Original Study

Constanze Graml*, Manuel Hunziker, Katharina Vukadin

Cult and Crisis: A GIS Approach to the Sacred Landscape of Hellenistic Attica

<https://doi.org/10.1515/opar-2019-0024>

Received February 12, 2019; accepted June 18, 2019

Abstract: From a political point of view, 3rd century BCE Athens represents a shattered unity. Parts of the Athenian countryside and even the city itself were occupied by foreign troops. This loss of control affected the city's political, economic, social, cultural, and religious life. Since Cleisthenic times, relations between political units and religious communities had become institutionalised through specific cults. Other cult places of relevance to the larger community and therefore with a catchment area that exceeded a deme, e.g. Eleusis, were also affected, as they lay within the occupied territories. This partial inaccessibility of the countryside risked the disruption of religious duties. The project “Cult and Crisis: The Sacred Landscape of Attica and its Correlation to Political Topography” aims to identify potentially affected cult places with no limitations regarding their possible catchment area by analysing their placement in relation to foreign military bases. Alterations in cult practice can plausibly be detected in changes ranging from cessation to the rerouting of ritual movement or the establishment of substitute cult places. As these “solutions” rarely feature in written sources, our GIS-based approach will focus on material remains from sanctuaries. Although an object's use for ritual practice cannot be deduced with certainty, the distribution of finds certainly attests to human activity. This contribution presents a trial of this approach, taking the Sounion area as its case study.

Keywords: Cult Topography, Athens and Attica, Hellenistic Period, Macedonian Occupation, Material Remains of Cult Practice

1 Introduction: Ancient Greek Religion, Greek Land and Politics

The veneration of Greek gods is intimately connected to the location of their cult places within the territory of a Greek city-state (*polis*) (de Polignac, 1984; Alcock & Osborne, 1994; Baumer, 2004; Cole, 2004; de Polignac & Scheid, 2010; Moser & Feldman, 2013; Baumer, 2018). This association produced a complex sacred landscape where rituals linked different cult places of different relevance to different groups of people, for example by means of processions or races (de Polignac, 1984; Graf, 1992; Graf, 1996; Stavrianopoulou, 2015). The inhabitants of the city-state participated in these rituals, becoming members of the cult community; at the same time, the communally practiced cult became part of each participant's “personal religion”

Article note: This article is a part of the Special Issue on Unlocking Sacred Landscapes: Digital Humanities and Ritual Space, edited by Giorgos Papantoniou, Apostolos Sarris, Christine E. Morris & Athanasios K. Vionis

***Corresponding author: Constanze Graml**, Institut für Klassische Archäologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Katharina-von-Bora-Straße 10, Munich, 80333, Bavaria, Germany, E-mail: constanze.graml@gmx.de
Manuel Hunziker, Institut für Klassische Archäologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, 80333, Bavaria, Germany
Katharina Vukadin, Institut für Klassische Archäologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Munich, 80333, Bavaria, Germany

(Parker, 1996; Sourvinou-Inwood, 2000a, 2000b; Arnaoutoglou, 2003; Kindt, 2009, 2012, 2015). Besides cult practice of relevance for the entire community, smaller subgroups of worshippers were established based on regional, ethnic or other criteria (Baslez, 2006; Ismard, 2010; Scheid & Polignac, 2010; Kloppenborg & Ascough, 2011; Vlassopoulos, 2015; Constantakopoulou, 2015; Baumer, 2017; Ackermann, 2018)¹. The cultic performances of these different “levels” of religious life can be anchored in the same sanctuary or executed in specific independent cult places (Jost, 1998; Parker, 2005). Thus, rituals function as performative acts that shape a related, collective identity of a polis and its subgroups, thereby creating multiple religious identities (Assmann, 1997, 2000). It is obvious that cult topography is strongly dependent on the location and lay-out of the city-state. Access can be restricted by natural catastrophes or military occupation, for instance, which in turn affects use of the sacred landscape (Baumer, 2018, p. 276).

In the case of the Athenian polis, literary sources describe multiple occasions when military occupation in the Athenian countryside restricted cult activity at sanctuaries located in the occupied areas (fig. 1). During the Peloponnesian War (431–404 BCE), certain religious practices in Athens were constrained by the establishment of a Spartan garrison at Deceleia in 413 BCE, as well as the likely connected Dema wall and forts (McCredie, 1966, pp. 63–71). The cult for the Eleusinian goddesses Demeter and Persephone was affected to such a degree that processions from Athens to Eleusis could not be celebrated in the canonical way. Instead of walking the *hiera hodos* and passing by the sanctuaries along the road, the participants marched to the Piraeus harbour before travelling to Eleusis by ship (Rhodes, 2011)². The Athenian military commander Alcibiades also acknowledged this limitation of the Eleusinian cult. In 407 BCE, he decided to accompany the Eleusinian procession with armed forces and led the pilgrims through the territory occupied by the Spartans³. In the 4th century BCE, when the Macedonians subdued Greece, the Athenian orator Demosthenes attests the possibility of practising a ritual pertaining to normally associated with cult places in restricted areas, raising the possibility of moving the ritual to another location. The cult of Heracles, whose sanctuary was situated outside of Athens, had previously been practised inside the fortified city in times of war⁴.

These historical records show that shifts in political topography may hinder the performative use of the corresponding religious landscape, besides other effects, e.g. the use of resources (Oliver, 2007). Nonetheless, compensatory strategies clearly existed to allow religious duties to be fulfilled despite such obstacles. Written sources, however, concentrate on cult places of polis and even supra-polis relevance, such as Eleusis. In general, a variety of solutions could be imagined and might be interpreted based on archaeological records of the Hellenistic Athenian countryside (fig. 1). The Macedonian occupation lasted for almost one-hundred years in parts of Attica, with further interaction both before and after this period, making an approach based on the material remains tempting despite the low resolution of the Hellenistic chronology⁵.

1 Within a sanctuary, at least one of the multiple religious identities of the worshipper (individual or part of a community) was expressed. As the sources of information are mostly uninscribed objects, the intentions of the person who brought the artefact to the sanctuary are unknown. Consequently, the object testimonies cannot be categorized according to the ranges of religious practice, as “membership in different communities could overlap” (Vlassopoulos, 2015, p. 260).

2 Rhodes (2011) referring to Xen. Hell. 1.4.20: “then, as his first act, he led out all his troops and conducted by land the procession of the Eleusinian Mysteries, which the Athenians had been conducting by sea on account of the war.” and the more detailed Plut. Alc. 34.3: “Ever since Deceleia had been fortified, and the enemy, by their presence there, commanded the approaches to Eleusis, the festal rite had been celebrated with no splendor at all, being conducted by sea. Sacrifices, choral dances, and many of the sacred ceremonies usually held on the road, when Iacchus is conducted forth from Athens to Eleusis, had of necessity been omitted.”

3 Plut. Alc. 34.4: “Accordingly, it seemed to Alcibiades that it would be a fine thing, enhancing his holiness in the eyes of the gods and his good repute in the minds of men, to restore its traditional fashion to the sacred festival by escorting the rite with his infantry along past the enemy by land.”

4 Dem. 19.86: “but when you had been led astray by these men, you brought your wives and children in from the country, and ordered the festival of Heracles to be held within the walls, in time of peace.”

5 For example, imagining an analysis of the Peloponnesian War exclusively based on the material remains seems risky, although the chronology of the Classical period is seemingly more precise. It is the silence of the written testimonies and the known *Zeitgeist* of Post-Macedonian Hellenistic Attica that necessitates the combined archaeological and GIS-approach.

Figure 1. Map of Attica with the indications of the cult places of Deceleia, Tourkovouni, Lathoureza, Trapouia, and Mounichia (M. Hunziker).

A first indication of an altered sacred landscape might be the discontinuance or even complete abandonment of a cult site. For instance, the peak sanctuary on Mt. Tourkovouni, which has not yet been linked to a specific deity, might be an example of a sanctuary shutting down (Baumer, 2004, pp. 103–104). Archaeological evidence suggests the sanctuary was first active during the Iron Age. Earlier traces cannot be identified as remains of cult practice. No material remains have been associated with the period subsequent to the erection of a peribolos wall during Hellenistic times. As there are no written sources referring to the sanctuary, the reason for its abandonment is unknown. Later finds from the Roman period are too scarce and only seem to indicate use by passers-by. In another example, cult practice clearly ended in the settlement-bound sanctuaries at Lathoureza (Baumer, 2004, pp. 105–107). The two buildings, a *tholos* and a *naiskos*, show no traces of regular cult practice after the 5th century BCE. The location of Lathoureza within the settlement could, however, indicate that the area at the southern spurs of Mount Hymettus succumbed to more general changes in settlement pattern. Both examples show no material traces of use during the late 4th and 3rd century BCE.

Other cult sites seem to have been newly established during the period of interest, such as the sanctuary of Trapouria in the Laureotike, which is dated only based on material evidence visible on the surface of the site (Lauter, 1980; Baumer, 2004, p. 93). This sanctuary lies in the vicinity of a late Classical settlement. For rural sanctuaries, this development of new foundations seems surprising as most of the Attic demes at this time become less influential (Baumer, 2009, pp. 186–188).

As for the rituals practiced, no unambiguous written examples of changed practice are known from the Hellenistic period⁶. The cult of Bendis in Mounichia (Garland, 1992, pp. 111–115; Planeaux, 2000/01), which lay within the harbour area controlled by the Macedonian troops, might offer an example of altered rituals.

⁶ For the Peloponnesian War, the alteration of the processional route to Eleusis is attested in written sources (see above).

Inscriptions referring to the Bendis cult attest to two different cult associations, one in the *asty* and one in the Piraeus⁷. Additionally, after the installation of the Macedonians in Mounichia, the Bendis cult spread to other parts of the Athenian countryside, namely to the island of Salamis (Osborne, 2004–2009). All aspects of this development indicate hindered access to the Piraeus during the period of military occupation and, as a result, the dislocation of the Bendis cult (Steinhauer, 1993; Mikalson, 1998, pp. 140–145; Arnaoutoglou, 2003, p. 69).

Another possible solution for hindered rituals might be the creation of substitute sanctuaries in order to provide new anchoring points for ritual practice. This “solution” seems highly attractive and might be inferred from the initially mentioned Demosthenes passage, as the renouncement of cult activity seems a drastic measure, especially when considering that religious practice strongly tends towards the traditional. Additionally, it might offer further explanations for the “visiting gods” (Alroth, 1987) in sanctuaries, which are cult places of other deities.

Regarding the core question of potential effects on religious life, one must consider the possibility of unbroken continuity. This would mean that within the controlled unities, religious life went on almost unchanged, as has been demonstrated for inner-deme religious life at Rhamnous (Oetjen, 2014).

In order to understand the outlined hypothetical alterations, it is important to consider the historical setting of the project “Cult and Crisis: The Sacred Landscape of Attica and its Correlation to Political Topography”. After its loss of the battle of Chaeronea in 338 BCE, Athens initially remained largely unharmed by Macedonian forces. The situation changed dramatically with the Athenian upheaval in 323 BCE after the death of Alexander the Great, when a Greek alliance attempted political insurrection. With the loss of the battles at Amorgos and Crannon, the Macedonians regained their position of hegemony over Greece. The revolting poleis prepared for the Macedonian counterattack. When the Macedonian troops arrived at Athens, the polis surrendered and accepted the terms of peace, including the installation of Macedonian garrisons (fig. 2). For approximately one-hundred years afterwards, Athens stood under Macedonian occupation, even though the polis tried several times to regain its autonomy from the Macedonian kings and full sovereignty over its entire territory. With the loss of full control over parts of its territory, Athens had to face several critical consequences. The occupation of the Piraeus harbour and important parts of the cropland caused a serious supply shortfall, as is attested in several inscriptions⁸. Furthermore, the wish for reunification of the city and the harbour was expressed⁹ (Oliver, 2007, pp. 49–67). The critical situation of the polis originating from the changed political landscape had many varying consequences, which were likely different for each garrison. Moreover, a delayed effect of the garrisoning caused by alterations in land use and settlement structure has to be taken into account. Therefore, this study will consider the period from the 4th to the 2nd century BCE.

Core research questions framing this discussion of religion in Hellenistic Athens are:

- “Without evidence from written sources, does archaeology provide an alternative method for the detection of crisis in religious life?”,
- “How was religious life affected during and after the Macedonian occupation of parts of Attica?”, and
- “What coping strategies may have existed to deal with any such hinderance to ritual practice?”.

The first section presents the planned methodology. The project is still in the concept phase, with the intention that archaeological data, entered into a geographic information system (GIS), will enable the development of further object-based queries. The second section presents an initial case study using viewshed analysis to demonstrate the difficulties and biases of our approach. Its main problem lies in the non-accessibility of the archaeological data, e.g. due to its current state of publication. This paper concludes with a brief outline of plans for further case studies and the expansion of the project to cover the entirety of Attica.

⁷ IG II² 1283.

⁸ IG II² 653 and 654 honouring foreign grain donors. Other harbours had to replace the Piraeus as main harbour of Athens.

⁹ SEG 25:89; IG II² 654 and 657.

Figure 2. Map of the Macedonian garrisons (Wellem Verlag, C. Binder).

2 Methods: Mapping Sacred Space(s) Intertwined with Distribution of Quantities of Archaeological Material, Object Types and Divine Epicleseis

This project approaches the topic at hand from a holistic perspective, aiming to map all known cult sites of Attica. To retrace the hypothesized and alternative “solutions” for hindered ritual practice, a GIS analysis, or data analysis, has been chosen, which will include a number of different variables. Besides historical sources (literary sources, epigraphy, and numismatics) that have bearing on this question, especially in its political dimension, archaeological data will be the focus of this study.

The sacred landscape of Attica, containing a variety of cult areas such as shrines, altars and other installations/landmarks is entered into a schematic data model. To facilitate this process, the project group has developed a digital platform. This platform serves as an object-oriented documentation tool of massive capacity and allows editors to enter comprehensive content for each object (artefact, literary attestation). This data can be edited at any time, depending on the state of research and purpose and enables queries regarding quantities of objects, quantifies and distribution of object types or the distribution of deities

according to their specific denomination. In addition, this interactive dataset can be accessed via a geographic information system (GIS) for the purposes of visualization and geographic analysis. Besides these structures of long-term use, the crucial ephemeral parts of any sacred landscape, such as processions or races, have to be embedded as well. Inscriptions are another category of evidence, providing information that goes beyond that of objects. In cult decrees and normative texts referring to cult places, the recipient of cultic veneration is addressed by name and possible by-names. These epicleses/epithets function as specifications of the deity and are sometimes specific to the cult place, a function, role, or other traits of the worshipped deity (Parker, 2003, p. 176; Belayche et al., 2005). With their quality of distinction, the attestations of epithets might reveal possible shifts of cult places. For example, the sudden appearance of an additional epithet could refer either to a new role *ex novo* or to the shift of a cultic quality from one sanctuary to another without necessarily replacing the sanctuary of origin. Alternatively, the appearance of specific functional epiclesis like *Sotēr/Soteira* at several sanctuaries might indicate an aspect of general importance, such as salvation. This specific quality of epigraphic evidence is also partially relevant for literary sources if they can plausibly be contextualised in a specific cult context of Hellenistic Attica. Therefore, the GIS analysis will also include textual sources and map them to places of relevance.

A potential limitation of this object-based approach is the accessibility of material. Besides the published finds, an unknown number of objects exists in the excavation depots. The material remains, of which only an unknown percentage has outlasted until modern times, are likely to be biased, e. g. due to excavation methods or the chosen research focus. Therefore, each site needs to be approached individually by keeping these potential biases in mind.

Since the project focuses on the correlation of political and sacred landscapes, the political landscape, which consists primarily of military structures used for the control of the Athenian territory, will be included in the GIS analysis. Many Athenian military fortifications are known from literary sources as well as from archaeological evidence. Potential limitation for mapping military activities are the mobility of an army as well as the use of ephemeral, and therefore hardly detectable, military structures.

Control over an area is based on a range of factors (Frederiksen et al., 2016), such as (inter)visibility and landscape structure. The GIS analysis, which will incorporate relevant variables such as intervisibility and height above sea level, aims to clarify the overall concept and structure of the military control system in Attica as it correlates to the deme structure (Fachard, 2016) and certainly other factors, such as points of strategic interest for defence or supply of resources. With regard to the aspect of control, it has to be emphasized, that the choice for garrisons was certainly not based upon sacred landmarks, but certainly upon economic or strategic ones. However, the fundamentally present religious facet in every aspect of ancient Greek life was influenced, be it immediately by blocking religious activity or be it indirectly by altering the use of land and the settlement structure, which was based upon it.

Areas of interference between the sacred landscape and military control will be filtered and given priority for the distribution analysis with regard to the quantity of archaeological finds and typology. These areas are more likely to be linked to the historical development of Hellenistic Athens, especially during the periods of foreign military control by Macedonian troops. In this case, the unity of sacred and political landscape is very likely to have been affected, which may in turn have led to hindered ritual practice or alternative solutions. As a further means of confirming such outcomes, other archaeological markers for critical events, namely coins hoards (i.a. Thompson, Mørkholm, & Kraay, 1973, pp. 1–54)¹⁰ with deposition dates in the period of interest, will be mapped in the GIS analysis.

For the sanctuaries located in these critical areas, a distribution analysis of the archaeological finds aims to detect alterations within the material remains. The materiality of practiced religion at cult sites is varied, including votive offerings, depositions, and sacrifices, and is hence well suited to statistical analysis. More specifically, the material from the period of interest will be compared to the material from earlier as well as later periods. As artefacts relevant to this question are usually imprecisely dated, the chronological span of the political interference to be studied has to take this lack of chronological clarity

¹⁰ The online database Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards (IGCH: <http://coinhoards.org/>) as the permanent continuation of the initial project will provide data sets that are more complete.

into account. Therefore, the period of intermittent Macedonian occupation (322–228 BCE), which lasted for almost a century, together with the adjacent centuries will serve as the basis of a case study considering the direct or indirect correlation between political and religious landscapes from a material perspective (fig. 2). The distribution of material finds will also be incorporated into the GIS, by loosely mapping the movable objects within the geographic units of the sanctuaries to facilitate the diachronic visualization of the distribution of finds, be it as accumulation regarding chronology or type, or be it dissemination all over Attica in relation to specific cults and cult places. Moreover, the categorisation of finds (typology) will permit the mapping of sites where objects in these categories have been found.

The materiality of ephemeral ritual sites such as procession or race routes (Stavrianopoulou, 2015, pp. 349–361) is difficult to substantiate, but they certainly follow the Athenian road system (Costaki, 2006; Ficuciello, 2008; Korres, 2009; Fachard, 2015), rendering these axes of movement temporarily sacred. As the project aims to detect possible shifts of cult places, the known axes of movement need to be visualized. If actual shifts of cult places can be substantiated through the proposed approach, the placement of the substitute anchoring points for ritual practice in relation to the formerly established sacred way needs justification. During most processions or other rituals comprising movement, specific points or landmarks, such as smaller sanctuaries or shrines, were passed. It is therefore interesting to observe whether a shift in a procession's terminal point caused all the previously established stops to be ignored, or whether they were still taken into account as far as possible.

Since the project is intended to apply a holistic approach and likely to be enlarged for supplementary research questions, the sanctuaries outside the potentially threatened zones will also be analysed in detail in a second phase using the proposed methods. By acknowledging multiple settlement areas within the polis territory, this study aims to avoid assumptions regarding a one-dimensional policy of control or regulation of interaction. Instead, the interdependence of the multiple uses of land has to be questioned and analysed for each region independently, since the material remains allow a multitude of readings. The causality for alteration or continuity of the Hellenistic sacred landscape of Attica will be answered based upon the critical analysis of defined focus regions with an enlarged focus on the development before and after the period of interest.

3 Case Study: Sounion

These preliminary considerations are tested in a first case study focussing on the micro-region of the Laureotike, particularly in the area of Sounion and the neighbouring deme Atene. The area, well known for its economic value due to the silver mines, has been extensively surveyed and the results have been comprehensively published by Hans Lohmann (Lohmann, 1993). The rural sanctuaries have been studied by Lorenz Baumer (Baumer, 2004). Moreover, the material finds of the sanctuaries at Sounion have recently been published (Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, 2015). In contrast to other focus regions, such as the Piraeus (Garland, 1992; Mikalson, 1998; Oliver, 2007), Rhamnous (Oetjen, 2014) or Aixone (Ackermann, 2018), the written testimonies are less dominant and make Sounion a suitable candidate to demonstrate the opportunities and difficulties of the intended approach.

During the period of interest, a Macedonian garrison was stationed in Sounion from 295 to 228 BCE (Oetjen, 2014, map and pp. 11–18; Oliver, 2007, p. 109). According to epigraphic evidence, soldiers participated in the cults of the deme and no additional cults were officially installed (Oetjen, 2014, p. 38). The accessibility of Sounion for the Athenians and the participation of other demes in the cult of Poseidon, which was of importance to the entire polis, is not known. In addition to the garrison within the settlement, the neighbouring Gaidouronisi or Patroklos Island was used as a military base for Ptolemaic troops (Oliver, 2007, p. 129 & 155; Oetjen, 2014, p. 11). Further military structures are highly disputed, as the identification of tower remains could indicate either a military purpose or the economic relevance of settlements for silver mining (Goette, 2000, pp. 86–90; Oliver, 2007, pp. 105–109), since this raw material deposit made the entire Laureotike highly important for the polis. For example, Ober (1985) analyses the Athenian fortification system only with regard to land border defence (Ober, 1985, p. 3), i.e. the Northern border. The defensive system of the coastal regions is excluded. Apart from securing agricultural self-sufficiency (Ober, 1985, pp. 206–207), military fortifications including ship sheds at the entrance to the Saronic Gulf were needed (Ober,

1985, p. 206: secure coastlines as premise for the land defence) because of important shipping routes for grain (Goette, 2003, pp. 157–158)¹¹.

Possible traces of cult activity during the Late Helladic period have been found in the area of the Poseidon *temenos* (Salliora-Oikonomakou, 2004, p. 33). However, a historical gap becomes evident after the late Bronze Age (Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, 2015, p. 10). At least from the Archaic period onwards, the *temenos* of Poseidon and the *temenos* of Athena were active (Salliora-Oikonomakou, 2004, pp. 33–34, 116; Barletta, 2017, p. 2; Goette, 2000, p. 42). A third small *naiskos*, located in the *temenos* of Athena, was possibly attributed to the hero Phrontis (Barletta, 2017, pp. 4 & 8; Goette, 2000, p. 42)¹². The only parallel for the immediately neighbouring cults of Poseidon and Athena is the Athenian Acropolis (Barletta, 2017, p. 5). However, the cult venerating Poseidon was of supra-deme importance at least from the 5th century BCE onwards, as the penteteric festival described by Herodotus VI 87 and the Athenian treasury lists of the Other Gods¹³ suggest (Goette, 2000, pp. 43–44). Other cults within the fortified settlement area are evident from movable small finds such as reliefs or inscriptions. Due to early excavations, missing or unspecific documentation, and the still incomplete state of publication, religious practices beyond the two large *temene* are hardly retraceable. Epigraphic evidence exists for the cults of Aphrodite Pontia, Apollo, Asclepius, and Zeus. Iconographic identification based on fragmented and low-quality finds suggests the veneration of Priapos, a hero, the Nymphs or Graces with Hermes, and a female deity, perhaps Aphrodite (Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, 2015, pp. 138–140; Goette, 2000, pp. 50–53). The architectural remains of a small *naiskos* inside the fort of Sounion (Baumer, 2004, p. 100: Att 31 Sounion: Naikos in der Festung) cannot be attributed to a specific deity. However, the specific chronology of their cultic veneration remains unclear since they only appear once.

Only the material remains from the *temene* of Poseidon and Athena at Sounion seem to offer a chronological spectrum dense enough for statistical evaluation. However, the recent publication of small finds from both these sanctuaries by Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis (2015) has shown the material remains to be problematic due to the excavation history as well as the excavated contexts. Sounion had already been excavated by Valerios Staïs in the years 1897–1915, without systematic excavation techniques and accurate documentation. The excavated finds come from different contexts, namely two *bothroi* and landfills, and can only partially be attributed to specific find spots (Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, 2015, pp. 6–7). Without these details, many finds cannot be specifically attributed to one of the sanctuaries. Moreover, the majority of the published finds date to the 7th and the 6th century BCE, rendering them irrelevant to the project (Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, 2015, pp. 1–2). As no data related to stratigraphy was documented, the dating of the artefacts is nowadays based solely on stylistic criteria. This approach is especially problematic when considering the still uncertain chronology of late Classical and early Hellenistic pottery in Attica. The most promising sites, such as the Agora of Athens or the Kerameikos, were either excavated in the same period with insufficient documentation (Stichel, 1990) or offer secondary filling contexts due to recurring restructuring works (Rotroff, 1982, 1997, 2006) and are therefore still in flux and potentially biased. Nevertheless, recent restructuring works in the National Archaeological Museum of Athens brought further material remains from Sounion to light, which will be analysed in the coming years. A second volume with these newly rediscovered finds from the National Archaeological Museum is currently in preparation (Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, 2019) and will eventually shed more light on the later periods.

These difficulties and certain biases notwithstanding, an overview of the artefacts known so far lists 261 objects, catalogued in the recent publication of Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, (2015, pp. 145–241). Only 24 objects from the Classical to the Hellenistic era are currently published. Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis rightly emphasizes a discrepancy between the Classical building phases: the massive enlargement of both *temene* surprisingly reveals a negligible number of small finds (Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, 2015, p.

¹¹ Sounion is also mentioned by Oliver (2007). His focus lies of course on the Piraeus, but other supply harbours such as Rhamnous are integrated into his analysis of the grain supply of Athens in the period of interest.

¹² Phrontis is known from Homer, Od. 3.278.

¹³ IG P 369 lines 62 and 82. Goette (2000, p. 43) rightly emphasizes that Athena from Sounion is not mentioned.

142). Regarding the temporal distribution of the finds, the impact of the Persian War becomes visible in the published small finds as most date from before the historically documented destruction of Sounion (Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, 2015, p. 11). A disruption of activity at the sanctuary until Periklean times (Goette, 2000, p. 24), comparable to other cult places such as the Acropolis, seems plausible. The larger gap in the material remains may result from the earlier excavations (Alcock, 1993, p. 175; Goette, 2000, p. 31 on the disregard of Roman or “late” finds), as the historical approach with its focus on archaeological remains of great prominence was still a dominating bias. Eventually, the completion of the second volume of small finds might compensate for this imbalance of material remains.

The epigraphic evidence from Sounion, comprising seven inscriptions for the period of interest, is rather meagre compared to other Macedonian garrisons (Oetjen, 2014, p. 2). Therefore, no complementary information can be gained regarding the religious life of the garrison deme.

Since the religious main sites of the focus region are problematic for the chosen material approach, a look into the micro-region and its development provides additional information.

Within the wider area of Sounion, comprising the demes Sounion and Atene, lie additional cult sites of different periods¹⁴, namely:

- a cave sanctuary close to Anavyssos (Baumer, 2004, p. 86: Att 4 Anavyssos: Höhlen von Palaia Fokaia - Kastela-i-Spilila),
- a shrine at Pusipelia (Baumer, 2004, pp. 90–91: Att 12 Kamareza: Heiligtum von Pusipelia),
- a rural shrine close to Legraina dating from the 4th to 1st century BCE. (Baumer, 2004; pp. 91–92: Att 13 Legraina: Landheiligtum LE 20/Palaia Kopraisia; Salliora-Oikonomakou, 2004, pp. 78–82),
- two peak shrines in the area of Thimari (Baumer, 2004, p. 100: Att 32 Thimari/Charaka: Heiligtum auf dem Profitis Elias; pp. 100–101: Att 33 Thimari/Charaka: Kultterrasse auf dem Kassidis [?]),
- a possible sanctuary at Aspharaki (Baumer, 2004, p. 135: A Att 1 Anavyssos, Aspharaki: Heiligtum [?]),
- another possible sanctuary close to Sounion at Gur-i-Kuki (Baumer, 2004, p. 137: A Att 16 Sounion: Gur-i-Kuki/Kokkino Vrachos: Heiligtum [?]),
- a third possible peak sanctuary in the area of Thimari (Baumer, 2004, p. 137: A Att 18 Thimari/Charaka: Statuenplattform/Gipfelheiligtum [?]),
- other cult places not precisely locatable, such as the likely sanctuary at Pasa Limani or the Heracleion at Pounta Zeza (Salliora-Oikonomakou, 2004, pp. 52–53 & 64–65).

A first view-shed analysis shows the immediately controllable areas from the garrison at Sounion and from Gaidouronisi (fig. 3 and 4). The chosen height for the view-shed points lies 12 m above ground level¹⁵. It becomes evident that the Ptolemaic garrison on Patroklos Island was mainly established to hold the Macedon garrison at Sounion at bay (Goette, 2003, p. 160). The Macedonians chose Sounion with the evident goal of controlling the entrance to the Saronic Gulf and its favourable harbour, as well as to control the wealthy southern point of Attica with its important silver mines. The direct control by intervisibility of all cult places within the Sounion fortifications was possible for the cult places at Pasa Limani and Pounta Zeza and the peak sanctuaries on Profitis Elias and Kassidis. All potentially affected sites, which were identified through the view-shed analysis, are also problematic, as they remain mostly unexcavated. The available dates, based mainly on surface finds, show that the Anavyssos cave sanctuary, the rural shrine at Legraina, and the peak sanctuary on the Profitis Elias can only be traced until the 4th century BCE. A possible sanctuary at Aspharaki shows late Classical traces as does the site at Gur-i-Kuki. A possible peak sanctuary close to Thimari shows no Hellenistic finds. The sites at both Pasa Limani and Pounta Zeza are only known from moveable finds, which date to the 5th/4th century BCE. Only the site of Pusipelia and the peak sanctuary on the Kassidis existed during the Macedonian occupation, but Pusipelia had its peak in the 2nd century BCE, i.e. after the occupation.

¹⁴ Most dates for sites are not based on excavation data, but mainly on surface finds. Therefore, they have been integrated into the view-shed analysis, although they might not fit into the project focus.

¹⁵ Height estimated based on comparable fortifications in Attica, see Ober (1985, p. 165) Vathychoria Tower C 9.9 m preserved, (p. 166) Strongylos Pyrgos 12.3 m preserved, (p. 168) Aigosthenai Tower A ca. 20 m.

Figure 3. View shed analysis: areas visible from the Sounion garrison (M. Hunziker).

Figure 4. View shed analysis: areas visible from Patroklos Island/Gaidouronisi (M. Hunziker).

The material remains neither allow a statistical analysis nor provide enough information on the relocation of cult places. There is missing evidence for cult continuity through the Macedonian period for most of the sites, meaning a shift in the rural sacred landscape at that period is highly likely.

4 Preliminary Results

Considering the presented case study of Sounion in the context of the overall project, the impact of the Macedonian garrison at Sounion and the Ptolemaic occupation of Patroklos Island cannot be tested using the material remains from the *bothroi* and the landfills. The detected material does not provide enough data that can be attributed to the period of interest and it is problematic, due to the narrow focus of the early excavation, the research focus set so far, and the insecure stylistic dating of Hellenistic objects. These

factors pose a challenge to the project overall. Therefore, it is impossible to verify whether cult practice in this area was affected, whether considering the Athenian *polis* level of the cult of Poseidon, the local level, or mere “private”, personally motivated level. The sacralised movement axes remain unclear.

One can observe, however, that the religious life of this rural part of the Laureotike changed, as most of the sanctuaries ceased to exist in the late Classical period. These smaller sacred centres were certainly of local relevance and therefore have to be analysed together with the settlement structure of the area. The economic life of the Laureotike dramatically changed in the late 4th century BCE when the “silver rush” stopped and the mines were no longer exploited (Alcock 1993, pp. 110–111; Goette, 2003, p. 161). The overall settlement pattern was therefore influenced on the one hand by the abandonment of the silver mines and on the other hand by the Macedonians at Sounion (Oliver, 2007, p. 109). This multifactorial development led to changed cult practice below the overall *polis* level¹⁶. Only in Roman times, the Laureotike was exploited again for silver (Alcock, 1993, pp. 110–111). Besides these economic aspects, a change in the religious *Zeitgeist* has to be considered as another potential variable.

Thus, the case study clearly proves biases for the settlement and the *temene* at Sounion. The complexity of the holistic approach, taking into account the ancient as well as the modern history of the site and the consciously and unconsciously biased perception of the archaeological remains, makes the two sanctuaries unusable for the project until further material becomes available. The assumed developments in the surrounding areas are based on surface archaeology. However, interrelation with the settlement structures in the Laureotike is obvious. This connection to the rural/peripheral settlements naturally raises the question of the overall importance of the cult. Regarding the case study of Sounion, the movement axes will be included in a next step based on archaeological remains intertwined with GIS least-cost analysis. Accounting for the movement axes might lead to further insights into cult alteration at sanctuaries that were not immediately controllable by the garrison. To answer the project’s core question while avoiding falling prey to composition fallacy, the approach needs to be extended to the entire sacred landscape of Attica.

Acknowledgements: We would like to thank the UnSaLa Network, namely Professor Christine Morris (Dublin), Dr Giorgos Papantoniou (Nicosia), and Professor Athanasios Vionis (Nicosia), for valuable and constructive suggestions on planning and developing the project idea. Moreover, we thank the participants of the Rethymnon workshop and the anonymous reviewers for their effort and the invaluable suggestions to improve this paper and the project. Professor Lorenz Baumer (Geneva), Professor Ruth Bielfeldt and Dr Henry Heitmann-Gordon (both Munich) lent their critical eyes regarding content and language. All errors of course remain our own.

References

- Ackermann, D. (2018). *Une microhistoire d’Athènes. Le dème d’Aixônè dans l’Antiquité*. Bibliothèque des Écoles Françaises d’Athènes et de Rome 379. Athènes: École française d’Athènes.
- Alcock, S. E. (1993). *Graecia capta: the landscapes of Roman Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Alcock, S. E. & Osborne, R. (1994). *Placing the Gods. Sanctuaries and Sacred Space in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Alroth, B. (1987). Visiting Gods - Who and why? In T. Linders & G. Nordquist (Eds.), *Gifts to the Gods: Proceedings of the Uppsala Symposium 1985* (pp. 9–19). Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.
- Arnaoutoglou, I. N. (2003). *Thusias heneka kai sunousias: Private Religious Associations in Hellenistic Athens*. Athens: Academy of Athens.
- Assmann, J. (1997). *Das kulturelle Gedächtnis: Schrift, Erinnerung und politische Identität in frühen Hochkulturen* (2nd ed.). München: Beck.
- Assmann, J. (2000). *Religion und kulturelles Gedächtnis*. München: Beck.

¹⁶ The cults practiced at the mines, as the mine names referred to different deities, may also have stopped. Regarding the archaeological evidence, the assumed sanctuaries have not been detected so far and cannot be tested.

- Baslez, M.-F. (2006). Entraide et mutualisme dans les associations des cités grecques à l'époque hellénistique. In M. Molin (Ed.), *Les régulations sociales dans l'Antiquité* (pp. 57–168). Rennes: Presses Université de Rennes.
- Baumer, L. (2004). *Kult im Kleinen. Ländliche Heiligtümer späarchaischer bis hellenistischer Zeit: Attika-Arkadien-Kynouria*. Rahden, Westfalen: Leidorf.
- Baumer, L. (2009). Von allen Göttern verlassen? Anmerkungen zum Strukturwandel in den ländlichen Heiligtümern Attikas von späarchaisch-klassischer bis in römische Zeit. In Chr. Auffahrt (Ed.), *Religion auf dem Lande. Entstehung und Veränderung von Sakrallandschaften unter römischer Herrschaft* (pp. 177–190) Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Baumer, L. (2017). Conceptions de réseaux culturels dans l'Antiquité – l'exemple de l'Attique. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne*, 43(1), 310–320.
- Baumer, L. (2018). Raisons de l'abandon et du maintien de sanctuaires ruraux en Attique: quelques cas d'étude. *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 235(2), 275–289.
- Barletta, B. (2014). *The Sanctuary of Athena at Sounion*. Athens: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Belayche, N., Brulé, P., Freyburger, P., Lehmann, Y., Pernot, L., & Prost, F. (Eds.). (2005). *Nommer les dieux. Théonymes, épithètes, épicles dans l'antiquité*. Turnhout: Brepols.
- Cole, S. G. (2004). *Landscapes, Gender, and Ritual Space. The Ancient Greek Experience*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Constantakopoulou, C. (2015). Regional Religious Groups, Amphictionies, and Other Leagues. In Eidinow, E. & Kindt, J. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion* (pp. 273–289). Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Costaki, L. (2006). *The Intra Muros Road System of Ancient Athens*. Toronto: University of Toronto.
- Fachard, S. (2015). Roads out of Attica. In M. M. Miles (Ed.), *Autopsy in Athens. Recent Archaeological Work on Athens and Attica* (pp. 139–153). Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Fachard, S. (2016). Modelling the territories of Attic demes: a computational approach. In J. Bintliff & N. K. Rutter (Eds.), *The Archaeology of Greece and Rome. Studies in Honour of Anthony Snodgrass* (pp. 192–222). Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press.
- Ficuciello, L. (2008). Le strade di Atene. Paestum: Pandemos.
- Frederiksen, R., Muth, S., Schneider P. I., & Schnelle, M. (Eds.). (2016). *Focus on Fortifications. New Research on Fortifications in the Ancient Mediterranean and the Near East*. Fokus Fortifikation Studies 2. Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Garland, R. (1992). *Introducing new Gods: The Politics of Athenian Religion*. London: Duckworth.
- Goette, H. R. (2000). *Ho axiologos dêmos Soûnion: Landeskundliche Studien in Südost-Attika*. Rhaden, Westfalen: Leidorf.
- Goette, H. R. (2003). Cape Sounion and the Macedonian Occupation In: O. Palagia & S. V. Tracy (Eds.), *The Macedonians at Athens, 322–229 B.C. Paper presented at an international conference held at the University of Athens 2001, May 24–26, (Athens, Greece)* (pp. 152–161). Oxford: Oxbow Books.
- Graf, F. (1992). Umzüge und Prozessionen: Raum und Religion in der griechisch-römischen Antike. In F. Graf & E. Hornung (Eds.), *Wanderungen* (pp. 85–112). München: Fink.
- Graf, F. (1996). Pompeii in Greece. Some Considerations about Space and Ritual in the Greek Polis In: R. Hägg (Ed.), *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis. Proceedings of the 3rd International Seminar on Ancient Greek Cult, Athen, 16–18 october 1992, Skrifter utg. av Svenska Institutet i Athen, 4^o 14* (pp. 55–65). Stockholm: Svenska institutet i Athen.
- Ismard, P. (2010). *La cité des réseaux: Athènes et ses associations, VI^e -I^{er} siècle av. J.-C.* Paris: Publ. de la Sorbonne.
- Jost, M. (1998). Sanctuaires publics et sanctuaires privés. *Ktema Civilisations de l'Orient, de la Grèce et de Rome antiques*, 23, 301–306.
- Kindt, J. (2009). Polis Religion - A Critical Appreciation. *Kernos Revue internationale et pluridisciplinaire de religion grecque antique*, 22, 9–34.
- Kindt, J. (2012). *Rethinking Greek Religion*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Kindt, J. (2015). Personal religion: a productive category for the study of ancient Greek religion? *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 135, 35–50.
- Kloppenborg, J. S. & Ascoug, R. S. (2011). *Greco-Roman Associations. Texts, Translations, and Commentary: Attica, Central Greece, Macedonia, Thrace*. Berlin: de Gruyter.
- Korres, M. (Ed.). (2009). *Attikís odoí. Archaiói drómoi tīs Attikís*. Athína: Ekdotikós Oíkos Mélissa. [In Greek]
- Lauter, H. (1980). Ein ländliches Heiligtum hellenistischer Zeit in Trapuria (Attika). *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 1980, 242–255.
- Lohmann, H. (1993). *Atene: Forschungen zu Siedlungs- und Wirtschaftsstruktur des klassischen Attika*. Köln: Böhlau Verlag.
- McCredie, J. R. (1966). *Fortified Camps in Attica*. Princeton, New Jersey: American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Mikalson, J. D. (1998). *Religion in Hellenistic Athens*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Moser, C. & Feldman, C. (Eds.). (2013). *Locating the Sacred. Theoretical Approaches to the Emplacement of Religion*. Oxford and Oakville: Oxbow Books.
- Ober, J. (1985). *Fortress Attica. Defense of the Athenian Land Frontier 404–322 B.C.* Leiden: Brill.
- Oetjen, R. (2014). *Athen im dritten Jahrhundert v. Chr. Politik und Gesellschaft in den Garnisonsdemen auf der Grundlage der inschriftlichen Überlieferung*. Duisburg: Wellem.
- Oliver, G. J. (2007). *War, Food, and Politics in Early Hellenistic Athens*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Osborne, M. J. (2004–2009). Five Hellenistic Decrees of the Salaminian Thiasotai of Bendis. *Hóros. Éna Archaiognōstikó Periodikó*, 17–21, 657–672.

- Parker, R. (1996). *Athenian Religion. A History*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Parker, R. (2003). The Problem of the Greek Cult Epithet. *Opuscula Atheniensi*, 28, 173–183.
- Parker, R. (2005). *Polytheism and Society in Athens*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- de Polignac, F. & Scheid, J. (2010). Qu'est-ce qu'un „paysage religieux“? *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 227, 427–434.
- de Polignac, F. (1984). *La naissance de la cité grecque: Cultes, espace et société VIIIe-VIe siècles avant J.-C.* Paris: Ed. la Découverte.
- Planeaux, C. (2000/01). The date of Bendis' entry into Attica. *The Classical Journal*, 96(2), 165–192.
- Rhodes, P. J. (2011). *Alcibiades: Athenian Playboy, General and Traitor*. Barnsley: Pen & Sword Books Ltd.
- Rotroff, S. (1982). *Princeton, Hellenistic Pottery: Athenian and imported moldmade bowls. The Athenian Agora 22*. Princeton, New Jersey American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Rotroff, S. (1997). *Hellenistic Pottery: Athenian and Imported Wheelmade Tableware. The Athenian Agora 29*. Princeton, New Jersey American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Rotroff, S. (2006). *Hellenistic Pottery: the plain wares The Athenian Agora 33*. Princeton, New Jersey American School of Classical Studies at Athens.
- Salliora-Oikonomakou, M. (2004). *Ho archaios dīmos tou Souniū. Historikī kai topographikī episkōpisi*. Korōpī: Tumpīs. [in Greek]
- Scheid, J. & Polignac, F. (2010). Qu'est-ce qu'un « paysage religieux » ? Représentations cultuelles de l'espace dans les sociétés anciennes: Avant-propos. *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 227(4), 427–434.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2000a). What is Polis Religion?. In R. G. A. Buxton (Ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (pp. 13–37). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sourvinou-Inwood, C. (2000b). Further Aspects of Polis Religion. In R. G. A. Buxton (Ed.), *Oxford Readings in Greek Religion* (pp. 38–55). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stavrianopoulou, E. (2015). The Archaeology of Processions. In R. Raja & J. Rüpke (Eds.), *A Companion to the Archaeology of Religion in the Ancient World* (pp. 349–361). Chichester. West Sussex: Wiley Blackwell.
- Steinhauer, G. (1993). Neótera stoicheía gia ton salaminío thíaso tis Bendídos. *Archaïologikī Ephimerís*, 132, 31–47. [in Greek]
- Stichel, R. (1990). Die hellenistische Nekropole im Kerameikos von Athen und die Chronologie der hellenistischen Keramik In: Epistimonikī Syntaxisī gia tīn Ellīnistikī Keramikī (Ed.), *B' Epistimonikī Syntaxisī gia tīn Ellīnistikī Keramikī. Chronologikā problēmata tis ellīnistikīs kerameikīs. Praktika, Rodos 22–25 Martiou 1989* (pp. 39–43). Athīna: Tameio Archaïologikōn Porōn kai Apallotriōseōn.
- Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, Z. (2015). *Sounion Revisited: the Sanctuaries of Poseidon and Athena at Sounion in Attica*. Oxford: Archaeopress Archaeology.
- Theodoropoulou-Polychroniadis, Z. (2019). *Academia.edu* [personal profile]. Retrieved September 02, 2019, from <http://independent.academia.edu/ZettaTheodoropoulouPolychroniadis>.
- Thompson, M., Mørkholm, O., & Kraay, C. M. (1973). *An Inventory of Greek Coin Hoards*. New York: The American Numismatic Society.
- Vlassopoulos, K. (2015). Religion in Communities. In Eidinow, E. & Kindt, J. (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ancient Greek Religion* (pp. 257–271). Oxford, Oxford University Press.