of the preserved stretch, and it was apparently destroyed by the builders of wall C when it intersected or coincided with their line; larger stones in wall C near either end of wall D seem to support this suggestion.

There are now no visible ancient remains on the hill enclosed by these walls (B, C, D). The peak area is now occupied by a sheepfold, while further to the north

⁷⁰ A not unexampled situation, see "Koroni," p. 47 and p. 5, *supra*.

are the remains of a modern structure, evidently an army pillbox. We noticed no sherds on our visits to the site.

The remains themselves do not make clear the nature and purpose of the walls. Surely, however, they served a defensive purpose. Their siting admits of no other explanation.

A reasonable conjecture would seem to be that this northern hill was occupied by a force hostile to that which occupied Kynosoura itself and which built wall A. A garrison on this hill would effectively prevent the force on Kynosoura from attacking, by land at least, the surrounding countryside and would effectively contain it on the peninsula. Wall B would protect such a garrison from attack by the force on Kynosoura. Perhaps wall C should be connected with the same project, though the difference in construction is puzzling; an alternative would be to connect it with wall A, as an original outer line of defense which was abandoned when the hostile garrison occupied the hill. Wall D is preserved in so short a stretch that neither its tactical purpose nor an occasion for its construction can be suggested.

E. A hitherto unnoticed wall is found on the north slope of the southernmost hill of the peninsula (height 16 on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XVIII, cf. Fig. 8, inset). It has now practically no preserved height, being visible only as a line of rubble on the slopes of the hill. From its location it must have faced north, and it must, therefore, have been intended to defend the promontory against attack from the land. Occasionally the original faces of the wall can be seen, and these indicate that it was *ca.* 2.40 to 2.50 m. thick.

About 15 m. south of the wall, on top of the southernmost hill, are remains of several buildings, preserved to a height of from 0.50 to 1.70 m. These could well be modern. About 40 m. south of these buildings, on either side of the peninsula, are structures that appear to be towers or watch posts. They are 2.60 m. east-west and 2.40 m. north-south, with the side facing the land open. The walls are of rubble *ca.* 0.65 m. thick. Whether or not any of these remains at the tip of the peninsula are ancient is not now evident. The only pottery visible is late Roman or Byzantine in date, but even this is so scarce and so loosely associated with the walls as to be far from conclusive. It is possible that this wall and its towers should be associated with the same events that led to the building of the northern wall A.

F. On both the east and west slopes of the highest peak of Kynosoura (height 93 on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XVIII) are masses of loose rubble which may well have belonged to house walls. No walls are now visible, but a considerable number of sherds may be collected in the area, and it is sure that it was once inhabited.

FINDS FROM KYNOSOURA (all from area F) :

1. Fragment of the base of a partly glazed jug. Pl. 20, f. 1.

D. of foot *ca.* 0.12 m. Reddish clay only slightly gritty. Band of black glaze around ring-foot. Unglazed interior. Fifth or fourth century (from straight foot).

2. Wall fragment of a partly glazed jug. Pl. 20, f, 2.
Max. dim. 0.05 m. Unglazed except for a band of red glaze 0.01 m. wide. A technique that is common in the later fifth century and in the fourth century.
3. Base fragment of a black-glazed one-handler (?). Pl. 20, f, 3.
D. of base *ca.* 0.08 m. Glaze fired red. Probably late fifth or fourth century.
4. Base fragment of a black-glazed fish plate or bowl. Pl. 20, f, 4.
Outer D. of base *ca.* 0.095 m. Glazed both inside and out. Very thick ring base (0.032 m. wide). Center missing. Fourth century (?).
5. Rim fragment of "umbrella stand." Pl. 20, f, 5.
Out-turned thickened rim. Horizontal and vertical combing on interior. Body grows larger below rim. Cf. "Koroni," no. 46.
6. Rim fragment of a semi-glazed basin. Pl. 20, f, 6.
D. *ca.* 0.30 m. Wide horizontal rim with two grooves. Red glaze on rim and interior. Fourth century.
7. Rim fragment of black-glazed plate. Pl. 20, f, 7.
D. *ca.* 0.16 m. Slightly thickened rim. Outside surface slightly articulated. Glaze partly flaked away. Cf. Thompson, no. A 70. Late fourth century.
8. Rim fragment of a black-glazed kantharos. Pl. 20, f, 8.
D. *ca.* 0.09 m. Ledge on outside of rim. Cf. D. M. Robinson, *Olynthus*, XIII, pl. 190 and pl. 192 no. 522B. This example is, however, lighter in fabric and probably comes from the taller type. Late fourth century.

The sherds from Kynosoura thus show that the site was occupied in the late Classical or early Hellenistic periods. The latest pieces belong with H. A. Thompson's Group A, as does the pottery from Koroni and that from Patroklos Island; Kynosoura seems, however, to have a greater proportion of earlier pieces than either of those sites. It is, therefore, not impossible that Kynosoura, or some part of it, is contemporary with these two Chremonidean War sites, but the proof is far from conclusive.

THE PLAIN OF ATHENS AND ITS BORDERS

HELIOUPOLIS

Chance finds of coins, arrowheads, sling bullets, and pottery made in the Athenian suburb of Helioupolis have led Mrs. Eirene Varoucha-Christodouloupoulou to identify this place as the site of a military establishment.⁷¹

The finds were made in 1941 and 1943 in the Second District of Helioupolis, on the lower slopes of Mt. Hymettos, a district formerly called Kara (and so indicated on the *Karten von Attika*, Bl. IV). Most of them come, more specifically, from the area around Odos Neftonos (Newton Street) in this suburb. There are now no remains

⁷¹ Varoucha, pp. 321-349. This article is the sole publication of the finds from Helioupolis, and the numbers in my summary of them correspond to the publication numbers. In Mrs. Varoucha's article the coins from Helioupolis appear on pp. 323-326, arrowheads on p. 332, bullets on pp. 332-333, and pottery on pp. 334-335.

of ancient walls to be seen in the district, though there is some probability that such walls did once exist and have now vanished.⁷²

The coins found fell into the following groups:

- a. one gold Alexander. Late fourth century (no. 1).
- b. two gold tetradrachms (nos. 2 and 3).
obv.: ΑΔΕΛΦΩΝ heads of Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II.
rev.: ΘΕΩΝ heads of Ptolemy I and Berenike I. Year K.⁷³
- c. one silver tetradrachm of Ptolemy I (Svoronos, *Ptolemies*, no. 247).
- d. four bronze coins of Ptolemy I.
- e. 45 bronze coins of Ptolemy II.⁷⁴
- f. one bronze coin of Chalkis (early third century B.C.).
- g. 6 bronze coins of Athens (early third century B.C.)
- h. one bronze coin of "Eleusis."
- i. one bronze coin of Athenian Kleruchs in Delos.

⁷² "Traces of ancient walls and buildings" were noted by E. Dodwell, *Tour through Greece*, I, pp. 482-483, at Palaio Kara, and it is likely that these were in the area from which the finds come. A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, II, p. 28, failed to find noteworthy remains here, but it is often true that Dodwell, who was interested in rubble walls, noticed and recognized as ancient things which to others seemed unimportant. Alternatively, it is possible that whatever Dodwell saw had already vanished, through stone-robbery or some other cause, before Milchhöfer visited the site. In view of Dodwell's almost incredible accuracy in other cases of this sort (cf. Kaisariani, *infra*) it would be dangerous to assume that Dodwell invented the ruins at Kara.

⁷³ The dating of these coins has been much discussed. Svoronos, *Ptolemies*, II, pp. 92 f., assigns them to Ptolemy II, with dates indicating years after Arsinoe's death in 271. E. T. Newell and others have assigned the initiation of the series to Ptolemy III Euergetes; cf. A. B. Brett, *Amer. Num. Soc. Museum Notes*, V, 1952, pp. 6-7. Mrs. Varoucha reverts to Ptolemy II, but suggests that the dates indicate years after the marriage of Ptolemy II and his sister. It is worth noting that if the coins are considered part of the same group as the Ptolemy II bronzes, and all the finds are related to the Chremonidean War, it will be necessary to accept this new dating both as to reign and as to year.

⁷⁴ The following issues are represented (references are to Mrs. Varoucha's numbers; the comparisons given here supersede Mrs. Varoucha's, which, according to the photographs, are sometimes erroneous):

Svoronos, <i>Ptolemies</i> , II, Class Z, Series B, Size A:	
Δ (282/1)	(Svor. 564 but w. ✕ instead of Σ) : 13.
Θ (278/7)	(Svor. 572) : 10, 11, 22-28.
! (277/6)	(Svor. 576) : 6, 7.
Λ (275/4)	(Svor. 581) : 12, 14, 20.
Π (271/0)	(Svor. 589) : 29.
↑ (267/6 or 265/4)	(Svor. 553) : 36; same but w. ✕ : 8, 15, 16, 30, 34, 35.
⊠	(Svor. 557) : 18
without letter (?)	(Svor. 600) : 38; same but w. ✕ : 39.
Size B:	50.

Besides the coins Mrs. Varoucha published three arrowheads (p. 332) and four sling bullets (pp. 332-333) from Helioupolis; these perhaps support the theory of military activity in the area, but give no indication of date. Likewise she publishes a miscellany of pottery fragments, the greatest number of which are from wine amphoras. Miss Grace examined these for Mrs. Varoucha, and in her opinion they belonged largely to the late fourth century and beginning of the third century B.C.⁷⁵ These are the only fragments for which the date is given, though she also lists, without description or photographs, fragments of two black-glazed vessels. Several fragments of "umbrella stands" complete the catalogue.

Again it is the bronze coins of Ptolemy II that establish both the identity of the military establishment that occupied the area and the date. These coins represent by far the majority of the coins and are the most conspicuous of all the finds. They are like those found at Koroni and Vouliagmeni, and even come from some of the same years. These facts, combined with the rest of the material which is similar to that from Koroni, make it virtually certain that the two sites are contemporary. Whatever the exact nature of the military establishment at Helioupolis, it must be connected with the Chremonidean War as a Ptolemaic location.

MT. HYMETTOS CAMP (Fig. 9)

The ridge of Mt. Hymettos runs generally north and south dividing the plain of Athens from the Mesogeia. The main peak (alt. 1027.1 m.) is now occupied by a radar station and Nike Missile base. To the south of the peak the ridge follows a southwesterly course, dropping quickly and becoming very narrow, with the sheer descent of the Kako Rhevma on the west. South of the Kako Rhevma it again rises and spreads into a broad, reasonably level crest. On this level area near its northern end is a small fortified enclosure (about 1400 m. west southwest of the peak) (Pl. 11, a).⁷⁶


The plan⁷⁷ of the fortification is roughly trapezoidal; it extends about 47 m. east-west and 36 to 47 m. north-south. Its relatively regular plan, when compared to other rubble fortifications, may be attributed to the level ground which demanded few accommodations from the line of the walls. The outer walls are built of field stones without mud or other binder; stones of moderate size were used in the two faces, between which is a fill of slightly smaller stones. The thickness is regularly 2.35 m. The walls are now preserved to only about 1.30 m. high at their highest (Pl. 11, b).

⁷⁵ Varoucha, p. 334, note 2. It is notable that the so-called "Spanish" amphoras, fragments of which Mrs. Varoucha found at Helioupolis and elsewhere, and which attracted her attention because of their rarity, also occurred in abundance among the finds from Koroni (the dipinto neck, "Koroni," no. 44 and many examples of the toes in the stored context pottery).

⁷⁶ It is shown on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. IV, directly under the letter E of *Hymettos*.

⁷⁷ Based on observations made in company with Fordyce Mitchel in December 1961.

The walls do not meet at either the northeast or southeast corners. There was almost certainly an entrance at the southeast, though the condition of the walls does not permit accurate measurement of its original width; the northeast corner may have been closed. Along the outer face of the northern wall are three piles of rubble which appear to be the remains of small towers.⁷⁸ It seemed likely that the two eastern towers



MT. HYMETTOS CAMP

FIG. 9. Plan of Hymettos Camp

flanked a gateway, *ca.* 1.60 m. wide, though its faces or jambs are now destroyed.

A series of rooms lines the inner faces of the enclosure walls. These are formed by rubble walls about 1 m. thick built roughly parallel to the defense walls and at a distance of 2.50 to 3.50 m. from them. Cross walls, also 1 m. thick, divide the complex into individual rooms.⁷⁹ These are now in a very ruined condition, so that it is impossible to be sure exactly how many rooms originally existed. There is no trace of building in the open center of the enclosure, and the rough state of the rocky ground makes it virtually certain that no free-standing buildings ever existed.

Evidence for the date of this fortification is, unfortunately, very limited. Careful

⁷⁸ After careful searching we distinguished what seemed to be parts of the original faces of these towers, and on this basis the plans were drawn; there is, however, serious possibility of error due to the very ruined state of the remains.

⁷⁹ The remains of these rooms were wrongly interpreted by A. Milchhöfer as part of the outer defense wall, to which he thus ascribes "double-wall construction" (Text, II, p. 27).

searches in the enclosure by the writer on two occasions and by others on other occasions have produced no pottery save one or two small fragments of coarse, undatable cooking pots. There are, however, numerous fragments of black- and red-glazed Laconian-type roof tiles in all parts of the enclosure; they were especially numerous in the room at the southeast corner where a shepherd had removed much of the fallen rubble to make himself a shelter. These tiles, similar to those found on Koroni and at other fortifications (e.g. Kastraki, "Leipsydriion," etc.), would seem to guarantee the antiquity of the structures and to rule out the former opinion that they were built during modern times, perhaps during the War of Independence.⁸⁰

The purpose of the fortification, like its date, is not immediately clear. The site is isolated and very difficult of access. Any force encamped there would be effectively cut out of any action in the Athenian plain. It is possible that there was once a route over Hymettos which passed this point, but any such route would have been quite difficult and would hardly have had any considerable importance. The site does, however, command an excellent view over the Athenian plain; in fact, with the exception of the slopes of Hymettos immediately below it, the whole plain can be seen. Of the sites considered in this study, the Hymettos tower, Kastraki, Dekeleia, Katsimidi, "Leipsydriion," Yerovouno, the Kamatero wall and the Mouseion and Mounichia can be observed. It may therefore be suggested that the Hymettos Camp served as a lookout and signaling post.

If this was the purpose of the fortification, it may further be suggested that the lookout was not an Athenian one, but rather that of a force which did not control the city. The entire Athenian plain is visible from the Acropolis, Lykabettos, or Tourkovouno, and the Acropolis itself commands a view of all the sites mentioned above. Since this is the case, it would be difficult to imagine the occasion which might have led a force with a lookout available within the city's defenses to establish another which offered no additional advantage in such an inaccessible spot on Hymettos. To a force which did not control the city, however, the Hymettos site might have provided an admirable alternative.

KAISARIANI (Pl. 2)

In October 1805, during a journey to the summit of Hymettos, Edward Dodwell noticed the remains of a fortification wall:

I took notice of a long wall composed of large blocks, apparently of the highest antiquity, which led me to conjecture that an insular hill, rising to the south of the Metochi, might be the site of some ancient demos. Having crossed the dry bed of the Ilissos, which is at its northern foot, I found the imperfect remains of a wall, rising not more than a foot above the ground, which leads to the summit of the hill, and terminates in the foundations of a square tower; two other adjoining hills are encircled by the walls, which appear to have included a

⁸⁰ Cf. A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, II, p. 27.

town of at least two miles in circuit. Although the traces are very imperfect, and apparently of high antiquity, it is surprising that they were unknown to former travellers.⁸¹

The same walls were apparently seen at about the same time by Sir William Gell, who says that the wall encloses four hills.⁸²

These walls, discovered by Dodwell, have apparently been lost since the early nineteenth century. Milchhöfer searched for them, but, misunderstanding Dodwell's route, he was unable to locate them, and his discussion of the question has led others astray.⁸³ The walls were rediscovered by the writer in May 1962.

They lie on the slopes of the hill called "Kaisariani Berg" (Pl. 11, e) on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. IV (height 375.1), and seem to have defended a considerable area.⁸⁴ From the modern paved road, which runs along the northern foot of the hill on the south side of the torrent bed, the wall runs southward up the slopes of the hill for perhaps 300 m. It then turns eastward and follows a ridge to the peak of the hill. The line is continued to the north of the road and the torrent bed for only about 10 m., running northward up the slope of the low east-west ridge which lies there.

The wall is only 0.80 to 0.90 m. thick, constructed, on the slopes of Kaisariani Berg, of two faces in the manner of other thin rubble walls (e.g. Thriasian "Lager," Kamatero wall) (Pl. 11, c-d). To the north of the road the same thickness was achieved with single larger blocks of stone (the part to which Dodwell came first). The wall is in a very poor state of preservation, never exceeding 0.50 m. in height, but apparently it is little worse than at the time Dodwell saw it. The remains of the tower which were seen by Dodwell are now very uncertain, though the presence of greater amounts of fill and loose rubble on the peak of the hill may indicate that it once existed. The wall is so constructed that it always faces on lower ground, giving the defenders the advantage over an attacking enemy.

The extent of the fortified area can no longer be determined; certainly it included the peak and the north and northwest slopes of the Kaisariani Berg as well as a part of the ridge to the north of it, but it is difficult to identify the three (Dodwell) or four

⁸¹ Dodwell, *Tour through Greece*, I, p. 484.

⁸² W. Gell, *Itinerary of Greece*², London, 1827 (a reprint of the 1st edition of 1819 according to the Gennadeion catalogue), pp. 93-94.

⁸³ A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, II, pp. 23-24. The rediscovery of the wall now makes Dodwell's account of this area understandable. With reference to the *Karten von Attika*, Bl. IV, the landmarks in this account are to be located as follows:

Sirgiani monastery—Kaisariani

Metochi of Sirgiani—the lower Markos (height 217.9)

The site of an ancient demos (pp. 484-485)—Kaisariani Berg

Ruined church with ancient blocks (p. 485)—the higher Markos (height 371.1)

Remains of another ruined fortress on a detached conical hill (p. 481)—Gur-i-Korakut (height 358.0)

⁸⁴ They are indicated by a white line on Plate 2, a photostat of *Karten von Attika*, Bl. IV (central section).

(Gell) hills that it is said to have included. One wonders whether these statements were based on actual examinations of the whole length of the wall or if the travellers merely viewed the surrounding territory from the top of Kaisariani Berg. If the wall did extend much further, it must have done so toward the north and east, since otherwise the preserved sections would have no tactical meaning.

That the purpose of these walls was entirely military and that they did not enclose an ancient deme (as Dodwell, Gell, and Leake⁸⁵ supposed) or the settlement of the Pelasgians is evident from the fact that there are no remains of buildings and no traces of habitation (sherds, tiles, etc.) to be found. The site, commanding a view over Athens, easily defensible, and with a good source of water at Kaisariani, would have been a good temporary camp for a force attacking the city.

Since there are no remains other than the walls, the camp cannot be dated with any certainty. The probability is, however, that it is ancient. It cannot date in the Greek War of Independence, since it was seen earlier than that war by Dodwell and Gell. Their accounts, which show that it was already in a very poor state of preservation, imply that it was built long before their visits. While this might suit a date in the medieval history of Athens as well, there is as yet no attested example of a medieval rubble fort in Attica, and until one is found, the presumption is that such a construction is, if not modern, from ancient times.

GUR-I-KORAKUT

The same considerations which apply to the fortification on Kaisariani Berg would seem to be valid for another site about three kilometers to the north of it, where Dodwell noticed a fortification.⁸⁶ This hill, however, now lies wholly within a military training area, the restrictions of which prevented the writer from visiting the site. Milchhöfer was unable to locate the walls.⁸⁷

KASTRAKI (Fig. 10)

The northernmost of the ridges which run westward into the Athenian plain from the main mass of Mt. Penteli now has the name Kastraki. The westernmost peak of this ridge lies about two kilometers north of Kephissia and gives its name to the suburb of Kastri.⁸⁸ Surrounding the oval peak is a fortification wall of unworked field stones which has long been known, though taken for a comparatively modern

⁸⁵ W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens*², pp. 281-282; his account apparently depends on Dodwell.

⁸⁶ Dodwell, *Tour through Greece*, p. 481; cf. W. M. Leake, *Topography of Athens*², p. 282.

⁸⁷ A Milchhöfer, *Text*, II, p. 21.

⁸⁸ See *Karten von Attika*, Bl. V, where the peak is marked 500.6.




FIG. 10. Plan of Kastraki

structure.⁸⁹ The enclosed peak is a long, narrow oval running north and south; the actual peak is at the southeast side of this oval.

The peak commands an excellent view over the plain of Athens from the slopes of Mt. Hymettos across to Mt. Aigaleos and Mt. Parnes. The pass over Dekeleia (Tatoi) runs directly by the fort.

The ridge drops steeply to the plain on the west and south; to the east, along its northern part, it drops steeply to the valley between it and the main mass of Penteli, while along its southern half it falls less steeply to the ridge which connects it with Penteli. Access is possible from any side, but, likewise from any side, it is steep.

Today the plateau is occupied by a small unroofed chapel of Agios Phanourios, which lies just north of the peak, and by various improvements and plantings made by the caretaker of the chapel. Much stone has been moved to make a modern path to the chapel and to build benches, while in other areas rubble has been removed and holes dug for the planting of trees. The path to the plateau is clearly marked by arrows pointing to this shrine, and rest stops are provided every hundred meters or so. If activity continues at the present rate, the antiquities will be irreparably damaged within a very short time.

The heavy fortification wall completely encircles the plateau (Pl. 12, a); it is slightly more than 415 m. long and has a constant thickness, where both faces are preserved, of 2.40 to 2.50 m. It is built of unworked stones laid without mortar or other binder, and is preserved, especially along the west side, to a height of about two meters (Pl. 12, b). Although there is much fallen stone about, it is less where the wall is preserved to this height, and the wall was probably never much higher.

There is now no sign of a gate through the wall, though there must have been one. Where the modern path enters the plateau toward the center of the west side, the wall has been rebuilt by the caretaker, and this is a likely place for the gate to have been (Fig. 10, a). The wall is no longer traceable at the southeast corner of the plateau, and this offers another possibility for the location of a gate, but a less likely one because of the steepness of the ascent at this point.

Despite their ruined condition and the disturbance caused by the chapel and its dependent improvements, traces of buildings are still visible within the circuit. On the highest point, built against the east fortification wall, is a rectangular building 12.70 m. by 9.20 m. (Fig. 10, b). Its north and west walls are clearly visible, 1.15 m. in thickness, as is its southern wall, though this is less clear. It is not certain whether the fortification wall served this building as an east wall, or whether its wall was built along the fortification wall. The walls of this building are preserved to a height of only about 0.50 m., but the large amount of fallen stone which lies both in and

⁸⁹ "Moderne Steinwalle" on *Karten von Attika*; cf. A. Milchhofer, *Text*, III, p. 33, where it is compared with Etosi and Ninoi (Tamburi Gura) and tentatively assigned to the War of Independence.

around it undoubtedly belongs to the building and indicates that the walls were carried in stone to a considerable height. Both from the thickness of the walls and from the location at the highest point of the plateau, it may be inferred that this building was a watchtower.

Traces of a considerable number of other buildings are still visible within the fortified circuit. A large building (Fig. 10, c), measuring over ten meters in either direction, lies to the north of the chapel. Though its walls are too poorly preserved to admit certainty about any of its features, it appears to have had at least six rooms, and to have been built with little regard to right angles. A second free-standing building, roughly rectangular in plan (7.50 by 4.30 m.) lies just to the south of c.

Series of small rooms, perhaps storerooms, were built along the inner face of the fortification wall. They are either a simple string of rooms *ca.* 3.70 m. deep and 2 to 4 m. in width (as Fig. 10, d) or a more elaborate sort of structure two rooms deep (as Fig. 10, e). The complexes already mentioned are still well enough preserved to allow measurement and admit certainty about their general plan, but several other complexes in a more ruined state exist, particularly along the northern part of the east wall and near the middle of the west wall.⁹⁰

Evidence for the buildings mentioned above and indicated on the plan consists not only of rubble walls *ca.* 0.50 to 0.70 m. in thickness, but also of concentrations of fragments of glazed roof tiles. These are of Laconian type and have "classical profiles," i.e. they resemble those found in other fourth and third century contexts. Such evidence exists also in several other areas within the enclosure, indicated by corners on Figure 10, f, and other free-standing buildings probably once occupied these areas. The walls are, however, in very poor condition and no plan can now be recovered without excavation.

The fortification on Kastraki has been considered modern,⁹¹ and the only published finds from the site belong to the Byzantine period.⁹² The presence of ancient roof tiles, however, indicates that the buildings belong to an earlier period, and recent visits to the site have produced fragments of pottery which may be used to fix the date of the fortification more precisely.⁹³

⁹⁰ These have been indicated by dotted lines on the plan, Fig. 10.

⁹¹ A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, III, p. 33.

⁹² A hoard of Byzantine bronze coins was acquired by the Numismatic Museum in Athens. Most date from the twelfth century A.D., and the burial of the hoard has been tentatively assigned to the invasion of Athens by Léon Sgouras in 1203. See *B.C.H.*, LXXVII, 1953, p. 194. For this invasion see Nicetas Choniates (ed. Bekker), pp. 800-803, a contemporary account; W. Miller, *The Latins in the Levant*, London, 1908, pp. 31-32.

⁹³ The listed objects are all chance finds collected from the surface. The larger fragments, however, apparently came from excavation carried out by the caretaker of the chapel of Agios Phanourios in the course of planting trees near the west wall, slightly north of the point where the modern path enters the enclosure (slightly north of Fig. 10, a).

FINDS FROM KASTRAKI:

1. Body of a black-glazed kantharos. Pl. 3, no. 2; Pl. 21, a.
D. 0.09 m. Handles, part of body, and foot missing. Unglazed interior except for band at rim. Glaze fired black at bottom (where stacked, otherwise red. Cf. Agora P 4468. Last quarter of fourth century.
2. Body fragment of a similar kantharos. Pl. 3, no. 3.
3. Base of a black-glazed kantharos. Pl. 3, no. 4; Pl. 21, b.
D. 0.045 m. Groove around foot. Similar type to above.
4. Fragment of a broad-based black-glazed bowl. Pl. 3, no. 7; Pl. 21, d.
D. of base 0.07 m. Stamped in center with four palmettes. Last quarter of fourth century.
5. Black-glazed bowl. Pl. 3, no. 6; Pl. 21, e.
D. ca. 0.10 m. Cf. E. Breccia, *La Necropoli di Sciatbi*, Cairo, 1912, II, pl. LVI, no. 117. Last quarter of fourth century.
6. Fragments of a spouted mortar. Pl. 21, f.
L. of spout 0.07 m. Reddish clay. Slightly flaring spout. Second half of fourth century.
7. Fragments of a shallow stand basin. Pl. 3, no. 8; Pl. 21, c.
D. ca. 0.37 m. Thin red glaze on interior. Cf. Agora P 8312, P 8313. About the middle of the fourth century.

The pottery all may be classified with Thompson, Group A, and it is thus comparable to that found at Koroni and Patroklos Island. Those sites have provided a later date for the time when this sort of pottery went out of use, so that the chronological limits for Kastraki, as established by the pottery, should be considered to be the last quarter of the fourth century and the second quarter of the third century B.C. The site may thus be contemporary with Koroni and Patroklos Island or somewhat earlier.

DEKELEIA AND KATSIMIDI

The location of the deme and fortified camp of Dekeleia in the vicinity of modern Tatoi, on the southeast slopes of Mt. Parnes has long been made,⁹⁴ though there has been some argument as to whether the exact location of the Spartan camp was on a low hill south of Tatoi or on the high peak of Katsimidi to the north.⁹⁵

The southern hill, called Palaiokastros and now the site of the cemetery of the Greek royal family,⁹⁶ lies wholly within the royal estate of Tatoi. It is densely wooded with pines, and, due to security arrangements, it is now impossible to investigate what-

⁹⁴ E.g. W. Gell, *Itinerary of Greece*², London, 1827, p. 106; W. M. Leake, *Demi of Attica*², pp. 18-19.

⁹⁵ The former was the generally accepted location until it was attacked by C. Hanriot, *Recherches sur la topographie des demes de l'Attique*, Napoléon-Vendée, 1853, pp. 122-123. Cf. A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, VII, pp. 2-4; L. Chandler, *J.H.S.*, XLVI, 1926, pp. 15-16. Though opinion has generally tended to return Dekeleia to the fort on the southern hill, the case for Katsimidi is revived by Th. A. Arvanitopoulou, *Δεκέλεια, Πολέμων, παράρτημα*, Athens, 1958, pp. 13, 25.

⁹⁶ Arvanitopoulou, *op. cit.*, pp. 58-66.

ever ancient remains may still be visible. It is, however, sure that the hill was once fortified with a circuit wall, and some parts of the wall are apparently still preserved.⁹⁷ The wall, of which the total length has been estimated as something over 800 meters, seems to have been carefully built of rubble employing, to judge from the two published photographs, stones of considerable size in the faces. Its thickness was about two meters. The construction may have been comparable to the better sections of the Dema, and the size was roughly comparable to that of the Koroni acropolis, or twice the size of the Thriasian "Lager." Some remains of buildings within the circuit have been noticed.⁹⁸

The height called Katsimidi lies about two kilometers northwest of Palaiokastro (*Karten von Attika*, Bl. XX, height 850.7) and controls the road below it to the east which leads from Athens through Parnes to the Oropia. This hill, too, is on royal property, and an installation on its peak has now caused free access to it to be forbidden.

The peak of Katsimidi (Pl. 12, c), an oval about 165 m. east-west by 20 m. north-south, is also fortified.⁹⁹ On the north the mountain drops steeply, and here there are only occasional rock cuttings with no walls now to be seen. The walls, which protect the south side of the peak and its east end, are not of rubble ("unordentliches Gemäuer") as stated by Curtius, but of squared blocks, strengthened in some places with a second line of wall or with a rubble wall. Milchhöfer compares the construction of some parts of these walls with the Dema, others with Trikorynthos or "Leipsydriion."¹⁰⁰ Miss Arvanitopoulou, who has visited the site, adds some information about a structure "on the peak of Katsimidi" which she calls either a watchtower or a signaling tower. This is evidently the tower-like structure shown at the east of the fort in Curtius's map, since it agrees with Miss Arvanitopoulou's measurements. It

⁹⁷ The first description giving any details was that of T. Vassos, *Περὶ Δεκελείας, Ἀθήναιον* III, 1874, pp. 133-134, who made a test excavation. A further excavation was reported by L. Münter, *Das Grab des Sophokles*, Athens, 1893, p. 12. Milchhöfer, *Text*, VII, p. 3, apparently saw the wall personally, and most later accounts are drawn from his. Th. A. Arvanitopoulou, *Δεκέλεια*, although she does not add much to the foregoing descriptions, publishes the sketch plans drawn by Vassos, but not published by him, as well as the only photographs of the wall; it should be noted that the plans have been reduced in publication and the scale of 1:1000 to which Miss Arvanitopoulou carefully refers has not been maintained.

⁹⁸ L. Münter, *Das Grab des Sophokles*, p. 12: "Auf der Höhe in der Mitte des Lagers etwas gegen Osten befinden sich die Grundmauern eines Gebäudes, wahrscheinlich des Hauptquartiers des Königs Agis."

⁹⁹ The only plan is that published by E. Curtius, *Sieben Karten zur Topographie von Athen*, Gotha, 1868, pl. 7 and *Erläuternder Text*, p. 62; the most nearly complete description, and that followed here, is by A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, VII, p. 4.

¹⁰⁰ Either the masonry is quite varied or it has been variously observed. In addition to the testimony of Curtius (above) and Milchhöfer (whom I have followed), there is that of Miss Chandler (*J.H.S.*, XLVI, 1926, p. 16) who calls it "polygonal" and of Miss Arvanitopoulou (see next note) who calls it "isodomic."

is built of regularly and well worked blocks of local stone (averaging h. 0.50-0.60 m., l. 0.85-1.10 m., th. 0.35-0.65 m.).¹⁰¹ An irregularly planned building is shown on Curtius's plan within the walled area.

The choice between Palaiokastro and Katsimidi as the site of the Spartan camp at Dekeleia is not difficult. Most modern writers have preferred Palaiokastro on grounds not only of its position but also of the even more decisive fact of its size. Katsimidi, which is by far the smaller enclosure, could never have served not only for the not inconsiderable Spartan force that was stationed there but also for the many refugees that fled to Dekeleia. The few prehistoric remains (principally a few pieces of obsidian), on which Miss Arvanitopoulou bases her identification of Palaiokastro with the Dekeleia of the Attic Dodekapolis and excludes it as a possibility for the site of the Spartan camp, only prove a certain amount of activity in prehistoric times; they do not disprove activity in Classical times.¹⁰²

The identification of Palaiokastro as the Spartan camp at Dekeleia, here taken as established, is vitally important; for it is one of the few sites that can be connected with a known historical event.

There are now no means of dating the fortification on Katsimidi, and without any literary reference which might be connected with the site, its purpose cannot be surely explained. Its masonry, however, which clearly resembles that of the great Athenian garrison forts such as Phyle, Gyphtokastro, or Rhamnous more than the hasty and temporary work of the fortified camps, suggests that it was a permanent installation. Tentatively it may be considered a link in the defenses of northern Attica, established to guard the route over Parnes into the plain of Athens from the often Boeotian Oropia.

“ LEIPSYDRION ” (Fig. 11)

Remains of an ancient fortification (Pl. 12, d) in the southern foothills of Mt. Parnes north of the village of Menidi have long been known.¹⁰³ The fort lies on the

¹⁰¹ Th. A. Arvanitopoulou, *Δεκέλεια*, p. 25, with two photographs of this wall, p. 26. For two other photographs, probably of the same structure, see Sophia and Eirene, *Princesses of Greece*, and Th. A. Arvanitopoulou, *“Οστρακά ἐκ Δεκελείας*, Athens, 1959, pl. 8, figs. 18-19.

¹⁰² The writer has come to believe that the value of obsidian, in small quantities, as a topographical criterion for prehistoric sites has been overemphasized. An unusually good core was picked up by Cornelius C. Vermeule III on Koroni, and it is the only piece of prehistoric evidence found there; the writer has found occasional pieces almost everywhere in Attica.

¹⁰³ The best description, upon which the present one draws heavily, is a yet unpublished paper by C. W. J. Eliot, “Leipsydrion—An Attic Fort on Parnes,” *American School of Classical Studies at Athens, School Papers*, 1953, available only at the American School in Athens; Eliot has told the writer that he intends to publish an account of the fort in the near future, and the present account is, therefore, less detailed than it might otherwise be. See also A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, VII, p. 7. L. Chandler, *J.H.S.*, XLVI, 1926, p. 15; W. Wrede, *R.E.*, s.v. Leipsydrion. Eliot's account is the only one in which an attempt to date the inhabitation of the site is made.




FIG. 11. Plan of "Leipsydrion"

lowest and southernmost peak of a ridge which runs southward from the main mass of Parnes (*Karten von Attika*, Bl. XX and XXIV, "Karagufolesa"). Because of its height and its position forward from the main mass of the mountain, it commands a very extensive view over the whole plain of Athens.

The rubble wall (Fig. 11)¹⁰⁴ surrounds an uneven area of which the greatest extent east-west is about 75 m. and north-south about 65 m. The walls vary in thickness from *ca.* 2.00 m. to 2.80 m., and the maximum preserved height is about 1.10 m.

There was only one entrance to the fort, on its northern side; it was a simple opening in the wall, protected on the west by a square tower (Fig. 11, *l*) and on the east by a smaller tower or platform, *a*. A small tower or platform similar to that at *a* also lies between sections *b* and *c*. At *j* a peculiar structure protrudes from the wall. At first glance it appears to be a tower like *l*, but closer examination shows that it was hollow and opened within the fort, so that it was a sort of room rather than a solid tower. Both the odd spur at its northeast, which may have served to make its walls even to carry roof beams, and the great number of fragments of roof tiles found within the structure prove that it was roofed. It has been suggested that it may have been a guard house.¹⁰⁵ An alternative, perhaps desirable since the above suggestion does not explain the fact that the room protrudes from the wall, is that it was a roofed watchtower, giving shelter to the watchman on duty while giving him the best possible view of the terrain surrounding the fortification; a similar structure may be seen in the Acropolis tower on Koroni (Fig. 1, D; cf. "Koroni," pp. 31-32), which was partly roofed. A projection on the inner face of section *k* of the circuit wall may have belonged to a ramp or stairway giving access to the top of the wall and to the tower *l*. Except for these few individual features, the wall is of simple rubble construction, and its course and design were determined by the demands of the terrain.

Near the center of the fort is a small building, 3.00 m. by 5.80 m. The walls are preserved to a height of only 0.30 to 0.40 m. and have a thickness of *ca.* 0.50 m. There is a heavy concentration of fragments of red- and black-glazed roof tiles in the area.

A considerable number of sherds and glazed roof tiles have been found within the fort. Most of the fragments are of indeterminate date, but the tiles have profiles similar to those found on Koroni and the following objects are fairly distinctive.

FINDS FROM LEIPSYDRION :

1. Black-glazed kantharos. Pl. 3, no. 1; Pl. 20, g.

P. H. 0.09 m. Mended from many fragments. Rim and upper part of body including upper parts of both handles missing. Scraped line at top of lower moulding of foot; grooved resting surface with scraped line in and around groove. Black-glaze fired red in places. Buff clay. Cf.

¹⁰⁴ The writer visited the site with Fordyce Mitchel in December 1961, and, on another occasion, examined the surrounding territory. The plan is, however, based on that drawn by Eliot for his paper (see note 103, *supra*).

¹⁰⁵ By Eliot, *loc. cit.*

Thompson, no. A 29; "Koroni," nos. 14, 15, 35-38. The "Leipsydrion" kantharos has a slightly more curved body and more compact foot than these, placing it typologically between the above parallels and Thompson, no. A 28.

2. Fragment of a black-glazed bowl. Pl. 3, no. 5.
Max. dim. 0.061 m. Part of foot and wall preserved. Ring foot with grooved resting surface. Black glaze dark brown near foot; dipped (?). Buff clay. Second half of fourth century B.C.
3. Conical loomweight. (This piece has been lost since 1953.)
P. H. 0.05 m. Most of top broken off. Bevelled (Corinthian type). Two small holes set close together on bevelled side. Buff clay, gritty and micaceous. Cf. Pnyx, *Hesperia*, Supplement VII, 1943, pp. 76-77. Last quarter of the fourth century B.C.

No material has been found to suggest that the site was occupied in archaic times, as would have been necessary if the site were to be identified with the fort of Leipsydrion occupied by the Alkmaionidai in their struggle against Peisistratos (Herodotos, V, 62, 2). This is, however, the identification that has been made.¹⁰⁶ The material found, on the other hand, is comparable to that of Thompson's Group A and to the material from Koroni, and the site should, therefore, be dated in the last quarter of the fourth century or the first half of the third century.

It is difficult to see what purpose this fortification could serve in the defenses of Attica. It commands no route into Attica, but rather its location seems to have been chosen to command a view of activities in the plain of Athens. This suggests that the fortification was built by a force which was not in control of the plain or at least not in control of the city.

YEROVOUNO

About one kilometer east of the northern end of Mt. Aigaleos and the village of Kamatero there rises a broad hill called Yerovouno.¹⁰⁷ Bulldozers have recently opened roads both around its summit and on its slopes, and a considerable amount of building is currently going on there.

The remains of a fortification wall were found on this hill by A. Milchhöfer. He reported the quarry-stone (rubble?) foundations of an enclosure wall which surrounded an area of about 500 m. northwest-southeast by 200 m. northeast-southwest. He had no opinion of the exact age of the wall, but thought that it should in some manner be brought into connection with other defensive works in the vicinity, such as those in the valley between the Athenian and Thriasian plains and the wall on the crest of Aigaleos at its northern end.¹⁰⁸

Unfortunately Milchhöfer's must remain the most complete account of these

¹⁰⁶ See note 103, *supra*, for references. Eliot sees that, while the site could possibly be that of Leipsydrion, the present remains cannot belong to the famous fort.

¹⁰⁷ On the joint of *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VI and Bl. V. It is height 166.9 on Bl. VI and height 174.2 on Bl. V.

¹⁰⁸ A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, II, pp. 43-44.

walls.¹⁰⁹ Modern developments on the hill have made the traces of the wall impossible to follow, and even the ridge on the ground which a few years ago marked its course has now disappeared.¹¹⁰

The site has been assigned to many periods. Milchhöfer implies a Classical or Hellenistic date for it, but it has also been placed in Mycenaean times,¹¹¹ and most recently it has been called medieval.¹¹² That the enclosure was Mycenaean has been proved wrong, since there are no prehistoric sherds or other remains of the period to support this view.¹¹³ Mr. Hope Simpson's observation that the walls are medieval would seem to apply only to remains of a very large rectangular building near the summit; its walls are built of small stones and mortar and appear to be even more recent than Mr. Hope Simpson thought.

Some indication of the date of occupation of the site is given by the sherds which can now be picked up there. R. Hope Simpson reported "classical" sherds;¹¹⁴ those that the writer has found seem to be mostly of the early Hellenistic period. The following present some hope of dating:

1. Fragment of the body of a large kantharos. Pl. 4, no. 19.
D. ca. 0.12 m. Cf. "Koroni," no. 35.
2. Fragment of the base of a black-glazed kantharos. Pl. 4, no. 17.
D. ca. 0.06 m. No stem. Apparently of the short type. Cf. Thompson, nos. A 27, A 28.
3. Fragment of a black-glazed salt cellar. Pl. 4, no. 18.
D. ca. 0.07 m. Broad flat foot. Cf. Breccia, *La Necropoli di Sciatbi*, Cairo, 1912, II, pl. LVI, no. 116. Late fourth century B.C.
4. Fragment of the foot of a black-glazed kantharos. Not illustrated.
D. ca. 0.05 m. Apparently of the type found on Koroni.

There were also numerous fragments of wine amphoras, glazed roof tiles, and several fragments of an "umbrella stand."

While there is no direct evidence for the purpose of the fortification on Yero-vouno,¹¹⁵ the same considerations which applied to the Hymettos Camp and to "Leip-

¹⁰⁹ R. Hope Simpson, *B.S.A.*, LIII-LIV, 1958-1959, p. 293, fig. 1, indicates the walls on his map of the area, and his plan differs somewhat from the *Karten von Attika*, but there is no suggestion that he re-surveyed the walls, and the difference is probably due only to carelessness in a part of the map which did not concern his argument. The writer's observations are based on several visits to the site with his wife and Fordyce Mitchel and Eugene Vanderpool.

¹¹⁰ Eugene Vanderpool remembers seeing them much more clearly before World War II.

¹¹¹ H. G. Lolling, *Das Kuppelgrab bei Menidi*, Athens, 1880, p. 3.

¹¹² R. Hope Simpson, *B.S.A.*, LIII-LIV, 1958-1959, pp. 292-293.

¹¹³ *Ibid.* Mr. Hope Simpson found none while searching for a Mycenaean site; the writer also failed to notice anything that might even possibly have been Mycenaean.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 294.

¹¹⁵ E. Kirsten, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der attischen Demenforschung," p. 170, lists Yero-vouno as the site of Acharnai and considers the identification "gesichert." This is almost surely wrong; for the site has far too few remains for the deme, no good evidence has ever been found

sydrion" indicate that the site belonged to a foreign rather than to an Athenian force. It is an isolated position, neither very far from the city nor connected with the city, and its view encompasses the Athenian plain but not the accesses to that plain.

THE THRIASIAN PLAIN AND THE AIGALEOS-PARNES GAP

THE DEMA

The most impressive and hence the best published of Attic fieldworks is the wall which divides the plain of Athens from that of Eleusis and Thria in the broad gap between Aigaleos and Parnes.¹¹⁶ Between the plains and at the narrowest part of the gap runs a watershed, to which the Athenian plain runs at a higher level than the Thriasian and thus forms an elevated plateau. The Dema wall¹¹⁷ follows the contours of this plateau just to the west of the watershed and thus takes advantage, where possible, of higher position in relation to the approach from the Thriasian plain.

The wall is 4,360 m. long, and, in its well preserved sections, it is from 1.50 to 2.00 m. high. Its southern part (about two-thirds of its length) is composed of a series of fifty-three separate lengths of wall overlapping one another from south to north so as to leave a narrow sallyport aligned obliquely after each length, a system which resembles the indented trace¹¹⁸ except that the enfiling flanks are in every case pierced by sallyports. Because of the desirability of having sallyports which allow the defenders to emerge with their shielded side to the enemy and to emerge on the enemy's unprotected side, the flanks all face in the same direction; the plan is thus a compromise between the advantages of multiple sallyports and the indented trace.¹¹⁹ The northern section of wall which runs up the slopes of Mt. Parnes lacks the refinements of the southern section; it is merely a continuous line built of crude rubble to a thickness of about one meter.¹²⁰

there, and the sherds seem to show a short period of occupation. Acharnai is to be sought either at the site of the present town of Menidi or somewhere between that town and Mt. Parnes. This is another example of Kirsten's identification of a deme with the most conspicuous remains in an area even when the remains do not resemble those of a deme.

¹¹⁶ The principal publication is now J. E. Jones, L. H. Sackett, and C. W. J. Eliot, "Τὸ Δέμα: A Survey of the Aigaleos-Parnes Wall," *B.S.A.*, LII, 1957, pp. 152-189. A bibliography of previous studies is given there (pp. 152-153). The location of the wall and its relation to the other remains can, however, still be best seen on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VI. The house immediately to the west of the Dema (cf. "Dema," pp. 171-172) is published by J. E. Jones, L. H. Sackett, and A. J. Graham, *B.S.A.*, LVII, 1962, pp. 75-114.

¹¹⁷ The local name, "the link," is here used for convenience since the wall is widely so called.

¹¹⁸ Cf. R. L. Scranton, *Greek Walls*, pp. 149-157, and on this example, p. 155.

¹¹⁹ This was understood by S. Dow, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, pp. 205-206, who thus answers the complaint of R. L. Scranton (see note 118, *supra*) that the technique of the indented trace was misunderstood by the builders of the Dema.

¹²⁰ A detailed account of the wall, with both a map and an aerial photograph, is given in "Dema."

The Dema exhibits three major styles of construction. The first two of these three belong exclusively to the southern section of the wall, where it is built in separate lengths. Of these the more prevalent style, called by the investigators the "narrow style," is between 1.50 and 1.80 m. in thickness. The front face is built of boulders and worked blocks carried upwards to form a breastwork or parapet; there is a rough rear face and a rubble fill. A continuous ramp of rubble, up to 3 m. or more wide, was heaped up behind the wall giving access to the rampart walk.¹²¹ The other type, called the "broad style," was used by the builders in level areas where a stronger wall of greater height was required. In this style the thickness is 2.70 to 2.80 m., both faces are free-standing and well constructed, and in place of the continuous ramp of the narrow style each section has two individual ramps *ca.* 2.75 m. wide by 5 m. long. The construction of the sallyports between these lengths of wall depends entirely on the facing of the ramp at each intersection, and the Dema exhibits several funnel-like varieties.¹²² The northern section of the Dema is built in a third style, a narrow, free-standing wall poorly built of rubble. Its thickness is about one meter, and it is preserved in places to a height of one meter. Its poor preservation in its lower, southern stretches has led the investigators to suppose that it was unfinished.

These styles refer only to the plan of the wall in its various lengths; all of them exhibit further differences in masonry. In general the wall can be characterized as well-built rubble; the face of the wall does not exhibit any definite scheme of masonry, but it differs from what is called rubble elsewhere in this study in that the majority of the facing blocks show some degree of dressing.¹²³ The scheme to be found in any given length of the wall seems to depend on the gang of workmen who constructed it, so that wide variations of stonework occur, from rough boulder construction to sophisticated stone-cutting with indications of coursed, Lesbian, or polygonal techniques.¹²⁴ The investigators have concluded: "The general rusticity of the wall suggests a construction both economical and unpretentious—which in a field-work is not surprising—but its solidity and craftsmanship indicate also that it was not a hasty or haphazard construction, even though it was left incomplete."¹²⁵

The situation which the building of the Dema demands has often been considered.¹²⁶ Briefly, because of its many sallyports, relatively little height, and its great length, the wall would have had to be manned by a considerable force of defenders.¹²⁷ It was probably built to meet a specific danger and abandoned when the danger passed.

¹²¹ "Dema," pp. 159, 165-166, fig. 5, a, b.

¹²² "Dema," p. 158, fig. 4.

¹²³ "Dema," pp. 169-171.

¹²⁴ "Dema," p. 170, pls. 31-34.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*

¹²⁶ Most concisely by S. Dow, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, pp. 208-209; in greater detail in "Dema," pp. 175-181.

¹²⁷ S. Dow, *loc. cit.*, estimates at least 4000.

The recent investigators even consider it likely that the wall was never actually used.¹²⁸ The whole question of its purpose and use can, however, be more conveniently discussed in connection with the other remains of fortifications in its neighborhood—remains which have hitherto figured little in the discussions of the Dema.

The archaeological evidence for dating the Dema comes both from the wall itself and from the pottery found in connection with it. The style of masonry is of little chronological significance, since it is so varied and can only be described as “ basically dry rubble but exhibiting several other styles to a greater or less degree.” The best that can be done with this evidence is to conclude that it suggests, from the occasional use of quadrilateral blocks and coursing, of stack work, and of one drafted corner, a date in the Classical period rather than an earlier one.¹²⁹ The multiplicity of sally-ports, in that it must reflect tactical theories prevalent at the time of the wall’s construction, is a safer indication and one which, from comparison with other fortifications embodying similar systems, seems to point to the fourth or third century B.C.¹³⁰ The evidence of the pottery found on or near the wall is ambiguous and of little conclusive value; besides fragments of household wares, whose date could not be surely fixed, there were sherds from the archaic period, the fifth and the fourth centuries (and possibly as late as the third century).¹³¹ The most definite evidence comes from a ruined house found just outside the wall, immediately north of the modern railroad line. This building, evidently a farmhouse, seems to have been occupied for only a short time during the second half of the fifth century B.C. and perhaps re-occupied briefly during the second half of the fourth century. It is argued that the destruction of the house gives a *terminus post quem* for the construction of the wall; for a standing structure so close to the wall would have rendered the latter vulnerable. The second occupation may be connected with the building of the wall itself.¹³² The investigators have, on this evidence, assigned the wall to the latter part of the fourth century B.C., and, though there is no clear literary evidence for the construction of new defensive works by Athens at the time, they have chosen the rearmament of Athens in 337 B.C. after the defeat at Chaeronea as the most likely of possible occasions.¹³³

This dating of the Dema is, therefore, based primarily on pottery of fourth-

¹²⁸ “ Dema,” p. 175.

¹²⁹ “ Dema,” pp. 181-182. The assumption that “ the fact that a wall is of (dry) rubble ‘ gives a strong indication [of], if it does not prove, an early date,’ ” adopted by S. Dow, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 195, note 5, from R. L. Scranton, *Greek Walls*, p. 155, is no longer valid, as can easily be seen from the present tentative corpus.

¹³⁰ “ Dema,” pp. 182-183, where parallels are given.

¹³¹ “ Dema,” p. 183 and note 107. The latest of the pieces there mentioned is a bowl with incurving lip which is compared to Thompson, no. A 20. This should presumably be contemporary with the types from Koroni. For a fourth-century saltcellar “ built into the rubble packing of the Dema wall,” see *B.S.A.*, LVII, 1962, p. 100, no. 99, and p. 101.

¹³² *B.S.A.*, LVII, 1962, pp. 99-100 (nos. 88-98), 101.

¹³³ “ Dema,” pp. 187-188.

century type which was found in connection with the wall and with the house which lies immediately in front of the wall. The pottery is (see note 131, *supra*) dated by its similarity to examples in Thompson's Group A. Since it has been shown that pottery of this sort was in use in Attica as late as the Chremonidean War, the lower limit of the period to which the building of the wall may be assigned on archaeological evidence is considerably later than was thought by the recent investigators. Thus, while the date suggested by them is still a possibility, it is only one of several, including some in the first half of the third century, which must be considered.

THRIASIAN "LAGER" (Fig. 12)

To the west of the Dema the general level of the land falls off into the Thriasian plain, but the southern of the two spurs over which the Dema passes continues westward and rises again out of the plain. On the highest point of this spur, about three kilometers from the Dema, is a large fortified enclosure which has been mentioned in connection with the Dema but never thoroughly investigated.¹³⁴ The fortifications consist of a round, walled enclosure, strengthened by eight towers (Pl. 13, a), and a long, narrow wall which runs from the enclosure down the slopes in a southeasterly direction to the valley floor.

The height is enclosed by a rubble wall slightly more than 375 m. in circumference. The actual high point of the spur lies near the northeast corner of the large building at the north of the enclosure. From this point the ground slopes gently to the southeast and southwest and steeply on the north toward the floor of the valley. The circuit wall, in its best-preserved sections where two distinct faces can be observed, is about 2.25 m. in thickness. Everywhere rubble from the wall has fallen both in front and behind it, so that it now presents the appearance of a rounded mound rather than that of a proper defense wall with vertical faces.¹³⁵ This circumstance makes it difficult both to determine the character of the wall's faces and to make exact measurements of the preserved height of the wall. Its construction, however, seems to have been the common one, with two faces built of field stones of substantial size carefully

¹³⁴ *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VI, where it is properly indicated on height 173.2 and marked "Lager"; A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, II, p. 45, quotes Hauptmann Siemens's opinion that it might have been built by an enemy facing the Dema. S. Dow, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, p. 207, mentioned the "Verteidigungsmauer" attached to the "Lager" and noted that it needed study. S. Hood and J. E. Jones visited the site and their brief description is given in "Dema," pp. 172-173. The writer's own remarks and the plan, Fig. 12, are the results of numerous visits to the site in 1961-1962 alone and in the company of his wife, Eugene Vanderpool, and L. H. Sackett.

¹³⁵ L. H. Sackett suggested to the writer that such a considerable amount of fall on both sides of the wall might indicate that the fortification was forceably destroyed; for, he argued, natural circumstances would not produce this result. While the amount of fall is, perhaps, greater at this site than at any other, nonetheless the same phenomenon of fall on either side of a wall prevails at many other sites, and one must suppose that an earth tremor or other disturbance is capable of producing this effect.




FIG. 12. Plan of "Lager"

fitted together and a fill between the faces composed of somewhat smaller stones. The preserved height of the wall can be estimated as 1.00 to 1.50 m. in places, and, considering the amount of fallen rubble, it may originally have been about two meters high.

The circuit is strengthened by eight towers placed at unequal intervals around it. These are now in a very ruined condition, so that it is almost impossible to be sure what stones belong to the original plan of the towers and what to the wall. They all seem, however, to have been square or rectangular in plan, to have protruded between 4 and 5 m. from the outer face of the wall, and to have been between 4 and 5 m. wide. They were built in one operation with the circuit, for the east wall of one tower (that to the southwest of the intersection of the long wall and the circuit) bonds with the curtain. They are now filled with rubble except where modern disturbance, such as the removal of stones to build a shepherd's shelter, has taken place, and it is likely that they were so constructed. The towers are arranged in two groups at the southeast and the southwest of the fortification, where the approach to it lies over the most level ground.

No gates now are preserved in the circuit. The wall is badly destroyed at a point on the northeast where a modern path enters the enclosure, but the lowest course of a wall face is preserved, and the wall seems there to have been continuous. The likely place for a gate is between two of the towers, and, though it cannot now be found, there may well have been one a short distance to the west of the long wall.

Within the enclosure are the remains of a number of buildings; nothing is now left of these save badly ruined foundations of rubble, averaging 0.60 to 0.50 m. in thickness and seldom preserved to as much as 0.50 m. high. Among these foundations are numerous fragments of black- and red-glazed roof tiles of Laconian type and a few sherds. One of these, at the north, is a large complex measuring some 18 m. in either direction and comprising eight or more rooms which possibly opened onto a narrow corridor. The building probably extended further to the west and south than is shown on the plan (Fig. 12), for walls running in these directions continued through the last visible crosswalls.¹³⁶ To the southwest of this building are the remains of another large building (at least 15 by 17 m.). This appears to have had larger rooms than the more northerly building, and it may have served a different purpose. It was not constructed to a regular plan. A corner of a third building lies just to the north of the more northerly of the large buildings.

In addition to these buildings of which some recognizable part could be located, there are more fragmentary remains of others. These are identified by the presence of concentrations of ancient roof tiles and of very short lengths of rubble walls similar to those of the above mentioned buildings.

¹³⁶ The plan of the building should not be considered accurate in detail; the walls are too ruined to permit complete accuracy without excavation. As shown on the plan the building probably appears much more regular than it actually was.

From the walled enclosure a narrow wall runs down the slopes to the south-east. It begins at the south side of a tower and runs southward for a distance of some 36 m., where it vanishes as a modern path crosses its line. About 9 m. further on it reappears running in a more easterly direction. 6.60 m. further there are two projections from it toward the northeast, evidently the remains of a tower 4.00 m. wide. Thence it continues along the brow of the hill. At a distance of about 175 m. from the enclosure it begins to drop steeply into a saddle (Pl. 13, d), still following a line just to the east of the crest. From the saddle the wall climbs a low knoll (Pl. 13, b), at the peak of which a small tower (2.50 m. wide) projects 2.50 m. from the wall towards the northeast. From there it runs down the hill to the level of the valley, where it disappears into a dry stream bed.¹³⁷

This long wall (total length nearly 510 m.) has a constant thickness of about 1 m. It is in very poor condition, seldom having more than one or two courses of stones on the ground. It is best preserved in the saddle between the main height and the knoll, where it sometimes stands as high as 0.75 m. It is difficult to estimate the original height of this wall; there is very little loose rubble along it which might have fallen from the wall, nor is it easy to see why it should have been the object of extensive stone robbery, since there are no modern structures in its immediate area. Probably it was never meant to be very strong or defensible for an extensive period and thus was planned as only a light wall, *ca.* 0.75 m. high, to give a momentary advantage to defenders behind it.

All the remains described, the fortified enclosure and the narrow fieldwork, are clearly military in character and designed for a specific occasion rather than as a permanent establishment.¹³⁸ The site was chosen because it is relatively easily defensible and because it commands a wide view; it lacks such a necessary requirement of a permanent settlement as water. The buildings are, likewise, too few in number to have comprised a deme;¹³⁹ that they were occupied for only a short time seems likely from the paucity of occupation remains—sherds or the like, which are to be found on

¹³⁷ Whether or not this was the original end of the wall is not clear. One might expect that the wall would have continued across the relatively narrow valley to the slopes of Mt. Aigaleos, and, as one stands on the wall and looks across the valley, he can, with good will, see occasional piles of rubble in the cultivated fields more or less on the line that the wall ought to have followed. Closer examination, however, discloses no trace of the wall in these piles of rubble, and they appear to have been collected by farmers. The possibility that the wall once existed still remains, but there is now no trace of it.

¹³⁸ For the opposite view see "Dema," p. 173, where it is thought that the remains suggest a small permanent settlement with its own refuge, perhaps one of the small Attic demes.

¹³⁹ The "Gräber und Häuser" which are indicated on the *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VI, in the valley to the southeast of the "Lager" were visited by L. H. Sackett and the writer. While there is a great amount of stone which apparently belonged to buildings, some of the walls evidently made use of mortar, and there was no indication of ancient occupation. They are most likely of medieval or later date.

the surface, and there is no indication that what sherds are to be found are not of one period. While it is not certain that the long wall was built at the same time as the walled enclosure, since their junction is now ruined, the fact that the long wall does not appear to have continued to the top of the spur, as it certainly would have done had there been no enclosure, makes it sure that the wall was not built earlier than the enclosure, and since there is no sign of ancient re-use of the enclosure, it seems likely that the two should be taken together.

The conditions under which such a military complex would have been built are not common. An attack was expected from the east, from the direction of the Athenian plain and the city of Athens, and the establishment must, therefore, belong to some invading army rather than to a defending Athenian force. Likewise, while it commands a view over the further parts of the Thriasian plain and over much of the bay of Eleusis, it does not command a view of the ground immediately in its rear, so that presumably no attack was expected from that quarter. The historical situation which the camp demands is thus roughly the following: A force has invaded Attica and already controls at least part of the Thriasian plain. It has advanced part way toward the gap between Aigaleos and Parnes, evidently with the intention of using this route to enter the Athenian plain. At this point the invading force has encamped, and, fearing attack from the Aigaleos-Parnes gap, has built a fieldwork against that possibility.

The reason that such invaders decided to stop where they did and draw up a line of defense is a matter of conjecture, but it seems reasonable to assume that at this point they had met a defending force which was manning the Dema. The invaders would then have chosen the highest and most defensible position in front of that wall on which to build their camp and their line of defense.

If this assumption is correct, the Thriasian "Lager" must be dated at the same time as the Dema or later than the Dema. The assumption implies that the Dema was manned on at least one occasion. If the opinion of the investigators of the Dema is correct, and that wall was abandoned soon after its construction,¹⁴⁰ this may well have been the only occasion upon which it was used, and, in fact, that for which it was constructed.

The independent evidence for the date of the "Lager" is meager. There are abundant fragments of glazed roof tiles, but of these all that can be said is that they are probably Classical or Hellenistic. Fragments of cooking ware and wine amphoras were too small to give any indication of shape and therefore of date. Several fragments of "umbrella stands" (cf. Koroni, no. 46) have little chronological significance. The following three fragments are all that was at all distinctive:¹⁴¹

¹⁴⁰ "Dema," p. 175.

¹⁴¹ The glazed Classical sherds from the "Lager" mentioned in "Dema," p. 173 are in the British School of Archaeology in Athens. The lot consists of a number of coarse fragments of no distinctive shape and only one or two very small shapeless glazed fragments.

1. Base fragment of a black-glazed jug. Pl. 4, no. 21.
D. of base *ca.* 0.12 m. Glazed on interior and bottom. Shape of foot suggests fifth or fourth century.
2. Fragment of the base of a bowl or plate. Pl. 4, no. 20.
D. of base *ca.* 0.08 m. Red glaze. Straight foot suggests date in fourth century.
3. Fragment of the neck of a lagynos.
D. at rim *ca.* 0.04 m. Similar in shape to "Koroni," no. 50. Late fourth century to early third century.

Little as it is, this evidence would seem to confirm the conclusion already made, that the Thriasian "Lager" is contemporary with the Dema.

KAMATERO WALL

A long, narrow wall runs along the easternmost ridge of Mt. Aigaleos above the modern village of Kamatero.¹⁴² The wall, only 0.60 m. to 0.90 m. thick and seldom preserved to a height of half a meter, runs along the descending ridge, just to the southeast of its crest. Neither its beginning nor its end seems to be preserved; it begins at the northeastern corner of the height marked 346.3 on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VI, and continues *ca.* 400 m. in a fairly straight line to the edge of the field which lies at the southwest of the height marked 274.0. There is no present indication that it ever went further, but on the north, at least, it must have continued to include the field; the presence of fields at either end makes it possible that farmers have here removed the very light wall to facilitate cultivation.¹⁴³

The nature and purpose of this wall are not immediately clear. That it is not simply an agricultural field wall is sure; for there is not now nor ever could have been cultivated land on the rocky crest. That it is not some sort of boundary is made likely by the fact that the wall does not follow the actual crest of the ridge which would be the natural boundary, but runs just below the crest to the southeast of it. The natural explanation is that it is a military fieldwork facing southeast and expecting an enemy to come from that quarter.

A. Milchhöfer has suggested that this wall should be connected with the fortifications which he noticed on a low hill about 2.5 kilometers to the east (Yerovouno, see p. 61, *supra*) and that the whole complex of fortifications served some community settled in the Athenian plain around the modern town of Epano-Liosia.¹⁴⁴ It seems rash, however, to postulate a 2 to 3 kilometer extension of a 400 m. wall, when no

¹⁴² Noted by Hauptmann Siemens and indicated on the *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VI as "Verteidigungsmauer Front n. S. O."; see A. Milchhöfer, Text, II, p. 44. The writer visited the site with Eugene Vanderpool and made notes but no plan since the indication on the *Karten von Attika* seemed sufficient.

¹⁴³ A. Milchhöfer, Text, II, p. 44, suggests that height 274.0 might once have held a fort. Of this no trace at all could be found.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

trace of it has ever been seen. Furthermore, it is hard to envision a situation in which a deme in the Athenian plain would have built such an extensive fortification to protect it on the south, the direction of Athens herself.

A different solution is possible. The wall may be seen as a fieldwork, built for a specific occasion by a force invading the Athenian plain. If the wall continued to the northern height (274.0) it would have been a line of defense blocking the relatively easy route through Aigaleos which passes here.¹⁴⁵ Likewise, for an invading army, it might represent the last easily defensible point at which to stop before entering the plain of Athens itself.

Such an interpretation is strengthened by the character of the wall; its extremely light construction implies that it was a temporary structure rather than part of a permanent system of defense, and its siting, facing Athens, indicates that the enemy against which it was built was in control of the Athenian plain.

It is notable that these same conditions apply to the long wall attached to the Thriasian "Lager" described above (p. 69, *supra*). It is possible, and, in the absence of other evidence, perhaps likely that the two fortifications represent successive stages in a single invasion of Attica. If this is true, it would mean that the invading army, which was first stopped by the barrier of the Dema, later managed to turn that line of defense and to advance toward Athens. The date of the Kamatero wall, for which there is no independent evidence, would thus depend upon that of the Thriasian "Lager," and this, in turn, would depend upon that of the Dema.

PLAKOTO (Fig. 13)

It has been thought that the ancient road from Eleusis to Boeotia followed not the route of the modern road but a more easterly route.¹⁴⁶ This route follows a track due north from Eleusis which crosses dense olive groves and then enters the narrow valley of the Sarandapotamos River.¹⁴⁷ A fortification stands at either side of the entrance to this valley.

The southern fort, called Plakoto, stands on the peak of a low ridge which runs eastward from the main mass of the mountains to the southwest of the valley.¹⁴⁸ To the north and east the ridge falls very steeply to the floor of the valley, while to the south and west the slopes are more gradual.

The fort (Fig. 13)¹⁴⁹ consists of three walls built in two very different styles of masonry. An area of about 25 by 33 m. around the peak is enclosed by a very well-

¹⁴⁵ This route would be one to two kilometers shorter than the route around the northern end of Aigaleos.

¹⁴⁶ L. Chandler, *J.H.S.*, XLVI, 1926, p. 13.

¹⁴⁷ The road continues up the valley passing the Korynos fort and emerges in the Skourta plain near Miss Chandler's Panakton ("Boeotian fort" on Pl. 1).

¹⁴⁸ *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XXV, height ca. 220.

¹⁴⁹ This plan is taken and slightly corrected from one sketched by Colin N. Edmonson in 1959.

built wall some 2.00 m. thick (Pl. 13, e). It has a regular plan of five straight sides (Fig. 13, A-B-C); the sheer cliff at the north was sufficiently inaccessible, and no wall was built on that side. Three gateways, averaging 0.80 m. in width, give access to the enclosure (A, B, and C). The masonry of which this wall is constructed is the




FIG. 13. Plan of Plakoto

most careful of those included in this study; many of the stones appear to have been dressed, and they are fitted together with considerable use of stack-work; the degree of refinement is indicated by the fact that a drain (d) was included to allow water to run out through the wall, a feature found on no other of these sites. The impression

created by the masonry is not unlike that of the acropolis wall on the Agios Nikolaos peninsula at Thorikos.¹⁵⁰ At the peak of the hill, within the circuit, stand the remains of a circular tower (G) of similar, but perhaps even better, construction (Pl. 14, a). The tower was hollow, 6.50 m. in diameter, with walls *ca.* 1.10 to 1.15 m. thick; the entrance was at the southeast. Its walls are now preserved to a height of over 3 m., and the amount of fallen stone near by indicates that it was once considerably higher.

A second line of defense was formed by two outer walls. Of these one begins at the northern cliff at the west and runs southward and eastward to point D; the second begins at the northeast and runs southwest to D; this latter wall then turns northward again and approaches the inner circuit. At D the line of the western wall runs under that of the eastern. Both of these walls are of dry rubble, rather carelessly built, with an average thickness of 2.80 m. (Pl. 13, c). There are gaps, which perhaps represent gateways, at E and F.¹⁵¹ There are traces of rubble walls which probably belonged to buildings within both the inner and outer enclosures, the greater number in the inner area, but there is so much fallen stone over the whole site that it is impossible to recover their plans without excavation. Apart from the style of the walls, glazed roof tiles of Laconian type give the only indication of date, though some coarse sherds have been found and excavation might be expected to reveal more significant pieces.

The site, particularly from the tower (G), commands a wide view of the whole Thriasian plain from Eleusis to Mt. Aigaleos as well as overlooking the route from the north through the Sarandapotamos valley.¹⁵² The fortification must have functioned as a lookout and defense on this route, and the careful construction of the tower and inner circuit indicate that it was intended as a permanent establishment. The purpose of the outer circuit is, however, unclear, and even the reason for the peculiar plan of the walls is mysterious. It seems unlikely that these walls were contemporary with the inner circuit, and it may be suggested that they were hurriedly thrown up on an occasion when the limited area of the inner fortification would not suffice the troops to be quartered at the site. There is no indication of the date of such an occasion.

PALAIOKASTRO

A second fortification stands just northwest of the peak of the cone-shaped hill (*Karten von Attika*, Bl. XXV, height 319) northeast of Plakoto on the opposite side

¹⁵⁰ See p. 34, *supra*. The contention that the masonry resembles that of Phyle made by U. Kahrstedt, *Ath. Mitt.*, LVII, 1932, p. 18, note 1, shows an excess of enthusiasm for Plakoto.

¹⁵¹ Edmonson (see note 149, *supra*) indicated a gap at D, but the writer saw evidence that the western wall continued to its intersection with the eastern wall.

¹⁵² U. Kahrstedt, *Ath. Mitt.*, LVII, 1932, p. 18, denies that one can see this route, but he is mistaken.

of the mouth of the narrow Sarandapotamos valley. This site is variously called Palaiokastro and Palaiochori.¹⁵³

This structure is a simple circular rubble enclosure about 20 m. in diameter and preserved to a height of two meters or more (Pl. 14, b). The wall, 1.90 to 2.10 m. thick, is very well built of generally quadrangular stones, though these are not so carefully fitted as the inner circuit at Plakoto (Pl. 14, c). A single entrance cuts obliquely through the circuit at the northwest. The only other elaboration is a platform of rubble immediately north of the entrance, built against the inner face of the wall (Pl. 14, d). It is *ca.* 5 m. long and 1.10 m. wide, and perhaps formed a stairway or ramp giving access to the top of the wall. There is no evidence for the date of the structure; a very few coarse and undatable sherds are all that have, to the writer's knowledge, ever been found. The possibility, though not the probability, exists that it is modern.¹⁵⁴

The structure is unlike any other in Attica, and it is difficult to understand its purpose. While the site enjoys a good view of the further parts of the Thriasian plain, better because of its height than that of Plakoto, the rounded hill on which it stands obscures much of the immediately surrounding territory. It is, therefore, less desirable as a lookout than Plakoto, nor does its small size make it usable as a camp. Positive suggestions must await further evidence.

ISOLATED SITES

BESA (Fig. 14)

About four kilometers to the west of Thorikos rises the highest peak of the Laurion range, Vigla Rimbari (*Karten von Attika*, Bl. XVI, height 372.2). The area around this peak is enclosed by a rubble wall.

From its high position Vigla Rimbari commands an extensive view over the southern part of Attica. To the east the whole plain of Thorikos and Laurion lies beneath it, while to the southwest lie Mt. Olympos, the bay of Agios Nikolaos, and the site of the deme of Anaphlystos (near the modern harbor of Nea Phokea); to the west much of the coastal region can be seen as far as Vouliagmeni and Vari (save the part obscured by Mt. Olympos), and further north much of Mt. Hymettos is visible. The peak falls off in sheer cliffs on the east and south, but elsewhere the slopes are more gentle.

It is these sides, the northwest, north, and northeast, that were protected by

¹⁵³ Palaiokastro on the *Karten von Attika*; Palaiochori by L. Chandler, *J.H.S.*, XLVI, 1926, pp. 13-14, the best published description of the site.

¹⁵⁴ U. Kahrstedt, *Ath. Mitt.*, LVII, 1932, p. 18, note 1, doubts that it is ancient. The names applied to the site do, however, suggest that it was considered old at the end of the nineteenth century when the maps of *Karten von Attika* were drawn, and it seems unlikely that this would be the case if the walls were built in the Greek War of Independence or later.

a rubble defense wall about 140 m. long (Fig. 14). It is built of unworked field-stones of moderate size, with some larger stones used particularly toward the center of the wall's length (Pl. 15, a-b). There is a packing of small stones between the two faces, and the thickness varies from *ca.* 1.80 to 2.10 m. The wall is now in very poor condition and is seldom preserved to more than 0.50 m. high. It had no towers or




FIG. 14. Plan of Besa

other elaborations, and it was impossible to see where a gate might have been. The only notable features of the peak area besides the wall are cave-like holes in the ground on the northwest slopes. While some of these may not be natural, there is no indication that any activity connected with them was ancient, and they might, perhaps, be associated in some way with the mining operations so common in the area. Only a few sherds have ever been found at the site and those are coarse, shapeless, and undatable.

The site seems too far removed from the coasts, plains, and principal routes to

have served effectively as a camp. Its fine view makes it more suitable as a lookout or some part of a broader system of defense. A possible identification of the site can be suggested.¹⁵⁶ Pseudo-Xenophon, propounding a scheme for the more efficient use of the Laurion mines, considers the effect of war:

But I reckon that, even in the event of war, the mines need not be abandoned. There are, of course, two fortresses in the mining district, one at Anaphlystos on the south side, the other at Thorikos on the north. The distance between them is about sixty stadia. Now suppose that we had a third stronghold between them on the highest point of Besa. The works would then be linked up by all the fortresses, and at the first intimation of a hostile movement, every man would have but a short distance to go in order to reach safety.

(Pseudo-Xenophon, *De Vectigalibus*, iv, 43-44.
Translated by E. C. Marchant,
Loeb Classical Library)

Vigla Rimbari probably did lie within the territory of the deme of Besa, the center of which is to the southwest, and it is the highest point in the area. The fact that this peak has visual communication with both Thorikos and Anaphlystos¹⁵⁶ makes it a likely candidate for the site on which Pseudo-Xenophon proposed to build a fort. Whether the remains here reported are to be connected with a fort built for the purpose that Pseudo-Xenophon suggests is, however, a matter of conjecture.

MOUNT MERENDA (Fig. 15)

The rounded peak of Mount Merenda rises to the southwest of the village of Markopoulo in the Mesogeia. About 1300 m. west northwest of the summit (height 612, *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XIII) is a secondary peak (height 425) lying at the western end of a broad, fairly level ridge. The area around this lower peak is enclosed on the north, east, and south by a rubble defense wall (Fig. 15; Pl. 16, a).¹⁵⁷


The wall is some 113 m. long. It begins on the north at a point beyond which the builders evidently thought no defense was needed; the cliffs on the northwest would be difficult if not impossible to scale. It follows the contours of the land in a counterclockwise direction, being continuous except for a gateway at the southeast. On the south side the wall runs below and to the south of a steep rock face which

¹⁵⁶ This suggestion has been made by Eliot, p. 135. It was suggested to the writer by Eugene Vanderpool.

¹⁵⁶ The site of the fortification at Anaphlystos has tentatively been placed at Agios Nikolaos; see E. Kirsten in A. Philippson, *Die Griechischen Landschaften*, I, 3, p. 832, note 2. There are no recognizable remains.

¹⁵⁷ The walls were discovered by E. Smith and H. Lowry and reported in their unpublished paper, "A Survey of Mountain-top Sanctuaries in Attica," p. 28 in *American School of Classical Studies at Athens, School Papers*, 1954; this paper is available only in the library of the American School. The plan and observations presented here are based on notes made during a trip to the site in December 1961 by the writer and Fordyce Mitchel.

runs near to the survey marker. It ends abruptly, and, although the terrain is very rocky and difficult of access, it does not stop at an ideal place. It is possible that the wall once turned northward from this point to meet the rock face, which would have made a very secure circuit; such a return was indicated on a sketch plan made by Miss Smith and Miss Lowry (see note 157), but careful examination revealed no trace of it now remaining.



MT. MERENDA - WEST PEAK

scale : 0 10 20 30 M.

FIG. 15. Plan of Mount Merenda

The wall is built of field stones, and in its best preserved sections it is about 1.60 m. high and 2.10 m. thick (Pl. 16, b, c). The absence of much fallen stone in these well-preserved areas makes it unlikely that it was ever much higher. The single gateway (Pl. 16, d) is a simple opening in the wall; the faces are not parallel so that it is 2.50 m. wide at the inside and only 1.70 m. wide at the outside.

The enclosed area is larger than might be expected from the length of the wall, since the ridge extends in a westward direction for some distance before ending in a steep cliff. The highest point, where a survey marker now stands, commands an

excellent view of the Mesogeia. There is no trace of building within the enclosure, nor were any tile fragments found on the surface; the rough, rocky surface of the ground makes it likely that no buildings ever existed.

Only a very few sherds were found in spite of a careful and exhaustive search. These were all coarse and shapeless and might date from any period. It is notable that even these few sherds were found mostly near the southwestern end of the wall within a very limited area, and they may, in fact, all have come from one coarse pot or a small number of pots.

These indications suggest that the fortification was both hastily built and quickly abandoned. Its position suggests its use as a watch-post for the observation of activities in the Mesogeia. There is, however, unfortunately no archaeological evidence for its date.

ETOSI (Fig. 16)

The hill of Etosi lies at the northeast of the Mesogeia, just southeast of the village of Pikermi and on the south side of the Megalo Rhevma.¹⁵⁸ It rises steeply more than 100 m. above the surrounding plain, and, because of its height and isolated position, it is readily visible from many considerably distant points and itself commands an excellent view—almost the whole of the Mesogeia to the west and south, the road to the Athenian plain around Hymettos to the west, Raphina and Loutsia to the east, and part of the bay of Marathon with Kynosoura to the northeast.

The hill is steep on all sides, but it can be approached relatively easily by its north and east slopes. On its west and northwest sides it has sheer rock cliffs. The peak lies at the southwest end of the ridge, and around it a roughly circular area (slightly more than 100 m. in diameter) is enclosed by a rubble defense wall (Fig. 16).¹⁵⁹ The wall protects the enclosed area from the approaches on the north, east, south, and southwest sides. On the west and northwest the steep cliffs were evidently considered sufficient defense, and no wall was built; at the north the wall can be traced to within a few meters of a sheer drop, while at the southwest it approaches a low, but almost vertical, cliff that rises to the peak. No entrance can now be located, but it is likely that one existed on the eastern side where one now approaches on a modern path along the crest of the ridge; any of several breaks in the wall may possibly have belonged to such an entrance. A second entrance may have existed on the southern side, perhaps where the line of the wall steps back slightly but suddenly.

The wall is built of rubble, employing unworked stones of varying sizes. In places it is preserved to a height of over one meter, and its thickness, where preserved, is a relatively constant 2.30 m. It is a simple fortification, varying in its line to follow

¹⁵⁸ *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VII (north edge) and Bl. XII (south edge), height 196.9.

¹⁵⁹ The only notice of this wall is, to the writer's knowledge, A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, III, p. 3, but perhaps W. M. Leake, *Demi of Attica*², p. 76, refers to the remains on Etosi.

the contours of the land and built without towers or other elaborations, but it is rather more considerable than the "Reste von einem roh gehäuften Steinwall" of Milchhöfer.¹⁶⁰

Within the enclosure are several piles of rubble and possibly some badly ruined and fragmentary lines of wall, indicating that at some time several buildings stood there. There are, however, no roof tiles visible on the surface; only a few sherds of any kind have been found, and these are small, undatable bits of coarse ware.




FIG. 16 Plan of Etosi

That the site is military is clear from the thickness of the wall and the choice of position; neither the peak area nor the crest of the ridge to the east of it is now cultivated, and it probably has never been. Its size and position make the site suitable for a temporary camp for any army expecting action in the northern part of the Mesogea, but there is no indication of when or by whom it may have been used. It

¹⁶⁰ A. Milchhöfer, Text, III, p. 3.

resembles other demonstrably ancient camps, but A. Milchhöfer reports that it is said to have been used as a lookout during the War of Independence, and he concludes that it was used as a refuge at that time or perhaps earlier and that it was for this purpose that the wall was built.¹⁶¹

APHIDNA

The hill called Kotroni (*Karten von Attika*, Bl. XIX, height 366) which commands the valley bordered by the towns Kalentzi, Kapandriti, and Kiourka in north-east Attica has long been identified with the deme of Aphidna (Pl. 15, d).¹⁶² Aphidna is said by Philochoros to have been one of the twelve towns of Kekrops,¹⁶³ and legend records it as the strong hiding place in which Theseus concealed Helen from her brothers.¹⁶⁴ According to the law of Kallisthenes inserted as evidence in Demosthenes's *De Corona*,¹⁶⁵ Aphidna was, in the fourth century, a strong place of refuge, and, since it is grouped with the known garrison-forts, it is sometimes assumed to have been one of them.

The hill of Kotroni rises steeply from the surrounding valley; its north and southwest slopes are very steep, though it falls off more gradually toward the southeast. Its peak is a relatively level oval about 125 m. long (north-south) and about 40 m. wide (east-west), at the northeast side of which stands a small church of Zoodochos Pigi. Ancient remains have long been noted on the peak and on the ridge which runs from it toward the southeast, but they have never been described in detail.¹⁶⁶

The peak area is encircled by a defensive wall, traces of which are still visible on the surface. The wall appears to have been of rubble, built with two faces of good-sized field stones and a packing of smaller stones (Pl. 15, e). There is nowhere more than one course above ground, and in most places the line of the wall is indicated only by a distinct ridge in the earth. Several meters of the inner face are, however, visible

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁶² G. Finlay, "On the Position of Aphidna," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Literature*, III, 1839, pp. 369 f.; *Topography of Oropia and Diacria*, Athens, 1838.

¹⁶³ Strabo, p. 397; *F.Gr.Hist.*, 328 F 94. Jacoby, commentary *ad loc.*, concludes that Philochoros's list is a fabrication based on the number twelve, and that it only shows that Philochoros had, or thought he had, some reason to believe that the places mentioned were especially ancient.

¹⁶⁴ Herodotos, IX, 73.

¹⁶⁵ XVIII, 38: "All property in the country shall be immediately removed, if in a radius of 120 stades, to the city and Piraeus, if outside this radius, to Eleusis, Phyle, Aphidna, Rhamnous, or Sounion."

¹⁶⁶ G. Finlay, "On the Position of Aphidna"; A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, III, p. 60 (his estimate of the size of the upper area is rather greater than that of the writer who paced it); S. Wide, "Aphidna in Nordattika," *Ath. Mitt.*, XXI, 1896, pp. 385-409, especially p. 388. Most recently Th. A. Arvanitopoulou, *Δεκέλεια*, Athens, 1958, p. 12. Other descriptions seem only to repeat Milchhöfer's account.

above ground on the west side, and, on the east side where a modern path crosses the line of the wall, both faces are visible in the ground; the thickness at this point is 2.00 m.¹⁶⁷ Traces of a second wall and an occasional outcropping of rubble, some of which apparently preserve an outer face, form the only visible evidence for this lower defense.

Within the upper fortification there is much evidence of long occupation of the site. Traces of rubble walls, especially along the western side, together with many fragments of black- and red-glazed roof tiles attest the existence of a number of buildings. Much pottery remains on the ground in spite of recent intensive collecting of sherds,¹⁶⁸ and its range indicates that the site was occupied throughout antiquity. Besides much coarse ware, fragments of wine amphoras, and tiles, the writer's small sampling contained fragments of Middle Helladic Gray Minyan ware and a chert blade,¹⁶⁹ a small fragment of a red-figured vessel, possibly a stand, dating from about the middle of the fifth century,¹⁷⁰ a fragment of a black-glazed bowl with stamped decoration of the same or a slightly later period,¹⁷¹ and other, less datable, black- and red-glazed fragments. A fragment of a Sgraffito bowl attested to occupation during the Byzantine period.

There is no way of deciding now, without excavation, to which period in this long occupation the walls might belong, nor is it possible to judge accurately their exact style of construction. It is, however, doubtful whether these walls ever made Aphidna into one of the great garrison forts. The traces bear no resemblance to those of Phyle, Rhamnous, and Sounion, which are permanent structures built of great, dressed blocks; they could withstand a siege as Aphidna could not. It would

¹⁶⁷ A crosswall in the upper circuit was noted by Milchhöfer and is indicated on the *Karten von Attika*; this is no longer visible, and it seems possible to the writer that the traces originally seen might have belonged to some sort of gate defense. The entrance (or an entrance) to the upper circuit should, according to the land formation, have existed in approximately this location, and the purpose of a crosswall here is difficult to imagine.

¹⁶⁸ E.g., Sophia and Eirene, Princesses of Greece, and Th. A. Arvanitopoulou, *Ἵστὴρα καὶ ἐκ Δεκελείας*, Athens, 1959, pp. 12-13.

¹⁶⁹ For Middle Helladic graves to the southwest of Kotroni, see S. Wide, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXI, 1896, pp. 388-409; on the pottery cf. A. J. B. Wace and C. W. Blegen, "Premycenaean Pottery of the Mainland," *B.S.A.*, XXII, 1916-1918, pp. 181, 183, 184, 187. The Mycenaean sherds often noted from Aphidna (e.g. by Stubbings, *B.S.A.*, XLII, 1947, p. 8; D. Fimmen, *Die Kretisch-Mykenische Kultur*, Berlin, 1921, p. 6) rest on Wide's remark (*op. cit.*, p. 388): there is no guarantee that his sherds were in fact Late Helladic rather than of any other Bronze Age period.

¹⁷⁰ The sherd shows the lower part of a garment decorated at the bottom with a horizontal line from which fine vertical lines run downward. Below, a decorative band of which two squares, one with an ex, the other with a maeander, are preserved. The shape and the finished interior with at least one reserved band suggest a stand (cf. L. Talcott, *Hesperia*, V, 1936, pp. 59-69).

¹⁷¹ Decoration consists of palmettes outside a ring of ovules; the glaze is firm and the decoration careful; the bottom has a narrow brown circle on an unglazed ground. Cf., for decoration only, D. M. Robinson, *Olynthus*, XIII, pl. 220, no. 70. For possible identification of the shape cf. Corbett, *Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, p. 303.

be surprising to find that the system of garrison-forts, which resemble one another so closely, also included the more humble, and evidently unique, example at Aphidna. It is likewise hard to believe that Aphidna ever had fortifications comparable to those of the garrison-forts; for such durable walls could hardly vanish without a trace. It seems, therefore, better to suppose an error in the text of the law in Demosthenes; the law is an interpolation in any case, and should not have the same weight as the sure archaeological evidence. But if it is likely that Aphidna was not one of the garrison-forts, the evidence does not supply a positive alternative, and both the nature and date of the walls at Aphidna must await further information to be identified.




FIG. 17. Plan of Korynos

KORYNOS (Fig. 17)

About three kilometers south of the town of Kavasala and of the Skourta plain, on an isolated peak in the Parnes range, stands a small fort with rubble walls.¹⁷² The site was noted and a brief description of it made by Ioannis Sarres.¹⁷³

The fort lies on a commanding height near the road which leads through Parnes

¹⁷² It lies on the height marked 519.8 on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. XXV, three kilometers almost directly south of Kavasala, but the fort is not indicated on the map nor is it mentioned in Milchhöfer's Text.

¹⁷³ I. Sarres, "Τὸ Κάστρον τοῦ Κορυνοῦ," *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1927-1928, pp. 112-119.

from the Skourta plain to the Thriasian plain;¹⁷⁴ the same road is guarded at its lower, Thriasian end by Plakoto and Palaiokastro (see pp. 72-75, *supra*). It not only commands this road, but also enjoys a good view of the fort above Kavasala directly to the north of it, the fort called Panakton by Miss Chandler¹⁷⁵ and others.

The height upon which the fortification lies is precipitous (Pl. 16, e), and access to it is possible only from the east or west. On these sides the height is protected by a defense wall built of medium sized field stones laid to form two faces, with a packing of smaller stones between them. The best preserved section of wall is that on the west, about 45 m. long and from 2.90 m. to 3.30 m. thick, which now stands to a height of 1.50 to 2.50 m. (Pl. 17, a). The wall on the east, especially near the entrance, seems to have deteriorated in the past thirty years, and it is now impossible to locate the exact position of the gate.

There are no traces of buildings within the fortified enclosure, nor, indeed, is there any real evidence that the site was ever used, or, if used, for what purpose. Sarres reported in 1928 that he found no sherds or other datable material,¹⁷⁶ and the writer was unable to find as much as one helpful sherd. The lack of remains of buildings is also supported by the complete absence of roof tile fragments.

Sarres concluded that the fortification served as a refuge for the scattered inhabitants of the surrounding area,¹⁷⁷ and that, indeed, it could be used to fix the location of the deme of Melainai.¹⁷⁸ Sarres does not, however, present detailed reasons for thinking that the site was a refuge for local demesmen, and two considerations seem to argue against this interpretation. It is not clear from where the people who used such a refuge would have come, since there are only limited antique remains in its immediate area and nothing that seems to resemble a deme-center. Secondly, it would be odd to find such a refuge located in a strategic point on a main route; the object of a refuge would be purely defensive, and the purpose of those using it would be to avoid an invading enemy. The location of the fortification on a major route and near the border of Attica and Boeotia indicates, rather, that its purpose was more aggressively military. Its position is, indeed, analogous to those of such border garrison-forts as Gyphtokastro and Phyle. Its construction is, however, much less permanent than these, and it cannot have been intended to serve as a continuous guard post for the border nor ever to withstand a siege.

If the fort above Kavasala is accepted as a Boeotian rather than an Attic fort,¹⁷⁹

¹⁷⁴ The road is now suitable only for jeeps, but, except for the route by Phyle, which has no motor road, it provides the only direct communication between Attica and the Skourta plain.

¹⁷⁵ *J.H.S.*, XLVI, 1926, pp. 15 f.

¹⁷⁶ I. Sarres, 'Αρχ. Έφ., 1927-1928, p. 114.

¹⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 115.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, pp. 115-119. The identification of Korynokastro with the deme of Melainai is accepted as "gesichert" by E. Kirsten, "Der gegenwärtige Stand der attischen Demenforschung," p. 169.

¹⁷⁹ It is so accepted by U. Kahrstedt, *Ath. Mitt.*, LVII, 1932, pp. 18-19, 27. More recent investi-

then Korynos might be seen as an Attic counter position, not a permanent position as Kahrstedt suggests,¹⁸⁰ but one established to meet a specific emergency. Such an emergency could have occurred in connection with an actual invasion, a threatened invasion, or simply persistent border raids.

“ ERENEIA ”

About 7.5 kilometers west of the village of Koundoura, toward the western end of the Koundoura valley (Pl. 8, b) and at its south side, a hill (height 670 m.) rises above the small chapel of Agios Georgios; the peak of this hill is enclosed by a rubble fortification wall.¹⁸¹ The hill on which the fort stands is one of the foothills of Mt. Pateras, which borders the Koundoura valley on the south and divides it from the Megarid. The hill is separated from the main mass of the mountain by a deep gully, and it is toward this gully and Mt. Pateras that the heaviest fortifications face.

The fortifications of this hill are in two parts. The southern side of the hill is protected by a heavy fortification wall some 40-50 m. long running along the brow (Pl. 17, d).¹⁸² The wall is 3.20 to 3.50 m. thick and preserved as high as 3.50 m.; it is built in two faces of fairly large stones and boulders with a regular packing of small stones (Pl. 17, b). Three towers strengthen the defenses. The westernmost is round, 6.50 m. in diameter; it is set into the curtain wall, so that it at first appears to be apsidal. The central tower, similar to the western one, stands near the highest point of the hill. The eastern tower is smaller and is only a semicircle, for the outer face of the curtain is continuous behind it. One small gateway, 0.75 m. wide, cuts the curtain just west of the westernmost tower. The inner face of the curtain wall is thickened just to the west of the small eastern tower, and this probably once formed a ramp or stairway leading to the rampart walk.

To the east of the small eastern tower the wall is poorly preserved and it quickly vanishes on that side; a careful search produced no trace of a continuation, but the hill there becomes steeper, and perhaps no wall was ever built. To the west of the western tower the wall turns sharply northward and continues down the hill toward the valley; this section becomes progressively poorer, and eventually it vanishes at no very significant point.

gators of the Attic border forts, such as C. N. Edmonson, hold this view, though they have not published it.

¹⁸⁰ *Ath. Mitt.*, LVII, 1932, p. 19.

¹⁸¹ The site is published by I. Sarres, 'Ερένεια, 'Αρχ. 'Εφ., 1910, pp. 151-158. His description of the remains is short, and the writer's description is based on notes made at the site in March 1962. Sarres's publication has apparently failed to get into the topographical literature on this area, and N. G. L. Hammond, *B.S.A.*, XLIX, 1954, p. 108, mentions the site without reference to Sarres.

¹⁸² See plan, Sarres, 'Αρχ. 'Εφ., 1910, pp. 155-156.

The second part of the hill's fortifications consists of a wall which runs all along the northern side of the hill, considerably below its peak and about 200 m. north of the southern wall (Pl. 17, c).¹⁸³ The wall appears to have had only one face, though that is very well built, and rubble was merely piled between this face and the rising slope behind it. It is from 1 to 2 m. thick and preserved to a height of 1.00 to 1.50 m.

There are a few remains of buildings within the fortified area. Toward the western end of the north wall and some 30 m. behind it is a terrace wall, 0.80 m. thick and about 40 m. long, which serves as the north wall of a series of rooms (Pl. 18, a); a typical room is 10 m. long and 4 m. deep.

There is little evidence for dating these remains. Besides coarse sherds there are glazed roof tiles similar in profile and glaze to those found at other fortified sites, and the writer found one small black-glazed sherd. Though these do not allow precise dating, they are a sufficient indication that the site should be assigned to the Classical or Hellenistic periods rather than to either a prehistoric or post-antique period.

The lower, northern slopes of the hill and the area between the hill and the chapel of Agios Georgios are covered with fragmentary rubble walls of houses. This must have been the site of a settlement of considerable size.

Almost opposite the hill and running northward from the center of the valley toward its northern side is a long field-stone wall (Pl. 18, b); its single preserved face, which is built of large stones, faces toward the west. The writer is unable to suggest the purpose of this wall; it seems to have no relation either to the fort on the southern hill or to the house remains on the lower slopes. That it is ancient seems, however, evident from its construction.

The identification of the site at Agios Georgios with the ancient Ereneia rests on very little evidence.¹⁸⁴ Pausanias mentions the town once (I, 44, 5), but the only factual information that he gives is that Ereneia is a Megarian town. Sarres supposes that Ereneia must be in this general area because Pausanias gives it this brief notice in the section in which he considers other northern Megarian towns such as Aigosthena. Leake has tentatively put Ereneia at Koundoura,¹⁸⁵ but since Sarres found no ancient remains there, he chose the only place within the Koundoura valley at which he did find such remains.

The difficulty with this identification is that the Koundoura valley was almost surely Attic rather than Megarian; it is completely enclosed by mountains on the south, west, and north, where it might have connected with Megarian territory, while it opens naturally toward the east into Attica. If this is the case, the remains at Agios Georgios are Attic rather than Megarian, and the identification of the site as Ereneia

¹⁸³ The hill is now densely overgrown with pines and brush, making it difficult to walk from one part to another and impossible to take measurements; the distance between the walls is, therefore, only a rough estimate.

¹⁸⁴ Sarres, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1910, pp. 151-158, gives the arguments.

¹⁸⁵ W. M. Leake, *Travels in Northern Greece*, II, p. 408.

is impossible. This view is supported by the remains, for the strongest part of the fort, the southern wall with its three towers, faces not toward the north or east, as it would if an attack were expected from Attica, but toward the south and Megara.

The site would seem to have had two functions. It had a fairly large settlement as is shown by the many house remains, and it had a fortification whose function it was to protect the Attic border in this area against incursions from Megara. It was thus similar to Panakton-Eleutherai, if these two names referred to one site, or to Rhamnous, in that it combined a civilian settlement and a military post. It differed from these, however, in the size and importance of its military post. This border with Megara was not on the normal invasion routes, and it may be that the fort was not continuously garrisoned. There is no literary reference which seems to identify it.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF ATTIC FORTIFICATIONS

The descriptions of the various sites in Chapter II have included brief remarks on the military use for which each site seemed to be suitable. In the absence of explicit evidence, the function of a site must be determined by comparison with sites whose functions are known or by comparison with the general testimony of ancient literary sources. The sites included in this study have been called many things—garrison-forts, fortified demes, refuges, and medieval or modern fortifications, as well as field-works and fortified camps. These types of fortifications must, then, be considered individually so that their characteristics may be defined.

THE GARRISON-FORTS

ATHENIAN GARRISONS

The defense of Attica outside the city of Athens was, in Classical and Hellenistic times, based on a number of garrisoned forts at the borders¹ and at other strategic points. These strongholds were placed at strategic points, on the borders of Attica, on major routes, and at key coastal points, not so much in the hope that they could themselves prevent the entry of an invading army or fleet, but more because they could force such an army to weaken itself. An invader could not afford to leave these strongholds unreduced; for, if they were left, their garrisons could at any moment emerge to disrupt the enemy's communications and, if faced with a superior force, retreat again into the strongholds.² Thus Gyphtokastro³ (Panakton on Pl. 1), Myoupolis⁴ (Oinoe on Pl. 1), and Phyle⁵ stood in the northwest border territory on major routes into Attica; Eleusis⁶ on the crossroads of the routes between Athens

¹ The question of the identification of the Attic border forts is a complicated one, which has not yet been resolved, and of which the writer has made no special study. See especially L. Chandler, *J.H.S.*, XLVI, 1926, pp. 1-21 and U. Kahrstedt, *Ath. Mitt.*, LVII, 1932, pp. 8-28, as well as bibliography in the notes *infra*. Recent, as yet unpublished studies by C. N. Edmonson propose other identifications. In view of these uncertainties, which fortunately do not affect the present argument, the writer has used the modern name for a site in preference to an ancient name, where the latter might cause confusion.

² This principle was recognized by U. Kahrstedt, *Ath. Mitt.*, LVII, 1932, p. 19. Unless a pass is very narrow it is difficult for a fort actually to control it without the benefit of long-range weapons.

³ See W. Wrede, *Attische Mauern*, pp. 32-33. Cf. J. Wiesner, *R.E.*, s.v. Panakton, 1949. The use of the name Panakton on Plate 1 does not reflect a firm opinion of the writer on the identification of the site.

⁴ See Wrede, pp. 25-26. Cf. J. Wiesner, *R.E.*, Supplement VIII, 1956, cols. 370-372, s.v. Oinoe.

⁵ Wrede, pp. 28-29. Cf. *Ath. Mitt.*, XLIX, 1924, pp. 153-224.

⁶ See G. Mylonas, *Eleusis and the Eleusinian Mysteries*, Princeton, 1961, pp. 92-95, 124-125, 152.

and the Peloponnesus and Athens and Thebes; Rhamnous⁷ both in the northeast border country and on the sea route from Athens to Euboea; and Sounion⁸ at the key coastal point.

It was basic to the purpose of the garrison-forts that they be as nearly impregnable as possible and that this impregnability depend not upon superior forces but upon the strength of the fortress itself. The whole usefulness of such strongholds would vanish if they could be taken by assault. They were thus strongly built, and the fourth-century walls which stand at these sites are impressive both for their size and as examples of sophisticated military architecture. They were kept garrisoned, and after Chaeronea the ephebes were stationed in them for the second year of their training.⁹

The distinction between these forts and the sites considered in Chapter II is, therefore, real. The difference in masonry is significant; for it was only with massive walls such as the garrison-forts exhibit that a site could reasonably be expected to repel an attack by superior forces.

FOREIGN GARRISONS

From time to time in the Hellenistic period foreign rulers of Athens kept Athenian bids for freedom in check by means of garrisons placed on the Mouseion hill in the city itself and on the Mounichia in Piraeus.¹⁰ These fortifications are now very poorly preserved, but judging from the remains of the Mouseion fort, they, too, were positions of considerable strength fortified with carefully built walls, and not comparable to the sites described in Chapter II.¹¹

OTHER ATHENIAN DEFENSES

Although the garrison-forts are those for which there is literary evidence, there were also subsidiary military works which served with them for the protection of Attica. It can hardly be doubted that some scattered watchtowers, such as those at Mazi and Varnava,¹² belonged to the system of defense based on the garrison-forts.

⁷ See J. Pouilloux, *La forteresse de Rhamnonte*, pp. 14-42.

⁸ See Wrede, pp. 10-11, 37-38. Cf. B. Stais, *Tò Σούνιον*, Athens, 1920.

⁹ For a discussion of the life and organization of these garrison-forts see Pouilloux, esp. pp. 78-92, 107-167.

¹⁰ Other garrison-forts were occupied by the Macedonians from time to time (see W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, London, 1911, p. 230 and *passim*) but the suggestion that some of these were built by the Macedonians (cf. G. Säflund, *Opuscula Archaeologica*, I, 1935, pp. 92-110) has not been widely approved and is almost surely wrong.

¹¹ For the Mouseion fort see H. A. Thompson and R. L. Scranton, *Hesperia*, XII, 1943, p. 331. For Mounichia see W. Judeich, *Topographie von Athen*², Munich, 1931, pp. 162-163; cf. A. Milchhöfer, *Text*, I, p. 62.

¹² For Mazi see Wrede, pp. 24-25; for Varnava, *ibid.*, p. 32.

These towers were apparently outposts of those forts, the one at Mazi being connected with Myoupolis or Gyphtokastro and that at Varnava with Rhamnous. They are built in the same careful and massive stonework and are located at strategic points not directly observed by the forts yet within what might reasonably be expected to be territory which the forts protected.

These subsidiary structures thus fulfill what may be considered the basic requirements for parts of the defense system of Attica—to show a certain degree of permanence and to be located in a strategic spot not covered by another part of the defense system. The latter requirement is based on a principle which the writer considers axiomatic in the attribution of subsidiary fortifications to the Athenian defense system—that a subsidiary fortification would have been built by Athens only if it performed a useful function which was not performed by one of the major fortifications. Two structures on Hymettos illustrate the manner in which this principle is here applied. The Hymettos Camp is so located that it does not seem to offer any considerable threat to an invader, and, as a watch-post, it commands a view no more extensive than that commanded by points within the city; the site is thus here considered non-Athenian. On the other hand, the tower on the north peak of Hymettos (see Appendix) is here considered Athenian; for, since it is located on the eastern edge of the broad peak on which it stands, it commands an excellent view of the whole Mesogeia and the route between Hymettos and Penteli, an area not under surveillance from the major fortifications, and its view of the Athenian plain, while it allows line-of-sight communication with Athens, is otherwise limited by the western slopes of Hymettos. It thus performs a function not otherwise performed and does not duplicate the function that can be performed from the city itself.

Some of the sites described in Chapter II also fulfill these requirements to a greater or lesser degree and may, therefore, be assigned with some probability to the same system of defense. Katsimidi, which stands on the route over the shoulder of Parnes from the Oropia to Athens, and which is at least partly built of large, squared blocks as are the garrison-forts, is closest to those forts and was probably one of them; it fills what would otherwise be a wide gap between Phyle and Rhamnous. “Erenea,” although it is built of rubble, is nevertheless extremely solidly built; its location, too, would allow it to fill a gap in the chain of border defenses. For Thorikos there is literary evidence, and it seems sure that it was added to Attica’s defenses at the close of the fifth century.

Somewhat less sure are the three sites on the road from the Skourta plain to the Thriasian plain. Plakoto, at least in its inner circuit, exhibits considerable care in construction, and its site would be important in the defense of this route; it should probably be seen as a subsidiary fort or watch-post dependent on Eleusis. As stated in Chapter II, Palaiokastros gives no indication of its use or date; it may have had a purpose similar to that of Plakoto, but the explanation of the need for two such

fortifications is obscure; the writer has no satisfactory suggestion. The rubble fortification at Korynos, near the northern end of this route, has a strategic position not otherwise covered and could, therefore, be seen as part of Attica's border defenses, but its poor construction is not typical of this system. It may, however, be noted that the great thickness of its walls, like that of the walls of "Erenea," may indicate a difference between this fort and the more common type of rubble forts, and this difference could be that it was intended as a link in the border defense system. It is possible that they were not continuously or heavily manned, their use being confined to times of particular danger.

Still another sort of installation which may be considered a part of the Athenian defense system is the signalling station. Communication between the garrison forts and Athens and Piraeus would have been very desirable, and the usefulness of Sounion, for example, would have been greatly increased by the possibility of warning Piraeus of the arrival of a hostile fleet. The fortifications at Atene and Vari-Anagyrous have been identified as signalling posts. The principal requirement of such posts is one of location. They must be so located as to have line-of-sight communication with the two points which they are supposed to connect.¹³ Both these sites satisfy this requirement; the Atene fort is in view of Sounion and Vari, while Vari is in view of both the Atene fort and Piraeus. The fortifications at these two sites are lighter than those at others, since they were not, according to this hypothesis, intended to resist a concentrated attack.

FORTIFIED DEMES

Some of the fortifications described in Chapter II have in the past been connected with the Attic demes. They have been seen as acropoleis connected with deme-centers.¹⁴ It has been shown that Koroni, or at least its fortifications, had no connection with the deme of Prasiai other than that it undoubtedly stands on territory which belonged to the deme. The question arises, did any deme have a fortification which belonged to it?

It is, of course, well known that some fortifications stood at the sites of deme-centers or near them. Rhamnous and Eleusis are the most notable examples of these, for here the deme- or city-center lay within part of the fortifications.¹⁵ At Sounion,

¹³ For the importance of signalling and some methods that might be used see Polybios, X, 44-47.

¹⁴ E.g. Koroni identified as the acropolis of Prasiai by Lolling, Frazer, and Kirsten; the walls along the western slopes of Hymettos identified as demes by Dodwell, Gell, and Leake; Yerovouno identified as Acharnai by Kirsten; Korynos identified as Melainai by Sarres and Kirsten; the Thriasian "Lager" identified as a deme by the investigators of the Dema; Agrieliki identified as the acropolis of Marathon by Soteriades. See references under the sites in Chapters I and II.

¹⁵ That Rhamnous lay within the outer fortifications is reasonably sure. The ridge to the east which Pouilloux, p. 16, took as its site has been shown by excavations, both official and illicit, to have been only a necropolis.

too, the fortifications lay not far from the deme-center, but the deme-center did not lie on the promontory itself.¹⁶ If, as is possible, Panakton is to be identified with the fort at Gyphtokastro and Eleutherai with the town or district near by, the same situation would exist. But in all these instances the fortification at or near the deme-center does not belong to the deme but rather to Athens; its function is not so much the protection of the single deme in whose territory it happens to be as the protection of Athenian territory, and accordingly these forts were garrisoned by Athens with Athenian forces.

It is, indeed, hard to see what the purpose would have been of a fortification which belonged to a deme. After the synoikismos the demes had no independent foreign policy, and any menace to them would have come in connection with a general menace to Athenian territory. There is no evidence that the demes were expected to take, or did take, independent action to meet such a menace. It follows that an acropolis is not a necessary part of a deme-center, and that the topographical method of identifying a fortification with a deme-center is a dangerous one.

A possible purpose for which a deme might have provided itself with a fortification, the only one that has occurred to the writer, is to afford a refuge for its citizens in time of invasion. This would suppose that a deme might make preparations for defense over and above those made by Athens for all Attica, much as a contemporary community might construct public bomb shelters in addition to the defensive measures taken by the national government. These would, however, not differ from the less specific refuges or *Fluchtburgen* with which some rubble fortifications have been identified, and these hypothetical deme-refuges may be considered with them.

The only remaining possibilities for fortified demes would thus be the pre-synoikismos settlements. Of the sites considered here, only Dekeleia, Trikorynthos, and Aphidna fall into this group. The likelihood that the walls of Dekeleia come from this early period has here been denied, but for the other sites it remains a possibility.

REFUGES

In the absence of more concrete suggestions, many rubble fortifications have been identified as refuges, temporary fortifications built to protect people in the countryside at a time when they were menaced by an invasion.¹⁷ The purpose and use of such refuges are plausible, but, so far as the writer knows, there is no sound evidence for them. It seems, on the contrary, that the strategy for the defense of Athens and

¹⁶ Strabo, IX, 1, 22, seems to imply this; cf. J. H. Young, *Hesperia*, X, 1941, p. 165.

¹⁷ E.g. Kynosoura so identified by Soteriades; Korynos identified by Sarres (see references in the relevant sections of Chapter II). W. Wrede, *Attika*, Athens, 1934, p. 30, mentions as "*Fluchtburgen*" the sites here called Agrieliiki, Trikorynthos, and Koroni.

Attica ignored the possibility of using such refuges and relied rather on the defenses of the city, of Piraeus, and of the garrison-forts to protect the people. The clearest example of this strategy is the decree of Kallisthenes inserted in Demosthenes's *De Corona*. While the decree is a forgery, it has been suggested that it is a Hellenistic forgery reflecting conditions of the third century.¹⁸ Whether or not it is accurate in detail and whether it refers to conditions in the fourth century or in the third century is not critically important for the picture it gives of Attic defense strategy.¹⁹ This decree provides:

that no Athenian be allowed upon any pretext whatsoever to pass the night in the country, but only in the City and Piraeus, except those stationed in the garrisons; that the latter keep each the post assigned to him, leaving it neither by day nor by night. That all property in the country be immediately removed, if within a radius of 100 stades, to the City and Piraeus; if outside this radius, to Eleusis, Phyle, Aphidna,²⁰ Rhamnous, or Sounion.

(Demosthenes, XVIII, 37-38)

The function of supposed refuges was, at least in this case, taken over by the major fortifications of Athens, Piraeus, and the garrison-forts.

In the absence of literary evidence on refuges and of a surely identified example of a refuge, the characteristics of such a structure must be inferred from the purpose that it would have been intended to serve. That purpose is to protect the citizens of outlying districts from attacks of an enemy. It is evident that this is a purely defensive purpose which would be best served by a site which is as inaccessible as possible, to make it difficult to attack, and as strategically unimportant as possible, to minimize the enemy's need to attack it. Little can be said of the walls that would have been built by the defenders, save that they would probably be of a rough and temporary sort.

These conditions exclude most of the sites described in Chapter II; for most of these are located in places either near enough to the city or to garrison-forts to make a separate refuge unnecessary or in places with such obvious strategic importance that they could not be overlooked by an army engaged in a serious attack on Attica. Of those suggested as refuges, Koroni has been shown to be a different kind of site; Korynos is located on the important route between the Skourta plain and the Thriasian plain; Trikorynthos controlled the road between the plain of Marathon and Rhamnous; and Agrieliki controlled that between the Marathonian plain and the Mesogeia.

¹⁸ Pouilloux, p. 61, note 4 and p. 62; he cites P. Treves, *Études Classiques*, IX, 1940, pp. 138-175.

¹⁹ That the inserted decree reflects the original decree, at least in its broader outlines, is suggested by references to the decree of Kallisthenes in the body of speeches, e.g. Demosthenes, XVIII, 36; XIX, 86, 125; Aeschines, II, 139; III, 80.

²⁰ The writer has suggested that the inclusion of Aphidna in this list may be suspect (see pp. 82-83, *supra*).

Only Kynosoura, and more particularly the northern hill,²¹ remains as a plausible candidate for such a refuge, and it has been noted (p. 45, *supra*) that for even this site there are other possibilities.

MEDIEVAL FORTIFICATIONS

It is difficult to exclude the possibility that any fortification at which no positive evidence has been found for ancient occupation resulted from some post-antique activity. A Byzantine sherd was found near the wall at the southern tip of Kynosoura, one was found at Aphidna, and a hoard of Byzantine coins has been found at Kastraki. For the latter two sites, however, there is abundant evidence for ancient occupation, too, and it is with the ancient occupation that the walls are to be associated; the Byzantine evidence merely shows a medieval re-occupation of the sites, and it is, perhaps, surprising that such evidence did not appear in more places.

While it is, then, possible that any site which has no evidence for its dating might belong to the middle ages, there is, to the writer's knowledge, no example of a surely medieval fortification in Attica built in the dry-rubble style; it is thus impossible to prove one of these fortifications medieval either by direct evidence or by analogy. The common medieval construction, combining stone, tile or brick, and mortar, does not occur at the sites here considered.

FORTIFICATIONS OF THE GREEK WAR OF INDEPENDENCE

Although several Attic fortifications have been thought to come from the time of the Greek War of Independence (e.g. those of Kastraki, Etosi, the Hymettos Camp), none are, to the writer's knowledge, proven to have come from that period, nor have any been connected with a specific action in that war. A sure example of a nineteenth-century fort of this type would thus be valuable for purposes of comparison.

One such fortification still stands in the Cleft Way leading to Delphi. It was noticed by H. N. Ulrichs in 1837 or 1838 and connected by him with an episode which took place in 1823, when Odysseus Androutsas at the wall fought a Turkish army advancing through the narrow pass to the valley of the Plistos and the plain of Chryso and Salona. Ulrichs describes the wall as low, built of field stones without mortar, and nearer in appearance to a sheepfold than to proper fieldworks.²²

²¹ That enclosed by walls B, C, and D (see pp. 44-45, *supra*).

²² H. N. Ulrichs, *Reisen und Forschungen in Griechenland*, I, Bremen, 1840, pp. 146-147. There is no reason to doubt the identification, though it is rather difficult to find a good account of the engagement. Most likely it is the engagement between the Greeks and the forces of Yussuf Pasha briefly recorded in the histories of the war; cf. T. Gordon, *History of the Greek Revolution*, II, London, 1832, p. 19; S. G. Howe, *Historical Sketch of the Greek Revolution*, New York, 1828, p. 149; W. M. Leake, *Historical Outline of the Greek Revolution*, London, 1836, p. 105. The

Remains of this wall are still clearly visible in the Cleft Way (Pl. 19, b, c),²³ far below the modern road from Levadia to Arachova, about 300 m. west of the Megas monument. The valley is here very narrow with steep slopes to both north and south. The ground rises toward the west, and the center of the valley is divided by the dry river bed. The wall divides the valley on either side of the river bed. On the northern side it proceeds from the banks almost directly northward for about 50 m., then, as it climbs the slope, it turns more and more toward the east. About two-thirds of the way up the slope the wall stops climbing, and, running at a level and almost directly eastward, it continues to the mouth of the valley: the total length of this half is about 350 m. Although the wall is not so well preserved on the southern side of the river bed, it appears to have there followed a similar plan, so that the whole formed a horseshoe into which the enemy would have to march. The wall itself is built of field stones of moderate size and has two good faces; since its thickness is only 0.90 to 1.00 m., there was seldom need for packing between the faces. On level or moderately sloping ground it is free-standing, and the wall is seldom preserved to a height of more than 0.50 m., but in its upper, eastern parts on the northern slope, it is built with its rear face against the steeply rising ground, and here the outer face stands to a height of almost two meters.

Several features of this wall are worthy of notice. The wall was no minor undertaking; for its total length, now between 450 and 500 m., was probably nearly 700 m. in 1823. The force that manned and presumably built it was fairly small, about 500 men,²⁴ and the accounts of the action imply that there was no great time for preparation. Such a fieldwork could thus apparently be built with great speed.

In construction the wall in the Cleft Way resembles the narrow walls in Attica: that on the Kaisariani Berg, the Kamatero wall, and that attached to the Thriasian "Lager." The plan of the wall in the Cleft Way, however, reflects the difference between ancient and modern warfare. The flanks, or ends of the horseshoe, which allowed the defenders to surround the attacking enemy, would be of use only to men with rifles. The distance from these ends to the floor of the valley is too great for spears or arrows. The thinness of the wall is notable; the purpose of the wall was to offer a protected place from which men armed with rifles might fire on an advancing enemy, and there is in this situation no point in building a thick wall, and in fact a thick wall might be a disadvantage unless it were provided with loopholes. It is therefore to be expected that walls meant to be used with gunfire will be thin; the converse, however, that thin walls are necessarily to be connected with gunfire and

Guide Bleu—Grèce, Paris, 1956 mentions a medieval wall barring the way (p. 258); this is presumably the same wall erroneously identified.

²³ This description is based on observations made in May 1962 by the writer, his wife, and E. B. Harrison.

²⁴ T. Gordon, *History of the Greek Revolution*, II, p. 18.

with the Greek War of Independence, does not follow. The thin wall on Kaisariani Berg is known to have been built a considerable time before this war. None of the Attic walls here considered exhibits fully the characteristics of the wall in the Cleft Way, and, while the possibility remains, none can be identified as a structure from the Greek War of Independence.

FIELDWORKS

Fieldworks are constructed to give a defending army an advantage during a pitched battle. They need not enclose an area, but can simply run along a battle line which would be advantageous to the defending force. Even a relatively small obstacle will serve this purpose, for any obstacle can cause the attacker to lose momentum and falter momentarily. It thus provides a barrier which, though not itself impregnable, can be successfully defended by a sufficient number of men, and, because of the advantage given by the fieldwork, the number of defenders can be rather less than that of the attackers.²⁵

An illustration of the use of a fieldwork is given by Xenophon describing the invasion of the Theban plain by Agesilaos in 378 B.C.²⁶ Chabrias, directing the Theban resistance, built a set of stockades which Agesilaos unsuccessfully tried to penetrate for days. The defenders marched parallel to him inside the stockade and concentrated their strength wherever he appeared. They took one opportunity, when Agesilaos was off guard, to launch a sortie, and when Agesilaos counterattacked, they retired again within the stockade. When the line of defense was finally penetrated, by an unexpected attack at dawn, the defenders saw that the position was no longer tenable, and they retreated within the city, but the fieldworks had proven a considerable advantage.

The principle of a fieldwork must, however, be much the same in any age. Thus while the Dema, the long wall attached to the Thriasian "Lager," the Kamatero wall, and probably the wall on Kaisariani Berg can be identified as fieldworks, their dates must be determined on independent evidence.

MILITARY CAMPS

LITERARY EVIDENCE

The fullest statement on Greek military camps is given by Polybios in his comparison of the Roman and Greek systems of encampment:

The Greeks in encamping think it of primary importance to adapt the camp to the natural advantages of the ground, first because they shirk the labour of entrenching, and next because they think artificial defenses are not equal in value to the fortifications which nature provides unaided on the spot. So that as regards the plan of the camp as a whole they are obliged to adopt all kinds of shapes to suit the nature of the ground, and they often have to shift the parts

²⁵ For references to other fieldworks see "Dema," p. 176.

²⁶ Xenophon, *Hellenica*, IV, 4, 9-10, 38-42, 49.

of the army to unsuitable situations, the consequence being that everyone is quite uncertain whereabouts in the camp his own place or the place of his corps is.

(Polybios, VI, 42. Translated by W. R. Paton, Loeb Classical Library)

This passage points out that unlike the Romans the Greeks sought a naturally strong site for their camps; such camps were, it seems, regularly placed on hills or mountains and in other inaccessible places. Polybios does not, indeed, here mention any artificial fortification, and it could be inferred that the Greeks were accustomed to rely entirely on the natural strength of the site chosen. This inference is, however, shown to be wrong by many specific instances of Greek encampment reported in the ancient historians, and the passage should be taken only to imply that the Greeks chose their sites so that the artificial fortifications required would be as little as possible. The second point made by Polybios, and the one of which he seems to disapprove, is that Greek camps, because of their sites, could have no regular plan.

While the fact that an army built and settled in a fortified camp is often noted in the historians, descriptions of the operation are few. Perhaps the most famous is the account of the Athenian army at Pylos:

They had no iron tools for working stone, but picked up stones and put them together just as they happened to fit; and where mortar was needed, for want of hods, they carried it on their backs, bending over in such a way as would make it stay on best, and clasping both hands behind them to prevent it from falling off. And in every way they made haste that they might complete the fortification of the most vulnerable points before the Lacedaemonians came out against them; for the greater part of the place was so strong by nature that it had no need of a wall. . . . The Athenians in six days completed the wall on the side toward the land and at such other points as most needed it.

(Thucydides, IV, 4-5. Translated by C. F. Smith, Loeb Classical Library)

The site was, as in Polybios, a naturally strong one, but the Athenians further strengthened it in its more vulnerable places with a wall. The wall was of rubble, built of unworked field stones, and it was completed in the space of six days.

Thucydides uses the verb *τειχίζειν* of the project at Pylos as he does of that at Dekeleia (VII, 18-19), and in both cases it surely refers to the building of a stone wall. By the fourth century, however, a more specific phrase comes into use; Xenophon writes of a *χαρακωμα* (*Anabasis*, V, 2, 18; *Hellenica*, V, 4, 38), and Arrian says of Alexander: *τὸ δὲ στρατόπεδον τάφρω τε καὶ χάρακι ἐτείχισεν* (III, 9, 1). These latter words became the common ones used by Polybios and Diodoros to describe the building of a fortified camp.

The meaning of *τάφρος* is clear; it is a ditch or trench dug around the camp as the *fossa* was dug around the Roman camp.²⁷ The question remains, however, what

²⁷ It is not surprising that Attic camps do not seem to have been supplied with a trench. In the naturally strong places where camps were located, if a trench were to be dug, it would have to be cut in solid rock. The advantages of a trench would hardly seem worth the effort that this would require.

was a *χάραξ*, an important question for the study of Attic camps since it is used by both Pausanias and Strabo of the camp of Patroklos on Patroklou Nesos. The word is generally taken to mean a palisade of wooden stakes, and that it often had this meaning can be seen from Polybios's description of Roman soldiers carrying stakes with them to form such a palisade (XVIII, 18) and from Aristophanes's joke at the expense of a soldier who fell on a stake while jumping a trench (*Acharneis*, 1178). But if this were the only sort of defense to which *χάραξ* could apply, not only would there be slight literary evidence in the appropriate period for the sort of camp which Koroni is shown by excavation to have been, but the topographical problem of Patroklos's *χάραξ*, so neatly settled by the rubble fortification on Gaidouronisi, would again be unsolved.

That there was, however, some freedom in the use of the word *χάραξ* appears from Polybios himself; for in his description of the Roman camp, which immediately precedes that of the Greek camp, *χάραξ* is the word used to describe the *vallum* (e.g. VI, 34; 35, 5), and this was certainly not regularly a wooden palisade. The suggestion may thus be made that *χάραξ* could refer to any temporary fortification and could thus apply equally well to a rubble wall or to a wooden palisade. This is confirmed not only by the camp on Patroklos Island (an example which would not stand alone, involving, as it does, circular reasoning) but also by a site on Methana in the Peloponnesus. An inscription records an agreement about common land between the city of Troezen and that of Arsinoe of Methana (*I.G.*, IV², 76); one of the stipulations is that neither side occupy the *χάραξ*, and this *χάραξ* is used in later clauses as a fixed geographical point. The *χάραξ* has not been adequately identified with remains, but the implication that it was something more permanent than a ring of wooden stakes is clear in the fact that it could be considered a fixed point in the topography of the area and that its occupation could be considered threatening.²⁸

If the word *χάραξ* can thus have a greater latitude of meaning than is usually given it, it is quite possible that many descriptions of camps which use the stock phrase *τάφρω τε καὶ χάρακι* have been misinterpreted and that in some cases the "palisade" was actually a field-stone wall. It may be suggested that the choice of material for such defenses was determined primarily by what was easily available, and on Attic hills certainly the most readily available material is loose stone.

The literary sources give no idea of the elements that went into the Greek camp, only that those elements were disorganized. The Spartans, however, are said to have had a few more rules in camp building than the other Greeks. Xenophon (*Constitution of the Lacedaemonians*, XII, 1) says that unless the terrain demanded another

²⁸ The writer has not had an opportunity to visit Methana and search for possible remains of this structure. For the topography of Methana see F. Hiller von Gaertringen, *Ἀρχ. Ἐφ.*, 1925-1926, pp. 71 ff.; cf. L. Robert, *Hellenica*, XI-XII, Paris, 1960, p. 159, note 2. See also A. Philippson, *Die Griechischen Landschaften*, III, part I, pp. 58 ff.

form they built their camps round; that they kept and guarded their weapons in a central place; and that they had regular assignments as sentries. About the buildings and other equipment of a camp he unfortunately gives no information.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE.

Two fortifications in Attica have been almost certainly identified as military camps; the walls on Gaidouronisi (Patroklos Island) are, on grounds of literary evidence, surely those of the camp established by Patroklos during the Chremonidean War, and Koroni, on the evidence of historical situation and the coins found, is another camp established during the same war by the same commander.²⁹

Both camps are located on hills, where their defenses can take advantage of the natural strength of the terrain; both have beaches which allow easy communication by sea. These advantages seem to have outweighed the disadvantages which the sites present for living on them; neither has a good supply of water (Koroni has none; Patroklos Island only one cistern and a brackish well); both have fairly steep slopes which must have presented difficulties to builders. It appears that, just as pointed out by Polybios, the defensibility of the site was the primary consideration.

The artificial strengthening of the sites was achieved with heavy rubble walls averaging 2.5 m. in thickness. These were built from the material at hand, and the stones were generally unworked. They were solidly built, but with no thought to their aesthetic quality. The walls were invariably located to take advantage of the slopes on which they were built, so that they always face on lower ground. This necessitated a highly irregular plan, and there was no hesitation in changing the line of a wall to follow the contours of the land. The construction was economical, and where the site itself provided sufficient protection, no wall was built. Irregularly spaced and planned towers served to strengthen the defenses.

Within the fortification buildings were built to serve the needs of the soldiers; some were built along the fortification walls, others as free-standing structures. As in the case of the walls, aesthetics played no part, and the planning and execution of these buildings is extremely haphazard. All seem to have been built of stone, a more readily available material on these hill sites than even mud brick. Koroni has shown that some of the buildings undoubtedly served as barracks and others as storerooms; some, judging from the amount of pottery found, may have been mess halls.

The finds from these sites illustrate what may be called the civilian aspects of the life of the camp rather than the strictly military aspects. The plates, bowls, and cups reflect only the obvious fact that even an army must eat; the many fragments of wine amphoras reflect what must have been a major problem, the procurement of drinking water. It is not surprising that so little evidence of military activity remains.

²⁹ The importance of Dekeleia as a known camp has been noted (p. 58, *supra*). So few of its details are known, however, that it provides only general confirmation.

So far as is known, these camps were never captured or even attacked (see Chapter IV), and spent weapons could not, therefore, be expected to be found. And while the soldiers might well leave behind pottery and other furnishings, which they had probably, at least in part, requisitioned locally, in the expectation of acquiring new supplies at their next post, their weapons, which were the tools of their trade, they would take with them.

The archaeological evidence, like the literary evidence, thus shows that while fortified camps adhered to some broad principles of placement, fortification, and building, they did not obey fixed rules of detail but were built as economically as possible to fill the specific requirements of the occasion.

The same principles seem to have been observed in the construction of the remaining sites described in Chapter II, sites that have for one reason or another been excluded from the other kinds of fortifications in Attica.³⁰ The similarity in choice of site, the occurrence of rough but efficient construction, and the prevalence of walls of about 2.5 m. thickness show the connection between these sites and Koroni and Patroklos Island. But the lack of uniform details in camps makes it difficult to identify them surely without independent confirmatory evidence. Such evidence is provided by the coins from Vouliagmeni and Helioupolis, but elsewhere it is lacking. If, however, a reasonable occasion for the establishment of a camp at a given site can be found, and that occasion falls within the range of dates suggested by the finds for the date of the fortification at that site, the probability that the fortification is in fact a fortified camp is greatly increased. If no such occasion presents itself, the question of identification remains entirely open.

³⁰ The sites available as possibilities for camps are the following: Vouliagmeni, Agrieliki, Trikorinthos, Kynosoura, Helioupolis, Hymettos Camp, Kastraki, "Leipsydriou," Yerovouno, Thriasian "Lager," Mt. Merenda, Etosi, Aphidna.

CHAPTER IV

MILITARY CAMPS AND ATHENIAN HISTORY

The attempt to connect the sites tentatively identified as camps with specific events is made difficult by the fact that, with a very few famous exceptions, fortified camps are not mentioned in the ancient literary sources. If, however, the requirement that in order to be identified a camp must have been specifically mentioned is abandoned, as it must be, then nearly any invasion of Attic territory could provide the occasion for the construction of a camp. The possibilities must be limited, and they can be, if the site itself provides an indication of its date.

EVIDENCE FOR THE DATE OF CAMPS

FINDS

The primary consideration in assigning dates to the sites must be the objects found at them. Those which have produced coins can be accurately placed, and the three sites, Koroni, Vouliagmeni, and Helioupolis, have been assigned to the Chremonidean War on this evidence (Patroklou Charax is added to this group on literary evidence). Less accurate, but still very valuable, is the evidence of pottery. What evidence of this sort the writer has been able to collect from the surface of the sites has been included with the descriptions of the sites.

It is remarkable that, excepting those sites which have been identified in Chapter III as other types of fortifications (and excepting the puzzling sites of Aphidna and Trikorynthos), all the sites which had any datable objects produced pottery of one sort, which may be compared with H. A. Thompson's Group A.¹ A few earlier pieces occurred occasionally, but on each of the sites the bulk of the material could be classified with this group.

It is, then, very important that the chronological limits of Thompson's Group A be defined, for it is within these limits that the historical context of all these fortifications must be sought. The limits originally proposed by H. A. Thompson for his Group A were roughly the foundation of Alexandria and the turn of the fourth and third centuries or possibly the first few years of the third century.² The excavations at Koroni have, however, shown that the lower limit which he proposed is considerably too early, and that pottery comparable to that of Group A was in use at least as late as the Chremonidean War.³ Since no new evidence bearing on the upper limit of the

¹ See examples and references under the following sites: Koroni, Patroklou Charax, Vouliagmeni, Kynosoura, Helioupolis, Kastraki, "Leipsydrion," Yerovouno, Dema, Thriasian "Lager." Reference is to H. A. Thompson, "Two Centuries of Hellenistic Pottery," *Hesperia*, III, 1934, pp. 311-480.

² Thompson, p. 315.

³ See p. 15, *supra*, with confirmatory evidence from Patroklou Charax, p. 25, *supra*.

Group has been found, Thompson's must, for the present, be accepted. This gives a very wide range of possible dates for the sites, from about 325 B.C. to at least 265 B.C. It is within this period that the historical occasion for their construction must be sought.

STYLE

For those sites at which no datable objects have been found, the only criteria for dating that are now available are the walls themselves and the principles according to which the fortifications seem to have been constructed. The similarity of the unidentified fortifications both to one another and to Koroni or Patroklou Charax has been noted, and the writer has been unable to discover a criterion by which the fortifications might be separated and classified in such a way as to reveal a development in the type. This difficulty can be explained in two ways; either all these fortifications were built within a relatively short span of time, or the requirements and techniques of building this sort of fortification continued unchanged for a long time.

To decide between these possibilities should be easy, but it is made difficult by the lack of comparative material. There are, in fact, only two fixed dates for fortified camps in Attica: 413 B.C., when Dekeleia was fortified by the Spartans, and 267/6 to 265/4 B.C. when Koroni and Patroklou Charax were built. The difficulty is increased by the fact that Dekeleia is imperfectly known.

There is, however, a discernible difference between Dekeleia and the third-century camps. The walls at Dekeleia seem to be better built than those of the third-century sites; they employ larger stones, and some of these appear to have been worked.⁴ They are also thinner than most rubble walls found in Attica.⁵ The walls of Dekeleia thus appear more comparable to those at Thorikos (the acropolis wall) and at Atene (circuit wall near tower B) than to the rough 2.5 m. walls of the third-century camps or the unidentified camps. The unidentified camps, on the other hand, show greater affinities to the third-century camps than to Dekeleia. The possibility exists, therefore, that these affinities have chronological significance and that all the unidentified and undated camps should be seen as belonging to a relatively short period, the period indicated by the dated sites. The evidence does not warrant a conclusion, but if this should be the case, it would be understandable in the context of the constant invasions of Attic territory which took place in the century following the death of Alexander.

HISTORICAL EVENTS TO WHICH CAMPS MIGHT BE ASSIGNED

It has been noted that all the unidentified but dated sites under consideration

⁴ If the photographs are to be trusted; cf. Th. A. Arvanitopoulou, *Δεκέλεια, Πολέμων, παράρτημα*, p. 18.

⁵ But no thinner than the thinnest parts of the Koroni acropolis wall and thicker than the narrow fieldworks.

belong to the period between 325 and 250 B.C., and the possibility has been recognized that the unidentified and undated sites also belong to approximately this period. The known events of these years must be considered to determine what likely occasions exist for the building of camps.

The conditions which must exist for the building of a camp have been indicated in the descriptions of the sites. All require a foreign force in Attica, one which does not control the city, and probably one which does not control the border forts; the camps, occupying defensible positions well within the borders of Attica, would serve no purpose for a force which had strong control over the borders of the country and which therefore had nothing to fear for its men stationed in the interior; the sites around the Athenian plain, at least, would be of little benefit to a force which already controlled that plain.

The early Hellenistic history of Athens does not lack foreign invaders. The death of Alexander threw the Greek world open to the struggles of the successors, and Athens, where the idea of freedom died slowly, did not remain passive. The history of the late fourth century and the third century is the story of a continuing struggle to throw off one or another conqueror and of Athens's repeated failure.⁶

In 323, after the death of Alexander, Athens joined in the Hellenic War (or Lamian War) against the Macedonian regent Antipater. Though Athens lost heavily, she did not herself suffer a major invasion. After the battle of Amorgos in 322, Kleitos landed some troops at Rhamnous and ravaged the paralia (Plutarch, *Phocion*, 25), but this did not involve a long campaign or a battle. The Athenians peacefully received Antipater's garrison on Mounichia in 322.

With the death of Antipater in 319 Athens became involved in the question of the Macedonian succession. Antipater had made his son Cassander chiliarch, but he had given the regency to a general Polyperchon. Before news of Antipater's death became known at Athens, Cassander achieved putting Nikanor, a partisan of his own, in charge of the Mounichia garrison. The next year Alexander, son of Polyperchon, invaded Attica to drive Nikanor out. He encamped near Piraeus (Diodoros, XVIII, 65), and he was later joined by his father with a much larger force who also encamped near Piraeus (Diodoros, XVIII, 68). Having accomplished nothing, Polyperchon moved on to the Peloponnesus, and eventually Alexander departed to Macedonia.

This would at first seem to provide a good occasion for the building of camps, but unfortunately none of the sites here considered could be thought of as *πλησίον τοῦ*

⁶ The account here given is not meant to be a capsule history of the period; it is concerned only with invasions. It does not present a new view of the history; a reconsideration of the whole period is needed, but that is a separate and monumental task. The reconstruction which the writer follows in the main is that of W. S. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, London, 1911. The outlines of the history as brilliantly drawn in Ferguson's essay are for the most part still valid, but modern scholarship has indicated that some of the evidence, particularly the epigraphical evidence, must be redated.

Πειραιῶς. The fact that no camp for these forces now exists indicates a caution to be observed in interpreting the sources. Not every camp need be a fortified camp. In these events the forces of Alexander and Polyperchon, though they were unable to take the Mounichia garrison, were undoubtedly stronger than Cassander's forces; they need not have feared open attack. The difference between a fortified camp and an unfortified one is perhaps indicated by Diodoros; for the encampment at Piraeus he uses only the verb *στρατοπεδεύειν*, while at the siege of Megalopolis (XVIII, 70, 4) he adds the phrase *δύο θέμενος παρεμβολάς* seemingly to describe fortified camps.

Once Alexander had withdrawn, Cassander renewed his efforts to gain control of Athens. He got control of the Long Walls between Athens and Piraeus and seized Panakton (Pausanias, I, 25, 6). Peace was made by the Athenians, and Demetrios of Phaleron was placed in power.

The tactics of Cassander's invasion were those often employed—to gain control of the great garrison-forts at whose mercy Attica lay. It is unlikely that an army that controlled these strong forts would spend its time building fortified camps. The forts provided the same advantages but to a greater degree, and they were ready-made.

Whatever other difficulties Athens had during the ten years of Demetrios of Phaleron's rule, a foreign invasion was not one of them, and Cassander's garrison in Piraeus kept Athens loyal. In 307, however, Demetrios Poliorketes arrived on the scene, took Piraeus, and blockaded Cassander's garrison in Mounichia; he later took Mounichia and razed the fort (Diodoros, XX, 45, 1-46, 1; Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 8, 10). Demetrios had almost instant success in his efforts at Athens. He gained Piraeus and the city at once, and he was forced to besiege only Mounichia. The opportunity or purpose for building fortified camps does not seem to present itself, for he had the walls of Athens and Piraeus at his disposal.

On Demetrios's departure Athens again came under pressure from Cassander, and from 307 to 304 Athens was constantly at war.⁷ Cassander was in possession of Phyle and Panakton, and he began to besiege the city (Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 23). This was the first time in a century that Athens had faced a siege.⁸ It was a full-scale effort with Cassander's forces established in front of the city walls. As such, it presents the first large action in the Athenian plain with which the fortified sites at the borders of the plain might be connected. Some of these sites, Yerovouno, "Leipsydrion," and Kastraki, are at a distance from the city perhaps too great for active participation in a siege, but a watchpost like the Hymettos Camp could have proved useful to Cassander.

However Cassander was established, he was forced to retreat rapidly when Demetrios returned in 306, and Demetrios not only released the city from the siege but took Phyle and Panakton and returned them to Athens (Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 23).

⁷ Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 112-117.

⁸ K. J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, IV², part 1, Berlin and Leipzig, 1925, p. 159.

Again Demetrios was in possession of the city and Piraeus, and he had little need to build camps. His troops probably spent the winter quartered in the city and Piraeus.⁹

With Demetrios's departure from Attica for Asia in 302 Cassander again became a threat to Athens, but Athens was able to deal with it by changing governments and making peace with Cassander. This meant that Demetrios, on his return in 296, was regarded as an enemy. Having gathered new forces after his disaster at Ipsos in 301, he arrived in Attic waters, but there he was beset by a storm and lost most of his fleet. With what forces were left, he began a war against Athens, but he accomplished nothing (Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 33). Nothing more is known of this apparently insignificant action, but it does present a possible occasion for the building of one or more camps. Demetrios was apparently without a base, and with his reduced forces he might have found it advisable to provide himself with a fortified position. There is, however, no indication where such a position might have been; we do not even know on which coast of Attica his fleet was wrecked. The occasion must remain only an indefinite possibility.

Having accomplished nothing against Athens, Demetrios went off to the Peloponnese to await reinforcements. With these he returned to Attica, took Eleusis and Rhamnous, and began a siege of the city. A Ptolemaic fleet appeared off Aigina to aid Athens, but it was outnumbered by Demetrios's ships and withdrew without an engagement. The siege worked great hardship on the Athenians, and in 294 they capitulated. Demetrios, having learned to what extent he could trust the friendship of the Athenians, put garrisons into Piraeus, Mounichia, and the Mouseion (Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 33-34). This was, like that of Cassander in 304, a full-scale siege, and it is possible to see in it an occasion for the building of some of the posts in the Athenian plain. Again, however, Demetrios controlled at least some of the garrison-forts, and he was not threatened from the outside; his need for additional fortified points was not pressing, and he need not have built any.

During the 280's, while Demetrios was engaged in a struggle to keep the Macedonian kingdom which he had acquired almost by chance, Athens again revolted. An Athenian force stormed the Mouseion and captured it from Demetrios's garrison (Pausanias, I, 26, 1-2). Encouragement and grain shipments with which to provision the city were offered by foreign rulers, and a full revolt against Macedonian control was undertaken. Demetrios eventually appeared to counter this revolt, and for a second time he lay siege to the city. He was, however, persuaded to abandon it by the pleas of noble Athenians and by the imminent arrival of Pyrrhos of Epeiros (Plutarch, *Demetrius*, 46). The exact extent of the revolt and the chronology of events are not altogether clear, but possibilities for the establishment of camps seem to be present.¹⁰

⁹ Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 118.

¹⁰ The date of Olympiodoros's attack on the Mouseion has been based on mention that the Athenians were in control of the city in a decree honoring Spartakos which is dated by the archon

The siege of Athens by Demetrios provides the same opportunities for camps as previous sieges, and it suffers from the same disadvantages. A new feature is, however, present in the shipments of grain from abroad which the Athenians received. Piraeus was at this time still in the hands of the Macedonians, and it may be assumed that grain deliveries were made elsewhere.¹¹ This might be seen as an opportunity for the establishment of fortified positions at these ports.¹²

It does not, however, appear that unloading the grain and transporting it by land to the city was an especially hazardous venture; the Macedonians controlled only Piraeus, and they could easily be contained there. There is, in fact, no indication of any difficulty. The transaction with the foreign donor was complete when the grain was delivered at the port, and for the last part of its journey, the grain would have been in Athenian hands.¹³ Had the Athenians wished to have the added protection of a fortified position, it is likely that they would have made use of one of those already in existence, such as Thorikos or Rhamnous. It is hardly likely that fortified camps were built by the foreign allies of Athens in connection with these grain shipments. The only hint of military forces concerns Ptolemy I's squadron of light cruisers (*ἄφρακτοι*), which, under Zenon's leadership, helped escort grain; such a squadron, dependent as it would be on its speed and mobility, is unlikely to have established itself on the Attic mainland or, indeed, to have taken part in any land operations.

With Demetrios's final defeat, Greece again became restive, and Antigonos Gonatas invaded Attica. Athens resisted, however, and he was stopped at Eleusis by Olympiodoros with a force of Eleusinians.¹⁴ This action, if it lasted for longer than a quick engagement, might provide an occasion for a camp built in opposition to the fortified city of Eleusis. The action would seem to demand a camp to the west or north of Eleusis, if one was built at all, and the only possibilities are Plakoto (the outer walls?) or Palaiokastro.¹⁵

Antigonos did not repeat his attempt on Athens, and he seems to have been content with the control of Piraeus. Relations between Athens and the king were

Diotimos (*I.G.*, II², 653, lines 21-22); Diotimos, formerly placed in 289/8 B.C., is now dated 285/4 B.C.; cf. W. B. Dinsmoor, *Hesperia*, XXIII, 1954, pp. 284-316, and B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1961, p. 233. Grain shipments in this and the preceding year (archonship of Diokles) are recorded in honorary decrees: *I.G.*, II², 650, 651?, 653, 654, cf. 655.

¹¹ Piraeus seems still to have been in Macedonian hands in the archonship of Euthios (283/2, Dinsmoor-Meritt); cf. *I.G.*, II², 657, lines 33-36. Its recovery by Olympiodoros (Pausanias, I, 26, 3) is connected by W. W. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, Oxford, 1913, p. 118, note 13, with a force sent by Tenos to aid the Athenians, for which thanks are given in the archonship of Ourios (281/0, Dinsmoor-Meritt), recorded in *I.G.*, II², 660, lines 25-46.

¹² For this view see V. Grace, *Hesperia*, XXXII, 1963, pp. 329-332; objections to it are raised by E. Vanderpool, J. R. McCredie, A. Steinberg, *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 72-75.

¹³ See the decree in honor of Audoleon, *I.G.*, II², 654, lines 29-30.

¹⁴ Pausanias, I, 26, 3; cf. Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 153.

¹⁵ The Thriasian "Lager" will hardly fit, since it faces the wrong way to meet an attack from Olympiodoros who held Eleusis.

variable, but one blessing to the Athenians seems to have been a cessation of foreign invasions. It was more than a decade and a half before the city again suffered a siege.

The Chremonidean War, which began somewhere between 267/6 and 265/4 B.C., provided a new situation. Four separate forces were engaged¹⁶ in this struggle of which the prize was the city of Athens. The multiplicity of armies created a unique situation; while in other sieges of the city the attacking army was in undisputed control of Attica outside the city, Antigonos, while threatening the city, was himself threatened. The forces themselves were more nearly balanced than in earlier engagements, and although Antigonos eventually proved that his strength was more than a match for that of the allies, the outcome of the contest was not apparent at the beginning. The unique possibilities which this war provides, as well as the fact that it is the only occasion during the third century for which there is literary evidence for the construction of a fortified camp, demands that it be considered in detail. This will be done in the next section (pp. 107-115, *infra*).

After the fall of Athens to Antigonos the city ceases for a time to be the object of serious interest.¹⁷ In 229 Athens purchased her independence from Macedon, and the rest of the century was free of invasions. The next major conflict within the borders of Attica was, in fact, the massive attack of Philip V; this not only belongs to a new phase of history, where Athens is at the mercy of the great powers of Rome and Macedonia, but it falls far too late for consideration as the occasion on which any of the dated camps might have been built.

Occasions to which the camps can be assigned are thus strictly limited; any of the great sieges of Athens provide possible occasions, but there is no positive evidence for such construction and the need for it is not often apparent. The conditions of the Chremonidean War were, however, different; there is the explicit statement that at least one camp was built, and a necessity for fortified camps can be inferred from the conditions which obtained.

THE CHREMONIDEAN WAR

The new evidence provided by the finds from Koroni, Vouliagmeni, and Helioupolis demands a reconsideration of the events of the Chremonidean War, and a new reconstruction of these events to accommodate all the evidence now available will here be attempted.

¹⁶ Antigonos, and the allies, Athens, Sparta, and Ptolemy.

¹⁷ Brief attacks were made on Attica; Alexander, son of Krateros, invaded about 251/0 (Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, p. 193), but his attention seems to have been directed principally toward Salamis. Aratos made continual attempts on Piraeus (Plutarch, *Aratus*, 33), but he was unsuccessful, and the story of his flight across the Thriasian plain (*ibid.*) hardly reads as if he had a near-by fortified camp into which he might retreat.

LITERARY EVIDENCE

The basic facts from which the events of the Chremonidean War must be reconstructed are given by Pausanias. They are:

1. A wall and camp were built on a desert island off Sounion by Patroklos, the commander of the Egyptian triremes sent by Ptolemy to aid Athens when Antigonos was besieging her (I, 1, 1).
2. Nothing much for the safety of Athens came from this expedition (I, 7, 3).
3. Areus, the Spartan king, brought out the Lacedaemonians in a body. Antigonos had surrounded Athens and closed the access to the city to Athens's allies. In this situation Patroklos urged Areus and the Lacedaemonians by heralds that they begin battle with Antigonos, in which case he would fall on Antigonos's back. Patroklos could not, however, initiate action on land with his Egyptian sailors against the Macedonians. The Lacedaemonians were eager to chance a battle, but Areus, seeing that their supplies were used up, thought it best to husband their resources and not spend them on other people's business, and he led them back. The Athenians held out for a very long time, but eventually they made peace with Antigonos, and they accepted a garrison on the Mouseion (III, 6, 4-6).

Another event concurrent with these is reported by Justin: a mercenary band of Gauls revolted in Megara, and Antigonos rushed with his whole force, leaving only a small band at Athens to give the appearance of a camp, to put it down. He did put down the revolt, slaughtering the Gauls, and the result was to dishearten the Athenians' allies and give new heart to the Macedonians (XXVI, 2). Pompeius Trogus notes the destruction of the Gauls and adds that Antigonos killed Areus at Corinth (*Prolog.*, 26) and Plutarch confirms this last fact (*Agis*, 3).

EPIGRAPHICAL EVIDENCE

The decree which records the alliance against Antigonos is partly preserved (*I.G.*, II², 687-688 and suppl. p. 664). It was moved by Chremonides, whose name the war bears (cf. Hegesandros in Athenaeus, VI, 250F), and passed during the archonship of Peithidemos.¹⁸ It records the formal alliance between Athens on the one hand and Sparta and her allies on the other with the purpose of freeing Greece from tyranny. Conspicuous mention is made of the resolve of Ptolemy II to free

¹⁸ This is now dated in 265/4 by B. D. Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, pp. 223-226; Meritt considers this date certain and sees it as one of the few fixed points in third-century chronology (*per litt.*, November 2, 1960). The date accepted in 1913 was 266/5 B.C.; cf. Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, p. 297, note 58 with references to others who held this view. Tarn later revised his date to 267/6; see W. W. Tarn, "The New Dating of the Chremonidean War," *J.H.S.*, LIV, 1934, pp. 26-39.

Greece, following the policy of Ptolemy I and Arsinoe II, and of alliances between Ptolemy and Athens and between Ptolemy and Sparta.

Details of Patroklos's expedition can be deduced from a series of inscriptions in which he is mentioned on Crete, Thera, and Keos,¹⁹ and it was probably from the city of Arsinoe on Keos that he launched his expedition to Attica.²⁰

A newly discovered inscription from Rhamnous promises to give important new information about the Chremonidean War and about the chronology of the period. It is unpublished but it is known to be a decree in honor of a certain Epichares, a hipparch, who is praised for a number of things he did, among them that "he made provision for adequate shelter for the troops of Patroklos who came to aid." The archon Peithidemos is mentioned so that the connection with the Chremonidean War is sure.²¹

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

In addition to the long known site on Gaidouronisi which must be the Patroklou Charax of Pausanias and Strabo (Pausanias, I, 1, 1; Strabo, IX, 398), three additional sites have yielded coins and other objects which connect them with the Chremonidean war. Of these, Koroni was certainly a Ptolemaic camp, perhaps the principal camp, to judge from its size; the Ptolemaic establishment at Vouliagmeni can probably be connected with the walls there and be identified as another coastal camp; that there was an establishment at Helioupolis is certain, but its exact nature is now uncertain.

PREVIOUS RECONSTRUCTIONS

Historians have reached general agreement about the course of events in the Chremonidean War.²² The decree of Chremonides was passed in the fall of the archonship of Peithidemos. This was tantamount to a declaration of war, and Antigonos took up the challenge.²³ The next spring he invaded Attica and took control of the

¹⁹ *Inscriptiones Creticae*, III, Itanos, 2-3; III, Olous, 4, lines 35-42. *I.G.*, XII, 3, 320 (Thera); *I.G.*, XII, 5, 1061 (Karthaiia).

²⁰ For a discussion of the movements of the fleet and other aspects of Patroklos's command see M. Launey, *Rev. Ét. Anc.*, XLVII, 1945, pp. 33-45. It is likely that this is the occasion on which Koresia changed its name to Arsinoe; see L. Robert, *Hellenica*, XI-XII, Paris, 1960, pp. 144 ff.

²¹ The information about the inscription is given by Varoucha, p. 344. It will be published by Mr. B. Petrakos.

²² The best accounts are the following: Ferguson, *Hellenistic Athens*, pp. 175-181; Tarn, *Antigonos Gonatas*, pp. 294-302; Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, IV², part 1, pp. 587-591, IV², part 2, pp. 502-506. Some eccentric ideas of A. N. Oikonomides, *Δωδεκανησιακὸν Ἀρχεῖον*, II, 1957, pp. 218-227 and *Νέον Ἀθήναιον*, I, 1955, pp. 9-14, are suitably dealt with by J. and L. Robert, *Rev. Ét. Gr.*, LXXI, 1958, p. 193, No. 63 and p. 234, No. 200.

²³ B. D. Meritt has pointed out to the writer that Athens was involved in fighting two years earlier (267/6 B.C.) during the archonship of Menekles (*I.G.*, II², 665, lines 7-8); cf. B. D. Meritt, "The Year of Kydenor," *Χαριστήριον εἰς Ἀναστάσιον Κ. Ὀρλάνδον*, I, Athens, 1964, pp. 196-197. For

territory outside the city. Patroklos arrived in Attic waters, established his camp on Gaidouronisi, and held control of the sea. Areus marched out with his Peloponnesian forces and advanced as far as Corinth, where his way was blocked by the Macedonian garrison in Acrocorinth. A stalemate had been reached, and when Areus's supplies ran low, he led his forces back to Sparta. The failure of Patroklos to use his fleet to transport the Peloponnesian troops to Attica by sea around the garrison in Acrocorinth has been seen as the result of Antigonos's control of the harbors of Attica; there would have been no place for the Peloponnesians to disembark.

Either at the end of this first year of campaigning or, more probably, early in the next season, Antigonos put down a revolt of his Gallic mercenaries in Megara. He then fought Areus, who had been encouraged by Patroklos to attack the Macedonians, in a battle at Corinth. Areus was killed, and the Peloponnesian forces were rendered harmless. This was the only active campaigning of the war. Antigonos went back to his siege and blockade of Athens, and after a long resistance Athens capitulated. Patroklos, unable to attack on land without Areus's support, presumably withdrew in either the first or second campaigning year.

A NEW RECONSTRUCTION

Recent discoveries have now shown that Patroklos was rather more active than had been thought. Perhaps too much emphasis has been put on Pausanias's statement that not much came of the expedition, though it is true that it did not achieve the safety of Athens. Patroklos established his forces not only on the small island off the Attic coast, but also at Koroni and Vouliagmeni, two good harbors of Attica, and at Rhamnous. While this does not demand a change in the accepted course of events, it does raise a question. Patroklos did control landing points at which he might have disembarked the Peloponnesian forces, had he chosen to bring these to Attica by sea. His failure to do this thus becomes even less intelligible.

More puzzling is the existence of a Ptolemaic establishment in Helioupolis, on the edge of the Athenian plain, which was presumably under Macedonian control and several kilometers from the sea and from the nearest known harbor in Patroklos's control. This is especially surprising in view of the statement that Patroklos refused to risk his forces on land without the prior advance of Areus and the Peloponnesians. Several difficulties would be removed if Areus and the Peloponnesians did in fact invade Attica during the first season of the war. The view that he did not is based upon the Macedonian control of Acrocorinth (a fact which, though probably true, is never mentioned in the sources on the Chremonidean War), the statements of Pau-

the date see W. B. Dinsmoor, *Hesperia*, XXIII, 1954, pp. 284-316 and Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 233. This might reflect skirmishing between Athenians and Macedonians prior to the Chremonides decree, but the major campaign, involving all the allies, must still be placed after the Grand Alliance recorded in the decree.

sanias that Antigonos had closed off access to Athens, that Areus marched back when his supplies ran out, and that nothing much came of the allies' efforts, and the fact that the final battle took place at Corinth. The most specific of these statements concerns access. The phrase of Pausanias (III, 6, 5) is *περικαθημένον δὲ Ἀντιγόνου τὰς Ἀθήνας καὶ τῆς εἰσόδου τῆς ἐς τὴν πόλιν τὰ Ἀθηναίων συμμαχικὰ εἴργοντος*. It seems questionable to the writer that the isthmus of Corinth would naturally be considered the *εἴσοδος ἐς τὴν πόλιν*. The phrase could, on the other hand, be properly applied either to routes at the Attic border or to the passes leading into the Athenian plain. In fact, the picture which seems to be described by this clause is that of Antigonos and his forces established in the country immediately surrounding the city of Athens itself, the Athenian plain, and by holding this position effectively blocking any communication between the Athenians, who were inside his lines, and the allies, who were outside them. If this was the case, there is no indication that Areus did not enter Attica, either by sea on Patroklos's ships, or, more likely, by slipping past the Macedonian garrison in Acrocorinth. It would be more natural for Patroklos to urge Areus to attack Antigonos if Areus were face to face with his adversary than if he were some seventy or eighty kilometers away at the isthmus, helpless before the garrison of Acrocorinth. Had Areus moved into position on the edge of the plain of Athens, Patroklos might well have been emboldened to prepare his promised attack on the Macedonian rear by putting men into fortified positions on the opposite side of the Athenian plain, and Helioupolis could be explained as one of these positions.

This suggestion offers a further advantage; it is no longer necessary to invent a second Peloponnesian expedition, an action for which there is no direct evidence. The view that there were two advances of the Peloponnesian forces was designed to accommodate the following series of events which is explicit in the literary sources: (1) Areus marched out from Sparta; (2) he later marched "back"; (3) he was slain at Corinth. Had Areus marched only to Corinth in (1), as happened in previous reconstructions of the events, he could only have returned home in (2) and in order to be present at Corinth for (3) he would have had to march out again. But if Areus marched to Attica in (1), his return march to Corinth or any other place between Attica and Sparta could be described as a march back (*ἀπήγγεν ὀπίσω τὴν στρατιάν*), and the battle at Corinth (3) could have taken place during this return march. The solution is economical and removes the question of why Areus, having been so notably unsuccessful once, would have, under identical circumstances, attempted the same thing again the next season.

The reconstruction of events according to these theories is thus as follows: The decree of Chremonides was passed in the fall of the year of the archonship of Peithidemos. When the campaigning season opened the next spring, Antigonos invaded Attica, and, unable to take the city by assault, he established his forces in the Athenian plain around the walls for a siege. Meanwhile Patroklos arrived with the Ptolemaic

fleet; he established his forces at convenient and useful points along the Attic coast. Only Piraeus and Sounion appear to have been closed to him, and he took over other good harbors such as Vouliagmeni and Porto Rapti (Koroni), as well as establishing a small camp on Gaidouronisi to keep watch on Sounion. Cooperation between Athenians and Patroklos was good, and the hipparch Epichares saw to the requirements of some of Patroklos's forces at Rhamnous.

Meanwhile Areus, fulfilling his part of the alliance, brought his infantry into Attica. He found the Macedonian forces barring the way to the city itself, and he was forced to stop, encamp, and wait.

Patroklos, who saw that matters had progressed well to this point, prepared to do his part even in a land battle, though it was not his element, and he established his own forces on the edge of the Macedonian controlled area at the edge of the Athenian plain. He then explained his position to Areus and urged that the Peloponnesians initiate action, which he promised to support.

For some reason, and this remains a mystery, Areus did not choose to attack. Perhaps the Macedonian army appeared to be too strong; it certainly was able to win later at Corinth. Perhaps he had no confidence in his Egyptian allies. Whatever the reason, Areus made no attack, and when the season progressed and his supplies were running low, he broke camp and marched back toward the Peloponnesos.

The passage of the Peloponnesian forces may provide the occasion for the revolt of the Gauls in Megara. The mercenaries may have expected support from Areus; but it appears that none was given. Antigonos arrived immediately with almost his whole force and slaughtered the Gauls. He then continued to Corinth. Here he met Areus, who perhaps had decided to see what effect the Megarian revolt would have. The two armies finally came to battle, and, without Egyptian support, Areus was in an even worse position than when he had declined to fight in Attica. The Peloponnesians were defeated, and Areus was killed.

Antigonos returned to the siege of Athens, but the Athenians held out for a long time still. It is not known whether the Ptolemaic forces remained, holding their coastal positions and maintaining their blockade against the Macedonian fleet, but this seems likely. The prolonged Athenian resistance is easier to understand if they still had at least one ally. Both Patroklos and the Athenians may have hoped that the Peloponnesians would regroup and return. This did not happen, however, and eventually, probably after the withdrawal of the Ptolemaic fleet, the city capitulated.

THE DATE OF THE CHREMONIDEAN WAR.

The date of the major events of the Chremonidean War depends on the date assigned to the decree of Chremonides, and this, in turn, depends on the date of the archonship of Peithidemos. The precise determination of this date involves the whole complicated question of tribal cycles and the Athenian calendar, and no new informa-

tion is here offered that might help to clarify the question. As matters now stand the date of this archonship is thought to fall between 267/6 B.C. and 265/4 B.C.²⁴ The latter date, proposed by B. D. Meritt, has been accepted by the writer as representing the most recent results of modern research. It should, however, be emphasized that no part of the writer's reconstruction of the course of events is contingent upon the exact date.

It is, nevertheless, notable that if Meritt's late date for the archonship of Peithidemos is correct, it supports some aspects of the new reconstruction of the course of events in the Chremonidean War, and conversely, unless some points of this reconstruction are accepted, this date for Peithidemos cannot be right.²⁵ An independent date for the death of Areus in 265/4 can be obtained from the Spartan king list.²⁶ In the orthodox view of the war, Areus's death at the battle of Corinth comes in the second campaigning season. This means that even if this campaigning season was the latest one possible, 264, it would have to be preceded by one other, 265, and the decree of Chremonides and the archonship of Peithidemos could fall no later than 266/5; the alternative of 267/6 would be possible. Using the writer's reconstruction of events and Meritt's date for Peithidemos, the decree would have been passed in 265/4, the campaign in Attica would have begun in 265/4, and the battle of Corinth with Areus's death would have come in 264, the first campaigning season.

The end of the war comes in the archonship of Antipatros, formerly dated in 263/2 and now put in 261/0 by Meritt.²⁷

SITES TO BE ASSOCIATED WITH THE CHREMONIDEAN WAR

Four military sites must be connected with Patroklos's activities during the Chremonidean War—Patroklou Charax, Koroni, Vouliagmeni, and Helioupolis, and the inscription from Rhamnous shows that he occupied that site too. The location of these sites indicates the broad outlines of the strategic aims of Patroklos. The coastal sites, on important harbors, ring Attica and are established at points that are easily defensible against attack from the mainland—Koroni and Vouliagmeni are peninsulas, and Patroklos Island is completely isolated by water. One other site among those described in Chapter II shares these advantages. The Kynosoura peninsula lies on the broad, open bay of Marathon, and its junction with the mainland, defended by a rubble fortification wall, is easily defensible against attack from the land. It

²⁴ See p. 108, note 18, *supra*, and Varoucha, p. 347, note 2.

²⁵ Meritt, *The Athenian Year*, p. 226, notes the faster movement of events required by his date, but he did not seem to have realized that under former views of the reconstruction of events this would have been impossible; but see now his "The Year of Kydenor," pp. 196-197.

²⁶ See Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte*, IV², part 2, pp. 156-158. It can fall in either 265 or 264; Tarn prefers 265, which will not work under any hypothesis with Meritt's date for Peithidemos; see Tarn, *J.H.S.*, XL, 1920, p. 150.

²⁷ See Beloch, *op. cit.*, p. 502. Meritt's view may be found in *The Athenian Year*, p. 226.

satisfies well the requirements of a camp for a sea power facing a land power. Since the pottery found on the peninsula is consistent with a third-century date, it is at least possible that Kynosoura should be seen as another station in the ring with which Patroklos controlled the Attic coast.

The only sure Ptolemaic position inland is that at Helioupolis. Since modern building has removed all traces of any walls that may once have existed, certainty about the details of this position is impossible, but some conclusions are possible from the site that was chosen. Helioupolis lies with its back to Mt. Hymettos, facing the plain and the city of Athens. The slopes behind it are extremely steep, and a force encamped there need have little fear of attack from behind. The site would thus have served well as an easily defensible post from which Patroklos could attack Antigonos from the rear, once Areus had joined battle with the Macedonians in the Athenian plain. But it is unlikely that this one site would have accommodated much of the Ptolemaic force, which required at least four and possibly five or more coastal sites. The possibility presents itself, therefore, that Patroklos established not one site on the border of the Athenian plain, but a series of them. Kastraki, which, from its pottery, must be dated somewhere in this period, is a good candidate, as is "Leipsydriion" for the same reasons. The Hymettos Camp, which the writer has found unintelligible as a position for a force which controlled the Athenian plain, might have been indispensable as a lookout and communications center for such a series of camps. And finally, even the sites of Kaisariani Berg and Gur-i-Korakut would be understandable in this context; the different construction of the former and lack of information about the latter make these, however, less convincing.

All known Ptolemaic positions lie to the east of Athens. Since Patroklos offered to fall on the Macedonians *κατὰ νότον* when the Spartans attacked, the Spartan position is to be sought in the west. This is natural, for if the Spartans arrived by land, they would almost certainly have come by way of Eleusis; if they came by sea, they might have disembarked on the bay of Eleusis. Only one fortified camp lies between Eleusis and Athens, the Thriasian "Lager," and the material from it does not exclude a Chremonidean date.²⁸

The situation which seems to be required by the structures in and near the Aigaleos-Parnes gap (see p. 70, *supra*) is intelligible in the context of the Chremonidean War. Pausanias reports that Antigonos had closed the way to the city, and it is easy to see the Dema as a link in this barrier.²⁹ Areus would have advanced to this

²⁸ A conceivable confirmation of this attribution, though it is far from decisive, is the fact that the Thriasian "Lager" is round; it will be recalled that according to Xenophon Spartan camps where possible had this form (pp. 98-99, *supra*).

²⁹ This need not imply that the Dema was built at this time, only that it was manned. The writer has no firm view on this question; the possibility exists, however, that the superior planning and execution of the Dema in comparison to what have been tentatively called Ptolemaic or Spartan

barrier and then encamped, not wishing to risk a frontal attack on such a large army in such a strong position. But if, as suggested (p. 72 *supra*), the Kamatero wall should be connected with the Thriasian "Lager," the stalemate between Areus and Antigonos did not last. Somehow Areus was eventually able to turn the position of the Macedonians and progress to the edge of the Athenian plain above Kamatero.³⁰ Once Areus had outflanked the Dema, Antigonos could do nothing but withdraw to the plain of Athens.

But the Kamatero wall is suitable only for a temporary position. It cannot be the place where Areus and his army waited until their supplies were gone and from which they withdrew toward the Peloponnesus. Nor does it seem likely that, having once gained the plain of Athens, Areus would have withdrawn to the Thriasian "Lager" again. The last of the rubble fortifications in the Athenian plain provides a suitable site for the Peloponnesians to have encamped—Yerovouno. It is a large site, well located, and near to the previous position at the Kamatero wall.³¹

The situation created by all these hypothetical movements would be the following: Athens stood in the center, protected by her walls and unable to be taken by assault; outside the walls the Macedonians were encamped, unable to take the city, but at the same time preventing the allies from reaching the city; they in turn were surrounded by the allies, the Spartans on the west at Yerovouno, the Ptolemaic forces on the east and north in smaller camps. It is a situation in which Patroklos's plea to Areus to begin the battle is natural.

It need hardly be pointed out that, with the exception of the four certain sites, the identifications here proposed are tentative. That the majority of sites included in this study and all of the dated camps should be assigned to one occasion which previous opinion found most remarkable for its lack of activity is immediately suspect. It need not, however, be wrong. The close resemblance of the sites to one another both in their physical features and in the material which has been found at them points to the possibility that they were all built at the same time. Proof is lacking, but the number of minor confirmations, which are singly unconvincing and perhaps appear to be due to coincidence, are in their sum remarkable. Confirmation, modification, or abandonment of the identifications must await the further evidence which can be obtained.

defenses should be attributed rather to superior Macedonian skill in fortification and siegecraft than to the ideas and purposes of a different age.

³⁰ It would be possible to go around the Dema along the broad ridge of Aigaleos to the Kamatero wall. The writer has, in fact, made the greater part of this journey with no serious hardship.

³¹ The camp is not round, but the hill is not one on which a round camp could be conveniently built.

CONCLUSION

This study, using Koroni as a basis, has sought to collect the presently available evidence for fortified military camps in Attica and to evaluate that evidence. The progress thus achieved is considerable; for, with the exception of the two sites of Dekeleia and Patroklou Charax, the existence of fortified camps had not previously been recognized, and of the sites considered few were published and some unnoted.

The results obtained in this study are, however, far from complete, and the observations, attributions, and identifications made vary greatly in reliability. The study was forced to take the form of a tentative essay rather than a final examination because of this wide variance in the amount of evidence available. At one end of the scale is Koroni, at which excavations have provided abundant evidence for the character of the site, its date, its function, and its place in history; at the other end are such sites as Mt. Merenda, Etosi, Mt. Agrieli, and Kaisariani Berg, at which none of these things can be surely determined.

This lack of information is not, however, final. In every case even brief excavations would quickly settle many of the questions which have been raised here. Such excavations could well produce results which would be important far beyond the immediate significance of the sites themselves; Koroni has shown how the ephemeral character of this sort of site can be used to establish fixed points in the dating of the objects found, and the Chremonidean sites have shown how their precise identification can help to fill the gaps in the course of historical events left by the literary and epigraphical sources.

Such excavation need be costly in neither time nor money. The sites are small and unaesthetic; all that would be required at each would be a series of tests to determine the nature of the structures that stood there and to recover sufficient datable material to fix the place of the site in history. A campaign undertaken with these objectives and limitations might be able to accomplish its work within one season.

The need for such an investigation is critical. Because attention has not been drawn to most of the sites and because their lack of artistic value is immediately apparent, they do not receive proper protection. The rapid rate of expansion of the city of Athens and the increased building activity in the mountains and on the coasts of Attica threaten almost all the sites, and it will not be long before many of them share the fate of Helioupolis and Yerouvouno.

This study has, the writer hopes, been sufficient to indicate the potential value of exact knowledge about the fortified military camps of Attica. But if this potential is to be realized, additional work must be undertaken, and it must be undertaken quickly.

APPENDIX

SOME ATTIC TOWERS

During the trips made by the writer to sites described in Chapter II and to other sites which seemed possible candidates for fortified camps a number of isolated towers were visited. While these do not fall within the scope of this study, it seemed valuable to record new observations concerning these towers where such observations were made.

ST. DEMETRIOS TOWER (Fig. 18; Pl. 19, a)

The long ridge of St. Demetrios (*Karten von Attika*, Bl. VIII and XIII) runs northwest-southeast parallel to the coast about six kilometers to the south of Vari. It rises steeply from the plain about 500 m. from the shore; only the north side has a more gentle slope, and this can be ascended on foot. This north slope has recently attracted a real estate development, and it is now scarred by the cuts of a bulldozer.

At the western end of the ridge (*Karten von Attika*, Bl. VIII, height 190) are the remains of a small rectangular tower (5.85 by 4.30 m.) which has hitherto escaped notice. It is built of large, carefully worked blocks of the local conglomerate. The blocks vary in size, some being as long as 2.00 m. The joints are, though not regular, carefully made. The thickness of the wall is everywhere formed by only one row of blocks, and it measures about 0.55 m. The highest preserved parts rise 1.70 m., and there is no indication on the stones that it was ever higher; the fallen blocks in the area might be sufficient to restore the whole tower to this height, but little higher. In spite of recent explorations by illicit diggers, there is still a considerable amount of earth within the tower, and it may have been solid. There are no fragments of tiles about that might indicate that the tower was roofed.

The site enjoys a wide view of the coastal area in which it stands, and it communicates visually with Vari. The few sherds found at the site are not exactly datable, but the firm glaze that they exhibit suggests a Classical rather than Hellenistic date. It may be tentatively suggested that this tower formed another link in the system of lookouts and signaling posts of which Vari-Anagyrous and the Atene fort were parts. The tower would have surveyed a part of the coast which could not be seen from these two sites.

HYMETTOS TOWER (Pl. 18, d)

The remains of an ancient watch tower stand on a minor peak of Mt. Hymettos

about four kilometers north of the main peak (*Karten von Attika*, Bl. IV, height 726.2); they do not seem to have been described previously.¹

The tower is a solid drum of rubble with an outer face of well-fitted field stones. It is 8.10 m. in diameter and is preserved to about 1.70 m. above the ground. The tower and its surrounding area abound in sherds and glazed roof tiles. These come mainly from the tower itself and its immediate area, and there do not appear to have been subsidiary structures.




FIG. 18. Plan of St. Demetrios Tower

FINDS FROM HYMETTOS TOWER:

1. Fragment of a black-glazed cup. Pl. 4, no. 24; Pl. 21, i.
D. ca. 0.11 m. Firm black glaze. Circles on base. Later fifth century or early fourth century.
2. Fragment of a black-glazed mug. Pl. 4, no. 23; Pl. 21, g.
D. ca. 0.08 m. Glazed inside and outside. Late fifth century to early fourth century.
3. Fragment of a kernos. Pl. 4, no. 22; Pl. 21, h.
D. ca. 0.16 m. Coarse ware; reddish orange surface. Hole drilled obliquely through shoulder. Early fourth century.

There was no indication that the late fifth to early fourth century date suggested by these pieces was not the right one.

¹ The tower is noted and illustrated, but differently interpreted by V. Scully, *The Earth, the Temple, and the Gods*, New Haven and London, 1962, pp. 27-28, 220 note 21, fig. 34.

The tower is located toward the eastern side of the broad peak on which it stands. It therefore enjoys a fine view over the Mesogeia and the eastern slopes of Hymettos as well as the pass at the northern end of Hymettos, but its view of the Athenian plain and the western slopes of Hymettos is limited; it does, however, communicate visually with Athens. This would suggest that the tower was placed to watch the territory outside the Athenian plain which could not be seen from the city. The tower may, therefore, be tentatively identified as part of the permanent Athenian defenses.

AIGALEOS TOWER (Pl. 18, c)

On the highest peak of Aigaleos and almost directly south of the Dema are the remains of a tower.² It is about 5.50 m. in diameter, built of dressed and well-fitted stones on its outer face. Only about three courses (0.90 m.) are visible above the fallen stones which surround it, but it may be estimated that the tower is preserved about 1.50 m. above ground level. It is now a solid drum, filled with small stones, and from all indications it was always so. A rubble enclosure abuts the tower on its southwest side; it is oval in plan, with outer dimensions of about 9 by 13 meters; its walls are about 2.50 m. thick, so that the enclosed area is very small. Rubble also lies around the tower, but on its other sides no wall faces could be discovered, and this may be only fall from the tower itself. A considerable number of fragments of glazed roof tiles lies scattered around the area, indicating that the tower, the enclosure, or both were once roofed.

As now preserved, the tower commands an impressive view in all directions: on one side all of the Athenian plain from Piraeus to Parnes, on the other all of the Thriasian plain from the coast to the hills in front of the Dema. The view of the Dema itself and of the Daphne pass is cut off by lower ridges of Aigaleos.

The tower certainly served as a watchpost. The investigators of the Dema have connected it with the Dema both because of its proximity and because of the similarity of construction.³ While this may well be correct, the alternative explanation, that the tower was a part of the permanent Athenian defense system and fulfilled a similar purpose to that of the Hymettos tower on the opposite side of the Athenian plain, should not be ignored.

KOUNDOURA TOWER

Scanty remains of a hitherto unnoticed round tower, apparently similar in construction to the Hymettos tower or the Aigaleos tower, lie at the south side of the

² See "Dema," pp. 174-175. The tower appears on *Karten von Attika*, Bl. VI, height 452.8.

³ "Dema," pp. 174-175. They argue, p. 174, note 52, that the Aigaleos tower and the tower immediately behind the Dema would have been intervisible had they each been 15 to 20 m. tall—a not impossible height.

Koundoura valley about halfway between the town of Koundoura and "Ereneia"; the road between these two points passes only a meter or two to the north of the tower. Only one course of its well-built face is now visible, and that is all but obscured by a heavy growth of brush.

No detailed examination of the tower was made, but from its location it may be tentatively identified as another Athenian post on the border between Attica and Megara, perhaps dependent on "Ereneia."

INDEX

GENERAL

- ACHARNAI, 19 note 14, 62 note 16
Acrocorinth, 110-111
Agesilaos, 96
Agios Georgios, 85-86
Agios Nikolaos, 33-34, 74-75, 77 note 156
Agios Phanourios, 54, 55 note 93
Agrielikí, Mt., 35, 91 note 14, 92 note 17, 93,
100 note 30, 116
Aigaleos, Mt., 54, 61, 63, 70-72, 74, 114, 115
note 30, 119
Aigaleos tower, 27, 119
Aigina, coins of, 9
Alexander, son of Krateros, 107 note 17
Alexander, son of Polyperchon, 103-104
Alkmaionidai, 61
Anagyrous, *see* Vari-Anagyrous
Anaphlystos, 75, 77
Androutsas, Odysseus, 94
Antigonos Gonatas, 15, 106-112, 114-115
Antipater, 103
Antipatros, 113
Aphidna, 81-83, 92, 93 note 20, 94, 100 note
30, 101
Aratos, 107 note 17
Areus, 108-115
Arrowheads, 30, 46, 48
Arsinoe (Keos), 109
Arsinoe (Methana), 98
Arsinoe II Philadelphos, 109
Atene, 25-28, 91, 102, 117
Athens, 2, 15-16, 18, 24, 32-34, 43, 46, 48, 50,
52, 54, 57-58, 60-61, 63, 72, 79, 88-92, 97,
101-115, 116, 119
Athens, Acropolis, 50
Athens, Agora, 11-12, 13 note 36, 14-15, 17,
24, 56
Athens, coins of, 9, 15, 47
Attic Dodecapolis, 58, 81, 92
Attic Tetrapolis, 41, 92
Audoleon, 106 note 13
Azenia, 25 note 15
BARRACKS, 7-8
Besa, 75, 77
Boudoron, 32-33
Buildings, 6-8, 20-21, 23, 25, 27-28, 30-32, 34-
35, 37, 45, 47 note 72, 49, 52, 54-55, 57-58,
60, 63 note 116, 65-66, 69, 79-80, 82, 84, 86,
99
CASSANDER, 103-105
Chabrias, 96
Chalkis, coins of, 9, 47
Charaka, 25
χάραγμα, 97
χάραξ, 97-98
Chremonidean War, 14-16, 18, 24-25, 28 note
18, 30-31, 46, 47 note 73, 48, 66, 99, 101,
107-115, 116
Chremonides, 108-109, 111-113
Cleft Way, 94-96
Coins, *see* Aigina, Athens, Chalkis, Demetrios
Poliorketes, "Eleusis," Euboean League,
Megara, Ptolemy I, Ptolemy II
Coins, Byzantine, 55 note 92, 94
Command post, 23
Corinth, 108, 110-113
Crete, 109
Cyprus, 9-10
DATING, evidence for, 10-11, 14-15, 101-102,
116, and *passim*
Dekeleia, 50, 54, 56-58, 92, 97, 99 note 29, 102,
116
Dema, 37, 57, 63-66, 70-72, 91 note 14, 96,
101 note 1, 114-115, 119
Demes, 1, 2, 27-28, 35, 41, 50-52, 56, 62 note
115, 75, 77, 84, 91-92
Demetrios of Phaleron, 104
Demetrios Poliorketes, 104-106; coins of, 9-10
Drakonera, 41, 43
EARLY BRONZE AGE SETTLEMENTS, 32

- Egypt, Egyptians, 12-15, 105, 107-115; *see also*
Ptolemy I, Ptolemy II
- Eleusis, 17, 63, 70, 72, 74, 88, 90-91, 105-106,
114
- “Eleusis,” coins of, 9, 15, 47
- Eleutherai, 87, 92
- Epano Liosia, 71
- Epichares, 109, 112
- “Ereneia,” 85-86, 90-91, 120
- Etosi, 37, 54 note 89, 94, 100 note 30, 116
- Euboea, 89
- Euboean League, coins of, 30
- FIELD WALLS, 37
- Field works, 63-64, 69-72, 88, 94, 96
- Foreign garrisons, 89, 103-106, 108
- Fortified demes, 16, 35, 41, 71-72, 88, 91-92
- GAIDOURONISI, 18-25, 98-99, 109-110, 112; *see also*
Patroklos Island Garrison forts, 33 note
37, 58, 81-84, 87-93, 103-106; *see also*
Foreign garrisons
- Gates, 4-6, 28, 33-37, 40-41, 44, 49, 54, 60,
68, 74-79, 82 note 167, 84-85
- Gauls, 108, 110, 112
- Greek War of Independence, 37, 50, 52, 54
note 89, 75 note 154, 81, 94-96
- Gur-i-Korakut, 51 note 83, 52, 114
- Gyphtokastro, 17, 34, 58, 84, 88, 90, 92; *see also*
Eleutherai, Panakton
- HARBORS, 2, 8, 23, 32, 110, 112-113
- Helioupolis, 30 note 25, 46-48, 100-101, 107,
109-111, 113-114, 116
- Hellenic War, 103
- Herodes Atticus, 36-37
- Houses, *see* buildings
- Hymettos Camp, 48-50, 62, 90, 94, 100 note
30, 104, 114
- Hymettos, Mt., 28, 46, 48, 50, 54, 75, 79, 90,
91 note 14, 114, 117, 119
- Hymettos tower, 50, 90, 117-119
- KAISARIANI, Kaisariani Berg, 47 note 72, 50-
52, 91 note 14, 95-96, 114-116
- Kallisthenes, 81, 93
- Kamatero, Kamatero Wall, 50, 51, 61, 71-72,
95-96, 115
- Kapandriti, 81
- Kara, 46, 47 note 72
- Kastraki, 37, 50, 52-56, 94, 100 note 30, 101
note 1, 104, 114
- Kastri, 52; *see also* Kastraki
- Kato-Souli, 37, 41
- Katsimidi, 50, 56-58, 90
- Kavasala, 83, 84; *see also* Korynos, Panakton
- Keos, 5, 15-16, 109
- Kephissia, 52
- Kleitros, 103
- Koroneia, 2-4
- Koroni, iii, 1-16, 23-25, 28 note 18, 30 note 25,
35, 44 note 70, 46, 48, 56-57, 58 note 102,
60-62, 70-71, 91, 92 note 17, 93, 99-102, 107,
109-110, 112-113, 116
- Korynos, Korynokastro, 72 note 147, 83-85, 91,
92 note 17, 93
- Kotroni, Mt., 35, 81, 82 note 169
- Koundoura, 85, 86, 120
- Koundoura tower, 119-120
- Kynosoura, 41-46, 79, 92 note 17, 94, 100 note
30, 101 note 1, 113-114
- LACEDAEMONIANS, *see* Sparta
- Lamian War, 103
- Lamps, 23
- Laurion, 75, 77
- “Leipsydrion,” 50, 57-62, 100 note 30, 101
note 1, 104, 114
- Loutsa, 79
- Lykabetos, 50
- MACEDONIA, Macedonians, 15, 103-115
- Mandra tis graias, 35-37
- Marathon, 35-46, 79, 93, 113
- Markopoulo, 77
- Masonry, 4-8, 13, 18-87 *passim*, 89-91, 94, 99-
100, 102, 117-120
- Mazi, 89-90
- Medieval fortifications, 52, 88, 94
- Megalopolis, 104
- Megara, 32-33, 85-87, 108, 110, 112; coins of,
9, 10 note 26
- Melainai, 84, 91 note 14
- Menidi, 58
- Merenda, Mt., 77, 100 note 30, 116

- Mesogeia, 48, 77, 79-80, 90, 93
 Methana, 98
 Mikro Kavouri, 30-33; *see also* Vouliagmeni
 Military camps, 2, 13, 16-18, 24, 33, 35, 45, 52, 56-58, 77, 80, 88, 96-116
 Mounichia, 17, 50, 89, 103-105
 Mouseion, 17, 50, 89, 105, 108
 Myoupolis, 17, 88, 90; *see also* Oinoe
- NEA PHOKEA, 75
 Necropoleis, 28, 41 note 60, 56, 82 note 169;
see also tombs
 Nikanor, 103
 Ninoi, 37, 54 note 89; *see also* Oinoe
- OBSIDIAN, 31, 41, 58
 Oinoe, 35, 37, 88
 Olympiodoros, 105 note 10, 106
 Olympos, Mt., 75
 Oropia, 57-58, 81 note 162, 90
- PALAIOCHORI, 75, *see also* Palaiokastro (near Eleusis)
 Palaiokastro (near Eleusis), 34, 74-75, 84, 90, 106
 Palaiokastro (Tatoi), 56-58
 Panakton, 72 note 147, 84, 87-88, 92, 104; *see also* Gyphtokastro, Kavasala
 Parnes, Mt., 54, 56-58, 60, 63, 70, 83, 90, 114, 119
 Patroklos, 15, 18, 24-25, 98-99, 109-111, 114
 Patroklos Island, Patroklou Charax, 15, 18-25, 27, 28 note 18, 46, 56, 98-102, 108, 110, 112-113, 116
 Peithidemos, 14 note 38, 108-109, 111-113
 Peloponnesian War, 32, 43
 Peloponnesus, 89, 98, 103, 105, 112; *see also* Sparta
 Penteli, Mt., 52, 54, 90
 Perama, 32
 Philip V, 107
 Phyle, 17, 34, 41, 58, 74 note 150, 82, 84, 88, 90, 104
 Pikermi, 79
 Piraeus, 28, 33, 89, 91, 93, 103-106, 107 note 17, 112, 119
 Plakoto, 34, 72, 74-75, 84, 90, 106
- Pfistos, 94
 Polyperchon, 103-104
 Porto Raphti, 1-2, 4, 15, 112; *see also* Koroni
 Pottery, amphoras, 11 note 27, 12-14, 24, 30, 48, 62, 70, 82, 99
 Pottery, dating of, 11-15, 17, 25, 101-102
 Pottery, household wares, 7, 10-14, 20, 23-24, 25 note 15, 27, 28 note 18, 29, 31, 34-35, 37, 41, 45-46, 50, 52, 55-56, 60, 62, 65, 66, 68-71, 74-76, 80, 82, 86, 99, 100, 101, 114, 117-118
 Pottery, "umbrella stands," 46, 48, 62, 70
 Prasas, 2 note 10, 4, 12
 Prasiai, 1, 2, 4, 91
 Ptolemy I Soter, 106, 109; coins of, 9, 10, 47
 Ptolemy II Philadelphos, 15, 18, 107 note 16, 108-109; coins of, 9, 10, 13 note 36, 30-31, 47-48, 99, 109
 Pylos, 97
 Pyrrhos, 105
- RAPHINA, 79
 Raptopoula, 1 note 3
 Refuges, 16, 43, 81, 84, 88, 92
 Rhamnous, 17, 34, 58, 82, 87, 89-91, 93, 103, 105-106, 109, 112-113
 Romans, 96-97, 107
 Roof tiles, 5, 8, 50, 52, 55, 60, 62, 68, 70, 74, 82, 84, 86
- ST. DEMETRIOS TOWER, 117
 Salamis, 32, 107 note 17
 Sallyports, 63, 64
 Salona, 94
 Sarandapotamos, 72, 74-75
 Signaling stations, 28, 50, 57, 91
 Skourta plain, 72 note 147, 83-84, 90, 93
 Sling bullets, 46, 48
 Sounion, 15, 17-18, 27-28, 34, 82, 89, 91, 108, 112
 Sparta, Spartans, 15, 56, 58, 97-99, 102, 107-115
 Spartakos, 105 note 10
 Stairways, 34, 60, 75, 85
 Stavrokoraki, Mt., 37, 38 note 55
 Stomi, 41; *see also* Kynosoura
 Storerooms, 6, 23, 28, 49, 55
 στραποπέδευιν, 104

- TAMBURI GURA, 37, 54 note 89
 Tatoi, 54-56; *see also* Dekeleia
 ταξιθεω, 97
 Temples, 2 note 6, 28, 30
 Thebes, 89, 96
 Thera, 109
 Thorikos, 33-34, 74-75, 77, 90, 102, 106
 Thria, Thriasian plain, 61, 63-75, 84, 90, 106,
 107 note 17, 114-115, 119
 Thriasian "Lager," 51, 57, 66-72, 91 note 14,
 95-96, 100 note 30, 101 note 1, 106 note 15,
 114-115
 Tombs, Mycenaean, 33; *see also* Necropoleis
 Tourkovouno, 50
 Towers, 5-6, 27-28, 33-35, 40-41, 45, 49, 55,
 60, 66, 68-69, 74, 76, 80, 85, 89-90, 102,
 117-120
 Trikorynthos, 37-41, 57, 92-93, 100 note 30,
 101
 Troezen, 98
 VARI-ANAGYROUS, 27-29, 75, 91, 117
 Varnava, 89-90
 Velatouri, Mt., 33
 Vigla Rimbari, 75, 77
 Vouliagmeni, 30-33, 48, 75, 100-101, 107, 109-
 110, 112-113
 WALLS, *passim*
 Watch posts, watch towers, lookouts, 5, 23, 25,
 27, 45, 50, 55, 57, 60, 74, 77, 81, 89-90, 104,
 114, 117, 119
 YEROVOUNO, 50, 61-62, 71, 91 note 14, 100
 note 30, 101 note 1, 104, 115, 116
 ZENON, 106
 Zoster, Cape, 30-33; *see also* Vouliagmeni

ANCIENT AUTHORS

- Aristophanes, *Acharneis*, 1178: 98
 Arrian, III, 9, 1: 97
 Athenaeus, VI, 250F: 108
 Bekker, *Anecdota Graeca*, I, 299: 2 note 6
 Demosthenes, XVIII, *De Corona*, 38: 81, 83,
 93
 Diodoros, 97
 XVIII, 65; 68: 103
 XVIII, 70, 4: 104
 XX, 45, 1 - 46, 1: 104
 Hegesandros, 108
 Herodotos, V, 62, 2: 61
 IX, 73: 81 note 164
 Hesychios, 41 note 66
 Justin, XXVI, 2: 108
 Pausanias, I, 1, 1: 15 note 41, 20 note 8, 24,
 98, 108-109
 I, 7, 3: 108, 110
 I, 25, 6: 104
 I, 26, 1-2: 105
 I, 26, 3: 106 notes 11, 14
 I, 31, 2: 2 note 6
 I, 32, 7: 37 note 53
 III, 6, 4-6: 15, 108, 110-111
 Philochoros, 81
 Photius, 41 note 66
 Plato, *Hipparchus*, 229 a: 2
 Plutarch, *Agis*, 3: 108
Aratus, 33: 107 note 17
Demetrius, 8-10: 104
 23: 104
 33-34: 105
 46: 105
Phocion, 25: 103
 Polybios, VI, 34-35, 5: 98
 42: 13, 96-97, 99
 X, 41-47: 91 note 13
 XVIII, 18: 98
 Pompeius Trogus, *Prolog.*, 26: 108
 Stephanus Byzantius, 2-4
 Strabo. IX, 1, 20 (p. 397): 81 note 163
 IX, 1, 21 (p. 398): 24, 98, 109
 IX, 1, 22 (p. 399): 4 note 13, 41 note 61,
 92 note 16
 Thucydides, II, 93-94: 32
 IV, 4-5: 97


- VII, 18-19 : 97
 VIII, 95, 1 : 4 note 13
 Xenophon, *Anabasis*, V, 2, 18 : 97
Constitution of the Lacedaemonians, XII, 1 : 98, 114 note 28
Hellenica, I, 2, 1 : 34
 IV, 4-49 : 96
 V, 4, 38 : 97
 Pseudo-Xenophon, *De Vect.*, IV, 43 : 34, 77

INSCRIPTIONS


- Inscriptiones Creticae*, III, Itanos, 2-3 : 109 note 19
 III, Olous, 4 : 109 note 19
Inscriptiones Graecae, II², 650 : 105 note 10
 II², 651 : 105 note 10
 II², 653 : 105 note 10
 II², 654 : 105 note 10, 106 note 13
 II², 655 : 105 note 10
 II², 657 : 106 note 11
 II², 660 : 106 note 11
 II², 665 : 109 note 23
 II², 687-688 : 108, 111-113
 II², 2497 : 4 note 13
 II², 4977 : 2 note 6
 II², 5189 : 36
 II², 7549 : 41 note 62
 II², 7551 : 41 note 62
 II², 7553 : 41 note 62
 IV², 76 : 98
 XII, 3, 320 : 109 note 19
 XII, 5, 1061 : 109 note 19



Map of Attica Showing Location of Sites






Plan of Kaisariani




scale : 0 1 2 3 CM.

Profiles of Sherds



scale : 0 1 2 3 CM.


Profiles of Sherds



a. View looking Southeast



b. North Acropolis Wall, looking East



c. North Acropolis Wall, Outer Face



d. Gate E and Storerooms

Koroni





a. Building G



b. Bronze Coin of Ptolemy II (No. 72)



c. Kantharoi



d. Fish plates


Koroni



a. From Shore



b. North Long Wall



c. Cistern




d. Outer Wall of Building




e. Inner Wall of Building


Patroklos Island



a. Mainland from Patroklos Island




b. Koundoura Valley from "Ereneaia," looking North and East



a. Wall, Outer Face



b. Gateway



c. Altar (?)




d. Building Wall



e. Agrieliki


Vari-Anagyrous




a. Tambourri Gura




b. Trikorynthos: Acropolis Wall




c. Kynosoura from Trikorynthos




d. Kynosoura: Wall A




a. Hymettos Camp



b. Hymettos Camp: East Wall




c. Kaisariani : Wall (On Kaisariani Berg)



d. Kaisariani : Wall (On Kaisariani Berg)



e. Kaisariani Berg from East



a. Kastraki: Looking North



b. Kastraki: Wall



c. Katsimidi



d. "Leipsydrion"




a. Thriasian "Lager"



b. Thriasian "Lager"




c. Plakoto: Outer Circuit




d. Thriasian "Lager"




e. Plakoto: Inner Circuit



a. Plakoto: Tower



b. Palaiokastro: from Outside




c. Palaiokastro: Inner Face




d. Palaiokastro: Gate and Stairs



a. Besa




c. Mandra tis Graias




d. Aphidna




b. Besa



e. Aphidna : Wall



a. Mount Merenda



b. Mount Merenda




c. Mount Merenda



d. Mount Merenda: Gate



e. Korynos




b. "Erenea" Fort: South Wall



d. "Erenea" Fort: South Wall



a. Korynos




c. "Erenea" Fort: North Wall




a. "Erencia" Fort: Retaining Wall




b. "Erencia" Fort: Field Wall




c. Aigaleos Tower



d. Hymettos Tower



a. St. Demetrios Tower




b. Wall in Cleft Way



c. Wall in Cleft Way



a. Lamp




b. Sherds



c. Kantharos Bases




d. Lekane



e. Amphora Toe

Patroklos Island




f. Kynosoura: Sherds



g. "Leipsydriion": Kantharos




a. Kantharos



b. Kantharos Base



c. Standed Basin



d. Broad-based Bowl




e. Small Bowl



f. Spouted Mortar


Kastraki



g. Hymettos Tower : Mug



h. Hymettos Tower : Kernos



i. Hymettos Tower : Cup