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Abstract

The focus of the present study is on the archaeological record of archaic (700-480 BCE) contexts found on mainland Greece in the region known as the Argolid. Its main concern is with interpreting the archaeological evidence in terms of human activities to arrive at a better understanding of the cultural and social developments of the archaic Argolid. From an archaeological perspective we can only speak of activities that leave some trace in the material record; here I examine writing, subsistence-related activities, and rituals.

The first chapter deals with inscriptional evidence, attempting to monitor, through the use of writing, the impact of literacy upon Argolic society. Part I shows how the use of perishables can influence our perceptions of the role of early writing in Greece. Parts II and III assess the kinds of literacy that existed, and the areas of society that were literate, within archaic society, particularly within Argolic society.

In the second chapter the survey evidence is given priority, since as many as three Argolic surveys have recently been published. The discussion centres on the exploitation of the landscape by means of agricultural, non-agricultural, and maritime activities, as a way of generating a clearer picture of the region's social organisation.

The third chapter places emphasis on excavation material in an attempt to observe ritual activities in Argolic society. Part I concentrates on rituals of a communal nature, in honour of divinities; Part II deals with funerary rituals, mainly the burial evidence. Both aim to gain insight into the social structures that motivated the ritual system.

An index of sites (Appendix A) accompanies the main text, providing bibliographic and descriptive material for each individual site. Two more appendices (B and C) can be consulted for an overview of metal objects and the location of cults whose divinities are known.
TO MY GRAM,
MY MOTHER AND FATHER,
TRACEY, SHAWN, AND DENNIS
Table of Contents

VOLUME 1:

Abstract ...............................................................................................................................................2
Table of Contents .................................................................................................................................4
Acknowledgements ...............................................................................................................................8
Abbreviations .......................................................................................................................................11
Transliteration of Greek Names ............................................................................................................15
List of Figures ......................................................................................................................................16
List of Tables .....................................................................................................................................19
Introduction ....................................................................................................................................20

Chapter I ..................................................................................................................................28

The Uses of Writing and Literacy ........................................................................................................28

I.1. Direct and Indirect Evidence for the Early Uses of Writing .....................................................31
   I.1.1. INTRODUCTION .........................................................................................................................31
   I.1.2. REVIEW OF PUBLISHED WORKS .................................................................................................32
   I.1.3. KNOWN USES OF THE GREEK ALPHABET. THE DURABLE MATERIALS ........................................33
   I.1.4. KNOWN USES OF PHOENICIAN AND KYPRIOT WRITING SYSTEMS. A COMPARISON ..........34
       I.1.4.a. The Date and Place of Transmission of the Alphabet ..........................................................34
       I.1.4.b. Known Uses of Writing in Phoenicia ..................................................................................35
       I.1.4.c. Known Uses of Writing in Kypros ....................................................................................36
   I.1.5. THE USE OF PERISHABLE WRITING MATERIALS IN NON-GREEK SOCIETIES .................................................................................................................................37
   I.1.6. EVIDENCE FOR THE USE OF PERISHABLE WRITING MATERIALS IN GREECE ..........38
       I.1.6.a. Writing-Tablets ..................................................................................................................38
       I.1.6.b. Papyrus ................................................................................................................................41
       I.1.6.c. Leather ..................................................................................................................................43
       I.1.6.d. Wood ..................................................................................................................................45
   I.1.7. POTENTIAL USES OF THE GREEK ALPHABET. THE PERISHABLE MATERIALS ..................46
       I.1.7.a. What We Would Expect to Find on Perishable Materials .................................................46
       I.1.7.b. Perishables Used for School Exercises and for Relaying Messages ................................47
       I.1.7.c. Other Potential Uses of Perishable Writing materials .......................................................48
   I.1.8. UTILITARIAN VERSUS CEREMONIAL USES OF WRITING IN GREECE .................50
       I.1.8.a. Pots and Potsherds in Utilitarian Contexts .........................................................................50
       I.1.8.b. Potsherds. Unique Survivors of a Whole Range of Materials Used in Utilitarian Contexts ...51
   I.1.9. SUMMARY ...............................................................................................................................52

I.2. Studies on Regional Variations in the Uses of the Greek Alphabet ............................................53
   I.2.1. INTRODUCTION .........................................................................................................................53
   I.2.2. CURRENT OPINIONS ...................................................................................................................54
       I.2.2.a. Whitley's Model ..................................................................................................................54
       I.2.2.b. Defining Literacy .................................................................................................................55
       I.2.2.c. Three Forms of Literacy .....................................................................................................56
   I.2.3. A CONTROVERSIAL VIEW. 'SCRIBAL' LITERACY IN GREECE ...........................................56
       I.2.3.a. Signs of 'Scribal' Literacy in Crete ......................................................................................57
       I.2.3.b. Public Legal Inscriptions in Crete ......................................................................................58
       I.2.3.c. Public Legal Texts in Athens. A Question of Preservation ................................................59
       I.2.3.d. Public Inscriptions in Sparta, or Lack Thereof .................................................................61
       I.2.3.e. Spensithios, The Kretan Scribe .........................................................................................63
       I.2.3.f. Signs of 'Scribal' Literacy in Attica and Elsewhere ............................................................63
       I.2.3.g. The Power of Greek Scribes ...............................................................................................65
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I.2.3.h. The Role of Scribes and the Use of Perishable Materials</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.4. AN EXAGGERATED VIEW. GRAFFITI AS SIGNS OF ‘INFORMAL’ LITERACY</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.4.a. Graffiti in Athens</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.4.b. Graffiti and Literacy</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.5. AN ALTERNATIVE VIEW. ‘CRAFT’ LITERACY</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.5.a. Literate Athenian Artists</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.5.b. Who Could Read in Archaic Athens?</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.2.6. SUMMARY</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3. Another Test Case. Literacy in the Argolid</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.2. SIGNS OF ‘SCRIBAL’ LITERACY IN THE ARGIVE PLAIN</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.2.a. Hiaromnamos as Scribes</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.2.b. Damioergoi as Literate Public Officials</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.2.c. Artynta: Another Group of Literate Officials?</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.3. SIGNS OF ‘INFORMAL’ LITERACY AT ARGOS AND HALIEIS</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.3.a. Literate Soldiers at Halieis</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.3.b. Casual Writers of Graffiti in the Argive Plain?</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.3.c. The Writing of Ostraka at Argos?</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.3.d. Argive Merchants with Basic Reading Skills</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.4. ‘CRAFT’ LITERACY IN THE ARGOLID</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.5. WHO COULD READ IN THE ARGOLID?</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.5.a. Signatures from the Argolid</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.5.b. The Advertising Value of Signed Works</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.5.c. Passers-by and the Reading of Inscribed Tombstones</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I.3.6. SUMMARY</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter II</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Exploitation of the Natural Landscape</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1. Settlements and Agriculture</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.2. REVIEW OF PUBLISHED WORKS</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.3. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEYS IN GREECE</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.4. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEYS IN THE ARGOLID</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.4.a. The Southern Argolid Survey</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.4.b. The Methana Survey</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.4.c. The Berbati-Limnes Survey</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.5. THE ORGANISATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPE</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.5.a. Settlement Patterns in the Argolid: The Survey Evidence</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.5.b. Settlement Patterns in the Archaic Period and their Relation to Agricultural Activities</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.5.c. The Potential Contribution of Historical Events to the Interpretation of Changes in the Late Archaic Landscape</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.5.d. Early Classical 'Farmsteads'</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.6. PASTORAL ACTIVITY AND THE ROLE OF ANIMALS IN FARMING</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.6.a. Sharing the Land between Farmer and Shepherd</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.6.b. Grazing the Uncultivated Land</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.6.c. Those Who Reared Animals</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.6.d. Those Who Owned Animals</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.6.e. The Economic Benefits of Pastoralism</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.6.f. Social Aspects Associated with the Keeping of Animals</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.1.7. SUMMARY</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2. Non-Agricultural Resources</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.2. MINING AND METALWORKING</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.2.a. The Lack of Evidence for Mining in the Argolid</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.2.b. The Exploitation of Nearby Mines</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.2.c. The Lack of Archaeological Evidence for Metalworking</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.2.d. The Miners</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.3. QUARRYING AND BUILDING ACTIVITY</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II.2.3.a. Quarrying of Stone for Building Projects</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Bibliography

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography of Ancient Sources</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature of Religious Rituals</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter III</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Nature of Religious Rituals</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1. Rituals for the Divinities</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.2. REVIEW OF PUBLISHED WORKS</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.3. RITUAL KILLING AND RITUAL DINING</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.3.a. The Archaeological Evidence</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.3.b. The Epigraphical Evidence</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.3.c. Animal Sacrifices in the Rural Landscape</td>
<td>181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.3.d. The Concept of Hospitality</td>
<td>183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.3.e. The Communal Meal. How Communal Was It?</td>
<td>185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.4. PROCESSIONS, GAMES, AND OTHER RITUALS AT FESTIVALS</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.4.a. The Archaeological and Literary Evidence</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.4.b. The Inscriptional Evidence</td>
<td>191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.4.c. The Symbolism of Processions</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.4.d. A Festival without Religious Content?</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.4.e. Behaviour Inversions at Festivals</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.4.f. Rites of Passage</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.1.5. SUMMARY</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2. Rituals for the Dead</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2.1. INTRODUCTION</td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2.2. REVIEW OF PUBLISHED WORKS</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2.3. BURIALS</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2.3.a. The Archaeological Evidence</td>
<td>204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2.3.b. Grave Typology</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2.3.c. Spatial Groups</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2.3.d. Demography</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III.2.4. SUMMARY</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography of Ancient Sources</td>
<td>220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliography</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
VOLUME 2:

Appendices
Figures
Acknowledgements

My first idea was to print only three copies; one for myself, one for the British Museum, and one for Heaven. I had some doubt about the British Museum.

Oscar Wilde, In Memoriam

A topic involving another century, another culture, and another language could never have been attempted, nor completed, in a vacuum. Without the official and unofficial support and advice of scholars and friends, it could never have begun. I owe initial support to Dr. Anne Foley, my mentor and M.A. supervisor.

I am indebted to those who were involved in accepting my research proposal at the doctoral level, Prof. J. N. Coldstream and my Ph.D. supervisor, Dr. Alan Johnston. From the onset, Dr. Johnston gave me freedom to pursue my own interests and provided much assistance at every stage in my research. I am especially grateful to him, for, unlike many supervisors, he agreed to supervise a large part of this thesis from abroad. I am also indebted to those who examined my dissertation for the degree of Ph.D., Dr. Graham Shipley and Prof. Anthony Snodgrass, for their astute comments and expert editing. On a more personal note, I feel fortunate to have met Dr. Shipley while he was Visiting Fellow at the BSA, not only because I respect him enormously as a scholar but also because I (and others) thoroughly enjoy his company and appreciate his dedication to students.

Without the initial funding of ‘les Fonds FCAR (pour la formation de chercheurs et l’aide à la recherche)’ and the Overseas Research Studentship (CVCP), this thesis would have remained an idea, a dream. Two more grants, the first from the British School at Athens (BSA) and the second from the Canadian Archaeological Institute at Athens (CAIA), enabled me to complete my work in Greece.

During my time in London I met some remarkable people both at college (Emmanuelle Curti, Kaelyn McGregor, Manolis Stefanakis, Holly Parton, Sophie Hay, Raffaele Luiselli, Adrian Miles, Keith Wilkinson, Jane Sidell, Dr. Hafed Walda, Eric Nordgren,
and George Carleton) and in halls of residence (Ajay Hauzaree, Vlad Petrus, Oktay Yaman, Ahmed Abdel-Bar, Sunita Phadnis, Reiko Kubota, Naoko, Eva and Nikos, and Bruce Spevak). I thank them for adding a bit of colour to my life in this ‘gray’ city.

In Athens the staff at the BSA and CAIA provided various forms of assistance above and beyond the call of duty. The librarians of the BSA, Ms. Penny Wilson-Zarganis, Ms. Sandra Pepelasis, Ms. Margaret Cozell, and Ms. Anne Sackett, were always there to help me. I also thank Ms. Helen Fields, Ms. Helen Clark, and Ms. Maria Papaconstantinou, the Directors (now Mr. David Blackman, formerly Prof. Richard Tomlinson) and Assistant Director, Dr. Lesley Beaumont, and finally Dr. Ian Whitbread, Director of the Fitch Lab. At CAIA I worked with Dr. David Jordan, Director, and Ms. Katherine Alexander, former Assistant Director, who became ‘une grande amie’. These two friendly communities brightened up my life in Athens.

If I were to thank all my friends, the list would be endless. I limit myself here only to those people who put up with me on a daily basis: during my B.A. Keith Adams, during my M.A. Ian Crystal, José Sabourin, and Michael Beattie, in Athens Damla Demirözü, Michael Boyd, Rebecca Sweetman, Amanda Kelly, Angela Michaels, Roger Doonan, Pauline Gleeson, Koji Mikami, Andrea Nanetti, Leonora Neville, Vasiliki Konortou, ‘Stringy’ Carter, Graham Chandler, Malcolm Nicholson, Seán Byrne, Marie-Claude Boileau, and Elina Stamatatou-Vossynioti. All have (often unknowingly) contributed to the completion of this research. Michael Boyd, Rebecca Sweetman, Damla Demirözü, and Amanda Kelly deserve especial praise here, for their staunch encouragement. I thoroughly appreciated Rebecca’s gracious offer to read through two chapters of this thesis.

While in Argos, I was given the opportunity to work with Prof. J. M. Fossey and his wife, Eleni Zoitopoulou, who taught me a great deal about the Argolid. I thank them for the lovely time I had working and living with them and being escorted to many archaeological sites in the region. I also want to thank Markus Broer, for being a great companion on my fieldwork two summers in a row.

I owe special recognition to Ka. Maria Kostaliatou and K. Takis Kontos, for opening up their house to me and for making me feel at home in Greece.
In the last few years of my research I have not been the easiest person with which to spend time, especially during those long hot summers in Athens. So, Dennis Papaioannou, who willingly and patiently stood by me even at my worst moments, deserves my most warm-hearted thank you. I just want him to know that, ‘What seems to us bitter trials are often blessings in disguise.’

My most faithful companion in Greece was a stray dog named Méli. She sat by my side day in and day out as I was writing this thesis, and her wonderful spirit really enlivened my rather monotonous life. Her recent premature death is weighing heavily on my heart as I write this, and I so wish that she knew how much she really meant to me and how much she will be missed.

Finally, my family: Gram, Robert and Catherine, Shawn and Valerie, and Tracey Beaufils. I feel odd about simply thanking them, for they deserve much more. This thesis is dedicated to them.
Abbreviations

Museums

BM  British Museum, London
EM  Epigraphical Museum, Athens
MFA Museum of Fine Arts, Boston
Met. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York
Mus. Museum
NAM National Archaeological Museum, Athens

Chronology

c.  circa

All dates I give are to some extent merely accepted conventions, and unless otherwise specified are all BCE (before the common era).

Pottery Decoration

bf  black figure
bg  black glaze or black-glazed
rf  red figure

The term glaze is used conventionally as in most publications dealing with black glaze pottery, although the word is inaccurately used. Black gloss would perhaps be more accurate, but so as not to confuse the reader, I retain the use of black glaze.

Epigraphic Notations

[ ]  missing letters, lost or illegible
[...]  three letters lost
[---]  unknown number of letters lost
( )  not shown on artifact, but word is known from other inscriptions or writings and supplied
<>  letter omitted in error
In general, for persons I have tried to represent the Greek spelling by the usual conventions in preference to traditional Latinised forms. Thus, I write Herodotos for Herodutus, Diodoros for Diodorus, but there are certain names and abbreviations that remain in their well-accepted Latinised forms (for example, Thucydides, Plato, Strabo, Plutarch, etc.).

The names of works given are usually those in the Loeb Classical Library, whenever a translation in that series exists.
Abbreviations

AA Archäologischer Anzeiger
AAA Athens Annals of Archaeology
AD Αρχαιολογικόν Δελτίον (Chr = Χρονικά)
AE Αρχαιολογική Εφημερίς
AJA American Journal of Archaeology
AM Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung
AR Archaeological Reports
BAR British Archaeological Reports
BCH Bulletin de correspondance hellénique
BSA Annual of the British School at Athens
CAH Cambridge Ancient History
CIG Corpus Inscriptionum Graecarum
CNRS Centre national de la recherche scientifique
CQ Classical Quarterly
CRAI Comptes rendus de l’Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres
CVA Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum
Diss. Dissertation
É. Édition(s)
Ed., Eds. Editor(s)
ed. Edition
EF École française
EFA École française d’Athènes
To Ἐργον Το Ἐργον τῆς Αρχαιολογικῆς Εταιρείας
fc. forthcoming
IG Inscriptiones Graecae, the corpus of Greek inscriptions published by the Deutsche Akademie der Wissenschaften in various editions (2nd ed. indicated by superscript 2; 3rd by superscript 3: Berlin, 1873-)
JDAI Jahrbuch des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts
JFA Journal of Field Archaeology
JHS Journal of Hellenic Studies
JOAI Jahreshefte des österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien
LIMC Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae (1981-).
MDAI Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts. Athenische Abteilung
nd no date
np no publisher
ns new series
OpAth Opuscula Atheniensia
opus citatum
Πρακτικά Πρακτικά τῆς εν Αθήναις Αρχαιολογικῆς Εταιρείας
RA Revue archéologique
N.B. Throughout this study I shall use the term Greek and Greece, meaning ancient Greek and ancient Greece.
Transliteration of Greek Names

In general, I have tried to be consistent, but complete consistency in the transliteration of Greek into Latin letters is impossible. Except where Latin forms of Greek words, such as Athens, have been effectively assimilated into English, I have resisted the latinisation of Greek words. Thus, I write Korinthos and Kypros, not Corinth and Cyprus. Sometimes, however, there are neither ancient nor modern Greek equivalents, such as Laconian, Attic, and Corinthian, so I have preserved the familiar English forms.

In the text I have tried to use the name current in the historical periods (for example Hermione, not Kastri or Ermióni); however, when referring simply to the site or the area I use the modern Greek name with accents. Also if no ancient place-name exists for a given site or area, I use the modern Greek name.

Finally, the word mycenaean is reserved for the archaeological period (late helladic III) and its culture. Mykenai refers to the site, mykenaians to its occupants in the historical period.

For modern Greek personal names I have tried to keep as close as possible to the modern pronunciation, therefore Georgos Georgas will be Yeorgos Yeorgas.

I transliterate terms using the following conventions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek</th>
<th>Latin</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(αυ)</td>
<td>af or av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ</td>
<td>g or y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(γγ)</td>
<td>ng,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γκ</td>
<td>nk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(γξ)</td>
<td>nx,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γχ</td>
<td>nkh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ευ)</td>
<td>ef or ev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>i or e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ</td>
<td>y or i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ</td>
<td>kh or h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
List of Figures

Figure 1. Map of the Argolid showing the approximate position of archaic sites
Figure 2. Map of the Argolid showing the Argeia and Akte
Figure 3. Map of the Argive plain showing the rivers (Inákhos, Erasinós, Kharadros or Xérias) with the lake at Lerna
Figure 4. Map of the Bérbati region
Figure 5. Map of Methana
Figure 6. Map of the southern Argolid showing the approximate location of its three topographical zones
Figure 7. Greek and Phoenician inscriptions showing assertiveness and a concern for establishing a record of permanence
Figure 8. Seal stone from Gythion (?) declaring ownership (New York, Met. 32), c. mid-sixth century
Figure 9. Ivory writing-board from Marsiliana d’Albegna in Etruria, c. late eighth or early seventh century
Figure 10. Fragment of a black figure pot with a boy writing on a tablet (Brussels, Musées Royaux A 1013A), c. late sixth century
Figure 11. Marble scribe from the Athenian akropolis (Athens, Akropolis 114), c. 520
Figure 12. Terracotta statuette of a scribe from a tomb in Thebes (Paris, Louvre B 114), c. 500
Figure 13. Cup by Onesimos showing a trainer with stylus (once in Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3139), c. early fifth century
Figure 14. Cup by Douris showing a tutor with a student writing on a tablet and a tutor holding a papyrus roll on the reverse (Berlin, Staatliche Museen 2285), c. early fifth century
Figure 15. Red figure sherd by Onesimos showing a papyrus roll with boustrrophedon writing (Oxford G 138), c. 485
Figure 16. Spensithios decree inscribed on a bronze abdominal guard, Krete (London, BM 1969.4-2.1), c. 500
Figure 17. Sacral law mentioning the hiaromnamon, inscribed on a series of stones covering the underground passages at Tiryns (SEG 22.269), c. 600-550
Figure 18. Final clause of a law mentioning the hiaromnamones, on the crowning stone of a structure from the Perseia fountain house at Mykenai (IG IV 493; SEG 11.300), c. 525
Figure 19. Part of a limestone plaque inscribed with a list of armour mentioning the hiaromnamones at Asprókhoma near Mykenai (SEG 11.298), c. 475
Figure 20. Part of bronze helmet inscribed ‘to Enyalios’ from Asprókhoma (SEG 23.187), c. 475
Figure 21. Base for a bronze statuette dedicated by the four hiaromnamones at the Heraion, c. 480-475
Figure 22. Doric capital inscribed with the funerary epigram of Hyssematas from near the Heraion (Argos Museum E 210: SEG 11.305), c. late sixth century
Figure 23. Stone stele dedicated by the four hiaromnamonos at the Heraion (Athens, EM 581; IG IV 517; SEG 11.303), c. 460-450
Figure 24. Stone stele with the name of the fourth Argive tribe, the Hynathoi, from Argos (SEG 41.283), c. 400
Figure 25. Stone stele, reused in Roman times, mentioning the hiaromnamonos at Argos (SEG 33.275), c. 450-425
Figure 26. Stone stele bearing a list of nine damiorgoi from the Larisa at Argos (IG IV 614; SEG 11.336), c. 575-550
Figure 27. Bronze plaque bearing part of sacral law and mentioning the damiorgoi, from the Heraion (IG IV 506; SEG 11.302), c. 575-550
Figure 28. Bronze plaque concerning the treasures of Athena and mentioning the artynoi at Argos or Halieis (IG IV 544), c. 480
Figure 29. Bronze plaque concerning a proxeny for Gnosstas of Oinous, from Argos (SEG 13.239), c. 475
Figure 30. Graffito on a black glaze sherd from Halieis (Náplio, Leonárdho Museum HC 99), c. fifth century
Figure 31. Graffito on an Attic black glaze plate from Tiryns, c. fifth century
Figure 32. Ostrakon (?) of Alkandros on the foot of a black glaze skyphos from Argos (SEG 36.340), c. 475-450
Figure 33. Graffito on the base of an Attic black glaze cup from Argos (Argos Museum 87/43/1), c. 500-480
Figure 34. Inscribed lead plaque from Argos, c. fifth century
Figure 35. Dipinto from the Heraion, c. seventh century
Figure 36. Bronze shield-band with signature of Aristodamos, c. 575-550
Figure 37. Bronze plaque dedicated by Kleandros, from Tourovrysi (?), c. 525
Figure 38. Signature of [Poly?]medes on two statue bases for marble kouroi from Delphi (Delphi Museum 4672 + 980), c. early sixth century
Figure 39. Signature of three Argive sculptors on a base dedicated at Olympia by Praxiteles, son of Krinis (Olympia Museum 12, 23, 28, 20; SEG 11.1250), c. early fifth century
Figure 40. Signature of Dorotheos of Argos dedicated by an Argive at Delphi (Delphi Museum 3840), c. fifth century
Figure 41. Signature of Dorotheos of Argos on a base dedicated by Aristomenes at Hermione (IG IV 684; SEG 11.379), c. 460-450
Figure 42. Signature of Kresilas of Krete on a base dedicated by Alexias at Hermione (IG IV 683; SEG 11.378), c. 460-450
Figure 43. Funerary column inscribed with the epitaph of Damotimos, reused in a hellenistic cistern, from Troizen, c. 550-525
Figure 44. Funerary column inscribed with the epitaph of Praxiteles from Troizen (IG IV 800; SEG 11.387), c. 500
Figure 45. Doric entablature blocks with holes for inscribed bronze plaques from the hypostyle hall at Argos, c. fifth century?
Figure 46. Map of the southern Argolid showing the main archaic sites
Figure 47. Map the Argolid showing the approximate location of the three surveyed areas
Figure 48. Map of survey in southern Argolid
Figure 49. Map of Methana showing the main archaic sites
Figure 50. Survey tracts and steep slopes on Methana
Figure 51. Map of Berbati-Limnes showing the main archaic sites
Figure 52. Map of the survey tracts in the Berbati-Limnes region
Figure 53. Map of the southern Argolid with city-state territories as they may have been divided in the eighth and seventh centuries.

Figure 54. View of Magoula of Sambariza (E9) from west.

Figure 55. Map of the southern Argolid showing ‘farmsteads’ within a four-kilometre range of larger centres.

Figure 56. View of the akropolis of ancient Methana (Megalokhório-Palaiokastro MS10) from south.

Figure 57. Bronze plaque from the sanctuary of Epidauros mentioning Kallippos and his oiketai (SEG 26.499), c. early fifth century.

Figure 58. Plan of the Heraion.

Figure 59. Plan of Argos showing the Deiras, agora, Larisa, theatre ‘à gradins droits’, Stoa Pi, and Hypostyle hall.

Figure 60. The ‘Aspis’ and Deiras of Argos, with a clearing on the lower flank of the hill showing the sanctuary of Apollo Pythaeus.

Figure 61. Temple foundations at Hermione.

Figure 62. Fishhooks from the lower town at Halieis.

Figure 63. Murex shell from Portokhēli.

Figure 64. Map of the Argolid showing the location of sites with evidence for animal sacrifice and feasting.

Figure 65. Roasting spits (obeloi) from Argos.

Figure 66. Plan of Argos showing archaic find-spots.

Figure 67. Sketch plan of Áyios Ilías.

Figure 68. Plan of Epidauros (Asklepieion).

Figure 69. Plan of the sanctuary of Apollo at Halieis.

Figure 70. Map of Mykenai.

Figure 71. Map of Prosymna.

Figure 72. Plan of the hestiatorion (West Building) at the Heraion.

Figure 73. Dedication on a bronze plaque from Kallistratos, the cook at Epidauros (Asklepieion; Athens, NAM 8166; IG IV 1204), c. 450.

Figure 74. Decree from Tylissos, Knossos, and Argos mentioning sacrifices in the context of hospitality, c. 450-400.

Figure 75. Mask from Tiryns (Náfplio, Léonardho Museum).

Figure 76. Inscriptions ‘to Hera’ on bronze vases won in contests at the Heraion, c. 470-425.

Figure 77. Pithos and cist tomb from Argos, c. eighth and seventh century.

Figure 78. Map of the Argolid showing the location of sixth century burials.

Figure 79. Plan of Argos showing the distribution of eighth century burials.

Figure 80. Plan of Argos showing the distribution of seventh century burials.
List of Tables

Table I.1. Attic, Kretan, and Spartan Inscriptions of Archaic Date .............................................54
Table II.1. The Location of ‘Town’ and ‘Village’ Settlements in the Southern Argolid.120
Table II.2. The Location of ‘Farmsteads’ in the Southern Argolid .................................................121
Table II.3. The Location of ‘Town’ and ‘Village’ Settlements in Methana ......................................122
Table II.4. The Location of ‘Farmsteads’ in the Berbati Valley ......................................................123
Table III.1. Sites Where We Find Evidence of Animal Sacrifice and Feasting ..........................173
Table III.2. Sanctuaries of Artemis in the Argive Plain .................................................................184
Table III.3. Bronze Prize Vessels Inscribed to Hera ...............................................................192
Table III.4. Sixth and Early Fifth Century Burials in the Argolid, Excluding Argos ............206
Table III.5. Sixth and Seventh Century Burials at Argos ............................................................207
Introduction

It is because Humanity has never known where it was going that it has been able to find its way.
Oscar Wilde, *The Critic as Artist.*

‘The one duty we owe to history is to rewrite it’ (Oscar Wilde, *The Critic as Artist*). But it is not enough to simply rewrite history; we need to understand in some sense how it happened, how past social systems, institutions, and relations functioned (Renfrew 1984, 3). This approach to archaeology has been called ‘social archaeology’.

A study along these lines assumes from the start that the ancient Greeks, like all other humans, used material culture during the course of their activities to say things about themselves (Morris 1998, 4). There is of course a variety of levels on which one can approach the material culture of a society: for example, studies of the typology or the production of artifacts. My concern here is with contexts of human behaviour and activities.

The focus of this study is on the archaeological record of archaic (c. 700-480 BCE) contexts found on mainland Greece in a region now known as the Argolid (*Figure 1*). My work can be described as an archaeological investigation into past human activities, an attempt to study the effects these activities had on the cultural development and history of the archaic Argolid. Rather than being a strictly problem-oriented analysis, which may miss a great deal, this study takes a more sensitive approach to archaeological exploration and tries to recreate the history of human action. All humans create social structures, and have the capacity to transform them through their actions. My aim therefore is to examine the role played by human behaviour and activities in creating and transforming the social structures of the archaic Argolid.
The Regional Approach

Rarely have archaeologists approached archaic data in this way. There has been surprisingly little consciousness of a site- or even a region-oriented social archaeology in the sense Renfrew gives, although recent regional survey projects have tried to correct this situation. It has become normal for such studies to integrate socio-economic, political, geographical, and ecological variables, and to assume that an understanding of human behaviour can benefit from looking beyond individual settlements. Regional studies allow us to observe the wider context of many activities that affect land use and settlement (Wright et al. 1990, 581-582).

The time is right for a study of human patterns of activity in the Argolid, because as many as three systematic and intensive survey projects in this region have recently been published (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994; Wells [B.] 1996; Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997). The perspective that recent survey work has forced upon the archaeology of the Argolid (and elsewhere) means that we can now study human activities of a specific period in great detail. This is a boon for those studying the archaic Argolid, because reports of regular excavations, rescue excavations, and casual collection of surface remains are largely unpublished.

My analysis of the issues under consideration therefore builds upon a considerable amount of survey work done by others. There are, of course, drawbacks. Because the Argolid has been studied at different times by separate survey teams from different countries, one faces the problem of coping with the unevenness of their methodology and publications.

Geographical Considerations

The Argolid is not a discrete unit with physical landscape uniformity (Figure 2); the Argeia is hemmed in by the eastern mountain chain and thus isolated from the rest of the promontory, the Akte. The core of the Argeia, the Argive plain at the heart of the Argolic gulf, is a triangular area about 195 km^2 surrounded by mountains (Figure 3). Only a small part of this area, the Berbáti valley to the north of Argos, has been recently
surveyed by a Swedish team (Figure 4; Appendix A-19; Wells [B.] 1996). This small plain served the region as a passageway of communication to the Isthmos at Korinthos.

By contrast, the Akte, rather like an isle linked to the mainland, has received more attention from survey teams. Although the Epidauria, the largest and most northern territory of the Akte, has not (yet) been intensively surveyed, a major part of the second largest Aktean territory, the Troizenia, has; a British team recently conducted an intensive survey of the peninsula of Methana (Figure 5; Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997).

At the southern end of the Akte is another peninsula, the southern Argolid, barred to the north by a large mountainous region (the Dhidhyma and Adheres ranges) from the Argive plain, the Saronic gulf, and the gulf of Korinthos (Figure 6). This area, with its three different topographical regions (the upland country, the central zone, and the southernmost part), is the largest part of the Argolid to have been intensively (and extensively) surveyed. A team of Americans has been publishing the final results of this massive undertaking since 1987 (Runnels and van Andel 1987; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994; Runnels, Pullen, and Langdon 1996; Munn [forthcoming]).

**An Historical Perspective**

From a historical perspective, too, the Argolid was separate politically and culturally from the adjacent Akte, at least in the archaic period. We gather that Argos was the largest and most prosperous community of either the Argeia or the Akte in archaic times (Appendix A-10). The texts are unequivocal about Argive hostility to Sparta, beginning no later than the expulsion of the Asinaians around 700, and continuing with Argos’ defeat of Sparta at Hysiai near the Argive border in 669-668 BCE (Appendix A-3; Foley 1988, 31, 166). The Argive king, Pheidon, may have been responsible for many of these activities, but the extent of his domain and his exact dates are uncertain (see Tomlinson 1972, 81-84; Kelly 1976; Hammond 1982, 338-339; Foley 1988, 166-167).

The conflict with Sparta ended in the fifth century with the massacre of the Argives at Sepeia around 499-494 BCE. This defeat allegedly wiped out the city’s male population and encouraged the serf, slave, or perioikic (neighbouring) population of the plain to
marry the wives of the deceased. Regardless of whether any truth lies behind these
stories, the battle itself has interesting repercussions for the history of Argos in the early
fifth century. The Argives used the defeat as an excuse to remain neutral (or perhaps pro-
Persian) during the Persian wars (Hdt. 7.150, cf. 7.61.3). Meanwhile the city recovered
from its losses and regained the strength to destroy its neighbours, Mykenai, Tiryns, and
Midea, in the 460s. These conquests brought about a redistribution of land, a re-division
of the citizen body, and a new political establishment -- democracy.

By contrast, the Akte had never been a centre of political or economic power. The
region’s ‘modest resources and, even more, its limited access to inland Peloponnese have
given it only minor roles in the history of Greece’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel

Previous Studies

In her work on the eighth and seventh century Argolid, Foley (1988) clearly emphasises
the dichotomy existing between the Argeia and the Akte. Unfortunately, the results of
systematic surveys were not fully available to her then, and her discussion of the Akte
was necessarily based on the uneven quality of previous scholarship. Despite these
limitations, her book has become an important reference for any study of the Argolid.
Divided thematically and topographically, it focuses on settlement patterns, graves,
pottery, metalwork, terracottas, seals, inscriptions, and sanctuaries of the eighth and
seventh century Argolid (for a review, see Munn 1994; for an introduction to earlier
periods, see Courbin 1966; 1974, Deshayes 1966, Hägg 1974; Runnels, Pullen, and
Langdon 1995). The index of sites from neolithic to Roman times offers the reader a
short introduction to, and a full bibliography of, about one hundred and twenty sites in the
Argolid.

An equally vital site index for the southern Argolid can be found in Jameson, Runnels,
and van Andel’s A Greek Countryside (1994), thus complementing and updating Foley’s
site register. This survey of the southern Argolid is much more than a catalogue of sites,
however. It covers a broad range of individual studies geared to understanding the
‘pattern of human settlement’ over the past 20,000 years and to reconstructing the ‘human
ecology' and cultural environment of the region (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 214-215). Rightly acclaimed as one of the most thoroughly documented and comprehensive regional surveys in Greece, it can be used as a springboard for many other studies of the (southern) Argolid. This publication, together with the Methana (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997) and Berbati-Limnes (Wells [B.] 1996) surveys and earlier geological work in the Argolid (Lehmann 1937; Zangger 1993), should help to change the pace and focus of Argolic studies in the years to come.

A recent book by J. Hall (1997a) also touches on aspects of Argolic culture from a more fluid, regional standpoint. He draws on archaeological, historical, linguistic, and mythological data from the Argolid in his discussion of ethnic identity in Greek antiquity.

More conservative approaches to material culture have been published in a series of papers delivered in two recent conferences on Argos and the Argolid. The first, held at Fribourg (Piéart 1992), focuses on the geometric period, though a few archaeological contributions by Pariente (1992, 195-230), Kritzas (1992, 231-240), and des Courtils (1992, 241-251) deal with later material. The second series of papers (Actes de la table ronde, Athènes-Argos), published jointly by the French School at Athens and the Greek Ministry of Culture, focuses on the topography and urbanism of Argos from neolithic to modern times (Pariente and Touchais 1998). The articles on archaic material, however, are rather brief and merely descriptive (see Barakari-Gleni and Pariente 1998, 165-176; Pariente, Piéart, and Thalmann 1998, 211-225; Barakari-Gleni 1998, 271-280). Another recent publication by the French School, Argos. Une ville grecque de 6000 ans, serves as a good guide to the city's architecture and archaeological remains, but little else (Piéart and Touchais 1996; on the architecture of Argos, see Vollgraff 1956; Moretti 1993 [J.-C.]; Bommelaer and des Courtils 1994).

Two major historical works on the Argolid were written in the 1970s by Kelly and Tomlinson (see also Wörrle 1964 for fifth century Argos). Kelly's *A History of Argos to 500 B.C.* (1976) is overall well documented, using some archaeological evidence to support its arguments (for a review, see des Places 1978, 352-353; Tomlinson 1978, 194; Cartledge 1978, 89-91). Unfortunately, the author is preoccupied with the problem of dating the (mythical) figure of Pheidon and the whole question of Asine's destruction in the eighth century. Tomlinson's *Argos and the Argolid* (1972) is a handy general study of
Argolic, or rather Argive, history, but archaeological references are few and far apart. The archaic period is summarised in a mere twenty pages.

**Another Study of the Argolid?**

On the whole it seems that much ground has been covered by others interested in the history and archaeology of the Argolid. To a greater or lesser degree, however, these studies reflect the concepts or misconceptions of their own time. This study is no different, because understanding the past depends, in part, on ‘the personal interests and prejudices, and the cultural and even socio-economic background of the archaeologist’ (Dyson 1993, 202). This is especially true of archaeological studies, whose authors essentially strive to collect all the available data, interrogate them in their overall context, look for general patterns, and try to make sense of them. The difficult task of bringing into meaningful relationship the data from different categories of evidence remains solely within the hands of one individual.

To this day, however, few individuals have attempted to publish studies treating archaeology as a basic source for archaic cultural history (cf. Jeffery 1976; Snodgrass 1980a; Boardman 1980; Dougherty and Kurke 1993; Mitchell and Rhodes 1997; Fisher and van Wees 1998). It is fair to say that the field of archaic Greek studies, in the context of analysis of archaeological data, remains relatively untrodden. This is particularly obvious for regions on the mainland outside Attica (Athens) and Laconia (Sparta). Whether it is from a lack of interest or from an unwillingness to deal with the scattered archaeological record of the archaic period, our knowledge of regions such as the archaic Argolid lags far behind. Although certain scholars, particularly Foley and Hall, have done a lot to clarify our overall understanding of the region in the eighth and seventh centuries (both works end at 600 BCE), nothing comparable has been attempted for the remainder of the archaic period. What needs to be examined is the nature of the archaeological evidence in its entirety for the sixth and early fifth centuries, and how it relates to questions of present interest for the region’s history.
Filling in the Gap

This gap in the archaeological record for the archaic Argolid may at first sight seem surprising, given the general importance of the region and the large amount of excavations undertaken there over the last century. Excavators, however, have been mainly interested in bronze age remains and have published little archaic material systematically. Past publications of sites in the Argolid are read as dissected entities. They provide only a selective coverage of the finds, governed largely by considerations of artistic quality rather than by concern for the assemblages as a whole. Usually excavation reports fail to provide any information whatsoever on archaic material, or if do, they leave out vital contextual and chronological information. Hence the number of objects that are out of context and simply labelled archaic.

Following such a catalogue of deficiencies, it might be questioned whether the published evidence can be used to any serious effect. I believe that much can be done through synthesis of extant data, even if it is old or of less than ideal quality. In any case, all archaeological studies must eventually face the problem of a flawed database, because the archaeological record represents only what time and climate have spared from destruction. So, a preliminary step is to bring some order to the haphazard state of the published evidence, currently scattered over numerous excavation reports, by compiling a systematic database of all the material culture (including architecture) mentioned in publications to date. The outcome of this exercise is set out in Appendix A.

Such a systematic investigation of the evidence in its context should then allow for the identification of patterns of human behaviour and activities. From an archaeological perspective, we can only legitimately speak of behaviour and activities that leave at least some discernible trace in the material record. Many do not, because the archaeological record is an imperfect residue left behind by these activities (Morris [I.] 1998, 9). The activities that do, however, can be used to reconstruct vivid images of how the ancient Greeks lived.

Leaving aside eating, sleeping, and communicating verbally, perhaps the most important activities were related to subsistence, for example, farming, tending animals, or fishing.
The religious domain was no less important, however, and worshipping, burying the dead, or participating in festivals and games formed an essential part of ancient Greek life. Another activity that we only begin to trace archaeologically in the archaic period is writing. With the introduction of the alphabet in the eighth century, reading and writing were becoming, for some, routine activities.

This study of human activities is arranged in chapters, each devoted to a specific aspect of the archaeological record. The first is a study of the inscriptional evidence, attempting to monitor, through writing, the impact of literacy upon Argolic society. The second chapter deals primarily with survey evidence. Greeks exploited the natural landscape in a variety of ways, which invite discussions about settlement patterns, land-use, land ownership, systems of labour, status of workers, availability of land and sea resources, and the like. The third chapter on religion gives priority to excavation material, since most archaic artifacts come from religious contexts. Worshipping presents so many ambiguities and difficulties, however, that inscriptional evidence also needs to be considered in this discussion. Moreover, throughout this study the literary record is used 'to constrain the somewhat endless interpretative possibilities which the artefacts present' (Morris [I.] 1998, 6).
Chapter I
The Uses of Writing and Literacy

He would stab his best friend for the sake of writing an epigram on his tombstone.
Oscar Wilde, Vera or The Nihilists.

The social anthropologist begins by learning the language of the society that s/he is studying, trying to see the world as his or her informants perceive it, through direct verbal testimony (Renfrew 1984, 31). The social archaeologist, however, has no such recourse, and the closest one can come to this kind of study is by examining the small body of inscriptive evidence that has survived in the archaeological record. It provides the only direct evidence of ancient writing and language, and thus the first step toward perceiving the ancient world as it may have been perceived by its inhabitants. Here, I emphasise ‘first step’, because the extant inscriptions on stone, metal, and clay are only the exceptions that have survived almost infinitely better than other more perishable substances.

The ‘second step’, then, would be to recognise the potential use of perishable writing materials. Unfortunately, previous studies on the uses of the alphabet and, to some extent, on ancient literacy have ignored this approach, insisting that we cannot assess the quantitative importance of organic materials. Thus, the present view of early writing and ancient literacy is biased and has led to assumptions that writing in archaic Greece was mainly used for public, ceremonial display rather than for utilitarian purposes.

In an attempt to remedy this situation, I begin by asking how the use of perishable materials can influence our perceptions of the role of early writing. The first section of this chapter examines the indirect evidence for perishable materials, and the possibility that they were used extensively for early Greek writing. By showing how other, less permanent, vehicles for writing did exist in Greece, I shall be in a better position to
discuss the potential uses of perishable writing materials in utilitarian contexts. This has serious implications for the ideas presented in Part II of this chapter.

In this section I build on Whitley's (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 761-772; Whitley 1997, 635-661; 1998, 311-331) studies of regional variations in the uses of the Greek alphabet in Attica, Krete, and Sparta, for they comprise the main research dealing specifically with literacy in the archaic period. Unfortunately, however, his studies ignore the possibility that many texts were written on perishable materials and therefore they need to be re-evaluated according to the realities of archaeological preservation and survival.

When we ask what kinds of literacy existed in archaic Greece and what areas of society were literate within a single community, we are told that at least three distinct areas of Greek society practised writing: scribes, artists, and (a few male) citizens. Whitley argues that in Attica 'informal' literacy was widespread among artists and citizens, but that in Krete few were literate because writing was in the hands of scribal class. Both arguments are extreme and misdirected.

I begin by challenging Whitley's view that the invention of the alphabet placed writing firmly within reach of the common Greek (in Attica). Even reading was a highly valued skill in archaic Athens (Hedrick 1994, 162-164). Scholars find it hard to conceive of archaic Greece as an alphabetic culture that retained the need for 'scribal' literacy, but as Whitley has shown for Krete, 'scribal' literacy prevailed at this time. Krete, however, was far from being unique in having 'scribal' literacy. Scribes were at work in the wider world of archaic Greece, and Krete is where we find the best-preserved examples of these processes. Scribes all over Greece probably made extensive use of perishable materials in their daily writings, but of course no evidence of this survives in the archaeological record.

Some might say that a city such as Athens (or Sparta) was in many respects exceptional and that, taken in isolation, is unrepresentative of the cultural and historical environment of archaic Greece. In part this is why, in the last section of this chapter, I turn to the Argolid as another test case. By studying the inscriptions of the archaic Argolid in the light of what is known (and inferred) about Attica, Krete, and Sparta and about ancient
literacy in general, we learn a lot about the workings of a society whose members may have used writing in their private and public dealings with each other.
I.1. Direct and Indirect Evidence for the Early Uses of Writing

I.1.1. INTRODUCTION

In examining the uses of the Greek alphabet we are faced with icebergs: only one-eighth or less of this ice peak is visible to the sailor (Millard 1991, 110). The evidence we tend to recover from the archaeological record is what emerges on inscribed stone, metal, and clay. So it is easy to assume that what we find more or less corresponds to the situation in antiquity; yet inscriptions on stone, metal, or pottery are exceptions rather than the rule (Cornell 1991, 23; Millard 1991, 110). ‘Because of the differential preservation of writing media, ... texts written on [these] durable substances, dominate in the archaeological record, giving us a biased picture of the uses of early writing’ (Postgate [N.], Wang, and Wilkinson 1995, 479). This has led to assumptions that writing in archaic Greece was principally used for religious, ceremonial, and monumental display, and that the Greeks did not initially exploit the potential of writing for administrative and social purposes (Thomas [R.] 1994, 34; Steiner 1994, 76).

In examining the uses of the alphabet we need to consider what is absent (Millard 1991, 110). By looking at Greek literary and pictorial sources, we shall see that the Greeks also wrote on perishable materials such as papyrus, leather, wood, and particularly wax tablets in archaic times (Jeffery 1990, 51; Thomas [R.] 1992, 57). These materials (together with cloth, bark, and palm and other leaves) happened to be more convenient to store than were stone, metal, and clay (pots) and were reusable. Hence, we expect them to serve utilitarian purposes for writing everyday administrative and commercial documents (Postgate [N.], Wang, and Wilkinson 1995, 477-499).

If these ideas hold good for the role of early writing in Greece, they will have a significant impact on our understanding of the uses of writing and, to some extent, of literacy in the archaic period. I begin by looking at evidence from the predecessors of the alphabetic system, since the alphabet was most likely learnt from Phoenicians writing on
wax tablets (Jeffery 1982, 823). I shall then be in a better position to discuss the possibility of perishable materials being used extensively for early Greek writing. This information will serve as groundwork for the next section of this chapter, which deals with the subject of regional variations in the uses of the Greek alphabet. It is from this perspective that I intend to monitor the impact of writing upon Argolic society.

I.1.2. REVIEW OF PUBLISHED WORKS

A whole stream of research has been devoted to determining how, when, and to what degree writing became established in Greek culture (Svenbro 1988a, 1). Surprisingly, few works deal with the uses to which the alphabet was put in specific regions of Greece. I know of only three articles that have taken up the subject of regional variations in the uses of the Greek alphabet: Stoddart and Whitley’s ‘The Social Context of Literacy in Archaic Greece and Etruria.’ (1988); Palaima’s ‘The Advent of the Greek Alphabet on Cyprus: A Competition of Scripts.’ (1991); and more recently Whitley’s ‘Cretan Laws and Cretan Literacy’ (1997). Although R. Thomas’ books, Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens (1989) and Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece (1992), also examine the uses of writing, they deal mainly with classical Athens. Other more general studies focusing on archaic literacy rather than on the uses of the alphabet include Cartledge’s (1978) article and Boring’s (1979) book on Sparta, and Harvey’s (1966) article on Athens.

Much more attention has been devoted to the earliest uses of the alphabet, and less to its later applications. For the early uses of writing in Greece one must read Johnston, ‘The Extent and Use of Literacy: The Archaeological Evidence’ (1983) and Lang, ‘The Alphabetic Impact on Archaic Greece’ (1991), who compares Greek to early Phoenician uses of writing. Useful for a consideration of the early uses of writing in the Near East is Millard’s article on ‘The Uses of the Early Alphabet’ (1991). Though it deals mainly with the alphabets of the Levant, it concludes with some relevant remarks about Phoenicians and Greeks. In addition to Millard’s work, Postgate [N.], Wang, and Wilkinson’s article, ‘The Evidence for Early Writing: Utilitarian or Ceremonial?’ (1995) provides a good overview of bronze age writing in Mesopotamia, Egypt, China, and
Mesoamerica and its role in utilitarian contexts. Some of their ideas, however, are challenged by Wilkins (1996b).

More general works on the subject of literacy include Havelock’s well known Preface to Plato (1963) and Prologue to Greek Literacy (1971), W. Harris’ Ancient Literacy (1989), Robb’s Literacy and the Paideia in Ancient Greece (1994), and of course Goody’s studies on literacy (1963; 1977; 1986; 1987). A different, more fluid approach to literacy is found in the works of Svenbro (1988a) and Steiner (1994), and in the papers found in Detienne’s, Les Savoirs de l’écriture. En Grèce ancienne (1988).

For the study of Argolic epigraphy, the following standard sources should be consulted: Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (hereafter SEG), L’Année philologique and L’Année épigraphique, and Jeffery’s The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece (1961), revised, with a supplement by Johnston, in 1990. Also Foley’s (1988) study of the Argolid and J. Hall’s Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity (1997a) further emphasise the dichotomy between the Argive plain and the Akte through inscriptions and script.

I.1.3. KNOWN USES OF THE GREEK ALPHABET. THE DURABLE MATERIALS

Since we can read Greek, we can come near to deciphering the meanings of inscriptions and some rules that standardise their use (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 763). Studies in the uses of writing have grouped extant inscriptions by type according to their subject matter (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 761-772; Palaima 1991, 455ff.; Whitley 1997, 635-661). Following by and large the descriptions in the standard publications, they came up with six different categories, which I define briefly as follows:

- **legal texts**, including law codes (sacred and secular), decrees, lists (of official names, casualties, finances, armour, etc.) records (of public works, treasure), boundary markers, and other public documents, carved on stone or engraved in metal by a professional mason or smith;
- **inscribed gravestones**, carved on stone probably by a professional mason (cf. Viviers 1992);
- **dedicatory inscriptions**, carved on stone or metal by a professional mason or smith;
- **dipinti**, painted on pottery by a professional pot painter before the pot was fired;
dedicatory graffiti, scratched on pottery, either by the dedicator or by a professional, to designate an object as a votive offering; onomastic graffiti, scratched on pottery (sometimes on stone) either by the person who wrote his/her own name or by a professional.

The earliest alphabetic inscriptions do not predate the eighth century. During the eighth and early seventh century some individuals wrote graffiti or dipinti on pottery. We find the names of owners names scratched on pots and graffiti marking the contents of vessels (Johnston 1983, 65-67; Jeffery 1990, 427). From about 700 BCE we also find labelled offerings to the divinities, messages, abecedaria, love/hate names, and boasts that so-and-so could write. Some Greeks also chose to write longer inscriptions, as long as a few lines, usually in verse (Robb 1994, 44). Later on, vase painters also wrote names, often their own names as signatures or the names of mythological figures that were painted on pots before firing took place. These we call dipinti.

We know of a few early formal texts from Greece. Many of the early surviving formal inscriptions on stone include legal texts (especially sacred laws) and funerary monuments. The first appearance of public legal texts comes from seventh century Krete: the so-called laws on stone blocks from Dreros (Jeffery 1990, 315; Whitley 1997, 635-661; 1998, 311-331). A few marked tombstones appear in the first half of the seventh century (Thomas [R.] 1992, 59).

I.1.4. KNOWN USES OF PHOENICIAN AND KYPRIOT WRITING SYSTEMS. A COMPARISON

I.1.4.a. The Date and Place of Transmission of the Alphabet

Although considerable controversy exists over the exact place and date of transmission of the alphabet (for a detailed review of the contrasting position, see Bernal 1990, 1ff.; Jeffery 1990, 1-42, 425-428; more recently, Woodard 1997), many scholars assume that at some point in the eighth century the Greeks learnt to write from the Phoenicians (the Osteria dell’ Osa graffito is of c. 775; Hdt. 5.57-58.2; Jeffery 1982, 823; 1990, 3ff.; Thomas [R.] 1992, 54, 56). It is generally agreed that the alphabet was transmitted in one place only, though the place of transmission is disputed (Jeffery 1990, 6).

Guarducci (1987, 18) favours Krete, because its alphabet shows some similarities with the Phoenician script, because Krete had close links with Phoenicia, and because it had the
added advantage of being in a good position to transmit the alphabet to the rest of Greece. Jeffery (1990) disagrees with this theory and believes that Krete must have derived its alphabet from the commercial city of Al Mina in Syria. Alternatively, Johnston (1983, 63-68) suggests Kypros as a strong candidate for the place of transmission of the alphabet. A more recent study supports the idea that the Greek adapters of the Phoenician script must have been Kypriot scribes accustomed to writing with the syllabic Kypriot script (Woodard 1997).

If the adaptation of the Phoenician script for Greek use was the work of Kypriot scribes, it is inherently probable that the Greeks were influenced by both a Phoenician and a Kypriot tradition. This brings us to consider whether they used the alphabetic script ‘for all of the various purposes for which the [Kypriot] syllabic … [and Phoenician scripts were] used’ (Woodard 1997, 256).

First we turn to Phoenicia.

I.1.4.b. Known Uses of Writing in Phoenicia

Though royal and formal texts of various types have been found in Phoenicia between 1200 and 900 BCE, so far no ostraka, graffiti, or seals come from this period (Millard 1991, 106). After a gap of about one hundred years, inscriptions re-emerge, taking the form of graffiti, formal and ‘occasional’ inscriptions, and seals (Millard 1991, 106).

At this time it was common to write graffiti on pots, usually notes of content or of purpose, or owners’ names. Lang (1991, 66ff.), who compares some of the early Greek graffiti with documents typical of what the Phoenicians were writing in the tenth and ninth centuries, maintains that the two societies share a similar assertiveness and interest in creating documents of permanence (Figure 7).

Although we find few monumental inscriptions in Phoenician from the homeland until Persian times, we know of some ‘colonial’ Phoenician inscriptions from the eighth century (Robb 1994, 282 n4; McCarter 1975). A similar concern with establishing a record of permanence appears in these short formal texts (Lang 1991, 7; Millard 1991, 105).
Seals with inscribed legends of owner’s or maker’s marks begin to be written in the eighth century. Almost all published Phoenician seals have motifs, which express identity (Millard 1991, 105-106). We find the same thing happening in Greece, where seal designs of the geometric and archaic periods usually appear without inscriptions but are nonetheless identifiable by their personal blazons (Boardman 1970, 158). One of the few inscribed examples that has survived from mainland Greece (Gythion ?) was cut about the mid-sixth century, declaring ownership; the name is set in two lines, as on the earlier Phoenician stones and in Aramaic and Hebrew glyptic (Figure 8; New York 32: Boardman 1970, 141; Millard 1991, 111). It seems likely that the Greeks learned the art of seal carving from the Kypriots (and the Ionians), who in turn were influenced by the Phoenicians (see Richter 1968, 45; Boardman 1970, 140-141; Reyes 1994).

I.I.4.c. Known Uses of Writing in Kypros

When we look at the inscriptional evidence from Kypros, a slightly different picture emerges. The earliest Kypriot syllabic text has been found on one of three inscribed obeloi (roasting spits) in an early Kypriot Geometric I (c. 1050-950 BCE) tomb at Palaepaphos-Skales; other written signs have been identified in the dromoi of two tombs and on a bronze cup (Masson [E.] and Masson [O.] 1983, 411-415; Palaima 1991, 451). As Palaima (1991, 452) points out, these finds substantiate the idea of a transitional stage between the bronze age Kypro-Minoan writing and the Kypriot syllabary. This material also indicates that a predecessor of the historical Kypriot syllabic may have been in use at an earlier date than the canonical date of about 825-775 for the introduction of the Greek alphabet.

The next relatively securely dated and identified inscriptions in Kypriot syllabic are vase inscriptions (graffiti and dipinti), dedications, funerary inscriptions, seals, and clay tablets of the eighth to sixth centuries. One of the earliest inscriptions is on jug (Kypriot Geometric III style) from Polis, with five (non-alphabetic) signs painted on it before it was fired (Karageorghis and Karageorghis 1965, 351-359). In the seventh century we find several graffiti, ownership inscriptions on metal vases, dipinti, and seals (Palaima 1991, 470-471).
The absence of public legal texts in archaic Kypros is odd when compared to the regular use of the Greek alphabet for such documents in Greece, especially in Krete, where the amount of legal texts is exceptional (Palaima 1991, 465).

The common use of Kypriot syllabic script on seals and rings also seems peculiar in comparison with the use of Greek alphabetic writing on archaic seals elsewhere in the east Mediterranean, and deserves further attention. According to Palaima (1991, 456-457), almost all the inscribed seals (seventh-fifth century) have Kypriot syllabic script, though one is Eteocypriot, two are Phoenician, and three are in Greek alphabetic script. In his view the high proportion of Kypriot syllabic texts indicates a clear penchant for the island's 'national' script by the Greek-speaking population of the archaic period.

Another oddity of Kypriot writing has been noted by Palaima (1991, 457-458). It concerns the use of clay tablets, restricted as far as we can tell to Kypriot syllabic writing. The three examples so far discovered deal with cult regulations and accounting. Another tablet, not of clay but of limestone, lists numerals.

I.1.5. THE USE OF PERISHABLE WRITING MATERIALS IN NON-GREEK SOCIETIES

If the Greeks used the alphabet to do what the Hebrews, the Phoenicians, and the Kypriots had done with their letters for generations, they perhaps also adopted some of the materials upon which these people wrote. Besides stone, metal, and clay, these cultures also used perishable materials for writing.

Some scholars believe that the (Kypriot) Greeks learned to write from Phoenicians writing on wax-tablets (Braun 1982, 28; Jeffery 1982, 823). Although we have no surviving wax-tablets from Phoenicia, the fact that they were repeatedly used among Aramaic scribes suggests that the Phoenicians had them too (Millard 1991, 112). Such writing-boards have a long tradition of use in the Near East (Shear [M. I.] 1998, 187-189). The late bronze age shipwreck at Ulu Burun, off the coast of Turkey, provides us with the earliest extant example (Bass 1986, 269-296; 1990, 169; Bass and Pulak 1987, 321; Bass et al. 1989, 10-11). The small, ivory-hinged, wooden board was instantly identified as a writing-board. Mention of the wooden writing-board is made in Babylonian tablets from the late third and early second millennia, indicating that it was a well-established writing material (Millard 1991, 113).
Another popular writing material was papyrus. We know from the literary sources and from seals or clay bullae (impressions made by seals, once attached to papyrus rolls) that the Phoenicians wrote on papyri (Millard 1991, 112). The first clear clue that the use of papyrus had stretched beyond the borders of Egypt appears in a text of c. 1100 BCE, generally known as ‘The Voyage of Wen-Amon’, who travelled from Egypt to Phoenicia taking with him, *inter alia*, five hundred rolls of fine papyrus (Driver 1965, 82; Lewis [N.] 1974, 84). The biblical texts (*Jeremiah* 36.29-32) are also revealing: they speak of written messages exchanged between kings, and from courts to local officials, thus implying the existence of writing on papyrus (Millard 1991, 110). Moreover, we have tangible witnesses to the papyri that have perished -- the clay bullae.

If the Phoenicians wrote on leather, the same argument applies. The Egyptians used leather scrolls on a daily basis; they were probably cleaned for repeated reuse (Millard 1991, 112). Undoubtedly, the Phoenicians used them as well.

Woodard (1997, 256) maintains that the Kypriot scribes had at different times written verses in syllabic script on perishable materials. They may have also recorded legal documents on less permanent materials such as wood, bronze, or even clay (Palaima 1991, 466).

**I.1.6. EVIDENCE FOR THE USE OF PERISHABLE WRITING MATERIALS IN GREECE**

From what we have seen of Phoenician (and Kypriot) writing habits, we gather that organic writing materials were readily and widely used in these lands. Now the question remains: did the Greeks adopt some of the materials upon which these people wrote? The answer is inevitably rather speculative, but the literary and pictorial sources, supplemented by archaeology, point a way forward.

**I.1.6.a. Writing-Tablets**

We first encounter the word for writing-tablets (*pinakes*) in Homer’s story (*II. 6.168-169*) of the letter that King Proitos, king of Tiryns, sent with Bellerophon, who carried to Lycia a coded message ordering the messenger’s death sentence (see Bellamy 1989, 289-307).
To slay him he [Proitos] forebore, for his soul had awe of that; but he sent him [Bellerophon] to Lycia, and gave him mournful signs, engraved in a folded tablet (grapsas en pinaki ptykto) many deadly things, and bade him show these to his own father-in-law [Iobates], that he might be slain (II. 6.168-169, adapted from the Loeb translation, Murray 1937; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 1).

The tablet (here a pinax, an equivalent to deltos) was folded and no doubt sealed, to prevent Bellerophon from deciphering its (non-alphabetic ?) signs (Schmidt 1920, 58; Einarson 1967, 13). It was probably made of wood or some other perishable material. Whether it was covered with wax, as in later examples (Hdt. 7.239, 8.135), remains open to question.

Another early clue to the use of writing-tablets in Greece comes from an archaeological context; it is the eighth or early seventh century ivory writing-board from a grave in Marsiliana d’Albegna in north Etruria (Figure 9; Florence, Museo Archeologico: Diringer 1963, 273; Jeffery 1984, 377-378; 1990, 236f.; Millard 1991, 112-113). This type of tablet was originally hollowed out in the centre and filled with wax, where letters were engraved in the wax with a stylus (of bone, metal, or wood). Although all the wax has vanished, some writing was incised retrograde on the ivory edge of the tablet. On it we can see twenty-two north-west Semitic letters together with the Greek letters Υ, Χ, Φ, Ψ, supporting the view that the Etruscans adopted a Greek alphabet perhaps from Euboia, to judge from its letter-forms (Diringer 1963, 273; Jeffery 1984, 377). The implication is that the Greeks already used writing-tablets before the alphabet was passed on to Marsiliana sometime in the late eighth or early seventh century.

Apart from the Marsiliana tablet and the reference in Homer, I know of no other early evidence for the use of writing-tablets at a time when the Greeks were learning the alphabet. However, a careful inspection of some of those ‘items of unknown purpose’ from geometric and archaic sites in Greece may reveal some ivory, bone, or bronze pieces that will turn out to be either from writing-tablets, or even perhaps from styli (Postgate [N.], Wang, and Wilkinson 1995, 476). Such was the case after they found the Ulu Burun tablet; when additional hinges from the Near East and the Greek mainland, whose significance had previously mystified archaeologists, were identified as such, the
extensive use of writing-tablets was eventually acknowledged (Payton 1991, 99-106; Shear Mylonas 1998, 187).

The earliest representation of a writing-board known to me dates to the end of the sixth century (Figure 10; Belgium, Musées royaux d'art et d'histoire A1013A: Bioul 1989, no. 5). The scene, on a black figure fragment, depicts a boy, most likely a student, sitting on a stool with a wax-tablet on his lap and a stylus in his right hand. Another figure stands in front of him holding a baton; this must be the schoolmaster. The idea that students learned how to read and write with wax-tablets in the sixth century further supports the view that the writing-tablet was a medium used for teaching the alphabet, perhaps since the days of its Phoenician transmission.

Another early representation (c. 520 BCE) of writing-boards can be seen resting on the laps of seated marble scribes from the Athenian akropolis (Figure 11; Athens, Akropolis Mus. 114: Payne [H.] 1950, 47, 74; Trianti 1998, 29-33). A similar scribe appears in the form of a clay figurine (c. 500 BCE) from a tomb in Thebes (Figure 12; Paris, Louvre B114: Mollard-Besques 1954, 20, pl. 15). This so-called seated scribe holds a stylus and a red diptych tablet bordered in yellow. The letters engraved on the tablet remain impressed in the clay.

Writing-tablets continued to be used throughout the fifth century, for we find an increasing amount of pictorial and literary references to them (Immerwahr 1964, 18ff.). The theme of the seated student or trainer writing with stylus and tablet occasionally fills out the tondo of early fifth century red figure cups: for example, one from Italy by Onesimos depicts a trainer with stylus (Figure 13; Berlin, Staatliche Mus. inv. 3139: ARV 321 no. 23; Immerwahr 1964, 19; Boardman 1975, fig. 235), and another in the Philadelphia University Museum (4842) shows a seated young man with tablet and stylus (ARV 231; Immerwahr 1964, 17-48). One early fifth century red figure cup (by Douris) from Cerveteri depicts a young student holding a wax-tablet on one side and a bearded man (trainer ?) holding a papyrus roll on the reverse (Figure 14; Berlin, Staatliche Mus. inv. 2385: ARV 431 no. 48; Daremberg and Saglio 1892, 468; Immerwahr 1964, 19; Boardman 1975, fig. 289).
These scenes serve as a reminder that organic materials were used on an ‘everyday’ basis, in environments where the alphabet was being taught to young men (perhaps as many as one hundred and twenty per school, based on Herodotos’ (6.27) story of the boys who escaped the collapsing roof in a Khiot school) at least as early as the fifth century. The alphabet was also taught to young women, as a fifth century female figurine holding a tablet on her lap testifies (Athens, NAM 12706). Immerwahr (1964, 27) believes that women may have learned how to write at home, since we have no direct evidence for girls’ schools (see also Guettel Cole 1981, 219-245).

In the written sources of this period writing-tablets appear in the form of (military) messages and state records. Herodotos (7.239) uses the word δελτος when Demaratos (c. 515-491 BCE), Ariston’s son, sends a message to the Spartans: he ‘took a double tablet, scraped away the wax, and then wrote Xerxes’ intention to march into Greece on the wood ...’ (Adapted from Loeb translation, Godley 1928). Later on in his Histories Herodotos (8.135) refers to Thebans writing on tablets for the city.

When a man called Mys entered into the temple, three men of the town following him that were chosen on the state’s behalf to write down the oracles that should be given (apo tou koinou hos apograpomenous ta thespieein emelle), straightaway the diviner prophesied in a foreign tongue. The Thebans that followed him were astonished to hear a strange language instead of Greek, and knew not what this present matter might be; but Mys of Europus snatched from them the tablet (delton) that they carried and wrote on it that which was spoken by the prophet, saying that the words of the oracle were Carian; ... (Adapted from Loeb translation, Godley 1930; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 2).

I.1.6.b. Papyrus

In antiquity papyrus grew almost exclusively in Egypt. The early stages of the introduction of papyrus to the Greek world are inferred from depictions of papyrus plants on Minoan pots, although we have no evidence that Minoan Krete ever had papyrus, much less wrote on it.

From a reference to papyrus rope in Homer (Od. 21.390-391) we know that this world knew something of Egypt and had either seen or heard of papyrus (Lewis [N.] 1974, 85). ‘Now there lay beneath the portico the cable of a curved ship, made of bublos [papyrus]
plant, wherewith he made fast the gates, and then he himself went within.’ (Adapted from Loeb translation, Murray 1942; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 3). Papyrus rope is also mentioned by Herodotos (7.25): Xerxes charged both the Phoenicians and the Egyptians with the making of the ropes of papyrus and linen for his bridge over the Hellespont.

It is likely that papyrus products entered Greece early, perhaps in the bronze age, but it remains uncertain when the Greeks got to know papyrus as a writing material. Some maintain that the Greeks knew nothing of papyrus rolls until they set up trading contacts with Egypt, either during the rule of Psammetikhos I (c. 664-610 BCE), or when the Greek merchants were able to establish a commercial centre of their own in the Nile delta (c. 615-600 BCE), the city of Naukratis (Austin 1970, 20ff.).

Phoenician traders visited the settlements of Greek traders in the (papyrus-using) Levant from in the late ninth or early eighth century (Lewis [N.] 1974, 85). Therefore, some have maintained that the Greeks came into contact with papyrus through a Phoenician intermediary rather than through Egypt (Austin 1970, 36). Those who make this assumption support it with the Greek name for papyrus, *bublos* or *bublion* (*biblion*), also the Greek name for the Phoenician port of Gebal (Jeffery 1990, 56). As Jeffey concludes, the derivation of *bublos* from the city of Byblos points to Phoenicia as the original source for papyrus. Even though this view has been challenged on philological grounds, for possibly the Greeks actually gave Byblos its name from the material and not vice versa (Masson [E.] 1967), the likelihood of a Phoenician intermediary remains strong.

Certainly, the Phoenician scribes made use of papyrus rolls (see above), and we suppose that along with the alphabet the Greeks obtained from the Phoenicians the materials upon which to write (Austin 1970, 36; Jeffery 1990, 56; cf. Page 1964, 163). By the early sixth century, when clearly the Greeks began trading directly with Egypt, there is no doubt that papyrus was being used by the Greeks (Austin 1970, 36; Lewis [N.] 1974, 87; Jeffery 1990, 56). An interesting remark in support of a sixth century date is Herodotos’ (5.58) declaration that during his time (i.e. early fifth century) the Ionians still called papyrus rolls ‘skins’. Such a remark would be pointless, if papyrus had just then begun to be used for writing (Lewis [N.] 1974, 88).
We also have pictorial examples of papyrus rolls depicted on Greek vases and on figurines from the sixth century onwards (see Walters 1903, 51; Birt 1907, 158-159; Immerwahr 1964, 18ff.; Robb 1994, 186). For the most part they resemble the previous scenes with writing-tablets (for more examples, see Immerwahr 1964, 17-48). We see tutors using papyrus rolls for dictation (Immerwahr 1964, 20). One example of a school scene painted on a red figure sherd by Onesimos (Figure 15; ARV 222 no. 55; Oxford G 138, Immerwahr 1964, 19) actually shows boustrophedon writing on the papyrus roll. According to Jeffery (1990, 76), this style of writing was perhaps a deliberate attempt to show the antiquity of the roll.

The use of papyri in non-public contexts is known only from a late source (Athenaeus, Deipnosophistai 1.3a, AD 200). Athenaeus writes about the fashion of 'sovereigns' who collect books (and oracles on papyrus rolls), and traces it back to two tyrants of the sixth century, Polyclrates of Samos and Peisistratos of Athens (Lewis [N.] 1974, 88). It is also said that Solon, a poet and a scholar himself, had collected a 'library'. Although we imagine that it might be easy for a tyrant to found a 'library' in Samos, where contact with merchants who used papyrus was closer than it was on mainland Greece (Jeffery 1990, 331), we must beware of interpreting these late reports too literally. Unfortunately, the earliest known Greek papyrus that was probably used in a private context, because it was discovered along with personal goods in an Athenian tomb (dubbed the poet's tomb), dates to no earlier than the (? second half of the) fifth century (Catling 1982, 11; Cockle 1983, 147; Immerwahr 1990, 171 n1; Parkinson and Quirke 1995, 65-66). We may never know its contents; the papyrus itself is badly preserved and remains unpublished.

I.1.6.c. Leather

The Greeks most likely derived the usage of leather for writing from the Phoenicians (Hdt. 5.58; Jeffery 1990, 58). 'It cannot have been a cheap product, for ... the process of preparing it [the skin] ... was laborious, and the hides of sacrificed animals usually went to the temple officials, who were not to resell at a loss' (Jeffery 1990, 58). A leather scroll was reusable, however; the ink just needed to be wiped off or perhaps 'washed out' (Jeffery 1990, 58).
Herodotos (5.58), in telling how the Ionian Greeks became acquainted with Phoenician writing and learning, remarks: 'And so in the old days, for lack of papyrus, the Ionians called papyrus-sheets skins and used to employ the skins of goats and sheep; and even to this day there are many foreigners who write on such skins.' (Adapted from Loeb translation, Godley 1928; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 4). He fails to suggest a date for the prevalence of this practice; but Jeffery (1990, 57) finds two clues in other sources that offer some help. The first has to do with the relation between leather and the character of eastern Ionic lettering in sixth century stone inscriptions from Samos, Miletos and Khios.

Compared with the contemporary lettering of mainland Greece it is small, hasty and often untidy ... The Ionic script approximates to a cursive script; and it may be inferred that this as not due to chance, but that in Ionia the practice of writing on ἰσίδεραι [skins] had become sufficiently common for the contemporary cursive hand to influence the formal lettering of the masons ... the practice of writing on ἰσίδεραι was well established by c. 575 (Jeffery 1990, 57).

The second clue appears in a fragment from Pindar (c. 518-434 BCE). In his Olympian Ode 6, 154 Pindar calls the leader of his chorus skytala Moisan (σκυτάλη of the Muses). The use of skytale, best known as a method of sending dispatches within Spartan military ranks (Plutarch, Lycurgus 19; Aul. Gellius 17.9; cf. Thuc. 1.131.1; Xenophon, Hellenica 3.3.8; Diehl 1952, 36, F 81; Page 1964, 136; Jeffery 1990, 58), has been argued to be highly unlikely (Hornblower 1996, 1415).

When Euripides (c. 485-406 BCE) wants to make Apollo’s oracles at Delphi seem older, from antiquity, he writes of ‘ink-dripped skins’ (ἰσίδεραι μελαγγαφεῖς, Nauck 1964, 556, F 627), thus reflecting the primitive associations that the leather roll had for the Greeks of the classical age and indicating that it was used beyond Ionia (Jeffery 1990, 58). It is worth noting here that Amandry (1950, 149ff.) believes the Delphic oracles to have been recorded not on leather but on wax-tablets.

There is also reference to written ἰσίδεραι in a sixth century lead letter from Olbia (Vinogradov 1981).
I.1.6.d. Wood

Wood served the Mediterranean world for documents and letters from an early date. Pliny (NH 13.88) draws attention to the implication of its use in Homer’s time (Il. 6.168f. -- Proteus’ letter to Bellerophon on a tablet no doubt made of wood).

In the early archaic period the Greeks used wood for ‘their cult-statues and the structural parts of their buildings [see Paus. 2.19.3], before they mastered the art of carving in stone on a monumental scale …’ (Jeffery 1990, 51). For all we know, wood may have been used as extensively as stone for writing, since the literary sources (West 1972, 141-142, F 36.18-20; Paus. 1.18.3; Plutarch, Solon 25) inform us that Solon’s laws were painted on a set of wooden axones, later to be replaced by stone or bronze (for a discussion of axones, see below; Thomas [R.] 1992, 83). Axones were probably squared wooden logs that were inscribed along their length (Jeffery 1990, 52).

Wood was used for many public documents of the archaic period (Jeffery 1990, 51). Painted wooden boards, called leukomata, occur in connection with the first Homeric hymns that were kept on Delos (Thomas [R.] 1992, 83). We find further evidence for the use of wood by the city-state in a late fifth-century (408-407 BCE) inscription recording expenditures for the construction of the Erechtheion on the Athenian akropolis (IG I3 476, line 291). It mentions the payment of four drachmas for four wooden tablets or boards (sanides), on which were written temporary, presumably daily records (Lewis [N.] 1974, 73). A late source (Diod. Sic. 9.27.4) informs us that painted wood was also used for the early laws of Mytilene. According to a saying by Pittakos (c. 560-570 BCE), ‘the strongest rule was that of the ‘painted wood’, … that is, the Laws’ (Jeffery 1990, 52).

Some have even suggested that dipinti emerged from the earlier use of painted letters on wood and leather (Várhelyi 1996, 37).
I.1.7. POTENTIAL USES OF THE GREEK ALPHABET. THE PERISHABLE MATERIALS

I.1.7.a. What We Would Expect to Find on Perishable Materials

In all these ways we have seen that other, less permanent, vehicles for writing did exist in Greece. The literary and pictorial evidence provide us with some clues of what we would expect to find on organic writing materials in Athens, Mytilene, Thebes, Delphi, Sparta, Ionia, and Delos. We are told, for example, that Solon and perhaps Pittakos inscribed laws on wood, that the Athenians kept records of works done at the Erechtheion on wooden tablets, that the Thebans recorded oracles on writing-tablets, and that the priests at Delphi probably recorded Apollo’s oracles on leather scrolls. These references support what we already know: that perishable materials were used for writing the same kinds of texts that we find on durable materials. The implication here is that the absence of one type of inscription (say, laws on stone) in a specific setting or region could just mean that an organic medium (such as wood) was used instead of a durable substance for the same purpose. I shall pursue this point in the next section of this chapter, where I examine regional variations in the uses of the Greek alphabet.

If the Greeks used perishable materials for writing the same kinds of texts (legal texts, records of work, oracles) that we find on durable materials, they used them instead of, or in conjunction with, stone, metal, and clay. This leads us to question whether stone and metal inscriptions were permanent copies of original documents (Immerwahr 1985, 129). If people felt a need to transcribe original documents in a permanent medium, this would entail that the originals be written on less permanent, more portable, substances, such as papyrus, leather, or some other organic substances (Boring 1979, 34 and n24). Thus, these originals could have acted as official texts, kept safely in some appropriate place (e.g. a temple, Hdt. 5.90) for future reference. Although I seriously doubt that for every permanent document there also existed an original on wood, papyrus, or leather, we may suppose that some original texts made of perishable materials were used to guide the cutter in the production of more permanent documents on stone and metal (see Nenci 1994, 459-466 on the Selinous law).
I.1.7.b. Perishables Used for School Exercises and for Relaying Messages

The literary and pictorial evidence further influences our perceptions about the use of writing on perishable materials: not only were such writing materials interchangeable with durable ones, but also more importantly they were used for different purposes. We have evidence on pottery for wax-tablets and papyrus rolls that were used for school exercises; we also hear of wax-tablets (Demaratos' message to the Spartans) and leather or papyrus rolls (Sparta's *skytalai*?) that were used for relaying messages of a military nature. Writing here is being used for social (educational) and bureaucratic purposes -- two contexts that merit more attention.

We expect that the process of education involved writing (cf. Hedrick 1994, 164), but we have no clear evidence of this in the surviving inscriptions. Though abecedaria testify that some Greeks knew their alphabet, pots and potsherds would hardly be suitable for school exercises; anything beyond learning letters, numbers, and a few words demanded larger, flatter surfaces than potsherds (note, however, that there are several Etruscan 'exercises' on pots).

Pots or potsherds were also hard to incise and impossible to reuse, unless one wrote on the reverse (inside) surface. Perhaps, if ink was used on potsherds after firing, they could be reused, but we have no archaeological evidence for this in the archaic period. In any case, the archaeological context of several inscriptions on pots (and perhaps potsherds, though see below) suggests that their primary function was dedicatory. Though it is possible that schooling took place in sanctuaries, it is unlikely that it made extensive use of pots and potsherds.

Rather, students were more likely to use wax-tablets, and tutors papyri. The former wrote out school exercises on the waxed surfaces of tablets; the latter used papyrus rolls as teaching devices, consulting them for lessons or assigning extracts from them to be copied out by students. After each lesson, students carried off their tablets, folded under the arm, and tutors carried off their papyri, rolled up under the arm. Both items, portable as they were, suited the school environment well.
Wax-tablets were also used for dispatching messages. Being small, foldable objects, their contents could be outwardly sealed or *in extremis* secretly hidden under the wax coating. The tablets were convenient for concealing messages, because they were easily destroyed by removing the waxed surface or by burning the board. Hence, we find literary references to their use in relaying messages of a military nature.

Another possible option for relaying messages was to use leather rolls. Though the system of the Spartan *skytalai* has been doubted, it is nonetheless possible that other methods of sending written messages were used in secretive military operations.

*I.1.7.c. Other Potential Uses of Perishable Writing materials*

So much for a bird’s eye view of what we know from the surviving inscriptions and have learned from the literary and pictorial sources. What we need to remember is the possibility of keeping records of every kind on perishable materials: inventories, records of ownership, sales, debts and taxes, ritual manuals, almanacs, horoscopes, astronomical texts, private remarks, chronicles, literature, and various administrative or bureaucratic documents.

Inventories or lists of commodities were kept by palace administrations in bronze age Greece, but as yet no traces of such documents have been found for the archaic period. We have no records that show whether inventories were kept -- no records of one’s property, animals, slaves, produce, and gifts (dedicatory or funerary). This is perhaps surprising, given the evidence we have for records of officials, of public works done on sacred sites or buildings (repairs, roads built), and of temple treasures (Jeffery 1990, 61).

The practice of marking property with boundary stones goes back to the archaic period, which suggests that property rights were protected. However, records of ownership, sales, debts, and taxes are almost unknown in archaic Greece, except for three archaic bronze plaques from Kroton and another from Lokroi Epizephyrioi dealing with the deposition of property (Jeffery 1990, 258-259, 285). It is possible that such transactions in Greece were simple unrecorded exchanges. Compared with cultures of the Levant, where written deeds of sales and tax collecting (cf. Egypt: Postgate [N.], Wang, and
Wilkinson 1995, 466) were apparently the norm (Millard 1991, 110), the absence of such documents in Greece is surprising.

The practice of inscribing lists of offerings, names of officials, sacred or secular, and victors in contests (at festivals that were themselves recorded chronologically) shows an interest in recording dates (Jeffery 1990, 60, 334). Yet, there is no early evidence for the use of ritual manuals (cf. China and Palestine: Millard 1991, 106), almanacs, horoscopes and astronomical texts (cf. Classical Maya: Postgate [N.], Wang, and Wilkinson 1995, 45).

We may never know whether the Greeks kept chronicles of political or historical events in the archaic period (cf. Spensithios decree below). The closest we come to learning of political and/or historical events at this time is through examining casualty lists, public memorials, legal codes, interstate treaties, and records of names or festivals.

Some scholars believe that writing was at a very early date used in the composition of poetry (Powell [B.] 1991a; Robb 1994, 8). Immerwahr (1990, 19) suggests that the graffito on the famous ‘Cup of Nestor’ was influenced by eighth century book script. I doubt that the early alphabet was used in this way, but it is possible that the more regular script of the seventh century onwards was influenced by an earlier style of writing (book script ?) practised on papyrus (Immerwahr 1990, 18-19).

The silence about these categories of texts is total. The potential for loss due to the use of perishable materials might account for this silence. But we must also consider the possibility that these forms of writing simply never existed. Writing had perhaps not yet come to serve these purposes. Surely, if such utilitarian documents coexisted with more formal, ceremonial ones, we might expect that some evidence would have survived.
1.1.8. UTILITARIAN VERSUS CEREMONIAL USES OF WRITING IN GREECE

I.1.8.a. Pots and Potsherds in Utilitarian Contexts

However unimpressive pots and potsherds might seem at first sight, they happen to give us first hand knowledge of utilitarian writing in the archaic period. When inscribed with possessive names, commercial notations, or the names of ostracised individuals, they function on a social, administrative, and commercial level.

One gets the impression from early graffiti bearing simple names that 'writing was seized on widely as a way for individuals to mark their possessions and keep interlopers away' (Thomas [R.] 1992, 59). These identification marks have also been interpreted on a symbolic or magical level as curses (Immerwahr 1990, 14; Thomas [R.] 1992, 60). Whatever their meaning, there was a definite practical aspect of attaching names to objects; throughout the archaic period names were inscribed on votive pottery, apparently because their owners wanted to be remembered (Goody and Watt 1968, 40; Johnston 1983, 67; Svenbro 1988a, 65; Thomas [R.] 1992, 61, 84-85). Clearly, these graffiti functioned on an everyday social level that was far removed from any form of ceremonial and monumental display.

The institution of ostracism, introduced in Athens at the beginning of the fifth century, gives us an idea of how utilitarian writing operated at an administrative level. So far thousands of Athenian ostraka have been found, and many, perhaps most, of the ancient deposits remain undiscovered, since the majority of ostraka were probably taken beyond the city walls and buried there (Lang 1990, 19ff.; Immerwahr 1990, 91; Brenne 1994, 13-24). The small size of the writing on the ostraka from the North Slope of the Akropolis imply that some of them were written by what we might call professional scribes (Broneer 1938, 228-243; Lang 1990, 142-158; Immerwahr 1990, 92; Brenne 1994, 16, 19). These ostraka were prepared in advance, but apparently dumped unused (Lang 1990, 19), suggesting that the whole affair was carried out in an effective bureaucratic manner.

The occasional inscribed weight, stamp on jar handle, coin legend, and pot mark, perhaps denoting the contents or capacity of vessels, also indicate that in the archaic period writing was probably involved in commerce (see below; Millard 1991, 105; cf. Johnston
1983, 63-68). Although these early commercial notations do not reflect a standardised system, they indicate that merchants benefited from the ability to record transactions at a private level.

I.1.8.b. Potsherds. Unique Survivors of a Whole Range of Materials Used in Utilitarian Contexts?

The evidence from potsherds brings us to consider whether their role resembled more closely that of organic writing materials than that of durable materials. On the one hand, clay was unfit for public display on the same scale as was stone and metal. On the other, clay, once fired, had the same advantages as stone and metal, and more -- it was readily available, easy to work with, and 'cheap'. In theory anybody could scratch letters into its surface (see below). Nevertheless, pots offered rather small rounded surfaces to write on; they were also impossible to re-use and inconvenient to store.

Long documents were obviously better kept on clay tablets, but as far as we know, the Greeks did not write on them. The reason for this neglect of a cheap and abundant medium is unknown, but Jeffery (1990, 51) believes that it may be 'due at least in part to the force of convention, since the Phoenicians ... did not use them either.' Although Kypriot scribes did use them (so far three archaic examples have been found in Kypros), their occurrence has been described as an oddity restricted to Kypriot syllabic writing (Palaima 1991, 457-458). It seems fair to suggest that the general availability of more convenient perishable materials in Greece as well as in Phoenicia removed any advantages the clay (tablets) might once have had (as they did in bronze age and Near Eastern societies other than Phoenician).

Contrary to this view, Havelock (1971, 14 n32) argues that the selection of potsherds for the institution of ostracism presumes the absence of any ready supply of suitable writing materials, i.e. perishable materials. Yet, the use of potsherds in ostrakophoria seems to have been a deliberate choice. Some voters seem to have placed a significant amount of attention on the appearance of their sherd or pots, as the many Athenian kylix bases and rim fragments testify (Lang 1990, 8; Immerwahr 1990, 92). Clay may have been chosen over other available materials, because it was 'cheap', readily available, and served its
purpose well on an ephemeral and utilitarian level. We can just as well imagine how easy it would be to scratch a few letters on a piece of wood, a length of bark, a leaf (as for petalism at Syracuse: Diod. Sic. 11.86-87; Wissowa 1937; Liddell, Scott, and Jones: πεταλισμός), or a lump of wax; it is entirely feasible that perishables were also used in ostrakophoria.

If this line of argument is acceptable, potsherds may well be the unique survivors of a whole range of materials that would have been available for utilitarian purposes but that has now perished.

1.1.9. SUMMARY

Taken as a whole, therefore, it is worth reiterating that 'because of differential preservation of writing media, formal ceremonial texts, written on more durable substances, dominate in the archaeological record, giving us a biased picture of the uses of early writing' in Greece (Postgate [N.], Wang, and Wilkinson 1995, 479). The occasional survival of utilitarian texts on clay (possessive names, commercial notations, ostraka), together with certain other evidence for the use of organic materials (school exercises, military messages), helps to correct this bias. We must be wary of assuming that writing was reserved for ceremonial purposes. If the inscriptive evidence appears to be limited to the ceremonial, monumental, and religious spheres, that is a comment on the evidence but not on the possible uses of writing in archaic Greece (Cornell 1991, 12).
I.2. Studies on Regional Variations in the Uses of the Greek Alphabet

I.2.1. INTRODUCTION

Some scholars maintain that to evaluate ancient literacy, we must recognise the patterns of use to which writing was put within a general historical framework and within varied regional, social, and political environments. Studies on the subject of regional variation in the uses of the Greek alphabet hold that ‘statistically significant differences’ in the uses of writing (that is, ‘differences in the kinds and quantities of inscriptions that survive’) reflect differences in the social and political systems of any particular society (quotation from Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 762; Palaima 1991, 449-471; Whitley 1997, 635-661; 1998, 311-331). Stoddart and Whitley put forth two different ‘models’ for the social context of literacy in archaic Greece, using Attica and Krete as test cases. In the first, the number of private or informal inscriptions prevails over the number of (later) public or official inscriptions such as laws. They thus conclude that literacy was relatively widespread in Attica. The Kretan ‘model’ is totally different, since the earliest inscriptions include many Kretan laws; conversely personal inscriptions are rare. The authors conclude that the uses of literacy were more restricted in Krete, because writing was in the hands of a scribal class.

The sceptical reader will immediately notice that the application of this ‘model’ disregards the possibility that many texts were written on perishable materials. Whitley (1997, 640) acknowledges that writing on perishable materials existed and may even have been widespread, but he refuses to acknowledge the affects of this tradition in his study. He writes, ‘a lost tradition is, by definition, unknowable, and so immaterial to this argument.’

If I have insisted throughout on the idea that perishable materials were used in archaic Greece, it is because I feel that it can influence our perception of the role of writing in different regions of archaic Greece. Although we may regret their loss, we must not let this gap in our picture be an excuse to make assumptions based only on what is preserved.
on stone, metal, and clay. True, we shall never be able to assess the quantitative importance of organic writing materials; yet we cannot simply dismiss their existence as 'a lost tradition.' What if the absence of one type of inscription in a specific setting or region results from the use of a perishable material that has now vanished from the archaeological record? Such a gap in the record cannot be taken as proof that a particular society was illiterate or failed to put literacy to widespread official use (see Whitley 1997, 635-661).

To encourage further exploration on the subject of the uses of the Greek alphabet, I shall build on Whitley’s study, modifying, adjusting, or discarding his original hypothesis according to the realities of archaeological preservation and survival. In addition to the writing materials that have now perished, it hardly needs to be said that the available evidence is fragmentary, pre-selected, concentrated in certain categories (especially pottery), and unevenly distributed in time and space (Cornell 1991, 10). These are the identifiable realities and circumstances that we need to consider before we address the question of Argolic literacy.

1.2.2. CURRENT OPINIONS

1.2.2.a. Whitley’s Model

Much has been and can be said about the gross statistical differences presented in Table 1.1 below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Inscriptions c. 700-480 BCE</th>
<th>Attica (Athens)</th>
<th>Krete</th>
<th>Laconia (Sparta)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Legal Texts</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gravestones</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dedications</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipinti</td>
<td>758</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


I outline here Whitley’s most recent conclusions.
Alphabetic or informal literacy was widespread in archaic Attica. The large number of graffiti indicates that many Athenians ‘found it a worthwhile exercise to practice the new found skills of writing’ (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 764; Whitley 1997, 641).

In contrast with Athens, signs of informal literacy, such as personal names, owner’s names, jokes, abecedaria, and graffiti are rare in Krete and Sparta. Dedicatory inscriptions, dipinti, and tombstones inscribed with the name of the person commemorated are also uncommon (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 766; Whitley 1997, 646-670).

The abundance of Kretan legal texts coincides with the virtual absence of all other forms of writing and ‘is exactly what we would expect in a situation where few were literate, perhaps because literacy was the preserve of a scribal class’ (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 766; quotation from Whitley 1977, 655; my italics).

‘There is little contemporary epigraphic evidence to suggest that literacy was put to widespread official use in archaic …’ Athens and Sparta. Apart from the ‘dromos’ decrees, ‘there are no extant legal texts inscribed on either stone or bronze from Archaic Athens until about 520 B.C, and it is only after this time that other forms of public inscriptions … become common’ (Whitley 1997, 645).

These views have gained some support in recent studies (Palaima 1991, 449-471; Hall [J.] 1997a), though they are not universally shared (cf. Cornell 1991, 7-34). Although Whitley’s statistics are affected by the sixth century gap in Crete, he fails to mention this in his article (see, however, Prent 1996-97, 35-46; Whitley, Prent, and Thorne 1999, 215-264). I, for one, have problems accepting Whitley’s use of the word literacy.

1.2.2.b. Defining Literacy

The subject of ancient literacy is a complex one, and every scholar has his or her own particular definition of the word. Whitley (1997, 639) defines literacy ‘as the ability to read and write short texts.’ He specifically states that this required ‘more than the ability simply to sign one’s name’, yet he includes simple names in his calculations of Athenian graffiti. For my purposes, I shall re-define literacy as the basic ability to write one’s name, a few words, or short texts. ‘In general, it is assumed that the ability to write implied an ability to read, though it is recognized that this was not always the case’ (quotation from Boring 1979, 1; Thomas [R.] 1992, 10).
By modern standards literacy in the ancient world was therefore restricted. Just how restricted it was is impossible to tell. As Whitley (1997, 639) notes, 'questions about the rate of literacy in ancient Greece are secondary to the more general question of what kinds of literacy may have existed in different communities employing essentially the same 'technology of the intellect', and of what areas of society were literate within a single community.

In his conclusions Whitley (1997, 639) makes the distinction between three forms of literacy: 'informal' or 'alphabetic' literacy, 'craft' literacy, and 'scribal' literacy. 'Informal' literacy is the kind of literacy that today we might call survival skills or functional literacy; in antiquity it perhaps comprised the basic ability to read and write simple messages or names. The assumption is that anybody could learn these skills; presumably the Athenians did, but the Kretans and Spartans did not (Whitley 1997, 635-661). In a society where 'craft' literacy prevailed, we assume that much of the 'upper classes' and a large number of skilled artisans knew how to write (Whitley 1997, 639). Once again Whitley sees this as a product of Athenian society. Both these forms of literacy stand in contrast to 'scribal' or 'administrative' literacy, where writing was in the hands of a particular class of specialists or bureaucrats skilled in writing -- the scribes (Harris [W.] 1989, 7-8; Whitley 1997, 639). Scribes were a characteristic part of Near Eastern palace states, where literacy was used for largely administrative purposes, and Whitley sees a similar situation happening in Krete. But as we shall see, the Greek scribe of the archaic period was much more than was the typical palace scribe of the Near East.

Each definition of literacy presents its own problems of interpretation and therefore needs to be examined within its own epigraphical and archaeological context.

**1.2.3. A CONTROVERSIAL VIEW. 'SCRIBAL' LITERACY IN GREECE**

Who would be more likely to use a new writing system than professional scribes? Recall that the Greek acquisition of the Phoenician script probably occurred in Kypros, when, according to Woodard (1997), Kypriot scribes established there the beginnings of an
alphabetic scribal tradition. As Woodard (1997, 258) concludes, ‘Such a continuation of tradition signals that the passage of the alphabet west from Cyprus was not simply a matter of passive transfer along trade routes at the hands of merchants. It was, at least in part, an active process effected by the movement of scribes out of Cyprus.’

We stray into treacherous areas if we suggest that Kypriot scribes are entirely responsible for the spread of the Greek alphabet; yet the idea that writing spread by means of ‘scribal’ literacy seems consistent with the picture of the place of writing in archaic Greece. We can assume that this scribal class did not disappear with the adoption of the alphabet. The question is: do we have evidence of its existence?

I.2.3.a. Signs of ‘Scribal’ Literacy in Krete

‘The picture … we see emerging is one of the conveying of Cypriot alphabetic traditions to Euboea, Crete, and Rhodes, and elsewhere as well’ (Woodard 1997, 236). Krete was perhaps one of the earliest places to receive the alphabet (the ‘green’ script), together with other ‘oriental ideas’ (Woodard 1997, 236). As was mentioned previously, ‘the letter-forms of the Cretan alphabet are those which are the closest to the Phoenician characters, [though] the alphabet-type which Crete displays is nonetheless an already slightly altered form of the [hypothesised] earliest version of Cypriot’ (Woodard 1997, 236). If Kypriot scribes established themselves in Krete at the beginning of an alphabetic scribal tradition, they probably brought with them many features that we normally associate with the function of writing in Near Eastern societies. Consequently, we find that Kretan punctuation (e.g. by multiple dots) exhibits a formal scribal practice of North Semitic origin but uncommon elsewhere in Greece; that the Kretans inscriptions often begin from right to left as did the Phoenician ones; and that sometimes, like the Phoenicians, they invoked a deity at the beginning of a decree (Millard 1976, 140; Jeffery 1990, 310; Robb 1994, 94 n16; Whitley 1997, 659).

Whitley (1997, 658) argues that archaic Krete was exceptional in retaining many of these ‘scribal’ features, and in lacking those ‘informal’ signs of writing common in other parts of archaic Greece. Table I.1 (see above) shows that Kretan graffiti, dedicatory inscriptions, *dipinti*, and tombstones inscribed with the name of the person
The development in literacy that took place in other regions of archaic Greece, especially in Athens, never took place in Crete, because literacy was confined to a scribal class (Whitley 1997, 659). If we believe the data, we should assume that this development never took place in Sparta either, because as yet no graffito has turned up in the archaeological record. Yet, no one has ever suggested that Spartans were illiterate because writing was in the hands of a scribal class. The reason is that Sparta has no extant epigraphic evidence for public legal texts until the late archaic period; whereas Crete is an island where considerable epigraphical evidence for early written law seems to have survived (see above, Table I.1).

Before examining further the question of ‘scribal’ literacy in Crete, let us look more closely at the evidence for public legal texts.

I.2.3.b. Public Legal Inscriptions in Crete

As Table I.1 (above) shows, Crete has produced a striking amount of archaic public and legal texts on stone compared with private dedications or graffiti. Apparently, these ‘were no more intended to be read by the average ... [Kretan] than was the Code of Hammurabi by the average Babylonian’ (Whitley 1997, 660). Why then go to great trouble to carefully inscribe laws, to give them a material, epigraphic form, when few could have derived any communicational benefit from this action?

Whitley believes that the purpose of writing down laws on stone was to preserve in a permanent way ‘the customs and practices of the small communities of Archaic Crete’ (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 766). In this way the contents of the texts were never criticised. ‘The monumentality of such inscriptions would [then] appear all the more imposing’ and symbolic (quotation from Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 766; Whitley 1997, 660). Writing down a law on stone was meant partly to stabilise it for evermore, that is, if we assume that Kretans were relying on the written text alone for transmission of laws. Clearly, ‘oral transmission continued to be fundamental even once laws were written down’ (Thomas [R.] 1996, 15). There is even a surprising amount of evidence for early
laws being sung; according to a late source, free Kretan children had to sing the laws (Aelian, *Varia Historia* 2.29; Camassa 1988, 140ff.; Thomas [R.] 1996, 14-19).

Thomas (1996, 31) maintains that ‘the monumental inscription of law [on stone] was intended not only to fix it publicly in writing, but to confer divine protection and a monumental impressiveness on just those kinds of law which did not receive the time-honoured respect accorded the unwritten laws and customs’ (Detienne 1988b, 51-53; Steiner 1994, 66). Most of the Kretan laws deal with ‘specific regulations written down in response to a specific problem’ (Whitley 1997, 655). It was such laws, about procedure and constitution, which required the added support of divine protection.

Where their contexts can be identified, the laws of Krete are often associated with temples, written up on the temple walls, or set in the precinct (Whitley 1997, 655). More than half (Dreros, Axos, Lyttos, Knossos and Gortyn) were actually inscribed on the temple walls themselves. On present evidence this practice is almost exclusive to Krete (except for three late examples), and it is on this island that the earliest (from Dreros c. 650-600 BCE) and best (from Gortyn) examples have been found (Jeffery 1990, 55). As Jeffery (1990, 59) explains, this practice accounts for the numerous legal texts that have survived from Krete: ‘The laws of Krete survive [infinitely] because they were written on the walls of the temples; those of the same period at Athens were probably all, like Solon’s, written on wood, for no traces have been found.’

1.2.3.c. Public Legal Texts in Athens. A Question of Preservation

Apart from the various ‘dromos’ decrees, ‘there are no [extant] legal texts inscribed on either stone or bronze from Archaic Athens until about 520 B.C., and it is only after this time that other forms of public inscriptions ... become common (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 763; Jeffery 1990, 68-78; quotation from Whitley 1997, 645; cf. Stroud 1978, 35). Hence, Whitley’s (1997, 645) comment that ‘there is little contemporary epigraphic evidence to suggest that literacy was put to widespread official use in the Archaic period’ in Athens (cf. Stroud 1978, 20-42). We should not, however, accept this as proof that official inscriptions were written only rarely and in later times, but merely as evidence that if they existed earlier they were not written on stone, metal, or clay. No great
surprise. It is tempting to re-write Whitley's words as 'there is little contemporary
epigraphic evidence in stone or metal to suggest that literacy was put to widespread
official use in the Archaic period'.

Yet, as he (Whitley 1997, 645) himself remarks, 'there is plenty of contemporary and
later literary evidence to support the traditional view that both Drakon and Solon were
responsible for the promulgation of written law in the period between 640 and 560'.
Drakon wrote at least a law on involuntary homicide, and it may have set off the tradition
of written laws in Athens (Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 264-267 no. 86; Robb 1994, 127;
Thomas [R.] 1996, 26). We know of his laws from their later publication, which include
archaisms probably derived from earlier originals (Stroud 1968; Whitley 1997, 645). 'By
Solon's time the custom of written law was well-established ...' (Thomas [R.] 1996, 10).
Undoubtedly, the series of laws that were publicly displayed on wooden axones or bronze
kyrbeis were Solon's doing (Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 12.4). He himself writes about the
abolishment of mortgage markers and debt, even for those citizens exiled or enslaved by
debt (Diehl 1954, 46, F 26.28-30; Robb 1994, 131). From the 'description of his
accomplishments [it] sound[s] as though he addressed only, or at least mainly, those
matters that were presently troubling and dividing the community' (Robb 1994, 131).

Though the wooden axones or bronze kyrbeis seem to have been real enough, the
confusion over their use deserves further consideration. Stroud (1979) and others
maintain that Solon published his laws on wooden axones. Contrary to current opinion,
Immerwahr (1985, 129) suggests that Solon's laws were originally written on bronze
kyrbeis, erected on the akropolis, and that they were later rewritten on wooden axones, set
up in a stoa of the agora around 500 or 461 BCE. If we consider the evolution of legal
texts, we might be tempted to assign axones to the post-Solonian period, because their
sophisticated arrangement (apparently individual laws and axones were numbered) and
uniqueness (they had neither forerunners nor successors) suit a later period better
(Immerwahr 1985, 123-135).

This theory has important consequences for the way in which Whitley interprets the uses
of law in archaic Athens. He (1997, 645) concludes: 'Law may have been made public in
Archaic Athens, but there seems to have been no desire to make a law a monumentum
aere perennius'. He opts to follow the ancient authors, who tell us that Solon's laws were
first written on wooden axones, which he believes were hardly ‘monumental’ in form. From an ancient’s point of view, the use of wooden boards, square in section and mounted horizontally, may have had the effect of being as monumental and as ceremonial as stone or metal inscriptions (Detienne 1988, 21). About their resistance to weathering -- wood, when kept indoors, resisted the ravages of time very well; Pausanias (1.18.3) and Plutarch (Solon 25) both report seeing Solon’s axones in the Prytaneion (Jeffery 1990, 51; Osborne 1997, 76).

What if Solon’s laws were written on bronze kyrbeis that have now perished? These bronze inscriptions were just as much concrete, visible, and tangible monuments as were laws published on stone. We might wonder, however, why they have all perished, when some bronze inscriptions have survived from elsewhere in Greece. The bronzes could well have been damaged by the Persians during the attack on the Athenian akropolis -- cf. in Nero’s time the 3000 bronze tablets burnt on the Capitoline hill (Suetonius, Vespasian 8.5; Immerwahr 1985, 134; Eder [W.] 1986, 267; Thomas [R.] 1994, 36). This presumed destruction poses one serious problem: how was the text preserved to be later transferred to wooden axones in the first half of the fifth century? I can think of two possible answers: either they were preserved on portable documentary originals (i.e. on perishable materials) that could be transported elsewhere, or more likely, the laws were preserved in the memory of mnemones (remembrancers) or scribes (see below).

L2.3.d. Public Inscriptions in Sparta, or Lack Thereof

So far Sparta has yielded no public inscriptions until late in the fifth century and no epigraphic evidence for written law (see above, Table I.1). However, an early fifth century votive stele from Thalamai, IG V 1.1316, was actually written by a Spartan (see also the sixth century votives from Sellasia, IG V 1.920 and IG V 1.919: SEG 11.889; Jeffery 1990 200 no. 24). There is therefore no reason to believe that written laws did not exist in Sparta in the archaic period, as is implied by some of our late literary sources (Whitley 1997, 648). These refer to the famous ‘Lykourgan’ rhetra, apparently ‘prohibiting’ the writing of laws in Sparta (Plutarch, Lycurgus 13.3-4). When Zeuxidamos was asked why the Spartans failed to write down their laws about valour and to let their young men read them, he replied: because it is better for them to become
accustomed to deeds of valour than to give their attention to writings (Plutarch, *Moralia* 221B).

The image of Sparta priding itself on living without written laws is, however, better suited to the classical period, because the Spartan *rhetra* was evidently a genuine written law dating to the seventh century or earlier (Cartledge 1978, 26; Jeffery 1990, 186; Thomas [R.] 1996, 18).

Despite this evidence, some scholars still maintain that 'in Sparta there was no overwhelming reason to make law into a public document' (Whitley 1997, 648). In Boring's (1979, 7) words,

> For the Spartans, state business was not necessarily public business, and there is little reason to think that the average citizen had a great need to keep up on current affairs by means of public notices. We must beware, however, of interpreting the small number of such [public] inscriptions in Sparta as strong evidence of the general prevalence of illiteracy.

For one thing, archaeological survey or excavation in an area of archaic and classical habitation might change this picture of Spartan literacy (Cartledge 1978, 32-33). Moreover, as in Athens, public inscriptions may well have been written on perishable materials.

Though rather paltry, the dedicatory material from Sparta implies that some Spartans were literate and corroborates the explicit statement of Plutarch (*Lycurgus* 16.10; *Moralia* 237A) that the Spartans, like the Kretans, learned as much reading and writing as was thought necessary (Cartledge 1978, 32; Whitley 1997, 648). On the one hand, Whitley (1997, 649) interprets Plutarch's statement to mean that 'literacy was restricted in its use for those purposes most necessary in archaic Greek aristocracies -- for the commemoration[s] ... of the actions and achievements of individuals' (Whitley 1997, 649). Cartledge (1978, 32-33), on the other hand, supposes that 'only public functionaries [or scribes] were called upon to perform routine acts of literacy on a day-to-day basis.' This brings us back to the idea of 'scribal' literacy in Krete and the 'Spensithios phenomenon'.
I.2.3.e. Spensithios, The Kretan Scribe

For evidence that a 'scribal' literacy prevailed in archaic Krete there exists a unique piece of evidence -- the Spensithios decree. It was written on a bronze abdominal guard (that was probably manufactured much earlier) around 500 BCE (Figure 16; London, BM inv. 1969.4-2.1: Jeffery and Morpurgo-Davies 1970; Edwards and Edwards 1977; Ruzé 1988, 82ff.; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 120ff. no. 22; Robb 1994, 87-89; Whitley 1997, 656; Thomas [R.] 1997, 21). Spensithios, a Kretan scribe, was to inscribe and memorise the affairs of the city, both secular and divine; he probably also oversaw 'all past records of the city, written and unwritten, secular and divine' (Thomas [R.] 1996, 22). Moreover, he may have read aloud the texts that had been recorded in the past (Raubitschek 1970, 155). He received a salary, was immune from taxes, was present at and participated in sacred and secular affairs of the community, performed public sacrifices for certain cults, and handed down his privileges to his sons (Thomas [R.] 1997, 24). This seems astonishing, because it had long been thought that Greece, unlike the Near East, avoided 'scribal' literacy (Thomas [R.] 1996, 24).

I.2.3.f. Signs of 'Scribal' Literacy in Attica and Elsewhere

Krete was not the only region in Greece to use scribes. We know of scribes working in Athens and elsewhere in archaic Greece. ‘That Athens knew a period when the scribe was a revered figure, one closer to Spensithios in social and civic standing than to the humble street scribe [of the hellenistic period], is suggested by three …’ archaic marble statues of scribes from the Athenian akropolis (Figure 11: Payne [H.] 1950, 47, 74; Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 766; quotation from Robb 1994, 96 n27). Whether they were particular treasurers of Athena, secretaries (katalogeis), or members of the college of eight magistrates called hieropoioi (Aristotle, Ath. Pol. 54.3-5), these figures, even damaged, manage to look very professional and rather grand (Detienne 1988b, 65; Trianti 1998, 29-33).

Athenian scribes seem to have been responsible for the 'dromos' decrees (IG I3 508, 509; Whitley 1997, 657). Furthermore, we suspect that the Areopagus group of scribes wrote the ostraka of the Athenian Akropolis (North Slope) (Immerwahr 1990, 92). According
to Raubitschek (1970, 155), Athenian scribes were often asked to read aloud time-honoured laws and decrees.

Public scribes are also known from Elis and Samos. The inscription on a bronze plaque (early fifth century) from Olympia refers to a first-class scribe or secretary, Patrias, who seems concerned to protect his legal position within the community (SEG 29.402; van Effenterre 1979, 279-293; Jeffery 1990, 218 n5; Thomas [R.] 1996, 24). On Samos, one particular scribe, Maiandrios, seems to have been a person of some importance (Hdt. 3.123; Whitley 1997, 658). As Polykrates’

most trusted servant, he is chosen to go [to Sardis to] verify the report of Oroetes’ wealth, the lure designed to entice Polycrates to Sardis and to his death there, ... After the murder of his master, Maeandrius reappears ... as the ruler of Samos, the individual whom the tyrant has chosen to inherit his sceptre and power’ (Steiner 1994, 173).

Maiandrios was perhaps not a worthy man as far as many of his fellow citizens were concerned, but he does seem to be a person of high status.

If public writing was in the hands of scribes in various communities of archaic Greece, Crete was clearly not a unique society in this respect. Because of the differential preservation of writing media, Kretan legal texts written on stone walls dominate the archaeological record, giving us the impression that the situation in Crete differs significantly from that in other regions of Greece. If we realise the implications of these biases, however, we might assume that the Kretan material embodies in many respects processes at work elsewhere in archaic Greece (Gagarin 1986, 81-86, 127-128; Thomas [R.] 1996, 22ff.).

In light of this, I believe that Ruzé (1988, 82ff.) is right in regarding Spensithios as if he were typical of scribes as a class in archaic Greece as a whole. We should probably accept this view, even for Athens. Even if, as Whitley (1997, 658) maintains, none of the non-Kretan scribes had ‘a monopoly in public writing, nor were they officials as we would understand the term’ from the Spensithios decree, their power was nonetheless strong.
Some members of Greek *poleis* ‘in the early stages of the public use of writing were acutely aware of the power of writing, the power of the scribe, and the power of anyone who had control of the written records’ (Ruzé 1988; quotation from Thomas [R.] 1996, 24). It seems that the position of scribes was enhanced as texts became more numerous and difficult to keep track of (Ruzé 1988, 92). Here we must remember that scribes probably also wrote and kept track of documents on perishable writing materials, a subject to which I shall return later.

By controlling the written word, scribes would have reinforced their positions in society. Not surprisingly, then, the privileges of the scribe became so threatening for politically fragile communities, that some cities took measures to ensure that they did not abuse their (presumably superior) knowledge of writing (Detienne 1988b, 71; Thomas [R.] 1994, 39). We have an example of this happening in Erythrai, a city in Ionia that tried, probably in the fifth century, to curb the power of scribes in various ways, such as preventing secretaries from serving the same magistrate twice (Engelmann and Merkelbach 1972, nos. 1 [now lost], 2, 17; Thomas [R.] 1994, 93; Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 89-94 no. 40). Also, the famous Tean curses of c. 480-450 BCE carry a ‘set of imprecations directed against certain officials (*timocheon* or *tamieuon*) who ‘do not read out the writing on the *stele* to the best of their memory and power’’ (*SEG* 31.985; Hermann 1981, 1-30; Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 62-66 no. 30; Detienne 1988b, 67; quotation from Thomas [R.] 1996, 23).

Despite this need to control the power of scribes, Greek cities could not do without them (Ruzé 1988, 93). ‘Lurking amongst the inscriptions are hints that only officials could read anyway’ (Thomas [R.] 1996, 25). If officials were forced to read aloud the inscriptions, and if a reading aloud of the laws was a common occurrence, ‘it mattered less if people could not read the inscriptions’ (Harris [W.] 1989; quotation from Thomas [R.] 1996, 23). It also seems less likely that the population at large was required to read the laws, when a periodic reading informed illiterates of their contents (Steiner 1994, 67; Thomas [R.] 1996, 23).
1.2.3.h. The Role of Scribes and the Use of Perishable Materials

Whatever their role in society, it seems that scribes had occasion to use organic writing materials, especially in utilitarian contexts. If we consider the possibility that Greek scribes were trained and accomplished in Kypriot and Near Eastern writing traditions, we should accept that they knew about the advantages of perishable writing materials and would have used them extensively in their daily administrative duties. Physically, virtually no evidence for this practice survives today. For this reason, perhaps, we find it hard to conceive of archaic Greece as an alphabetic culture that retained the need for 'scribal' literacy.

1.2.4. AN EXAGGERATED VIEW. GRAFFITI AS SIGNS OF 'INFORMAL' LITERACY

If the power of scribes remained strong in various communities of archaic Greece, literate skills were probably not as widespread as scholars have assumed. When many people acquire the skills of writing, the uniqueness and value of a scribe decrease rapidly (Robb 1994, 89). Since scribes and secretaries, including those in Athens, were magistrates or important officials rather than clerks right into the classical period (Thomas [R.] 1996, 24), the idea that the invention of the alphabet placed writing skills firmly within reach of the common Greek (male citizen) seems exaggerated.

Let us look at the 'popular inscriptions' that have figured prominently in the arguments for widespread literacy -- the graffiti.

1.2.4.a. Graffiti in Athens

What do graffiti tell us about the kinds of literacy seen in the population at large? Many have assumed that graffiti were written by individuals who dedicated an object or marked it as their own property. In this respect, these ‘informal’ inscriptions differ from all other inscriptions, because they were presumably executed by non-professionals. It follows, then, that a large number of graffiti should be equated with widespread ‘informal’ literacy (Jeffery 1990, 63). In Langdon's (1976, 49) words,
The large series of Acropolis dedications and ostraka from Athens confirm the prevalence of literacy for the 6th and 5th centuries, and the Hymettos inscriptions do the same, I feel, for the 7th century ... This is not to claim that everyone in early Athens and its environs could read and write, but it seems likely to me that by the end of the 7th century there was [were] as many literate citizens as illiterate.

Whitley (1997, 641) also sees the hundreds of early Attic graffiti in Table 1.1 (above) as direct evidence of the Athenians showing off their ‘new found skills of writing’ and as proof ‘that writing was never in Attica the preserve of a scribal class’ (Langdon 1976, 49; quotation from Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 764).

Some degree of literacy is implied by the individually inscribed graffito, but the evidence is not as straightforward as is usually thought. There is an unbalanced impression, created by the fact that most of the graffiti we find are on pieces of broken pots, that potsherds were the modern equivalent to our ‘scrap paper’, just lying around waiting to be scribbled upon by ordinary people who knew how to write. To judge from the hundreds of graffiti from the Athenian agora, however, graffiti that were arranged to fit onto the potsherds -- that is, not to be part of any original inscriptions made on a pot before it was broken -- are uncommon (Lang 1990). Except for ostraka, the ballots used by Athenians between 488 and 418 BCE in voting at ostrakophoria, only a few graffiti (i.e. the so-called ‘names on sherds’) that predate the practice of ostracism were incised on what was probably a sherd, not a complete pot.

If most of the Athenian agora graffiti were written on whole pots, the assumption that anyone could just pick up a sherd and conveniently use for writing deserves to be reviewed. It seems that Athenians who presumably wrote Lang’s ‘names on sherds’ chose their pieces with considerable attention. In all but two cases they found the softest, flattest surfaces available -- the walls of large coarse or unglazed wares (twenty-five examples, see Lang 1990, 17-21) whose surfaces could be scratched easily with any relatively sharp implement. Notice that in general these ‘casual’ writers of graffiti seem to have avoided the harder surface of black glaze pottery, perhaps because a metal point was necessary to inscribe them (Lang 1990, 8).
Most black glaze wares were presumably inscribed by people who knew how, and who had occasion, to use a metal writing point. Skilled writers -- artists, scribes, or other professionals -- may have inscribed this kind of pottery, since a 'casual' writer not only had to get hold of such a writing instrument but also had to learn how to use it. Unless one were accustomed to writing with a metal point (on wax or papyri), it would have been relatively difficult to use, especially to apply the right amount of pressure and scratch through the hard surface of black glaze pottery. In some instances where inexperienced writers incised black glaze pottery, the circular letters (thetas and omicrons) are often small and irregular (Lang 1990, 43). One way of overcoming such difficulties was to write on the bottoms of complete pots. Unlike sherds, vases provided larger, flatter surfaces to work with and could be held more steadily, if placed on their rims. Perhaps that is why the majority of graffiti on black glaze pottery from the Athenian agora were written on the bottom of complete vessels (Lang 1990, 28). The size of a pot was also relevant -- the bigger the pot, the flatter the surface. So perhaps these graffiti were written on whole pots, rather than on sherds, by people who were aware of the difficulties of inscribing black glaze pottery.

There is another reason for challenging the idea that someone could just pick up a sherd and conveniently use it for writing: archaeological context. When we look at the context of many Athenian graffiti, a large number of them come from sanctuary sites, especially from the shrine of Zeus on Mount Hymettos (Langdon 1976; one exception is Tourkovouni, see Lauter 1985). We have to ask ourselves how such pieces of inscribed clay could have been appropriate offerings to a god. State of preservation proves that whole pots were dedicated, then broken and cleared away to be dumped into votive deposits. This is a far cry from just picking up a potsherd lying around the agora or sanctuary and using it as a piece of scrap paper to practice writing one's name.

I.2.4.b. Graffiti and Literacy

Given the nature of our evidence, there are of course limits to what can be said about the full context of graffiti on pots. One point of difficulty is whether some individuals actually practised the skills of writing by incising their own pottery or whether they had their pots inscribed by the literate. Either way, we can never be sure that the motive of
people who resorted to a professional was their own illiteracy; in certain cases it might equally have been their desire to get hold of good quality engraving (Boring 1979, 9).

Another difficulty is that illiteracy cannot always be offered as an explanation of very small number of extant inscriptions. The abundance or paucity of material culture in any given area often depends on the fortunes of excavation (see Prent 1996-97, 35-46 on the sixth century Kretan lacuna). Moreover, many scholars have focused on the study of archaic Athenian pottery, and their publications have influenced the way in which others speak of Greece in connection with literacy. Athens was also unique in having ostrakophoria and therefore in yielding a large amount of fifth century graffiti on potsherds. To this practice, which has been at the centre of arguments for widespread 'informal' literacy, there was no Spartan or Kretan counterpart.

1.2.5. AN ALTERNATIVE VIEW. 'CRAFT' LITERACY

Robb (1994, 252) believes that the first literate Greeks were neither scribes nor 'aristocrats', 'but rather a small nucleus of craftsmen who made the objects that bore the first inscriptions'. Though the evidence for 'craft' literacy 'comes earlier in the [inscriptional] record and bulks larger than does any other body of evidence' (Robb 1994, 13), we must remain aware that this picture would be considerably different, if pottery had not survived in the archaeological record.

I.2.5.a. Literate Athenian Artists

Whitley (1997, 644) speaks of archaic Athens as a society where 'craftsman' literacy prevailed. Certainly, Athens has yielded several hundred painted inscriptions on pots and dedications on stone or metal objects (see above, Table I.1). Except for graffiti, these dipinti and dedications had to be done with the tools of the creators; it was therefore beneficial for the early vase-painter, mason, or bronze-worker to learn how to write, and to impart their knowledge to others who learned their craft (Jeffery 1990, 62). 'Some may have been illiterates, who copied a draft made by the [literate] client; but the ingenious plotting often shown in fitting one or more hexameters into a limited and
irregular space suggests that for the most part craftsmen were themselves literate' (Jeffery 1990, 62). So, it seems that early in the archaic period Athenian artists were writing their own inscriptions and signing their own works in the course of their business.

The practice of signing vases and sculptures makes us wonder whether Athenian artists intended to advertise themselves by signing their works. For artists’ signatures to be effective in this way, there must have been a fairly wide reading audience (Whitley 1997, 644). Without readers, these inscriptions presumably fell on blind eyes. Whitley (1997, 644) maintains that signatures and names on the so-called Little Master Cups of the sixth century, together with *kalos* inscriptions on black glaze vases, ‘were meant to be read, [aloud at Attic] *symposia*’ (aristocratic male drinking parties) (Beazley 1932, 194; Boardman 1974, 58; quotation from Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 765). Many Little Master Cups, however, have been found in Italy (for example, Vulci, Tarquinia, Taranto, Selinunte), and so were never destined to reach an Athenian audience in the first place. Many even display nonsense inscriptions, or what amounts to alphabetic gibberish (Beazley 1932, 195). But before we conclude that signatures of the seventh and sixth century had not (yet) the advertising value that some had later (Boardman 1974, 58), let us turn to another type of inscription that is thought to have been read by the average Athenian.

**I.2.5.b. Who Could Read in Archaic Athens?**

Once again Whitley (1997, 644) assumes from the positioning of sixth century inscribed gravestones beside roads or tracks that passers-by were meant to read them. It is true that several grave ‘inscriptions addressed a passer-by, a casual wayfarer, and asked him or her to remember and take pity upon the person buried’ (Svenbro 1988a, 51, 54; quotation from Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 764), but this does not guarantee that inscriptions were read by the general public (see also Hedrick 1994, 162-164).

Firstly, as grave markers, they had a ‘significance quite independent of whether they were read’; they were reminders, ‘stone memorials’, or ‘symbols of honour’ (Thomas [R.] 1989, 49). The memory and name of the deceased would easily have been passed down
orally from generation to generation. ‘Memory is the diary that we all carry about with us.’ (Oscar Wilde, *The Importance of Being Earnest*).

Secondly, according to the prevailing view as expressed, for example, by Svenbro (1988a, 51, 58, for ancient texts of the classical period), those who could read, read aloud (ἀναλέγω, meaning to collect up, off the text), and gave their voices, as it were, to the object. In his view, reading aloud was not only meant for an audience; it was the way in which the written words would reach the reader’s own ears as well. Since inscriptions contained few, if any, word divisions, written words were probably deciphered by most people only when heard pronounced. This concept might seem strange to us, but a glance at the opening sentence of Raymond Queneau’s novel, *Zazie dans le métro* (1959) puts us quickly in the right mood. It is only by using our own voices, by hearing ourselves pronounce (aloud or in our minds) the word, ‘Doukipudonktan, ... ‘, which is actually a sentence, that we succeed in recognising what the eye cannot pronounce -- (C’est) d’où qu’ils puent donc tant (Svenbro 1988a, 166).

In an oral society where writing was inevitably perceived as something incomplete in itself, requiring a vocal supplement, reading aloud may have represented a zone of interference between the two (Svenbro 1988a, 2, 47). Hence the voice of those who read aloud would have been highly regarded in a community (De Kerckhove 1986, 289ff.; Svenbro 1988a, 51, 54, 64, 116; Thomas [R.] 1994, 33). To whom did these voices belong?

In the context of Attic symposia, those who knew how to read were possibly male ‘aristocrats’, or at least belonged to a circle of individuals who were wealthy enough to afford signed works and to drink at symposia.

In a religious context, the ability of the votaries themselves being able to read the inscriptions is always dubious. It is possible that dedicatory inscriptions went hand in hand with the objects, perhaps valuable objects, and so ‘had a significance other than that carried by the written words alone’ (Thomas [R.] 1989, 38). The inscriptions may have been used as a demonstration of wealth and piety, ‘meant to impress ...some gathering of ‘pre-literate’ Athenians’ (Robb 1994, 26). Greater worth could be attributed to an object, if it was inscribed (Stoddart and Whitely 1988, 765).
1.2.6. SUMMARY

In archaic Greece the skills of literacy were limited to certain areas of society within a community. At least three main areas of society practised literacy: professional scribes, artists, and perhaps a few (male) citizens. It seems unlikely that the population at large were expected to be able to write and read, even in archaic Athens.

Professional scribes wrote and read out public inscriptions for the state. Archaic legal inscriptions that have survived from Crete provide an excellent example of some of the scribal processes at work in the wider world of archaic Greece. We expect that Greek scribes also used writing for day-to-day administrative duties. No evidence for this practice survives in the archaeological record, however, probably because scribes used perishable materials for writing such documents.

Skilled artisans inscribed objects with 'informal' (?) or dedicatory inscriptions on stone, metal, or clay. Some of these are epitaphs carved on tombstones, but most are dedicatory inscriptions, graffiti, and dipinti on movable objects deposited in sanctuaries. It is these inscribed works that predominate in the epigraphical and archaeological record. This large amount of evidence for 'craft' literacy in Athens and elsewhere suggests how inscribed objects and the work of literate artists may have become desirable, popular, and perhaps highly valued. This does not, however, entail that inscribed objects were meant to be read by the average citizen; reading an inscription without word division required skill and practice, and so we may assume that the voice of the reader was respected.

The idea that the use of writing in Athens extended beyond trained artists and scribes to include many citizens seems exaggerated. Some Athenian graffiti suggest that certain groups of individuals (mainly male citizens ?) occasionally inscribed their own pots, but most people probably relied on literate artists or other professionals.

Cities such as Athens, which attracted artistic life, may have had a larger literate community that that of a small Kretan city. Nevertheless, the uses of writing and the
kinds of literacy that existed in both areas resemble each other closely. Krete was clearly not the unique society that Whitley wants it to be in this respect.

However, this is not to say that literacy was a neutral skill with predictable results and effects, independent of a society's character and existing customs (cf. Goody and Watt 1963, 304-345). The effects of literacy may well turn out to be specific, determined by a particular cultural context. But abundance or paucity of extant inscriptions cannot be an accurate reflection of the early applications of writing in the different regions of archaic Greece. The realities of archaeological preservation and survival play a significant role in the way in which we understand archaic Greek literacy. They are neither predictable nor measurable.

If Attica and Krete were not as diametrically opposed as Whitley's statistical analysis implies, how worthwhile is it to pursue further the subject of regional variation in the uses of the Greek alphabet, based on existing data? What are the possibilities for learning more from data of yet another region? Taken in isolation, statistical differences between the kinds and quantities of archaic inscriptions have little value. But a careful study of inscriptions individually and in the context of their total cultural and historical environment should provide a more detailed illustration of the processes at work within specific areas of society, or at the very least, within archaic Greece as a whole. Let us turn to the Argolid to find out.
1.3. Another Test Case. Literacy in the Argolid

1.3.1. INTRODUCTION

No ancient writers care to tell us whether the people of Argos or any number of other small towns in the Argolid were literate; no one was interested (Boring 1979, ix). Nor is there any interest in this century. When scholars write about ancient Greek literacy, they usually focus on Athens, occasionally on Sparta and Krete. ‘Indeed if asked to write a monograph about literacy in almost any of the other cities [except Athens and Sparta], I think that it would have proved impossible’, wrote Boring (1979, ix-x) about Spartan literacy. Archaic Argos may have produced Akousilaos -- a writer who, according to Josephus (Contra Apionem 1.13), lived a short time before the Persian wars -- and Telesilla (Hdt. 6.76; Polyainos, Strategemata 8.33; Paus. 2.20.8; Diehl 1925, 61), an important fifth century poetess (also la ‘Jeanne d’Argos’), but who else? For this reason ‘Argos is of little importance in the literary classical tradition, and this in turn helps to explain why, in comparison with other Greek cities, Argos has been neglected’ by contemporary scholars till recently (Tomlinson 1972, 222).

The benefit of this neglect by writers, both past and present, means that a study of Argolic literacy can remain relatively free from prejudice. Fortunately, we can base such a study on about one hundred or so archaic inscriptions that bear the unmediated mark of their writers, whoever they may have been. This brings us to the central question: who could read and write in the archaic Argolid?

1.3.2. SIGNS OF ‘SCRIBAL’ LITERACY IN THE ARGIVE PLAIN

1.3.2.a. Hiaronnamones as Scribes

Thomas (1996, 19) maintains that the hiaronnamones (ἱαρωννάμονες, in Ionic hieromnemones), together with the mnamones (the Doric form of the word, used in Krete, Nemea, and Halikarnassos), ‘must form a linchpin in the transition [of oral] to written law. …the very name suggests that these officials were at first responsible for
‘remembering’ -- perhaps remembering judicial cases, a living archive, sacred and secular rules, perhaps ‘oral law’ (see also, Jeffery and Morpurgo-Davies 1970, 150; Edwards and Edwards 1977, 139-138). Once writing spread to their communities and was used for public record, many of these (hiero)mnemones ended up as scribes and guardians of the written word, adding on to their earlier responsibility as ‘memorisers’ the new task of writing (Thomas [R.] 1996, 20).

Both van Effenterre (1973, 39) and Thomas (1996, 22) argue that memory continued to be an important duty of the (hiero)mnemones, and that writing did not take over public business completely. The main duties of these officials included custody of shrines and supervision of religious ceremonies (van Effenterre 1973, 39; Beattie 1975, 26). Sometimes they also took care of secular affairs, which meant that they were responsible for public registers and records (Beattie 1975, 26).

In Greek inscriptions the term hieromnemon appears for the first time in the late seventh-early sixth century, at Tiryns (here hiaromnamon). Amazingly, it is first in the Argolid that we find clear evidence for the existence of this scribal class.

Let us therefore examine the inscriptive evidence within its archaeological and historical context.

**The Hiaromnamon at Tiryns**


This text is a sacral law inscribed on a series of large stones covering the underground passages (north-west side of fortifications of the lower city) leading to the cistern on the outside of the citadel (Figure 17; Appendix A-16; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 5). Its twenty-three ‘fragments are of immense epigraphical [and historical] importance, establishing for the first time that the alphabet at Tiryns was related to that of Argos-
Mycenae and not to the Kleonai-Phleious group, as was previously thought’ (Jeffery 1990; quotation from Hall [J.] 1995a, 587).

We find important references to the ἀλιαία (haliaia), the δάμος (damos), and to a single ἐπίγνωμων (epignomon), as well as to the gods Zeus and Athena. The existence of a sovereign popular body (damos) and an assembly (haliaia) in the year around 600 BCE suggests very strongly that Tiryns was independent from Argos at this time (Verdhelis, Jameson, and Papakhristodhoulou 1976, 189, 192; Hall [J.] 1995a, 587). O. Hansen (1985, 162-163) goes as far as to suggest that there was an amphictyony of Tiryns, which Argos destroyed, together with Nauplia around 600. Foley (1988, 127), however, prefers to see Tiryns as a community dependent upon Argos for religious affairs (see however, Foley 1998, 142, where she raises doubts on this matter). Her claim centres on the dearth of archaeological evidence for an archaic settlement at Tiryns and similarities between the Tirynthian and Argive alphabet (see also Piérart 1991a, 570). But as J. Hall (1997a; 1997b, 89-109) points out, her first point is weakened by the fact that that the area around Tiryns remains little excavated in comparison with Argos, whereas her second fails to recognise that the Tirynthian script is very similar [but not identical] to that of Argos. Though the existing epigraphical evidence is still very restricted, its letterforms present 'a certain amount of innovation compared with Argos' (Hall [J.] 1995a, 611).

The fragmentary nature of the Tiryns inscription does not permit full recovery of its contents, but clearly they have to do with meetings where wine and probably food were consumed, with specified contributions to them and with fines imposed for failure to conform and take care of the libations (Verdhelis, Jameson, and Papakhristodhoulou 1976, 204-205; Hansen [O.] 1985, 162 n5). These fines were imposed on the πλατιώναρχοι (platiwoinarkhoi), whoever they were (college of attendants [?], Dubois 1980, 239-251; wine-drinkers, Koerner 1985, 452-457; drunkards, van Effenterre 1982, X; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 296), by the hiaromnamon. In this inscription he does more than merely remember; he seems to have had priestly functions associated with keeping order in the religious community of Tiryns (Thomas [R.] 1996, 20; Hansen [O.] 1985, 162 n5; Osborne 1997, 78).
The power of the *hiaromnamon* is more evident at Mykenai, where an early inscription (c. 525 BCE) from the akropolis mentions (a body of ?) *hiaromnamones* in connection with the cult of Perseus (Figure 18; Appendix A-11; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 6; on Perseus, see Paus. 2.15.4; 2.16.6). The inscription consists of the final clause of a law added on the crowning stone (capping block) of the structure from the hellenistic fountain house at Mykenai (Appendix A-11; Jeffery 1990, 172). It was found by Tsountas (1892, 65) between the ‘Lion Gate Tomb’ and the ‘Tomb of Clytemnestra’, but it must have come originally from a building (perhaps an archaic fountain house, see Holland, Hood, and Woodhead 1953; Jameson 1990a, 215) identified as the spring (fountain ?) of Perseus described by Pausanias (2.16.6) as being on the road from Mykenai to Argos.

Three additional fragments (found by Papadhimitriou in the 1950s but still not fully published) probably belong to the same monument, giving us the original inscription (Argos Mus.: Jeffery 1990, 445 no. E [not from Elaious]; Jameson 1990a, 215). This inscription is also on a circular object, perhaps the base for a shaft that supported the capping block (Jameson 1990a, 215). Its fragmentary nature makes it difficult to decipher, but according to Jameson (1990a, 213-223) its subject matter appears to be the same as that found on Tsountas’ text, even if the writing on this inscription is earlier. These three fragments have been interpreted as the main text, to which Tsountas’ inscription was an addendum (Jameson 1990a, 215).

Tsountas’ text translates loosely as: ‘If there is no body (college ?) of *damiorgia*, the *hiaromnamones* for (the *heroön* or fountain of ?) Perseus will serve as adjudicators or judges (*kritēras*) for the parents, as it has been decided.’ So, it seems that matters closely related to cult or *polis* regulations could be included under the title of *hiaromnamon*. This implies that the office of *hiaromnamon* in the initial sense of ‘remembrancer’ had probably acquired increasingly important responsibilities. We are told that in the absence of *damiorgoi* (in Ionic, *demiourgoi*, see below), they were expected to judge and to take
control of cult matters. Their position in the community was therefore an important one, perhaps second only, or equal, to the *damiorgoi*.

This direct reference to the *hiaromnamones* in a position of (acting) ‘judge’ is consistent with previous picture of the scribe’s developed role in archaic Greece. Recall Beattie’s (1975, 8-47) arguments in favour of Spensithios acting as a ‘Reeve’, and judge, of a special kind. Although the hypothesis was rejected by Edwards and Edwards (1977, 140) and others, Spensithios definitely had the right or responsibility of deciding the order of procedure. His position was also second to, if not on a par with, the *kosmoi*, the highest ‘magistrates’ of a Kretan city.

*Hiaromnamones* at Asprókhoma(ta) (Mykenai) *c.* 475

*SEG* 11.298, 22.260.  
*MITSOS* 1946, 116-117; *PAPADIMITRIOU* 1955, 231; *LAZZARINI* 1976, 312 no. 936; *JEFFERY* 1990, 173-174 no. 3, 445.

*Hiaromnamones* are further attested in an inscription from Asprókhoma, an area only one kilometre north-west of the citadel at Mykenai, on the road to Kleonai (*Figure 19*; Appendix A-11). The inscription, dating to about 475, is written on a limestone tablet or plaque only two centimetres thick. The text refers to the *hiaromnamones* in connection with sets of armour and weapons, presumably dedicated by them in a temple (Jeffery 1990, 173). The temple was probably that of Enyalios, god of war, identified by another inscription (to which I shall return) at Asprókhoma, and the *hiaromnamones* were probably those of the cult of Perseus from Mykenai (Shear [T.] 1966, 195; Tomlinson 1972, 209).

The idea that (non-military) officials dedicated weapons seems to have puzzled Mitsos (1946, 116-117), who explains this custom in the light of an undated passage about Archinos of Argos (Polyainos, *Strategemata* 3.8). Apparently, ‘when Archinus was tyrant in Argos the old weapons were dedicated to the gods after new ones had been issued by the city’ (Mitsos 1946, 117). We need not go this far, however, if the unknown temple is indeed that of Enyalios. Given his persona as god of war, we expect his worship to involve the usual offerings of a military nature. Unfortunately, few finds from
the sanctuary have been published (or found?), but a pile of iron spearheads and a bronze helmet appear among them.

What is interesting about this particular inscription is the way in which it was carved to imitate bronze (Jeffery 1990, 173). In addition to the unusual thinness of the stone, the omicron is cut as ‘a small drilled hole, like those of Argive bronze’ plaques originally nailed onto the façades of temples (Jeffery 1990, 173). Its letters, including the omicron as a simple dot, resemble those found later on a bronze helmet inscribed ‘to Enyalios’ (Figure 20; Náfploi, Leonárdhos Mus.?: SEG 23.187; Mylonas 1966a, 70ff.; Daux 1966a, 782; Mylonas 1967a, 96; Lazzarini 1976, 243; Jeffery 1990, 445 no. 3a). Both inscriptions come from Asprókhoma and date to around 475. If this bronze helmet belonged to one of the sets of shields, helmets, and javelins mentioned on the limestone plaque, then the plaque almost certainly came from the temple of Enyalios, where perhaps it was inscribed by the same hand that inscribed the helmet.

To take this hypothesis one step further: what if this hand belonged to one of the hiaromnamones mentioned on the limestone plaque? One of them could have inscribed the sets of armour and weapons, dedicated them, and then written up a document recording the dedication as part of a list of temple treasuries.

A Group of Four Hiaromnamones at the Heraion

c. 480-475

c. 460-450

1. Bronze statuette of 480-475 BCE:
WALTER 1911, 141 no. II, fig. 72; SCHWYZER 1923, no. 96.3; LAZZARINI 1976, 313 no. 938; JEFFERY 1990, 169 no. 21.

2. Bronze statuette of 460-450 BCE: SEG 16.244.
WALTER 1911, no. 1, 139-140, fig. 71; SCHWYZER 1923, 96.2; MASTROKOSTAS 1957, 24; LAZZARINI 1976, 313 no. 939; JEFFERY 1990, 153, 166, 170 no. 36.

IG IV 517; SEG 11.303, 16.244, 34.289.
RICHARDSON 1896, 42-48; MICHEL 1900, 710; WALDSTEIN 1902, 197-202 no. 2; ROEHL 1907, no. 39.14; SCHWYZER 1923, no. 96.1; VOLLGRAFF 1930, 28-30; BUCK 1955, 288 no. 82; WÖRRLÉ 1964, 12, 19, 48, 84-85; LAZZARINI 1976, 313 no. 937; STROUD 1984, 208-209; JEFFERY 1990, 152, 164, 170 no. 32; VAN EFFENTERRE and RUZE 1994, no. 86; BILLOT 1997, 48.

Three inscriptions from the Heraion mention a group of four hiaromnamones, who presumably dedicated public offerings to the goddess (Appendix A-13). The earliest offering (c. 480-475 BCE), a bronze statuette (now lost) with inscribed base, was
dedicated by four *hiaromnamones* from the proceeds ‘of the hippodrome’ (Figure 21). This inscription alludes to the Heraia, the games commemorating Hera at the Heraion, where horseracing was one of the features (see Chapters II.1.6.f and III.2.4.b; Jeffery 1990, 161-162). The hippodrome is known from a funerary inscription of the late sixth century (Figure 22; see also below, I.3.4.c; Argos Mus. E210: *SEG* 11.305, 22.262, 33.294; Daly 1939, 168; Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948, no. 136; Peek 1955, 79 no. 305; Hansen [P.] 1975, 21 no. 141; 1983, 74 no. 136; Robert [J.] and Robert [L.] 1984, 438-439; Moretti [L.] 1953, 44-47; Jeffery 1990, 168 no. 15, 443; McGowan 1995, 628). Whatever the proceeds were remains unknown.

The other two inscriptions mentioning four *hiaromnamones* date to c. 460-450 BCE, that is, to a period after the destruction of Mykenai in 468, when Argos had influence over what was now an Argive Heraion. The first inscription is a stone base that once bore a statuette (see Appendix D, Text 7). Perhaps here, too, the dedication came from the proceeds of some part of the Heraia, either the *hippios dromos* (men’s footrace) or the horseracing (Jeffery 1990, 166). The second inscription is inscribed on a massive limestone *stele*, a *telamon* (stone frame/support) into which was inserted an inscribed bronze or lead plaque, now lost (Figure 23; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 8). The preserved part of our document thus served as a heading to the real contents of the inscription (Waldstein 1902, 202). The inscription was the property of Hera, to whom the four *hiaromnamones* made the offering.

Importantly, the four *hiaromnamones* mentioned on the stone *stele* carry the names of the four tribes of Argos: the Dymanes, the Hylleis, the Pamphyloi, and the Hymathioi. From this evidence, Buck (1955, 283) argues that the *hiaromnamones* at the Heraion consisted of a ‘representative’ picked from each tribe. Common to all Doric states were the following three tribes: Dymanes, the Hylleis, and the Pamphyloi. The fourth tribe, the Hynathioi, is in evidence only in the Argolid, or rather in Argos (Buck 1995, 283; Tomlinson 1972, 54, 86, 188-189; Wörle 1964, 11; Roussel 1976, 249; Jones [N.] 1980, 112-113). The name of the fourth tribe, Hynathioi, first appears in this inscription or perhaps in another of about 460-450 BCE, still not fully published (see Appendix D, Text 9; Argos Mus.: *SEG* 41.283; Jeffery 1990, 444 no. E; Kritzas 1992, 231-240; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, no. 65).
Though only partly published, this second text, written on a bronze plaque found about two hundred metres from the temple of Apollo at Argos (Kapetanos plot), deserves further attention for the light it sheds on the Hymathioi and the political institutions of Argos around the mid-fifth century. The text mentions a body of magistrates, the ‘Twelve’, distributing money to twelve unnamed groups, traditionally called ‘phratries’, though perhaps they did not exist as early as this (Wörle 1964, 17; Roussel 1976, 154; Charneux 1984, 207; Piérart 1985, 346-347; Kritzas 1992, 235; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 274).

Kritzas (1992, 235) associates two of the ‘phratry’ names appearing in this text with those which are found under the heading of Hymathioi on an Argive inscription of c. 400 BCE (Figure 24; Kritzas 1980a, 498; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 10). He therefore suggests (1992, 236) that we have here the twelve ‘phratries’ of this non-Dorian tribe, the Hymathioi. The number twelve may be related to the months of the year, if we suppose that each ‘phratry’ took control of the affairs of the tribe for one month (van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 274). Since the Argives did not hesitate to give as eponyms for the ‘phratries’ of this fourth tribe the names of important mythical figures or divinities (such as Temenos, Diaphontes, and Hera), we can assume that the Hymathioi were not composed solely of new citizens, but included old ‘phratries’, formerly of the three Dorian tribes, as a result of a re-division of the citizen body (van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 274; cf. Roussel 1976, 248; Jeffery 1976, 140). If the formation of this fourth tribe took place a little before the middle of the fifth century, it could be interpreted as a democratic institutional reform intended to break up the existing social structures and integrate new citizens (Kritzas 1992, 236; Hall [J.] 1995a, 590; Foley 1998, 137-143).

By this time Argos had conquered Mykenai and Tiryns and taken over the administration of the Heraion. Buck’s (1955, 283) idea that one hiaromnamon was picked from each Argive tribe fits comfortably into this scenario. It fails, however, to explain the presence of four hiaromnamones mentioned in the first of the series of inscriptions from the Heraion, seemingly dating to a period (480-475 BCE) when Mykenai is thought to have had influence over the sanctuary (Adshead 1986, 101; Kritzas 1992, 232; Hall [J.] 1995a, 613).
Unfortunately, we have no clear evidence of Mykenai’s tribal system at this time. Our only clue is provided by Herodotos (7.202), who writes that during the Persian wars Mykenai sent eighty soldiers (hoplites) at the battle of Thermopylai (in 480 BCE) and that together with Tiryns, Mykenai fielded a joint force of four hundred hoplites at the battle of Plataia (in 479 BCE). If the military organisation of Mykenai was such that each tribe contributed a regiment to the army of the city, then the number of men (four hundred, less Tirynthians, and especially eighty), in multiples of four, suggests that Mykenai had four tribes by about 480 BCE.

With such an assumption, we might suppose that Mykenai’s tribal system influenced the cult administration and therefore the number of hiaromnamones at the (Mykenaian) Heraion. This would explain the presence of the four hiaromnamones mentioned in the earliest inscription at the Heraion -- they were ‘representatives’ picked from each tribe. Yet, the editors of the Asprokhoma dedication suggest that the five sets of armour listed in the inscription were dedicated separately by at least five individual hiaromnamones (Mitsos 1946, 116; Jeffery 1990, 173).

If we reject the hypothesis that Mykenai had four tribes at least by 480 BCE, we must suggest other interpretations for the inscription from the Heraion dating to 480-475 BCE. An unlikely hypothesis would be that the four hiaromnamones at the (Mykenaian) Heraion corresponded not to the number of tribes but to some other division of the population. It may even have been an arbitrary number. If, like Spensithios, the hiaromnamones were foreign scribes hired by a particular city to render their services to that community (van Effenterre 1973, 37 and esp. 1979, 284ff.), they may have had little to do with any tribal system.

Another possibility is that the inscription from the Heraion dating to 480-475 BCE is Argive and was dedicated by a group of four hiaromnamones from Argos. The problem with this hypothesis lies in the fact that hiaromnamones are not (yet) attested in inscriptions from the city of Argos before the mid- or late fifth century (see below). Unless we conclude, as did Strøm (1998, 90) in her study of the Heraion bronzes, that the appropriation and annexation of the Heraion by Argos took place sometime between 675 and 575 BCE, the earliest in this series of inscriptions mentioning four damiorgoi is difficult to explain as Argive.
**Hiaromnamones at Argos**

Argos Museum  
*SEG* 33.275, 34.290 .  

At Argos *hiaromnamones* are first attested in the later fifth century (c. 450-425 BCE). We find the word written on this *stele* from the Koros plot, at the south-west angle of the *agora* (Figure 25; Appendix A-10-69; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 11). The stone is very damaged, because it was re-used as a boundary marker, as a threshold, and as a covering for a drainage pipe during the first few centuries AD (Mitsos 1983, 243). Therefore, out of the sixty-three inscribed lines, only a few are preserved and nine were read by the editor (Mitsos 1983, 243).

The final nine lines mention the punishment that will fall on all those who are negligent, and those who render inoperative the decisions inscribed on the *stele*, including those who propose and preside (the *hiaromnamones, boathooi* [?], and president). It was a crime of treason against the city not to respect the letters of this written law (Detienne 1988b, 50). The repetition of the punishment reinforces the idea that ‘not conforming to what was written’ was a cause for worry and that it was important to obey the decisions taken by those in charge. Again the responsibility was in the hands of the *hiaromnamones* and the *boathooi* (?).

These measures were perhaps taken after a disaster or an attack against the public order of Argos. The event in question is unknown, though at line fifteen the editor sees traces of ‘Lakedaimon’ (Mitsos 1983, 248). Mitsos believes that the decree refers to the well-known events of 418-414 BCE, when the Argive generals conspired with King Agis of Sparta (Thuc. 1.89-118; 5.59.5-63). This act would have been interpreted as an attempted coup by the oligarchs to take over democratic Argos, with the help of Sparta. To prevent further attempts (which did happen one year later), the city threatened all those who went against the regime, i.e. the oligarchs who were against the democracy (Mitsos 1983, 248).

Mitsos’ reading of the inscription only makes sense if the inscription belongs to the end of the fifth century. In a recent study, however, van Effenterre and Ruzé (1994, 390) date
the inscription to the second or third quarter of the fifth century, based on the letterforms. This new date suggests that the hiaromnamones were known at Argos before the late fifth century.

With respect to Mitsos' hypothesis about a disaster or an attack against the public order of Argos, do we know of any such events taking place between 475 and 425 BCE? The only clash between Argos and Sparta that we know of for this period is the battle at Tanagra in 458, when the Argives helped the Athenians fight the Spartans, who were defeated by an army of Argives and Athenians at Oinoe (Meritt 1952, 340-380; Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 77-78 no. 36; Jeffery 1990, 164 no. 30). But these events will not have affected public order at Argos. Perhaps we need not look beyond the Argive plain for an explanation. As a result of the internal conflicts of the 460s between Argos and the other communities of the plain, Argos may have taken measures to ensure that its enemies respected the (new) laws of the city.

1.3.2.b. Damioroi as Literate Public Officials

In 'Homeric' times damioroi (dāμιοργοι, in Ionic demiourgoi) were skilled workers of public things, such as seers, healers, carpenters, bards, judges, and heralds (Od. 8.135, 9.135, 17.382-386, 20.134-135; Finley 1956, 57ff.; Murakawa 1957, 385ff.). The roles of bard and judge remind us most readily why the title of damioros was later used by many Peloponnesian states to refer to a high-ranking public official, a 'magistrate' (Thuc. 5.47; Gaisford 1948, 765= Etymologicon Magnum, δημιοργος; see Busolt 1920, 505-509; Jeffery 1975, 319).

The inscriptive evidence from the Argolid has usually been taken to support this view of the archaic damioroi. Wörle (1967, 61ff.) maintains that they were a specific board of 'magistrates', like the nine Attic archons, except that within this board individual members did not have different titles and duties, as the archons had at Athens (see also Jeffery 1975, 320, 324; Detienne 1988b, 70). It is equally possible, however, that the damioroi represented a special category of citizens, fluctuating in number according to how many passed the required standards of lineage, wealth, or perhaps even literacy.

What is clear from the inscriptive evidence of the Argolid is that the term damiorgos was not used in order to signify craftsman-damiorgos in archaic times (Murakawa 1957, 391). Jeffery’s (1975, 330) study of the damiorgoi shows that their chief business was nomophylakia, like that of the Athenian Areopagus. More specifically, as we shall see, the damiorgoi at Argos, the Heraion, and Mykenai dealt with serious acts of impiety, including desecration of shrines and temples, and with threats or offences against the state. Not only did they keep order and impose fines at sanctuaries, they also acted as overseers of public buildings and festivals. Moreover, to judge from the Perseia inscription at Mykenai, they were also responsible for reviewing the performance of the halithia (whoever or whatever they were). This presupposes that the position of the damiorgoi was powerful. Acting as chief judges, they probably supervised most of the city’s officials, including the hiaromnamones, whose powerful roles as scribe and judge elsewhere in Greece were threatening for politically fragile communities. To undertake such duties, one presumably had to be literate.

### A Group of Nine Damioroi at Argos  c. 575-550

On the Larisa, in situ.

*IG IV 614; SEG 11.336, 17.147, 39.348.*

ROEHL 1882, no. 30; 1907, 54.1 no. 37.3; COLLITZ and BECHTEL 1899, 121 no. 3260; ROBERTS 1887, 109 no. 73; VOLLGRAFF 1928b, 231; 1932, 389-393, pl. 1; PEEK 1941, 200; MITSOS 1952; FINLEY 1957, 141; MURAKAWA 1957, 391; HUXLEY 1958, 599ff.; HAMMOND 1960, 33-36; WÖRRLIE 1967, 61-70; JEFFERY 1975, 323-325, 330; KELLY 1976, 131-133; ARNHEIM 1977, 64-67; CARLIER 1984, 394-395; JEFFERY 1990, 156-158, 168 no. 7; PIÉRART 1991b, 142-144; PARIENT 1992, 217; VAN EFFENTERRE and RÚZÉ 1994, no. 87.

This inscription, written around 575-550 BCE, was found on a stele (door post ?) rebuilt into the wall of the Venetian tower on the Larisa, the akropolis of Argos with its mediaeval castle on the summit (Figure 26; Appendix A-10-81; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 12). It records either a decision taken by the city under the responsibility of the damiorgoi or a dedication offered by nine members of the board of damiorgoi (van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 322). We have only the last lines of the text; the first lines may have been written on a separate stone (Hammond 1960, 33). In the first two lines we read, ‘under the ‘reign’ of the nin[e d]amiorgoi’ (---) ν ἐν[ἐνα ἡμιοργο[ι]] ἐν[ἀναστατο], followed by a list of nine names.
Since many of the names have a flavour of Argive epic, Vollgraff (1932, 377-389) has argued that the inscription might be a list of the mythical heroes set up by Pheidon of Argos -- a list of *damiorgoi-basileis* (Wörle 1964, 61-70; Carlier 1984, 394). But such an explanation is unlikely; as Mitsos' (1952) prosopography shows, some of these (royal) names were also used by Argives living during the archaic period. This was especially the case with aristocrats (Piérart 1991b, 142), who apparently liked to attach themselves (by name) to their glorious past. The idea of glorifying one's past would certainly explain the rare use of the Homeric verb *anassein* instead of the more usual *arkhein*. Perhaps, then, the Argives saw in the *damiorgoi* the inheritors of a royal and prestigious power (van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 322).

Another explanation for the nine is that they formed a group of 'magistrates' in power during that year, with three *damiorgoi* chosen from each of the three Dorian tribes (Hammond 1960, 33-36; Wörle 1964, 12, 61-63; Tomlinson 1972, 189). In this context the verb *anassein* suggests that they held the highest position (Carlier 1984, 395), but even here it is perplexing (Jeffery 1975, 324). Jeffery (1975, 324) wonders why this rare verb was used and suggests that these men had to perform some special duty. And why was the number nine referred to, if it happened to be the normal number of the board (Jeffery 1975, 324)? Jeffery believes that these *damiorgoi* have all been listed and their names added up, because this inscription commemorated some particular event, as it did in the record of the eight Athenian *hieropoioi* who were in charge of the *dromos* for the Panathenaia in 566 BCE (Jeffery 1975, 324; 1990, 72 no. 18). We might therefore assume that these are the names of nine men elected from a larger group having the title of *damiorgoi*, to act out their duties as expected by the verb *anassein* (Jeffery 1975, 325).

---

**A Group of Six Damiorgoi at Argos**

*c. 575-550*

On the Larisa, *in situ.*

SEG 11.314, 22.263.

The inscription is of similar appearance, measurements, and date to the previous text; it, too, was found built into a Venetian wall of the Larisa (see Appendix D, Text 13; Jeffery 1990, 158). In Jeffery's opinion, they may well both be by the same mason. This second, and probably later, text records the consecration of objects to Athena Polias and the conditions of their usage in the sanctuary (van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 324). It begins with 'when the six mentioned by name (in the left column) were damiorgoi, this is what was done in the sanctuary of Athena; the objects, the working materials, and the [---], they dedicated to Athena Polias.'

There is a contrast between the damiorgoi (and the priests, sacrificers, etc.) and a simple individual, a traveller or a suppliant (whediestas), who is forbidden to use the objects of the goddess outside the sanctuary. This implies that in the past some people thought that the practice (i.e. the private use of sacred objects) was permitted (Bourguet 1930, 6; Jeffery 1990, 158). The damiorgoi fined the culprits, and the amphipolos took care of the objects (Buck 1955, 283).

Only six damiorgoi are listed here. Their number continues to be a multiple of that of the three Dorian tribes, and can therefore be simply explained as a list of six individuals selected from a larger body to oversee (and pay for ?) the renovations done in the precinct. However, scholars who maintain that the nine formed a board of 'magistrates', whose number was later cut down to six, seek other, more complex explanations. Some (Wörle 1964, 61ff.; Tomlinson 1972, 189; Arnheim 1977, 64-67; Carlier 1984, 394) see this reduction as a sign of a (constitutional) reform that took place between the two dates - - 'the substitution for monarchy of a closely controlled oligarchic system' (Tomlinson 1972, 189; on kingship, see also Paus. 2.29.2; Diod. Sic. 7.13-14; Plutarch, Moralia 340C). Others believe that the term damiorgos refers to different people in the two inscriptions, that is, the names of the six damiorgoi belong to mythical kings whereas those of the nine belong to ancient kings and heroes (Vollgraff 1932, 377-389; Carlier 1984, 394). More recently, van Effenterre and Ruzé (1994, 324) suggested that the diminished number of damiorgoi represents either a decrease in population or a reduction in the competencies of the damiorgoi. This last suggestion is perhaps the most logical in view of the next two inscriptions.
Damiorgoi at the Heraion
c. 575-550

Athens, National Mus., inv. Argeia 14016
*IG IV 506; SEG 11.302.*

Five fragments of a badly damaged bronze plaque, originally nailed to a wall, were found at the Heraion in 1895 (Figure 27; for the Greek see, Appendix D, Text 14). The bronze worker used 'the same tall, careful lettering as did the mason of ... [the stone law on the Larisa], and the two inscriptions must be close in date', this one probably being a little later according to Jeffery (1990, 158). The text begins by stating the punishment (of exile and confiscation of property) for vandalising the inscription and for disregarding the written words, i.e., the law. Then it goes on to the main text, where it states that all who kill, commit any other crime, or contrive against (the city ?) shall be punished by cursing, death, or exile, like the famous Tean curses (Jeffery 1990, 158). It ends, 'but if there is no (body or college ?) of *damiorgoi*, ... (or if there is no *damiorgos*).'

Two points stand out here. First, since the *damiorgos* gave out penalties for defacing inscriptions and for ignoring written laws (Kelly 1976, 132), he was probably literate. Second, since provision was made for when there was no *damiorgos*, 'the implication is that, at the administrative level, there is little connection [at this time] between the [*damiorgos* at the] Heraion and [the six or nine *damiorgoi* from the city of Argos'] (Hall [J.] 1995a, 610). This explanation further supports the idea that during this period the Heraion was under the influence of Mykenai.

The possibility that *damiorgoi* were not always available for duty appears again more clearly in the Perseia inscription from Mykenai, to which I now return.

Damiorgoi at Mykenai
c. 525

SEE ABOVE FOR BIBLIOGRAPHY
For the following reading of this inscription, I thank my supervisor who gave me access to Jameson's unpublished notes.

In the final clause of a law added as a crowning stone of the hellenistic fountain house at Mykenai (see above, I.3.2.a), mention is made of a vacancy in the office of the *damiorgia* -- 'If there is no body (college ?) of *damiorgia*, ...'. This vacancy cannot be understood
simply as an occasional or temporary absence of the *damiorgia* (cf. Jeffery 1975, 327; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 356). Although it is possible that in a city as small as Mykenai there were occasional lean years with no citizens 'wealthy' (or skilled) enough to qualify for the category of 'workers for the public', or that in a busy year they might neglect to provide overseers for one of the smaller cults (Jeffery 1975, 327), the inscription is better explained as resulting from some crisis (*anarchia*, as in Athens or *akosmia*, as in Crete) that stopped the *damiorgia* from taking up office or assembling at the time when the sanctuaries needed them (IG IV 493; Wörle 1964, 69 n28; Jeffery 1975, 327; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 354-356). The absence of *damiorgoi* at Mykenai and the (Mykenaian) Heraion perhaps signalled the start of internal conflicts between the communities of the Argive plain, a period of unrest that was to end in the destruction of Mykenai, Tiryns, and Midea.

I.3.2.c. Artynoi. Another Group of Literate Officials?

If it can be shown that the duties of the *artynoi* were similar to those of the *damiorgoi* (Tomlinson 1972, 198), as our next inscription suggests, I think they, too, were literate.

*Artynoi at Argos or Halieis* c. 480-470

Paris, Petit Palais, Formerly of the Collection Tyskiewicz, Dutuit no. 118.

*IG IV 554; SEG 11.315, 15.199, 37.1783, 42.273.*


This inscription, on a bronze plaque dating to about 480-470 BCE, has no known place of origin, but has been attributed to Hermione, Argos, and Halieis (Figure 28; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 15). It concerns the use of 'the treasures of Athena [by the city] to meet some emergency' (Jeffery 1990, 161). Both the president of the council, named Ariston, and his fellow councillors (the *artynoi*) were to be 'protected by this law from any subsequent impeachment on the grounds of illegal procedure' (Jeffery 1990, 161). The last line states that the council in office will enforce (the exile and the confiscation of
property), otherwise they (the members of the council) will themselves be liable to Athena.

Though the origin of this text remains unknown, Jameson's (1974a, 67-75) attribution of the inscription to Halieis has been readily accepted by many scholars. Brandt (1992, 83-93), however, argues against the attribution to Halieis, favouring Argos instead. He suggests that the dimensions, topic, and form of this bronze plaque all fit the architrave blocks of the sanctuary of Apollo Lykios at Argos, where such texts are known to have been displayed. Moreover, the letterforms resemble that of another bronze plaque of about 475 BCE from Argos (Figure 29; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 16; proxeny for Gnosstas of Oinous, found in the agora: SEG 13.239; Charneux 1953, 395-397 no. 3; 1984, 208; Guarducci 1969, 51-52 no. 4; Jeffery 1990, 162, 169 no. 22; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 151 no. 35).

Yet Brandt's arguments can also be used in favour of an attribution to Halieis. Bronze plaques were also nailed to temple walls at Halieis (Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus. HM 620: SEG 42.281; Jameson 1974a, 73; 1976c, 235; and HM 237, 345, 388; Jameson 1974a, 71 n18; Foley 1988, 130). Furthermore, the Argive script in our example was often used at Halieis.

Since the epigraphical and archaeological evidence remains equivocal, we must look elsewhere for clues. The political vocabulary of the inscription may help. The artynoi, otherwise unknown in Argolic inscriptions, appear in Thucydides 5.47.9, dating to 420 BCE, as Argive officials (see also, Plutarch, Moralía 291E, for Epidauros). It has been suggested that they replaced the damiorgoi as principal 'magistrates' from about the first quarter of the fifth century as part of a democratic reform after Sepeia (Wörrle 1964, 76; Tomlinson 1972, 198; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 382). True, the damiorgoi have not (yet) been attested epigraphically at Argos after 550 BCE (and at Mykenai after 525). But this is no proof that the artynoi or any other group took their place.

Given the nature of our evidence, only generalisations are possible. Whoever the artynoi were, they seem to have held a specific office of some importance, either at Argos or at Halieis. Their role was at least partly judicial. We can therefore assume that, like the damiorgoi, they would have benefited from being literate.
1.3.3. SIGNS OF ‘INFORMAL’ LITERACY AT ARGOS AND HALIEIS

The evidence gathered so far suggests that a small section of the population, made up of a few professionals and officials within the Argive plain, would have been skilled in writing for administrative purposes. This picture seems consistent with our previous discussion of ‘scribal’ literacy in Attica, Sparta, and Krete. Now it remains to be asked whether only such public functionaries and scribes were literate in the archaic Argolid.

The epigraphical evidence for ‘informal’ literacy is not as helpful as we might have hoped. For one thing, we have as yet little inscribed pottery for the Argolid. Only brief descriptions of graffiti have been published (mainly for the Heraion and Argos), often without illustrations, specific dates, script types, and archaeological contexts. Moreover, rarely do these graffiti give us anything more than a name, referring to a divinity, a person, or both. Graffiti that record the names of divinities do help in identifying the god or goddess worshipped at a specific site, but give us little information about their writers. Onomastic graffiti, on the other hand, sometimes do. This is especially true with names that have been written on objects from contexts other than votive deposits.

1.3.3.a. Literate Soldiers at Halieis

To judge from the preliminary publications of fifth century graffiti at Halieis, soldiers used writing as a way of marking their possessions (Jameson 1969, 321, pl. 80; 1974a, 71 n21; 1976c, 234). Personal names were scratched on drinking cups found within the confines of the akropolis (Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus., HP 317: Daux 1966a, 789). Jameson argues that within this area was a soldiers’ garrison, perhaps a Laconian one (Boyd and Rudolph 1978, 333-355; Boyd and Jameson 1981, 327-328; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 71). At least seven and possibly eleven names are in the Argive alphabet, two are in the East Argolic or Laconian, and one at least (possibly as many as five) is compatible with the script of Korinthos and its allies (Jameson 1974a, 71). Other fifth century graffiti from Halieis include an abecedarium in the Argive alphabet and single names (?) on black glaze sherds (Figure 30; Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus., HC 99: Jameson 91).
1969, 319, pl. 80; 1976c, 234; Jeffery 1990, 446 no. 9b). These were found in the northern half of the akropolis, presumably in non-votive contexts dated after the 'Tirynthian' resettlement, which means that they too perhaps belonged to soldiers.

Though much of the archaic material from Halieis remains unpublished (Appendix A-38), we can draw a few conclusions based on what we already know. First, Spartan interest in Halieis can be seen from the alphabet used there through the fifth century. The script, called East Argolic, is distinct from the other identifiable Argolic script -- the one used in the Argive plain. ‘The distinction between the two regions arises in part from the differential treatment accorded certain letter forms, … but the most significant variations are firstly, that the east Argolic scripts prefer the ‘red’ alphabet [and used sigma], while the Argive plain favours the ‘blue’ alphabet … [and] generally tends to employ san (Foley 1988; Jeffery 1990, 175; quotation from Hall [J.] 1997a, 149-151). Hall (1997a, 147) has shown that even the settlements within these two regional groups show slight, though distinct differences in chirographic principles despite their geographical proximity to one another.

Taken as a whole, the East Argolic script of Halieis is similar to the Laconian; it differs only in the absence of certain refinements (Jeffery 1990, 174-202; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 71). The East Argolic script may have reached the Akte via Laconia (Jeffery 1990, 42, 174-175; Foley 1988, 124ff.), and may therefore reflect the ties that the eastern peninsula, and especially Halieis, had with its neighbour Laconia.

A second point to remember is the arrival of the ‘Tirynthians’ at Halieis in the fifth century (Hdt. 7.137.2; Strabo 8.6.11). The question is whether these newcomers were the descendants of the citizens of Tiryns attested around 600, villagers who took advantage of Argive weakness after the defeat at the battle of Sepeia (c. 494 BCE), or the so-called ‘slaves’ (see Chapter II.1.5.b.) expelled from the responsible positions that they held in Argos during this time of weakness, or indeed some combination of these (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 77). ‘Herodotos (7.137) identifies Halieis as “from Tiryns” at the time of Aneristos’ exploit before 446,’ but ‘the exact date of their coming and … [of course] the precise identity of the new settlers are [is] uncertain’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 77). What is certain is that the Argive alphabet, presumably brought by natives of the Argive plain, first appears at Halieis in the second
quarter of the fifth century. Some of these newcomers were probably literate, as the Argive graffiti on the drinking cups suggest. Indirectly, then, we have evidence of 'informal' literacy among the former inhabitants of Tiryns.

Judging from the Halieis graffiti, these 'casual' writers were not exclusively local or 'Tirynthian'. One graffito (perhaps more) on the drinking cups also shows the script of Korinthos and its allies. We know of Corinthian and assorted Peloponnesian troops helping Halieis to fight back an attack by Athenians around 460 BCE (Thuc. 1.105.1). The events that surround the Athenian attack are unclear, but it has been suggested that Athens' aim was to secure good communications with their ally Argos in one of that city's rare periods of activity in this century ... The Athenians (and Argives) wanted either to prevent the establishment at Halieis, under the protection of Sparta and its allies, of the refugees recently expelled by Argos from Tiryns in the Argeia, or to strike before fortifications [in Halieis] were completed (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 76).

I.3.3.b. Casual Writers of Graffiti in the Argive Plain?

As we have just seen, onomastic graffiti often marked people's property, and so were probably inscribed by their owners. This usually applies to inscribed pots used in non-votive or utilitarian contexts.

Of the eleven published Argive graffiti, only five examples are onomastic (SEG 31.318, 36.340, 38.310, 40.328; Protonotariou-Dheilaki 1972a, 155; Bommelaer and Grandjean 1972, 176; Pariente, Aupert, and Moretti [J.-C.] 1988, 719-720; Onasoglou 1990, 88), and only one example comes from a non-votive context. It was found in a grave at Argos, situated at 262 Gounari Street (Appendix A-10-53: SEG 31.318; Protonotariou-Dheilaki 1972a, 155, pl. 120). The name $E\acute{\sigma}v\acute{\iota}\acute{a}$ was scratched on the bottom of this fifth century black glaze skyphos. The writing appears to be Ionic, and therefore probably not incised by an Argive.

The remainder of the graffiti from the Argive plain are dedictory. Three of them, however, bear personal names. The first two graffiti are fragmentary and no longer preserve the full names of the individuals (Appendix A-10-64 and A-10-40, Argos Mus.,
Aphrodision: Daux 1968, 1028 fig. 15; Lazzarini 1976, 189 no. 73; and Theatre: SEG 16.251; EF 1956b, 386). They were both inscribed on Attic cups of about 450 BCE. The third example comes from the temple of Hera at Tiryns (Figure 31; Frickenhaus, Müller [W.], and Oelmann 1912, 105 no. 226; Jeffery 1967a, 20; 1975, pl. 48; 1990, 150 no. 10). The inscription is on an Attic black-glazed plate of the fifth century. It was a public dedication by the phrouroi, guards who perhaps watched over the akropolis of Tiryns (Jeffery 1967a, 20). The phrouroi are known from other inscriptions (on stone) in the Argolid (Kyra: IG IV 194; Jamot 1889, 186-187; Jeffery 1967a, 20-21; Íria: Jeffery 1967a, 18-20; 1990, 444 no. G; Lazzarini 1976, 33 no. 941). Given the probability that soldiers at Halieis were literate, it is likely that the phrouroi were as well.

I.3.3.C. The Writing of Ostraka at Argos?

Aristotle (Pol. 1302b.18-19) tells us that the Argives used ostraka (Wörle 1964, 126; O’Neil 1981, 342). As yet, however, only one isolated example of what appears to be an ostrakon has been found at Argos (Figure 32; Appendix A-10-65: SEG 36.340; Touchais 1986, 688; Catling 1986, 26; Pariente et al. 1986, 764-765; Piéart and Thalmann 1990, 97). The graffito reads 'Αλκανδρος and was written on the inside surface of the foot of black glaze skyphos (c. 475-450 BCE). Clearly, the name was incised after the pot had been broken, and therefore could be an ostrakon, even if the name is unattested in Argive prosopography. The (secular) context of this graffito -- it was found in the stoa of the agora -- lends further support to the ostrakon interpretation. It is interesting that in Athenian ostrakophoria the location of the ‘polling-station’ may have been somewhere in front of the Stoa Basileios (Brenne 1994, 20).

If ostracism did take place at Argos in the fifth century, we would expect to find more than just one ostrakon. Only two other graffiti beside the Alkandros graffito possibly served as ostraka. The first is incomplete; only the last three letters can be read. Thus, it could originally have been part of a dedicatory inscription, with the name of the donor ending in [---]γις (Appendix A-10-59; Bommelaer and Grandjean 1972, 176 fig. 28). The second graffito is the name Φαίνηπο written on the base of an Attic black glaze cup (c. 500-480 BCE). Its context, in the excavations off room G of the theatre, seems non-votive (Figure 33; Pariente, Aupert and Moretti [J.-C.] 1988, 719-720, fig. 28), and the
writing, which is later than the vase, was scratched around the bottom of the foot in a manner resembling that of Athenian ostraka. But the name Phaenip(ō) is in the genitive case; if it were an ostrakon, we might expect it to be in the nominative like that of Alkandros.

**I.3.3.d. Argive Merchants with Basic Reading Skills**

Inscribed weights appear only rarely in archaic Greece; so the series of inscribed lead weights (c. 500 BCE) from the agora of Argos stands out here (Appendix A-10-65: Piérart et al. 1987, 591; Catling 1987, 18, fig. 23). To some extent these weights indicate that merchants benefited from the ability to read (and perhaps write) in the course of their business. Whether they inscribed their own weights is impossible to determine, but certainly lead was soft enough to be scratched with any sharp instrument. Lead plaques were often used by private individuals to write curses; and in the commercial activities of the agora at Argos (three) lead plaques of the fifth century list various kinds of merchandise (Figure 34; Appendix A-10-59: Piérart et al. 1987, 591; Catling 1987, 18, fig. 23). These were probably texts documenting the registration or delivery of goods, such as hay (Piérart et al. 1987, 591).

**I.3.4. ‘CRAFT’ LITERACY IN THE ARGOLID**

Inscribed dedications, especially those on stone or metal, suggest that for the most part Greek artists were ‘craft’ literate in the archaic period. We have evidence of ‘craft’ literacy among sculptors, masons, and bronze workers working in the Argolid. Inscribed altars, stone and metal objects, statue bases, and bronze plaques come from all over the region. There is no doubt that in the archaic period a small literate community of artists worked in and around Argos and Epidauros, the two areas where we find the most dedications.

Strangely, however, we have no direct (or published) evidence for literacy among pot painters of the Argolid, except for an early (seventh century) dipinto from the Heraion...
The inscription reads: '[-]andros dedicated me.'

Luckily, we do have graffiti on (local and imported) pottery from the Argolid, and to judge from their contents, they may have been inscribed by professionals (EF 1956b, 387 fig. 45; Daux 1968, 1032 fig. 15; 1969, 1004; Piérart et al. 1987, 590 fig. 7; Pariente, Aupert, and Moretti [J.-C.] 1989, 721). Most of the dedicatory graffiti (except for three pieces above) are anonymous and generic, such as ‘I am for the hero’ or ‘I belong to Hera’; they lack the common formula ‘so-and-so dedicated me (this) to ...’. The donor’s name is always left out. When compared with inscriptions on stone and bronze, this kind of anonymity seems odd, because the dedicator’s name was an important and integral part of stone and bronze dedications. Here we assume that dedicants requested that their names be written on the stone or bronze. With graffiti, however, it is possible, though unlikely, that individuals actually inscribed their own pottery and purposefully left out their names. Perhaps the absence of personal names is better explained as follows: pots were inscribed in advance, so owners never got a chance to request a personal dedication. What better way to suit the needs of various worshippers, than to make graffiti anonymous?

1.3.5. WHO COULD READ IN THE ARGOLID?

A few artists even went through the effort of signing their works in the course of their business. Surely, these artists would have wanted their signatures not to fall on blind eyes. The question is: whose eyes did they fall on?

If Argolic artists were advertising their skills to potential clients, both parties needed to be literate. Let us look at the evidence in more detail to see if artists attracted the attention of literate clients from the Argolid.
I.3.5.a. Signatures from the Argolid

The earliest (c. 575-550 BCE) recognised signature of a bronze worker is written in the Argive script on a fragment of a bronze shield strap with two small relief panels and part of a third (Figure 36; Malibu, J. P. Getty Mus. 84.AC.11: SEG 35.266; Anonymous 1985, 166; Jeffery 1990, 444 no. B, pl. 74 no. 6). It states that ‘Aristodamos of Argos made it [the bronze object]’; its provenance remains unknown.

Another sixth century (c. 525 ? BCE) signature of a bronze worker was found on a bronze plaque or stele dedicated by Kleandros (Figure 37; Private possession: SEG 26.419; Androutsopoulos 1949, 73-75; Lazzarini 1976, 278 no. 721; Hansen [P.] 1983, 195 no. 366; Jeffery 1990, 173-174 no. 7, 445). The inscription is said to come from Tourovrysi near Áyios Yeórgios in Nemea, but Jeffery (1990, 173) assigns it to a hand from Mykenai. The texts begins with the signature of an unknown artist, whose name ends in [---]ιαδές.

We find more evidence for Argive sculptors signing their works on the bases of statues. None of these signed bases was set up in Argos, however. They come from Olympia, Delphi, and Hermione (Appendix A-50).

One of the earliest (late seventh-early sixth century) and most famous of Argive sculptures was signed by a certain (Poly/ ?)medes (Figure 38; Jeffery 1990, 154-156). The signature is on the base of a kouros in Delphi, along with another similar inscribed base and kouros, the two identified in previous literature as Kleobis and Biton (Delphi Mus. 4672, 980: Homolle 1909, 5f.; Von Premerstein 1910, 41-49; Schwyzer 1923, no. 317; Daux 1937, 61ff.; Richter 1942, 78ff.; van Groningen 1945, 34-43; Buschor 1950, 35ff.; Tod 1946, 4-5 no. 3; Marcadé 1953, no. 115; Vatin 1977, 13-22; Foley 1988, 128; Jeffery 1990, 154-156, 168 no. 4, 444). The inscriptions themselves are badly damaged and this has resulted in considerable controversy over their decipherment. Jeffery (1990, 155) sees the first line of the second inscribed base as the name of another sculptor, perhaps from the same workshop as (Poly)medes, whose name ended in [---]τοῦν. However we choose to decipher these inscriptions, one maker was undoubtedly Argive and signed his name in the Argive script.
A signed base from Olympia once (c. 480-475 BCE) supported a group of bronze statues (Figure 39; Olympia Mus. 23, 28, 30, 12: SEG 11.1250; Roehl 1882, nos. 41-42, 95; 1907, 56 no. 11, 27 no. 3; Loewy 1885, 24-26 no. 30; Dittenberger and Purgold 1896, 630-631; Collitz and Bechtel 1899, 124-125 nos. 3270-3271; Roberts [E.] 1887, 114 nos. 80-81; Schwyzer 1923, no. 80.3; Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948, nos. 142, 153; Hansen [P.] 1983, 204-205 no. 380; Jeffery 1990, 160, 169 no. 19, 211, 215 no. 20, 443, 446, pl. 28). The monument was dedicated by Praxiteles, an Arkadian who emigrated to Sicily, but bears the signatures of three Argive sculptors: Asopodoros, Atotos, and Argeiades. A fourth artist, Athenodoros, was Akhaian. Although the monument is generally described as Argive, its inscription is not in true Argive script, 'because it uses the non-Argive lunate gamma' (Jeffery 1990, 160). Perhaps the sculptors themselves did not carve out the letters on the stone bases, but left them to the masons (see below, for such an example from Hermione).

Another statue base from Olympia was signed by an Argive sculptor, whose name is now lost (Olympia Mus. 946: Roehl 1882, no. 44a; Loewy 1885, 27-28 no. 32; Dittenberger and Purgold 1896, 632; Collitz and Bechtel 1899, 125 no. 3273; Jeffery 1990, 166, 169 no. 24). The name of the sculptor was in a different script from that of the dedication, which was written in Ionic lettering. The artist may have been one of the several Argive bronze workers flourishing around 475 BCE (Jeffery 1990, 166).

Dorotheos was certainly one such sculptor. His signature appears on a base for a group of bronze statues set up at Delphi (Figure 40; Delphi Mus. 3840: Pomtow 1909, 170; Bourguet 1929, 326ff. no. 502; Peek 1934, 47; Marcadé 1953, no. 30; Jeffery 1990, 166, 170 no. 35). Although the attribution to Dorotheos remains tentative in this example, we have another base from Hermione that bears his signature in Argive letters (Figure 41; IG IV 684; SEG 11.379; Loewy 1885, 43-44 no. 51; Philadelpheus 1910, 174; Peek 1934, 45ff. no. 8b; Marcadé 1953, no. 31; Jameson 1953, 149ff.; Lazzarini 1976, 190 no. 75; Jeffery 1990, 178-179, 182 no. 9). The Hermione base was found on the 'Bitsi' near the second tower of the Venetian wall that cuts across the promontory roughly halfway from the tip (Jameson 1953, 148-149). The text is in the East Argolic script, but the signature is in Argive letters of about 460-450 BCE (Jeffery 1990, 178-179). Dorotheos no doubt
came ‘from Argos to see his work erected, and signed the base himself’ (Jeffery 1990, 178-179); not all sculptors did.

The last of the series of signatures from the Argolid is from a Kretan sculptor, Kresilas (Figure 42; IG IV 683; SEG 11.378; Roehl 1882, no. 47; 1907, 29 no. 2; Loewy 1885, 36 no. 45; Roberts [E.] 1887, no. 287; Michel 1900, 823 no. 1066; Peek 1934, 45ff. no. 8a; Marcadé 1953, no. 63; Jameson 1953, 149ff. no. 2; Hammond 1960, 33-36; Wörle 1964, 61ff.; Guarducci 1967, 366-367 no. 5; Lazzarini 1976, 189-190 no. 74; Jeffery 1990, 178-179, 182 no. 8, 446). This inscription was also found in the Venetian wall at Hermione. Perhaps the sculpture came from the same workshop as the previous dedication, though the writing dates to c. 450 BCE or a little later (Jeffery 1990, 178-179, 446). The signature of Kresilas is not in the Aiginetan script of Kydonia (which he never uses, see Marcadé 1953), his native city, ‘but in the same lettering as the dedications’ (Jeffery 1990, 179). According to Jeffery, either Kresilas sent no signature with this bronze or the local masons failed to copy his signature exactly from the draft.

I.3.5.b. The Advertising Value of Signed Works

On current evidence it seems that, if Argolic artists were trying to advertise their skills to potential clients, they were not doing a good job of it within the Argolid. Signatures of Argolic (especially Argive) sculptors and bronze workers have been rarely found within the Argolid. Perhaps artists were so well known within their own community that they need not bother to sign works that were set up locally. It is equally possible, however, that their signatures were ineffective, because the local population was on the whole illiterate. Then, the presence of signed works at Olympia and Delphi might imply that the ‘international’ mix of members from those communities in general were literate.

I.3.5.c. Passers-by and the Reading of Inscribed Tombstones

Another type of inscription that is thought to have been read by the average citizen is the funerary monument. On the basis that some inscribed gravestones are positioned beside paths and address passers-by, some scholars assume that such passers-by could read what
was written (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 764; Svenbro 1988a; Whitley 1997, 644). So far very few inscribed gravestones have been found in the Argolid, and none of them addresses passers-by.

Earlier I argued that as grave markers, they had a significance regardless of whether they were read. That does not mean 'that their written context was irrelevant; but ... [as with] other tangible memorials in some ways, they [were] not purely documents whose written content was all that mattered.' (Thomas [R.] 1989, 51). The shape of a monument said something about the social position of the individual (McGowan 1995, 632). Some grave markers had 'visual connotations directly related to the use of columns on racecourses' (McGowan 1995, 626).

This concept can be illustrated more clearly by three funerary monuments from the Argolid. The first two are columns from Troizen. The earliest column is on an octagonal shaft of about 550-525 BCE that was re-used in a hellenistic cistern (Figure 43; IG IV 801; SEG 11.388; Legrand 1893, 84-86, 627; Roehl 1907, no. 110; Schwyzer 1923, 49 no. 102; Vollgraff 1929, 234; Peek 1934, 50-52; 1955, 56 no. 216; Welter 1941, 39ff., 54; Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948, no. 30; Hansen [P.] 1975, 21 no. 143; 1983, 75-76 no. 138; Jeffery 1990, 176, 181 no. 2, 445, pl. 32; Robb 1994, 66-67; McGowan 1995, 621). A capital originally stood on top of the shaft, 'which carried a tripod won, according to the epigram, by Damotimos, the son of Amphidama, in a race at the Games in Thebes' (Jeffery 1990, 176). The inscription reads on two faces: side A, 'This is the tombstone of Damotimos; his dear mother, Amphidama, had it made because no children were born in his megaron.' and side B, 'And the tripod that he won running at Thebes ... unharmed, she set up over (her) son.' (McGowan 1995, 621). These games probably paid tribute to Apollo Ismenios, or they were funeral games, where one tried to win tripods (Jeffery 1990, 176). The reference to Damotimos entering a Theban contest probably reflects Troizen’s general attitude towards its neighbours across the Saronic Gulf (Jeffery 1990, 176).

The second funerary monument from Troizen (c. 500 BCE) was a round, unfluted column found beside the road from Galatás to Troizen (Figure 44; Poros Mus. ?: IG IV 800; SEG 11.387; Legrand 1900, 179-180; Wilhelm 1905, 416; Roehl 1907, no. 110.7; Schwyzer 1923, no. 101; Welter 1941, 40, 51; Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948, no. 29; Peek 1955, no.
165; Guarducci 1967, 364 no. 2; Hansen [P.] 1975, 21 no. 144; 1983, no. 139; Day 1989 [J. W.], 25; Jeffery 1990, 176ff., 182 no. 3, pl. 32, 445; Robb 1994, 65; McGowan 1995, 621). Previous publications show a hexagonal socket on top of the column, indicating that it once held a statue that perhaps commemorated the skills of the deceased (Legrand 1900, 180). Its epitaph reads: ‘Vison [the father] made this monument for dead Praxiteles, and his companions piled up this mound, moaning heavily, in exchange for his good deeds; and their fleeting work they completed in one day.’ (McGowan 1995, 621).

The possibility of a visual association between a funerary column and a column on a racecourse is further suggested by an inscribed Doric capital of about 500 BCE discovered near the Heraion (Figure 22; also see above, I.3.2.a; SEG 11.305; 22.262; 33.294). The capital served both as a monument for a young man who died in battle, and as a memorial to his athletic prowess (McGowan 1995, 628). The epitaph reads: side A, ‘I, Kossina, have buried Hyssematas near the hippodrome, providing a memorial for many men today, and those who will come after, of a brave man’, and side B, ‘who died in battle and lost young manhood, (he was) prudent, a winner of victories, and wise among his peers.’ (McGowan 1995, 628). Because Hyssematas was buried beside the hippodrome, ‘it is possible that his athletic prowess lay in chariot racing. Apparently, by using the column ..., Kossina intended to bring to mind the shape of a turning post on a racecourse.’ (McGowan 1995, 628). The ‘turning post’ shape of the capital and Kossina’s choice of location for the tomb near the hippodrome provided enough visual information for passers-by to realise that Hyssematas was an ‘aristocrat’: he was wealthy enough to own race horses (McGowan 1995, 632).

I.3.6. SUMMARY

From the hundred or so specimens of sixth and fifth century inscriptions that have survived from Argos and the Argolid we can at least say that some people could write. Evidence for ‘scribal’ literacy, or for the administrative use of writing, centres around the Argive plain, at Argos, Mykenai, and Tiryns. Two main areas of society used writing in this way: professional scribes (the hiaromnamones) and high-ranking officials or judges (the damiorgoi and the artynoi).
The hiaromnamones comprised only a small proportion of the population at Argos (with the Argive Heraion), Mykenai (with the Mykenaian Heraion and Asprékhoma), and Tiryns. We hear of four such officials working together for one community. Perhaps they were ‘representatives’ picked from each of the four local tribes. Part of their services to a community included taking over the office of damiorgoi in their absence, judging cult matters, imposing fines, keeping order in religious affairs, and ensuring that written laws were respected.

As judges and public workers, the damiorgoi at Argos and Mykenai (and the Mykenaian Heraion) dealt with serious acts of impiety, imposed fines, punished state offenders, oversaw the running of public buildings and festivals, and supervised the work of city officials. They were also responsible for exiling, or confiscating the property of, those who defaced or ignored written laws, killed, and committed crimes against the city. If they were highest in command and saw themselves as the inheritors of a royal and prestigious power (Kelly 1976, 132; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 322), they were no doubt also literate.

The artynoi, who may have replaced the damiorgoi at Argos, held a judicial position, similar in many respects to that of the damiorgoi. Like the damiorgoi, they must have come across written documents in the course of their duties. Though they perhaps chose to leave most of the writing to scribes, to the hiaromnamones, they probably knew how to read.

Unfortunately, the few other public inscriptions that could be used to support the existence of ‘scribal’ literacy in the Argolid mention neither the hiaromnamones nor the damiorgoi. As we have already seen, one comes from Argos and lists payments to ‘phratries’ (Argos Mus.: Jeffery 1990, 444 no. E; Kritzas 1992, 231-240; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, no. 65). Two others come from Halieis (Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus. HM 620: SEG 42.281; Jameson 1974a, 73; 1976c, 235; Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus. HM 237, 345, 388: Jameson 1974a, 71 n18; Foley 1988, 130); these texts, written on bronze plaques, have been published only in preliminary form. Two more legal texts have been discovered at the sanctuaries of Epidauros, but they date to the late fifth century (IG IV 913-914; IG IV² 1.40-41, 1.146; Jeffery 1990, 181-182 nos. 17-18, 446).
Although there are limits to what may be said about the extant public inscriptions, it is interesting that the existing evidence for 'scribal' literacy is almost exclusively confined to the Argive plain, with just a few exceptions in the Akte. This brings us to consider whether the communities of these two regions put literacy to different uses. In a recent study Hall (1997a, 152) has questioned whether the differences that emerge between the two regions concerning the choice between the 'red' and 'blue' alphabets has an ethnic significance. Unlikely, he concluded (see also Foley 1988, 124ff.). It is also unlikely that writing was put to different uses in both regions. If there is as yet relatively little evidence of 'scribal' literacy in the Akte, it is probably more a consequence of survival and archaeological recovery than any cultural or ethnic differences between these two regions. As at Athens and Sparta, I think the scribes at Epidauros, Hermione, Troizen, and other communities of the Akte wrote their public documents on perishable materials.

We should also note the technical details of the inscriptions; some of these survive better than the documents themselves and are more often to be found in the archaeological record. Argos provides us with a good example. The holes on the many architrave blocks from the hypostyle hall in the agora at Argos happen to match those on inscribed bronze plaques, indicating that the inscriptions were originally nailed to the façade of a building (probably that of the temple of Apollo Lykios) (Figure 45; Thuc. 5.47.11; EF 1953b, 248-253; Bommelaer and des Courtils 1994). From the holes visible on the one hundred and seventy blocks at his disposal, des Courtils (1981, 607-610) estimates that over one hundred bronze plaques once covered the façade of this building. If the plaques originally covered the entire exterior of this building, we might expect to recover many more bronze plaques from Argos in the future, unless of course they have corroded completely or were recycled in antiquity. It is worth noting that similar plaques with holes were found at Mykenai, the Heraion, the sanctuaries of Epidauros, and Halieis. This implies that the practice of nailing bronze plaques to (temple) walls was fairly widespread within the communities of the Argolid. It also shows how dangerous it is to draw conclusions about the epigraphical habits of a region based only on the documents themselves.

What is at least clear is that some areas of society within the communities of the Akte were literate. Signs of 'informal' literacy in the form of graffiti and of 'craft' literacy in the form of dedications have been found throughout the region. The best evidence for
‗informal‘ literacy comes from Halieis. Soldiers living there (in a Laconian garrison ?) wrote casual graffiti, usually their own names, on several black glaze cups from the akropolis area. This kind of ‗informal‘ literacy reminds us of the graffiti from Abu-Simbel in the Sudan, where Greek mercenaries (from Ionia and the Dorian Hexapolis) serving with the Egyptian king Psammetikhos inscribed their names on the statues of Rameses II (Bernard and Masson [O.] 1957; Meiggs and Lewis 1988, 12-13 no. 7). As Whitley concludes: ‘No Cretan, Argive or Spartan ever scrawled his name thus‘ (Stoddart and Whitley 1988, 767). He may have a point, because so far we have very little evidence for literate soldiers in the Argeia; the only possible sign of such literacy comes from Tiryns, where guards (the phrouroi) of the sanctuary dedicated an inscribed pot to their local goddess. Perhaps more Tirynthians (including soldiers) knew how to write, because the use of the Argive script at Halieis suggests that some of Tiryns‘ former inhabitants were literate.

In general, ‗casual‘ non-dedicatory graffiti appear only rarely in excavations of Argolic sites. A single sherd from Argos was interpreted as an ostrakon; but little else indicates that ostrakophoria were ever held at Argos. Some (male) citizens and merchants at Argos no doubt knew how to read and perhaps write. Evidence for this, however, is meagre; only a few lead weights have so far been found at Argos.

Dedicatory graffiti occur more frequently. As anonymous dedications, they tell us nothing about their writers, which in itself seems odd; their anonymity suggests that perhaps the graffiti were prepared (in advance) by potters and vase painters. These graffiti, together with one painted dipinto from the Heraion, make up the only surviving evidence we have for literacy among Argolic potters and vase painters.

We have more evidence for ‗craft‘ literacy among Argive sculptors, masons, and bronze workers. Some Argive sculptors evidently signed their works as a means of advertising themselves, but not within Argos itself; only one signed work by an Argolic artist has been found in the Argolid, at Hermione. It is possible that artists‘ signatures had little advertising value in a primarily illiterate society.

There is little explicit evidence that people in the Argolid read inscriptions; no inscribed tombstone even addressed passers-by. It seems that the visual aspects of the monuments
alone were enough to reveal the status of the deceased. Whatever else passers-by needed to know about the dead person, they could get by asking one of his/her family members or one of the few literate members of their community, who could read out the inscription.

So much for what we know of literacy from Argolic inscriptions. If we compare the results of what is preserved from the Argolid with what has survived from other regions in Greece, we can at least recognise that the Argolid had the same kinds of literacy as did Attica, Krete, and Sparta. This is as far as I will go on the subject of regional variations in the uses of the Greek alphabet, because to speak of regional ‘models’ of literacy based on differences in the quantities of inscriptions is misleading, pace Hall (1997a, 145) who continues to maintain that ‘most of the other regions of mainland Greece -- notably, Euboia, Korinth, the Argolid, Lakonia and possibly Boiotia -- appear to follow the Attic model’ of literacy, i.e. the number of personal or informal inscriptions outweighs the number of official inscriptions (my italics).
Chapter II

The Exploitation of the Natural Landscape

It seems to me we all look at Nature too much, and live with her too little.
Oscar Wilde.

In this chapter the focus shifts to the physical landscape. In the past, the landscape has been perceived as a phenomenon that is primarily a human creation; it has been studied and understood by archaeologists in functionalist terms just like a ceramic pot (Darvill 1997, 2). These studies have been important stages in the development of archaeological approaches to landscape, but as a social concept, a landscape incorporates a broader variety of themes on the interaction between people and the worlds that they inhabit (Bender 1993, 1).

A landscape is potentially dynamic and historically sensitive; but does a study of spatial organisation in settlements necessarily reflect behaviour and social organisation? Although the organisation of settlement space is related to aspects of life, it is important to remain aware of some of the limitations of settlement studies in archaeology.

In attempting to generate a balanced picture of the archaic landscape of the Argolid, I place the emphasis in this chapter on human activity and human involvement. Part I builds on the three intensive survey projects conducted recently in the Argolid outlined in the Introduction. The discussion begins by looking at agricultural activities in the landscape, and by making inferences about settlement data, general trends in patterns of land ownership, and the relation and interaction of agricultural labour. ‘Did landowners work their own holdings? What labour systems were in operation?’ (Alcock 1993, 55). How does land ownership relate to residence? Although the material record from surveys provides the essential data – ‘site size, location, and function’ -- these questions
sometimes have to be interpreted in the light of what we know from excavations and various ancient testimonia (Alcock 1993, 55).

Any discussion of the agricultural landscape must naturally embrace pastoral activities. Here I address similar general questions about ownership, the status of workers, and the economic and social benefits of owning animals.

The exploitation of the natural landscape in archaic times was in no way limited to farming and the rearing of animals. Non-agricultural and maritime activities, such as mining, the exploitation of clay sources and timber, quarrying, and fishing, were also important. Since there is very little direct archaeological evidence for these activities, we must invariably turn to the extant products that derive from these resources.

This approach to material culture may seem somewhat encyclopaedic, but only such a holistic approach can create a clearer picture of how people exploited the environment around them.
II.1. Settlements and Agriculture

II.1.1. INTRODUCTION

The typical Greek polis was a unit including both town and country -- a settlement area (asty) and a rural territory (chora) (Shipley 1996, 8). From archaic to hellenistic times there were a thousand or more poleis scattered throughout Greece; but in a recent article on city-chora relationships, we are told that ‘there are only two, Sparta and Athens, about which we have anything like the requisite sort of detailed evidence to conduct a fruitful analysis …’ (Cartledge 1998, 40). However, times are changing fast: certainly the publication of the three intensive surveys in the Argolid makes it one of the most well published regions in Greece, especially when compared to Attica (see below for a review of surveys in Greece.).

The information available from Argolic surveys can no doubt be used to determine what human activities appear in the archaeological record, but can it bring us closer to understanding past interactions in the human landscape on a social level? I believe that a close analysis of survey data for a specific historical period, when taken together with textual and excavation material, allows us to think in social time (the span of an adult lifetime) and thus contributes greatly to the understanding of settlement patterns in a socio-historical context. These patterns need to be explained in terms of agricultural strategies and social structure. We need to ask ourselves what people chose to do, and where. In an agricultural society this question translates as: who owned and farmed the land, what agricultural strategies did they pursue, where did they live, and how could they move around? The choice of where to live may seem secondary here, but it is especially relevant to the subject of land exploitation.

After examining such questions, I shall move on to another aspect of the agricultural landscape: the place of animals in farming. Although ‘the countryside of the shepherd is a different countryside from that of the arable farmer ..., the two ... must meet’ (Osborne 1987, 50). Agricultural activities tie in with animal husbandry, since the cultivated, together with the uncultivated, land was exploited in antiquity.
II.1.2. REVIEW OF PUBLISHED WORKS

Apart from the evidence of surveys, discussion of human landscape, land-use, and agriculture has been limited to before or after the archaic period (for the bronze age, see Halstead 1987; 1992; for the classical period, see below). To my knowledge, Foxhall (1995, 239-250; 1997a, 113-136) is the only scholar who has approached the subject of agricultural systems for the early iron age and archaic periods. In ‘Bronze to Iron: Agricultural Systems and Political Structures in Late Bronze Age and Early Iron Age Greece’ (1995) she suggests changes that occurred in agricultural economies between late bronze age states and poleis of the early archaic period. More recently (1997), in an article on Solonian property classes, she has briefly touched upon the agricultural systems of archaic Greece (on Solon, see also Gallant 1982, 119ff.). Isager and Skydsgaard’s book, Ancient Greek Agriculture (1992), provides another brief treatment of pre-classical agriculture and animal husbandry, although it essentially deals with classical Greek agriculture.

Most discussions of pre-modern Greek agriculture have focused on the classical period, especially classical Athens. Important works for this period, besides that of Isager and Skydsgaard, include Amouretti’s (1986) study of cereal and olive culture, Osborne’s Classical Landscape with Figures (1987), Burford’s (1993) study of land and labour, and Foxhall’s forthcoming book on olive cultivation. The series of papers delivered in Athens (Wells [B.] 1992) and in the Leicester-Nottingham conference (Shipley and Salmon 1996; for review, see Gill 1998b) also present important discussions of the human landscape in later periods.

For hellenistic and Roman landscapes, the works of Foxhall (1990a), Barker and Lloyd (1991), and Alcock (1993) are basic. Their observations and those of others greatly help us to understand some of the results of recent surface survey projects in Greece.
In the past twenty-five years or so archaeologists have progressively turned to survey as a means of studying the past. The alleged aims of most of these surveys include the observation of human settlement and land use in various regions throughout history (see Cherry 1983, 375-416; 1994, 91-112; Bintliff and Snodgrass 1985, 123-161; 1988a, 57-71; 1988b, 506-513; 1991, 88-93; Bintliff 1985, 196-216; 1997, 1-38; Cherry, Davis, and Mantzourani 1991; Barker 1991, 1-9; Barker and Lloyd 1991; Wells [B] 1996; Cavanagh et al. 1996; Snodgrass 1985b, 87-95; 1987-89, 52-70; 1990, 113-136; Davis 1991, 132; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994; Alcock, Cherry, and Davis 1994, 137-170; Alcock and Cherry 1996, 207-211).

Alcock (1993, 33ff.) provides an excellent overview of the current progress of regional survey in Greece and of the problems affecting survey methodology and interpretation of survey results (note that her bibliographic entry for Roy et al. 1988 is incorrect). Here I list some of the most important published intensive surveys undertaken in Greece.

The largest study area (70 km$^2$) has been surveyed by a British/Dutch team in Laconia near Sparta, on the east side of the Eurotas river (it is only partly published, see Cavanagh and Crouwel 1988, 77-88; Cavanagh et al. 1996; Mee and Cavanagh 1998, 141-148; for review, see Gill 1998a, 137-138).

Two other surveys in the western/central Peloponnesos include those at Messenia and at Megalopolis. The Minnesota project that took place in Messenia was essentially concentrated on reconstructing a bronze age environment (McDonald and Rapp 1972). In Arkadia two study areas were explored by a British team between 1981 and 1984, in the territory of Megalopolis (60 km$^2$) (Lloyd, Owens, and Roy 1985, 217-224; 1988, 179-182; 1992, 185-194).

So far there has been no intensive survey of Attica except for Lohmann’s (1985, 27-57; 1993) work in the south-west, in a region known in classical times as Atene. The survey focused mainly on classical and later material.
In Boiotia two large survey projects have taken place: the first from 1979 was in south-west Boiotia (55 km²) (Bintliff and Snodgrass 1985, 123-161; Bintliff 1985, 196-216; 1991b, 122-132), and second more recent one (1985 to 1989) was conducted in the Skourta plain (44 km²) (Munn and Munn 1989, 274-275; 1990, 73-127).

A collaborative British, American, and Greek survey took place in 1983-84 in the north-west part of the island of Keos (20 km²) (Cherry, Davis, and Mantzourani 1991). A second Cycladic island project was undertaken by a British team on Melos (30 km²) in 1976-77 (Renfrew and Wagstaff 1982). More recently, a survey team has been working at Ayia Kyriaki on Melos (Photos-Jones et al. 1999, 377-413).

Kythera and Krete too have received a fair amount of attention from surveyors. Most of the projects (such as Sphakia, Praisos, Mesara plain, Gournia, and Kythera), however, are ongoing and their results are not all fully published (see Nixon, Moody, and Rackham 1988, 159-173 for Sphakia; Whitley, Connor, and Mason 1995, 405-428; Whitley, Prent, and Thorne 1999, 215-264 for Praisos; Broodbank 1999, 191-214 for the British, as opposed to the Australian survey of Kythera).

Another recent survey by the Danish in Aetolia has only been published in preliminary form (Dietz et al. 1998, 234-314; see also Petropoulos and Rizakis 1994 for a preliminary report on Patras).

In the north-east Peloponnnesos there have been no fewer than six survey projects: the most recent of these is the Eastern Korinthia Archaeological Survey (not yet published), an on-going American project; the largest is the Nemea Valley Archaeological Project (50 km²), a joint American-Greek-British venture carried out in 1984-89 (Wright et al. 1990, 579-659; Alcock 1991b, 421-463); another project is being carried out by the Dutch on the plain of Astros (Goester 1993, 39-112); the other three, to which I now turn, I have already been noted in the Introduction.
II.1.4.1. ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEYS IN THE ARGOLID

I summarise here the results of the three surveys that form the basic structure of this chapter.

II.1.4.a. The Southern Argolid Survey

The Argolid Exploration Project (AEP), an American undertaking of the early 1980s in the southern Argolid, focuses on a particular area, which is smaller than a region (such as Messenia or the Argolic Akte as a whole) and larger than a single polis (Figure 46; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 3). The peninsula faces the Argolic gulf and the open Aegean (Figure 47). Because of its geographical position, it seldom operated as a closed system; it always had contact with the Akte, the Argive plain, and the neighbouring islands across the sea.

Although coverage by intensive survey of the region was only about 20% (44 km²), much more was surveyed extensively (Figure 48; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 218). In addition to the excavations at Halieis and the Frankhthí cave, the total research project included a wide range of ethnographic studies (Forbes [H.] 1976, 236-250; Forbes [H.] and Koster 1976, 109-126; Forbes [M.] and Clark 1976, 251-264; Koster and Koster 1976, 275-285), studies in ethnoarchaeology (Murray [P.] and Kardulias 1986, 21-41) and geomorphology (Pope and van Andel 1984, 281-306; van Andel and Lianos 1983, 303-324), and has produced many other articles that integrate the several levels of research (for example, Runnels and van Andel 1987, 303-334; van Andel, Runnels, and Pope 1986, 103-128).

The publication of the first of three projected volumes focuses on the survey evidence (for a ‘preview’ to Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, see van Andel and Runnels 1987). As many reviewers note, it includes a very good geological and environmental analysis by van Andel, and a brilliant historical and archaeological synthesis by Jameson (see Davis 1995, 458-465; Alcock and Cherry 1996, 209-211; Gill 1996, 128-130; Osborne 1996c, 165-169; Broodbank 1997, 371-374). However, details concerning the individual periods within a site are in most cases only given a cursory explanation (Alcock and Cherry 1996, 210). Another disadvantage for those studying the historical periods, is that
the finds (pottery, coins, architectural members, etc.) have not yet been published (Munn, forthcoming; cf. Runnels, Pullen and Langdon 1995 for the prehistoric and early iron age finds).

**II.1.4.b. The Methana Survey**

The rugged volcanic peninsula of Methana was explored intensively in the 1980s by a British team, whose members have recently published the survey results (Figure 49; Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997). The peninsula, barely attached to the north of the Troizenia, is located on the Saronic gulf, 'in the orbit of several of the major political centres: Aigina, Argos, Athens, Corinth, and Mycenae' (Figure 47; Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 2). Despite its close proximity to the Troizenia, it was often politically and culturally independent of its neighbours (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 33).

Although only 21% of the peninsula (10 km²) was investigated by the survey team, the peninsula itself is not large; surveyors maintain that the area remaining to be explored consisted of 'slopes so steep that few if any sites are likely to have been located or have survived there' (Figure 50; Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 33).

**II.1.4.c. The Berbati-Limnes Survey**

The Berbati-Limnes survey, the most restricted of the three projects in the Argolid, is a collaborative Swedish/American project focusing on a small area east of Mykenai, the valley or plain by the village of Prosymna and the mountainous region around the village of Limnés (Figure 51; Appendix A-19; Wells [B.] 1996, 9). The area is hemmed in by mountains, but a number of strategic passes leading to Mykenai and Korinthos would have been used as a means of communication with the outside world (Wells [B.], Runnels, and Zangger 1990, 207). The surveyed areas seem marginal today when compared with prosperity of the Argive plain; perhaps it was just as peripheral in antiquity (Wells [B.] 1996, 9).

The Berbati-Limnes area has about 61 km² of very uneven territory, of which about 25 km² were surveyed intensively (Figure 52; Wells [B.] 1996, 16). The survey's
methodology was modelled on that of the southern Argolid survey, but the presentation and interpretation of the results leave the reader somewhat disappointed. The publication is basically a detailed description of artifacts and their find-spots. Except for the brief concluding remarks on prehistoric land use and economy, it offers only a limited discussion of settlement patterns and land-use in the archaic period.

II.1.5. THE ORGANISATION OF THE AGRICULTURAL LANDSCAPE

With the evidence from these and other surveys we have become more aware of the variety of ways in which human activity has been organised within the Greek landscape, but surveys have (as yet) only imperfectly revealed the landscape of the archaic period. Compared with the numerous studies in settlement and land use for the classical period, the archaic has received little attention, probably because it is less visible than the classical period. Unfortunately, one cannot simply apply interpretations of classical data to the archaic period, because what holds for the former period, does not necessarily hold for the other.

The following discussion of the agricultural landscape of the archaic Argolic is an attempt to correct this imbalance, on the basis of published evidence.

II.1.5.a. Settlements Patterns in the Argolid: The Survey Evidence

The study of different archaeological surveys presents a few practical problems. Surveys vary in intensity, leading to inconsistencies in site identification. For example, the approach used for site collection in the southern Argolid survey failed to make allowances for data assemblages that would help to distinguish site components of differing functions and/or periods (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 223). Furthermore, the size of sites for specific periods can be rather haphazard (Osborne 1996c, 165-169); the extent of ‘find-spots’ (usually referred to as sites) in the Berbati-Limnes survey is not even recorded. In the southern Argolid there are areas about whose soils, past or present, no information is available, because only major drainage systems were mapped in the geomorphological studies (on climate and geography of Greece, see Semple 1932; Philipppson 1952; Rackham 1990, 88-91; Sallares 1991). ‘Attempts to
determine the paleofertility of soils were made during the southern Argolid survey, but failed because chemical analyses can only determine present compositions, not show the chemical history of the soils’ (Zangger 1992, 15). We must also remember that Argive pottery from the archaic period is still relatively unknown, less visible than late geometric sherds, and certainly more difficult to date (see Runnels, Pullen, and Langdon 1996). Caution must therefore be used in interpreting the survey evidence.

Unlike scientific experiments, intensive surveys cannot be replicated. Methodologies can be criticised and compared, and the finds can be re-scrutinised; in the end, however, we have no choice but to accept the authors’ interpretations. A study of the historical periods that aims to use the full archaeological potential of survey results must therefore deploy as much topographical, geological, and historical information as possible. This task is not always easy, since the importance of survey is usually ‘on a general diachronic perspective’ (Alcock and Cherry 1996, 210). Nonetheless, it forms an important part of any study that attempts to discuss agricultural activities in the landscape.

In this section I begin by presenting the available data on the physical environment.

The Use of the Terms ‘Town’, ‘Village’, and ‘Farmstead’

I must first define my use of the words ‘towns’, ‘villages’, and ‘farmsteads’. They are mere labels and correspond in no way to any modern uses of the terms (an ancient ‘town’ might only be very small modern village; a ‘farmstead’ might only be a shed or a barn), hence, their appearance within quotation marks.

In most historical terms, ‘towns’ were perhaps cities, city-states, or states, and in Greek terminology, poleis, but in discussing landscapes I prefer to avoid of such terms and their implied connotations. Such words have always been difficult to define, and here is not the place to review what constitutes an archaic city/city-state/state or polis (see Snodgrass 1977; 1986b, 47-68; Morris [I.] 1991, 25-57; Hansen [M.] and Fischer-Hansen1994, 23-90; Hansen [M.] 1997, 9-23).
The Southern Argolid (Figure 48)

During the eighth century the size of settlements, and probably also the size of the population, increased sharply, as is the case in the rest of Greece (Snodgrass 1971, 402-416; 1980a, 19-24; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 374). From the eighth to the seventh century there is some degree of continuity of site location in the southern Argolid, with an increase in the number of sites and a higher percentage of new sites in the seventh and sixth centuries (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 374).

By the seventh century a hierarchy of settlements had emerged, with ‘towns’, ‘villages’, and isolated ‘farmsteads’. The appearance of ‘towns’, created by the concentration of the functions (and populations ?) of scattered villages, which had been founded in the geometric period, marks a significant change from earlier periods (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 254). Here, as elsewhere in the Argolid, activity is best documented at nucleated ‘town’ or ‘village’ sites.

There was a ‘high degree of continuity of settlement [from the archaic to the classical period] (between 70% and 80% of Archaic sites continued to be occupied) and no sharp changes in land use’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 382).

The ‘Towns’ (Figure 53)

We find three archaic centres in the southern Argolid, at Hermione (E19 in the survey’s site register), Halieis (A65), and possibly at Mases (C11). Hermione (22.5 ha = 0.23 km²) and Halieis (18.0 ha = 0.18 km²) were large fortified ‘towns’, with sanctuaries, cemeteries, and evidence of a built-up area of habitation (Appendix A-38, A-50; see Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 249 for the categories of site functions).

Hermione was the largest and longest-lived centre of the southern Argolid, with a total ‘home territory of some 39 km², of which 18 [km²] were cultivable and eventually [it] possessed not only the territory of the “aborted” polis of Mases but also that of Eileoi, Didymoi, and Thermisi, for a total area of some 275 km², of which 87 [km²] were cultivable’ (Appendix A-36, A-45, A-51, A-52; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 377, table 1.1). By contrast, Halieis was small, with a total territory of 84 km² (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, table 1.1). Yet it had a high percentage (43% or 36 km²)
of agricultural land to total territory. As far as we can tell, it had no archaic ‘villages’ within its territory.

The region of Halieis has been described as a large area of flat alluvial coastal plain, with low rolling hills divided by several small basins and some larger valleys (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 153). It did not have the best agricultural land, because of the poor flow of its main stream and its lack of springs, but other factors made up for its relative fertility (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, figs. 3.9-11; Acheson 1997, 173). One of these has to do with its soils. ‘Because of the very shallow slope of the land, water retention in the soils of the coastal plain would have been ... [high and] the danger of soil erosion on the lowlands [Loutro Alluvium] would have been minimal.’ (Acheson 1997, 173). The total territory exploited by its ‘town’ inhabitants probably also included the deep and rich Upland soils of the Flámboura area on the neck of the Halieis peninsula (Appendix A-42; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, figs. 3.19, 6.18).

On the east side of the peninsula the adjacent promontory of Hermione is rock-strewn and plunges abruptly into the sea (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 153). The kámboś of Hermione, a plain of four to five kilometres on the east side of the peninsula, has a bit of Upland soils and Loutro Alluvium, thus making the area good for agriculture (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 39, fig. 6.16). Moreover, the coastal plains of Dhardheza and Kapari, together with a large portion of the Pikrodhafni valley, were also very fertile. The (Upland) soils in these areas lay above ophiolites, a bedrock combining ‘dark igneous rocks, thin purple limestones, dark shales, and cherts’, which forms excellent soils (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 17, fig. 6.16). These areas were also irrigated by springs and streams in the various drainage systems (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 39, figs. 3.10-11). All these factors make for ‘good agricultural land in the interior valleys’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 17).

Both Hermione and Halieis also had ‘excellent small harbours’ (van Andel and Runnels 1987, 109). The bay at Hermione had a draft of ‘less than one or two metres of water until the rapid rise of the sea in the third and fourth centuries AD’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 209). This shallowness, together with its protected beach and enclosed harbour, would have made it convenient for the drawing-up of small ships in the archaic
period (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 54). It was in fact coveted by Athens in the fifth century.

Another port of Hermione mentioned by Homer (II. 2.562) and Pausanias (2.36.1-3) has been attributed to Magoúla Evstráfoú (C 11), ancient Mases (Appendix A-36; Homer, II. 2.562; Paus. 2.36.2), which was for a short time a small ‘town’ (5.0 ha = 0.05 km²). Mases’ total territory was only 45 km², but more than half (23.5 km²) of it was agricultural land (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, fig. 1.18; table 1.1). The settlement was located near good Upland soils and Lower Flamboura Alluvium, with several streams and springs nearby (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, figs. 6.16, 6.19). In the archaic period Mases probably cultivated the ‘inland valley of Loutró … and the small coastal valleys to the south (Dhouroufi and Lakkes) (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 34-36); not for long, however, since Hermione absorbed Mases, turning the ‘town’ into a ‘village’ or perhaps just ‘a local agricultural center depending on Hermione’ (quotation from van Andel and Runnels 1987, 107; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 34, 375-377, 467).

The ‘Villages’ (Figure 46)

Some nine (possibly as many as fourteen) archaic ‘villages’ have been identified in the southern Argolid. The survey team determined whether these sites were ‘villages’ on the basis of size (1.0 to 5.0 ha = 0.01 to 0.05 km²), architectural remains, and a comprehensive cross-section of ‘domestic’ artifacts (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 249). When looking through the register of sites, however, one notices that the density and spread of artifacts in the archaic period is low (1% to 8% of the total sherd count), and only a few structures, probably dating to later periods, are visible (at E9, F4, and G1). Except for Mases (C11), it is unlikely that these sites, identified by the presence of a handful of sherds, were flourishing centres in archaic times. But pending the final presentation of the artifacts of the historical periods (Munn [forthcoming]), their identification in the site index as ‘villages’ must by default be accepted as published.

Besides Mases (C11), another large settlement was located in the territory of Hermione, on the hilltop west of Kinéta (E36, Appendix A-50). It was larger than Mases in size, estimated at 6.0 hectares (= 0.06 km²), but unlike Mases had no visible architectural
remains (see Table II.1 below). It sits on the edge of good arable soils, the Upland soils, in an area with streams and groundwater reservoirs (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, figs. 3.9-10, 6.16).

Magoúla stá Ilía (G1), located on the south-east edge of the Iliókastro plateau, was also a sizeable ‘village’ (area not determined in survey), with a possible temple at the south-east edge of the site (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 519). As an inland site, it lacks harbour facilities and other advantages offered by the sea, but made up for this with its proximity to good Upland soils and its abundance of streams (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, figs. 3.9, 6.16). The Iliókastro plateau also offered good quality water from groundwater supplies and perennial springs nearby (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, fig. 3.10).

Three smaller ‘village’ settlements were noted in the survey at Sambaríza Magoúla or ancient Eíones (E9, Figure 54; Appendix A-58), Áyios Ioánnis (F4, Appendix A-35), and Profitís Ilías in the Foumni area (F5, Appendix A-46). These range from about 0.16 to 1.40 hectares (that is, 0.0016 to 0.0140 km²). Sambaríza Magoúla, located at the eastern edge of the survey area, yielded architectural remains, perhaps dating to the archaic period, but little archaic pottery (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 485).

Áyios Ioánnis has architectural features, but only a small percentage of archaic sherds; Profitís Ilías has no visible architecture and even fewer sherds (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 508-509). Both sites, however, are located in the Foumni drainage basin, near streams and good Upland soils (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, figs. 3.11, 6.16-17). Profitís Ilías lies inland, so it lacked the advantages of the sea.
Table II.1. The Location of ‘Town’ and ‘Village’ Settlements in the Southern Argolid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>On Hilltop or Akropolis</th>
<th>Close to Arable Land</th>
<th>Near Coastal Plain or Valley</th>
<th>With Potential Harbour</th>
<th>Inland</th>
<th>Close to Water Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hermione E19 *</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haliës A65 *</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mases C11</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magoûla G1</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinêta E36</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eïones E9</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áyios Ioánnis F4</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profitis Ilías F5</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel (1994). ‘Towns’ are marked by an asterisk.

The So-called ‘Farmsteads’ (Figure 46)

The southern Argolid survey identified between seven and sixteen small ‘farmsteads’, dating to the archaic period, four of which also had eighth century material. They range in size from 0.05 to 0.60 hectares (= 0.0005 to 0.0060 km²), with the largest sites (C12, B2, and B57) concentrated in the rich agricultural areas of Mases and Flámboura (Appendix A-36 and A-42). Although some of these have roof-tile concentrations (C12, E71, and G22), only one site has visible structures (B2). Three sites (B67, E40, and E47) have only a few archaic sherds, but they have nonetheless been identified as ‘farmsteads’ in that period.

As with ‘village’ sites in the southern Argolid, most ‘farmsteads’ obtained water from nearby streams or groundwater (see below, Table II.2; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, figs. 3.9-11, 6.16). All but one (C12) lie inland, close to good arable soils and within four kilometres of a more nucleated centre (Figure 55).
Table II.2. The Location of ‘Farmsteads’ in the Southern Argolid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>On Hilltop or Akropolis</th>
<th>Close to Arable Land</th>
<th>Near Coastal Plain or Valley</th>
<th>With Potential Harbour</th>
<th>Inland</th>
<th>Close to Water Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dhoroúfi ridge B2</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vísta C12</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flámboura B67</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pikrodhafni E40</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermióni valley E47</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ermióni valley E71</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iliókastro area G22</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The Methana Survey (Figure 49)

It is clear that in the archaic period the Methana peninsula ‘was exploited almost exclusively from ‘villages’ or other similar nucleated settlement centres’ (i.e. hamlets) (Foxhall 1997b, 257). The available evidence for the size of sites points to a general increase during the archaic period.

Geometric and archaic habitation is centred essentially on three nucleated settlements: one ‘town’ and two ‘village’ sites (Gill and Foxhall 1997a, 57-61). Óga (MS67), at Kypseli on the east coast of Methana, was the largest (6.1 ha = 0.061 km\(^2\)), with at least one, perhaps two sanctuaries and a large quantity of archaic sherds (Appendix A-68; Mee et al. 1997, 146-147). This ‘town’ was located near somewhat flat land, which is rare on Methana, and adjoined good farmland (see below, Table II.3).

Another rarity on Methana was water. The Methanioi relied on cisterns, because springs and wells were few and far apart (James et al. 1997, 7). Since the peninsula has always been hotter and more arid than the rest of mainland Greece, its agricultural land must have suffered from lack of water (James et al. 1997, 5). The rate of precipitation in antiquity, as now, was probably low, but since we have no certain methods to determine precipitation patterns for prehistoric and historic times (Zangger 1992, 15; cf. Lehmann 1937, 31-49; Balcer 1974, 143; Forbes [H.] 1982, 36; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 157-161), we can only hypothesise.

The ‘village’ of Methana (MS10) on the west side of the peninsula was smaller (5.2 ha = 0.052 km\(^2\)) than Óga and appears to have no associated sanctuary or other architecture.
(Figure 56; Appendix A-63; Mee et al 1997, 122-127). Its identification as an archaic 'village' must be based on the numerous sherds found there; the site apparently remained a large 'village' settlement until classical times, when it became the major site on the peninsula (Gill, Foxhall, and Bowden 1997, 65). All the architectural elements date to the classical and hellenistic periods. The site itself sits on a low but prominent akropolis, only a few metres from the sea. The land below it now grows citrus fruit and was thus perhaps also fertile in antiquity.

At Magoula (MS60), a small site (1.8 ha = 0.018 km²) on the north end of the peninsula, the survey team found numerous cut blocks, of unknown date, and a mix of archaic fine wares (Appendix A-61; Mee et al. 1997, 143-144). Though this 'village' is much smaller than ancient Methana, it yielded almost as much pottery (Gill and Foxhall 1997, table 5.2).

Obviously, preference was for coastal locations on Methana. Whether the population took advantage of the sea as a means of livelihood, or for communication with other communities, or both, is difficult to say. Access by sea to major 'towns' in the Argeia and the Corinthia, however, must have been a consideration for those settling on the coast of Methana (cf. Wagstaff and Cherry 1982, 259).

Table II.3. The Location of 'Town' and 'Village' Settlements in Methana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>On Hilltop or Akropolis</th>
<th>Close to Arable Land</th>
<th>Near Coastal Plain or Valley</th>
<th>With Potential Harbour</th>
<th>Inland</th>
<th>Close to Water Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Óga MS67 *</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magoula MS60</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana MS10</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Methana's other archaic sites have not been identified as 'farmsteads' per se, though two of them are close to easily cultivable land and about the size of regular 'farmsteads', that is, less than one hectare (for size, see Gill and Foxhall 1997, 59). The problem with identifying Áyios Konstantínos (MS12, Appendix A-66), on the west coast of the peninsula, as a 'farmstead' is that the survey team reported only one sherd identifiable as archaic and no associated features (Mee et al. 1997, 127-128). It is noted, however, that the area 'overlooks excellent agricultural land which was doubtless being cultivated'
(Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 40; quotation from Gill and Foxhall 1997, 57), though perhaps not in the archaic period. Similarly, the other site at Makróngru (MS123) appears to have yielded only one archaic sherd (Appendix A-62; Mee at al. 1997, 161-162).

**The Berbati-Limnes Survey (Figure 51)**

The Berbáti region has no identifiable archaic ‘towns’ or ‘villages’; it has only small ‘farmsteads’ at this time (Appendix A-19). Ekroth (1996, 215) lists eight archaic sites as ‘farmsteads’ in the Berbáti valley, in three disparate areas (Find-spots 20, Find-spot 24, and those on the Phyesoumia spur FS21, FS522, FS523, FS525, FS527, FS528), without giving any settlement sizes. At both find-spots 20 and 24, we may assume the existence of several buildings; but on the Phyesoumia spur only one structure (if that) has been located at the five find-spots (Ekroth 1996, 213). The majority of these got a supply of water through springs on the plateau and the Kefalari Rema (Ekroth 1996, 219). Table II.4 below shows their setting in the landscape.

What is interesting is that all these ‘farmsteads’ lie on the west-north-west side of the valley, close to the pass towards Mykenai. The whole eastern and southern part of the region, including the upper Limnés area, had no visible traces of human activity during the archaic period (Ekroth 1996, 215). The reason for this distribution was probably that the pass to Mykenai would have been the main entrance to the Berbáti valley at this time as so attracted settlement close by (Ekroth 1996, 215).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>On Hilltop or Akropolis</th>
<th>Close to Arable Land</th>
<th>Near Coastal Plain or Valley</th>
<th>With Potential Harbour</th>
<th>Inland</th>
<th>Close to Water Sources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Find-spot 20</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find-spot 24</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phyesoumia spur</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


‘As opposed to the development in the Southern Argolid there does not seem to be much continuity from the Archaic times to the Classical in the Berbati-Limnes area.’ (Penttinen 1996, 280).
Areas Not Included in the Surveys

We know of other Argolic ‘towns’ existing outside the survey areas both from excavations (Appendix A) and from literary references; here I use only the contemporary or near contemporary evidence of Homer, Hesiod, and Herodotos. Two Aktean ‘towns’ are mentioned by Homer and Herodotos: Troizen (Appendix A-56; Homer, Il. 2.561; Hdt. 3.59; 7.99; 8.1, 43, 72; 9.28, 31, 102, 105) and Epidauros (Appendix A-28 and A-31; Homer, Il. 2.561; Hdt. 1.146; 3.52; 5.82; 7.99; 8.1, 43, 72; 9.28, 31).

The major ‘town’ in the Argeia was Argos (Appendix A-10; Homer, Il. 1.30; 2.115; 4.171; 6.152, 224; 9.22; 13.379; 14.119; 15.30; 19.15; Od. 1.344; 3.180, 263; 4.99, 174, 562, 726, 816; 15.80, 224, 239. 274; 21.108; 24.37; Hdt. 1.31; 1.182; 3.131; 5.57, 61, 67-68, 86-89; 6.75-84, 92; 7.148-152; 9.12, 34). Mykenai (Appendix A-11; Homer, Il. 2.569; 4.52, 376; 7.180; 9.44; 11.46; Od. 3.305; 21.108: Hdt. 7.202; 9.31), Tiryns (Appendix A-16; Homer, Il. 2.559; Hdt. 6.77, 83; 9.28, 31), Midea (Appendix A-20), Asine (Appendix A-22), and Nauplia (Appendix A-17; Hdt. 7.76), however, were no doubt also important centres of population in the Argeia (Whitley 1988, 180).

The problem with identifying these places as ‘towns’ is that the location of some of the related settlements has yet to be securely established. As Morgan and Coulton (1997, 93) point out for Tiryns, however, it would ‘be most unwise, given the very limited extent of excavation in the surrounding plain, to draw negative conclusions about an absence of related settlement, and thus to dismiss Tiryns as an urban centre.’

II.1.5.b. Settlement Patterns in the Archaic Period and their Relation to Agricultural Activities

Overall, it is fair to say that no ‘towns’ were missed in survey, although some may have lain outside survey areas (for example, in the Thermisi area and on the Dhídýhma plateau). The impression we get is that the majority of the population in the Argolid preferred to live in ‘towns’ or ‘villages’, even if they were living mainly from agriculture (Gallant 1982, 119; on towns, see Alcock 1991a, 421-463; Whitelaw and Davis 1991, 265-281; Bintliff and Snodgrass 1988a, 60-63). Residence in a central ‘town’ offered a possibility for social and political connections, community life and facilities, and defence
(or a sense of security), which hardly any ‘villages’ and no ‘farmsteads’ could provide (Osborne 1987, 59; Cherry, Davis, and Mantzourani 1991, 345; Alcock 1993, 105-107). Competition and expenditure by elites living in ‘towns’ also contributed to local economic activity (Gallant 1982, 117-119; Alcock 1993, 116).

On the whole, the appeal of a ‘town’, with its various religious, civic, and economic attractions, seems obvious to many of us. ‘Town life nourishes and perfects all the more civilised elements in man.’ (Oscar Wilde). But we live in a market economy, with most of life’s necessities at our instant disposal. If we lived in a society where we had to rely directly on agricultural production, we might think twice about settling in a city. Unless we farmed the land in its immediate vicinity (which in our day is of course rare, given the large suburban spread), we would have to spend a great deal of time travelling to and from our fields (see Wagstaff and Augustson 1982, 109-110 for ethnographic evidence from Greece). In antiquity access to fields was hampered by the long distances farmers had to travel from their place of residence to their plots, which were often segmented and spread across the territory of the community, and by the slow means of transportation available to them (Chisholm 1979; Jameson 1990b, 173; Cherry, Davis, and Mantzourani 1991, 464). How, then, did ‘town’ inhabitants find time to travel to their fields, cultivate their land(s), and also participate in the social and political activities of the ‘town’?

There was obviously a great variety in the wealth and status of people collectively called ‘farmers’. Let us begin from the top with substantial landowners. How much time they devoted to their own land depended on their other responsibilities and needs, i.e., they could perhaps be absentee landlords (Jameson 1994a, 60). If they obtained the labour of others to help in the work required on their more distant holdings, their less fertile land, or their entire estates, then they were more likely to live a leisure life in ‘town’. Who were those others?

**Tenant Farmers or Agricultural Slaves**

Tenancy was a basic system of agricultural labour (see Burford 1993, 177-181). Under it, those who cultivated the land did not own it, but at least had the permission to farm and to support themselves from it (Willetts 1969, 496; de Ste. Croix 1981, 135; Jameson 1992, 136). These tenants probably had little choice about where to live (a point to which I
shall return). For landlords this was ‘cost-effective’, with tenants keen to invest a lot of time and effort in land that they did not even own (Osborne 1985a; Wood 1988).

Agricultural slavery was another way of liberating landlords from personal cultivation of their own holdings (see Burford 1993, 208-222). The subject of slave labour in archaic and classical Greece, however, is a disputed one. Jameson (1977-78, 122-145; 1992, 138-145) argues in favour of slavery and suggests that agriculture was so intensive that slavery was advantageous on even the smallest plots. Wood (1983, 1-46; 1988, 42-80) challenges this point of view, suggesting instead that the use of slaves in agriculture was negligible. In her view the wealthy hired out their land to the poor, ensuring their own profits and at the same time offering the poor land on which to live (see also Osborne 1988, 279-323; Gallant 1991a, 30-33).

In discussing agricultural labour we must rely heavily on the literary sources, because the existence of slaves is extremely difficult to detect in the archaeological record (Jameson 1994a, 61). Jameson (1990b, 191-192; 1990c, 103-104) points out that no distinctive quarters have been identified for them in houses; they either lived in with their owners’ or with their own family, indistinguishably from citizens or metics (cf. possible slave burials in the Akanthos cemetery). Fortunately, two early written sources mentioning slaves in connection with Argos have come down to us.

The first is in an early fifth century inscription from the sanctuary of Epidauros (Figure 57; Appendix A-28; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 17). The bronze plaque mentions a certain Kallippos and his φοικίαται (= oiketai), slaves or serfs (Ephdavros Mus.: SEG 26.449, 30.393, 31.321, 38.318, 40.338; Orlandhos [K.] 1978, 104-105, fig. 63; Touchais 1978, 672, fig. 71; Lambrinoudhakis 1980a, 191-192, pl. 122a; 1980b, 58-59; 1990, 174-183; Billot 1992; Jeffery 1990, 444-445, no. F; for another Argive at Epidauros, see also IG IV2 1.137; Robert [F.] 1933, 383; Lazzarini 1976, 232 no. 402; Jeffery 1990, 166, 170 no. 37). Kallippos was arguably an Argive landowner (αγρόκτιος) who came to Epidauros as a supplicant after the battle of Sepeia (Lambrinoudhakiš has not yet published the text, and the use of the photo in Jeffery was on the understanding that his interpretation was not questioned). In this case the term oiketai refers to the individual connected to an οίκος, a household family, rather than to an οίκια,
a house (Xenophon, *Oeconomicus* 1.5; Jameson 1992, 142). The *oiketai* were therefore the dependants or slaves of Kallippos.

Another piece of information for the existence of slaves in the Argeia comes from Herodotos’ (6.71-83) much disputed passage about the battle of Sepeia, where he uses the word *douloi* (as used in other Ionian texts). When Argos was defeated by Sparta and lost thousands of men, the *douloi* took over state business until the young Argive citizens, the sons of the dead, attained maturity. These young men apparently overthrew the *douloi* (perhaps around 478), who then captured Tiryns and held it (perhaps until 468) until they once again tried to gain control of Argos and were defeated (Hdt 6.83; Seymour 1922, 24-30; Willetts 1959, 495-506; O’Neil 1981, 341-343). In other versions of the same story (Aristotle, *Pol.* 1303a 6-7; Plutarch, *Moralia* 245C-F; Paus. 2.20.8-9) the *douloi* of Herodotos are replaced by *perioikoi*. These ‘dwellers around’ were normally non-citizen dependent workers (see Burford 1993, 193-207 on dependent labour; also Pollux, *Onomastikon* 3.83, who in the second century AD speaks of a group called the *gymnetes* [meaning ‘Stripped men’, either bare of weapons or stripped in order to work, as Hesiod, *Op.* 391-393, recommends] at Argos as ‘between slavery and freedom’; Snodgrass 1980a, 89; see also Foley 1998, 139).

There is a vast, though often misdirected, literature on this topic (Seymour 1922, 24-30; Lenschau 1938, 412-429; Luria 1933, 211-228; Willetts 1959, 501-502; de Sanctis 1966, 49-52; Lotze 1956, 54ff.; 1971, 102ff.; Forrest 1960, 221-241; Tomlinson 1972, 97-98; van Compernolle 1975, 355-364; Asheri 1977, 21-48; Arnhem 1977, 67-70; Adshead 1986, 91-103; Vidal-Naquet 1986, 209-210; Demand 1990, 59-60; Cartledge 1980, 89-91). Lotze’s (1956, 53-55) argument is perhaps the most reasonable; he suggests that the term *douloi* comes from an earlier period, when it was used to describe peasants who had by the sixth century acquired citizenship (cf. Forrest 1960, 222; Whitley 1988, 181).

In the end we must admit that we simply do not know whether the *douloi* of Herodotos were citizens, agricultural serfs (Willetts 1959, 496; Arnhem 1977, 68), or full ‘slaves’ (Whitley 1988, 181 n53). What is probable, however, is that the Argives had slaves and used them to run their larger estates (perhaps under the supervision of a bailiff?).
The *Autourgoi*

We can assume that the relatively wealthy farmers formed only a small part of the population. The majority was probably free landowners of modest means (Burford 1993, 167-172; Jameson 1994a, 62), who worked their own land, as the *autourgoi* of Thucydides (1.141.3) suggests. No doubt a middling class of landowners existed as well, and I shall return to them later.

Ideally the smallholders possessed enough land to deliver minimum subsistence when cultivated in the usual non-intensive way, with traditional Mediterranean crops, that is, cereals, vines, pulses, and perhaps olives (Halstead 1987, 83; Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981, 283, see also Burford 1993, 120ff. for ploughing and planting). In truth, however, many may have failed to achieve this standard, especially since the quantity of crops varied immensely from year to year and the small landowners must have cultivated the undesirable and unproductive land (Cherry, Davis, and Mantzourani 1991; Osborne 1987, 38; Jameson 1992, 145; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 564). The closer the land was to ‘towns’, the more valuable it must have been, for its proximity to the ‘town’ reduced travelling time to fields and provided access to water and fertilisers from the town’s houses (Jameson 1994a, 62).

Those smallholders who did not have enough land to be securely self-reliant, either needed to implement extra measures of agricultural extensification (e.g. spreading out into marginal lands) and diversification (e.g. investing in livestock), or to augment their income by working for others. In the first instance, the evidence from survey suggests that ‘such extensification seems to start no earlier than the late sixth century, and is more generally a fifth- and fourth-century phenomenon across Greece’ (Foxhall 1997a, 127). We should therefore consider the second option in more detail or one would have to assume that the category did not exist.

The smallholders could have supplemented their income by working for others. In addition to working in the fields, they might find work as craftsmen, peddlers, in transportation, or as seamen (Alcock 1993, 106; Jameson 1994a, 62; on hired free labour, see Burford 1993, 81, 186-193). All of this may have been sporadic, part-time work for which a ‘town’ location was advantageous, especially if they turned their residence into a
place of commerce (Jameson 1990b, 185; 1994a, 62). ‘Village’ settlements, to which we now turn, would also have served them in this function (Jameson 1994a, 63).

**Residence outside Major Centres**

So far, the picture that I have constructed of the residents in ‘towns’ is one of a mixed community of relatively well-to-do absentee landowners, residing in ‘town’ for social and political reasons, and perhaps smallholders taking advantage of employment opportunities (Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981, 286). For the majority of small ‘towns’, however, ‘the total number of people who could productively take up predominantly urban residence would be limited’ (Alcock 1993, 116); the remaining population would have to live elsewhere. ‘Village’ life was another option.

According to our definition, ‘village’ life might approach the conditions of a ‘town’, if the ‘village’ was sizable and far enough from a ‘town’ to have social and economic autonomy. ‘Villages’ that were close to major centres probably relied on the nearest ‘town’ ‘for craft production, agricultural processing facilities, and opportunities for employment and exchange’ (quotation from Alcock 1993, 102; on trade and exchange, see Garnsey, Hopkins, and Whittaker 1982; Osborne 1991a, 119-145; Meijer and van Nijf 1992; Foxhall 1998a, 295-309). Large ‘villages’ could provide the community with better resources, an improved lifestyle, and added security, as well as alleviate any civic duties and agricultural catastrophes by sharing the responsibility among themselves (Alcock 1993, 102).

The extent to which ‘villages’ attracted occupants is a crucial element in determining the role of the countryside in archaic Greece. ‘Villages’ must have been far more numerous than ‘towns’ (see Hansen 1995, 51, 80), but to judge from most published maps, the opposite seems to be true. Very little work has been published on ‘villages’ of the historic period (except, for example, Askra in Boiotia, see Bintliff and Snodgrass 1988a, 57-71; Zagora; Emborio; Vroulia), but Hansen (1995) has examined the role of the kome, a term which he believes in some contexts (e.g. the Dorian Peloponnesos) designated a ‘village’. However, we have no direct evidence that the term kome can be applied to archaic ‘villages’; as Hansen (1995, 80) himself notes, ‘kome is surprisingly rare in archaic and classical sources ...’. It is only in the classical period that Argos used

In trying to understand the place of the ‘village’, we should ask how much of the population would go for the ‘less sociable’ option of ‘village’ life. Population estimates are generally unreliable, but they give us some idea of the distribution of population. For example, in the archaic period the total area of the known ‘villages’ in the southern Argolid covers about twenty hectares compared with the forty and a half hectares taken up by the ‘towns’ of Hermione and Halieis. If area can be connected with population, the ‘villages’ of the southern Argolid may have supported as much as half the population of ‘towns’ (Morgan and Coulton 1997, 125). Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel (1994, 562, table B.6) estimate that ‘village’ sites in the southern Argolid have a population of about 2,400 and smaller sites (farmsteads, special-purpose sites ?) have a population of 135. If we suppose that most sites were inhabited at the same time and that small family units lived on ‘farmsteads’ (though unlikely, see below), there would have been a population of about 2,550 living outside ‘towns’ in the archaic period (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 549). This can be compared to a total ‘town’ population of 3,330 for Hermione (2,110) and Halieis (1,220). According to the authors’ estimates, therefore, some 41% of the population lived outside ‘towns’. ‘Furthermore, since the survey covered only 20% of the area of the peninsula, there may well be other... ['village’ settlements] in the territory of either city’ (Morgan and Coulton 1997, 125).

Granted that these figures might be misleading with regard to what was happening in the countryside (especially since ‘off-site’ pottery scatters were not recorded, see Alcock, Cherry and Davis 1994, 137-169), the place of the ‘village’ in the southern Argolid was clearly important. We might start by asking why some people chose to live in ‘villages’ rather than ‘towns’.

The principal reason for choosing ‘village’ life over ‘town’ life may have been to cut down on long travelling distances between place of residence and individual plot(s). I would propose that middling farmers and people who gained access to land via dependency relationships worked the land around ‘villages’, because it was likely to be less valuable, and thus more accessible, than the land found near ‘towns’.
Archaic ‘Farmsteads’ and the ‘New Model’ of Classical Agriculture

The factors that encouraged the progress of village-based residence may be comparable to those that led to the establishment of rural sites, usually called ‘farmsteads’ (Cherry, Davis, and Mantzourani 1991, 477). Increased settlement beyond main centres has been seen as evidence of an agricultural strategy that tries to maximise subsistence production (Halstead 1987, 77-87; Garnsey 1991, 92-94; Hodkinson 1988, 38-41; Cherry, Davis, and Mantzourani 1991, 463-464; Burford [A. M.] 1993, 59-61; Alcock et al. 1994, 163-164; Osborne 1985b, 119-128). In this scenario agriculturalists living on ‘farmsteads’ no longer needed to travel to and from their fields, could grow cereals and pulses on a yearly rotation, and could raise animals on their land, dropping manure where it would be most needed. This ‘new model’ of agriculture must also have operated in combination with the more traditional, Mediterranean agricultural system (Halstead 1987, 77-87).

Some (Gallant 1982, 111-124) have used such a change in the agricultural regime to explain the appearance of ‘farmsteads’ (in the archaic period); others see it as resulting more from a rise in population (Snodgrass 1977, 13; 1980a, 22-24; Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 81; Jameson 1994a, 57; cf. Osborne 1987, 59-70). Neither of these hypotheses can be supported by survey data from the Argolid. There is no evidence in the archaic period for a ‘plethora of small isolated rural farmstead[s]’, such as the more densely populated and intensively farmed countryside of the fifth, fourth, and third centuries (Foxhall 1997a, 123-127; cf. Morris 1994a, 363). Nor is there ‘evidence for dramatic changes in cultivation practices’ during the archaic period; the basic ‘repertoire of crops and techniques available to farmers in the Late Bronze Age’ remained unchanged in the eighth to sixth centuries (Foxhall 1997a, 123, 127). Moreover, the survey evidence ‘hardly suggests over-population or a landscape approaching its carrying capacity’ (Foxhall 1997a, 127).

Since architectural remains are usually not adequately well preserved to be identified, one is required to argue from size and composition of the ceramic (and roof-tiles) scatters whether a site might be a ‘farmstead’ or larger site. Given the very small concentration and size (between 0.05 and 0.60 ha) of archaic ‘farmsteads’ in the southern Argolid, is it unlikely that the rural sites here and the Berbáti valley were indeed individual farmsteads,
inhabited for at least some part of, if not all, the year (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 249; Ekroth 1996, 217). It should be noted here, however, that the definition of a site based on size is problematic and has prompted several methodological debates on the subject (see Bintliff 1985, 196-216; Wright et al. 1990, 604-608; Cherry, Davis, and Mantzourani 1991, 16-31; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 224-228). For example, in the forthcoming volume of the Laconia survey, most sites are smaller than 0.50 hectares, and a site of 0.60 hectares is unusually large for a 'farmstead' (sites less than 0.15 ha are designated single ‘farmsteads’, those from 0.15-0.29 ha ‘multiple farmsteads’ and from 0.30-2.99 ha ‘hamlets’; personal communication, Dr. Graham Shipley).

Rather, archaic ‘farmsteads’ may represent single storage shelters, used seasonally by labourers who had to work land at some distance from their place of residence (for the classical period, see Osborne 1985b, 119-128; 1987; 1988a, 279-323; 1992a, 21-27; Bintliff and Snodgrass 1985, 123-161; Snodgrass 1990, 127-128; Cherry, Davis and Mantzourani 1991, 335-337; Lohmann 1992; cf. Roy 1996a, 104-116). The ability or desires to keep such shelters in the countryside was perhaps more typical of wealthy landowners, since ‘they represent additional capital investment in the countryside, at a level well beyond the means of the poor’ (Alcock 1993, 61).

So long as the nucleated centre was no more than one to two hours away (up to about eight kilometres), fields could be conveniently exploited from such ‘villages’ or ‘towns’. Every known archaic ‘farmstead’ in the Argolid is within four kilometres of a nucleated place of residence (for the southern Argolid, Figure 53). What is more, all these ‘farmstead’ sites lie on, or next to, known ancient land routes. Therefore, any surplus production could be sent to ‘villages’ or ‘town’ residences easily by inland routes or by sea, and then be shipped to external markets by sea from the larger centres. With these advantages, what would have been the point of isolating oneself in a ‘farmhouse’ on a permanent basis (for the classical period, cf. Osborne 1985b, 119-128; 1987, 56-70; 1992a, 25)?
II.1.5.c. The Potential Contribution of Historical Events to the Interpretation of Changes in the Late Archaic Landscape

The picture we get for the Argolid changes by the end of the archaic period, when we witness a substantial decrease in the relative number of ‘villages’, together with a partial abandonment of ‘farmsteads’ in Berbáti and the southern Argolid (a point to which I shall return), and soon after a rise in the number of classical ‘farmsteads’. The problem in interpreting such shifts in focus are enormous. Were they a result of depopulation, of population movement -- from ‘villages’ to ‘town’, or of some crisis? (for a discussion of nucleated versus dispersed settlement, see Wagstaff and Cherry 1982, 251-256; Runnels and van Andel 1987, 322-330; Bintliff and Snodgrass 1988a, 69-71).

The first of these possibilities, depopulation, is a simplistic interpretation of survey data but, when combined with historical evidence, requires fuller reflection. The second, population movement, is obviously more complex and deserves more attention than I can give it here. The third, usually occasioned by warfare, is perhaps the most popular explanation of a kind that we often reject, but sometimes it certainly must have served as a trigger for population changes.

The slighter evidence for ‘villages’ and ‘farmsteads’ in the late archaic period might also reflect less intensive exploitation of the landscape. Whatever the interpretation, the data should not go unchallenged; they are worth exploring from many angles in an attempt to understand more fully the changing patterns of landholding at the end of the archaic period.

The Decrease in the Number of ‘Villages’

Usually, a decrease in the number of ‘villages’ has been analysed in conjunction with the later rise in the number of classical ‘farmsteads’. Given the problems of how land ownership relates to residence on rural sites, however, it would be unwise to assume a widespread movement of people from ‘villages’ or ‘towns’ into the rural countryside. Instead, we could consider a movement of the population from ‘village’ to ‘town’.
If there is a direct relationship between the loss of smaller sites and the growth of larger ones, it would be difficult to prove without proper investigation (urban surveys) of ‘town’ sites of the same period in the surveyed areas. Yet the observed general increase in ‘town’ sizes from archaic to classical times hints at such a redisposition of the people across the landscape.

Let us assume a movement of population from smaller to larger centres after the archaic period. What conditions may have made people move out of ‘villages’? Perhaps middling farmers, who had been previously living in ‘villages’, had by then accumulated enough wealth to consider the possibility of moving into ‘towns’. If they were becoming more ambitious, they may have desired the social life and luxuries the ‘town’ could provide. With fewer of these people living in ‘villages’, the number of opportunities for agricultural employment would be reduced for the poorer ‘village’ inhabitants and they may have been forced into ‘towns’, if there were work opportunities to be found there (Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981, 285; Jameson 1994a, 55-63).

Whatever the situation may have been, any shift in investment (by ‘villagers’) from the countryside to ‘towns’ would have contributed to the apparent neglect of the rural landscape. This abandonment comes out even more clearly when we look at the pattern for archaic ‘farmsteads’ in the Argolid, particularly in the Berbáti valley.

The Apparent Abandonment of Archaic ‘Farmsteads’

On the evidence of surface finds in the southern Argolid only one archaic ‘farmstead’ continued into classical times; this demonstrates little continuity from archaic to classical times in this area. The same picture is evident at Berbáti, where the valley was nearly deserted in the late archaic period (Ekroth 1996, 225). Here too, only one of the areas where archaic ‘farmsteads’ were identified, Find-spot 24, continued into the classical period.

Berbáti is particularly interesting from an historical viewpoint. The near abandonment of the valley seems to have occurred in response to very specific historical circumstances and must be seen both in relation to its proximity to Argos and Mykenai and in the broader context of the Argeia’s history. Recall the battle of Sepeia, when the Spartans
invaded and defeated the Argive army, and the Argives are said to have lost some 6,000 men (Hdt. 6.71-83; Wells 1923, 76). The outcome of this battle might be interpreted in many different ways; it may have resulted in a fall of the Doric regime at Argos, which was supplanted by a new organisation (perhaps governed by slaves, serfs, rebels, or residents from perioikic communities, see above; Jameson 1992, 135-146). If those who farmed land in Berbáti did so via dependency relationships, this new regime enabled them to seek opportunities elsewhere, such as in Argos. With the death of their landlords, they perhaps had no other choice but to seek their livelihood in ‘town’.

A second hypothesis is that the Berbáti valley was farmed by the inhabitants of neighbouring Mykenai, who under this new regime gained access to land previously owned by the Argives killed in battle. With abundant fertile land now available on the plain, the Mykenaians would have abandoned cultivating the more isolated valley of Berbáti (on the fertility of the Argive plain, see Finke [also known as Zangger] 1988, 5, 149).

A third, and somewhat unlikely explanation for this shift has been perceived as a need for security (Andrewes 1990, 176f; Ekroth 1996, 225 n114). The local instability in Argos may have triggered population mobility in out-lying communities, because living in the countryside had become too dangerous. The problem with this argument is that it assumes that the ‘rural’ sites were inhabited.

Another consideration to bear in mind, if the Berbáti valley was farmed by Mykenaians, is the loss of men in the Persian wars. As noted above (Chapter I), Mykenai sent eighty soldiers at the battle of Thermopylai in 480, and together with Tiryns, fielded a joint force of four hundred hoplites at the battle of Plataia in 479 (Hdt. 7.202; Paus. 2.16.5). If these men came from any community with a minimum of between 2,000-3,000 people (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 558), the loss of hoplites may have played a role in depopulating the land-owning class of Mykenai, resulting in a reduced exploitation of the Berbáti valley.

A similar explanation can be given for the southern Argolid, because Hermione (Hdt. 8.72; 9.28.5) and probably Halieis (together with Hermione) also sent troops to fight the
Persians (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 556). Hermione is assessed to have had
a minimum of 567 men of the lower classes (the crews of three warships sent to fight at Salamis) and 333 of higher social and economic rank. Even if these 900 represented the entire muster of all able-bodied citizens, which... [Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 556] argued they do not, ... these estimates make no allowance for light-armed troops from the lower economic classes,... Nor for slaves or resident aliens, whose number at this time we have no means of gauging (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 557-558).

Surely, ‘village’ inhabitants contributed to these military contingents, particularly dependents and slaves. The loss of men who cultivated land near ‘villages’ and ‘farmsteads’ might therefore explain why ‘village’ and ‘farmstead’ sites were abandoned at the end of the archaic period.

II.1.5.d. Early Classical ‘Farmsteads’

How different was classical occupation of the countryside from that of the archaic, given the apparent decrease in the relative number of ‘villages’ at the end of the archaic period and substantial increase in the number of classical ‘farmsteads’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 249-250, 549; Ekroth 1996; Penttinen 1996, 272, 278-279)? If the survey data for this shift in focus and its corresponding agricultural ‘revolution’ has been understood ‘correctly, ordinary citizens were significantly better off in the fifth century than in the sixth’ (Morris [I.] 1994a, 352). The ‘new model’ would not have appealed to everyone, however. In some places maybe only the wealthy landowners could take these chances; resulting in the poor being left behind in the ‘towns’ (Jameson 1992, 145; Morris [I.] 1994a, 364; see also Roy 1996a, 104ff. for Euripides’ poor ‘peasant’ farmer, who lived in an isolated farm).

Again, the settlement history of the Berbáti valley in the early fifth century is of interest. It is argued that the Berbáti ‘farmsteads’ in the classical period ‘were originally kleroi allotted to free men in the historical context of a land reform in Argos around the middle of the 5th century’ (Penttinen 1996, 279). After the subjugation of the previously independent communities in the neighbourhood, Mykenai and Tiryns, Argos probably incorporated at least some of their inhabitants into its citizen body (see Chapter I.3.2.a).
Together with Mykenai, the inhabitants of the Berbáti valley must have been controlled by the Argives in the 460s.

This picture brings to mind a reform similar to that of Kleisthenes' at Athens (Caskey and Amandry 1952, 216-219; Piéart 1983, 275; Charneux 1984, 207; Penttinen 1996, 280). The Argives may well have given land to non-citizens within the recently subjugated territories to expand the base for Argive citizenship (Strabo 8.372-377; Gschnitzer 1958, 69; Penttinen 1996, 281). The average size of these landholdings may have been relatively small (Penttinen 1996, 279), at least in the beginning, thus coinciding with the average size typically given to a family farm (Jameson 1978, 131).

What is significant here is that the potential size of individual plots depended less on how much arable land actually existed and more on the socio-political system of Argos. The land reforms may have created a larger number of small landowners and thus a tightening of pressure upon the resources of the Argive countryside. Without the means to acquire more land, these new landholders turned to more productive ways of farming.

In contrast the southern Argolid seems to have had a totally different socio-political structure in this period. In classical times it supported two 'towns', Hermione and Halieis, which interacted with the countryside in a rather different way from Argos. First, unlike Argos, they are not known to have any 'interest in ... expansion, that is, in acquiring more territory for ... [their] existing inhabitants; their limited land kept them minor towns' (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 378).

II.1.6. PASTORAL ACTIVITY AND THE ROLE OF ANIMALS IN FARMING

Pastoralists were heavily 'dependent on gaining access to adequate grazing ... [lands; yet] we have very little idea how this was managed in antiquity in any specific case'. (Forbes [H.] 1995, 330). Pastoralism leaves almost no detectable residues in the archaeological record. Consequently, this study of pastoral activity, like any other, must remain general. Both the writings of Hesiod and the more recent work of ethnographists are helpful, but they can rarely be supported by concrete evidence from the archaic Argolid.
It is only in recent studies that animal husbandry has been incorporated into landscape studies of the ancient world (Koster and Koster 1976, 275-285; Koster 1977; Chang and Koster 1986, 97-148; Jameson 1988, 87-119; 1989, 7-17; Garnsey 1988, 196-209; Hodkinson 1988, 35-74; 1990, 139-164; Cherry 1988, 6-34; Forbes [H.] 1994, 187-196; 1995, 325-338; cf. earlier works such as Keller 1963). The work of Hodkinson and H. Forbes stands out here. Hodkinson (1988, 35-74; 1990, 139-164) argues that in (classical) Greece wealthy landowners took an interest in animal husbandry and that this activity went hand in hand with the agricultural activities of their estates. Forbes presents (1994, 187-196; 1995, 325-338) similar conclusions, but emphasises the wealth that animal husbandry created through the exploitation of both the cultivated and uncultivated landscape, and through that of (slave) labour.

I now examine some of these ideas in more detail.

### II.1.6.a. Sharing the Land between Farmer and Shepherd

Any farmers who had no animals and any shepherds who had no farms would have depended on each other in antiquity. Farmers presumably put agricultural land and crop surplus at the disposal of shepherds, and in return got to improve soil fertility by having animals drop manure directly on their land or by accumulating it in folds and spreading it in their fields (for example, see Homer, *Od.* 17.297-299 for the use of manure; Forbes [H.] 1995, 329). Shepherds, however, also would have needed to exploit uncultivated land (a point to which I shall return).

### II.1.6.b. Grazing the Uncultivated Land

The grazing of many, if not most, ancient flocks also required large amounts of uncultivated land (Forbes [H.] 1995, 331). Mountainous areas were probably exploited for this purpose (James et al. 1997, 40), which meant that shepherds had to travel long distances to reach this uncultivated land (Burford 1993, 153; Forbes [H.] 1995, 331). They were often nomadic and therefore less likely to own land. We sometimes picture them as poor, landless wanderers, but this rather depends on whether they owned the animals they tended.
II.1.6.c. Those Who Reared Animals

In Homeric society the role of the shepherd was still a respected figure, not confined, as in later periods, to men of low status (Hodkinson 1990, 143). With the appearance of ‘towns’ his predominance diminished (Hodkinson 1988, 35-74; 1990, 139-164; Skydsgaard 1992, 9-12). Apparently many were of inferior status, several being slaves (Xenophon, *Hellenica* 4.6.4). ‘Even those who were free [were the poorest among the free and] seem not to have owned the animals they tended’ (Forbes [H.] 1995, 322).

II.1.6.d. Those Who Owned Animals

The owning of animals appears to have been the domain of the wealthy, not of the lowly individual (Forbes [H.] 1995, 332). The more land one owned, the easier it was to keep a large amount of animals. Small peasant subsistence farms could only support a few farm animals (Burford 1993, 151), though Foxhall believes that we have overestimated the extent of land required to provide for such a small number (in Wells [B.] 1992, 170). She stresses that there were many sources of fodder, such as olive prunings, and olive and vine press cake available for animals. Perhaps, then, traction animals would have been worthwhile keeping on a small farm. There is no doubt that larger farms made good use of traction animals.

Nevertheless, an animal also demands a great deal of time and effort (see Burford 1993, 144ff.). One has ‘to consider all the problems that go with the care and management of animals: their feeding, their reproduction, their stalling, their diseases’, and so forth (Wells [B.] 1992, 168). It is unlikely that small subsistence farmers had time to spare on such activities, unless the results brought them sufficient rewards.

II.1.6.e. The Economic Benefits of Pastoralism

What were the rewards of pastoralism? One can store riches much more successfully in animals than in vast tracts of fallow land, and one can eat them too (Gallant 1982, 118;

Pigs ‘are potentially the best-suited of domestic animals to intensive rearing since they thrive on household and garden waste and can be confined in a small area’ (Burford 1993, 147-148; quotation from Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 289). In the temple of Apollo at Halieis the excavators found several bones of piglets (some forty-nine piglets, compared to thirty-eight ovicaprids) (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 289). This seem to be confirmation of local animal husbandry (Jameson 1976b, 74-91; 1988, 87-119).

Together with its contribution to food, pastoralism was also an activity that encouraged the production of goods by way of trade (Forbes [H.] 1995, 322). Sheep and goats supplied foods such as meat and milk as well as hides, wool, and hair (see Burford 193, 146ff.). To judge from the evidence of spindle whorls and loom-weights from ‘farmsteads’ at Berbáti, Lerna, and Fouúrhoi, ‘the preparation and weaving of wool was important, even if it was] largely a household industry’ (Caskey 1955, 32; quotation from Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 294; Ekroth 1996, 187-192; on the importance of wool, see Pliny, NH 8.190-193).

Some species of animals were above all work animals and would have provided extra help on farms. Hesiod (Op. 405) advises: ‘First, get yourself a house, a woman, and a plough ox.’ Although the ox would have had an advantage as a draught animal in the days of poor harness, mules and donkeys were often used for ploughing as well as riding (for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 18; Hesiod, Op. 436, 606, 816; Rackham 1990, 107-108). ‘Work animals were not normally regarded as acceptable victims for sacrifice’, but when an ox was no longer needed it must surely have been eaten (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 287).

Animals were also used for transportation. The story of Kleobis and Biton, as reported by Herodotos (1.31), describes how these two youths of Argos dragged their mother in an ox-cart from Argos to the Heraion, because the oxen had not yet returned from the fields to the town. In addition, ‘the many traces of wheel ruts associated with ancient roads throughout Greece are a reminder that we should not underestimate the value of the ox
cart and the more lightly loaded donkey-cart, ... but in most of the Akte, where no roads went, donkeys, and horses, and more recently mules, have been indispensable pack animals’ (Renfrew 1972 355; Rackham 1990, 105-106; quotation from Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 288). Horses were not as useful as draught animals, since the method of harnessing them was somewhat inefficient (Meijer and van Nijf 1992, 136).

Animal husbandry could therefore be used 'as a means of short-term accumulation of wealth, normally more difficult to achieve through agriculture' (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 297). We should therefore think of it as an activity mainly reserved for the wealthy (Forbes [H.] 1995, 332).

II.1.6.f. Social Aspects Associated with the Keeping of Animals

The elite would have used the breeding of animals, particularly of horses and cattle, as a way of increasing their status in society (Aristotle, Politics 1321a.11; Hodkinson and Hodkinson 1981, 279). Breeding allowed for social displays in festivals or games, through feasting on domesticated animals (cattle) and through racing (horses) (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 297). 'Both aspects are seen in the Homeric poems and have continued to be prominent [in archaic times], however different the cultural forms’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 297).

Fortunately, feasting leaves behind some traces in the archaeological record (see Chapter III, Table III.1). We have several bone collections come from religious sites in the Argolid: Halieis, Lerna, Midea, Tiryns, Áyios Adrianós, and Asine (Reese 1994, 194). Halieis produced a few knuckle bones, often modified and probably used in divination, exotic fauna such as ostrich eggshell, and a high concentration of goat bone-cores (Appendix A; Reese 1994, 193). Although no bones have been reported from Hermione, a number of terracotta statuettes of (bronze) cows and of (terracotta) women holding cows were dedicated to Demeter Chthonia, suggesting the annual killing of cattle (Jameson 1974c, 118; Touchais 1980, 605; see also Paus. 2.35.5-8, Chapter III.1.4.a). Cattle were normally the major victims of animal sacrifice before the success of Christianity in the second century AD. But at times other animals were sacrificed, owing
to the limited supply of cattle, the lack of funds to obtain them, or the requirements of a particular cult. The pig was one of them.

Horses were bred for racing by the local elite in some areas of Greece (Piérart 1992a, 119-155; Burford 1993, 150-151). The Argive plain was known for its horse breeding in the eighth century (Piérart 1992a, 199-155). This tradition carried on into the archaic period, since we have inscriptive evidence mentioning a hippodrome, located somewhere on the road from Argos to the Heraion, at a place called Khónikas (see Chapters I.3.2.a; I.3.4.c; III.2.4.b; and Appendix A-15). Although ‘we do not know whether there were stadiums for chariot races in any of the Aktean cities in antiquity, ... a few horses may certainly have been bred and maintained [there] by the local elite’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 288).

II.1.7. SUMMARY

With the available survey evidence we can now better understand how the agricultural landscape of the archaic Argolid was exploited. On an environmental level, the natural factors that influenced the decision of what land to cultivate include contemporary climate, soil properties, and site properties. Very little is yet known about the local climate and soil fertility in antiquity, but something can be said about the general topography of sites. To judge from the location of most sites, ‘coastal plains and flat inland basins ... [were] preferred places for agriculture, because their drainage is excellent and their stoniness is limited.’ (Zangger 1992, 15). Proximity to water was also paramount.

The location of place of residence with respect to arable is especially significant in this context. In general, we assume that the inhabitants of the Argolid lived in nucleated settlements and practised a subsistence-based agriculture on fragmented holdings. Such choice of residence could mean that farmers travelled long distances to and from their fields, unless they were wealthy enough to own the land close to the settlement, or to own a cart, or to leave the work on their plots to others. In an Argolic context there is no doubt that tenancy and slavery was a vital source of agricultural labour for wealthy landowners.
The farmers who had to work their own land perhaps supplemented their income by working for larger landowners. By definition, these poorer landowners worked the less valuable land, probably located at a considerable distance from 'towns'. To cut down on long travelling distances, they may have taken up residence in 'villages', which offered them some of the advantages of 'town' life, without the extra burden of travel.

'Village' life involved a large percentage of the population. We can assume that the middle classes, who benefited from farming land close to their place of residence, and those who gained access to land via dependency, lived in 'villages'. Middling farmers living in 'villages' could easily exploit the labour of the poorer landowners, or non-landowners, who needed to supplement their income with part-time work.

This situation seems to have changed by the end of the archaic period, when it can be argued that middling farmers moved out of 'villages' for a variety of reasons. The poor perhaps followed them, because there were fewer opportunities for agricultural employment in 'villages' devoid of those middling farmers.

Nevertheless, a number of other possibilities can explain the apparent changing patterns of landholding at the end of the archaic period. The decrease in the number of 'villages' and the partial abandonment of 'farmsteads' at the end of the archaic period could be a result of depopulation, population movement, or a crisis of some sort, as noted above. Whatever the reason, the survey evidence does point to the countryside being neglected for some time.

A detailed knowledge of the agricultural landscape in the transition between the archaic and the classical periods would facilitate a human interpretation of the processes involved in settlement pattern change. The settlement history of the Berbáti valley may be a good example. Its proximity to Argos and Mykenai made it vulnerable to the events that triggered depopulation in the first few decades of the fifth century, the loss of men in the battle of Sepeia and in the Persian wars. The former contributed to the 'downfall' of the land-owning classes in Argos; the latter affected the hoplite populations of Mykenai, and probably also Hermione and Halieis. No doubt those living in neighbouring 'villages' and farming land in remote areas took advantage of this situation and moved into 'towns'.
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Land close to these centres, which had previously been owned by the wealthy ‘town’ folk, may have become available for cultivation by middling farmers, poor landowners, serfs, and perhaps even slaves. The more remote areas such as the Berbáti valley, where agricultural land was available, were partially abandoned in favour of the less remote and more fertile areas, such as the plain of Argos.

The picture presented here emphasises how the organisation of the agricultural landscape can be argued to have been governed more by socio-political factors than by geographical considerations. It is argued that when Argos took the democratic step of allotting small plots to its citizens in classical times, it was primarily concerned with implementing a new socio-political system. As a result, it would have created a large number of small landowners who, having no means of acquiring more land, gave in to the pressures of production by farming their land in an intensive way. In the long run, such land reforms would have contributed to the depletion of the natural resources in the area (see Zangger 1992, 13-19 for soil erosion in the Argive plain; cf. Gallant 1982, 116-117).

The southern Argolid had a different socio-political history. Its two ‘towns’ had no interest in expansion and any pressure to exploit the countryside in an extensive way did not come before the fourth century.

Arable farming was not the only way of exploiting the land. Those who owned animals benefited from animals grazing on their land through the spread of manure to improve soil fertility, from work animals, and from pack animals. The breeding of horses and cattle may also have provided social benefits for an elite through racing and feasting.
II.2. Non-Agricultural Resources

II.2.1. INTRODUCTION

Although it is very hard to judge from archaeological evidence alone, there are signs that at least some areas of the Argolid exploited the natural resources around them through non-agricultural activities. Here I look at five such activities in the Argolic landscape: mining, quarrying, clay extraction, wood-cutting, and hunting and gathering.

I refer the reader to Appendix B for a discussion of some of the uses to which metals were put in the archaic Argolid.

II.2.2. MINING AND METALWORKING

Our most detailed records of ancient mining relate to the silver mines at Lavrion in Attica. We also know that mining took place on and around Mt. Pangaeum in Thrace (Hdt. 5.1; 7.112; 9.75), in Khalkidike (Strabo 10.1.9), and on Siphnos (Hdt. 3.57; Paus. 10.2.2) and Thasos (Hdt. 1.64; 3.46-47, see Shepherd 1993, 69ff. for an overview of these ancient mining sites). However, no ancient author mentions any ancient mining or metalworking in an Argolic context.

II.2.2.a. The Lack of Evidence for Mining in the Argolid

Argos, Mykenai, and the Heraion were known for their bronzework (Jeffery 1976, 141; Jameson 1976d, 82; Rolley 1982; 1986; 1992, 37-54; Healy 1987, 58; Foley 1988, 96; Strøm 1998, 73), but there is no geological evidence that metals were mined in the Argeia. What is still needed is a systematic search for ore deposits and ancient workings in the region. Without it, discussion of mining must inevitably fall back on studies of typology, which presume local production on the basis of visual criteria of metal objects. Although we cannot exclude the possibility of some metal production from local sources.
in the region by the late sixth century, when many centres will have had full-time metalworkers, we must be careful in interpreting these typological studies. Even if it can be proved that metals were worked locally (for example, from evidence of wasters), the raw materials need not come from local mines. The importation of raw metals -- either as ingots or as ready-made artifacts -- into the Argolid is more than likely (see Cartledge 1983, 15; Snodgrass 1983, 23-26 on the importation of metals).

**II.2.2.b. The Exploitation of Nearby Mines**

The closest known ancient mine where copper may have been obtained is at Nemea (Taylour 1964). The date of the workings remains unknown. If it supplied the Argeia with copper in the archaic period, there still remains the problem of tin, which was needed to make tin bronzes (Shepherd 1993, 71). A Greek metallurgist, who had seen the entire repertoire of official reports in Greece, informed Benton (1964, 138) that the country had no tin. Pausanias (5.37.5-6) mentions the port of Crisa (near Delphi) as a source of tin, but there is much controversy over this name and its location (Davis 1929; Alsop 1964; Benton 1964; Healy 1978, 60; Shepherd 1993, 71). Of course tin may have been imported from Cornwall, or elsewhere in Brittany, and from the west coast of Italy (Muhly 1973, 404-413), but at some cost (we are ill informed about the costs of ancient transport, see Meijer and van Nijf 1992, 133ff.).

**II.2.2.c. The Lack of Archaeological Evidence for Metalworking**

Another problem with seeing Argos, Mykenai, and the Heraion as important bronze-working centres is that we have no archaeological evidence (slags, kilns, crucibles, etc.) for metalworking in these areas for the archaic period (copper slag was found in the late bronze age levels at Mykenai, see Davies [O.J] 1932, 985-987). Archaic and classical kilns have been identified at Argos, but it seems that they were ceramic kilns (see below; Piteros 1996, 99-102).

The only archaeological evidence that could date to the archaic period comes from Palaiokástro (G2) in the southern Argolid (Figure 46). Iron slag of unknown age was found here; it has been associated with the exploitation of iron in this area. Perhaps the
mining of iron was a reason for founding the classical ‘town’ at Eileoi, close to the archaic ‘village’ of Magoula stá Ilía (Appendix A-58; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 302).

II.2.2.d. The Miners

This idea of a mining town brings to mind Emile Zola’s Germinal, where the poor inhabitants of a small town lived and died for their local mine. The picture that we conjure up for antiquity may not be that far removed from Zola’s (Osborne 1987, 76-81). Mining was a very dangerous, unhealthy, and physically demanding activity that no privileged class would attempt. Much of the hard physical work was left to slaves.

II.2.3. QUARRYING AND BUILDING ACTIVITY

Extracting rock from a quarry was perhaps just as physically demanding as underground mining (for techniques used, see Scranton 1941; Coulton 1974; Dworakowska 1975; Osborne 1987, 91; Shepherd 1993, 410ff.). Unlike mining, however, quarrying was a much less dangerous occupation, and for this reason may have been more respectable. We should perhaps not exaggerate the role of quarrying in any society, however, because it was surely a far from prestigious activity; those who so worked probably had no choice in the matter, being too poor to own and work a piece of land.

In the archaic period the demand for large quantities of stone must have come primarily from public building projects and to a lesser degree from house-building, depending on availability. I begin by examining the former in some detail.

II.2.3.a. Quarrying of Stone for Building Projects

Though quarrying left fewer marks in the landscape than silver mining invariably did (Osborne 1987, 91; Burford 1993, 117), it is nonetheless reflected in the building activity of two communities of the Argolid.
The first large building project took place at the Heraion (Figure 58; Appendix A-13); the second at Argos (Figure 59; Appendix A-10). The Heraion underwent important works in the early archaic period, including the Old Temple (late seventh century), North Stoa (seventh century), North-east Building (late seventh-early sixth century), and West Building (late sixth century) (Amandry 1952, 273; des Courtils 1992, 250). In contrast, we find surprisingly few archaeological remains at this time in Argos (des Courtils 1992, 241); as far as we know, no trace of important architectural activity exists for this period (des Courtils 1992, 250). The sanctuary of Aphrodite, whose cultic activity goes back to the seventh century to judge from the pottery, has failed to produce architectural remains before the fifth century (Paus. 2.20.8; des Courtils 1992, 241). The sanctuary of Apollo Pythaeus on the ‘Aspis’ at Argos has indeed yielded a few architectural fragments dating from the end of the sixth century, but no archaic remains in situ (Figure 60; Vollgraff 1956, 18-19; Roux 1957, 485).

A change comes at the end of the sixth and the beginning of the fifth century (des Courtils 1992, 242). The Argives probably constructed a temple in honour of Apollo Lykios around 500. The one hundred and sixty-five blocks of a Doric building in poros that were found reused in the hypostyle hall at the limits of the classical agora suggest this (Figure 45). The blocks belonged to a building, most probably the temple of Apollo, where official inscriptions were written on bronze plaques affixed to its walls (see Chapter I.3.2.c; des Courtils 1981, 607-610). This construction testifies to a re-awakening of building activity in the city, but the structure remains isolated, either because it really was, or because of the hazards of archaeological explorations within the city. It is possible that the other sanctuary of Apollo, on the ‘Aspis’, also received a building around this time (des Courtils 1992, 250).

In the years 460-450 BCE we see a veritable fever of building activity, as much at the Heraion as in Argos. At both sites we have evidence of a building programme implying an overall architectural conception, which suggests not only that the construction of the monuments had been envisioned from the start, but also that the initiators had designed, perhaps in the field, the overall plan of the buildings in these two areas as a single and project (des Courtils 1992, 250). Recall that the Heraion was now in the hands of Argos (see Chapter I.3.2.a).
The ambitious building programme of the Heraion in the 460s, aimed at embellishing and enlarging, was political and matched the institution of the Games in honour of Hera (see Chapter III.1.4) of patriotic character (des Courtils 1992, 251). At the same time the creation of a popular agora (Stoa ‘Pi’) and buildings for the assemblies to meet at Argos (the theatre ‘à gradins droits’ and the hypostyle hall; Appendix A-10-33; A-10-66) are clear symbols of democracy (Ginouves 1972; des Courtils 1992, 249, 251).

II.2.3.b. Locating Local Quarries

Most public buildings at Argos and the Heraion were made of local limestone, or partly limestone and partly mudbrick, but without a search for the source of identical material in the natural landscape, we cannot determine the approximate location of local quarries. ‘Being a moveable surface feature the rock face of any ancient quarry ... would be destroyed by later workings or become weathered, unrecognizable as a quarry and so become integrated into the natural landscape’ (Shepherd 1993, 409).

A few local quarries have been identified in the southern Argolid during the survey, but whether these were exploited in archaic times remains open. Small limestone quarries were perhaps opened up in the Fóúrnoi valley (F59) and in the hills south of Koiládha (B47) to provide stone for Hermione when it erected the city walls and the foundations of a late archaic temple (Figure 61; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 303). Conglomerate quarries found north of Kranídhi may have been exploited in archaic times to build the walls of Halieis’ temples (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 303-304). Unlike those at Hermione, the fortification wall of Halieis was built with mudbrick (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 305). Similarly, the domestic architecture at Halieis consisted of mudbrick walls set on stone socles.

II.2.3.c. Stone for Domestic Structures

It is clear that for domestic architecture any stones would do. Unfortunately, our knowledge of seventh and sixth century private architecture is slight. As I have just
mentioned, the houses at Halieis were built of mudbricks and timber on a stone socle. This construction seems not to have been unique to Halieis.

A few remains of archaic houses have been excavated in isolation at Argos, but they are limited to building foundations, in the north-west of Argos (Appendix A-10-4), in the centre of the city (Appendix A-10-17, A-10-26), and to the south-east of the agora (Appendix A-10-79). These structures underwent rebuilding at the end of the classical and beginning of the hellenistic period (Barakari-Gleni and Pariente 1998, 167) and were then levelled in Roman times.

**II.2.3.d. Building with Imported Stones**

Sometimes local stone was unfit for building, 'because it was too soft and would crumble when worked or exposed to the weather' (Osborne 1987, 81). Building stone would then have to be imported into the area, often at great expense (see Burford 1960, Snodgrass 1983, 16-26; Meijer and van Nijf 1992, 116ff. on the transportation of building materials). Despite that, building materials comprised the main cargoes in antiquity (Snodgrass 1983, 18).

The only known evidence of imported stone for construction comes from the sanctuary of Eileoi, whose columns were cut of andesite that was no doubt imported from the Saronic gulf (Appendix A-51).

**II.2.3.e. The Use of Marble**

Imported stone was also used to make sculptures from about 650. Stone suitable for carving sculptures, such as marble, could be hauled over long distances by sea (from Naxos and Paros, and elsewhere; on sea-transport, see Snodgrass 1983, 16ff.). Apparently, the only good sourced of marble in classical times were the quarries near Tegea, at Doliana (Osborne 1987, 88).

As far as we know, this picture obtains for the archaic period as well. The southern Argolid lacks deposits of good-quality marble, such as was used for the inscribed marble *perirrhanterion* at Halieis (Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus. HS 22, 33: Jameson 1969, 320, pl.
The Argeia was no different in this respect. The fact that the Argives used bronze rather than stone for their archaic inscriptions suggests that Argos had no good local stone (Jeffery 1976, 141). Bronze was also easier and cheaper to transport than good-quality carving stone.

Perhaps the absence of marble in the region explains why this particular stone was rarely used for building (marble as a building-stone begins to be used elsewhere around 550; Snodgrass 1983, 18). Only 'in the fourth century did [the Epidaurians] import Pentelic marble for a major part of the superstructure of the round Tholos, as well as for the sculptures of the temple of Asklepios' (Burford 1969; quotation from Osborne 1987, 89).

**II.2.3.f. Precious Stones**

Some stones were desired for their aesthetic value, like Troizen's 'variegated dark red and white stone' (Osborne 1987, 81). But as Theophrastus remarks, such stones were not that valuable and thus of little importance for the economy of any Greek city (Osborne 1987, 81).

**II.2.4. WOOD-CUTTING AND THE USE OF WOOD**

In contrast with the rather restricted use of stone in modern rural contexts, its rate of recurrence in the archaeological record may seem remarkable (Orme 1981, 90). Undoubtedly, it occurs in abundance on Greek sites because it have survived the test of time infinitely better than has the wood that was originally used to build houses. Could it be, however, that stone was in fact used more often than wood for building, because of a local scarcity of wood?

**II.2.4.a. Wood for Building**

An affirmative answer to this question is doubtful, even if we are still under the impression that in Homer's days Greece was a country full of trees (Meiggs 1982; Hughes 1983, 436-445; cf. Rackham 1990, 92-111; 1996, 28-29). Although we observe
the gradual replacement of wood for stone in some archaic temples, this change was probably due to the obvious advantages of stone rather than to deforestation for timber.

Wood was nevertheless a vital resource, and it must have been important for Greek cities to assure an adequate supply (Meiggs 1982; Meijer and van Nijf 1992, 117). Most of the timber for beams, uprights, and the strengthening of walls in the southern Argolid could have been supplied locally in the archaic period (Snodgrass 1983, 18; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 306). In 1686 Portokhóli bay was still depicted as 'surrounded down to the shore by large pine trees' (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 307). The consequences of timber cutting were obviously minimal in this region (and elsewhere, see Rackham 1996, 28-29). The same cannot be said about the Argeia, where the demand for wood used for construction, shipbuilding, and to meet energy needs, must have been higher. Here the demand for wood could perhaps not be met locally.

It has been said that the firing of kilns to manufacture roof tiles must have brought about severe damage to the Mediterranean forests in antiquity (Wikander 1990, 290 n13; Wertime 1983, 445-452). This too is doubtful at least in archaic times, when it was mainly public and religious buildings that were roofed with tiles. For the roofs of houses, tiles could be used, but brushwood, stretched out over wooden planks to hold up a coating of mud, was also common (Forbes [H.] 1997, 198). This brings us to consider the use of rubble, reeds, and brushwood in building and other activities.

II.2.4.b. Wood from the Uncultivated Landscape

The uncultivated landscape also provided wood for building (Forbes [H.] 1997, 208). Rubble, reeds, and brushwood (i.e. twigs) have probably been used recurrently, especially by shepherds who built huts, animal folds, and fences (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 305-306; Forbes [H.] 1997, 197).

A far more extensive application of this vegetation was for use as firewood in cooking and heating (Forbes [H.] and Koster 1976, 122; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 308; Forbes [H.] 1997, 199).
II.2.4.c. Rights to Wood-cutting

All these activities (and more, i.e. ship building, the making of tools, cremation, etc.; see Hesiod, Op. 420-436 for the many uses of wood) could well have contributed to the depletion of the natural landscape (even if it is a renewable source). Yet to imagine that wood was rare at this time would be misguided. In theory, if access to wood was somehow limited, it was perhaps because the wealthy estate owners held the rights to wood-cutting in their area or certain trees within these estates had been designated as public or sacred (see Burford 1993, 24). Consequently, the communal land may have suffered from over-exploitation.

In reality, however, we have no idea how wood-cutting was managed in antiquity. We might assume from a hellenistic agreement between Troizen and Methana concerning rights to wood-cutting that communities did come to impose controls on them (IG IV\(^2\) 1.76, 1.77, IG IV 752).

II.2.5. THE EXPLOITATION OF CLAY SOURCES AND CERAMIC MANUFACTURING

A great variety of natural clay sources was no doubt exploited in the archaic Argolid, but we have no physical evidence to prove that this activity took place in any given region. We have only modern clay sources to study, and matching these with ‘ancient pottery compositions’ has produced varying negative results (Jones [R. E.] 1986, 52). ‘To an extent, therefore, the term ‘pottery source’ is an abstract one and the process of determining it is an approximation’ (Jones [R. E.] 1986, 7).

Nevertheless, the establishment of local production of pottery at any given site implies the presence of suitable and accessible sources of clay nearby. Although raw clay can sometimes be transported over some distance, ethnographic studies show that in the majority of cases clay beds were located within a half hour’s walk from the potter’s workplace (Jones [R. E.] 1986, 872). So, if we can identify local production centres, we can presume that clay sources were exploited close to these potential workshops.
II.2.5.a. Identifying Local Workshops

Archaeologists have tried to locate production centres in archaic Greek sites, but without much success. This kind of identification requires archaeological evidence that is often hard to find. For example, we need evidence for kilns, ‘pottery wasters’, or a concentration of pottery from a settlement site in a range of related ... fabrics. In their absence, ... one popular approach is to integrate the attribute[s] of chemical and petrological composition into the existing framework of pottery attributes derived on traditional visual criteria (Jones [R. E.] 1986, 8).

To my knowledge, such scientific investigation of pottery from the Argolid deals exclusively with the bronze age (see Jones [R. E.] 1986, 192-205). Nothing comparable has been attempted with archaic pottery.

Despite this lack of evidence, many scholars speak of local production centres in the archaic Argolid (Daux 1959b, 755; Courbin 1966; Coldstream 1968; Rafn 1984, 305-308; Foley 1988; Ekroth 1996; and others). Most pottery workshops have been identified by a concentration of pottery that, to the naked eye, has a uniform fabric or painted decoration. As was mentioned earlier, this kind of investigation needs to be supported by scientific analysis or by direct archaeological evidence for the manufacture of pottery. Since neither option is possible for the archaic period, we must consider two others.

II.2.5.b. Archaeological Evidence for Pottery Making

First, if we can find archaeological evidence for pottery making in prehistoric periods, we can at least be sure that the topography of the area offered a potential for good clay sources. Our second option is to find evidence for roof tiles and large utilitarian containers. These items were usually of local fabrication (Jameson, Runnells, and van Andel 1994, 307), because they weighed too much to be transported very far. With the introduction of the concept of mass-production through the use of moulds, tiles could be made by local potters or by a group of itinerant potters who specialised in roofing buildings.
Argos is the only site that has so far yielded direct evidence for the manufacture of pottery in archaic times. Two kilns and one waster have been dated to the archaic period (Appendix A-10-47; A-10-75; Piteros 1996, 99-102). We also know that clay sources were exploited in the area during the bronze and early iron ages, because a number of kilns for those periods were found (EF 1955b, 314; 1957, 677 fig. 31; Daux 1959b, 768 fig. 24; Cook [R.] 1961, 64-67; Belshé, Cook [K.], and Cook [R.] 1963, 8-13). No doubt the banks of the Inákhos, Xeriás (the ancient Kharadros), and Erasinos nearby supplied potters with good clay in those periods as well as in archaic times (Figure 3).

Several pottery workshops of the archaic period have also been identified on the basis of storage jars and pithoi (Appendix A-10-2; A-10-24; A-10-38; A-10-39; A-10-59; A-10-83; pithoi at A-10-46; A-10-55). If they were in fact workshops, it is interesting that the majority appear to be located around the agora, a situation parallel to that of Athens with its pottery workshops close to the agora. Another hint of local production comes from clay tiles. It is argued that Argos played an important role in the production of architectural terracottas (Winter [N.] 1993, 149).

According to Foley (1988, 73), the Khaos shrine at Mykenai may have had its own pottery workshop (Appendix A-11). ‘Among the sources of clay that probably served the needs of potters at Mycenae, those at Plesia and Longaki have been the more important’ (Jones [R. E.] 1986, 192).

To my knowledge, no kilns have been found here. A great many roof tiles and some pithoi, however, were discovered during the excavations on the acropolis and at the Khaos shrine (Appendix A-11; Wace 1949, 85; Cook [J.] 1953a, 30-68). It is possible that these were produced locally or near the Heraion, where already in late seventh century buildings were roofed with tiles (Coulton 1976, 29, 215; Pfaff 1990, 149-156; Billot 1990, 101, 139; Ekroth 1996, 21).

Another so-called local workshop has been placed at Asine on the evidence of four pots of the same fabric found in a grave (Appendix A-22; Rafn 1979, 29). No archaeological evidence for pottery production has come down to us for the archaic period, but bronze age kilns are known (Frödin and Persson 1938, 67, fig. 66).
The only indirect evidence for pottery production at archaic Asine comes from the archaic roof tiles on the Barbouna hill (Wells [B.] 1990, 152-161). These, however, were probably produced at Argos in the fifth century.

Bronze age kilns were discovered at Berbáti, a presumed centre of prehistoric pottery production (Jantzen 1938, 553 pl. 11).

The Berbáti survey also has yielded a large amount of roof tiles, probably belonging to small structures related to agriculture and a possible archaic temple, together with pithoi (Appendix A-19; Ekroth 1996, 179-228). Given the site’s proximity to Mykenai and the Heraion, it is possible that these roof tiles came from a centre of production at one or both of these places.

Like Berbáti, Tiryns has evidence of bronze age kilns and archaic tiles (Appendix A-16; Dragendorff 1913, 338-341; Catling 1980, 29). Perhaps it exploited clay sources near the sea.

The only reasonably identifiable ceramic workshop in the archaic Argolid is that of Kourtáki (Appendix A-12). The thousands of whole pots found stacked one inside the other at this site came from a workshop associated with a sanctuary (of Demeter and Kore ?) (Papakhristodhoulou 1969, 131f.; Foley 1988, 150; Kosmetatou 1996, 117). It was definitely in a good location to exploit the banks of the Inákhos river, where, ideally, clay sources could be found.

A few places (Halieis, Stavros, Kalaureia) in the Akte yielded a large number of roof tiles and some pithoi (Appendix A-38, A-41, and A-70; Jameson 1979, 262; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 442; Welter 1941, 10, 45). A workshop was no doubt established near Halieis and Hermione by the sixth century (Winter [N.] 1993, 149). Its location was perhaps closer to Hermione that to Halieis, because Hermione, unlike Halieis, had access to water from the numerous streams in the area. Without water (and wood to fire kilns) pottery production was impossible.
II.2.6. EXPLOITING THE ‘WASTELAND’ FOR FOOD

Long after the introduction of agriculture and the domestication of animals, the communities of the Argolid continued to gather uncultivated plants and, to a smaller extent, to hunt (on ancient hunting, see Lane Fox 1996, 119-153; for a hunting scene from Tiryns; Foley 1988, 62-63). They searched the landscape for a variety of wild plant and animal products that, at present, still form a vital part of the traditional Greek diet (Forbes [H.] 1997, 208).

The mountainous landscape in the Argolid is likely to have encouraged the hunting of game. ‘Remains of red deer have, in fact, been found in a fourth-century B.C. deposit in the sanctuary of Apollo at Halieis’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 194, 261). Hares, foxes, boar (Hdt. 1.43), partridges, and other wild birds were no doubt hunted (Malagardis 1991, 109-114); snails too may have been collected to be eaten.

Wild greens, mushrooms, and an assortment of herbal plants are still part of the diet of Greeks today, and we can presume that in antiquity they were consumed in even greater quantities (Forbes [M] and Clark 1975, 251-264; Foxhall and Forbes [H.] 1982, 74-75; Forbes [H.] 1997, 202-203). Not only could they be used in cooking, but more importantly they supplied the local community with medicines.

II.2.7. SUMMARY

Despite our lack of explicit information on the various activities by means of which the landscape of the archaic Argolid was exploited, the inhabitants surely made use of the natural resources at hand. Mining was perhaps the exception, because no mines have been found in the Argolid. The Argeia seems to have exploited the nearby mine of Nemea for its copper, however. Iron was worked at Palaiokástro in the southern Argolid, but no mine has (yet) been found to indicate that iron ore was extracted in this area.

Quarrying, though also difficult to pinpoint archaeologically, was logically carried out near centres that used large quantities of stone for building. At least two large building projects were planned in the Argolid, at the Heraion and at Argos. The stone used in these building projects seems to come from local sources; however, no quarries have yet
been identified in the area. We know of only a few quarries in the Argolid, at Foúrnoi and Koiládha. Hermione and Halieis no doubt exploited these when they constructed their religious and civic buildings.

When stone was unsuitable for building, a community sometimes imported it from elsewhere. Marble, in particular, was imported, because the Argolid lacked such good-quality stone. The region must have imported marble from the islands or from Doliana, to make small-scale objects and sculptures. Importing cannot have been cheap, and for this reason perhaps, marble seems not to have been used in construction at this time.

Wood was another important building material in the archaic period, and no doubt the inhabitants of the Argolid exploited the natural environment in search of timber for building houses and boats, brushwood for building huts, animal folds, fences, for firing kilns, for heating and cooking, and for making tools. If wood-cutting was prohibited on private estates, and if the wood on communal land was being over-exploited, perhaps it had become a valuable commodity by archaic times. The use of stone in construction was an alternative solution.

Stone walls were able to support more weight and thus a more sturdy roof. During the course of the seventh and sixth centuries more and more public and religious buildings were roofed with tiles. The production of tiles may have been a local activity, because they were heavy and difficult to transport for very long distances. Where large amounts of roof tiles have been found, we might expect a ready source of clay in the area. As with mines and quarries, the problems of identifying clay sources are enormous, since little archaeological evidence of kilns or other equipment have come down to us in the archaic period.

Thus, it follows from what has been said above that most of these activities required the work of specialists and a poor or unfree workforce that was willing to endure the physical hardships associated with mining, quarrying, and perhaps even wood-cutting. On a smaller scale, the collection of brushwood for heating and cooking, and hunting and gathering also demanded a lot of time and labour from individuals of a household. Together with farming, all these activities took up a vast amount of time in the daily lives
of the ancient Greeks. As we shall see, those who lived near the sea had even more opportunities to occupy their time.
II.3. Maritime Resources

II.3.1. INTRODUCTION

The Argolid, with its long coastline, has at different times turned itself towards the sea. There are specific resources of the sea that the region may have offered, such as fish, salt, purple dye, and harbourage. To determine whether these resources were exploited in archaic times is difficult, however, because, like the exploitation of land resources, they leave few traces in the archaeological record.

II.3.2. FISHING

Bintliff and Gallant have presented two opposing views on the significance of fish in antiquity. Bintliff (1977, 117-122, 216-218, 240-244) maintains that fish was a primary resource for the Argolid, especially for the southern Argolid, despite the fact that the Aegean can only maintain a small number of fish, owing to the shortage of rivers emptying into it (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 311). He thinks that fishermen followed the movement of fish.

Gallant (1985) presents a more balanced view of fishing. He believes that despite the ancient literary and iconographic interest in fish (see Malagardis 1991, 114-115), in reality it could only partly supply communities with nourishment. The fishing equipment in those days made the activity very demanding physically and in general made large-scale fishing impossible; catches were perhaps no more than a kilo or two a day. Gallant argues that the movement of fish was also more difficult to observe that has been alleged and that no community could depend on fishing for its existence.
II.3.2.a. Fish as a Supplement to Farming

Gallant (1985, 40-42) sees fishing above all as an activity that complements agriculture when crops failed or produced low harvests. Fish, when smoked, dried, salted, or pickled, could make up for seasonal food shortages and even short-term famines, if eaten with fresh fish.

The Argolid, and particularly the southern Argolid and the Methana peninsula with their long coastlines, was very well situated for farmers who needed to supplement their food intake with fish (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 313). For example, the Halias had about thirty-eight kilometres of coastline, compared to about thirty-two kilometres for Hermionis (Jameson 1976d, 85). No doubt the inhabitants of Halieis took advantage of these opportunities. Its very name brings to mind a fishing town, since Halieis is probably derived from halieus, meaning fisherman (see Liddel, Scott, and Jones 1940, s.v. ἅλιευς, but cf. Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 311 for Halai, meaning salt pans). In fact Halieis is the only place that has yielded concrete evidence for fishing: three fishhooks from the early sixth century and small pieces of lead (probably seventh-sixth century) used to weigh down fishnets were discovered around the akropolis (Figure 62; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 315, fig. 5.23).

Who then was using this equipment?

II.3.2.b. Those Who Fished

We do not know enough about fishing as an occupation. We can only assume that in many coastal communities farmers would fish regularly in their spare time to enhance the family diet or to allow for a bit of surplus, if exchanged in the agora. Perhaps fishing was also a supplementary activity for poor men who owned little or no land.

II.3.3. SALT-PANNING

A great deal of salt was needed to preserve dried fish, and it is possible that salt was collected in the archaic Argolid for this and other purposes. To produce salt one needed
to build ‘temporary mud dikes’ and let the ‘summer sun evaporate the trapped sea water’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 310). No traces of mud dikes were detected during the southern Argolid survey, but this is to be expected given the build-up of soil that has accumulated over the years (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 311).

II.3.4. TEXTILE DYEING WITH MUREX SHELLS

‘Murex trunculus, Bolinus brandaris … and the related Thais heamastoma … were used in the Mediterranean basin to produce a colour-fast purple dye’ (Figure 63; Hdt. 4.152, mentioning a purple fisher from Itanos). These two murex varieties were discovered at various places on the coast and sea in the southern Argolid (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 317). No actual dye installations, however, have been identified in the region. ‘Since the flesh is edible and useful as fish bait, and since the shell is ornamental, the small quantities … [that have been found cannot be used as] evidence of a shell-purple dye industry’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 317).

According to Plutarch (Alexander 36) in 331 BCE Alexander the Great came across a large amount of textile (the worth of 500 talents) dyed with Hermionian purple that had been stored in Susa for one hundred and ninety years (on the importance of purple dye in the textile industry, see Meijer and van Nijf 1992, 103ff., especially 107). If this story has any bearing on reality, we can assume that by the late sixth century Hermione exploited the sea for its murex shells to dye clothing. This type of textile production was probably a household activity in archaic times, as other textile establishments seem to suggest (see above, II.1.6.e).

II.3.5. HARBOURAGE

The Argolid ‘projected into the sea routes that ran up and down the east coast of Greece and across the Aegean, and inevitably it was of interest to ships travelling those routes’ (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 380).
II.3.5.a. The Location of Natural Harbours

I have already mentioned that the harbours of Hermione, Halieis, and Eiones (Sambaríza Magoúla) were sought-after by Athens, and at times perhaps also by Sparta (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 320). Halieis' small harbour at the entrance to the Argolic gulf was apparently important enough to be sheltered by a diagonal extension of the city wall (Jameson 1969, 311-343; cf. Hdt. 3.60 for Samos). The same may be said about the walls at Petrothálassa, which it seems stretched to the sea and functioned as a shelter for a small port (Appendix A-47; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 54).

Another important harbour was that of Mases. Its focus was on the Argolic gulf; it 'was, no doubt, always the port for travel to the Argeia, and it may be significant that it flourished along with Argos in the eighth and seventh centuries but declined thereafter' (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 337-378).

Pogon (at Vídhi), the harbour of Troizen, was one of the finest in the Peloponnesos (Appendix A-57; Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 16; Hall [J.] 1995a, 582). It was in this harbour that the Greek navy assembled before sailing to Salamis in the war of 480 BCE (Hdt. 8.42). Another good harbour on the Saronic gulf was that of Epidaurus town, which Argos may have used to secure entry to the gulf when helping Aigina in its struggle against Athens (Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 81).

Other harbours in the Argolid include one at Nauplia (exploited by Argos) and two good harbours at Asine in the Argeia (Tomlison 1972, 44-45; Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 81; Zangger 1994, 221-239; Hall [J.] 1995a, 582). In the Akte there was also a harbour at Vathy on the Methana peninsula (James et al. 1997, 5).

II.3.5.b. Communication by Sea

Communication by sea was important in archaic times, but as Hesiod (Op. 689-691) warns, 'Do not put all your livelihood in hollow ships. Leave the greater part behind, put only the lesser part on board. It is a terrible thing to come to disaster on the waves of the sea.' (for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 19). Transportation by sea was always
perilous, both for cargo and personnel. This was particularly true of ships sailing south along the coast of the Argolic gulf, where they had to circumnavigate the Hermionid or Cape Malea (Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 81; see also Hall [J.] 1995a, 582-583 for the harassment by pirates of shipping in the Argolic gulf).

The importance of imported goods, such as metals, marble, fine pottery, clothing, and works of art, probably made the risk worthwhile, however. Some of these goods could be exchanged for assistance provided to ships moored locally (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 380). This type of exchange promoted mercantile activities, which must have played an important role in the development of communities located near harbours.

Communication by sea also meant that there was successful exchange between regions of the Argolid and elsewhere, when seafarers went abroad to sell their goods and services (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 322-323).

**II.3.5.6. Boat Building**

Only those communities with good harbours and access to wood could build and beach the boats needed for such journeys (on boat building, see Meijer and van Nijf 1992, 159-164). Boat building probably offered extra ‘cash’ for those who needed to supplement their income with part-time work.

**II.3.6. SUMMARY**

The sea was a valuable resource for those inhabiting the Argolid in archaic times. Though fishing was only a part-time activity to supplement farm produce, it could be used as a short-term solution to food scarcity. Salt was needed to preserve fish, and certain places in the southern Argolid offered the possibility for salt collection. Apart from fish, other sea creatures were no doubt eaten. One of these, the *murex trunculus*, was used as bait to catch fish and was probably also eaten. In large numbers the murex shell served to dye clothing purple.
Certainly many coastal sites in the Argolid offered the added advantage of an excellent harbour. Being on sea routes, these harbours were of interest to those travelling up and down the east coast of Greece. The possibilities for exchange of imported goods with travellers and for temporary ventures out to sea by the locals increased communications between regions and promoted the local economy. Boat building also contributed to the community's stability.

The overall impression from looking at land and sea activities is that the Argolid was never rich in natural resources. What was available, such as stone suitable for building, wood, clay, fish, salt, and natural harbours, must have been exploited to some extent, but metals, good-quality stone, and a variety of other commodities needed to be imported into the region. The Argolid’s natural resources had only minimal economic importance. On a local basis, however, they may have been significant, since a community with resources to offer could eventually become a centre for craft production, providing extra income for the local inhabitants, or a point of contact for exchange, attracting merchants and neighbours into the area.
Chapter III
The Nature of Religious Rituals

In a Temple everyone should be serious except the thing that is worshipped.
Oscar Wilde.

We now move from the natural to the ceremonial, from the profane to the sacred. Greek religion was a matter 'of doing not of believing, of behaviour rather than faith' (Cartledge 1985, 98). This activity, this behaviour, we call ritual. Unlike both religion and magic, ritual refers to a formal performance that is acted out (repetitiously) according to explicit and communally-recognised rules of behaviour, rather than to abstract concepts and beliefs (see Renfrew 1985; 1994; Hodder 1982b, 159; Whitehouse 1996, 9-29 for archaeological definitions of ritual; see Lewis [G.] 1980 for an anthropological introduction to ritual).

Social anthropologists concerned with interpreting 'religious' behaviour observe ritual activity in all its visual, verbal, spatial, and temporal dimensions. For the archaeologist, most of this information is lost. Some archaeologists are thus as pessimistic about the investigation of ancient religious rituals as they are about social archaeology. Their reaction is understandable, given the lack of an agreed theoretical framework for analysis and interpretation of religious data in classical archaeology.

Even if not all the behavioural specifics (the how) of rituals can be discerned archaeologically, where these activities can be shown to involve either the use of special artifacts or special places, or both, we can use this concrete evidence to guide our thinking. What we interpret are physical manifestations of human activity, determined by the actors in ancient rituals, who went to these places and used special objects to pay respect to the divinities or to the dead.
However, if we can establish that a ritual took place, we should avoid making hasty generalisations about the intent (the why) of ritual activity. Archaeologists are ill equipped to start making ‘direct’ interpretations (i.e. the olive means life; libations at the grave are to nourish the dead) about religious beliefs. Whatever we conclude about ritual activities can only ‘make sense to us’; we can never be certain that this was what ‘made sense to them’.

Rather, we need to focus on contextualising the pattern of material evidence for rituals of each particular time and place. Only when we have considered all the available evidence can we say something about ‘the cultural conditions’ and context that such patterns addressed (Barrett [J.] 1991, 1; Morris [I.] 1992, 203). This is no easy task, but it is crucial to look at ritual within the wider context of the society that created it, if we want to generate broader conclusions about the general social structure of the society under consideration.

My emphasis in this chapter is on contextual analysis of the ritual system of the archaic Argolid, to see how we can gain insight into the social structures that motivated it. I examine ritual in two frames: sanctuary and burial. The first section deals with sanctuaries and rituals in honour of divinities. Here I concentrate on rituals of a communal nature, those that involved the social state of a group. When we ask what kinds of communal rituals existed in the archaic Argolid, we can see that some were designed to fraternise, others to exclude; some focused on women, others on men; some helped to legitimate social control, others to make contradictions acceptable. The list goes on, but what is important to notice is that all these rituals contribute to a picture of society through which groups of people defined themselves.

‘Religious ... [rituals] inevitably bear on the problem of death, and the rituals associated with the transition from life to death, including the burial itself, stand in special relation to the sacred rituals of life’ (Renfrew 1985, 17). In Part II of this chapter I explore the patterns of burial evidence within the total ritual context of the archaic Argolid. My investigation of burials follows closely the guidelines set forth by Morris (1992) in his analysis of burial rituals in ancient society.
If the study of ritual is a study of symbolic action, then it is only through such a study that we can approach the role played by human behaviour in creating the social structures of the archaic Argolid. This is because in rituals people use symbols to make explicit social structures (Morris [I.] 1992, 1).
III.1. Rituals for the Divinities

III.1.1. INTRODUCTION

The worshipping of divinities in archaic times produced substantial deposits. Often we can trace cults of this period back to the ninth or eighth century, but permanent structures for worship were then still relatively uncommon. The appearance of temples, altars, and temenos walls after about 750 BCE 'implies a definite change in people’s perception of [sacred] space... Now the space was organised and divided up [tem-ene] and [in some places] a frontier was clearly drawn between what was sacred and what was profane' (de Polignac 1995a, 20).

Within this sacred space were performed two types of rituals: individual rituals, usually involving private worship, and communal rituals. Individual rituals, such as gift-giving, libation, purification, and prayer, can sometimes be traced archaeologically by the discovery of certain objects (votive objects, perirrhanteria, hydriai, phialai), but they could take place within domestic environments and required no specific actors (Renfrew 1985, 21-22). Sacrifice, feasting, processions, and games, on the other hand, were exclusively communal rituals, that is, public rituals carried out, either by groups of people, or by designated individuals [priests, officials] acting on the communal behalf, and often doing so in a communally recognised sacred area. The concept of communal ritual does not, of course, imply that participation is open to the whole community: it need not be public in that sense, although it could be so. The right of participation in specific rituals may be rigidly defined (Renfrew 1985, 21).

I concentrate particularly on this aspect of communal rituals, because it involved group dynamics and societal organisation.

III.1.2. REVIEW OF PUBLISHED WORKS

Several works deal with ancient Greek religion, but fewer focus on ancient Greek ritual. Hodder, in The Present Past. An Introduction to Anthropology for Archaeologists (1982b,
159), apologises for the brevity of his chapter on ritual, partly because the process of compartmentalisation of (bronze age) archaeology has hived ritual as a peripheral aspect of human behaviour. This situation has changed over the last decade, particularly as the result of the work of a group of British prehistorians, based within the post-processual tradition (see Hodder 1990; Barrett [J.] 1991; 1994; Bradley 1993). The vitality of this field of study may be demonstrated by the interest shown in conferences that have been dedicated to themes of ritual and belief (Garwood, et al 1991; Waldren, Ensenyat, and Kennard 1995; Wilkins 1996). The works of Renfrew (1985; 1994a; 1994b) and Whitehouse (1991; 1996) are essentially ‘landmarks’ in the study of ritual in Greek and Italian archaeology.

Anthropologists have long been concerned with examining ritual, and their studies may be traced back to the important contributions of van Gennep (1960, first ed. 1909), Durkheim (1964, first ed. 1912), and Frazer (1976, first ed. 1900). These scholars profoundly influenced the work of later anthropologists of many different schools (Turner [V.] 1969; Leach 1976; 1982; Lévi-Strauss 1962; 1963; 1966). More recently G. Lewis’ Day of Shining Red (1980), La Fontaine’s Initiation. Ritual Drama and Secret Knowledge across the World (1985), and B. Morris’ Anthropological Studies of Religion (1987) provide a good introduction to the analysis of ritual symbolism.

Classical archaeologists are now beginning to draw on this rich literature, but for more than half a century it had been neglected (Wilkins 1996a, 2). In the context of classical studies, perhaps the greatest contribution on this subject has been made by Burkert. He has written a number of important books, of which the most recent in translations are Structure and History in Greek Mythology (1979), Homo Necans (1983, for a review, see Bremmer 1985), and Greek Religion (1985). They provide comprehensive discussions on Greek religion and rituals, based on the literary tradition. Moreover, they provide useful comparisons between ancient Greek rituals and those from the Near East (see also Quaegebeur 1993).

Other works in the classical tradition deal with more specific aspects of rituals in ancient Greece, but again mainly from a literary viewpoint. The work of de Polignac (1984; 1995a; 1995b, 7-19; 1996, 59-66) is perhaps an exception here. Others, such as Parker’s Miasma (1982), focus primarily on classical Athens, but are nonetheless excellent works.

The subject of animal sacrifice ties in with that of ritual dining. M. Goldstein’s dissertation on *The Setting of the Ritual Meal in Greek Sanctuaries* (1978) is a useful general guide; for more recent articles on specific sites, one can also consult Bookidis (1990; 1993) for Korinthos and Tomlinson (1980; 1990) for Perakhora. In the context of the symposium, Schmitt Pantel (1985; 1990), Bruit (1990a), and O. Murray (1990) touch on different aspects of ritual dining.

Finally, a number of works deal with processions and festivals. For a good general discussion of Greek religious festivals, one should consult N. Robertson’s recent book on *Festivals and Legends. The Formation of Greek Cities in the Light of Public Ritual* (1992). Like many other works on this subject, the emphasis is on classical Athens. Another important article on public rituals by Connor (1987) gives a good introduction to methodology, and a highly problematic explanation of the story of Pisistratos and Phye from processions in which mortals impersonate the divinity. A more recent article by Graf (1996) on *pompai* in Greece provides insight into the different forms of processions connected with specific religious experiences, from the display and confirmation of civic order to the quest for individual blessing. For a discussion of the Olympics and other Panhellenic festivals, one can consult McGregor (1941), Cartledge (1985), Raschke (1988), and Morgan (1990). To my knowledge, Zeitlin (1970) is the only scholar who discusses festivals in an Argive context.
Wherever there was ritual killing, there was ritual dining, because the flesh of an animal was never wasted (Dietrich 1988, 36). However, a feast could take place without animal sacrifice, if the worshippers ate raw or boiled fruit, vegetables, cereals, and so forth (Bruit 1986; 1990a; Jameson 1994b, 37-38).

We have plenty of references to animal sacrifices and feasting in the literary and pictorial record of archaic Greece (Thonges-Stringaris 1965, 1-99; Fehr 1971; Dentzer 1982; Verbanck-Piéard 1992, 85-106), but nothing, except late sources, specifically refers to these activities in the Argolid. For this reason, I prefer to concentrate on the archaeological and epigraphical evidence.

III.1.3. The Archaeological Evidence

Table III.1 below lists all archaic sites in the Argolid where we find explicit signs of animal sacrifice and feasting (Figure 64). I begin by examining the individual evidence for animal sacrifice, before I move on to the subject of feasting.
### Table III.1. Sites Where We Find Evidence of Animal Sacrifice and Feasting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SITES</th>
<th>Evidence of Animal Sacrifice</th>
<th>Evidence of Feasting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Knife/Axe</td>
<td>Spits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-28</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-36</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-71</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-81</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ayios Ilías</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbáti</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fóúrnoi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraion</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastráki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kounoupítsa</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Kokkýgion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykenai</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Akropolis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kháos</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asprókhoma</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BA tombs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Óga</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna</td>
<td></td>
<td>√</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stávros</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Knives and Axes for the Slaughter**

The actual ritual killing of the animal could leave behind traces in the archaeological record in the form of knives and axes. Knives have rarely been reported from sites in the Argolid: only in the temples of Apollo at Halieis and at Epidauros respectively (Appendix A-28; A-38). The same applies to axes. There is no doubt that at both these sites animals were being sacrificed; we also have plenty of skeletal remains to prove it.
Spits for Roasting the Animals

Once slaughtered, the flesh of an animal was cooked, either roasted on spits or boiled in large cooking vessels (Figure 65). Spits (obeloi) in sacred context have so far only been found in the Argolid at the Heraion (Waldstein 1902, 66, 77, fig. 31) and at the temple of Apollo at Halieis (Mazarakis Ainian 1988, 105ff.). In a funerary context, longer spits have also been found in three eighth century graves at Argos (Courbin 1957; 1974, 11, 13, 40, 136; 1983, 155; Protonotariou-Dheflaki 1980; Foley 1988, 83).

When Waldstein (1902) excavated the spits at the Heraion he proposed to connect them with Pheidon’s monetary reforms, in which the king withdrew the old obeloi and offered them to Hera. Courbin (1983, 149-150), who restudied the whole problem, suggests that the Argive obeloi formed a proto-monetary system in the late eighth century. More recently Strøm (1992a, 41-51, esp. 49), however, concluded that the Heraion obeloi were dedications, possibly of official character, used for the roasting of meat at banquets. The fact that spits have also been found at Halieis together with the horns of goats, animal bones, iron knives, swords, and spears makes this clear. Here we might suppose that they formed part of the sacred utensils of Apollo.

Cooking Pots

If meat was boiled, we should also be looking for evidence of cooking ware. So far, only the tholos at Berbáti and the temples on the akropoleis of Tiryns and Óga on Methana have reportedly yielded cooking vessels in sacred contexts (Appendix A-19; A-56; A-68), although on older excavations, such as at the Heraion, cookers were probably not noted as such. Even if the cooking pots suggest that an assortment of foods was being prepared on the premises, we cannot, however, be sure that this always involved meat and its attendant animal sacrifice.

Animal Bones and Horns

The most indisputable evidence for sacrifice and feasting comes from the non-edible parts of the animal, the horns or other skeletal remains. Animal bones have been reported from several sites in the Argolid; since they are the only sure sign that an animal has been sacrificed and eaten, their contexts deserve more attention.
Animal sacrifice may have taken place at Argos on Párodhos Belfnou, where a clay-lined pit was found containing bird and ankle-bones, olive pits, kraters of the early archaic period, a plate, together with other vessels and objects (see square 18 in Figure 66; Appendix A 10-28). It may seem surprising to learn that chickens and other birds were sacrificed in antiquity (Burkert 1985, 55). The ankle-bones, however, probably belonged to mammals. The structure of the pit, and the objects found inside, point to a ceremonial function. Perhaps this was some sort of heroon, similar to that found at the foot of the theatre.

Closeby, in the area between Goúnari Street and the theatre, was found a pit with masses of ceramic evidence and some animal horns and bones, together with two turtle-shell lyres (Appendix 10-36). The construction has been interpreted as a heroon, dating to the late sixth or early fifth century.

In another pit on Párodhos Danaou (Kotsiantis plot) in the north-east part of the Argos, horns of sheep and deer, as well as other animal bones, have been reported (Appendix A-10-71). The deposit made the excavator think that this was a cult place, perhaps related to Hera and some hero, or possibly even Aphrodite and Ares.

On Mt. Árakhnaio (Áyios Iías), north-west of the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros and north of Kazárma, burnt animal bones as well as many open-shaped pots were found on a small elongated plateau, near foundations of sizeable rectangular constructions (Figure 67; Appendix A-25). The foundations have been interpreted as enclosure walls for the open air temene of Zeus and Hera with their respective altars located inside them. The burnt animal bones found here indicate that animals were sacrificed to these divinities.

Remains of bone were found in the area to the north of the tholos at Berbáti (Wells, Ekroth and Holmgren 1997, 195). The deposit was initially classified as debris from a tomb cult.

In the courtyard of Building E (identified as a small shrine of Apollo) in the sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros burnt bone and votives were found in an ash layer that was probably debris spread from the altar of Apollo (Pythaeus) (Figure 68; Appendix A-28).
Animal bones were also discovered in a well during the construction of a house in Foumnoi village (Appendix A-46). The well contained small quantities of pottery, loom-weights, pieces of iron, a bronze handle, several coins, and two figurines. Since the objects seem votive in character and show signs of burning, we can assume that they came from a nearby shrine or altar, where animal sacrifice and feasting had taken place.

Three functions, temple, treasury, and hestiatorion, have been put under the same roof at Halieis (Figure 69; Mazarakis-Ainian 1988, 118). In the middle room (the hestiatorion, see below) of the temple of Apollo at Halieis was found a high concentration of goat bone-cores (Appendix A-38). Goats were apparently sacrificed here in large numbers.

Both shrines at Mykenai (Kháos and Asprókhoma) have produced animal bones (Figure 70; Appendix A-11). It seems that animal sacrifices and feasts in honour of Hera and Enyalios were held at these two places (for the cult of these deities, see Tomlinson 1972, 203-204, 209-210).

In the area of the bronze age tholos at Prosymi, archaic deposits from two bronze age tombs (10 and 40) contained many small fragments of charred bone, three or four animal teeth, probably of a dog, and part of the horn of a bull (Figure 71; Appendix A-14). There is no doubt that feasting took place here, though the dog’s teeth may have come from a burial, unless the ancient Greeks ate dogs (for Sardis and Latium, see Greenewalt 1976, 31ff.; Smith [C.] 1996, 80ff.).

The Species of Sacrificed Animals

Although excavation reports usually fail to mention the species of the animal, in general the excavated evidence consists mainly of ovicaprids (Jameson 1988, 90-93). Note, however, Pausanias’ (2.26.9-10) remark that it was against the custom of the Epidaurians to sacrifice goats.

According to Van Straten (1995, 77) piglets were even more popular than goats and sheep, as they happen to have been the cheapest animals, but no bones of piglets have yet been identified at Argolic sites. Bones of pigs, however, were noted from the temple of Apollo at Halieis (Appendix A-38). It is possible that the terracotta female pig-carriers
dedicated to the goddess Demeter in the Argolid may have replaced the need for an actual sacrifice of a piglet (Appendix A-38; A-56).

According to Xenophon (pseudo-Xenophon or the Old Oligarch, Ath. Pol. 2.9), the Athenian state often provided cattle for sacrifice, which meant that the poor could eat meat just like the rich. Hera’s most important festival in the Argolid, known in the fifth century as the Hekatombaia (one hundred cattle), is perhaps another such case (see below III.2.4.a; Bernardini 1976, 213-217; Burkert 1983, 162ff.). However, to judge from the bone deposits at this and other sanctuaries throughout mainland Greece, apparently few cattle were slaughtered (Bevan 1986; cf. Van Straten 1995, 170-174, see below). The only published mention of any part of a bull’s anatomy in an Argolic context is the horn from a bronze age tomb at Prosymna (Blegen 1937, 198; 1938, 380-382). This situation stands in sharp contrast to the bone evidence from Miletus, Samos, and Ephesos (Peters and von den Driesh 1992; Karwiese et al. 1998).

When the bone evidence from the Athenian agora was analysed, Reese (1989, 63-70) found that most of the burnt bone fragments come from sheep and goat. Attic sacrificial calendars (c. 440 onwards) indicate that when the state was low on funds, cattle were hardly ever slaughtered (SEG 33.147; Sokolowski 1969, 18, 20; Jeffery 1990, 75, 128, 334f.; Rosivach 1994, 14-29; Van Straten 1995, 171-173; Morris [I.] 1992, 123).

Utensils Used in Ritual Meals

The act of eating and drinking was a public affair. While we cannot normally predict the precise form that such ceremonies took (see, however, the mid-fifth century law from Selinous: Jameson, Jordan, and Kotansky 1993; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 20), we might expect the archaeological record to be particularly helpful here, since the equipment for the occasion is likely to be the focus of unusual elaboration and the residues especially copious. Feasting required the use of utensils, for which we have ample evidence in archaic sanctuaries. Some vessels can be associated with storage, mixing, cooling, pouring, serving, and drinking of wine; others were for the cooking, serving, and eating of food. We find much more evidence for (wine) drinking than for eating, however.
The problem with identifying these utensils directly with feasting is that some of this equipment could be votive (and domestic) in nature. The exceptions might be pots for storage, pots for the mixing and cooling of wine, and pots for cooking. These vessels would hardly be appropriate gifts to deities. Moreover, if any utensil shows signs of burning, we can safely assume that it once formed part of a ritual feast.

The Consumption of Wine

The presence of kraters and amphorae, connected with the storing and mixing of wine, suggests the possibility of a feast, even if we cannot be sure that food was consumed (two shrines at Argos, Appendix A-10-45; A-10-81, the temple of Apollo at Asine, a sanctuary at Berbáti, a shrine at Kastráki, a temple at Kounoupítsa, and the temple of Zeus at Stávros). Drinking also took place at the bronze age tombs of Mykenai (Wace 1932; Wace, Hood, and Cook [J.] 1953, 68-83), but this act was in honour of the dead, in the phenomenon we now call ‘tomb cult’ (Snodgrass 1980a, 38-40, 49-65; Humphreys 1981. 96-126; Whitley 1988, 173-182; 1995, 43-63; Morris [I.] 1988, 750-761; Alcock 1991a; 447-467; Hägg 1992b, 169-176; 1999; Antonaccio 1992, 85-105 1993, 46-70; 1994, 79-104; 1995; de Polignac 1995a).

The Consumption of Food

We find evidence for eating, such as plates or bowls, in places where we have no visible traces of a sacrifice; in the absence of any cutting and roasting implements or animal bones, all we can say is that at least non-animal products were being eaten at these sites.

The evidence of plates and bowls suggests that feasting took place in several places at Argos (Appendix A-10-10; A-10-28; A-10-40; A-10-51; A-10-61). Two of these areas are associated with tombs, the first with a ‘tomb cult’ in bronze age tombs on the Deíras (A-10-10), the second with a burial south-west of the Odeon (A-10-51). The other signs of feasting at Argos were reported from two pits that could be interpreted as heroa (A-10-28; A-10-61) and from an area connected to a cult to Erasinos (A-10-40).

Ritual dining appears to have taken place at Berbáti (in the tholos area), at Methana (in a temple that has not yet been attributed to a particular divinity), on Mt. Kokkýgion in
honor of Zeus, and on the akropolis at Mykenai where Hera was worshipped (Appendix A-63; A-49; A-11).

The Preparation of Food
Cooking pots and burnt objects or bones are the most conspicuous signs of a feast. As I have already mentioned, few sites have yielded cooking vessels. We find more evidence for the preparation of food in the burnt bones and objects that have been recovered at various sites throughout the Argolid (see above, Áyios Ilías, Berbáti, Epidauros, Foúrnoi, and Prosymna).

Dining Arrangements
As far as we known, ritual meals usually took place within the confines of the sanctuary (cf. the Selinous law, where meat was not to be carried away from the sanctuary, see Jameson, Jordan, and Kotansky 1993). Although feasting took place in simple open-air areas set around an altar (Homer, Il. 447-474), under temporary shelters, in certain rooms of temples, dining *en masse* is identified archaeologically by the existence in sanctuaries of multiple dining rooms called *hestiatoria* (Jameson 1994b, 46-47; see also Cooper [F.] and Morris [S.] 1990, 66-85 for dining seated in round buildings; Börker 1983, for the possibility of stoas and peristyle buildings being used for dining).

At Halieis people dined in a separate room, with a separate entrance, under the same roof as the *cella* in the temple of Apollo (Figure 69; Appendix A-38). The room was decorated with painted plaster, was paved, and had a drain along the east side for the channelling of water, but no benches on which to sit or recline. Bergquist (1990a, 36) believes that in the early archaic period one did not recline at banquets (cf. Dentzer 1982; Boardman 1990, 122-131; Cooper [F.] and Morris [S.] 1990, 66-85; Jameson 1994b, 51-53). Nevertheless, there may have been wooden benches on which to sit, for example the columns and the spectator 'tiers' overlooking the racetrack here are thought to have been wooden (cf. the benches at Korinthos, Bookidis 1990, 88-89).

The only other known archaic dining hall in the Argolid is the West Building at the Heraion (Figure 72; Appendix A-13, Brownson 1983, 233-224; Waldstein 1902, 131-
The original function and date of the building are uncertain; some have called it a gymnasium or a hospital for women, others a hestiatorion; some date it to the late sixth century, others to the mid- or late fifth century. An early date seems more acceptable, and the twelve benches or couches in each of the three rooms on the north side of the building, together with the off-centre doorway, point to its function as a hestiatorion (Tomlinson 1972, 238). Frickenhaus (1917, 121-130) proposed that at the great festival to Hera the thirty-six most prominent citizens of the city of Argos, among them the hiaromnamones, gathered in the three dining rooms. Certainly the twelve couches in each room bring to mind the inscription mentioning the body of magistrates, the ‘Twelve’, distributing money to twelve unnamed groups, traditionally called ‘phratries’ (see Chapter I.3.2.a: Wörrle 1964, 17; Roussel 1976, 154; Charneux 1984, 207; Piérart 1985, 346-347; Kritzas 1992, 235; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 274). It is possible, however, ‘that the feasting was not restricted to the [small] rooms ..., since around the courtyard on to which the rooms opened, on the three sides, the surrounding colonnade was doubled, leaving ample space for a larger number of couches, perhaps less durable in form, to be laid out at the time of the festival’ and ritual meal (Tomlinson 1972, 238).

Similar buildings have been found in other Argolic sanctuaries, but they date mainly to the classical period. Those of Asklepios at Epidauros (Kavvadhias 1900a, 143-154; 1990b, 103-105; 1902, 49-51; Frickenhaus 1917, 131-133; Delorme 1946, 108-119; Tomlinson 1969, 106-112; Goldstein [M.] 1978, 246-257) and at Troizen (Legrand 1897, 543-551; 1905, 259-318; 1906, 52-57; Frickenhaus 1917, 114-118; Welter 1941, 31-35; Goldstein [M.] 1978, 262-274), however, have the same distinction from room to room with a limited number of couches (Tomlinson 1969, 106f.). What is clear in all these examples is that ritual dining in specially built areas was restricted to a certain group of people.
An inscription on a bronze plaque from Epidauros (c. 450 BCE) mentions a certain Kallistratos, a μάγειρος (a cook), who no doubt was at the service of the Asklepieion (Figure 73; Athens, NAM inv. 8166: IG IV 1204; IV² 1.144; Kavvadhias 1891, 37-38, no. 12; Michel 1990, 823, no. 1067; Roehl 1907, no. 109.2; Lazzarini 1976, 199 no. 78; Jeffery 1990, 182 no. 16, pl. 34). We know that from the fifth century onwards the mageiros was often a public official whose duties included the killing, the butchery, and the cooking (Detienne 1979, 21). Kallistratos was therefore the official in charge of sacrifice as well as cooking of the victims. His official appointment implies that sacrifices and communal meals at Epidauros were being held on a regular basis and were being controlled by an official body.

III.1.3.c. Animal Sacrifices in the Rural Landscape

The slaughter and consumption of a domestic animal was a festive occasion for all communities of the Argolid. Normally these events took place at sanctuaries, but sometimes they occurred at tomb cults, heroa, or graves. The latter seems to have been the case at Argos. That none of the known fourteen archaic sanctuaries in the city has (yet) yielded clear evidence of ritual killing and dining seems odd. At first sight, this pattern gives the impression that animal sacrifices were rarely performed in urban sanctuaries. Let us see if evidence from other Argolic sites can support such a supposition.

Sacred precincts that have yielded evidence of animal sacrifice outside Argos are the sanctuary of Zeus and Hera at Áyios Ilías, the temple of Apollo at Epidauros, the Heraion, the temple of Apollo at Halieis, and the two shrines (one to Hera and another to Enyalios) at Mykenai. Except for the suburban temple of Apollo at Halieis, located outside the city gate, the sites are all extraurban (Appendix C-52; C-43/C-55; C-61; C-28; C-41; C-38).

This picture suggests that ancient feasts were hardly localised within the town or village, but rather were celebrated in the middle of the countryside. It is consistent with de Polignac’s (1984; 1995a) basic argument that extraurban sanctuaries marked cultural and
territorial boundaries (the city being a 'bipolar' entity), and their foundation was synonymous with the foundation of the polis. Since the publication of de Polignac's influential ideas, however, the subject of extraurban sanctuaries has been open to debate (see for example, Hall [J.] 1995a, 577-613; Malkin 1996, 75-81). Malkin (1996, 75) suggests that we look at extraurban sanctuaries in religious terms, that is, as 'the division of the same between the Greeks and their gods'. He believes that this division corresponds to the 'relationship between humans and divinities' in Greek sacrifice, when both parties shared the same sacrificial victim, except that the gods got the fat and bones and humans got the meat (Malkin 1996, 79). Just as the distribution of victims is unfair, so is the distribution of land: the divinities 'got relatively small temene in the “centres” of cities, and broad, excellent lands in the most dangerous and inconvenient places.' (Malkin 1996, 79). It is possible that the allotment of such land also signified de Polignac's conceptual ideas of 'centre and periphery' and of 'territoriality', but according to Malkin (1996, 79-81) these connotations only came into being over a long period of time.

The idea of the 'division of the same' and the desire to 'give up' land and animals for the divinities was a significant element of religious behaviour, and perhaps the regular need for sacrifices at non-urban sanctuaries represented a re-enactment of this 'return' of property (i.e. land, crops, and animals) offered to the gods in the early period of settlement. If in the archaic period the land on which were founded these extraurban sanctuaries no longer seemed to be dangerous and distant because its surroundings were now being cultivated, it is possible that some cities took advantage of their location as a way of delimiting territory (see Malkin 1996, 80-81 for Cyrenaica). In this case the regular procession of animals from 'towns' out to rural sanctuaries served to reinforce the community's 'control over the territory, a control that was exercised according to the norms of agrarian civilization' (de Polignac 1995a, 40) and to intensify the unity of the social group by the co-operation it required (for processions in the Argolid, see III.1.4.a and III.1.4.c). The parade of the animals from the 'town' through the communal fields that made up the cultivated territory also symbolised a control over the (once) 'dangerous' wilderness, since the sacrificial animals were always domesticated species.

Rural sanctuaries with their accompanying festive sacrifices might 'articulate the necessary organic relationship between countryside (the economic basis) and urban centre (the political superstructure)', but not necessarily on an equal footing (Cartledge 1998,
43). It seems that the city was only a secondary, though usually unifying, religious pole (Jost 1990, 229, 236). Its sanctuaries were adapted to an urban setting and regrouped in a reduced space that limited the amount of victims for sacrifices (or perhaps prevented sacrifices altogether) and their accompanying processions. Certainly the practice of animal sacrifice suited the image of a ‘wild’ or ‘primal’ countryside better than it did the civilised character of the city, and this may be one of the reasons why at present no urban site in the Argolid has yielded clear evidence of ritual sacrifice.

**III.1.3.d. The Concept of Hospitality**

The idea that most Argolic sacrifices and feasts were held at rural sanctuaries makes us wonder whether these ritual activities provided a setting for communal gatherings of groups from two or more communities. It is tempting to liken such rural gatherings to those described by Gernet (1981, 21-61) as occasions for exchanging hospitality and for sharing between the neighbouring communities which participated in them on a relatively equal footing (see also Burkert 1985, 254). Participation in common cult activities was apparently a way ‘of showing neutrality or friendship’ (Sinn 1996a, 71).

The notion of shared hospitality between groups of people from different (but neighbouring) communities finds support in the epigraphical record. An inscription (c. 450-400 BCE) from Tylissos and two joining fragments from Argos, drawn up by Argive arbitrators to settle a series of disputed points between Knossos and Tylissos, mentions sacrifice in the context of hospitality (Wissowa 1937, col. 1723ff.; Kahrstedt 1942, 72-91; Vollgraff 1948; Graham 1964, 154-165, 235-244; Tomlinson 1972, 134-136; Meiggs and Lewis 1988, no. 42; Jeffery 1990, 165, 170 no. 39; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 222-233). One of the fragments from Argos (A: lines 16-17) states that the Knossos and Tylissos must make a communal sacrifice of a cow to Hera at the Heraion before the Hyakinthia; the other fragment (B: lines 38-42) states that the inhabitants of Knossos must offer hospitality to all who come to sacrifice (Figure 74; Argos Mus.: SEG 11.316; 15.200; 22.264; 25.360; 26.424; 30.354; 39.344; Roberts 1887, 112 no. 77; Vollgraff 1910, 331-354; 1913, 279-308; Dittenberger 1915, 67-69 no. 56; Schwryzer 1923, 41-42 no. 83; Guarducci 1935, 56 no. 4; 1969, 552; Buck 1955, no. 85).
It is clear from this inscription that sacrifices, and their ensuing feasts, were meant to encourage or restore good relations between two communities. These two communities, however, were Kretan. To catch a glimpse of shared worshipping between communities in the Argolid, we must look for evidence of sanctuaries located at the borders of regions. Most often, these frontier sanctuaries were dedicated to the worship of Artemis (Schachter 1992; de Polignac 1994, 6).

As Table III.2 (below) shows, the cults of Artemis in the Argive plain were mainly west of the Inákhos river (Argos, Magoula, Dhouka, Oinoe, Mt. Lykone, Mt. Artemision, Mt. Megalovoúni), and on the borders with Arkadia (Mitsos 1949, 73-77; Tomlinson 1972, 210ff; Fossey 1987, 71-88). They are positioned around the western hills, and each sanctuary is on a road leading from Argos and at the borders with Arkadia. Most of these sites are located in the mountains, in wild areas, which Tomlinson (1972, 210) interprets as a result of Artemis' nature as the huntress. However, it is more likely that placement of these cults served to reinforce the religious contacts between Arkadia and the Argolid (Pritchett 1980, 32-33, 91-92; Fossey 1987, 77-88; de Polignac 1995a, 38-39; 1998, 146). The neighbouring communities had an obvious mutual interest in their existence.

Table III.2. Sanctuaries of Artemis in the Argive Plain

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Epithet</th>
<th>Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argos (Agora) [C-22]</td>
<td>U: road</td>
<td>Peitho ?</td>
<td>Remains; Paus. 2.21.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhouka ? [C-46]</td>
<td>EU: mountain</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Votives; Paus. 2.25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heraion ? [C-57]</td>
<td>EU: boundary</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemision [C-48]</td>
<td>EU: mountain</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Sherds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lykone [C-47]</td>
<td>EU: mountain</td>
<td>Orthia</td>
<td>Remains; Paus. 2.24.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megalovoúni [C-49]</td>
<td>EU: mountain</td>
<td>Oraia</td>
<td>Sculpture; late inscription</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magoula [C-58]</td>
<td>EU: boundary</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Votives; Paus. 2.24.5 ?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinoe ? [C-59]</td>
<td>EU: boundary</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Inscription; Paus. 2.25.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EU=extraurban; SU=suburban; U=urban  
Numbers in square brackets [C-... ] correspond to site numbers in Appendix C.

We can assume that these places were frequented by the neighbouring populations of both regions at certain times of the year, perhaps for festivals in which sacrifice and feasting would take place and for travellers or traders who journeyed across borders 'under the protection of a sanctuary' (Sinn 1996a, 67). Unfortunately, lack of excavation prevents us from proving that such activities actually took place. The rural character and location of the cults, however, point in that direction.
III.1.3.e. The Communal Meal. How Communal Was It?

The evidence of sacrifice discussed so far hints at the possibility that feasts were prime opportunities for meetings of inhabitants from different communities. The communal consumption of food was meant to create or reinforce links between members of one or more communities (Detienne 1979, 10; Schmitt Pantel 1985, 150, 154-155). But it could also be a ritual of exclusion. I would now like to turn to this aspect of communal dining.

Both the social and religious aspects of communal eating have been discussed at length in the context of the symposium, but the process of consumption at sanctuaries has received less attention. The identity and demarcation of the group is revealed in consumption, that is, in the practice of eating together or separately (Goody 1982, 38, 47-48). According to Goody (1982, 47-48), this activity consists of the following phases:

- the assembling of the participants
- the serving or distribution of the cooked food
- eating the food
- clearing away

while the following aspects require comment:

- the distribution in time (daily meals, feasting, etc.)
- the structure of a meal
- ways of eating (table manners, cleansing)
- the technology of eating (table, instruments, etc.)
- who eats with whom (the eating group)
- the differentiation of the cuisine
- the disposal of any surplus (of importance in sacred meals)

Archaeological evidence can only impinge on a few of these points. The most important one in the context of this research centres on the assembling of the participants, that is, the eating group.

The Eating Group

Forms of dining can give much information about the social structure of a society. The *hestiatorion* marked a certain hierarchy between those who were privileged enough to eat indoors, and others who ate outside or in more temporary structures. The question is:
what type of hierarchy? Was it based on age, gender, wealth, family descent, or some sort of group membership? The question of age, wealth, and family decent is an important one for the study of dining rooms, but direct evidence is lacking for any decisive answers. We must therefore concentrate on gender and group membership.

It has been maintained that men did not customarily eat with women, nor, presumably, with their children (Dentzer 1982, 509-511). Although we can never be sure that this was the case, three archaic inscriptions seem to support this gender-based segregation. The first provides us with some details about the organisation of communal meals at Sikyon. The earliest use of the word *hestiatorion* appears in this late sixth or early fifth century inscription (Athens, NAM: SEG 11.244; 30.350; Orlandhos [A. C] 1938, 5-12; Peek 1941, 200-207; Lejeune 1943, 185ff.; Buck 1955, no. 96; Jeffery 1990, 143 pl. 23; van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 290 no. 75). It mentions two prerequisites for belonging to a group of people (a civic association similar to the *syssitia* of Crete, see below) who shared the *hestiatorion* and other possessions: one must live in Sikyon and make contributions in one form or other. Seventy-three people are listed among those who belong to this group. They all seem to be male.

Another early inscription concerned with communal meals comes from Tiryns and is therefore directly relevant to Argolic society (see Chapter 1.3.2.a for bibliography). The fragmentary nature of the inscription does not permit full recovery of its contents, but it is clear that the subject matter deals with regulations pertaining to meetings, where wine and probably food were consumed, with specified contribution to them, and with fines imposed for failure to conform (Jameson, Verdhelis, and Papakhristodhoulou 1975, 204-205). Since the names of Zeus and Athena are evidently linked with the organisation of these meetings, they were seemingly of religious character. It is not certain, however, whether we have a reference to occasional cult gatherings as in the Attic *parasitoi* or with meetings on the order of the *syssitia* or *phiditia* (men's clubs or messes) of Sparta and Crete (on *syssitia*, see Singor 1990, 80-82).

A few explanations have been given for the group mentioned as *platiwoinoi* (those who take wine), and the prominent *platiwoinarkhos*, presumably at the head of group. The original editors (Verdhelis, Jameson, Papakhristodhoulou 1976, 195-199) liken them to the Attic *parasitoi* (parasites, those who take their food [sitos] besides, see Athenaeus
Dubois (1980, 250-256), however, believes that the *platiwoinoi* were a college of attendants (sacred ‘cup-bearer’ priests) for the cult of Zeus and Athena, in charge of libations of wine at religious ceremonies. Van Effenterre and Ruzé (1994, 296) compare them to the *pariwoinoi*, who were drinkers or drunkards. Whoever they were, these men formed groups of a collective and selective character. They probably held no official status, but came from a distinctive class of male citizens, probably an elite (Jameson 1990a, 216). In this respect, Tiryns was surely not unique (Jameson 1992, 138).

A third inscription supporting the idea of segregated eating comes from Krete -- the Spensithios decree of about 500 BCE (see Chapter I.2.3.e). The last few lines of side B list the conditions required for admission into a men’s club (the *andreion*).

**III.1.4. PROCESSIONS, GAMES, AND OTHER RITUALS AT FESTIVALS**

Rituals performed in association with festivals were civic in nature, organised by (and for) the community. Particular days were set aside for such demonstrations of piety. On these days members of the community joined in a procession towards the sanctuary, sacrificed animals, held feasts, and sometimes participated in a variety of other ritualised performances (dancing, hymns, play-acting, athletic games, and other contests).

Here I intend to focus on only three of these rituals: processions, play-acting, and athletic games. I deliberately refrain from using the evidence for sacrifices and feasts to support the existence of festivals at specific sites, because, even if the remains give the impression that these activities are residues from festivals, they could equally come from contexts connected with other types of gatherings (for example, funerals, tomb cult, marriages). For obvious reasons, I also exclude from this discussion such activities as dancing, the recitation of hymns, musical contests, and so forth -- they rarely leave traces in the archaeological record for us to examine and are not restricted to festival settings (see for example, Appendix A-10-36 for lyres buried in a *heroön*).

We are poorly informed about Argolic festivals. Although we gather that most festivals began with a procession to the sanctuary, few sacred routes have been identified (Hall [J.]
1995a, 612-613). The same goes for costumes and masks, which were part of play-acting at some ceremonies; only a few clay masks have been found in sacred contexts (Jantzen 1975, 159-161; Vernant 1984, 13-27; 1985; Carter 1987, 355-383; see also Burkert 1985, 103-104). We are slightly better equipped to identify athletic games, because these were held in specifically built locations, recognisable from architectural remains. The inscriptive evidence also helps here, as many prizes were inscribed with the names of contests or the like. We also find inscriptions referring to the existence of individual buildings for games, such as hippodromes, which have not yet been discovered. Finally, we have the ancient authors, whose testimonies inform us about some ritual activities at Argolic festivals.

III.1.4.a. The Archaeological and Literary Evidence

Processions

The Argive Procession

The only procession in the Argolid for which we have evidence is the Argive march from Argos to the Heraion (Burkert 1983, 162-163). This demonstration of piety is well known from ancient literature. The earliest reference to it appears *prima facie* to be the tale of Kleobis and Biton, as reported by Herodotos (1.31). These two youths of Argos dragged the cart of their mother, the priestess of Hera, from Argos to the Heraion, because the oxen had not yet returned from the fields to the town, which was the starting point of the procession. Upon their arrival, Kleobis and Biton were granted the greatest mortal blessing -- they entered the temple of Hera where they fell into a deep and eternal sleep.

Herodotos ends his story by remarking that the Argives set up statues to them at Delphi. However, the two *kouroi* found at Delphi at the turn of the century have (?) perhaps wrongly been connected with the story of Kleobis and Biton (*Figure 38*; Chamoux 1955, 5ff.; Von Premerstein 1920, 41ff; Schwyzer 1923, no. 317; Daux 1937, 61ff; Richter 1942, 78ff; van Groningen 1945, 34ff; Buschor 1950, 35; Tod 1946, 4-6 no. 3; Marcadé 1953, no. 115, pl. 24; Vatin 1977, 13-22; 1982, 509-525; Faure 1985, 56-65; Foley 1988, 128; Jeffery 1990, 154-156, 168 no. 4, pl. 26; Croissant 1992, 72; Ridgway 1993, 70). Hall (1995a, 595-596), who re-examined the epigraphic and iconographic evidence,
convincingly shows that these two statues did not represent Kleobis and Biton, even though they are Argive.

So, neither the Herodotean story nor the Delphi kouroi can be used as evidence for an archaic procession from Argos to the Heraion. The earliest such evidence is to be found in Pindar’s tenth Nemean Ode (10.34), usually dated to about 464 BCE (Hall [J.] 1995a, 596). It is around this time that a new ‘sacred way’ going from Argos to the Heraion can be traced in the archaeological record; it replaced the old ‘sacred way’ between Mykenai and the Heraion in the early fifth century, after the Argive destruction of Mykenai and Tiryns (Hall [J.] 1995a, 612-613). Excavations near the village of Khóníkas, about one kilometre west of the Heraion, ‘have brought to light the remains of [an early fifth century] monumental colonnaded poros building’, perhaps connected with the yet undiscovered ‘hippodrome’ (see below, III.1.4.b). Hall (1995a, 612), however, prefers to view the building ‘as part of the new program of monumentalization taking place at the Heraion, ... symbolizing Argos’s newly won control over the sanctuary and her newfound domination over the plain’.

Another Procession from Argos to the Heraion?

We are told that the virgin girls of Argos took part in a procession to the Heraion and there performed choral dances (Euripides, *Elektra* 172f.). If this reference relates to an actual event, then a date before the mid-fifth century might be postulated for its establishment.

A Procession from the Heraion to Nauplia?

It is likely that the Heraion was associated with another procession, for which only a scrap of evidence survives. Pausanias (2.38.2) says that Hera (that is, her cult statue) was bathed every year (by women) in the spring of Kanathos near Áyia Móni at Nauplia to recover her virginity. This event must have been established in the archaic period, when many cult statues were still relatively small, portable wooden objects.
A Procession at Hermione

Pausanias (2.35.5-8) also describes in great detail a procession held in honour of Demeter at Hermione. The passage is so explicit that it deserves to be quoted in full:

... Chthonia was brought to Hermione by Demeter, and made the sanctuary for the Hermionians. At any rate, the goddess herself is called Chthonia, and Chthonia is the name of the festival they hold in the summer of every year. The manner of it is this. The procession is headed by the priests of the gods and by all those who hold the annual magistracies; these are followed by both men and women. It is now [2nd c. A.D] a custom that some who are still children should honour the goddess in the procession. These are dressed in white, and wear wreaths upon their heads ... Those who form the procession are followed by men leading from the herd a full-grown cow, fastened with ropes, and still untamed and frisky. Having driven the cow to the temple, some loose her from the ropes that she may rush into the sanctuary, others, who hitherto have been holding the doors open, when they see the cow within the temple, close the doors. Four old women, left behind inside, are they who dispatch the cow. Whichever gets the chance cuts the throat of the cow with a sickle. Afterwards the doors are opened, and those who are appointed drive up a second cow, and a third after that, and yet a fourth. All are dispatched in the same way by the old women, and the sacrifice has yet another strange feature. On whichever of her sides the first cow falls, all the others must fall on the same. Such is the manner in which the sacrifice is performed by the Hermionians (Loeb translation, Jones 1931; my italics; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 21).

The sanctuary of Demeter Chthonia has been located in the vicinity of the main church of the modern town, Ayios Taxiárkhis (the Archangel Michael), beyond the city walls on the slopes of the Prón (Appendix A-50; and Appendix C). Although it has not been excavated and thus remains undated, several inscriptions found at Hermione attest Demeter’s worship from at least the 460s (see Chapter I.3.5.a).

Masks Used in Play-acting

According to Jameson (1990a, 218-220), the terracotta masks discovered in the bothros at Tiryns should, by analogy with the mask found in the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta, be connected with an adolescent festival in honour of a female divinity and a male hero (Figure 75; Jantzen 1975, 159-161; for Artemis Orthia, see Vernant 1984, 13-27; 1985; Carter 1987, 355-383; see also Burkert 1985, 103-104). These masks were worn
by individuals, who were play-acting the role of terrifying (female) creatures, probably Gorgons (Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 88; Jameson 1990a, 218-210).

**Athletic Installations**

No site in the Argolid except Halieis has yielded physical evidence for sporting contests at festivals. It seems that Halieis was the site of an important (unknown) festival, which included athletic contests (Appendix A-38). The architectural remains point to the establishment of footraces, as starting lines of a narrow racecourse (16 m by 167.4 m) were found in the area of the sanctuary. The excavators speculate that wooden tiers ran along the east side of the track for spectators. At a later period (c. fourth century) a bath complex has also been identified, as would be normal at this time for a site of athletic competitors (Jameson 1974c, 119).

Pausanias (2.24.2) mentions that a racecourse, in which the Argive held games in honour of Nemean Zeus and at the festival of Hera, adjoined the sanctuary of Athena Oxyderkes on the Deíras at Argos. If the reference is to the festival of Hera at the Heraion, Argos probably only took possession of the games there sometime after 460. Moreover, the games of Nemean Zeus were only transferred to Argive control at the end of the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century (see Musti and Torelli 1986, 262-263; Miller 1990, 24-20; Doffey 1992, 193). These two events suggest that the racecourse probably dates to the fourth century.

**III.1.4.b. The Inscriptional Evidence**

**The Hippodrome**

The Heraion had a hippodrome for horse-races, but no such structure has (yet) been discovered (Daly 1939, 168). We know that it existed from two inscriptions found near the Heraion: the first reference is on a sixth century memorial of a young warrior; the second is on a stone statue base dedicated at the Heraion around 480-475 by four hiaromnamones (see Chapters I.3.2.a; I.3.4.c; II.1.6.f).
Prizes Won at Games

The games in honour of Hera at the Heraion are well known from ancient authors, but their evidence is late and often confusing. The fifth century bronze vessels inscribed *par’ Heras Argeias* provide better proof that such games were held (Amandry 1980, 233-234). These vessels were given as prizes to the victors in the games. We have six examples from various contexts dating between 470 and 425 BCE, all mentioning the games of Argive Hera (Figure 76; see below, Table III.3). This series is the most numerous after that of the Panathenaic amphorae.

Table III.3. Bronze Prize Vessels Inscribed to Hera

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shape</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Provenance</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hydria</td>
<td>c. 470-450</td>
<td>Ankara (found in tomb at Sinope)</td>
<td><em>SEG</em> 30.1456; 39.1365; AMANDRY 1971, 615 no. 3; JEFFERY 1990, 164.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinos (lebes)</td>
<td>c. 450-425</td>
<td>BM (found in tomb near Piraeus)</td>
<td><em>SEG</em> 11.330; SMITH 1926, 256-257; VOLLGRAFF 1930, 33f.; AMANDRY 1971, 65; JEFFERY 1990, 170 no. 43.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All dates are BCE

It is noticeable that the bronze prizes date to the period after the conquest of Mykenai and Tiryns, when Argos was free to dominate the region and control the Heraion.

Contests in Rites of Passage

An early inscription (c. 525 BCE) from the akropolis of Mykenai mentions (a body or college [?] of) *hiaromnamones* in connection with the cult of Perseus (see Chapter I.3.2.a; and Appendix A-11). As was shown in Chapter I, it reads as follows: ‘If there is no body (college [?]) of *damiorgia*, the *hiaromnamonas* for (the heroön or fountain of [?]) Perseus will serve as adjudicators or judges (*kriteras*) for the parents, as it has been decided.’ The reference to parents shows that we have to do with children, most likely sons;
the reference to acting as judges shows that the disputes might occur, over either success in some contest or the achieving of some standard; [the reference to] ... parents and high officials of the state suggests that the issues affected membership in the community, i.e. the achieving of status as a citizen or in a hierarchy among citizens. Since it is Perseus’ cult officials who are to substitute for the δαμιουργοί, Perseus would seem to be patron of the institution whereby boys took their place in the Archaic community of Mykenai. (Jameson 1990a, 215).

III.1.4.c. The Symbolism of Processions

Religious festivals marked periods when groups came together, setting themselves apart from others, in celebrations that contrasted with the normality of everyday life. ‘The fundamental medium of group formation is the procession, pompe’ (Burkert 1985, 99). ‘Hardly festival is without its pompe’, but unfortunately, hardly any Argolic pompe has left its mark on the landscape. Only the famous Argive procession from Argos to the Heraion has (so far) been securely identified.

For this reason, perhaps, it has also attracted the attention of scholars, who speak at length about the symbolism behind the act. As I have stated earlier, de Polignac (1995a, 40) has interpreted this procession as a collective reaffirmation of Argos’ control over the cultivated territory. The analogy is with a ‘sacred ploughing, in which the processional route represents a symbolic furrow leading from the dwelling place of human beings in the centre, to the dwelling place of the deity on the edge of the plain now taken over by agricultural civilisation.’ (de Polignac 1995a, 42). This ‘agrarian mediation’ between the Argives and Hera apparently invoked ‘the first form of protection that they desired from her: namely, fertility’, fertility of the fields, of the flocks and herds, and of humans (de Polignac 1995a, 42).

Of these three points, human fertility in the context of processions ought to be considered more closely. Marriage was the ritual that ensured fertility, and in the Argolid it was Hera who exercised power over this fundamental institution. Although she is never worshipped as the wife (‘Teleia’) of Zeus in the Argolid (Aloni-Ronen 1997, 18-19; see Jost 1985, 358-359 for such cults in Arkadia), certain signs point to Zeus’ presence at the Heraion in the context of his coupling with the goddess. Myth tells the story of how Zeus turned himself into a cuckoo on Mt. Kokkýgion near Hermione in order to flutter into
Hera’s bosom (Homer, *Il. 14.296*; Kallimakhos Fr. 75.4; Theokritos 15.64; Paus. 2.17.4), and in the Heraion the gold and ivory image of Polykleitos carried a sceptre on which this cuckoo perched (Paus. 2.36.1; 2.17.4; cf. *LIMC*, s.v. Hera 682ff.).

The bathing of her statue in the springs at Nauplia also ties into this image of Hera. The implication is that her marriage to Zeus required that she first take a bridal bath to recover her virginity. The thousands of *hydriai* found at the Heraion (Waldstein 1902, 100f.; Caskey 1952, 175ff., 197ff.) may have been associated with such ceremonies (Guettel Cole 1988, 163-164; cf. Foley 1988, 73, 137-138; Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 90). What is odd about this matter is that Hera’s cult statue had to be taken all the way to Nauplia, even though there existed a perfectly good stream for purifications close to the Heraion (cf. Demeter at Phaleron, Burkert 1990, 77-85; Parker 1983, 28). In another passage from Pausanias (2.16.1) the Eleutherion stream at the foot of the hills near the sanctuary is said to be frequented by the priestess of Hera and perhaps other women at the sanctuary for purifications and other rituals in their secret ceremonies. Why was this place not used for Hera’s bath? I would guess that the more distant springs of Nauplia offered the perfect setting to parade the image of Hera through the edge of cultivated territory. If the ceremony had taken place just a short distance from the Heraion (i.e. the Eleutherion), the procession would have lost its grandeur, its goal. The procession, therefore, was perhaps as important as the purification ceremony.

If we suppose that the bathing of Hera’s statue was a women’s affair, we might suggest that this hypothesised procession symbolised human fertility through its connection with women. In a similar bathing ceremony of unknown date, the image of Pallas Athena (the famous Palladion from Troy), along with the shield of Diomedes (paraded by young men, *paides*), was apparently paraded by women (young virgins, *loutrochooi* and all women of Argos, *argeiai gunaikes*) in the procession that bore Athena from the acropolis to bath in the river Inakhós (scholiast on Kallimakhos, *Hymn to Athena* 5.1; Paus. 1.28.8; 2.23.5, for a recent discussion, see Billot 1999, 7-28). ‘This annual Argive ceremony of the Bath of Pallas ... also draws attention to ... [Athena’s] interventions in the domain of [human] fecundity’ (de Polignac 1995a, 82).

It is possible that the public nature of such processions accentuated
the crucial yet temporary responsibility of the women vis-à-vis the perpetuation of the community' [i.e. giving birth]... That responsibility conferred upon the women a latent citizenship of a religious nature, without which there could never have been any citizenship of the other, political, kind' (de Polignac 1995a, 73, see also Brumfield 1996, 67-74).

I now return to Hera’s role as matrimonial goddess in the context of festivals. At the Heraion it was Hera who supervised the switch over from childhood to that of adulthood, via the ritual of marriage (de Polignac 1995a, 63). The virgin girls of Argos took part in a procession to the Heraion and performed choral dances (Euripides, *Elektra* 172f.; also on a geometric krater, Krystalli-Votsi 1980, 85-92). These virgins probably participated for the first time in the solemn festivals held in the Heraion (Auffarth 1999, 44), and their movement out of the town centre represented a distancing or a change of status (de Polignac 1995a, 62). ‘This presentation of the younger generation to the goddess and the community was also -- through the performance of dances and songs, designed to give pleasure to both -- [and provided] an integration into the cult and, thereby, equally into society’ (de Polignac 1995a, 62).

**III.1.4.d. A Festival without Religious Content?**

Although choral dances were probably performed in many festive occasions, the chorus of maidens from Argos reminds us of the myth of the Danaids at Argos. When Pindar (*Pythian Ode* 9.11f.) describes the marriage of the forty-eight daughters of Danaos, he says that the Danaids formed a chorus. Gernet (1981, 25) stresses the importance of this word, because lively choruses present a structure that obscured the opposition between sexes. Whatever the importance of the choral dance may have been in the context of the procession of Argive virgins, the main issue is that the integration of young virgins into society was a ritual to prepare girls for marriage.

This idea stands in opposition to the main theme of the Danaid tetralogy as it was presented by Aeschylus in the *Suppliants*. The play focuses on the desperate wishes of a group of women to escape the fate of marriage (Diamantopoulos 1957, 222ff.). The forty-eight Danaids, loyal to Artemis, murder their bridegrooms, except for one Danaid, Hypermnestra, who, acting out of loyalty to Aphrodite and Hera, deceives her father and
saves her husband from death in order to bear children. Aphrodite defends her motives in court, and the Argives forgive her rebellious actions.

To commemorate Hypermnestra’s acquittal and the survival of her husband, Lynkeus, the Argives held an annual ‘Beacon’ \( (\text{pyrsos}, \text{previously called Lynkeia}) \) festival on the Larisa (Paus. 2.25.4; Diamantopoulos 1957, 220-229; Detienne 1988c, 159-175; Piérart 1998, 165-193; Auffarth 1999, 39-48; Billot 1999, 50-51). As Diamantopoulos (1957, 223-224) argues,

the tradition of the trial and acquittal of Hypermnestra was therefore sponsored by the Argive state ... two reasons for this state sponsoring are clear: by holding a festival in memory of a judicial decision given by the \textit{demos} and concerning the ancestress of the Argive kings, the Argive state both stressed in the person of Hypermnestra the seniority of the royal house to which she gave birth, and indirectly paid honour to the court that rendered the decision. It [thus] brought out the antiquity of the \textit{demos} as a judicial body as well as that of the dynasty.

There was little religious about the institution of this public festival, even if Hypermnestra acted out of devotion to Hera and Aphrodite. Its main theme was political, and in the context of the outcome of the battle of Sepeia the subject of forced marriage must have been a topical issue. The festival could be connected to ‘an internal policy of [Argive] constitutional reforms’ (Diamantopoulos 1957, 244). The first of these reforms, which we have already discussed in the context of the land distribution (Hdt. II. 6.83; see Chapter II.1.5.c), may have begun immediately after Sepeia, when the wives of the dead warriors were forced to remarry so that losses of the city might be restored (Plut., \textit{Mul. Virt.} 245 F; van Compernolle 1975, 362-363). According to Auffarth (1999, 45) the feast of lights also symbolises Argos’ ‘claim to domination of the plain, as does the frequent use of the Danaids as place-names in the Argive plain’ (see also Piérart 1992a, 119-148).

\textit{III.1.4.e. Behavioural Inversions at Festivals}

Rituals often draw attention to society’s moral limits by making particular statements in the guise of behavioural inversions or reversals of norms (Arens 1988, 223). This perspective might offer a profitable line of interpretation for rituals that involve the reversal of genders.
The attitude of the Danaids has been seen by Auffarth (1999, 39-48) as ‘a reversal of order of the polis’. He therefore sees the myth as a rite of reversal, where the ritual, rather than being reversed back in order to reinforce the normal order, was used as a didactic ‘model of identification for a communitas (as defined by V. Turner [1969]), people living for a time on the margins of society’ (Auffarth 1999, 48). Despite this marginalisation, the city of Argos kept them as ancestors in their cultic memory. The maidens brought the Greeks civilisation from Egypt, invented the pentekonter (a ship with fifty oars, Apollodoros 2.1.12), opened the water sources on the Argive plain to make agriculture possible there (Paus. 2.37.1), and finally, brought the Greeks the mysteries of Demeter from Egypt (Paus. 2.22.1).

Another rite of reversal (involving transvestitism and role inversion) is meant to have taken place at Argos during the Hybristika (the outrageous) festival (IG XIV 1293 A; Graf 1984, 245-254; Pirenne-Delforge 1994, 154-160, 167-170, 205, 394ff., 453ff.; Lambropoulou 1995, 149; Billot 1999, 21, 33). Plutarch (Mul. Virt. 245 F) mentions a certain festival celebrated at Argos at which the men and women exchanged clothing in the worship, presumably of Aphroditos or Bearded Aphrodite (? Ares). We have no clue about the date of this festival, but, if it came into being with the setting up of a formal cult (temple) of Aphrodite at Argos, it could date to the early fifth century.

The strong emphasis on the female principle and the inversion of normal activity finds a parallel in the story of Telesilla, the poetess of Argos. Before describing Telesilla’s organised resistance against the Spartans in Argos, Pausanias says that in front of the statue of Aphrodite was a slab with a bas-relief depicting Telesilla, her books at her feet and her helmet in hand, which she is about to place on her head (on statues associated with rites of inversion at Sparta, see Flemberg 1995, 121). The helmet might be a reference to the arming of Argive women during the battle of Sepeia (the sources also mention an Areas worshipped by women). Pausanias (2.20.8-10) describes the event as follows:

Telesilla mounted on the wall [of Argos] all the slaves and such as were incapable of bearing arms through youth and old age, and she herself, collecting the arms in the sanctuaries and those that were left in the houses, armed the women of vigorous age, and then posted them where she knew the enemy would attack. When the Spartans came on, the
women were not dismayed at their battle-cry, but stood their ground and fought valiantly. Then the Spartans, realising that to destroy the women would be an invidious success while defeat would mean a shameful disaster, gave way before the women. This fight has been foretold by the Pythian priestess in the oracle quoted by Herodotos [6.77], who perhaps understood to what it referred and perhaps did not:— ‘But when the time shall come that the female conquers in battle, driving away the male, and wins great glory in Argos, many an Argive women will tear both cheeks in her sorrow.’ (adapted from Loeb translation, Jones 1931; my italics; for the Greek, see Appendix D, Text 22)

Notice that it was the women who were armed by Telesilla, and that it was their presence that made the Spartans retreat; no mention is made of slaves, male youths, or old men being armed and fighting off the enemy. Women seem to have held temporal power here.

Whatever the truth that lies behind this story, in the context of norm inversions, there is a link between the role of women after Sepeia and Telesilla, and between Telesilla and the position of women at the Aphrodite festival. It is can hardly be coincidental that Telesilla’s image was set besides that of Aphrodite’s. What is interesting is that during both events women held a temporary position of power, even if soon after they went back to the real world of male domination. Once again this power was emphasised (mainly) in the context of religious rituals.

Both these festivals had a somewhat initiatory character -- the prenuptial maidens in particular – which brings us our next subject, rites of passage.

III.1.4.f. Rites of Passage

‘Only from a few parts of Greece is there information preserved on the tests and contests through which young people made the transition, in stages, into adulthood and thus into full membership of their communities’ (Jameson 1990a, 216). It so happens that the Argolid provides us with two examples of such rites.

The hideous masks at Tiryns (Jantzen 1975, 159-161), as well as at Sparta, were apparently used during transition rituals, as part of rites of passage for boys reaching adolescence. Although these masks are often thought to depict Gorgons, they also recall
the description of the outward disfigurement of the mad Proitides from Tiryns. Jameson (1990a, 216) believes that these rites of passage were confined to an elite group, perhaps the sons of the men mentioned in the famous inscription from Tiryns.

Although no masks have (yet) been found at Mykenai, a similar local institution has been identified on the basis of the Perseia inscription. By analogy with rituals in evidence at Sparta and Tiryns, it is thought that masks at Mykenai would also have been part of a ritual put on by dancers wearing these frightening masks to evoke 'the struggle of the young hero [Perseus] against a female monster' (Jameson 1990a, 213). These rituals may have been held at the heroön of Perseus and at the Chaos shrine, two locations that represent the beginning and the end of the initiation (Auffarth 1999, 45).

**III.1.5. SUMMARY**

Ritual is seen by social anthropologists as 'holding society together', as having certain 'political functions, in that it is a mechanism for the legitimisation of social control', and as 'making contradictions acceptable' (Burns and Laughlin 1979; quotation from Hodder 1982b, 167). This brief study of communal rituals in the archaic Argolid can be seen to support this view.

In the first instance, killing and dining rituals must have helped to reaffirm bonds between groups and to legitimate social control. The evidence we find for these activities comes from rural sanctuaries; this location suggests a general community focus and perhaps a strengthening of bonds within and between communities. The procession of domesticated animals through the cultivated landscape was a visible display of a community's wealth and control over territory. The ensuing feast provided a perfect setting for communal gathering of groups within and between communities to exchange hospitality. Feasting, however, could also be a ritual of exclusion. The differentiation between eating groups appears in the architectural remains, with special building marked off as dining halls for the privileged -- archaic hestiatoria were found at Halieis and at the Heraion. This type of hierarchy seems to go beyond wealth and status; it may also signal a demarcation between male and female roles within religious society. But even within male groups, communal meals seem to have been of a collective but also selective nature.
Rituals often helped to legitimate social control and to make contradictions in society acceptable. The festive rituals in themselves contrasted with the normal daily activities. On special days members of a community usually set out for a sanctuary in a procession. In the case of Argos, the procession has been interpreted as a collective reaffirmation of Argive control over the territory. The ritual apparently also evoked the idea of a symbolic ploughing over agricultural territory, to ensure fertility. In the Argolid this was Hera’s role. She intervened in human fertility, through her status as goddess of marriage. Since this domain fell to women, it is possible that certain rituals were exclusively female and accentuated the temporary responsibility of the women vis-à-vis the perpetuation of the community. This position of temporary power was probably in direct contrast with women’s real power in society. Religious rituals therefore provided the setting in which such contradictions were deemed acceptable.

Hera also presided over the transition from the world of childhood to that of adult life, through the institution of marriage. In preparation for marriage, young girls took part in processions (and festivals) that involved a change of status and integration into society. There was no escaping one’s fate of marriage; this is clear from the story of the Danaids. It is possible that the only known non-religious festival at Argos was set up to emphasis, through the mythical character of Hypermnestra, the importance of child bearing and Argive lineage.

Behavioural inversions were common in religious rituals involving rites of passage, but at Argos there seems to have been a festival that involved the reversal of genders. This ritual may have celebrated the role played by women during the famous (and perhaps fictitious) attack on the Spartan army at Argos. ‘Reversal of identity and imitation of the powers of the opposite sex can … [serve to] reaffirm the social order’ (Lambropoulou 1995, 153). Here again we might have an example of women being given temporary power in the context of religious rituals.

When boys entered adulthood, they had to leave behind the protection offered by women (their mothers) in order to become full members of society. This transition was sometimes marked by rituals involving performances by dancers wearing frightening
masks of female monsters. These rites of passage allowed their new qualities to come into being.
III.2. Rituals for the Dead

III.2.1. INTRODUCTION

When told that his medical bill would be a large one, Oscar Wilde said: ‘Ah, well then, I suppose that I shall have to die as I lived -- beyond my means.’ This witticism illustrates what many archaeologists who study burials assume, that ‘patterns in death reflect patterns in the life of a society’ (Hodder 1982a, 197). Ethnoarchaeological studies of burial data, however, have shown that burial ritual is not a passive reflection of other aspects of life, that it does not constitute a mirror image of social organisation (Hodder 1982a, Ch. 8).

As I. Morris (1992, 23-24) maintains:

At the most fundamental level (although this probably never happens in reality) we [should] assume as little as possible [about burial rituals], and simply look for patterns in the burial record. This in itself is subjective, since we have to decide what features are worth looking at. Prehistorians tend to assume that the treatment of the body, the provision and placing of the grave goods, the use of markers, the spatial arrangement of cemeteries and so on are worth investigating ...; [while] ancient historians can be a little more confident since the literature from Homer [onwards] suggests that many of our expectations about what actions would carry meaning are valid.

But, we have to minimise our assumptions about what practices ‘mean’ until we have broken the evidence down along the five axes Morris (1992, 29) proposes: typology, time, contexts of deposition, space, and demography.

In this section I address the burial evidence of the archaic Argolid with these five axes in mind. I examine the first three axes together, under the general heading of typology. The first step is to ask what, if anything, grave typology can tell us about the social structures of the time. Here I also identify points at which patterns changed as well as the nature of these changes, and compare burials with other classes of evidence, thereby incorporating time and contexts of deposition into my study of typology. My investigation of burial
evidence along the last two axes (space and demography), however, is unfortunately somewhat limited by the evidence available.

III.2.2. REVIEW OF PUBLISHED WORKS

Death is a subject that has captivated many scholars. For general works on the subject of death rituals, Hertz (1960), van Gennep (1960), Huntington and Metcalf (1979), Bloch and Parry (1982), and Danforth and Tsiaras (1982) are among the best.


Two conferences on death, the first edited by Gnoli and Vernant (1982), and the second published as *AION ArchStAnt* (1988), contain important articles on Greek ideas of death. Another collective effort, by Humphreys and King (1981), presents ethnographic studies from around the world.

Works on burials are fewer. The main problem is that there is so much archaeological evidence to be collected from scattered primary sources (i.e. excavation reports), that it is very difficult to create a good synthesis of burial data. Kurtz and Boardman's *Greek Burial Customs* (1971) was one of the first good synthesis available, but it focuses mainly on Athens between 1100 and 325 BCE and is now almost thirty years old. More recently, I. Morris has written two books on burial, one specifically discussing burial rituals in a Greek and Roman context (1992) and another dealing with death and burial in the eighth to fifth centuries (1987, see also 1989). These two works are central to the discussion of rituals for the dead presented in this chapter. Other important studies concentrate on Athenian burials: Strömberg (1993), Houby-Nielsen (1995, 129-191; 1996, 41-54; 1998, 127-145), and Kistler (1998).

For a discussion of archaic burials in an Argolic context, one should consult Rafn (1979; 1984, 305-308; 1991, 57-71) for fifth century graves at Asine and Halieis. Though their focus is mainly on eighth century graves in the Argive plain, Hägg (1965, 117-138; 1974;
III.2.3. BURIALS

III.2.3.a. The Archaeological Evidence

‘How we interpret the archaeology of the seventh and sixth century depends largely on what we make of the events between 750 and 700’ (Snodgrass 1977; 1980a, 15-84; 1987, 170-210; 1993; quotation from Morris [I.] 1998, 24). So I begin with a summary of the earlier evidence, and then discuss its implications for the later archaic Argolid.

The Eighth and Seventh Centuries

Many local differences can be seen in the burial customs of the eighth century Argolid, but some common features can be distinguished. The method of disposal of the dead preferred by most of the communities of the Argive plain was inhumation in contracted positions (see Foley 1988, 34-46 for a review of the evidence). At Asine and Nauplia, however, some cremations were also found.

We also find distinctions in grave types and size, position of the corpse, and orientation of graves. Three main grave types are known: the simple pit, the cist (a stone-lined pit), and the pot burials, either huge storage jars (pithoi) for adults or other types of pots (mainly amphorae and kraters) for infants (Figure 77). These types were all found at the main sites in the eighth century, except at Asine, where pithoi have yet to be discovered (Hägg 1998, 132). Moreover, when we compare the size of cists, we notice that those from Asine were longer and narrower than the norm, whereas those from Tiryns (and probably from Argos) were shorter and wider (Hägg 1974, 125, fig. 33; 1983a, 29). The proportions of the cists at Asine are a direct result of the positioning of the body in the grave, because skeletons were placed supine, stretched out on their backs, as opposed to the more common crouched or contracted position found elsewhere in the Argolid (note, however, that Argos has two supine burials from this period; see Hägg 1998, 132)
The orientation of the graves at Asine was also unique. Its early graves show a clear predisposition to place the head of the corpse an easterly direction; while at other sites this orientation was rare (Hägg 1980, 119-126; 1998, 132).

Argos also has some unusual graves. These were larger, both wider and longer, than most graves in the Argolid (Hägg 1974, 125, fig. 33c; 1983a, 27-31). To some extent their unusual size results from the fact that some were used for multiple burials. However, a few large tombs contained only one corpse (Courbin 1957, 322-386). These have been designated as warrior tombs.

Around 700 BCE, rich graves, especially the ‘warrior’ graves, peter out at Argos (see Foley 1988, 47-52). Cists were abandoned in favour of *pithoi* (Hägg 1983a, 27-31; Foley 1988, 50). The *pithoi* were of a different shape from those of the eighth century (cylindrical as opposed to ovoid), and contained no grave goods (Foley 1988, 50). Most have a westerly-south-westerly orientation (Hägg 1998, 133).

Only two graves stand out from this pattern. They are two *poros* graves of the late seventh or early sixth century found in the Bakaloyiannis plot (Kypseli: T 83 and T 84) at Argos (EF 1955b, 312; Bommelaer, Croissant and Grandjean 1971, 736; Courbin 1974, 123; Morris [I.] 1987, 184; Foley 1988, 48, 206). One of these two graves also contained unusually ‘rich’ material -- two pins wrapped in gold leaf and fragments of a terracotta plaque -- even though it had been disturbed.

Most seventh century cemeteries therefore present a monotonous picture of burial traditions. Rich displays of goods seem to have been inappropriate in burial. Grave goods were rare and metals leave almost no traces of their existence in the archaeological record.

By 650 BCE most graves are grouped in cemeteries, located along the routes leading from the town, without lavish memorials. A new public space for the dead was thus created.
The Sixth and Early Fifth Centuries (Figure 78)

In the sixth century cist burials come back into fashion. As Tables III.4 and III.5 show, almost half of the known sixth century burials were in cists. Although *pithos* graves were still popular, they were no longer used exclusively.

**Table III.4. Sixth and Early Fifth Century Burials in the Argolid, Excluding Argos**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Type of Burial</th>
<th>No. of Burials</th>
<th>Sex or Age</th>
<th>Grave Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skhinokhóri</td>
<td>A-4</td>
<td>In.</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Female ?</td>
<td>Pins and 1 sphinx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykenai</td>
<td>A-11</td>
<td>In: cist; tile</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Iron and 1 pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skafidháki</td>
<td>A-6</td>
<td>In. ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Female ?</td>
<td>1 pot, little basket, necklace, silver rings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauplia</td>
<td>A-17</td>
<td>In: pit + <em>pithos</em></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbáti</td>
<td>A-19</td>
<td>In: cist ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine</td>
<td>A-22</td>
<td>In: cists</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Female ?</td>
<td>Many pots, glass, pin, bronze, iron sandal attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros</td>
<td>A-31</td>
<td>In: cist ?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis</td>
<td>A-38</td>
<td>In: cists, pits,<em>pithos</em>, with tumuli C: early 6th c.</td>
<td>Many, in groups</td>
<td>Female ?</td>
<td>Many pots, attachment for wooden chest, spindle, iron blade, mirror, bronze pots, iron sandal attachments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troizen</td>
<td>A-56</td>
<td>In. + grave marker</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throní</td>
<td>A-65</td>
<td>Grave marker</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In= Inhumation; C= Cremation*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Number</th>
<th>Type of Burial</th>
<th>No. of Burials</th>
<th>Sex or Age</th>
<th>Grave Goods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A-10-1</td>
<td>In: pithos</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2 pots; 3 pots + 1 phiale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-11</td>
<td>In: pithos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-19</td>
<td>In: pithos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-20</td>
<td>In: pithos</td>
<td>3 (reused)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1 pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-22</td>
<td>In: pithos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>3 imported pots + geometric krater with child</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-25</td>
<td>In: pithos (late 7th-early 6th)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Child + adults</td>
<td>Many small pots, figurines, phiale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-47</td>
<td>In: pithos</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1 pot outside the grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-48 ?</td>
<td>In: pithos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-70 ?</td>
<td>In: pithos + krater</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1 pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-78</td>
<td>In: pithos, cist</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1 pot and figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-40</td>
<td>In: urn</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>4 pots; 2 pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-44</td>
<td>In: urn ?</td>
<td>2 skulls</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>35 pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-36</td>
<td>In: pithos, cist, cauldron, krater</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Children + 1 female ?</td>
<td>2 pots (kalathoi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-51</td>
<td>In: cist, pit, and pithos</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Child; female ?</td>
<td>Many small pots, bronze bowl, iron sandal attachments, iron horse bits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-52</td>
<td>In: urn and cist , multiple burials</td>
<td>Many</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Many pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-15</td>
<td>In: cist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1 pot and figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-29</td>
<td>In: cist</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>? (rich)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-49</td>
<td>In: cist</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1 pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-53</td>
<td>In: cist</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pots, one was inscribed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-54</td>
<td>In: cist</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Child + adult</td>
<td>Over 50 pots, many imported and figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-56</td>
<td>In: cist ?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Many imported pots and figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-79</td>
<td>In: cist, 'pyre'</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>7 imported pots; 16 pots with 'pyre'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-3</td>
<td>In: pit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1 pot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-9</td>
<td>In: pit ?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Small pots and figurines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-12</td>
<td>In: pit + tile</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>Pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-14</td>
<td>In: secondary burials in pit</td>
<td>6 (family graves)</td>
<td>5 adults (female); 1 child</td>
<td>Many imported pots, figurines, 3 pairs of iron attachments for sandals (from female burial)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-61</td>
<td>In: unspecified type + pit with secondary burials</td>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>Child + young male warriors</td>
<td>150 pots, lamps, bone pins, bronze blades, iron handles, shield straps, drilled bone, figurines, the fitting for boots or heavy sandals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-30</td>
<td>In. ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-50</td>
<td>In. ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-63</td>
<td>In. ?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Bronze phiale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-60</td>
<td>In: grave marker secondary</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>13 pots</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-10-78</td>
<td>Stele</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Female ?</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In= Inhumation; C= Cremation

The late seventh or early sixth century cremation from Halieis stands out here. It was reported as one of the earliest burials in a large cemetery with some fifty sixth and fifth century cist graves. Something about this individual was 'unique', but we will never know what.
III.2.3.b. Grave Typology

The different grave types of the eighth century have been associated with different ethnic groups at Argos. Foley (1988; 1998, 140), who has studied the burial evidence for the eighth century Argolid in great detail, suggests that in Argos ‘cist burials may have been used with some degree of exclusivity by the Dorian segment of Argive society’. The ‘subservient non-Dorian’ population, on the other hand, began to bury ‘their dead in *pithoi* and other graves [mainly other pots and pits] -- burials which generally had fewer offerings than cists.’ (Foley 1998, 141)

Foley (1998, 138, 140, 141) provides three basic points in support of her argument:

- Cists account for the majority of burials at Argos during the eighth century, but not at Tiryns (and perhaps not at Mykenai and Nauplia).
- Cists tend to be richer in grave goods than *pithoi*.
- There was an apparent spatial differentiation in the choice of grave types, with cists being found in the centre and eastern area of Argos, while *pithoi* and pits located on the periphery of the city, in the north, west, and south-west areas.

Her arguments have been systematically deconstructed by J. Hall (1997a, 122-128), who has studied the question of ethnicity in the Argolid and its relation to burial. I agree with Hall’s objections, having reached similar conclusions myself, based on a study of archaic burial evidence in context. But more needs to be said on this subject. For one thing, Hall provides no alternative explanations for the changes in mortuary practices of the seventh and sixth centuries. Although these changes cannot be explained through models of ethnicity, they cannot just be ignored. After considering Foley’s arguments in more detail, I intend to offer an interpretation for these changes in the context of social structure.

**The Cist-Using Dorians: A Misguided View?**

Foley (1988, 137-143) believes that the Dorians were the dominant group at Argos during the eighth century and that they used cists with some degree of exclusivity; whereas the dominant group at Tiryns was non-Dorian and used *pithoi* (she also presents a weak case for the use of *pithoi* at Mykenai and Nauplia). She uses the number of each burial type to
support her conclusions. The twenty-nine late geometric cists at Argos are compared with the mere fourteen pithoi; at Tiryns, however, only five of the twenty-nine graves she mentions are cists (Foley 1998, 141). What she purposely excludes from this brief survey are the forty-six dark age and geometric graves recently found near the Agricultural prison at Tiryns (see Foley 1998, 141 n20). The Greek excavator notes that most of these are cists (Hatzipouliou 1988, 123-125), but Foley refuses to acknowledge them because no precise information was given about their dates (except that they were geometric).

Foley is certainly not the only one to see cists as a higher-status mode of mortuary disposal. Hägg (1983a; 1998) has also argued that the rich favoured cists while the poor had a tendency to inter their dead in pithoi. Undoubtedly, the cists of Argos are usually richer in grave goods than the pithoi (see Foley 1988, Appendix B; Hall [J.] 1993, Ch. 4 and Appendix A). The contents of a grave, however, cannot be used to differentiate graves of the rich or poor. Ethnographic comparisons indicate that there is no correspondence between splendour of graves and grave goods and wealth and social standing of the deceased (for a study case, see Ucko 1969, 266-267). What is more, a good many eighth century cists at Argos contain no grave goods, whereas certain pithoi were richly furnished or ornately decorated (Protonotariou-Dhei'laki 1980, 63, grave 48, and Hägg 1974, 24, 39; Courbin 1974, 34ff; Foley 1988, 210, pithoi T23, Bakaloyiannis plot).

Foley (1988, 38) suggests that pithoi ‘were convenient and perhaps less costly than cists and no doubt were a quicker method of burial’. As Blitzer (1990, 675-711) has cleverly demonstrated in her ethnographic study of koroneika, the modern equivalent to pithoi, this assumption is incorrect. The amount of time it took to make a pithos would almost certainly prescribe that they had to be ‘ordered in advance’, perhaps as much as eighty days in advance. For this reason pithoi were probably not acquired expressly for burials; existing domestic pithoi were surely pressed into service for this purpose. Their use was certainly more costly than lining a cist with stone slabs or pieces of stone and rocks. Moreover, a considerably deeper pit had to be dug for a pithos than for a cist, because the pithos was inserted into the ground at an angle as opposed to being laid down flat (Hall 1997a, 126).
Foley's assertion that the location of cists in Argos was principally central and easterly, whereas that of *pithos* burials was peripheral, is implausible. Hall (1993; 1997a, 123) has re-studied the geometric burials at Argos and his maps clearly show that *pithoi* appear alongside cists in the central and eastern part of the town, while cists are attested alongside *pithoi* both to the north and to the south. Not only are cists, *pithoi*, and pits spread out throughout Argos, they also occur together in cemeteries (Dheilikaki 1977, 98-99; Hall [J.] 1997a, 128). As Hall (1997a, 128) notes, 'this is a very strange situation if each grave type bears a diacritical reference to a specific ethnic group': 'we would have to accept a situation in which members of different ethnic groups were buried alongside one another'.

Another objection to Foley's theory is that cists make up almost three-quarters of the burials at Asine (Hägg 1974, 160). 'This ... represents the highest proportion of cists for any site in the Argive plain, yet if there is any *polis* in the Argolid for which a non-Dorian identity is stressed by the literary tradition, it is Asine' (Hall [J.] 1997a, 128).

Finally, Foley's argument cannot be used to justify the sudden disappearance of cists at about 700 BCE, when *pithoi* and pot burials replaced cists throughout the Argolid. 'If grave types were ... intimately related to ethnic groups, is it likely that the Dorians suddenly adopted a mode of disposal that was previously associated with another, lower-status ethnic group?' (Hall [J.] 1997a, 128).

**The 'Structural Revolutions' of the Eighth and Sixth Centuries**

All in all the evidence fails to uphold the view that cists correspond to an exclusively Dorian mode of burial. It may be that grave types in the eighth century Argolid carried no social, economic, or ethnic meaning, but we cannot rule out the possibility that the differences were related to other social structures.

I. Morris (1987, 184) explains how mortuary practices in Athens isolated the prominent group (*agathoi*), who were given formal cemeteries, from the low-status group (*kakoi*), who were excluded from these formal cemeteries. After 750 BCE this distinction between elite and non-elite disappeared and was replaced by something more egalitarian. Everyone was entitled to the same kind of burial and cemeteries were no longer
exclusive. The gradual increase in the use of *pithoi* after 750 was perhaps a consequence of allowing the *kakoi* access to formal cemeteries, in graves other than those used by the *agathoi*.

'Some of the rich responded by differentiating themselves in new ways, using lavish grave goods and markers ...' (Morris [I.] 1998, 25). This would explain the rich warrior graves that sprang up at Argos at the very end of the eighth century (Hägg 1980, 120f.; 1988, 132-133; Foley 1988, 37). These exceptionally spacious graves contained armour and weapons (the richest had a panoply), *obelo* (spits), and banqueting equipment (Foley 1988; Hägg 1998, 132-134). The selection of objects might refer to the Homeric model of 'princely' hospitality and to the large communal meals that the heroes had in the homes, or to the banquet that accompanies the warrior funerals (de Polignac 1996, 35; 1998). This banquet reference may also be viewed more metaphorically, in that it represented the deceased as *agathoi* in a general sense and thus associated the individual with the 'acceptable' conduct and lifestyle of *agathoi* (Houby-Nielsen 1996, 49). Whatever the case may be, it is clear that by the late eighth century the cemetery had become the setting for social conflict (Morris [I.] 1998, 27).

'After about a generation or so, a more egalitarian ethos won out.' (Morris 1998, 25) These values are perhaps best represented by 'middling citizens', the *metrioi* (Morris 1998, 26). This group was 'neither poor nor rich'; each individual cultivated his land and did his share of civic duty as a hoplite (Morris [I.] 1998, 26). In archaic Greek literature (especially in Archilochus, Solon, Xenophanes and Hesiod), 'the good community is presented as a group of such men', who represented the highest 'source of human authority' (Morris [I.] 1998, 26). Conversely, the lyric poets, an elite, presented the other extreme.

The community of middling men was just a rabble of peasants, while the good society was a group of like-minded aristocrats who transcended the boundaries of the individual *polis*. Such creatures lived in a world of luxury, using the same kind of vessels, clothes, and houses as the gods, heroes, and Lydians, and they claimed to draw authority from the links with these privileged groups (Morris [I.] 1998, 26, my italics).

Argos was apparently enthusiastic to adopt the new ways of the 'middling' culture (Morris [I.] 1998, 30). I would argue that it was these people who associated themselves with a particular style of mortuary symbolism that best represented their values. The
pithoi, which came from domestic contexts associated with agricultural activities, can be seen as an ideal symbol for such a group. It was relatively plain, did not allow for display of grave goods, and showed strong ties to the agricultural landscape.

Since extravagance was no longer proper in burial, and families no longer succeeded in showing off their dead as noble warriors or aristocrats (Morris [I.] 1998, 25; van Wees 1998, 340-341), they redirected their wealth towards sanctuaries (Snodgrass 1980, 54). The seventh century bronzes (especially tripods) at the Heraion, a principal meeting point for competitive emulation between aristocratic groups, attest to this custom (Aloni-Ronen 1997, 18). During the seventh century, therefore, ‘the elitists would legitimate their claims to be special elite by appeals to sources of authority outside the polis’ (Morris [I.] 1998, 27).

Since the cemetery ceased to be the setting of social conflicts in the seventh century, it is possible that cist graves were no longer appropriate -- what was the point in having a large empty grave? -- and that the only acceptable form of burial was the pithos. To accept this idea requires a leap of faith, but I have found no other explanations for the abandonment of cists around 700 BCE.

So, what seemed like a triumph for those engrossed in ‘middling values’, perhaps looked very different to those who lived in the world of luxury (Morris [I.] 1998, 27). By redirecting their source of wealth towards sanctuaries, they were also redirecting their attention towards external groups outside the boundaries of the polis.

In the sixth century everything changed. At most sites the amount and richness of excavated votives declined steadily, attaining fairly low levels in the fifth (Snodgrass 1989-90, 287-294). Until the mid-sixth century there were very few wealthy or outstanding graves. Only one cist from Argos dates from this period (Appendix A-10-51). This cist, located at the foot of the Larisa in the area of the public square, was quite unusual, not only because of the grave-type but also because of its grave goods, since it included eight miniature vases (skyphoi of the mid-Corinthian period, see Daux 1967b, fig. 24), a shallow bronze bowl, four iron horse bits, and a pair of iron sandals.
The appearance of this cist might signal what was to come in the mid- and late sixth century, when we see a slight shift back towards display. Morris (1998, 35) suggests that there was a swing back toward middling ideology around 550-500 BCE. This shift was less notable than that of the late eighth century, but was nevertheless significant. Once again, the elite temporarily opposed this, with some lavish cists in the late sixth century (Appendix A-10-14; A-10-29; A-10-54; A-10-79; Morris [I.] 1988, 35). The richest grave of this period (c. 525-500), from the Kanellopoulou plot at Argos, stands out as the most impressive archaic grave of all these and has been thought to come from the Argive royal line (Appendix A-10-61; Morris [I.] 1987, 184). It contains the inhumations of two warriors, accompanied by fifty pots and many bronze and iron weapons. The structure is unique for Argos, and has recently been identified as a heroon (Pariente 1992, 205).

Since a similar pattern is attested at Mykenai, Asine, and Halieis, it may be that the reintroduction of cists in the sixth century was part of an attempt by the elitist groups to reaffirm their authority. But this situation did not last, because in the fifth century 'there was an abrupt collapse in funerary display all over central Greece. No rich grave goods have been reported from ...' [the early and mid fifth century] (Morris [I.] 1998, 32). Morris (1992, 152) sees the fifth century as a period when ceremony and display were restrained throughout Greece as a result of a solid communal belief. From an historical point of view, the Persian wars of 480-479, in which Argos took no part, and the establishment of a democracy at Argos in the 460s may have played a part towards bringing about this new ideal. This idea seems also to have 'coincided with an important change in literary culture', when 'new poetic forms ... [appeared, such as] the epinician ode, mediating between the interests of the aristocratic household and the community of citizens' (Morris [I.] 1998, 35).

III.2.3.c. Spatial Groups

Who gets buried where is another complex question. The location of tombs was most probably controlled by the community (Riva and Stoddart 1996, 94). By the seventh century many communities transferred their cemeteries beyond the city walls and set up a new public space for the dead (Morris [I.] 1998, 25). This shift away from intra-mural burial is connected to the concept of death as polluting. These new feelings towards
pollution may have required all adults to be inhumed collectively. Only the graves of children, heroes, and founders were permitted within the settlement area, usually in the agora or by the gates (Morris [I.] 1987, 57-71, 193; Houby-Nielson 1995, 131). The graves of children were still acceptable within the city walls, seemingly because little pollution could result from such insignificant bones (Parker 1983, 41).

This pattern of spatial segregation is not so evident at Argos, however, since they never completely abandoned the notion of intra-mural burial (Morris [I.] 1987, 184). Nevertheless, J. Hall (1997b, 99) has identified three clusters of eighth century cemeteries outside the city walls: in the north-west section of modern Argos at the foot of the ‘Aspis’; in the central area near Ayios Petros; and in the south-western area near the agora (Figure 79). These burial plots must have been connected to separate villages or hamlets (Hägg 1982, 300).

Though the central area had a substantial and significant cemetery in earlier times, graves in this region virtually disappear in the seventh century. Instead, the cemeteries in use at this time are located to the south and in a new area to the north (Figure 80; Hall [J.] 1997b, 99). As Hall points out, the most reasonable explanation for this change is to presume that previously isolated villages had come together to create one large settlement.

This pattern persists into the sixth century, except that the new nekropolis to the north of Argos is abandoned. The cemeteries in the central and especially the south areas were still extensively used for burial.

III.2.3.d. Demography

Lately there has been an enormous interest in ancient gender, but this research deals mainly with the literary and pictorial evidence rather than the archaeological evidence from burial rituals (see, however, Strömberg 1993; Morris [I.] 1992). At least for the Argolid, this is due in part to the lack of sexed skeletons, which makes it hard to say much about the gender of skeletons. If we follow Strömberg’s methodology for sexing Athenian graves of the geometric period, the gender of only about half a dozen Argolic
graves can be identified on the basis of grave goods (Appendix A-4; A-6; A-10-36; A-10-61; A-22; A-38). The weapons indicate a male burial (A-10-61), while the various items of jewellery (A-4; A-6; A-22), the spindle (A-38), and most the iron sandal attachments come from female burials (A-10-14; A-10-51; A-22; A-38). The majority of burials, however, cannot be sex-determined according to Strömberg’s methodology. As Houby-Nielsen (1995, 140-141) points out, it is not often possible to identify the sex of the deceased by recognising the expressed gender role of the burial context.

We have even less information about age. All we can say is that at Argos child burials are very uncommon down to 725 BCE, when they suddenly multiply, rising from 12% to 43% (Morris [I.] 1992, 79). Morris (1987, 57-109, 182-185, 218-221) argues that the rise in child burials was to some extent brought about by changes in the way children were buried (see also Houby-Nielsen 1995, 132ff.). His explanation is that for two centuries the Argives preferred to bury their children with only modest rituals, which left behind few traces in the archaeological record. Then around 725 BCE, they chose to dispose of their children’s bones in a new way, by burying them in pots.

III.2.4. SUMMARY

Burials are difficult to interpret, but placing them in their archaeological contexts can provide a revealing account of social structure and how it changed through time. The forms chosen for display and disposal seem to relate to other aspects of society. Foley has tried to see in the different grave types at Argos differences between ethnic groups. Although most of her ideas can be refuted, they help raise interesting questions about mortuary practices at Argos.

There were rapid shifts towards the group ethos in eighth century Argos, which may have influenced modes of disposal and display. The succeeding period was one of intense social conflict, and the patterns blur. I have offered some suggestions to explain the changes in burial after 700, but these need not be definitive explanations. Unlike Foley’s theories, however, the ideas presented here can also be applied to the sixth and early fifth century burials.
What I have tried to do is to give explanations for certain actions in the context of burial. These actions were only part of the funeral ritual, and may not even have been the most important part. For instance I offered no discussion of the funerary procession or the laying out of the corpse, because we have no direct evidence for such rituals. Although we do have evidence for ritual dining in connection with graves, this comes primarily from tomb cults, which is another subject altogether (cf. three early structures from Asine, related to a cult of the ancestors, Hägg 1983b, 189-193; Mazarakis-Ainian 1999, 9-36).
Conclusions

*Humanity takes itself too seriously.*
*It is the world's original sin.*
*If cavemen had known how to laugh, history would have been different.*
*Oscar Wilde*

The type of analysis that prioritises patterning of material culture 'is likely to be more particularistic', yet some general hypotheses may still be generated from such interpretations of past human activities (Hodder 1982a, 215). On a symbolic level, we find 'structural oppositions' such as literate/illiterate, urban/rural, profane/sacred, elite/peasant, men/women, youth/adulthood, and life/death. These symbolic principles are detectable in most societies, although they are accentuated differently in every society (Hodder 1982a, 215).

Interpretation of the nature of these structural oppositions in the archaic Argolid is by no means straightforward. For example, what did it mean then to be a literate as opposed to an illiterate individual? In western society, where literacy is usually taken for granted, being illiterate puts one at a disadvantage (i.e. not being able to deal with regular business transactions, etc.), but being literate offers no great privileges either. Obviously, in a primarily oral society illiterate individuals were in the majority and consequently illiteracy was not considered an impediment. Literacy was restricted to only a few social areas (scribes, artists, and a select group of citizens) and literate individuals did have an advantage over illiterates, in that they were often in high-ranking positions. This is why some members of Greek *poleis* took measures to ensure that scribes did not abuse their positions. So the gap between literate and illiterate was wide, but not impossible to breach. Unlike today, however, there seems to have been an interest in controlling the written word rather than in teaching it to the population at large.

Another structural opposition present in every society is the distinction between urban and rural. For us, an urban life requires no immediate contact with the countryside, since we live in a market economy where the basic necessities are at our instant disposal. The
modern farmer has much more in common with the ancient Greeks than with the urban folk of today. I stress ‘ancient Greeks’ rather than ‘ancient Greek farmers’, because in the archaic period most individuals were tied directly to the land, mainly via arable farming and animal husbandry, even if they lived in an urban environment.

With respect to the supernatural world, however, the opposite is true. In ancient Greek society the sacred and the profane were on two different planes; their boundaries were clearly marked, both physically and ritually. Rituals were performed according to explicit and communally recognised rules of behaviour, which helped to legitimate social control and to make contradictions acceptable. The right of participation in some rituals was rigidly defined on the basis of status, gender, or age.

This brings us to consider differences between elite and peasants, men and women, and youths and adults. These divisions are not as easy to discern from the preserved record as we would want them to be, but the study of human activities and behaviour does point a way forward. We can presume that the elite were probably better equipped to acquire writing skills than the underprivileged. Wealthy individuals were also in a better position to exploit the natural environment with little effort, since they could afford to leave the work on their landholdings to others while they enjoyed a leisurely social life in town. In terms of their relationship with the divinities, they could also gain respect in their communities by offering gifts and sacrifices and by organising select gatherings of male citizens. Women too may have held temporary power in religious settings, but this role was probably in direct contrast to their real power in society. There was no escaping the fate of marriage for young girls. In fact, they were specially prepared for this role through various rites of passage. In order to become full members of society, boys too had to go through a period of transition marked by rituals.

The last rite of passage in every society is the transition from life to death. The rituals associated with burials and funerals, however, are particular to each society. How Argolic families chose to bury their dead may be one indication of the changes in social structure and other cultural transformations of the eighth to fifth centuries. Different status groups expressed themselves through different mortuary practices and displays; the type of grave, the burial gifts, and the position of the corpse are informative here. In general, the more egalitarian the society, the more uniform the burial contexts.
What I hope to have shown in this study of the patterning of material culture in the archaic Argolid is that the symbolic systems that can be discerned are a part of, even if concomitantly a summation of, normal human activity in social context. Although the limited archaeological evidence tends only to direct us towards assumptions that cannot be scrupulously tested, the remarkable merit of this type of approach to the history of societies is that, unlike literary accounts, everybody helped to create them everywhere — young and old, rich and poor, men and women, literate and illiterate, citizen and foreigner, free and unfree, in town and country, in life and death.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Halieis (Portokéli)</td>
<td>A-38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutro</td>
<td>A-39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastráki</td>
<td>A-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stavrós</td>
<td>A-41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flámboura</td>
<td>A-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kástro</td>
<td>A-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ákra (Amilianós (Metókhí)</td>
<td>A-44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ⅲ.Ⅲ. B. THE SOUTHERN ARGOLID: THE REGION OF HERMIONE.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didymoi Cave (Dhidhyma)</td>
<td>A-45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fournoi</td>
<td>A-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrothállassa or Thalassópetra</td>
<td>A-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katakifí Gorge</td>
<td>A-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Kokkygión (Profitis Ilías)</td>
<td>A-49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermione (Er míóni)</td>
<td>A-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileoi (Ilíokástro)</td>
<td>A-51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermisí Kástro</td>
<td>A-52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koufó</td>
<td>A-53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ⅵ.Ⅰ. A. THE REGION OF TROIZENIA: THE MAINLAND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fousía</td>
<td>A-54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psíftí</td>
<td>A-55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troizen (Troízina or Dhamalás)</td>
<td>A-56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogon (Vidhíi)</td>
<td>A-57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elones ? (Sambriza Magoula or Pigádhia)</td>
<td>A-58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatás</td>
<td>A-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazárétto</td>
<td>A-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ⅵ.Ⅰ. B. THE REGION OF TROIZENIA: THE METHANA PENINSULA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magoula</td>
<td>A-61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makróngru</td>
<td>A-62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana (Megalokhórío-Palaiokástro)</td>
<td>A-63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kounoupitsa</td>
<td>A-64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throni</td>
<td>A-65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áyios Konstantínos</td>
<td>A-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guúri-Gljáti</td>
<td>A-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Óga</td>
<td>A-68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ⅵ.Ⅰ. C. THE REGION OF TROIZENIA: THE ISLAND OF HYDREA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoriza (Ydhra)</td>
<td>A-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.Ⅵ.Ⅰ. D. THE REGION OF TROIZENIA: THE ISLAND OF POROS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalaureía (Poros)</td>
<td>A-70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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A Postscript to Mining: The Metal Objects

Appendix C

The Location of Sanctuaries Whose Divinities have been Identified

URBAN SANCTUARIES
- Sanctuaries on Akropoleis
- Sanctuaries on the Slopes of Akropoleis
- Sanctuaries in the Agora
- Urban Sanctuaries on Roads in Towns
- Urban Sanctuaries on the Sea

SUBURBAN SANCTUARIES
- Extramural Sanctuaries near Town Gates
- Extramural Sanctuaries on the Slopes of Hills

EXTRAURBAN OR RURAL SANCTUARIES
- Extramurban Sanctuaries on Roads
- Extramurban Sanctuaries on Roads near Bronze Age Tombs
- Extramurban Sanctuaries on Mountain Tops
- Extramurban Sanctuaries at Boundaries
- Extramurban Sanctuaries in Marshes
- Extramurban Sanctuaries on the Sea
Transliteration of Greek Names

In the appendices I have altered slightly some modern Greek letters (see γκ, ξ, and μπ) in transliteration to make them sound more like the original Greek.

I transliterate terms using the following convention:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Greek Letter</th>
<th>English Equivalent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>α</td>
<td>a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(αυ)</td>
<td>af or av</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>β</td>
<td>v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γ</td>
<td>g or y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(γγ)</td>
<td>ng,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γκ</td>
<td>gk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(γξ)</td>
<td>nx,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>γχ</td>
<td>nkh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>δ</td>
<td>dh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ε</td>
<td>e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ευ)</td>
<td>ef or ev</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ζ</td>
<td>z</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>η</td>
<td>i or e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>θ</td>
<td>th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ι</td>
<td>i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>κ</td>
<td>k</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>λ</td>
<td>l</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>μ</td>
<td>m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(μπ)</td>
<td>b or mb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ν</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ντ)</td>
<td>d or nt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ξ</td>
<td>x or ks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ο</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>π</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ρ</td>
<td>r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>σ, ξ</td>
<td>s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>τ</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>υ</td>
<td>y or i</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ϕ</td>
<td>f</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>χ</td>
<td>kh or h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ψ</td>
<td>ps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ω</td>
<td>o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A
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There are many things that we would throw away,
If we were not afraid that others might pick them up.
Oscar Wilde, The Picture of Dorian Gray.

The divisions of the Argolid into the Argeia and the Akte follow those of Faraklas (1972a, 1972b, 1973), but boundaries and areas are, inevitably, rather arbitrary. I have divided the Argeia into sites west of, and including, Argos belonging to the modern Eparkhía Árgous, and those east of Argos belonging to the modern Eparkhía Nafplías. The Akte has three natural geographical units that today form separate administrative districts (Eparkhía-ies): the regions of Epidauria, Hermionis, and Troizenia. The Epidauria is now combined with the south-eastern corner of the Argive plain and the town of Nafplio (Eparkhía Nafplías and Eparkhía Ermióndhos). The Hermionis, which is henceforth called the Southern Argolid, is in the present Eparkhía Ermióndhos. I have divided it between the territories of the cities of Hermione and Halieis. The Troizenia (Eparkhía Troizinías) belongs to the Nomós Attikís and comprises the north-east mainland, the peninsula of Méthana, and the islands of Póros (ancient Kalaureia) and Ýdhra (ancient Hydrea).

Within each land division I have numbered the sites moving from west to east. An alphabetical index of sites appears below the table of contents. Sites within Argos have been further subdivided numerically according to their location on the map of Argos. Here I include seventh century material only when the site was also used during the sixth century; for those sites that are exclusively dated to the seventh century, one must consult Foley (1988). An alphabetical index of the excavated plots in Argos is also provided. Whenever possible, I give the ancient place name first, followed by the modern place name (transliterated from the Greek and accented). For personal names, especially those of plot owners, I have simply anglicised the word according to its pronunciation in Greek, leaving out the accent, since accents for personal names vary enormously.
Site Index

THE ARGEIA

The Argive Plain: West of, and including, Argos
A-1 Dhoúka(s)
A-2 Oinoe (Merkoúri)
A-3 Hysiai (Akhladhókambos)
A-4 Skhinohóri
A-5 Kefalári
A-6 Skafidháki
A-7 Elaious (Spiliotáki)
A-8 Magoula (near Kefálari)
A-9 Lerna (near Mýloi)
A-10 Argos (Árgos)

The Argive Plain: East of Argos
A-11 Mykenai (Mykínai)
A-12 Kourtáki
A-13 The Heraion (Iráio)
A-14 Prosymna (Iráio)
A-15 Khónikas
A-16 Tirys (Thríntha)
A-17 Nauplia (Náfplio)
A-18 Aria (Ária)
A-19 Berbatí (Prósymna or Prósymni)
A-20 Midea (Midhéra)
A-21 Lefkákia
A-22 Asine (Asíní coast)
A-23 Áyios Adhríanós (Proftis Ilías)
A-24 Limnés

THE ATKE

The Region of Epidauria
A-25 Áyios Ilías (Mt. Arakhnaío)
A-26 Íría
A-27 Lessa ? (Ligourió)
A-28 Epidauros Sanctuaries (Ierón Asklípiou + Náos
Apólлонos)
A-29 Gýftókastro
A-30 Hymithion (Yrníthion)
A-31 Epidauros (Palaiá Epídavros)

The Southern Argolid: The Region of Halieis
A-32 Dhoroúfi (Dhouróufi) Ridge
A-33 Áyios Ioánnis Kartéris
A-34  Vísta
A-35  Áyios Ioánnis
A-36  Mases (Koiládha Bay)
A-37  Fránhthi
A-38  Halieis (Portokhéli)
A-39  Loutró
A-40  Kastráki
A-41  Stavrós
A-42  Flámboura
A-43  Kástro
A-44  Ákra (Ai)milianós (Metókhi)

The Southern Argolid: The Region of Hermione
A-45  Didymoi Cave (Dhidhyma)
A-46  Foúrnoi
A-47  Petrothálassa or Thalassópetra
A-48  Katafiki Gorge
A-49  Mt. Kokkýgion (Profitis Ilías)
A-50  Hermione (Ermióni)
A-51  Eileoi (Iliókastro)
A-52  Thermísí Kástro
A-53  Koufó

The Region of Troizenia: The Mainland
A-54  Foúisia
A-55  Psiftí
A-56  Troizen (Troízina or Dhamála)
A-57  Pogon (Vidhi)
A-58  Eíones ? (Sambaríza Magoúla or Pigádhwίa)
A-59  Galatás
A-60  Lazaréitto

The Region of Troizenia: The Methana (Methána) Peninsula
A-61  Magoúla (Áyios Nikólaos)
A-62  Makríngrou (Kaiméni Khóra)
A-63  Methana (Megalokhório-Palaiokástro)
A-64  Kounoupítsa
A-65  Throní
A-66  Áyios Konstantínos
A-67  Goúri-Gljáti (Kypséli)
A-68  Óga (Kypséli)

The Region of Troizenia: The Island of Hydrea (Ýdhra)
A-69  Khoríza (Episkopi)

The Region of Troizenia: The Island of Kalaureia (Póros)
A-70  Kalaureia (Póros)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Index in Alphabetical Order</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ákra (Ai)milianós (Metókhi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argos (Árgos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aria (Ária)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asine (Asíni coast)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áyios Adhrianós (Profitis Iliás)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áyios Iliás (Mt. Arakhnaío)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áyios Ioánnis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áyios Ioánnis Kartéris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Áyios Konstantínos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berbatí (Prósymna or Prósymni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhoroufi (Dhouroufi) Ridge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dhouka(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didymoi Cave (Dhdhyma)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eileoi (Iliókastro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eîones ? (Sambariza Magoúla or Pigádhia)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elaious (Spiliotáki)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros (Palaiá Epídavros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epidauros Sanctuaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flámboura</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fóurnoi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fóúzia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fránkhthi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galatás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goúri-Gljáti (Kypselí)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gyftókastro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halieis (Portokhéli)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Heraion (Iraio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermione (Ermióni)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydrea (see Khoríza on Ýdhra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymnithion (Ymnithion)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hysiai (Akhladhókambos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Íria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kalaureia (Póros)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kastráki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kástro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katafíki Gorge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kefalári</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khónikas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Khoríza (Episkopi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koufó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kounoupítsa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kourtáki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazarétto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lefkákia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lerna (Mýloi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lessa ? (Ligourió)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limnés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loutró</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magouýla (near Kefálari)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magouýla (Áyios Nikólaos)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Makróngrou (Kaiméni Khóra)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mases (Koiládha Bay)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methana (Megalokhório-Palaiokástro)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midea (Midhéa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mt. Kokkýgion (Profitis Ilías)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mykenai (Mykinai)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauplia (Náfplio)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Óga (Kypselíi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oinoe (Merkoúri)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Petrothálassa or Thalassópetra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pogon (Vídhi)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosymna (Iraío)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psífti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skafidháki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skhinokhóri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stavrós</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermisi Kástro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Throní</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tiryns (Tírintha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Troizen (Troižina or Dhamála)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vísta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Αγιος Αδριανός (Προφήτης Ηλίας) A-23
Αγιος Ηλίας (Αραχναίον) A-25
Αγιος Ιωάννης A-35
Αγιος Ιωάννης Καρτέρης A-33
Αγιος Κωνσταντίνος A-66
Αγιος Νικόλαος A-61
Άκρ. Αμυλιανός (Μετόχι) A-44
Αλεξις (Πορτοκάλιον) A-38
Άργος A-10
Άρια A-18
Ασίνη (Παραλία Ασίνης) A-22
Αχλαδόκαμπος A-3
Βίστα A-34
Βόδιον A-57
Γαλατάς A-59
Γυρτόκαστρο A-29
Δίδυμα A-45
Δορόφι A-32
Δούκας A-1
Επίδαυρος (Παλαιά Επίδαυρος) A-31
Επισκοπή A-69
Ερμονή A-50
Πλύκαστρον A-51
Ηραίον A-13/14
Θερμησία (Κάστρον) A-52
Θρονί A-65
Ιερόν Ασκληπιοῦ + Ναός Απόλλωνος A-28
Τραί A-26
Καμμένη Χώρα A-62
Καλαύρια (Πόρος) A-70
Καστράκι A-40
Κάστρο A-43
Καταφύκι A-48
Κεφαλάριον A-5
Κοκκύγιον (Προφήτης Ηλίας) A-49
Κουφό A-53
Κούνουπιτσά A-64
Κουρτάκιον A-12
Κυψέλι A-67/68
Λαξαρέττο A-60
Λέρνη (Μύλοι) A-9
Λευκάκια A-21
Λημναί A-24
Λουτρό A-39
Λυγούριον A-27
Μαγούλα
Μάσης (Ορμ. Κούλαδος)
Μεγαλοχώριον
Μερκούριον
Μιδέα (Παλαιώκαστρον)
Μυκήναι
Νάυπλιον
Πετροθάλασσα
Πηγάδια
Πρόσυμνα
Σκαφιδάκιον
Σπηλιωτάκης
Σταυρός
Σχινοχώριον
Τίρυνς
Τροιζήν
Υρνήθιον
Φλάμπουρο
Φούρνοι
Φούσια
Φάργχη
Ψήφτα
Χώνικας
Site Index for Argos

Agora: Hypostyle Hall A-10-65
Agora: Inside Hypostyle Hall A-10-66
Agora: Stoa A-10-67
Anagnostopoulos Plot: Odhós Kofiñoítou A-10-68
Aphrodision: South Quarter A-10-69
Aphrodision (South of): Odhós Ayíou Yeóryíou A-10-70
‘Aspis’ or Profitis Ilías: North Slope A-10-71
‘Aspis’ or Profitis Ilías: South-west Slope A-10-72
‘Aspis’ or Profitis Ilías: South Sector A-10-73
Athenasopoulou Plot: Párodhos Goúnari 7 A-10-74
Atréos (Odhós) A-10-75
Ayía Sotíra A-10-76
Bakaloyiannis Plot: South of Baths A-10-77
Baths Area A-10-78
Bertzeletos Plot: Odhós Vas. Sofías 25 A-10-79
Boulos Plot: Odhós Kallérgí 5 A-10-80
Bonoris Plot: Odhós Tripóleos 7b A-10-81
Bouboureká Plot: Odhós Ayíou Yeóryíou 44 A-10-82
Boudheri Plot: Párodhos Theátrou 44 A-10-83
Cemetery (South of): Virgin Mary Chapel A-10-84
Deiras (Deirádha) A-10-85
Efstratiadhis-Delis Plot: Párokhos Theátrou A-10-86
Floros Plot: Odhós Káraískákí 6 A-10-87
Florou Plot: Párokhos Theátrou 12 A-10-88
Fotopoulou Plot: Foot of ‘Aspis’ at Párokhos Aspídhos A-10-89
Fououkos Plot: Odhós Kaváfí and Messinías-Arkadhías A-10-90
Fragkou Plot: Across National Gym A-10-91
Gavrílou Plot: Párokhos Goúnari. A-10-92
Georgas Plot (see Yeorgas Plot: Odhós Zograíou 9) A-10-93
Gkrania Plot: Odhós Goúnari A-10-94
Hospital Area: Foot of ‘Aspis’ on Odhós Korínthhou A-10-95
Iliopoulou Plot: Odhós Yeorgantá and Goúnari A-10-96
Ioanndíwis Plot: Párokhos Níóvis A-10-97
Irakléous Street A-10-98
Kalatzis Plot: Odhós Papanikoláou A-10-99
Kaloyeropoulou Plot: Odhós Th. Kolokótroni 10 A-10-100
Kanellopoulou Plot: Odhós Tripóleos 26 A-10-101
Karmoyianni Plot: Agora A-10-102
Kazas Plot: Odhós Irakléous 158 A-10-103
Kontou Plot: Párokhos Belínou A-10-104
Koromikhis Plot: Odhós Foronéos 5a A-10-105
Koros Plot: Odhós Atréos and Párokhos Theátrou A-10-106
Korous Plot: Odhós Tripóleos 11 A-10-107
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Kosma Plot: Odhós Th. Kolokótroni 12
Kotsiantis Plot: Párodhos Danaou
Kotsomyti Plot: Odhós Tripóleos 19
Kouro Plot: Odhós Tripóleos 11
Kypséli Square
Larisa: North of Theatre, West of Odhós Goúnari
Larisa: East Slope
Larisa: North-west Slope, North-east Corner
Larisa: Summit
Lembetzis Plot: Párodhos Theátrou
Maniati Plot: Odhós Atréos
Míaouli (Odhós)
Museum Area: Odhós Vas. Ólgas
National Gym (North of)
Odeon (South-west of): Public School Number 5
Palaiologos Plot: Párodhos Tripóleos
Papanikolaou Plot: Odhós Danaou 21
Peppa Plot: Odhós Kofinioti 27
Pliigkikou-Xeni-Rikou Plot: Odhós Irakléous 50, 51, 54
Piliou-Zakharaki-Renta Plot: Párodhos Asklipioú 23
Plati-Zisi-Diamanti-Xixi Plot: Odhós Danaou 27
Pouli Plot: Corner of Odhós Atréos and Danaou
Pouli Plot: Odhós Karatzá 8
Raptis Plot: Between Odhós Feidhonos and Roússou.
Reskou Plot: Odhós Goúnari 22
Siambli Plot: Párodhos Karatzá 44
Sirouni Plot: Párodhos Theátrou 5
Sklíri Plot: Corner of Odhós Goúnari and Foronéos
Stragka Plot: Odhós Ayiou Yeoryióu 3
Symeonidhis Plot: Odhós Meándrou and Polynékous
Strengela-Skolovos Plot: Odhós Theátrou
Theatre and Agora Area: Odhós Tripóleos
Theatre- Alíaia ‘à gradins droits’
Theodhoropoulou Plot: Odhós Perséos 41
Thivaiou Plot: Odhós Inákhou 98 and Korytsás
Tsouloukas Plot: Danaou 59
Tsoukgriani Plot: Corner of Odhós Atréos and Danaú
Vigkos Plot: Odhós Korínthou 138
Xintaropoulos Plot: Odhós Ayiou Konstantínou
Yeorgas Plot: Odhós Zográfou 9
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A-10-21
ΚΩΡΟΣ, Σ., Οδός Ατρέως
A-10-69
ΚΟΣΜΑ, Αφοί, Οδός Θ. Κολοκοτρώνη 12
A-10-17
ΚΟΥΡΟΣ, Π., Οδός Τριπόλεως
A-10-56
ΚΩΣΤΙΑΝΟΥ, Χρ., Πάροδος Δαναού
A-10-71
ΚΩΣΤΟΥΜΗ, Π., Οδός Τριπόλεως 19
A-10-62
Λάρισα, Ανατολική πλευρά
A-10-80
Λάρισα (Δ. Πρόποδες), Δ. της οδού Γούναρη
A-10-35
Λάρισα (Κάστρο), ΒΑ. γωνία
A-10-81
Α-10-82
ΑΛΕΜΠΕΤΖΗΣ, Γ., Πάροδος Θεάτρου
A-10-79
ΜΑΝΙΑΘΗ, Β., Οδός Ατρέως
A-10-72
Μουσείο, Οδός Βασ. Ολγας
A-10-24
ΜΠΑΚΑΔΟΓΙΑΝΝΗΣ, Γ. Δ., Νότια των Λουτρών
A-10-55
ΜΠΕΡΤΖΕΛΕΤΟΣ, Οδός Βασ. Σοφίας 25
A-10-30
ΜΠΑΛΑΣΣΟΥ, Στ., Οδός Καλλέρης
A-10-29
ΜΠΟΝΩΡΗΣ, Οδός Τριπόλεως 7β
A-10-57
ΜΠΟΥΛΙΖΗ, Γ., Πάροδος Θεάτρου 44
A-10-37
ΜΠΟΥΜΠΟΥΡΕΚΑ, Γ., Οδός Αγ. Γεωργίου 44
A-10-50
Νεκροταφείο Παναγίας, Δ.-ΝΔ. του νεκροταφείο
A-10-77
ΞΥΝΤΑΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οδός Αγ. Κωνσταντίνου
A-10-31
Οδός Ατρέως
Οδός Κορινθίου
Οδός Ηρακλέους
Οδός Μιαουλή
ΠΑΛΑΙΟΛΟΓΟΣ, Χρ., Πάραδος Τριπόλεως
ΠΑΠΑΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ, Η., Οδός Δαναού 21
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ΦΩΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Αικ., Πάροδος Ασπίδος
A. THE ARGEIA

The Argeia, an alluvial valley at the head of the Argolic gulf and below the eastern face of the mountains of Arkadia, serves together with the smaller plains to its north as a corridor of communication with central Greece and as the link by which the more rugged Akte is attached to the Peloponnesos.
A.i.a. The Argive Plain: West of, and including, Argos

Nomós Argolíðhos: Eparkhía Árgous
Greek Name. Δούκας, Τούρλα

1:50000 map reference. 22° 31' 30'' E and 37° 43' 30'' N.

Location. In the north-west Argolid, south-east of the modern village of Dhóuka(s), at the top of the Toúria peak, overlooking the valley of Dhóuka.

Excavation. Greek Eforeía excavations.

Features. Here lie remains of an archaic building, probably of a temple.

Finds. Many bronze pins and pieces of bronze strips come from a votive deposit inside the building.

Function. Special-purpose site: shrine?

Comments. The site has no previous signs of occupation; it was founded in the archaic period. It could well be the sanctuary of Artemis mentioned by Pausanias (Paus. 2.25.6; de Polignac 1988a, 146 n8).
Oinoe (Merkouri)

Greek Name. Μερκούριον

1:50000 map reference. 22° 33’ E and 37° 36’ 30’’ N.

Location. In the south part of the central plain near the Arkadian border, about 15 km south-east of Argos, at modern Merkoúri, near the foot of Mt. Artemísion (Mt. Malevós) to the north and Mt. Kteniá to the south, on a valley where the Xérias river ends. This valley is approached through a spectacular gap in the hills west of Argos, where the Kharadros river has forced its way out to the plain through a gorge. Unlike the Berbatí gorge, the valley does not open out into such a wide plain.

Excavation. Greek Eforeía, chance find, 1986.

Finds. An inscribed votive base of the second half of the sixth century was found at Mouzaka on Lamba Plot and built into the wall on the right as one goes along the road from Sykia to Karya (Mitsos 1949, 74). It was dedicated to Artemis.


Comments. This base attests to the presence of a sanctuary of Artemis mentioned by Pausanias (2.25.2-3). Pikoulas (1988) identifies the finding place as the ancient Argive town of Oinoe. Papakhatzis (1976, 185 n3), however, places Oinoe near the modern village of Mazi where Protonotariou-Dheílaki (1974, 84) noted some archaic walls. The site itself is uncertain.

The stele is important in that it probably marked the boundary of the road that lead from the plain of Argos to Mantinea. If this is so, it will refer to Pausanias’ (8.6.4) middle road leading to Arkadia, which is called δία τοῦ Πρινοῦ.

The settlement in the valley provided a line of communication to Mantinea, the Arkadian city with who the Argives were on friendly terms (Tomlinson 1972, 38). So the importance of the Oinoe valley was political rather than economic.
A sanctuary of Artemis was also apparently situated on the top of Mt. Artemision, above Oinoe (Paus. 2.25.3), but no ancient remains are now visible, except for a concentration of sherds and a wall of coarse blocks between Mt. Xerovoúni and Mt. Malevós (Mt. Artemision), at about 75 metres north by north-west from the chapel of Profitis Ilías (Pritchett 1980, 32 figs. 1, 4, pl. 3; Winter [J.] and Winter [F.] 1990, 256).
**Hysiai (Akhladhókambos)**

**Greek Name.** Ἀχλαδόκαμπος

**1:50000 map reference.** 22° 35' E and 37° 31' N

**Location.** South-west corner of the Argolid, around the slopes of Mt. Paravounáki high above the Xábrio valley, just east of the modern village of Akhladhókambos, and about 5 km south of ancient Kenkhreai.

A church and a spring on an akropolis, by the side of the main road, mark the ruins. From here one gets a good view of the valley looking towards Mt. Parthénion, which is on the border with Arkadia.

**Excavation.** Unexcavated.

**Features.** A fortified akropolis dates to the sixth century. Its walls are a mixture of polygonal and trapezoidal masonry that are difficult to date. There are foundations of massive semi-circular towers or bastions, now barely noticeable, but perhaps clearer in the nineteenth century when they were first reported.

**Function.** Habitation site: fortification.

**Comments.** The site was presumably fortified at least from the great development of hostilities between Argos and Sparta in the later sixth century. It was chosen for its strategic position (looks out to the passes at the head of the valley to Arkadia) and also because of its spring. It was destroyed in 416 by the Spartans (Paus. 2.24.7).
**Skhinokhóri**

Tomlinson 1972, 39.
Foley 1988, 195.

**Greek Name.** Σχινοχώριον

**1:50000 map reference.** 22° 39' E and 37° 42' 15'' N.

**Location.** In the north-west part of the central Argolic plain, about 11 km north-west of Árgos, in a valley south-west of the Inákhos river.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía excavations.

**Function.** Habitation site: village or farmsteads?

---

**Skhinokhóri: Skála**

Papakhristodhoulou 1970b, 117-118.
Pikoulas 1995, 267-270.

**Greek Name.** Σκάλα

**Location.** A short distance north-east of Ayía Kyriaki (Αγ. Κυριακή), south-west of Skhinokhóri.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía excavations.

**Comments.** An archaic settlement is reported between the bronze age chamber tombs and the modern village. The site of ancient Lyrkeia was nearby, on the hills at the edge of the plain.

---

**Skhinokhóri: Khélimi**

Banaki-Dhimaki 1996, 104.

**Greek Name.** Χέλμης

**Location.** In a valley north-west of Skhinokhóri, where one of the branches of the Inákhos river ends.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía excavations, 1991.

**Features.** The Greek Archaeological Service found eight graves, which were part of a larger cemetery connected with an important settlement. Only one burial per grave was found, without gifts, except for graves 1 and 8.

**Finds.** Both graves had bronze pins, and grave 1 had a sphinx of the early fifth century.
Greek Name. Κεφαλάριον

1:50000 map reference. 22° 41' 30" E and 37° 36' N.

Location. In the central plain about 5 km south-west of Άργος, near Ellinikó, and about 4.5 km north-west of the coast. Kefalári is where the ancient Erasínos issues from the rock.

Excavation. Unknown.

Finds. A sanctuary deposit of the archaic period with 100s of vases and figurines was excavated at the height of the Magoúla Kefalarioú.

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary.

Comments. The site was re-occupied in archaic times.
Greek Name. Σκαφιδάκιον

1:50000 map reference. 22° 41' 30" E and 37° 34' N.

Location. In the south-west part of the Argive plain, about 11 km south-west of Árgos, 2.5 km north-east of Mýloi, at the edge of the Argive plain, south-east of Skafidháki and north of Mt. Pontion.

Excavation. Greek Eforéia excavations.

Features. Graves (probably some of which were archaic ?) were found here.

Finds. The graves contained little baskets, a bg *lekythos* decorated with birds, a necklace, and silver rings.

At Megála Lithária a pottery fill of archaic sherds mixed in with later ones was found under levels of a hellenistic building.

Function. Special-purpose site: cemetery.

Comments. Perhaps this cemetery belonged to a nearby settlement.
Greek Name. Σπηλιωτάκης

1:50000 map reference. 22° 41' 30'' E and 37° 31' N.

Location. About 5 km south-west of Kivéri village (south of Mýloi) and less than 2 km south of Spiliotáki's railway station, south of Mt. Pontion, near the border with Arkadia.

The site is difficult to find; one has to look for a low rocky knoll covered with shrubs in the area of the Athanassopoulos Plot, about 500 m from the church of Áyios Demetríos. The Xovrió river runs near here, from Kivéri.

Excavation. Greek Eforeía excavations.

Features. An excavation under Verdhelis was carried out about 100 m from the votive deposit (below), with the hope of finding the sanctuary. They uncovered the foundations of a rectangular building, with a Doric colonnade and two rooms, oriented north-east, south-west. This structure was identified as a temple with a double sekos, which dates to the late sixth-early fifth century.

Finds. A large votive deposit dates from the sixth century to the hellenistic period. It includes miniature pots and 100s of terracotta figurines, an inscription of bronze from the second half of the fifth century, and a relief representing a goddess who could be Demeter.

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary. Habitation site: fortification?

Comments. The temple is probably dedicated to Demeter and Kore. The area is strategic, for it guards the pass to Arkadia. It seems to be inhabited for the first time in the archaic period.
Magouła (near Kefalari)

Vollgraff 1907, 179-180.
Touchais 1985, 775.
Fossey 1987, 81.
Foley 1988, 150-151, 184.

**Greek Name.** Μαγούλα

**1:50000 map reference.** 22° 42’ 45” E and 37° 35’ 30” N.

**Location.** South-west of Argos, at the side of the road to Myloi where it crosses the Erasinos, between Néa Kios and Kefalári.

**Excavation.** French School excavations.

**Features.** Vollgraff found the foundations of a small building.

**Finds.** Fragments of a monolithic Doric column with sixteen flutes were discovered at the north-east angle of the building. Apparently 1000s of pots and 100s of figurines of the seventh and sixth centuries were found in a votive deposit situated a few metres away.

**Function.** Special-purpose site: shrine.

**Comments.** This small temple perhaps belongs to Artemis.
Greek Name. Λέρνη (near Μύλοι)

1:50000 map reference. 22° 43' E and 37° 33' N.

Location. About 4 km north-west of Kivéri and 12 km south of Argos, just a few hundred metres west of the coast, on the road to Ástros.

Excavation. American School and Greek Eforeía excavations.

Finds. Fragments of pottery were recovered from the surface over the House of Tiles and particularly from three wells in Area B, one of which yielded bf and Corinthian sherds, a series of nineteen terracotta spools, and three loom-weights. Two of the wells produced, in addition to pottery, fragmentary terracotta figurines of Argive type representing seated females (Caskey 1955, 32).

Function. Habitation site: farmstead?

Comments. The spools and loom-weights may represent the equipment of a single weaving establishment.

This region is more likely to have been occupied as a series of farms, well watered from the springs at the foot of the hills, and controlled from Argos.

North-west of Lerna
Catling 1989, 29.

Location. Plot beside the Μύλοι-Τrípolis road, 200 m north-west of Lerna.


Finds. It is noted that very little pottery was found; fifth century material came from the vicinity of the late fifth century isodomic wall. The finds include two antefixes.

Function. Special-purpose site: shrine?

Comments. Surface finds raised hopes that this might be the site of the temple of Demeter mentioned by Pausanias.
The three divinities worshipped in the sacred wood of Lerna were primarily Demeter, Dionysos, and Aphrodite (Musti and Torelli 1986, 336). The area must have been in direct communication with the world of the dead, since at least two divinities worshipped there are linked with Hades (Paus. 2.26.7, 3.37.5).
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Greek Name. Άργος

1:50000 map reference. 22° 43' 30" E and 37° 38' 15" N.

Location. About 6 km north of the coast of Néa Kíos, between the Erasinos and Inákhos rivers. It is dominated by two hills, the Larisa (300 m) with its mediaeval castle on the summit, and the hill of Profitis Ilías conventionally (90 m), and wrongly, called the ‘Aspis’ (Aspídha). The ravine of the Deíras (Deiradha) separates the two hills, at the foot of which lies the habitation zone. Its expansion is blocked to the north and to the north-east by the Xérias (ancient Kharadros), a seasonal river bed which empties out into the Inákhos river.

Excavation. The first archaeological activity was at the site of the hellenistic theatre, which was partly excavated by Kóphiniotis in 1891. At the beginning of this century the French School under Vollgraff excavated at various times between 1902 and 1930 in areas not covered by the modern city, including several bronze age settlements and about ten bronze age tombs on the ‘Aspis’. At the summit of the Larisa he cleared two archaic temples in the court of the Franco-Venetian fortress and found bronze age fortification walls. The Deíras also began to be excavated at the turn of the century; there they found mainly bronze age chamber tombs, often including later material. Around the same time Vollgraff excavated the theatre, the roman odeon, and some byzantine mosaics. Excavations were resumed in 1952 with Roux, Courbin, and Charneux, and work has continued since.


Comment. The urban centre of Argos during the archaic period occupied about the same territory as the modern village. Fortification walls were found in the Larisa and to the south and south-west of the city (Barakari-Gleni and Pariente 1998, 165). The whole city was fortified in archaic/classical times.

The main roads include: 1) running north-south and leading to the agora, it follows the modern Irakléous-Goúnari streets; 2) running north of the current Theátrou street, leading to the agora through a monumental doorway of the imperial period; 3) following the modern Atréos street, which went behind the Stoa Pi and led to the Aphrodision and Aliáia; 4) leading to the theatre from the crossing of Goúnari and Theátrou streets; and 5) running north-west/south-east in the north-west sector of the city near the Xérias (the ancient Kharadros) river (Barakari-Gleni and Pariente 1998, 166).
All the roads passed through city gates leading into the agora, but the only one that was identified is the Deiras gate, between the Larisa and the Deiras, where ended the road coming from Mantinea through Oinoe.

The most important cemeteries developed outside the walls, to the north and south, on the slopes, near the road leading from Korinthos to Tegea.

The plan of buildings inside the walls is still not well known. We find archaic and classical houses to the north, towards the Deiras, and especially to the east of the line formed by the nymphaeum of the Larisa and the theatre-Aliaia ‘à gradins droits’. They must have been concentrated along the streets that linked Argos to the many villages in the area. As we approach the place where they converge, small sanctuaries and workshops begin to multiply. At this point, from the sixth century onwards, the agora was installed in a space defined by the streets of the Heraion, the road from Korinthos to Tegea, and the street leading from the Kylarabis Gate to the Aphrodision.

**Argos, Hospital Area: Foot of ‘Aspis’ on Odhós Korínthou  A-10-1**
Protonotariou-Dheflaki 1966, 122-127; 1974, 76.
Hägg 1974, 143.
Courbin 1977b, 327.
Foley 1988, 203-204.

**Greek Name.** Οδός Κορίνθου

**City map reference.** Square 5. Sondage 85.

**Location.** On the grounds of the new hospital near the foot of the ‘Aspis’.


**Features.** As many as ten pithos burials of the seventh century were found in this area.

A sixth century ovoid pithos (IIIa13), oriented north-south, lay over a geometric cist. The grave was 1.75 m long; the body was badly preserved. Another sixth century cylindrical pithos (IIIa8) with a similar orientation and closed by a stone slab also held a badly preserved body.

**Finds.** Two pots, a ‘psefos’ and a pyxis with vertical handles, were found inside the first grave, pithos IIIa13. The second grave contained an oinochoe, two aryballoi, and one phiale.
Argos. Strengla Plot: Foot of 'Aspis' at Odhos Diomidhous 136

Dheilaki 1977, 112.

**Greek Name.** ΣΤΡΕΓΓΔΑ, Οδός Διομήδους

**City map reference.** Square 8. Sondage 214.

**Location.** At 136 Diomidhous Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforia rescue excavations, 1972.

**Comments.** A coroplast's workshop has been identified in this area. The material has not (yet) been published.

Argos. Kazas Plot: Odhós Irakléous 158

Dheilaki 1977, 97-98; 1979, 208.

**Greek Name.** ΚΑΖΑΣ, Χ., Οδός Ηρακλέους 158

**City map reference.** Square 5. Sondage 234.

**Location.** At 3 Irakléous Street.


**Features.** The graves here are mainly hellenistic, but one pit burial is archaic.

**Finds.** A small pot was found inside the grave.

Argos. Poulou Plot: Odhós Karatzá 8


**Greek Name.** ΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Οδός Καρατζά 8

**City map reference.** Square 8. Sondage 276.

**Location.** On Karatzá Street near the Deiras.


**Features.** Archaic walls and an embankment or cutting were found.

**Comments.** These walls may be the foundations of houses.

Argos. Fotoupolou Plot: Foot of 'Aspis' at Parodhos Aspidhpos

Touchais 1989, 602.

**Greek Name.** ΦΩΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Αικ., Πάροδος Ασπίδος

**City map reference.** Square 8. Sondage 381.
Location. On Párodhos Aspídhos, at the foot of the ‘Aspis’ on the east and south-east flank of the hill.

Excavation. Greek Eforeia rescue excavations, 1980.

Features. The Greek Archaeological Service found a very unusual feature sealed by a hard deposit containing a group of five decapitated horse burials of archaic date. Remains of two walls were found east of the horse burials.

Finds. With the burials they found archaic sherds.

Comments. Horses in antiquity were probably decapitated during the killing process; we cannot say in this case whether they were sacrificed or just killed on account of illness. In the absence of associations for these animals their significance is elusive.

Argos. Siambli Plot: Párodhos Kаратzá 44 A-10-6
Dheilaki 1977, 121-122; 1979, 208.

Greek Name. ΣΙΑΜΠΛΗ, Πάροδος Καρατζά 44


Location. On Párodhos Kаратzá, next to Strengla Plot.


Finds. The Greek Archaeological Service found only one archaic sherd.

Comments. There was cult activity in the area.

Argos. ‘Aspis’ or Profitis Ilias: North Slope A-10-7
Aupert, Piérart, and Touchais 1980, 698.

Greek Name. Προφήτης Ηλίας (‘Ασπίδα’)

City map reference: Squares 5 and 83. Sondage 262.

Location. North sector of the ‘Aspis’, under the hellenistic bastion.


Features. The excavators found a polygonal fortification wall almost 3 m wide. Though one part of it is middle hellenistic, the earlier wall might be archaic.

Finds. An archaic votive deposit was found over a floor north of the polygonal fortification wall. It contained many small cups, terracotta rings, and small bells, as well as some figurines (Aupert, Piérart, and Touchais 1980, 697, fig. 12).
Comments. It seems that the ‘Aspis’ was fortified during the archaic period. A votive deposit here indicates some sort of cult activity, perhaps it was associated with the yet undiscovered temple of Hera Akraia.

**Argos. ‘Aspis’ or Profitis Ilias: South-west Slope**

Vollgraff 1906, 37; 1907, 159ff.; 1920, 219-226; 1956, 11-12, 43-45, 51-76.
Bergquist 1967, 18-19.
Tomlinson 1972, 23.
Coulton 1976.
Musti and Torelli 1986, 290.
Foley 1988, 140-142.
Hägg 1992a, 9-36.

**Greek Name.** Προφήτης Ἡλίας (‘Ασπίδα’)

**City map reference.** Squares 5 and 83. Sondage 262.

**Location.** South-west flank of the ‘Aspis’, in an area where various other buildings discovered by Vollgraff at the turn of the century.

**Excavation.** French School excavations and rescue, 1902-1990.

**Features.** A three-chambered building (Building E), probably a temple, was excavated by Vollgraff within the south bastion wall. Among the other remains excavated were four terraces and buildings that included among them two stoas, an altar, and a cistern. The west terrace wall and perhaps the altar have been designated as archaic (Hägg 1992a, 12).

The foundations of one of the stoas, a one-aisled West stoa in the east part of the north boundary of the sanctuary, may also be archaic. Very few remains are left, but according to Vollgraff, it was 26 m long and may have been two storeys. This West Stoa has its east end cut into the rock, so that a wall, not a colonnade, must have formed part of the south façade. It has been dated to the sixth century.

**Finds.** Geometric and archaic sherds were noted in the area of the west terrace wall. A seventh-sixth century votive deposit of many miniature pots, female and animal figurines, terracotta wreaths and fruits, and the head of a small bronze figurine (Apollo ?) was located just north of the sanctuary area, near the church of the Profitis Ilias (Vollgraff 1907, 156, fig. 5; and 1956, figs. 22-23).

Sixth and fifth century column fragments and architectural terracottas were found in the area (Vollgraff 1907, 156, fig. 4; 1907, 155, fig. 4; and 1956, fig. 14).

**Comments.** The site has suffered severe destruction and there is little left of the archaic buildings. It was obviously a cult site of geometric origin before the archaic temenos was
established here. We know from a hellenistic inscription that an archaic temple was built somewhere in the west part of the temenos and an altar in the east part.

Vollgraff’s Building E can be reasonably identified with the temple of Hera Akraia; associated finds suggest a date in the sixth century for this temple. The sanctuary itself was probably began as a terrace and an altar, and later a temple.

The main road leading to the temenos must have run from the central part of the town of Argos in the south-east (Bergquist 1967, pl. 4).

*Argos. ‘Aspis’ or Profitis Ilías: South Sector*  
A-10-9
Touchais 1980, 596.  
Antonaccio 1995.

**Greek Name.** Προφήτης Ηλίας (‘Ασπίδα’)

**City map reference.** Squares 5 and 83. Sondage 262.

**Location.** South part of the ‘Aspis’ in the area of the Deiras.

**Excavation.** French School excavations and rescue, 1902-1990.

**Features.** Two archaic graves had been opened in the bronze age Tomb 93, and a third next to it (Tombs 94, 95, and 96).

**Finds.** Miniature pottery as well as terracotta figurines of females and horsemen were found. In the south side of the bronze age Tumulus A were found archaic ceramic material (Antonaccio 1995, 13, fig. 1).

**Comments.** Here is evidence of cult activity.

*Argos. Deiras (Deiráðha)*  
A-10-10
Vollgraff 1904, 367, 374-375; 1956.  
Deshayes 1953, 59-89.  
Roux 1957, 474-487.  
Daux 1959b, 769-774.  
Deshayes 1966, 5-6, 8, 27, 94, 226, 229, 252.  
Bergquist 1967, 18-19.  
Deshayes 1969, 574-616.  
Tomlinson 1972, 23.  
Foley 1988, 140.  
Billot 1989-90, 52-57.  
Hägg 1992a, 12.

**Greek Name.** Δειράδα

**City map reference.** Squares 8 and 83. Sondage 57.

**Location.** The area between the ‘Aspis’ and the Larisa.
**Excavation.** French School rescue excavations, 1902-1958. Vollgraff discovered nine tombs early in the century. Later excavations were conducted by Deshayes.

**Finds.** A fragment of an antefix, decorated black on beige, was found in trench E. On the surface near trench J a fragment of palmette antefix with red and ochre was found. Another three fragments of painted architectural terracottas (simas) with red and ochre and black on cream ground came from trench D. Two of the simas date to the second half of the sixth century. Fragments of three painted antefixes and a tile were discovered in the dromos of a bronze age Tomb 10 and others from Tomb 30.

Archaic figurines and pottery were found at the bottom of Tomb 16 (Deshayes 1966, pl. 75). An archaic deposit, including one complete bowl, fragments of several others, sherds of a thick-walled conical stand, and the lip of a trefoil oinochoe, was found in Tomb 17 (Deshayes 1966, 51, pl. 57). Archaic pottery was also collected above the dromos of Tomb 19, on the surface and around the dromos of Tomb 26, and in the collapsed chamber of Tomb 29 (Deshayes 1966, 70-73). In the chamber of Tomb 5 was found a single fragment of an archaic vase.

**Comments.** Antefixes of this type probably come from the temple of Apollo Pythaeus, also known from the area (in ancient Greek, Deirás means a ridge of a chain of hills) as Apollo 'Deiradotes' (Paus. 2.24.1). The grave goods also suggest that some sort of tomb cult existed here.

---

**Argos. Piligkikou-Xenaki-Rikou Plot: Odhós Irakléous 50, 51, 54**

Touchais 1977, 547.

**Greek Name.** ΠΗΛΙΓΚΙΚΟΥ, Π., ΞΕΝΑΚΗ, Α., ΡΙΚΟΥ, Ι., Οδός Ηρακλέους 50, 51, 54

**City map reference.** Square 9. Sondage 183.

**Location.** At 50, 51, and 54 Irakléous Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforēia rescue excavations, 1971.

**Features.** A cemetery was in use here from bronze age to archaic times. Grave 1 is a burial pithos of early archaic years. A small geometric well in the area seems to have been filled up in archaic times.

**Finds.** Some archaic sherds were found in the area.

**Comments.** Several rescue digs in the area indicate the presence of a large cemetery (see below).
Argos. Odhós Irakléous

Psykhoyiou 1997, 91.

Greek Name. Οδός Ηρακλέους

City map reference. Square 9.

Location. On Irakléous Street, 80m north of Diomiodhou.


Features. A pit, 2.55m deep, was found covered a tile, with three adult burials.

Finds. Inside the pit were pots of archaic and early classical period.

---

Argos. Theodhoropoulou Plot: Odhós Perséos 41

Dheilaki-Protonotariou 1974, 81; Dheilaki 1977, 102.
Touchais 1978, 664.

Greek Name. ΘΕΟΔΗΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Οδός Περσέως 41


Location. At 41 Perséos Street.


Features. The excavator mentions that the area was a cemetery from geometric, archaic and hellenistic years, but nothing more specific. This area must be part of the previous plot on Irakléous Street.

---

Argos. Ioannidhis Plot: Párodhos Nióvis

Foley 1988, 140.

Greek Name. ΙΩΑΝΝΙΔΗΣ, Χρ., Πάροδος Νιώβης


Location. On Párodhos Nióvis, in the north-west of Árgos, 1.3 m south-west of the ancient agora and 260 m east of the ‘Aspis’.

Excavation. Greek Eforía rescue excavations, 1981.

Features. The Greek Archaeological Service found bronze age, archaic, and classical tombs. In an archaic grave (Tomb 3) they found three burials placed together with Attic and Corinthian pots. In the east part of the grave there was a square area with bones of adults--probably a secondary burial.
Tomb 4 can be paralleled with the previous grave. It is 2.4 m deep, and only 15 cm away from Tomb 3. It had been reused, because one part of it was left uncovered. Probably this was the family grave of two adults and a child, with its tiny bones and small Corinthian pots. This grave is dated to the early fifth century.

**Finds.** Tomb 3 had two Corinthian pots, Boiotian, Attic, and Corinthian _pyxides_, a Corinthian _skyphos_, an _oinochoe_, and a _lekythos_, all dating to the last quarter of the fifth century. Tomb 4 contained a Corinthian _pyxis_, an _amphoriskos_, small _kotylai_, a tripod, _kraters_, bottles, a bg Siana cup, and an Attic miniature _kylix_ with a scene of teenager preparing for horse-riding. An Attic bg _lekythos_ depicting a scene with three women by the Aimonis painter was found together with two Corinthian _pyxides_ of the white style and a Laconian _skyphos_.

Among the _figurines_ was an idol with two women baking bread similar to the ones found at Tiryns and Argos.

Three pairs of _sandals_ were also recovered from the woman’s burial.

---

**Argos. Vigkos Plot: Odhós Korínthou 138**

Daux 1961, 675.
Alexandri 1962, 93.

**Greek Name.** ΒΙΓΚΟΣ, Οδός Κορίνθου

**City map reference.** Square 10. Sondage 74.

**Location.** At 139 Korinthou Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforia rescue excavations, 1959.

**Features.** The Greek Archaeological Service found two _cist graves_; one was fifth century and the other was hellenistic.

**Finds.** In the fifth century tomb was a _pyxis_ with _protomai_ on the rim and some _figurines_.

---

**Argos. Reskou Plot: Odhós Gounari 22**

Barakari-Gleni and Pariente 1988, 167 n.27.

**Greek Name.** ΠΕΣΚΟΥ, Γ., Οδός Γούναρη 22

**City map reference.** Square 12. Sondage 310.

**Location.** At 22 Gounari Street.

**Excavation.** Rescue excavation, 1976.
Comments. Votives indicate cult activity in the area.

**Argos. Kosma Plot: Odhós Th. Kolokótri 12**


Greek Name. ΚΟΣΜΑ, Αφοί, Οδός Θ. Κολοκοτρώνη 12


Location. At 12 Th. Kolokótri Street.


Features. Archaic and classical embankments or cuttings were found here.

Finds. Archaic sherds were collected in the area.

Comments. Probably the cuttings were part of foundations to archaic houses.

**Argos. Kaloveropoulou Plot: Odhós Th. Kolokótri 10**

Kritzas 1979, 228.

Touchais 1980, 596.

Greek Name. ΚΑΛΟΓΕΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Α., Οδός Θ. Κολοκοτρώνη 10


Location. In the centre of town at 10 Th. Kolokótri Street.


Finds. A few archaic sherds were found here.

Comments. This place was also used in geometric times.

**Argos. Thivaiou Plot: Odhós Inákhou 98 and Korytsás**

Piteros 1989, 80.

Greek Name. ΘΗΒΑΙΟΥ, Χρ., Οδός Ινάκχου 98/ Κορυτσάς


Location. At 98 Inákhou Street.


Features. Tombs were found here, including a burial píthos of the early archaic period.
**Argos. Skliri Plot: Corner of Odhós Goúnari and Foronéos**

Daux 1967b, 825, 828.
Papakhristodhoulou 1970a, 108.
Michaud 1971, 865, 872.
Courbin 1977b, 327.

**Greek Name.** ΣΚΛΗΡΗ, Οδός Γούναρη/Φορωνέως

**City map reference.** Square 17. Sondage 136.

**Location.** At the corner of Goúnari and Foronéos Streets, across from Avgousti Plot on Goúnari Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia rescue excavations, 1968.

**Features.** The Greek Archaeological Service excavated a cemetery area and found an archaic burial *pithos* with three bodies inside it (Papakhristodhoulou 1970a, pl. 89a). It probably dates to the late seventh century, but it was reused twice, probably at a later date, in the sixth century. When the third body was put in, a hole was made on the side of the *pithos*, which was later covered up by tile fragments.

**Finds.** Some fine Corinthian pots were recovered from the burial (Papakhristodhoulou 1970a, pl. 88; Michaud 1971, figs. 145-147).

**Argos. Koromikhis Plot: Odhós Foronéos 5a**

Protonotariou-Dheilaki 1974, 78.

**Greek Name.** ΚΟΡΟΜΙΧΗΣ, Οδός Φορωνέως 5α

**City map reference.** Square 17. Sondage 154.

**Location.** At 5a Foronéos Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia rescue excavations, 1970.

**Finds.** Archaic sherds were found in the area of roman graves.

**Comments.** The area was occupied in archaic times.

**Argos. Iliopoulos Plot: Odhós Yeorgantá and Goúnari**

Protonotariou-Dheilaki 1972a, 155.
Foley 1988, 204.

**Greek Name.** ΗΛΙΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Β., Οδός Γεωργαντά/Γούναρη

**City map reference.** Square 17. Sondage 145.

**Location.** On Yeorgantá and Goúnari Streets.
Excavation. Greek Eforiea rescue excavations, 1969.

Features. Geometric and archaic graves were found here. Excavators identified an archaic burial *pithos* with two phases; possibly one of these dated to the sixth century.

Finds. The *pithos* contained two *kylikes*, a Corinthian *pyxis*, and a late geometric krater with the bones of a child.

*Argos, Athanasopoulou Plot: Párodhos Goúnari 7*  
Kritzas 1977, 130.

Greek Name. ΑΘΑΝΑΣΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Δ. και Χρ., Πάροδος Παύναρη 7


Location. On Párodhos Goúnari, at number 7, near the Church of Timios *Prodromos*.


Finds. The Greek Archaeological Service found archaic levels with many figurines of riders, warriors, females, and animals.

Comments. The finds suggest cult activity.

*Argos, Museum Area: Odhós Vas. Ólgas*  
EF 1957, 647-660.  
Leelely and Noyes 1976, 58.  
Foley 1988, 207-208.

Greek Name. Μουσείο, Οδός Βασ. Όλγας


Location. Near the city centre, in sector epsilon, on Vas. Ólgas Street.


Features. A protogeometric to archaic *cemetery* with cist and *pithos* burials was excavated. One early seventh century *burial krater* held the bones of a child.

Finds. An abundant quantity of ceramics was found; they note 300 *lamps* of all periods, a large quantity of Attic rf and bf *fragments*, and many fragments of Corinthian rf *kraters* (EF 1957, fig. 15).

A ‘faisselle à fromage’ (Argos Mus.: inv.II 582+582bis) was found in sondage A at the bottom of a hellenistic well. The fragments were mixed with two similar vases and fragments of fifth century local bg *skyphai* imitating Attic ones (Argos Mus.: inv.II 645; EF 1957, 657-660, fig. 47).
Comments. From the sixth century to the hellenistic period this area seems to have had workshops.

**Argos. Floros Plot: Odhós Kariaiskáki 6**

Daux 1967b, 801-849.
EFA 1968, 192-194.

**Greek Name.** ΦΛΟΡΟΣ, Σπ., Οδός Καραϊσκάκη 6

**City map reference.** Square 18. Sondage 114.

**Location.** In Su 76-77 at 6 Kariaiskáki Street, north of the chapel of Áyios Kharalámbos.

**Excavation.** French School rescue excavations, 1966.

**Features.** A late seventh-early sixth century grave in a pit was found against the mouth of *pithos* 209 (Daux 1967b, 833; Foley 1988, 210). Against the mouth of this *pithos* was found a deposit of small late Corinthian pots and the bones of a child.

Two funerary *pithoi* were found in SU 76b during rescue excavations. One of them (T 211) was ovoid in shape, small, and without offerings. The other (T 212) was cylindrical, and later than the previous *pithos*, Tomb 211. It had been reused twice; the first inhumation dates to the early sixth century (Daux 1967b, 833; EFA 1968, 193, Plan 1, pl. 138c).

**Finds.** The first burial contained a deposit of small late Corinthian pots and the bones of a child (Daux 1967b, 833; Foley 1988, 210). Of the two *pithoi*, the offerings of Tomb 212 all go back to the first inhumation: they include fifteen small Corinthian vases (Argos Mus. inv. B 173: *pyxides, skyphoi, amforiskoi, kalathoi*, etc.), some of which are miniatures, as well as two female figurines in a group depicted as cooking, and a bronze *phiale* (Daux 1967b, 833-834, fig. 2; EFA 1968, 193, pl. 139a).

**Comments.** This area is associated with a cult.

**Argos. Papanikolaou Plot: Odhós Danaout 21**

Dheilaki-Protonotariou 1974, 79.
Kritzas 1976, 192-197.
Toucharis 1977, 547.
Foley 1988, 209.

**Greek Name.** ΠΑΠΑΝΙΚΟΛΑΟΥ, Η., Οδός Δαναού 21

**City map reference.** Square 18. Sondages 161 and 175.

**Location.** At 21 Danaou Street.

Feature. An early archaic (seventh century) burial *pithos* has been put inside a geometric grave.

   Part of an archaic wall was found in the south section of the excavation.

Comments. The walls may be part of an archaic house.

---

**Argos. Yeorgas Plot: Odhós Zográsou 9**

Touchais 1977, 547.
Foley 1988, 142.

Greek Name. ΓΕΩΡΓΑΣ, Δ., Οδός Ζωγράφου 9


Location. On school grounds at 9 Zografou Street.


Finds. Next to a hellenistic building the excavators found an archaic deposit with female and animal figurines.

Comments. Votives attest the presence in that area of cult activity in the archaic period.

---

**Argos. Kontou Plot: Párodhos Belíou**


Greek Name. ΚΟΝΤΟΥ, Πάροδος Μπέλιου

City map reference. Square 18?

Location. On Parados Belínou.


Features. A pit, 1.70 m by 0.90 m by 0.50 m, was found in the south-east part of the excavation. It was lined with clay.

   In the west part of the plot they found the remains of a building (4.20 m), with a floor of large river stones, at geometric levels. The building’s first phase dates to the early sixth century, with additions in the fourth century.

Finds. Placed vertically inside the pit were five mudbricks. Mixed into with these were female *protomai*, animal and bird figurines, ankles bones, olive pits, *kraters* of early archaic period, phallic *satyrs*, *pyxides*, *lekythoi*, *plaques*, *sphinxes*, pieces of small clay *cart*, bird bones, a small *plate*, and horse-rider and seated female figurines.

   Inside the building they found small clay models of capitals (?).
Comments. The structure of the pit, and the votives found inside, point to a ceremonial function.

This area was used from the early archaic period to the fourth century.

Argos. Blatsou Plot: Odhós Kallérgi 5

Greek Name. ΜΠΛΑΤΣΟΥ, Σπ., Οδός Καλλέργη

City map reference. Square 18. Sondage 263.

Location. At 5 Kallérgi Street.


Features. The Greek Archaeological Service discovered three cist tombs. The first two were hellenistic and the third, which contained the remains of four successive burials, yielded rich late archaic material.

Argos. Bertzeletos Plot: Odhós Vas. Sofías 25

Greek Name. ΜΠΙΕΡΤΖΕΛΕΤΟΣ, Οδός Βασ. Σοφίας 25


Location. Close to the central square of the city, in a cemetery area, at 25 Vas. Sofías Street.

Excavation. Greek Eforeía excavations, 1952.

Features. The excavators found burials dating from the geometric period.

Comments. There seems to be a long interval in the occupation of this site during the archaic and classical period. Perhaps the city becomes more limited at this time. It is only in the fourth century that they begin to reuse this site again, first perhaps as cemetery and then for a building of unknown use. The fact that this site was used twice as a cemetery is proof that is was situated near to a road or pass and at close proximity to the city, in other words, near one of the city gates. Its location to the north of the east quarter (of the city) must be near the Eileithyian gate, which we know from Pausanias (2.28.3), where ends the road from Mykenai (and probably also the Heraion).
Argos. Xintaropoulos Plot: Odhós Ayíou Konstantínou

Papakhristodhoulou 1969, 128.

Greek Name. ΞΥΝΤΑΡΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οδός Αγ. Κωνσταντίνου


Location. South-east of the Ayíou Pétrou Square, on Ayíou Konstandínu Street.


Finds. When the Greek Archaeological Service dug the lower levels they found archaic Siana type cups; one had a dolphin and octopus.

---

Argos. Peppa Plot: Odhós Kofinioti 27

Kritzas 1976, 203.

Greek Name. ΠΕΠΠΑ, Α., Οδός Κοφινιώτη 27


Location. On the perimeters of the city at 27 Kofinioti Street.


Comments. There is a sanctuary deposit here suggesting cult activity.

---

Argos. Theatre-Aliaia 'à gradins droits'

Vollgraff 1920, 223; 1958, 516-570.
McDonald 1943, 80-84.
Ginouvès 1972, 75-82.
Le Roy 1975, 190-194.
Marchetti 1994, 134.
Piérart and Touchais 1996, 52.

City map reference. Squares 22 and 23.

Location. At the extremity of the Prón (a projection of the Larisa towards the south-west), just north of the sanctuary of Aphrodite.

Excavation. French School, sondages, 1912, and excavations, 1953.

Features. This theatre has a series of tiers (37-38 seats) cut in the natural rock, without diazóma, flanked by two lateral staircases, and divided into two equal parts by a central staircase. These tiers, on average about 0.33 m in height, are straight, except at the top where they begin to curve slightly. Many irregularities are visible, and perhaps wooden
or stone seats were added in places where the landscape was dug in. Erosion certainly affected the rock over the centuries.

The steps of the staircase were grooved to stop people from slipping. It seems also that the architect had foreseen another means of access above the central staircase. An exterior ramp gave direct access to the higher rows of seats. Almost no traces of an orchestra have been found, but the excavators reconstruct it as trapezoidal, like the one from the theatre at Syracuse.

**Finds.** A remarkable particularity is that a large number of blocks on the east face of the supporting wall have one or more letters incised deep into them, probably masons' marks. The letters are characteristic of fifth century Argive writing (Jeffery 1990, 151-152).

**Comments.** This structure was identified at the spot where the *Aliaia*, the popular assembly, and the tribunal of Argos gathered. With its thirty-seven tiers, the structure could hold as many as 2300-2500 people. It may have been a sort of *bouleuterion*, mentioned by Herodotos (7.148) in describing the scene when the envoys of Sparta appeared at the Argive council during the Persian wars. It must have served also for musical and theatrical representations, before the construction of the large hellenistic theatre next to it (Marchetti 1994, 134; Piérart and Touchais 1996, 52). The structure belongs to the period of building activity that took place between 460 and 440, when Argos established a democracy.

The area was transformed into an odeon during the roman period.

---

**Argos, Efstratiadhis-Delis Plot: Párodhos Theátrou**

*Courbin 1980, 85-92.*

**Greek Name.** ΕΥΣΤΡΑΤΙΑΔΗΣ, Α.-ΝΤΕΛΗΣ, ΕΘ., Πάροδος Θεάτρου

**City map reference.** Square 23. Sondage 8.

**Location.** On Párodhos Theátrou.


**Comments.** Votive deposits testify to the presence of cult activity in the area.
Greek Name. Λάρισα (Δ. Πρόποδες), Δ. της οδού Γούναρη


Location. Foot of the Larisa, between the road of the Deiras to the north and Goúnari Street to the east, in sector dsheta.


Finds. The excavators found a votive deposit of small bases and archaic figurines (seated females, horses and riders, dogs, rams, etc.) similar to the finds from the French School excavations of 1956 (EF 1957, 673-677) to the east of the theatre (Daux 1959b, fig. 16).

Comments. The results of these excavations seem to indicate the presence of cult activity nearby.

Greek Name. ΓΚΡΑΝΙΑ, Αφοί, Οδός Γούναρη (δίπλα Θέατρο)


Location. North, at the foot of the theatre, in the area between Goúnari Street and the theatre, in the South Quarter (sector gamma).


Features. During the excavation they found a small square construction in rough polygonal masonry, with a door to the south. Under the south wall of this structure was a small oblong tumulus. It covered a pit in which were found two turtle shells, probably from lyres, sherds, and figurines (EF 1957, figs. 16-17).

Archaic houses were constructed all around; but only a few corners of dry masonry have survived. The floors were made of beaten earth or gravel. Traces of fire indicate many phases.
A few tombs were situated nearby. The opening of a funerary *pithos* was surmounted by a cylindrical opening, filled with clay (EF 1957, fig. 24). Other tombs were of children buried in a cauldron and in a krater (EF 1957, fig. 25). A cist tomb with a second funerary cauldron was also found. Altogether five skeletons of the sixth century were found. Four of them were of children under ten years of age.

**Finds.** Masses of ceramic and some animal horns and bones were found in the pit where the two turtle shell lyres had been placed. These include a large krater, small intact *kalathoi*, cups, Corinthian *skyphoi*, many fragments of Attic *skyphoi* with figurative decoration, an Attic bf *lekythos* of c. 510, Argive bf *skyphoi* and two *krateriskoi* with female or animal figures, spools, female and animal (bird) terracotta figurines, and a lamp (EF 1956b, 366; 1957, 673-674, figs. 18-22; Courbin 1980, 111, figs. 17-20).

Two bg *oinochoai* were found in the cist tomb.

**Comments.** The square underground chamber has been interpreted as a *heroön*. It dates to the late sixth-early fifth century. This area was originally associated with the cult of Apollo Lykios, but now has been re-attributed to that of Zeus.

---

**Argos. Boudheri Plot: Párodhos Theátrou 44**

Dheilaki 1977, 113.

**Greek Name.** ΜΠΟΥΔΕΡΗ, Γ., Πάροδος Θεάτρου 44

**City map reference.** Square 23. Sondage 203.

**Location.** On Párodhos Theátrou, at number 44.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforéia rescue excavations, 1972.

**Finds.** An archaic animal *figurine* was found here.

---

**Argos. Piliou-Zakharaki-Renta Plot: Párodhos Asklpioú 23**


**Greek Name.** ΠΗΛΙΟΥ, ΖΑΧΑΡΑΚΗ, ΠΕΝΤΑ, Πάροδος Ασκληπιού 23

**City map reference.** Square 23. Sondage 212.

**Location.** At 23 Asklpioú Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforéia rescue excavations, 1972.

**Finds.** Many sherds were found in a large well. A compact layer yielded many iron fragments, some of which I assume were archaic.
Comments. This was a workshop area in the archaic/classical period. Since the compact layer was not associated with the workshop, the excavator suggests that it belonged to a sanctuary.

Argos. Gavrilou Plot: Párodhos Goúnari

Greek Name. ΓΑΒΗΛΟΥ, Π., Πάροδος Γούναρη
Location. On Párodhos Goúnari.
Find. Many moulds of figurines from the sixth and fifth centuries, together with iron fragments in a compact layer, were found here.
Comments. This area is probably to be associated with the previous workshop area.

Argos. Theatre Area
Vollgraff 1932-33, 231-238.
EF 1955b, 317; 1956b, 386, 391.
Aupert et al. 1982, 647.

City map reference. Square 23.
Location. In the area of the theatre, on the slopes of the Larisa.
Excavation. French School excavations.
Features. Excavators found traces of a circular hearth. In the north parados of the theatre they found a strange sort of favissa, roughly square, oriented east-west, built out of reused column drums and roughly packed stones.

An unsuccessful attempt was made to locate the wall supposed to exist on the south side of the koilon marking the theatre’s extreme limit. In one of the tests, part of a sixth and fifth century cemetery was found, including two archaic burial urns. The cemetery had been buried under the make-up for the south side of the koilon (Pariente, Aupert, and Moretti [J.-C.] 1989, 721).
Find. Between the walls of the favissa were found nearly 700 fragmentary figurines, about 300 miniature vases, and a few moulds of various dates ranging from the third
quarter of the sixth century to the third century. These finds resemble those found by Courbin (EF 1957, 674) to the east near the modern road, i.e. in a pit constructed of small stones with classical finds, especially figurines, inside it (Aupert et al. 1982, 647; Abadie et al. 1983, 839-840, figs. 1-2).

In Hall G the excavators found a foot of an Attic cup inscribed with the name ΨΑΕΝΙΟ (c. 500-480).

With the archaic urn burials they found a tripod pyxis, a pyxis with a concave lid, and two miniature skypoi (Argos Mus.: inv.88.54.1-2; Pariente, Aupert, and Moretti [J.-C.] 1989, figs. 27-29). The second burial contained another tripod pyxis into which was placed a miniature skyphos (Argos Mus.: inv.88.58.1-4; Pariente, Aupert, and Moretti [J.-C.] 1989, figs. 25-26).

In a well (2) dug in the rock at the level of the seating area, Vollgraff (1933) found an archaic inscription (c. 475-450) on the lip of a small bronze vase: 'I belong to Erasinos of Argos.'

Under the modern road was recovered a lot of domestic pottery and some fragments of sixth to fourth century fine ware, including a fragment of archaic rf pottery and a lamp of the first half or the mid-fifth century (EF 1955b, 317, figs. 14-15).

About 6 m east of the theatre's stage (on the west side) were found sherds similar to those from the clearing of the theatre. These include bf sherds, bowls, scales, conical weights, and spools, all thrown there after the construction of the wall (EF 1956b, 386). More archaic pottery, including some rare sherds of sixth century Korinthos, came from a sondage in the cavea of the theatre (EF 1956b, 386, 391).

**Comments.** We can conclude about the hearth area that it was associated with the small pit discovered in 1981 immediately to the south of the orthostats. The large deposit in the north parodos of the theatre might be a rubbish dump for a workshop, but it was more likely a favissa, where votive objects were buried. Perhaps the favissa was built in the second century. The implication is that in this zone was once a sanctuary. If the inscription was found in situ, as the excavator believes, it attests to a cult of Erasinos river in this area from the early fifth century (Moretti [J.-C.] 1998, 239).
**City map reference.** Square 23.

**Locations.** At the north street and the small square of the theatre.

**Excavation.** French School excavations.

**Features.** The excavators discovered an archaic road. The east extremity of this road was found under the modern street, and the south-east angle lies under Gounari Street to modern Tripolis. The west extremity goes towards the small square, which opens on the south *parodos* and the back of the theatre’s stage.

**Finds.** Only one archaic sherd was found in association with the archaic road.

**Comments.** This must have been the ancient road to Neméa and Tripolís, following the modern Tripóleos Street.

---

**Argos. Karmoyianni Plot: Agora**

Aupert et al. 1978, 788.
Touchais 1987, 530.
Piérart et al. 1987, 595.
Catling 1987, 18.
Piérart 1991b, 141-144.

**Greek Name.** ΚΑΡΜΟΓΙΑΝΝΗ, Αγόρα

**City map reference.** Squares 23 and 29.

**Location.** At the north-west angle of the ancient agora.

**Excavation.** French School excavations.

**Features.** While digging the septic tanks of the ancient toilets located near the south-east angle of the Karmoyiannis café, the excavators discovered three foundation blocks of the north wall of the hypostyle hall (Pariente, Aupert, and Moretti [J.-C.] 1988, 708). A roughly trapezoidal enclosure 6 m x 2.5 m, defined by nine limestone posts, eight of which were found in situ, enclosed a large pit, covered by a layer of ash and carbonised logs. The posts have on two or three of their faces circular cavities probably used for inserting a double barrier of wood (Piérart et al. 1987, 530; Catling 1987, 18; Pariente 1992, 195ff.).
**Finds.** In the area of the ancient toilets the excavators came across an abundance of archaic material. The north-west post of the trapezoidal enclosure has a sixth century inscription: έγγυς τον ευ χριβαίς (Piérart et al. 1987, fig. 16; Catling 1987, fig. 35).

Inside the North Stoa in Karmoyianni Plot in sectors AM 76-7/AL-AM 78 the excavators found a single fragment of a Corinthian oinochoe with an inscription in the Corinthian alphabet. Also in the North Stoa were found many architectural fragments, of which some bear traces of fire: under-cover tiles of the mid-sixth century, cover-joints of the fifth century, classical sima, and so forth (Piérart, Pariente, and Touchais 1991, 674, 679).

In the area of the Byzantine disturbance on its north side, among the deeper deposits of the pillared room, was a level of archaic material (Catling 1989, 25).

**Comments.** The reused posts were originally part of a fence around a sculptural group in the archaic agora. This complex implies that the site may lie within the epiphanestatos topos of Argos. Identified as a heroon, dating to the mid-sixth century, the structure referred to the seven fallen heroes who fought against Thebai and the their epigones.

It was thought that the temple of Apollo Lykios was situated in this area, but excavations have proved this theory incorrect. Instead the excavators have found a major structure, some sort of orchestra (forthcoming in Études Pélop. XI).

---

**Argos, Syrengelas-Kolovos Plot: Odhós Theátrou**


**Greek Name.** ΣΥΡΕΝΓΕΛΑΣ-ΚΟΛΟΒΟΣ, Οδός Θεάτρου

**City map reference.** Square 24. Sondage 13.

**Location.** On Theátrou Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforia rescue excavations.

**Comments.** Votive deposits suggest cult activity in the area.

---

**Argos, Raptis Plot: Between Odhós Feidhonos and Roússou**

Daux 1961, 675.

Alexandri 1962, 93.

**Greek Name.** ΡΑΠΤΗΣ, Οδός Φειδώνος/Ρούσσου

**City map reference.** Square 24. Sondage 75.

**Location.** Between Feidhonos and Emm. Roússou Streets.

Features. Nine tombs dating from the geometric to the hellenistic period were found here (Alexandri 1962, 93). One was archaic and had a funerary vase holding two skulls on the outside of the tomb (Daux 1961, 675; Alexandri 1962, 93).

Finds. One tomb contained about thirty-five bf vases, of which one depicts Apollo. The tomb with the funerary vase held a Corinthian pyxis (Daux 1961, 675; Alexandri 1962, 93).

Archos. Plati-Zisi-Diamanti-Xixi Plot: Odhos Danaou 27 A-10-45

French 1993, 16.
Onasoglou 1990, 88.

Greek Name. ΠΛΑΤΗ, Γ., ΖΗΣΗ, Γ., ΞΗΣΗ, Δ., ΔΙΑΜΑΝΤΗ, Η., Οδός Δαναού


Location. Part of the Public School (Δημοτικό Σχολείο), at 27 Danaou Street.


Finds. The lower levels of the excavation produced the following: a late archaic/early classical deposit with over 2000 painted kyathoi and an (sacred?) amphora inscribed ϛοσαν or ϛοσαμ (French 1993, 16).

Comments. Deposits of this size presumably come from a shrine.

Archos. Tsouloukhas Plot: Danaou 59 A-10-46

Kritzas 1979, 220.

Greek Name. ΤΣΟΥΛΟΥΧΑΣ, Αθ., Οδός Δαναού 59

City map reference. Squares 24 and 30. Sondage 244.

Location. At 59 Danaou Street.


Finds. Archaic pottery was found, including a late archaic Corinthian pithos with animal zones and sphinxes.
**Greek Name.** ΑΝΑΓΝΩΣΤΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ, Οδός Κοφινιώτου

**City map reference.** Square 25.

**Location.** On Kofiniótou Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia rescue excavations, 1991.

**Features.** An archaic burial *pithos*, 1 m by 0.70 m, was found here.

- A fifth century well was excavated in the south part of the plot.
- Another well was found with a huge amount of sherds from late eighth to early seventh centuries. These sherds were wastes from an archaic kiln nearby.

**Finds.** Outside the *pithos* they found a miniature hand-made *prochous*.

The sherds from the well will be important in establishing a good pottery sequence for the archaic period.

**Comments.** This was an area of ceramic workshops.

---

**Greek Name.** ΕΤΠΑΚΑ, Οδός Αγ. Γεωργίου


**Location.** At 3 Ayiou Yeoryiou Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia rescue excavations, 1972.

**Features.** The Greek Archaeological Service found two archaic *pithos* burials and a third grave with an archaic and hellenistic phase. The offerings all belong to the hellenistic reuses.

**Comments.** The use of archaic *pithoi* for hellenistic burials is well known.

---

**Greek Name.** Δήμος (Εργα Ο.Τ.Ε.), Αγ. Γεωργίου

**City map reference.** Square 28. Sondage 242.

**Location.** On Ayiou Yeoryiou Street, close to number 4.
Excavation. Greek Efareia rescue excavations, 1973, when OTE was digging trenches for their cables.

Features. A late archaic tomb was covered by two slabs and was 1.7 m deep with a pebble floor. The skeleton was lying with its head to the west.

Finds. Inside the tomb they found a krateriskos.

Argos. Boubourekas Plot: Odhos Ayiou Yeoryiou 44

Greek Name. ΜΠΟΥΜΠΟΥΡΕΚΑ, Γ., Οδός Αγ. Γεωργίου 44


Location. At Ayiou Yeoryiou Street 44.


Features. Graves of the sixth century were found here.

Comments. This area was in constant use from geometric to roman times.

Argos. South-west of Odeon: Public School Number 5
EF 1957, 683.
Daux 1967b, 808, 817, 825.
EFA 1968, 192-194.
Courbin 1974, 146.
Foley 1988, 208.

Greek Name. Δημοτικό Σχολείο (5), Πάροδος Αγ. Γεωργίου


Location. At the foot of the Larisa in the area of the public square, east of Kypseli, about 150 m south-west of the odeon.


Features. A seventh century pithos burial was found here with several others, all empty. One held the bones of an infant.

The excavators found two tombs, without offerings, but which dated to the beginning of the sixth century (Daux 1967b, 817).

To the east many bronze age levels had been destroyed by a dense cemetery dating from the archaic to the hellenistic period. Over fifty graves had been used continuously from the geometric to the hellenistic period. A cist grave (T 223) was found dating to the early sixth century. It had been opened and reused, and in later times was
cut in two by a hellenistic wall. The grave goods belong to the first inhumation. Tomb 248 was also a pit, but it had been protected by three slabs, and held a child’s skeleton with offerings inside and outside the tomb. Another burial, pithos T 225, contained three skeletons. A simple pit without cover slabs (T 228) contained a skeleton and two offerings with an interesting association.

**Finds.** Many sherds from all periods, including archaic, were recovered from the tombs. T 223 included eight miniature vases (skyphos) of the mid-Corinthian period, see Daux 1967b, fig. 24), a shallow bronze bowl, four iron horse bits, and a pair of iron sandals. Pithos T 225 had a Corinthian alabaster (Daux 1967b, fig. 27). Tomb 228 contained a pyxis and a rf Attic lekythos of about 460 (Daux 1967b, fig. 28). Tomb 248 included three cups with feet, an amphoriskos, a miniature krater, a skyphos, and a cup (Daux 1967b, figs. 29-30). At the same spot the excavators also found an archaic layer and recovered a fragment of bf pottery with incised heads of horses (Daux 1967b, 808).

---

**Argos, Symeonidhis Plot: Othós Menándrou and Polyeíkous**  
A-10-52

Spathari 1996, 93-95.

**Greek Name.** ΣΥΜΕΩΝΙΔΗΣ, Οδός Μενάνδρου/Πολυείκους

**City map reference.** Square 28.

**Location.** At the corner of Menándrou and Polyeíkous Streets, 400 m south of the south slopes of Larisa, north of national gym.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforia rescue excavations, 1990-91.

**Features.** The Greek Archaeological Service found more than seventy graves of the sixth, fifth, and fourth centuries in this area.

Cist graves with multiple burials were dated from the end of the sixth century to the hellenistic period.

Burials in urn-type graves were found facing east-west; they date to the end of the sixth century.

**Finds.** Several late sixth century grave offerings were found in the cist and urn burials. Archaic vases were found mixed in with hellenistic burials.

**Comments.** The area was used as a cemetery from late archaic to late hellenistic times (see next two entries, North of National Gym and Orphanage at Ayía Sotira). The variety and richness of the offerings reflect the socio-economic situation of the inhabitants of Argos at this time.
**Argos. North of National Gym**

Kharitonidhes 1968, 128-130.
Krystalli 1968, 172.
Protonotariou-Dhelaki 1972a, 155.
Dhelaki-Protonotariou 1974, 78-79.
Hågg 1974, 143.
Courbin 1977b, 327.
Foley 1988, 213.

**Greek Name.** Εθνικό Γυμναστήριο Άργους, ΝΔ. της πόλης

**City map reference.** Squares 28 and 35. Sondage 104.

**Location.** In the same area as the Frangos Plot, north of the National Gym and north-west of the city centre.


**Features.** The Greek Archaeological Service found two seventh century *pithos* burials as well as a fifth century *cist grave*.

**Finds.** In the grave were bg pots, one of which was inscribed with a *graffito* to *exvía*.

---

**Argos. At Ayía Sotíra**


**Greek Name.** Αγ. Σωτήρα

**City map reference.** Not on map.

**Location.** At the old people’s home (or the orphanage ?) at Ayía Sotíra and in the south part of Árgos, close to the road to Trípolis, which follows the ancient road to Tegea.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforia excavations.

**Features.** An archaic *grave* made from *poros* slabs held the body of a dead person and the body of a child, which was inserted at a later time.

**Finds.** In the first grave they found eighteen Attic, thirty-seven Corinthian (small *kotylai*, *pyxides* and *tripods*), and a few Argive *pots* of the late sixth and early fifth centuries. The Attic ware was mass produced bg pottery; one shows a scene of Herakles and Hephaistos. The Argive ware was locally made with simple plant decoration in red or white. One *pyxis* was from Laconia, but was a copy of a Corinthian type. The mid-fifth century vase probably belonged to the later child burial. Apparently two early pots were family heirlooms.

This grave also contained many *figurines* of the seventh and sixth centuries.
Argos. Bakaloviannis Plot: South of Baths  
Courbin 1956a, 183-218; 1974, 52; 1977b, 327.  
Foley 1988, 201.

Greek Name. ΜΠΙΑΚΑΛΟΓΙΑΝΝΗΣ, Γ. Δ., Νότια των Δουτρών

City map reference. Square 29. Sondage 54.

Location. South of the bath complex.

Excavation. French School rescue excavations, 1953.

Features. Two cylindrical pithoi of the seventh century were found here.

Finds. Under a classical road (6) were found archaic remains of pottery, probably coming from the foundation trenches of an older wall (Courbin 1956a, 204-207, figs. 22-23, 26-27).

A hellenistic well in this area contained geometric and archaic pottery, including an Argive krater of the seventh century, fragments of rf pottery, and remains of two Attic bell kraters of the second quarter of the fifth century, one of which was painted by Hermonax and shows the Minotaur fighting Theseus with a young girl (Ariadne ?) standing there ready to crown the victor (EF 1956b, 370-372, fig. 18).

Under a foundation trench of a hellenistic wall was found a Corinthian pithos with stamped decoration (lion, lioness, bird, and griffin).

Argos. Kouros Plot: Odhós Tripóleos 11  
Alexandri 1965, 60.  
Daux 1963a, 748-751.  
Touchais 1977, 549.

Greek Name. ΚΟΥΡΟΣ, Π., Οδός Τριπόλεως

City map reference. Square 29. Sondage 82.

Location. South of the ancient theatre, parallel to 11 Tripóleos Street.


Features. A fifth century grave (14) was discovered here, which was part of a series of graves discovered in the area. This grave was 175 cm long, oriented north-south, and contained two disturbed skeletons with heads facing north.

Finds. Many finds were recovered from the grave, including seven late Corinthian pyxides, seven Corinthian kotylai, an Attic vessel, three Argive copies of Attic and
Corinthian imports, a *kylix*, a *lekythos*, and various *figurines*. The *kotylai* date the grave to the late fifth century; however, many figurines are earlier in date.

**Argos, Bonoris Plot: Odhós Tripóleos 7b**

Kharitonidhes 1968, 127-128.  
Touchais 1980, 590-618.  

**Greek Name.** ΜΠΟΝΩΡΗΣ, Οδός Τριπόλεως 7β

**City map reference.** Square 29. Sondage 87.  
**Location.** At 7b Tripóleos Street, now in the courtyard of the Fifth Ephorate for Byzantine Antiquities.  
**Features.** Beneath a roman imperial house with mosaic floors lay a fifth century *poros* structure, which may be a shrine or an altar (Touchais 1980, 599).  
**Finds.** The excavators found a large votive deposit, including *figurines*, *wreaths*, *spools*, stamped *loom-weights*, *kotylai*, and other *pottery* (Touchais 1980, 599). A sherd was inscribed *he[ga ...]*

Some blocks of the fifth century structure had *mason’s marks* on them. Lion-head simas and other architectural features were also found.  
**Comments.** The area was sacred by the early archaic period (seventh century), and the structure was perhaps the sanctuary of Hera Antheia, in, or close to, the agora (Foley 1988, 141; Hall [J.] 1995a, 605).

**Argos, Palaiologos Plot: Párodhos Tripóleos**

EF 1955b, 312.  
Daux 1967a, 802.

**Greek Name.** ΠΑΛΑΙΟΛΟΓΟΣ, Χρ., Πάροδος Τριπόλεως  
**City map reference.** Square 29. Sondage 106.  
**Location.** In Su 74, near Kypseli Square.  
**Excavation.** French School rescue excavations, 1966.  
**Features.** The excavators found a terracotta conduit dating to the archaic period (Daux 1967b, 808).
Greek Name. Δήμος (Πλατεία Κυψέλης), Συνοικισμός

City map reference. Square 29. Sondages 133, 149 and 151.

Location. South-west of the ancient agora, in the South Quarter, formerly called the Refugee Quarter, to the north-west of the modern cemetery of the Tripolis road.


Features. Around 700, or in the first decades of the seventh century, a building was excavated near walls U and AU. The dimensions of this building, the care given to its construction, and the large blocks used, assure us that this was an important structure. Its socle was found in situ; over it was perhaps a mudbrick construction, which may have had a roof.

Wells and seventh century tombs (T.315, 318, 319) are probably associated with this building (Bommelaer and Grandjean 1972, 226). Some seven other seventh century tombs were found in this area. Four of these were in pithoi, two were in other types of funerary jars, one was in a pit, and two (late seventh century ones) were actually poros graves.

Finds. Along the north side of wall U and between this wall and wall C, they found many pots in fragmentary state: lipped cups (inv. C.23536, 23529, 24041), other fragments of vases of unknown shape, an inscription, χι, on a fragment of a lip (inv.70/271), a local bg cup (inv. C.26582), krateriskos fragments (inv.70/287), and spools (inv. C.26558) (Bommelaer and Grandjean 1972, 178, figs. 26, 28-32).

One of the pithoi (T 318) contained a pitcher. The two poros graves had pins wrapped in gold leaves, fragments of a terracotta plaque, and four early Corinthian pots.

Comments. The building was identified as a small shrine, with a ceramic workshop nearby.
**Argos. Theatre and Agora Area: Párodhos Tripóleos**

Touchais 1978, 664.
Kritzas 1976, 195.

**Greek Name.** Δήμος (έργα υδρεύσης), Πάροδος Τριπόλεως

**City map reference.** Square 29. Sondage 164.

**Location.** Near the theatre and the agora, on one side of Tripóleos Street, across from number 6a.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía rescue excavations, 1971.

**Features.** The excavators found one archaic tomb here and a grave monument in poros dating to the end of the sixth century.

**Finds.** The monument covered secondary inhumations and was filled with an abundance of ceramic material (Touchais 1978, fig. 49). The tomb had eleven pyxides with lids and two kyathiskoi.

---

**Argos. Kanellopoulou Plot: Oδhός Tripóleos 26**

Kritzas 1977, 132-134.
Touchais 1978, 644.
Foley 1988, 218.
Pariente 1992, 205.
Antonacci 1995, 212-213.

**Greek Name.** ΚΑΝΕΛΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΥ, Ι., Οδός Τριπόλεως 26

**City map reference.** Square 29. Sondage 187.

**Location.** In the south sector of the city, at 26 Tripóleos Street, east of the south cemetery.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía excavations, 1972.

**Features.** A child grave of unspecified type, dated to the late seventh-early sixth centuries was found here (Kritzas 1977, 132).

The most important remains were that of a rectangular sekos made of excellently cut and fitted limestone poros blocks, whose north wall was set over a plaque covering a geometric tomb. The floor was paved with poros chips and had small pits or holes into which were inserted skulls and other bones, as well as dedications transported from primary burials elsewhere. One skull was found inside a pot. The construction dates to the late sixth century (Kritzas 1977, 132).

**Finds.** A large amount of pottery (about 150 vessels) was recovered, and of good quality Corinthian, Attic, and bg local ware. Kotylai were the most common, though there were...
also many *pyxides*, Attic *lekythoi*, Corinthian *oinochoai* and *skyphoi*, Attic *kylikes* with scenes of Herakles wrestling a lion, and a Corinthian *plate* with Herakles fighting Triton. Many *lamps*, *bone pins*, bronze *blades*, drilled *knucklebones*, iron *handles*, *shield straps*, and fittings for the soles of boots or heavy *sandals* were found between the skulls. Also found were *plates*, *hoofs of animals*, *marble figurines*, and a terracotta *male* with lyre (Kritzas 1977, 132-133, pls. 116, 118, 119-120).

**Comments.** This area became the focus of a cult in the late sixth century. It was probably where young warriors were buried. The structure is unique for Argos. It has been identified as a *heroön*, dating from the mid-sixth century (Pariente 1992, 205).

---

**Argos. Kotsomyti Plot: Odhós Tripóleos 19**

Kritzas 1979, 212-249, esp. 226.
Touchais 1980, 596.

**Greek Name.** ΚΩΤΣΟΜΥΤΗ, Π., Οδός Τριπόλεως 19

**City map reference.** Square 29. Sondage 238.

**Location.** At 19 Tripóleos Street on the road to Trípolis, in front of Kypseli Square, opposite the Kanellopoulou Plot.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforía rescue excavations, 1973.

**Finds.** Under hellenistic remains was found votive material of the late archaic period, including *sherds* and *figurines*.

**Comments.** The votive material suggests the existence of a cult *place* close-by, but the area could not be excavated because of the modern buildings.

---

**Argos. Florou Plot: Párodhos Theátrou 12**

Kritzas 1979, 212-217.
Barakari-Gleni and Pariente 1998, 166.

**Greek Name.** ΦΛΩΡΟΥ, Ευ., Πάροδος Θεάτρου 12

**City map reference.** Square 29. Sondage 239.

**Location.** On Párodhos Theátrou, at number 12.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforía rescue excavations, 1973-1975.
**Features.** In the south part of the excavation, the Greek Archaeological Service found an archaic level of hard soil and pebbles that is probably an ancient road used in classical and hellenistic times, if not before (Kritzas 1979, 214).

**Finds.** A archaic bronze *phiale* was found in a tomb here.

---

*Argos. Aphrodision: South Quarter*  
*A-10-64*

Croissant 1972, 137-154.  
Croissant and Aupert 1973, 475-500.  
Coulton 1976.  
Croissant 1983.  
Foley 1988, 141.  
Piérart and Touchais 1996, 53.

**City map reference.** Square 29.

**Location.** Over an area of middle helladic habitation in the South Quarter of the city, south of the odeon.

**Excavation.** French School excavations.

**Features.** The visible temple dates to the late fifth century, but the remains of a small roughly worked foundation probably belong to an earlier temple or altar. These foundations were incorporated into those of the classical temple that followed it around the middle of the fifth century. The original temple was a small building, 13.4 m x 6.2 m, comprised of a *pronaos in antis* and a *cella* (Daux 1968, 1021-1039; Piérart and Touchais 1996, 53). Two of the foundation blocks of the east façade of the earlier temple’s *pronaos* had mason’s mark: E and N (Daux 1969, 966, fig. 15).

A rectangular terrace about 9 m was built around the earlier temple. It must have followed an ancient orientation, probably that of the road, which came from the *agora* (Croissant et al. 1975, 609). The terrace was partly destroyed by the fifth century construction of the new temple, yet it was also partly preserved, at least to the east, as a landing for access to the main façade of this temple (Daux 1968, 1000-1002; Piérart and Touchais 1996, 53).

A rectangular altar also belongs to the period of the old temple. It measures 1.75 m wide and 6 m long, and is located a few metres in front of the east façade of the temple.
It was built on a terrace and both constructions have been dated to the mid-sixth century (EFA 1970, 122).

In the sanctuary of Aphrodite are the remains of a late sixth century stoa, similar to the one built on the akropolis at Sparta, which is more firmly dated to the sixth century. It is a one-aisled stoa facing north-east, with a length over 20 m and a depth of about 4.30 m. The foundation slabs for a colonnade and a terrace wall to retain the floor and carry the rear wall are visible.

To the north of the sanctuary the excavators found part of an archaic wall made out of the same material as the stoa wall. It was parallel to the roman peribolos wall cleared in 1973 on the south side of the staircase to the Aliaia. The archaic wall must have served both as the north limit of the temenos and as the retaining wall for the staircase to the Aliaia (EFA 1979, 261).

**Finds.** Discarded offerings from the temple of Aphrodite include miniature vases and figurines from the mid-sixth to the end of the fifth century. The figurines and the miniature vases are similar to those found at the Heraion and at Perakhora: votive cups with or without handles, krateriskoi, oinochoai, and miniature amphorae (Daux 1968, 1025-1029, figs. 11, 16, 18-23; and 1969, 996, figs. 19-27; EFA 1969, 143-144; and 1970, 122, pl. 112b; Croissant 1983, pls. 123, 129-133, 141, 143).

The pottery reflects the activity of the Attic and especially Corinthian workshops of the second half of the fifth century: oinochoai, skyphoi, kalathoi, miniature lekythoi are the most common shapes. The sixth century is less well represented in the pottery, though one of the most important pieces is a sixth century Attic stamnos with an inscription to Aphrodite [ανες ταυπο ναγιαντα]. The name of the goddess was also found on four more sherds, making the identity of the sanctuary very certain (Daux 1968, 1027-1028, fig. 15).

Terracotta figurines of females and animals were the most numerous offerings, the majority of which seem to have been produced in local Argive workshops (Foley 1988, 141).

**Metal objects** were extremely scarce here, in sharp contrast to the Heraion. These include a bronze phiale and mirror and a miniature gold figurine of the mid-fifth century. There was also a great number of bronze and terracotta rings found here (Daux 1968, 1028-1030, figs. 16, 22-3, 25; and 1969, 996-1012, figs. 20, 28, 23; EFA 1969, 143-144).

Under the pronaos of the fifth century temple was found a small foundation deposit consisting of miniature vases and figurines, dating back to the early sixth or late
seventh century. These offerings probably come from the destruction of an earlier temple (EFA 1970, 122).

In an area near the stoa a considerable quantity of sherds, miniature vases, and figurines were apparently discarded after a cleaning operation in the sanctuary. The lot can be dated to the last quarter of the sixth century, with older pieces, one of which is the interesting series of moulded lead miniature figurines (Croissant and Aupert 1973, 476-479, figs. 5-8). More lead figurines were found in following years (Croissant, Aupert, and Piérart 1974, 761; EFA 1979, 259).

Comments. All these offerings prove the existence of a previous cult in this place. If there was at the end of the seventh century already a cult building here, it must have been a simple oikos, isolated within scant enclosures (Daux 1969, 1002; Foley 1988, 141). Then the fifth century temple to Aphrodite was built.

The series of moulded lead figurines can be well distinguished from that of the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia in Sparta and could well represent the production of a local workshop.

Argos, Agora
Tomlinson 1972, 21-22.
Croissant et al. 1975, 705.
Aupert et al. 1982, 640.
Touchais 1986, 688.
Pariente et al. 1986, 764.
Catling 1986, 26; 1987, 18.
Aupert 1987, 511-517.
Piérart and Thalmann 1990, 97.
Piérart and Thalmann 1992, 125.
Marchetti 1994, 136-137.
Piérart and Touchais 1996, 47-51.
Pariente, Piérart, and Thalmann 1998, 212.
Barakari-Gleni and Pariente 1998, 166.

City map reference. Square 29.

Location. Across the street from the site of the theatre, south-east of the large stoa, in sector alpha.

Excavation. French School excavations.

Features. A large canal (EA), descending from the north to the roman gate on the Tsiramenes Plot, was the first construction in the agora at the end of the archaic period; it
permitted the drainage of a huge zone prone to floods. It was oriented north-south, open-air, paved, and over 4 m wide and about 1.3 m to 1.5 m deep. Its east wall was exposed to a length of about 8 m (in squares BE/BF 95). It was build in rough polygonal masonry. To the south the canal passed about 30 m to the east of the zone that marks Building L. In later times it was covered over and expanded (Piérart and Touchais 1996, 50-1).

The remains of its low-triglyph altar, of the mid-fifth century, and blocks from an entablature of a Doric building that was part of the sanctuary have been found in later constructions, but not the temple itself. This building must be towards the north, from where come the most ancient remains of the agora (Piérart and Touchais 1996, 47-48).

In Square BB 81, under the roman sewers, they found archaic buildings (Piérart and Thalmann 1990, 97). Within the North Stoa as found another level containing archaic buildings (houses ?).

Under the classical stoa, they found remains of archaic settlement (?), which had previously been identified in a neighbouring area (Catling 1986, 26; Piérart and Thalmann 1990, 97).

In Square BG 84 the excavators found traces of an ancient road (known as north road or Theatre road) linking the south part of the agora with the Aphrodision and the theatre-Aliaia ‘à gradins droits’.

Finds. An interesting find from the area of the earlier terrace wall includes a series of small lead weights, marked with various letters (Piérart et al. 1987, 591; Catling 1987, 18; Piérart and Thalmann 1992, 125). At the foot of the terrace wall was found an ostrakon for Αλκανδρος of about 460-450 (Touchais 1986, 688; Catling 1986, 26; Piérart and Thalmann 1990, 97).

The destruction layer at the limit of these sectors (84-85) yielded many bg vases, of which one was an Attic bg cup of 480-460 inscribed on its foot ς[ξηψ ?] το heq[ε]ς (Piérart et al. 1987, fig. 7; Catling 1987, fig. 22). A similar graffito was found in the theatre excavations (see, EF 1956a, 387, fig. 45). Three inscribed lead strips, one of which refers to straw and fodder recalling the commercial activities of this part of the agora, were also recovered in the excavation. Other weights and lead strips were found in layer 7, and they too must come from these archaic levels (Piérart et al. 1987, 591; Catling 1987, 18, fig. 23).

Comments. The overall material has led the archaeologists to conclude that this is not an habitation area but one belonging to the archaic agora (Piérart et al. 1987, 530, 591; Catling 1987, 18).
The orientation of the walls follows two principal directions, which the classical and hellenistic remains also follow. It is thus clear that the major topographic directions of the *agora* were fixed before being set up in the classical period (Pariente, Piérart, and Thalmann 1998, 213).

The canal did not cut in two the *agora* but simply marked its eastern limit.

The discovery of the Attic cup with an inscription to a hero suggests the existence of a *heroic cult place* in the zone of the South Stoa (Pariente 1992, 218 n.171; Barakari-Gleni and Pariente 1998, 166 n12). The votive material, ostrakon (?), weights, and lead strips suggest that a zone of *public or administrative buildings* was annexed to the *agora* as early as the archaic period (Pariente, Piérart, and Thalmann 1998, 213). They formed the southern limit of this public space from the seventh century onwards.

It seems that the roman planning of the doorway near the terrace of Apollo (Bommelaer et al. 1970, 788-793) is a metamorphoses of a monumental archaic *entrance way* to the *agora* that existed since archaic times. This archaic entrance gave access to all those who entered the city by the actual Theátrou Street, or who, coming from the sanctuary of Apollo Pythaeus to the north, followed the terrace of Apollo Lykios from the east (Marchetti 1994, 138).

The triangle that is formed by the north wall of the hypostyle wall and the west side of the terrace of Apollo must correspond to the place dhelta, as Aupert (1987, 513) originally proposed.

The present state of excavations show that the *agora* did not have a square or rectangular shape but had that of an irregular polygonal (Piteros 1998, 198). The excavations have exposed only (1.5 hectares of) the north-west sector of the original *agora* (6 hectares).
City map reference. Square 29.

Location. Between the theatre area and the city centre.

Excavation. French School excavations.

Features. The building is about 32.65 m square, whose roof is held by sixteen equidistant Ionic columns resting on square bases. The façade, facing east, is in the Doric order with fifteen bays in antis. It was parallel to the axis formed by the ancient road that ran along the modern Gounari/Tripoleos from Korinthos to Tegea.

Comments. This building is the most ancient monument so far explored in the agora. It dates to the second half of the fifth century. In plan it is similar but smaller than the council hall at Sikyon. Some see it as functioning as a bouleuterion for the city (des Courtils 1992, 249); others see it as the sanctuary of Artemis Peitho (Paus. 2.21.1; Aupert 1987, 515-516). It also appears ideally situated to be a commemorative monument of Danaos (Marchetti 1994, 134).

Its erection in the 460s coincides with the installation of a democracy at Argos and is thus part of the building activity that took place between 460 and 440 (Piérart and Touchais 1996, 48-49).
City map reference. Square 29.

Locations. Between the theatre area and the city centre.

Excavation. French School excavations.

Features. The fragments of an early fifth century Doric building were found in the hypostyle room. This building is one of the most complete ones found so far in the agora, but its location remains unknown (EF 1953b, 248, 250, 253).

Finds. The fragments of the Doric building include seven architrave blocks, about fifty blocks of the frieze and about eighty drip-stones. The architrave blocks (two complete ones) were stuccoed with care. Their detail and dimension, just as with those of the frieze blocks and the drip-stones, point to the existence of a colonnade. The architrave blocks have holes for bronze nails, which suggest that inscribed bronze plaques were attached to the façade of the building, for public display. The building may have been destroyed during the levelling of the agora or its blocks were transported to a neighbouring sanctuary.

Above the foundation of a wall near the hypostyle room the excavators found a layer, poor in pottery, but containing a few fifth century bg sherds (Aupert et al. 1976, 754).

Comments. The architectural fragments come from the temple of Apollo Lykios, now thought to be situated in the south-east corner of the agora (Piteros 1998, 198). Part of the evidence for this sanctuary rests in an inscribed fifth century altar found in the north-west part of the agora (Roux 1953, 119-123; des Courtils 1981, 607-610).
Features. The excavators uncovered a late sixth century stoa. It probably had a poros colonnade. The structure and dimensions of the stoa may never be fully known. So far, to judge from the foundations, the minimum number of columns amounts to ten. The only column that may have belonged to the stoa was found reused in a roman building; it was a fragment of an unfluted drum.

Comments. The stoa must have been part of the programme designed to enlarge the sanctuary.

Argos. Koros Plot: Odhós Atréos and Párodhos Theátrou A-10-69
Dheilaki 1977, 119; 1979, 208-209.
Touchais 1978, 644; 1980, 596.

Greek Name. ΚΩΡΟΣ, Σ., Οδός Ατρέως


Location. At Atréos Street and Párodhos Theátrou, on the east side of the agora.


Features. During the excavation of the classical temple discovered on Atréos Street, architectural elements dating from the mid-fifth century were found.

The ancient road that passes through the Florou Plot continues here.

Finds. An important archaic inscription was found reused as a boundary stone of the roman agora.

Archaic pottery and mudbrick were found in the layers under the classical temple.

Comments. This was an area of cult activity in the archaic period, and perhaps also the area of an archaic sanctuary (Consolaki and Hackens 1988, 282). Dheilaki (1977, 119) proposes to see this area as the sanctuary to Hera Antheia or Demeter Pelasgia, but Touchais (1978, 789-790) believes that this is the place where Athena Salpix was worshipped. The attribution is founded on a nearby inscription mentioning the goddess.

Argos. Sirouni Plot: Párodhos Theátrou 5 A-10-70
Dheilaki 1977, 113.

Greek Name. ΣΙΡΟΥΝΗ, Α., Πάροδος Θεάτρου 5

City map reference. Square 30. Sondage 201.

Location. On Párodhos Theátrou, at number 5.

Features. The Greek Archaeological Service found a burial pot here together with remains from archaic to Christian times.

Finds. A small krater was found inside the grave.

Argos. Kotsiantis Plot: Πάροδhos Danaóu

Kritzas 1979, 222.

Greek Name. ΚΩΤΣΙΑΝΤΗΣ, Χρ., Πάροδος Δαναού


Location. On Párodhos Danaóu, in the north-east part of the town.


Finds. The Greek Archaeological Service found many archaic sherds and figurines at geometric levels. In a pit about 5 m deep they found seated and standing female figurines, horse-riders with shields, and animals figurines, together with animal bone and horns of sheep and deer.

Comments. The deposit made them think that this was a cult place since at least the geometric period. Perhaps Hera and some hero were worshipped here, or possibly even Aphrodite and Ares.

Argos. Maniati Plot: Odhós Atréos

Kritzas 1979, 212-214.

Foley 1988, 142.

Greek Name. ΜΑΝΙΑΤΗ, Β., Οδός Ατρέως

City map reference. Square 30. Sondage 249.

Location. On Atréos Street.


Comments. The area shows signs of cult activity in archaic times.

Argos. Tsougkriani Plot: Corner of Odhós Atréos and Danaóu

Kritzas 1979, 228.

Greek Name. ΤΣΟΥΓΚΡΙΑΝΗ, Κ., Οδός Ατρέως/Δαναού

**Location.** On the corner of Atréos and Danaú Streets.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía rescue excavations, 1973.

**Finds.** Above the geometric layers was found archaic **votive material**, including twelve **figurines** with some fragments of females, horse-riders, birds, and other animals.

**Comments.** Probably the area was a geometric cemetery, where **worshipping** went on until the end of the hellenistic period. The votive deposit testifies to the presence of **cult activity**.

---

**Argos. Pouli Plot: Corner of Odhós Atréos and Danaú**

Morou 1988, 110.

**Greek Name.** ΠΟΥΛΗ, Δ και Π., Οδός Ατρέως/Δαναού

**City map reference.** Square 30. Sondage 295.

**Location.** At the corner of Atréos and Danaú Streets.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía rescue excavations, 1981.

**Finds.** An archaic level containing **sherds** was found here.

**Comments.** Perhaps there are archaic **tombs** in the area.

---

**Argos. Foustoukos Plot: Odhós Kaváfi and Messínias-Arkadhías**

Piteros 1996, 100-102.

**Greek Name.** ΦΟΥΣΤΟΥΚΟΣ, Οδός Καβάφη/Μεσσηνίας-Αρκαδίας

**City map reference.** Square 31.

**Location.** Kaváfi Street and Párodhos Messínias-Arkadiás.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía excavations, 1991.

**Features.** The Greek Archaeological Service found the bottom part of a late archaic/early classical **kiln** (dia. 50 cm).
**Argos. Fragkou Plot: Across National Gym**

Kharitonidhes 1968, 128-130.
Krystalli 1968, 172.
Papakhristodhoulou 1970a, 110-111.
Michaud 1971, 867.

**Greek Name.** ΦΡΑΓΚΟΥ, Δ., ΝΑ. τον Εθν. Γυμναστ.

**City map reference.** Square 35. Sondage 131.

**Location.** North-east of the National Gym (Stadium).

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia excavations, 1965-1968.

**Finds.** The Greek Archaeological Service found graves dating from the classical and hellenistic period. With the graves there was an archaic inscription on a stele *in situ*. The name inscribed was *hαγιαποθεσ*, the genitive of Hagesis.

---

**Argos. South of Cemetery: Virgin Mary Chapel**

EF 1953b, 258, 260, 263; 1954, 180, 183; 1955b, 312-314.
Beazley 1956, 213.
Leekley and Noyes 1976, 58.
Foley 1988, 212.

**Greek Name.** Νεκροταφείο Παναγίας, Δ.-ΝΔ. του νεκροταφείο

**City map reference.** Square 36. Sondages 50 and 52.

**Location.** West of the *agora*, of the actual south cemetery, and of the chapel of the Dormition of the Virgin Mary.


**Features.** A cemetery ranging from bronze age to roman times with particularly important protogeometric and geometric burials was excavated. The excavators found three small archaic *pithos* burial, intact, closed by a tile, and oriented east-west. They date to the seventh century (EF 1953b, fig. 56).

The excavators also found a non-stratified well near the house of the Refugees (EF 1955b, 312).

**Finds.** On one grave was laid an Attic cup of the late sixth century and an Argive bf cup decorated with two dancing satyrs on the inside. An identical cup, intact, was found inside the *pithos*, with two *pyxides*, one of its lids, a *krater*, and two miniature *skyphoi* dating to the end of the sixth century (EF 1953b, fig. 57).

Among the other discoveries here were number of Corinthian *lekythoi* and *pyxides*, several rf sherds from *hydrias*, bell-kraters, an italiote fragment, and a fragment...
of krater in apulian ‘chalice’. Two masks of female divinities were also recovered. Many lamps of all types were found in all the sondages, of which one is decorated with the episode of Odysseus and Sirens (EF 1954, 180, 183).

The well contained much local bg pottery dating from the end of the seventh century (EF 1955b, 312, fig. 7).

**Argos. Odhós Miaoulí**  
*A-10-78*

Psykhoyiou 1997, 90.

**Greek Name.** Οδός Μιαουλή

**City map reference.** Square 37 ?

**Location.** On Miaouli Street, between Mikras Asias and Platira Street.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforía rescue excavations, 1992.

**Features.** Ten graves were discovered spread throughout this area, but none has been dated to an exact period. Most of them were cist graves, but some of them were small archaic burial pithoi (T. 26, 29, and 31). One of them contained a very tall body.

**Finds.** Close to tombs T. 21 and T. 22 was an archaic krater. Some archaic figurines were found in a cist (either T. 25 or 27).

**Argos. Lembetzi Plot: Párodhos Theátrou**  
*A-10-79*


**Greek Name.** ΑΕΜΠΕΤΖΗΣ, Γ., Πάροδος Θεάτρου

**City map reference.** Square 37. Sondage 292.

**Location.** In the south-west sector of the city, between Atréos Street, Párodhos Danaóú, and Párodhos Theátrou.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforía rescue excavations, 1980-1981.

**Features.** A cist tomb, a large deposit, and a ‘pyre’ were found. The cist tomb was found at a depth of 2.16 m. It contained the one skeleton extended with its head facing west. It was dated to the second quarter of the sixth century.

The votive deposit, 2.30 m deep and 1 m in diameter was partly covered by roman ruins. It was used from the early archaic years until the late classical period.

The ‘pyre’ was found in the south-west section of the excavation, under the remains of two hellenistic walls. It was in a 1 m by 1 m pit, about 2.10 to 2.27 m in depth. There were remains of burnt wood, bones, and earth together with many sherds.
Foundations of a large structure, probably a house, date from the archaic period.

**Finds.** Seven Attic vases were deposited on the tomb. One was a bf *kylix*, Siana type (MA 5977), with a scene of Theseus and the Minotaur on one side, and of two hoplites fighting on the other. It was dated to about 560. Another vase (a lydios MA 6104) was lying beside the body’s right shoulder. An *alabaster* (MA 6105) was found by the body’s right hand, together with a Corinthian *kotyle* (MA 6106) by its right knee, and two unpainted *lekythoi* (MA 6107 a-b).

About sixteen Attic bg and bf vases (a *krater*, eleven *kylikes*, a *lekythos*, two *oinochoai*, and a *cup*) were associated with the archaic levels of the ‘pyre’, including a bg *krateriskos* with Gorgon heads painted in the handle in the tradition of local Argive *krateriskoi*, which were mainly found in Kourtáki and unpublished votive deposits in Argos.

In the deposit was found Attic and Corinthian pottery, including a Corinthian *skyphos*, and a large number of local bg *krateriskoi*, all ranging in date from the beginning of the archaic period to the end of the classical. Terracotta animal *figurines*, bronze *rings*, and clay models of *wheels* were also found. **Comments.** The ‘pyre’ was associated with libations in honour of the dead. They used the area for worship and burials. The large votive deposit, from the late eighth-early seventh century to the classical period, also testifies to the presence of cult activity.

Probably the grave belonged to a hoplite warrior who did well in a battle, given the subject of the *kylix*.

---

**Argos, Larisa: East Slope**

EF 1956b, 366.
Tomlinson 1972, 24-27.

**Greek Name.** Δάρισα, Ανατολική πλευρά

**City map reference.** Square 83. Sondage 58.

**Location.** In an olive grove on the east slope of the Larisa.

**Excavation.** French School soundings, 1955.

**Features.** The excavators wanted to find the circuit wall, which in its south-west, north-east orientation, linked the akropolis of the Larisa to the gate of the Deíras. Only a few blocks of either the north or south circuit remained in place.
Finds. The sherds found here were unstratified and date between the middle helladic period to roman times.

Comment. Enough is left to suggest that the circuit wall here was similar to better preserved sections of its south-west flank in the Larisa, above the chapel of St. George. The date is still uncertain, but the excavators presume that the structure goes back to the sixth century.

**Argos, Larisa: Summit**

A-10-81
EF 1928, 476; 1955b, 314.
Vollgraff 1928a, 315-328, pls. 7-8; 1932, 369-393; 1934, 137-156; and 1956, 51-76.
Béquignon 1930, 480.
Scranton 1941, 34-35.
Roes 1953, 190-291.
Roux 1957, 474-487.
Courbin 1966, 12, 27.
Boardman 1963b, 122.
Daux 1965b, 896; 1966c, 932.
Tomlinson 1972, 24.
Foley 1988, 140-142.
Jeffery 1990, 158-159.
Billot 1992, 56.
Hågg 1992a, 11.

Greek Name. Λάρισα (Κάστρο), BA. Γεώνια

City map reference. Square 84. Sondage 86.

Location. At the summit of the Larisa.


Features. In the northern half of the interior court of the Venetian fortress there are foundation walls of two temples, excavated by Vollgraff in 1928-30. The better preserved foundations, located in the north-west, are thought to be of archaic date and to belong to Athena Polias. The other foundations situated to the east may be those of Zeus Larisios.

The earliest wall on the Larisa after the mycenaean period is constructed of well-fitted limestone blocks, in a style similar to Lesbian masonry. It dates to the archaic period (Scranton 1941, 34-35).

Finds. A large deposit of votives dating to the eighth and seventh centuries was found without associated stratigraphy. Nor were any building remains excavated (Roes 1953, 90-104).
Over 300 small vases were recovered, most of them with sloppy decoration, but a few with more careful painting. Some of the latter include a krater, an oinochoe, many cups, and an important collection of Corinthian vases (aryballoi, skyphoi, kotylai, pyxides, and kalathoi). Also found in this deposit were hundreds of rings (some in lead), many small bronze, iron, and bone objects, a bronze and a lead figurine, and a small faïence figurine of the god Bes. The deposit dates from the mid-eighth to the mid-seventh centuries.

An important offering of a bronze plaque was found in a votive deposit on the Larisa, which Vollgraff assumed came from the sanctuary of Athena Polias.

An inscribed stele was found inserted into the south wall of the Larisa, bearing a list of nine demiourgoi (IG IV 614). In the east wall another inscribed block mentions the temenos of Athena Polias (EF 1928, 476).

Comments. Possibly the deposit belonged to one of the three sanctuaries mentioned by Pausanias on the Larisa summit, especially that of Larisaean Zeus and of Athena Polias.

The plaque denotes the existence of a cult, if not a sanctuary of Envalios. No remains have ever been found to confirm its existence on the Larisa.

---

Argos, Larisa: North-west Slope, North-east Corner

Daux 1965b, 896-897.

Greek Name. Λάρισα (Κάστρο), ΒΑ. γωνία

City map reference. Square 84. Sondage 86.

Location. On the north-west flank of the Larisa.


Finds. The finds included a terracotta door-mouse and three female figurines.

---

Argos, Kalatzis Plot: Odhós Papanikoláou


Greek Name. ΚΑΛΑΤΖΗΣ, Β., Οδός Παπανικολάου

City map reference. Sondage 596. Not on map.

Location. On Papanikoláou Street. The area was only partly excavated, because the building crosses over into the adjacent plot.
Excavation. Greek Eforeia excavations.

Finds. Many figurines, mostly horse-riders and some seated female figurines, were found.

Comments. This is a coroplast's workshop.

Argos. Odhos Atréos

A-10-84

EFA 1988b, 128.
French 1990, 12.

Greek Name. Ὀδός Ατρέως

City map reference. Unknown.

Location. To the south on Atréos Street.

Excavation. French School rescue excavations.

Finds. On the south side of the town near the agora, at the corner of Atréos Street, an extensive building plot revealed continuous occupation. On stretches of the road uncovered in rescue work, geometric and archaic levels with sherds but no structures were reached at the north (French 1990, 12).

While they were doing water works on Atréos Street, the excavators made a rescue excavation and found two occupation phases: one starting from late geometric times and continuing through to classical times, and a later hellenistic phase. They found sixth century Attic pottery (EFA 1988b, 128).
A.i.b. The Argive Plain: East of Argos

Nomós Argolídhos: Eparkhía Nafplías
Greek Name. Μυκήναι

1:50000 map reference. 22° 45' 30" E and 37° 43' 45" N.

Location. North of Argos and modern Mykínai and about 2 km east of Fíkhtia, 15 km from the sea, half hidden in a mountain glen or recess, between Mt. Áyios Ilías (750 m) on the north and Mt. Zara (600 m) on the south.

The citadel is on a dale between two bare hills.

Excavation. Greek Eforeia and British School excavations; British School survey.

Mykenai was extensively excavated since the turn of the century. The Greek Archaeological Society began work at the site in the nineteenth century, and in 1874 excavation was initiated by Schliemann and continued by Tsountas in 1886-1902. Excavations by the British School were conducted some twenty years later (1920-23, 1939, 1950) under Wace. Sporadic work on the akropolis by the Greek Archaeological Service has produced some new information about the archaic remains. Recently, the Greeks under Iakovides and the British under French have worked on a intensive survey of Mykenai; their results will appear as a publication of the Greek Archaeological Society.

Function. Habitation site: town or village?

Comments. Ancient Mykenai has been occupied since the neolithic period, but it is famous for its bronze age palace, tombs, and grave circles. After the destructions of the late helladic IIIC the akropolis continued to exist as a small community and sanctuary. Little is known of the iron age remains, though by the late geometric period the site had become a small settlement. Remains from the historic ages include a seventh century temple on the akropolis, an apsidal temple near the House of the Oil Merchant, and two shrines about 1 km away from the citadel. The presence of so many different areas of worship in and around the citadel suggests that Mykenai may have held a more prestigious place among the archaic cites of the Argive plain than is evident from the humble nature of the archaeological remains. The settlement was destroyed by Argos in 468 and resettled in the hellenistic period.
**Mykenai: The Akropolis**

Schliemann 1878, 115.
Tsountas 1887, 158-172; 1888, 59-79.
Kourouniotis 1901, 18-22.
Wace 1939, 210-212; 1949, 24, 84-86; 1964, 84-87.
Mylonas 1966b, 131-133.
Gercke and Hiesel 1975, 7-36.
Wright 1982, 186-210, 194.
Foley 1988, 143, 190-191.
Hall [J.] 1995a, 598-600.
Klein 1997, 290.

**Location.** On the citadel, on top of the bronze age palace.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia and other excavations. Renewed study of the archaic temple under the British School.

**Features.** A small but innovative archaic sanctuary once stood here. No architectural remains belonging to this temple were found in situ; many were incorporated into the existing foundations of a hellenistic temple, showing that earlier constructions certainly once existed. The archaic temple was probably a small rectangular sekos with a pitched roof, stone geison, and walls decorated with relief sculpture. The roof design is heavily influenced by earlier developments in the region of Korinthos, especially the temple of Poseidon at Isthmia. The relief sculpture is without comparison on mainland Greece. The collective sculptural and architectural evidence points to a date in the last quarter of the seventh century for the temple (Klein 1997, 291).

**Finds.** An inscription found by Tsountas on the north-west of the summit of the citadel (IG 4.492) speaks of Athena. Another inscription was found in a fill above Grave Circle A. It reads: τo ἴδιον ἐκ[...] on a sixth century on a bg fragment (IG 4.495). With this Schliemann reports many terracotta figurines and a small vase (Schliemann 1878, 115). Many tiles and sculptural fragments were also found, ranging in date from the early sixth century to the hellenistic period (Wace 1949, 85). The sculpture fragments seem to be reliefs from an altar, which stood to the south of the temple (Wace 1949, 85).

Votive offerings found in the north terrace-fill point to the establishment of cult in the late eighth century, but few objects dating to the archaic period were ever found. Seven bronze pins and two fibulae were found around the temple. The majority of the pins can be dated to the eighth and early seventh centuries. In addition to the pins and fibulae, bronze rings were also found around the temple’s north and south terraces and in Schliemann’s trial pit. Other bronzes include hooks, disks, and a handle.
Three female terracotta figurines and one animal (ox ?) statuette were discovered in the area of the temple and the south terrace (Mykenai inv. 39-22, 39-267, 39-286, Athens: NAM 7741, Náfplion: Leonárdho Mus. 9622).

Among the fine painted wares, drinking vessels and containers are most common. Shapes include skyploi, cups, kotylai, kantharoi, and kraters. These vessels must have been the property of the sanctuary and may have been used in ritual drinking. A few miniature pots were found, including one possible dinos, a miniature skypho, and several bowls.

**Comments.** The identity of the divinity worshipped within the temple has been assumed to be either Hera or Athena. A boundary stone from the temenos of Hera (see below, Perseia fountain), the relief sculpture of a woman lifting a veil (Athens, NAM inv. 2869), and a few female terracotta figurines speak in favour of a cult of Hera.

The temple had little demonstrable influence on its successor at Mykenai or on other temples in the Argolid. It was damaged, if not destroyed, by the Argives in 468.

The sanctuary is built on top of an earlier settlement and in this way is paralleled by the cult at Tiryns.

---

**Mykenai: House on the Citadel**

Schliemann 1878, 115.
Daux 1965a, 715-717.

**Location.** In the interior side of the south sector of the Citadel wall.

**Excavation.** Unknown.

**Finds.** Although no evidence was found of any occupation between the end of the bronze age and the hellenistic period, the soil that had drifted down from the akropolis did contain a few rare geometric, archaic, and classical sherds, showing that at least some parts of the akropolis were continuously occupied after the end of the mycenaean period.

---

**Mykenai: West of Citadel**

Petrakos 1989a, 8-11.
Catling 1989, 29.
Touchais 1989, 600.

**Location.** Within the sector west of the citadel, above the 1972-73 building complex.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía stratigraphic tests, 1988.
Finds. Iakovides came across disturbed layers that had an archaic bronze pin and fragments of a relief *pithos* of the early sixth century. It was decorated with bands of bulls and confronting sphinxes (Touchais 1989, 599, fig. 29).

Comments. Probably this area was used in the archaic period.

---

**Mykenai: Near the House of the Oil Merchant**

Daux 1959a, 613.
Verdhelis 1966b, 85-87.
Drerup 1969, 28.
Foley 1988, 143-144, 190-191.
Fagerström 1988, 30.
Hägg 1992a, 16-17.
Klein 1997, 298.

Location. Near the House of the Oil Merchant, south-west of the akropolis and directly north of Grave Circle B.


Features. Verdhelis excavated the foundations of an *apsidal building* that could date to the late eighth-early seventh century. The building itself was small (9 m x 3.5 m), oriented north-south, and comprised of three sections, a porch, and two inner rooms.

Finds. Most of the finds from the apsidal building were geometric or archaic and of votive character. The north-east section of a house located in front of the House of the Oil Merchant yielded some archaic terracotta *figurines* (Daux 1959a, figs. 20-21, 23).

Comments. The offerings indicate that this was a *cult building*.

---

**Mykenai: The West House**

Verdhelis 1964, 162; 1965b, 146-148.
Tournavitou 1995, 2.

Location. Just west of the House of the Oil Merchant.


Features. The area of the south vestibule wall was built over in archaic and hellenistic times. Wall A, running east-west across the court, 5.50 m south of the south porch wall up to the east wall of the house, was an *irregular construction* of archaic/classical date, built over the mycenaean drain. Walls Γ and E, both of the sixth century, were built over the foundations of the south wall of the mycenaean house.

Finds. A number of archaic clay *figurines* and a few *vases* of the sixth century were found near the south-west corner of the vestibule itself. The head of another female
figurine and large pieces of archaic Corinthian tiles were also recorded at the east end of the south porch wall.

Comments. The finds suggest a religious use for the whole space of the vestibule in the archaic period.

_Mykenai: The House of Sphinxes_
Tournavitou 1995, 2.

_Location._ Directly to the south of the House of the Oil Merchant.


_Features._ In the south-east part of this mycenaean house and especially Rooms 3-5 were heavily disturbed by archaic walls.

_Finds._ A considerable amount of pottery was also found.

_Mykenai: Tsenos Plot_
Onasoglou 1990, 91-93.

_Greek Name._ ΤΣΕΝΟΣ

_Location._ The field is 100 m south of the treasury Atreus, and 50 m from the fence around this tholos.

_Excavation._ Greek Eforeia rescue excavations.

_Features._ An archaic tile-covered grave, oriented north-south, was found with the skeleton of a young man.

_Finds._ A bg lekythos decorated with flowers (honey suckle) and an iron stlegeidia was found with the corpse.

_Mykenai: The Bronze Age Tholos Tombs_
Daux 1959a, 615.
Wace 1964, 44.
Demakopoulou 1990.
Antonaccio 1995, 30-41.
Ekroth 1996, 206 n.29.

_Location._ The tombs are all to the west of the akropolis.

_Excavation._ Greek Eforeia and the British School excavations.

_Features._ Some archaic construction took place south of the dromos of the tomb of 'Aigisthos'. Its east and north walls were uncovered, as well as a cross-wall to the west.
The floor associated with the structure was lower than the *dromos* floor. Dimensions of the structure were imprecise. Papadhimitriou interpreted the rectangular hollow defined by tiles and full of black earth located in the centre of the preserved space as a *hearth*.

**Finds.** In 1892 Tsountas found a large number of archaic *figurines* in the Kato Phournos Tomb. Wace investigated the tomb and recorded another possibly archaic female figurine.

He also found seventh century *pitchers* and *kotylai*, a possible *pyxis*, miniature *phiale* fragments, and ‘inconsiderable fragments of other archaic glazed vases’ in the Epano Phournos tomb. Among the material was bg pottery, including a fifth century *kylix*, a terracotta head, a miniature *phiale* handle, and lead (votive ?) sheets.

The tomb of ‘Aigisthos’, excavated by Wace in the 1920s and by Papadhimitriou in 1954-57, yielded a female figurine, late bg pottery, a single Attic bf sherd, loom-weights, a painted terracotta cornice fragment, roof-tiles, fragments of Corinthian anthemia, two joining fragments of a small *triglyph* (altar ?), and a small torso from a female statue (Daux 1959a, 615, figs. 24-25).

A bf column *krater* with Dionysos, silens, and maenads was recovered from the area of structure in the tomb of ‘Aigisthos’.

Archaic *pottery* was found in the *dromos* of the tomb of Klytemnestra (Athens: NAM 1422; Demakopoulou 1990) and perhaps in the *dromos* and chamber of the Panagia tomb. The former tomb also contained miniature lead female *figurines*, a dozen fragments of human and animal *figurines*, including six horses.

Archaic *votives* were deposited near the tumulus of the treasury of Atreus.

**Comments.** J. Cook interprets the post-mycenaean tomb material as miscellaneous rubbish and not as evidence of a cult. On the other hand, Papadhimitriou (1957, 129-131) maintains that a shrine or altar was founded on top of the tomb of ‘Aigisthos’, and that the fragments found their way into the chamber after the collapse. He also thought that the structure with the hearth was a ‘Sacred House’.

Among the eighty-eight post-mycenaean *sherd* from this area two thirds date to the late geometric period. Most of the pottery consists of open shapes (75% of total) and some *miniatures*. The composition of the material therefore speaks in favour of a cult.
Mykenai: The Perseia Fountain House
Wace 1964, 99.
Daux 1965a, 709.
Mylonas 1967b, 160-163.

Location. West of the akropolis and north-east of the Tomb of Klytemnestra.

Excavation. British School and Greek Eforeía excavations.

Features. In the neighbourhood of the Perseia fountain, Wace observed traces of a channel of terracotta pipes of uncertain date (archaic or later).

Finds. Geometric and archaic sherds occurred in the top metre of the fill and a few even lower. Geometric and archaic pottery was fairly plentiful lower down the ridge, and the buildings may have been constructed during this time, but an earlier date cannot be excluded. Hood remarks that there were very few post-mycenaean sherds behind the fountain house itself.

An inscription (IG 4.493) of the second quarter of the fifth century was identified as the boundary stone of the sanctuary of Hera. Another small fragment of inscription dating to 550-525, written boustrophedon, was reused in a hellenistic wall.

Comments. The inscriptions are interesting because they are some of the few that have survived from Mykenai (see Chapter I for details).

Mykenai: The Panayía Ridge

Greek Name. Παναγία

Location. In the area north of the line of the main road from Fíkthia to Mykines.

Excavation. Greek Eforeía excavations?

Features. Around the Panayía ridge they found a late sixth century cist tomb.
**Mykenai: The Kháos Shrine**

Cook [J.] 1953a, 30-68.
Wace, Hood, and Cook [J.] 1953, 34.
Hägg 1987, 98.
Foley 1988, 144-145.
Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, 89.
Antonaccio 1995, 147-152.

Greek Name. Χάος

Location. Approximately 1 km south, south-west of the akropolis, on the east bank of the Kháos (or Khávos) streambed, near the mycenaean causeway.

Excavation. British School excavations.

Features. The shrine had two main phases: archaic and hellenistic. To the first belongs a rubble wall that formed the north limit of the shrine and a pit along the interior of the north wall. The abundance of tiles in the west part of the walled area probably means that section was roofed, while the central portion was an open court. The roofed area may have been some kind of storage room for the cult paraphernalia.

Finds. Several dozen archaic roof-tiles were recovered from the archaic shrine.

Below the paving in the west section, a largely archaic deposit of material was incorporated into the fill of stones. The votives in this deposit begin in the late geometric period and continue until the early fifth century in some quantity, with a few from the later fifth and early fourth century. The archaic pottery includes kantharoi of local Argive production as well as krateriskoi on high feet (Cook [J.] 1953a, 42-44). The latter, however, seem to be miniature versions of slightly earlier, late geometric, pedestal-kraters that are the exact equivalents of the louteria found at Menidhi and at the Heraion, i.e. meant as receptacles for bath-water (Hägg 1987, 97). Although there are also other shapes present, especially notable are the kalathoi, the shapes predominating are kraters and drinking cups; there are no amphorae.

There are numerous terracotta figurines of horses and riders, but seated female figurines also occur and are even slightly more numerous than the riders and the horses without riders taken together (Hägg 1997, 98). The metal objects were very few: some bronze pins and an iron spear-head (Cook [J.] 1953a, 66-68). Mixed with the archaic deposit were iron nails and bits of carbonised wood. Close to it there was an oblong pit filled with loose, dark earth containing some ash, animal bones, and pottery including a fifth century bf skyphos (Cook [J.] 1953a, 32; Hägg 1987, 98). Before the laying of the
pavement the pit had been partly covered with a stone packing in which several pieces of the hopper *quern* were incorporated. The archaic deposit itself gives every appearance of having been deliberately transported into this position; the majority of the figurines and miniature *kotylai* were found near the east end of the deposit, while the more or less undamaged *kantharoi* were mostly packed close together, and sometimes inside one another in the west part. Odd sherds and fragments of figurines were found in the earth in other parts of the enclosure, but did not form a regular stratum, outside the central belt of the deposit area (Cook [J.] 1953a, 32-33).

Coarse domestic wares are hardly represented in the deposit. Imports are confined to Corinthian and some Attic, with a single East Greek Lydian (Wace, Hood, and Cook [J.] 1953, 34).

**Comments.** The cult seems to have originated in the late geometric era. It seems to have been a significant cult, in the earlier archaic period at least; for though fine bronzes and ivories are lacking among the dedications, the vases compare favourably with those found at other sanctuaries in the Argolid (Cook [J.] 1953a, 33).

The identification of the shrine as that of the hero Agamemnon rests on fragments of inscribed vases of the fourth century and later, when it was rebuilt in hellenistic times. These sherds cannot prove that a cult to Agamemnon existed as early as the archaic period. There is nothing that demands the conclusion that Agamemnon was always honoured on this spot. It seems more likely that *Hera* was worshipped here.

---

**Mykenai: Asprókhoma(ta)**

Mylonas 1967a, 95-96; 1968, 111-114.
Daux 1966a, 782; 1967a, 657.
Foley 1988, 145.

**Greek Name.** Ἀσπρόχωμα(τα)

**Location.** About 1 km north of the akropolis, at a place called Asprókhoma(ta), on the route to Kleonai.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia and American School excavations.

**Features.** During the excavation of the sanctuary Mylonas found two buildings. The building identified as the temple comprised only one *sekos* oriented north-south, like the temple on the akropolis, with an entrance on the south side. An unusual feature is the presence of a door in the east side, recalling the disposition of the temple of Apollo at
Bassae. Near the centre of the sekos remained in part a socle of which the long side was oriented towards the east doorway; perhaps it supported the cult statue. From the associated finds the temple has been dated in the fifth century.

The earlier secondary building in the shape of an ‘L’ had a room on an angle and two wings. The east wing was a stoa where they found five column bases in situ; in front of this stoa were placed two altars, probably of earlier date. The north wing of the building was made up of two rooms, of which the floor of the west room was made of poros plaques. In front of the east side of this room were found four poros bases (trophies, according to Mylonas) (Daux 1967a, 657).

About 5 m from the south side of the temple they discovered the foundations of a rectangular altar, oriented towards the east.

**Finds.** One important find was a fragment of cheek guard for a bronze helmet bearing a fifth century inscription to ἐναλ[ας].

In front of the West Stoa stood an altar in the fill of which bones of small animals were found mixed with late geometric and early archaic sherds (Foley 1988, 145).

An orientalising skyphos suggests a date in the early seventh century for the sanctuary (Daux 1966a, 782).

Outside the east wall of the stoa they found an ‘amas à pieds’ and iron spearheads, with a Protocorinthian aryballos. These were probably discarded offerings that might give a clue to the date of this building (Daux 1967a, 657).

**Comments.** It seems that the sanctuary was in use the early seventh century; at first it probably consisted only of an altar, although Mylonas thinks there may have been a temple. The presence of a stone pavement at the south-west corner of the stoa may have served to support a primitive temple connected with the altar in front of the stoa (Foley 1988, 145).

The sanctuary was probably dedicated to Enyalios, who was the god of war. There is only one other known temple to this god in the Argolid, at Argos (Foley 1988, 145).
Greek Name. Κουρτάκιον

1:50000 map reference. 22° 46' 30" E and 37° 38' 30" N.

Location. In the central plain about 4 km north-east of Árgos along one of the roads towards the Heraion. The site is some 30 m north-east of the church on Saravakou Plot.

Excavation. Greek Efořeia excavations.

Features. Thousands of small pots were discovered in association with the ruins of a building, which was probably a ceramic workshop. The dimensions of the two rooms were 1.45 m by 2.2 m and 6 m by 5 m. The smaller room had a round depression (kiln?) in the middle, which was accessible by two steps located in its south-west corner (Papakhristodhoulou 1969, 131, pi. 75).

Finds. Many of the votives were krateriskoi of the late seventh and sixth centuries. The vases in general resemble in shape and decoration contemporary pots from the Kháos shrine at Mykenai.

Figurines, including many seated females and riders as well as various animals, were also found (Foley 1988, 150).

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary.

Comments. The fact that many of the pots were whole, stacked one inside the other, suggests that they were being produced here for use as votives. The building may have been a workshop connected with the sanctuary of Demeter Mysia that Pausanias (2.18.3) saw on the roads from Mykenai to Argos or Tiryns. Presumably the sanctuary is to be located somewhere in the region of the workshop (Foley 1988, 150).

The site must have been an important sanctuary visited by vast numbers of pilgrims, since pots, figurines, and other small objects found here can be counted in hundreds of thousands (Hägg 1992a, 13).
**The Heraion (Iráion)**

Wheeler 1894, 351-360.
Richardson 1896, 42-61.
Waldstein 1892; 1900, 473-474; 1902; 1905.
Müller [V.] 1929, 244.
Jenkins 1931-32, 27-34.
Daly 1939, 165-169.
Payne [H.] et al. 1940.
Amandry 1952, 222-274.
Stillwell 1952.
Sparkes 1962, 135.
Tomlinson 1972, 33-34, 230-246.
Leekley and Noyes, 1976, 62f.
Snodgrass 1980a, 53.
Wright 1982, 186-201.
Foley 1988, 172.
Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 85.

**Greek Name.** Ἡπαῖον

1:50000 map reference. 22° 46' 30'' E and 37° 41' 45'' N.

**Location.** Between modern Árgos and Mykínes, about 5 km south-east of the citadel at Mykenai and 7 km north of Árgos town. The sanctuary stands on a south spur of a low mountain, bounded on two sides by the streams Eleutherium (to the north-west) and Asterion (to the south-east). Almost the entire Argive plain, the mountains that surround it, and the bay of Náfplio to the south can be seen from here.

**Excavation.** Investigations at the turn of the century; German Institute and Greek Eforeí excavations; American School excavations and architectural studies.

General Gordon, who dug there briefly in 1836, discovered the site by chance in 1831. In 1854 limited investigation were carried out by Rangabé and Bursian, who partly uncovered the foundations of the later temple. Schliemann made soundings in 1874, and Stamatakis cleared a bronze age tholos in 1878.

The American School of Classical Studies under Waldstein first undertook large scale excavations during the years of 1892-95. On the upper terrace part of the Old
Temple of the seventh century was excavated. It superstructure may have been mud-brick and wood, as little of it survives. Waldstein also discovered some earlier geometric and bronze age remains of a prehistoric settlement and tombs north of the South Stoa, and two tholoi.

A further investigation was carried out in 1949 under Caskey and Amandry. Pfaff is now working on the classical sanctuary and Lawton is studying the sculpture from the Second Temple (still unpublished, see Antonaccio 1992, 86 n3).

**Function.** Special-purpose site: sanctuary.

**Comments.** It has been reported (Waldstein 1905, 61) that no stratigraphic studies were possible in the early excavations at the Heraion. Thus the depth of any given object found in the building is meaningless. Apparently strata had been dug through, mixed up, and covered over again before the excavators came to the site. For this reason one has no dating evidence from the pottery, nor is speculation usually possible since the provenience of a given object is mentioned only rarely in the publication.

Morgan and Whitelaw (1990, 84) maintain that the ceramic fabric of the eighth and seventh century suggests that the greatest proportion of pottery of the Argive regional style at the Heraion was made at Argos (cf. Foley 1988, 65-66).

The architecture is equally problematic, and no two scholars can agree on precise dates for the archaic buildings. In the course of their transfer to the NAM in Athens, and during the long period in which they awaited adequate study, the architectural terracottas from the Heraion were reduced to confusion. So many pieces are marked ‘West Building’; on others the pencil marks are indecipherable. They are being re-examined by Pfaff.

The main (fifth century) road to the sanctuary, apparently with the same general direction as the modern one, would have come from the town of Argos in the south-west, running towards its end along the south side of the temenos and turning finally to the entrance in the west.

The new building project, involving the construction of a new temple, goes back to the mid-fifth century. This refutes the hypothesis that the new building project was a result of the fire that burned down the old temple in 423.
The Heraion: The West Building
Waldstein 1902, 131-134.
Frickenhau 1917, 121-130.
Amandry 1952, 239-254.
Coulton 1976, 103-105.

Location. West of the second, later temple.


Features. The West building has a central peristyle court 12.24 m by 10.12 m, with two-aisled porticoes to the east, south, and west, and a one-aisled portico with rooms behind to the north. It has sometimes been supposed that this building had two storeys; but both the form and date of the building are disputed. The building had been dated later than the terrace of the Second Temple of Hera (late fifth century), but the positive arguments for the later date do not seem very compelling. As in the North Stoa, the inner colonnade of the West Building has the same spacing, with the consequent suggestion of an early wooden entablature. A date in the late sixth century is therefore acceptable.

Finds. An inscribed rim of a large fifth century krater was found mixed up with a quantity of early pottery and figurines behind the retaining wall of the West Building. The inscription reads: $\text{[ra]}^\text{[1]} \text{ heqa}^\text{[3]} \text{ si}^\text{[2]}^\text{[i]}$. A large number of bronze pins, fibulae, and rings were attributed to this building, but may in fact belong to the deposits about the retaining wall.

Comments. One might interpret the krater as being part of the levelling fill, therefore providing a terminus post quern for the construction of the West Building of about the mid-fifth century. There are obviously substantial uncertainties in the restoration of the West Building.

The original function of the building is uncertain, and conjecture has made it a gymnasium and a hospital for women. However, the benches or couches and the off-centre doorway point towards a hestiatorion (see Chapter II for details).
The Heraion: The North Stoa (Stoa II)
Brownson 1893, 221.
Waldstein 1902, 112-114.
van Buren 1926, 7, fig. 6.
Amandry 1952, 226-235.
Bergquist 1967, 21-22.
Coulton 1976, 26-30.
Pfaff 1990, 155-156.

**Location.** Between the Old temple and the Second temple.

**Excavation.** American School excavations, 1892-1895 and 1949.

**Features.** The North Stoa (Upper Stoa or Stoa II) is the largest and most monumental stoa of the Heraion. It is a two-aisled stoa with a projecting wing, facing south. It is the earliest known stoa to have stone columns and walls of isodomic masonry. The whole building is 62.10 m long and about 9.20 m deep. Along the south side runs a stylobate of grey limestone and two steps, all the visible surfaces of which are dressed smooth. It had an inner and outer colonnade; it is possible that the columns were originally wooden, being gradually replaced. The architrave was probably also wooden. A ridge-tile roof would be consistent with the general style and construction of the stoa. Perhaps it carried three-peaked antefixes.

**Finds.** Tiles of the late seventh-early sixth century type were found on the site of the North Stoa.

Several valuable fragments of pottery, a small terracotta head, several bronze mirrors, and a piece of bf pottery were found around the stoa.

**Comments.** The date of the building varies according to scholars; there are difficulties in attributing columns and capital to this stoa. In general, most would agree to a date in the late seventh-early sixth century. Others argue that the building was probably erected at the earliest in the second half of the fifth century. A re-examination of its remains in situ suggests that it was probably the next significant building to be constructed after the Old Temple (Pfaff 1990, 155).

The Heraion: The North-east Building (Stoa III)
Waldstein 1902, 114-116.
Amandry 1952, 235-239.
Bergquist 1967, 21-22.
Coulton 1976, 35-36.

**Location.** North-east of the North Stoa, just below the Old Temple terrace.

**Excavation.** American School excavations, 1892-1895 and 1949.
Features. This building was a two-aisled hall (?), opening south, with an inner colonnade of polygonal columns. In its present state rough slabs resting directly on the foundations close its south side. These slabs do not belong to the original structure, but the course that carries them does, so far as can be seen. As Amandry points out, the North-east Building is probably earlier than the stepped terrace wall in front of it; since that follows the orientation of the North Stoa.

Finds. A monolithic column shaft was found in the building.

Comments. The monolithic shaft suggests more positively a date in the early sixth rather than the fifth century, for this mode of construction was used only for very small columns after the archaic period.

The Heraion: The Old Temple
Brownson 1893, 221.

Location. On the uppermost terrace of the site, above the ruins of the Second Temple.

Excavation. American School excavations, 1892-1895.

Features. The temple foundations date to the seventh century (c. 650-625). A small section of the stylobate belonging to this structure still remains on the flagging in the south-west part.

Finds. A great number of smaller objects of all descriptions came to light, some below and inside the temple foundations. They include fragments of archaic pottery, terracotta figurines and masks, bronze pins and clasps, a bronze cock, several scarabs, pieces of gold leaf, stone, bone and ivory seals, beads, and various other objects.

Some three-peaked antefixes found on the site seem to belong to this temple or to the North Stoa.

Comments. The temple has been dated on architectural grounds to the last quarter of the seventh century.

The Heraion: Below the Old Temple
Brownson 1893, 224.

Location. The cutting just below the Old Temple.

Excavation. American School excavations, 1892-1895.
Finds. From here came by far the larger part of the immense collection of terracotta figurines and smaller objects. Besides the terracottas, masses of pottery fragments were found, all archaic, quantities of iron and bone rings, terracotta and ivory relief-plaques, seals, scarabs, beads, small stone sculptures of animals, mirrors, pins, clasps, and so forth.

The Heraion: Near the Foot of the Stepped Retaining Wall
EF 1950b, 315-316.
Caskey and Amandry 1952, 168.

Location. Near the foot of the stepped retaining wall, just east of the East Building, and on the south end of one of the natural terraces.


Finds. Below a fifth-fourth century stratum lay a seventh-sixth century layer containing 1000s of objects and fragments of metal, stone, and terracotta, in addition to a great number of small votive pots, many of which were unbroken, lying closely packed like eggs in a basket. The vases, mainly miniatures, are of local ware. Many hydriai, together with oinochoai, skyphoi, and cups were represented here. The bronzes include miniature phialai, pins and brooches, and part of a statuette of a bronze kouros (Athens, NAM 16357). The fragment is comparable to the stone statues from Delphi, so-called Kleobis and Biton.

Comments. The abundance of offerings evokes the deposit of lamps and skyphoi discovered in Troizen by Legrand (1905, 302-304).

The Heraion: The South Stoa (Stoa VI)
Waldstein 1902, 127-130, pls. 20-22.
Amandry 1952, 222-274.
Roux 1961.

Location. South of the Second Temple, on a lower terrace.


Features. This building is the best preserved Peloponnesian stoa of the fifth century, and one of the earliest anywhere with substantial remains of a stone entablature. Several stylobate blocks survive. The roof has been restored as a simple rafter roof.

Comments. It was built at some time between 470-455 and 420.
**Location.** The findspots are unknown.

**Excavation.** American School excavations, 1892-1895.

**Finds.** Several painted inscriptions were found: a Corinthian *aryballos*, fragments of a *dinos*, and a fragment of late Corinthian ware. As for incised inscriptions, they include several examples: on a small bowl, on the inside of an open *vessel*, on several *b.f. sherds*, on a *b.g. sherd*, on the foot of a *kylix*, and on many more sherds.
Prosymna (Iráion)  A-14

Greek Name. Ἡπατῆς
1:50000 map reference. 22° 46' 30" E and 37° 41' 30" N.

Location. About 1 km north-west of the Heraion and a few kilometres south of Mykenai.

Excavation. American School excavations, 1890s, and also in 1925, 1927-28.

Function. Special-purpose site: shrine and cemetery.

Comments. In Pausanias (2.17.2) Prosymna is located ‘above’ the Heraion, which made Blegen designate the prehistoric settlement and cemetery by this name. This sometimes causes confusion with Prósymna (or as it is now called Prósymni) in the Berbatí region.

Prosymna: The ‘Secondary Shrine’
Blegen 1939, 410-411, 420, 423.
Antonaccio 1992, 100.
Hägg 1992a, 15.

Location. About 700 m north-west of the Heraion, about 75 m north-west of a tholos tomb and some 25 m south-west of chamber Tomb 17.

Features. Excavations revealed a small terrace, supported in part on its south-west side by a massive wall of conglomerate limestone. The terrace, or rather platform, had a length of about 12.5 m from south-east to north-west and a width of about 8.5 m. On its north-west side it was bounded by a shallow streambed, and the original construction at this end had doubtless been carried away in the course of time by occasional torrents. On the north-east and south-east sides a substructure of rough stones was brought to light, but apparently the only retaining wall meant to be visible was that already mentioned on the south-west side. It was found standing to a height of 2 m; the best built section was only 4.7 m long, but the line was continued 5.7 m farther south-east by a wall of smaller stones. The floor of the platform was reached at an average depth of about 0.55 m below the modern surface of the ground; it was roughly level, formed of some large stones and a fill of smaller stones and gravel. The topsoil covering it contained hellenistic and classical sherds as well as some earlier fabrics (Blegen 1939, 410).
At the centre of the terrace there was also perhaps an ash altar, where burnt sacrifices were offered, as indicated by the thick deposit of charred matter in a restricted area on the floor of the platform (Blegen 1939, 411).

**Finds.** Near the centre of the platform was a deposit of burnt debris, black earth, and carbonised matter, occupying an irregular area about 1.2 m in diameter (Blegen 1939, 411). The layer was 0.2 m thick and contained fragments of bronze, a piece of iron and some sherds of Protocorinthian and associated vases (Blegen 1939, 412-428, figs. 3-11). Similar pottery and bits of bronze came to light almost everywhere about the platform, but most of these remains were utterly shattered and badly decayed. The bronzes found in the deeper earth along the north-east and south-west sides of the platform included many mesomphalic phialai, for the most part in fragmentary and corroded state, corresponding to Dunbabin’s later type at Perakhora from the first part of the sixth century (Blegen 1939, 420). Numerous pins (Waldstein 1907, 207-239) and fragments of various other metal offerings were also recovered.

Sherds were especially abundant, and there were many small votive vases of the unpainted Protocorinthian style (Blegen 1939, 411). Terracotta horse figurines from the terrace belong to the seated goddess and rider type, but the riders have been broken away (Blegen 1939, 423). Also found were loom-weights and wreaths.

A black glazed sherd with an inscription $h\gamma\alpha\varsigma\varepsilon\upsilon\mu[i]$ was taken by Blegen (1939, 412, fig. 11) as evidence that the platform was merely an outlying altar belonging to Hera.

**Comments.** The evidence seems to warrant the conclusion that the platform had been prepared to support a small shrine to Hera, by the side of the old road to Mykenai.

It is true that no traces of the actual building could be recognised; if there was ever one at all it must have been a small and simple edifice, perhaps constructed mainly or entirely of crude brick. Its most important feature was apparently an altar. Perhaps the altar itself constituted the shrine, although there must presumably have been some sort of shelter in which the votive offerings could be kept (Blegen 1939, 411).

---

**Prosymna: The South-west Slope**
Blegen 1939, 437-440.

**Location.** On the south-west slope below the Heraion.

**Finds.** A great many bronze straight pins were found, for the most part badly corroded, which all belong to DeCou’s (Waldstein 1907, 207ff.) classifications.

---

Appendix A-14
An Egyptian **bronze statuette** of Horus (Harpokrates) in the usual seated attitude dates to the 2sixth dynasty (late sixth century) (Blegen 1939, 437).

**Prosymna: The Bridge across the Révma tou Kastroú**

**Location.** The bridge goes across a dry streambed around the north and west of the site. This streambed, the Révma tou Kastroú, may be the Eleutherion of Pausanias.

**Finds.** **Bronze griffin protomai** found alongside the foundations of the bridge date by style to the early part of the sixth century (Blegen 1939, 428-430).

Fragments of a foot of a **marble statue** from the bridge were found by a shepherd at the site of a small chapel of Ayía Kyriaki, at the summit of the knoll toward the east of the Heraion. Its style had been dated to the late sixth century, and Blegen (1939, 435-437) thinks the fragment is from an archaic **kore**, which had presumably been dedicated in the sanctuary of Hera.

**Prosymna: The Bronze Age Chamber Tombs**
Hågg 1987, 99.
Antonaccio 1995, 56.

**Location.** In the area of the bronze age **tholos**.

**Features.** Evidence for a possible early archaic **burial** occurs in Tomb 8.

A low **wall** was recorded inside one of the chamber tombs (50) and dated to the archaic period by the **bronzes** discovered on it (Antonaccio 1995, 201).

**Finds.** Intrusions among the chamber tombs began in the late eighth century and continued into the archaic period. In Tomb 10 they found archaic material in a layer of black earth and ashes, containing many small fragments of charred bone. It yielded also a fragment of an archaic female **figurine** of the seated type. From this point to a depth of 5 m in a shaft, the objects recovered seemed to be of still more recent date; they included a few lumps of iron and bronze fragments, part of the **horn** of a bull, and sherds of a Corinthian **aryballos** (Inv. 61; Blegen 1937, 198; 1938, 380-382).

Tomb 8, a built cist never fully published by Blegen, included **pottery**, terracotta **spools**, **lamp** fragments, a bronze **rod**, and a **pyxis** (Hågg 1974, 61 n108-109; Foley 1988, 45; Antonaccio 1995, 59-60).
Tomb 40 contained a small Corinthian jug (Inv. 864), a number of fragments of Protocorinthian pottery, representing several *skyphoi*, a bronze bowl and pin (Blegen 1937, 133-135, fig. 319). There were also a few animal bones, with three or four teeth, probably of a dog (Blegen 1937, 133).

**Comments.** These offerings were given to the heroised dead.
Khónikas (Néo Iraío)

Greek Name. Χώνικας

1:50000 map reference. 22° 46' 30" E and 37° 40' 15" N.

Location. In the Argive plain, about 1 km south of the Heraion, a place called Khónikas, Kokkínia, or Néo Iraío.

Excavation. Greek Eforeía excavations.

Features. A very large (80 m long) monumental colonnaded poros building of the early fifth century was discovered in a field. The building, which was probably a stoa, with its associated architectural elements was connected with the Heraion.

Finds. Corinthian tiles and a few akroteria lay in a destruction level on a pebble floor. Other architectural items include a half column base (47 cm), and an Ionic capital with white stucco and an attachment hole in the eye. Small finds include an iron obol, a stone mortar, and various small bronzes, probably from classical times. Pottery was also found (French 1993, 16; Onasoglou 1990, 85-86).

Function. Special-purpose site: associated with sanctuary.

Comments. The site, on the presumed road from Argos to the Heraion, is in the area where the hippodrome (known from an inscription) is thought to lie. Parallels are noted to a structure at Nemea (French 1993, 16; Onasoglou 1990, 85-86).

The building should be viewed as part of the new programme of monumentalisation taking place at the Heraion, and almost certainly stood on the new Sacred Way that connected Argos with the Heraion (Hall [J.] 1995a, 612).
Tiryns (Tírintha)

Schliemann 1886.
Winter [F.] 1903, 26, 34.
Müller [K.] and Sulze 1930, 134-139.
Vanderpool 1963, 281.
Verdhelis 1965a, 66-73.
Tomlinson 1972, 41.
Michaud 1973, 299.
Gercke and Hiesel 1975.
Wright 1982, 201.
Kilian 1984, 61.
Catling 1984, 25.
Fagerström 1988, 29.
Jameson 1990a, 213-223.
Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 87.
Hägg 1992a, 17.

Greek Name. Τίρυνς

1:50000 map reference. 22° 48' E and 37° 36' N.

Location. On a low rocky hill in the Argive plain, almost 4 km north of Náfploio, and 2 km from the coast. At present it is over 1 km distant from the sea, but it was much closer in antiquity (Zangger 1993, 85).

Excavation. German Institute and Greek Eforeía excavations.

Function. Habitation site: town or village?

Comments. The surrounding areas and the materials of post-mycenaean periods have received less attention that the bronze age citadel; hence perhaps our comparative ignorance of the site’s post-iron age development.

The settlement was destroyed by the Argives in 468, but was not completely abandoned (Michaud 1973, 299).
**Tiryns: The Upper Citadel**

Schliemann 1886, 229, 293-296, 357.  
Frickenhuis, Müller [W.], and Oelmann 1912, 56-93, 103-105.  
Müller [K.] and Sulze 1930, 134-139.  
Wright 1982, 201.  
Fagerström 1988, 29.  
Foley 1988, 145-146.  
Jameson 1990a, 213-223.  
Hägg 1992a, 17.  
Schwandner 1988, 269-284.  
Demakopoulou 1990, 375-379.  
Antonaccio 1992, 104.  
Hall [J.] 1995a, 598.

**Location.** At the highest point on the site.

**Excavation.** German Institute excavations.

**Finds.** In the doorway to the north of the gate to the upper citadel, together with a number of roof-tiles, an antefix was found. It was of light yellow clay, with red-brown decoration. Apparently the antefix belonged to the same building as the Doric capital (below).

In the later wall which ran across the great court about one half metre above the concrete floor, there was found an old Doric capital of the early sixth century. The material is a *poros* sandstone of light colour; it was covered with fine lime plaster 1-2 mm thick. It is unknown to which building the capital belonged. No shaft was found. Another capital 'en sofa' was found in the recent excavations (Schwandner 1988, 276-283, figs. 8-12).

A large quantity of figurines and other terracotta objects were found in an inverted corner of the south-east akropolis wall, immediately under the surface. All the pieces lay close to the circuit wall, but outside of it, and therefore must at some time have been thrown from the citadel. As the objects seem almost all to have been votive offerings, they must have belonged to some sanctuary existing above the citadel (Schliemann 1886, figs. 62-63, 66, 76, 83, 87, 94-95). These include about 100 miniature Protocorinthian vases such as *skyphoi, oinochoai, and pyxides*, as well as a large number of undated vases such a *kantharoi*, one-handled cups, *cooking pots*, and *bowls*. Apart from the pottery, bronze bowls, pins, and rings, iron pins, and a lead *wreath* were found (Frickenhuis, Müller [W.], and Oelmann 1912, 56-93, 103-105).
The second deposit was a *bothros*, 20 m east of the megaron, which held a deposit of *miniature vases*, *miniature koulouria*, terracottas, *fibulae*, *pins*, as well as that the more famous seventh century Gorgons *masks* and clay models of *shields* (Jantzen 1975, 159-161).

A bronze *phiale* was also found in this area.

**Comments.** The identification of Hera is strengthened by a graffito with her name on the base of a classical black glaze bowl found on the citadel (Jantzen 1975, 105). Moreover, the deposit in which the masks were found is connected with the cult of a goddess, usually thought to be Hera because of her importance in Tiryns.

We can imagine that on the same spot where the Christians afterwards built their church -- that is, at the south end of the castle -- there existed a *temple* or some sanctuary.

---

**Tiryns: North-west Galleries**

Frickenhaus, Müller [W.], and Oelmann 1912, 105.
Verdhelis, Jameson and Papakhristodhoulou 1975, 150-205.

**Location.** On the citadel.

**Excavation.** German Institute and Greek Eforeía excavations.

**Finds.** *Inscriptions* in false boustrophedon were found incised on a series of stone plaques, reused to cover the north-west galleries of the akropolis. They deal with one or many religious rules, dated to the early sixth century, or even the end of the seventh century (see Chapter I for details).

The excavators also found a *graffito* on the rim of a large glazed Attic plate (Frickenhaus, Müller [W.], and Oelmann 1912, 105, fig. 43).

**Comments.** In the ‘syrinx’ *inscription* from the citadel of Tiryns, the community called itself a *damos* in the early archaic period.

---

**Tiryns: The East Gateway on the Middle Citadel**

Jantzen 1975, 105f.
Hall [J.] 1995a, 598.

**Location.** In the area of the middle citadel.

**Excavation.** German Institute excavations.
Finds. An inscription to Athena on a krater (Ἠϑαιαί Ἠμί) and two archaic votive helmets make the worship of Athena at Tiryns very likely (Jantzen 1975, 105f.; Foley 1988, 147).

Comments. The location of her cult, however, is probably better sought in the vicinity of the eastern gateway to the citadel (Hall [J.] 1995a, 598-599).

**Tiryns: Outside the Citadel**
Touchais 1984, 760.

**Location.** Outside the west fortification wall, around the citadel.

**Excavation.** German Institute excavations.

**Features.** Graves of the geometric and later periods have been located in this area, together with a hellenistic pit filled with archaic architectural fragments.

**Comments.** The architectural fragments are probably connected with the inscription that mentions Zeus and Athena.

**Tiryns: Unknown Context**
Touchais 1978, 664.

**Location.** Towards the south (LXI-LXII 142).

**Excavation.** German Institute excavations.

**Finds.** A layer contained an abundance of Corinthian and Attic bf sherds.
**Nauplia (Νάψπλιο)**

Tomlinson 1972, 44-45.
Dheiliaki 1977, 91.
Foley 1988, 191.
Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 90.

**Greek Name.** Ναύπλιον

**1:50000 map reference.** 22° 49' E and 37° 34' 30" N.

**Location.** In the Argive plain, at the modern town of Nauplio, on the Palamidhi (Παλμίδη) road.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia excavations.

**Features.** The graves reported here are mainly mycenaean and geometric, but seven at Prónoia are seventh century pithoi, and two at Palmidhi are archaic. The first of these is a pithos, the second a pit burial.

**Function.** Special-purpose site: graves.

**Comments.** This cemetery area shows continuity from prehistoric years.

Nauplio has produced very little material, owing largely to modern overbuilding and the rarity of redevelopment in the historic town. Its main function seem to have been to act as a harbour for Argos, after 700.
Greek Name. Αρια

1:50000 map reference. 22° 49′ 30″ E and 37° 34′ 30″ N.

Location. In the Argive plain, about 2.5 km east of Náfplio, near Mt. Apias on the road to ancient Epidauros.

Excavation. Greek Eforía rescue excavations.

Features. A pit was found on the Karvouniari Plot.

Finds. It contained a small lead plaque with a scene of a sacred wedding.

Function. Special-purpose site: shrine?

Comments. This seems to have been a votive deposit probably associated with a nearby shrine.
Greek Name. Πρόσυμνα

1:50000 map reference. 22° 50' 30" E and 37° 42' 45" N.

Location. The Berbati valley, as it is known archaeologically, is at modern Prósypma or Prósypmi, behind the Heraion, about 7 km south-east of Mykenai and 6 km north of Midea.

The plain is shut off by a ring of mountains and approached most easily through a defile at its south-east corner.


During the last ten years a surface survey (intensive, 1988-90) has been carried out in the valley, with on-going excavations under the auspices of the Swedish Institute. The village of Prósypmi was excluded from the survey.

Function. Habitation site: farmsteads.

Comments. The meaning of the name Berbati is obscure. It is said that in Albania today there still exists a village by the name of Berbati; on the other hand, in the first half of the sixteenth century this name also constituted a family name carried by numerous soldiers in the service of the Venetians. It could also be of Turkish origin.

Pausanias did not mention this region, presumably because there was nothing to take him into it.

The archaic material from each findspot is not very extensive but seems to be distributed over a larger number of findspots. These have been interpreted mainly as farmsteads (Findspots 20-21, 24, 522-523, 525, 527-528), a possible tomb (near Findspot 18), a cult place (Findspot 516), and a possible sanctuary (Findspot 402).

It is noteworthy that no geometric/archaic habitation was located at the former settlement centre of the valley, the Mastos, or in its immediate surroundings. As a whole the late geometric and the archaic activity in the valley is concentrated in its north-west part. The settlement spread from the west to the east, which suggests that the late
geometric settlers entered the valley from the west, i.e. they came over the pass from Mykenai (Ekroth 1996, 219).

It is possible that the modern dirt road reflects an ancient road or path, which functioned as a side road leading from the mycenaean road through the one of the settlements down to the valley floor. The mycenaean road could very well have been functional during geometric times since parts of it are still transversable by jeep today. A second communication route toward the west must have run across the lowest point of the pass, where there is a footpath today (1 hour walk) (Ekroth 1996, 220).

The Berbati-Limnes survey had revealed a settlement pattern for late geometric period that is best explained as the result of a resettlement of the valley from Mykenai. This implies close connections between the two areas at the time. In the archaic period even closer intercommunity relations are indicated by the identical character of parts of the pottery assemblages from the cult by the Berbati tholos and the Kháos shrine (Ekroth 1996, 220).

Comments. In the Southern Argolid a gap between geometric and recognisable archaic has been observed. Runnels, Pullen, and Langdon (1995) suggest that this gap should not be interpreted as a sign of depopulation, but rather can be explained as a lower date for the end of the geometric style or a break in the contact with west Argolid in favour of local pottery production, which is difficult to compare with the rest of the Argolid and thus more difficult to date. Interpretation of the material remains from archaic settlements in Attica and the Kyklades is also difficult in some cases, for little material has been recovered from each individual site. It has been suggested as an alternative explanation to the depopulation that there might be errors in the interpretation and dating of the pottery here also (Osborne 1989, 297-322). Thus the scarcity of seventh and sixth century material at Berbati should perhaps not simply be interpreted as a drop in population. A lower date for the end of the Argive late geometric style would facilitate the dating of the plain ware at Berbati. As it is, the fine ware from, for example, Findspot 20 and 24, is predominantly late geometric, while the plain ware is probably archaic. If the late geometric style continued into the seventh century, the fine and the plain wares or the end of the late geometric pottery and the beginning of the archaic pottery would coincide.

The archaeological record for the Argive plain does not contribute much to clarify whether there was a decrease in population or not. The pottery chronology is not well established for the archaic period in the Argolid. Foley (1988, 163-166) assumes a drop
in Argive pottery production and an increase in imported wares, mainly from Korinthos. Most of the material of this period comes from sanctuaries, while settlements on the plain were deserted in favour of the east Argolid. If cult activity continued or even increased, the surrounding area could not have been drastically depopulated. In the Berbati valley the cult activity at the tholos definitively shows an increase in archaic times and there might even have existed a shrine or temple where the church of Áyios Pétros is situated today. The later written sources mention conflicts with Sparta during the seventh and sixth centuries, which could have led to a depopulation, but it is hard to tell how much trust should be put into these sources. If one compared the development at Berbati with the picture presented by other field surveys in the Argolid, there is a distinction. The results of the Southern Argolid survey show clear increase in the number of sites from the geometric to the archaic period, which is explained by an increase in the agricultural production (Runnels and van Andel 1987, 316f, 326; van Andel and Runnels 1987, 104f.). Also the results of the Neméa survey seem to indicate an increase in activity from the geometric to the archaic period (Wright et al. 1990, 647; Ekroth 1996, 224).

What is important to stress is the fact that Berbati valley was inhabited in the seventh and sixth centuries and that the decrease in material from the settlements does not necessarily mean a large drop in the population, especially since the cult by the tholos tomb shows an increase in material. From the late sixth and early fifth centuries the situation is different, since the material is very scanty. In total only a few late archaic sherds were found at the settlements and at the cult place by the tholos.

That the synoikismos was not completed until so late is not without parallel for the Argolid, as has been suggested by Koerner (1985, 452-457, especially 457) for Tiryns. Koerner suggests that the inner structure of the polis at Tiryns was formed before the synoikismos took place and that this process was not completed in the seventh century. Whatever the reason, Ekroth (1996, 225) finds it safe to conclude that in the end of the archaic period the Berbati valley was partially, although not completely, deserted.

Berbati: Near Findspot 18
Hägg 1974, 129-130.
Ekroth 1996, 182.

Location. Downslope from Findspot 18, in Tracts 84, 90, and 92.

Features. A cist-like structure [archaic?] with large slabs on top had been sunk into the scarp, and in the field above several large slabs were noticed. This could be interpreted as the remains of a cist grave of a type well documented in the Argolid (Hägg 1974, 129f.). The whole area including Tracts 82, 84, 90, and 92 could have contained several tombs, which have now been obliterated or heavily disturbed by bulldozing (Ekroth 1996, 182).

Finds. Some Corinthian roof-tile fragments and geometric/archaic sherds were picked up on the overgrown terraces. Two miniature archaic vessels (nos. 3-4) were found in a newly bulldozed scarp below a tobacco field during a geological field trip in Tract 90. All the material belongs to the same geological horizon.

Berbati: Near Findspot 7
Wells [B.], Runnels, and Zangger 1990, 229-230.
Ekroth 1996, 182.

Location. From the slopes beneath Findspot 7 (eighth century pithos burial) towards the Kefalári Rema.

Finds. A few archaic sherds and a spool were found in Tracts 76, 78, and 80 (Ekroth 1996, 182).

Berbati: Findspot 20
Wells [B.], Runnels, and Zangger 1990, 229.

Location. Findspot 20, located in Tract 94, is situated on the same spur as Findspot 18 (eighth century graves) and Findspot 7 (eighth century pithos burial), but further downslope to the south-east. Here the spur flattens out and forms a plateau just to the west of the Kefalári Rema at the head of a ravine. The findspot has a very good view over the whole valley floor. The area is partly terraced and dense in vegetation such as olives and maquis (Ekroth 1996, 182).

Finds. A dense scatter of geometric/archaic material was found here, including fifty-one geometric/archaic sherds, twenty-four pieces of roof-tiles, and three pieces of poros, coarse clay, perhaps fired mud-bricks.
The archaic fine ware is more sparse than the late geometric. Argive archaic material seems to be lacking, but some Corinthian imports are present. No. 14 is a Corinthian conventionalising *kotyle* or *skyphos* of a type that was widely dispersed during the sixth and fifth century (Ekroth 1996, 186). There are only a few fine wares belonging to the sixth century, and perhaps more plain ware. The plain ware is represented by many different shapes (nos. 15-23).

The roof-tiles are mainly Laconian, both painted and unpainted, and they could be archaic.

Comments. Due to the large quantities of material, the function of the findspot must have been some kind of permanent settlement, maybe one or several farmhouses, established in the eighth century and in use until the sixth century (Ekroth 1996, 187).

Berbati: Findspot 24
Wells [B.], Runnels, and Zangger 1990, 229.

Location. About 125 m to the west of Findspot 20 on the same plateau to the west of the Kefalári Rema and in the same tract, 94.


Finds. The sample from this area contained fifty-six geometric/archaic sherds, six roof-tiles, one loom-weight, and two spools. Of archaic date is a fragment of an Argive *kantharos* (no. 31) from the first half of the sixth century. The plain ware (nos. 34-36) is similar to that of Findspot 20: mortars, and shallow and deep basins. It seems to be mainly archaic, but some of it may be geometric. Few sherds can be assigned to the sixth century.

The loom-weight (no. 37) is of the usual conical type; loom-weights of similar shape found in Korinthos and have been dated to the seventh century. One of the spools (no. 38) has the same shape as examples found at Argos, Prosymna, and Korinthos and is most likely archaic. The roof-tiles (no. 39) are both pan-tiles and cover-tiles of the Corinthian type.

A rich scatter of material was picked up in two associated tracts, Tracts 94 and 96. In all eighteen geometric/archaic sherds, six roof-tiles, one loom-weight, and two spools were found. A basin/*pithos* or *larnax* is of archaic date. The archaic spools (no. 47) are of the same shape as the previous one, no. 38. This one deserves mentioning, since it
carries a stamped palmette at one end. The roof-tiles (no. 42) are both Corinthian pan and cover-tiles.

**Comments.** The date of the material from Tracts 94 and 96 conforms to the date of the findspot material and also fills the gap in the seventh century. The settlement began around the late geometric period and continued into archaic times. The spools and loom-weights found suggest that textile production must have taken place at the findspots (Ekroth 1996, 192).

The material also points towards the presence of one or several farmhouses, probably part of the same complex as those found at Findspot 20 (Ekroth 1996, 190).

**Berbati: Findspot 26**

**Location.** On a tongue of preserved marl soil between two remas, downslope to the east of Findspots 20 and 24 in Tract 98.


**Features.** Traces of wall were visible in the south part of the findspot.

**Finds.** The concentration of material was dense, including sherds, tiles, stone rubble, and square blocks. A late sixth century Corinthian kotyle (no. 48) was found here, along with fifteen geometric/archaic sherds and at least as many tiles (Ekroth 1996, 192).

**Comments.** The function of the findspot is difficult to determine from the material; perhaps this material was brought there by erosion from Findspots 20 and 24 just up the slope.

**Berbati: The Phyesoumia Area**

**Location.** The Phyesoumia spur is situated close to the pass toward Mykenai and is also easily reached from the Mykenaian road (Ekroth 1996, 221). The region lies to the south of the spur where Findspots 20, 24, and 26 are situated. It must be considered as a whole if any conclusions about the function of the findspots located here are to be reached. Findspot 528 in Tract 559 is the northernmost of the geometric/archaic findspots in the area. Findspot 527 in Tract 564 is the southernmost of the geometric/archaic findspots on the Phyesoumia spur. The five findspots located in this area are: 522-523, 525, 527, 528.

Finds. Almost every findspot and tract yielded both fine and plain pottery and many roof-tiles. A quantity of the archaic pottery, both fine and plain ware, was imported from Korinthos (Ekroth 1996, 201). Loom-weights and spools were also found.

Findspot 527 had many roof-tiles and a few sherds and is associated with some large limestone blocks, though not squared, and a quantity of smaller limestone rubble (Ekroth 1996, 199). A late sixth to early fifth century loom-weight (no. 73) and an archaic krater (no. 72) were also found here. Tract 564 contained four geometric/archaic sherds, including an archaic krater (no. 76), loom-weights, and two spools (nos. 77-78).

Findspot 523 is in Tract 557, located to the south-east of Findspot 522 and to the south-west of Findspot 525, just to the west of the dirt road. There they found five archaic sherds, five Corinthian roof-tiles, and a lower stone from an andesite saddle quern. A limestone block with a cutting perhaps identifying it as a threshold was also noted in the tract. Associated Tract 557 yielded three archaic sherds. The date of the material sampled stretches over a long period of time, from the late eighth-early seventh century down to the sixth and maybe even to the fifth century. It includes two basins, one of which was a sixth-fifth century shallow basin from Korinthos (no. 69) (Ekroth 1996, 198).

In Tract 556, in a terraced olive grove just to the west of the dirt road, is Findspot 522 where a very worn column drum was found together with a small, crude limestone basin, both of these close to a cement-rubble construction a few metres in diameter. Five geometric/archaic sherds were found at Findspot 522 and four in its associated Tract 556. The date of the material is from late geometric to the sixth century. A sixth century bowl and an archaic pithos were found (nos. 58-59). At the findspot many more roof-tiles than sherds were noted.

To the east of Findspot 522, on the other side of the dirt road in Tract 562, was Findspot 525, where ten geometric/archaic sherds and one Corinthian pan-tile were sampled. The datable fine ware from the findspot seems to be archaic from the seventh and sixth centuries: a sixth century kantharos (no. 62) and an archaic pithos (no. 63). From Tract 562 came one archaic sherd.

Associated Tract 563 to the south of Findspot 525 contained one archaic sherd: an Attic cup or skyphos of the sixth to early fifth centuries. A large cut limestone block, roughly 1 m by 1 m was found in the centre of the tract.
Findspot 528 yielded twelve geometric/archaic sherds, all fine ware, and one spool. Most sherds seem to be archaic and of Argive manufacture. In the associated Tract 559 six archaic sherds and one large piece of a Corinthian pan-tile were sampled. It includes a sixth-fifth century krater and a sixth century straight-sided basin. The material in the tract came from the south part of the tract while the Findspot 528 lies in the north part. Tracts 560, 561, and 555, to the south of Findspot 528, contained a scatter of material, including sherds, both fine and plain ware, a rim of a neckless, gobular pithos, a jug or oinochoe, (no. 56), and a lekane stand or pithos (no. 57).

**Comments.** The conclusions that can be drawn from this material is that farmhouses were probably situated all along the ridge of the spur. It is impossible to deduce from the remains what kind of farming activity took place in the valley. It is possible that the tending of goat and sheep existed side by side with agriculture. The loom-weights and the spools could indicate that textiles were also produced. The settlement must have begun in the late geometric period and continued into the archaic period, which is best represented in its earliest phases.

The tiles from Findspot 528 suggest some kind of structure, but the sherd material is too scanty to allow any closer definition. The absence of plain ware is to be noted (Ekroth 1996, 193).

**Berbati: Findspot 21**
Ekroth 1996, 201.

**Location.** To the east of Findspot 15 in Tract 87 on a gently sloping alluvial fan overlooking the valley floor.


**Finds.** The material included a large amount of roof-tiles but fewer sherds. Cut blocks of conglomerate, one of which had a cutting indicating that it could be a block from a press-bed, were found.

An archaic skyphos or krater (no. 82) and a mortar (no. 83) were also found along with nine geometric/archaic sherds and twelve roof-tiles. All the fine ware seems to be archaic.

From Tracts 552 and 551 downslope to the south of Findspot 21 came three geometric/archaic sherds.
Comments. Due to the large number of roof-tiles noted, this findspot could represent a more permanent kind of structure, probably a farmstead. The main periods at Findspot 21, however, were classical/hellenistic and the majority of roof-tiles are likely to originate from structures of these periods (Ekroth 1996, 201).

**Berbati: Findspot 516, A Cult Place or Sanctuary**
Ekroth 1996, 201-205.

**Location.** Just on the north edge of the caved-in chamber of the mycenaean *tholos* (Findspot 515), which is situated north-west of the Mastos. The majority of the material was concentrated densely in a spot very close to the chamber of the *tholos*.

It was decided that all the material would be picked up; this deviation from the usual sampling method was made because it was believed that the function of the findspot could be better understood if all material was closely studied.


**Finds.** The ceramic material stretched from the late eighth century down to the end of the sixth century (Ekroth 1996, 205). The majority of the archaic sherds are from vessels manufactured in the Argolid. Only one fifth of the material consisted of plain ware and these sherds originated from different shapes than those findspots interpreted as farmsteads, like Findspots 20 and 24. The fine ware includes shapes that are only encountered at this findspot; archaic examples include a late seventh-early sixth century mesomphalic relief *phiale* (no. 89), *kalathoi* (nos. 98-99), and a decorated miniature cup (no. 100). These have almost exact parallels from the Kháos shrine at Mykenai.

Most of the miniatures (like nos. 101-103) seem to be Argive, but no. 100 is a Corinthian miniature krater or cup with painted figure decoration, perhaps attributable to the ‘Miniature horse workshop’.

Around ten sherds are Corinthian imports; only one *kotyle* (no. 95) is archaic, the rest are earlier.

The very fragmentary rider figurine (no. 105) is of the usual Argive archaic type.

The latest material is difficult to define, but the krater rim (no. 104) is glazed, which must place it late in the archaic period or early in the classical period.

Comments. Judging from the location of this findspot (close to the *tholos*) and the special character of the material found, it seems safe to conclude that it had a cultic function. The pottery is best paralleled, both in singular instances and as a whole, by the
material from the Kháos shine at Mykenai (Wace, Hood and Cook [J.] 1953, 69-83), but also by the geometric/archaic deposits in the chamber tombs at Prosymna (Blegen 1938, 377-390) and Argos (Deshayes 1966, 50-54), and the chamber tombs and tholoi at Mykenai (Wace 1932, 23, 31-34, 38, 43, 47, 49, 95, 114f.).

Berbati: Findspot 402, A Sanctuary?

Location. Tracts 403-409, 411, 414-416, 418 are situated in the area around a church and to the north and the east of Findspot 402. The distribution is likely to have some connection with Findspot 402. A scatter of geometric/archaic material was found in Tracts 403-409.


Finds. The sampled geometric/archaic material from eleven tracts and three findspots in this area consists of around fifty sherds, many tile fragments, and one female figurine. The material is both fine and plain ware, often paralleled in the settlement material from Findspots 20 and 24.

Some pottery was sixth century, including basins (nos. 114 and 120), a skyphos or cup (no. 115), a stand (no. 116), and an amphora or jug (no. 118).

The figurine (no. 112) was found in the north-west part of Tract 403, which is right below the area where Wrede (unpublished) claims he saw large foundations. At the site of the Áyios Pétros church (Findspot 23), right above Tract 403, Wrede noted a large foundation of ‘an archaic temple’ and local informants told the surveyors that when the church was constructed many ‘archaia’ (i.e. ancient objects and remains) were found (Ekroth 1996, 208). The figurine might have come from that shrine (Ekroth 1996, 218).

Comments. Presumably there was some kind of late geometric and archaic occupation in the area, which has been destroyed by activity during the later periods (Ekroth 1996, 208). The finding of the figurine strengthens the assumption that there was a sanctuary here (Ekroth 1996, 210).
**Berbati: Tract 223**
Ekroth 1996, 212.

**Location.** East of the Klisoura, on the high plateau in the region of Loutsa.


**Finds.** One archaic sherd was picked up in Tract 223. This sherd, a weathered rim of a Corinthian lipless *kotyle*, was found on the top of Rakhi Kalogirou, which commands an excellent view of the Argive plain.
Midea (Midhéa)  

Greek Name. Μιδέα (Παλαιόκαστρον)

**1:50000 map reference.** 22° 50' 30" E and 37° 39' N.

**Location.** At the edge of the Argive plain, south of modern Mídheá, about 12 km south-east of modern Mykínês, on top of a steep-sided hill called Palaiókastro. The Xeriás river runs just south of the akropolis.

**Excavation.** Swedish Institute and Greek Eforeía excavations.

**Finds.** Åström cleared the east gate from debris and found in the higher layers large parts of a terracotta house model, probably dating to the archaic period (French 1991, 24).

There are also pottery fragments indicating some sort of post-mycenaean habitation in the district below; however, the precise location has not been established (Hägg 1962, 89).

A few archaic sherds and one almost complete pot (kantharos) were discovered out of context, in area N, to the north-east of Terrace 10, near the citadel wall (Wallberg 1992, 33-39). The sherds belong to typical kantharoi or kraters of east Peloponnesian Argive ware, dating from the end of the seventh to the sixth century. The ceramic workshop where the complete kantharos was probably produced was discovered in the modern village of Kourtaki in 1966 (Papakhristodhoulou 1969, 131f.; Kosmetatou 1996, 117).

**Function.** Habitation site: fortification?

**Comments.** Wallberg reports that in 1990 trenches, which were laid out against the fortification wall on the lower terraces, contained mixed material of archaic to roman date, indicating habitation of the citadel in these periods and suggesting that the post-mycenaean habitation at Midea was more continuous than has been assumed (French 1991, 24).

Strabo (8.6.11) says that Midea and several other cities were destroyed by the Argives because of disobedience, an event which scholars usually date to the end of the
eighth or seventh century or more likely in the 460s, depending on the identification of
the ancient site as Midea (Foley 1988, 178).
Lefkákia

EF 1955a, 244.
Vollgraff 1956, 33.
Catling 1985, 21.
Touchais 1985, 778.
Foley 1988, 184.

Greek Name. Λευκάκα

1:50000 map reference. 22° 51’ 45” E and 37° 33’ 30” N.

Location. About 6.5 km east of Náfplio, on the road to Asíni, in the modern village of Lefkákia, around the village square, south of the modern church.

Excavation. Greek Eforeía excavations.

Features. The Greek Archaeological Service excavated a substantial archaic temple here. The foundations, at some point preserved on two courses, are of rectangular ashlar blocks.

Function. Special-purpose site: shrine.

Comments. This might be a temple of Apollo. No previous occupation at this site has been reported.
Asine (Asíni)

Frödin and Persson 1938.
Kelly 1967, 422-431.
Tomlinson 1972, 42, 75, 226.
Styrenius 1975, 177-183.
Morgan and Whitelaw 1990.
Arkhondidhou-Aryri 1983, 60.

Greek Name. Ασίνη (Παραλία Ασίνης)

1:50000 map reference. 22° 52' 30" E and 37° 31' 45" N.

Location. On the Argolic gulf about 10 km south-east of Náfplio, about 2 km south-east of modern Asíni. The plain of Asine is about 4 km².

Though there is no substantial barrier, Asine forms a separate region of its own, distinct from the open air of the Argive plain.

Excavation. French School, preliminary mapping of the akropolis (Kastráki), 1920; Swedish Institute excavations, 1922-30, and 1970 to present-day.

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary and graves.

Habitation site: town or village?

Asine: The Akropolis

Leekley and Noyes 1976, 59.

Location. On a rocky headland, 52 m high, also known as Kastráki.


Finds. Two archaic deposits with terracotta figurines and other objects were found on the akropolis. Among them were horsemen with shields (Poulsen [E.] 1994, 20).

A geometric bronze female figurine was also found on the akropolis (Leekley and Noyes 1976, 59).

About 1500 ceramic sherds and twenty odd other objects coming from the settlement area were selected as belonging to the post-geometric periods. Since the bulk of the fineware is post-geometric bg, we can assume that there is an equally considerable amount of post-geometric plain wares. There were also a few archaic grey wares (Poulsen [E.] 1994, 9).
The earliest pottery fragments dating after the geometric period are three pieces of archaic cups or cup-skyphoi, rim fragments of an Attic or Corinthian krater, and a bell krater in rf style (Poulsen [E.] 1994, 14). The belly fragment of a jug also belongs in the earlier part of the period, either to the sixth or fifth century. Many rim fragments are dated to the late seventh century and to the third quarter of the sixth century (Poulsen [E.] 1994, 17). A number of lekane fragments were found, and one of them (no. A189) is Corinthian from the late archaic period (Poulsen [E.] 1994, 18).

Mortars, lamps, and cooking ware were also recovered here (Poulsen [E.] 1994, 19).

Comments. Compared with the substantial remains and deposits of the prehistoric periods, those of the later periods are admittedly rather scanty. The Italian fortification work during World War II has destroyed a good deal of the akropolis. Nonetheless, the visible remains add information of interest to the history of the site and the region as a whole. The inventory of pottery shapes demonstrates that the deposit relates to cult activity and some habitation, perhaps classical (Poulsen [E.] 1994).

Asine: North-west of the Akropolis
Papakhristodhoulou 1969, 132.
Styrenius 1998.

Location. The lower city surrounds the akropolis on the north-west slope.
Excavation. Swedish Institute excavations in 1922-30, and Greek Eforeía excavations.
Features. A fifth century cist tomb was reported.
Comments. The vegetation and erosion have destroyed the original three terraces of the lower city, and the site was also severely plundered for stone by Italians during the war.
**Asine: Barbouna hill (Levendhis sector)**

Renaudin 1921, 304.
Barrett 1954, 421-444.
Vollgraff 1956, 31.
Foley 1988, 142-143.
Billot 1992, 35-98.
Hägg 1992a, 18.

**Location.** Opposite or north of the akropolis in the north-west direction is the Barbouna Hill. The temple is just west and north-west of the highest point (92 m) on a constructed terrace.


**Features.** In the early period the focal point within the *temenos* was a simple, apsidal structure on a narrow stone socle. This building (B) had walls of mud-brick and a thatched roof. It was destroyed about 720.

Another building, Building A, was erected slightly further east. Its early history is somewhat obscure, as pottery found in the trenches by the walls only gives a terminus post quern for its erection at the end of the eight century. It could be an immediate successor of Building B. It must have been re-built a number of times; in its later phase it measured 4.3 m by 9.6 m and was oriented north-south with a door at the south end slightly off-centre. The building was in two sections, and on three sides of the interior rooms were benches running along the walls. Its walls were of mud-brick.

**Finds.** In the area of the Building A were found geometric, Protocorinthian, and Corinthian sherds as well as figurines and a few bronze rings and pins. Perhaps the most important find was a small archaic lead statuette, believed to be that of Apollo.

Near the ruins of the temple the excavators found a fragment of marble statue, probably a *kouros* torso (Renaudin 1921, 304, fig. 7).

Large quantities of tiles were found inside Building A. Further, by the outer wall of the north short end, a deposit of tiles of different kinds, both roof-tiles and *simas*, is reported (Wells [B.] 1990, 157-160).

**Comments.** If the apsidal Building B on the summit of the Barbouna hill is correctly identified with the geometric sanctuary of Apollo Pythaeus, then contrary to what Pausanias (2.36.5, 3.7.4, 4.8.3, 4.34.9) says, it was violently destroyed: charcoal mixed with fragments of burnt mud-brick indicate its destruction in the late geometric IIb phase (730-710 BCE). On the other hand, Building B is almost immediately succeeded by the...
rectangular Building A, where associated material suggests a period of use from the end of late geometric or sub-geometric through to the fifth century, so there may have been some continuity of cult practice, if not of archaeological installations (Hall [J.] 1995a, 581).

The latest roof decoration of Building A dates to about 500 and is not of local manufacture. Some of the architectural terracottas, at least a sima, were perhaps produced in an Argive workshop. In the early fifth century the Asine area was under Argive control, and it may be fairly certain that the cult of Apollo Pythaeus was still highly popular in the first half of the fifth century. After that, rapid decline may have set in (Wells [B.] 1990, 160-161).

**Asine: Area 12, North-west of Chamber Tomb 7**

Hägg 1962, 87, 89.

**Location.** In a field south-west of the track, about 300 m north-west of chamber tomb 7.

**Excavation.** Swedish Institute excavations.

**Finds.** Some sherds could be archaic or later. These include three fragments from a vase and a lip fragment of an open vessel.

**Comments.** There are fragments indicating some sort of habitation in the area during the archaic and classical and/or hellenistic periods. However, the precise location of this post-mycenaean habitation has not been established. It is probably to be found in the hitherto unexplored area in the neighbourhood.

**Asine: Kamaniola Plot, North-east of the Akropolis**

Michaud 1971, 874.

**Greek Name.** ΚΑΜΑΝΙΟΛΑ

**Location.** In an orchard (now a camping) owned by the brothers Kamaniola, approximately 100 m east of the akropolis, just above the sandy beach.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforia investigations, 1969 (E. Protonotariou-Dheflaki), and Swedish Institute excavations, 1970-72 and 1974.

**Features.** A total of twelve trenches were dug, ten in the main area and two approximately 25 m further east (Rafn 1979, 9). In the north part of trench 11 there was
found the burial of an adolescent, cist grave 1970-26, partly disturbed by trial trench D4 from the previous year. It was oriented north, north-east by south, south-west and lay at a depth of 260 m and was about 1.4 m by 0.35 m by 0.30 m. Only four stone slabs of the cist remained, three of them still in situ. No covering slabs were preserved. The body had been placed outstretched on a layer of pebbles with its head to the west and its right arm resting on the pelvis. It was probably the skeleton of a thirteen year old boy.

In 1971 new trenches were opened to the west of the main area, and two more cist graves were found: one was that of a child, grave 1971-78, and the other was that of an adult, grave 1971-79, partly in the same trench. They both had the same orientation, and were constructed as rectangular cists with short and long sides consisting of large upright stone slabs, the gap in between filling with smaller stones. The orthostats as well as the cover stones were rather irregular in size, badly cut, and imperfectly fitted.

The child’s grave lay at a depth of 2.22 m and had inner dimensions of 0.60 m by 0.24 m by 0.20 m. The cist was made of six upright standing slabs of limestone, two on each of the long sides, one on each of the short ones, smaller stones filled the gaps in between. It was covered by three large flat stone slabs. At the bottom of the cist was a layer of pebbles on which lay the nearly disintegrated skeleton of a child.

The second grave, 1971-79, extended towards the west from trench W 27.7/N 15.3, through the partition wall into trench W 25.7/N 18.4. The cist lay at a depth of 2.30-2.45 m and was oriented north, north-east by south, south-west, measuring 1.7 m by 0.35 m by 0.30 m. It was built of upright slabs of limestone, three on each of the long sides, and one on each of the short ones with smaller stones between the slabs. Two large flat stones were used as a cover. Probably a third slab had covered the lower end of the grave, but it was missing at the time of excavation. This fairly well preserved skeleton of a young adult female lay outstretched with the hands to the west, left arm along the side, and right arm resting on the pelvis. The grave dates to about 490-470 and is the wealthiest of the three graves.

In general, the first grave dates to about 490-480, the second and the third to about 490-470. The dates given for each of the three graves show that they are not very far from each other in time; in fact they all belong to the transition from the late archaic to the early classical period.

**Finds.** In the child’s grave 1970-26 a single bg kotyle (c. 490-480) lay very close to the right leg, almost covering the knee (Styrenius and Vidén 1971, 147, fig. 1; Rafn 1979,
11). This pot is a very common vase shape for funeral as well as for daily use (Rafn 1979, 25; also Styrenius and Vidén 1971, 147).

Grave 1971-78, also a child’s grave, contained seven pots: a painted tripod *pyxis*, four *kotylai* with pattern decoration, a bg miniature krater, a bg cup (similar cup found at Lerna) all dating from the early fifth century. The *pyxis* is a shape very often found in a child’s grave, and this vessel may have held contents of some nature. The miniature vessels were perhaps meant as toys for the child (Rafn 1979, 25).

Grave 1971-79 contained many gifts: an Attic cup, which is a very common shape among grave offerings, and six so-called White style *pyxides* (three large and three small) and two of their lids, which in Korinthos is a rare find in the graves. Apparently the convex *pyxis* was more popular as a grave gift in the Argolid, where it has been found in several graves at Árgos (Papaspiridhi-Karouzou, 1938, 18). The grave also held other offerings besides pottery: a fragmentary glass vase, a bronze pin-head, a fragment of an iron pin, a bronze pendant or pin-head, and a pair of iron reinforcements for sandals. It did not appear that the sandals had originally been worn on the feet, rather that they were placed beside the body. They were made of one piece.

Iron reinforcements for sandals very similar to the pair from Asine were found at Halieis in a grave from the first half of the fifth century, actually sitting on the feet of the skeleton (Rudolph 1983, 73). Solid footwear must have been needed for walking the rough terrain (Rafn 1979, 26).

Of the fifteen pots found in the three graves at Asine only one, the cup 1971-8.9, is an Attic import. Most of the other pots are Corinthian; they include the only offering in the boy’s grave, the four small *kotylai*, and the *pyxides*. The miniature krater and the tripod *pyxis*, the cup and the small *pyxis*, are neither Corinthian nor Attic. The four pots are all of the same fabric, probably all from a local workshop, either at Asine or elsewhere in the Argolid (Rafn 1979, 29).

**Comments.** The three graves from Kamaniola Plot belonged to a period not represented in the earlier excavations at Asine, the early fifth century. It was believed that the site was uninhabited during the years c. 700-300 (Rafn 1979, 9). The finds just mentioned may to some extent lead to a reconsideration of this conclusion.

No traces of walls or houses were found in connection with the graves, but a few sherds seemingly belonging to the fifth century were found in the excavated area (Rafn 1979, 30).
Judging from the three graves the inhabitants of Asine built their graves less carefully than it is known from other places. The graves were carefully laid out, however, all with the same orientation, and in at least two graves the bodies had been placed in an outstretched position with their heads to the west. The three burials differed from each other in their contents (Rafn 1979, 25).

The choice of pottery in the graves reveals that Corinthian pots were preferred to Attic and to local ones (Rafn 1979, 30).
Greek Name. 'Αγιος Αδριανός (Προφήτης Ηλίας)

1:50000 map reference. 22° 52' 30" E and 37° 36' 15" N.

Location. In the south-east part of the central Argive plain, about 5.5 km east of Tiryns and 3 km east of Néa Tíryns, on a hill 2.5 km north-west of the Áyios Adhrianós, where the chapel of Profitis Ilias can be seen.

From this area (also called Katsíngri) one gets a good view of Mykenai, Prosymna, Midea, and Asine.

Excavation. Greek Eforeía excavations.

Features. The chapel rests on a temple foundation; the sekos (6.6 m by 13 m) was divided by an axial wall and oriented east-west. The exterior walls were built of large rough stones, with a mud-brick superstructure.

Finds. In a trial excavation in 1962 Dhei'laki-Protonotariou discovered an archaic votive deposit. Archaic sherds, including miniature skyphi and figurines, pins, fibulae, and a small bronze phiale were found in a sounding opened within the foundation; roman sherds were found outside the walls.

Nearby a small cave yielded a further deposit of ceramic and metal objects; the most important find was a lead porpi, some kind of belt attachment, carrying a scene with female, who wears a long khiton and polos, and a male who clasps his cloak.

Function. Special-purpose site: shrine.

Comments. This small temple was probably dedicated to Hera (Hall [J.] 1995a, 597). It was put on the same spot as building from mycenaean times.

On the south side of the hill were found Cyclopean walls, suggesting that the akropolis is fortified in mycenaean times.

On the slopes of the hill on which the temple and chapel are situated are terraces, which may indicate the position of an ancient settlement, perhaps Lessa. Pausanias (2.25.9-10) mentions that the temple to Athena was on the classical road from Tiryns to
the Asklepieion at ancient Epidauros. This classical road may well have followed the path of the earlier mycenaean road. The earlier mycenaean road went from Mykenai to Prosymna, continued south-east past Dendra and Midea, passing east of Áyios Adhríanós and then across the bridge at Kazárma east towards the mycenaean settlement at ancient Epidauros. Within the region of Kazárma where the mountain ridges converge to form a narrow east pass, the road converged (perhaps between Áyios Adhríanós and Kazárma) with a second mycenaean road, a road from Tiryns past the region of the dam and Áyios Adhríanós to Kazárma (Balcer 1974, 149).

The boundary of Argos, however, should be further to the east, while Áyios Adhríanós is hardly on the direct line of the road from Midea to ancient Epidauros, which is more likely to have passed further to the north, under the slopes of Mt. Árakhnaio. If so, both the name of Áyios Adhríanós and the precise position of Lessa must remain uncertain (Tomlinson 1972, 42).
Limnés

Wells [B.], Runnels, and Zangger 1990, 217-238.
Ekroth 1996.

Greek Name. Λίμνες

1:50000 map reference. 22°53’ E and 37° 42’ 45” N.

Location. East of the Berbati valley, upland, on a plateau.

Excavation. Swedish Institute, Berbati-Limnes intensive survey, 1988-90. Their survey permit did not include the village of Limnés.

Finds. In all only nine geometric/archaic sherds and two roof-tile fragments were noted in the whole of the Limnes region. They are very dispersed.

In Tract 34 a Corinthian pan-tile fragment was found. Further south close to the modern village of Limnes, another Corinthian pan-tile was picked up in Tract 182 and from Tract 181 came three geometric/archaic undiagnostic sherds. At Findspot 44, located on the north slopes of Vigliza, a geometric or archaic base of a krater or an amphora was found. In Tract 157 one archaic sherd was found. In Tract 3 on the north slopes of Kondovouni four undiagnostic tile fragments and three most likely archaic sherds were picked up. In Tract 12, to the south of the Mykenaian road, one undiagnostic bg archaic sherd was found. Two archaic sherds came from Tract 107, north of Brekon hill, one of which come from a bowl with handles attached to the rim (Ekroth 1996, 212).

Function. Habitation site: field building ?

Comments. Prósymni and Limnés are geographically close but still lie worlds apart. The people from Limnés look north to Korinthos; while those from Prósymni look towards the Argive plain. Only in 1967 was the road between the two villages modernised to facilitate communication between the two areas.
B. THE AKTE

The east finger of land projecting some 70 km from the Peloponnesos just below its juncture with central Greece at the Isthmos of Korinthos was referred to in antiquity as the Argolic Akte (meaning peninsula). The earliest extant use of the name Akte for this part of the Argolid is in the historian Polybios (5.91.4) of the second century. It is also used by Diodoros (12.43) in the next century speaking of Athenian raids on the area in 420, and since he diverges from the chief authority for the period, Thucydides, he may be copying information and terminology from the fourth century historian Ephoros (Jameson 1976b, 90 n3).

Surface surveys of the Akte were first conducted by members of the German Archaeological Institute in Athens beginning in 1909 and by Philadhelpheus in the same year in connection with brief excavations he conducted at Ermióni and Portokhéli on behalf of the Greek Archaeological Society. It was not until 1972 that the first systematic survey (mainly of the southern Argolid) took place with a team of various specialists under the auspices of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
B.ii. The Region of Epidauria

Nomós Argolidhos: Eparkhía Nafplías and Eparkhía Ermionídhos

The Epidauria, at the upper end of the Akte, is the largest of the three regions of the Akte. Much of it lay along the Saronikos gulf, east of the Argeia, but it also straddled the peninsula with two small coastal plains on the Argolic gulf, at Kántia and Íria. The settlement of Epidauros was on the Saronikos gulf at what is now known as Old Epidauros (Palaía Epídavros). Access by land (before 1973, when a motorway opened) was difficult from the Isthmos of Kórinthos, but would have been much easier from the Argeia along valleys running east-west. On the road from Epidauros to Argos lay the city’s chief sanctuaries of Apollo Maleatas and Asklepios, near the modern village of Lygoúrio.
Áyios Ilías (Mt. Arakhnaíó)

Hägg 1992a, 19.

**Greek Name.** Ἁγιὸς Ὑλία (Ἀραχναΐόν)

**1:50000 map reference.** 23° 00-01’ E and 37° 38’ N.

**Location.** On Mt. Arakhnaion, north-west of the sanctuary at Epidaurus and north of Kazárma.

Mt. Arakhnaíó forms a shallow east-west crescent on the east border of the Argeia. It is divided into two main peaks: the long, lower twin summited east peak (1139 m) is called either Arna or Mavrovoúni, while the higher pointed west peak (1199 m) is called Áyios Ilías.

Traces of ancient road connecting the north and south sides of the mountain via the saddle can still be seen (and used) immediately to the east of the cavea-like area and on the south edge of the saddle. A modern unimproved road begins at the top of the cavea, goes over the saddle, and then down the gently sloping north valley to the modern village of Arakhnaíó (Rupp 1976, 262).

**Excavation.** Unexcavated.

**Function.** Special-purpose site: shrine.

Habitation site: farmstead.

---

Áyios Ilías: The Saddle Site


Rupp 1976, 264.

**Location.** Between the two peaks, where the river Maryérí runs.

**Features.** A large outcropping of limestone is enclosed on the north, east, and west sides by rubble walls, in places preserved to a height of four metres. Within the walls the earth is thick but unburned.

**Finds.** There are numerous coarse wares and obsidian chips to be found, but nothing archaic.

**Comments.** There were no traces of any type of altar or sacrificial debris here. The location, layout, and finds suggest that it is the probable location, from the bronze age onward, of a small village or farming settlement that utilised the fertile soil of the cavea-
like area to the south and the grazing lands in the saddle and on the slopes of the mountain.

Clearly these scant remains do not support the placing in this area of the altars of Zeus and Hera (Paus. 2.25.10).

*Áyios Ilias: The Summit*

Foley 1988, 176.

**Location.** Directly to the west of the saddle, on a small elongated plateau with a series of level areas at different elevations at the summit.

**Features.** Three archaeological and two architectural features were surveyed. Remains of walls were found. Both foundations are sizeable rectangular constructions, one roughly 13 m by 6 m, the other 12 m by 5 m. There is also a semi-circular area defined by crude low rubble walls and natural rock outcroppings. A rough terrace wall forms its south side; both the walls and the outcropping provide a windbreak for the level interior area.

**Finds.** Three sherd concentrations and burnt animal bones in a fine dark-brown soil matrix were located on the summit. In the first concentration is fine dark soil with burnt bone fragments and numerous sherds, mainly open shape vessels: one-handed cups, kylikes, skyphoi, and bowls, dating from the archaic period with an admixture of some classical bg ware.

The second concentration (eighth-seventh century) about 20 m to the south-east of the benchmark and 10 m to the east of the first concentration, is situated on a slight rocky slope and extends almost 4 m along the slope and 2.5 m up. Numerous late geometric sherds and some Protocorinthian (c. 720-640) and early Argive archaic (c. 690-650) sherds were observed with the same predominance of open shapes.

The third concentration with a diameter of about 2 m lies 10 m to the north-east of the benchmark. These sherds appear to be mostly archaic but again with some classical bg sherds.

Fragments of curved terracotta pan-tiles and cover-tiles were found in the general area of the two foundations.
Comments. All of the above ceramic material suggests a continuous period of use of the summit from the second half of the eighth century through at least the sixth century with sporadic use probably into the roman era.

The interpretation of the two foundations is difficult. There are two possible explanations. First, that they represent the foundations of naiskoi or small temples; second, that one or both represent the enclosure walls for the open air temene of Zeus and Hera with their altars located inside them. These altars could have been either simple ash altars, on or around natural rock platforms, or simple built-altars. The walls could have served as windbreaks as well as delimiting the temene. The concentrations of sherds could then represent the sacred refuse piles that would have resulted from the periodic cleaning of the temene. But why do we have no indications of entrances into these areas?

Pausanias mentions nothing other than two altars on the mountain top. His report, however, is not based on personal observation, and offers no detailed description of the place. Most mountaintop sanctuaries of Zeus have no formal architectural elements or plans, but consist only of an accumulation of burnt animal bones, ashes, fragments of votive pottery, and earth often found around an outcropping of rock. Naiskoi or small temples are very rare in these mountaintop sanctuaries and Pausanias’ informant(s) would not have overlooked these structures, if they or their ruins had existed. Therefore the concentrations of sherds, ash, and burnt animal bones on the mountaintop would be the best candidates for the location of the two ash altars. Most likely the altars would have stood in and around the first concentration, from where one has a clear view to the south of the probable site of ancient Lessa at Kazárma, and the valley to the south of Mt. Arákhnaion. If this hypothesis is correct, then the function of the other two concentrations remains unclear (Rupp 1976, 267). What is clear is that the altars of Zeus and Hera mentioned by Pausanias were located on the summit of the Áyios Ilias peak of Mt. Arákhnaion and not in the saddle between it and the Arna peak as was previously thought (Rupp 1976, 267-268; Foley 1988, 176).
**Íria**

Touchais 1978, 670.
Foley 1988, 182.

**Greek Name.** Ἰρία

1:50000 map reference. 23° 01’ E and 37° 29’ 15” N.

**Location.** Just over 1 km from the Argolic gulf (the bay of Toló), in a coastal valley, south-east of Dhrépano, at the modern town of the same name.

**Excavation.** Unknown.

**Finds.** Sherds of the geometric to the hellenistic periods have been recovered and in both the late helladic and classical periods the site was fortified.

**Function.** Habitation site: farmstead?

**Comments.** The upper part of the valley in the plain of Íria has excellent farmland and may have been in dispute between the three principal cities of the Akte: Epidauros, Hermione, and Halieis (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 22).
Lessa ? (Ligourió)

**EF 1950a, 302-305.**
**Tomlinson 1972, 42.**
**Foley 1988, 186-187.**

**Greek Name.** Λυγουριον

1:50000 map reference. 23° 03' E and 37° 36' 30" N.

**Location.** Near Ligourió, about 800 m east of modern Khoutalaika on the road from Náfplio to Palaiá Epidavros.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia excavations.

**Features.** Some scholars place the ancient community of Lessa on the slopes that dominate the village of Ligourió. The polygonal walls, most probably archaic, which are still visible at the top of the hill, deserve to be studied.

**Function.** Habitation site: fortification.

**Comments.** The excavator believes that the most ancient sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas, at a distance of only 3 km, was related to this akropolis, which was destroyed by the Epidaurians who introduced the cult of Asklepios (EF 1950a, 304).

Tomlinson (1972, 42) suggests that either the site of the archaic temple at Áyios Adhrianós or better the hilltop fortress at Katsíngri might be the location of Lessa.
Greek Name. Ιερόν Ασκληπιοῦ καὶ Ναός Απόλλωνος

1:50000 map reference. 23° 05' E and 37° 36' N.

Location. The Asklepieio and the temple of Apollo at Epidauros are located on the road to Pálaia Epidavros, just after the town of Ligourió.

Excavation. Greek Eforcía excavations.

Kavvadhias and Stais excavated at the sanctuary at Epidauros beginning in 1881, uncovering the theatre, various temples, the gymnasium, and associated buildings in the area. Martin [R.] and Metzger (1942-43) investigated parts of the site including the temple of Asklepios in 1945. Between 1948 and 1951, Papadhimitriou worked at the site, but concentrated mainly on the temple of Apollo Maleatas on the heights east of the sanctuary. Most of the finds were of the archaic period. Lambrinoudhakis and Mitsos resumed work on the site in 1974 (Leekley and Noyes 1976, 61).

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary.

Comments. From the late sixth century the Epidauros festival had been patronised by outsiders, such as Delphi.
**Epidauros Sanctuaries: The Temple of Apollo on Mt. Kynortion**

Papadimitriou 1949, 361-383.
EF 1950a, 304; 1950b, 315-316; 1952, 218-222.
Aupert 1976, 607.
Catling 1979, 18.
Tomlinson 1983, 92-94.
Mylonas 1988, 92-96.
Billot 1990, 95-139.
Hägg 1992a, 19.

**Location.** On the slopes of Mt. Kynortion, east of the Asklepieion sanctuary.

There must have been a direct route from the east side of the lower sanctuary to the upper, but at present this is blocked by the perimeter fence surrounding the main archaeological zone, the lower sanctuary. To reach the Ireó Maleáta sanctuary the visitor has to return along the modern road towards Ligourió. At the first house on the right hand side of this road (leaving the sanctuary) a dirt track branches off to the north. Another track to the right soon leads in a generally east direction, passing the perimeter of the main archaeological zone close to the remains of the *Propylon*. From here the track climbs steadily until it reaches a farmhouse. Up to this point it is just about passable for cars; beyond the farm it is not. Just before the farm, on the south side of the track, is a large cistern (Tomlinson 1983, 92-93).

**Excavation.** Greek Eforiá excavations.

**Features.** Below the paving in the south area of the *cella* of the classical temple was part of an earlier wall, evidently of the sixth century to be associated with the archaic predecessor of the classical temple. It has not (yet) been properly published.

About 7 m north of the grand retaining wall of the sanctuary a second retaining wall was constructed in large *poros* blocks (EF 1952, 221).

An altar of the seventh century consisted of two elliptical stone rings (Touchais 1977, 551).

Among the finds from the rectangular *poros* Building E of the great altar, originally dug by Kavvadhias, were two rustic votive *altars*, inscribed *αρταμίτος | αρεμίως*, and *ἀπόλλων | δειφα[δωτα] (SEG 38.320-321; Catling 1989, 28; Touchais 1988, 627; Mylonas 1988, 96). Nothing of this is now visible. The classical altar has been erected on top of the archaic one (Touchais 1979, 561). The archaic altar was connected to the temple by a path, not by steps (Catling 1980, 30).
**Finds.** Over one hundred small *kotylai*, many *alabasters* and other *vases*, especially Corinthian and Attic (EF 1950a, 304), rings, mirrors, two bronze *wheels*, *pins*, *knives* and *swords*, arrowheads, double-axes, gold leaves from *wreaths*, the left foot of an archaic bronze *figurine*, a small lead *kouros*, and a large number of terracotta *figurines* were recovered in a burnt deposit found to the north-east of the classical temple (EF 1950a, 304, fig. 15; Aupert 1976, 607; Touchais 1979, 561, fig. 81). A terracotta *lion-spout* belonged to the archaic temple (Epidauros Mus.: O 15/57 and P 16/72). Other architectural terracottas have been attributed to Epidauros; they include hexagonal antefixes (Epidauros Mus.: ME αξ 353 and 381; Billot 1990, 107, fig. 5).

Numerous finds were discovered in the north-east corner of the temple. They include burnt *animal bones*, many *miniatures vases* (*kotylai*, an alabaster decorated with a female figure--Artemis), Attic *bif cups*, *figurines*, and *metal objects*. A graffito, inscribed ΛΑΔΕΜ (= λαδης), was also found on a small sherd (Papadimitriou 1949, figs. 8-10).

From the fill predating the classical temple’s construction was recovered a bronze plaque with an *inscription* dated to c. 475-450 (Orlandhos [K.] 1978, 105, fig. 63; Touchais 1978, 672, fig. 71).

Archaic sherds, including a large *krater* of the mid-fifth century, were found near the retaining wall (EF 1952, 221).

**Comments.** The relatively high proportion of Argive dedications at the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas most probably reflects Argos’ interest (especially access to the gulf) in the area from the early seventh century. The bronze plaque with four corner holes shows that it had once been fastened to a temple wall.

---

**Epidauros Sanctuaries: The Temple of Asklepios**

Kavvadhias 1900a.
Martin [R.] and Metzger 1942-3, 329.
Burford 1969.
Tomlinson 1983.

**Location.** On the plain at the foot of Mt. Kynortion, in the area of the lower sanctuary.

**Excavation.** Greek Efoeia excavations.

**Features.** Within the limits of the site of Building E is a small *structure* in the north-west corner, which may have been a shrine or small temple dedicated to Apollo.

Perhaps the foundation of a ground *altar* was found west of Building E (the old *Abaton*). It is nearly square and consists of three concentric sets of limestone slabs; its
innermost square is dated to the sixth century, which would make it the oldest surviving structure in the sanctuary.

One other feature belongs to the early period, and that is a well (A), probably of the late sixth century. It was essential to the practices of the healing cult.

**Finds.** In the area of the Abaton and its annexes, the interior walls of room one held a large quantity of Attic bf sherds from the mid-sixth to the mid-fifth centuries: fragments of mid-sixth century *kothon*; a fragment of early fifth century panathenaic *amphora*; and a fragment of mid-fifth century white-ground cup with a winged genie.

In the courtyard of Building E was excavated an ash layer which was probably debris spread from the altar. The ash contained burnt animal bones and votives dedicated to Apollo (Pythaeus) and Asklepios, which are the earliest finds excavated in the sanctuary (Tomlinson 23, 75).

**Comments.** It seems therefore that the building was erected during the mid-fifth century, in a place previously consecrated to cult activities (Martin [R.] and Metzger 1942-3, 329).
Gyftókastro

Gyftókastro A-29

Faraklas 1972, 12, figs. 11a, 12b, 14a-b, 16a, 17b.
Foley 1988, 180.

Greek Name. Γυφτόκαστρο

1:50000 map reference. 23° 06' 30" E and 37° 31' N.

Location. South of Mt. Koryphaon, about 1 km south-west of modern Stavropódhion and about 6 km north-east of Karnezaïka, actually now part of the Eparkhía Ermionidhos.

Excavation. Surface survey, Faraklas.

Features. From the archaic period there was probably a sanctuary and a settlement here. The site was also fortified from archaic times onwards.

Finds. Surface finds were noted.

Function. Habitation site: fortification.

Comments. The site was re-occupied in the archaic period.
Hyrnithion (Yrnëthion)

Faraklas 1972, 11, figs. 14a to 17b.
Fossey 1987, 76.

Greek Name Yρνηθιον

1:50000 map reference. 23° 07' 30" E and 37° 38' N.

Location. Immediately south-west of hellenistic and roman Hynnthion, about 3.5 km south of the Apollo Maleatas sanctuary at ancient Epidauros.

Excavation. Surface survey, Faraklas.

Features. Faraklas notes the existence of an archaic sanctuary here, though its date is far from certain.

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary.

Comments. Perhaps this is the sanctuary of Artemis Koryphaia.
**Epidauros (Palaiá Epídavros)**

Faraklas 1972, 11.
Touchais 1977, 554.

**Greek Name.** Ἐπίδαυρος (Παλαιά Ἐπίδαυρος)

**1:50000 map reference.** 23° 10' E and 37° 38' N.

**Location.** On the east coast of the Argolid, in a sheltered harbour between two small capes.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia excavations.

In 1888 Stais excavated seven mycenaean chamber tombs near the harbour. Papadhimitriou later investigated the site and described various remains. Protonotariou-Dhetlaki excavated the theatre in 1970. Kritzas and Whittlesey surveyed the underwater remains.

**Function.** Habitation site: town or village?

**Comments.** Palaiá Epídavros has a harbour, settlement, and sanctuary. There are remains of fortification walls and the ruins of a small temple. A nekropolis of geometric to roman times has been discovered at 'Mínia' about 1.5 km from the city of Palaiá Epídavros (Leekley and Noyes 1976, 61-62). Unfortunately, the material from this region remains largely unpublished.

---

**Epidauros: South-east of the Town**

Faraklas 1972, 46-47.
Foley 1988, 192.
Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 80.

**Location.** About 500 m south-east of the modern town of the same name on the east coast of the Epidauria region.

**Excavation.** Unknown.

**Features.** A sizeable temple has been excavated with remains of Protocorinthian, classical, and later votives. There are also fortified circuit walls (Foley 1988, 192).

**Finds.** There is much geometric to hellenistic pottery; the material remains largely unpublished.

**Comments.** Perhaps this is the sixth century sanctuary of Artemis (Koruphias or Koryphaia ?) (Paus. 2.29.1).
**Epidaurus: Minia on Cape Kléftis**
EF 1952, 221.
Papakhristodhoulou 1969, 133.
Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 80.

**Greek Name.** Μίνια (Ἀκρ. Κλέφτης)

**Location.** To the right of the pedestrian street in the modern town, about 1.5 km south-east from it.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforéia excavations.

**Features.** Fourteen *cist graves* date from geometric to roman times. Perhaps some are archaic.

**Finds.** On top of the hill, among numerous fragments of sculptures, Papadhimitriou found the lower half of the torso of an archaic *kouros* (EF 1952, 221).

---

**Epidaurus: Katsimilis Plot at Katarákhí**
Touchais 1984, 760; 1985, 778.

**Greek Name.** ΚΑΤΣΙΜΙΛΙΣ, Καταράχη?

**Location.** Where remains of a sanctuary (probably classical) were found, at a place called Kataráki.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforéia excavations, 1975.

**Features.** Levelling work here destroyed the south wall of a substantial *building*.

**Finds.** They found a small *bronze kore* dating to about 600 mixed in with archaic *pottery* (Touchais 1984, 750, fig. 47; Catling 1984, 26, fig. 36).

**Comments.** The statue is associated with a temple.

The statue is of Laconian influence and shows the conservatism of the time.
B.iii.a. The Southern Argolid: The Region of Halieis

Nomós Argolídhos: Eparkhía Ermionídhos

The territory of Halieis includes the Flámboura plain, the western end of the peninsula, the commune of Portokhéli, and half of that of Kranídhi, together with the island of Spetses (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 18 n.c).
Dhoroufi (Dhouroufi) Ridge

Greek Name. Δορούφι

1:50000 map reference. 23° 06' 30" E and 37° 24' N.

Location. In the region of Kranidi, on the north and north-east slopes of a hill near the coast, approximately 2 km south of Koiladha.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Features. The foundations of two farmsteads were discovered in a terraced field.

Finds. The survey team found thirty-four archaic sherds, including cups, kraters, and domestic wares, Laconian and Corinthian roof-tiles, resembling those from the temple of Apollo at Halieis.

Function. Habitation site: farmsteads.

Comments. The site was probably connected with Mases in the archaic period.
Áyios Ioánnis Kartéris


Greek Name. Άγιος Ιωάννης Καρτέρης

1:50000 map reference. 23° 07' 30'' E and 37° 27' N.

Location. Approximately 4.5 km south-west of Dhidhyma village, in a coastal plain by a small modern chapel in an area known as Salánti on the sea.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Finds. Only two bg sherds were reported.

Function. Habitation site: farmstead.
Vísta


Greek Name. Βίστα

1:50000 map reference. 23° 07' 30" E and 37° 24' 30" N.

Location. On a low hill that forms the north end of a north-south ridge, about 600 m south of Koiládha.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Finds. A small number of archaic sherds was found.

Function. Habitation site: farmstead.

Special-purpose site: shrine?

Comments. The site was a settlement with a possible shrine.
Ávios Ioánnis


**Greek Name.** Άγιος Ιωάννης

**1:50000 map reference.** 23° 08' E and 37° 25' 45" N.

**Location.** On a rocky promontory 4 km west of Foúrnoi village and about 700 m north of Fránhthi cave, on the coast.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** Sherds were found.

**Function.** Habitation site: village.
Greek Name. Μάσες (Ορμ. Κοιλάδας)

1:50000 map reference. 23° 08' E and 37° 25' 30" N.

Location. In terraced agricultural fields on the west slopes of the Fránhthi headland, about 1.3 km east of Koiláda across the bay. It is also known as Lófos Fránhthi.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.


Comments. The inland valley of Loutró, to the east of the Koiláda Kámbos, and the small coastal valleys to the south (Dhóroufi and Lákkes) are likely to have been attached to Mases in the archaic period (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 34).

*Mases: The Temple Terrace on the Fránhthi Headland*

Location. On the west slope of the Fránhthi headland.

Excavation. Unexcavated, surface study of architectural features by Dengate.

Features. A terrace wall of large boulders and roughly worked blocks is probably archaic in date and may have been built to support the foundations of a temple.

Finds. The survey team identified fluted columns, antefixes, Doric capitals, and ashlar blocks belonging to the temple. There are reports of a metope-like relief showing a boar found in this general vicinity. Other architectural remains were observed submerged in the bay to the west of the temple terrace; balloon photographs show traces of apparently rectangular structures or moles. Over two hundred and fifty sherds (several miniature cups), heavy Corinthian roof-tiles, loom-weights, spools, and a figurine have been recovered. One part of an antefix with traces of dark red colour was recovered, but nothing more is known of this roof, except that is is similar to the Halieis-style roof of the temple of Apollo.

Comments. The foundations and the architectural remains of a terrace indicate the presence of an archaic sanctuary (of Apollo) and perhaps even a settlement.

In the archaic period Mases would have become a unit in the polis of Hermione.
Mases: *Magoulá Evstratiou*

**Greek Name.** Μαγουλά Ευστρατίου

**Location.** On an artificial mound, located in the Kámbos about 1.5 km south-east of Koiládha and 500 m from the present shoreline.

**Finds.** The team found some worked blocks and sherds.

**Comments.** This site is a settlement.

Mases: *Near Modern Quarry*

**Location.** At the entrance to a modern limestone quarry, at the south end of the Fránkhthi headland, about 1.8 km east of Koiládha.

**Finds.** The survey team found two bg sherds from a krater and a kalathiskos.

**Comments.** The site was undoubtedly the *nekropolis* of classical Mases.
Greek Name. Φράγκθη

1:50000 map reference. 23° 08' E and 37° 25' 30" N.

Location. On the west coast of the east peninsula on the Argolic gulf, about 5 km north of the modern town of Kranídion and about 300 m south-east of Koiládha, across the bay.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Function. Habitation site: village?

Fránkhthi: The Fránkhthi Hill
Faraklas 1973, figs. 8a-b.
Foley 1988, 179-180.

Location. At a place called Fránkhthi Hill, north of the cave.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Features. Faraklas (1973, figs. 8a-b) reports remains of a settlement in the archaic period.

Comments. The site was apparently a harbour and may be the site of ancient Mases.

Fránkhthi: The Fránkhthi Cave
Jacobsen 1979, 276.
Foley 1988, 179-180.

Location. Inside the cave.

Excavation. American School excavations.

Finds. Archaic sherds were found in an around the cave.

Comments. It is not until the late archaic or early classical times that Fránkhthi cave seems to have been visited by more than perhaps the odd shepherd. Finds, regrettably unstratified, from both the forepart and the rear of the cave suggest that it may have served a cult purpose in the historical periods. Unfortunately the excavators do not know as yet what deity or deities were worshipped here, but the Nymphs and/or Pan would be reasonable possibilities. Nor do they know the length of time that the site was utilised as a place of worship, but the discovery of roman lamps testify to its use at least until then.
Halieis (Portokhéli)

Michaud 1971, 875.
Baladie 1980, 216.
Foley 1988, 149, 194.
Mazarakis Ainian 1988, 117-118.
Billot 1992, 35-98.
Bergquist 1990a, 23-37.

Greek Name. Αλείς (Πορτοκέλιον)

1:50000 map reference. 23° 09' E and 37° 19' N.

Location. At the south-west end of the Hermionis across the bay from modern Portokhéli, now partly submerged in the sea.

The harbour is roughly oval in shape with a diameter at the present time of about 1.5 km north-west to south-east and a little less than 1 km north-east to south-west. It is connected to the Argolic gulf by a channel about 1.5 km long and its narrowest, 250 m wide. The south and east sides of the harbour have been subject to a marked increase in sea level, so that the edge of the classical town is now submerged to a depth of over 2 m (Jameson 1969, 311, 315).

Excavation. German Institute and American School investigations, Greek Eforéia rescue excavations, American School excavations.

Unpublished notes were made by Frickenhaus and W. Müller in 1909, Wrede in 1926, and Jameson and his wife in 1950 and thereafter on a number of visits. Excavations other than clandestine were confined to some brief tests in 1909 for the Archaeological Society of Athens by Philadelpheus (notebook and short publication in Πρακτικά 1909, 182) and to salvage work on a number of graves in the nekropolis of the ancient town in 1958-59 by Verdhelis, the Ephor of Argolid-Corinthia (Jameson 1969, 311).


Comments. The site occupies two areas, an akropolis and a lower town. From the late seventh to the fifth centuries buildings were constructed on the akropolis; the fortifications themselves date to the seventh century but were destroyed c. 580-600. The akropolis suffered destruction at various times from the sixth century onwards.
By the early sixth century this flourishing city had an orthogonal plan, one of the earliest cities in Greece to be planned in this way.

Three sanctuaries were discovered here: one of Athena on the akropolis dated to the early sixth century, one of Demeter outside the city, east of the akropolis, and one of Apollo submerged into the north-west part of the harbour dating from the early seventh century.

It is evident that the site was inhabited before the coming of the Tirynthians in the early fifth century, although no literary reference to it before their immigration had been found. On archaeological evidence alone we cannot say whether the arrival of the Tirynthians was a violent or peaceful one. Maybe the destruction of the second quarter of the fifth century was due to resistance to them or the result of the Athenian attack of c. 460, or even a peaceful reorganisation and enlargement. Occurrence in the later fifth century of graffiti in alphabets that were in the local East Argolic rather than in the Argive-Tiryns suggests a mixed garrison or population of natives and immigrants. No sure sign of Athenian occupation in the late fifth century has been detected (Jameson 1969, 321).

Sometime before 430 a single Spartan is said to have captured the town.

**Halieis: The Temple of Apollo in the Harbour**

Michaud 1972, 651.  
Mazarakis-Ainian 1988, 105-119.  
Bergquist 1990a, 23-37.  
Billot 1992, 42.

**Location.** Outside the city, only a short distance along the shore of the harbour, submerged in the sea. The building lies about 1.5 m under water, from 10 m to 40 m from the shore and some 600 m north of the city gate on the way to Hermione.

**Excavation.** American School excavations.

**Features.** The long and narrow temple measures 4.5 m by 28 m and has walls, unique for this site, of flattish dark grey limestone slabs finished only on their outer face (cf. the construction of the shrine of Apollo at Asine). It has three chambers, a pronaos, but no peristyle. It opens to the south facing the altar, where a short pronaos leads to the sekos (8 m) over a wide, carefully cut threshold of limestone resting on heavy poros foundations. Half way down the sekos are two large blocks of poros, off centre to the
west, with a smaller base behind them which supported a post or column. The place between the base and the cross-wall to the north was excavated.

Beyond the cross wall a much longer rear chamber contains at least four column bases, set at irregular intervals and originally fluted in circular upper parts. The rectangular plinth of most of the south base was left rough below a point at which they assume to be the floor level, about 13 m below the top of the walls (Jameson 1974c, 116). Two (one single rough circle, the other, two semi-circles) supported columns along the central axis of the building in the north part of the rear chamber (the northernmost room). It is possible that the latter were a replacement for an earlier series, and that the processing of replacing the bases began at the front of the building and did not reach the rear end (Jameson 1979, 262).

In all three chambers, against the inner face of the outside wall of the building, were found a total of seven semi-circular bases of dark grey limestone, which permit the restoration of an original spacing of about 1.5 m. The excavators conjecture that they served as bases for wooden columns whose back side would have been engaged in the mud-brick resting above the limestone walls. No doubt both the free-standing and engaged columns were thought to be necessary for the support of a roofing system of large terracotta tiles, sufficient remains of each have now been recovered to undertake restoration. The width of the building and the spacing of the bases along the sides are close to those of the earliest temple of Artemis Orthia at Sparta (Jameson 1979, 262).

As a finishing touch the walls were plastered on the inside and perhaps on the outside. On the inside the plaster bore traces of painted designs.

**Finds.** A multitude of finds were reported from this building. Two bases of *perirrhanteria* (lustral basins) were found near a statue base in the front chamber.

Behind the statue base, in the so-called treasury, much pottery was found, including Attic *b* and *r* pottery, Corinthian *aryballoi*, over two hundred miniature *skophoi*, and *kotylai*. There was a lot of metal, including a *votive wheel*, a bronze ram utensil, *inscribed iron keys* (ταπολλοί), a *keyhole frame*, an *inscribed bronze plaque*, iron *axe-adzes*, a *double axe*, a hoard of silver *coins*, iron *bars* and *spits*, iron and bronze *knives*, *swords*, and *spear points*. The spits were used for roasting meat; while the other tools may have been used for sacrifices or in the building of the temple and thereafter dedicated to Apollo (see Appendix B). A great deal of animal *bones*, amber from the Baltic, an ostrich *eggshell* from Africa, a rock *crystal point*, and a terracotta *figurine* were reported as well.
The middle room also yielded pottery, bronze protomai of animals, iron and bronze knives, swords and spearheads, and animal bones.

The north or rear room produced over five thousand miniature skyphoi and kotylai, iron and bronze knives, swords and spear points, and a bronze goat.

Cover-tiles in the building were angular Corinthian types. Traces of eaves-tiles of unequal height ran along the length of the eaves of the roof. Antefixes had flat, smooth faces that rose to three peaks. Similar tiles have been found at Mases, Nemea, and the Heraion.

Comments. The extraordinary proportions of the older building (1:6) may in fact have been less extreme if a peripteron of columns ran around the building at floor level; the proportions might be reduced to 1:4, which could still have a decidedly archaic character. Finds from the floor level show that it was used as early as the second quarter of the seventh century and was probably destroyed by fire near the mid-fifth century. The unsuccessful Athenian attack in 460 or 459, which may also have been the cause of a notable destruction level on the akropolis, would suit the date of the finds. Thereafter the remains of the building were levelled, effectively sealing 13 cm of deposit, for a terrace in front of another building to the east (Jameson 1974c, 116).

Three functions, temple, treasury, and hestiatorion, were grouped under the same roof here. The first room, the cella, was where the cult image stood. It was distinct from the hestiatorion and the treasury, each entered through a separate door (Mazarakis-Ainian 1988, 118). The middle room (hestiatorion) may have served as a inner sanctum where oracular and purification rites were performed, as the bones and horns of animals testify. The third room was evidently a storage area, where over five thousand miniature wine cups were found.

**Haliets: The Racecourse in the Harbour**

Bergquist 1990a, 23-37.

**Location.** In the harbour, to the south of the monumental altar, at a distance of about 12 m.

**Excavation.** American School excavations.

**Features.** The racetrack was about 16 m wide and 167.40 m long. Rectangular slabs of limestone, without foundation, show the characteristic pair of parallel grooves for the feet.
of the runner, separated by square cuttings for upright posts into six individual lanes. Two lines of wall ran along either side of the track, which apparently terminated in another starting line a stade (180 m) to the south.

The suggestion of practice tracks on the west side of the stadium has not been confirmed (Jameson 1979, 263-264).

The structure to the east may have served as foundation for wooden bleachers or for mounded earth for spectators. On the west side, the inner line of wall takes the form of a slightly curved recess, from 5.5 to 10 m from the north end, before resuming its straight course to the south. One may compare traces of a similar (and unexplained) curved construction on the south side of the track at Epidauros.

An isolated wall west of the racecourse, and the south end of the stadium, running directly towards the ‘hostel or ‘bath’ complex, may have supported a channel for bringing water into the sanctuary, as would be normal for a site of athletic competitors (Jameson 1974c, 119).

finds. The pottery seems to belong to fill used in the construction of the racecourse which, in its existing form, would be later than the middle or third quarter of the sixth century, but as yet we do not know how much later (Jameson 1973, 227; 1974c, 119). About one metre east of the curve, on the edge of the racetrack itself, excavation uncovered a bg Laconian stirrup krater, and other fragments of bg and bf pottery from the sixth century.

Comments. The racecourse is relatively narrow when compared with the fourth century courses at Olympia (20 lanes) and Epidauros (10 lanes).

Halieis may have been the site of an important festival, which included games.

Halieis: The Later Remains of the Sanctuary in the Harbour
Bergquist 1990a, 23-37.

Location. Submerged underwater, near of the temple of ‘Apollo’.

excavation. American School excavations.

Features. A very destroyed building (Temple 2) is located immediately to the east of the temple of Apollo. It is small, 28.26 m by 6.45 m, without preserved internal divisions. It too is oriented south. Extensive exploration of this building and others in the area shows that preceding the topmost foundations, classical in appearance, there had been
construction in technique and materials similar to that of the older building and which may have be attributed to the archaic period (Jameson 1979, 263). It lay higher on the slope than the previous building and has been robbed much more completely (Jameson 1979, 263).

Between the two temples is a drainage channel, the edge of which runs along the side of the Apollo temple, to catch the run-off from the two temples (Cooper [N.] 1990, 74).

A long submerged monumental altar, 3 m by 17.5 m, was placed between the front of the temple and the racecourse. It had two bases on either side near is north end, perhaps for a canopy or baldachin. Similar altars with bases are known at Perakhora and at the Aphaia temple on Aigina. Probably only a partial not a full canopy covered the altar. It is probably later than the Apollo temple.

Adjoining the altar house to the north is a rectangular room, roughly 7 m by 8 m, with a foundation for a central support, and beyond that, smaller compartments, just south of the well excavated in 1971. The excavators have suggested previously that these rooms formed part of a hostel or bath for use of visitors to the sanctuary and its games. More precise indications of their functions have not been forthcoming (Jameson 1979, 263).

A formal entranceway, a propylon, was also built, leading from the coastal road to the open space between the altar and the racecourse (below).

Finds. The finds of the second temple include drinking vessels and iron weapons. Eleven fragments of ridge-tiles, one pan-tile, and five fragments of an akroterion disk were found in a layer covering the foundations (Cooper [N.] 1990, 78-82).

Comments. In the original publications this building was regarded as a stoa, but in view of the architectural terracottas, the building was re-interpreted as a second temple dating from about 600 (Cooper [N.] 1990, 65). Bergquist (1990a, 36) believes that the finds from, and the length of, the building speak in favour of a hestiatorion (dining room), which was later given a secondary temple function. The fact that the building had an akroterion, however, is apparently proof that it was a temple (Cooper [N.] 1990, 82). Treasuries and possibly fountain houses are the only other buildings known to have been decorated with akroteria, and the foundations at Halieis are too large to belong to either of these. The archaic sanctuary thus included two temples, side by side, facing an altar. The buildings were in use simultaneously.
The visitor left the Hermione-Halieis road, along which as cuttings on the shore suggest, lay shops and houses, and entered the sanctuary just to the north starting line of the stadium, near the south end of the altar (Jameson 1979, 263).

_Halieis: The Akropolis_
Daux 1966a, 788-789.

**Location.** Approximately 50 m in elevation above the harbour. From here the city spreads fan-like in a northerly direction, extending down to the shore.

**Excavation.** American School excavations.

**Features.** Tests were made within the rectangular structure on the west side of the akropolis to determine the date of the building; it was probably built in the mid-fifth century. No earlier building appears to have occupied this area, although early material was found here (Williams [C.] 1968, pl. 140d).

A retaining and defence wall on the west side of the akropolis was dated by its fill to around 600. No buildings found within the limits of excavation appear to go with this wall.

The altar found north of the square and circular towers was perhaps archaic.

**Finds.** On the west side of the akropolis, north of the archaic wall, the excavators found an ashy layer full of pottery dating to the first half of the fifth century, including a bj oinochoe with Dionysos and satyr (Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus. HP 288: Jameson 1969, pl. 80), Laconian wares (Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus. HP 377-378, 380: Jameson 1969, pl. 80), and Corinthian imitations (Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus. HP 416: Jameson 1969, pl. 80). Many of the later fifth century sherds had graffiti on them—names of men, most likely soldiers of the Laconian garrison (see Chapter I for details).

Lead figurines and a terracotta face of about 500 are associated with a shrine, but were found in the fifth century building on the west side of the akropolis (Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus. HC 165: Jameson 1969, 319 n19).

The votives and pottery associated with the altar area are of a sixth and early fifth century date, probably synchronous with the building of the defence system berme. The cult was characterised by a variety of miniature vessels, miniature bronze armour (shields, helmets, greaves), miniature bronze axes and mirrors, bronze and silver pins and earrings,
lead figurines of Spartan type, terracotta female, male, and animal figurines, and fragments of inscribed bronze (Náfploio, Leonárdho Mus. HM 142, 365: Jameson 1969, 321, pl. 80). A fragment of an inscribed marble periirrhanterion may date from this period and thus shows continuation of the cult in the area (Náfploio, Leonárdho Mus. HS 22, 33: Jameson 1969, 320, pl. 80).

Comments. The akropolis suffered destruction around 590-580 with much Laconian pottery in the debris. Votive objects attest the renewed use of the akropolis after about 580, although no fortifications have been associated with this period.

No buildings can be identified with the cult activity on top of the akropolis.

Halieis: The Lower Town
Aupert 1976, 614.
Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 255.

Location. On the lower slopes of the akropolis.

Excavation. American School excavations, 1962, 1968-70, 1972-76. The excavations have concentrated on post-fifth century levels, though earlier levels going as far back as the seventh century have been explored on a smaller scale.

Features. It seems probable that a city wall existed on the east side of lower town, contemporary with the fortifications of mud-brick on the akropolis built in the late seventh century (Jameson 1974c, 115).

Halieis was laid out, at least in part, according to a system of orthogonal planning. Numerous streets and avenues have been located on the lower half of the city, and from these the location of several others can be proposed with fair degree of accuracy (Aupert 1976, 614, fig. 48). The plan seems to be divided into two zones of insulae; the fortification and the dictates of the terrain appear to have led to the decision to break continuity (Boyd and Rudolph 1978, pl. 87).

A number of remains of house foundations, particularly a sequence of walls and floors within House 5 (?), Street 3, Insula B-C in the north-east quarters of the town, prove clearly the existence of a habitation during the archaic and early classical period. The oldest level, Level C, showed traces of archaic and classical habitation, of which the walls were oriented like those of the earlier levels of habitation. This implies that the visible (fourth century) city plan overlay an earlier (archaic ?) one.
In the eastern half of the city, at least, a gap in occupation is indicated by a complete lack of finds assignable to the second half of the fifth century. There is a level, Level C, dating to the first half of the sixth century to about 460, that extends certainly throughout the east half of the lower town, possibly also throughout the western sector. Perhaps this corresponds to the city defences and the first organisation of a city plan (Boyd and Rudolph 1978, 334, 338).

**Finds.** The stratum underneath level C contained mostly sherds of the seventh century, mixed with fragments of Argive and Laconian late geometric (Rudolph 1983, 68). A Near Eastern cylinder seal was found in level C, which dates to the archaic period.

Additional excavations around the central pillar of the Mint Building (formerly House Pi) in the north-east quarter of the town revealed a layer of sand and pebbles, found also in other parts of the building. This stratum, which extended downwards for some depth, covered a deposit of late archaic/early classical pottery, mixed with animal bones, Laconian and Corinthian roof-tiles, as well as with marine shells.

**Comments.** The assortment of finds indicates some sort of dump, possibly connected with the rites performed at this spot. The finds from the lower level (C) seem to indicate that the Mint area has a long history as a public, or sacred, place, deriving from earlier periods (Rudolph 1983, 68).

Within the city the orthogonally planned settlement of the sixth century indicates either a recovery after the attack on the akropolis early in the century and a carefully planned rebuilding of the lower town or colonisation by successful attackers.

**Halieis: In the Vicinity**

Jameson 1969, 340-341; 1974c, 118.
Touchais 1980, 605.

**Location.** On the south side of the road, on a small north-facing terrace of a hill immediately to the east of the akropolis hill.

**Excavation.** American School investigations.

**Finds.** Philadhelphus found lamps and female pig-carrier figurines on the same terrace in 1909 (Jameson 1969, 340-341).

**Comments.** Surface finds point to the presence of a small sanctuary (to Demeter ?).
The road to Hermione would have continued through a low valley to the north and into the plain of Flámboura, passing graves and other traces of classical structures. No excavation or clearing has been attempted yet.

**Halieis: The Nekropolis East of Portokhéli**
Daux 1960, 688.
Rudolph 1983, 72-73.

**Location.** Along the modern and ancient road from Halieis to the Kósta area, about 3 km east of Portokhéli and about 30 m south of the Kósta road, on the plots of Kaloyeropoulou and Pikoula.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia excavations, 1958; joint study and publication with the American School; American School excavations, 1973, 1975, and the southern Argolid survey.

**Features.** During the 1958 excavations, two areas were identified (Dengate 1980, 274ff.). The earliest burial found is Grave 1 in area 2, a sarcophagus that has been tentatively dated to the late sixth-early fifth century. Graves 2, 4-5, 14-15 seem to belong to the first half of the fifth century; the remainder are later. Grave Groups 1 and 3 can be dated to the second quarter of the fifth century. Most of these were simple cists covered with slabs of *poros* or sandstone.

The 1970s excavations at the west end of the ravine revealed twenty new graves dating mainly from the second half of the sixth to the first quarter of the fifth century (Rudolph 1983, 72-73). This series of graves included three or possibly four tumuli-like structures. The two rectangular tumuli would have been markers above the single grave each contained, while the larger one(s) could have been a family district. The other graves appear to be simple pits, and there is also one *pithos*.

Most of the graves identified during the survey were simple, rectangular cist of the classical period, but some may be archaic. The earliest burials, probably cremations in large *hydria* and amphorae, date to the late seventh-early sixth century.

**Finds.** Grave 1 contained an early fifth century *oinochoe* with scenes of Athena and Hermes (Náfplio, Leonárpho Mus. NM 10245), a mid-fifth century *olpe* (Náfplio, Leonárpho Mus. NM 10244), a *Droop cup* of around 510 (Náfplio, Leonárpho Mus. NM 10242), a palmette cup of about 500 (Náfplio, Leonárpho Mus. NM 10239), three bg
cups of 480-500 (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. NM 10241-3), a bg *vicip* of about 475 (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. NM 10240), a *skyphos* with rays and heavy foot of the same date (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. NM 10327), and a bronze *strigil* (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. HM 962).

Grave 2 had a mid-fifth century bg *skyphos* with two pairs of men and women facing each other (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. NM 10247), a bg *skyphos* with rays (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. NM 10248), a bronze swinging handle for a small wooden chest (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. HM 966), and a worked bone fragment, perhaps a spindle-whorl (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. HV 306).

The early fifth century finds from Graves 4-5 and 14-15 are include: a patterned *skyphos* of the first half of the fifth century and an iron *strigil* from Grave 4 (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. HP 1540 and HM 963); four bg *skvphoi* of about 470-460 (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. HP 1642, 1646, 1644, 1649) and an iron *strigil* blade (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. HM 965) from Grave 14; and a rf column krater of about 475-450 (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. HP 1672), five bf *cups* of c. 480 (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. HP 1693, 1699-1700, 1727, 1703), and three bg *skvphoi* of around 470-460 (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. NM 10262-4, 10266) from Grave 15.

In Grave Groups 1 and 3 the excavators found three bg *skvphos* dating to 470-460 (Náfplio, Leonárðho Mus. HP 1804, 1823, 1826).

When the second series of graves was excavated at the western end of the ravine, Grave 1 contained a Laconian *klyix* by the Boreas Painter, dating into the first half of the sixth century. In most cases a number of vessels were placed in the grave on or beside the body. Grave 14 was a particularly rich burial of a woman, with a large, plain bronze mirror, a bronze pyxis, a pair of iron sandals, and eighteen vessels dating the burial to the first half of the fifth century.

The survey collected about 165 sherds of mostly fine bg and bf pottery ranging in date from the late seventh through to the mid-fourth century. Much of the pottery is Attic. A bronze mirror and a terracotta mirror case, a large female *protome* of terracotta, and a few fragmentary figurines should be mentioned.

**Comments.** The excavators noted extensive grave robbing. Weathering and road constructions have since destroyed the graves excavated in 1958.

The furnishings in the graves found in the 1970s are quite simple. In general the chronology of the nekropolis coincides with the findings from the city’s north-east quarters, except that the archaic period is better represented in the cemetery.
The Indiana University excavations are being published by Rafn as a volume of the Halieis series.
Loutró

Greek Name. Λουτρό

1:50000 map reference. 23° 09' 30" E and 37° 24' 15" N.

Location. A valley about 2 km north of Kranidi and 4 km south-east of Koiládhia.


Function. Habitation site: farmstead.


Loutró: Ávios Andréas

Greek Name. Ἄγιος Ἄντρέας

Location. On a slope of a low hill about 2 km north of Kranidi in the area called Loutró.

Finds. Only four archaic sherds were found.

Comments. This is a farmstead or a small settlement.


Loutró: North-east of Village

Location. In fields approximately 1 km north-east of the Loutró well.

Finds. Several sherds were found, possibly as early as the late archaic period.
Greek Name. Καστράκι

1:50000 map reference. 23° 10' E and 37° 24' 30" N.

Location. In the region of Kranidhi, on a steep conical hill with a narrow level summit 500 m north of Loutró.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Finds. One archaic figurine and a few archaic sherds, including fine ware cups and kraters, were reported.

Function. Special-purpose site: shrine?
Stavrós

Greek Name. Σταυρός

1:50000 map reference.  23° 10' E and 37° 19' 30" N.

Location. In the region of Portokhéli, at the intersection of dirt roads (a place called Papastavraiíka) between Portokhéli and Flámboura, probably along the ancient road (at ‘cross-roads’) from Halieis to Ermióni.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Features. The many conglomerate blocks in situ indicate a temple or shrine.

Finds. Large concentrations of pottery, principally bg cups and kraters, were found together with ten roof-tiles. A foot kylix bearing a graffito was dedicated to Zeus.

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary.

Comments. This is a sanctuary of Zeus, to judge by the inscribed sherd.
Flámboura

Greek Name. Φλάμπουρο

1:50000 map reference. 23° 10' 30" E and 37° 19' 45" N.

Location. In the Kranidhi region, directly opposite the Portokhéli Bay, in a flat plain.


Function. Habitation site: farmsteads.
            Special-purpose site: shrines.

Flámboura: The Magoúla West of Áyioi Taxiárkhai

Greek Name. Αγ. Ταξιάρχαι

Location. On the western most summit and adjacent slopes of a low conglomerate hill with three peaks approximately 100 m west of Áyioi Taxiárkhai.

Finds. The survey team found sherds and a rectangular worked limestone block, in which was inserted a slab of lead for holding an object such as a sculptured stele (said to have been removed from here).

Comments. The predominant character of the site is that of a settlement, but the block suggests the presence of a shrine or sanctuary.

Flámboura: North of Village

Location. On a low rise adjacent to the modern wine-pressing tank, about 1 km from the bay of Kranidhi and 3 km north-east of Portokhéli.

Finds. Two figurines, a kalathos, a skyphos, and a miniature skyphos dated to the sixth-fifth centuries were recovered.

Comments. The finds suggest cult activity and the presence of an archaic shrine.
Location. In the valley bottom, 1.6 km from Kranidhi Bay and 2.5 km north-east of Portokhéli.

Finds. Sherds, mostly bg cups, bowls, and oinochoai were found.

Comments. This is probably a farmstead.
Greek Name. Κάστρο

1:50000 map reference. 23° 10' 30" E and 37° 24' 30" N.

Location. On a steep conical hill, 1.4 km north of the Profitis Ilias peak and about 0.5 km east of Kastraki, between Fournoi and Kranidhi, in the region of Kranidhi.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Finds. Some archaic sherds, including cups, amphorae, jugs, and a few pyxides were reported.

Function. Habitation site: fortification.

Comments. This site has been identified as a refuge.
Greek Name. Άκρα Αιμιλιανός (Μετόχι)

1:50000 map reference. 23° 12’ E and 37° 17’ 45” N.

Location. On the coast at the south end of the eastern peninsula opposite Spétses and approximately 2 km to the east of Kósta, some 3.5 km to the south-west of Portokhéli and 11 km to the south of Ermióni.

Excavation. Unexcavated.

Features. Faraklas and the French School excavators reported an archaic sanctuary nearby the settlement.

Finds. No archaic finds were reported from the settlement itself.

Function. Habitation site: farmstead or fortification?

Comments. It is perhaps more likely that this site is a military outpost or farmstead.
B.iii.b. The Southern Argolid: The Region of Hermione

Nomós Argolidhos: Eparkhía Ermionídhos

The Southern Argolid covers the regions of Hermione and Halieis. It can further be divided into three parallel zones: first, the upland country, south of the rugged border range, in which are set two small plateaux at Dhidhyma on the west and Iliókastro on the east; second, a central zone of east-west valleys from the Fránkhthi headland in the west to Cape Mouzaki on the east; and third, the southernmost part, consisting of gentle hills, many small valleys, and the island of Spetses (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 29).

Much of the Flámboura plain and the western end of the peninsula are assigned to Halieis rather than to Hermione (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 18 n.c). The territory of Halieis includes the commune of Portokhéli and half of that of Kranídhi, together with the island of Spetses (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 18 n.c). To Hermione belongs the rest of the modern Eparkhía Ermionídhos (except for an area east of Thermísi, which belonged to Troizenia in antiquity).
Greek Name. Δίδυμο

1:50000 map reference. 23° 09' 45" E and 37° 28' 30" N.

Location. Within a large, cavernous sinkhole at a place called Megáli Spiliá (Μεγάλη Σπηλιά), 1 km north-west of the village of Dhídhyma.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Finds. Only archaic sherds were found in the survey.

Function. Habitation site: field building.

Comments. The site is an animal fold.
Fournoi

Greek Name. Φόυρνοι

1:50000 map reference. 23° 10’ 30” E and 37° 25’ 45” N.

Location. A long tract of land to the east to west of Fournoi village.


Fournoi: South of Public School in the Village

Location. In the village of Fournoi, in a flat area south of the public school house.


Finds. Surface sherds were reported.

Comments. This is a settlement.

Fournoi: The Well
Dheilaki 1977, 87.

Location. Discovered during the construction of a house in the Fournoi village.

Excavation. Greek Eforeia rescue excavations and American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Features. Here is one of the few wells discovered in the southern Argolid.

Finds. Small quantities of pottery were found, together with animal bones, loomweights, pieces of iron, a bronze handle, several coins, and two figurines. A number of ceramic objects show signs of burning.

Comments. The material in this well is votive in nature. It probably comes from a shrine or temple nearby.
Fournoi: West, North-west of the Village

**Location.** In a level orchard on the north bank of a seasonal streambed about 1.3 km west, north-west of Fournoi.

**Finds.** Possibly five archaic sherds were found.

**Comments.** This site may be a farmstead.

---

Fournoi: Profitis Ilias

**Location.** On terraced fields on the north slope of a prominent hillock on the south edge of Fournoi village.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey, 1972 and 1979-81.

**Finds.** Some sherds were found.

**Comments.** This is a small village.
Petrothalassa or Thalassópetra

Greek Name. Πετροθάλασσα

1:50000 map reference. 23° 12' E and 37° 20' 30" N.

Location. In the south part of the Hermionis region, on the summit of a small hill with conglomerate outcropping, almost midway between Ermióni (about 6 km south) and Portokhéli (5.5 km north-east), and only 800 m from the sea beside the line of ancient Halieis-Hermione road.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Features. Walls described as a double line of fortification were noted on the south slope. Clear traces of ancient quarrying are visible in the bedrock here.

Finds. Sherds of the late sixth to fourth century, including many bg fine wares, domestic coarse wares, amphorae, large basins, and pitheoi were found.


Comments. Two archaic villages are situated very close to one another, one also being a natural harbour. The latter site was destroyed in 1981 by bulldozing in order to build summer homes.

The site may have belonged to Halieis, though it more likely belonged to Hermione.

Remains of an orthogonally planned site of classical date (unexcavated, so could therefore be archaic as at Halieis) are visible here.
**Katafiki Gorge**


**Greek Name.** Καταφίκι

**1:50000 map reference.** 23° 13' E and 37° 25' 15" N.

**Location.** On a high limestone cliff-face on the west side of the Katafiki Gorge at its midpoint with good views of Ermióni in one direction and to the Fouýrnoi end of the gorge in the other, approximately 4.7 km north-west of Ermióni.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** One archaic sherd was found, together with a boundary marker inscribed ροος.

**Function.** Special-purpose site: inscription.

**Comments.** The inscription dates to sometime within the sixth-fourth centuries. It once marked the boundary between the territories of Ermióni and Philanoréia (Fouýrnoi) in the classical period. Originally it could only have been to delimit grazing areas, and indication of the importance of herding in late archaic times or classical times. It points to a long history of pastoralism and of assertion of territorial rights.
Mt. Kokkýgion (Profitis Ilías) A-49

Faraklas 1973, 9, figs. 14a-b, 15a-b, 16a-b.
Langdon 1976, 108.
Zimmermann Munn 1985.
Foley 1988, 184.

Greek Name. Κοκκύγιον (Προφήτης Ηλίας)

1:50000 map reference. 23° 13' 30" E and 37° 23' 15" N.

Location. About 2 km west of modern Ermióni, on the west peak of Mt. Profitis Ilías, approximately 20 m south-west of the summit of Mt. Kokkýgion, ‘Cuckoo mountain’.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Features. Faraklas reported two sites, both of which are sanctuaries. Site A was identified as a sanctuary from archaic to roman times, though questionable in the archaic and classical period. The other, site B, is a roughly rectangular building formed by walls made of a double row, c. 0.85 m wide, of unworked limestone blocks and slabs, some over 1.5 m long and set upright as orthostats. The north wall is 33 m long, with a wall of about 14 m on the east an over 4 m on the west. On the south the fourth wall is formed by a nearly sheer drop. A layer of ash was visible at several points in the enclosure; it is almost certainly remains of an ash altar.

Finds. The majority of archaic sherds were open shapes (kotylai, small cups, and bowls). One tile was collected.

Function. Special-purpose site: shrine.

Comments. This second enclosure (B) is apparently the shrine of Zeus mentioned by Pausanias (2.36.2) (Foley 1988, 184).
Hermione (Ermióni)

Greek Name. Ερμίονη

1:50000 map reference. 23° 15' E and 37° 23' N.

Location. Near the modern village of the same name (Ermióni), on the peninsula, 1.20 km long, and across the bay on the slopes of the Prôn.


Comments. Ermióni is the least known archaeologically of the Akte's towns. There have been no full publications of its excavations.

Hermione: The Temple on the Bìsti Promontory

Philadelpheus 1910, 177-179.
Frickenhaus and Müller [W.] 1911, 37.
Jameson 1959, 109-120.
Foley 1988, 181.

Location. On the pine-covered, rocky peninsula known as the Bìsti (meaning 'tail' in Albanian) in the saddle between the two high points of the eastern part of the peninsula.

Excavation. Greek Eforeía and American School investigations.

In 1909 Philadelpheus cleared the foundation of a late archaic temple and deposited the few architectural remains that he found in the church of Áyios Nikólaos. All of these have now disappeared, but McAllister has published a brief study of the remains in situ in 1969.

Features. The foundations of the temple measure 16.25 m by 32.98 m and are of local grey limestone in large, well-fitted, polygonal blocks (McAllister 1969, fig. 2). The temple plan was probably hexastyle with twelve columns on a side and a platform with two steps. The cella had both pronaos and opisthodomos and probably a double row of seven columns, or pair of superimposed columns, in the interior.

There must have been at least two courses above those that are now preserved, because the blocks carried on the specifically levelled bed would not be wide enough for the stylobate. If there were two steps in the manner of the Delphi model, the resulting proportions are remarkably close to those of Aigina. The suggested column spacing...
follow the archaic scheme with wider intervals on the front than on the sides, contracted at the corners. The corner columns may have been enlarged. There was no ramp for the temple, or are there any signs of an altar.

**Finds.** Philadelpheus found a few architectural remains, together with two column drums that were built into the north circuit wall of the Bitsi.

**Comments.** McAllister dates the building to the end of the sixth century and believes that it was dedicated to Poseidon or, less likely, to Athena (Paus. 2.34.11). The money received by Ermióni from the Samian exiles for the purchase of the island of Hydrea (modern Ýdhra) may have been used to pay for its construction (Hdt. 3.58-59). At some point the temple was completely destroyed, and when a church was built, only its foundations were worth using.

**Hermione: The Prôn (stoûs Miloûs) Hill**
Philadelpheus 1910, 177-179.
Scranton 1941, 72.
Spathari-Papadhimitriou 1996, 104-105.

**Location.** At the church of Áyios Taxiárkhis (the Archangel Michael), on the lower slopes of the hill Pausanias referred to as the Prôn.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforía excavation and American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Features.** Philadelpheus excavated graves (chiefly classical and hellenistic) on the north slope of the Prôn, along the motor road leading to Kranídhi. A stretch of wall on the slopes of the Prôn outside the fortifications, together with other remains, is to be associated with the famous sanctuary of Demeter Chthonia (Frickenhaus and Müller [W.] 1911; Scranton 1941, 72).

**Finds.** A series of inscribed dedications of bronze cows were presented to this goddess (IG IV 683-684; SEG 11.378-379; Roehl 1907, 29 no. 2; Loewy 1885, 36, 43-44, nos. 45, 51; Roberts 1887, no. 287; Michel 1900, 823 no. 1066; Philadelpheus 1910, 174; Peek 1934, 45ff. no. 8a-b; Jameson 1953, 149ff. no. 2, pl. 50; Marcadé 1953, nos. 31, 63, pls. 7.1, 11.4; Hammond 1960, 33-36; Wörrle 1964, 61ff.; Guarducci 1967, 366-367, no. 5, fig. 193; Lazzarini 1976, 189-190 nos. 74-75; Jeffery 1990, 178-179, 182 nos. 8-9, pl. 33). Although these were not found on the Prôn, they must come from this precinct.
The remains of the cemetery included terracotta figurines, but the material was mostly classical through late Roman in date.

Comments. There was a sanctuary of Demeter here (Paus. 2.34.6-12), whose reputation was already established in the sixth century.

A huge cemetery from geometric to Roman times is located in this area, but excavations are required before anything can be known about the individual plots.

**Hermione: The Hilltop West of Kinéta**

**Location.** On the slopes of a hill and in the surrounding citrus orchards west of Kinéta (on the south shore of Potókia Bay), about 2.7 km south-west of Ermióni.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** Some thirty archaic sherds were found, including bg kraters and bowls, and a few coarse wares.

**Comments.** This is a large village.

**Hermione: On a Hill North-west of the Village**
Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 495, no. E47.

**Location.** In a field on a slight rise about 4.25 km north-west of Ermióni.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** Finds include bg sherds and a variety of domestic coarse wares.

**Comments.** The place is a settlement.

**Hermione: In the Kámbos**

**Location.** In an olive grove in the Ermióni kámbos about 1.4 km north-west of the town.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** Only a few archaic sherds were recovered.

**Comments.** This is probably a habitation place or a storage building.
**Hermione: On a Stream Bank North-west of the Village**

**Location.** On two terraces on the west bank of a seasonal streambed about 3.4 km north-west of Ermióni.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** Only three archaic sherds were identified.

**Comments.** This is a farmstead.

**Hermione: On a Hilltop North-west of the Village**

**Location.** In a field on a hilltop about 4.2 km north-west of Ermióni.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** Some bg kraters, plain jugs, and large basins were found.

**Comments.** This site is a farmstead.

**Hermione: Pikrodháfni**

**Location.** On low rise in fields about 3.75 km west, south-west of Ermióni.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** Some twenty sherds have been reported, with a variety of bg cups, bowls, kraters, amphorae, and coarse jugs.

**Comments.** This is a farmstead.
Greek Name. Ηλιόκαστρον

1:50000 map reference. 23° 16' E and 37° 26' 30'' N.

Location. On a plateau in the vicinity (400 m north) of the modern village of the same name, about 9 km north-east of Hermione.

The name Iliokastro or Karakasi is a modern coinage, but the ancient Eileoi, mentioned by Pausanias (2.34.6), survived as Ilia and in modern times as Stá Ilía. There are two major sites about 4 km apart: Magoula stá Ilía and Palaiókastro, which is classical.


Comments. Pausanias (2.34.6) mentions that there was a sanctuary of Demeter and Kore here.

Eileoi (Palaiókastro): The Ancient Village?

Welter 1941.
Faraklas 1973, 10.
Osborne 1987, 62.
Foley 1988, 178.

Location. Around a small limestone peak overlooking a deep valley in the eastern peninsula, about 2.5 km west of modern Iliókastro and about 9 km north-east of Ermióni.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Features. There may have been a settlement here in archaic times, though the visible remains date to the classical period.

Finds. At least one archaic sherd was found.

Comments. The name Eileoi may derive from a kind of vine once grown on the plateau, unless of course the vine was named from the place (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 31).

The site has considerable natural advantages.
**Eileoi: North-east of Iliókastro**

**Location.** In terraced fields on a low ridge about 1.3 km north-east of Iliókastro village.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** Sherds and tiles were found.

**Comments.** This is a farmstead.

---

**Eileoi: North-west of Iliókastro**

**Location.** Near a modern farmhouse on a small rise 1 km north-west of Iliókastro village.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** Several sherds, mainly cups, bowls, and domestic wares, together with roof-tiles were recovered from the area.

**Comments.** This is a farmstead.

---

**Eileoi: West of Iliókastro**

**Location.** In terraced fields on the south slope of a low hill about 650 m west of Iliókastro.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Finds.** About eight sherds of the late sixth-early fifth centuries were recovered.

**Comments.** This is a farmstead.

---

**Eileoi: South of Iliókastro at Magoula sta Ilia**

**Location.** On an artificial mound, currently terraced for olives and cereal, located at the south edge of the plateau about 1.5 km south of Iliókastro village.

**Excavation.** American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

**Features.** There may have been a settlement and a shrine here. Worked blocks of andesite and poros limestone probably come from a temple or a shrine at the south-east edge of the site.
Finds. Many sherds were found. A worked stone block may be interpreted as an offering table. Two column drums were found near this object. Two limestone blocks may be corners of a monument. A local informant reported that a headless kouros was found at this place.

Comments. This is probably a sanctuary deposit, where some sort of cult activity took place.
Greek Name. Θερμισία (Κάστρο)

1:50000 map reference. 23° 18' 15" E and 37° 25' 15" N.

Location. On a high limestone crag, together with terraced fields immediately to its north, about 2 km north-west of Thermisi(a) village and 1.5 km from the Thermisi saltpans.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Finds. At least sixteen sherds date to the seventh-fifth centuries, most of them being bg fine wares.

Function. Habitation site: village?
Koufó


Greek Name. Κουφό

1:50000 map reference. Cannot locate on the map, but about 23° 19' 30" E.

Location. On the south and west sides of a limestone outcrop high on the Adhéres mountain ridge, approximately 1.5 km north-east of Sóros.

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Features. The site consists of the rubble foundations of three of more rectangular structures clustered to the south and west sides of the outcrop.

Finds. Many seventh-fifth century bg sherds, including skyphoi, a krater, an amphora, domestic wares with many jugs, a miniature oinochoe, a large basin, a pithos, and a Corinthian A amphora.

Function. Habitation site: village?
B.vi.a. The Region of Troizenia: The Mainland

Nomós Attikís: Eparkhía Troizinías

The Troizenia, even including the peninsula of Méthana, the islands of Póros (ancient Kalaureia) and, in antiquity, Ýdhra (ancient Hydrea), was not much larger than the Southern Argolid (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 25). Its coastal plain is agriculturally the richest part of the Akte, with a relatively dense population (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 25). With much less good land, the peninsula of Méthana and the island of Póros had periods of independence from Troizen in antiquity (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 25).
Foúsia

Faraklas 1973, figs. 12a to 16b.
Foley 1988, 193.

Greek Name. Φούσια

1:50000 map reference. 23° 12’ 30” E and 37° 34’ 15” N.

Location. In the region of Epidauria, less than 2 km south-west of Áno Fanári, near Áyios Yeoryios, in a valley area.

Excavation. Surface survey, Faraklas.

Finds. Various sherds from geometric to roman times were found.

Function. Habitation site: village?

Comments. Faraklas believes this site to be an unfortified settlement.
Psiftí

Faraklas 1972, 15, figs. 15a to 18b.
Foley 1988, 195.

Greek Name. Ψήφτα

1:50000 map reference. 23° 20' E and 37° 32' N.

Location. In the north Troizenia a little over 4 km south-west of the Isthmos of Méthana, near the coast.

Excavation. Surface survey, Faraklas.

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary

Comments. An archaic sanctuary (of Artemis Saronias) is suggested by the presence of surface finds. No signs of previous occupation are visible here.
Troizen (Troízina or Dhamalás)

Faraklas 1972, 14.
Foley 1988, 198.

Greek Name. Τροίζην

1:50000 map reference. 23° 21' E and 37° 30' 30" N.

Location. West of Troízina and Galatás, lying below the slopes of Mt. Adhéres, the ancient Phorbantion.

Excavation. French School and German Institute investigations, French School and Greek Eforeia excavations.

The French School exposed the remains in 1890 and 1899, and the German Institute re-examined them in 1932. Recently the Greek archaeologists uncovered graves in the area.


Comments. The site is also known as ancient Troizin, modern Troízina, and formerly Dhamalás.

There is a settlement and sanctuary of Hippolytos near the Asklepieion, a temple of Demeter Thesmophoros on the slopes beyond the city walls, near the temple of Poseidon, and archaic graves halfway between the agora and the Asklepieio (Welter 1941, 39-40).

Troizen: Palaid Eviskovi
Welter 1941, 34.
Musti and Torelli 1986, 320-322.
Billot 1992, 71.

Location. In the area of the bishop’s palace or church, near the Asklepieio, where the remains of the temple of Hippolytos can be seen to the north (Paus. 2.30.6).

Excavation. French School excavations?

Features. The temple is peripteral and has 11 by 6 columns. Only the foundations can be seen today.

Comments. Hippolytos was probably worshipped here. There was also a settlement associated with the sanctuary.

It is said that the tomb of Hippolytos was here.
**Troizen: The Agora**
Legrand 1893, 93; 1905, 281-282.
Welter 1941, 18.

**Location.** East of the church of Episkopi.

**Excavation.** French School excavations.

**Comments.** Perhaps Apollo Thearios, Artemis Sotiera, and Zeus Soter were worshipped here. The temple of Apollo was considered by Pausanias (2.31.9) to be older than the temple of Apollo in Samos.

---

**Troizen: The Temple of Aphrodite (?) on the Slopes of the Akropolis**
Legrand 1905, 271-274.
Welter 1941, 19-20.

**Location.** On the slopes of the akropolis.

**Excavation.** French School excavations, 1899.

**Features.** Legrand discovered a temple with pronaos, cella, and statue base at the turn of the century. He identified it with Pan (Paus. 2.32.6), but Welter believes it to have belonged to Aphrodite.

**Comments.** The locality of this temple on the slopes towards the akropolis may have contributed to its epithet, Aphrodite Akraia.

---

**Troizen: Near the Temple of Aphrodite**
Legrand 1905, 271-274.
Le Roy 1967, 35.
Welter 1941, 20.
Billot 1990, 122.

**Location.** A little to the south of the temple of Aphrodite (Paus. 2.32.5) near a ruined chapel, almost at the point where the path from the Dhamalás to the Kástro crosses the traces of walls.

**Excavation.** French School excavations, 1899.

**Finds.** A fragment of triglyph and ‘larmier’ in tuff with traces of stucco and paint on them were found in 1890 (Legrand 1905, 269, fig. 2). More fragments of architectural terracottas were discovered in a large (storage ?) jar on a terrace on the slope of the akropolis. Part of a lion-head spout was incised with motifs in brown and reddish brown.
**Comments.** Some of these fragments may come from the neighbouring sanctuary of Aphrodite, though they could also have come from above the hill.

**Troizen: Loris Plot**
Legrand 1905, 280.

**Location.** Close to St. George, towards the north-west.

**Excavation.** French School excavations.

**Finds.** In a garden near the south-east corner of a large temple was found part of a small archaic head.

In the field east of the temple in the direction of St. George they excavated a well with debris of terracotta decoration and a small cornice fragment in tuff with traces of paint.

**Troizen: Near Dhamalá (Modern Troízina)**
Legrand 1905, 310-313.
Welter 1941, pl. 9.

**Location.** On the slopes that dominate the road that goes towards the lower mill and Manetas house.

**Excavation.** French School, surface exploration.

**Finds.** Many terracotta and some metal objects were found almost at surface level in the area between the highest houses of the village and the highest level of the road. Two complete female figurines and parts of some twenty other figurines were also recovered in the area (Legrand 1905, figs. 19-28).

**Comments.** These objects must have come from a sanctuary above, and the small terrace on the slope is a likely location for such a building.

**Troizen: West of Village**
Legrand 1905, 302-303.
Welter 1941, 20-25.

**Location.** On the slopes that overlook a path leading to the lower hill, beyond the city walls, but much closer to the city that the sanctuary of Aphrodite.

**Excavation.** French School excavations.
**Finds.** A votive deposit, including many *figurines*, hundreds of *lamps*, *spools*, and *spindles* was found on a terrace above the temple area.

**Comments.** No architectural remains were found here, but Welter believes that the building materials for the temple were used for later houses. The temple was identified as that of *Demeter Thesmophoros* (Welter 1941, 21).

*Troizen: Unknown Findspot*
Konsolaki 1989a, 49-51; 1989b, 63-64.

**Location.** Unknown.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeia excavations.

**Finds.** Fragments of a column with two archaic *inscriptions* were found together with another *inscribed* block fragment.

An archaic *grave marker* was reused to seal a hellenistic cistern. It was *inscribed* on the reverse, along the edges, as a prize (a tripod cauldron) that Damotinos won in Thebai (Welter 1941, 39)
Greek Name. Βόδιον

1:50000 map reference. 23° 23′ E and 37° 31′ N.

Location. On the coast of the eastern Argolid at the west end of the Pogonós Lake, 3 km north-east of Troizen, near the modern village of Výdhi.

Excavation. Unexcavated.


Comments. This was an unfortified settlement and harbour from the archaic to the roman period but has not been excavated.

The Greek fleet that fought the Battle of Salamis in 480 mustered in this harbour, called ‘The Beard’, and the Athenians sent women and children to safety there during the Persian war of that year (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 26).
Eiones ? (Sambríza Magouía or Pigádhia)  A- 58

Greek Name. Πηγάδια

1:50000 map reference. 23° 23' 30" E and 37° 25 N.

Location. About 4 km east of Thermisi village on a low rounded hill, about 500 m from the sea, a little west of the Koumbourlá salt pans.

Though this area is in the modern Eparkhía Ermionídhos, the site needs to be detached from this modern commune and given to Troizenia (Eparkhía Troizinías), because most of the land here would have been Troizenian in antiquity (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 18 n.b)

Excavation. American School, southern Argolid intensive survey.

Finds. Some archaic sherds were collected.

Function. Habitation site: village

Comments. Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel (1994, 59 n.1) suggest that this site is ancient Eiones (Iliad 2.559-578).
Galatás

Greek Name. Γαλατάς

1:50000 map reference. 23° 27' E and 37° 29' 30" N.

Location. About 400 m south-west of modern Galatás, across from the island of Póros.

Excavation. Surface survey, Faraklas.

Features. Surface finds show the probable existence of a sanctuary in the archaic period.

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary?
Greek Name. Λαζαρέττο?

1:50000 map reference. 23° 28' E and 37° 29' 30" N.

Location. In the eastern peninsula on the coast opposite the island of Poros, and about 700 m south-east of modern Galatás.

Excavation. Surface survey, Faraklas.

Features. Possibly there was a sanctuary of Athena Apatousia here in the archaic period, but the dates of occupation are uncertain.

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary?
B.vi.b. The Region Of Troizenia: The Methana Peninsula

Nomós Attikís: Eparchía Troizinías
Magoúla

Catling 1985, 22; 1987, 19.
Touchais 1987, 531.
Foley 1988, 187.

Greek Name. Άγιος Νικόλαος

1:50000 map reference. 23° 20' 30'' E and 37° 38' N.

Location. On the north coast of Methana, on the akropolis west of modern Áyios Nikólaos, on conical hill with terraced slopes.

Excavation. British School, Methana Survey.

Finds. The survey team reports an excellent range late sixth century pottery. There is a mix of fine wares, mostly matt-painted and decorated with linear patterns. The latest archaic pottery is represented by an Attic bf skyphos (c. 490-475), a bf sherd (c. 500-475) and an Attic bg cup (c. 500-475) (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 143).

Function. Habitation site: village?
Makróngru


Greek name. Καμένη Χώρα

1:50000 map reference. 23° 21’ E and 37° 37’ N.

Location. East of Kaiméni Khóra, the island volcano.

Excavation. British School, Methana Survey.

Finds. Only one linear decorated sherd from the archaic period was found (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 161).

Function. Habitation site: farmstead?
Methana (Megalokhório-Palaiokástro) A-63

Foley 1988, 188.
Catling 1988, 23.
Konsolaki 1989b, 63-64.

Greek name. Μεγαλοχώριον

1:50000 map reference. 23° 21’ 30” E and 37° 35’ N.

Location. On a low but prominent akropolis (of ancient Methana) on the west coast of the Méthana peninsula, about 1 km south-west of modern Megalokhório.

Excavation. British School, Methana Survey.

Features. Substantial fortification walls run along the north and west sides of the akropolis. The masonry is of two styles, dating to the classical and hellenistic periods.

Finds. The archaic pottery includes numerous sherds from both open and closed shapes: kraters (one column), an amphora, a hydria, and smaller vessels such as cups, dishes, bowls, and well as miniature Corinthian skyphoi (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 126).

An archaic cup handle, two bg sherds, and the rim of a stemmed dish were found nearby, south-east of the akropolis (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 141).


Special purpose: shrine?

Comments. The place (MS 10) was probably settled from the geometric period, judging from its impressive range of archaic to late hellenistic pottery.

The distribution of archaic sherds south-east of the akropolis suggests that the settlement had expanded and was not simply confined to the akropolis. This area (MS 56) might represent the eastern limits of ancient Méthana (Paus. 2.34.1)
Kounoupítsa

Catling 1985, 22, 28.
Touchais 1985, 780.

Greek name. Κουνουπίτσα

1:50000 map reference. 23° 22′ 30″ E and 37° 38′ N.

Location. East of and in a ravine above Kounoupítsa, on the north part of the Méthana peninsula, between Øga and Magoúla.

Excavation. British School, Methana Survey.

Features. Here is located a small temple, with a terrace wall in Lesbian masonry (late sixth-late fifth centuries). The only architectural clue to the date of the temple is the terrace wall. It is clear that this wall was built at the same time as the temple.

Other walls suggest a platform 13.9 m by 8.2 m for a temple aligned north-south, with its south wall built close to the terrace wall. There are also four columns of volcanic stone, unfluted and fairly roughly shaped; it is possible that these are not part of the temple.

Finds. The earliest sherd belongs to a bg Attic krater of the fifth century; all the other closely datable sherds are fourth century (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 136).

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary.

Comments. The sanctuary is not located near a centre of habitation and is roughly midway between the settlement at Øga and Magoúla. It is conceivable that it acted as an extra-urban sanctuary for one of these settlements and marked the boundary between the two. The north-south alignment of the temple is clearly determined by the topography, but it is possible that the choice of site was made to allow for the construction of a temple facing out towards the Saronikos gulf and Salamis.

Due to the nature of its recent destruction (bulldozed) much of the sherd material has been lost and a few finds confirm a date only for the fifth century, although the architecture might suggest establishment in the archaic period. No votives have been found and the name of the deity is unknown (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 68).
Throní

Deffner 1909, 341-355.
Catling 1988, 23.
Konsolaki 1989b, 63-64.
Pariente 1990, 723.

Greek name. Θοπώ

1:50000 map reference. 23° 23' E and 37° 35' N.

Location. On the edge of the plain of Throní, west of modern Méthana town, south-west of Vromolimni.

Excavation. British School, Methana Survey.

Features. Cut blocks were found here.

Finds. At least thirty-seven fragments of votive skyphoi were found at the edge of Throní plain.

On the plain itself was a rough block of trachyte, 0.78 m long, 0.45 m wide, and 0.45 m thick (Deffner 1909, 354-55; Premerstein 1909, 356-362; Jeffery 1990, 175-176, 181, 406; Foley 1988, 129, 274). It was inscribed in a form of boustrophedon, and may have been laid flat across the grave rather than serving as a stele. It was dedicated by Eumares for his son Androkles, and seems to date from the sixth century (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 59).

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary?

Comments. This is perhaps the site of a temple. It is described as having an archaic votive deposit with a classical (early fifth century) farmstead nearby (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 174).

Since the archaic sherds seem to have been accompanied by some slag, it does not seem that this is a funerary deposit (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 59).
Greek name. Άγιος Κωσταντίνος

1:50000 map reference. 23° 24' E and 37° 35' 30" N.

Location. North-east of Loutra, on a rocky knoll that is covered in garrigue.

Excavation. British School, Methana Survey.

Function. Habitation site: farmstead?

Finds. Only one rim sherd from a bg cup was archaic in date.

Comments. The site is quite small, about 4800 m², and without features.
Gouiri-Gljáti

Faraklas 1972, 15, figs. 16a to 18b.
Catling 1985, 22.
Foley 1988, 180.

Greek name. Κυψέλη

1:50000 map reference. 23° 24' 30" E and 37° 37' N.

Location. On the east coast of Méthana, north-west of Óga.

The Gouiri-Gljáti ridge, north-east of Kypselí, consists of a rock outcrop, narrow uncultivated terraces, and one possibly classical or hellenistic tower.

Excavation. British School, Methana Survey.

Finds. A glazed sherd of the archaic period was found here.

Function. Habitation site: farmstead?

Comments. Surface material indicates a probable settlement whose periods of occupation are uncertain.
**Óga**

**Greek name.** Κύψέλη

**1:50000 map reference.** 23° 24' 30" E and 37° 37' N.

**Location.** The main akropolis settlement on the east coast of Methana, in the plain of Cape Mikros Kavalláris.

**Excavation.** British School, Methana Survey.

**Function.** Habitation site: town.

---

**Óga (MS 67)**

Catling 1985, 22; 1987, 19; 1988, 23.

Touchais 1985, 780.

Foley 1988, 191.


**Location.** North-east of Kypseli, on a low but prominent hill.

**Excavation.** British School, Methana Survey.

**Features.** On the summit of the akropolis there is a square tower dating to about 400, together with the foundations of other structures. These were apparently pulled up to facilitate cultivation, but not the tower since it had been built on bedrock. Scattered around the akropolis are probably classical column drums and cut blocks, an altar, a millstone, a press weight and rock-cut inscriptions, preserved *in situ* (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 146).

**Finds.** A large number of unpainted and decorated sherds from both closed and open vessels date to the archaic period (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 147). There is a wide range of shapes which include kraters (some column, one from Laconia), amphorae, lekanai, a jug, cups, *skyphoi*, Corinthian *aryballoi*, a Corinthian *pyxis* lid, bowls, Corinthian miniature *skyphoi*, and other votives, as well as *cooking pots* (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 147-148).

**Comments.** The architectural fragments hint at the presence of a sanctuary.

---

*Above Óga (MS 68)*

Catling 1985, 22.


**Location.** West of Mikros Kavalláris and north-east of Kypseli.
Excavation. British School, Methana Survey.

Finds. Plenty of archaic sherds with as many as one hundred and eighty-eight fragments of miniature skyphoi, mostly Corinthian in fabric, and matt-painted sherds, along with two archaic/classical lamps have been recovered on these terraces (Mee and Forbes [H.] 1997, 148).

Comments. Although there are no architectural remains above Ōga, the votives collected here indicate a sanctuary.

Bone fragments and reports of tombs suggest that there might also be a settlement and cemetery above Ōga.
B.vi.c. The Region of Troizenia: The Island of Hydrea

Nomós Attikís: Eparkhía Troizinías

The island of Ydhra (ancient Hydrea) is long and mountainous with little arable land (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 28). In antiquity it belonged to Hermione in the archaic period, but was sold to a group of exiles from the island of Samos around 524 (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 28). Eventually, they entrusted the island to Troizen and they settled in Krete (Hdt. 3.59.1-3). It seems that Hydrea remained in the hands of Troizen thereafter (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 28).
Khoriza (Ýdhra)  A-69

Jameson 1959, 117.
Foley 1988, 177.

Greek name. Επισκοπή

1:50000 map reference. 23° 25' 30" E and 37° 18' 30" N.

Location. On the island of Ýdhra, about 2 km west of the modern town of Ýdhra, near a place called Episkopí.

Excavation. Unexcavated.

Finds. Some archaic sherds were found on the hillside above the lower wall.

Function. Habitation site: farmstead?
B.vi.d. The Region of Troizenia: The Island of Poros

Nomós Attikís: Eparkhía Troizinías
Kalaureia (Poros)

Greek name. Καλαύρια (Πόρος)

1:50000 map reference. 23° 28' 30" E and 37° 31' 30" N.

Location. On the island of Póros, ancient Kalaureia, across the mainland at Galatás.

Excavation. Swedish archaeologists, 1894; 1938 topographical work by Welter.

Function. Special-purpose site: sanctuary.

Habitation site: fortification?

Comment. Poros became well-known as the centre of the Kalaureian amphictiony, if there was such an organisation (see Hall [J.] 1995a, 577-613).

Poros: The Temple of Poseidon at Palatía

Location. On the plateau of Palátia, a little over 1 km from the north-east coast, in a saddle between the highest hills of the island, c. 550 m above sea level.

Features. The sanctuary dates from the geometric period, but other finds suggest a date possibly as early as the ninth century for the introduction of the cult in this area. The main structural remains are of the temple itself, standing in an enclosure measuring 55.5 m long by 26.6 m wide. Very little survives of this building, but its capitals and other features date it to the late sixth century (c. 520). The stone apparently comes from Aigina. The presence of roof-tiles of earlier date has, however, been noted by Welter (1941, 10, 45) and this may indicate an earlier temple, probably of mud-brick. Remains of various other structures have been found, but they are all of late date.

Finds. Various small finds were published by Wide and Kjellberg, including pottery of several periods, among them mycenaean, geometric, and archaic. From the publication it seems that they found a fairly large quantity of Protocorinthian and Corinthian pottery.
There were also bronzes and figurines, although only a few examples of each were actually published. Animals are mentioned quite frequently among the bronzes. It is clear that bronze pots and other ornaments had also been dedicated at the sanctuary. Seated females, mounted riders, and animals are the common types of figurines.

**Comments.** Continuity of cult from the bronze age has been claimed here, since the cult was established in an area of late helladic tombs. However, because no iron age material has been found, the probability that the cult dates back to the bronze age is slim (Foley 1988, 148).

The earliest temple belongs to Poseidon. The site was also a settlement in the archaic and later periods, which may have had defensive walls in the classical period (Foley 1988, 194).

Apparently the people from Ýdhra took the stone from the sanctuary to build their mansions.

---

**Poros: North of modern Póros**

Welter 1941.
Faraklas 1972, 16.
Foley 1988, 194.

**Location.** North of modern Póros.

**Excavation.** Unexcavated.

**Features.** In the archaic period a sanctuary was possibly established here.

---

**Poros: Megalokhóri**

Touchais 1988, 628.

**Location.** Not located on map.

**Excavation.** Greek Eforeía, surface finds.

**Finds.** Around Megalokhóri they found many inscriptions published in IG IV (often with mistakes) and four other unpublished inscriptions (three stelai and a base). Three archaic inscriptions, IG IV.853, 854, and 857, were transferred to the Poros Museum.
Appendix B

A Postscript to Mining: The Metal Objects

The following account, intended as a postscript to mining, shows some of the more interesting uses to which metals were put in the archaic Argolid. These include agricultural implements, building materials and tools, coins, domestic items, jewellery, footwear, and military objects. Metals were certainly used in other contexts, such as in casting statues, but as non-practical objects, they tell us little about everyday life.

The bulk of the evidence that has survived comes from religious rather than domestic contexts, although many of the objects could have been used before being dedicated. We must bear in mind that archaeological record of metal artifacts is seriously compromised and depleted by several post-depositional factors: the melting down of votives by temple officials, the increasing frequency of plunder from the late classical period onwards, and the susceptibility of metals to corrosion and disintegration (Hodkinson 1998, 56). Consequently, the number of excavated metal artifacts is a minimum to be multiplied many times over in any estimation of their original numbers.

Agricultural Implements

It is often assumed that Hesiod (Op. 387 and elsewhere) refers to metal agricultural implements, but, as Morgan (1990, 197) points out, there is scant evidence to support this assertion. Some knives, perhaps used as agricultural implements, have been found in the Argolid; yet we have no evidence of sickles, scythes for cutting grass, or other common implements.
Building Materials and Tools

Stone, wood, and mudbrick were the main building materials in archaic Greece, although metals had a part to play in construction work as well. Clamps and dowels made of iron were used in the building of many temples. Sometimes ceilings, vaulted roofs, and even walls were gilded, though most of the evidence for this has not survived. Our evidence for the use of metals as building materials in the Argolid is unfortunately limited to iron nails. Iron nails were found in an archaic deposit at the Khóos shrine near Mykenai (Cook [J.] 1953a, 32; Hägg 1987, 98).

More evidence exists for the use of metal tools. Heads of carpenters’ tools were often produced from iron. Sunk into the floor of the temple of Apollo at Halieis were found iron axe-adze and double axe heads (Jameson 1974b, 116). Perhaps these had a monetary value or were used as tools in the construction of the temple and then dedicated to the god. Also found here was a bronze tube with a ram’s head (Michaud 1972, 651, fig. 156), which may have been used as a pick.

Knives, spatulas, and other such implements from the Heraion may have been tools (Waldstein 1905, 259, 264, 299-300, pls. 92, 126; Caskey and Amandry 1952, 182, pl. 47; Strøm 1998, 88). They find counterparts in the neighbouring deposits or in the sanctuaries of Argos (Strøm 1998, 88).

Coins

Silver was an important metal in Greek coinage, especially for Athens, because of its own silver mines. Where silver was not locally available, coins were made by either overstriking or counter-marking coins in circulation, or by striking new coins from melted silver or from imported bullion. Early coin dies were made from bronze or steel.

We have evidence of silver coins being used at Argos from about 468 onwards (Gardner 1887, 52; Babelon 1907, 828; Head 1911, 437). Some were found beneath the floor of the Isthmian temple of Poseidon in a deposit that was buried around 480-475 (Kraay...
Troizen also yielded silver coins of the second quarter of the fifth century (Gardner 1887, 56; Babelon 1907, 495; Head 1911, 443).

Domestic Items

Many metals were used domestically for making furniture, tableware, utensils, and toilet articles. Metals also strengthened or merely decorated wooden furniture. Bronze and occasionally silver were used for tableware, everyday utensils, and toilet articles.

Furniture

We have some bronze furniture fragments from the Argolid. At the Heraion fragments of low tripod stands with lion's paws were found (Athens, NAM 14020, 14019, 20631 b and c: Waldstein 1905, 295-296, pls. 124-125; Strøm 1998, 80), suggesting the use of the tripod rings and bowl as a foot bath, for which the large dimensions and low position of the bowls seems appropriate (Strøm 1988, 80). They may have been symposium equipment (Strøm 1998, 80).

Moreover, four examples of double paws of lions connected with a bar that shows traces of iron rivets are presumably parts of furniture, but their function is unknown (Athens, NAM 14024: Waldstein 1905, 296, pl. 125; Strøm 1998, 81).

Tableware

The enormous quantity of tableware from the Argolid attests to the frequent use of bronze in contexts involving eating and drinking. The majority of these come from sanctuaries, where feasting and banqueting occurs in large numbers (see Chapter III). At the Heraion more than a thousand fragmentary bronze vases or separate fragments were found, including miniature vases, which were non-functional (Waldstein 1905, 275-298; Caskey and Caskey and Amandry 1952, 179-180 nos. 72-79, pl. 46; Strøm 1998, 78). A rather large part of the large bronze vases belongs to banqueting services; they comprise cauldrons, kraters, hydriai, oinochoai, jugs, skyphoi, bowls, and other drinking vessels, as
well as plates for serving food (Athens, NAM 20581, 20584 d, 20586, 20587 b, 20623, 20658: Waldstein 1905, 284-286, 288-289, 294, pls. 112-120, 123; Caskey and Amandry 1952, 179; Rolley 1986, 242, fig. 264; Strøm 1998, 81-83).

There is no decisive sign of banqueting equipment having played the same role at Argos as at the Heraion (Strøm 1998, 85). Very few fragments of bronze vases have been found in the sanctuaries of Argos, but both the Athena sanctuary on the Larisa and the Aphrodisision have yielded fragments of handle plates with palmette-volute ornaments (Strøm 1998, 85). Other bronze vases, including phialai, of normal and miniature size were also discovered at the Aphrodisision (Strøm 1998, 85). A few non-contextualised bronze vessels have been attributed to Argos on typological grounds; many come from the collection of bronzes in the Louvre (Paris, Louvre: 2665, 2721, 2731, 2749-2750, 2756, 2758, 2760: de Ridder 1915, 108, 113-115, 127. pl. 98-99; Lamb 1929, 136).

Several bronze pots come from tombs in Argos and may have been connected with ritual dining. In an area east of Kypseli Square at Argos a tomb containing a shallow bronze bowl was found (Strøm 1998, 85). A phiale was found in another tomb on the Florou plot at 12 Theátrou Párodhos (Kritzas 1979, 214; Strøm 1998, 85).

Utensils

In addition to bronze vessels, the Argolic sanctuaries have yielded many bronze utensils, connected with the function of vases, such as ladles, sieves, and other implements for scooping. At the Heraion this equipment was found in large numbers (Athens, NAM 13982: Waldstein 1905, 296-297, pls. 125, 129, 136; Strøm 1998, 82).

Toiletry Articles

Among the most common toiletry articles found in the Argolid are bronze mirrors. They belong to a class of votive objects that had sometimes been used before being dedicated; many, however, were too small and fragile for anything but votives. The two common types are hand mirrors and stand mirrors.
The hand mirror is almost exclusively found at the Heraion (Athens, NAM 14012, 20453, 20456 and 20458: Waldstein 1905, 264-266, pls. 92-93, 103-105; Caskey and Amandry 1952, 180 nos. 84, 86, pl. 46; Strøm 1998, 76) and Prosymna (Blegen 1939, 414-415, fig. 5; Oberländer 1967, 237 no. 361; Strøm 1998, 78), except for one fragment at Troizen (Oberländer 1967, 26) and a possible handle fragment from the Aphrodision of Argos (Argos Mus. 73/658: Daux 1968, 1029; Strøm 1998, 78). These were usually made of a very thin bronze plate, an indication that they were meant for votive use only (Strøm 1998, 76).

Stand mirrors have handles that serve as a stand, which enabled the mirrors to be placed upright on the shelf or table (Lamb 1929, 127). Many of the stands are in the form of female figures. Mirrors with attached handles from the Heraion are few (Athens, NAM 13975: Waldstein 1905, 196-197, 266, pls. 70, 96-98, 106-108; Jenkins 1931-32, 33; Payne [H.] 1934, 163 n2; Gjødesen 1944, 157-158; Congdon 1981, 137 no. 15, 216 no. 123, pls. 12-13; Rolley 1983, 231; 1986, 94-97; Strøm 1998, 60).

Jewellery and Clothing Accessories

Ancient jewellery was made chiefly of gold, silver, and electrum. More practical items, such as clothing accessories, were made of bronze. Some diadems, wreaths, hair ornaments, earrings, finger rings, bracelets, pendants, and attachments to clothing such as fibulae, pins, and belt buckles were found in the Argolid.

Diadems, Wreaths, and Hair Other Ornaments

There is little evidence for the use of diadems, wreaths, and hair ornaments. Several bronze sheets from the Heraion have been interpreted as diadems (perhaps they were bracelets?) (Boston, Mus. of Fine Arts inv.94.44: Waldstein 1905, 270-271, 277-278, 337, pls. 102-103, 111-112; Comstock and Vermeule [C.] 1971, 210; Strøm 1998, 88).

A lead wreath was found at Halieis in a fifth century building on the west side of the upper part of the akropolis area (Jameson 1969, 318, pl. 80). It was too small and heavy to have been worn, however.
Earrings

Earrings were more common in the Argolid. At Argos they come from tombs as well as from the sanctuary of Athena on the Larisa and the Aphrodision (Daux 1969, 996; Amandry 1953, 29-33, pl. 10; Strøm 1998, 85). A common type of earring with an inverted pyramid or cone appears at Argos in the seventh century and continues through the archaic and classical periods (Strøm 1998, 85). No archaic pendant earrings have been found at the Heraion and Prosymna.

Rings

Bronze rings were found at the temple of Apollo on the Barbouna hill at Asine (Frödin and Persson 1938), on the akropolis at Mykenai (Foley 1988; Klein 1997), and at the Heraion (Boston, Mus. of Fine Arts inv.94.45: Waldstein 1905, 250-251, 332, pls. 88-89; Caskey and Amandry 1952, 180-181; Boardman 1970, 154-157; Comstock and Vermeule [C.] 1971, 201, 211-212; Strøm 1998, 85). No counterparts to these rings exist at Argos.

Necklaces and Pendants

Necklaces and pendants are rarer than rings. A bronze pendant was found on the Kamaniola plot at Asine (Michaud 1971, 874; Rafn 1979), and a necklace was found along with silver rings in a grave at Skafidháki (Verdhelis 1963, 54; Barakari-Gleni 1990, 119-123; Catling 1989, 30).

Fibulae, Pins, and Other Decorative Attachments

Fibulae, pins, belt buckles, and other decorative attachments had more practical uses than jewellery. Such items were worn to hold up clothing. Most of these objects were made of bronze and have been found in sanctuaries of female divinities or in tombs, where they were dedicated (Strøm 1995, 78).

A few examples of bronze fibulae come from Tomb 8 at Prosymna (Blegen 1938, 380, fig. 4; Strøm 1998, 85). One of the ring fibulae with a thread wire from Prosymna
(Athens, NAM 20908: Waldstein 1905, 249-250, pl. 88) is a western European type with a counterpart in the archaic deposit of the Hera shrine at Mykenai (Athens, NAM 14034: Cook [J.] 1953a, 66, fig. 41; Strøm 1998, 85). Lead was sometimes used for making fibulae. An unusual small fibula of lead shows a female and male figure representing Zeus and Hera (Alexandri 1964, 525-530; Strøm 1998, 66). It was found unused. Another small fibula of lead was found at Áyios Adhrianós together with some bronze pins (Dheilaki-Protonotariou 1965, 65; Hall [J.] 1995a, 597; Strøm 1998, 65-66).

The Heraion collection of bronze pins includes straight pins and loop pins (Waldstein 1905, 207-250; Caskey and Amandry 1952, 181-182). Pins were also found in the Athena sanctuary on the Larisa as well as sporadically throughout Argos (Appendix A, 10-74: Jacobsthal 1956, 28-29, fig. 118; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1984; Strøm 1998, 87), in a temple deposit at Dhoúka (Protonotariou-Dheilaki 1972a, 155-156), at Mykenai (Oxford, Ashmolean Mus. 272.93: Jacobsthal 1956, 134), in some Prosymna tombs (Blegen 1938, 378, fig. 2; 1939, 412, fig. 3; Jacobsthal 1956, 97; Kilian-Dirlmeier 1984; Strøm 1998, 87), and at Asine on the Barbouna hill (Frödin and Persson 1938, 148-151). An iron pinhead was found on Kamaniola plot at Asine (Rafn 1979, 25f.).

Belt buckles and decorative attachments for clothing were worn in archaic times. A bronze buckle apparently comes from the Heraion (Boston, Mus. of Fine Art inv. 94.42: Comstock and Vermeule [C.] 1971, 444, no. 647). A lead belt attachment was also found at Áyios Adhrianós (Alexandri 1964). And finally, a fifth century decorative attachment for clothing was found at the Heraion (Caskey and Amandry 1952, 182-183). It shows no sign of wear.
Footwear

A few pairs of iron attachments for wooden sandals come from the Argolid. One pair was discovered at Argos about 150m to the south-west of the odeon in Tomb 223 (Daux 1967b, 825, fig. 25). Another pair of fittings for the soles of boots or heavy sandals were placed between the skulls in a grave at 26 Tripóleos Street, Kannellopoulou plot (Kritzas 1977, 132-133). A third tomb north-west of Argos on Ioannidhis plot contained three pairs of iron sandals (Barakari-Gleni 1991, 171-204; Pariente 1991, 858).

Military Equipment

Iron replaced bronze as the metal for weapons in the archaic period, but bronze continued to be used for armour. The manufacture of shields and other parts of military equipment is a very important side of the bronze work of archaic Argos (Strøm 1998, 88). The Argive shield straps with relief decoration of mostly mythological subjects were to a large degree found in Olympia; only a few come from the Argolid (see Appendix A-10-61). Nevertheless, there is no reason to doubt that the Olympian examples were of Argive manufacture, Argive inscriptions having been already in the moulds (Kunze 1950, 212-214; Bol 1989, 88-89; Strøm 1998, 73). The most logical location for an Argive workshop of bronze shields must be in Argos itself (Strøm 1998, 73). On the other hand, there is no certain evidence of weapons from the Heraion; apparently objects of military nature were not dedicated at the Heraion (Strøm 1998, 88).

Bronze shields, iron sword handles, and other bronze weapons were found at Argos in a pit inside a grave on the Kannellopoulou plot at 26 Tripóleos Street (Appendix A, 10-56: Kritzas 1977, 122-135; Morris [I.] 1987, 184). This grave (c. 525-500) has been identified as a heroön to a young warrior. The area became the focus of cult in the late sixth century and was probably where young warriors were buried (Pariente 1992, 205).

Large quantities of bronze and iron swords also come from the temple of Apollo at Halieis (Michaud 1972, 651; Mazarakis Ainian 1988, 118 n47). Iron spearheads were found at the Kháos shrine as well as at Asprókhoma near Mykenai (Cook [J.] 1953a, 66-
68). Many iron spearheads come from the temple of Apollo at Halieis (Mazarakis-Ainian 1988, 188 n47).

As far as we know, only a few helmets come from the Argolid; one is the inscribed helmet to Enyalios from Asprókhoma near Mykenai (Náfplion, Leonárdho Mus.?: SEG 23.187; Mylonas 1966a, 70ff.; 1967a, 96; Daux 1966a, 782; Lazzarini 1976, 243; Jeffery 1990, 445 no. 3a) and another is a Corinthian one from Hermion (Kunze 1955, figs. 4-5).

Horse equipment was often part of one’s military paraphernalia. Most of the bronzes connected with horses (horse bits) or carriages come from the Heraion (Waldstein 1905, 298-299, 326-328, pls. 126, 134; Jeffery 1990, 168 no. 13; Strøm 1998, 87-88).
Appendix C

The Location of Sanctuaries Whose Divinities have been Identified

Urban Sanctuaries

Sanctuaries on Akropoleis

**Apollo at Asine**

*PAUSANIAS 2.36.4-5*

At Asine the main sanctuary of Apollo (Paus. 2.36.4-5) was at the summit of the Barbouna Hill, at the centre of the geometric settlement on the north and south flanks of the hill. The first temple (Building B) was apsidal and goes back to the mid-eighth century. At the end of the eighth century a rectangular *oikos* (Building A) replaced it, until its destruction by the Argives around 710 BCE (Paus. 2.36.5). The temple was almost immediately reconstructed by the Argives; the last roof dates to the end of the sixth century (Wells [B.] 1990, 157-161).

Some of the archaic votives found in the area include cups, kraters, jugs, a *kalathos*, and a variety of cooking wares. The archaeologists also recovered figurines, mortars, and lamps.

**Athena (?) at Halieis**

*APPENDIX A-38*

Athena was apparently worshipped on the akropolis of Halieis, but no buildings can be identified with cult activity here. Two altars, an inscribed fragment of a *perrihanterion,*
and an associated votive deposit point to the presence of an archaic cult here. The marble
perriantierion was found near one of the altars (Náfploio, Leonárdo Mus. HS 22, 33:
Jameson 1969, 320, pl. 80). Usually such lustral basins were placed at the entrances to
sanctuaries to mark the spatial transition between secular and sacred territory, between
secular and sacred activities (for archaeological, pictorial, and literary evidence of these
lustral basins, see Ginouvès 1962, 229-310; Guettel Cole 1988, 162).

The votives here were characterised by a variety of miniature vessels, miniature bronze
armour (shields, helmets, greaves), miniature bronze axes and mirrors, wreaths, bronze
and silver pins and earrings, lead figurines of Spartan type, terracotta female, male, and
animal figurines, and fragments of inscribed bronze (Náfploio, Leonárdo Mus. HM 142,

Most votives are of types associated with a variety of deities, and even the interesting
series of miniature items of armour finds parallels in the cult of more than one divinity.
But the cult is unquestionably that of a goddess, and the most likely one for the acropolis
is always Athena (Jameson 1974a, 71). The presence of wreaths, however, makes Hera
another likely candidate.

**Athena at Argos (Larisa)**

PAUSANIAS 2.24.3; STRABO 8.6.7
APPENDIX A-10-81
VOLLGRAFF 1928a, 315-328, pls. 7-8; 1932, 369-393; 1934, 137-156; 1956, 51-76; 1958, 516-570;
BÉQUIGNON 1930, 480; ROES 1953, 452-528; FOLEY 1988, 141; HÄGG 1992a, 11; BILLOT 1992, 56;

At Argos Athena is presumed to have had a temple on the Larisa, the main akropolis of
the city, where she is known as Athena Polias (Paus. 2.24.3; SEG 11.314; see Chapter I;
and the graffiti to Athena Polias, Vollgraff 1929, 206-234; Lazzarini 1976, 243 no. 475;

In 1928 Vollgraff found an important votive deposit (c. 750-650 BCE) on the Larisa,
which he attributed to Athena, but in reality it cannot be associated with any of the
excavated structures. It dates from the mid- to late-eighth century and included over three
hundred small cups, aryballoi, skyphoi, kotylai, pyxides, kalathoi, a krater, an oinochoe,
hundreds of rings (some in lead), bronze and lead figurines, and a variety of iron, bronze,
and bone objects.
Enyalios at Argos (Akropolis)

Athens, NAM 16515
SEG 11.327
APPENDIX A-10-81
PLUTARCH Mul. Virt. 245c-f
VOLLGRAFF 1934, 137-156, fig. 1; LAZZARINI 1976, 255 no. 565; FOLEY 1988, 126; JEFFERY 1990, 156, 168 no. 2, pl. 26, 444; STRÖM 1998, 73.

A bronze plate with a dedicatory inscription to Enyalios was excavated in a mixed stratum with votives of the Athena sanctuary on the Larisa. It is probably Corinthian. The plaque suggests the existence of a cult, if not a sanctuary of Enyalios. No remains have ever been found to confirm its existence on the Larisa or elsewhere in Argos, but Plutarch (Mul. Virt. 245c-f) reports that the city of Argos had a sanctuary of Enyalios known from former times. At some point the cult may have been assimilated with that of Ares at the foot of the Larisa.

Hera at Tiryns

PAUSANIAS 2.24.3
APPENDIX A-16

Scholars disagree about the identity of the deity worshipped on the upper citadel at Tiryns. Some follow Jameson’s (Verdhelis, Jameson, and Papakhristodhouloú 1976, 199; Antonaccio 1993, 61) earlier identification of the building as the temple of Athena and perhaps Zeus and Herakles, arguing from the archaic inscription of a law (see Chapter I). In a more recent article, however, Jameson (1990a, 213-223) seems less anxious to defend this identification. Instead, he argues that the terracotta masks discovered in the bothros at Tiryns should (Jantzen 1975, 159-161), by analogy with the mask found in the sanctuary of Artemis Orthia at Sparta (Carter 1987, 355-383), be connected with an adolescent ritual in honour of a female divinity and a male hero. The hero intimately associated with Tiryns is Herakles, whose name, meaning ‘glory of Hera’, suggests that Hera was his divine partner (see also Foley 1988, 147; Wright 1982, 198). The hideous masks also recall the description of the outward disfigurement of the mad daughters of Proitos of Tiryns, whose madness was provoked by Hera or Dionysos and spread to all women of the city (Diphilus, Fragment 126; Hesiod, Fragment 37.14f; 133).
The identification of Hera is strengthened by a graffito with her name on the base of a classical black glaze bowl found on the citadel (Jantzen 1975, 105; cf. Verdhelis, Jameson, and Papakhistoodhoulou 1976, 199; Johnston 1979, 277-280). Alongside the epigraphic evidence, we have that of the ancient authors (Pausanias 2.17.4-15, 8.46.3; Moschus Megara 38; Clement of Alexandria Protreptius 4.47.5), whose testimonies lend strong support to the presence of a Hera cult on the citadel. Pausanias (2.17.4-15) tells us that the old cult statue at Tiryns, brought to the Heraion when the Argives destroyed the ‘town’ in the fifth century, was a small, seated image of Hera.

As Hall (1995a, 598) remarks, the appearance of wreaths and pomegranates and the striking parallels between many of the votives at Tiryns and those at the Heraion also point to Hera as chief deity. The other votives found here include many miniature bowls, skyphoi, and other shapes, terracotta figurines, a few bronze rings, pins, and fibulae.

---

**Hera at Mykenai (Akropolis)**

PAUSANIAS 2.24.3


In the *Iliad* (IV.52) Mykenai is described as one of Hera’s favourite sites (Wright 1982, 14 n44; Hall [J.] 1995a, 600). We know that one of Mykenai’s urban sanctuaries was probably dedicated to her in the early sixth century. It lies over the ruins of the bronze age palace on the akropolis. Although this sanctuary has often been attributed to Athena on the basis of a bronze plaque, found north-west of the citadel and dated about 500 BCE or a little later (Athens, NAM 11757: *IG* IV 492; *SEG* 11.299, 40.334; Tsountas 1887, 158-172; 1888, 59-79; Roehl 1907, no. 51.1; Schwyzer 1923, 48 no. 97; Vollgraff 1929, 221-222; Wace 1949, 86; Buck 1955, 282 no. 80; Levi 1945, 301; Marcadé 1953, 184-185; Jeffery 1990, 174 no. 2, 445; Lambrinudakis 1990, 180-181; Morgan and Whitelaw 1991, 88; Antonaccio 1993, 61), Hall (1995a, 599-600) has convincingly argued for the worship of Hera (see also Hägg 1987, 97; Foley 1988, 144; Antonaccio 1994, 88). A boundary stone (c. 470-460 BCE) from the temenos of Hera (Náfplio, Leonártho Mus.: *SEG* 13.236, 42.284; Wace, Hood, and Cook [J.] 1953, 27-29, fig. 5; Jeffery 1990, 174 no. 4), the relief sculpture of a woman lifting a veil (Athens, NAM inv.2869: Kourouniotis 1901, 18-22; Harl-Schaller 1972-73, 94-116; Raftopoulou, 1993, 5), and a few female figurines and an ox figurine, together with a sherd dedicated to Hera (Hall [J.] 1995a, 600 n156), point in favour of a cult of Hera.
Herakles at Tiryns

Since Tiryns is the homeland of Amphritryon, Herakles’ mortal father, and the place from which Herakles began the Labours, it is likely that there would have been a cult of Herakles here. He is mentioned in the sacral law from the lower city (see Chapter I, SEG 22.269; Verdhelis, Jameson, and Papakhristodoulou 176, 15-203). It is difficult to know, however, whether this refers to a sanctuary of Herakles or the name of a month in the sacred calendar. It is likely that Herakles was an established divinity in Tiryns in archaic times and that he received a temple here (Foley 1988, 127; Salowey 1995, 20). If correct, then it would be the earliest reference for the worship of Herakles in Greece (Salowey 1995, 20).

Frickenhaus, Müller [W.], and Oelmann (1912, 19) provide evidence for an early cult of Herakles by quoting Clement of Alexandria (Protr. 42), who states that two Kretan sculptors, Dipoinos and Skyllis, created a statue of Herakles at Tiryns. The sculptors can be dated to the fiftieth Olympiad (580-577 BCE) by Pliny (N.H. 36.9-10), so there may have been at least a statue of Herakles at Tiryns in the archaic period.

Poseidon at Kalaureia

The temple of Poseidon on the island of Póros is on the plateau of Palátia, a little over one kilometre from the north-east coast, in a saddle between the highest hills of the island, about 550 metres above sea level. It was never properly excavated or published, but it seems that the sanctuary dates from the geometric period, when a temple of mudbrick may have been built (Welter 1941, 10, 45). The finds, however, suggest a date possibly as early as the ninth century for the introduction of the cult in the area.

Today only the main structural remains of the archaic temple (late sixth century) are in situ. In the last quarter of the sixth century the sanctuary acquired a temple and an altar. The discovery of an inscribed marble base to Poseidon was made in the sanctuary of Poseidon between the propylon and the bouleuterion (Póros Mus. MPI 628: SEG 38.324).
The inscription remains undated and awaits fuller publication. The appearance of bronze horses and bulls and male terracotta riders among the dedications strengthen his identification (Hall [J.] 1995a, 597), but seated females are also mentioned. Other votives include bronze vessels and various bronze ornaments.

The sanctuary is meant to be the centre of an early amphictiony (Strabo 8.374; Paus. 2.33; Welter 1941; Kelly 1966, 113-121; Bergquist 1967, 35; Snodgrass 1971, 402), but Hall (1995a) has convincingly argued against this theory. If, as is suspected, the site was also a settlement in the archaic and later periods, when defensive walls were built (Foley 1988, 194), this temple must thus be interpreted as urban.

**Zeus at Argos (Larisa)**

PAUSANIAS 2.24.3
APPENDIX A-10-81

Little is known of Zeus’ temple on the Larisa, except that the foundations situated to the east of the temple of Athena Polias may be those of Zeus Larisaian (Paus. 2.24.3). O’Brien (1993, 121) maintains that Zeus sanctuary on the akropolis is of late date, but Piérart (1996, 181) sees his cult beginning with that of Athena Polias.

**Sanctuaries on the Slopes of Akropoleis**

**Aphrodite at Troizen**

PAUSANIAS 2.32.6
APPENDIX A-56

On the slopes of the akropolis at Troizen a temple with *pronaos, cela*, and statue base was discovered by Legrand at the turn of the century. He identified it with Pan (Paus. 2.32.6), but Welter (1941, 19-20) believes it to have belonged to Aphrodite (Paus. 2.32.6). The locality of this temple on the slopes towards the akropolis may have contributed to her epithet, Aphrodite Akraia (‘Height’).

A few architectural fragments in the Póros museum have been attributed to this sanctuary; they seem to date to the late archaic period.
Two inscriptions from Argos were probably dedicated to the Dioskouroi. The first is a stone base for bronze kouros statue (c. 590-570 BCE) dedicated by the sons of Nirakhas (Berlin Mus. 7837; IG IV 564; SEG 15.201; Roberts 1887, 108 no. 72; Collitz and Bechtel 1899, 121-122 no. 3262; Roehl, 1907 no. 36.1; Neugebauer 1931, 78f.; Schwyzer 1923, no. 79; Lazzarini 1976, 206 no. 203; Jeffery 1990, 156, 168 no. 6, pl. 26). Its context is unknown. The second inscription of the fifth century was found in the area of the theatre (Argos Mus. Inv. E44: EF 1956b, 389 no. 1). Like the previous inscription, it mentions the Anakes, the Dioskouroi.

It is possible that the Dioskouroi were worshipped in the area of the theatre on the slopes of the Larisa in the fifth century, but Pausanias' (2.22.5) only mention of a sanctuary of the Dioskouroi in Argos places it near the Eilithyia gates. Piérart (1982, 146) locates their sanctuary in the north-eastern part of the ancient city (see also below).

In the area of the theatre of Argos, on the slopes of the Lárissa, Vollgraff (1933, 231-238) found an archaic inscription (c. 475-450 BCE) on the lip of a small bronze vase, reading: ‘I belong to Erasinos of Argos’, in a well dug into the rock at the level of the seating area. The implication is that in this zone was once a sanctuary. If the inscription was found in situ, as the excavator believes, it attests to a cult of Erasinos (the river) in this area from the early fifth century (Moretti [J.-C.] 1998, 239).
An attic red figure krater inscribed with the name of Herakles ([H₆]αξλεος) was found in the theatre at Argos. Moretti (1998, 240) takes this as evidence that there was a sanctuary of Herakles near the theatre.

Sanctuaries in the Agora

**Aphrodite at Argos**

PAUSANIAS 2.20.8
APPENDIX A-10-64

At Argos Aphrodite's temple was near the centre, south-west of the agora, at the seat of government (Paus. 2.20.8). Although cultic activity goes back to the seventh century to judge from the pottery, the actual temple was apparently erected in the late fifth century on a terrace built in the second half of the sixth century (des Courtils 1992, 241). A rectangular structure, however, was perhaps an earlier temple or altar dating to the middle or late sixth century.

The identification of Aphrodite is secured by two graffiti (c. 450), inscribed Aphrodite (τας Αφροδίτης [ἀγύρων] ἂς I [αινείκος ταφος τις]), found during the excavations of the Aphrodision (Argos Mus. SEG 31.317; Daux 1968, 1028 fig. 15; 1969, 1003, fig. 34; Lazzarini 1976, 189 no. 73, 242 no. 473).

Plenty of votives, including miniature cups, krateriskoi, oinochoai, lekythoi, amphorae, skypoi, kalathoi, female and animal figurines, terracotta rings, a bronze phialé, a mirror, rings, a miniature gold figurine, and moulded lead miniature figurines were recovered during excavations. Many of the pots date to the fifth century, whereas the figurines have been dated to the late seventh and sixth centuries, thus provided some indication of the date of the establishment of the cult here (Foley 1988, 141). Bronzes are extremely scarce at this sanctuary.
Apollo at Argos (Agora)

PAUSANIAS 2.19.3-5
APPENDIX A-10-65

The most important (and reputedly the earliest) cult at Argos was that of Apollo Lykios ('The Wolf'), whose sanctuary is situated somewhere in the agora (Paus. 2.19.3-5; Hall [J.] 1995a, 606). It was hypothetically located under the present Karmoyianni café at the entrance to the archaeological site (Hall [J.] 1995a, 606), but this location has recently been challenged (Marchetti 1994, 136-137). In studying the design of the large classical stoa (Pi) in the south part of the agora (squares BA/BB 83.85), the excavators revealed traces of an earlier polygonal terrace wall, i.e. a foundation wall belonging to a building (PA), which is earlier than the classical Stoa Pi (Catling 1987, 18). Associated with it were layers dating to the end of the sixth and the beginning of the fifth century (Touchais 1986, 688; Catling 1986, 26). This terrace is at the centre of three large streets of modern Argos, where the sanctuary of Apollo is thought to be, and corresponds to the principle part of the sanctuary, where the actual temple stood. The orientation of the terrace, which is almost exactly parallel to the poros foundation of the south wall of the classical building (Stoa Pi), is exactly what we expect for the temple of Apollo (Marchetti 1994, 136-137). So, the temple is now thought to be situated in the south-east corner of the agora (Piérart and Touchais 1996, 47-51; Piteros 1998, 198).

Apollo at Troizen

PAUSANIAS 2.31.6; 2.32.2
LEGRAND 1893, 93; 1905, 281-282; WELTER 1941, 18; BILLOT 1992, 70; JAMESON, RUNNELS, and VAN ANDEL 1994, 72.

Pausanias (2.31.6) regarded the temple of Apollo Thearios in the agora of the Troizen as one of the three oldest he knows of; a date in the seventh century would thus be reasonable for this cult. Like the temple of Apollo Lykios at Argos, this temple is at the political centre of the city, where they set up official acts (IG IV 748, 755).

In front of the Apollo sanctuary stood a hut of Orestes that was said to have been erected to avoid receiving the murderer in a normal house (Paus. 2.31.8). A priestly group met there weekly for a sacral meal. Apparently Apollo himself purified Orestes at Delphi with a pig sacrifice (Burkert 1985, 81). Vase paintings (Paris, Louvre, K710) give an
idea of the procedure, similar to that used in the purification of the Proitides: the piglet is held over the head of the person to be purified and the blood must flow directly onto the head and hands.

**Herakles at Troizen**

APPENDIX A-28
PAUSANIAS 2.32.4
WELTER 1941, 34-36.

According to myth, Herakles was active in Troizen as well. In the *temenos* of Hippolytos there was a fountain of Herakles, so named because Herakles helped the Troizenians find water (Paus. 2.32.4). Archaeologically, the spring can be identified near the healing area of the Asklepieion and the temple of Hippolytos, where a fountain house was supplied with water from a natural spring, originating at the base of Mt. Adheres, ancient Phorbantion (Welter 1941, 34-36). Welter concludes that the mineralogical properties of the water here probably formed the basis for the cult of Asklepios at the site.

Moreover, a stone *stele* (c. 425-400 BCE) dedicated by Euthymides to Asklepios mentions Herakles at Troizen (Athens, EM ?: *IG* IV 760; *IG* IV3 1159; *SEG* 36.351; Legrand 1893, 86ff.; Roehl 1907, no. 110.8; Schwyzer 1923, no. 103; Jeffery 1990, 177-178, 182 no. 6).

**Demeter at Argos (Agora)**

PAUSANIAS 2.22.1
APPENDIX A-10-65

Demeter is thought to have had one or two sanctuaries near the *agora* at Argos (Paus. 2.22.1, see also 1.14.2). Her epithet, Pelasgia, no doubt meant to imply that she was an ancient goddess (Schachter 1990, 12). Dheïlaki (1977, 119) proposes to see the classical temple discovered on the Koros plot at Atreos Street and Theatrou Parodhos, on the east side of the *agora* as the sanctuary to Demeter Pelasgia. The identity of the goddess worshipped here is controversial, however, and Dheïlaki herself admits that it could also be the temple of Hera Antheia. Others have proposed Athena Salpix (‘Trumpet’), who is known from a fourth century inscription discovered nearby (Argos Mus. Inv. E 67: Touchais 1978, 789-790; Piérart 1982, 127 n22; 1983, 272 n23; Charneux 1983, 264; Piérart 1996, 191-193; see also Paus. 2.21.3). What is clear is that the archaic material found under this sanctuary suggests an older date for the cult (of a goddess) here.
Hera at Argos (Agora)  

Hera is thought to have had a sanctuary on the agora at Argos, though her cult was apparently not that important here (Paus. 2.22.1, 2.24.1; Pollux 4.78; Billot 1992, 57). In south-west Argos, on the Bonoris plot (Tripoleos 7b) near the agora, the Greek Archaeological Service uncovered a fifth century structure and a large votive deposit (figurines, wreaths, spools, loom-weights, kotylai, and other pottery), which included a sherd inscribed to Hera (he[gaς ευι ?]). The area was sacred by the early archaic period (seventh century), and the structure was perhaps the small shrine or altar of Hera Antheia, in, or close to, the agora (Paus. 2.22.1; Foley 1988, 141; Hall [J.] 1995a, 605).

Hippolytus at Troizen  

Pausanias (2.32.1) mentions a very famous precinct of Hippolytus near the agora at Troizen. Only the foundations of the temple can be seen today.

Zeus at Argos (Agora)  

The area around the agora, at Gkrania plot between Gounari Street and the theatre, was originally associated with the cult of Apollo Lykios, but now has been re-attributed to that of Zeus. Here the excavators found a rectangular sekos with an important group of votives and a lyre made from tortoise shell. Because of the lyre, which is reminiscent of Pausanias’ description (2.19.7) within the sanctuary of Apollo Lykios of a statue of Hermes with a tortoise that the god had caught to make a lyre, the area was originally attributed with Apollo. Now excavators believe that the sekos was probably a heroön rather than a votive deposit in the sanctuary of Zeus.
Pausanias says that the actual temple is to Nemean Zeus, which means that it was probably erected after Argos took hold of the Nemean Games at the end of the fifth century. Nevertheless, the area was no doubt consecrated to Zeus in archaic times.

Urban Sanctuaries on Roads in Towns

**Artemis at Argos**

*PAUSANIAS 2.21.1; 2.23.5*

*APPENDIX A-10-66*


A building was found between the theatre area and the city centre of Argos, parallel to the axis formed by the ancient road that ran along the modern Gounari/Tripoleos from Kórinthos to Tegea. The structure (mid-fifth century) is unusual for it is square plan, with sixteen equidistant Ionic columns resting on square bases. It is similar but smaller than the council hall at Sikyon, and for this reason some scholars see it as functioning as a *bouleuterion* for the city (des Courtils 1992, 249). Others, however, maintain that here is the sanctuary of Artemis Peitho ('Persuasion') (Paus. 2.21.1; Vollgraff 1920, 219-220; cf. Aupert 1987, 515-516). The building also appears ideally situated to be a commemorative monument of Danaos (Marchetti 1994, 134).

All the epigraphical evidence for the worship of Artemis at Argos is late, except for an inscribed limestone *stele* dated to about 430-420 BCE (Lippold 1950, 170 pl. 41.1; Brulotte 1994, 106-108). It depicts Artemis in the guise of huntress and was offered by a certain Polystrata. It belongs to one of the two cults in the city mentioned by Pausanias (Peitho ‘Of Persuasion’ at 2.21.1 or Pheraia at 2.23.5).

Urban Sanctuaries on the Sea

**Aphrodite at Palaíá Epídavros**

*SEG 40.339*

*APPENDIX A-31*

*PAPADHIMITRIOU 1952, 212.*

A inscription to Aphrodite was found on the acropolis at Palaíá Epídavros. Although no exact details or photographs have been published, it is possible that the graffito dates to the fifth century.
**Apollo at Mases**

The unexcavated temple discovered at Mases, in the terraced agricultural fields on the west slopes of the Frankhthi headland, a little over one kilometre east of Koiládha across the bay, is contemporary with and similar to that of Halieis’ temple of Apollo. It could well belong to Apollo (Billot 1992, 43).

The finds include over two hundred and fifty sherds (several miniature cups), heavy Corinthian roof tiles, loom-weights, spools, a figurine, and various architectural elements.

**Artemis at Palaía Epidhavros**

Pausanias (2.29.1) mentions a temple to Artemis at Palaía Epidhavros. This seems to correspond to a sizeable temple that had its origins in the sixth century (Arkondidhou-Aryri 1984, 46-49).

**Poseidon at Hermione?**

In 1909 Philadelpheus cleared the foundation of a late archaic temple on the ‘Bitsi’ in Hermione and deposited the few architectural remains that he found in the church of Áyios Nikólaos. All of these have now disappeared, but a brief study of the remains in situ has been published by McAllister in 1969. She dates the building to the end of the sixth century, and believes that it was dedicated to Poseidon or, less likely, to Athena (Paus.2.34.11). The money received by Ermióni from the Samian exiles for the purchase of the island of Hydrea (modern Ýdhra) may have been used to pay for its construction (Hdt. 3.58-59). At some point the temple was completely destroyed, and when the church was built, only the temple’s foundations were worth using.
Suburban Sanctuaries

Extramural Sanctuaries near Town Gates

_Apollo at Argos (Deiras)_

_Pausanias_ 2.24.1
APPENDIX A-10-9

Even if the remains of what is believed to be a temple of Apollo Pythaeus at Argos, also known from its location on the Deiras ridge between the 'Aspis' and the Larisa as Apollo 'Deiradiotes' (Paus. 2.24.1), is strictly speaking inside walls of the city, it functions as a peripheral sanctuary (de Polignac 1984; 1998a, 146 n4; contra Billot 1992, 56). It was first excavated by Vollgraff in 1906 (final publication in 1956, 11-12). Subsequent remodelling of the sanctuary have caused almost all traces of the temple to vanish; only a monumental altar, two _simas_, and a series of antefixes of the mid-sixth century survive (Deshayes 1966, 215-220; Billot 1990, 95-139).

The identification of Apollo Pythaeus can be found in several official documents of Argos, one of which is an Argive inscription from Delphi (Delphi Mus. 3962-3+2720: Homolle 1897, 301: _SEG_ 30.497; Karo 1910, 196-198; Dittenberger 1920, no. 28; Schwyzer 1923, no. 81; Bourguet 1929, 54ff no. 90; Amandry 1980, 234; Jeffery 1990, 162-164, 169 no. 23, pl. 28; Vatin 1991, 140-141; Bommelear 1992, 265-293).

The votives, found in a deposit just north of the sanctuary, mentioned by Vollgraff include many miniature pots as well as terracotta figurines of the archaic period.

_Apollo at Halieis_

APPENDIX A-38

The oldest temple of the submerged sanctuary to Apollo dates back to the end of the seventh century and the beginning of the sixth century. It is located outside the city, only
ten to forty metres from the shore and some six hundred metres north of the city gate on the way to Hermione.

The name of Apollo (ταξιλλονς) is visible on iron keys (c. 475-450 BCE) found in the treasury of the temple (Náfplio, Leónardho Mus. HM 556: SEG 26.443; Jameson 1974a, 72 pl. 14; 1976c, 235; Jeffery 1990, 446 no. B). These were found along with other votives including aryballoi, over two hundred miniature skyphoi and kotylai, a metal votive wheel, a bronze ram utensil, a keyhole frame, an inscribed bronze plaque, iron adzes, a double axe, a hoard of silver coins, iron bars and spits, iron and bronze knives, swords, and spear points.

A great deal of animal bones, amber from the Baltic, an ostrich eggshell from Africa, a rock crystal point, and a terracotta figurine were also found here. Two bases of perirrhateria (lustral basins) were also found near a statue base in the front chamber of the temple.

Athena at Tiryns

An archaic inscription of a law found beside the underground passage north-west of the lower citadel at Tiryns mentions Athena Polias, along with Zeus and Herakles (see Chapter I; Verdhelis, Jameson, and Papakhristodhouloú 1976, 150-205). In addition to this inscription, a fourth century terracotta head of Athena, a fragment of a miniature shield-band, three seventh century kantharoi, and the rim of a black glaze krater bearing an inscribed dedication to Athena (Ἀθηναίς ἑμί), were found in the area of the middle citadel, making the worship of Athena at Tiryns very likely (Jantzen 1975, 105). The location of the Athena cult is probably in the vicinity of the eastern gateway to the citadel (Jantzen 1975, 106; Touchais 1984, 759; Hall [J.] 1995a, 598-599).

Demeter at Halieis

An archaic inscription of a law found beside the underground passage north-west of the lower citadel at Tiryns mentions Athena Polias, along with Zeus and Herakles (see Chapter I; Verdhelis, Jameson, and Papakhristodhouloú 1976, 150-205). In addition to this inscription, a fourth century terracotta head of Athena, a fragment of a miniature shield-band, three seventh century kantharoi, and the rim of a black glaze krater bearing an inscribed dedication to Athena (Ἀθηναίς ἑμί), were found in the area of the middle citadel, making the worship of Athena at Tiryns very likely (Jantzen 1975, 105). The location of the Athena cult is probably in the vicinity of the eastern gateway to the citadel (Jantzen 1975, 106; Touchais 1984, 759; Hall [J.] 1995a, 598-599).
A sanctuary of Demeter was identified about one hundred metres outside the city walls of Halieis, on a hill east of the akropolis. There Philadelpheus found lamp and figurine fragments in 1909. The recent survey in the southern Argolid picked up a dense concentration of sherds from miniature cups, lamps, and fragments of terracotta figurines. The identification of Demeter is secured by a fragment of kemos, votive lamps, and female figurines carrying piglets. No date has yet been proposed for its period of use, but to judge from the votives a date in the archaic period seems reasonable.

**Hera at Argos (Deiras ?)**

- **C-31**
- PAUSANIAS 2.24.1
- APPENDIX A-7

Hera's second sanctuary at Argos has not yet been identified with certainty, but its location must be sought near the Deiras on the slopes of the 'Aspis'. Vollgraff's 'Building e' within the southern bastion wall on the south-west slopes of the 'Aspis' is a possible candidate for the temple of Hera Akraia mentioned by Pausanias (2.24.1). Associated finds suggest a date in the sixth century for this temple. The sanctuary itself was probably began as a terrace and an altar, and later a temple.

An archaic votive deposit (including small cups, terracotta rings, small bells, as well as some figurines), found over a floor north of the polygonal fortification wall on the north slope of the 'Aspis', also suggests cult activity associated with this yet undiscovered temple (Aupert, Piérart, and Touchais 1980, 697-699).

**Extramural Sanctuaries on the Slopes of Hills**

**Demeter at Hermione**

- **C-32**
- PAUSANIAS 2.35.4-5
- APPENDIX A-50

Demeter was chief deity of Hermione. Her sanctuary has been located in the vicinity of the main church of the modern town, Áyios Taxiárkhis, beyond the city walls on the slopes of the Prôn (Paus. 2.35.4-5). Its reputation was already established in the sixth century.
Two inscribed dedications of bronze cows, presented to Demeter Chthonia (see Chapter I: bases from Hermione signed by Dorotheos IG IV 684, SEG 11.379 and by Kresilias, IG IV 683; SEG 11.378), are associated with this sanctuary. They were found on the ‘Bisti’, the tail of land which projects into the sea from the modern town rather than on the Prôn, because their stone bases had been reused in the construction of the south tower of the Venetian fortification (Marcadé 1953, 163). Four more inscriptions to Demeter Chthonia, spanning probably four generations, were also recovered in this area (Jameson 1953, 149, see also Delphi Mus. 2501: Hoff and Stephensen 1933, no. 1.234; Colin 1922, 221-221, no. 147, pls. 25.3, 26.1; Courby 1927, 234-235, fig. 186; Jeffery 1990, 178, 182 no. 7, pl. 33, where Persephone is mentioned).

**Demeter at Troizen**  
PAUSANIAS 2.32.8-9  
APPENDIX A-56  
LEGRAND 1905, 302-303; WELTER 1941, 20-25.

A temple of Demeter Thesmophoros (‘Law-bearer’) was identified on the slopes of a lower hill beyond the city walls at Troizen (Paus. 2.32.8-9, who places it above the temple of Poseidon Phytalmios). Although no architectural remains were identified, a deposit including figurines, hundreds of lamps, spools, and spindles is said to come from a sanctuary associated with Demeter Thesmophoros. The divinity is identified by Welter (1941, 21) on the strength of the twenty-three female figurines, which are similar to those found in other sanctuaries of Demeter (Legrand 1905, 304-310). Welter believes that the building materials for the temple were used for later houses.

**Zeus at Tiryns ?**  
APPENDIX A-16  
TOUCHAIS 1984, 760.

In the ‘syrinx’ inscription from the citadel of Tiryns mention is made of Athena and Zeus as the patron deities of the community (see Chapter I: Frickenhaus, Müller [W.] and Oelmann 1912, 105; Verdhelis, Jameson and Papakhristodhoulou 1975, 150-205; Antonaccio 1992, 104-105). Outside the west fortification wall, around the citadel, archaic architectural fragments found in a hellenistic pit have been connected to the inscription mentioning Zeus and Athena (Touchais 1984, 760). Perhaps here lay the (yet) undiscovered temple of Zeus.
Extraurban or Rural Sanctuaries

Extraurban Sanctuaries on Roads

Apollo at Hermione (near Mt. Kokkýgion) C-35
PAUSANIAS 2.36.2
JAMESON, RUNNELS, and VAN ANDEL 1994, 580.

Pausanias (2.36.2) mentions a fourth temple of Apollo outside the city of Hermione, on the edge of Mt. Kokkýgion, on the road from Hermione to Mases. The ruinous temple has been taken to be at the beginning of the Pikrodhafni valley, since it is on an alternative route to Mases (Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 580). It has not been located.

Demeter at Kourtáki? C-36
PAUSANIAS 2.18.3
APPENDIX A-12

Thousands of small pots (many krateriskoi) and figurines were discovered in association with the ruins of a building, situated about four kilometres north-east of Argos in the direction of the Heraion. The building may have been a ceramic workshop, because thousands of pots were found whole, stacked one inside the other. This workshop has been connected with the sanctuary of Demeter Mysia that Pausanias (2.18.3) saw on the roads from Mykenai to Argos or Tiryns. Presumably the sanctuary is to be located somewhere in the region of the workshop (Foley 1988, 150).

The Dioskouroi near Argos? C-37
PAUSANIAS 2.36.6
LONDON, BM
IG IV 566
ROEHL 1907, no. 40.17; ROBERTS 1887, 116 no. 82a; WALTERS 1899, 28 no. 253; COLLITZ and BECHTEL 1899, 125-126 no. 3274; VOLLGRAFF 1930, 29; 1933, 236; LAZZARINI 1976, 207 no. 204; PIÉRART 1982, 146; JEFFERY 1990, 169 no. 28; BILLOT 1992, 78.

According to Pausanias (2.36.6) a sanctuary of the Dioskouroi lay between Argos and Lerna, that is, south-west of the city, near the gates of Eilithyia (cf. Piérart 1982, 146). Pausanias says that the images represent the Dioskouroi and their sons, Anaxis and
Mnasinious, and with them their mothers, Ilaeira and Phoibe. They are of ebony wood and made by Dipoinos and Skyllis, perhaps in the sixth century.

An inscription to the Dioskouroi was found in an unknown context near Argos. It is a bronze votive wheel (c. 475-450 BCE) inscribed to the Anakoi (Anakes), an appropriate offering to Kastor the horse-tamer (Jeffery 1990, 169). Perhaps it came from this sanctuary.

**Enyalios at Mykenai (Asprókhoma)**  
C-38

APPENDIX A-11  
Náfplio, Leonárdho Mus.?  
SEG 23.187  

At Mykenai Enyalios is known from an inscription on a bronze helmet ‘to Enyalios’ (see also Chapter I). His temple was about one kilometre north of the akropolis, at a place called Asprókhoma, on the route to Kleonai. The building identified as the temple comprised only one sekos oriented north-south, like the temple on the akropolis, with an entrance on the south side. An unusual feature is the presence of a door in the east side, recalling the disposition of the temple of Apollo at Bassae. Near the centre of the sekos remained in part a socle of which the long side was oriented towards the east doorway; perhaps it supported the cult statue.

From the associated finds (many small animal bones, early archaic skyphoi and aryballoi, and iron spear-heads) the temple has been dated in the fifth century, though late geometric and early archaic sherds point to the sanctuary having been in use from the late eighth century (Daux 1966a, 782; Foley 1988, 145).

**Zeus at Stavrós**  
C-39

APPENDIX A-41  
JAMESON, RUNNELS, and VAN ANDEL 1994, 442.

Many conglomerate blocks in situ together with large concentrations of pottery (cups and kraters) and some roof tiles were found in the region of Portokhéli, at the intersection of dirt roads (a place called Papastavraiika) between Portokhéli and Flámboura, probably along the ancient road (at ‘cross-roads’) from Halieis to Ermióni. The identification of the cult place comes from a foot kylix bearing a graffito to Zeus.
Extraurban Sanctuaries on Roads near Bronze Age Tombs

Hera at Mykenai (Kháos Shrine)

APPENDIX A-11

A mycenaean road, running from the citadel of Mykenai, crossing the Kháos ravine by means of a viaduct in cyclopean masonry, and then skirting the eastern foothills of the Argive plain, finally arrives at the Heraion. The road was no doubt used in late geometric and archaic times, since two roadside shrines were established at this time close to its two termini (Hall [J.] 1995a, 601). One of these roadside shrines, the so-called ‘Agamemnoneion’, functions as the symmetrical doublet to the shrine (see below) at the end of the Mycenaean road at Prosymna (Hall [J.] 1995a, 601).

The ‘Agamemnoneion’ is located about one kilometre from the citadel at Mykenai, by the Kháos ravine close to the Mycenaean viaduct. The identification of the shrine as an ‘Agamemnoneion’ in the eighth century is controversial, because it is based on inscribed dedications dated to the hellenistic period (Cook [J.] 1953a, 64). The excavator pushes back the identification to an earlier phase because of what he sees as the predominantly masculine character of the votives, particularly the kraters, kantharoi, horse-rider figurines and the twenty fragmentary horses, which he thinks may have been ridden (accepted by Wright 1982, 194; Foley 1988, 144-145; Ekroth 1996; cf. de Polignac 1984, 131 n12; Antonaccio 1987, 240; 1994, 399; Morgan and Whitelaw 1990, 89). If J. Cook’s interpretation is correct, the number of male riders (about forty-five examples) would almost equal that of female figurines (about sixty examples).

A suggestion by S. Marinatos (1953, 87-88) that the ‘Agamemnoneion’ was a shrine to a female deity, namely Hera, has been re-considered recently by both Antonaccio (1995, 151) and Hall (1995a, 602). To judge from the early votives (especially the bronze phialai and the wreaths), Hall strongly suspects that the shrine belonged to Hera.
Hera at Prosymna (Secondary Shrine)

About seven hundred metres north-west of the Heraion, at a place called Prosymna, there was a small shrine dedicated to Hera. It is identified with Hera from an archaic graffito to the goddess on a black glaze sherd (Blegen 1939, 412, 421, fig. 11; Lazzarini 1976, 252 no. 547) and from the remarkable similarity of the votives to the artifact assemblage of the nearby Heraion (Hall [J.] 1995a, 601; Strøm 1995, 91).

The votives included fragments of bronze, a piece of iron, many mesomphalic phialai, numerous pins, and fragments of various other metal offerings. Sherds were especially abundant, and there were many small votive vases of the unpainted Protocorinthian style (Blegen 1939, 411). Terracotta horse figurines from the terrace belong to the seated goddess and rider type, but the riders have been broken away (Blegen 1939, 423). Also found were loom-weights and wreaths.

Perseus at Mykenai

Pausanias (2.18.1) mentions that by the side of the road from Mykenai to Argos there was on the left a hero shrine of Perseus. The neighbouring folk paid him honour. The inscription from Mykenai mentions Perseus in connection with the hiaromnamonas (IG IV 493, see Chapter I). The inscription might have come originally from a building associated with Perseus, perhaps an archaic fountain house (Paus. 2.16.6) or a heroön (Paus. 2.18.1).

Extraurban Sanctuaries on Mountain Tops

Apollo at Epidauros (Maleatas)
An archaic predecessor of the classical temple to Apollo Maleatas was identified on the slopes of Mt. Kynortion, east of the Asklepieio sanctuary, and some eight kilometres inland from the harbour settlement at Palaïa Epidavros. The site has not (yet) been properly published, but we know from an inscribed bronze plaque (c. 475-450 BCE) found in the fill predating the classical temple’s construction that this temple was also dedicated to Apollo Pythios (see Chapter II: SEG 26.449, 30.393, 31.321, 38.318, 40.338). Among the finds from the rectangular poros Building E of the great altar dug by Kavvadhias were found also two rustic votive altars, inscribed αρταμίτος | αρεμονάς, and απολ[λωνος] | δειπαδ[ωτα] (Mylonas 1988, 96 fig. 115; Touchais 1988, 627; Catling 1989, 28). Nothing of this is now visible. The classical altar has been erected on top of the archaic one (Touchais 1979, 561).

About one hundred small kotylai, many alabasters and other miniature vases, especially Corinthian and Attic (EF 1950a, 304), rings, mirrors, two bronze wheels, pins, knives and swords, arrowheads, double-axes, gold leaves from wreaths, the left foot of an archaic bronze figurine, a small lead kouros, and a large number of terracotta figurines were recovered in a burnt deposit found to the north-east of the classical temple.

Artemis at Epidauros (Maleatas) C-44
SEE ABOVE FOR BIBLIOGRAPHY
APPENDIX A-28
SEG 38.32, 41.310bis

As was just mentioned, an altar dedicated to Artemis Hegemone was found at the sanctuary of Apollo Maleatas. Moreover, a fourth century inscription which describes the offerings to be made to Apollo refers to the other gods who live in the same sanctuary, particularly Lato his mother and Artemis his sister.

Artemis on Mt. Koryphon (Hyrnithion) C-45
PAUSANIAS 2.28.2
APPENDIX A-30
FARAKLAS 1972, 11, figs. 14a to 17b; FOSSEY 1987, 76; FOLEY 1988, 181-182; BILLOT 1992, 44.

Faraklas notes the existence of an archaic sanctuary immediately south-west of hellenistic and Roman Hynithion, about 3.5 kilometres south of the Apollo Maleatas sanctuary at Epidauros. Although its date is far from certain, this was perhaps the sanctuary of Artemis Koryphaia (‘Of the Peak’) on Mt. Koryphon mentioned by Pausanias (2.28.2).
The reference by Pausanias to a boundary with Asine places the sanctuary to the south-west of the Asklepieion, which corresponds to the site found by Faraklas, but this information contradicts the implication from the order of the text that it lay between the Asklepieion and the town of Epidauros (Palaia Epídhavros), that is, to the east of the former (Fossey 1987, 76).

Artemis (?) at Dhouka(s)  

Artemis on Mt. Lykone (modern Megalovoúni)  

In the north-west Argolid, south-east of the modern village of Dhouka(s), at the top of the Toulooupa peak, the Greek Archaeological Service found an archaic building, with a votive deposit inside it. Many bronze pins and pieces of bronze strips come from this votive deposit.

This building has been identified as the temple of Artemis mentioned by Pausanias (2.25.6) at Orneia. The problem is that most scholars seem to think that Orneia is at modern Káto Bélesi, renamed Lýkea, several kilometres to the south-east of Dhouka (see Fossey 1987, 82 for bibliography). If we accept this location, then the sanctuary at Dhouka was not that of Artemis mentioned by Pausanias.

Pausanias (2.24.5-6) mentions a sanctuary of Artemis Orthia (‘Of the Steep’) in Mt. Lykone, which he saw when going from Argos to Tegea. This mountain, known today as Mt. Megalovoúni or Piryiós, is southwest of Argos (in distinction to Mt. Megalovoúni to the north of Argos, see below). There, he saw white marble images of Apollo, Leto, and Artemis, which they say were done by Polykleitos (late fifth century).

This is possibly the sanctuary excavated by Kophiniotis (Anonymous 1888, 20) in 1888-89 on Mt. Lykone (Frothingham 1888, 360; 1889, 101-102). The remains seem to date to the early classical period, but the cult may have been introduced here at an earlier date. The sanctuary was in use as late as the mid-fourth century.
Artemis on Mt. Artemision above Oinoe  

PAUSANIAS 2.25.3  

A sanctuary of Artemis was apparently situated on the top of Mt. Artemision (Mt. Malevós), on the borders between Arkadia and the Argolid above Oinoe, on the road to Mantinea (Paus. 2.25.3). Mt. Artemision obviously took its name from Artemis, and in antiquity was the name of the peak so called today, as well as of the whole ridge of which the peak forms the principal summit (Fossey 1987, 78, 81).

No ancient remains are now visible, but between Mt. Xerovouni and Mt. Artemision (Mt. Malevós), at about seventy-five metres north by north-west from the chapel of Profitis Iliás, a concentration of undiagonistic sherds and a wall of coarse blocks was noted (Pritchett 1980, 32 figs. 1, 4, pl. 3; Winter [J.] and Winter [F.] 1990, 256).

Artemis on Mt. Megalovoúni  

MISTOS 1949, 73-77; FOSSEY 1987, 78ff.

An early hellenistic inscription identifies a small open-air site high on the west side of Mt. Megalovoúni at the shrine of Artemis Oraia. The sculptured heads discovered here apparently range in date from the sixth to the third centuries. A cache of terracottas was also apparently found, but no details were provided. The sculpture at least indicates that the sanctuary dates from the late archaic period.

Hera at Áyios Adhrianós (Katsingri)  

APPENDIX A-23  

In the south part of the central Argive plain, about five and a half kilometres east of Tírintha and three kilometres east of Néa Tíryns, on a hill two and a half kilometres north-west of the Áyios Adhrianós, where the chapel of Profitis Iliás can be seen, are the remains of a small peak sanctuary dedicated to Hera. The discovery of this archaic temple seems to be connected to the settlement below (Dheilaki-Protonotariou 1965, 65-66; Daux 1963a, 748), perhaps the ancient ‘town’ of Lessa mentioned by Pausanias (2.25.9-10; 2.25.26; Papakhatzis 1976, 189, 193-194). There Pausanias notes the presence of a temple of Athena, but this is probably not the temple at Áyios Adhrianós.
The votive material contained archaic sherds, including miniature skyphoi, figurines, pins, fibulae, and a small bronze phiale, but the material remains largely unpublished.

Nearby a small cave yielded a further deposit of ceramic and metal objects; the most important find was a lead porpi, some kind of belt attachment, carrying a scene with a female, who wears a long khiton and polos, and a male who clasps his cloak. The iconography has suggested to Alexandri (1964, 525-530) that the woman is Hera and the man is probably Zeus. Hall (1995a, 597) supports her theory, adding that the types of votive contained in the deposits are typical dedications to Hera.

posing at epeiros (maleatas)  \c-51
\gi\  iv^2  1.150
lazzarini 1976, 243 no. 478.

A fifth century stone altar or boundary stone was dedicated to Poseidon at the Maleatas sanctuary (\gi\ iv^2 1.150; Lazzarini 1976, 243 no. 478).

Zeus and Hera at Áyios Ilías  \c-52
pauSanias 2.25.10
appendix A-25

On Mt. Arakhnaio, north-west of the sanctuary at Epidauros and north of Kazárma in the Argeia, relatively limited investigation appears to have located the altars of Zeus and Hera. It is believed that this is the site above Lessa mentioned by Pausanias (2.25.10): ‘when rain is needed they sacrifice to them here’.

Masonry foundations were discovered, together with sherd concentrations (mainly from open shapes), suggesting the use of the summit from the later eighth until at least the sixth century.

Zeus on Mt. Kokkýgion  \c-53
pauSanias 2.25.10
appendix A-49

Surface reconnaissance at the Zeus sanctuary on Mt. Kokkýgion in the southern Argolid (Paus. 2.36.2) led to the discovery of an enclosure, as well as many open vessels of archaic to classical date (Langdon 1976, 108; Zimmermann Munn 1985).
Extraurban Sanctuaries at Boundaries

Apollo at Lefkákia

APPENDIX A-21

About six and a half kilometres east of Náfplio, in the modern village of Lefkákia, around the village square, the Greek Archaeological Service excavated a temple. This might be a temple of Apollo located at the boundary of Nauplia. No previous occupation at this site has been reported.

Apollo at Epidauros (Asklepieion)

APPENDIX A-28
PAUSANIAS 2.26.1; 2.27.7
KAVVADHIAS 1891, 37 no. 9; JEFFERY 1990, 180, 182 no. 11; BILLOT 1992, 77.

The oldest document of the worship of Apollo Pythaeus at Epidauros comes from the sanctuary of Asklipios, functioning around the middle of the sixth century (Paus. 2.26.1ff.; 2.27.7). The cult of Asklipios, however, soon overshadowed that of Apollo with a sanctuary that became famous throughout the Greek world in the classical period.

In the first quarter of the fifth century a bronze lebes dedicated to Apollo Pythios was found in Building E (IG IV 1169; IG IV\(^2\) 1.142; Kavvadhis 1891, 37 no. 9; Jeffery 1990, 180, 182 no. 11). The text reads: τοῦ [α]πολλῶνος εἰμι τοῦ πυθίου. Notice that Apollo is here called Pythios, not Pytha(i)eus, an epithet that associates him directly to Delphi rather than to Argos (Billot 1992, 77).

Artemis at Epidauros (Asklepieion)

PAUSANIAS 2.27.5
APPENDIX A-28
IG IV\(^2\) 1.195

Pausanias (2.27.5) mentions a temple of Artemis inside the grove of Asklipios. The temple was built at the end of the fourth century at the earliest, but there may have been a simple altar, where the later one stood. A late fifth century inscription to Artemis was found on a stele on the west part of the Abaton (Kavvadhis 1900a, 186 no. 1).
An archaic (?) inscription found at the Heraion mentions Artemis (Ἀ[γρ]αι[ω]).

About five kilometres south of Argos, at the side of the road to Myloi where it crosses the Erasinos, near the roads to Hysiai and Lerna, Vollgraff (1907, 139-184, esp. 179-180) found the foundations of a small building, made of tuff with monolithic Doric columns. Apparently thousands of miniature pots and hundreds of figurines of the seventh and sixth centuries were found in a votive deposit situated a few metres away; none has been published. This small temple has been attributed to Artemis (perhaps the Artemis of Paus. 2.24.5 ?). It lies in a boundary area, at the side of the river, probably dividing Argos and Lerna.

Two joining fragments of a limestone base to support a dedication to Artemis (αμνητις | ὡν Ἀγαίου | [α]νεξεκε | ἀσταμι) was found at Zevgolatio (?) near Merkouri. The inscription is to Artemis from Amyntis and dates to around 550-500 BCE.

Pikoulas (1988) identifies the finding place as the ancient Argive town of Oinoe, which Pausanias (2.25.2) describes as being across the torrent called Kharadros (modern Xeriás), somewhere near the borders of Argos and Mantinea, thus dividing the Argolid and Arkadia. It is at in fact in the valley at Merkouri that the Xeriás River ends, near the foot of Mt. Artemision (Malevos) to the north and Mt. Kreion (Kteniás) to the south. Papakhatzis (1976, 185 n3), however, places Oinoe near the modern village of Mazi where Protonotariou-Dheilaki (1974, 84) noted some archaic walls.
Excavations at ancient Elaious, about two kilometres south of modern Spiliotáki, revealed a large rectangular building that has been identified as the sanctuary of Demeter and Kore (Verdhelis 1966a, 121-122; Daux 1966a, 791-792). A large votive deposit dates from the sixth century and includes miniature pots and hundreds of terracotta figurines, an inscription of bronze from the second half of the fifth century, and a relief representing a goddess who could be Demeter. The area is strategic, for it guards the pass to Arkadia. It seems to be inhabited for the first time in the archaic period.

In the whole of the Argolid, there is no sanctuary richer and more impressive than the Heraion near Prosymna. This sanctuary commanded a good view of the surrounding plain. The remains visible today date to the late seventh or sixth century, except for the second temple and the South Stoa (see Chapter II).

There is no doubt about the identity of the goddess here. One example of Hera’s name has been found inscribed on a rim of a large fifth century krater, found mixed up with a quantity of early pottery and figurines behind the retaining wall of the West Building (a hestiatorion of the mid-fifth century?). The inscription reads: [τας] Ἡβας ημι.
bathed in a spring at Nauplia to restore her virginity, and the women employed in the sanctuary rituals were required to purify themselves in a stream on the way from Mykenai (Paus. 2.16.1; 2.17.1; see also Amandry 1952, 273, for alternative water sources: cisterns and baths with plastered floors in the North Stoa). The miniature hydriai found at the Heraion may therefore have been associated with such ceremonies (Guettel Cole 1988, 164), though one must also bear in mind that Hera was thought responsible for teaching Argives how to sow the land (Foley 1988, 135) and the association of hydriai with Hera might imply the recognition of the need for water in agriculture (see Foley 1988, 73, 137-138 for the drought hypothesis).

Extraurban Sanctuaries in Marshes

**Artemis at Psifti**

C-62

PAUSANIAS 2.30.7-10; 2.32.10
APPENDIX A-55

Artemis Saronia was worshipped at the shallow and marshy sea called the Phoibaian lagoon (now lake Plivea in Aliki beach), near Troizen (Paus. 2.30.7-10). Welter (1941, 38-39; see also Foley 1988, 195) places the temple on the south coast of the gulf of Methana, also known as the sea of Psifaia, at Psifti, where he noticed a foundation wall of poros blocks measuring thirty-two metres and a base apparently inscribed with a text that would support the identification of the building as a temple (no text nor reference to the inscription is provided). Perhaps the building (temple ?) dates back to the archaic period, because Faraklas (1972, 15) noticed surface finds of the archaic period here.

Extraurban Sanctuaries on the Sea

**Athena at Lazaretto ?**

C-63

APPENDIX A-60
FARAKLAS 1972, 15; FOLEY 1988, 185.

Athena Apatousia was perhaps worshipped at Lazaretto, in the eastern peninsula on the coast opposite the island of Póros, and about seven hundred metres south-east of modern Galatás. No surface finds have been reported, and the dates of occupation are uncertain.
Appendix D
Greek Texts

κτείναι μὲν δ’ ἄλειπνε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τὸ γε θυμῷ,
πέμπτε δὲ μὲν Ἀυκίνηδε, πόρεν δ’ ὃ γε σήματα λυγρᾶ,
γράψας εὖ πένακι πτυκτοὶ θυμοφρόνα πολλά,
δειξαι δ’ ἦνώγει ὃ πενθερφυ, ὅφρ’ ἀπόλλοιτο.

Text 1. Homer, Iliad 6.168-169

τότε δὲ θυμὰ μοι μέγιστον γενέσθαι λέγε-
ται ὑπὸ Θηβαίων ἐλθείν ἄρα τὸν Ἐὐρυπέλα Μὺν περιστρωφῶμεν πάντα
τὰ χρηστήρια καὶ ἐς τὸν Πτέρων Ἀπάλλωνος τὸ τέμενος. τούτῳ δὲ τὸ ιρὸν
χαλέπται μὲν Πτέρων, ἢστι δὲ Θηβαίων, κεῖται δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς Κωπαίδος Λι-
μῆς πρὸς οἰκήτω ἐκχαρίφης πόλιος. ἐς τούτῳ τὸ ιρὸν ἐπείτε παρ-
ειδεῖν τὸν καλεμένον τοῦτον Μὺν, ἐπεστὶ δὲ οἱ τῶν ἄστων ἀφετοῖς
ἀνδρὰς τρεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ κοινοῦ ως ἀπογραφομένως τὰ θεσπεῖν ἔμελλε, καὶ
πρόκατο τὸν πρόμανταν βαρβάρω γλώσσῃ χράν, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐπομένους
τῶν Θηβαίων ἐν δόματι ἔγειρον ἀκούστας βαρβάρου γλώσσης ἀντὶ Ἐλ-
λάδος οὐδὲ ἔχειν, δ’ τι χρήσωνται τῷ παρεόντι πρόγνατον τῶν δὲ Ἐὐρυπέλα
Μὺν ἐξασφάλσαντα παρ’ αὐτῶν, τὴν ἐφέροντο δόλτον, τὰ λεγόμενα ὑπὸ τῶν
προφητῶν γράφειν ἐς αὐτὴν, φανὲρα δὲ Καρή μὲν φωνῇ χράν, συγγραφά-
μενον δὲ ὀξεοθῆναι ἀπόντα ἐς Θεσσαλίην.

Text 2. Herodotos, Histories 8.135

κεῖτο δ’ ὑπ’ αἴθουσῃ διπλῶν νεός ἀμφιέλξῃς
βόξλινῳ, ψ’ ἐπέδθης θύρας, ἐς δ’ ἦρεν αὐτὸς.

Text 3. Homer, Odyssey 21.390-391
οἱ δὲ Φοινίκες οὕτω οἱ σὺν Κάδμῳ ἀπικόμενοι, τῶν ἦσαν οἱ Γε- 
φυραῖοι, ὄλλα τε πολλὰ ὀλιγάσαντες ταύτην τὴν χώρην ἐσήγαγον διδασκα-
λεία ἐς τοὺς Ἐλλήνας καὶ δὴ καὶ γράμματα σῦν ἔδω ἐρίν πρὸν Ἐλληνα, ὡς ἐμοὶ δοκεῖν (ἀράτα μὲν, τοῖσι καὶ ἀπαντεῖς χρεώνται Φοινίκες, μετὰ δὲ 
χρόνου προβαίνοντος ἁμα τῇ φωνῇ μετέβαλλον καὶ τὸν φυήμας τῶν γραμ-
μάτων). περιοίκεσιν δὲ σφετ τὰ πολλὰ τῶν χώρων τούτων τὸν χρόνον Ἐλ-
λήνων Ἰωνες, οἱ παραλαβόντες διδαχῆ παρὰ τῶν Φοινίκων τὰ γράμματα 
μεταφρασμένας σφετῶν ὁλίγα ἐχρέωντο, χρεώμενοι δὲ οὐράσασθαι, ὄσπερ 
καὶ τὸ δῴκαιον ἐφηε ὑπαγόντων Φοινίκων ἐς τὴν Ἐλλάδα, Φοινίκες 
κεκλήθαν, καὶ τὰς βύρλιτος ἀδιφόδερας καλέσαν ἀπὸ τοῦ παλαίοι Ἰω-
νες, διὰ κατὰ ἐν σπῶν βύρλιτο ἐχρέωντο ἀδιφόδερα αὐγάσα τε καὶ ὀδι-
γοῖ. ἐπὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ κατ' ἐμὲ πολλαὶ τῶν βαρβάρων εἰς τοιαύτας ἀδιφόδερας 
γράφουσι.

Text 4. Herodotos, Histories 5.58
2 – – – ας ηνα (…τινα πλατιφωινάρχονς [τάν ζωμίαν
παρσεβάν] τον φοινόν οί δὲ μὲ ηπερπάραρεφλοιεν

Фοιφοθεν

ho ἐπιγνώμον ἐπεξείδιστο τὸν ὄχλον νακαι.

**Bloc 8:**
--- νονς αἱ μ' ἐξετ – – –
--- ας εραν – – –

**Bloc 9.** *Face A:*
--- ἐπιγνούν τὸς ε – – –
--- σπ – – –

*Face B:*
--- ο – – –

**Bloc 10:**
--- ν αἱ τις ἐξετ – – –

**Bloc 11:**
--- πλατιφωινάρχονς διπλεευν ὄφλεν – – –
--- ὄμονς ηπερτα – – –
--- ἥποκα Φοινα(…) ατοπ – – –

**Bloc 12:**
--- πλατιφωινάρχο – – –
--- ϕ.α γενομ – – –
--- ο δὲ ζωμί – – –

**Bloc 13.** *Face A:*
--- ζωμίας ενστε – – –

*Face B:*
--- παί ἄνδρ – – –
--- τ.λ τι – – –

**Bloc 14:**
--- ὀφρυνος – – –
--- α ενστε α – – –
--- Ἰάρα τραπ – – –

**Bloc 15.** *Face A:*
--- α το ηπερκλειο ἐπευθ – – –

*Face B:*
--- ο δὲ αγ(…)θεν δ – – –

*Face C:*
--- . . επο . – – –

Text 5. Sacral law mentioning the *hiaromnamon*, inscribed on a series of stones covering the underground passages at Tiryns (*SEG* 22.269), c. 600-550 (see Figure 17)
Text 6. Final clause of a law mentioning the *hiaromnamones*, on the crowning stone of a structure from the Perseia fountain house at Mykenai (*IG* IV 493; *SEG* 11.300), c. 525 (see Figure 18)

\[ T \delta \zeta \text{ hérαc } \delta[\mu] ια | \text{όφω } \deltaι \text{ το } hidi[lo] | \]
\[ \text{ annoyed } | \]
\[ \text{Φερίων } : \text{ Σόλιχις} \]
\[ \text{ιαρομναμόνες } : \text{ ανέθ} \]

Text 7. Base for a statuette mentioning the four *hiaromnamones* at the Heraion (*SEG* 16.244), c. 460-450
(From Mastrokostas 1957, 24)

\[ \text{hλα στάλα } : \text{ καλ } \text{ ς τελαμονι(ν)} \]
\[ \text{Παρά } : \text{ τας } \text{ hérαc } : \text{ τας } \text{ Πρώ-} \]
\[ \text{πα } : \text{ ιαρομναμόνες } : \text{ τοίδι } \]
\[ \text{Πυρφαλίον } : \text{ Δυμάνς } : \text{ δρέτευε,} \]
\[ '\text{Αλκαμένες } : \text{ hυλλεύς,} \]
\[ '\text{Αριστόδαμος } : \text{ hυρνάθιος,} \]
\[ '\text{Αμφίκριτος } \text{ Πανφύλ-} \]
\[ \text{ίλος.} \]

Text 8. Stone *stele* dedicated by the four *hiaromnamones* at the Heraion (Athens, EM 581; *IG* IV 517; *SEG* 11.303), c. 460-450 (see Figure 23)
Text 9. The name of the fourth tribe, Hrynathoi, and the 'Twelve' on a bronze plaque from Argos (SEG 41.283), c. 460-450

Text 10. Stone stele with the name of the fourth Argive tribe, the Hrynathoi, from Argos (SEG 41.283), c. 400 (see Figure 24)
Text 11. Stone stele, reused in Roman times, mentioning the hiaromnamones at Argos (SEG 33.275), c. 450-424 (see Figure 25)

> - - Łv ęννέμα δεμποργοί ęf -

← αγάσσαντο

→ Ποταμός

cαὶ Σθένελας ἕοιχθενίδα

cαὶ Ἰππομέδων

cαὶ Χάρων ὁ Ἀρχεσίλα

cαὶ Ἀδραστος

cαὶ Φορθαγόρας

cαὶ Κτέσος ὁ Μίντονος

cαὶ Ἀριστόμαχος

cαὶ Ἰχονίδας.

Text 12. Stone stele bearing a list of nine damiorgoi from the Larisa at Argos (IG IV 614; SEG 11.336), c. 575-550 (see Figure 26)
→ ἐπὶ τονδεονέν: δαμιοργόντον: τὰ ἑ-
← [v] Ἀθαναίιας: ἐπολύμεθε: ταὐδὲν: τὰ ποίμα-
→ ματα: καὶ τὰ χρέματα τε: καὶ τὸν -----
← ὁ.... ἁνέθεν: τὰ Ἀθαναίιας: τὰ: Πολυάδι:
→ Συλέως: τε → τοῖς: χρέμασι: τοῖς: χρεστερ-
→ καὶ Ἠρατούς → τοῖς: τοῖς: τὰς θυσί: μὲ χρέ-
→ καὶ: Πολύτροπο: → λοιπο: ἤθεδέστοις: ἠχόδος
→ καὶ Ἑξάκεστος: ← τὸ τεμένεσι: τὸ [τὰς Ἀθαν↓
→ καὶ: ἡγήλας: → αἰτίας: τὰς: Πολύαδος: δαμίσι-
→ καὶ Ἐρύθηρως ← ἰον δὲ: χρῆσθο: πρὸ οἶ: τὰ
→ → ἰαρᾶ: αἱ δὲ σιναίτο: ἀγκάθεσ-
← ἁσθο: ἡοῖς δὲ δαμιοργός: ἐπολύνανθεσσότα:
→ ἕο δ' ἐμφύτολος: μελεταέντο: τοῦτον.

Text 13. A group of six damiorgoi from the Larisa at Argos (SEG 11.314), c. 575-550
(From Buck 1955, 283 no. 83)

-- τὰ γράμματα: τὸ ἁδέν: ἡ<է> ἁγνοι
--- ἡ κυρχέοι: τὰς ἀράς: τὰς ---
--- γὰς: τὰς Ἀργειάς: τὰ δὲ πάμφιτα ---
-- αἱ: καὶ: θᾶνατον: ἡ ἁλλὸ τι καρφὸν: ή ---
--- ἐπιτεχνώτο: εἶ. οἱ: Φίσζειε: ιο ---
--- οὲ: πρὸγρηζούς: ἐξπροβοῦσθο ---
--- αἱ δὲ μὲ δαμιοργοῖς τις: ἡοῖς
--- κ' Ἀργειάς: καὶ: καὶ: Φοι: ε ---
--- ο: τοι: θυλῆς: ἀποδομεῖν ---
--- γὰς: Ἀργειάς γα: κατὰ: κ ---
-- νέποιειν Φοι ἐστο: ποὶ: τὰς: θέρας ---

Text 14. Bronze plaque bearing part of a sacral law and mentioning the damiorgoi
from the Heraion (IG IV 506; SEG 11.302), c. 575-550 (see Figure 27)
Text 15. Bronze plaque concerning the treasures of Athens and mentioning the *artynoi* at Argos or Halieis (*IG IV* 554), c. 480 (see Figure 28)

'Aλιαίαι : ἔδοξε : πρό- 
'ἔξενον : ἔμεν : Γνώστι- 
'αν : τὸν Φοινόντιον 
τοῖς 'Αργείοις : ἄφρε- 
τευελ' Επικράτες : Π- 
ανφύλας : Ρίνονος : 

Text 16. Bronze plaque concerning a proxeny for Gnosstas of Oinous, from Argos (*SEG 13.239*), c. 475 (see Figure 29)

Κάλλιπ(π)ος : ηϊκέτας 
Εὐκλέος ηϊώς vac. 

tὸν Ἔπιδαυρίον vac. 
παρ' Ἀπόλλονος vac. 
Πιθίο Ἀργείος vac. 
ἀρχίς καὶ Φοικίδατα.

Text 17. Bronze plaque mentioning a certain Kallippos and his slaves or serfs from Epidaurus (Epidhavros Mus.: *SEG 26.449*), c. early fifth century
Τούτονδε κοινά ἐστο τὸ ἐστιατόριον καὶ τὰ ὄρε καὶ ὡς χαλκιῶν καὶ τὰλ(λ)α Φοικέουσιν γα καὶ τὰ τέλε φέρουσιν: πολεῖν δὲ μηδὲ συναλύζεσθαι ἐξέστο.

Text 18. Law from Selinous, c. mid-fifth century

αἰκὼν μὲν πρώτωσα γυναικὲς τε βοῶν τ' ἄροτρα, κτητὴν, οὐ γαμετήν, ἢτις καὶ βουσὶν ἐποίτο.


μηδ' ἐν νησίν ἄπαντα βλέψοι καθήσαι τίθεσθαι, ἄλλα πλέον λείτεν, τὰ δὲ μελονα ἄρτοιξεσθαι· δεινὸν γὰρ πόντου μετὰ κόμης πτῆματι κύροις, δεινὸν δ' εἰ κ' ἐν' ἀμαξών ὑπέρβιον ἀχθος ἀείρας ἄξωνα κανάξως καὶ φορτὶα μαυρωθεῖν.

Τὸ δὲ λόγῳ μάλιστα ἐξειπέν ἐνεὼν Αἴμητρος ἔστη ἐπὶ τοῦ Προνώς. τοῦτο τὸ ἐνεὼν ἐνεὼν μὲν Κλεμένιου Φωκανέως παῖδα καὶ ἀδελφῆν Κλωμένου Ἡθόναν τοὺς ἰδρυσαμένους φαῖεν εἶναι. Ἅργυριοι δὲ, διὰ τὸ ἔν τῇ Ἀρχαλίδα ἡλίθει Δήμητρι, τότε Ἀδέραν μὲν λέγουσι καὶ Μίστον ὡς ἔπειν παρασκεύασαν τὰς θείς. Καλλόταν δὲ οὔτε δικοὶ δέξασθαι τὴν θεῖν οὔτε ἀποκείμενι τι ἄλλῳ ἢ τιμήν· ταῦτα δὲ οὐ κατὰ γνώμην Ἡθόνας θητοῖς, ἀλλὰ διερρέειν ἐπὶ Δήμητρος ἐνεὼν ἐπιστῇ τὸ ἐνεὼν. Ἡθόνα δ’ οὖν ἐὰν θῆς τὰ αὐτὴ καλεῖται καὶ Ἡθόνας ἐορτήν κατὰ ζῶον ἔγοναι ὡς δόξας, ἄγοναι δὲ οὔτως. ἡγοῦται μὲν αὐτῶς τῆς πομπῆς ὡς τὴν τούτων θεῖαν καὶ δοῦν τὰς ἐπιστευτικὰς ἄρεις ἔγοναις. ἐποντά δὲ καὶ γυναῖκες καὶ ἄνδρες, τοὺς δὲ καὶ παιδίτας ἦν ὁδοὶ καθάετον ἦδη τὴν θείν τιμῆν τῆς πομπῆς· οὕτως λεισὺν ἐδηθητα καὶ ἐπὶ ταῖς κεφαλαῖς ἔγοναι εφαρμόζουσιν. πλέονται δὲ οἱ στέφανοι οἰκίων ἐκ τοῦ ἀνθῶς δ᾽ ἐκαλοῦσιν τῇ ταύτῃ κοιμοσάλαλα, ὥς ὅπως ἐμιλ ὠσείν ὅταν καὶ μεγέθει καὶ χρώσει. ἔπεστι δὲ οἱ καὶ τὰ ἐπὶ τοῦ θητοῦ γραμματικοί. τοῖς δὲ τῆς πομπῆς πέμπουσιν ἐποντά δὴ, ἄγελες βοῦν ἄγοντας διεικαμένην δεξομοι τε καὶ ὄβρηζοντας ἐτο ὀμοσίστος. ἡλάσατες δὲ πρὸς τὸν ναὸν ὃ ἐν ὁσὶν φέρεσαν τῇ ἔροις τοῖς τοῦ θείας καὶ δοῦν τὰς ἐπιστευτικὰς ἄρεις ἔγοναις. ἐποντά δὲ καὶ ἐναπεκατέσθαι ἔγονοι τέως τῶν ὑδρας, ἐπειδὰν τὴν βοῦν ὅπως ἐπὶ τὸ ναὸν ἀνήμαν ἐκ τῶν δεσμῶν, ἔτεροι δὲ ἰσαπεκατέσθαι ἔγονοι τέους τῶν ὑδρας, ἐπειδὰν τὴν βοῦν ὅπως ἐπὶ τὸ ναὸν προσέθαντας τὰς ὑδρας, τέσσαρας μοῦνες, καὶ τῶν μὲν εις αὐτῆς πεποικότων τῆς μάχης, ὅπως δὲ ἐὶ τὸ άλος τοῦ Ἅργους κατέφυγον διαφαρμάτων καὶ τούτων, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἔξισταν κατὰ ὁμολογίαν, ὡς δὲ ἔγοναν ἀπατώμονοι συγκατακανέναν τοῖς ἀλαστοῖς τῶν λοιμών, οὕτως τοὺς Λακεδαίμονας Κλεομένης ἦγεν ἐπὶ ἄρχον ἀνδρῶν τὸν Ἅργους. Ἀλεξίστα ἡδὲ οἰκέτας μὲν καὶ δοῦν διὰ νεώτητα ἢ γήρας ὁπλα ἀδύνατον φέρειν ἄσαν, τοῦτον μὲν πάντας ἀνεβάζουσιν ἐπὶ τὸ τέιχος, οὕτως δὲ ὡσαὶ ἐν ταῖς οἰκίας ὑπελείπετο καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ιερῶν ὁπλα ἀθρόσασα τὰς ἀκμαχούσας ἠλίκαι τῶν γυναικῶν ὑπόλειος, ἐπάλασα δὲ ἐτασσεν κατὰ τούτο ἦν τὸς πολε-μίους προσοσάτος ἠπιστάτω. ὡς δὲ (ἄγγελος) ἔγονον τοῖς Λακεδαίμονοι καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες οὐτε τοῖς ἀλαστοῖς καταπλάγησαν δεξάμενας ἔμαχοντο διερμαγμένος, ἐκτάθα εἰς τοὺς Λακεδαίμονοι, φρονησάτες ὡς καὶ διαφθείρασι σφυτοῖς τῶν γυναικῶν ἐπιφόνος τὸ κατάθορα ξέξαν καὶ ὀρειείς μετὰ σποτείδου γενόσωτο ἤ σωμαρά, ὑπελκοῦν τοῖς γυναιξί πρῶτον δὲ ἐξὶ τῶν ἀγώνα τοῦτον προσεσῖμαν ἦν Πυθία, καὶ τὸ λόγον εἶχεν ἄλλως εἶτε καὶ οὐνείς ἐδόλωσεν Πουδώτως.

ἀλλ’ ὅταν ἡ θῆλεια τῶν ἄρχενα νυκήσασα ἐξέλασε καὶ κόσμος ἔν Ἅργελον ἄρτηται, πολλὰς Ἡρακλέως ἁμεριδοφέας τότε θῆσαι.

Text 21. Pausanias, 2.35.4-8
Την δε το θεάτρον Αρφολύτης ἔστιν λεγών, ἐμφασίσθη 
δὲ τοῦ ἐνδος Τελεσίλλα ἢ ποιήσασα τὰ ἀντίματα ἐπειρά-
σαι στήλης· καὶ βιβλία μὲν ἄκειν ἔχοντας οἱ πρὸς τοὺς 
ποιήν, αὐτὴ δὲ ἐς κράνος ὀμηνιάζουσα τῇ χειρὶ καὶ 
ἐπιτίθεται τῷ κεφαλῇ, μέλλουσα. ἦν δὲ ἡ Τελεσίλλα 
καὶ ἄλλος ἐν ταῖς γυναιξὶν εὐδόκιμος καὶ μᾶλλον ἐτιμᾶτο 
ἐτὶ ἐπὶ τῷ ποιήμα. συμβάντος δὲ Ἀργελοῦ ἀναγίγμαί λόγου 
μυανόνιος πρὸς Κλεομένην τὸν Ἀναξαγόραδον καὶ Λακεδαι-
μονίους, καὶ τῶν μὲν ἐν αὐτῷ παπτακότοις τῇ μάχῃ, 
ὅσι δὲ ἐς τὸ ὄλος τοῦ Ἀργοῦ κατέφυγον διαφθοράν 
καὶ τούτων, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα ἔξωτον κατὰ ὀρμογονίαν, ὡς 
δὲ ἐγκαταστάθηκεν συγκατακαυθέντων τῶν ὄλοι 
τῶν λοιπῶν, οὕτω τοὺς Λακεδαιμονίους Κλεομένης ἤγεν 
ἐπὶ ἐρμον ἀνδρῶν τὸ Ἀργος. Τελεσίλλα δὲ οὐκέτας μὲν 
καὶ ὅσι διὰ τετήρη ἢ γῆτας ὑπὸ ἄνωντοι φέρειν ἦσαν, 
τοῦτος μὲν πάντας ἰσχυρότερον ἐπὶ τὸ τείχος, αὐτῇ δὲ 
ὀπίσω ἐν ταῖς ἐκλείπεστε καὶ τὰ ἐκ τῶν λεγῶν 
ὄλθα ἀνθρωπίσα τὰς ἀκμαῖοτας ἡλικίας τῶν γυναικέων 
ἀπλησίν, ὀπλασία δὲ ἐταυτεῖα κατὰ τοῖοτο ἢ τοὺς πολέ-
μοιοὺς προσέπτεσα ἡμίλικτο. ὡς δὲ ἐκεῖ, ἐγκαταστάθη 
ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ γυναῖκες ὑπὲρ τοῖς ἀλαλαγμοῖ 
κάταληψαν δεξάμενοι τοὺς λιμήντας ἀνθρώπους, ἢνανθά 
ὁ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, προσέπτεσαν ὡς καὶ διαφθοράν σφυῖ 
τὰς γυναίκας ἐπιρρόθως τὸ κατάθυμα δεξί καὶ ὁραλεῖσι 
μετὰ ὅπως ἔκαπησεν τὸν κυματόρρυθον οὕτως ὑμηρότα, 
ἐπιτίθετο διὰ τοὺς γυναῖκας ἐπὶ τούτον προσεπήμην 
ἡ Πυθία, καὶ τὸ λόγον ἤτο ἄλλος ἤτο καὶ συνείς 
ἐκθέλεις 'Ἡρώδοτος:

ἀλλὰ ἦτο ἡ θήλεια τῶν ἄροιν νυκήσασα 
ἐξελάτη καὶ κύδος ἐν Ἀργελοῦ ἄρητα, 
πολλὰς Ἀργελοῦ ἀμφιδικτεῖς τῷ θῆσαι.
Since it was impossible to illustrate all features and artifacts, only those that presented a type, some problem, or an especially interesting attribute have been drawn or reproduced photographically. All drawings are by the author, based on the sources quoted.

Note that figure illustrations are not to scale.
Figure 1. Map of the Argolid showing the approximate position of archaic sites
(After Foley 1988, 252 map 1)
Figure 2. Map of the Argolid showing the Argeia and Akte
(After Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 15 fig. 1.2)
Figure 3. Map of the Argive plain showing the rivers (Inákhos, Erasinós, Kharadros or Xérias) with the lake at Lerna
(From Piérart and Touchais 1996, 10)
Figure 4. Map of the Bérbati region
(From Wells [B.]1996, 10 fig. 1)
Figure 5. Map of Methana
(From Mee and Forbes 1997, 50 fig. 5.2)
Figure 6. Map of the southern Argolid showing the approximate location of its three topographical zones
(After Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 152 fig. 3.2)
Figure 7. Greek and Phoenician inscriptions showing assertiveness and a concern for establishing a record of permanence
(From Lang 1991, 66 fig. 3; 67 fig. 6)
Figure 8. Seal stone from Gythion (?) declaring ownership (New York, Met. 32), c. mid-sixth century
(From Boardman 1970, 141 fig. 186)

Figure 9. Ivory writing-board from Marsiliana d’Albegna in Etruria, c. late eighth or early seventh century
(From Jeffery 1982, 377)
Figure 10. Fragment of a black figure pot with a boy writing on a tablet (Brussels, Musée Royaux A 1013A), c. late sixth century
(From Bioul 1989, 17)

Figure 11. Marble scribe from the Athenian akropolis (Athens, Akropolis 114), c. 520
(From Payne and Young 1950, pl. 118.1)
Figure 12. Terracotta statuette of a scribe from a tomb in Thebes (Paris, Lourve B 114), c. 500
(From Higgins 1967, pl. 32a)

Figure 13. Cup by Onesimos showing a trainer with stylus (once in Berlin, Staatliche Museen 3139), c. early fifth century
(From Boardman 1975, fig. 235)
Figure 14. Cup by Douris showing a tutor with a student writing on a tablet and a tutor holding a papyrus roll on the reverse (Berlin, Staatliche Museen 2285), c. early fifth century
(From Daremberg and Saglio 1892, 468 fig. 2598; Boardman 1975, fig. 289)
Figure 15. Red figure sherd by Onesimos showing a papyrus roll with boustrophedon writing (Oxford G 138), c. 485
(From Birt 1907, 143 fig. 80)

Figure 16. Spensithios decree inscribed on a bronze abdominal guard, Crete (London, BM 1969.4-2.1), c.500
(From van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 97 no. 22)
Figure 17. Sacral law mentioning the *hiaromnamon*, inscribed on a series of stones covering the underground passages at Tiryns (*SEG* 22.269), c. 600-550
(See Appendix D, Text 5)
(From van Effenterre and Ruzé 1994, 298-299 no. 78)

Figure 18. Final clause of a law mentioning the *hiaromnamones*, on the crowning stone of a structure from the Perseia fountain house at Mykenai (*IG* IV 493; *SEG* 11.300), c. 525
(See Appendix D, Text 6)
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 31 no. 1)
Figure 19. Part of a limestone plaque inscribed with a list of armour mentioning the *hiaromnai*on*es* at Asprókhoma near Mykenai (*SEG* 11.298), c. 475
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 31 no. 3)

Figure 20. Part of bronze helmet inscribed ‘to Enyalios’ from Asprókhoma (*SEG* 23.187), c. 475
(From Daux 1966, 782 fig. 13)
Figure 21. Base for a bronze statuette dedicated by the four *hiaromnamones* at the Heraion, c. 480-475
(From Jeffery 1990 pl. 28 no. 21)

Figure 22. Doric capital inscribed with the funerary epigram of Hyssematas from near the Heraion (Argos Museum E 210: SEG 11.305), c. late sixth century
(McGowan 1995, 628 fig. 11)
Figure 23. Stone stele dedicated by the four hiaromnamones at the Heraion (Athens, EM 581; IG IV 517; SEG 11.303), c. 460-450
(See Appendix D, Text 8)
(From IG IV 517)
Figure 24. Stone stele with the name of the fourth Argive tribe, the Hynathoi from Argos (*SEG* 41.283), c. 400
(see Appendix D, Text 10)
(From Kritzas 1980, pl. 228)
Figure 25. Stone *stele*, reused in Roman times, mentioning the *hiaromnamones* at Argos
(SEG 33.275), c. 450-425
(See Appendix D, Text 11)
(From Mitsos 1983, 244, 245 fig. 2)
Figure 26. Stone stele bearing a list of nine *damiorgoi* from the Larisa at Argos (*IG IV* 614; *SEG* 11.336), c. 575-550
(See Appendix D, Text 12)
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 26 no. 7; Guarducci 1967, 128 fig. 25)

Figure 27. Bronze plaque bearing part of sacral law and mentioning the *damiorgoi*, from the Heraion (*IG IV* 506; *SEG* 11.302), c. 575-550
(See Appendix D, Text 14)
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 27 no. 9)
Figure 28. Bronze plaque concerning the treasures of Athena and mentioning the artynoi at Argos or Halieis (IG IV 544), c. 480
(See Appendix D, Text 15)
(From IG IV 554)

Figure 29. Bronze plaque concerning a proxeny for Gnosstas of Oinous, from Argos (SEG 13.239), c. 475
(See Appendix D, Text 16)
(From Guarducci 1969, 51 fig. 4)
Figure 30. Graffito on a black glaze sherd from Halieis (Náplio, Leonárdho Museum HC 99), c. fifth century
(From Jameson and Williams 1968, pl. 145)

Figure 31. Graffito on an Attic black glaze plate from Tiryns, c. fifth century
(From Frickenhaus, Müller, and Oelmann 1912, 105 fig. 43)
Figure 32. Ostrakon (?) of Alkandros on the foot of a black glaze skyphos from Argos (SEG 36.340), c. 475-450
(From Pariente et al. 1986, 765 fig. 1)

Figure 33. Graffito on the base of an Attic black glaze cup from Argos (Argos Museum 87/43/1), c. 500-480
(From Pariente, Aupert, and Moretti 1988, 719 fig. 28)
Figure 34. Inscribed lead plaque from Argos, c. fifth century
(From Catling 1987, 18 fig. 23)

Figure 35. Dipinto from the Heraion, c. seventh century
(From Waldstein 1905, 185 fig. 102)

Figure 36. Bronze shield-band with signature of Aristodamos, c. 575-550
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 74 no. 6)
Figure 37. Bronze plaque dedicated by Kleandros, c. 525
(From Androutsopoulos 1949, 73 fig. 1)

Figure 38. Signature of [Poly ?]medes on two statue bases for marble kouroi from Delphi (Delphi Museum 4672 + 980), c. early sixth century
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 26 no. 4)
Figure 39. Signature of three Argive sculptors on a base dedicated at Olympia by Praxiteles, son of Krinis (Olympia Museum 12, 23, 28, 20; *SEG* 11.1250)  
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 28 no. 19)

Figure 40. Signature of Dorotheos of Argos dedicated by an Argive (Delphi Museum 3840), c. fifth century  
(From Marcadé 1953, fig. 34)

Figure 41. Signature of Dorotheos of Argos on a base dedicated by Aristomenes at Hermione (*IG* IV 684; *SEG* 11.379), c. 460-450  
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 33 nos. 8-9)
Figure 42. Signature of Kresilas of Krete on a base dedicated by Alexias at Hermione
(IG IV 683; SEG 11.378), c. 460-450
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 33 nos. 8-9)

Figure 43. Funerary column inscribed with the epitaph of Damotimos, reused in a
hellenistic cistern, from Troizen, c. 550-525
(From McGowan 1995, 621 fig. 2)
Figure 44. Funerary column inscribed with the epitaph of Praxiteles from Troizen (*IG IV* 800; *SEG* 11.387), c. 500
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 32 no. 3)
Figure 45. Doric entablature blocks with holes for inscribed bronze plaques from the hypostyle hall at Argos, c. fifth century?
(From Bommelaer and des Courtils 1994, pl. 9 b-d)
Figure 46. Map of the southern Argolid showing the main archaic sites
(After Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 238 fig. 4.21)
Figure 47. Map the Argolid showing the approximate location of the three surveyed areas
(After Foley 1988, 252 map 1)

Figure 48. Map of survey in southern Argolid
(From Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 217 fig. 4.1)
Figure 49. Map of Methana showing the main archaic sites
(After Mee and Forbes 1997, 58 fig. 5.2)
Figure 50. Survey tracts and steep slopes on Methana
(From Mee and Forbes 1997, 34 fig. 3.1)

Figure 51. Map of Berbati-Limnes showing the main archaic sites
(From Wells [B.] 1996, 214 fig. 33)
Figure 52. Map of the survey tracts in the Berbati-Limnes region
(From Well [B.] 1996, 17 fig. 6)

Figure 53. Map of the southern Argolid with city-state territories as they may have been divided in the eighth and seventh centuries
(From Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 374 fig. 6.15)
Figure 54. View of Magoula of Sambariza (E9) from west
(From Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 485 fig. A.23)
Figure 55. Map of the southern Argolid showing ‘farmsteads’ within a four-kilometre range of larger centres
(After Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 247 fig. 4.31)
Figure 56. View of the akropolis of ancient Methana (Megalokhório-Palaiokástro MS10) from south
(From Mee and Forbes 1997, 124 fig. 11.3)

Figure 57. Bronze plaque from the sanctuary of Epidauros mentioning Kallippos and his oiketai (SEG 26.499), c. early fifth century
(See Appendix D, Text 17)
(From Lambrinoudhakis 1980a, pl. 122a)
(Figure 58. Plan of the Herodian
(After Ferrar and Toucheas 1996, 3-4)
Figure 59. Plan of Argos showing the Deiras, *agora*, Larisa, theatre 'à gradins droits', Stoa Pi, and Hypostyle hall
(After Pariente and Touchais 1998, 201 fig. 6)
Figure 60. The ‘Aspis’ and Deiras of Argos, with a clearing on the lower flank of the hill showing the sanctuary of Apollo Pythaeus
(After Hall 1997, 604 fig. 8)

Figure 61. Temple foundations at Hermione
(From Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 590 fig. E8)
Figure 62. Fishhooks from the lower town at Halieis
(From Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 315 fig. 5.23)

Figure 63. Murex shell from Portokhéli
(From Jameson, Runnels, and van Andel 1994, 319 fig. 5.25)
Figure 64. Map of the Argolid showing the location of sites with evidence for animal sacrifice and feasting
(After Foley 1988, 252 map 1)
Figure 65. Roasting spits (obeloi)
(From Piérart and Touchais 1996, 28)
Figure 66. Plan of Argos showing archaic findspots
(From Pariente and Touchais 1998, pl. 10)
Figure 67. Sketch plan of Áyios Ilías
(From Rupp 1976, 264 fig. 6)

Figure 68. Plan of Epidauros (Asklepieion)
(From Tomlinson 1983, 41 fig. 4)
Figure 69. Plan of the sanctuary of Apollo at Halieis
(After Bergquist 1990, 25 fig. 2)
Figure 70. Map of Mykenai
(From Tournavitou 1995, fig. 1)
Figure 71. Map of Prosymna
(From Antonaccio 1995, 55 fig. 6)
Figure 72. Plan of the *hestiatorion* (West Building) at the Heraion
(From Börker 1983, fig.10)

Figure 73. Dedication on a bronze plaque from Kallistratos, the cook at Epidauros
(Asklepieion; Athens, NAM 8166; *IG* IV 1204), c. 450
(From Jeffery 1990, pl. 34 no. 16)
Figure 74. Decree from Tylissos, Knossos, and Argos mentioning sacrifices in the context of hospitality, c. 450-400
(From Vollgraff 1948, pls. 1-2)
Figure 75. Mask from Tiryns (Náfplio, Léonardho Museum) (Jantzen 1975, 160 fig. 7)
Figure 76. Inscriptions 'to Hera' on bronze vases won in contests at the Heraion, c. 470-425
(From Amandry 1980, 215 figs. 2-4; Jeffery 1990, pl. 29 no. 26)
Figure 77. *Pithos* and cist tomb from Argos, c. eighth and seventh century
(From Piérart and Touchais 1996)

---

Figure 78. Map of the Argolid showing the location of sixth century burials
(After Foley 1988, 252 map 1)
Figure 79. Plan of Argos showing the distribution of eighth century burials
(From Hall 1997b, 97 fig. 5)
Figure 80. Plan of Argos showing the distribution of seventh century burials
(From Hall 1997b, 98 fig. 6)