
The Harbors of Ancient Athens

Author(s): Thomas W. Ludlow

Source: *The American Journal of Philology*, Vol. 4, No. 2 (1883), pp. 192-203

Published by: The Johns Hopkins University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/287600>

Accessed: 27-02-2020 15:40 UTC

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

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



JSTOR

The Johns Hopkins University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Philology*

IV.—THE HARBORS OF ANCIENT ATHENS.

I.

It is not necessary to enumerate here the various positions which have been assigned, during the last fifty years, to the different harbors of ancient Athens. It is sufficient to say that, in the early part of the century, the easternmost natural haven (Phanari) of the Peiraic peninsula was identified as the port of Phaleron. Later, the investigations of several distinguished German scholars, especially of Ulrichs and Curtius, led them to place Phaleron at the eastern extremity of the bay of the same name, near the spot now known as Haghios Georgios. This theory is now generally accepted; and the port of Phanari is known as Mounychia, and the southeastern harbor of the peninsula (Pasha-Limani)¹ as Zea. There has been no dispute about the identity of the main harbor of the Peiraieus, which has now resumed its classic name; but the subdivision of this harbor, attempted in accordance with ancient texts, is a matter of much uncertainty.

II.—PHALERON.

“In the maritime towns of antiquity, the seaport was frequently separate from the city proper, and at some distance from it. In early times there were very few artificial harbors, surrounded by quays, divided into basins, and protected by jetties, breakwaters, and fortifications, as in many modern seaports. . . . The ancients chose as a rule, for their ports, a small natural gulf or inlet, sheltered from the fury of the open sea, and provided with a gently inclined beach, upon which their vessels could be drawn up.”² An examination of the conformation of the Athenian coast renders it doubtful whether these conditions are fulfilled in the site ascribed to Phaleron at Haghios Georgios. This site is described as follows by M. Émile Burnouf, ex-Director of the French School at Athens: “It would be impossible to establish a harbor near *Τρεῖς Πύργοι*, except

¹ Stratiotiki—(Leake).

² Charles Lenthéric—*La Provence Maritime Ancienne et Moderne*. Paris, 1880, p. 209.

by the construction of breakwaters of great extent ; and even such breakwaters would afford incomplete protection against winds from the west and south. There remains no vestige of a breakwater, or of engineering works of any kind ; while the cape at the extremity of the bay would afford but scant shelter to a single fishing boat."¹

In the harbor of Phanari, on the other hand, at the western end of the Phaleric bay, we have a beautiful little natural basin, almost circular, and about one-fifth of a mile in diameter. This basin has a single narrow entrance, contracted still further by ancient Hellenic breakwaters, which remain almost perfect. The harbor is sheltered on three sides from the wind, and it possesses the sandy beach which was sought by the ancients for their ports. At the water's edge are remains of numerous shipways and houses, both cut in the rock and constructed of blocks of hewn stone. Even taking into consideration that, before the Persian war, the naval power of Athens was comparatively inconsiderable, and that the ships were small and drawn easily up on the shore, it would seem reasonable that so excellent a natural harbor should be chosen in preference to the open coast near Haghios Georgios, exposed to storms and difficult to defend against a hostile surprise. It must be conceded that Haghios Georgios is considerably nearer Athens than Phanari ; but we shall see below that the distance of the latter place from the city accords better than that of the former with the length of the Phaleric Long Wall as given by Thucydides.²

III.

I will not repeat the arguments of Ulrichs and Curtius in favor of the identification of Haghios Georgios with the ancient Phaleron. These arguments are reviewed and summed up very clearly in Curt von Wachsmuth's *Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum*,³ a work of much erudition, in which is brought together a mass of ancient information with reference to each question discussed. I will now consider some points in the scanty ancient testimony that remains to us regarding the topography of the Athenian seaports, which seem to throw doubt upon the solution generally accepted.

The Long Walls to Phaleron and the Peiraieus were begun in 459 B. C.⁴ If Phaleron was at Haghios Georgios, nearly two miles of

¹ La Ville et l'Acropole d'Athènes. Paris, 1877, p. 136.

² Book II, chapt. 13.

³ Leipzig, 1874, p. 306 *et seq.*

⁴ Thucydides, I 107.

shore along a plain, in some places indeed marshy, but in general smooth and accessible, lay exposed to a hostile attack from the sea between the Long Walls,¹ of which the usefulness was thus seriously impaired. It is true that Athens had, at the time of the construction of the Long Walls, almost reached the zenith of her power both by sea and by land. However, it would not be safe to assume that she could consider herself secure against even a raid from the sea. An old rival and bitter enemy—Aigina, the “eyesore of the Peiræus”—lay only a few miles distant across the Saronic gulf, her temple of Athena in plain sight from Athens three miles inland. Aigina was indeed much crippled, but she still retained some semblance of independence.² It was not until 455,³ four years after the Long Walls were begun, that she was forced to surrender her last ships to Athens. Many of the allies of Athens had considerable naval power until long after this. It was thirty years later that Lesbos revolted and was crushed; and the presiding city of the confederacy had before her the example of the revolt of Thasos,⁴ to warn her against over-confidence in the fidelity of her allies. Yet the Outer and the Phaleric Long Walls were begun some eighteen years after the Peiræus had become her principal seaport; and there was therefore no urgent necessity for seeking to assure the connection between the metropolis and Phaleron; while the attempt to do so in the way that Thucydides tells us it was done, always granting that Phaleron was at Haghios Georgios, would have introduced an obvious element of weakness into the whole system of fortification.

The following is the main passage of Thucydides which bears upon the defences of Athens and her ports at the beginning of the Peloponnesian war: “The length of the Phaleric Long Wall was thirty-five stadia, to the fortifications of the city. The circuit of that portion of the fortifications of the city which was kept under guard was forty-three stadia, in addition to the portion left unguarded, between the [outer] Long Wall and the Phaleric Wall. The length of the Long Walls to the Peiræus was forty stadia; and

¹ Cf. Wachsmuth—*Die Stadt Athen im Alterthum*, p. 558.

² Cf. G. von Alten, in the *Erläuternder Text of Curtius and Kaupert's Karten von Attika*, Berlin, 1881. Heft I, p. 10, “Die Nähe des feindlichen Aegina, von welchem man jeder Stunde eines Ueberfalls gewärtig sein konnte, allein machte eine solche Sicherung [the fortification of the seaports] nöthig.”

³ George W. Cox—*The Athenian Empire* (Epoch series). London, 1876, p. 31. 4465-463 B. C.

of these the outer one was guarded. The whole circuit of the Peiraieus, including Mounychia, was sixty stadia, of which the half was guarded."¹

Even if we allow that the entire land side of the Peiraic peninsula, including the circuit of the promontory of Eëtioneia, was held under guard without reference to the Long Walls to Athens—a condition which is highly improbable—we must fill out from the sea-walls of the peninsula a large part of Thucydides' thirty stadia. The inference is easy, that at the beginning of the war, although an attack from the sea may not have been much dreaded, still it was thought necessary to take proper precautions.² Yet, according to the accepted theory concerning the harbors, we must believe that a long stretch of sandy beach was left unprotected between the Peiraic peninsula and Phaleron. We know that the middle Long Wall was not guarded, and that there was a portion of the city wall, "between the Long Wall and the Phaleric Wall," which was not occupied by the garrison. We must imagine, therefore, about three square miles of land, in great part fertile, of which the value to Athens would have been inestimable, during the Peloponnesian invasions, exposed to a bold nocturnal raid at the hands of such enemies as the Lacedaemonians. Worse than this, the middle Long Wall might have been seized, or even an entrance to the city have been gained by surprise over the undefended section of the fortifications.

An argument perhaps still more forcible against the existence of this great intervening space between Phaleron and the Peiraieus is found in Thucydides' description of the crowded state of the city at the time of the first Peloponnesian invasion. Thucydides' words are as follows: "When the country people arrived in Athens, some few of them found lodgings in the houses of friends or relatives; but the great majority established themselves in the open spaces of the city, and in all the sacred enclosures of gods and heroes, except the Akropolis and the Eleusinion, and some other places which were kept resolutely closed.³ Even the spot beneath the Akropolis, called the Pelasgikon, was thus occupied, in spite of curses which had been proclaimed against its settlement,

¹ Thucydides, II 13, 7.

² Later, the Athenians became more careless in their watch toward the sea, as we know by the amusing incident of the planned Spartan attack upon the Peiraieus, described by Thucydides, Book II, 93.

³ Καὶ εἰ τι ἄλλο βεβαίως κληστὸν ἦν.

and of the words of the Pythic oracle, 'It is better that the Pelasgikon should remain fallow.' I think, for my part, that this oracle meant the opposite of its popular interpretation, and that it was not on account of the impiety of inhabiting the Pelasgikon that disasters befell the city, but on account of the war that it became necessary to occupy the Pelasgikon. The oracle was doubtless rendered with knowledge that this place would never be given over to dwellings in time of prosperity, although it does not state this plainly. Many of the newcomers constructed quarters for themselves in the towers of the city walls, and wherever else any one was able to find accommodation; for there was not room enough in the city for so large a number as were crowded into it. Finally, they took possession of [the space between] the Long Walls, and of the greater part of the Peiraieus."¹

If three square miles of ground had been available, between the Long Walls and the Phaleric Wall, it would hardly have been possible for the want of room to be so pressing. That this space could not have been left unoccupied for fear of attack is shown by the fact already often alluded to, that the middle Long Wall and a certain portion of the city wall were left unguarded. The Phaleric deme, as Strabo tells us, began at the boundary of the Peiraic, and extended along the adjacent shore.² Yet no mention is found of the occupation by the refugees of the territory of this deme, which would have been, in great part, within the walls.

Another argument against the identification of Haghios Georgios with Phaleron is furnished by the very nearness of this point to Athens. The intervening distance is only about thirty Attic stadia;³ while that to the city from the little promontory on the northern side of Phanari agrees much more closely with the length of thirty-five stadia assigned by Thucydides to the Phaleric Wall. To explain away this and other difficulties in the measurements given by Thucydides, Curtius supposes that the historian used a stadion measure smaller than the usual Attic; and other scholars suppose inexactitude on the part of Thucydides, or excessive windings of the walls. The latter supposition is very unlikely in the case of fortifications of the nature of the Long Walls, upon such ground

¹ Thucydides, II 17; cf. II 52.

² Strabo, 398, 21: Μετὰ δὲ τὸν Πειραιᾶ Φαληρεῖς δῆμος ἐν τῇ ἐφεξῆς παραλίᾳ . . .

³ Wachsmuth, p. 330.

as this part of the Attic plain, and the first two seem disproved by independent evidence.¹

IV.—MOUNYCHIA.

Mounychia, the Akropolis² of the Peiraieus, is identified by the German scholars with the steep hill above the harbor of Phanari. There seem to be weighty reasons for doubting the correctness of this assumption. The smaller peninsula, which forms the southern extremity of the Peiraic peninsula, is, there can be no doubt, the Ἀκτὴ of the ancients;³ famed for its quarries of building stone, abundant remains of which still exist. In Herodotos, VIII 77, we have preserved the following words of an oracle:⁴ "When they shall make a bridge with their ships between the sacred headland (ἀκτὴν) of Artemis of the golden sword and sea-girt Kynosoura, etc." But Pausanias tells us that "the Athenians have still another harbor, that at Mounychia [where there is] a temple of the Mounychian Artemis."⁵ As no other Artemis is mentioned in connection with the seaports, except the Thracian Bendis, whose sanctuary was in the neighborhood of that of Artemis Mounychia,⁶ this is enough to establish a presumption that Ἀκτὴ and Mounychia were merely different names for the same locality. This presumption is strengthened by Herodotos' account of the disposition of the Persian fleet before the battle of Salamis: "Those who were stationed near Keos and Kynosoura brought up their ships and

¹ See Wachsmuth, pp. 330 and 334, etc., for this evidence. Milchoefer[†] says, in the explanatory text of the *Karten von Attika*, 1881, Heft I, p. 24, §6, that the Phaleric bay extended probably, in ancient times, much further inland towards the city; and that even now it is impossible to walk dryshod in a straight line from Athens to the site at *Τρεῖς Ἱεργοί* (Haghios Georgios). The sea at the eastern side of the bay is shallow and even obstructed by reefs, so as to be ill-fitted for navigation. Towards the western side of the bay, remains of ancient houses exist; these must have been in the deme of Phaleron. Milchoefer (*loc. cit.*) seems inclined to the opinion that the port of Phaleron occupied a position now wholly inland, upon the supposed ancient inland extremity of the Phaleric bay, and not far distant from the southern Long Wall. It is probable, however, that this inlet was already, in the earliest historic times, extremely shallow.

² Wachsmuth, p. 307.

³ See Wachsmuth, p. 316 *et seq.*, for proof of this.

⁴ Wachsmuth, p. 317, and note 6.

⁵ Pausanias, I 1, 4.

⁶ Xenophon—*Hellenica*, II 4, 11. Cf. Plato—*Πολυτεία*, a¹, I.

blockaded the whole strait as far as Mounychia. This movement was made in order to cut off the retreat of the Hellenes, . . ."¹

A glance at the map shows that it is unlikely that the blockading line was extended further than the extremity of the Peiraic peninsula. If the line of ships had been carried beyond Ἀκτὴ to the Phanari harbor, a large number of ships would have been in such a position as to be unable to render any service—the whole Peiraic headland being necessarily between these ships and the scene of battle.

Under the word *Μουνυχίων*² we find in Photios the following explanation: Ἡρώδης τινος καθιερώσαντος αὐτὴν (Μουνυχίαν Ἀρτέμιδα) ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ Πειραιῶς ἀκρωτηρίῳ.³ Wachsmuth quotes this sentence as evidence that Mounychia was the Akropolis of the Peiraieus. The word ἀκρωτηρίῳ describes excellently the peninsula of Ἀκτὴ, which, too, was peculiarly fitted to be the Akropolis; not only by nature, since it is connected with the main peninsula merely by a narrow isthmus, and since it commands completely the entrances both to the main Peiraieus harbor and to the harbor of Pasha-Limani, but also by art;⁴ for considerable remains of its ancient fortifications survive. The hill above Phanari, called Mounychia by the Germans, is higher and steeper; but before the invention of gunpowder, Ἀκτὴ was plainly a more advantageous site for the Akropolis. Strabo's description of Mounychia runs as follows: Λόφος δ' ἐστὶν ἡ Μουνυχία, χερρονησιάζων καὶ κοῖλος καὶ ὑπόνομος⁵ πολὺ μέρος φύσει τε καὶ ἐπίτηδες ὥστ' οἰκήσεις δέχεσθαι, στομίῳ δὲ μικρῷ⁶ τὴν εἴσοδον ἔχων· ὑποπίπτουσι δ' αὐτῷ λιμένες τρεῖς. Τὸ μὲν οὖν παλαιὸν ἐτετείχιστο καὶ συνόκειστο ἡ Μουνυχία πλησίως ὥσπερ ἡ τῶν Ῥοδίων πόλις, προσειληφύια τῷ περιβόλῳ τὸν τε Πειραιᾶ καὶ τοὺς λιμένας πλήρεις νεωρίων, ἐν οἷς καὶ ἡ ὀπλοθήκη, Φίλωνος ἔργον· ἄξιόν τε ἦν ναῦσταθμον ταῖς τετρακοσίαις ναυσίν, ὧν οὐκ ἐλάττους ἔστελλον Ἀθηναῖοι.

¹ Herodotos, VIII 76.

² Wachsmuth, p. 307, note 6.

³ Cf. the use of the word ἀκρωτηρίου with reference to this very Ἀκτὴ, or to a part of it, in Plutarch, Themistokles, frg. 1, of Müller: Frg. Hist. Graec. II, p. 353. (Wachsmuth, p. 320, note 4.)

⁴ Cf. Wachsmuth, p. 315, note 4. Diodoros, XX 45, and XIV 33.

⁵ Some prominent scholars consider that the expression κοῖλος καὶ ὑπόνομος applies with peculiar aptness to the hill nearest the mainland, on account of the remarkable passage hewn from the rock in very ancient times, and containing a flight of steps which descends to a great depth in the southwest slope of the hill. This explanation seems, however, rather far-fetched. This underground passage has not yet been thoroughly investigated.

⁶ Στομίῳ δὲ μικρῷ applies very well to the narrow peninsula by which Ἀκτὴ is joined to the rest of the Peiraic peninsula.

Τῷ δὲ τείχει τούτῳ συνήπτε τὰ καθειλκυσμένα ἐκ τοῦ ἄστεος σκέλη· ταῦτα δ' ἦν μακρὰ τείχη, τετταράκοντα σταδίων τὸ μῆκος, συνάπτοντα τὸ ἄστυ τῷ Πειραιεῖ . . .¹

The word *χερρονησιάζων*—forming a peninsula—seems to adapt itself admirably to Ἀκτὴ, while it cannot without a stretch of meaning be applied to the hill above Phanari. Ἀκτὴ, again, and the neck of land by which it is connected with the rest of the peninsula, are much better “adapted for dwellings,” and for the wide streets and symmetrical plan of Hippodamos—resembling those of Rhodes in beauty²—than the steep, rough slopes of the Phanari hill. The rest of the description appears to suit equally well either site.

Wachsmuth mentions³ the remains of a Doric temple found upon the shore of the Pasha-Limani by Colonel Leake, and says that “Leake attributed these ruins incorrectly to the temple of Artemis Mounychia.” He gives, however, no reason why they should not belong to the temple in question as well as to any other. Again, Wachsmuth thinks⁴ that only one theatre can have existed, in ancient times, in the seaport city. As considerable remains of a theatre survive upon the northwestern slope of the Phanari hill, and as Thucydides mentions τὸ πρὸς τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ Διονυσιακὸν θέατρον,⁵ he argues that the Phanari hill must be Mounychia. This argument is upset by the discovery in 1880 of another theatre at the north-eastern extremity of Ἀκτὴ,⁶ close to the bay of Zea (Pasha-Limani), which it overlooks. If, therefore, Pasha-Limani is the ancient haven of Mounychia, we have in this new theatre τὸ πρὸς τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ θέατρον.⁷

¹ Strabo, IX 395, 15. Ed. Didot, 1853, p. 339. ² Wachsmuth, p. 319.

³ Wachsmuth, p. 328.

⁴ Wachsmuth, p. 320, note 3.

⁵ Wachsmuth, p. 320, note 2. Thucydides, VIII 93, 1. Cf. Lysias, XIII 32 and 35.

⁶ See Karten von Attika, mit erläuterndem Text, herausgegeben von E. Curtius und J. A. Kaupert. Berlin, 1881. Heft I, Bl. II.

⁷ Mr. Dragatses, in his article on Τὰ θέατρα τοῦ Πειραιῶς καὶ ὁ Κωφὸς λιμὴν, published in the *Παρνασσός* for 1882, p. 257 *et seq.*, gives satisfactory evidence that both theatres existed before the Peloponnesian war. He proceeds with an attempt to show from a study of Xenophon's account of the campaign of Pausanias against Thrasybulos, that the Κωφὸς λιμὴν was not, as is usually accepted, either the inlet west of Eëtioneia or the marshy bay, now in great part filled up, at the northern extremity of the Peiraic harbor; but that it was the first of the subdivisions of the main harbor near its entrance. Even in connection with the usual theory of Peiraic topography, this part of M. Dragatses' essay can hardly be considered successful; while if Thrasybulos' headquarters were on Ἀκτὴ, the Spartan commander's scouting expedition towards Eëtioneia would explain itself.

V.—THE PEIRAIEUS.

We read in Pausanias that "before Themistokles came into office . . . the Peiraieus was not the port of Athens, but Phaleron, where the sea is [comparatively] very near the city . . . But when Themistokles became prominent in the government, seeing that the Peiraieus was better adapted to the needs of navigation than Phaleron, and that it had three havens while Phaleron had but one, he took the necessary steps to create this seaport for the Athenians. And down to my own time, ship-houses have existed there; and the tomb of Themistokles is situated near the largest haven . . .

"The Athenians have still another harbor—that at Mounychia, where is the temple of Artemis Mounychia—besides the port of Phaleron, which I have mentioned already. Near the Phaleric harbor stand the temples of Demeter and of Athena of Skiras, beyond which is that of Zeus. Here, too, are the altars of the so-called Unknown Gods, etc.

" . . . Twenty stadia distant [from Phaleron] is the promontory of Kolias,¹ upon which the current cast up the wreckage after the destruction of the fleet of the Medes [at Salamis] . . ."²

*Ἐχει δὲ ὁ Πειραιεὺς λιμένας τρεῖς, πάντας κλειστούς· εἰς μὲν ἐστὶν ὁ Κανθάρου λιμὴν καλούμενος, ἐν ᾧ τὰ νεώρια ἐξήκοντα, εἴτα [τὸ] Ἀφροδίσιον, εἴτα κύκλῳ τοῦ λιμένος στοαὶ πέντε.³

Ζέα . . . εἰς τῶν ἐν Πειραιεὶ λιμένων.⁴

Graser is of opinion⁵ that by "the three harbors of the Peiraieus" are meant the three divisions of the main harbor formed by two projections of its shore-line. He thinks that these three havens were described as *κλειστούς*, because the fortifications at the entrance defended at once all the inner subdivisions of the harbor. This opinion is shared by Colonel Leake and by M. Burnouf, among other scholars of high standing. The adjective *κλειστούς* could refer equally well to the fact that these inner harbors were protected—"closed"—from the violence of the sea.

¹ Pausanias, I 1, 5. This distance corresponds very closely with that from Phanari to the promontory at the eastern extremity of the Phaleric bay.

² Pausanias, I 1, 2, 4, 5.

³ Frg. 4 in Müller's Frg. Hist. Graec. IV, p. 450. (Wachsmuth, p. 310.)

⁴ Hesychios, at the word Ζέα. (Wachsmuth, p. 307, note 5.) For other authorities mentioning the three harbors of the Peiraieus, see Wachsmuth, Part II, pp. 306–28 *passim*.

⁵ Wachsmuth, p. 311.

The most important point in the passage from Pausanias is that, after speaking of Phaleron and the Peiræus, with its three harbors, he mentions Mounychia as *another* harbor, implying that it was not one of the three havens of the Peiræus proper. This militates against the modern theory that the three havens in question are the Peiræus, Pasha-Limani, and Phanari, and that the two last are the old Zea and Mounychia. We know that Mounychia was on the Peiraic peninsula; if, then, its harbor was not one of the *λιμένας τρεῖς αὐτοφυεῖς*,¹ the three havens in question must have been subdivisions of the main harbor.

VI.

From all that has preceded I venture to infer that the topographical arrangement of the chief harbors of Athens set forth last by M. Burnouf,² but not defended in detail by him, and agreeing in the main with that of Colonel Leake, is not only a possible, but even the probable arrangement. According to this theory the small peninsula at the extremity of the Peiraic peninsula is Mounychia or Ἀκτὴ; and the port beneath it to the northeast is ὁ ἐπὶ Μουνυχίᾳ λιμὴν. Phanari is the ancient Phaleron, and the hill above it is the Akropolis of Phaleron.

It still remains to settle the relative positions of the three bays of the main Peiræus harbor—Zea, Aphrodision, and Kantharos. Different students have proposed in turn every arrangement of the names rendered possible by the existing number of bays; but no one of these arrangements seems based upon conclusive evidence. The chief naval establishment was on the harbor of Zea; we have therefore some reason to identify as Zea the largest of the three interior bays—the first on the right hand side upon entering the harbor. This position, commanding the narrow entrance and protected itself by the Akropolis of Ἀκτὴ, would have been especially favorable for the naval station; and the opinion that it was here is supported by the discovery near the modern Custom House, which stands on the point between this bay and the Πορθμεῖα or commercial port, of the important naval inscriptions first published by Boeckh. In these inscriptions reference is frequently made to “the Arsenal”³

¹ Thucydides, I 93, 3. (Wachsmuth, p. 307, note 2.)

² Émile Burnouf—La Ville et l'Acropole d'Athènes. Paris, 1877. Plate XI, and p. 136 *et seq.*

³ See A. N. Meletopoulos—Ἀνέκδοτος Ἐπιγραφή. ἐν Ἀθήναις, 1882, p. 6, for quotations from the inscriptions.

in such terms as to leave little doubt that the arsenal in question was the famous Arsenal of Philon, which, as appears from the long inscription relating to it found last year near the Pasha-Limani (Mounychia)—as I believe, at some distance from its original position—stood “in Zea.” I think it therefore probable that this first bay is the ancient Zea, and that the great arsenal stood near it, perhaps, as suggested by Milchhoefer,¹ on the ridge between it and Mounychia, which was the second in importance of the old Athenian naval stations. It may be remarked that these positions for the naval stations and for the Akropolis would have been especially convenient for the transportation to the Akropolis and to the arsenal of the spars and rigging, etc., of which there is frequent mention in the naval inscriptions.

VII.—THE LONG WALLS.²

I have touched already upon the question of the length of the Long Walls to Phaleron and to the Peiraieus. I will give one other passage which, with that quoted already from Thucydides,³ establishes clearly that there were three Long Walls—two from Athens to the Peiraieus, and one to Phaleron: “Antiphon [says] to Nikokles that there were three walls in Attika, as Aristophanes tells us in the *Τριφάλης*—the Northern, the Southern, and the Phaleric Walls. The wall which ran between the other two was called the Southern Wall; it is mentioned by Plato, also, in his *Gorgias*.”⁴

In connection with this τὸ διὰ μέσου τεῖχος, we meet with a difficulty. The Scholiast on Plato's *Gorgias* tells us that: διὰ μέσου τεῖχος λέγει δ καὶ ἄχρι νῦν ἐστὶν ἐν Ἑλλάδι. Ἐν τῇ Μουνυχίᾳ γὰρ ἐποίησεν καὶ τὸ μέσου τεῖχος, τὸ μὲν βάλλον ἐπὶ τὸν Πειραιᾶ, τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ Φάληρα.⁵

A possible explanation suggests itself from the topography of the ground, *i. e.* that the middle Long Wall was carried along the

¹ Cf. Karten von Attika, 1881, Blatt IIa, and explanatory text, p. 48. Drums of Peiraic limestone and a Doric capital of Pentelic marble have been found upon this site. The dimensions of the drums correspond very well with those given in the new inscription for those of the Arsenal; the capital is a few inches higher than it should be, but possibly the specifications of the contract as to measurements were not adhered to rigidly.—See American Journal of Philology, No. 11, October 1882, p. 317 *et seq.*

² See Wachsmuth, Part II, pp. 328–36.

³ Thucydides, II 13, 7.

⁴ Harpokrates (Suidas), at the words διὰ μέσου τεῖχος. (Wachsmuth, p. 328, note 2.)

⁵ Scholiast upon Plato's *Gorgias*, p. 304, Herm. (Wachsmuth, p. 328, note 2.)

crest of the steep hill above Phaleron, and down to the little point at the northern side of the entrance to the port of Mounychia, forming thus a dividing wall between Phaleron and the rest of the Peiraic peninsula.¹ This course would give to the Middle Wall approximately the length of forty stadia assigned to it by Thucydides, while other courses suggested heretofore make it fall short of this measurement. To arrive at definite results, and to settle, perhaps, this whole question of the harbors and of the Long Walls, it will be necessary to institute a thorough investigation on the spot.

The construction of the Middle Long Wall by Perikles, although the Phaleric and the Peiraic Long Walls existed already so near together, can be accounted for as a measure of extra precaution, to ensure communication with the sea if one or the other of the ports should chance to fall into the hands of an enemy, or one of the exterior walls to be carried by storm.

The German scholars do not claim to have found any vestige of a Long Wall between the shore near Hagios Georgios and Athens. They mention only some scanty ancient remains close to the sea.² These may well mark the site of an ancient settlement; my contention is merely that, for the reasons enumerated, this settlement, if it ever existed, cannot have been the port of Phaleron—the earliest seaport of Athens of which we have historic record. Burnouf, on the other hand, says: “The line given by the German scholars for a Long Wall from the cape near Treis Pyrgoi to Athens is entirely imaginary. In the whole intervening space there exists no vestige or trace of such a wall.”³

THOMAS W. LUDLOW.

¹ An ancient boundary monument of a public space before a gate was found in its original position on November 27, 1882, on the southern side of the hill in question, just within the exterior fortifications. I have no map sufficiently detailed to show its exact position; but from the description, the monument may very possibly refer to a fortification wall between the Peiraieus and the eastern haven. The inscription, which is prior to the IVth century, is as follows:

(Γ)ΡΟΓΥΛ

ΟΔΕΜΟΣ(ι)

ΟΗΟΡΟΣ

(π)ροπύλ

ου δημοσ(ι)

ου ὄρος.

Παρνασσός, Nov. 30–12, 1882, p. 862.)

² Wachsmuth, p. 330.

³ Work cited, p. 137.