

EPINEIA KAI LIMENES: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HARBOURS AND CITIES IN ANCIENT GREEK TEXTS

BY

ANTON BONNIER

Abstract

The aim of this article is to explore the relationship between harbours and cities as presented in literary sources dating primarily to the Archaic and Classical periods. Although it has been recognized that access to the sea and sailing routes was of great importance for the economic and political life of ancient Greek city-states, there have been few studies of the relationship between cities and harbours, and in particular of the emblematic role played by harbours within literary sources. Harbours are often presented as extramural entities in relation to cities and although urban centres would depend on harbours for the import and export of goods, and for maintaining navies, the relationship between harbours and cities is not unproblematic if we look at what harbours signify within these texts.*

INTRODUCTION

We see in modern times also many states and territories in possession of anchorages and harbours conveniently situated for the city, not so near as to encroach and become part of the same town, but close enough to be controlled by walls and other such defence-works. It is therefore clear that if communication with those places is productive of good, then that good will accrue to the state; but if of evil, it is easy to guard against that by laying down laws to prescribe who are and who are not to be allowed to come into contact with each other.¹

The passage above, taken from the *Politics* of Aristotle, highlights both how the sea was used and how it was perceived, and more specifically, what the relation was between harbour and city, two features within the text of the *Politics*, which form distinct parts of a political landscape. What is interesting is not just the rôle played by the harbour as an economic or military feature of the city and its territory, but also the way in which the harbour represents a place possibly detrimental to the city and the character of the state. The harbour, therefore, has an important symbolic role, which is situated outside of the urban sphere, and which may indeed be threatening to the city's interests, but the port-area is still incorporated into the wider territory of the city and the state. One must of course remember that Aristotle's discourse in the *Politics* and, in general, in his treatment of many subjects is pre determined by an idealised picture of the perfect state and may not always reflect com-

mon opinion or practice. Nevertheless this passage presents several aspects of the harbour as a symbolic entity, both in terms of use and territoriality.

Although previous monographs and articles have explored the use and function of harbours,² there has been limited research concerning the image, rôle and representation of harbours within Greek literature and thought.³

* This is a reworked and extended version of a paper originally given at a symposium on the use and function of city gates in antiquity held at the Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, in March 2006, and carried out through the initiative of the Swedish Pompeii Project and Professor Anne-Marie Leander Touati. Many thanks are due to the participants of the higher seminar at the Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies, Stockholm University, and especially to Dr. Gunnel Ekroth, for reading drafts and giving valuable comments, many thanks are also due to Dr. Jenny Wallensten for giving valuable comments on a later version. All mistakes and idiosyncrasies remain my own.

¹ Arist. *Pol.* 1327a 33–40: ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ νῦν ὀρώμεν πολλὰς ὑπάρχοντα καὶ χώραις καὶ πόλεσιν ἐπίγεια καὶ λιμένας εὐφυῶς κείμενα πρὸς τὴν πόλιν, ὥστε μήτε τὸ αὐτὸ νέμειν ἄστῳ μήτε πόρρω λίαν, ἀλλὰ κρατεῖσθαι τείχεσι καὶ τοιοῦτοις ἄλλοις ἐρύμασι, φανερόν ὡς εἰ μὲν ἀγαθὸν τι συμβαίνει γίνεσθαι διὰ τῆς κοινωνίας αὐτῶν, ὑπάρξει τῇ πόλει τοῦτο τὸ ἀγαθόν, εἰ δὲ τι βλαβερὸν, φυλάξασθαι ῥᾶδιον τοῖς νόμοις φράζοντας καὶ διορίζοντας τίνας οὐ δεῖ καὶ τίνας ἐπιμίγεσθαι δεῖ πρὸς ἀλλήλους (all translations from Aristotle are by T.A. Sinclair (Penguin 1981) unless otherwise stated).

² An important study from the earlier 20th century is the work by Lehmann-Hartleben (1923) which discusses harbours in the ancient Mediterranean from the Bronze Age to the Roman period. Here the function and structural make-up of the harbour is focused upon, rather than the relationship between cities and harbours specifically. The work of Blackman (1982a and b) is also important to mention here, and while its focus is much broader as compared with that of this article, Blackman (1982b, 193–196) also highlights certain issues concerning the symbolic and ideological relationship between harbours and cities, though he does not present an in-depth discussion of these.

³ In von Reden's discussion of the Piraeus and its political and territorial context within the Athenian state (von Reden 1995) the ideological and cultural tension between the city and the harbour is highlighted. The studies carried out by Amit (1965) and Garland (1987) on the Piraeus also need to be mentioned, though again these are not primarily interested in the Piraeus as a symbolic entity within Athenian thinking, but instead mainly cover its history and structural development.

Representation of harbours within the literary sources therefore demands further attention, especially when one considers the importance often attributed to the sea in connection with studies of pre-industrial trade and exchange in general, and ancient Greek trade in particular.⁴ Sita von Reden has previously suggested, in an interesting and well-argued study, that the harbour in many ways represents a landscape detached from the city, particularly in terms of political thinking, although it is mainly in connection with the Piraeus that she explores such a relationship.⁵

Discussion is therefore needed of the general representation of harbours in connection to urban environments, if we are to investigate how consistent this type of view on harbours would have been within ancient Greek thinking. The aim of this article is to explore the symbolic rôle played by harbours, in connection with different cities and settlements, and in particular, to consider to what extent harbours are represented as part of a separate landscape in relation cities and the urban sphere.

In using the term ‘detachment’ and ‘separation’, I am referring to representations and depictions within the literary sources of the harbour as a feature of the state that is physically separated from the urban sphere, either through the placement of city-walls or by the fact that the city is situated inland. In connection with the representations of physical separation, I will also explore nominal and symbolic separations, i.e. cases where harbours are presented as separate entities and features although it may not be possible to detect any clear physical separation. It should be stressed that the aim of this article is to discuss not the physical *realities* of settlement-topography in connection to harbours and the sea,⁶ but rather what these entities signify in relation to the urban sphere, and how the relationship between harbours and cities is presented within ancient literature. The sources which will be considered consist of literary texts, dating to the Archaic and Classical periods, although some earlier and later sources will also be discussed in order to explore more fully some of the arguments presented. Inscriptions will not be examined though they would provide a suitable topic for a separate study.

The first part of the article will deal primarily with territoriality and how harbours are represented in the light of their physical location in connection to cities, and also in terms of their nominal position. The rôle of the terminology used to denote harbours will also be considered, and in particular what types of places these words point to, in relation to the urban sphere. The final part of the article will consider how harbours are treated as features separate from the urban sphere, in the light of symbolical and ideological imagery.

HARBOURS AND CITIES: REPRESENTATIONS OF TERRITORIALITY, SEPARATION AND USE

Topographically, an inland location was a common feature in the placement of Greek cities. This is especially true in terms of the major Classical *polis*-states such as Athens, Corinth, Sparta and Thebes, which were all situated in the interior. In the cases of Thebes and Sparta the distance, between the city and the coast would have been substantial. The positions of urban communities inland from the coast must have prompted discussions and descriptive accounts of territorial control. One needs to consider not just how the interaction between harbours and cities is described and discussed in the literary sources, but also how the inland positioning of cities would have influenced the use of the coast and the sea by their inhabitants. In the cases of the cities mentioned above, the harbours are clearly topographically separate from the urban landscape (although sometimes connected with inland cities through the construction of long walls). They may, in some cases, even display certain of the features of autonomous communities.⁷

Inland locations were common elsewhere in the Archaic and Classical world and in several instances we find descriptions of harbours controlled by inland centres. Thucydides states in the introduction of his history that a reason for the position of the cities inland rather than by the coast was the presence and “wide prevalence of pirates” in what he sees as part of an ancient past.⁸ The location of cities

⁴ The importance of maritime trade, as well as trade in general, has been at the heart of the debate on the ancient economy, particularly within the setting of the formalist and substantivist debate. The importance of the scholars involved, such as Rostovtzeff and Finley, illustrates the weight placed on these questions. See Andreau 1995; see also the foreword by Morris in Finley 1999.

⁵ Von Reden 1995. In this article von Reden (p. 36) concludes that the Piraeus was viewed as an obstacle to political unity both in periods of oligarchy and of democracy.

⁶ The rôle of harbours in connection to the settlement-patterns and physical environment of the hinterland, in the regions bordering the Corinthian Gulf, will be further examined in my forthcoming PhD thesis entitled *From harbour to hinterland: landscape, settlement development and coast – inland interaction by the Corinthian Gulf, c. 600–300 B.C.*

⁷ The Piraeus has been shown to contain buildings connected to the institutions of the *polis* such as the Agora of Hippodamus which acted as a political meeting-place, as well as the ‘Old Bouleuterion’, known from an inscription dating to the third century, Amit 1965, 80; von Reden 1995, 27. The rôle of different cults (especially foreign) has also been thought to suggest a separate identity associated with the harbour as distinct from the city (Amit 1965, 85–88; Garland 1987, 101–138), although such views have also received some criticism from von Reden (1995, 30–31).

⁸ Thuc. 1.7 (all translations from Thucydides are by R. Harrison (Penguin 1954) unless otherwise stated); de Souza 1999, 27, there are problems, however, concerning the description of piracy in the past in the narrative of Thucydides in relation to his own contemporary views (see de Souza 1999, 23).

away from the coast is thus explained by the potential danger which the sea and the coast presented to them, and such a placement in relation to the sea is therefore represented as the result of a conscious choice made by the community in order to protect itself from these threats. The physical separation between city (*polis/asty*) and harbour (*limên*) is also emphasized in several other parts of Thucydides' text, such as the description of the harbour Cophos, located in the territory of Torone "not far from the city".⁹ A similar situation is suggested by the description of the base of the Corinthian fleet in the initial conflict with Corcyra:

This fleet sailed from Leucas to the mainland opposite Corcyra and came to anchor at Chimerium in the territory of Thesprotis. There is a harbour here, and above it, at some distance from the sea, is the city of Ephyre in the Elean district.¹⁰

In this passage the harbour is represented as a feature of the territory of the specific city, although it is hard to define the processes of interaction and methods of control existing between the city (Ephyre) and its harbour. It is also difficult, on the basis of Thucydides' text, to know whether the harbours mentioned would have comprised some form of built environment or whether they would simply have been natural harbours appropriated by a city or community in its vicinity.

Herodotus also gives some examples of cities, located in the interior, which were in control of harbours, but the information on harbours given within his narrative is limited,¹¹ a situation which is rather surprising, given the geographical and ethnographic interests present in his narrative. Pogon, in the area of Troezen, is described by Herodotus as the harbour of Troezen.¹² There are also cases where a harbour is stated as being situated in the territory of a specific community, such as the harbour of Oricon which is located, according to Herodotus, in the territory of Apollonia.¹³ Oricon is thus not explicitly controlled by the city but is located within its territory. The use and relationship between a harbour and a city placed in the hinterland of the coast is also highlighted by Xenophon in the *Anabasis*, where he describes Harmene as the port of Sinope.¹⁴

Another useful text, dating to the 4th century B.C., is the *Periplus*, falsely attributed to Scylax of Caryanda.¹⁵ It is a sailing-manual, possibly derived from several other sources, and much information is provided on harbours, both in Greece and in other parts of the Mediterranean.¹⁶ It is therefore an important source for the function and description of harbours and also in terms of the relationship between harbours and cities. Although the information given in the text is extensive, most of the descriptions seem to follow certain formulas. The most common context in which a harbour is mentioned consists of the description of a named place as being a city and harbour (*polis* and *limên*). This type of usage is exemplified by the description of the Greek city of

Heraclaea in the region of Illyria as a "city and harbour".¹⁷ It is hard to exactly determine if the text signifies a separation between a harbour and a city located inland or whether we are dealing with a harbour which is conjoined the settlement itself.

There are instances in the *Periplus* where harbours are presented as connected to or controlled by cities located in the hinterland of the coast. Here harbours are presented as situated in the territory of a specific city or community, for example, in the region of Cyrenaica we hear of "a harbour [*limên*] in the territory of Cyrenaica".¹⁸ There are also occasions when we find that harbours are mentioned in connection with cities that are specifically described as being located inland. In the case of Cyrene, we are told that from the harbour to Cyrene the distance is eighty stades. And Cyrene is located in the interior.¹⁹ Further:

... out of the Cyrenean harbour to the harbour by Barce, [the distance is] 500 stades. And the city of the Barcaeans is distant from the sea 100 stades.²⁰

A similar picture is also given for the city of Ambracia which is described as a "Greek city at a distance of 80 stades from the sea".²¹ In this area there is also a fort and a closed harbour (*limên kleistos*) located by the coast.²² The term *kleistos* seems in this instance to indicate the presence of harbour fortifications, such as are found particularly as-

⁹ Thuc. 5.2.

¹⁰ Thuc. 1.46: 'Επειδὴ δὲ προσέμειξαν τῇ κατὰ Κέρκυραν ἡπίερω ἀπὸ Λευκάδος πλέοντες, ὀρμίζονται ἐς Χειμέριον τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος γῆς. ἔστι δὲ λιμὴν, καὶ πόλις ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ κεῖται ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἐν τῇ Ἐλαιάτιδι τῆς Θεσπρωτίδος Ἐφύρη.

¹¹ Although the artificial harbour (λιμένα χῶμα) constructed at Samos, in the reign of the tyrant Polykrates, is an important exception (Hdt. 3.60).

¹² Hdt. 8.42: Πάγωννα τὸν Τροιστηνίων λιμένα.

¹³ Hdt. 9.93: διὰ τῆς Ἀπολλωνίης χώρας ἐς θάλασσαν παρ' ὤρικον λιμένα.

¹⁴ Xen. *Ana.* 6.1.15: τῇ δ' ἄλλη ἀφικνοῦνται εἰς Σινώπην καὶ ὠρμίσαντο εἰς Ἀρμύνην τῆς Σινώπης.

¹⁵ For the date and authorship of the *Periplus*, see *OCD* s.v. Scylax, and Blackman 1982a, 79.

¹⁶ Blackman 1982a, 79.

¹⁷ Ps.Scyl. 22.5: Καὶ πόλις ἐστὶν Ἑλληνίς ἐνταῦθα, ἣ ὄνομα Ἡράκλεια, καὶ λιμὴν (all the texts from the *Periplus* have been taken from K. Müller, *Geographi Graeci minores*, vol. 1, Paris).

¹⁸ Ps.Scyl. 108.11–12 (all translations from the *Periplus* are by the author): Χερρόνησοι Ἀχιλίδες, λιμὴν (ταῦτα τῆς Κυρηναίων χώρας ἐστὶ).

¹⁹ Ps.Scyl. 108.19–21: Ἐκ δὲ τοῦ λιμένος εἰς Κυρήνην στάδια ὀγδοήκοντα. Ἔστι δὲ Κυρήνη ἐν μεσογείᾳ.

²⁰ Ps.Scyl. 108.24–25: Ἐκ δὲ λιμένος τῆς Κυρήνης μέχρι λιμένος τοῦ κατὰ Βάρκην στάδια φ' ἢ δὲ πόλις ἢ Βαρκαίων ἀπὸ θαλάσσης ἀπέχει στάδια ρ'.

²¹ Ps.Scyl. 33.1–2: Ἀμβρακία πόλις Ἑλληνίς· ἀπέχει δὲ αὕτη ἀπὸ θαλάττης στάδια π'.

²² Ps.Scyl. 33.2–3: Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ θαλάττης τείχος καὶ λιμὴν κλειστός.

sociated with military harbours, and which would be used in order to close the mouth of the harbour during periods of military conflict, and thus the term *limên kleistos* should be translated as “a closable harbour”.²³ These examples from the *Periplus* show how harbours are presented as features which are tied into the territorial structure of cities which are located inland, but which are separated from the urban sphere, as a matter of geographical necessity, because of the position of the main city.

The *Periplus* also presents examples of harbours the site of which are related, not just to cities located away from the coast, but also to broader geographical entities such as specific regions and areas. This is exemplified by several instances where harbours have a connection with whole islands. The islands are usually coupled with a specific formula “island and city and harbour” (νησος καὶ πόλις καὶ λιμῆν). This type of description is, for example, used in connection with Ithaca,²⁴ and also in the case of Corcyra, where this Greek city is listed together with three harbours located by the city itself.²⁵ The specific reference in this passage, to the harbour as being located close to the city of Corcyra suggests that this may not always be the case with settlements listed for other islands, such as Ithaca. Broader regional associations are also emphasized in connection with the description of sailing routes in Libya where a harbour, named as Ammun’s *halous*, is described by Pseudo-Scylax as a port of Syrtis, and thus viewed as connected with a whole region rather than just a city.²⁶

Perhaps the clearest indications of the physical connection and political appropriation of specific harbours and harbour sites by urban centres situated in the hinterland, as well as of what may be defined as controlled separation in the physical sense, come from the many examples of walls built from cities to harbours and the coast. The construction of such fortifications seems to have occurred at a number of cities, particularly during periods of war as parts of their defence strategy. The most famous example of the construction of long walls leading down to the harbour from the city is Athens and the Piraeus, where walls linking the city with its harbours were initially constructed in the middle of the 5th century B.C., in order to enhance the naval defence of the city.²⁷ Thucydides also mentions several other constructions of this type in his narrative of the Peloponnesian War. Walls were set up between Megara and its harbour at Nisaea some time prior to the conflict in which the city was involved.²⁸ The building of walls between city and harbour is also mentioned by Thucydides in connection to Alcibiades’ campaigns in the Peloponnese in 418 B.C., where walls were set up between the city of Patras and the coast. Walls were also constructed in Argos in 417 B.C. leading down to the sea.²⁹

The walls would not only make the harbour connected with the city into a defensive unit but would also facilitate

imports of supplies when the city was put under siege and would perform an important strategic function, beyond those mentioned by Aristotle. Harbours were thus valuable components of the state in terms of military activity carried out by the different cities, and became connected to the cities’ defences. It may therefore seem contradictory to suggest that these walls effect physical separation, between urban centres and harbours, but given the fact that the original fortifications surrounding the city would separate the harbour from the area of the city, the harbour should still be seen as extramural, though the movement of goods and people would have been protected through these long walls.³⁰ Some care needs to be taken with interpretations of this kind. The position of the city’s defences would in most cases have been established before the walls leading to the coast were built, and would also dictate the layout of such constructions. Features such as natural topography and the physical location of the city in relation to the coast and suitable harbours would also have influenced the position of the different long walls.

Even in relation to cities located by the coast, harbours are often presented as being separated from the urban sphere, and sometimes also extramural entities. This is highly important in terms of the representation of harbours and how these are presented as places which were detached from the urban sphere, both physically and nominally. The passages which have been discussed above describe harbours connected to inland cities. Territorial control and separation from urban environments have therefore been highlighted as matters of geographical necessity. (We need not venture into the question concerning the original reasons for the placement of cities). It is consequently of relevance to note that certain features of separation are also evident in the relationship between coastal settlements and harbours. In several of the literary sources, therefore, one finds evidence that there existed a complex relationship between cities and their neighbouring maritime landscapes.

Such a situation seems, for example, to be implied by Thucydides within his narrative of Athenian action in southern Italy during the Peloponnesian war, where he states that several Italian cities would not allow the Athenians inside the city walls “but would only give them water and liberty to anchor and, in the case of Tarentum and Locri, not even

²³ Blackman 1982b, 194.

²⁴ Ps.Scyl. 34.13: νησός ἐστιν Ἰθάκη, καὶ πόλις καὶ λιμῆν.

²⁵ Ps.Scyl. 29: Κατὰ δὲ Χαονίαν νησός ἐστι Κόρκυρα, καὶ πόλις Ἑλληνίς ἐν αὐτῇ, λιμένας ἔχουσα τρεῖς κατὰ τὴν πόλιν.

²⁶ Ps.Scyl. 109.13: ἐπίνειον, Ἀμμωνος ἀλοῦς τῆς Σύρτιδος.

²⁷ Garland 1987, 22–26.

²⁸ Thuc. 4.66. These walls are also mentioned by Strabo (9.1.14) in his description of Megara.

²⁹ Thuc 5.52, 5.82.

³⁰ Although here we are approaching a discussion which is based on topography rather than on representation in the literary sources.

this”.³¹ Here we get a clear indication of the notion of separation even in a coastal environment, as the places of anchorage represented as situated outside of the city walls. Xenophon also offers descriptions where the harbours of coastal settlements seem at least to be nominally separate from the cities. One passage is particularly relevant, as it highlights this separation of harbours and cities by the coast, but at the same time indicates the importance of the interplay between these:

All this time Alcibiades was in his castle and he could see from there that the Athenians were moored on an open shore with no city behind them and that they were getting their supplies from Sestus, which was about two miles away from the ships, while the enemy, inside a harbour and with a city [Lampsacus] at their backs, had everything they wanted. He therefore told the Athenians that they were in a very poor position and advised them to shift their anchorage to Sestus, where they would have the advantages of a harbour and a city.³²

In this passage the harbour is represented as separate feature, but also dependent in relation to the city. The text also highlights the relationship of an urban centre, in association with its function as an important market, and the harbour, in connection to the movement of goods. Of course the military context of this passage should not be underestimated, as Alcibiades’ decision is influenced by the need for a more beneficial supply-system in times of war. It would not have been suitable for the fleet to draw supplies only by means of sea-routes or from a city further down the coast, as the harbour could have been blocked off and seems in this specific instance to have been open and unprotected. The harbour at Sestus was, for that reason, seen as a better alternative as it could be protected and was also connected to a city.

Nevertheless, in the case of Sestus, the harbour is clearly presented as a separate feature from the city, and therefore as detached from the urban environment, although it in many ways depends upon the city and is also located in its immediate vicinity.³³ A similar situation is reflected in the position of Lysander’s fleet at Lampsacus, which is anchored in a harbour with “a city at their backs” (ἐν λιμένι καὶ πρὸς πόλει).³⁴ Again the harbour seems to be represented as situated outside of the limits of the city itself, although it is located near the coast.³⁵

Xenophon presents other cases of urban environments by the coast which may be considered as detached, such as the city of Sicyon, the harbour of which forms an important background to the narrative of events taking place in the Peloponnese. In this case it is hard to determine the relation between the harbour and the urban environment of the city, also when we study the material remains.³⁶ Strabo states that the old settlement was situated on the coast but continued to serve as a harbour after the construction of the new city, and he thus implies that the old city would have incorporated a harbour into the city plan. But this passage should primarily

be seen as testimony of the situation in later periods, and it presents us with problems if we try to apply its evidence to an earlier situation.³⁷

However, the treatment of the harbour of Sicyon elsewhere within the narrative of Xenophon raises some doubts as to whether it should be considered as an integrated part of the city. In these other instances Xenophon describes how Euphron gives the harbour of Sicyon (and not the whole city) to the Spartans.³⁸ In fact, he records Euphron as having said in a speech addressed to the Spartans that, if it had been possible, he would have given them the city and not just the harbour, showing that this might be considered, at least nominally and symbolically, as separate from the rest of the settlement. Due to the fact that Euphron is able to isolate the harbour from the rest of the city and give it to the Spartans, it should probably also be regarded as an extramural entity. These passages thus show that the harbour may be considered as a specific entity in relation to the city, even if the location of the city itself was on the coast.

The *Periplus* also provides some examples of harbours which are connected to cities located in the immediate vicinity of the coast, although it is difficult to assess whether the harbour is intended to be seen as a feature separated from the city. In such instances we are simply provided with the name of the city or community listed together with καὶ

³¹ Thuc. 6.44.2: τῶν μὲν πόλεων οὐ δεχομένων αὐτοὺς ἀγορᾶ οὐδὲ ἄσται, ὕδατι δὲ καὶ ὄρμῳ, Τάραντος δὲ καὶ Λοκρῶν οὐδὲ τούτοις.

³² Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.25 (all translations from Xenophon are by R. Warner (Penguin 1966): Ἀλκιβιάδης δὲ κατιδὼν ἐκ τῶν τειχῶν τοὺς μὲν Ἀθηναίους ἐν αἰγιαλῷ ὀρμούντας καὶ πρὸς οὐδεμίᾳ πόλει, τὰ δ’ ἐπιτήδεια ἐκ Σηστοῦ μετιόντας πεντεκαίδεκα σταδίου ἀπὸ τῶν νεῶν, τοὺς δὲ πολεμίους ἐν λιμένι καὶ πρὸς πόλει ἔχοντας πάντα, οὐκ ἐν καλῷ ἔφη αὐτοὺς ὀρμεῖν, ἀλλὰ μεθορμίσαι εἰς Σηστὸν παρήνει πρὸς τε λιμένα καὶ πρὸς πόλιν.

³³ It is of course important to connect the image projected by the sources with the situation revealed by the available archaeological remains; in the case of Sestus we cannot do this adequately as the site has not been explored systematically. The site should probably be identified with settlement-traces at a plateau by the Yalova valley, overlooking a bay which must have acted as a good natural harbour (see Casson 1926, 216–217; *PECS*, 830). Here, the location of the city, as detached from the harbour, seems dependent on the natural topography and in concerns for security and defence.

³⁴ Xen. *Hell.* 2.1.25.

³⁵ Here it is again hard to draw anything from archaeological remains, as traces at the site have been few, and there has been no systematic investigation which might clarify the relation between the layout of the city in relation to the coast (see *PECS*, 480).

³⁶ In general, Sicyon also presents us with a problem in terms of material remains, as it is hard to locate the pre-Hellenistic settlement exactly, though it was probably situated on the coastal plain in the area of modern Kiato. Some limited excavation has been carried out there, but the picture remains blurry (see Griffin 1982, 6–15 and Lolos 2005, 275).

³⁷ Strab. 8.6.25.

³⁸ Xen. *Hell.* 7.3.3: νῦν δ’ οὐ ἐγκρατὴς ἐγενόμην τὸν λιμένα παραδέδωκα ὑμῖν.

λιμῆν. This is the case for example with Messene in Sicily which is listed as “Μεσσήνη καὶ λιμῆν”.³⁹ This type of formula is also given for Siphæ in Boeotia and Cyllene in Elis, as well as many others.⁴⁰ In this context the text seems to refer to the actual physical presence of a harbour in connection with the coastal site. In these cases it is hard to determine the level of separation between harbour and settlement, although, in other sources, both Cyllene and Siphæ are mentioned as ports belonging to certain inland communities.⁴¹

Overall, the information given in the *Periplus* on the physical connections between harbours and cities are not always clear. The use of *limên* seems to refer to a place which may be both a settlement and a harbour, and which forms a territorial entity in itself. However, due to the character of this text as a coastal pilot, it is the harbour itself that is the important feature in this instance and not its physical integration with the city or the function of the harbour within wider networks. The *Periplus* is therefore a difficult source to use in relation to issues of separation, particularly in the case of settlements located topographically in close connection to harbours.

From the passages above it becomes clear that harbours located in direct connection with settlements on the coast were often considered as features distinct, at least nominally, from the urban landscape. This observation is highly important in relation to the treatment of harbours within literary texts. The literary material should also be correlated with available archaeological and topographical evidence, in order to test the applicability of such representations in the written records to the reality of harbour-topography in relation to urban centres, although this undertaking would fall beyond the scope of the present study.⁴²

HARBOUR-TYPES, THEIR ENVIRONMENT AND DIFFERING RELATIONSHIPS TO THE URBAN LANDSCAPE

Part of the problem about determining the way in which harbours are represented as detached from the urban sphere, within the literary sources, may be related to the function of different harbour-types, and what type of places and environments are presented in the texts. We are accordingly faced with a discussion in which one needs to take account of the dates of the texts as well as the aims and interests of the different authors.

A common harbour-type, which figures in many of the literary texts, is the natural harbour which forms part of both the physical and the political landscape. These natural harbours often feature in the earlier literature of Greece, such as the Homeric epics. In Homer, harbours are seldom described as being connected to a specific settle-

ment, but acts instead as natural entities within the maritime landscapes faced by the sailors during their perilous voyages.⁴³ In the *Iliad*, for example, we find descriptions of harbours presented as natural features of the landscape rather than as man-made entities.⁴⁴ As such they are clearly separate from the urban landscape, if the term “urban” is indeed applicable within the epics. There are, however, some instances where harbours are linked politically to a specific community or settlement, like the harbour of the Laestragonians, which is a natural harbour but controlled by the Laestragonian settlement which is located in the hinterland.⁴⁵

Natural harbours are common also within texts dating to the Classical period and Thucydides offers several examples, not necessarily under any direct political control, but often located in a specific territory or region. In connection to the conflict between Corinth and Corcyra in 433 B.C., he mentions a place called Sybota which is described as “not an inhabited place, but a harbour in Thesprotis”.⁴⁶ A similar harbour, located by the Saronic Gulf, is Spiraëum, and Thucydides comments that the site consists of “an uninhabited harbour [λιμῆν ἐρημὸς] in Corinthian territory

³⁹ Ps.Scyl. 13.7.

⁴⁰ Ps.Scyl. 38.2; 43.2.

⁴¹ Both of these settlements are referred to as *epineia* of specific communities, for Kyllene, see Thuc 1.30 and Strabo 8.3.4, for Siphæ, see Steph.Byz. *Ethnica*. 573.1 Σῖφαί, ἐπίνειον τῆς Θεσπιακῆς. At Siphæ the traces of 4th century walls suggest that the harbour was incorporated in to the defences of the settlement on the coast and would therefore not have acted as an extramural entity in relation to this settlement, though it would clearly have been geographically separated from the main settlement further inland (see Fossey 1988, 168–171).

⁴² Even if we should find that harbours were more often than not separated from the city through the placement of city walls, this might also depend heavily on the nature and use of the harbour. For example, it may be more important to fortify a military harbour rather than one used solely for commercial purposes. It is also important to discuss how much such a placement of city defences reveals about the wish to exclude harbours from the urban landscape and how much it may depend on the topographical environment and the suitability of location. Only future studies will solve such issues.

⁴³ The occurrence of natural harbours was, as we shall see, of importance to Greek sailing routes both during the Archaic and Classical periods (Morton 2001, 108–110).

⁴⁴ For example Hom. *Il.* 1.432–434: “When they entered the deep harbour, they furled the sail, and stowed it in the black ship, and the mast they lowered by the forestays and brought it to the crutch quickly, and rowed with oars to the place of anchorage” (tr. A.T. Murray, Loeb 1999): οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ λιμένος πολυβενθέος ἐντὸς ἴκοντο ἰστία μὲν στείλαντο, θέσαν δ' ἐν νηὶ μελαίνῃ, ἰστὸν δ' ἰστοδόκη πέλασαν προτόνοιον ὑφέντες καρπαλίμως, τὴν δ' εἰς ὄρμον προέρεσαν ἑρετμοῖς.

⁴⁵ Hom. *Od.* 10.86–110; see also Morton 2001, 24, for a discussion of the physical environment of this harbour.

⁴⁶ Thuc. 1.50.3: ἔστι δὲ τὰ Σύβοτα τῆς Θεσπρωτικῆς λιμῆν ἐρημὸς.

nearly on the frontier of Epidaurus".⁴⁷ In these cases harbours are treated as part of the natural landscape and definitely lie outside the urban sphere, although they may, in terms of territorial boundaries, be connected to certain cities.

Indications of a built environment being associated with harbour sites within the earlier literature are also given in the *Odyssey* in connection to the harbour of the Phaeacians.⁴⁸ The harbour itself must be regarded as a natural harbour, created by the two headlands stretching into the sea on either side of the city walls. It is hard to determine exactly how far the harbour actually relates to the urban landscape of the city and the layout of the city walls. The harbour seems to be located outside of the city walls, and may be defined as an extramural entity rather than being a part of the *asty* itself. However, there are at the same time some unmistakably urban features located in the area of the harbour. In particular a meeting-place or market (*agora*), and a shrine dedicated to Poseidon are situated in the area of the harbour.⁴⁹ We find in this situation that, even if the harbour is positioned outside of the city walls, it still has some of the traits which one would associate with the urban sphere. But there are also some ambiguities—an *agora* may indicate trade in products carried by the sea and the location of a shrine of Poseidon by a harbour cannot be regarded as exceptional. The city of the Phaeacians should of course not be read as blue-print for a Greek city in the 8th century B.C. It is intended to reflect an idealised city and community, and will also represent an idealised setting for a natural harbour in connection to the city. Throughout the epic the Phaeacians seem to represent the most civilized and urban of all the cultures that Odysseus meets, and the urban layout is consequently something which should be seen as exceptional.

Similar descriptions in the later sources are, however, few and, in most of the instances which have been discussed above, harbours are simply mentioned in connection with the geographical location, while little is said about the structures and features which are associated with these sites. There are cases where some information is given or at least hinted at. Thucydides presents Cyllene, located in the territory of Elis, as a harbour which consists both of a built environment and also under the direct control of another settlement or city. In his account of the conflict between Corinth and Corcyra in 433 B.C., the Corcyreans burned the port of Cyllene, thus indicating the presence of a built environment at the site (which could be set on fire and as presumably could some of the ships also). The port is described as "Cyllene, the *epineion* of Elis",⁵⁰ thus suggesting direct political control of the harbour by the Eleans and the city of Elis. Here, the harbour is a part of a settlement and is also incorporated into some form of constructed environment, while still being separ-

ated from the main urban sphere formed by the city, which was located inland.

Herodotus' description of the harbour of Samos, built by the tyrant Polycrates in the 6th century B.C., is also important in connection to representations of harbours as constructed environments.⁵¹ The harbour with its large artificial mole is an example of an early "constructed" harbour and it is clearly also under the control of a specific settlement,⁵² although Herodotus gives little information with regard to the relationship between the harbour and the city. On the basis of the material remains, the harbour lies topographically in direct connection with the city and the harbour area and the moles were incorporated into the systems of defences surrounding the settlement,⁵³ although walls may have existed which separated the harbour from the actual area of the city.⁵⁴ But, in terms of representation within the literary sources, little can be said on the relationship (nominal and physical) between the Samian harbour and adjacent urban landscape.

Similar fortified harbours may in other instances also indicate the presence of a built-up environment. The author of the *Periplus* also talks of coastal-sites that would have been comprised of closed or fortified harbours (*limēnes kleistoi*). For example, one of the three harbours connected to the main settlement on Corcyra is listed as being fortified,⁵⁵ as well as a harbour located by the city of Ambracia.⁵⁶ In the case of Ambracia, it should be stressed that the harbour is located in connection to a fort, controlled by the city, situated inland, suggesting that the term, *limēn kleistos*, was not only applicable to harbours lying in direct connection with cities.

The use of *limēn kleistos* thus probably points to (primarily military) harbours, either incorporated into the defences of a city, or in connection to other military features such as forts.⁵⁷ The sources do not indicate whether there would have been any wall(s) which would have separated the area of the city from the area of the harbour. The term, consequently, does not necessarily indicate that these sites were incorporated into the urban sphere, even if walls connected to the main city would have encompassed the moles.

⁴⁷ Thuc. 8.10.3: Σπείραιον τῆς Κορινθίας· ἔστι δὲ λιμὴν ἐρήμιος καὶ ἔσχατος πρὸς τὰ μεθόρια τῆς Ἐπιδαυρίας.

⁴⁸ Hom. *Od.* 6.262–265, see also Casson 1971, 362.

⁴⁹ Hom. *Od.* 6.265–272.

⁵⁰ Thuc. 1.30.2: Κυλλήνην τὸ Ἠλείων ἐπίγειον.

⁵¹ Hdt. 3.60.

⁵² Blackman 1982a, 80.

⁵³ Lehmann-Hartleben 1923, 55–56; Casson 1971, 362.

⁵⁴ *Samos XV*, Gesamtplan.

⁵⁵ Ps.Scyl. 29: τούτων ὁ εἷς κλειστός.

⁵⁶ Ps.Scyl. 33.2–3.

⁵⁷ Lehmann-Hartleben 1923, 68; Casson 1971, 363.

THE TERMINOLOGY: *LIMĒN* AND *EPINEION*

The problem concerning the function and environment of different harbour-types, and how these influence the description and treatment of the relationship between harbours and cities, can be related to semantics, and one need to examine and discuss the use and contexts of certain words which refer to harbours and harbour-settlements. In the passage from the *Politics* (1327a33), mentioned initially, Aristotle uses two different words for harbours, ἐπίνεια and λιμέναις. The exact meaning and use of these words are hard to define, especially in comparison to each other. They are in most contexts used in order to signify harbours of various sorts—within different environments, and associated with a variety of functions, in connection to cities as well as other communities and territorial entities. The use of both *limên* and *epineion* may give some indication of the wider territorial connections and functions of harbours in relation to the urban sphere. Attention must be given to the use and contexts of these words in order to understand the representation of interaction between cities and harbours as given by the available literary sources.

Other words are occasionally used in order to denote harbours in both Archaic and Classical texts, although these are not numerous and reveal little in terms of the relationship between harbours and cities. *Hormos* may be mentioned, although this word could be translated simply as an anchorage and usually refers to a natural harbour or a temporary shelter for ships.⁵⁸ *Prosbolê* is occasionally also used in order to signify a stop-off point for ships and Thucydides uses the word in order to define Cythera as a “port for merchant ships [ὀκκάδων προσβολή] from Egypt and Libya”.⁵⁹ Similarly the settlement and harbour of Messina is described as the port or gateway of Sicily (προσβολῆ εἶναι αὐτοῦς τῆς Σικελίας).⁶⁰ Overall, the use of this word in connection to harbours is rare, particularly in terms of its function in relation to cities.

We also find the term *naustathmon* used in order to define a harbour or naval station.⁶¹ The image we get from the use and context of the word is that it was mostly associated with a temporary harbour or anchorage rather than with a permanent port connected to a specific settlement. For example Thucydides notes that, in connection to the revolt of Mytilene, the Athenians held Malea which was “used only as a port for their ships and a place for their market [*agora*]” (ναύσταθμον δὲ μᾶλλον ἦν αὐτοῖς πλοίων καὶ ἀγορὰ ἢ Μαλέα).⁶² The use of *agora* in this passage should probably be seen as indicating a temporary market set up in order to supply the Athenian fleet which was stationed here.

The most common word used in Archaic and Classical texts (including the Homeric epics) to signify a harbour,

however, is *limên*.⁶³ The word itself does not seem to carry any universal meaning. *LSJ* defines *limên* primarily as a harbour, but also as a metaphorical haven or a place of refuge; in terms of function and type, it seems to cover a wide range of harbours.⁶⁴ In general, the translations and meanings that may be derived from the use of *limên* are closely dependent on the date of the text as well as the context of the word. From the passages discussed above we may note that the use of *limên* in early literature often reflects the presence of a natural harbour which is often detached from any city or settlement.⁶⁵

During the Classical period the word is widely used in order to describe a number of different harbour-types with a wide range of functions, also in connection with different cities and settlements. In Thucydides the word is used in order to define both an uninhabited natural harbour, such as Spiraëum in Corinthian territory,⁶⁶ and harbours that consist of a built, man-made, environment which lies under the direct control of a specific city or community, like the Piraeus of Athens which Thucydides describes with the genitive form as “the harbour of Athens” (τοῦ Πειραιῶς τοῦ λιμένος τῶν Ἀθηναίων).⁶⁷ But the use of *limên* indicates in many instances, a feature which should be located beyond the urban sphere.⁶⁸

Epineion seems, on the other hand, to carry a much more definite meaning. Most of the time the word is used to denote the presence of a harbour or a port placed away from a specific city under the jurisdiction of which it is placed,⁶⁹ thus conveying a similar meaning to *limên* in some instances. Another thing signified by the word, may be a naval presence and the military use of the harbour or harbour-settlement. *LSJ* translates the word as a “sea-port where the fleet of a country lies”.⁷⁰ These *epineia* may also be seen as coastal fortresses of the city particularly when

⁵⁸ *LSJ* s.v ὄρμος.

⁵⁹ Thuc. 4.53.3.

⁶⁰ Thuc. 6.48.

⁶¹ *LSJ* s.v ναύσταθμον.

⁶² Thuc. 3.6.2.

⁶³ According to the TLG database the word is used 544 times in all forms in literary sources dating between the 8th and 4th centuries B.C.

⁶⁴ *LSJ* s.v λιμήν.

⁶⁵ For example Hom. *Il.* 1.432–434 and *Od.* 10.86–110.

⁶⁶ Thuc. 8.10.3.

⁶⁷ Thuc. 2.93.1.

⁶⁸ This can be noted in the case of harbours lying at some distance from an urban centre, such as the Piraeus (Thuc. 2.93.1), as well as harbours situated by cities near the coast, such as the *limên* of Sikyon (*Xen. Hell.* 7.3.3), and also in the case of a natural, uninhabited harbour such as Spiraëum (Thuc. 8.10.3).

⁶⁹ Blackman describes the function of these *epineia* as being that of “out-ports” of certain cities (Blackman 1982b, 193); see also the discussion by Lehmann-Hartleben 1923, 24–26.

⁷⁰ *LJS* s.v ἐπίνειον.

linked with a wall leading from the sea to the principal settlement.⁷¹

In most cases, it also seems as though the word *epineion* is used for a harbour with a certain amount of built environment and infrastructure, rather than simply a natural harbour in the territory of the city, a feature, as we have seen, which sometimes designated a *limên*. What seems to be a primary aspect of an *epineion* is that it is a port which is located away from the city to which it is politically connected, but which, because of its political connection to the urban centre, acts as an extension of the city coastward. That the term *epineion* conveys this sort of meaning has already been stressed in previous research, in the first half of the 20th century by Lehmann-Hartleben,⁷² and also more recently by David Blackman and Klaus Freitag.⁷³ What has been lacking within the previous discussion of its usage is a comparison with *limên*, as well as attention to chronological considerations surrounding the use of these words.

The use of *epineion* is fairly restricted, particularly within the literature dating to the Archaic and Classical periods,⁷⁴ a fact which creates certain problems of interpretation. The earliest instances of use can be dated securely to the work of Herodotus and Thucydides, but there are also some examples that could possibly be earlier, although these are more difficult to date. For example Stephanus of Byzantium writes that, according to Hecataeus, the harbour Charadrus functioned as a *limen* and *epineion* of Cilicia.⁷⁵ Strabo also uses the 4th-century-B.C. historian Antiochus as a source in his description of the *epineion* belonging to the city of Heraclaea.⁷⁶ But care needs to be taken in regard to the use of *epineion* within these passages, as it is difficult to assess whether the word was actually used in the text to which the later writers are referring.

Returning to more securely dated instances, we find similar scarcity of the use of the word. The term is used only once in the narrative of Herodotus, where he describes the function of the Phaleron bay outside of Athens as an *epineion* of the Athenians. Herodotus points specifically to the use of the bay as the Athenian *epineion* before the construction of the Piraeus.⁷⁷ Thucydides uses the word two times in his narrative as label for the harbour of Cyllene in Elis. Aristotle also uses *epineion* in his discussion of harbours and anchorages located at a distance from the city but under its political jurisdiction and control.⁷⁸ In this passage, the specific reference to both *epineia* and *limenes* suggests that there must have been a difference in the meaning of the two words.

Epineion is also used as a label for the Piraeus in one of the surviving versions of a fable of Aesop, where the harbour-town is described as “the *epineion* of Athens”.⁷⁹ But the dating which should be applied to this text is difficult to establish. Usually the fables of Aesop, in the form which they have been transferred to us, are dated to the Hellenistic

or Early Roman periods which date the use of the word in this context later than the Classical period.⁸⁰ Another difficulty with the use of the text arises from the presence of different versions of the same fable. In another version of this passage, *limên* is used instead of *epineion*,⁸¹ highlighting the problem of determining the exact distinction between the use of either *limên* or *epineion* within the texts.

It is noteworthy that *epineion* seems always to be used within similar contexts and to describe similar functions, whereas *limên* is applied to a more diverse range of different harbour-types (constructed or natural). In most instances from the Classical period, *epineia* are evidently harbours located either in the territory of a city situated inland, or else in a politically unified region, and they are described as being under direct political control of centres and communities. Furthermore, the use of *epineion* seems to indicate the presence of a constructed or settled environment at the harbour site.

Epineion is used predominantly in post-Classical texts, dating mainly to the Roman or Byzantine periods,⁸² especially in the work of writers with geographic or ethnographic interests, primarily Strabo and Pausanias. As in the earlier texts, *epineion* is almost always used to denote a harbour connected in some way with a city or community from which it is physically separate. For example Cyllene is referred to as an *epineion* of Elis by Strabo, just as it had been in the narrative of Thucydides.⁸³ The harbour is clearly separate physically from the *asty* and *polis* of Elis, a fact which is evident from Strabo’s statement that the distance between the harbour and the city itself was one hundred and twenty *stadia*.⁸⁴ This separation of the city (*asty/polis*) and the port (*epineion*) is also illustrated in several other instances. In

⁷¹ As is suggested by Blackman 1982b, 193.

⁷² Lehmann-Hartleben 1923, 24–26.

⁷³ Blackman 1982b, 193; Freitag 2000, 312–313.

⁷⁴ A TLG search for *epineion* shows that the word is used around fourteen times in the body of Archaic and Classical literature, including fragments known quoted in later texts.

⁷⁵ *FGrHist* 1a,1, F.265.1 λιμὴν καὶ ἐπίγειον Κιλικίας.

⁷⁶ Strab. 6.1.15: ‘Ἐξῆς δ’ ἐστὶ Μεταπόντιον, εἰς ἣν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἐπίγειου τῆς Ἡρακλείας εἰσὶ στάδιοι τετταράκοντα πρὸς τοῖς ἑκατόν.

⁷⁷ Hdt. 6.116: Φαλήρου (τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν ἐπίγειον τότε τῶν Ἀθηναίων).

⁷⁸ Arist. *Pol.* 1327a.33.

⁷⁹ Aesop. *Fabulae* 75.3 (A. Hausrath & H. Hunger, *Corpus fabularum Aesopicarum*, 2nd ed. Leipzig): τὸ τῶν Ἀθηναίων ἐπίγειον.

⁸⁰ *OCD*, 29.

⁸¹ Aesop. *Fabulae* 75.1: τὸν τῶν Ἀθηναίων λιμένα.

⁸² According to the TLG database the word is used within post-Classical text (dating between the 3rd century B.C. and the 5th century AD) about 160 times in all forms.

⁸³ Thuc. 1.30.2; 2.84; Strab. 8.3.4: ὁ τῶν Ἡλείων ἐπίγειον ἢ Κυλλήνη.

⁸⁴ Strab. 8.3.4.

connection with his description of the region of Sparta, for example, Strabo states that the port of the city, Gythaeum, is “located at a distance of two hundred and forty stadia from Sparta”.⁸⁵ This type of physical separation between harbour and city is also illustrated in a passage concerning Nisaea, the harbour of the Megarians, which, according to Strabo, is located 80 stadia from the city.⁸⁶

In this context we see again the use of *epineion* as a noun describing a port lying away from the city but within its territory, and also placed directly under its jurisdiction. In the case of Nisaea, the harbour is also connected with walls stretching from the city of Megara. In his description of Nisaea, Strabo also uses the word *limên* when describing the physical presence of a harbour at the site, while *epineion* is used to indicate its function and relationship to the city.⁸⁷ As in the Classical examples, *epineion*, is more clearly indicative of function and harbour-type than *limên*. In most of the cases where *epineion* is used in the text of Strabo, it conveys the implication that these harbours are nominally connected or “owned” by a community or city—thus forming part of the territorial set-up of a specific state. This ownership is clearly emphasized by Strabo in connection with the Boeotian city of Thespieae, where he states that the city “has an *epineion*, Kreusa”.⁸⁸

Pausanias’ use of the word functions similarly. In some instances *epineion* should be equated with a coastal settlement dependent on an urban centre in the interior. This seems, at least, to be the case with the Achaean city of Aegaera and its port, which carries the same name.⁸⁹ The text specifically makes a distinction between the place named Aegaera by the coast and the “upper city” (ἄνω πόλις) located in the hinterland. The use of “upper” indicates also the presence of a “lower” city, or as stated in the passage “the city by the coast” (ἐπὶ θαλάσση) which suggests that the port of Aegaera also consisted of a settlement or built environment, rather than simply a natural harbour appropriated by a political centre in the region.

The Byzantine lexicon *Suda*, dated to the second half of the first millennium A.D.,⁹⁰ also gives a late perspective on the use and function of the word, although the text may draw on information derived from much earlier literature. In line with what we have deduced from the other texts that have been discussed, the *Suda* defines the role of the *epineion* as a port or harbour-settlement which is geographically separate, but politically connected, to an inland city.⁹¹

The description of an *epineion*, in the text, summarises many of the features that have been noted from the examples presented above. The representation of an *epineion* as a settlement or even as an extension of the city by the sea (πόλισμα παραθαλάσσιον) is certainly significant, as it highlights the presence of a built environment associated with the harbour, as well as the importance of the harbour in its function and relation with urban centres. This emphasis

on a built environment at these harbours makes a clear distinction from uninhabited natural harbours which were also present by the coastal landscape. However, the *Suda* refers specifically to the presence of merchant vessels, rather than ships of military nature, such as was found in the *epineion* referred to by Thucydides in connection with Cyllene.

The post-Classical sources that have been discussed above provide comparative data helpful for the understanding of the function of the word in earlier sources. We find several features that are repeatedly associated with an *epineion* both in the early and the later texts. From the discussion above, it is evident that the meaning embedded within the use of *epineion* is often close to the use of *limên* in many of the Classical sources, although some differences exist. While *limên* may be used in order to describe a wide range of harbour sites, *epineion* always seems to refer to a formal harbour site containing some form of built environment and which is connected to a specific city or community in the interior.

Nevertheless, that the distinction between the words cannot have been rigid within Classical literature is shown by descriptions of certain harbour sites, such as the Piraeus, as both *limên* and *epineion* in different texts. One should also recognize possible shift in the usage of the word over time. As has already been shown, the word *epineion* is much more common within the later sources, Strabo and Pausanias in particular, as compared to the Classical sources. Both *epineion* and *limên* often seem to relate and signify a harbour which lies separated from the urban landscape and distinct from the urban sphere. The main difference, how-

⁸⁵ Strab. 8.5.2 (all translations from Strabo are by H.L. Jones (Loeb 1988) unless otherwise stated): Γύθειον τὸ τῆς Σπάρτης ἐπίγειον ἐν διακοσίοις καὶ τετταράκοντα σταδίοις ἰδρυμένον.

⁸⁶ Strab. 9.1.4: ἡ δὲ Νίσαια ἐπίγειον ἐστὶν τῶν Μεγάρων δεκαοκτὼ σταδίου τῆς πόλεως διέχον.

⁸⁷ Strab. 9.1.4: μετὰ δὲ τὰς Σκειρωνίδας πέτρας ἄκρα πρόκειται Μινωα ποιοῦσα τὸν ἐν τῇ Νισαίᾳ λιμένα. ἡ δὲ Νίσαια ἐπίγειον ἐστὶν τῶν Μεγάρων δεκαοκτὼ σταδίου τῆς πόλεως διέχον, σκέλεσιν ἐκατέρωθεν συναπτόμενον πρὸς αὐτήν.

⁸⁸ Strab. 9.2.25: ἐπίγειον δ’ ἔχουσιν αἱ Θεσπιαὶ Κρέουσαν.

⁸⁹ Paus. 7.26.1: Ἐς δὲ τὸ ἐπίγειον τὸ Αἰγαιρᾶτων—ὄνομα τὸ αὐτὸ ἢ τε πόλις καὶ τὸ ἐπίγειον ἔχει—, ἐς οὖν τὸ ἐπίγειον ὡς Αἰγαιρᾶτων δύο καὶ ἑβδομήκοντα ἀπὸ τοῦ κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τὴν Βουραϊκὴν εἰσὶν Ἡρακλέους στάδιοι. ἐπὶ θαλάσση μὲν δὴ Αἰγαιρᾶται οὐδὲν ἐστὶν ἐς μνήμην, ὁδὸς δὲ ἐκ τοῦ ἐπινείου δύο σταδίων καὶ δέκα ἐς τὴν ἄνω πόλιν.

⁹⁰ *OCD*, 1451.

⁹¹ *Suda* E.2489.1–3 (A. Adler, *Suidae lexicon* (Lexicographi Graeci, 1.1–1.4.), 4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner) “Epineion: from the [fact] that in it merchant ships rest idly in water [νήχεσθαι] or are beached. Or a town/settlement by the sea, the dockyards of the city are located there” (tr. by the author): Ἐπίγειον: παρὰ τὸ ἐν αὐτῷ νήχεσθαι τὰς ὀλκάδας καὶ ὀκέλλειν. ἢ πόλισμα παραθαλάσσιον, ἐνθα τὰ νεώρια τῶν πόλεων εἰσιν ὡς περ Πειραιεὺς τῶν Ἀθηναίων καὶ Νίσαια τῆς Μεγαρίδος. δύναται δὲ ἐπὶ παντὸς ἐμπορίου καὶ παραθαλασίου χρήσασθαι τῷ ὀνόματι οὕτω, ὃ νῦν οἱ πολλοὶ κατὰβολον καλοῦσιν.

ever, if we draw upon later sources to explain differences in use and signification, seem to be that *epineion* implies the presence of a greater structural environment and a more defined and formalised political status in relation to a city or a political centre. The terms *limên* and *epineion* both seem to be used with reference to what Blackman sees as being specifically indicated by *epineia*, which he describes as “out-ports”, related to a specific city.⁹²

SOCIAL AND IDEOLOGICAL REPRESENTATION OF HARBOURS WITHIN THE LITERARY SOURCES

The passage from the *Politics* cited at the beginning of the article clearly highlights the symbolic aspects of harbours as a territorial feature of the city, and in particular how the harbour is represented as an extramural feature and as separated from the urban sphere. Within this passage harbours convey a certain amount of symbolism and socio-political significance, which is also embodied in the representation within other literary sources. One must consequently examine the social and ideological elements embedded within the representation of harbours in these sources to clarify how these help to enforce images of the harbour as a detached feature from the urban landscape.

Control of harbours within the territory of a city was often recognized as an important factor both for economic prosperity and military strength and prowess. This is a theme which is clearly projected in Thucydides’ narrative of the Peloponnesian war, where he comments, in a frequently cited passage, on the wealth of Corinth as being due to its connection with harbours and land-routes passing through the Isthmus.⁹³ In a similar fashion, Isocrates, in his eulogy of the Cypriot king Evagoras, also celebrates the construction of both markets and harbours in the territory of the state in order to facilitate contact with the outside world.⁹⁴ In fact, Isocrates claims that the city, when it was previously ruled by the Phoenicians, had become barbarian and was not hospitable to Greeks, and did not contain a trading-port or harbour in its territory.⁹⁵ Harbours are, in these instances, represented as a necessary feature of a civilized Greek community and important places within the territory connected to the city, acting in particular as connection points between the city and the outside world. It is the ability and importance of a city to control a harbour, often located outside of its city walls, which comes to be emphasized in the use and description of harbours within the passage from Isocrates.

Harbours are represented as entities not just important to the states in the territory of which they are situated, but also to other inland polities dependent on the movement of goods from harbours, as well as movements of goods and people in the opposite direction. This is highlighted by Thu-

cydides in a speech given by the Corinthians during the allied congress at Sparta in 432 B.C.:

... but those who live inland or off the main trade routes ought to recognize the fact that, if they fail to support the maritime powers, they will find it much more difficult to secure an outlet for their exports and to receive in return the goods which are imported to them by sea.⁹⁶

Harbours are also represented as beneficial places that act as protective refuges within the natural landscape. The image of a harbour as a place of refuge occurs within texts dating both to the Archaic and the Classical periods where the picture of a safe (natural) harbour in a storm is commonly projected.⁹⁷ Similar depictions are also common within Athenian tragedy but in such cases the descriptions of harbours are usually part of symbolic and metaphorical imagery, rather than being references to actual harbours.⁹⁸

On the other hand, there are also occasions when harbours represent something else, something dangerous and disruptive in regard to the city. The sea and coasts can present some real, violent, physical danger to the state, as is emphasized by Thucydides in relation to the prevalence of piracy in the ancient past.⁹⁹ The coast (and so also a harbour or harbour-settlement) is presented as a potential setting for a violent attack on the city. But the dangers which are de-

⁹² “... a number [of cities] not directly approachable by ships did in fact have outlets to the sea – ‘out-ports’. This was particularly a feature of the Greek world, common enough for there to be a technical term in Greek *epineion*” (Blackman 1982b, 193).

⁹³ Thuc. 1.7.

⁹⁴ Isoc. *Evag.* 47.

⁹⁵ Isoc. *Evag.* 47: Παραλαβών γὰρ τὴν πόλιν ἐκβεβαρβαρωμένην καὶ διὰ τῶν Φοινίκων ἀρχὴν οὔτε τοὺς Ἕλληνας προσδεχομένην οὔτε τέχνας ἐπισταμένην οὔτ’ ἐμπορίῳ χρωμένην οὔτε λιμένα κεκτημένην.

⁹⁶ Thuc. 1.120.2: τοὺς δὲ τὴν μεσόγειαν μᾶλλον καὶ μὴ ἐν πόρῳ κατῳκνημένους εἰδέναι χρὴ ὅτι, τοῖς κάτω ἢ μὴ ἀμύνωσι, χαλεπωτέραν ἔξουσι τὴν κατακομιδὴν τῶν ὠραίων καὶ πάλιν ἀντίληψιν ὧν ἡ θάλασσα τῇ ἠπιέρῳ δίδωσι.

⁹⁷ In Archaic literature this occurs, for example, in the description of the shield of Hercules, where Hesiod refers to an image of a safe harbour: “And on the shield was a harbour with a safe haven from the irresistible sea, made of refined tin wrought in a circle, and it seemed to heave with waves” (Hes. *Sc.* 207–209, tr. by H.G. Evelyn-White, Loeb 1936): Ἐν δὲ λιμὴν εὖρομος ἀμαιμακέτοιο θαλάσσης κυκλοτερῆς ἐτέτυκτο πανέφθου κασσιτέροιο κλυζομένῳ ἴκελος.

⁹⁸ See, for example, Aesch. *Supp.* 471, where a metaphorical evocation of the dangers which the sea presents without a safe harbour (*limên*) is given by the King of Argos. Euripides, too, adopts the formula of using the harbour as a metaphor for safe refuge, developing the image of a harbour as a natural entity in the coastal landscape, for example in *Andr.* 749, χειμάτος γὰρ ἀγρίου τυχοῦσα λιμένας ἤλθες εἰς εὐνήμους and also in *Tro.* 125 where he refers to the safe harbours of Greece (λιμένας Ἑλλάδος εὐόρους).

⁹⁹ Thuc. 1.7.

scribed are not just connected to military concerns. Harbours are also represented as entities which are morally detrimental and damaging to the character and function of the state. They are seen as presenting not just physical danger but also to what may be described as symbolic or ideological danger, as has been discussed by von Reden in the case of Athens and the Piraeus.¹⁰⁰

This fact may be illustrated, in the first place, from the treatment and discussion of harbours and the sea in the works of Plato and Aristotle. Let us again return to the passage by Aristotle concerning the rôle of harbours which was presented at the beginning of this article. As we have already seen, Aristotle states that harbours and ports, which are physically separate from the city, can be beneficial to the city, if the state can control who enters the harbour from the city as well as movement in the opposite direction. Such need for control over communications between harbour and city arises from the dangers which harbours present to the character of the state and its population:

There is a good deal of argument about communication with the sea and whether it is a help or a hindrance to states governed by good laws. Some say that to open one's state to foreigners, brought up in a different legal code, is detrimental to government by good laws, and so is the large population, which, they say, results from the using of the sea to dispatch and receive large numbers of traders, and is inimical to running a good constitution.¹⁰¹

What makes harbours dangerous, according to Aristotle and others, is their connection with foreign influence and the inflow of foreign peoples and goods into the city, which tends to have an effect on the laws and government of the state. The sea is, in this respect, linked with the outside world and with what can be labelled as foreign.¹⁰² In this context, harbours are represented as gateways between the state and the outside world. Aristotle also makes it clear that, if a government can control this situation, then harbours may be beneficial to the state, but, if not, they are to be regarded as problematic. The ability to control the movement of both people and goods is thus important in relation to the representation of the harbour as a feature which should be separated from the city.¹⁰³

Implicit in these problems we also find economic considerations which influence Aristotle's reasoning. In the passage quoted above he states that part of the problem for the state about having a harbour is the fact that it may attract to the city a large number of traders, something which is "inimical to running a good constitution". This is not simply due to the foreignness of traders, but also to the wider economic factors which may affect cities and the organisation of states. In his discussion of the good governance of cities and states, Aristotle represents trade as a problematic feature, and the same concern is also incorporated into his discussion on harbours.¹⁰⁴ Aristotle writes:

So too people must import the things which they do not themselves produce, and export those of which they have a surplus. For a state's trading must be in its own interest and not in others'. Some throw their state open as a market for all comers for the sake of the revenue they bring; but a state in which such aggrandisement is illegitimate ought not to possess that kind of trading-centre at all.¹⁰⁵

Aristotle recognises the need for the state to export things which it produces and to import products which cannot be found within the city's territory. Harbours play an important role in the movement of goods and are thus important features of the organisation and prosperity of the city. But Aristotle also highlights the importance of regulation in regard to trading activities. If the state acts as an open market then this will be hindrance to good government and trade cannot, according to Aristotle, be conducted for the purpose of profit-making by individuals but should instead be carried out by the state, with the aim of selling its surplus and acquiring the goods that it lacks. As we have seen, the solution

¹⁰⁰ Von Reden 1995, 25: "There are, moreover, particular problems which emerge from the political and ideological constructions of the *polis*: first, a harbour town upsets the structural subordination of a local deme to the *asty*; secondly, the harbour as the gate to foreign trade calls into question the ideological emphasis on autarky; and thirdly, the concentration and importance of foreigners, not infrequently linked themselves by the same place of origin, weakens the concept of citizen status".

¹⁰¹ Arist. *Pol.* 1327a11–18: Περὶ δὲ τῆς πρὸς τὴν θάλατταν κοινωνίας, πότερον ὠφέλιμος ταῖς εὐνομουμέναις πόλεσιν ἢ βλαβερὰ, πολλὰ τυγχάνουσιν ἀμφισβητοῦντες· τό τε γὰρ ἐπιξενουῖσθαί τινας ἐν ἄλλοις τεθραμμένους νόμοις ἀσύμφορον εἶναι φασὶ πρὸς τὴν εὐνομίαν, καὶ τὴν πολυανθρωπίαν γίνεσθαι μὲν γὰρ ἐκ τοῦ χρῆσθαι τῇ θαλάττῃ διαπέμποντας καὶ δεχομένους ἐμπόρων πλῆθος, ὑπεναντίαν δ' εἶναι πρὸς τὸ πολιτεύεσθαι καλῶς.

¹⁰² This foreign element is something which von Reden (1995, 32–33) has highlighted in connection to the Piraeus, something which is clearly considered something opposite to the *polis* and its citizen body: "The Piraeus thus seems to have been used in what has been called the 'rhetoric of otherness' – that is, the emphasis of the cultural limits of citizenship, which were essential for the self-consciousness of the Athenian *polis*".

¹⁰³ The desire to separate the harbour, and also *emporía*, from the main urban area, sometimes through the placement of city walls, in order to control movement has been discussed by Blackman (see for example 1982b, 196).

¹⁰⁴ Aristotle (*Pol.* 1258a38) distinguishes between acquisition of goods derived from household management (farming) and the acquisition of goods and profit from trade and exchange as well as the charging of interest which is considered as something unnatural and which should also be faced with dislike.

¹⁰⁵ Arist. *Pol.* 1327a25–31: ὅσα τ' ἂν μὴ τυγχάνῃ παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄντα, δεῖσθαι ταῦτα, καὶ τὰ πλεονάζοντα παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄντα, δεῖσθαι ταῦτα, καὶ τὰ πλεονάζοντα τῶν γιγνομένων ἐκπέμψασθαι τῶν ἀναγκαίων ἐστίν. αὐτῇ γὰρ ἐμπορικῆν, ἀλλ' οὐ τοῖς ἄλλοις, δεῖ εἶναι τὴν πόλιν· οἱ δὲ παρέχοντες σφᾶς αὐτοῦς πᾶσιν ἀγορὰν προσόδου χάριν ταῦτα πράττουσιν· ἢν δὲ μὴ δεῖ πόλιν τοιαύτης μετέχειν πλεονεξίας, οὐδ' ἐμπόριον δεῖ κεκτῆσθαι τοιοῦτον.

for Aristotle is the construction of ports within the territory of the state but at some distance from the city itself (the heart of the state). Thus he explains the function of an *epineion*.

Part of Aristotle's reasoning on the use of harbours, and of the effect of the sea on different communities and urban environments, relates to the ideal of self-sufficiency. This ideal is noticeable also in other Classical philosophers, such as Plato whose ideas were probably an important influence on Aristotle.¹⁰⁶ Plato also presents a discussion regarding the function and use of harbours in relation to the ideal community of Magnesia, which forms the basis of a section of the *Laws* relating to good laws and government. Plato argues that harbours can never be beneficial but will always present danger to the city and the state. He claims that the community would soon be in a depraved state if it would use harbours in its territory and sea for its survival:

For if the state was to be on the sea-coast, and to have fine harbours, and to be deficient in many products, instead of productive of everything, in that case it would need a mighty saviour and divine lawgivers, if, with such a character, it was to avoid having a variety of luxurious and depraved habits.¹⁰⁷

It is clear that Plato regards harbours as detrimental to the law and government of the state due to the foreign influences and “luxurious and depraved habits” which the foreign elements represent.¹⁰⁸ It is important also to note that, in this passage, harbours are described as natural features of the coastal landscape, which may or may not be appropriated by a city or a community. We may contrast the picture of a built and controlled environment presented in the discussion of Aristotle.

The idea of self-sufficiency is also of some importance and requires close attention if we are to understand the arguments presented by Plato. As we have seen in his discussion on harbours, Plato clearly regards self-sufficiency as an ideal for the running of a morally strong state. If, instead, the state is dependent on the outside world in order to feed its population, then it will also receive bad habits and foreign customs. Again, ideas of profit and reliance on a merchant economy are represented as the true enemies of the state, rather than the harbours themselves:

... for by filling the markets of the city with foreign merchandise and retail trading, and breeding in men's souls knavish and tricky ways, it renders the city faithless and loveless, not to itself only, but to the rest of the world as well.¹⁰⁹

The harbour is therefore a necessary link in a chain which connects the city with foreign traders and their goods, and is thus a clear prerequisite for the possibility of establishing a market. In this passage, it is apparent that what is really detrimental to the state is in fact the market and the retail trading which “renders the city faithless and loveless”. But it is

not just the import trade which creates a danger to the state. If the state produces a surplus, which it starts to export, this will also affect the laws and character of the community. With regard to this problem of surplus and export, Plato states that an ideal city cannot be both “highly productive” and “all-productive”. If this would be the case, the city would need to export its surplus and “would be flooded in return with gold and silver money—the one condition of all, perhaps that is most fatal, in a state, to the acquisition of noble and just habits of life”.¹¹⁰

Fortunately, although the territory of Magnesia contains harbours, the city is situated at some distance from the coast, the countryside produces everything which is needed and there are no other states surrounding its territory. This means that the harbour will not be as frequently used as in other Greek states, and the highlighting of this fact must undoubtedly be seen as a critique by Plato of contemporary Athens.¹¹¹ Moreover, the territory is hilly and will, as a result, only be all-producing rather than highly productive, and the state will not produce a surplus which it will export to other lands and cities.¹¹²

The views expressed by Plato and Aristotle should, however, be treated with some caution. It is important to keep in mind that they were both philosophers and describe ideal situations of law and government as a part of the critical opposition to democratic politics and political culture of Athens that existed in the late 5th and early 4th centuries B.C.¹¹³ In an Athenian context, harbours, and the Piraeus specifically, seem to have been mentally connected in some ways with the democracy, not least through the historical legacy of Themistocles.¹¹⁴ The critique of harbours, trade and foreign influences should be seen as part of an embracing of conservative ideals in which self-sufficiency was cel-

¹⁰⁶ Amit 1965, 96.

¹⁰⁷ Pl. *Leg.* 4.704d: εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἐπιθαλαττία τε ἐμελλεν εἶναι καὶ εὐλίμενος καὶ μὴ ἀμόφορος ἀλλ' ἐπιδεῖς πολλῶν, μεγάλου τινὸς ἔδει σωτήρως τε αὐτῇ καὶ νομοθετῶν θεῶν τινῶν, εἰ μὴ πολλὰ τε ἐμελλεν ἦθῃ καὶ ποικίλα καὶ φαῦλα ἔξειν τοιαύτη φύσει γενομένη (all translations from Plato are by R.G. Bury (Loeb 1921) unless otherwise stated).

¹⁰⁸ This link between luxury and foreign habits is asserted also in the view on “the barbarian” in much of the ancient Greek literature, see Briant 1989; Miller 1997, 188–217.

¹⁰⁹ Pl. *Leg.* 4.705a: ἐμπορίας γὰρ καὶ χρηματισμοῦ διὰ καπηλείας ἐμπιπλάσα αὐτήν, ἦθῃ παλίμβολα καὶ ἄπιστα ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἐντίκτουσα, αὐτήν τε πρὸς αὐτὴν τὴν πόλιν ἄπιστον καὶ ἄφιλον ποιεῖ καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ὡσαύτως.

¹¹⁰ Pl. *Leg.* 4.704b–705c.

¹¹¹ See Amit 1965, 95–96; von Reden 1995, 26–27.

¹¹² Pl. *Leg.* 4.704b–705c.

¹¹³ See Ober 1998 in general for the critique of the democracy within Athenian texts during the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. On the Piraeus specifically, see von Reden who also stresses the problems associated with the Piraeus during periods of democracy (von Reden 1995, 26–27, 33–36) and Amit (1965, 96).

¹¹⁴ Amit 1965, 74; von Reden 1995, 28–29.

ibrated, and the land was viewed as the primary base of subsistence for the state. We cannot be sure how widespread and common these views on harbours would have been either among the educated and wealthy in Athens, who were the primary producers and consumers of such literary texts, or among the greater citizen-body.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the texts that I have presented above, I hope to have shown how harbours are frequently represented as entities which are both physically and nominally separate from cities and the urban centres. They are, however, also often treated as necessary features which become integrated into the political and territorial construction of different states and their territories. Even in the case of harbours located directly by a city or settlement, the different texts present them as situated nominally outside of the urban sphere and, when they are clearly described as being placed outside of existing city walls, also physically. This physical and nominal relationship between harbour and city is therefore a significant and important aspect to recall when considering the representation of harbours as problematic entities in relation to the *polis*, an attitude which is present both in the works of Plato and Aristotle. On the basis of the evidence from literary sources of Archaic and primarily Classical date, it may be suggested that the harbour was a territorial feature which was often thought of as something separate or something which should be separated from the urban sphere and there may be a wide variety of underlying reasons for such views. The placement of walls in relation to harbours must, for example, be linked with the defensive strategies of specific cities. The exclusion of harbours from the inner defensive circuit of the city may have resulted from a need for protection against attacks from the sea (although, as we have seen, harbours were sometimes fortified and connected to the walls of the city). Concerns for defence are important when considering activities representing harbours as extramural features in relation to cities. However, there were other aspects of separation between harbours and cities that may be presumed influential in the ideological construction of the harbour as malevolent and dangerous to the city and the state, and these went beyond purely military concerns.

Different functions and relationships are highlighted by the use of certain words to describe and denote harbours. Both *limên* and also, less frequently, *epineion* are used to signify a harbour within the Archaic and Classical literature, but we can also see some difference in the meanings of the two words, connected to the relationship between harbours and cities. *Limên* is the most commonly used term for describing a harbour in Archaic and Classical literature. In

many instances *limên* signifies a natural harbour or anchorage which is a natural feature of the coastal landscape. Harbours consisting of some form of constructed environment and which lie under direct control by a city are also labelled *limên*, and this use of the term is exemplified by Thucydides' description of the Piraeus in the genitive form as "the port of the Athenians" (τοῦ λιμένος τῶν Ἀθηναίων).¹¹⁵

In contrast to the broad usage of *limên*, the word *epineion* always indicates a harbour lying at some distance from a city, in relation to which it functions as territorial property. *Epineion* also seems to signify a built environment, such as a settlement, in connection to the harbour, and is consistently presented as a man-made feature rather than a natural entity in the landscape. The word is more commonly used in texts of post-Classical date, something that has not been sufficiently discussed by previous studies. Usually in Classical literature *limên* and *epineion* are used interchangeably in the description of harbours connected to inland cities. In post-Classical sources, however, *epineion* seems to acquire a more definite meaning and is consistently used in order to describe a harbour connected with an inland community. What is significant and important to note is the fact that, in the texts discussed in this article, both *limên* and *epineion* are frequently used to signify extramural entities.

Presentations in literary texts are not to be viewed as representations of reality, but should rather be viewed as biased images and projected ideas. As has already been stated above, further investigation should be carried out concerning the position of cities located by the coast and the arrangement of city walls in relation to harbours. A study of this kind would be a suitable way of examining whether a consistent pattern is visible in terms of the material remains as well (taking into consideration the general military strategies of cities). This type of investigation would also shed more light on the differences between the positioning of military and commercial harbours in relation to cities and the question whether there is any difference between the ways in which these would have been connected to city defences.

Furthermore, it must be remembered that neither the physical division between harbour and city, nor the general placement of settlements, is likely to have been the result of a need for protection against ideological dangers, such as those depicted by Plato and Aristotle, but rather the consequence of a large variety of geographic, military and economic factors, as well as centuries of urbanization and political development. But if harbours were indeed placed outside of the urban sphere, these geographical, and other, considerations would have helped to enforce the dichotomy between harbour and city which may be noted in the literary sources.

¹¹⁵ Thuc. 2.93.1.

This dichotomy which analysis of ancient text reveals has important implications for the use of harbours by different cities, and the relation between these. Harbours are clearly revealed as important in the territory of a city or community, and they are in many ways represented as necessary features for the prosperity of the state, in terms of the economy as well as the military defence. At the same time, harbours are thought of as dangerous entities, at least in the conservative political thought presented by philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle. For both of them, harbours function as the intermediaries between the state and the outside world and, if the outside world gains too much influence on the state, they will be disruptive to the government and the laws of the community.

Anton Bonnier

Department of Archaeology and Classical Studies
Stockholm University
SE-106 91 Stockholm
anton.bonnier@antiken.su.se

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Amit 1965 M. Amit, *Athens and the Sea. A study in Athenian sea-power* (Collection Latomus, 74), Brussels 1965.
- Andreau 1995 J. Andreau, 'Twenty years after Moses I. Finley's *The Ancient economy*', *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 50, 1995, 947–960.
- Blackman 1982a D.J. Blackman, 'Ancient harbours in the Mediterranean. Part 1', *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration* 11.2, 1982, 79–104.
- Blackman 1982b D.J. Blackman, 'Ancient harbours in the Mediterranean. Part 2', *International Journal of Nautical Archaeology and Underwater Exploration* 11.3, 1982, 185–211.
- Briant 1989 P. Briant, 'Histoire et idéologie: les Grecs et la "décadence perse"', in M.-M. Mactoux & E. Geny (eds.), *Mélanges P. Lévêque II* (Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besançon, 377), Besançon 1989, 33–47.
- Casson 1926 S. Casson, *Macedonia, Thrace and Illyria: their relations to Greece from the earliest times down to the time of Philip son of Amyntas*, Oxford 1926.
- Casson 1971 L. Casson, *Ships and seamanship in the ancient world*, Princeton, N.J. 1971.
- Finley 1999 M.I. Finley, *The ancient economy*, Berkley, Los Angeles & London 1999.
- Fossey 1988 J.M. Fossey, *Topography and population of ancient Boiotia*, Chicago 1988.
- Freitag 2000 K. Freitag, *Der Golf von Korinth. Historisch-topographische Untersuchungen von der Archaik bis in das 1. Jh. v. Chr.* (Quellen und Forschung zur antiken Welt, 34), München 2000.
- Garland 1987 R. Garland, *The Piraeus: from the fifth to the first century B.C.*, London 1987.
- Griffin 1982 A. Griffin, *Sikyon*, Oxford 1982.
- Lehmann-Hartleben 1923 K. Lehmann-Hartleben, *Die antiken Hafenanlagen des Mittelmeeres. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Städtebaues im Altertum*, Leipzig 1923.
- Lolos 2005 Y.A. Lolos, 'The sanctuary of Titane and the city of Sikyon', *BSA* 100, 2005, 275–298.
- Miller 1997 M. Miller, *Athens and Persia in the fifth century B.C. A study in cultural receptivity*, Cambridge 1997.
- Morton 2001 J. Morton, *The role of the physical environment in ancient Greek seafaring* (Mnemosyne, Suppl., 213), Leiden, Boston & Köln 2001.
- Ober 1998 J. Ober, *Political dissent in democratic Athens. Intellectual critics of popular rule*, Princeton & Oxford 1998.
- von Reden 1995 S. von Reden, 'The Piraeus – a world apart', *Greece and Rome* 42, 1995, 24–37.
- Samos XV H.J. Kienast, *Die Stadtmauer von Samos (Samos XV)*, Bonn 1978.
- de Souza 1999 P. de Souza, *Piracy in the Graeco-Roman world*, Cambridge 1999.

