

ERGASTERIA:
Works Presented to John Ellis Jones
on his 80th Birthday.

(ed.) Nicholas Sekunda

Gdańsk 2010

PRIFYSGIOL CYMKU
URDD Y GRADDEGION
ADRAN GLASUKOL



UNIVERSITY OF WALES
GUILD OF GRADUATES
CLASSICAL SECTION

Editorial Note

It was only at the beginning of this year that I received an invitation to attend the celebrations of John's eightieth birthday on 10 October 2009. When I passed on news of this meeting to Graham Shipley in Nottingham on 26 February it was Graham who first suggested the appropriateness of producing a volume to celebrate his life and work. At the time I doubted the possibilities of getting anything ready in time, and it was only in Dublin in March that Phil de Souza persuaded me that it would be possible, and put me into contact with a large number of potential contributors. The fact that this volume has arisen in such a short time is a token of the esteem and affection in which John is held by his fellow academics: both as a person and as a researcher into the past. Many others wanted to contribute, but could not do so because of constraints on time. I am sure that there are others who would have been able and willing to contribute if asked, and I ask their forgiveness for my oversight.

This publication has appeared thanks to the financial support of the Vice-Rector of Gdańsk University, Professor Grzegorz Węgrzyn, the Dean of the Faculty of History of Gdańsk University, Professor Zbigniew Opacki, and also thanks to a generous contribution from the Classical Section of the Guild of Graduates of the University of Wales, organized by Professor Ceri Davies. I take this opportunity to thank all of these organizations and individuals personally. I would also like to thank Graham Shipley for his advice on printing matters.

Nick Sekunda
Gdańsk University

AKANTHINA



Published for the Institute of Archaeology, Gdańsk University
by 'Project' Sp. z o. o., ul. Kościuszki 51B, 87-100 Toruń, Poland.
Seria Monograficzna „Akanthina” nr 4
ISBN
Gdańsk 2010.

Table of Contents

Hugh Sackett, A Tribute to John Ellis Jones	5
A Bibliography of the Publications of John Ellis Jones	10
John Prag, Lost and Found: the Tale of a Miner’s Shovel	15
David W.J. Gill Amenhotep III, Mycenae and the Laurion	21
James Whitley, Eteocretans and Eteo-britons: The Intellectual Prehistory of the Minoans	35
R.V.W. Catling, ἘΡΜΗΣΙΟΣ ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΣ - A Spartan Craftsman of Ionian Origin?	41
Susan Deacy, ‘Knowing the story told about Erichthonios’: looking at ‘the goddess Athena, the maiden warrior’	56
Tracey E. Rihll, ‘Athens’ Silver Springs’	64
Michael Vickers, ‘Hagnon, Amphipolis and Rhesus’	75
Philip de Souza, ‘Raids on the coast of Attica’	81
John Davies, Mines, Miners and Macedon	93
Graham Shipley ‘Pseudo-Scylax on Attica’	99
Stephen Lambert, ‘Athens, Sokles and the Exploitation of an an Attic Resource (IG II ² 411)’	114
Nicholas Sekunda, ‘The Golden Pig Tower’	125
David Blackman, Catherine Bouras, John Hayes, Maria Costanza Lentini, Miscellanea Apicula’	149
Hugh Sackett, ‘A Knidian thymiaterion from Roman Knossos’	158
Duncan Cloud, ‘The Lex Horrendi Carminis of Livy’	168
Ceri Davies, ‘Cambrian Euripides’: Three Welsh-Language Versions of the Alcestis’	177

Pseudo-Skylax on Attica¹

Among the Greek geographical writings preserved in a thirteenth-century manuscript, now in Paris,² is the earliest extant copy of an intriguing *periplous* or ‘circumnavigation’. An introductory note, probably composed in the sixth century AD, attributes it to Skylax of Karyanda, ostensibly the Karian who according to Herodotos (4. 44) explored the Indian Ocean for king Darius around 500 BC. The attribution to Skylax must be false, however, for the actual text makes many statements that were not true until well after that time. Therefore the unknown, presumably male, author and his work are usually called ‘Pseudo-Skylax’ (abbreviated to Ps.-Skylax).

The prose text enumerates the coasts of the Mediterranean and the Black Sea known to the Greeks, and some hinterlands. Beginning at the straits of Gibraltar, it moves along the north shore of the Mediterranean to the Dardanelles, proceeds clockwise round the Black Sea, and returns via Asia Minor, the Levant (but not the Indian Ocean), and Egypt to the Straits of Gibraltar and a short way down the coast of West Africa. It often gives the distance from one place to another, or the length of a stretch of coast. These distances are sometimes expressed in days (and nights) of sailing, at other times in *stadia* or ‘race-tracks’. The latter unit, *stadion* in the singular, is anglicized as ‘stade’ and is usually assumed to have averaged c.185 m, though some scholars favour a smaller value; it is thus, coincidentally, almost exactly a nautical cable (somewhat less than an English furlong).³

The coastal description of about eight thousand words has been thoroughly quarried by regional archaeologists and historians for specific data, but the erratic spelling of the manuscript leaves the identification of many places, and often their relative positions, open to debate. There are some surprising omissions (it is possible that what we have is a post-classical précis of a fourth-century original, though I do not share that view).⁴ Over-enthusiastically emended by earlier editors,⁵ the work has only recently benefited from more careful and holistic analysis. Indeed, only in the twenty-first century has it been readily available in modern languages (Counillon 2004; Garzón Díaz 2008), perhaps because of the difficulty of establishing a reliable text. It will soon appear in English.⁶

¹ I thank the Loeb Classical Library Foundation for a grant enabling me to extend a period of research leave awarded by the University of Leicester in 2006–7. Other acknowledgements will be given in subsequent publications, but here I must mention Prof. Hans-Joachim Gehrke and Prof. Richard Talbert for their sustained encouragement. For the present paper, I thank Reviel Netz, Graham Oliver, Robin Osborne, and Peter Rhodes for helpful initial comments, and particularly David Blackman and Kalliopi Baika for information about Attic harbours. Some modern Greek place-names are in italics with the stress indicated by an acute accent. ‘mi’ = miles. C5, C4, etc. = 5th, 4th century, etc. (BC unless stated).

² Parisinus supplément grec 443, known as ‘D’ in the scholarship on Greek geography.

³ 1 cable is one-tenth of a nautical mile. The latter measure (originally conceived as equivalent to 1 minute of arc of the Earth’s surface) has had various values but is currently exactly 1,852 m. (A furlong is 220 yards = 660 ft = c.201.1 m.)

⁴ See n. 35 below.

⁵ Notably Müller 1855, regrettably still regarded as the standard edition despite the fact that Fabricius 1878 offers a better text.

⁶ Shipley forthcoming-a and Shipley forthcoming-b, though note the unpublished translation of Allain 1977: 89–132, and selections in Warmington 1934: 134–41; Shipley 2007.

The *periplous* is now generally believed to be a work of literary research rather than a record of first- or even second-hand maritime knowledge. From internal evidence, it was compiled in the third quarter of the fourth century bc, very likely in 338 or just after.⁷ It is thought that the author drew upon written sources, now lost, to gather information about peoples, places, and geographical features outside his own experience. It is now generally thought that the treatise was not accompanied by a map (Janni 1982, 606; González Ponce 1991). The author does not, to any great extent, make use of information from his great geographical-historical predecessors such as Hekataios (Peretti 1979, 118–49), Ephoros (Peretti 1961), and Theopompos (Peretti 1963). Occasional mythological and historical nuggets in the treatise may be of his own devising. Various remarks show that he adopts a vantage-point in east-central Greece, in or near Athens.⁸ He is sometimes assumed to have been Athenian,⁹ but it is safer to suppose only that he was working there.

In honour of John Ellis Jones, much of whose distinguished contribution to Classics has been made in Athens and Attica, and who has striven to give a ‘sense of place’ to ancient sites, I shall attempt to elucidate the nature and origins of Pseudo-Skylax’ knowledge of Attica and how he attempts to define an identity for it.

Let us begin with the relevant section of the *Periplous*.

1. Text and translation

Section numbers are as in Müller, but with new subsection numbers added.

56. . . . παράπλους δὲ τῆς Μεγαρέων χώρας μέχρι Ἰαπίδος, ἔστι γὰρ οὗτος ὄρος τῆς Ἀθηναίων χώρας, στάδια ρμ’.

57. {Ἀττική.} μετὰ δὲ Μεγαρεῖς εἰσὶν Ἀθηναίων πόλεις. καὶ πρῶτον τῆς Ἀττικῆς Ἐλευσίς, οὗ ἱερὸν Δήμητρος ἔστι καὶ τεῖχος {καὶ νῆσος Σαλαμίς}. κατὰ τοῦτό ἐστι Σαλαμίς νῆσος καὶ πόλις καὶ λιμὴν. ἔπειτα ὁ Πειραιεὺς καὶ τὰ σκέλη καὶ Ἀθηναί. ὁ δὲ Πειραιεὺς λιμένας ἔχει γ’. 2. Ἀνάφλυστος τεῖχος καὶ λιμὴν. Σούνιον ἀκρωτήριον καὶ τεῖχος, ἱερὸν Ποσειδῶνος. Θορικός τεῖχος καὶ λιμένες δύο. Ῥαμνοῦς τεῖχος. εἰσὶ δὲ καὶ ἄλλοι λιμένες ἐν τῇ Ἀττικῇ πολλοί. περίπλους τῆς Ἀθηναίων χώρας στάδια α, ρμ’. ἀπὸ Ἰαπίδος χώρας ἐπὶ Σούνιον στάδια υφ’. ἀπὸ Σουνίου μέχρι τῶν ὄρων τῶν Βοιωτῶν στάδια χν’.

⁷ Aitolian control of Naupaktos (§36), which Philip II enacted after Chaironeia (Marcotte 1986: 170), is the latest *terminus post quem*. A *terminus ante quem* is harder to fix, since the *periplous* patently includes much information that was out of date in the 330s, so that in principle any apparent lower limit (such as Spartan control of S. Messenia, §46, which also came to an end after Chaironeia) could simply reflect a failure to update an existing text. The most suggestive *terminus ante quem* dates are the mention of Thebes (§59), destroyed by Alexander in 335, and the use of the R. Strymon as the E limit of Macedonia (pushed back by Alexander in 336; Marcotte 1986: 171). Despite the cumulative evidence of C4 compilation, a few scholars persist in believing that it is a revision of a late archaic text (e.g. Peretti 1979 and elsewhere; Garzón Díaz 1998–9). See, rather, Counillon 2004: 24–7; Marcotte 1986: 170–3; Shipley 2008: 282–3.

⁸ See e.g. the references to ‘the sea on our side’ (§40) and ‘this sea’ (§59, §61). Athenocentric viewpoint: Counillon 2001: 18–19.

⁹ Marcotte 1986: 168–70 (Megarian, Aiginetan, or Athenian authorship but pro-Athenian attitude); Counillon 1998a: 142 (Athenian).

58. κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἀττικὴν εἰσι νῆσοι αἱ Κυκλάδες καλούμεναι, . . . μετὰ ταῦτα ἐπάνειμι πάλιν ἐπὶ τὴν ἠπειρον, ὅθεν ἐξετραπόμην.

59. {Βοιωτοί.} μετὰ δὲ Ἀθήνας εἰσὶ Βοιωτοὶ ἔθνος· καθήκουσι γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι ἐπὶ ταύτην τὴν θάλασσαν. . . .

Select apparatus criticus

56. Ἰαπίδος Müller e Steph. Byz., Hdn.: ἄπιδος D (et similiter §57. 2)

57. 1 Ἀττικὴ secl. Fabricius, alii | καὶ νῆσος Σαλαμῖς secl. Müller | υφ' Gail: ξ' D ||

2. Θορικὸς Miller: εἰρικὸς D. | ῥαμνοῦς M.: ῥάμνος D. | Βοιωτῶν Gail: Βοιωτίων D

59. Βοιωτοί (primum) secl. Fabricius: βοιωταί D | Βοιωτοὶ (secundum): βιωτοὶ D

Translation

My translation attempts to capture the awkwardness of the original, and reflects the character of the sole authoritative manuscript (such as the varied format of numbers). The words enclosed in braces (curly brackets) are present in the manuscript but generally regarded as later interpolations.

56. . . . And the coastal sailing of the territory of the Megarians as far as Iapis—for this is a boundary of the territory of the Athenians: 140 stades.

57. {Attica.} And after the Megarians are cities of the Athenians. And first in Attica is Eleusis, where the sanctuary of Demeter is, and a fort {and the island of Salamis}. Opposite this is Salamis, an island with a city and a harbour. Next the Piraeus and the Legs (i.e. *the Long Walls*) and Athens. And the Piraeus has 3 harbours.

2. Anaphlystos, a fort with a harbour; Sounion, a promontory with a fort; a sanctuary of Poseidon; Thorikos, a fort with two harbours; Rhamnous, a fort. And there are also many other harbours in Attica. Voyage around the territory of the Athenians 1,140 stades. From the Iapid territory up to Sounion 490 stades. From Sounion as far as the boundaries of the Boiotians 650 stades.

58. {Boiotians.} And opposite Attica are the islands called Cyclades . . . After these places I return again onto the mainland, from where I turned away.

59. And after Athens are the Boiotians, a community: for these, too, come down to this sea. . . .



Fig. 1. Attica, with places named in the text (D. Miles-Williams).

2. A multi-*polis* region

Ps.-Skylax, somewhat surprisingly at first sight, introduces Attica with the phrase ‘cities of the Athenians’. Then, after stating that the first place you come to (not, be it noted, the first city) is Eleusis,¹⁰ he expressly calls Salamis an island and a *polis* (city-state).

As all undergraduates know, Attica was a single *polis*. Has Ps.-Skylax misunderstood the situation, despite his probable Athenian identity or residency? Or—since he includes both Salamis and several of the larger Attic demes—should we revise our concept of *polis* to include such places? It is not necessary to believe either of these things.

¹⁰ Eleusis is no. 362 in the Copenhagen inventory of *poleis*, Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 637, but only because of its brief independence in 403–401.

One possibility is that he is introducing the passage in an automated, habitual way: he often introduces a region by undertaking to tell us about its *poleis* even if he includes things that are patently not *poleis* or even settlements, such as rivers and forts. But in none of the single-*polis* territories (Halieis, Hermion, Troizen, Kalauria, Epidauros, Korinthia, and Megaris) or single-*polis* islands (Belbina, Aigina) that he has described just before Attica does he make the mistake of undertaking to list *poleis* (plural). It appears to be a conscious choice here (all the more so since at the next mention he varies the nomenclature, using the topographic name ‘Attike’).

The choice is technically correct: Attica did contain more than one *polis*. Salamis was a cleruchy, and therefore a dependent *polis* of Athens, not a constituent deme.¹¹ Although the *periplous* as a whole mentions hundreds of *poleis*, both Greek and barbarian, its general aim is not to enumerate or analyse the cities, or city-states, of the world as such, but to measure and characterize the world geographically by setting out its component units. In view of this, the author’s intention here may have been, without labouring the constitutional niceties, to classify Attica implicitly together with other, similarly multi-*polis* regions such as Laconia and the Argolid.

Somewhat inconsistently, perhaps, as he leaves Attica the author refers back to it simply as ‘Athens’ (§59). In this part of the *periplous* he varies between calling regions after their *polis*, their territory, and their inhabitants,¹² probably a case of deliberate *variatio* rather than incompetence or manuscript error.

3. Regional *periploi*?

This is one of only four passages in the work¹³ where the term *periplous* (a ‘sailing around’, ‘voyage around’, or ‘circumnavigation’) is used to denote the length of a region’s coast. The term Ps.-Skylax favours elsewhere, using it over 70 times, is *paraplous* (a ‘sailing beside’, ‘coastal voyage’, or ‘coasting’).¹⁴ Three of the four cases of *periplous* refer to locations in the Argolid–Saronic gulf area: the territory of Halieis (§50. 2), that of Hermion (§51), and Attica (§57. 2). The fourth *periplous* is of Thrace from the R. Strymon to the Danube (§67. 10), but is of doubtful reliability since it is the summation of several shorter distances, the list being introduced by the more usual term, *paraplous*.

It is not because Attica is a peninsula that the author uses the term *periplous*. While the small, irregular territory of Halieis and the larger Attica are peninsulas, Hermion and (on a continental scale) Thrace are partly concave and partly straight. Conversely, he often fails to apply the term to capes and other convex coasts. He also uses *paraplous* indifferently as to whether a coast is convex (such as a cape), straight, or concave (such as a bay).

It is obvious that *periplous* and *paraplous* could easily be confused by a copyist, and we cannot rely absolutely on the manuscript. We have seen, indeed, that *paraplous* may have

¹¹ Flensted-Jensen and Hansen 2007: 217; Hansen 1996: 30–2; Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 637–9 no. 363.

¹² e.g. §50. 1 ‘after Argos’, §50. 2 ‘after the Epidaurian territory’, §57. 1 ‘after the Megarians’.

¹³ Other than passages thought to have been added later (§106. 4, §114).

¹⁴ Note also the participle περιπλέοντι in two further passages that are probably additions (§69, §111. 8) and the variant phrase παράπλους . . . περι τοὺς κόλπους (§66. 5).

been corrupted into *periplous* in the case of Thrace. On the principle of *lectio difficilior*, however, it is more likely that the few instances of *periplous* have been transmitted correctly than that the ubiquitous *paraplous* has been altered to *periplous* in these cases. So why do instances of *periplous* cluster in one part of Greece? Probably, as in the rest of his work, Ps.-Skylax is using information with a local origin presented in a specific format, possibly from a distinct source or sources.¹⁵

4. Local maritime measurements

The figure of 140 stades (c.26 km, c.162 mi) for the Aegean coast of Megara (§56) should include both the western stretch, where the Skironian rocks front the sea for several miles, and the Megarian plain as far as where the ridge of Mt Kerata (mod. *Trikéri*) meets the sea and Attica begins. The distance of 490 stades (c.91 km, c.57 mi) for Attica as far as Sounion (§57. 2) appears to have been measured from Kerata.¹⁶ The figure of 650 stades (c.120 km, c.75 mi) from Sounion to the Boiotian border (§57. 2 ad fin.) takes us well past Oropos at the northern limit of Attica—indeed, almost to the narrows of Euboia just south of Chalkis.¹⁷ If the figure is correctly transmitted, it appears that Ps.-Skylax implicitly assigns Oropos to Attica (see (5) below).

The possible origin of these figures is worth considering. It is striking that all three, despite their large size, embody a claim to high precision, being divisible by 10 and not by 100. Two numbers of the same kind appear in adjacent paragraphs. A few lines earlier Ps.-Skylax gave the length of the west side of the Saronic gulf as 740 stades (§51. 3). A few lines later he gives the length of Euboia as 1,350 stades (§58. 3). Out of 83 distances in the *periplous* that are expressed in stades,¹⁸ no other large ones are ‘precise’ in this sense.¹⁹ Indeed, of 22 distances greater than or equal to 400 stades, only one other is not divisible by 100.²⁰ Why do five of the six figures of this kind refer to one area of Greece?

Ps.-Skylax also gives many short, local distances that are divisible by 10 but not by 100.²¹ Most of the regional extents for the east side of Greece (§§49–64) are of this sort.²² It seems possible that for this part of his narrative Ps.-Skylax had access to special

¹⁵ See Counillon 2004: 44, 72–3, etc., on Black Sea itineraries. On the precise sense we should give to ‘compilation’ in this connection see Müller 1855, xlix.

¹⁶ A ‘path’ in Google Earth which I constructed on 26 June 2009 measured 92 km (c.57 mi), which at 185 m to the stade makes c.500 stades. This can only be a rough approximation, naturally, since each observer will construct the ‘path’ differently.

¹⁷ From Sounion via the coast to a point opposite Oropos is only c.100 km (c.62 mi) or c.540 st. From Sounion to the modern boundary with Boiotia, beyond *Skála Oropouí*, is c.110 km (c.68 mi) or c.590 st.

¹⁸ Excluding the probably interpolated discussion of the ratio of stades to days (§69) and the list of sea crossings in the Aegean (§113).

¹⁹ The next longest are 320 st. from Apollonia to Amantia by land (§26. 1); and 210 st., the length of Istris Island in the Adriatic (§21. 1).

²⁰ 620 st. from the harbour of Barke to Euesperides (§108. 3).

²¹ A few are not even divisible by 10, such as 7 st. from Messenian Kyparissos to the sea (§45).

²² Argeia has 150, Epidaurus 30 and 130 (if the text is correct), Hermion 80, Troizen 30, Megara 140, Attica 490 + 650 = 1,140, Boiotia 250, and Thessaly 30. Those that are multiples of 100 are Halieis at 100, Kalauria 300, Corinth 300, Lokris 200, and Phokis 200.

sources—perhaps of an administrative nature—in which local coastings were given as multiples of 10 stades.

These data probably had a navigational rather than a land-based origin, since road data, whether measured by surveyors or by bematists, could easily have been given to the nearest stade, as is the case with many of Ps.-Skylax' local land distances; it is hard to see why they would have been restated as multiples of 10. I am not aware of any evidence that the rounding of numbers was practised systematically in classical Greece, though there are plenty of suspiciously 'round' or conventional numbers in ancient sources.²³

The figure of 740 stades for the western Saronic gulf is the sum of several shorter distances, which Ps.-Skylax himself lists.²⁴ It is attractive to suppose that the figures for the Attic and Euboian coasts have a similar genesis: that is, Ps.-Skylax has totalled, but chosen not to list, a series of shorter distances expressed as multiples of 10.

5. Insider knowledge

Besides drawing on some sort of regionally specific documentation, Ps.-Skylax may be drawing on first-hand knowledge of Attica, or at least supposes his readers to have such knowledge.

Attica is the first region of southern Greece for which he names two sanctuaries, the others being Euboia (§58) and Boiotia (§59).²⁵ But Eleusis was world-renowned and the temple of Poseidon at Sounion was a major navigational landmark, so their inclusion is not surprising.

A likelier example of local expertise is the casual reference to the Long Walls between Athens and Piraeus as 'the legs' (*skelē*). It appears to be the earliest use of the word to denote the Long Walls,²⁶ yet he deploys it casually and without explanation, perhaps adopting local usage.

Local knowledge may find its strongest expression, however, in the information (given twice: §56, §57. 2) that Iapis is the border of Attica.²⁷ It is the only statement of the kind in the entire *periplous* until we reach the Levant,²⁸ though there are passing references to 'the borders' of a region or people,²⁹ including one here (§57. 2), and the end of

²³ See, on the Roman sources, Scheidel 1996.

²⁴ The exact details of the component figures are disputed: see Müller 1855, 45, on §§51–4.

²⁵ Other sanctuaries in continuous Hellas: at mouth of gulf of Corinth (§35), Delphi (§37), Lechaion (§40), Tainaros (§46), Diktynna in Crete (§47. 3), S side of Isthmus (§55), Zeus Kenaios and Geraistos in Euboia (§58. 3), Delion and Aulis in Boiotia (§59).

²⁶ See LSJ s.v. σκέλος, II. Aristophanes uses the phrase 'Megarian legs' (*Lysistrata*, 1170) for the walls between Megara and its port, Nisaia. The next earliest use of σκέλη for the Long Walls of Attica appears to be by Strabo (9. 1. 15 and 24); cf. Plutarch, *Kimón*, 13; *Lysander*, 14; Diod. 13. 107.

²⁷ If the name is correctly restored; the MS has 'Apis'.

²⁸ A feature or place as ὄρος of a region: §104. 3 (restored; Askalon as end of Koile Syria), §105. 2 and §106. 1 (Pelousiac mouth of Nile as end of Arabia).

²⁹ 'The frontiers' of a region: ὄροι at §43 (restored, Lepreon); ὄρια at §55 (Megaris), §59 (Lokris), §102. 1 (Pamphylia), §105. 2 init. (Syria).

‘continuous Hellas’ is placed at the Peneios river (§65. 2 with §66. 1; cf. §33. 2). Of Iapis itself, nothing is known save that two late authors cite (without quoting) Kallimachos’ poem *Hekale* (third century BC) for the information that it is a ravine or gorge (*charadra*) ‘leading off to Megara’.³⁰ On the basis of the last phrase, Iapis is reliably identified as the lengthy but shallow stream-bed (*Ammosoura*) running first from Attica down into Megaris,³¹ then turning SE and running towards the sea below the SW face of Mt Kerata.³² The sloping land on either side of the watercourse is broad enough, perhaps, to warrant the phrase ‘the Iapid territory’ which Ps.-Skylax uses when he mentions it for the second time. The area may be related to the *orgas* or sacred land that the Megarians were accused of cultivating before the Peloponnesian war.³³ It has been suggested that the area was neutral ground between the eastern limit of Megarian territory and the western limit of Athenian (Chandler 1926: 12 and pl. 1; Legon 1981: 203, 285–90).³⁴ The *orgas* may have been the sloping land between the stream and the mountain crest above it to the east; topographically if not politically speaking, the easternmost corner of the Megarian plain.

At the other limit of Attica, however, Ps.-Skylax chooses³⁵ not to mention Oropos, the frontier settlement that changed hands periodically between Athens and the Boiotians and became Athenian again in 338. Indeed, he does not define the northern border of Attica at all, but when we look at the distances in this passage we shall see that he fairly certainly, though silently, includes Oropos within Attica. Writing in or shortly after 338 (as we know from other evidence), he may have chosen to treat its possession as common knowledge and a return to normality, from an Athenian point of view, rather than dwell on its recent change of status.

6. Selectivity and connectivity

Ps.-Skylax’ western frontier of Attica is of course coastal, being the point at which a watercourse meets the sea. As usual, he gives no indication of the course of the frontier further inland.

Between those two boundaries, Ps.-Skylax’ account of Attica is pretty thin, if we consider that he must have known the region well. He mentions only eight places, all settlements, though most are described as forts, harbours, or both. He omits Mts Hymettos

³⁰ Herodian (C2 AD), *De prosodia catholica*, 3. 1. 98. 5–7: Ἰαπίς, χαράδρα Ἀττικὴ εἰς Μέγαρα ἀπάγουσα, ὡς Καλλιμάχος Ἐκάλῃ; repeated verbatim by Stephanos of Byzantion (C6 ad), s.v. Ἰαπίς. Both texts survive only in later abridgements.

³¹ As made clear by Ober 1985: 108 map 8.

³² Milchhöfer 1895: 20; Milchhöfer 1900: 40–1; Talbert 2000: map 59 A2 with Traill 2000: 908.

³³ Thuc. 1. 139. 2, ‘the sacred and undefined land’; Philochoros *FGrH* 328 F 121; Plut. *Per.* 30. 2; Gomme 1945: 449, comments sagely: ‘apparently some strip between the two territories which it had been agreed to leave neutral, but . . . not marked by boundary-stones’.

³⁴ For other suggestions see Ober 1985: 216–17, 225–6 (also 108 map 8), agreeing that the *orgas* was W of the Kerata range.

³⁵ I say ‘chooses’ because I do not believe we have only a late antique précis, though this would explain omissions (Vossius 1639 ap. Diller 1952: 59; Fabricius 1846: 5; Müller 1855: xlii–xlili, xlix; Peretti 1961: 6, 15, 34, 38; Desanges 1978: 98).

and Pentelikon, both clearly visible from the sea, as well as the inland massif of Parnes that protects Attica on the north; but this can hardly be significant since he also omits all the mountains of the Peloponnese. There are no rivers (unless we count Iapis), not even the two famous Kephisos rivers (one at Eleusis, one at Athens) or the Ilissos (at Athens); but this, too, is predictable, for they do not compare in size to the five rivers he mentions in ‘continuous Hellas’.³⁶ What is noteworthy is that he conveys no sense that there are substantial towns in inland Attica, in contrast to his accounts of other parts of Greece. In Laconia (§46), for example - admittedly a somewhat larger region - he names fifteen coastal places (about ten of which are dependent *poleis*), two capes, and a river, and adds that ‘in the interior is Sparta and many other cities’. In Argolis (§49) he does not forget the dependent *poleis* of Nauplia, Kleonai, Mykenai, and Tiryns, only one of which is on the sea. In the almost landlocked Arkadia (§44) he names seven inland cities.³⁷ Of Attica he comments instead that there are ‘many other harbours’.

One might, perhaps, suppose that the selective portrayal of Attica is due to the fact that Attica contained only two *poleis*. Yet the author is prepared to list non-*poleis*, since he includes a number of Attic demes. Given that there were about 139 of the latter, many of them very substantial settlements, why does he not mention large inland towns such as Aphidna, Acharnai, and Paiania? One might, for example, have expected a mention of coastal Marathon in view of its historical associations.

Rather than using a political, economic, or demographic criterion, Ps.-Skylax appears to have selected only major, fortified, coastal places for mention by name.

The term ‘fort’ (τείχος) occurs no fewer than five times in this passage, compared with three times in Korinthia, once in Laconia, and twice in Boiotia. Piraeus is not called a fort; perhaps the author considered that such a comment would be redundant in view of its very great size. Neither is Rhamnous called a harbour (indeed, it had two harbours, as Ps.-Skylax correctly observes of Thorikos); this is an evident slip. We need not be surprised at the inclusion of Anaphlystos (*Anávyssos*), a deme of which relatively little is known archaeologically,³⁸ for it was large enough to send ten members to the city council (Whitehead 1986: 373); Xenophon (*Poroi*, 4. 43) identifies Anaphlystos and Thorikos as the two fortifications in the southern mining district.³⁹ (The two harbours of Thorikos were either side of the cape just east of the town.)⁴⁰ Sounion is presumably included for its importance as a geographical marker, but is also correctly described as a fort.⁴¹ On the other hand, the author omits inland border forts such as Eleutherai, Oinoe, Panakton, and Phyle. He is evidently not trying to enumerate Athens’ defensive system as such, only its coastal strongpoints.

³⁶ Peneios (§33. 2, §66. 1), Acheloös (§34. 2), Alpheios (§43), Eurotas (§46), Spercheios (§62. 1–2).

³⁷ If we restore Megalopolis, as I believe we should.

³⁸ Eliot 1962: 75–109, in his extended study of the deme, notes (at 105; cf. also fig. 7 between pp. 53 and 54) that in the late C19 ancient harbour installations were visible; *contra*, Whitehead 1986: 402, cites McCredie 1966: 77 n. 156 as saying ‘there are no recognizable remains’; similarly, Lohmann 1993: 68; Dr K. Baika confirms the absence of demonstrable shipsheds from autopsy (pers. comm.).

³⁹ On the basis of Xenophon and Ps.-Skylax, Anaphlystos has been described as a ‘major fort’ in that area (Hansen 2004: 624). Cf. Xen. Hell. 1. 2. 1 for the fortification of Thorikos in 410 bc.

⁴⁰ K. Baika informs me that their modern names are *Phrangolimáni* (to N) and *Pórto Mandrí* (to S). The fortification wall lay across the neck of this cape; it is shown well in Osborne 1985: 30 map 4.

⁴¹ Shipsheds: Baika 2007–8: 65–6.

The word ‘harbour’ (λιμὴν) occurs five times (once in a general statement), compared with eight times in Laconia but only once in most regions of southern Greece.⁴² Only here, furthermore, does Ps.-Skylax use the catch-all phrase ‘many other harbours’.⁴³ One would expect Attica to contain more harbours than a small region, but the supplementary comment is at odds with the author’s usual practice: having mentioned the most important naval and commercial harbours, why give any space to others?

A distinct cluster of minor harbours may be observed in the indented coast of south-eastern Attica. Presumably all of them (like the larger double port of Thorikos, which Ps.-Skylax does name) were involved in the movement of processed ores out of the Laureion district.⁴⁴ Three are situated in close proximity: from south to north they are Pasá Limáni, with ancient naval installations;⁴⁵ *Poúnda Zéza* (ancient Porthmos?), a promontory with a small natural harbour offering the shortest passage to Helene Island (*Makrónisos*);⁴⁶ and *Gaidourómandra* (anc. Panormos?).⁴⁷ Further north, the bay of *Pórto Ráphti* served two demes, Steiria to the north and the better-known Prasiai to the south, from which religious missions set off each year for Delos.⁴⁸ Though familiar to ancient historians today chiefly for the third-century Ptolemaic fort on its south side at Cape Koroneia (*Koróni*),⁴⁹ the bay offers excellent natural shelter; it is ‘reputedly one of the best harbors of Greece’⁵⁰ and was undoubtedly one of the most important on the east coast already in the classical period.⁵¹ Further north still, one could add Halai Araphenides (*Loútsa*) near *Raphína*.⁵²

Among other Attic bays that will have served as anchorages, one could speculatively add Anagyrous (*Vári*) on the west coast,⁵² *Skála Oropoú* in the north-east (near ancient

⁴² Since Akarnania (§34) he has specified particular places as harbours in W. Boiotia (§38), Elis (Kyllene, §43), Zakynthos (§43), Messenia (Prote, §45), Laconia (eight times, §46), Crete (§47, five times), and one each in Melos (§48), Nauplia (§49), Halieis (§50. 2), Hermion (§51. 1), Troizen (§52. 1), Kalaureia (§52. 2), Aigina (§53), Epidaurous (§54), and Megara (§56). Thus he omits important harbours in Aitolia (§35), W. Lokris (§36), Phokis (§37), the W. Megaris (§39), W. Korinthia (§40, naming Lechaion but not calling it a harbour), Sikyonia (§41), Achaia (§42), and E. Korinthia (§55, naming Kenchreai but not calling it a harbour)—or rather, he omits to state when a place he names is also a harbour. He is undeniably unsystematic, but the density of his information clearly increases in the Argolic-Saronic area. After Attica there follow 12 harbours in the W Aegean islands (§58), then none until Magnesia (§65. 1), after which continuous Hellas ends.

⁴³ Even ‘many harbours’ occurs only twice: once with reference to the Adriatic as a whole (§27. 2), and once with reference to Pharos I., off Libya (§107. 1).

⁴⁴ I am indebted to David Blackman and Kalliopi Baika for many of the references in this paragraph.

⁴⁵ For C4–C3 finds at *Pasá Limáni* see Oliver 2007: 107 n. 189; for ‘clear’ remains of shipsheds, Young 1941: 167; Petropoulakou and Pentazos 1973: 82; Goette 2000: 64–5; Salliora-Oikonomakou 2004: 51 (*non vidit*); confirmed by K. Baika (pers. comm.); underwater remains are under investigation by H. Tzalas.

⁴⁶ Young 1941: 165–9 (location of Porthmos), 169–72 (C4 sanctuary of Herakles at Porthmos), 183–4 (commercial links with Salamis?); but see Lohmann and Schaefer 2000: esp. 100–1 (placing the Herakleion at Sounion instead). See also Watrous 1982: 193 (HI farm to N of *Poúnda Zéza*).

⁴⁷ Goette 2000, 65–8, citing earlier work.

⁴⁸ For cultic links between Prasiai and Delos see e.g. Paus. 1. 31. 2; Parker 1996: 225; Ober 2008: 134 and n. 19.

⁴⁹ Probably of Chremonidean war date; the debate is summarized by Oliver 2007: 154–5.

⁵⁰ McCredie 1966: 2.

⁵¹ See Mersch 1996: 46 ff., 70 (*non vidit*); Meyer 1954; Gehrke 1992: esp. 103. Kraounaki 2002 describes underwater remains at *Mesogaia* harbour (or *Pórto Ráphti* bay), namely two jetties on its NW side (serving ancient Steiria) and possible shipsheds (at *Koróni* (serving Prasiai), though the former are undatable and the evidence for the latter seems inconclusive.

⁵² Oliver 2007: 107 n. 189, summarizes the archaeological evidence.

⁵³ Eliot 1962: 35–46, esp. 38 fig. 3.

Oropos), and even Brauron on the east coast (not far north of *Pórto Ráphti*), though the last may be rather exposed.⁵⁴ Beaches suitable for drawing up small ships, and even triremes on a temporary basis, include Marathon in the north-east (possibly fortified in the hellenistic period),⁵⁵ Halai Aixonides (*Áno Voula*) in the south-west,⁵⁶ and Phaleron, the neighbour and predecessor of Piraeus.

These and other minor ports of Attica would merit detailed collective study in their own right, but have not received close attention as a group, at least for the classical period.⁵⁷ They may be just as representative of life outside Athens, though in a different way, as the better-known fortified coastal settlements. Like their larger counterparts, they may have had a military purpose solely or principally in time of war.⁵⁸ In peacetime they were presumably conduits for the export *and import* of primary products such as crops, timber, and stone, and secondary ones such as wine, olive oil, and (in the south) silver and lead extracted in the Laureion. I emphasize ‘and import’ because these and other commodities may have moved not only into Athens but also out of the city to outlying parts. Moreover, they may have circulated in the form of mutual flows between one peripheral area and another, in a wholly non-urban economic network. We should also consider the possibility that there was direct trade between smaller communities and city-states near Attica, such as in Euboia and the Cyclades, not to mention indirect trade with places further off. Finally, even secondary anchorages may have had occasional military and naval roles in the defence of Attica, as *Koróni* did in the 260s.

Most or all of the harbours Ps.-Skylax names are important naval bases⁵⁹ or commercial harbours, or both. His passing remark about ‘many others’ may be another example of the display of local knowledge.

7. Conclusion

The *periplous* resists a simple analysis. Its few thousand words have generated acres of printed paper, to which the present, modest study has perhaps added a few square feet. But a degree of consensus has emerged, at least among a majority of commentators, about its fourth-century date and the plurality of sources that its author used.

I have argued that Ps.-Skylax implicitly and correctly classifies Attica as a multi-*polis* region, but without labouring the point; that he uses one or more lost (administrative?) sources specific to east-central Greece,⁶⁰ which contained a series of short maritime distances reckoned in tens of stades; that he adds details from local or personal knowledge without explaining them, because he assumes an Athenian readership; and that, in se-

⁵⁴ D. J. Blackman, pers. comm.

⁵⁵ McCredie 1966: 41–5 (possible H1 fort on the Kynosoura promontory at Marathon).

⁵⁶ Eliot 1962: 25–34, esp. 31 fig. 2; Osborne 1985: 23 map 3.

⁵⁷ For brief discussions of alternative harbours to the Piraeus in the early hellenistic period, see Oliver 2007: 63–4 and esp. 123–5.

⁵⁸ Munn 1993: 11.

⁵⁹ Other possible naval stations around Attica included (at least for a few years in C5) Boudoron on Salamis (McCredie 1966: 32–3; Lohmann 2007); but it was a fort rather than a harbour (D. Blackman, pers. comm.).

⁶⁰ Cf. Counillon 2004: 25, for Ps.-Skylax’ use of multiple sources, only some having a maritime basis.

lecting which places to name, he silently employs a selection criterion related to naval and commercial roles, but also alludes to smaller anchorages. He is not necessarily using the same principle of selection as in other regions, in Greece or beyond, where he may have had no first-hand experience. Indeed, the *periplous* appears to be primarily a work not of history, politics, or military science, but of geography. Although we have many fragments of earlier geographical accounts (notably by Hekataios), Ps.-Skylax can with some justice be called the oldest surviving Greek geographical work. In Attica, however, he modifies his geographical approach in the light of his political and military knowledge to a greater extent than in some other regions.⁶¹

Finally, we are just beginning to gain a rounded understanding of Ps.-Skylax' intellectual coordinates. He was working in or near Athens in proximity to, perhaps even closely with, the philosophers and scientists who were active just before or just after Aristotle's return from Macedonia in 335 bc. It will be a task for future research to clarify his place in intellectual developments at Athens in the second half of the fourth century.

D. Graham J. Shipley
University of Leicester

Bibliography

- M.L. Allain, 'The Periplous of Skylax of Karyanda' (Ph.D. thesis, Ohio State University, 1977).
- K. Baika, 'Pirate activities and surveillance of trade routes: new archaeological evidence from naval bases in the Aegean Sea' *Skyllis* 8 (2007–8) 56–72.
- L. Chandler, 'The north-west frontier of Attica' *JHS* 46 (1926) 1–21.
- P. Counillon, 'Datos en Thrace et le périple du Pseudo-Skylax' *REA* 100. 1 (1998) 115–24.
- P. Counillon, 'Λιμὴν ἔρημος', in P. Arnaud and P. Counillon (edd.), *Geographica historica* (Bordeaux, Nice 1998) 55–67.
- P. Counillon, 'Les Cyclades chez les géographes grecs' *REA* 103. 1–2 (2001) 11–23.
- P. Counillon, *Pseudo-Skylax, Le Périple du Pont-Euxin* (= *Scripta antiqua* 8, Bordeaux 2004).
- J. Desanges, *Recherches sur l'activité des Méditerranéens aux confins de l'Afrique* (= *Collection de l'École Française de Rome* 38, Rome 1978).

⁶¹ Cf. Counillon 1998b on Ps.-Skylax' representation of the military and commercial harbours of Cyprus.

A. Diller, *The Tradition of the Minor Greek Geographers* (= *Philological Monographs* 14, Lancaster, Pa., Oxford 1952).

C.W.J. Eliot, *The Coastal Demes of Attica: A Study of the Policy of Kleisthenes* (= *Phoenix Supplements* 5, Toronto 1962).

B. Fabricius, 'Ueber den Periplus des Skylax: zweiter Abschnitt' *Archiv für Philologie und Paedagogik* 12. 1 (1846) 5–85.

B. Fabricius, *Anonymi, vulgo Scylacis Caryandensis, periplum maris interni cum appendice iterum recensuit B. Fabricius* (2nd edn. Leipzig 1878)

P. Flensted-Jensen and M.H. Hansen, 'Pseudo-Skylax' in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *The Return of the Polis: The Use and Meanings of the Word Polis in Archaic and Classical Sources* (Stuttgart 2007) 204–42.

J. Garzón Díaz, 'La geografía antigua y Escílax de Carianda' *MHA* [Oviedo] 19–20 (1998–9) 9–23.

J. Garzón Díaz, *Geógrafos griegos: Escílax de Carianda; Hannón de Cartago; Heráclides crético; Dionisio, hijo de Califonte* (Oviedo 2008).

H.-J. Gehrke, 'Zur Rekonstruktion antiker Seerouten: das Beispiel des Golfs von Euböia' *Klio* 74 (1992) 98–117.

H.R. Goette, 'Ο αξιόλογος δῆμος Σούνιον: landeskundliche Studien in Südost-Attika (= *Internationale Archäologie* 59, Rahden 2000).

A.W. Gomme, *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides, i: Introduction and Commentary on Book I* (Oxford 1945).

F.J. González Ponce, 'Revisión de la opinión de A. Peretti sobre el origen cartográfico del Periplo del Ps.-Escílax' *Habis* 22 (1991) 151–5.

M.H. Hansen, 'Πολλαχῶς πόλις λέγεται (Arist. Pol. 1276a23): the Copenhagen inventory of poleis and the lex Hafniensis de civitate' in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis* (Copenhagen 1996) 7–72.

M.H. Hansen, 'Attika' in M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (edd.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford 2004) 624–42.

M.H. Hansen and T.H. Nielsen, *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford 2004).

P. Janni, *Il periplo di Scilace* (1982).

R.P. Legon, *Megara: The Political History of a Greek City-state to 336 BC* (Ithaca, NY 1981).

- H. Lohmann, *Atene: Forschungen zu Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika* (Köln, etc. 1993).
- H. Lohmann, 'Wo lag das athenische Phrourion Boudoron?: Ein Beitrag zur historischen Geographie der Insel Salamis' in U. Fellmeth, P. Guyot, and H. Sonnabend (edd.), *Historische Geographie der alten Welt: Grundlagen, Erträge, Perspektiven* (Hildesheim 2007) 249–78.
- H. Lohmann and H. Schaefer, 'Wo lag das Herakleion der Salaminioi ἐπι πορθμῶ?' *ZPE* 133 (2000) 91–102.
- D. Marcotte, 'Le périple dit de Scylax: esquisse d'un commentaire épigraphique et archéologique' *BollClass* 7 (1986) 166–82.
- J. McCredie, *Fortified Military Camps in Attica* (= *Hesperia Supplements* 11, Princeton NJ 1966).
- A. Mersch, *Studien zur Siedlungsgeschichte Attikas von 950 bis 400 v.Chr.* (= *Europäische Hochschulschriften, Reihe 38: Archäologie* 58, Frankfurt am Main 1996).
- E. Meyer, 'Prasiai' *RE*, xxii. 2 (1954) 1695–6.
- A. Milchhöfer, *Karten von Attika, erläuternder Text, vii–viii: Nebst sieben Karten in Folio (Tatoi, Phyle, Megalo Vuno, Eleusis, Salamis)* (Berlin 1895).
- A. Milchhöfer with J. Jessen, *Karten von Attika, erläuternder Text, ix: Ergänzungsheft, nebst Gesamtkarte von Attika (12 Blätter 1 : 100 000)* (Berlin 1900).
- C. Müller, *Geographi Graeci minores*, I (Paris 1855).
- M.H. Munn, *The Defense of Attica: The Dema Wall and the Boiotian War of 378–375 BC* (Berkeley–Los Angeles–Oxford 1993).
- J. Ober, *Fortress Attica: Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier 404–322 BC* (Leiden 1985).
- J. Ober, *Democracy and Knowledge: Innovation and Learning in Classical Athens* (Princeton 2008).
- G.J. Oliver, *War, Food and Politics of Early Hellenistic Athens* (Oxford 2007).
- R. Osborne, *Demos: The Discovery of Classical Attika* (Cambridge, London, etc. 1985).
- R. Parker, *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford 1996).
- A. Peretti, 'Eforo e Pseudo-Scilace' *SCO* 10 (1961) 5–43.
- A. Peretti, 'Teopompo e Pseudo-Scilace' *SCO* 12 (1963) 16–80.

A. Peretti, *Il periplo di Scilace: studio sul primo portolano del Mediterraneo* (= *Biblioteca di studi antichi*, 23, Pisa 1979).

M. Petropoulakou and E. Pentazos, *Ἀττικὴ: οἰκιστικὰ στοιχεῖα. Πρώτη ἔκθεση* (= *Ἀρχαῖες ἑλληνικὲς πόλεις—Ancient Greek Cities* 21, Athens 1973).

M. Salliora-Oikonomakou, *Ο αρχαῖος δήμος του Σουνίου: ιστορική και τοπογραφική επισκόπηση* (Κοροπι 2004).

W. Scheidel, 'Finances, figures and fiction' *CQ* 90 (n.s. 46). 1 (1996) 222–38.

D.G.J. Shipley, 'A new presentation of selected Greek geographers' *Syll. class.* 18 (2007) 241–57.

D.G.J. Shipley, 'Pseudo-Skylax on the Peloponnese', in C. Gallou, M. Georgiadis, G.M. Musket (edd.), *Dioskouroi: Studies presented to W. G. Cavanagh and C. B. Mee on the Anniversary of their 30-year Joint Contribution to Aegean Archaeology* (Oxford 2008) 281–91.

D.G.J. Shipley, *Circumnavigation of the Inhabited World: The Periplus attributed to Skylax of Karyanda* (Exeter forthcoming-a).

D.G.J. Shipley, '[Skylax], Περίπλους τῆς θαλάσσης τῆς οἰκουμένης Ἑυρώπης καὶ Ἀσίας καὶ Λιβύης', in H.-J. Gehrke and others (edd.), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, v A: Beschreibende Geographie* (forthcoming-b).

R.J.A. Talbert (ed.), *Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World* (Princeton–Oxford 2000).

J.S. Traill, 'Map 59 Attica', in R.J.A. Talbert (ed.), *Map-by-map Directory: To accompany Barrington Atlas of the Greek and Roman World*, ii (Princeton–Oxford 2000) 904–18.

I. Vossius, *Periplus Scylacis Caryandensis: cum tralatione, & castigationibus Isaaci Vossii. Accedit anonymi Periplus Ponti Euxini è bibliotheca Claudii Salsmii, cum ejusdem Is. Vossii versione, ac notis* (Amsterdam 1639).

E.H. Warmington, *Greek Geography* (= *The Library of Greek Thought*, London, Toronto, New York 1934).

L.V. Watrous, 'An Attic farm near Laurion', *Studies in Attic Epigraphy, History and Topography presented to Eugene Vanderpool* (Princeton, NJ 1982) 193–8, pl. 24.

D. Whitehead, *The Demes of Attica 508/7–ca. 250 BC: A Political and Social Study* (Princeton 1986).

J.H. Young, 'Studies in south Attica: the Salaminioi at Porthmos' *Hesp.* 10. 2 (1941) 163–91.