A Landscape of Conflict?

Rural Fortifications in the Argolid (400–146 BC)

Anna Magdalena Blomley

Archaeopress Archaeology

Archaeopress Publishing Ltd
Summertown Pavilion
18-24 Middle Way
Summertown
Oxford OX2 7LG

www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978-1-78969-970-8
ISBN 978-1-78969-971-5 (e-Pdf)

© Archaeopress and Anna Magdalena Blomley 2022

Cover: The view from the fort of Kazarma (© Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports / Ephorate of Antiquities of Argolida; photo by the author).

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.
This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

To my parents

Contents

Contents ... i

List of Figures ... iii

List of Tables ... v

Acknowledgements ... vii

Note to the Reader ... ix
- On the transliteration of Greek toponyms, personal names and pottery terms ... ix
- On sites names and catalogue numbers ... ix
- The descriptive catalogue ... ix

Chapter 1: Introduction ... 1
- 1.1 Approaching a landscape of conflict ... 1
- 1.2 Fortification studies: a brief history of scholarship ... 1
- 1.3 Defining the Argolid ... 4
- 1.4 Studying fortifications in the Argolid: an outline ... 6

Chapter 2: The Landscape of the Ancient Argolid ... 7
- 2.1 Setting the scene ... 7
- 2.2 Landscape changes: from tectonics to vegetation ... 7
- 2.3 Land use: agriculture, pastoralism and 'marginal' resources ... 12
- 2.4 The scene is set: the landscape of the Late Classical and Hellenistic Argolid ... 18

Chapter 3: A Typology of Ancient Fortifications ... 19
- 3.1 Ancient terminologies and modern typologies ... 19
- 3.2 Fortified settlements, forts, towers and drystone circuits ... 21
- 3.3 Safety in numbers: the distribution of fortifications in the Argolid ... 23

Chapter 4: Dating Ancient Fortifications in the Argolid ... 31
- 4.1 Dating ancient fortifications: a persistent problem ... 31
- 4.2 Securing a date: dating by stratified and surface finds ... 31
- 4.3 Building a chronology: dating by architectural features ... 33
- 4.4 Polygonal problems: dating by masonry technique ... 41
- 4.5 Dating ancient fortifications: discussion and conclusions ... 44

Chapter 5: A Regional Study of Fortifications in the Argolid ... 45
- 5.1 The political geography of the Argolid (400–146 BC) ... 45
- 5.2 Settlement patterns in the Argolid (400–146 BC) ... 51

Chapter 6: Rural Fortifications as Territorial Defences ... 57
- 6.1 Movement: fortifications and roads ... 57
  - 6.1.1 Tracing ancient movement: the archaeological record ... 57
  - 6.1.2 Tracing ancient movement: A least cost path analysis ... 58
  - 6.1.3 Least cost paths and ancient fortifications in the Argolid ... 65
- 6.2 Visibility: fortifications as watch-posts and signal-stations ... 69
  - 6.2.1 Studying visibility: methods and practice ... 69
  - 6.2.2 Site visibility and intervisibility on the Akte ... 73
  - 6.2.4 Evaluating the 'visual networks' ... 83
- 6.3 Territories: fortifications and defensive strategies ... 84
  - 6.3.1 Late Classical and Hellenistic strategies of territorial defence ... 84
  - 6.3.2 Fortifications as 'deterrents' and the role of city walls ... 84
  - 6.3.3 'Dynamic' defences: the role of rural fortifications ... 89
  - 6.3.4 Conclusions: fortifications as strategic military sites ... 103

Chapter 7: Rural Fortifications as Local Defences **106**
7.1 Conflict: fortifications as places of refuge 106
7.2 Cultivation: fortifications and agriculture 112
7.2.1 Fortified architecture: between practicality and defensibility 112
7.2.2 Location: rural fortifications in context 114
7.2.3 Agricultural installations: rural fortifications as processing sites 117
7.2.4 Portable finds: everyday activities at rural fortifications 121
7.3 'Agricultural' fortifications: economy and agency 123

Chapter 8: Conclusions **127**

Bibliography **131**
A. General bibliography 131
B. Editions of ancient authors 159
C. Fragments 160
D. Inscriptions 161
E. Papyri 161
F. Electronic resources 161

Catalogue **163**
A. Fortifications in the Argolid 164
B. Possible fortifications in the Argolid 268
C. Fortifications and possible fortifications in the Argolid: location unknown 279
D. Fortifications and possible fortifications in the Argolid: now destroyed 284
E. Structures inconclusively or erroneously identified as ancient fortifications in the Argolid 290

Appendix **294**
The Masonry Technique and Chronology of Fortifications in the Argolid 294

Index of Sources **303**
Literary sources 303
Epigraphic sources 305
Papyri 305

General Index **306**

List of Figures

Figure 1.1 The landscape of the northeastern Peloponnese. 2
Figure 2.1 Watersheds in the northwestern Argolid and sedimentary deposits on the Argive plain (deposits after Fouache 1999: 170, fig. 49). 8
Figure 2.2 The Argolic and the Saronic Gulf: drainage basins and areas most susceptible to coastline changes. 10
Figure 2.3 Evidence for ancient land use in the Argolid (after Table 2). 13
Figure 3.1 The geographical distribution of fortified sites in the Argolid (by type). 20
Figure 3.2 The geographical distribution of towers in the Argolid (by size and shape). 22
Figure 3.3 The geographical distribution of fortified settlements in the Argolid (by size). 24
Figure 4.1 Kastraki (35): satellite image and sketch plan (Google Earth 2013). 33
Figure 4.2 The gates of Mantineia (Maher 2017: 223, fig. C8.7). 34
Figure 4.3 Plaka Leonidiou (63): satellite image and sketch plan (Google Earth 2013). 34
Figure 4.4 Sportiza (74): satellite image and sketch plan (Google Earth 2013). 34
Figure 4.5 The Southeast Tower at Asini (14): plan (Adam 1982: 57, fig. 24). 35
Figures 4.6–7 Argos' (12) hexagonal towers on the Aspis (above) and on the Larissa-Aspis wall (below) (Adam 1982: 58, fig. 26). 35
Figure 4.8 The possible hexagonal tower at Achladokampos (1) (Google Earth 2012). 36
Figure 4.9 The northwest side of the possible hexagonal tower at Achladokampos (1) from the north. 36
Figure 4.10 Drystone masonry on the north side of Agio Lias (2). 40
Figure 4.11 Roughly hewn coursed polygonal masonry at Agios Sostis (5). 40
Figure 4.12 Roughly hewn uncoursed polygonal masonry at Tyros (83). 40
Figure 4.13 Carefully fitted ashlar masonryat Asini (14). 40
Figure 4.14 Carefully fitted coursed trapezoidal masonry at Elliniko Astrous (21). 40
Figure 4.15 Carefully fitted uncoursed trapezoidal masonry at Ano Phanari (10). 40
Figure 4.16 Carefully fitted coursed polygonal masonry at Iria (31). 41
Figure 4.17 Carefully fitted uncoursed polygonal masonry at Palaia Epidavros 1 (54). 41
Figure 4.18 The distribution of masonry by type of joint (number of samples). 41
Figure 4.19 The distribution of roughly hewn masonry by shape of blocks (number of samples). 41
Figure 4.20 The distribution of fitted masonry by shape of blocks (number of samples). 41
Figure 4.21 Uncoursed roughly hewn polygonal masonry at Plaka Leonidiou (63). 42
Figure 4.22 The distribution of drystone masonry by type of site (number of samples, excluding drystone circuits). 42
Figure 4.23 The distribution of roughly hewn masonry by type of site (number of samples). 42
Figure 4.24 The distribution of carefully fitted masonry by type of site (number of samples). 42
Figure 4.25 The distribution of coursed polygonal masonry by type of site (number of samples). 42
Figure 5.1 The territory of Kleonai (after Marchand 2002b). 47
Figure 5.2 The territory of Hermion and the shared territory of Hermion and Epidauros (2nd century BC). 48
Figure 5.3 The territory Epidauros (3rd and 2nd century BC). 49
Figure 5.4 The fortifications on the Akte by city-state (400–146 BC). 50
Figure 5.5 Argive komai and dependent settlements (400–146 BC). 52
Figure 5.6 The fortifications in the territory of Argos. 53
Figure 6.1 The tower of Agios Sostis (5) from the south. 57
Figure 6.2 The view from the tower of Agios Sostis (5) to the north. 58
Figure 6.3 Surviving wheel-ruts and ancient bridges in the Argolid (after Φάκλαρης 1990; Πίκουλας 1995; Tausend 2006 and Πίκουλας 2012). 59
Figure 6.4 Least cost paths between Argos and Mantineia calculated with the ArcGIS Path Distance tool, the so-called 'Tobler's Hiking Formula' (after Tripcevich 2009 and White 2015) and the relative effort required to walk on different slopes (after Minetti *et al.* 2002). 60
Figure 6.5 The least cost paths between urban centres, compared to the surviving wheel-ruts and ancient bridges. 62
Figure 6.6 The least cost paths between urban centres and fortified settlements, compared to the least cost paths between urban centres and the surviving wheel-ruts and ancient bridges. 63
Figure 6.7 The least cost paths between fortified settlements, compared to the least cost paths between urban centres, the least cost paths between urban centres and fortified settlements and the surviving wheel-ruts and ancient bridges. 64
Figure 6.8 The least cost paths, compared to the 4th-century BC and Hellenistic fortifications in the region. 66
Figure 6.9 The results of the cumulative pathway analysis, compared to the distribution of 4th-century BC and Hellenistic fortifications. Paths marked in blue denote routes with a low overlap between different paths, paths marked in red denote routes with a high overlap. 66
Figure 6.10 The freestanding rectangular tower with chamfered corners at Kephalovryso (40). 67
Figure 6.11 The view from the possible tower at Kondyli (98). 68
Figure 6.12 The view from the drystone circuit at Vigliza (85). 68
Figure 6.13 The view from the tower at Tourkovrysi (78). 69
Figure 6.14 The view from the tower of Agios Sostis (5) to the south. 70

Figure 6.15 The binary viewshed of the fortified settlement of Achladokampos (1). 71
Figure 6.16 The classified viewshed of the fortified settlement of Achladokampos (1). 71
Figure 6.17 Site intervisibility in the territories of Halieis and Hermion. 72
Figure 6.18 Site intervisibility in the territory of Troizen. 72
Figure 6.19 Site intervisibility in the territory of Epidauros. 74
Figure 6.20 The view from Ano Phanari (10), with Palaia Epidavros and the Korinthia (left), Salamis and Attica (centre) and Aigina (right). 75
Figure 6.21 The view from Skala 1 (104) to the west, south and east, with Stavropodio (75) (left), the Benteni valley (centre) and the Argolic Gulf (right). The plain of Iria is just visible through the trees on the right edge of the picture. 75
Figure 6.22 Site intervisibility in the territory of Argos. 76
Figure 6.23 Intervisible 'site clusters' in the territory of Argos. 78
Figure 6.24 'Cluster 3': intervisible Argive fortifications in the plain of Prosymna. 79
Figure 6.25 The view from Agio Lias (2) to the east, with the plain of Prosymna (left) and the Argive plain (right). 79
Figure 6.26 'Cluster 5 and 6': intervisible Argive fortifications around Achladokampos (1) and south of the Zavitsa mountains. 80
Figure 6.27 The view from Tourniki: Gaidourovouni (79) to the east along the Xerias valley. 80
Figure 6.28 'Cluster 2': intervisible fortifications in the territory of Kleonai. 81
Figure 6.29 The area visible from fortifications in Argos' hypothetical signalling network (400–146 BC). 82
Figure 6.30 Argos (12), satellite-image (Google Earth 2018) with the remains of the city walls (after Pariente – Touchais 1998: pl. 12). 85
Figure 6.31 Ermioni (24): plan (Frickenhaus – Müller 1911: pl. 1). 85
Figure 6.32 Palaia Epidavros 1 (54): satellite-image with sketch plan (Google Earth 2018). 86
Figure 6.33 Porto Cheli (64): plan (McAllister 2005:, fig. 18). 86
Figure 6.34 Troizina (80): satellite-image with sketch plan (Google Earth 2018, after Welter 1941: pl. 2). 87
Figure 6.35 Argos, Larissa (12): the west wall of the outer circuit from the west. 88
Figure 6.36 Argos, Larissa (12): the outer circuit. Satellite-image with sketch plan (Google Earth 2018, after Πιτέρος 2013: 346, fig. 2). 88
Figure 6.37 Argos, Aspis (12): plan (Philippa-Touchais – Touchais 2006: 717, fig. 16). 89
Figure 6.38 a Galatas: Megali Magoula (25): the view to the west and north towards Troizina (80). 90
Figure 6.38 b Galatas: Megali Magoula (25): the view to the north and east towards Limanaki 1 (48) and Limanaki 2 (99), the straits of Poros, the island of Poros and the straits between Poros and Galatas. 90
Figure 6.38 c Phourkaria (61): the view to the southeast, south and southwest towards the island of Hydra. 90
Figure 6.39 Walking distances, cost boundaries and fortifications (400–300 BC). 92
Figure 6.40 Walking distances, cost boundaries and fortifications (300–235 BC). 92
Figure 6.41 Walking distances, cost boundaries and fortifications (235–146 BC). 93
Figure 6.42 Benteni Kiapha (16): the southwest wall from the southeast. 94
Figure 6.43 Kazarma (39): satellite-image with sketch plan (Google Earth 2013). 94
Figures 6.44 a–b The masonry at Kastraki (35) (above) and Kazarma (39) (below). 95
Figures 6.45 a–b The cross section of the south tower at Kastraki (35) (above) and tower II at Kazarma (39) (below). 96
Figure 6.46 Andritsa: Goulas (9): the cistern. 99
Figure 6.47 Agios Adrianos (3): the cistern from the south. 99
Figure 6.48 Kazarma (39): the cistern from the east. 99
Figure 7.1 Walking distances in southern Attica. 107
Figure 7.2 Possible places of refuge: walking distances and cost boundaries. 108
Figure 7.3 Possible places of refuge: walking distances, cost boundaries, agricultural installations and the probable maximum altitude for olive cultivation (500 mamsl). 109
Figure 7.4 Possible places of refuge: walking distances, cost boundaries, agricultural installations and modern agricultural areas. 109
Figure 7.5 The surface pottery assemblage from the drystone circuit at Vigliza (85) by functional category (after Penttinen 1996b: 268–70). 110
Figure 7.6 Crossbar cuttings at Elliniko: Kephalari (23) (outer door). 113
Figure 7.7 Crossbar cuttings at Kampia (32). 113
Figure 7.8 Cuttings for a double crossbar at Agios Adrianos (3). 114
Figure 7.9 Areas above an altitude of 500 mamsl (with fortifications by type). 115
Figure 7.10 Areas with a slope above 10° (with fortifications by type). 116
Figures 7.11 a–c Ancient press beds at Andritsa: Goulas (9) (a), Ierakas (28) (b) and Mykinai (51) (c). 118
Figures 7.12 a–d Ancient press weights at Asini (14) (a), Elliniko Astrous (21) (b), Mykinai (51) (c), and Troizina (80) (d). 118
Figures 7.13 a–d Ancient olive mills at Amygdalitsa (7) (a), Iliopoulaiika (30) (b), Pyrgouli (71) (c) and Malantrenion (101) (d). 119
Figure 7.14 The distribution of ancient agricultural installations at fortifications in the Argolid. 120
Figure 7.15 The distribution of portable finds (connected to specific agricultural or industrial activities) at fortifications in the Argolid. 122
Figure 7.16 The pottery assemblages from Agios Sostis (5) and Prosymna: Pyrgouthi (69) by functional category (after Cloke 2016: 901 and Penttinen 2005: 23–89). 123
Figure 7.17 The pottery assemblages from two unfortified rural sites from the NVAP by functional category (after Cloke 2016: 682–87, 799–818). 123

List of Tables

Table 2.1 Sediment deposits on the Argive plain (after Fouache and Gaki-Papanastassiou 1997; Fouache 1999). 9
Table 2.2 a Land use in the ancient Argolid: olives. 14
Table 2.2 b Land use in the ancient Argolid: cereals. 14
Table 2.2 c Land use in the ancient Argolid: vines. 15
Table 2.2 d Land use in the ancient Argolid: legumes. 15
Table 2.2 e Land use in the ancient Argolid: tree crops. 15
Table 2.2 f Land use in the ancient Argolid: pastoralism. 16
Table 2.2 g Land use in the ancient Argolid: wood. 16
Table 2.2 h Land use in the ancient Argolid: hunting. 16
Table 2.2 i Land use in the ancient Argolid: beekeeping. 16
Table 2.2 j Land use in the ancient Argolid: salt panning. 17
Table 2.2 k Land use in the ancient Argolid: fishing. 17
Table 3.1 Towers and possible towers in the Argolid. 25
Table 3.2 Fortified settlements and possible fortified settlements in the Argolid. Bibliographic references to individual finds at these sites can be found in the catalogue. 28
Table 3.3 Forts and possible forts in the Argolid. 30
Table 3.4 Drystone circuits in the Argolid. 30
Table 4.1 The width and stock length of stone-throwing palintones. 37
Table 4.2 The width and stock length of arrow-shooting euthyones, reconstructed from washers at Ephyra and the Mahdia shipwreck. 37
Table 4.3 The outer dimensions of the hexagonal towers (in meters). 38
Table 4.4 a The hypothetical inner dimensions of the hexagonal towers: battlements (width 0.4–0.8, all measurements in meters). 38
Table 4.4 b The hypothetical inner dimensions of the hexagonal towers: mudbrick walls (width 1.35–2.15; Miletus: 1.35–1.8; Samos: 1.35; all measurements in meters). 38
Table 4.4 c The hypothetical inner dimensions of the hexagonal towers: stone walls (width 0.4–1.42, Samos: 0.75–1.35, all measurements in meters). 38
Table 4.5 a The hypothetical stock length of catapults at the hexagonal towers (battlements; all measurements in meters). 39
Table 4.5 b The hypothetical stock length of catapults at the hexagonal towers (mudbrick walls; all measurements in meters). 39
Table 4.5 c The hypothetical stock length of catapults at the hexagonal towers (stone walls; all measurements in meters). 39
Table 6.1 Site clusters in the territory of Epidauros. 75
Table 6.2 Site clusters in the territory of Argos. 77
Table 6.3 Average monthly run-off from a tiled roof ($10m^2$) in the Argolid. 100
Table 6.4 Average monthly run-off from a stone surface ($10m^2$) in the Argolid. 100
Table 6.5 Estimated storage volume for a catchment area of $81m^2$ (tiled), a garrison of 16 men and a water consumption of 5 litres per day per person. 101
Table 6.6 Estimated storage volume for a catchment area of $77m^2$ (stone), a garrison of 16 men and a water consumption of 5 litres per day per person. 101
Table 6.7 Estimated storage volume for a catchment area of 230 m^2 (stone), a garrison of 16 men and a water consumption of 15 litres per day per person. 102
Table 6.8 Estimated storage volume for a catchment area of 195 m^2 (stone), a garrison of 40 men and a water consumption of 5 litres per day per person. 102

Acknowledgements

This monograph — completed during my time as Esmée Fairbairn Junior Research Fellow in Classics at New College, Oxford — is largely based on the research I undertook while writing my DPhil at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. Neither the DPhil thesis nor the monograph would have been possible without the help and support of many people in Oxford and beyond. Although the following list of names and institutions surely remains incomplete, I would like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to those who contributed to my research over the past years.

First and foremost, I would like to thank all those within the Greek Archaeological Service who made it possible for me to study the numerous sites that feature in this monograph. In particular, I am very much indebted to the present and former directors of five ephorates: Dr Alkistis Papadimitriou of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Argolida, Dr Anna-Vasiliki Karapanagiotou and Dr Konstantinos Kissas of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Arkadia, Panagiota Kasimi of the Ephorate of Antiquities of the Korinthia, Evangelia Pantou of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Lakonia, and Dr Stella Chryssoulaki of the Ephorate of Antiquities of Piraeus and the Islands. Without their kind permission to photograph more than 100 fortified sites, this monograph would not have been possible, and I would like to express my gratitude for their generosity. I would also like to thank Dr Anastasia Gadolou at the Directorate of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities (Department of Archaeological Sites and Monuments) for her invaluable help in applying for the permits to photograph the various archaeological sites, and Tania Gerousi at the BSA for her advice and support in submitting the necessary applications.

Secondly, I would like to thank my DPhil supervisor, Dr Maria Stamatopoulou, for all her patience, support and encouragement, both during my time as a doctoral student and beyond. I am very grateful to Maria for opening my eyes to the potential of the material in hand, for her comments and suggestions, for her assistance in obtaining publications, maps and permissions necessary for this research, and most of all for her enduring confidence that a study of rural fortifications in the Argolid is both feasible and worthwhile.

Thirdly, I am greatly indebted to my friends and colleagues Dr Peter Haarer and Dr Marco Raabe, who accompanied me on my fieldwork in the Argolid. Without their patience, endurance and humour in the face of all adversity (from unexpected snakes and uncooperative dogs to the omnipresent *pournari*), their keen eyes for pottery and polygonal masonry, and of course their immense skill in manoeuvring a car along windy mountain tracks my research would never have been possible.

Thinking back to this fieldwork, I would also like to thank the people of the Argolid — the local farmers, villagers, beekeepers and shepherds I had the pleasure of meeting during my travels. I am very grateful for their eagerness to share their unique local knowledge of the Argolid's landscape and its obscure archaeological sites, for their hospitality, for their patience with my unusual questions and limited modern Greek, and for their genuine (and to the archaeologist hugely encouraging) delight in seeing a visitor take interest in their local sites. Without their help and co-operation, this monograph would look very different and would not have been such a pleasure to write.

Furthermore, I would like to thank all those who made it possible for me to access archaeological and archival material, especially Dr Jutta Stroszeck, Dr Joachim Heiden and Dr Anne Fohgrub at the DAI Athens (for access to the DAI's archive and archaeological collection), the ASCSA (for access to the ASCSA Student Papers) and Gian Piero Milani at the BSA (for access to several images from the BSA's aerial photograph collection). I would also like to express my gratitude to all authors, artists and copyright holders who very kindly granted permission for the reproduction of plans and images: Prof. Jean-Pierre Adam, Prof. John M. Fossey, Ginette Gauvin, Dr Yvonne Goester, Dr Matthew Maher, Prof. Anna Philippa-Touchais, Prof. Curtis Runnels, Prof. Gilles Touchais, the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, the British School at Athens, the German Archaeological Institute at Athens, the French School at Athens, the Swedish Institute at Athens, the Archaeological Institute of America, the American Journal of Archaeology, Indiana University Press and Stanford University Press. For the images published in the article Goester 1993, the Netherlands Institute in Athens, Dr Yvonne Goester and myself have tried our best to identify and consult the copyright holders. The copyright of all photographs of archaeological sites taken by the author belongs to the Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports / Organization of Cultural Resources Development and the relevant Ephorates.

There are also many people who have contributed to this monograph 'behind the scenes' — academically, administratively and otherwise. In particular, thanks are due to Dr Lita Tzortzopoulou-Gregory at the AAIA, Vicky Tzavara at BSA, and the team at Archaeopress, especially Dr David Davison and Erin McGowan. I am also very grateful to the wonderful staff at Corpus Christi College and New College — the porters, librarians, kitchen and hall staff, and especially the maintenance team, who very kindly made the north arrow and scale bar for my fieldwork. I would also like to express my gratitude to the Clarendon Scholarship, Corpus Christi College, the Thomas Whitcombe Greene Fund and the Meyerstein Bequest for generously funding my studies and fieldwork.

In writing this monograph, I have profited greatly from many conversations and discussions with colleagues in Oxford and beyond. In particular, I would like to thank Prof. Andrew Wilson and Prof. Sylvian Fachard, who examined my DPhil thesis and whose comments proved invaluable on the path from the thesis to the monograph. I am especially grateful to Prof. Sylvian Fachard for several valuable discussions on Greek rural fortifications and for generously sharing his knowledge on the excavations on Argos' Aspis. I would also like to express my gratitude to my former college advisor Dr Jaś Elsner, to my colleagues Stephen Anderson, Dr Chloe Colchester, Dr Pieter Houten, Robin Lane Fox, Prof. Jane Lightfoot, Dr Thomas Mannack, Prof. Andrew Meadows, Dr Milena Melfi and Dr Claudia Wagner, and to the late Dr Mark Whittow, who provided much encouragement during the early stages of this project and will be very sadly missed.

Furthermore, I would like to thank numerous friends and family members for their help, support and encouragement over the past years, especially Rosmarie and Eddy Blomley, Blagovesta Atanassova, Ioannis Chalazonitis, William Guast, Stylianos Ieremias, David Leake, Christina Marini, Patrick Meyer-Higgins, Nefeli Piree Iliou, Geraldine Porter, Daniel Sawyer, Grace Stafford, Fleur Stolker, Daphne Vlanti and Chris Vogel. Very special thanks are due to Jonathan Griffiths, Theodore Hill and Sydney Taylor, who with great generosity and diligence undertook much proofreading for my work, and to Peter Haarer, for whose patience and support over the past years I am more grateful than a simple acknowledgement can express.

Finally, I am indebted — more than to anyone else — to my parents Joseph and Marina, who have been a source of immeasurable and unfailing support, encouragement and love over the past 30 years. This monograph is dedicated to them as a small token of my gratitude.

Note to the Reader

On the transliteration of Greek toponyms, personal names and pottery terms

This study uses the following spelling conventions: Modern Greek toponyms (including all toponyms used to refer to specific ancient fortifications in the Argolid) are transliterated according to the guidelines for contributors to the Annual of the British School at Athens,[1] while ancient toponyms, political communities and larger regions are referred to by the names in general use in anglophone scholarship (e.g. Athens, Corinth and the Peloponnese). This means that different spellings of the same toponym are used to describe an archaeological site and the associated ancient community. For example, 'Mykinai' and 'Asini' refer to archaeological sites, while 'Mycenae' and 'Asine' denote the associated ancient political communities. If alternative spellings for the same toponym are in general use in anglophone scholarship (e.g. 'Kleonai' and 'Cleonae'), the form closer to the Greek (in this case 'Kleonai') is given preference over the latinised version ('Cleonae'), with the exceptions of 'Attica', 'Carthage', 'Corinth', 'Crete', 'Cyclades', 'Cyprus', 'Mycenae' and 'Syracuse'.

For personal names, this study also uses different spelling conventions for ancient and modern names: modern personal names are not transliterated, while ancient authors are referred to by the form conventionally used in anglophone publications (for example Herodotus instead of Herodotos and Plutarch instead of Plutarchos).

For objects, especially pottery shapes, the conventional scholarly names are used, choosing spellings with 'k' rather than spellings with 'c' (e.g. 'krater' not 'crater') and if applicable using the plural ending '-ai' instead of '-ae' (e.g. 'lekanai' not 'lekanae'). The only exception is the plural of 'amphora', which will be spelt 'amphorae'.

On sites names and catalogue numbers

In the Argolid, ancient sites are often known under different names. In this study, each fortification is referred to under one main toponym (in transliteration as discussed above) and the catalogue number in parentheses. In the maps, the sites are labelled by catalogue number. Alternatives toponyms are not mentioned in the thesis itself, but are listed in the descriptive catalogue.

The descriptive catalogue

A descriptive catalogue of fortified sites in the Argolid is included as an appendix. It is divided into five sections: 'A. Fortifications in the Argolid', 'B. Possible fortifications in the Argolid', 'C. Fortifications and possible fortifications in the Argolid: location unknown', 'D. Fortifications and possible fortifications in the Argolid: now destroyed' and 'E. Structures inconclusively or erroneously identified as ancient fortifications in the Argolid'.

For each site, the catalogue includes the following information (if known): the main modern toponym, alternative modern toponyms, the ancient name, the location, the type of fortification, the approximate size, the masonry style, a short description of the site, its finds and its chronology, further information (such as the site's visibility or its historical context) and a short bibliography.

Whenever possible, the location of the individual sites was recorded with a handheld GPS device. These precise coordinates form the basis for the study's maps and GIS-analyses, but for the protection of the archaeological sites were not included in the catalogue.

The final manuscript for this monograph was submitted in April 2021. Any research published after this date could unfortunately not be included.

[1] Guidelines on the transliteration of Modern Greek, viewed 10 March 2021, <https://www.bsa.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/ABSA-Guidelines-rev-March-2020.pdf>.

Chapter 1

Introduction

1.1 Approaching a landscape of conflict

The modern Argolid is a region of contrasts: from fertile plains to inhospitable mountain ranges, from the harbours of Nafplio and Porto Cheli to the landlocked valley of Prosymna, from the urban centre of Argos to innumerable rural villages. At the centre of this varied natural and man-made landscape lies the Argive plain. Covering more than 80km^2 and surrounded by numerous subsidiary valleys, this fertile lowland forms the region's agricultural heartland, as well as one of the key crossroads of southern Greece (**Figure 1.1**).[1]

Over the centuries, the inhabitants of the Argolid paid a heavy price for this strategically and economically desirable location — the brutal Spartan destruction of Argive Hysiai in 417 BC,[2] Pyrrhus' attack on Argos in 272 BC,[3] the events vividly documented at the 6th-century AD refuge cave at Andritsa,[4] the Battle of Dervenakia during the Greek War of Independence[5] and the German occupation of 1943–1944[6] are just some among the many episodes of violence in the region's history. Even today, the Argolid's landscape bears witness to past conflicts and is visually dominated by fortified structures such as the Bronze Age citadels of Mycenae, Midea and Tiryntha, the Byzantine, Venetian and Ottoman walls on Argos' Larissa and Nafplio's Palamidi hill, and the more recent concrete constructions that guard the northern entrance of the Argive plain.

In this strongly fortified landscape, defensive structures from the Archaic, Classical or Hellenistic period seem few and far between, and are often dwarfed by their Bronze Age neighbours and predecessors. However, closer study reveals that this impression is misleading. In reality, nearly 150 fortified structures in the region can be associated (although sometimes only tentatively) with one or several periods of Classical antiquity. Most of these fortifications are located in rural areas and are visually less prominent than urban defences. This may in part explain why these sites have so far received comparatively little scholarly attention, were never collected in a single corpus and have not yet been studied systematically. It is this lacuna that the present monograph aims to fill with the first regional study of ancient fortification in the Argolid.

1.2 Fortification studies: a brief history of scholarship

Many of the Argolid's fortified structures first appeared in archaeological scholarship through the writings of foreign travellers. An unusually early example is the 15th-century diary of Ciriaco de' Pizzicolli (also known as Cyriacus of Ancona),[7] while the majority date to the 19th century.[8] Most travellers were eager to draw connections between military events mentioned by ancient authors and the archaeological remains they encountered in the landscape around them.[9] Their writing thus laid the foundations for a 'military-strategic' approach to ancient rural fortifications, which still continues to influence Classical scholarship today.

Building on this work, many further fortifications were located and recorded in subsequent topographical research, especially during studies on the Argolid's ancient road network[10] and in various surface surveys:

[1] The routes through the region will be discussed in detail in chapter 6, its landscape in chapter 2.

[2] Thuc. 5.83; D. S. 12.81.1.

[3] Plut. *Pyrrh.* 31–34.

[4] Κορμαζοπούλου and Χατζηλαζάρου 2005.

[5] On the Battle of Dervenakia (1822), see for example Gallant 2015: 81–82.

[6] On the German occupation of the Argolid, see for example Kalyvas 2006: 254–65.

[7] See for example Diary V, 63–69 for a description of Ciriaco's visit to the fort of Agios Adrianos (3) in AD 1448 (Wolters 1915: 91–100; Bodnar 1960: 63–64; Bodnar and Foss 2003: 335–39).

[8] The most important 19th- and early 20th-century travellers' reports are Gell 1810, 1817; Dodwell 1819; Gell 1823; Pouqueville 1826; Gell 1829; Leake 1830a, 1830b; Trant 1830; Le Puillon de Boblaye 1836; Forchhammer 1837; Ross 1841; Leake 1846; Wordsworth 1846; Curtius 1851, 1852; Forchhammer 1857; Rhankabes 1857; Vischer 1857; Clark 1858; Conze and Michaelis 1861; Bursian 1862, 1872; Μηλιαράκης 1886; Le Bas, Landron, and Reinach 1888; Philippson 1892; Παρασκευόπουλος 1895; Omont 1902; and Frickenhaus and Müller 1911. Further useful resources are Steffen and Lolling 1884 (documenting archaeological sites in the vicinity of Mykinai (51)), two unpublished papers on the Hermionid (Jameson and Jameson 1950) and the valley of Soulinari (Winter 1950) in the archive of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and the extracts from the diaries of A. Frickenhaus, W.A. Müller, W. Wrede and K. Gebauer in the archive of the German Archaeological Institute at Athens (D-DAI-ATH-Archiv-NL-Wrede, referred to in the following as Wrede 1959). I am very grateful to the ASCSA and the DAI for giving me the opportunity to access these documents.

[9] For example, the now-lost remains at Ellinon Lithari (113) on the Tretos pass were quickly associated with the 'Tower of Polygnotos' mentioned in Plut. *Arat.* 6–7 (Curtius 1852: 512; Bursian 1872: 39). Tausend 2006: 19 followed this traditional identification, whereas Bynum 1995: 60, 83–84, 99 argued for a location of this structure at Agios Sostis (5). Πίκουλας 1995: 177, 348–49; Πιτερός 1997e: 361 suggested an alternative identification with the tower of Phichtia: Limiko (58).

[10] For example Pritchett 1980, 1982; Πίκουλας 1995; Jansen 2002; Tausend 2006; Marchand 2009a, 2009b; Tausend 2020. Most of these

Figure 1.1 The landscape of the northeastern Peloponnese.

the *Argolid Exploration Project* (mostly referred to as the *Southern Argolid Survey* (1972 and 1979–82)),[11] a survey of the plain of Astros (1976–9),[12] the *Laconia Rural Sites Project* (1983–88),[13] the *Berbati-Limnes Archaeological Survey* (1988–90),[14] and the *Nemea Valley Archaeological Project (NVAP)* (1984–1990).[15] Two further surveys have been conducted since the 1990s (the *Western Argolid Regional Project (WARP)* and the *Troizen Archaeology Project)*, but have so far not been published in detail.[16]

Despite the increasing number of fortifications recorded since the 1970s, excavations at fortified sites in the Argolid remain rare, and usually focus on urban rather than rural sites.[17] Notable exceptions are L. Lord's 1930s excavations at various towers around the Argive plain[18] and the work carried out by the Swedish Archaeological Institute at the tower of Prosymna: Pyrgouthi (69) between 1995 and 1997.[19]

Unlike 'travellers' reports', synthetic research on Greek fortifications remained rare throughout the 19th and early 20th centuries[20] — with the exception of masonry studies[21] — and it was not until the 1970s and 1980s that the study of ancient fortifications developed into an independent field of archaeological research. This turning point in the history of Greek fortification studies is marked by the publication of F.E. Winter's '*Greek Fortifications*' (1971) — a work which together with A.W. Lawrence's more technical '*Greek Aims in Fortification*' (1979), J.P. Adam's '*L'architecture militaire Greque*' (1982) and A. McNicoll's '*Hellenistic Fortifications from the Aegean to the Euphrates*' (1997) is still considered a standard textbook on Greek military architecture. Closely related to these studies are publications on the developments of Greek artillery and siege-craft, for example E.W. Marsden's '*Greek and Roman Artillery from 399 B.C. to the 4th century A.D.*' (1969) and Y. Garlan's '*Recherches de poliorcétique Greque*' (1974). More recently, publications that focus on particular types of fortified sites (e.g. F. Lang's '*Archaische Siedlungen in Griechenland. Struktur und Entwicklung*' (1996), R. Frederiksen's '*Greek City Walls of the Archaic Period, 900–480 BC*' (2010), or O. Hülden's '*Das griechische Befestigungswesen der archaischen Zeit*' (2020)) or aim to provide a methodological overview (especially '*Ancient Fortifications. A Compendium of Theory and Practice*' edited by S. Müth and others (2016)) were added to this list of synthetic works.

Besides studies that discuss fortifications throughout the Greek world and beyond, regional fortification studies provide a contrasting and complementary approach to Greek fortified structures. Scholars had already begun to experiment with such studies in the early 20th century,[22] but it was not until J. Ober's influential (and controversial) '*Fortress Attica. Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier, 404–322 B.C.*' (1985) and M.H. Munn's '*The Defense of Attica. The Dema Wall and the Boiotian War of 378–375 B.C.*' (1993) that regional approaches rose to prominence in ancient fortification research. Following J. Ober's work in Attica, further regional fortification studies were conducted in many parts of the Greek world, including Sicily,[23] Epeiros,[24] Achaia Phthiotis,[25] Lokris,[26] the Phokis,[27] Arkadia,[28] Karia,[29] Central Anatolia,[30] Cyprus,[31] Crete,[32] Euboia,[33] Siphnos[34] and the Cyclades.[35] In many of these studies, fortified sites were viewed primarily as military-strategic defensive networks,[36] but more recent publications (such as S. Fachard's work on the fortifications of Eretria[37]) suggest that interpreting

studies were based on extensive fieldwork, which until the advent of handheld GPS devices, satellite imagery and GIS-based data collection still largely followed the methods used by 19th-century travellers, relying heavily on local informants and ancient literary sources.

[11] Jameson *et al.* 1994; Runnels *et al.* 1995.

[12] Goester 1983, 1993.

[13] Cavanagh *et al.* 1996.

[14] Wells, Runnels, and Zangger 1990; Wells and Runnels 1996.

[15] Wright 1990; Cloke 2016.

[16] For the *Western Argolid Regional Project,* see Gallimore *et al.* 2017; Tetford, Desloges, and Nakassis 2018; Caraher *et al.* 2020; Erny and Caraher 2020; James 2020; 'Western Argolid Regional Project (WARP)' (preliminary project information), viewed 5 August 2018, <http://westernargolid.org/?page_id=2>. For the *Troizen Archaeology Project*, see Fouquet 2015; 'Troizen Archaeology Project' (preliminary project information), viewed 5 August 2018, <http://www.troizenarchaeology.com>. Further fortifications have been published in the Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον or feature in regional site catalogues (e.g. Simpson 1965; Φαράκλας 1972a, 1972b, 1972c, 1973; Leekley and Noyes 1976; Simpson and Dickinson 1979; Foley 1988; Simpson and Hagel 2006). However, most of these catalogues focus on Bronze Age sites.

[17] For example at Argos (12) (e.g. Philippa-Touchais and Touchais 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011; Philippa-Touchais and Fachard 2015; Philippa-Touchais 2016; Philippa-Touchais *et al.* 2016), Asini (14) (e.g. Frödin 1938; Wells 1992; Penttinen 1996a) or Porto Cheli (64) (e.g. McAllister 2005).

[18] Lord 1938, 1939, 1941.

[19] Hjohlman et al. 2005.

[20] A rare exception is La Noë 1888. For a history of scholarship, see for example Hülden 2020: 17–35.

[21] See for example Wrede 1933; Säflund 1935; Scranton 1941.

[22] For example in Attica (Tillyard 1905) or Siphnos (Δραγάτσης 1920).

[23] Karlsson 1992.

[24] Dausse 2003, 2011.

[25] Chykerda 2010: 100–24; Chykerda, Haagsma, and Karapanou 2014a: 20–22, 2014b: 287–301.

[26] Dakoronia and Kounouklas 2019.

[27] Typaldou-Fakiris 2004.

[28] Maher 2012, 2015, 2017.

[29] Pimouguet-Pédarros and Geny 2000.

[30] Vergnaud 2012.

[31] Balandier 1999, 2002.

[32] Coutsinas 2011, 2013.

[33] Reber 2002; Fachard 2012; Chatzidimitriou and Chidiroglou 2014; Seifried and Parkinson 2014; Seifried 2017.

[34] Ashton 1991; Davies 1998; Birkett-Smith 2000.

[35] Louyot 2005; Louyot and Mazarakis Ainian 2005; Louyot 2008; Lambertz and Ohnesorg 2018. Regional fortification studies were also the focus of several conferences, for example Leriche and Tréziny 1986; Maele and Fossey 1992; Brunet 1999b; Kourtessi-Philippakis and Treuil 2011.

[36] See for example Maele 1982: 199–205; Fossey 1986: 135–41; Osborne 1987: 155; Fossey 1992: 128–30; Gauvin 1992: 145; Maele 1992: 106; Skorda 1992; Πίκουλας 1995; McInerney 1999: 343–46; Topouzi *et al.* 2002: 559–66.

[37] Fachard 2012. A further regional study that highlights the non-military function of ancient fortifications is Lambertz and Ohnesorg 2018 on the towers of Naxos.

rural fortified structures solely as 'territorial defences' may be oversimplified. This tension between different regional approaches gives rise to the main questions addressed in the present monograph: what is the purpose of ancient fortifications in the Argolid? Were they constructed primarily or exclusively as 'defensive networks' or did they also fulfil functions beyond a strictly military-strategic role?

1.3 Defining the Argolid

Before addressing these questions, it is necessary to define the monograph's scope of study, both geographically and chronologically. Today, the 'Argolida' or 'Argolis' is one of the five regional units of the Peloponnese, comprising of the Argive plain, the surrounding mountain ranges and the greater part of the Akte peninsula.[38] Its name derives from one of three adjectives connected to the toponym Argos: ἀργολίς, ἀργολικός and ἀργεῖος.[39] All three terms first appear as adjectives in connection with a noun (for example τὴν ἀργολίδα χώρην)[40], but by the second half of the 5th century BC Ἀργολίς and Ἀργεία had developed into toponyms in their own right.[41] By the Roman period, both terms could not only be applied to the territory of Argos,[42] but also to a wider region. For example, Pausanias and Herodian use the term Ἀργολίς (and in some instances Ἀργεία)[43] to refer to an area that includes most of the northeastern Peloponnese.[44]

Despite this 'regional' use of the terms Ἀργολίς and Ἀργεία, the pre-Roman Argolid did not form a coherent political or even cultural unit. Politically, the area was divided between numerous city-states (Argos, Epidauros, Halieis, Hermion, Kleonai, Methana, Mycenae, Orneai, Phleious, Tiryns and Troizen),[45] as well as other communities that were over time incorporated into the territories of their neighbours (for example Asine and Nauplia).[46] In the western part of the region, Argos gradually developed into a dominant political centre, so that by the Late Classical period the city's territory included the formerly independent settlements of Asine,[47] Nauplia,[48] Tiryns,[49] Mycenae[50] and Orneai[51] around Argive plain, as well as Kleonai[52] to the north and parts of the Thyreatis to the south.[53]

In contrast, none of the four cities on the Argolic Akte (Epidauros, Troizen, Hermion and Halieis) developed into a dominant regional centre, and — although the four Aktaian cities often fought alongside each other[54] — disputes between them are equally attested.[55] The Kalaureian Amphictyony, probably founded before the middle of the 7th century BC,[56] originally included the cities of Hermion, Epidauros, Aigina, Athens, Prasiai (later replaced by Sparta), Nauplia (replaced by Argos) and the Boiotian Orchomenos,[57] but there is no evidence that it served political or military functions besides its cultic role.[58]

[38] The northeastern Akte and the peninsula of Methana (as well as the islands of Poros, Hydra and Spetses) form part of the adjacent Nison regional unit.

[39] The term ἀργολίς — usually only attested in the feminine form, rather than as the rare masculine ἀργόλας (for ἀργόλας, see for example E. *Rh.* 41; E. fr. 630 (*TrGF*); Ar. fr. 311 (*PCG*) (Hoenigswald 1980: 105–06; Leukart 1994: 307–308; Piérart 2004: 599)) — is first attested in the 5th century BC (A. *Supp.* 236; E. *HF* 1016; Hdt. 1.82.2, 6.92.1), but remains rare until the Augustan period.

The ktetikon ἀργολικός (probably first attested in Hdt. 4.152.4) is more common and can be used to describe geographical features as well as objects (Hoenigswald 1980: 105; Piérart 2004: 599). For a use of ἀργολικός with geographical features (especially the Argolic Gulf), see for example Dem. 52.5; Scyl. 49, for a use with objects, see Hdt. 4.152.4. Unlike ἀργολίς, ἀργολικός is also attested in inscriptions, where it usually specifies metal objects (κρατῆρες Ἀργολικοί (*IG* II² 1424a (369/68 BC); *IG* II² 1425 (368/67 BC)); κυναῖ χαλκαῖ ἀργολ[ικαὶ (*SEG* xix 129 (352/51 BC)) or weight standards (δραχμὰς Ἀργολικοὺς (*IG* IV². i 97 (3rd century BC)). One exception is *Kaibel* 932 (235–200 BC) from Sidon, where ἀργολικός refers to the Nemean games.

The ethnic ἀργεῖος is already attested in the Homeric epics, where it can be used metonymically for all the Greeks (Drews 1979: 116; Wathelet 1992: 105; Hall 1995b: 580, 1997: 90; Cingano 2004: 60; Piérart 2004: 599). On the Homeric use of the toponym Ἄργος for the city of Argos, the Argive plain, the Peloponnese and Greece as a whole, see Wathelet 1992: 99–105, although Drews 1979: 121–24 previously doubted that the term could denote the plain or the Peloponnese. From the 7th century BC onwards, ἀργεῖος also served as a proper city ethic (Piérart 2004: 599).

[40] Hdt. 6.92.1.

[41] For example, Thuc. 5.75.4; Plut. *Ages.* 31.6 (Hirschfeld 1896a, 700; Hirschfeld 1896b, 728).

[42] Ἀργεία: Paus. 2.18.1.

[43] Paus. 2.1.1.

[44] Hdn. *De prosodica catholica*. 3.1.20, 3.1.279; Paus. 3.23.6, 4.2.4, 8.1.2, 8.4.6, 10.9.10, 10.15.1 (Hirschfeld 1896a: 700, 1896b: 728; Piérart 2004: 599).

[45] Piérart 2004: 600, 602–17.

[46] Piérart 2004: 600, 2006: 20–21.

[47] Asine was probably incorporated into the Argive territory during the late 8th century BC (Frödin 1938: 437; Kelly 1976: 44–46, 64–66; Piérart 2004: 600; Ratinaud-Lachkar 2004; Piérart 2006: 20–21).

[48] Kelly 1976: 45, 88–89; Piérart 2004: 602. The historicity of the Argive invasion of Nauplia is doubted by Hall 1995b: 583–84 due to the lack of evidence for a Spartan connection of the city (supposedly the Argives' motive for its destruction (Paus. 4.24.4, 4.27.8, 4.35.2)) and the insignificance of deep-water harbours in the Archaic period. Instead, Nauplia may have become a dependent polis (Piérart 2004: 602).

[49] Kelly 1976: 45–46; Piérart 2004: 615.

[50] Piérart 2004: 612.

[51] Piérart 2004: 612; Shipley 2018: 283.

[52] For the incorporation of Kleonai into the Argive territory, see section 5.1.

[53] The extent and chronology of the Argive control over the Kynouria and Thyreatis will be discussed in section 5.1. Herodotus' claim that Argos once controlled the western coast of the Gulf as far south as Cape Malea and the island of Kythera (Hdt. 1.82.2) is usually considered as unlikely (Kelly 1976: 40, 73, 116–17; Piérart 2004: 599).

[54] Hdt. 8.43, 8.72, 9.28.4, 9.31.3–4; Thuc. 1.27.2, 8.3.2; Xen. *Hell.* 4.2.16, 6.2.3, 7.2.2.

[55] *IG* IV². i 75 (early 2nd century BC); *IG* IV 751 (late Hellenistic), 791 (late Hellenistic); Piérart 2004: 600.

[56] The foundation of the amphictyony is traditionally dated by the *terminus ante quem* of the 7th-century BC destruction of Nauplia (Kelly 1966: 119; Tausend 1992: 13; Jameson *et al.* 1994: 68). In contrast Hall 1995a: 584–85 suggested that the amphictyony may not have been founded until the Hellenistic period, and included the transfer from Nauplia and Prasiai to Argos and Sparta in a deliberately archaising foundation history.

[57] Str. 8.6.14 (Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1935: 102; Kelly 1976: 74; Tausend 1992: 12–16; Jameson *et al.* 1994: 66; Piérart 2004: 600).

[58] Tausend 1992: 16–19; Jameson *et al.* 1994: 67–68. Kelly 1966: 119–21 suggested that the amphictyony may originally have been founded as a coalition against Argos, but later abandoned this idea (Kelly 1976: 74).

Culturally, the 'Argolid' was equally diverse. Unlike the inhabitants of neighbouring Arkadia,[59] the population of the Argive plain and the Akte were not united by an ethnonym or myth of origin,[60] a shared dialect[61] or a common Archaic local script,[62] nor by local cults[63] or common funerary customs.[64] The 'Argolid' thus not only remains politically fragmented, but also lacks the linguistic and cultural characteristics of an ethnic group.[65]

Strictly speaking, the present study thus aims to investigate fortifications in the territory of Argos and on Akte, rather than fortifications in the 'Argolid'. Nevertheless, the term 'Argolid' will be used for convenience's sake, although (unless explicitly stated) not for the modern administrative unit 'Argolida', but rather for the wider area of the Argive territory and the Aktaian cities. This area largely overlaps with the 'Argolida', but unlike the modern administrative unit also includes the southeastern part of the Akte, the territory of Kleonai and parts of the Thyreatis and Kynouria.[66]

As chapter 4 of this monograph will demonstrate, the overwhelming majority of datable fortifications in this area belong to the period after *c.* 400 BC. The political history of the Late Classical and Hellenistic Argolid has been addressed in several recent studies, and thus does not need to be repeated here.[67] For the purpose of this introduction, it must suffice to draw attention to the different 'agents' that dominate the region's politico-military narrative.

Throughout the Late Classical and Hellenistic period, individual city-states were key in shaping the Argolid's history.[68] Besides the local city-states of Argos, Epidauros, Halieis, Hermion, Kleonai and Troizen, the city of Sparta played a particularly important role, exerting considerable influence even after the battle of Leuktra in 371 BC.[69] In contrast to the traditional Argive-Spartan enmity of the Classical period and the 4th century BC,[70] the cities' relationship during the 3rd and 2nd centuries BC was more ambivalent, ranging from a brief Argive-Spartan alliance in 225 BC[71] to Nabis' Spartan control over Argos in 197 BC.[72]

In discussing the role of different city-states, it is important to point out that individual communities did not always act as coherent polities, but that internal division or *stasis* was a recurring event in the political history of the Peloponnese. The cities of the Argolid were no exception: for example Argos experienced a period of particularly violent *stasis* in 370 BC.[73]

Beyond individual city-states and their alliances, formal leagues or confederacies (in particularly the Achaean League) are a major feature in the politico-military narrative of the Argolid.[74] The Achaean League's emergence and history are closely linked to another key agent in the Hellenistic Peloponnese: the kingdom of Macedon. From the 340s until 197 BC, the Macedonian kings exerted various degrees of control over individual Peloponnesian city-states, which was often cemented through local garrisons[75] or the installation of pro-Macedonian rulers.[76] However, there are no signs of an imposition of Macedonian royal bureaucracy; their main interest in the Argolid seems to have been geostrategic rather than territorial.[77]

[59] Nielsen 1999: 22–36.

[60] Argos was considered as Dorian (with an additional Achaian and Pelasgian population), Asine and Halieis as Dryopean, Midea, Mycenae and Tiryns as Achaian, and Epidauros, Hermion and Troizen as Dorian and Ionian. Furthermore, ancient authors mention Karians in Epidauros and Hermion, Dryopes in Hermion and Troizen, and Achaians in Epidauros (Hall 1995a: 11, 1997: 67–77).

[61] Hall 1995a: 13, 1997: 156–58. On the differences between the West Argolic and the East Argolic dialect, see for example Bartoněk 1972; Fernández Alvarez 1981.

[62] Jeffery and Johnston 1990: 114–82; Hall 1997: 149–52.

[63] For example, cults of Apollo, Poseidon and Demeter are common on the Akte from the 8th century BC onwards (for example at Epidauros, Kalaureia, Troizen and Halieis), but not on the Argive plain (Hall 1995a: 13, 1997: 101). Although at least two cultic associations are known from the region (the Kalaureian Amphictyony and the cultic association of Apollo Pythaieus), both include cities outside the 'Argolid' (Tausend 1992: 10–19), and therefore cannot be considered as markers of a distinctive shared culture.

[64] Hall 1995a: 13; Dimakis 2016, but see also Schlehofer 2018: 167–72 for similarities between funerary practices in different parts of the region.

[65] For typical 'markers' of ethnicity in Classical antiquity, see for example Hall 1995a: 9, 1997: 22–25, 32–33.

[66] However, the region of study does not include the valley at the head of the Asopos river, which belonged to the independent Phleious (Meyer 1941: 272; Alcock 1991: 425–28; Piérart 2004: 613).

[67] See for example Kralli 2017; Shipley 2018. For less recent studies of the Argolid's history, see for example Μίτσος 1945; Tomlinson 1972; Jameson *et al.* 1994: 73–101.

[68] For a recent assessment of the role of city-states in the history of the Hellenistic Peloponnese, see for example Shipley 2018: 288.

[69] See for example Kralli 2017: 489; Shipley 2018: 36–37; Stewart 2018.

[70] For the enmity between Archaic and Classical Argos and Sparta, see for example Shipley 2018: 132–133, for several 3rd-century BC conflicts between the two cities, see for example Polyb. 2.64 (222 BC); Polyb. 4.36.5 (219 BC).

[71] Plut. *Cleom.* 17.4–5.

[72] Liv. 32.38–39.

[73] D. S. 15.57–58. For *stasis* in the Late Classical and Hellenistic Peloponnese, see for example Gehrke 1985: 31–34, 53–57, 84–87, 103–06, 127–31, 146–50, 154–59; Shipley 2018: 126–54.

[74] See for example Jameson *et al.* 1994: 90; Kralli 2017: 162–63, 169–70 for the incorporation of Argos, Epidauros and Troizen into the Achaean Leagues.

[75] For Antigonid garrisons, see for example Shipley 2018: 105–26. For a Macedonian garrison at Argos between 315 and 303 BC, see for example Piérart 2000: 309; Shipley 2018: 106; for a Macedonian garrison at Troizen before 270 BC, see for example Jameson *et al.* 1994: 88; Gill 2007: 61; Fouquet and Kató 2017: 103.

[76] For a list of Peloponnesian 'tyrannies' and their 'sponsors' between 371 and 197 BC, see Shipley 2018: 99–103.

[77] See for example Shipley 2005: 319–21.

The Macedonians were not the only Hellenistic power interested in strategically important locations on the Peloponnese. During the mid 3rd century BC, Ptolemy II Philadephos established a number of naval bases around the Saronic Gulf, including at Methana, which probably remained under Ptolemaic control until the mid 2nd century BC.[78] The Ptolemaic kingdom thus clearly maintained an important strategic foothold in the region.

From the late 3rd century BC onwards, Rome increasingly appears as a further political agent. The Roman victory over Philip V at Kynoskephalai in 197 BC marks the end of Macedonian power in the Peloponnese, while the defeat of the Achaean League and the destruction of Corinth in 146 BC clearly established the Roman control over the region.[79] This break in the Argolid's politico-military narrative forms the chronological endpoint of the current study, even though both urban and rural fortifications continued to be inhabited long into the Roman period.[80]

1.4 Studying fortifications in the Argolid: an outline

As noted above, no systematic study of fortified structures within this geographic and chronological framework — the territory of Argos and the Argolic Akte between *c.* 400 BC and 146 BC — has yet been attempted. The present monograph aims to fill this lacuna by combining traditional approaches (e.g. extensive on-site observations, epigraphic research, and architectural studies) with GIS-based methods of data analysis, shedding new light on the functions of rural fortifications by placing them within the context of their surrounding landscape.[81]

All 146 fortifications and possible fortifications in the Argolid are collected in a descriptive catalogue, which forms an appendix to this monograph. For each fortification, this catalogue includes the following information: the site's ancient and modern name, alternative toponyms, altitude, location (if known), type, approximate size, masonry, description of the structural remains, summary of finds, a brief discussion of the site's date, further information and a short bibliography.[82]

The discussion of the sites and their surrounding landscape is presented in seven chapters. Chapter 2 focuses on the Argolid's ancient environment, chapter 3 proposes a typology of fortified structures and chapter 4 creates the first systematic framework for dating ancient fortifications in the region. Chapter 5 discusses political structures and settlement patterns in the Argolid, chapter 6 explores the possible strategic role of rural fortifications, and chapter 7 considers their significance beyond a strictly 'military-strategic' function. The concluding chapter 8 offers a summary of the study's main results.

By combining different sources and methods, the current monograph not only provides the first systematic study of rural fortifications in the Argolid, but also casts new light on wider issues, such as the interaction between natural environment and human activity, or the impact of different forms of conflict on everyday life in ancient communities. It thus not only contributes to our understanding of the specific region, but also serves as a case study to test the potential of GIS-based methods of data collection and analysis in the wider field of Greek landscape archaeology and fortification research.

[78] See for example Gill 2007: 60–63; Fouquet and Kató 2017: 107; Meadows 2018: 135–36.

[79] See for example Shipley 2005: 316; Kralli 2017: 311–79; Shipley 2018: 79–86, 90–91.

[80] For the continued use of towers in the Argolid during the Roman period, see for example Σαρρή 2013, for Roman surface pottery from several sites, see for example Grigoropoulos 2011.

[81] All GIS-analyses were performed with the programme ArcGIS 10.4.1, with an underlying digital elevation model (DEM) derived from the 1 arc-second SRTM digital elevation data (Digital elevation model, viewed 7 November 2015, <http://www.eea.europa.eu/data-and-maps/data/eu-dem>). For the use of GIS-based methods in previous fortification studies, see for example Topouzi *et al.* 2002; Chykerda 2010; Chykerda, Haagsma, and Karapanou 2014b; Seifried and Parkinson 2014.

[82] This information was gathered from previous publications and during on-site visits. Sites that could not be located are listed in the catalogue, but could not usually be included in the analyses.