

1-1-2017

Population Reduction and a *Polis*

Lee Ann Turner
Boise State University

Population Reduction and a *Polis*

Lee Ann Turner

The first three sections of this chapter present the survey data and sites of the Protogeometric–Orientalizing, Archaic, and Classical periods in

our area. The fourth section discusses the changing settlement patterns that occurred during these periods.

The Protogeometric–Orientalizing Period

Some 24 sites have material dating to the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period (Fig. 20), which represents an increase in overall numbers from the 17 LM IIIC sites. All sites from this period are located in the western portion of the survey area, continuing a trend established in the preceding period. The hilly area east of Galatiani Kephala (44) and the northeastern lowlands are entirely abandoned at this time. Most sites are located on hilltops and hill slopes, primarily along or overlooking the Karteros River or encircling the upland area west of Galatiani Kephala (44). The preponderance of sites is in line with or south of Galatiani Kephala (44), while the north is more sparsely populated.

Protogeometric–Orientalizing site size appears to be generally larger than that of the the LM III

period. Of the 52 LM IIIA–IIIB and 17 LM IIIC sites, the vast majority are small. The LM IIIC small sites are comprised of 16 farmstead- or hamlet-sized sites and one small village, Prophetes Elias (28). During the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period (Table 7), however, only 71% of the sites are small: 46% are farmsteads (44, 80, 91, 99, 102, 118, 130, 133, 144, 151, 154) and 25% are hamlets (22, 105, 127, 129, 152, 160). Conversely, the number of Protogeometric–Orientalizing villages increases from one to five (Prophetes Elias [28], plus 97, 107, Korakia [134], Paratiritirion [157]), and there are now two towns (Astritsi Kephala [24], Choumeri Kephala [140]). This decrease in farmsteads, and the concurrent increase in hamlet, village, and town percentages, might indicate a nucleation of population.

Eleven Protogeometric–Orientalizing sites are new foundations (**91, 105, 127, 130, 140, 144, 160**) or re-foundations from the LM IIIA–IIIB (**99, 133**) or NP (**107, 151**) periods, meaning that 46% of settlements during this period are new sites. These new foundations range from small farms to a town, and include both low-lying and upland sites. While there is no obvious pattern in either location or size, six sites do ring the upland area directly west of Galatiani Kephala (**44**; clockwise from the north: **105, 91, 130, 140, 144, 107**).

The number of new foundations and the increase in site size in the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period suggests a slight demographic expansion. Notably, this is the only possible period of growth during the Protogeometric–Hellenistic period in the survey zone. Similar instances of nucleation and expansion have been noted elsewhere on Crete, specifically during the Protogeometric period. These are seen as a result of the emergence of new forms of social authority (Wallace 1997–2001, 91; 2003, 604–605; 2006, 166). Within our survey zone, the establishment of a new village (**107**) and town (Choumeri Kephala [**140**]), the expansion of small sites to village (**97**) and town sized (Astritsi Kephala [**24**]), and numerous new foundations exploiting previously unused locales would indeed support the idea of some sort of change in social organization during the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period.

Exactly when this local reorganization and expansion occurred remains uncertain; it could have begun in the Protogeometric period. Of the 24 Protogeometric–Orientalizing sites, four (Astritsi Kephala [**24**], Trochaloi [**80**], **127, 129**) have definitely identifiable Protogeometric material, while another five (**105**, Melissokopa [**118**], Choumeri Kephala [**140**], **151**, Paratiritirion [**157**]) have only possible Protogeometric remains. Although the total number of purely Protogeometric sites would mark a decrease from the 17 of the LM IIIC period, site size is larger overall. Only 66% of Protogeometric sites are small as compared to the ca. 95% of the LM IIIC period. The Protogeometric sites are 33% farmsteads (Trochaloi [**80**], Melissokopa [**118**], **151**), 33% hamlets (**105, 127, 129**), 11% villages (**157**), and 22% towns (Astritsi Kephala [**24**], Choumeri Kephala [**140**]). In general, this indicates that the pattern of larger site size noted in the overarching Protogeometric–Orientalizing

period is also found at its beginning during the Protogeometric period. Moreover, four of the nine Protogeometric sites (44%) are new foundations (**105, 127**, Choumeri Kephala [**140**]) or re-foundations (**151**). This situation also reflects the overall Protogeometric–Orientalizing pattern of movement into previously unexploited locales, and it is distinct from the LM III period where one of the LM IIIC sites (**124**) (5%) and 10 of the 52 LM IIIA–IIIB sites (20%) are new foundations.

Overall, Protogeometric–Orientalizing site location, although largely concentrated in the southwestern quadrant of the survey zone, is fairly dispersed across the landscape. As Saro Wallace (1997–2001, 84) notes, Central Crete in the Protogeometric and Geometric periods has a more widely spaced and nucleated site pattern than other parts of the island where clusters are more common. In the Galatas area, the dispersed pattern of the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period is sometimes due to the abandonment of low-lying sites within previous LM IIIA–IIIC clusters. For instance, of the westernmost LM IIIA–IIIC cluster (Melissokopa [**118**], **121, 122**), only Melissokopa (**118**) continues, the highest in elevation of the three. From the cluster of sites between Choumeri and Zinta (**128, 129, 133**), farmsteads **129** and **133** continue. The abandoned farmstead **128** is the only site of the three on level ground, while the highest (**129**; Pl. 25A), expands into a hamlet in the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period. The cluster south of Astritsi (**97, 102, 103**) has two continuing sites (**97, 102**). Again, the abandoned site **103** is the lowest lying, while the highest (**97**) expanded into a village in the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period. Continuing sites **97** and **102** may form a new cluster with hamlet **105** and farmstead **91**. These lie within the valley overlooked by Astritsi (**24**) and should perhaps be associated with that town. Only the highest site (Trochaloi [**80**]; Pl. 25B) from the cluster of sites **75, 80**, and **81** continues into the Protogeometric period, though it does shrink somewhat in size. From the LM IIIA–IIIC sites that followed the ridgeline (**3, 10, 13, 25, 22**) just east of ancient Galatiani Kephala (**44**), only site **22** continues. Site **22**, with its commanding views of Galatiani Kephala (**44**) and the western uplands, and a spring located 150–200 m to the north, was in fact in continuous use from PP through Archaic times.

All but five of the 24 sites dated to the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period are located on hilltops or slopes. Of the low-lying sites, site **102**, previously mentioned as part of the Astritsi cluster, has such a minor presence of post–LM III material (out of 308 sherds: one Geometric handle, one EIA handle, one Archaic cup, one possible Archaic–Classical loomweight) that its function is difficult to determine. There is, however, a spring to the south, and the finds here may be the detritus from its use. Site **99** may be in a similar situation, with somewhat more substantial finds and usage from PP times through the modern period. Located near the Church of Michael the Archangel and a branch of the Karteros River, site **99** is at the far north of the survey zone. Finds indicate that its primary ancient period of occupation was during the LM III period. The size of the site (0.45 ha) would make it a small hamlet at the time; in subsequent periods, it is no larger than a farmstead, because the Iron Age finds are much fewer and more random (a loomweight, two Geometric kraters, a Geometric/Archaic mortar and bowl, and a Classical lamp and cooking pot). The use of this site in later periods is probably tied to its location near to a water source. Interestingly, the site is within meters of an inn (*chani*; **99**), which is now used seasonally as a fruit stand but was once a way station for travelers going north–south through the Pedada (see this vol., Ch. 14). One of the main roads into the region goes by both our site and the *chani* to this day. The Iron Age site **99** may have operated in a similar manner: as a convenient place to stop and get water while traveling north–south through the area (Pl. 2A).

The remaining three low-lying Protogeometric–Orientalizing sites were more substantial. Two (**127**, **160**) are hamlet-sized foundations that do not continue further during the Iron Age. Site **160** is located in a valley next to a streambed west of the modern town of Galatas (**41**). Site **127** sits in a basin on a rocky outcrop west of Arkalochori, protected and hidden from the plain (Pl. 26A). A skyphos base found on-site places the foundation of site **127** in the Protogeometric period. Indeed, one of the aspects of the Protogeometric expansion seen elsewhere on Crete is movement into arable areas previously ignored in the LM IIIC period (Wallace 2003, 604–605). Our two short-lived sites, neither of which are defensible nor located

with a strategic vantage point, could certainly be understood in these terms as well. Furthermore, their abandonment at the end of the period could be taken as a failure of this movement into low-lying arable areas.

Site **107** is village sized. Not only is it large and low lying, but it is also long lasting. It is located in a valley on south-facing slopes behind two low hills, the western one topped by the modern town of Alagni's cemetery and the eastern one topped by a *mouгла* (μοϋγλα; a large pit containing the foul-smelling byproducts from present-day olive pressing). The site spreads along a well-watered ravine and is southeast of, but invisible to, Alagni (Pl. 26B). Finds, including a Hellenistic–Roman stone olive press (see this vol., Ch. 12, p. 97), date to the Geometric through Roman periods and may extend into the Byzantine era and later. Neopalatial sherds were found on the hill to the north. The water and protected nature of the site is probably the draw to this location.

Another Protogeometric–Orientalizing foundation, Choumeri Kephala (**140**), will prove to be a long-lasting and important town in the southern half of the survey zone. The site sits, covering some 4.55 ha, atop a hill located southwest of the modern town of Choumeri (Pl. 27A). The northern and western sides are sheer drops, making the site defensible. The hill sits between streams that feed into the north–south branch of the Karteros River, with a spring in the modern village (Pl. 27B). On-site were numerous cut blocks, two olive presses, mortars, and many Melian millstones (Pls. 28A–29C). Signs of quarrying appear along the northern edge of the site. Ceramic finds begin in the Geometric period and continue uninterrupted into the Early Roman period. Other previously published finds from the vicinity include two LM III tombs (Platon 1951, 445) and a building dated to the seventh century B.C. (Lembesi 1973, 567, pl. 537a). The olive presses suggest a source for the town's prosperity and longevity. Astritsi Kephala (**24**), which was founded in the LM III period but expanded during the Geometric and Archaic periods, will be the other important town in the area during these periods, especially in the northern portion of the survey zone (see below, pp. 88–89; Panagiotakis 2003, 360).

Other previously published finds from the survey area are funerary in nature (Sjögren 2003,

138–140). These include a single tholos tomb at Hagies Paraskies, located just west of Philissia and slightly outside the survey zone. It contained 119 vases, 26 of which were cremation urns dating to the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. A single tomb at Pano Kalives on the plain just north of Arkalochori contained Geometric urns and three aryballoi; a scatter of Geometric sherds in the neighborhood of Zinta was also interpreted as a burial site.

Three Bronze Age sites (97, Melissokopa [118], Paratiritirion [157]) are not used past the Geometric to Orientalizing period. Site 97, a LM III foundation, grows to a village-sized site in the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period, although Iron Age occupation ceases in the Orientalizing period. Interestingly, there are signs of quarrying at this site (Pls. 30A, 30B) and at a new nearby Protogeometric–Orientalizing hamlet (105; Pl. 31A) that continues into the Archaic period. Perhaps as one quarry site (97), presumably for Astritsi Kephala (24), was being abandoned, another one (105) was established.

In all, eight Protogeometric–Orientalizing sites (97, 127, 130, 144, 152, 154, 157, 160) do not continue into the Archaic period. These include both older sites and four (127, 130, 144, 160) of the new foundations. As mentioned in the paragraph above, the abandonment of quarry site 97 does not necessarily indicate the end of occupation in that locale because site 105 may have merely replaced it. If one discounts this site, the remaining seven abandoned sites (127, 130, 144, 152, 154, 157, 160) are

almost exclusively in the southern part of the survey zone. Only site 160, the low-lying Protogeometric–Orientalizing foundation described above, is located north of Galatiani Kephala (44). This cessation of settlements in the south could perhaps be related to the rise of the Protogeometric–Orientalizing-founded site of Choumeri Kephala (140). On the other hand, site size in the Archaic and Classical periods (see below) will be substantially larger in the south than in the north around Astritsi Kephala (24). This suggests that something more complex may be happening than the simple elimination of rival centers by a growing city. The abandoned Protogeometric–Orientalizing sites are almost all at the smaller end of the spectrum: farmsteads (130, 144, 154) and hamlets (127, 152, 160). Only Paratiritirion (157) is larger, as a mid-sized village that ends in the Orientalizing period. This loss of smaller settlements may indicate that there is perhaps more of a contraction, or a nucleation, of population in the south at the end of this period rather than a nucleation with Choumeri Kephala (140).

Finally, it should be noted that 10 of the Protogeometric–Orientalizing sites have either definite (24, 28, 44, 80, 97, 107, 140) or possible (22, 129, 157) Orientalizing material. These range from farmstead- (44, 80) and hamlet- (22, 129) to village- (28, 97, 107, 157) and town-sized (24, 140) sites. None are new foundations, and all but two (97, 157, both discussed earlier) continue into the subsequent Archaic period.

The Archaic Period

Some 19 sites are noted as having Archaic remains, a drop in number from the 24 in the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period (Table 8; Figs. 20, 21). There are two newly founded sites (93, 116) and renewed activity at two others (21, 55). This is a decrease from the 11 new or re-founded sites in the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period and suggests that the movement of people to previously unexploited locations, which might be said to characterize the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period, all but ceases in the Archaic period. There is a decrease nearly across the

board in site numbers. The number of farmstead-sized sites shrinks from 11 to nine (55, 80, 91, 93, 99, 102, 116, 133, 151), the number of hamlets from six to five (21, 22, 44, 105, 129), and the number of villages from five to three (28, 107, 134). The number of towns remains the same (24, 140). Five sites end in the Archaic period: four sites are Bronze Age (22, 102, 129, 133) and one is Protogeometric–Orientalizing (105). Three of these are small sites in the south (22, 129, 133); two (102, 105) are small sites near Astritsi Kephala (24). One caveat needs mention here, however:

the decrease in recognized Archaic sites is probably due in part to the continuation of the Orientalizing ceramic style into the sixth century B.C. (see this vol., App. F).

Panagiotakis (2003, 341, 360) sees an expansion in the Archaic period. The only area where the Galatas survey found any expansion in this period, however, is at the site of Galatiani Kephala (44) itself. The earliest Iron Age material was found here in a 0.33 ha area on the southern slopes. This area continues in use into the Classical and Hellenistic periods. Another cluster of pottery covering 0.81 ha is located on the hilltop and eastern slope, and it has material dated to the Archaic and Classical periods, suggesting that the hilltop was not reinhabited until the Archaic period. Together, these two clusters of pottery cover an area of 1.14 ha. Such an area would typically be categorized as a town, but because these two clusters are not definitely contiguous, a categorization as a hamlet is probably more suitable.

Beyond site 99, which may be a sporadically used water source, and the village (107) near modern Alagni's cemetery, both of which are discussed in the Protogeometric–Orientalizing section above (pp. 85–88), all Archaic sites are located on hill slopes or hilltops. The majority are also located in the western side of the survey zone, a continuation of patterns previously established in the LM IIIC and Protogeometric–Orientalizing periods.

All of the smaller sites, except 133 and 151, are located in the northern portion of the survey zone. Conversely, beyond the quarry at site 105, all hamlet- and village-sized sites are located in the southern portion. These hamlets and villages generally ring the arable uplands and are dispersed. Perhaps this variation in settlement patterns between small sites in the north and dispersed larger sites in the south can be attributed to the two towns in the area. In the north, Astritsi Kephala (24) may extend its influence throughout the nearby region, rather like a polis, discouraging larger settlements. In the south, Choumeri Kephala (140) may have a smaller sphere of influence or interest, thus allowing for larger settlements there.

Site 151, the only farmstead located in the southern half of the survey zone during the Archaic period, is particularly long lasting. It sits on the top and southern slopes of the Miliarisou hill,

about 150 m southeast of the *metochi* (μετόχι; seasonal site) of Miliarisou, located south of Zinta. At the northern base of the hill is a Venetian fountain for a spring that until recently, we were told, produced water all year long (Pl. 31B). The hill is steep on the western, northern, and eastern sides, and it therefore is defensible. Occupation of the site begins in the PP and continues into the NP period. As no LM III was found on-site, it may have been abandoned for a time, only to be re-founded in the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period, possibly as early as the Protogeometric period, and it continues throughout the Archaic and Classical periods. While the site covers some 0.35 ha, finds from the Iron Age are not as numerous as those from the NP period, suggesting that renewed occupation of the hilltop was more along the lines of a farmstead rather than a hamlet. The Iron Age finds were domestic in character and include jugs, mortars, a basin, and a pithos.

Of the new Archaic sites, the small site 116 near Astritsi only extends into the Classical–Hellenistic period. Site 21, on the other hand, is an older PreP–LM III site that showed renewed activity in the Archaic period. It is possible that it was continuously occupied, but no Protogeometric–Orientalizing finds were identified. The site is unusual and difficult to characterize: finds were scattered and not typical of Bronze Age domestic assemblages, though that is most likely due to its use in the Archaic–Hellenistic periods.

The two other new foundations, sites 55 and 93, are interesting in that they are the first sites to appear in the eastern side of the survey zone after the abandonment of site 55 in the LM IIIC period. They are very near to each other, and, in fact, they were originally considered by us as part of a single, large site. While site 55 is largely a NP site and, later, a Hellenistic and Roman site (with some LM III), a limited amount of Archaic material was also recovered. The amount of Archaic material suggests it was quite small at the time. Site 93 is primarily Hellenistic to Roman, but some Archaic and Classical material was also found there. The amount of remains suggests that this site was probably no larger than a farmstead during these periods. A large number of storage vessels and a piece of clay kiln slag found on-site suggest the presence of some sort of industry. Beyond this, why these

sites, and only these sites, appear in the eastern side of the survey zone in the Archaic and Classical periods is unclear. They are situated, at least,

on a route to the eastern Pediada, toward the developing and important polis of Lyttos.

The Classical Period

Sixteen sites have Classical remains (Fig. 22), a decrease from the 19 of the Archaic period. The loss is all in small sites, which decrease in number from eight to five (31%). There are again two towns (13%), three village-sized sites (19%), and eight farmsteads (37%; Table 9). The settlement pattern of the Classical period is strikingly similar to that of the Archaic. There is only one eastern site (**93**); all the rest are in the western half of the survey zone. All Classical sites except site **99** and the village (**107**) near the modern Alagni cemetery are located on hill slopes and hilltops. All but one (**151**) of the smallest sites (**80, 91, 93, 96, 99, 116, 118**) are located in the north, in the vicinity of the town of Astritsi. All hamlet- (**18, 21**, Galatiani Kephala [**44**]) and village-sized sites (Prophetes Elias [**28**], **107**, Korakia [**134**]) ring the arable uplands west and south of Galatiani Kephala (**44**), surrounding the town of Choumeri. Overall, the Classical period in the Galatas area might be described as slightly less populated than in the Archaic period, but stable.

There are two new foundations (**18, 96**) and one possible re-foundation (Melissokopa [**118**]) in this period, as opposed to the four in the Archaic period. Site **18** is a small hamlet in the hills south-east of Galatiani Kephala (**44**) that may continue into the Hellenistic period. Site **96**, a farmstead-sized site south of Astritsi Kephala (**24**), also continued into the Hellenistic period. This site is very near the LM III–Orientalizing quarry (**97**) and may represent the continued, though less dense, occupation of the same hill slope. Finally, Melissokopa (**118**) on the western edge of the arable uplands may have also been resettled in the Classical era. We must, however, remember that this site is continuously occupied from the PP period through the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period. As a result, especially given problems in identifying Archaic fabrics, it seems likely that the settlement’s Archaic phase was undetected by the survey. Whatever the case may be, Melissokopa (**118**) certainly expanded

in the Classical period into a village-sized site, though it does not continue beyond this period.

Another site, beyond Melissokopa (**118**), that ends in the Classical period, is site **91**. This farmstead, situated on a hill overlooking Voni, was inhabited as early as the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period. Astritsi Kephala (**24**), Galatiani Kephala (**44**), and Prophetes Elias (**28**) at Arkalochori are all in view from various portions of the hilltop. A spring 200 m to the northwest, now near a cemetery and church dedicated to the Metamorphosis tou Christou (Pl. 32A), is probably the reason for its longevity. An unusual object from this site is a stone that is roughly shaped like a Doric column capital and its plinth (25 x 27 cm; Pl. 32B). The top and bottom of this limestone “capital” are not parallel (height ranges from 10–14 cm), which does not make for a usable capital or a base. Other finds from this likely domestic agricultural site include fine wares, cooking ware, and storage vessels.

The village of Korakia (**134**) west of Zinta continues but shrinks to the size of a farmstead in the subsequent Hellenistic period (Pl. 33A). Founded in the PreP period, it is in continuous use through the LM III period. After the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period, the site reaches village size during the Archaic and Classical periods. The hilltop and eastern slope were occupied; the western side is a rough cliff face, and thus is defensible. It also has a view of the arable uplands in the southern portion of the survey zone. The water source may have been the spring at Zinta (Pl. 33B).

The site most representative of the Iron Age in the survey zone is Astritsi Kephala (**24**), located 1.5 km north of the modern town of the same name. It sits on a flat hilltop and the surrounding slopes, covering some 7.2 ha (Pl. 34A). The hilltop, as Krzysztof Nowicki (2000, 179) points out, has views of most “routes leading from the Knossos–Archanes area to the Pediada and to the Upper Mesara.” The hilltop, probably an acropolis,

is protected by gorges to the west and east, making it defensible (Sjögren 2003, 49). The ancient water source, a branch of the modern Karteros River, is located to the east. Rough-hewn stairs still visible on the western edge of the site were used in recent times as a shortcut for the retrieval of water from this source. The hilltop is covered with ancient walls and their tumble. In the center is a leveled, raised area measuring roughly 35 x 40 m, which may have been a platform for a temple. The northwestern corner is approached by a natural winding ramp. A possible cemetery for the site, as reported by local inhabitants, may be located to the south.

Finds at Astritsi Kephala (24) begin in LM III and continue, unbroken, into the Hellenistic period. While several LM III sherds (the earliest being a LM IIIB deep bowl) were found in the northwest quadrant of the hilltop, the later periods are much better represented and come from both the hilltop and slopes. Panagiotakis (2003, 382) cites Neolithic, PP, NP, and LM IIIA:1–IIIC finds from the site as well. He defines Astritsi Kephala (24) as going under the modern village, whereas we confine the site to the hilltop and slopes. Thus, his finds and date range reflect a larger area and include what we define as separate sites in the vicinity (e.g., 105, 112, 113, 116). Nowicki (2000, 179) defines and dates the site similarly to us: LM IIIC–Protogeometric, Geometric, Orientalizing, Archaic, Classical, and Hellenistic.

Other previously published finds from Astritsi Kephala (24) include the upper portion of a limestone armored and possibly seated female Dae-dalic statue. This gigantic statue, found in 1960, is dated to the mid seventh century B.C. (Davaras 1972; Adams 1978, 35; Sipsie-Eschbach 1982), and it has been suggested that it is a possible cult statue of Athena Tritogeneia (Boardman 1974). Another later draped limestone female statue has also been reported as having come from the site (Faure 1958, 505), as well as a Hellenistic female seated figure (Alexiou 1964, 284; 1965, 555). Interestingly, female terracotta figurines dated to the third century B.C. have also been found. These mostly portray a seated female figure with a phiale, though some stand, carrying a shield or holding a bird (Alexiou 1968, 404; 1969, 534). The predominance of female statuary, sometimes armed, would indeed seem to suggest a sanctuary of Athena at Astritsi Kephala (24). Beyond this, two decorated pithos

fragments have been discussed (Marinatos 1933–1935, 58, fig. 18).

Finds collected from Astritsi Kephala (24) during the course of our survey indicate a number of on-site industries. Ceramic wasters suggest a possible kiln within the southern portion of the site. A large stone with grab holes found on the northeastern hilltop may have been part of an olive press (Pl. 34B). Other stone finds include mortars and a Melian millstone fragment. Iron processing remains from the northeastern quadrant of the hilltop and loomweights were also recovered, as were roof tiles (Pl. 35A).

The form, size, and longevity of Astritsi Kephala (24) have made it a possible polis candidate for several scholars. Lena Sjögren (2003) posits that it could have been a particularly early one, because she sees Astritsi Kephala (24) as the center of a concentration of settlements during the eighth century B.C. From the perspective of our survey, the relative absence of Geometric–Classical sites around Astritsi Kephala (24) is remarkable. There are no more than three or four sites near it during any of these periods, and these are invariably quite small. This is different from the southern portion of the survey zone where site size is larger and dispersed. The near vacuum on the ridges around and in the valley below Astritsi Kephala (24) may be a sign of some sort of *synoikism* during the course of the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period (see above, pp. 85–88), quite possibly at its very start.

Sjögren (2003) sees the focus in the Pediada shifting eastward toward Lyttos from the seventh century B.C. onward. Lyttos, sometimes called Lyktos, is equated with the site of Anemomyloi near Xidas, to the northeast of Kastelli (Sjögren 2003, 81, 99–100, 106, 121, 123; Perlman 2004, 1175–1177). Lyttos seems to have been established by the LM IIIC period (Nowicki 2000, 177), following the abandonment of the Minoan center at Kastelli (Rethemiotakis 1997b, 325). Already mentioned in the *Iliad* (2.647) and by Hesiod (*Theog.* 477), Lyttos sent troops to Sparta during the Second Messenian War in 668 B.C. (Paus. 4.19.4). Nowicki (2000, 177) suggests that Lyttos had gained control of the Lassithi Plain to the east by the Archaic period. Didier Viviers (1994, 252–258) has also traced extensive Lyttian expansion at this time. The later Archaic period is, in fact, the time when our first and only eastern sites (55, 93) reappear, and they may mark a

route eastward toward Lyttos. The remainder of the eastern part of the survey zone, however, remains completely uninhabited, as it had since the LM IIIC period. The absence of any other changes in the eastern part of the survey zone in that or later periods suggests that contact was minimal. Perhaps this area operated as something of a “no man’s land” or “demilitarized zone” in between Astritsi Kephala (24) and Lyttos in the Archaic, Classical, and even Hellenistic periods. Lyttos, in fact, may have had more of a southern (Erickson 2010, 239) and eastern focus (Watrous 1982, 21–23; Nowicki 2000, 177) toward Lasithi during the Archaic and Classical periods. No Lyttian pottery has been identified from anywhere in the survey zone. Indeed, there are only two tentatively identified Iron Age (pre-Hellenistic) imports from the entire survey zone, and they both display Knossian characteristics.

All things considered, Astritsi Kephala (24) may have been a relatively isolated town during the Iron Age (also in the Classical and Hellenistic periods as, in fact, the entire region is to this day). It was separated from Lyttos by an empty expanse of territory. There were very few to no imports. Knossos, only slightly more distant to the north, showed little impact in the area as well. Indeed, several scholars (e.g., Coldstream, Huxley, and Webb 1999, 292; Erickson 2010, 235–238) argued that Knossos was in decline starting around 600 B.C. The EIA settlement at Kounavi (ancient Eltyna), some 4 km to the north of the survey zone, may have been the southern limit of Knossos’s influence (Dimopoulou-Rethemiotakis 1988; Rethemiotakis and Dimopoulou-Rethemiotakis 1994–1996, 315–317; Englezou 2004). Moreover, as noted above, Astritsi Kephala (24) itself demonstrates polis-like tendencies within the region of the northern Pediada. Astritsi Kephala (24) has occasionally been identified as the ancient polis of Lykastos (Spratt 1865, 90; Walbank 1979, 201; Masson 1985, 197–198; Panagiotakis 2003, 358). Lykastos is mentioned by both Homer (*Il.* 2.647) and Strabo (10.4.14 [C 479]), while Polybius (22.15) reports that Gortyn in the second century B.C. had taken Lykastos from Knossos and given it to Rhaukus. Rhaukus is usually located at Hagios Mironas on the western side of the Gazanos River and rather far from the Pediada. One would therefore expect that Lykastos would be relatively nearby, within Rhaukus’s sphere of influence. A more likely location for Lykastos, and one

followed by the majority of scholars, is Visala, east of the village of Kanli Kastelli/Prophetes Elias, otherwise known as Rocca (Gerola 1905–1932, I, 92, 181–190; Spanakis 1993, 685–686; Detorakis 1994, 132; see this vol., Ch. 14). It is situated on the eastern side of the Gazanos River, essentially across from Hagios Mironas, outside of the Pediada (Bursian 1872, 561; Evans 1921–1935, II, 74; Walbank 1979, 201; also see Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970, 113–114; McArthur 1993, 130, 145–146, 149–151; Sjögren 2003, 100, no. 430; Perlman 2004, 1146, 1185).

Astritsi Kephala (24) is most often equated with the Diatonion mentioned in the same passage by Polybius (22.15). In it, Diatonion, a possession of Knossos, was seized by Gortyn and given to Lyttos. Both Lykastos and Diatonion were later restored to Knossos by a Roman embassy led by Appius Claudius in 184 B.C. (Walbank 1979, 200–201; Perlman 1996, 247). Since Diatonion is given to Lyttos on the far eastern edge of the Pediada, it should be near Lyttos and logically east of Lykastos and within the Pediada. Astritsi Kephala (24) fits these criteria. The place name Detonion has been reconstructed on a Hellenistic funerary stela for a Cretan man found at Akko in Israel. It has been suggested that this may be the correct spelling of Polybius’s Diatonion (*SEG* 26.1679; Guarducci 1935, 46; Dothan 1976, 39). It should be noted, however, that the absence of Hellenistic ceramic material definitely datable to later than the third century B.C. from Astritsi Kephala (24) could indicate that the site was uninhabited, or only sparsely occupied, at the time of the Roman embassy. Indeed, no Hellenistic finds from Astritsi Kephala (Alexiou 1968, 404; 1969, 534), or even attributed to it (Trifiró 2001), can be dated beyond the third century B.C. While this might argue against the identification of Astritsi Kephala (24) with Diatonion, it could simply be an accident of site collection, because there is later Roman material on-site (French 1990, 71). Conversely, and what seems quite possible, is that the very seizure of the settlement—by Gortyn or at the initial takeover by Knossos—caused a period of depopulation, which would then explain the lack of post-third century B.C. Hellenistic pottery.

In 1958, Paul Faure (1958) made a suggestion, which still occasionally shows up in the literature today (e.g., Nowicki 2000, 179), that Diatonion

was a corruption of Tritonion in the Polybius manuscript tradition. Faure argued that the modern Karteros River is the ancient Triton River, rather than the ancient Amnissos River. The springs of the Triton River on Crete are described by Diodorus (*Siculus* 5.72.3) as the birthplace of Athena, hence her epithet Tritogeneia. Similar stories of bodies of water include Libya by Herodotus (4.180) as well as Boeotia and Arcadia by Pausanias (9.33.7 and 8.26.6, respectively). The aforementioned passage in Diodorus also mentions a temple sacred to Athena located on the Triton River. Because Astritsi Kephala (24) sits at the source of one of the branches of the Karteros River (called Tritonia by locals), it could have been, in Faure's (1958) scenario, the site of this temple of Athena Tritogeneia and might therefore be reasonably named Tritonion. As Faure (1958, 501–507) points out, even the modern name of Astritsi Kephala (24) may reflect that it stood on the Triton River,

because the name could be an elision of something like “stas Tritsi” (στάς Τριτσί) or “on the little Triton.” While Faure's suggestions are rather ingenious, it should be noted that they were conceived prior to the discovery of the Akko inscription, which confirms that the place name Diatonion or Detonion did exist on Crete in the Hellenistic period. The Triton River, too, is most often associated with the modern day Gazanos River that flows into Herakleion. This identification of the Triton River with Gazanos is anecdotally supported by a story associated with St. Myron (ca. A.D. 250–350). One of the miracles attributed to the saint was an instance of his causing the Triton River to become solid so he could cross it. Because his church, Hagios Mironas (ancient Rhaucus), is located on the western slopes of the Gazanos River, proximity would suggest that this is the Triton River in the story.

Conclusion

Of the 172 sites originally identified (some were deleted or combined during the study seasons) in the survey zone, 24 sites have Protogeometric–Orientalizing material, 19 have Archaic material and 16 have Classical material. Six sites (Astritsi Kephala [24], Prophetes Elias [28], Galatiani Kephala [44], 80, Melissokopa [118], Korakia [134]) may have been in use in all of these periods. All except Melissokopa (118) continue into Hellenistic or Roman times, and all but Astritsi Kephala (24) have some PP and NP material.

Settlement during the Iron Age in the Galatas area is characterized by an overall pattern established largely in the LM IIIC period. At this time, the LM IIIA–IIIB dispersed clusters scattered across the uplands and lowlands of the survey zone are replaced by a decided preference for western and upland site locations. Also striking is the near abandonment of the eastern half of the survey zone, which began in the LM IIIC period and continued uninterrupted through the Hellenistic period.

The nucleation and expansion noted in the general Protogeometric–Orientalizing period in the Galatas area may have started in the Protogeometric period, which has parallels elsewhere on

Crete. In the Mesara, a similar pattern of rural abandonment and urban nucleation has been noted (Watrous and Hadzi-Vallianou 2004g, 307–318). There, changes in population, cult, land redistribution and use, and social organization took place during the EIA, resulting in the appearance of two poleis (Gortyn and Phaistos) by the seventh century B.C. (Watrous and Hadzi-Vallianou 2004g, 339–350). In the Isthmus of Ierapetra, LM IIIC–Geometric settlement was nucleated in a few defensible sites; several polis sites can be identified by the seventh century B.C. (Nowicki 2012). Such a pattern has been observed across Crete (Nowicki 2000, 241–247). Wallace has associated this EIA expansion with changes arising from the emergence of new forms of social authority (Wallace 1997–2001, 91; 2003, 604–605; 2006, 166; 2010). In essence, she argues that the extension into new areas would increase commodity production and, in time, craft specialization. This would promote the emergence of a more complex social organization and, hence, would mark the beginning of the transition from LM IIIC citadel sites to poleis via regional proto-state polities (Wallace 2010, 234, 246–247, 257).

The subsequent Archaic through Classical periods are marked by a gradual reduction of site numbers in the Galatas area, a pattern observed in some but not all parts of the island. Just to the north of our survey zone, for example, the site of Smari was also abandoned by the seventh century B.C. (Hadzi-Vallianou 1995). Around Kavousi, site numbers decrease in Late Geometric–Early Orientalizing, with the rise of a single large nucleated settlement at Azoria (Haggis 2005, 84–86). After the abandonment of Azoria and later Kato Chorio/Prophetes Elias in the fifth century B.C., the isthmus and Kavousi area are all but unpopulated during the remainder of the Classical–Hellenistic period (Watrous et al. 2000, 477–478; Watrous 2001b, 89). This may be due to the *synoikism* of the region with Hierapytna (Ierapetra; Haggis et al. 2004, 390–391). The effect of the rise of a polis or polis-type site on settlement patterns has been noted elsewhere. In the Mesara, a number of settlements around Gortyn end in the late seventh century B.C., perhaps due to *synoikism* with that polis (Watrous and Hadzi-Vallianou 2004g, 318). In contrast, the Orientalizing–Archaic expansion in Lasithi is probably brought to an end by the rise of another polis, Lyttos (Watrous 1982, 21–23).

The gradual reduction in site numbers after the Protogeometric–Orientalizing period in the

Galatas area may indicate movement of population out of the area, although it is neither dramatic nor wholesale. Astritsi Kephala (24) itself may be said to display some polis-like features in the northern portion of the survey zone, but it does not take the form of the aggressive *synoikism* seen elsewhere, such as at Phaistos. The large scale reorganization of emerging, Central Cretan poleis—involving increased long-distance trade, intensified production, and surplus storage (cf. Kotsonas 2002)—does not seem to take place in our area. Astritsi Kephala (24) perhaps continued to control its immediate surroundings with little change in the settlement pattern into the Hellenistic period. The differing settlement pattern in the southern half of the survey zone, consisting of larger dispersed sites, may suggest that Astritsi's influence never extended that far. Finally, if Astritsi is the Diatonion mentioned by Polybius, then the city belonged to Knossos at least by the second century B.C. The lack of post-third century B.C. Hellenistic finds from Astritsi suggests that the town had fallen upon hard times, which could indicate that the area passed into Knossian hands not long before Gortyn seized the site, perhaps toward the end of the third or early in the second century B.C. Indeed, Knossos's movement into the region might be the act that spurred Gortyn's action.