

State formation and urbanization at Tegea

Knut Ødegård, Department of Archaeology, Conservation and History,
University of Oslo

The poleis on the plain around present-day Tripolis, and particularly Mantinea and Tegea, loom in the ancient sources on Arcadia, and with good reason. Both were important actors in politics and warfare in Greece in the 5th-4th century BC. There are several reasons for this. Both poleis were located on the easternmost and largest highland plain of Arcadia, which is vital for all communication on the Peloponnese, whether north-south or east-west. But the highland plain was also fertile and could support a large population and this is perhaps the most important factor behind the importance of both Mantinea and Tegea in the historical record.¹ This article will focus on Tegea in the southern part of the plain, particularly some key elements concerning the natural environment of great importance for the archaeological record, a reappraisal of the archaeological documentation, and a reevaluation of the long-debated question of when and how state formation and urbanization occurred.

Tegea and its territory

The polis of Tegea controlled the southern and larger part of the karstic plain of Tripolis, situated at approximately 610-630 meters above sea level (fig. 1). Contrary to the northern part of the plain, dominated by the polis of Mantinea, the part of the plain controlled by Tegea is not completely flat, but rather consists of low, undulating hills. Towards the west the territory bordered on the small polis of Pallantion, while in the east the territory stretched to the peak of the Mount Parthenion ridge.² There is every reason to believe that the foothills towards the south were in large parts controlled by Tegea and included present-day Mavriki and Vourvoura, although Sparta may have encroached upon Tegean territory during the Archaic period and annexed the settlements of Karyai and Oion.³ Tegea's territory was therefore quite large, slightly less than 400 km², and furthermore, a fair part of it was good agricultural land on the plain. But even though agriculture and production of cereals may have been important on the plain and at Tegea more specifically,⁴ there were some problems that

¹ Heine Nielsen, 2002, 323-329; Forsén, 2000,

² Jost, 1985, 143-144 and pl. A; Heine Nielsen, 2002, 323-329; Forsén, 2000,

³ Heine Nielsen, 2002, 96-97.

⁴ Roy, 1999, 328-329.

deeply affected the economy, the settlement pattern and, not the least, the modern archaeological investigation of the area.

Most of the upland plains in Arcadia have poor natural drainage and generally speaking floods and inundations have historically been far more of a problem than drought. The main river draining the central parts of the territory of Tegea from south to north is the Sarandapotamos, which in Antiquity was identified as the upper course of the Alpheios.⁵ In the case of Tegea, drainage of this river is through *katavothria*, or swallow holes, mainly to the northeast of the ancient urban area of Tegea. This was a precarious drainage, because the swallow holes are easily blocked and the ground water table will inevitably rise during the winter because of heavy rain and snow on the surrounding mountains. This particular hydrological situation has altered the landscape significantly since Antiquity and presents serious challenges for archaeological investigations. This is not a recent understanding. Already during a visit in winter 1833-34 Ludwig Ross remarked that:

„Das Emplacement dieser alten Stadt, in einer fetten und fruchtbaren Niederung gelegen, ist im Winter den Überschwemmungen der von den umgebenden Höhen herabfließenden Wasser sehr ausgesetzt, welche im Laufe der langen Zeit den Boden durch den abgesetzten Niederschlag beträchtlich erhöht haben. Daher ist von den Ruinen fast nichts sichtbar, und der ehemalige Umfang Tegeas lässt sich nur aus den über die Felder verstreuten Scherben, Ziegeln und andern Bruchstücken, so wie aus den Angaben der Bauern über die Fundamente und Mauerreste, die sie bei der Feldarbeit gelegentlich unter dem Boden finden, mit Wahrscheinlichkeit entnehmen.“⁶

Most archaeologists working at Tegea since Ross have reported on layers of silt overlying the ancient structures, particularly at the Sanctuary of Athena Alea, where more archaeological excavations have been carried out than elsewhere in the territory of Tegea.⁷ That the river Sarandapotamos has been responsible in one way or another has been assumed by several scholars and changing courses through history of this river is even apparent from its modern name (“Forty rivers”).⁸ During the Norwegian Arcadia Survey 1999-2001 and subsequent short periods of fieldwork, dr. Harald Klempe of the University College of Southeast Norway has studied more closely the geomorphology of the plain and has been able to document a

⁵ See the full discussion in Bakke, 2007, 28-35.

⁶ Ross, 1841, 66-67.

⁷ Milchhöfer, 1880, 57; Luce, 2014, 47-49.

⁸ Pritchett, 1965, 122-130; Knauss, 1988; Bakke, 2007, 31-33.

series of earlier riverbeds and sedimentation fans across the plain of Tegea.⁹ Dr. Klempe's work is an invaluable guide to the archaeology of the area, since we now know that some areas have been heavily affected by floods and sedimentation during historical times. One such area is around the Sanctuary of Athena Alea and stretching west towards Lake Takka. Here layers of silt up to 2-3 meters meters deposited after the 7th, but probably before the 11th century AD have covered virtually all archaeological traces of earlier periods. Obviously, interpretation of archaeological surface survey in such conditions presents serious problems. Although Sarandapotamos is not today a destructive river, some drainage problems still exist, as anyone who has visited the site of Tegea in winter will know. In periods of heavy rainfall, or during the melting of the snow on the mountains in spring, the groundwater table on the plain will rise and flood over lower lying ground, ditches and trenches, leaving a fine redeposited layer of silt when the water recedes. This means that even without an active flood agent as the river, there are still processes of landscape change going on. This slow, seasonal accumulation of silt has always been a common feature of the area and we now even have some archaeological confirmation through excavations. During the Hellenic-Norwegian Excavations at Tegea 2009-2013 in the centre of the ancient town of Tegea, we noticed that streets must have been regularly repaved, probably not only because of wear, but primarily to continually heighten the level of use.¹⁰ A deep drain ran alongside the so far one and only excavated street and maintenance of the drainage system in the town must have been an important and recurrent feature in the life of Tegea as a town.

This situation of regular flooding, whether from the Sarandapotamos, or from a rising groundwater level, must have presented numerous problems and we can easily imagine that transport and movement, particularly of heavy carts, would have been very difficult during winter and spring. But this situation also presented some advantages. The deposited silt would have improved soil quality and counteracted soil degradation. The floods would have caused blooms of blue-green algae in shallow pools and ponds and subsequent nitrogen fixation after such events also increased the fertility of the soil.¹¹ It is no coincidence that the most fertile

⁹ For the hydrological situation around the Sanctuary of Athena Alea see Klempe/Ødegård, 2014, 27-36. For a preliminary result of Klempe's geological survey see also <http://meetingorganizer.copernicus.org/EGU2011/EGU2011-5561.pdf>. A full report on the geological survey will appear in Ødegård (ed.), forthcoming. For the fluvial deposits in the Sanctuary of Athena Alea, see Luce, 2014, 47-49.

¹⁰ For a similar situation in the northern part of the Sanctuary of Athena Alea, see Tarditi, 2014, 86.

¹¹ Bjune, Krzywinski, Overland, 2014, 444.

areas on the plain today (for instance around the village of Kerasitsa, west of the Sanctuary of Athena Alea) are the ones with deepest layers of flood sediments.

The ancient town of Tegea: the archaeological documentation

Let us now turn to the archaeological documentation of the town of Tegea. For a very long time the basic publications have been V. Bérard's two articles from 1892-93.¹² Bérard arrived at Tegea in the late 1880s after having worked at Mantinea and he many times compared the two neighbouring towns. But although they are situated on the same plain, the hydrological situation is far more complex at Tegea. While the fortifications of Mantinea for instance were readily visible on the surface, nothing of the sort was, or is, the case at Tegea. Bérard made a number of assumptions about the perimeter and extension of the town of Tegea based on the example of Mantinea which we should question. Bérard remarked that the fortifications at Tegea could not be seen above ground and he does not specify how he proceeded in his search for them. Nonetheless, he claimed to have found and excavated stretches of the fortifications in four different points (A-D on fig. 2)). These points correspond roughly to the four cardinal points, although it must be said that even Bérard was hesitant whether the southern point (D) was indeed part of the fortifications. From these four points Bérard suggested that the walls could be followed under modern field-roads. Here Bérard drew on his experience from Mantinea where such a reuse of the solid foundations of the walls had been observed. The problem at Tegea, however, was that no field roads actually connected these four points. From Bérard's northern point (A), there is still a field road leading south-westwards to the village of Episkopi and his western point (C), but there are no such roads between the northern point A towards the eastern point (B) or between the western point C and the southern point D. When Bérard suggested an elliptical perimeter of fortifications at Tegea he must therefore primarily have based this on comparison with Mantinea.

No archaeological remains are visible at Bérard's four points today. In fact, it is not quite easy to pinpoint exactly where they are, even with a modern rectification of his map. The western point C is today inside the modern village of Nea Episkopi and presumably buried under modern houses, the northern point is on the southern bank of the small river of Sanovistras, while we have no certain indication on the exact whereabouts of the eastern point B. As

¹² Bérard, 1892; Bérard, 1893.

mentioned above, even Bérard himself doubted whether the southern point (D) formed part of the walls.

What Bérard actually found and interpreted as fortifications is another puzzle. He writes that about 3-4 meters were excavated in the east (B) and parts of a tower in the north (A), but then passes on to describe the building technique with the substructures in “pelasgian” technique (polygonal masonry) and mudbrick above, with a covering of tiles on top. Whether this was the building technique encountered in all four spots is not indicated, but it is mentioned that one tile with the stamp ΔΑΜΟΣ was found at the northern point.¹³

No further fieldwork has since been carried out on the fortifications of Tegea. Apart from trying to locate Bérard’s trial trenches, the Norwegian team has on several occasions, particularly during the archaeological survey 1999-2001, searched for archaeological remains that could complement Bérard’s short description, but no further direct evidence for the fortifications has been found until magnetometer survey was carried out at Tegea from 2003-2006 (see further below). It is important, however, to acknowledge that Bérard’s elliptical reconstruction of the perimeter of Tegea in large measure was based on comparison with Mantinea. We are reasonably certain that the southern half of this perimeter is not correct. Even though density of archaeological finds in the surface is not necessarily a good guide at Tegea, since, as we have seen, later sedimentation presents many problems, also magnetometer survey indicates that the urban area did not extend as far south as the Sanctuary of Athena Alea.¹⁴

The most important contribution in recent years to the archaeological documentation of Tegea has come from magnetometer survey 2003-2006, conducted by Dr. Tatyana Smekalova under the direction of the present writer. Short accounts of the main results have been made elsewhere¹⁵ and a longer presentation is forthcoming,¹⁶ here I will only highlight some of the most important aspects. The magnetometer survey documented a very regular street grid composed of *insulae* 25 x 75 meters (fig. 3). The huge agora in the centre of the town, 350 meters long and 75 meters wide, almost divided the town in a northern and southern half. There are some irregularities, most notably in the position of the north-south street 7, which entered through a gate in the north and is the only street in the grid to continue on the same

¹³ Bérard, 1892, p. 548. Another brick with a similar stamp, probably reused in an early Byzantine building, was found in the recent Hellenic-Norwegian excavations on the agora of Tegea.

¹⁴ Ødegård, 2010, 11; Ødegård/Klempe, 2014, 32-33.

¹⁵ Ødegård, 2010; Ødegård/Klempe, 2014, 33-34; *ARepLond*, 53, 2007, 23-24.

¹⁶ Ødegård (ed.), forthcoming.

line south of the agora (see also below p. 13). The agora was also 25 meters wider in the eastern than in the western end, this might have been a modification brought by the construction of a new and bigger theatre in the 2nd century BC on the eastern end of the agora.¹⁷ The streets in the grid stopped abruptly at a double walled structure 300 meters north of the agora (fig. 3). This double line of walls must clearly be interpreted as fortifications, particularly since at least three square structures (presumably towers) at irregular distance are connected with the line. We have evidence for streets north of the line of fortifications, but on a different rhythm and belonging to another grid than south of the line. This was indeed a rather surprising discovery, since this line is about 200 meters south of Bérard's northern perimeter, discussed above. It is therefore quite possible that we have different phases in the urban development at Tegea and correspondingly, different phases in the fortifications as well. Furthermore, the street grid documented by magnetometer would suggest a smaller and far more rectangular shape for the urban area than that proposed by Bérard. We still do not possess stratigraphic evidence for dating the urban plan of Tegea, but finds from the surface as well as the grid itself do give some clues.

During the Norwegian Arcadia Survey 1999-2001 almost the whole of the urban area was covered by intensive survey, but the earlier mentioned problems with sedimentation and earlier river courses makes an interpretation and dating based only on these elements hazardous. But it should be mentioned that the earliest material found in any quantity from the urban area can be dated to the second half of the 6th century BC. This includes not only pottery, but also 3 fragments of Doric capitals of the late 6th century, testifying monumental buildings of this date in the urban area.¹⁸

The grid itself is also of importance for the dating, although for comparison we possess very few regular street plans before the Classical period from the Greek motherland. But the plan of Tegea is clearly a *streifenstadt* with its long, rectangular insulae and not only the size of the blocks, but also the placement of the public areas of the agora in the centre of the town bears close resemblance to similar plans in colonial foundations in Magna Graecia, particularly Poseidonia (Paestum) and Metapontion.¹⁹ Although a precise dating is not possible on the basis of such analogies, the plan of Tegea has certainly more in common with 6th century BC foundations than later, Classical Hippodamean plans.

¹⁷ Vallois, 1926. The date of construction during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is given by Livy, 41,20, 6.

¹⁸ These capitals are now exposed in the new archaeological museum at Alea.

¹⁹ Ødegård, 2010, 20-21.

State formation and urbanization at Tegea

Having established some old and new facts about the natural environment and the archaeological documentation of the ancient town of Tegea, it is now time to turn to the question of when and how the polis of Tegea was formed. The debate on the relationship and development of town and polis, on urban settlement and state, is a long one and this is not the place to go in details on the general discussion in scholarship on state formation and urbanization.²⁰ The traditional view has been to view the two processes as either one and the same or at least so intertwined that it is difficult to distinguish between the two, with perhaps Athens as the typical example.²¹ Here I have chosen to focus on what we either know or can assume about the development at Tegea. Consequently the emphasis will not be on documentation of formal institutions or decisions, or to put it differently, on what a state was. At Tegea we have little information on the exact nature of political institutions even in the Classical period and almost nothing from the Archaic period. But instead of focusing on what a state is, we could try to focus on what the state did, or in other words on archaeological evidence that may be connected to the workings of a state. In this respect, I believe, Tegea can offer a welcome addition to the growing corpus of “alternatives to Athens”, as it has been termed in an influential study.²²

It can be difficult to distinguish between groups presenting some sort of common identity, networks between such groups of different forms and functions, and political entities. Tegea is a good illustration of this point, since the area was known under this name from the Homeric catalogue of ships and the Hesiodic catalogue of women. The population had some sort of ethnic identity with the other Arcadians from an early date, probably the Archaic period, if not earlier.²³ And finally, according to Strabo and Pausanias they also belonged to 9 different δήμοι, which eventually formed a polis.²⁴ Since recent studies suggest that identity and interaction within a community could take many forms and comprise very diverse activities,²⁵ all of which could in one way or another be of importance for building a community and forging a state, we should rather investigate the different networks that have left a mark in the

²⁰ Hansen (ed.), 2007, particularly 9-66.

²¹ Morgan, 2000, 189.

²² Brock-Hodkinson, 2000.

²³ Heine Nielsen, 2002, 45-52.

²⁴ Strab., 8, 3, 2; Paus. 8, 45, 1.

²⁵ Particularly Morgan, 2003.

archaeological or written record, or can be assumed to have operated in the area of Tegea. Here I will focus on just one such factor, namely religion.

Religion and sanctuaries

The importance of temples and temple building for the history of local communities has been well elucidated by modern scholarship, both for Arcadia generally and for Tegea more in particular.²⁶ At Tegea the most important cult centre during Antiquity was undoubtedly the Sanctuary of Athena Alea. The location of this cult centre is interesting. It is located in the immediate proximity of long ridge connecting the flood-prone plain of Tegea to the foothills to the south and on the easiest route from or towards the south, which later the main road connecting Tegea and Laconia followed.²⁷ Anyone coming from the south during the winter season would here be faced with the problem of crossing the river of Sarandapotamos, which in the most recent reconstruction almost encircled the sanctuary.²⁸

While cult activity here probably goes back to the Bronze Age,²⁹ a sequence of simple cult buildings from the Geometric period has been traced inside the cella of the Late Classical temple.³⁰ The very modest dimensions (the later building measured 4x12 meters), as well as the simple building technique in wattle and daub could very easily be the work of a small community without large resources. Nonetheless, the remains are extremely important as they show a local community investing in a common cult centre, which already had connections to other parts of the Peloponnese, as documented by the votive offerings.³¹ The last of the wattle and daub-buildings was destroyed by fire around 680-70 and may have been replaced by another small building in mudbrick.³² In the second half of the 7th century, however, the sanctuary was completely remodeled and a new, impressive temple in stone and marble was raised.³³ With its stylobate of 16x48.5 meters the new temple at Tegea was not only on a par with the most recent developments in architecture on the Peloponnese, it must also have been a major undertaking for a much larger and more prosperous community than that testified by the earlier cult buildings.

²⁶ Heine Nielsen, 2002, 176-184; Voyatzis, 1999,

²⁷ Pikoulas, 1999, 258 (no. 1) and map 3 (no. 1).

²⁸ Ødegård-Klempe, 2014.

²⁹ Østby, 2014, 15-16.

³⁰ Østby, 2014, 20-31.

³¹ Østby, 2014, 31.

³² Østby, 2014, 31-33.

³³ Østby, 2014, 35-50.

That this larger community now included large areas of the later territory of the polis of Tegea is proved by the simple fact that the new temple was built in marble from Doliana, about 9 km to the southeast of the sanctuary (fig. 1). Not only the distance, but also the fact that the quarries were located about 400 meters higher up in the mountains than where the sanctuary was situated says something about the logistics involved in building the Archaic temple for Athena Alea.³⁴

Not far from the marble quarries, at Mavriki (or more precisely Psili Korfi) another temple was constructed in the mid-6th century at a site where earlier cult activity dates back to the Late Geometric period (fig. 1).³⁵ Again Doliana marble was employed for the small temple, which based on the testimony of Pausanias is commonly believed to have been dedicated to Artemis. But intensive building and cult activity is not only evident in the Sanctuary at Athena Alea and in the southern part of the territory of Tegea.

In the opposite part of the territory, towards the north, activity is also evident in the Sanctuary of Demeter at Haghios Sostis (fig. 1). Although only scarce remains have been found of any buildings in this sanctuary, large amounts of terracottas from the late 7th century and later have been found at the site.³⁶ In the same area a votive deposit, including figurines and drinking vessels from the late 6th century, was also found by the Norwegian Arcadia Survey.

From this short and by no means exhaustive survey, it is clear that the late 7th-6th centuries was a period when Tegea's territory was structured and exploited in a different way than earlier.³⁷ Some of the sanctuaries mentioned above also acquired buildings that should be interpreted as belonging to a wider community with larger resources than what had been available earlier and some sort of communal enterprise was probably responsible for the quarrying, infrastructure and transportation of marble from Doliana to some of the new buildings. Although we have no direct information on structure and composition of these communal networks, an emerging state looms behind the archaeological evidence. And it is in this context we should also interpret the appearance of the urban centre at Tegea.

Urbanisation

³⁴ The quarries at Doliana have never been properly studied, but are briefly described and discussed in Bakke, 2007, 115-117, who also notes the importance of marble quarrying for the infrastructure.

³⁵ Voyatzis, 1999, 132; Bakke, 2007, 116-117.

³⁶ Karapanagiotou-Leventi, 2015.

³⁷ Heine Nielsen, 2002, 182-183.

As I have tried to show above, there is no reason to believe that a proper town existed at Tegea before the middle of the 6th century. Rather the developed and very regular plan of Tegea (fig. with its clear demarcation of private and public areas would suggest that we are dealing with a formal political foundation following similar procedures as that of a colonial foundation rather than a slow and organic growth. It should be emphasized that such a plan for a new city goes far beyond aesthetics and architectural fashion. Regular plans were made for a purpose and that is mainly to ensure a practical and efficient way of allotting land and plots for houses.³⁸ In colonial foundations this was obviously a prime concern for the new settlement, although a lapse in time between the foundation and the actual layout of the new town has been observed.³⁹ At Tegea the situation must have been different, since there is no evidence to suggest that new settlers were arriving, but we have on the other hand very few indications that the urban area had been much exploited before the mid-6th century. This would on the other hand make the land-division and allotments in the new town a far easier task, since there would have been less problems concerning existing property boundaries. The founding of a new and common centre for the Tegean state may in fact be one of the first direct political actions of the polis we know about.

It is tempting to suggest that urbanization at Tegea may have been part of a process of colonizing the plain, making rich agricultural land available through drainage and placing the new common centre of the polis in the middle of it. Unfortunately we still lack archaeological documentation to substantiate such theories, but we have what might be termed circumstantial evidence from the excavations in the Sanctuary of Athena Alea: We have stratigraphical evidence of floods in the Geometric and early Archaic period, and then again after the 7th century AD,⁴⁰ but we have nothing in the intervening period, which is exactly the period when the town of Tegea was born, flourished and died.⁴¹ This can hardly be a coincidence. When the town was founded on the plain, it was necessary to bring the Sarandapotamos under control through drainage works and the continued existence of the town necessitated constant cleaning and maintenance of the drainage. These continued efforts of keeping the plain under habitation and cultivation has so far eluded archaeological research, but that is mainly because we until recently have not been sufficiently aware of what we are looking for.

³⁸ Hoepfner-Schwandner, 1986, 256.

³⁹ Greco-Torelli, 1983, 226-231.

⁴⁰ Ødegård-Klempe, 2014, 8-9.

⁴¹ During the The Hellenic-Norwegian Excavations at Tegea 2009-2013 in the centre of the ancient city, directed by A. V. Karapanagiotou, D. Athanassoulis and the present writer, the latest phase of active occupation seems to have ended abruptly in the mid-7th century AD.

Hostilities with Sparta and the historical tradition

What caused this new new interest in the sanctuaries throughout the territory, and why did the growing state decide to found a town in the middle of the plain? In the written sources and the historical tradition one of the most consistent features about Archaic Tegea are the hostilities with Sparta. Herodotus is our earliest certain source for these wars, but in his time they were already a matter of legend.⁴² He mentions the hostilities while telling the story of how Lichas found the bones of Orestes at Tegea.⁴³ Herodotus connects these events to the reign of Croesus, which implies a mid-6th century date, a time when the Spartans had already subdued most of the Peloponnese. It is virtually impossible to track any details of the period of antagonism between Sparta and Tegea before c. 550, but Pausanias evidently was told that the Spartan king Charillos was responsible for one of the campaigns against Tegea, and he apparently lived six generations before the Spartans had defeated the Tegeans in war, dated by Herodotus to the mid-6th century.⁴⁴ That would certainly take the wars with Sparta back to the 7th century and Herodotus also hints that the Spartans were unsuccessful in their aggression against Tegea for quite some time. Since Sparta had reduced the inhabitants of Messenia to helots during the 7th century, it is hardly conceivable that the Tegeans would have been able to resist the Spartans without some sort of strong, communal defence.

These traditions can perhaps also be linked to the much-discussed “treaty” between Sparta and Tegea transmitted by Plutarch.⁴⁵ The question is both what is implied in Plutarch’s text and what the date of the agreement is.⁴⁶ Traditionally, the phrase χρῆστούς ποιεῖν in the text has been taken to imply that the Tegeans should not make Messenians citizens.⁴⁷ But even if the Aristotelian interpretation added by Plutarch is accepted and that the phrase should rather be interpreted as “not to kill anyone who sided with the Laconians”, it would still mean that the Tegeans had clear notions about who was citizen and who was not.

The traditional dating of the agreement is to the mid-6th century mainly on the basis of Herodotus, as discussed above. But some scholars would prefer a much later date, to the 460s and following Messenian revolts. Although an agreement in this period would make sense

⁴² Pretzler, 1999, 110.

⁴³ Hdt. I, 67-68.

⁴⁴ Paus., III, 7, 3.

⁴⁵ Plut. *Quaest. Graec.* 5.

⁴⁶ For a good recent discussion, see Heine Nielsen, 2002, 188-191.

⁴⁷ Jacoby, 1944, 15-16.

historically, it cannot be decisive, since we are not as well informed about Peloponnesian politics generally in the 6th as in the 5th century.

The historical tradition of a prolonged struggle between Sparta and Tegea from the late 7th century and ending in a formal agreement in the mid-6th century covers the period when a new and imposing temple was dedicated to Alea, the sanctuaries in the territory was redefined and received much attention from a larger community than before and, finally, the foundation of a new urban centre. Even though we cannot prove that the agreement transmitted by Plutarch should be dated to the mid-6th century, the aggregation of the archaeological evidence would in fact rather support an early dating than a late. The wars with Sparta was not only an important element in early Tegean history, they may have strengthened the territorial identity and provided the occasion for mobilizing large groups of inhabitants in defence of what was developing into a proper polis.⁴⁸ And there is also another interesting piece of evidence that could be added; the urban topography as transmitted by Pausanias.

The urban topography

Maria Pretzler has drawn attention to the fact that “at the time of Pausanias the Tegeans preferred a more anti-Spartan interpretation of their tradition” and that this “allow a glimpse at the changing nature of myth-symbols that preserves their significance for the community over a long time”.⁴⁹ But how were these traditions kept alive? They were obviously told and retold, as they were to Pausanias, but they were also rooted in the topography, or rather in the monuments and the places which formed the urban topography. Over time, myth and history, monuments and stories, would be woven together into the collective memory of the people inhabiting Tegea.⁵⁰ And although our archaeological documentation at Tegea does not allow us to go in Pausanias’ footsteps, we can at least visualize some of the main features of the urban topography as transmitted by him.⁵¹

Even before Pausanias describes Tegea, he has given his readers a brief overview of the city’s past. Apart from connecting Tegea to some of the most important Greek myths, Pausanias also gives us the mythical founder of the city and introduces the “anti-Spartan” tradition at Tegea by remarking that the Tegeans were the first of the Arcadians to resist the Spartans.⁵²

⁴⁸ Pretzler, 1999, 109-111; Østby, 2014, 53.

⁴⁹ Pretzler, 1999; 117-118.

⁵⁰ Tilley, 1994, 33.

⁵¹ This section owes much to the lucid interpretation of Pretzler, 2007, 95-99.

⁵² Paus, 8, 45, 1-3

The Sanctuary of Athena Alea and some monuments in the immediate vicinity are described⁵³ before Pausanias moves on to the city. The passage is not quite clear, however, as Pausanias simply goes from one Sanctuary of Athena to another, namely Athena Poliatis. This must have been inside the city, otherwise the story about the lock of Medusa's hair kept there for protection would make no sense. On the basis of what we now know about the plan of Tegea, we may imagine that Pausanias moved from the Sanctuary to the centre of the city, perhaps along what may have been the main north-south-road at Tegea, Street 7. This street is the only one that continues across the agora and results from the magnetometer survey suggest that it went through a gate in the north (the only documented so far). Where exactly the Sanctuary of Athena Poliatis was located is not clear from Pausanias' description, it might have been somewhere in the southern half of Tegea, since he seems to moving northwards from the Sanctuary of Athena Alea⁵⁴ and he clearly introduces the agora-area later, in 8, 48,1 (τῆς ἀγορᾶς δὲ μάλιστα εἰκουρίας πλίνθω κατὰ τὸ σχῆμα, Ἀφροδίτης ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῇ ναὸς καλούμενος ἐν πλινθίῳ καὶ ἄγαλμα λίθου). On the agora, Pausanias, as we have seen above, describes a temple for Aphrodite, two relief slabs with the lawgivers of Tegea and a mythical Olympic winner, an image of Ares, which he connects to a story on a Spartan attack on Tegea where the women made the decisive contribution, an altar to Zeus Teleios, the tomb of Tegeates and Maera, connected to the mythical past, a temple for Eileithyia connected to the local myth of Auge and Telephos and an altar to Gaia. He then passes on to the theatre, which he says is οὐ πόρρω δὲ τῆς ἀγορᾶς and here he inserts his long passage on the life and deeds of Philopoimen.⁵⁵ After this long interruption, Pausanias mentions a shrine to Apollo Agyieus, appropriate enough if he is still in the neighbourhood of the theatre and the agora, where there are four images, one for each of the phylai. Pausanias then passes on to the Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore,⁵⁶ which is highly likely the one documented archaeologically on Haghios Sostis (see above), in which case he has left the city proper. The following description of the cults and monuments around the Sanctuary of Demeter and on the "lofty place of Zeus Klarios should therefore probably also be situated on the low hills to the north of the city proper, where Pausanias inserts another episode from the early wars against Sparta.⁵⁷ Before Pausanias leaves Tegea by the road to Laconia, he mentions in passing that he also saw the house of the city's founder, Aleos, and the tomb of the hero Echemos and a relief showing the

⁵³ Paus. 8, 45, 4-8, 47, 4.

⁵⁴ Pretzler, 2007, 95.

⁵⁵ Paus. 8, 49, 1- 8, 52, 6.

⁵⁶ Paus. 8, 53, 7.

⁵⁷ Paus. 8, 53, 10.

fight between this Tegean hero and Herakles' son Hyllos (and consequently a Dorian), but he does not specify where.⁵⁸

Even though we do not know archaeologically any of the monuments he describes (apart from the theatre and the agora), we can now visualize how many of these monuments dotted the urban landscape, particularly on, or around the huge, rectangular agora, bordered on the eastern short end by the imposing Hellenistic theatre. From this short synopsis of Pausanias' description of the city of Tegea, we can see that he mainly focused on monuments either connected to the foundation of the city or its political organization, or on monuments somehow connected to the hostilities with Sparta. As we have seen, the state formation of Tegea was a result of a long development beginning in the 7th century or earlier and culminating in the foundation of the city in the latter half of the 6th century. This means that the urban topography of Tegea was created at a time when the hostilities with Sparta were not a distant, mythical past, they were almost contemporary history and it is not surprising that many cults, festivals or monuments established at the founding of the city were directly or indirectly connected to events or stories from the wars. Once the connection between history, myth and physical monuments and places had been made, the interplay between topography, traditions and memory could develop. And this interplay, I believe, is exactly what we can read in Pausanias.

Concluding remarks

Tegea offers an interesting case of state formation and urbanization. We can see clear indications both in the archaeological and written sources of a growing state in the 7th and 6th centuries, while the urbanization clearly happens later, probably sometime in the second half of the 6th century. Further archaeological fieldwork will hopefully shed more light on changes in the settlement pattern during these crucial centuries,⁵⁹ but we can already see at Tegea how the two processes of state formation and urbanization were not necessarily one and the same process, rather state formation seems to have been an ongoing process which in the mid-6th century had urbanization as a result. Whether this was a peculiar aspect of Tegea or rather a regional trend remains to be seen, and particularly the ongoing research at the neighbouring site of Mantinea will provide an interesting comparison.⁶⁰ I believe that the particular drainage situation at Tegea may have been one important reason for this phenomenon. Both

⁵⁸ Paus. 8, 53,10.

⁵⁹ See also M. Malmer's contribution to this volume.

settlement and agriculture on the plain depended on large and complex drainage works which only a communal undertaking on large scale could accomplish. In historical terms the foundation of large towns on plains, like both Tegea and Mantinea, was indeed the exception rather than the rule in Arcadia. The traditional pattern has always been settlement in villages and it is only in Antiquity and in more modern times, with Tripoli as the centre of the region, that this tradition has been broken. I would argue that in Antiquity this was possible because of a strong, centralized polis that could transform the plain into a productive and attractive habitat.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bakke, J., 2007; *Forty Rivers. Landscape and Memory in the district of Ancient Tegea*. Diss. Bergen.
- Bérard, V., 1892 ; « Tégée et la Tégéatide », *BCH*, 16, 1, 529-549.
- Bérard, V., 1893 ; « Tégée et la Tégéatide », *BCH*, 17, 1, 1-24.
- Bjune, A., Krzywinski, K., Overland, A., 2014; “Palynological investigations in the Sanctuary of Athena Alea”, in E. Østby (ed.), *Tegea II: investigations in the sanctuary of Athena Alea 1990-94 and 2004, Papers and Monographs of the Norwegian Institute at Athens* vol. 4, Athens, 443-449.
- Brock, R.-Hodkinson, S., 2000; *Alternatives to Athens. Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, Oxford.
- Forsén, B., 2000; “Population and Political Strength of some Southeastern Arkadian Poleis”, *Copenhagen Polis Centre Papers* 5, 35-55.
- Greco, E.-Torelli, M., 1983; *Storia dell'urbanistica. Il mondo Greco*, Bari
- Hansen, M. H. (ed), 2007; *The Return of the Polis: the use and meaning of the word polis in archaic and classical sources, Papers from the Copenhagen Polis Centre* 8, *Historia, Einzelschriften* H. 198.
- Heine Nielsen, T., 2002; *Arkadia and its Poleis in the Archaic and Classical Periods*, Göttingen.
- Hoepfner, W., -Schwandner, E-L., 1986; *Haus und Stadt im Klassischen Griechenland*, München.
- Jacoby, F., 1944; “Χρηστοῦς ποιεῖν (Aristotle 592R)”, *CIQ* 38, 15-16.
- Jost, M., 1985 ; *Sanctuaires et cultes d'Arcadie*, École Française d'Athènes, Études Péloponnesiennes IX, Paris.

- Karapanagiotou, A. V.-Leventi, I., 2015; « The Terracotta Figurines from the Haghios Sostis Sanctuary at Tegea », In *Figurines de terres cuites en Méditerranée grecque et romaine, vol. 2, Iconographie et contexte*, 431-436.
- Knauss, J., 1988; „Der Damm im Takka-See beim alten Tegea (Arkadien, Peloponnes)“, *MdI*, 103, 25-36.
- Luce, J.-M., 2014; “Le secteur nord à partir de l’époque paléochrétienne”, in E. Østby (ed.), *Tegea II: investigations in the sanctuary of Athena Alea 1990-94 and 2004, Papers and Monographs of the Norwegian Institute at Athens* vol. 4, Athens, 37-54.
- Milchhöfer, A., 1880; “Untersuchungsgrabungen in Tegea”, *MdI*, 5, 52-69.
- Morgan, C., 2000; “Politics without the Polis: Cities and the Achaean Ethnos, c. 800-500 BC”, in Brock, R.-Hodkinson, S., 2000; *Alternatives to Athens. Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*, Oxford, 189-211.
- Morgan, C., 2003; *Early Greek States beyond the Polis*, London.
- Pikoulas, Y., 1999; “The Road-Network of Arkadia”, in T. Heine Nielsen-J. Roy, *Defining Ancient Arkadia, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre Vol. 6*, Copenhagen, 248-319.
- Pretzler, M., 1999; “Myth and History at Tegea – Local Traditions and Community Identity”, in T. Heine Nielsen-J. Roy, *Defining Ancient Arkadia, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre Vol. 6*, Copenhagen, 89-129.
- Pretzler, M., 2007; *Pausanias. Travel Writing in Ancient Greece*, London.
- Ross, L., 1841; *Reisen und Reiserouten durch Griechenland*, Berlin
- Roy, J., 1999; „The Economies of Arkadia“, in T. Heine Nielsen-J. Roy, *Defining Ancient Arkadia, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre Vol. 6*, Copenhagen, 320-381.
- Ødegård, K., 2010; “Urban Planning in the Greek Motherland: Late Archaic Tegea”, *ActaAArtHist*, 23, 9-22.
- Ødegård, K.-Klempe, H., 2014; “The Sanctuary of Athena Alea and its setting”, in E. Østby (ed.), *Tegea II: investigations in the sanctuary of Athena Alea 1990-94 and 2004, Papers and Monographs of the Norwegian Institute at Athens* vol. 4, Athens, 27-36
- Ødegård, K. (ed.), forthcoming; *TEGEA III. Investigations in the urban centre*.

The Norwegian Arcadia Survey (1999-2006). Papers and Monographs of the Norwegian Institute at Athens.

Østby, E., 2014; “The Sanctuary of Alea at Tegea in the pre-Classical Period”, in E. Østby (ed). *TEGEA I: Investigations in the Temple of Athena Alea 1991-94, Papers and Monographs of the Norwegian Institute at Athens*, 3, 11-56.

Tarditi, C., 2014, “The Excavation in the Northern Sector: Classical and Pre-Classical layers”, in E. Østby (ed.), *Tegea II: Investigations in the sanctuary of Athena Alea 1990-94 and 2004, Papers and Monographs of the Norwegian Institute at Athens* vol. 4, Athens, 55-86.

Tilley, C., 1994 ; *A Phenomenology of Landscape : Places, Paths and Monuments*, Oxford.

Vallois, R., 1926; “Le théâtre de Tégée“, *BCH* 50, 1, 135-173.

Voyatzis, M.E., 1999; “The Role of Temple Building in Consolidating Arkadian Communities” in T. Heine Nielsen-J. Roy, *Defining Ancient Arkadia, Acts of the Copenhagen Polis Centre Vol. 6*, Copenhagen, 130-168.