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Preface

The Greek-Danish field project around the small village of Kato Vassiliki began during the summer of 1995 and was continued in 1996 and 1997. The present preliminary report presents some of the main results from the survey campaign 1995 and the first excavations carried out in 1996.

In Antiquity the area was named Chalkis, a town in the coastland of Aetolia by the gulf of Corinth. The term Aiolis was used by Thucydides for the coastland (or for parts of it) which was not, strictly speaking, included in Aetolia until the end of the Achaian occupation in 366 B.C. and the succeeding creation of the Aetolian league. Geographically this landscape extends roughly from the Acheloos river and south of Mt. Arakynthos to the sea. Some scholars suggest that settlements in this region were of polis-type in contrast to the usual type of “barbarian” Aetolian societies thought to be of the old fashioned ethnos type. Chalkis itself is supposed to be a link in the chain of Corinthian strongholds (“apoikiai”) along the north-western Greek coast, probably already established before 800 B.C. During the earlier years of the Peloponnesian war the town fell to the Athenians. Homer evidently meant the coastland when he used the term Aetolia.

Whatever the precise meaning of the terminology Aiolis, the coastal zone towards the gulf of Corinth (or Patraikos Kolpos as it is called today) is a specific geographical unit with a proper historical development compared to the landscape of present-day Aetolia. The choice of Chalkis as our joint topic of research was dictated by a wish to contribute to the study of the coastal zone in Antiquity and not least to a better
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Fig. 1. The area around the modern village of Kato Vassiliki. The site of Haghia Triada is seen in the front. Panagali in the background. (Photo Henrik Frost 1996).
understanding of the periods preceding the establishment of the powerful Aetolian league. What was the character of the Bronze Age societies? What was its Mycenaean society like (Chalkis was one of the five Aetolian towns contributing ships to the Trojan War)? What was its development to the Iron Age? How did a harbour town function along the sea route to Southern Italy at the time of colonization? What were societies like in Archaic and Classical times? What was the economic basis for life, what were the religious institutions like and what were the relations with the remaining part of the Greek world? A preliminary examination of the surface sherds before the project started indicated that the site of Haghia Triadha might be able to contribute at least some answers to such questions.

There is general agreement that the ancient town of Chalkis was situated near the sea, in the valley defined by mount Varassova (915 m.) to the West and Mt. Chloková (1039 m.) to the East. The territory of the city-state probably extends inland to the river Euvinos where it borders the territory of Kalydon. As for the more precise localization of the ancient town opinions, however, differ between the mound of Haghia Triadha, east of Kato Vassiliki and the site of Kastro/Pangali (from now on referred to as Pangali) at a plateau on the east slopes of Varassova (Fig. 2), with the majority of scholars preferring the latter. In a report from 1916, Konstantinos Rhomaios briefly mentions that the site of Chalkis could well be identified with the mound of Haghia Triadha. The results of the present project seem to indicate that Rhomaios was right. But still more data are needed for the final conclusion.

Previous field work in the area was carried out by Noack who measured and published plans and sketches of Pangali and A. Paliouras who excavated and restored the three-aisled basilica Haghia Triadha erected on bedrock on the very top of the Acropolis plateau of the mound. The work of Professor Paliouras on the church is clearly visible today. On the west side of the river Euvinos and Mt. Varassova – in ancient times called Mt. Chalkis – the large and important site of Kalydon was situated. The temple area, the Laphrion and the Heroon, the so-called Leonteion, were excavated by Konstantinos Rhomaios and Frederik Poulsen during three campaigns in 1926, 1928 and 1932 and extensively published. Kalydon constitutes our most important site of reference, but it should be emphasized that the town itself has not been studied, except for a trial excavation of Sotiriadis who reported the existence of Mycenaean walls and Mycenaean and Geometric sherds. For comparative reasons an excavation of the Kalydon Acropolis should have a high priority. As a curiosity it should be mentioned that even Poulsen and Rhomaios considered the possibility of an excavation “... in der Nähe von Vassiliki ..., wo die alte aitolische Stadt Chalkis gelegen hat, ...”. Finally the town of Makynia, the western neighbour of Chalkis has been measured and studied in recent years.

The campaign of 1995 lasted from July 3 to July 28. The primary aims were: 1) to accomplish intensive surveys on both sites 2) to carry out wall cleaning at the site of Haghia Triadha and 3) to measure and draw plans of architectural remains visible on the surface (Figs. 6 and 8). During the first campaign a grid of 10 x 10 m. square and 20 x 10 m. in Pangali was laid out (below Fig. 6).

The aim during the summer campaign of 1996, from June 24 to July 26, was to carry out excavations of strategical points at Haghia Triadha in order to get an impression of the stratigraphical situation and a better idea of the architecture preserved (below pp. 282-284). In addition a geological survey was initiated aimed at a general description of the geology in the valley, with special reference to the study of changing shore lines from Antiquity up to the present day.

At Pangali intensive surface collecting on a
Final Neolithic site near the south enceinte of the Pangali was carried out in 1995, and in 1996 (see below p. 255-257, 280-281) a trial trench $2 \times 2$ m. square was excavated on a higher terrace.

The participants in the two campaigns were the following:

1995:
Project leaders: Lazaros Kolonas and Søren Dietz
Field directors: Sanne Houby-Nielsen and Ioannis Moschos
Archaeologists: Michalis Cazis, Efy Saranti and Olga Christakopoulou
Surveying: Charalambos Marinopoulos, Poul-Erik Skougaard and Christos Kolonas
Pottery registration: Jonas Eiring
Conservation: Leonidas Pavlatos
Students: Annette Gabrielsen, Grith Thorgaard, Jesper Jensen, Trine Eltang, Heidi von Wettstein, Signe Gindrup, Theofanis Mavridis
Technicians: Spiros Pittas, Dimitris Evangeliou, Eugenios Tsamis, Avgerinos Anastasopoulos

1996:
Project leaders: Lazaros Kolonas and Søren Dietz
Field Directors: Sanne Houby-Nielsen and Ioannis Moschos
Archaeologists: Michalis Cazis

Fig. 2. Geodetic map of the area around the modern village of Kato Vassiliki (Geod. Inst. Athens).
Surveying: Charalambos Marinopoulos, Christos Kolonas
Pottery registration: Jonas Eiring
Geology: Kaj Strand Petersen
Photography: Hans Henrik Frost
Conservation: Leonidas Pavlatos
Technicians: Spiros Pittas, Dimitris Evangeliou, Eugenios Tsamis, Avgerinos Anastasopoulos, Apostolis Zarkadoulas.
Chalkis in Aetolia in Ancient Written Sources and Early Modern Travel Accounts. A Survey

by Sanne Houby-Nielsen

Introduction

Chalkis in Aetolia is only occasionally mentioned in ancient written sources. A brief survey of those few which do mention Chalkis in Aetolia gives the following impression: in the Homeric epics Chalkis was a settlement located by the sea. In the fifth century it is called a “polis” by Thucydides who also implies that it possessed a harbour, was situated opposite Patras near the river Euvenos and was of enough importance for the Corinthians and later for the Athenians to wish to control it. Its harbour was still functioning at the time of the “Social war” at the end of the third century B.C. as described by Polybius, who calls it Chalkeia. By the first century A.D. Chalkis appears to have passed into oblivion. Strabo at least displays some confusion as to Chalkis’ location and places it both east and west of Pleuron, though always near the river Euvenos and between Kalydon and Makynia. He also mentions that the town Chalkis was named after its mountain and sometimes bore the name Hypochalkis. In the second century A.D. Ptolemy by contrast calls Chalkis an inland town causing later lexiographers to enter into long discussions as to its correct location. Finally Statius seems only to use Chalkis as a poetical device.

The present paper is a preliminary account of Chalkis’ role in ancient written sources and its rediscovery in post-antiquity.

Homer and Mythology

Homer mentions five Aetolian cities which contributed no fewer than forty ships to the expedition against Troy: Pleuron, Olenos, Pylene, Chalkis, and Kalydon. He does not give us any hint as to their topographical relationship, but on grounds of later authors, Pleuron, Olenos and Pylene have been identified with existing ruins in the western part of Aetolia while Kalydon and Chalkis were identified with ruins in the eastern part. This Aetolia appears to have represented something like a limit to the “civilized” heroic world. At least, disgusting types such as king Echetos were placed in the areas beyond it towards the northwest.

This is the only time Aetolian Chalkis is mentioned by Homer. Here Chalkis is called “agchialon” which means something like “hard by the sea”, while Kalydon is called “petreessan” meaning “rocky”. In most of the Iliad and the Odyssey, Aetolia is equivalent of just Kalydon and Pleuron, or Kalydon alone. Thus Kalydon is the location for the popular story of the Kaly-
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A donian boar hunt, and Pleuron the site of the fight between Aetolians from Kalydon and the obscure tribe called the Kouretes based in Pleuron. With the exception of the Aetolians Thoas and Periphas, whose home city is not indicated, all Aetolians mentioned by Homer stem from the dynasties of Pleuron and Kalydon.

The glory of Kalydon is alluded to especially through the hero Diomedes, grandson of the king of Kalydon, Oineus, and son of Tydeus who settled in Argos, and nephew of Tydeus, the slayer of the Kalydonian boar. Diomedes ranks among the uttermost important heroes in the Iliad, so important that book 5 and part of book 6 is devoted solely to the description of his deeds in the battlefield (as book 11 and book 20 describe those of the great heroes Agamemnon and Achilles). Diomedes, it is true, is normally presented as the son of Argive Tydeus and not grandson of Aetolian Oineus. Nevertheless, there are a few episodes which show that Diomedes' Aetolian background was well-known to the Homeric audience and carried much significance. First of all, Diomedes' father, Tydeus, is once called "aitolios". Secondly, when Diomedes wins the horserace in honour of Patroklos, he is referred to as "an Aetolian by birth, but lord of the Argives, the son of horse-taming Tydeus". Perhaps Diomedes' success with horses goes back not only to his father but also to his grandfather, Oineus, who in one place is called the "horseman".

A third episode takes place when Diomedes seeks to persuade Agamemnon and Odysseus not to give up fighting. Obviously Diomedes feels that he has to compensate for his youth with some powerful argument in order to appear persuasive. To do so, he proudly and at length reminds his comrades of his great Aetolian ancestry, the kings of Kalydon and Pleuron. Finally, Diomedes' wounding of the god Ares is clearly provoked by the god's violation of Diomedes' Aetolian blood-ties. Thus, Diomedes attacks Ares, because the god is attempting to kill Periphas the "best of the Aetolian men" and because Athena arouses his sense of honour regarding his Aetolian roots by mocking him for not living up to Tydeus' and Oineus' reputation. A very similar, though late story tells how Diomedes avenge his insult which Achilles had committed against an Aetolian bloodrelative of his. The story is thought to go back to the Aithiopis, and thus to be pre-homeric.

Kalydon also plays another important role in the Iliad, for Achilles' wrath, his refusal to fight at Troy, and the delegations with gifts to persuade him to fight are paralleled with Meleagros' behaviour at Kalydon when Kalydon was at war with Pleuron. In fact Homer is so eager to show this parallelism that he seems to distort existing versions of the war between Kalydon and Pleuron to make it match the situation at Troy.

Other myths relating to Aetolia also centre on Kalydon. Herakles' wife Deianeira was the daughter of the king of Kalydon, Oineus (in other versions, of the king of Aetolian Olenos), and the centaur Nessos' attempt to rape Deianeira took place at the river Euvenos, which runs along the eastern side of the Kalydonian ridge coming from north-east. Even the girl Kallirhoe, who committed suicide out of pity for her admirer, and thereby gave her name to a spring at the Varassova, came from Kalydon.

As seen from this survey, Aetolia is an important area in the oral tradition and mythology of Early Archaic Greece, but it is Kalydon and Pleuron which are the mainstays of this Aetolia, not Chalkis. Chalkis' anonymity in ancient mythology was to diminish the interest in Chalkis of later ancient writers and especially of early modern travellers and even scholars.

Written sources

In his description of Athens' wars with Corinth, Thucydides relates how the Athenians succeeded in taking Boeotia and Phocis, made the Aiginetans surrender, and how a Athenian commander...
round the Peloponnesus, burned the dock-
yard of the Lacedaemonians, took Chalcis, a
city of the Corinthians, and making a
descent upon the territory of the Sicypo-
nians defeated them in battle".34

The event can be placed in the year 455
B.C. Writing about a later development in
the same war, Thucydides describes how
the Peloponnesians intending to march into Akarnania blocked the bay of Patras
with their fleet, since

"...they observed that the Athenians were
bearing down upon them from Chalcis and
the river Evenus..."35

These passages certainly indicate, that the
Chalkis Thucydides refers to was strategi-
cally speaking an important harbour town
which at one point was taken (or
founded?) by the Corinthians. Moreover
we may infer that Chalkis was situated
somewhere near the Euvenos river. This
information about Chalkis, however
sparse, is especially significant, since Thu-
cydides, who served as a general in the
Peloponnesian war, together with Poly-
bius, represent the only writers who are
likely to have actually seen Chalkis and the
Aetolian coast.

The Greek historian Polybius was born
around 200 B.C. in Megalopolis to a rich
and influential family, and till his thirtieth
year was involved in political and military
service, before politics took him to Rome,
Spain, Gaul and Africa. Polybius was there-
fore a warm defender of the Achaean
League and anti-Aetolian to a degree that
distorted his account of Aetolian affairs.36
However, this anti-Aetolian attitude hardly
affected his geographical view of the Co-
rinthian gulf which he cannot but have
known intimately.37 In his description of
Aetolian raids in Achaea, Polybius de-
scribes how

"...the Achaean naval commander made a
landing at Molycria and came back with
nearly a hundred captured slaves. Starting
again he sailed to Chalceia, and on the en-
emy coming to the assistance of that town
he captured two warships with their crews
and afterwards took with its crew an Aeto-
lian galley near Rhium".38

Chalkeia is no doubt equivalent of Chal-
cis. It can be deduced from Polybius' de-
scription that it was situated on the Aeto-
lian coast near Molykreion and Rhion.
Apart from confirming our impression
from Thucydides of Chalkis as a harbour
town, this passage indicates that Chalkis
was still an important town at the time of
Polybius, and his mention of Rhion
(which is securely identified) in connection
with Chalkis indicates that the latter is sit-
uated in the area east of the Euvenos river.

The geographical works of Artemidoros
are not preserved, but from other sources
he is known to have studied and written
them in Alexandria and to have had his
floruit around 104-101 B.C. His works
were especially devoted to the countries
bordering on the Mediterranean and Eux-
ine seas, and he seems to have travelled ex-
tensively in these parts.39 With regard to
Chalkis, Strabo mentions that he placed
the Chalkis mountain between the Ache-
loos river and Pleuron. Doing so Artemi-
dorus - again according to Strabo - con-
tradicted Apollodorus who placed Kalydon
between Pleuron and Chalkis.

The Greek historian Diodorus Siculus
from Sicily wrote most of his work on
Greek history in Rome at Augustus' time.
He is not least known for his accounts of
Delphic oracles on colonial settlements
and city-founding, since some of these
have been thought to render the original
oracles closely.40 One such account quotes
the oracle given to Myskellos from Rhype
in Achaea:

"The far darter himself points out to you;
do you understand him! Here is Taphias-
sos, the unploughed, on your path, and
there Chalkis; then the sacred land of the
Kouretes and then the Echinades. Great is
the ocean to the left. But even so I would
not expect you to miss the Lakinian cape,
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The landmarks of the first part of this sailing route are all situated in the bay of Patras and fully visible from the Achaean coast. By referring to Chalkis, Diodorus (or his source) is probably more likely to have in mind the mountain Chalkis than the city Chalkis. The “twin mountains” Chalkis and Taphiassos are commonly mentioned together by Greek and Roman geographers (Apollodorus, Strabo, Pliny) and often referred to as important landmarks in later sailing routes – which indeed they are – as I will come back to (compare Fig. 4). The “land of the Kouretes” then is the marshy and fertile fields which extend down from the site of ancient Pleuron and surround modern Mesolonghi. Again, Pleuron is commonly designated in mythical terms as land of the Kouretes by Hellenistic and Roman writers, as will be apparent below. In this way, the description of the sailing route in the bay of Patras refers to the most conspicuous geographical landmarks on the Aetolian and Akarnanian coast and it places Mt. Chalkis west of Mt. Taphiassos and east of Pleuron.

The description of the Aetolian coastal cities by Strabo (68 or 54 B.C. to 21 A.D.) represents the most extensive ancient written source for this area. However, it is generally recognized that Strabo’s seventeen books on Geography have to be read very critically, and that his geographical description of Greece is deplorably insecure (books 8-10). Firstly, being born in Pontus, Strabo had no first hand knowledge of Greece, and as far as can be reconstructed, his travels in Greece were limited to Rhodes, perhaps Kos and Samos, Corinth and perhaps Athens. His most extensive travels were in his own country, the neighbouring states Cilicia and Cappadocia, Asia Minor and Egypt. Thus, his books on Greece are mostly based on the works of other historians, especially Posidonius and on the above mentioned writers Artemidorus and Apollodorus, as well as on other people’s travel-stories. Secondly, Strabo as a true stoic was very much guided by his admiration for the Homeric epics which he conceived as an allegorical source of geographic information and thus an ideal work for all geographers. Even though Strabo was perhaps more selective and critical in his choice of Homeric quotations than hitherto thought, the fact remains that he followed Homer closely in his description of Greece, and not least Aetolia.

Strabo first mentions Chalkis in book 9. He has treated the cities held by the western Lokrians, Amphissa and Naupactus. Naupactus, he says, is near Antirrhion, and still survives and he tells us that it had been adjudged to the Aetolians by Philip. Immediately after, Strabo states: “Here [near Antirrhion], also, is Chalcis, which the poet mentions in the Aetolian Catalogue; it is below Calydon. Here, also, is the hill Taphiassus, on which are the tombs of Nessus and the other Centaurs, from whose putrefied bodies, they say, flows forth at the base of the hill the water which is malodorous and clotted; and it is on this account, they add, that the tribe is also called Ozolian. Molycreia, an Aetolian town, is also near Antirrhium.”

In book 10, Strabo begins with a description of Euboea and briefly mentions that apart from Chalkis in Euboea, there is also a Chalkis in Aetolia and in Elis. After Euboea he treats as promised earlier on, Akarnania and Aetolia, the remaining parts of Europe as he calls these areas. He starts out with a list of Akarnanian cities, then moves on to the Aetolian cities and mountains. In this survey, Strabo is clearly following Homer, since he states that the Aetolian towns are Kalydon and Pleuron and only mentions the inland (later) cities Trichonion and Stratos in order to explain to his readers the extent of Old Aetolia. Likewise he only mentions Naupaktos and Eu-palion to show the contrast of Old Aetolia in comparison with the wider extent of Aetolia Epictetus.
the mountain Arakynthos the inhabitants of Old Pleuron founded New Pleuron, and he gives us the location of the former as "near Kalydon". His next interest is to explain the location of Mt. Taphiassos (no doubt due to its connection with the myth of Nessos) and Mt. Chalkis (no doubt due to its connection with Homeric Chalkis). He says as follows:

"...above Molycreia are Taphiassos and Chalcis, rather high mountains, on which are situated the small cities Macynia and Chalcis, the latter bearing the same name as the mountain, though it is also called Hypochalcis. Near Old Pleuron is the mountain Curium, after which, as some have supposed, the Pleuronian Curetes were named.

The Euvenos River ...flows at first, not through the Curetan country, which is the same as the Pleuonian, but through the more easterly country, past Chalcis and Kalydon; and then, bending back towards the plains of Old Pleuron and changing its course to the west."51

And we are reminded that this is the river which forms the scene of the Nessos, Hercules and Deianeira story.

In short, Strabo does not give us a description of Aetolian cities as they appeared in his own day, since he is mainly interested in locating those mentioned by Homer. Nevertheless, in the above quoted passages he seems to use Antirrhion as centre for his description which means that his "above" and "below" means respectively "to the west of" and to the "east of". This gives us the following succession of cities and mountains which fits well with the information gained from earlier sources: (from west towards east) Old and New Pleuron, Kalydon, Chalkis (mountain and city), Mt. Taphiassos, Makynia, Molykreion and Antirrhion. However, Strabo's insecurity as to the geography of Greece and his dependence on earlier writers becomes clearly visible in a later list of cities and mountains according to which Pleuron and Halkyrra were situated east of the Euvenos river.52

With regard to Apollodorus' placing of Chalkis near the Acheloos river alluded to above, Strabo decides to reconcile both traditions by imagining two Chalkis mountains.53

It is not known whether Pliny the Elder (born 23 A.D.) has ever been to Greece. Only a small part of his Naturalis Historia, dedicated to the future emperor Titus, deals with the geography of Greece, and it is generally of a very summary nature.54 Apart from the sources Pliny himself mentions which are Theopompos, Isidorus, and Homer, he may have used Pomponius Mela and have had access to official lists of privileged cities made under Marcus Agrippa and Augustus.55 In his very short description of Aetolia, we among other things hear that

"The towns of Aetolia are Calydon on the river Evzenus seven miles and a half from the sea, and then Macynia and Molycria, behind which are Mount Chalcis and Taphiassus. On the coast is the Promontory of Antirrhium, at which is the mouth of the Gulf of Corinth."56

This description falls very nicely in line with the information about Chalkis given by Thucydides, Polybius, Diodorus and Strabo and may indeed reflect a common source-dependency. It is certainly very strange, that Pliny in a list of Aetolian cities, mentions only the mountain Chalkis and not the city. Likewise very strange is his source, Pomponius Mela, writing only a short time before Pliny, who lists only Naupaktos and Kalydon as Aetolian cities. Perhaps these selective descriptions, whatever their more or less sophisticated motivation,57 also testify to the poor knowledge which Roman historians and officials possessed of a ruinous Greek landscape, where all the important political and religious institutions, and possibly a greater part of the resident population, had been transferred to Nicopolis and Patras.58

Before leaving Pliny, it should not be overlooked that according to Pliny one of the Echinades islands was named Chalkis:
“...off Aetolia are the Echinades, Aegialia, Cotonis, Thyatira, Geoarais, Dionysia, Cynrus, Chalcis, Pinara, Nystus.”  

The Echinades are situated at the mouth of the Acheloos river, which forms the border between Aetolia and Akarnania. They became a subject of intense interest, both in antiquity and in modern times. This was due to two circumstances. Firstly, the islands were very important in the Homeric epics, especially Doullichion. Meges led forty ships to Troy from Doullichion and the sacred islands Echinades, and Doullichion along with Zakynthos, Same and Ithaka were subject to Odysseus, and the majority of Penelope's suitors came from Doullichion. Secondly, the islands represented a very interesting geological phenomenon. Due to the silting-up of the Acheloos river, the islands gradually became mainland. Strabo tells us that this "new" land was called Paracheloitis, and was the subject of much dispute between the Akarnanians and the Aetolians, a dispute which lies at the bottom of the myth of how Heracles overcame the Acheloos river, and thus made the Paracheloitis completely dry and as a price got married to the Kalydonian princess Deianeira. In view of these obvious Aetolian interests in the "new" land, it is therefore not without significance that one of the Echinades islands was called Chalkis.

P. Papinius Statius who died about 96 A.D. wrote his long poem about the war of the Seven against Thebes in Flavian Rome apparently in the hope of replacing the Aeneid as Rome's favourite poem. The first four books describe the preparations of the war against Thebes. Tydeus, son of Oineus in Kalydon, but settled in Argos, was one of the seven heroes who volunteered to support the Argive military expedition against Thebes. In Statius' poem he is supported by the cities of his fatherland. In close imitation of Homer's catalogue of ships, Statius thus lists those Aetolian cities which followed Tydeus. The cities are Pleuron, Kalydon, Pylene, Olenos and:

"...Chalkis, welcome port Among the Ionian waves, and that proud river whose head was shamed by wrestling Hercules."  

From this passage, we learn that Statius thought of Chalkis as a harbour, and located it at the mouth of the Acheloos river, since the mention of Hercules is a clear allusion to the myth of how Herakles wrestled with the river god Acheloos. No doubt Statius is influenced by Artemidorus who was seen earlier on to have located mount Chalkis near Acheloos. The term "harbour" is rather influenced by Homer's adjective of Chalkis, "hard by the sea".

As a poet Statius had certainly no intentions of writing accurate geography, and thus his mention of Chalkis is not of much use to us. On the other hand, it does support the general impression we had from Strabo, that Romans of the first century A.D. had no clear idea of the city's location.

Dionysius Periergetes probably wrote his geographic work, "Periigisis tis oikoumenis", consisting of 1186 hexameter verses sometime around 124 A.D. in Alexandria. Like Strabo his source of inspiration came especially from Poseidonius, Kallimachos and Apollonios and his favorite geography-book was Homer's works. Reaching northwestern Greece we hear of Ithaka and other islands

"...which the river Acheloos issuing from Chalkis embraces with its silvery swirls."  

Here we explicitly meet the concept that Chalkis was a mountain near the Acheloos, indeed the very one from which Acheloos springs. Again it is likely that Dionysios was influenced by Artemidorus' work.

We know little of the influential Roman geographer Ptolemy's life, except that he probably lived at the time of Marcus Aurelius (161–180 A.D.) and that he had studied in Alexandria. Strangely enough, in his books on geography, Chalkis figures in a list of inland cities in Aetolia, that is together with Arax thos, Pleuron, Olenos, and Kalydon.
If we are to believe Alexandrian scholia on Apollonius Rhodius, the famous Ortygia cult in Ephesos and on Delos, and on an island close to Sicily originated from the Aetolian "titanic" Ortygia cult. In fact scholia on Homer's Iliad locate this cult in Chalkis.

In summary, since Homer incorporated Chalkis in his list of Aetolian cities and placed it close to the sea, there seem to have existed three main traditions in antiquity as to what Aetolian Chalkis was and where it was located. According to the oldest tradition (Thucydides, Polybius, Strabo (his first list), Pliny, Diodorus), Chalkis was a city and a mountain situated near the Euvenus river. Combining the information given by these authors, we obtain the following list of cities and mountains moving from east towards west: Molypeiron, Makynia, Mt. Taphiassos, Chalkis (city with harbour and mountain), Kalydon and Pleuron. This tradition is likely to be trustworthy, since at least two of the writers may have actually seen Chalkis (Thucydides and Polybius).

The second tradition originates in the second century A.D. According to this, Chalkis was situated near the mouth of the Acheloos river. It was either a mountain (Strabo following Artemidorus, Dionysios Periergetes) or an island (Pliny) or a harbour (Statius).

The third and latest tradition makes Chalkis an Aetolian inland city (Ptolemy). Perhaps the first and second tradition need not contradict each other too much. If Pliny is right in listing an island at the mouth of the Acheloos river by the name Chalkis, we may presume that this island at one time became mainland as was the fate of other of the Echinades islands, and formed a mountain. At least, it is interesting that one such island which has turned into mainland is called Chalkitsa today.

The next section surveys how the written traditions regarding Chalkis were received by Byzantine writers and early modern travellers and scholars in ancient history and archaeology.

Byzantine lexicographers and early modern travellers and scholars

The existence of an earlier, ancient settlement on the Hagia Triada hill was well-known to the builders of the Early Byzantine basilica and fortification wall encircling the upper part of the hill. For in order to build the basilica, the builders had cleared the top of the hill of ancient settlement remains and when building the fortification wall they narrowly followed and partly reused a Classical fortification wall. Perhaps the bishop of the basilica even knew that he occupied the ancient site of Aetolian Chalkis. At least Chalkis’ existence was known to the Greek grammarian Stephanus Byzantinus who lived in the sixth century. Stephanus was the author of a lexikon, Ethnika, originally comprising more than fifty volumes which he had dedicated to Justinian I. His main interest was to trace the origin of place names of the oikoumene. Stephanus’ geographic orientation is accordingly not very accurate as is evident in his treatment of Chalkis. Under the heading “Chalkis” he lists the various Chalkis he knows of starting with Chalkis in Euboea, followed by Chalkis “a Corinthian city” and Aetolian Chalkis. Apart from separating between a “Corinthian” and an “Aetolian” Chalkis, he confuses Chalkis in Euboea with Aetolian Chalkis, since he says that the former was “also called Hypochalkis”. Due to the same mistake, he places the Aetolian city Halikyrna, likewise mentioned by Strabo, on Euboea. Regarding Aetolian Chalkis, Stephanus relies on Dionysius Periergetes and tells us that the river Acheloos issues from Chalkis and embraces other islands.

Much later, in the twelfth century, Eustathius, bishop of Thessaloniki, made a commentary on Dionysius Periergetes’ book on geography. Here Eustathius explains to us that the Chalkis, from which Dionysios says the Acheloos springs with its silvery swirls, is a mountain. An anonymous commentator, however, says that the Acheloos which embraces the Echinades islands issues from the Aetolian city note 69 Schol. Ap. Rhod. I. 419; see also Antonetti 1990, 66, 196, 263, 283, 302.
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Chalkis. Nikephoros Blemmidos is more vague, stating in his description of the Echinades (in a chapter on islands) that Acheloos issues from the earth of Chalkis.

From the thirteenth century we suddenly come across a direct source for the state of the episkepsis Baresobés (Varassova), but unfortunately it tells us nothing about ancient Chalkis. It is the metropolitan Ioannis Apokaukos who in 1218/1219 writes that the harvest of the episkepsis Baresobés was destroyed by a storm, and soon after he complains about the poor state of the episkepsis.

The two mountains Varassova and Klokova, the ancient Mts Chalkis and Taphiasos according to Diodorus, Strabo and Pliny, completely dominate the view from across the bay of Patras (Fig. 4). In fact these two huge mountains which fall dramatically into the sea form the most conspicuous feature of the Aetolian coast and are visible all the way down to the Frankish castle of Chlemoutsi at Kilini opposite Zakynthos and are clearly visible from Kephallenia. They therefore cannot but have caught the eye of the hundreds of pilgrims who travelled to Jerusalem and passed through the gulf of Patras and Corinth or stopped at Patras on their way southwards round the Peloponnese. Since trade in the Mediterranean became controlled by Italian market towns in the ninth to tenth centuries these towns established steady pilgrim routes running from especially Venice via first the Dalmatian coast, then via the Ionian islands and then rounding the Peloponnese and onwards to Crete and Cyprus and finally Palestine. Some, however, also travelled along the gulf of Patras and Corinth, and then inland to Constantinople. The pilgrims, however, did not pay much attention to ancient monuments and sites which they passed on their way. In their accounts and letters, they almost never refer to any ancient monuments.

On the other hand, local residents in the vicinity of the Aetolian coast were not completely uninterested in the antiquity of their land. At least the Spanish Jew Benjamin from Tudela, who stopped at Patras on his pilgrimage to Jerusalem in 1160-1173 noted the existence of a story that Patras was founded by Antipater, one of
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Alexander's generals, perhaps an attempt on the part of the Jewish minority living in Patras to legitimize their presence by reference to ancient history. About 250 years later, when Nicola from Martoni, stopped at Patras in 1395, he noted that all four walls of the bishop's palace were decorated with an Ilioupersis. At this time, interest in Greek antiquity, first and foremost manuscripts but also ancient geography, was about to take a real step forwards, especially in Italy, and this certainly also affected Aetolia. Within a few decades, the first foreign traveller known to us, the remarkable merchant Cyriac of Ancona (1391–1455), travelled through Akarnania and Aetolia and here carefully recorded and identified ancient ruins. At this time, Cyriac had already seen the temple of Hadrian in Kyzikos almost intact, and other famous monuments, likewise almost intact, such as the walls of Miletus and the temple in Didyma. The enormous impression which these well-preserved monuments must have made on him did not, however, lessen his interest in the far less famous and more ruinous monuments of Aetolia and Akarnania, nor did the fact that Cyriac’s travel through these parts of Greece was accidental. He was originally headed for Athens via the Corinthian Gulf, but a plague in Corfu had forced him to change travel plans and anchor at Arta, then the seat of the Neapolitan prince Carlo II, and travel over land. Cyriac’s travel through Akarnania and Aetolia can be reconstructed more or less in detail on the basis of letters which he sent to friends, and by sections of his Commentaria preserved in Carlo Moroni’s copies and finally from some entries in Cyriac’s diary (preserved in original). From these sources it follows that on the twelfth of January 1436, Cyriac visited Nicopolis and also thought he had seen Dodona (in reality some place near Arta), on the eighteenth of January he was at Ambracia (in reality Fidokastro). He proceeded southwards reaching Amphilocthrian Argos (in reality Stratos) later in January, then passed Paleio–Mani (Cassiope) reaching Alyzia (Omiadai) on February the seventh. From the latter place a sketch made by him is preserved forming part of the collection of Cyriac-manuscripts compiled by the architect Giuliano di San Gallo around 1500. The drawing shows the harbour of Omiadai and an inscription which even M.W. Leake and later the American excavations there failed to see. From Omiadai Cyriac moved on to ruins at a place called Bozichista, which is probably Pleuron and according to his diary he also reached Kalydon on the eight of February, which he says was called Artos at his time.

Cyriac did not visit Chalkis, but he no doubt knew of its existence from Homer, Ptolemy and Strabo and therefore may well have looked for it. In his note-book, Cyriac has noted in ancient Greek that “Homer mentions Kalydon as an Aetolian city” referring of course to Homer’s list of Aetolian cities which includes Chalkis. Ptolemy’s Geographica must also have been known to Cyriac. It had been translated already in 1410 in Florence and probably served as a stimulus for the travels in Greece made by the Florentine priest Christopher Buondelmonti in 1410–1420. Regarding Strabo, Cyriac is known to have admired Strabo greatly, and to have had a personal copy made in Constantinople in 1447. His travel experiences in Egypt were clearly influenced by Strabo’s accounts and adventures. It was most likely also Strabo who “guided” Cyriac through Akarnania and Aetolia, since the cities he thought he saw correspond to those mentioned by Strabo. If this is so, it cannot surprise us that Cyriac especially was on the look out for Kalydon and Pleuron on the Aetolian coast. As mentioned earlier on, these two cities were the only ones mentioned by Strabo in his actual list of Aetolian cities.

Ptolemy’s book on the Geography of Greece became highly admired in the Renaissance. It is especially this work which served as a basis for the earliest maps of Greece with ancient place names, and an early edition made in Bologna in 1477 carried a map of the Mediterranean.
Fig. 5. Detail from a map of Greece made by Nicolas So-phiauos in 1544 and published by Abraham Ortclius in 1580 in Antwerp. It shows Chalkis as an inland city, probably due to Ptolemy’s book on Greece. (From Koster 1995, cat. IV, pi. F).

With regard to Chalkis, it is interesting to see that on Renaissance maps Chalkis is shown as an inland city, hereby following Ptolemy’s description (Fig. 5). After Cyriac had travelled through Akarnania and Aetolia, he crossed back and forth over the Gulf of Patras and Corinth stopping at Patras, Lepanto (Naupaktos), Aegion and then Xerxes. From here his journey took him to Delphi, Thebes, Chalkis and Eretria in Euboea and finally Athens. This route is known as the "Path of the Gods."
ancient cities as stepping stones was to become the standard route and thus resulted in almost “standard” experiences and adventures of European travellers in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.96

The first travellers to follow this route and show some kind of interest in Aetolia were the Frenchman Jacques Spon and the Englishman George Wheler, mostly known for their drawings and descriptions of ancient monuments of Delos and Asia Minor, Delphi and Athens. Both also wrote travel accounts.97 Spon and Wheler reached Patras in December 1675 from where they planned to sail along the Corinthian Gulf to Kirrha and travel overland to Athens. They had read Strabo and Ptolemy, but primarily used Pausanias as their guide and had already been busy identifying ruins along the coast of Elis by using Pausanias. Just before their ship dropped anchor at Patras coming from Zakynthos, Wheler noted that:

“To the other hand [from Achaea], on the Romanian shore, are two very high-peaked Mountains; the first of which is called Gallata, from a Town behind it, bearing that name: which Monsieur Spon thinketh to be the ancient Calydon. Beyond the other Mountain we had the two castles [Rhion and Antirrhion] at the mouth of the Gulph in sight. Of Calydon Pausanias telleth this sad love story...”98

The mountains are of course Mt. Chalkis and Mt. Taphiassos, today called Varassova and Klokova, which were to be commented upon again and again by later travellers.99 As stated by Wheler, Spon identified the Turkish village Galata on the western side of Mt. Varassova with the site of ancient Kalydon. Spon’s argument was the similarity between the names Galata and Kalydon and Galata’s location.100 By location Wheler probably meant location in relation to Strabo whom Wheler and Spon allude to in other connections. Wheler, on the other hand, was more inclined to identify Kalydon with ruins which we know today are identical to Pleuron, saying “But whether Gallata, or ruins of another town, not far from thence towards Messalongia, which Sr Clement Hardy [consul of Morea, resident in Patras] told me he saw here, be ancient Calydon, I cannot determine, unless I had seen them both.”

For Wheler and Spon the Mts Varassova and Klokova formed a dramatic view, but were otherwise only of interest because they offered the opportunity to locate Kalydon. The reason was the sad story of the girl Kallirhoe from Kalydon and her tragic suicide told by Pausanias. Both Wheler and Spon repeat the story in their travel accounts and in their words the story certainly does turn into a veritable Renaissance romance.101 At a later point, when Spon and Wheler are waiting in vain for good winds at the castle of Morea, they actually cross over to the bay of Galata at Kryoneri immediately west of Varassova to wait for an English ship anchored at Messolonghi, and Spon identifies the spring here as Kallirhoe’s spring.102 They must thus have passed right by the bay of Chalkis and the visible fortification walls of Pangali and the Haghia Triadha hill. But their absorption with the tragic story of Kallirhoe has overshadowed any interest in locating mythically speaking anonymous cities such as Chalkis, and the ruins on Pangali and Haghia Triadha pass unnoticed.

Meagre as this attention is to the antiquity of Aetolia and in particular Chalkis, it is at least an indication of some kind of interest. Another 125 years had to pass by before the antiquities of Aetolia, including Chalkis, became solidly planted as part of common European cultural inheritance. Richard Chandler, especially known for his new edition of the Arundel Marbles from 1763, had passed the Aetolian coast in 1766 when travelling home from Asia Minor via Athens, Delphi and Galaxidhi and had even anchored at the mouth of the Acheleos river, but he never went ashore. His account of Aetolia is confined to a repetition of Strabo’s geographical remarks and myths surrounding the Echinate islands and the Acheleos river which
fascinated him greatly.\textsuperscript{103} He also gives us the history of Patras, which he visited, and describes its ancient monuments and, like Wheler and Spon had done, recalls Pausanias' account of the yearly Artemis Laphria cult, transferred to Patras from Kalydon, but he doesn't comment upon the location of Kalydon, nor any other Aetolian city.\textsuperscript{104} Perhaps Chandler's silence is due to the fact that his travel – along with that of his travel comrades Nicholas Revett and William Pars – had been paid for and arranged by the Society of Dilettanti in London. The specific aim of this society was to support the exploration of those ancient buildings which Vitruvius and other ancient writers had praised in order to enhance the contemporary architectural repertoire in England. From this perspective coastal Aetolia would have difficulties in catching the interest of Chandler having no famous buildings commented upon by Vitruvius to offer.\textsuperscript{105}

A turning point in the history of Aetolia, and in particular the rediscovery of Chalkis, is the year 1805. In that year no less than three European scholars more or less independently and with varying success actually inspected ruins in Aetolia and among other things took an interest in the location of ancient Chalkis and in the ruins on the Varassova mountain. Without doubt this new wave of interest in the topography of Aetolia (along with the Ionian islands and even Albania and Akarnania) owed much to a new interest in the Greek landscape especially among painters and poets in England and France who searched for the “picturesque” and “original” Greece, the Greece put in chains by the Turks. It was a feeling for the Greek landscape as being picturesque if rich in ancient ruinous temples and buildings, especially unknown ones, rather than well-preserved and famous ones.\textsuperscript{106} Such a landscape is Aetolia.

Edward Dodwell stayed in Mesolonghi for some days in February 1805 after having seen Zakynthos. Apart from studying the habits, traditions and language of the people living in Mesolonghi he also makes an excursion to a locality called Kyra Eirini (New Pleuron) which he believes to be Oiniai on account of Cyriac's and Strabo's description, and he makes a long and thorough description of the ruins, the first to survive in modern history. When admiring the view from this site, he makes several topographical observations. Among other things, he corrects J. Spon who identified Kalydon with Galata, since Dodwell (correctly) rather assumes the

"...remains of a city and Acropolis, composed of magnificent walls, constructed nearly in a regular manner..."

at the western banks of the Euvenos to be Kalydon. Moreover, Dodwell does not miss the chance to discuss and recall for us the myths surrounding the Echinades and the Acheloos river, nor to discuss the true identity of Doulichrion.

Dodwell would no doubt have liked to enter into the interior of Aetolia since the history of that area

"is imperfectly given by the ancients; seldom visited, and by no means ascertained by the moderns".\textsuperscript{107}

Moreover, he had been assured by

“two observing and learned travellers [Pouqueville and Leake], indeed I believe the only ones who have visited those districts in detail, that its mountainous tract contains the remains of many small walled cities, and the ruins of some theatres, but no traces of any temples”.\textsuperscript{108}

But Dodwell feared very much the robbers hidden in the mountains and on the whole the inhabitants of Aetolia who he believed to have inherited the rawness of the ancient Aetolian peoples. Accordingly, he was accompanied by armed men on his trip to Pleuron, since

"...the roads we had to pass were sometimes infested with robbers; for the Aetolians of the present age are not much be-
ter than those of the time of Polybius, who says that they neither maintained the laws of peace or of war, but robbing both friends and foes, were entirely devoted to plunder. Thucydides does not give a much better character of these warlike robbers, and Livy calls them a restless, vain and ungrateful people." 109

Dodwell leaves Mesolonghi on the fourteenth of February and sails towards Patras

"passing near the mouths of the Euvenos, enjoyed a fine view of Mt Chalkis, rising majestically from the sea. It is said that there are still some remains of the city of Chalkis, or Hypochalkis, at the foot of this mountain." 110

On the twenty-third of February Edward Dodwell left Patras and sailed towards Gallidhi. His boat again passed the Varassova and Klokova, and now Dodwell writes

"Strabo says they [Mt. Chalkis and Mt. Taphiassos] are very high; that which is nearest to Naupaktos is the loftiest, and is Taphiassos...It is evident from the geographer's words, that Chalkis is the mountain which rises from the Euvenos". 111

His boat obviously passed by close enough for his guide to point out to him

"...that a fetid stream rises at the foot of those mountains and enters the gulph." 112

Dodwell leaves it for his readers to connect this evil-smelling stream with the story of Nessos' grave on the Taphiassos and the evil-smelling Lokrians mentioned by Strabo. 113

He then goes on to say:

"I wished to land, and examine the coast between the two mountains, which is very little known; but so strong is the dread of robbers, that I prevail on no one to accompany me. Between the two mountains is seen a tract of pointed and rocky hills, intermixed with plains and glens, well suited to the positions of the forts and cities of ancient times. It is probable there were several in that space, particularly Lykira and Makynia, which might be discovered at the present day, were the inhabitants of a less barbarous description." 114

It is no doubt Strabo's second list of Aetolian cities which Dodwell has in mind when he places Halikyrna between Chalkis and Makynia. 115 Nevertheless, Dodwell's contribution to the discovery of Aetolia is his detailed description of Pleuron, though he mistook it for Oiniadai, and his correct identification of the site of Kalydon and the mountains of Chalkis and Taphiassos.

E. Dodwell had met F.-C.-H.-L. Pouqueville, who served for several years as the French consul-general of Ali Pasha in Arta. For Dodwell, who had never been to Aetolia before, Pouqueville seemed an experienced and learned scholar of antiquities. This, however, is not the impression one gets when reading Pouqueville's travel accounts. Pouqueville wrote twenty books about his travels in Greece, ten of which deal with Akarnania and Aetolia. In the latter books Pouqueville has managed to mislocate almost all ruins he saw in Aetolia and Akarnania, even though his references to ancient authors are sometimes impressively extensive. The plain of Aetolia is no exception.

Pouqueville places Homeric Pleuron at the Euvenos river — perhaps due to the aforementioned list of Aetolian cities by Strabo — and the later Pleuron at Arsinoe and Lysimachia, while he takes the actual ruins of Pleuron (at the kastro Kyra Eirini) to be Homeric Olenos. 116 He dismisses Dodwell's identification of the ruins near Kurtaga as Kalydon, and instead regards these ruins to be Krokylea and later Aagra - gas on reference to Thucydides. When looking in vain for Kalydon at Kryoneri and Galata in the delta west of Varassova, he "succeeds" in identifying the nearby village Hypochori with Homeric Chalkis, perhaps because the village's name is si-
milar to Hypochalkis. Then, upon riding around the Varassova and passing the village Mavromati, he maintains he saw cyclopean masonry here and believes these to be the site of ancient Kalydon. Pouqueville was obviously not satisfied either with J. Spon’s (correct) identification of the spring of Kallirhoe at Kryoneri, for he identifies Kallirhoe with a spring somewhere on the route between Mavromati and the road leading around Klokova.

Pouqueville does however come up with two correct identifications of relevance to Chalkis. For unlike Dodwell he places Makynia west of the Taphiassos mountain (at Mamoulada) and Molykreion at Rhion which is almost correct. One ought also to acknowledge that Pouqueville appears to possess a true interest in the topography of all historical sites, not just in those starring in myths.

Even though Pouqueville did not follow Dodwell in his identification of Kalydon and Chalkis, he still followed the most ancient written tradition which placed Chalkis at the Euvenos river near Kalydon. Not all scholars were happy with this interpretation. In 1828, G. Bernhardy wrote a commentary on Dionysius Periergeta, and in what seems to be a highly passionate defense on Dionysios as a trustworthy geographer he stated that it was no less than insane to locate Chalkis near Kalydon, as did some sources. It had, he said, to lie near the Acheloos river.7

The identification accepted today of the historical cities on the coastal plain of Aetolia goes back to one man. On the thirteenth of July, 1805, at 8.30 in the morning, the British colonel and former artillery officer at Constantinople Martin William Leake stepped out of his hired boat in the bay of Kryoneri, on the western side of the Varassova. He immediately started to inspect the cool springs issuing from mount Varassova which so many had sailed by and commented upon and soon starts his thorough inspection of Aetolian ruins, placing one after another correctly on his map.

Leake had suggested an inversion of two of the sentences in the troublesome passage by Strabo118 in which way the topography of sites indicated in this passage would fit the topographic informations given earlier on and those given by other ancient authors.119 This gave Leake the following sequence of sites between Mesolonghi and Naupaktos: Pleuron, Halikyrna, Chalkis, Makynia and Molykreion.

In his fieldwork, Leake accordingly identifies the ruins at the Kyra Eirini as New Pleuron,120 even locates the site of Homer’s Pleuron close by,121 identifies Halikyrna with Roman baths near Pleuron at a site midways between Mesolonghi and Kurtaga,122 places Kalydon at Kurtaga and locates the sanctuary of the Artemis Laphria,123 confirms the evidence for Varassova as being without doubt Mt. Chalkis and Klokova the Mt. Taphiassos.124 And regarding Chalkis, Makynia and Molykreion he writes

“And as there is no appearance of an ancient site between the river [Euvenos] and Mt Varassova, we may infer that Chalcis or Hypochalcis, the “Chalkis aghialon” of Homer, and the Chalceia of Polybius, stood in the valley between the two mountains, where is now the harbour called Gavrolimni. It would seem also, that the site of Macynia was between Taphias-sus and Molycreia, which at last, as I have already remarked,125 was on the first rise of the hills behind the castle of Rumili. I was informed at Patra, from whence the whole of this coast is well seen, that there are still some remains of a Hellenic fortress, now called Ovrio-kastro, between the mountains, and some vestiges also on the eastern side of Kaki-skala [Klokova] both of them confirming the preceeding conjecture, the former being Chalcis, the latter Makynia”.126

Several other current identifications of ancient ruins in Aetolia also go back to Leake127: Pylene (which Leake placed at the maritime end of the Kleisura ravine),128 Proschion (ruins between Angelo-
kastron and Aitolikon),

Angelokastron (at Konope) later called Arsinoe, Stratos and Oiniadai.

Since the publication of Leake’s topographic work in 1835, an evergrowing stream of enthusiastic travellers looking for “lost Greece” sailed past Varassova and Klokova. However, none of these travellers appears to have noticed the ruins on Pangali or Haghia Triadha nor to have taken an interest in Aetolia (or Akarnania) similar to the way the aforementioned gentlemen, or their predecessor Cyriac, had done. Among the many, many travellers in the nineteenth century who passed the coast of Aetolia and described their travels in books or letters, only few comment upon this landscape. Those who do are often impressed by the magnificence of the Chalkis mountain but do not attach any further comments on its ancient topography. Mostly the trip past Aetolia only provokes a repetition of the stories surrounding the Echinades and the river Acheloos.

This situation cannot only be explained with reference to the much feared Pasha in Ioannina and the klephtes. As with several ancient authors (Strabo, Pausanias) whose interest in ancient Greek sites follows the importance of the sites in myths and history, so travellers wished to visit and experience the “great” historic sites of ancient Greece. In addition, the negative view of the tribes of Aetolia which several ancient authors reveal, and which certainly was seen above to have influenced Dodwell, cannot have stimulated the interest in ancient Aetolia.

Chalkis in early modern scholarly literature and recent handbooks

The existence of the city Chalkis in Aetolia not only escaped the notice of most nineteenth century travellers to Greece, it also took a long time to penetrate into the works of scholars specialized in ancient Greece.

When J. Lemprière published his Classical Dictionary of Proper Names Men-
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located Hypochalkis at the entrance of the valley between Kloko?va and Varassova at the site of the village called Mavromati, but this theory did not stand for long.139 In his pioneering book on Aetolia of 1897, W.J. Woodhouse described the ruins of Pangali in detail and praised the walls as ”the acme of Aetolian military engineering”, far superior to those of Kalydon (a fact which puzzles him since Kalydon is more important in myths). On the basis of this study Woodhouse was in no doubt that these walls represented historical Chalkis and occupied the site of Homeric Chalkis. He thought the city had been called Hypochalkis due to its location below the mountain Chalkis and scolded Becker for having tried to adjust his location of Hypochalkis to Ptolemy’s mention of Chalkis as an inland city.140 F. Noack certainly also appear to have regarded the ruins of Pangali as representing ancient Chalkis and made admirably accurate drawings of the two E-W running fortification walls and the visible buildings in between them, as well as reconstructions.141 Due to Woodhouse’s and Noack’s work on Chalkis, the fortification walls of Pangali have later entered into studies on Greek fortification systems.142

In 1916, the Greek archaeologist K.A. Rhomaios was the first person to note the existence of ancient remains on the Hagia Triadha hill.143 In a brief notice in the Archaeologichon Deltion, he stated his disbelief in identifying ancient Chalkis with the Pangali remains due to lack of traces of long-time settlement. Instead he mentioned a Medieval circuit wall with towers on the low hill immediately east of the small fishing-town Vassiliki (the Hagia Triadha hill), and further noted the existence of two prominent Hellenistic circuit walls below the Medieval one with square and semi-circular towers barely distinguishable above the ground. This site, Rhomaios wrote, was the seat of the proper settlement of Chalkis or Hypochalkis, and further added as evidence the existence of an abundance of pottery on the hill as well as tombs towards the north–west at the modern road. It is therefore no doubt this site which Rhomaios and F. Poulsen had in mind when they, in their introduction to their preliminary report of the excavations in Kalydon from 1927, mentioned earlier plans to excavate in Chalkis.144

S. Benton did either not know of the existence of the settlement on the Hagia Triadha hill or had not considered the possibility of it having Mycenaean predecessors. In her report of Mycenaean finds from the Ionian islands from 1931/32, Benton still cited Mycenaean sherds found at Kryoneri, west of Varassova, for the probable site of ancient Chalkis.145

E. Kirsten, on the other hand, referred to Rhomaios’ interpretation of the Hagia Triadha hill in his travel account of Aetolia and Akarnania of 1941. Kirsten had visited the Hagia Triadha hill and from its appearance and location close to the sea, assumed the site to have been founded in Mycenaean times perhaps by people from Chalkis in Euboea on their way to Corfu and Italy.146

In their catalogue of Homeric sites, R. Hope Simpson and J.F. Lazenby relied on Benton’s identification of Homeric Chalkis with the site of Kryoneri.147 Wace and Stubbings, in their Companion to Homer, mistake Chalkis in the Iliad with the one which is mentioned in the Odyssey, which lies in Elis.148 Leekley and Efstratiou do not appear to be acquainted with the site

NOTE 139 Kruse 1825–1827, 245; Becker 1857, 23.

NOTE 140 Woodhouse 1897, 109–113.

NOTE 141 Noack 1916, 237–238 (with map).

NOTE 142 Lawrence 1979, see Chalkis in index.

NOTE 143 Rhomaios 1916.

NOTE 144 Poulsen & Rhomaios 1927, 3; compare Kirsten 1941, 102 n. 4.

NOTE 145 Benton 1931/32, 239.

NOTE 146 Kirsten 1941, 102 n. 4.


NOTE 148 Od. 15.259; this line and the following two lines do not seem to belong originally to the Odyssey, but are found in the Hymn to Apollo, though in a different order and with some verbal variations (Hymn. Hom. Ap. 425–427); for this debate, see Allen and Sikes 1904, 117; Stanford 1958, 251–252; van Thiel 1991, 209; Dawe 1993, 575.
of Haghia Triadha. In their survey of Archaeological Excavations in Central and northern Greece they referred to Chalkis as located on the site of Pangali and made no reference to Rhomaios or the hill of Haghia Triadha.\footnote{149}

Recently, S. Bommeljé and P. K. Doorn have made a provisional gazetteer of Aetolian sites. Here Chalkis figures with references to both the Pangali and the Haghia Triadha site.\footnote{150}

Aetolian Chalkis as a city has not been included in recent handbooks which set out to discuss major geographical locations in Greece such as C. B. Avery’s Handbook on Classical Geography from 1972. Nor has Aetolian Chalkis made its way into the Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites.\footnote{151} Again one suspects that Chalkis’ poor role in ancient myths and written sources is the cause. Thus, Chalkis has been duly excluded from entering R.E. Bell’s Dictionary of Classical Mythological Geography. Only in the very recent handbook on Greek historical cities by S. Lauffer is Chalkis mentioned, though Lauffer’s description of the ruins of Pangali and Haghia Triadha is inaccurate.\footnote{152}

Since Chalkis in Aetolia was added to the map of Greece by Leake, scholars have also speculated on the etymological origin of its name. Thus, Aetolian Chalkis figures in H. F. Tozer’s lectures on the geography of Greece, published in 1873. Here Tozer states that etymologically speaking, the various places called Chalkis, including Chalkis in Aetolia, owe their name to the existence of copper mines.\footnote{153} Another and related theory is that Chalkis was founded by settlers from Chalkis in Euboea.\footnote{154}

Apart from the similarity in name this theory was founded on a remark made by Strabo, according to which the Kouretes at one time settled in Chalkis in Euboea and later in Aetolia where they besieged the land of Pleuron.\footnote{155}

Conclusion

In summary, the rediscovery of Chalkis in post-antiquity has been quite a slow process in spite of the many travellers who passed through the gulf of Patras and noted the Varassova, especially so when considering that the Classical fortification walls on Pangali are highly visible from the sea, as is the prominent low hill of Haghia Triadha and its Byzantine walls and towers. Nevertheless, Chalkis was not associated with the Pangali-ruins until 1835, and it was not until the end of the last century that a scholar actually inspected the ruins on Pangali. And not until the onset of this century was the site of Haghia Triadha discovered and brought into connection with Chalkis and Hypochalkis.

When travellers and scholars in the seventeenth to nineteenth centuries did discuss Chalkis, they generally never doubted the location of Chalkis, but followed the most ancient tradition which placed Chalkis near the Euvenos river, close to the sea and east of Kalydon. Only a few opposed this view and held on to the late tradition which made Chalkis a mountain, harbour or island near the mouth of Acheloos and certainly Ptolemy’s view of Chalkis as an inland city failed to gain supporters after the middle of the nineteenth century with one exception. This is a commentary on Statius’ Thebaid from 1992 in which the commentators explain their readers, that “the Aetolian port of Chalkis stood on the banks of the river Acheloos”.\footnote{156}

It is the hope of the Greek-Danish co-operation project that further archaeological exploration of the site of Haghia Triadha and Pangali will promote not only the understanding of the archaeology of coastal Aetolia but also the way ancient myths and histories centering on Aetolia were constructed and functioned in antiquity as well as after.

\footnote{149}{Leekley and Efstratiou 1980.}
\footnote{150}{Bommeljé and Doorn 1987,112.}
\footnote{151}{Stillwell (ed.) 1976.}
\footnote{152}{Lauffer 1989, 163-164.}
\footnote{153}{Tozer 1873, 127, 376. Compare Strabo C 447 who mentions copper mines near Chalkis in Euboea.}
\footnote{154}{Curtius 1876, esp. 217; Bakhuizen 1981; Antonetti 1990, 64-67.}
\footnote{155}{Strabo 10.3.6.}
\footnote{156}{Melville & Vessey 1992 on 4.105.
The fertile valley between the two magnificent mountains, Mt. Varassova and Mt. Klokova, has long been identified as the location of ancient Chalkis (or Chalkea or Hypochalkis) mentioned briefly in ancient written sources. The Greek-Danish archaeological co-operation project began its investigation in this valley in 1995 by urban surveys in two places situated close to the sea, Pangali on the eastern slope of Mt. Varassova and the Haghia Triadha hill on the plain. These two sites were the sole places in the valley which were known to contain extensive remains of ancient walls.

The objectives in initiating archaeological investigation of the two sites by urban surveys were three-fold. Firstly, the surveys were meant to guide the choice of place for succeeding excavation units. Secondly, they formed the beginning of a long-term plan to survey the whole of the Kato Vassiliki Valley in an aim to study the relationship between the ancient fortified sites at the coast and their natural hinterland. Thirdly, it was hoped that urban surveys on the Pangali and Haghia Triadha would indicate the chronological span of human activity on the two sites and thereby give valuable information as to their functional relationship and hopefully settle the scholarly discussion as to the location of Homeric Chalkis and historic Chalkis, mentioned in the ancient written sources.

The site referred to as Pangali (first named thus by Bazin 1864, 362) is situated on the Eastern slope of the Varassova in a saddle created by a very pointed and steep ridge running North-South. The ridge terminates at the coast creating a sloping narrow saddle about 200-250 m. wide and approximately 800 m. long which opens towards a small natural harbour. Two Classical fortification walls, the masonry of which is trapezoidal-to-ashlar, run East-West crossing the ravine at a distance of 500 m. from each other, the Southernmost one is situated around 250-300 m. from the sea (the walls are indicated on Fig. 2). The walls block the entrance from the sea and from the North utilizing the sides of the ravine as natural fortification. In between the two fortification walls, several foundation walls from ancient large, rectangular buildings are visible (Fig. 6).

The survey was carried out between the two cross walls, an area which in many respects was ideal for urban survey, since no modern buildings or other human activities impeded the work of the surveyors. Also the degree of erosion in the ravine itself was limited, and as the area was used as pastural ground for cattle and sheep, it was relatively free of maquis and characterized by a comparatively homogenous visibility. Only the area to the South of the Western extension of the Northern cross wall was so densely covered with maquis that survey was impossible. Nevertheless most of this overgrown area is very steep being the lower part of the actual rise of the Varassova and therefore not likely to have been
integrated in the building activities of the
fortress.

Accordingly, the survey was kept to a
course 140–230 m. wide and 500–560 m.
long course stretching beneath the pointed
ridge in between the two cross walls
thereby covering the area of almost all vis-
ible buildings remains. Only one building,
PAE, was left out due to the maquis (Fig.
6). The survey area had been plotted onto
a 20 × 20 m. gridsystem. Since, however,
the 20 × 20 m. squares were felt to be too
big for the surveyors to survey systemati-
cally, the survey was carried out in 20 × 10
m. rectangles. This allowed surveyors to
walk in more even zig-zags and it facil-
itated an even speed and space-keeping of
the surveyors. The speed of the surveyors
was slow to normal walking as when mak-
ing country survey in order that results
would be comparable with future survey
of the hinterland. After each rectangle, the
surveyors recorded the number of sherds,
tiles, flints, obsidian and other ancient ma-
terial while they only collected diagnostic
examples. Each register sheet carried the
name of the surveyor in order to keep
trace of possible variation due to individ-
ual differences in registration. Having lo-
cated a rich Final Neolithic site at the
Southernmost end of the ridge centred
beneath a cavelike rockshelter, strategies
were changed (See Mavridis and Alisoy
below p. 272–79). Thus, the area was at first
surveyed in the above described way in or-
der to maintain a comparable survey
method, it was then submitted to intensive
survey. This meant that surveyors moved 1
m. at a time within the 20 × 10 m. rectan-
gles counting and sampling all ancient ma-
terial. The material from these two proce-
dures were kept apart. This latter, intensive
survey greatly helped the later choice of
excavation unit (see Michalis Cazis p. 280).

The general pattern on the Pangali, was
– with the exception of the Final Neo-
lithic site – the distinct lack of pottery
while tiles were plentiful and lay concen-
trated in and around the foundation walls
of the ancient buildings. The general im-
pression was that of a very short period of
habitation or use of the site. A supplemen-
ty survey of the neolithic site was con-
ducted in 1996. Traces of quarring activity
were discovered west of the Pangali ter-
race, on the eastern slope of Mt. Varassova.

The hill of Haghia Triadha, situated 1.5
km to the east of Pangali immediately at
the sea was – like Pangali – well suited for
urban survey. The hill measures approxi-
mately 350 × 200 m. and rises approxi-
mately 30 m. above sea level. A Byzantine
and below that, a Classical fortification

Fig. 6. Measurements of ar-
chitectural remains at Pangali
1995.
wall encircle its upper plateau (75 × 150 m.) while ancient terrace walls encircle its lower part. The area within the terrace walls and fortification walls formed the natural focus for the survey (Fig. 7). With the exception of the modest traces of a camping place, the hill has been spared modern building activity, and erosion is limited except for the steep slope towards the sea which suffers badly from erosion. As with Pangali, the hill is used for pasture and is thus covered mostly with grass and bushes giving a relatively even visibility of around 70-100% on the upper part of the hill, while vegetation on the lower parts were sometimes more dense. Finally, the constructors of the Byzantine basilica on top of the hill have evidently cleared its surrounding of ancient buildings, just as they may have terraced the area immediately outside the fortification walls.

The survey was accomplished within a N-S/E-W grid system consisting of 10 × 10 m. squares (Fig. 8). Otherwise survey was conducted as at Pangali.

The general pattern of the survey material was the richness in tiles as well as in pottery, the latter being even more numerous than tiles in some squares. In comparison to Pangali, the chronological distribution of material was far wider (see Eiring pp. 259–71 for samples of this material). The concentration of material confirmed the impression stated above of a levelling of the upper plateau in early Byzantine times, since material was clearly more plenty on the lower parts of the hill than on the plateau.
Fig. 8. Map showing architectural remains seen on the surface of Haghia Triadha. Grid system and structure names are shown on the plan (measured by Charalambos Marinopoulos and Poul Erik Skovgaard July 1995).
A Catalogue of Selected Finds from the Survey at Haghia Triadha, 1995

by Jonas Eiring

Introduction

What follows is a small selection of surface and wall-cleaning finds from the 1995 survey campaign at Haghia Triadha. It is important to stress that the presentation is preliminary, and that the compilation is somewhat arbitrary. Further study of the pottery is required in order to present a fuller picture. Nevertheless some important observations could already be made during the first season of the project: Human activities continued – with some important interruptions – on the hill of Haghia Triadha from the Early Bronze Age to the Hellenistic period. There followed a significant hiatus in the Roman Imperial period, which lasted until the construction of the Early Christian Basilica.

The local pottery sequences in this part of the country are very little known (compared with e.g. Attica and the Pelopon- nese). It remains to establish workable typologies of the material: identifying local wares as opposed to imported ones, determining the origin of the latter, and fitting the material into a chronological framework. In consequence, only very rough dates can be given here, and, pending the final publication, even these will be subject to changes.

Colour descriptions are stated in the catalogue according to the Munsell code. The diameter (D.) is always given, in centimetres (when estimated without decimal), when known, and other measurements as applicable. The word “glaze” is used as a conventional term. In the catalogue four/four number groups (e.g. 3930/3050) (Fig. 9) denote collections in 10m X 10 m. squares (denoted by the coordinate of the SW corner. compare Fig. 8) while three CAPITAL letters (e.g., ABO) (Figs. 10-11) denote collections in connection with wall cleanings (Fig. 8 and explanations above).

See also Comments on Chronology below p. 269-271
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Fig. 9

3930/3050:

1. Ring base (three joining fragments of a household jar). Semi-coarse, yellowish red (5YR 7/6) fabric with grey coring. Surface waxy to the touch. D.13. H.2.4. Date: (Late) A.

2. Tripartite strap handle. Semi-coarse, gritty, reddish yellow (5YR 6/6) gritty fabric. Dimensions: 4.5 X 3.2 X 0.9. Date: MH.

3910/3010:


3920/3010:


Fig. 9. Selected finds from the survey at Haghia Triadha 1995.
7. Fragment of a figurine or handle. Circular in section. Fine, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) porous fabric. Glossy black paint. D.2.4 L.6.7. Date: G to A. 3870/2980:

8. Small fragment from shoulder of lamp. Mouldmade. Fine, hard fired reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric. Small helices in relief at shoulder. Date: (Late) HL. 3950/3040:


14. Shoulder fragment with root of handle of thin walled storage jar. Reddish yellow (5YR 6/8), gritty fabric with white and red inclusions and few mica. Traces of red slip out. Three horizontal grooves under “glaze”. Dimensions: 10.0 x 9.0. Th.0.6. Date: A(?). 3870/3110:


17. Everted rim with triangular section from a jug. Slightly gritty, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric. Traces of matt brown slip in. D.8.0. H.1.8. 3770/3100:

18. Flat everted rim to belly of krater/bowl. Well fired, slightly porous yellow (10YR 7-8/6) fabric, with light red coring and some small black grits. Thin matt black slip in and lower wall out. Painted radial stripes on top of rim and a wavy horizontal band in reserved area beneath rim out. D.25.5. H.5.0. Date: LHIIIC. 3770/3100:

face worn and paler (7.5YR 7/6). Flaking, rather glossy black "glaze" in. D.9.8. H.2.9. Date: C to HL.


3810/3010:


3770/3030:


26. Base of plate. Fine, soft, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric. Rather glossy, brownish black "glaze" in and out, reserved underfoot except for the inside of the ring foot, which is "glazed". D.10.0. H.1.6. C.

27. Fragment of vertical strap handle with part of wall preserved. Fine fabric. Handle yellow at surface (10YR 7/6), with wall of vessel more compact and light brown (7.5YR 6/4). Matt grey to brown slip in and out. H.3.8. Date: A(?).

3770/3050:


3810/2980:


3800/3020:


31. Centre fragment with applied button as knob from a lid. Semi-fine, porous, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric with mica and white and dark inclusions (up to 1mm). Dimensions:3.4 × 2.7. Th.0.5-0.6. Date: HL ?

Slope near the sea:


33. Rim of a small bowl. Well fired, slightly gritty and porous, reddish yellow (5YR 6/6) fabric. Good, glossy
H.1.5. Date: 4th to 3rd c. B.C.

34. Small body fragment of cup or bowl. Unevenly fired, very pale brown (10YR 7/4) to reddish yellow (5YR 7/8) fabric. Fugitive but glossy black “glaze” in and out. Incised West Slope decoration out. Dimensions: 2.4 X 3.0. Th.0.2-0.3. Date: 3rd to 2nd c. B.C.


South slope:


38. Flat base of handmade cooking vessel. Coarse brown (7.5YR 5/4) fabric, burnt grey in patches. Mixed white inclusions, some of which may be calcite crystals. D.45. H.2.2. Th.0.8. Date: Prehistoric ?

39. (Not depicted) Large coarse ware basin with flat, everted, uneven rim. Reddish yellow (5YR 6/6) fabric, with mixed inclusions and voids up to 5mm across. D.int.55. H.9.6. Date: A ?

Fig. 10

AAI:

1. Flat everted rim to neck and (not joining) recessed base of jug (4 joining rim fragments, 2 base fragments, several not joining body fragments). Thin walled cooking ware, gritty red (2.5YR 6/8) fabric, with white and black inclusions (up to 3mm across). Horizontal shallow grooves at neck. D.(rim)9.5. D.(base)8. Cf. Agora XII, nos. 1698-1699. Third Meting, 113, pl. 62 no.57. Date: 4th to 3rd c. B.C.

2. Handle with part of wall of kantharos with tripartite strap handle. Porous, semi-coarse, brownish yellow (10YR 6/6) fabric with mica. W.2.7. Th.0.9-1.3. Yellow Minyan. Date: MHIII/LHI.


6. Rim of large handmade bowl/basin. Flaring T-bone rim with applied dec-
Fig. 10. Selected finds from wall cleaning at Haghia Triadha 1995 (wall cleaning 1).


ABD:


ABO:


AAD:


16. Body fragment of close shaped vessel. Well fired, semi- fine, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric, porous with mica and white and grey inclusions. Painted dark brown decoration out; vertical band with series of oblique lines. Dimensions: 4.8 x 1.8. Th. 0.4-0.5. Date: MH III.


20. Fragment of wishbone handle. Gritty, slightly porous, brownish yellow (10YR 6/6) fabric, with small pale inclusions. Dimensions: 5.2 x 5.4. Date: EH/MH.


H.2.0. Cf. OF 23, no. SKS 14 (460/50). Date: 5th c. B.C.


Surface near AAB:


Surface, 3050/4061:

25. Figurine (T-shape with breaks at three points). The long leg is perforated at break. Coarse fabric with dark greyish brown (2.5Y 4/2) core. Surface yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) to red (2.5YR 5/8). Pale oatmeal inclusions. Dimensions: 5.8 x 5.7 x 3.4. Date: EH.

Fig. 11

AAM:


5. Vertical handle with flat thumb-rest attached at top (rim not preserved) of kantharos. Fine reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric. Metallic brownish black "glaze" with marks from a sponge. H.3.2. Cf. Third Meeting, 190, pl.133, nos. 6642, 6645, 6637, OF XXIII, nos. FB 16 sqq. Date: 4th c. B.C. (second half).

6. Flaring rim with thickened lip of large bowl. Soft, slightly porous, very pale brown (10YR 7-8/4) semi-fine fabric. Traces of matt, brown slip in and out. D.c. 47. H.3.4. Date: HL (?).


8. Large handle with ovoid section. Fine, slightly porous, reddish yellow (5YR 7/6) fabric. Thick, matt dark brown slip. H. (of sherd) 4.3. W. (handle) 2.1 x 1.5. Date: A.

9. Conical figurine with breaks in both ends (Horse? The break at the thicker end with two holes, as if from legs). Handmade. Thick dark reddish brown paint. L.4.9. Date: A (?).

10. Horizontal handle with circular section from cup. Fine, soft, pink (7.5YR 8/4) fabric, worned glossy black "-glaze". Row of cuttings on one side, inscription in retrograde on the other: [ ] Th. (of handle) 1.0. Date: A.


14. Wall and root of horizontal handle of close shaped vessel. Core and internal
Fig. 11. Selected finds from wall cleaning at Haghia Triadha 1995.
surface light red (2.5YR 7/8). Exter-
nal margin and surface yellow (10YR

AAF:

15. Rather tall, carinated ring foot of jar.
Plain, very pale brown (10YR 7/4)
fabric. Small white and red inclusions
and few mica. D.9 H.2.7.

AAG:

16. From rim almost to base of small
bowl. Ring foot (broken off). Lip
rounded and slightly thickened. Fine
pink (7.5YR 7/4) fabric. Good, glossy
black “glaze” in and out, red where
thin. Thin double incisions under “-
glaze” out beneath rim. D.8. H.3.3.
Cf. Agora XII, 133sq (for a discussion
of date). Date: C.

ABS:

17. Rim to belly with root of horizontal
handle of handmade bowl. Misfired
grey, flaky fabric with white inclu-
sions and voids. Surface smoothed,
light olive brown (2.5Y 5/3), with
visible mica. D.21.5. H.6.7. Date: MH.

ABN:

18. Flaring rim of plate. Hard fired, pink
(7.5YR 7/4) fabric with redder cor-
ing. Uneven and worn brownish black
“glaze” in and out. Mouldings in and
one groove through “glaze”. Careless-

ABA:

19. Rim to concave shoulder of bowl or
jug. Cooking ware, reddish yellow
(5YR 6/6) to light brown (7.5YR
6/4) fabric, with small white and
black inclusions. Burnt marks at rim.
D.9. H.2.7. Th.0.3.

Cleaning of wall in 2990/4000:

20. Rim of plate with thickened edge
with mouldings. Powdery, reddish yel-
low (7.5YR 7/6) slightly porous fab-
cric. Fugitive brownish black “glaze” in
XXIX, p. 142. Date: Early HL.

21. Tripartite strap handle from jug.
Semi-fine, reddish yellow (5YR 7/6)
fabric with white inclusions, voids
and mica. Thin reddish brown slip.
L.9.2. W.(of handle) 2.3. Th.1.2. Date:
G (?) .

22. Conical foot. Fine but gritty, red
(2.5YR 6/8) fabric. Fugitive brownish
black slip. Surface much worn. D.4.2.
H.1.9.

AAO:

23. Rim to shouulder of jar. Slightly
thickened rim, outturned from
straight profile of body. Very pale
brown (10YR 7/4) fabric, fine paste
with large (up to 3mm across), angular,
dark inclusions. Surface pale yel-
H.5.5. Date: MH.

24. Offset rim (lip broken off) of plate.
Flaky, yellow (10YR 7/6) fabric.
Matt, brownish black paint imitating
black “glaze”. Turning marks beneath
Dest.25. Date: 2nd to 1st c. B.C.

ABF:

25. Ring foot of plate. Soft, slightly por-
ous, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fab-
cric. Surface eroded with very worn
black “glaze” in and out. Stamped pal-
mette decoration in, rather large and
sloppy. D.8. H.2.1. Date: 3th or early
2nd c. B.C.

ABR:

26. Rim to neck with root of handle near
rim of amphora/jug. Soft, slightly
porous, semi-fine yellow (10YR 8/6)
fabric. Light red core (2.5YR 7/8).
Flaking brown slip out. D.c. 11.5.
H.8.5. Date: G ?
27. Flat everted rim with two grooves on top from lekane. Porous, pale yellow (2.5YR 7-8/6) fabric, with dark inclusions (up to 2mm across) and small white grits. Traces of dark slip in. D.26.0. H.3.0. Date: HL.


29. Vertical, slightly hollowed offset rim of cooking pot. Bright reddish yellow (5YR 6/8), thin walled cooking ware with white and dark grits. D.31.0. H.5.0. Date: Late C.

AAH:

30. Part of rim and belly of ink well. Carinated beneath shoulder, groove at shoulder, rim sloping inwards. Soft, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7-8/6) fabric. Matt, slightly greenish black “glaze” out, at lower part of wall inside, and around rim. D.4.0. H.2.4. Date: HL.


32. Large cup, or jug. Vertical, tripartite handle with three horn-shaped protomes protruding above rim, one to each side, the third towards the centre of the vessel. Fine, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric, yellow (10YR 8/6) at surface. Cf. Curtius, E. & F. Adler, (eds.), OlErg IV, Berlin 1890, 201, pl. 69 no. 1298 (for a similar protrusion on a handle in black ware, found at Olympia). Schauer, C., in Third Meeting, pls. 106-07; ead., in Fourth Meeting, pls. 11-12 (the protrusion on the inside also occurs on Hellenistic jugs).

Comments on chronology

Bronze Age:

Examples of Early Helladic pottery found during the survey include a figurine (Fig. 10: 25) and a rim with plastic decoration found in the cleaning of wall AAI (Fig. 10: 6). Subsequent excavations in 1996 and 1997 have confirmed the presence of substantial amounts of Early Helladic material.

The Middle Helladic pottery\textsuperscript{158} included two pots from the survey (Fig. 9: 2 and handle, Fig. 9: 16). From the cleaning of wall AAI came two handles (Fig. 10: 2 and 5). A fragment of a handmade bowl came from wall ABS (Fig. 11: 17); a handmade jar from wall AAO (Fig. 11: 23). From wall AAD there was a body fragment with painted decoration, datable to MH III (Fig. 10: 16). From the same wall came a foot, dated to the transition to LH IA (Fig. 10: 21). Two triangular handles from coarse ware vessels (Fig. 9: 12) and (Fig. 10: 20) were found during cleaning of wall AAD.

The stemmed foot of a late Mycenaean kylix was found in the cleaning of wall AAM (Fig. 11: 12). The base of a mug, a surface find from the North slope of the hill, is late Mycenaean or Dark Age in date (Fig. 9: 3), and a bowl with painted stripes on the rim and a wavy band on the exterior (Fig. 9: 18) should be dated to LHIIIIC.

Geometric (?) :

Surface finds that has been dated to the Geometric period include a handle (Fig. 9: 10). One sherd from the northern area of the site have been dated tentatively to the Geometric period (handle: Fig. 11: 21). Another, possibly Geometric, piece is a jug with uneven rim from wall ABR (Fig. 11: 26).

Some seemingly Geometric sherds, allowing for local conservatism, could equally belong to the following period. A fragment, either of a figurine or handle, where there is not much more than the surface

\textsuperscript{158} The date of Middle Helladic and Early Mycenaean pottery is dependant on comparisons with the Argive sequences. See Zerner 1978 and Dietz 1991.
treatment to judge from, is one such case (Fig. 9: 7). A handle (Fig. 9: 23), as well as a jug (Fig. 11: 28) are other examples.

Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic Pottery:

Archaic and Classical:

Arguably Archaic are the following surface finds: an un“glazed” base fragment (Fig. 9: 1), a slipped rim from a cup (Fig. 9: 5), a storage jar (Fig. 9: 14), and a handle (Fig. 9: 27).

More definitely Archaic are a krater with banded decoration (Fig. 9: 13), a household bowl with a somewhat peculiar lip (Fig. 9: 30), and a flat base with concentric bands on both sides, presumably from a kalathos (Fig. 9: 37).

Several sherds, found during cleaning of wall AAM, are Archaic or Classical, but have not yet been dated more closely: two everted rims from amphorae or jugs look late Archaic or Classical (Fig. 11: 1-2); a body sherd from a cup or bowl with painted decoration is certainly earthen (Fig. 11: 4). A handle and a fragment of a figurine (Fig. 11: 8-9) have both been placed in the Archaic period on the somewhat unsatisfactory basis of the surface treatment, whereas the case for the inscribed and incised skyphos handle is more clear (Fig. 11: 10). A slipped base is also thought to be Archaic (Fig. 11: 11).

Late Archaic or early Classical is a lamp, probably imitating an Attic type, dated to the late sixth century or early fifth, from wall AA1 (Fig. 10: 3).

Among the surface finds, the base of a jug with banded decoration should be dated to the fifth century (Fig. 9: 25), whereas the ring foot of a black-“glazed” plate (Fig. 9: 26) is more likely to belong in the following century.

The skyphos of Attic type was evidently a popular drinking vessel at the site: among the Classical sherds from wall AAD, two such bases can be dated to the fifth century (Fig. 10: 18 and 22).

Three sherds found at wall ABD are all Classical, and probably from the fourth century: the rim of a small bowl; a bowl with a tall ring foot, a feature of that century; and a kantharos with offset rim (Fig. 10: 9-11). Without its base, the small bowl is not closely datable, but even when these bowls are better preserved, the profuseness of the shape and its many variations make a date complicated. This can be demonstrated by a small bowl from wall AAG (Fig. 11: 16): Judging by the way the foot is attached, and the vertical profile, it ought to belong in the first half of the fifth century, but, on the other hand, the relative lightness of the wall points to a later date, possibly well into the fourth century.

Classical to Hellenistic:

In the pottery classification, a large number of pots have been labelled ‘Classical to Hellenistic’. As previously mentioned, the local typologies are little known, but there is probably also a general conservatism in household shapes, which makes them difficult to date precisely. Furthermore, something which has been verified by two subsequent seasons of excavation, there seems to be a substantial amount of material from the late fourth century, i.e. on the, stylistically arbitrary, dividing line between ‘Classical’ and ‘Hellenistic’. One example from the survey is the foot of a kantharos (Fig. 9: 6), which finds good parallels in Elis and Patras in the late fourth century. A small rim fragment from a black-“glazed” plate bears resemblance to a series of late Classical plates found in Olympia (Fig. 9: 4). The small bowl (Fig. 9: 33) could have been manufactured either in the fourth or the third century; an even wider margin should be given to the date of the ring foot of a lekane (Fig. 9: 19), as well as of a pithos rim (Fig. 9: 15).

A jug from the cleaning of wall AA1 is thought to belong in the fourth or third century: the cooking pot fabric is consis-
tent with such a date, as is the horizontal rilling of the neck, common on plain and “glazed” jugs of the period. Regrettably, a parallel that combines the two features has yet to be found. From the same wall came a pedestal foot, probably imported from Elis, which fits in quite well in the series of late Classical cups (Fig. 10: 4). Also from AAI, and late Classical or Hellenistic in date, is the base of a “glazed” strainer (Fig. 10: 7).

Returning to wall AAM, some late Classical or Hellenistic sherds include the rim of a cup (Fig. 11: 3), which should share a fourth century date with a kantharos handle that can be dated to the latter half of the century (Fig. 11: 5). A cooking pot from ABQ should also be late Classical (Fig. 11: 29).

Hellenistic:

Surface finds, which can be dated to the Hellenistic period with some confidence, include the rim of a large echinus bowl (Fig. 9: 32) and a plate (Fig. 9: 36). A date in the third or second century could also be claimed for a small sherd with incised decoration (Fig. 9: 34), as well as a bowl with grooves beneath the rim (Fig. 9: 35). Two fragments of Hellenistic lamps were found (Fig. 9: 8 and 11). A small sherd with an applied button is the central piece of an “unglazed” lid, probably Hellenistic in date (Fig. 9: 31), as is the rim of an unguentarium (Fig. 9: 29).

The cleaning of wall ABO produced, among other things, a couple of echinus bowls. These are difficult to date closely when, as here, only the rim is preserved, but at least one of the two shows Hellenistic characteristics, with its thin wall and rather markedly inturned rim (Fig. 10: 13-14).

Three plates should be placed in the Early Hellenistic period: one from wall ABN at the southern edge of the site (Fig. 11: 18); another from the northern area (Fig. 11: 20); and a third, from wall AAH.

A date in the third century B.C. would have to be guessed at for a large bowl from wall AAM (Fig. 11: 6). A small vessel with an inwards sloping shoulder, and best described as an ink-well, must be third or second century in date, albeit no parallels have been found (Wall AAH: Fig. 11: 30). A lekane rim, found during the cleaning of wall ABQ should also be from that period (Fig. 11: 27).

A Classical shape which continues into the Hellenistic period is the plate with stamped palmette decoration. One such was found at wall ABF. The relatively large size of the palmette, and the careless design of the stamp, would indicate a date in the third century or later (Fig. 11: 25).

The plates with an offset rim are thought to have been produced from the middle of the second century B.C., and into the first. A fragment of a such a rim came from wall AAO (Fig. 11: 24).

This selection of finds from the first season ends with yet another question mark: a handle with horn-like “wings” and a conical protrusion inwards?
A Catalogue of Selected Finds from the Surveys at Pangali, 1995-1996

Introduction

Material from the Final Neolithic settlement at Pangali was collected during the systematic survey of the terrace in 1995 and before the excavation in 1996. The deposits were undisturbed by the later use of the terrace in connection with the fourth century B.C. fortification. In this short presentation only pottery has been treated. In addition, a fine series of well defined small flint and obsidian tools was collected on the surface. A trial excavation was conducted in 1996. Material from the excavation has not been included in the present study. It showed, however, that several phases of the Chalcolithic/Final Neolithic period was presented in the settlement (see Cazis p. 280).

The pottery depicted on Figs. 12 and 13 is a characteristic coarse ware material, often with a thin, slightly burnished slip. Paint is very uncommon. The decoration consists of “pointillé” and plastic lists creating various right-angled and curvilinear patterns. Thin rimmed open cups and bowls are usual. Similar deposits are found in the Peloponnese, Diros in Laconia and in the so-called Attica/Kephala group.

For general comments see Introduction to Eiring above p. 259.

Catalogue

Fig. 12 (1995)


8. Fragment of an open shaped vessel. Coarse dark red (2.5YR 4/8) fabric with mica and white and black inclusions. Same colour in and out. Decon-
Fig. 12. Selected sherds from survey campaigns at Pangali in 1995 and 1996 (1997: no. 169).
ration with curvilinear cordon with four dots. H.6.5. W.4.0. Th.1.2.


16. Rim of a bowl with hemispherical body. Thickened rim, flat on the top, squarish in section, slightly inside turned. Fine to semi-coarse, yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) fabric and core with white, black and brown inclusions and mica. Possibly slipped and burnished (very worn). H.3.2. W.2.6. Th.0.5.


21. Fragment of an open shaped vessel, possibly a jar. Very well fired, fine to semi-coarse, dark red (5YR 4/8) fab-


Fig. 12 (1996).

1. (Catalogue numbers 1-4). Fifteen fragments of a big pithos

b) Part of the same pithos. Description as above. Decoration: Part of two almost rectilinear and two curvilinear plastic bands. H.12.0. W.8.5. Th.1.3.

c) Part of the same pithos. Description as above. Decoration: One curvilinear plastic band from which two rectilinear ones begin. H.9.0. W.9.0. Th.1.2.

169. Fragment of a big vessel, possibly a pithos with a big strap handle with rounded edges. Not well fired. Coarse fabric with white, black inclusions and mica. Slipped and burnished, brown (10YR 4/3) out, dark red (2.5YR 4/6) in. From the base of the handle two narrow curvilinear plastic cordons begin. H.14.0. W.11.0. Th.0.8. (Surface find (27–6–97)).

Fig. 13

5. Thickened outturned rim, very flat on the top, squarish in section. From a coarse open, vessel, probably a pithos. Coarse fabric with white black inclusions and mica. Slipped and burnished red (2.5YR 4/8) out, strong brown (7.5YR 5/6) in. Core: similar to the outer surface. Decoration: An almost circular cordon decorated with dots (pointille decoration), and opposite a plastic area decorated with dot. H.4.5. W.7.0. Th.2.5.


12. Rounded, straight rim of an open bowl with hemispherical body. Clay
Fig. 13. Selected sherds from the survey campaign at Pangali in 1996.
well lavigated. Fine to semi-coarse, brown (7.5YR 5/3) fabric with sporadic inclusions of small stones and mica. Brown to grey core. Slipped and burnished in and out. Decoration with one horizontal and two oblique incised lines. H.2.2. W.1.5. Th.0.4.


16-17. Two fragments of a big shaped open vessels. Dark red (2.5YR 4/8) dark red (2.5YR 4/8) fabric with inclusions of small stones and mica. Slipped and burnished. The core is greyish-brown. Decoration with a plastic cordon on each of the sherds. H.3.0. W.3.0. Th.1.0.


21. Fragment of an open shaped (?) vessel. Coarse fabric with white, black inclusions and mica. Dark red (2.5YR 4/8), slipped and burnished in and out. Decoration with two plastic bands which form an angular pattern. H.2.5. W.2.5. Th.1.2.


37. Narrow, oval strap handle from an open shaped vessel (part of the body preserved). Coarse fabric with mostly white inclusions and mica. Slipped and burnished, yellowish brown (10YR 5/4) out, very dark gray (2.5YR 3/1) in. Grey core. H.5.5. W.5.5. Th.0.5.


44. Bevelled base of an open vessel. Coarse fabric with white, black inclu-


Excavations at Pangali, 1996

During the systematic survey of the area known as Pangali in 1995 (above pp. 255-258), a previously unknown prehistoric site was located at a small terrace on the rocky SE flanks of Mt. Varassova, above the eastern termination of the late Classical fortification wall. The site consists of a small upper and lower terrace above and at a partly destroyed rock shelter. Each terrace measures approximately 25 × 6 m., with a difference in altitude of 7 to 8 m., overlooking the sandy beach to the south. Intensive survey of the site had produced a considerable body of pottery and stone implements dating mainly from the Final Neolithic period.163

In July 1996 a test trench was opened at the upper terrace of the site. Here the deposit looked relatively thick and the surface was free from rocks and/or vegetation. The trench (2 × 2 m.) was excavated to bedrock. The deposit was 1 meter thick and four strata were separated: stratum 1 (topsoil), stratum 2, and stratum 3 and 3a with remains of a hearth. The soil excavated was dry-sieved in order to obtain a maximum amount of data.

A fair amount of sherds, stone and bone tools was recovered during the excavation, as well as a smaller number of palaeobotanical and palaeo zoological material (wet-sieving, which would have been most appropriate could not be used as water was not at hand and the site is rather inaccessible).

The pottery is characteristic of the Final Neolithic period and probably also includes pottery from the very beginning of the Early Bronze Age. It comprises coarse ware often, but not always, burnished. The use of paint is very limited. Decoration includes rows of small perforations and plastic ribs, creating rectangular and curvilinear patterns. Open shapes seem to be prevalent. They include cups and bowls of several types. Pithoi sherds are also present. In general the pottery from the trench relates very closely to the pottery from the survey made in 1995 and 1996.

Stone tools comprise several obsidian and flint blades, scrapers and core fragments, as well as by-products of chipping. Bone implements include mainly perforating tools.

The only man-made structure recovered was a rather well defined hearth, found in stratum 3a immediately above bedrock. It measured approx. 1.5 m. in diameter and consisted of very hard burned earth and small peices of clay as well as particles of fine gravel and charcoal. The small excavation did not bring to light any architectural structures. We hope such structures will come to light during forthcoming larger scaled excavations.

NOTE 163
Mavridis and Alisoy pp. 272-279.

by Michalis Cazis
Fig. 14. Trial trench at Pangali, 1996.
II.

Excavations at Haghia Triadha, 1996

Fig. 15 shows the areas in which excavations were conducted during the 1996 campaign. Sections (A,B,C,F and Z) are 50 m. x 50 m. Six square trenches (10 m. x 10 m.) (F14,15,19,25/G11 and S9) within three of these sections were opened. Only smaller areas of the trenches were excavated down to bedrock, except for trench F25, where bedrock was reached in level 20-50 cm. below surface. In addition, two 2 m. wide trial trenches, T x 1 and T x 3, were opened and one 1 m. wide trench, T x 2. The trial trenches were dug down to bedrock.

Excavations in trench F15. The trench was divided into four 5 m. x 5 m. subtrenches, two on the southside of the Byzantine wall AAB (F15/SW and F15/SE) and two on the northside of AAB (F15/NW and F15/NE). The two southern subtrenches were excavated to the bottom of stratum 1. In F15/SW a 2 m. wide trench was opened (from section 2990E) which was

by
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and

Ioannis Moschos

Fig. 15. Excavation areas at Haghia Triadha, 1996.
dug down to bedrock (Fig. 22 section 2990E). No architectural remains were found in this subtrench.

On the northside of the Byzantine wall AAB a heavy stone packing consisting of fallen stones from the upper courses of the Byzantine wall, was removed. The character of the stone packing had been studied carefully during the 1995 campaign. Excavation started below the stone packing. In the subtrench F15/NW two courses of a substantial wall, ABV, constructed from large (approx. 0.5 m. x 1.0 m.) ashlars of local sand stone were exposed (see drawing Fig. 16 and photo Fig. 17). The excavation around and to the north of ABV did not supply an unambiguous date, but the wall is evidently part of a fifth century B.C. perivolos framing the Classical acropolis. Other parts of this alignment were registered on the general plan from 1995 (Fig. 8) and larger parts were uncovered during the 1997 campaign. The foundation wall ACC, running at a straight angle to ABV rested on a fill which could be dated not later than the second/third quarter of the fifth century B.C. thus giving a terminus post quem for the erection of the foundation. A section through the layers in F15 is seen on Fig. 22 (2990E).

Excavations in trench G11. In this trench only the small area to the north of the Byzantine wall AAB between 3000E and the Byzantine tower AAL was excavated. Structure ACD is a foundation wall made of local sandstone, resting on bedrock (Fig. 18). A section is seen on Fig. 23 (3000E).

The limestone compartment walls ABY and AAM. The walls are seen on the plan Fig. 16, ABY is orientated almost N-S, turned slightly towards NE while AAM is orientated SSW-NNE. Both are approximately 3 m. wide framed by walls of carefully adapted limestone ashlars. The ashlar blocks were quarried at Mt. Varassova. Ashlars from the coffers walls were reused in the Byzantine wall. Towards N, AAM terminates in a square tower. The best preserved coffers wall ABY continued, towards S, below the Byzantine wall AAB (Fig. 19 a-b). The centre was filled with stones and soil (Fig. 20). A similar coffers wall AAD, terminating in a square tower was found on the west slope of the mound (Fig. 6).

According to typology, the large limestone compartment walls are supposed to be a fourth century B.C. fortifications. The type of construction and the dimensions are similar to the Pangali walls likewise suggested to be fourth century B.C. constructions. In late Classical times there were undoubtedly close relations between the old town at the coast and the newly founded in the mountains. The large coffers walls were probably not constructed until after the establishment of the Aetolian league in 366 B.C.

Excavations in trench F25. In the eastern half of the trench, bedrock was reached a
few centimeters below surface (Figs. 21-22) while in the western part a certain stratigraphy and architectural remains were preserved. The structure ABX consisted of two parallel foundation walls running almost exactly N-S. The walls enclose a corridor approximately 1½ m. wide. Towards S, the western wall turns west in a right angle. In the southern area a level surface with flat slabs indicates the presence of a courtyard. Concentrations of tiles and sherds were found in the NW and SW parts of the trench. The structure ABX should rather be dated to the fifth century B.C. than in the fourth century or Hellenistic period according to the finds (see below).
A Description of Sections.
Haghia Triadha, 1996

Section 2990E (Fig. 22)

South of wall AAB:

2. Sandy soil. Light olive brown (2.5YR 5/3). Tiles and stones. Fragments of opus caementicium.
2a. The soil is more grey and packed fragments of opus caementicium. The stratum continues north of the wall AAB — termed partly “cleaning of wall ABV”, partly stratum 1a.
3. Clayish soil. Light gray (2.5YR 7/2). A few smaller stones (less than 40 cm) towards the bottom of the layer. Sherds, fragments of opus caementicium and characteristic white sandstone inclusions (as 3830N, stratum 2).

North of wall AAB:


SECTION 3000E (Fig. 23)

3. Compact clayish soil with less sherds than stratum 2. Pale yellow (2.5YR 7/3). The level is excavated as stratum 3 in G11.

SECTION 3830N (Fig. 24)

1. Surface layer. Sandy soil, humus with reeds. Greyish brown (10YR 5/2). Numerous fragments of tiles. In the area close to the wall AAB, a concentration of stones (5cm to 20cm) is found.
1a. Clayish soil. Light brownish gray (10YR 6/2). Fragments of tiles and sherds are numerous. Shells and a few smaller stones.
2. Clayish soil. Pale yellow (2.5YR 8/2). Many sherds and fragments of tiles. Characteristic fragments of red sandstone (2.5YR 5/6) (compare 2990E, stratum 3). Charcoal and burned clay.
3. Clayish soil. Light yellowish brown (2.5YR 6/6). Stone (5 cm. to 15 cm.) concentration towards the Byzantine wall AAB. Sherds and clay (reddish yellow 7.5YR 8/6).

A Catalogue of Selected Finds from the Excavations at Haghia Triadha, 1996

by Søren Dietz

It should be emphasized that the following survey of characteristic and diagnostic selected pottery found during the campaign is preliminary. Most stratigraphical units were redeposited during various phases of construction and thus did not represent chronological units. As the chronological development of the local pottery is badly established, the date of Archaic, Classical and Hellenistic pottery is based on comparisons with better known sequences, especially from Athens (Agora), Corinth and to a certain degree from Elis (see also Jonas Eiring, Introduction and Comments to Chronology p. 259). Furthermore it should be emphasized that the examples depicted do not usually represent the whole chronological range of the pottery found in the contexts. An attempt to evaluate the chronological range in the groups is presented in the introduction to the various units.

Fig. 25

F15/ABV ABV is a sandstone ashlar wall in trench F15 (Section 2990E and Fig. 22). The diagnostic sherds depicted derive from a loose soil with rubble around the wall which came to light when the fallen stones from the Byzantine fortification wall were removed. The soil and the included sherds evidently derive from a landslide from the Acropolis. Date: Archaic to Hellenistic.

1. Rim of krater. Fine, hard, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric, black “glaze” (appears matt) on inside and rim and solid, covering zone on part of outside. Pink (7.5YR 8/4) slip on surface. Decoration in brown (7.5YR 5/4) horizontal lines. D.17. H.3.4. Cf. below Fig. 28: 4. Date: A (probably early).

2. Torus ring foot of skyphos. Very fine, hard, very pale brown (10YR 8/4) fabric. Smoothed surface. Inside painted in a black “glaze” colour (appears rather matt). The paint on outside is yellowish red (slightly lighter than 5YR 5/8) (Note! This is intentional not misfired). The same colour used for the circle below the bottom, while the dot in the centre is black. D.7. H.2.3. Date: A (?)


6. Rim sherd of basin/mortar (?). Coarse tempered, pale yellow (2.5Y 8/3) fabric with many black/brown stone, and a few white limestone inclusions. D.30 to 35. H.3.4. Date: -

7. Rim sherd of a lekane. Fine, soft reddish yellow (7.5YR 8/6) fabric. Faint traces of reddish brown (5YR 4/3) covering paint. Rounded rim and horizontal handles, Cf. Agora XII catalogue no. 1764 (fig. 21)(early varieties to 525 B.C.)/local imitation (?) (Waregroup as no. 4). Date: A, before 525 B.C.

F15/ACC/NW. The two cups were found in a soil with charcoal and stones (ACC-3)
Fig. 25. Selected finds from various architectural structures in F15.
The layer rested on bedrock and probably continued below the wall ABV. 30 sherds, all dated to the transition MHIII/LHI, were found in the layer.


F15/ACE. Pit in SW corner of F15 with concentration of tiles and sherds (section 2990E, STR 2 south of the Byzantine wall). Date: the layer was deposited in Late Roman/Byzantine times.


12. Rim sherd of bowl or large jar. Hard, fine reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric. D.15. H.4.8. Date: -

F15/ACA. The pit ACA is placed in the SW section of F15 where it filled up most of the trench (not seen on section 2990E south of the Byzantine wall). The deposit of stones and pottery evidently derived from higher up the hill and was redeposited after the construction of the Byzantine wall. Date: mixed prehistoric, C/HL and early Byzantine.


14. Lebes with vertical, square rim. Small white and dark inclusions. Reddish yellow (5YR 7/6) surface. Date: -


16. Splaying ring base for bowl. Semi fine, light red (2.5YR 7/6) fabric. Reddish yellow (5YR 7/8) soft surface with small inclusions. Date: -


20. Rim and handle of flange rim bowl. Snake handle on outside. Reddish yellow (approx. 5YR 6/8), gritty to sandy fabric with small inclusions. H.3.3. Date: HL.


22. Rim fragment, handle of cooking pot. Angular white inclusions, yellowish red/dark buff fabric. Date: -

Fig. 26:
F15/2/NW. STR. 2 east of the foundation wall ACC in TR F15/NW (above Fig. 16). It corresponds to STR 2 in TR G11 (section 3000E). To the west of ACC the corresponding level was called STR. 2a (see
Fig. 26. Selected finds from F15.


3. Kantharos (?) with high swung handles. Fine, hard red (2.5YR 6/6) fabric with mica. Traces of black, lustrous paint on strap handle and bands where the handle joins the body. D.3.5 min. H. 6.5. Date: C (?)


14. Section of small hemispherical bowl. Fine, very pale brown (10YR 8/4) fabric. Black “glaze” paint in bad quality covering the inside. Black, horizontal line on outside, below rim (not seen on Fig. 26). D.11. H.3.9. Date: C.

15. Large bowl with everted rim. D.31. H.12.0. Date: -

16. Ring base of open shaped vessel, bowl (?) Fine, reddish yellow (5YR 7/6) fabric. Fine black “glaze” on in and outside. D.12. H.3.2. Date: -


18. Thin walled sherd with two pierced holes. Medium tempered pink (5YR 7/4) fabric. H.5.7. Date: -

24. See above.

F15/2/NE. STR 2 east of the foundation wall ACC (continuation of F15/2/NW) is described as a hard packed, clayish layer with many sherds. In contrast to STR 2a (above) there are almost no tiles. Date: 6th-early 5th c. B.C.


22. (the drawing is upside/down). Stem from a close shaped vessel, probably a neck handled amphora (?). Fine, reddish yellow (5R 6/6) fabric. Covering black “glaze” - traces seen on foot. D.4.2. H.2.3. Date: -

23. Lid with concave knob. Flat top with string marks. Soft, reddish yellow to pink (7.5YR 8/6 to 5YR 8/4) sandy fabric. Fugitive (?) matt, brownish black “glazed” paint on outside. D.10.4. H.4.4 (F96-129). Date: 5th c. B.C.

24. See above.

25. Body sherd of a Corinthian (?) skyphos (the section on the drawing pl. 2 is too steep). Fine, soft very pale brown (10YR 8/4) fabric. Smoothed surface on outside. Dark brown paint, worn down to reddish yellow (5YR 7/6). Decoration with pendant semi-circles and horizontal, parallel lines. H.5.2. Date: -


27. Offset, triangular rim of large basin. Mouldings on outside of lip. Gritty, medium tempered, yellowish pink fabric with yellowish red core. D. (above) 60. H.12.3. Date: -

Fig. 27:

F15/2/NW. Date: Early A to HL.


3. Rim sherd of hemispherical bowl with thickened, rolled rim. Fine, pink
Fig. 27. Selected finds from F15.
(7.5YR 8/4-8/6) fabric, with small soft inclusions. Brown slip on inside. Painted decoration in matt brown colour, horizontal bands on rim and belly. Date: A (?) 


5. Shallow echinus bowl with thickened rim and groove below lip. Fine, soft, light red (2.5YR 7/8) fabric with few inclusions. Hard, glossy black “glaze” paint on in and outside. Cf. Agora XII, no. 821. Date: Late 5th. to early 4th c. B.C. 


7. Flat, flaring rim from a hydria (?). Fine, very pale brown (10YR 8/4) fabric with a pale brown (10YR 6/3) core. Traces of a dark slip on outside. Traces of black paint on top of the lip and a black, horizontal band on the inside. Shallow, horizontal grooves on outside below rim. D. (approx.) 16. Date: A. 

8. Bowl or small jar. Horizontal groove on inside rim, and horizontal grooves on outside indicating the transition between the concave rim and the globular body. Very fine, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric. The outside surface and the inside of the rim is covered with a rather matt, reddish brown (5YR 4/3) paint. D. (approx.) 15. H.7.5. Cf. for fabric, Fig. 9:7 (G11/2/NW). Date: (4th.-) 3rd c. B.C. 

F15/2/SW. STR 2 inside the Byzantine fortification wall is a sandy soil with tiles and stones. The pit ACA (Pl. 1) was cut into this STR which was redeposited from higher up the hill – at an earlier date than the pit ACA. Date: A/C to HL (mainly) - early Byzantine. 


16. Base of a household jar. Medium tempered, light red (2.5YR 6/6) fabric with predominantly white inclusions. D.9.2. H.3.1. Date: - 

17. - 


21. -


23. Fragment of a “Christian lamp” (?) Fine, reddish yellow (7.5YR 8/6) fabric with a few very small grits. Mould made decoration, palm tree, duck et. al. H.1.3. Date: 6th/7th c. A.D.

24. Rim of a large pithos. Very coarse fabric (inclusions 1-10 mm), dark to black. Reddish brown wash on outside and at top of the rim. D. (approx.) 50. H.11.8. Date: -

F15/3/SW STR 3 inside Byzantine wall (section 2990E). Clayish fill with smaller stones and many sherds. Byzantine sherds were all found near the wall. This might indicate that a foundation trench was cut through STR 3 even if no changes in the fill were noted. Mixed stratum redeposited. Date: Prehistoric (EH, MH and MYC), G, A, C, HL and early Byzantine.

25. Feet of figurine. Fine, light red (2.5YR 7/6) fabric. Black “glazed”. H.2.5. Date: A.


Fig. 28:

1. Rim sherd of postgeometric kotyle. Fine, reddish yellow (5YR 7/6) fabric. Very pale brown (10YR 8/4) burnished slip on outside. Decoration in red paint, meanders and parallel, horizontal lines (F96–173). Cf. Corinth XV, III. For hatched meander see no. 36 (LG). The more elaborated syntax and the inside indicates a date in EPC. Date: 7th c. B.C.


Fig. 28. Selected finds from F15.


13. Closed shaped jar. Medium tempered, reddish yellow (5YR 6/8) fabric with white inclusion and silver mica. Very pale yellow (more creamy than 2.5YR 8/2) slip on the outside. Very pale brown vertical bands (10YR 7/4), changing to red (when the colour is worn). H.3.7. Cf. Dietz 1980, fig. 46 and 47 (no. 35). Date: LH IA.


15. Large, open bowl or plate/basin. Coarse, medium tempered fabric with black core between light red (10R 6/8). Brown and black stone inclusions. D. (approx.) 50. H.2.9. Handmade. Date: -


F15/1/SE. Clayish, greyish brown surface soil with humus (section 3000E). Several small sherds. Date: C, HL, early Byzantine.
18. Rim and handle of a chytra. The rim is bevelled on inside. The strap handle has a central ridge. Orange to red (10R 5/6), gritty fabric with rather large, irregular white inclusions. Date: C/HL (?) 


26. Kantharos (?) with high swung strap handles. Fine, reddish yellow (5YR 7/6) fabric with few white inclusions. Thin brown slip on the inside. Date: - 

F15/2/SE. Approximately as STR 1 but with inclusions of white mortar from the Byzantine wall construction (section 3000E). Date: HL and early Byzantine. 


23. Small offset ring foot (cup or skyphos). Fine, soft grey fabric. Worn, dull, greenish to brownish Black “glaze” on inside, outside and under bottom. D.6.2. H.1.7. Date: - 


27. Flat ring base of bowl (?). Semi fine, pinkish buff fabric. Surface lighter. Traces of black “glaze” on inside. D.10.4. H.2.2. Date: - 

T × 3/1/ACH. Finds from the trial trench to the North of F15 near the foundation wall ACH. 

25. Miniature cup. Complete section preserved. D.2.5. H.1.5. (F96-177). Date: - 

Fig. 30: 

ABX-1/F25/2/NW. ABX-1 is a concentration of sherds in the NW section of F25 near foundation ABX. Dates: C. Probably deposited in late 5th – early 4th c. B.C. (one Byzantine sherd is considered a late intrusion). 


F25/1/NW. Surface STR in F25, NW section. Date: C, HL. 


4. Rim to belly of straight sided cup with simple, everted rim. Fine, pink
Fig. 30. Selected finds from F25.
(7.5YR 8/4) fabric. Matt dark red slip on outside, lighter red on inside.
D.6.9. H.4.2. Date: HL

F25/2/NW. The excavated material from the NW corner of F25 derives from the STR (2) in which the structure ABX was found (section 2990E (3890-3900)). The layer contains plenty of tiles and sherds.
Date: C (5th and 4th c. B.C.), HL, early Byzantine.

H.1.2. Cf. 3rd Hell. Conf., no. 11708, pp. 50-51 and pl. 19, g. Date: 3rd c.
B.C. (3rd to 4th quarter).

Date: C (?)

7. Straight sided, hemispherical small bowl. Fine, soft pinkish white (2.5YR 8/2) fabric. Matt, thin, dark brown slip on outside. Date: C (?)

8. Completely preserved loom-weight with incised figures and symbols on all four sides and below bottom. Semi-fine, pink (7.5YR 8/4), sandy fabric with small inclusions. H.5.5 (F96-56). Date: C/HL


11. Fragment of a lid with tapering profile and inturned rim. Pink (2.5YR 8/4) to light red (2.5YR 7/8) fabric.

12. Ring foot of household bowl. Semi fine fabric with light reddish brown (5YR 6/3) core. Surface smoothed, pale greenish buff. Black “glazed” paint on inside with two concentric incised circles in the bottom. D.5.2. H.1.9. Date: -

Date: -

F25/1(2)/NE. The level was reported as STR 2 but corresponds to STR 1 in F25/NW. The level rests directly on bedrock. Remains were preserved in grooves in the rock. Date: HL and early Byzantine.

Date: -

15. Simple ring foot of bowl. Fine, soft fabric with a few small white inclusions. Traces of a thin, reddish brown slip on outside. Finely incised spiral inside bottom. D.4.2. H.1.4 (F96-17, 2). Date: -

F25/1/SW. The surface layer is seen in section 2990E. Date: Prehistoric, C, HL and early Byzantine.


17. Flaring ring foot of kotyle/skyphos. Fine, pink (7.5YR 8/6) fabric. Glossy black “glaze” on in- and outside. D. (approx.) 7. H.1.5 (F96-13, 4). Date: -

H.3.7. Date: -

glaze” on in-and outside. Horizontal grooves. D.15.0. H.1.4. Date: -
20. Low, flaring ring base of a “Corinthian” kotyle/skyphos. Fine, pale pinkish buff fabric. Worn brownish black “glaze” on in and out(?) side. Reserved band on foot. (F96-13,2). Date: A/C
21. Concave base and part of belly of jar. Reddish yellow (7.5YR 8/6) fabric with more red, reddish yellow (5YR 7/8) core. D.6.8. H.2.7. Date: -
22. Female mould made head/face from a vertical strap handle. Small jug? Reddish buff (7.5YR -) soft, slightly porous fabric. Thin, glossy black “glaze”. H.3.5 (F96-3). Date: 3rd to 2nd c. B.C.
23. Thin walled lid with inturned rim. Fine, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric. Worn, matt flaking black “glaze” on in and outside. D. (approx.) 11. H.0.7. (F96-13,5). Date: -

F25/2/SW: The same layer as in F25/2/NW with many tiles and sherds (Fig. 15, 21 and section 2990E). The structure ABX continues in the SW part of the trench and is embedded in STR 2 (as in the NW corner). Date: C, HL, early Byzantine.

25. Lid with biconical knob. Light reddish brown (2.5YR 6/4) fabric with white and dark inclusions. H.2.2. Date: -
26. (F25/2:11). Cf. 3rd Hell. Conf. pl. 19.g (no. 11.708). Date: 3rd c. B.C./more likely) first quarter of 2nd c. B.C.
28. Small cylindrical knob of lid. Cooking ware with yellowish red (5YR 5/6) fabric and small white inclusions. H.1.8. Date: -

Fig. 31:

F25/2/SW. (See Fig. 30)

1. Cup (?) with thin, convex profile and groove below the rim. Yellowish pink (5YR -) soft fabric with very few visible inclusions. Black “glaze” on in and outside. D. (approx.) 15. H.5.7. Date: HL
2. Plain ring foot, convex profile for bowl/lekane. Medium tempered, pink (7.5YR 8/4) gritty/sandy fabric with small inclusions (mica). Matt, flaking greenish black “glaze” on inside. Date: Late C/HL.
5. Inwards, thickened rim, rounded profile with mouldings from a lekythos. Pale, pinkish buff, sandy fabric. Rim painted with matt black “glaze”. D.7.8. Date: -
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1. Stamped palmette pattern on inside bottom. D.5.0. H.1.6. Date: -
2. Ring foot of a bowl. D.5.0. H.1.9. Date: -
3. Thin rim and handle with ovoid section of a cup. H.3.9. Date: -
5. Attached “snake handle” of Hellenistic cooking ware body sherd. Date: HL.
7. Thickened rim, neck and almond shaped, vertical handle of an amphora. Medium fine, reddish yellow fabric with small dark grits and mica. D.10. H.8.2. Date: Late Roman (?)/Byzantine (?).
11. Vertical, triangular rim and almost horizontal shoulder of a Chytra (?). Fine, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) soft fabric with grey core and a few small dark and mica inclusions. D. (approx.) 28. H.2.5. Date: Byzantine (?)
15. Low, flaring, pedestal base of a cup. Fine, very pale brown (10YR 7/3) to gray, soft fabric. Flaking brownish black “glaze” on inside. D.4.2. H.2.2. Date: -
16. Flat base with deep, concentric grooves below bottom of a mortar. Coarse, pink (7.5YR 8/4) hard fired fabric with black inclusions. Outside smooched, inside, tempered with black gravel. D. (approx.) 16. H.5.3. Date: -
18. Vertical, triangular rim and almost horizontal shoulder of a Chytra (?). Fine, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) soft fabric with grey core and a few small dark and mica inclusions. D. (approx.) 28. H.2.5. Date: Byzantine (?)
20. Lid.
23. Low, flaring, pedestal base of a cup. Fine, very pale brown (10YR 7/3) to gray, soft fabric. Flaking brownish black “glaze” on inside. D.4.2. H.2.2. Date: -
25. Inturned rim of thin walled echinus bowl. Fine, reddish yellow (5YR 7/6)

S9/ACB. ACB is a concentration of tiles and sherd of in the NW corner of trench S9 (NW) also included in trench Txl, STR 1 (Fig. 15 and section 3830N (3080-3090) between 3080E and 3084E). Date: A(?), C and HL.


2. Flaring rim with split lip (grooved) of a hydria (?) Medium tempered, pale pinkish buff fabric with very small white inclusions and red grits. Thin, dull brownish black “glazed” paint on outside and at rim. D.20. H.4.2. Cf. Agora XII no. 1586 (425-400 B.C.). Date: C


4. Ring base of a bowl. Gritty, pinkish red slip on inside. D.5.6. H.1.9. Date: -

5. Part of rim and belly of a casserole with horizontal, circular handle. D. (approx.) 33. H.3.7 (F96-93). Date: HL


7. Fragment of a cyma with moulded frieze of egg and dart. Coarse, white (10YR 8/1) fabric with small red and larger black, angular inclusions. The surface is pale yellow (2.5Y 8/2). H.6.8. Date: A/C.

8. Short stem, low base of an unguentarium (or amphoriskos). Bright, light red (approx. 2.5YR 7/8) fine or semi-fine fabric. Flaking, reddish brown black “glaze” on outside. H.5.2 (F96-113). Cf. 3rd Hell. Conf.. pl. 147, b Date: 3rd to 2nd cent. B.C.

S9/2/NW. The kylix stem was included in the concentration ACB (see above).

9. Slightly everted rim, hollowed on inside of a jar/chytra. Coarse, light red (2.5YR 7/8) porous fabric with white, gray and black inclusions. D.11.8. H.4.1. Date: -


S9/1/NE. Surface layer S9. Dates: C, HL.


(S9/1/NW see Fig. 29).


15. Thickened rim of plate. Pierced hole through the wall partly preserved. Fine, soft, reddish yellow (5YR 7/6)
Fig. 32. Selected finds from Txl and S9.

18. Centre of a lid with mushroom knob, pierced through the wall. Medium tempered, pale yellow (5Y 8/3) gritty fabric with large voids. H.2.8 (F96-81). Date: A/C.


20. Thin, slightly outturned rim and part of belly of a cup or bowl with carinated section. Fine, hard, reddish yellow (5YR 7/6) fabric. Red (2.5YR 6/6) paint (slightly lustrous) on outside. Reddish brown paint on inside. D.10. H.5.4 Date: -


23. Rim and handle of a bowl with horizontal, circular handle at rim. Fine, reddish yellow (5YR 7/6) fabric with a few terracotta inclusions. Dark brown "glazed" paint on circular handle, on rim and band inside. D. (approx.) 22. H.2.6. Date: -

24. Flaring base and floor of a bowl. Black "glaze" with painted decoration on inside. D.10. H.5.4 (F96-170). Date: -

25. Cup with splaying lip and ring foot. D. (base) 6.0. Date: -

Fig. 34:

Tx1/1/4 (A). The lowest level in trench Tx1 – STR 4 was packed with big stones in a blackish earth (section 3830N). Dates: LH, A.


2. Body sherds of a bowl (?) Fine, hard, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric. Black "glazed" paint on inside and lower zone of outside. Upper bands painted in reddish yellow (lighter than 7.5YR 7/6)(broad bands) and reddish yellow (7.5YR 6/6). H.3.5. Date: A.


Tx1/1 (A). Eastern part of trench Tx1. See also Fig. 15.

5. Rim sherd (with double grooves) of a plate/dish (?). Fine, very pale brown...
Fig. 33. Finds from G11/2/NW Fig. 34, nos. 13 and 14.

Fig. 34, nos. 13 and 14.

(oYR 8/3) fabric. Covering black “glazed” paint. D. (approx.) 12. H.1.0. Date: Late C/HL.


F19/2/3 (A). The trial trench Tx2 is situated in section T, on the terrace below and east of the Byzantine wall. The upper part of the area was excavated previously. STR 3 was placed below the upper parts of foundation ABL - in the eastern part of the trench - resting on bedrock. Dates: A and LH.


8. Body sherd of a skyphos/kotyle. Pale buff fabric with yellowish pink inclu-

sions. Hatched band on lower body (very faint). D. (min.) 6.5. Date: Early A.

F19/1a/SW. Trench F19 is situated west of F15. The subtrench /SW was excavated outside (W) the Byzantine wall. STR 1a is the surface stratum, greyish-brown soil with mortar inclusions, towards the Byzantine wall. Dates: C and HL.


F19/2a/SW. Stratum 2 in trench F19 is situated just above bedrock. Date: C and HL.


Date: 4th c. B.C. last quarter.

F19/3a/NW. A thick clayish, greenish-brown layer on the bedrock was separated from STR 2a in F19/NW. Many tiles, sherds and pieces of bronze were found in the layer. Date: C (?) and HL.

12. Two pieces of bronze. One, a triangular arrow head. Hollow filled with lead. The other is a sheet of bronze. Arrow head: L. 1.15 x 0.71. Piece of sheet: 1.2 x 0.9 (F96-158). Date: -

G11/2/NW. Trench G11/NW was excavated to the north of foundation wall ACD until the line 3920N (Fig. 15). STR 2 is seen in section 3000E. The soil is hard packed yellowish clay with sherds. Dates: G, A, C and HL (see also Fig. 23).

13. Almost vertical, offset rim and part of


17. Body sherd of a closed vessel. Semi fine, pink (7.5YR 8/4) gritty fabric with white inclusions and voids. Worn brown painted decoration with dog tooth pattern. H.2.5. Date: Local Geometric (?)


19. Square, thickened rim of house hold basin. Coarse, pink (7.5YR 8/4) hard fired, sandy fabric with large inclusions. D. (above) 55. H.5.5. Date: -

20. Ring base and part of belly of a black “glazed” bowl. D.12.5. H.4.3 (F96-204). Date: A/C (?)


Fig. 35:

Tx1/2 (A). (See also Fig. 32). Eastern part of Tx1/2 towards the Byzantine wall. Layer with many sherds. Date: Prehistoric (EH), LH, G, A, C and HL.

1. Rim sherd of a large storage vessel. Coarse, reddish yellow (7.5YR 7/6) fabric with a few traces of silver mica. The rim is flat on top. Horizontal wavy line in relief on upper part of belly. D. (approx.) 50. H.10.2 (F96-153). Date: -

2. Thin rim of a cup. Very fine, soft, very pale brown (10YR 8/4) fabric. Pale yellow (creamy) burnished slip on outside, slightly more reddish on inside. Light red (approx. 2.5YR 7/8) paint only partly preserved. D.8. H.1.8 (F96-196). Corinthian (PC ?). Date: 7th c. B.C.


Fig. 34. Selected finds from Tx2, F19 and G11.
S9/1/NW. Sandy, greyish-brown surface soil in trench S9. Date: C and HL (?).

5. Rim, neck and handle of an amphora. Horizontal grooves on inside neck. Medium tempered, yellowish red, soft porous fabric. D.9.2. H.20.0. Date: -

6. Tall, plain vertical ring foot. Bevelled

G11/2/NW.

7. Outfalling, thin rim of a krater. Very fine, hard, reddish yellow (7.5YR 8/6) fabric. Pale yellow (2.5YR 8/4) paint/decoration on in and outside and on top of rim. D. (approx.) 30. H.7.0 (F96-194). Cf. West Slope tradition. Date: HL.

8. Ring base of hemispherical cup. D.6. H.5.3. Date: -

9. Rim sherd and handle of a hemispherical kylix (?) D.11. H.6.6. Date: -
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ΠΕΡΙΛΗΨΗ

Από το έτος 1995 βρίσκεται σε εξέλιξη ένα μεγάλο πρόγραμμα αρχαιολογικών ερευνών και πολιτιστικής ανάδειξης της περιοχής της Κάτω Βασίλικης στη ΝΑ Άιτωλία, όπου διατηρούνται τα ερείπια της αρχαίας πόλης Χαλκίδας, γνωστής και από τις αρχαίες πηγές. Το πρόγραμμα καταρτίστηκε από το Αρχαιολογικό Ινστιτούτο της Δανίας στην Αθήνα και μετά από γνωμοδότηση του Κεντρικού Αρχαιολογικού Συμβουλίου και σχετική εγκριτική απόφαση του ΥΠΠΟ, υλοποιείται σε συνεργασία με τη ΣΤΕΕΙΚΑ Πατρών.

Κατά το πρώτο έτος υλοποίησης του προγράμματος, καλοκαίρι του 1995, οργανώθηκε εκτεταμένη επιφανειακή έρευνα στις θέσεις Πάγκαλη και Αγ. Τρίαδα όπου είναι ορατές σχερώσεις της νυσσεύοντας και βιβλιακής περιόδου. Σκοπός της επιφανειακής έρευνας ήταν η αναζήτηση και ο εντοπισμός όλων των ορατών καταλοίπων ανθρώπινης παρέμβασης στο χώρο κατά την αρχαιότητα, προκειμένου να καταγραφούν, σχεδιάζονται και φωτογραφηθούν και να ληφθούν υπόθεση κατά την περαιτέρω χρήση υλοποίησης του προγράμματος. Τα επόμενα χρόνια 1996-1997, παράλληλα με την επιφανειακή έρευνα στις παραπάνω θέσεις, άρχισε και αρχαιολογική ανασκαφή.

Στο κείμενο αυτό παραθέτουμε τα πρώτα αποτελέσματα της έρευνας κατά τα έτη 1995-1996, τα οποία σε γενικές γραμμές είναι:

Α’ περίοδος 1995: Στη θέση Πάγκαλη η επιφανειακή έρευνα που διενεργήθηκε στην ανατολική πλευρά του όρους Βαράσσα και ειδικότερα στο χώρο που ορίζουν τα δύο σχηματικά τείχη της αρχαίας Χαλκίδας, μεταξύ άλλων απέκρυψε και όστρακα της νεωτέρης νεολιθικής περιόδου. Διαπιστώθηκε επίσης η σύντομη χρονική χρηση του χώρου κατά την χλωρική περίοδο και αποτυπώθηκαν οι ορατές θεμελιώσεις μεγάλου ορθογώνιων κτιρίων. Εξίσου σημαντικά είναι και τα νέα στοιχεία που ήρθαν στο φως από την επιφανειακή έρευνα στο άλλο μέτωπο του προγράμματος, στο λόφο της Αγίας Τρίαδας. Η διαχρονική καταίκηση ειδίκευτε από τα νυσσεύοντα χρόνια μας ήταν γνωστή τόσο από τα ορατά ερείπια αυτών των περιόδων όσο και από τη συστηματική ανασκαφή που διενήργησε ο καθ. του Πανεπιστημίου Ιωαννίνων Αθ. Παλιούρος και η οποία αποκάλυψε στην κορυφή του λόφου παλαιοχριστιανική βασιλική. Από τη δυσκόλη μας όσος σχετική επιφανειακή έρευνα προηγήθηκαν σημαντικά στοιχεία, κυρίως όστρακα, που διαφοροποιούσαν πλέον το χρονολογικό στίγμα της περιοχής.

Ο λόφος της Αγ. Τρίαδας, ευρισκόμενος σε ένα στρατηγικό σημείο της περιοχής από το οποίο ελέγχεται η εισόδος και η εξόδος του Κορυνθιακού, από τα στοιχεία που περισυλλέγει εκεί, φαίνεται ότι, με εξαίρεση τη δρομακτική περίοδο, κατακτήθηκε αδιακόπτως από τα ΠΕ μέχρι τα βυζαντινά χρόνια.

Β’ περίοδος 1996: Στη θέση Πάγκαλη, παράλληλα με τη συνέχιση της επιφανειακής έρευνας, στο χώρο όπου κατά το 1995 είχαν περισυλλεγεί νεολιθικά όστρακα, διενεργήθηκε δοκιμαστική ανασκαφή με τομή διαστάσεων 2 X 2 μ. που δεν συνέπεσε μεν με δομικά στοιχεία (τοιχούς κτλ.) της περιόδου αυτής, μας
απέφευξε όμως στρουμματογραφικά διάφορες φάσεις κατοίκησης της νεώτερης νεολιθικής.

Στο άλλο μέτωπο της έρευνας στο λόφο της Αγ. Τριάδας, αρχίσαμε
ανασκαφή κατά συστηματικό τρόπο. Ο υπό έρευνα χώρος ορίστηκε σε μεγάλους
tομείς (A, B, C, ... F, ... Z) από τους οποίους ερευνήθηκαν μικρά τμήματα (F14, F15, F19, F25, G11, S9, βλ. εικ. 15). Η ανασκαφή κάλυψε χώρο που εκτείνεται εντός και
eκτός της βυζαντινής σχήματος. Τρείς δοκιμαστικές Tx1, Tx2, Tx3 που
dιενεργήσαμε μέχρι το φυσικό έδαφος κρίθηκαν αναγκαίες για τον έλεγχο της
στρουμματογραφίας.

Τα αποτελέσματα της πρώτης ανασκαφικής μας παρέμβασης στο λόφο της
Αγ. Τριάδας είναι κατά την άποψή μας πολύ σημαντικά γιατί, εκτός από τις
θεμελιώσεις του 5ου και 4ου αι. π.Χ., ήρθαν στο φως, επιβεβαιώθηκε
στρουμματογραφικά και η μεγάλη περίοδος κατοίκησης στο λόφο.

Το κείμενο συνοδεύεται από σχέδια χαρακτηριστικών οστράκων.
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