KLEONAI, THE CORINTH–ARGOS ROAD, AND THE "AXIS OF HISTORY"

ABSTRACT

The ancient road from Corinth to Argos via the Longopotamos pass was one of the most important and longest-used natural routes through the northeastern Peloponnese. The author proposes to identify the exact route of the road as it passed through Kleonai territory by combining the evidence of ancient testimonia, the identification of ancient roadside features, the accounts of early travelers, and autopsy. The act of tracing the road serves to emphasize the prominent position of the city Kleonai on this interstate route, which had significant consequences both for its own history and for that of neighboring states.

INTRODUCTION

Much of the history of the polis of Kleonai was shaped by its location on a number of major routes from the Isthmus and Corinth into the Peloponnese. The most important of these was a major artery for north–south travel, from the city of Kleonai, the immediate destinations of this road were Corinth to the north and Argos to the south. It is in connection with its roads that Kleonai is most often mentioned in the ancient sources, and likewise, modern topographical studies of the area have focused on defining the courses of these routes, particularly that of the main

1. The initial fieldwork for this study was primarily conducted as part of a one-person survey of visible remains in Kleonai territory under the auspices of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens. I would like to thank then-director James Muhly for supporting the project, Maria Pilali for her crucial role in obtaining the necessary permit, and the Fourth Ephoriea of Classical and Prehistoric Antiquities and the Greek Ministry of Culture for granting it. In particular, I thank prior ephors Elisavet Spathari and Alexander Mantis for their interest in the project at Kleonai, and the guards and residents of Archaia Nemea and Kondostavlo for their active help. I would also like to thank Ronald Stroud, Stephen G. Miller, Ioulia Tzonou-Herbst, and James Herbst for reading earlier drafts of this article. Their comments and suggestions, as well as those of the anonymous readers and the editors of *Hesperia*, were of invaluable assistance. I owe particular gratitude to Bruce Stiver and John Luchin for their assistance with the illustrations. All of the photographs and translations of ancient texts are mine unless otherwise indicated. Spelling and punctuation in quotations from early travelers’ reports have been modified to conform to modern English.
Corinth–Argos road. Nevertheless, controversy over the basic route of the road remains, important portions of the road have yet to see extensive investigation, and the relationship between this road and Kleonai’s history has received little emphasis.

The purpose of this article is thus threefold. The first aim is to support those who have argued that this important road followed, at least in part, the route of the Longopotamos River, and to argue that the road on this basic route was the main, direct interstate route between Corinth and Argos throughout antiquity.

The second aim of the article is to document physical evidence for the road itself in greater detail than has previously been done, and to compare it with the ancient literary evidence. The northern portion of the route in Corinthian territory has already been well documented, but topographical investigations within the Kleonai valley have been few; here I propose that it is possible to identify the course of the road within Kleonai territory more precisely, particularly where the road passed near the site of the city proper. To this end I build a case based on evidence as diverse as ancient roadside features, the reports of local residents, old monopatia (or footpaths), autopsy of the region, and the reports of early travelers to Greece. These last are particularly important, since I argue that the early modern road from Corinth to Argos and the ancient road are essentially the same. This is demonstrable for the better-documented northern portion of the route, as a close comparison of the physical features of the ancient road and the itineraries of the early travelers will show; identifying the early modern road in the Kleonai valley and relating it to evidence for the ancient road will thus form a basis for reconstructing this crucial portion of the route.

A discussion of the significance of major interstate routes for our understanding of history is beyond the scope of this article, but it should not be controversial to assert that roads, as artifacts for the reconstruction of the ancient past, are as significant as any other edifice uncoverable by archaeology. In an age of increased agricultural mechanization (and the use of explosives in road construction), the Greek landscape and the ways in which one moves through it are changing rapidly; traces of roadside features and old paths are disappearing as previously inaccessible land is exploited. It is therefore important to document the results of autopsy and the memories of older residents, who remember a less-ravaged landscape, before traces of old routes and local memories are gone. For this reason, the majority of this paper is devoted to detailing the evidence for the course of the road itself, in the belief that the road represents primary evidence that should be recorded for its own sake, since its accurate identification is important for any future study of the history of the area.

The final aim of this study, which requires that a careful exposition of the road and its related features first be laid out, is to stress the significance of the relationship between the polis of Kleonai, its territory and borders, and the course of the Corinth–Argos road. Indeed, I will show that the road passes directly below Kleonai’s walls, and that the city thus had the capability of functioning much like a fortress on this major route. Adopting 2. I should begin by making clear the distinction between a route and a road. A route is a “natural” way through the landscape dictated by topography. A basic route may incorporate a number of different roads. Routes may be utilized more or less heavily in different periods, but unless the landscape changes, they continue to exist as an option for travel. One can discuss a specific road when there is physical evidence for its exact course, such as wheel ruts or terrace walls, or other evidence of the modification of the landscape for or by travel. Occasionally, even when physical evidence is lacking, it is possible to speak of a road when there is enough literary and circumstantial evidence (such as roadside structures) to pinpoint the course of travel through a landscape in a given period. I would like to thank Yiannis Pikoulas for helping me in the field and instructing me on the basics of ancient roads; I direct the reader to his works (1995, 1999) and their bibliographies for specifics on all aspects of ancient road construction in Greece and their detection by autopsy. I have also relied heavily on the works of W. K. Pritchett (e.g., 1969, 1980; his discussion of ancient Greek roads in 1980, pp. 143–196, remains the best introduction to the topic), and on Yiannis Lolos for advice and assistance in the field; Lolos 2003 is an invaluable source for the ancient terminology of roads.
a phrase coined by Fernand Braudel, Kate Adshead called the road from Corinth to (Argos and thence to) Tegae "an axis of history." It seems that this axis centered on Kleonai. The close relationship between Kleonai and this interstate route (and the city’s command of any easy alternative branches of it), which is reflected in the ancient sources for the road, had important ramifications for Kleonai’s history. The city’s topography and its potential control of this direct route ultimately had a significant impact on the city’s own political alliances and, to a certain extent, on those of its more powerful neighbors.

**CONTROVERSY AND THE LITERARY SOURCES**

In antiquity, the most direct and easiest route from northern Greece via the Isthmus and Corinth into the central and southern Peloponnese passed through the plain of Kleonai (Fig. 1). The other options—a coastal route along the Corinthian Gulf as far as Sikyon, or a mountainous route to the southeast toward Epidauros—constituted a significant detour for most destinations, and were preferable only when political reasons dictated. From the ancient city of Corinth, the direct route led first to Kleonai; from Kleonai, the traveler could branch off to head west via Nemea and Phlius to Elis or Sparta, or continue south directly to Argos.

The earliest reference to this route for long-distance travel appears in a fragment of Stesichoros, which places Kleonai on a route between Corinth and Argos as early as the 6th century B.C. The passage in question recounts the story of the Seven against Thebes, and Polynikes’ journey from Thebes to Argos takes him through Corinth and Kleonai:

αὐτὰρ ἐπειτ’ ἀπέβαιν ἐπ’, ἄστεα καλὰ Κορινθίου
ίμψα δ’ ἐγκτιμένας Κλεονίς ἡμθον

and [then Polynikes and the Theban lords departed for] the fair cities of Corinth, and swiftly arrived at [well-built] Kleonai.

In Stesichoros’s poem, Polynikes’ route takes him directly to the city of “well-built” Kleonai from Corinth, and the closeness of these two locations via the Corinth–Argos road is emphasized. Although the passage is heavily restored and, as poetry, should be used with caution, it clearly indicates that a route providing swift access from Corinth to the city of Kleonai and thence to Argos was already in use in the Archaic period.

By the Roman period, we have direct literary evidence in the form of reports by Strabo (8.6.19) and Pausanias (2.15.1) that confirm that the


4. There was also a route down the ancient Nemea valley that followed the Nemea River, and then turned west to Phlius. The main reason to choose this route for long-distance travel (and not merely for access to the sanctuary of Zeus at Nemea) would be to avoid a hostile force at Kleonai. Since Nemea was usually under the control of Argos, Kleonai’s ally, anyone needing to avoid Kleonai would usually also wish to avoid Nemea, but there were periods in which the northern half of this route beyond the ancient Nemea valley proper was used frequently for travel between Corinth and Phlius.

Figure 1. Passages into the Kleonai valley via the Longopotamos and Xerias (Leukon) rivers to the north and the Tretos pass to the south.

J. Luchin

The city of Kleonai was the main stop on a road between Corinth and Argos. Because of these and other literary sources, there is no dispute that the main Roman Corinth–Argos road passed through Kleonaian territory. There are, however, two natural entrances into Kleonaian territory from the territory of Corinth. The first is located in the southeastern corner of the Kleonai valley, where the Xerias (Leukon) River, fed by runoff from the low foothills that separate Kleonaian from Corinthian territory, creates a valley leading out to the Corinthian plain east of the ancient city of Corinth (Fig. 1). This is the same route taken by the old national highway and railroad between Corinth and Argos, and Adshead, Salmon, and others have argued that a hypothetical road taking roughly the same route as the old national road was the main road between Corinth and Argos in antiquity.6

The route of such a road would have followed the Xerias (Leukon) River valley to enter the Kleonai valley from the east, passing the site of ancient Tenea, a kome of Corinth that has recently been identified as having occupied the area between the modern towns of Chilomodi and Klenia.7 From Tenea, the route would pass between the gentle southern foothills of Mt. Skiona (Prophetis Elias of Mapso) and the northern foothills of the Psili Rachi range, which bounds the Argolid on the north. Judging by the topography, a road on this route would probably have passed just south of the hill of Prophetis Elias of Koutalas (Fig. 1; also Fig. 11, below). To continue to Argos, the road would have crossed the southern edge of

7. Kordosis 1997, esp. pp. 558–559. He argues that in the Classical period, the ancient town would have extended as a unified site from the northern side of modern Klenia all the way to the southern edge of the town known as “Palia Scholia,” but with a secondary core around the Bouvó hill of Klenia.
the Kleonai plain, running roughly parallel to the modern railroad, and entered the Trettos pass.

It is clear that there must have been a road connecting Tenea and Kleonai, but there is no reason why such a road would not have cut directly across the plain, and thus much further north than the modern highway; the modern highway and railway do not in fact lead to the city of Kleonai. A road following the Xerias valley past Tenea along the route of the modern railroad would not pass close to the ancient city of Kleonai at all, and taking it would represent a significant detour from both the cities of Corinth and Kleonai. This is particularly apparent when we compare this route with the alternative below. The ancient Corinth–Argos road via Kleonai was one of the major routes for interstate travel, which would have followed the easiest natural path allowed by topography and the most direct one between its destinations, criteria that the Xerias route does not meet.

It is important to remember, however, that even in antiquity, interstate routes were part of a large network of roads. These main thoroughfares, analogous to our freeways, were supplemented by numerous branch roads providing alternative routes for destinations lying off the main roads, and these in turn gave access to myriad local roads. It would be a mistake to assume that the ancient Greeks had significantly fewer options for travel than their modern counterparts. A natural route such as the Xerias valley in an otherwise mountainous area would surely have been used for some travel in antiquity; a local road along this route connecting Corinth and Tenea is likely, or one leading from Tenea and the Kleisoura pass directly to the Isthmus—although even this cannot be proven, since there is no evidence for a premodern road of any period on this course. What is clear is that none of the literary evidence for an ancient Corinth–Argos road can be demonstrated to refer specifically to a route via the Xerias valley, and it was almost certainly not the main road connecting Corinth and Argos via Kleonai. Thus we must seek elsewhere for the main road for long-distance travel.

The second natural route into Kleonai from Corinth appears to have carried the road mentioned in the literary sources in every unambiguous case, and there is physical evidence for the road itself. The basic route entered the Kleonai valley in the northeast near the modern town of Spathovouni, via a pass in the coastal hills west of Corinth carved by the seasonal Longopotamos River (Figs. 1, 2). After crossing the open

8. Pikoulas (1995, p. 28) notes that the existence of a road at all on this Xerias route is destined to remain hypothetical since the nature of the landscape is not conducive to the preservation of wheel ruts; however, one might expect to find other forms of physical evidence for a road as long-lived as the Corinth–Argos road, such as those pointed out below in discussion of the Longopotamos route. Evidence for other alternative routes into the Kleonai valley exists in the form of traces of the “mountain road” from Corinth to Tenea via modern Maplos, and reports of wheel ruts roughly along the route of the modern Corinth–Tripolis highway at the location Ζωντών: Pikoulas 1995, p. 37 and map, p. 36. Mountain road to Tenea: Sakellariou and Pharalkas 1971, pp. 21–22; Wiseman 1978, p. 81; Pikoulas 1995, pp. 39–41; Bynum 1995, pp. 14–26. The reconstruction of the route of this road is based primarily on Pausanias (2.5.4) and autopsy by R. Stroud (pers. comm.).
Kleonai plain at a diagonal, it then exited the valley in the southwest through the Tretos pass (Fig. 1). The Longopotamos pass provides the most direct route from the city of Ancient Corinth to Kleonai allowed by the topography, and the most recent studies of the ancient road between Corinth and Argos, those of Pikoulas and Bynum, have argued persuasively that this Longopotamos route is the one implied by both Strabo and Pausanias in their accounts. In his discussion of the region, Strabo (8.6.19 [C377]) says:

Kleonai is a little city situated on the road from Argos to Corinth on a hill, inhabited round about on all sides and well fortified, so that it seems to me that [Homer] properly called it "well-built Kleonai." There, too, is Nemea between Kleonai and Phlius and the sacred grove, in which the Argives are accustomed to celebrate the Nemean Games, and the location of the myth of the Nemean lion, and the kome Bembina. Kleonai is 120 stades from Argos, and 80 from Corinth. I myself have observed the settlement from Acrocorinth.

It is clear both from the distances Strabo gives and from his vantage point that the road to which he is referring in this passage takes a route via the Longopotamos. This route corresponds with the distances given by Strabo (80 stades between Acrocorinth and Kleonai = 14.284 km, which builders were able to ignore the constraints of topography.

9. It is significant that the modern Corinth–Tripolis highway does not follow the course of either of the routes discussed so far, and is even able to bypass the Tretos pass. Since its course was made possible by the extensive use of dynamite and modern machinery, its builders were able to ignore the constraints of topography.
is roughly equivalent to the 14 km between Kleonai and Acrocorinth via the Longopotamos route). The alternative via the Xerias valley is much longer, at almost 18 km.\textsuperscript{12} Strabo appears not to have visited Kleonai, but in his own words, only to have "observed it from Acrocorinth." It is worth noting that from Acrocorinth, Kleonai is not only visible, but it dominates the view toward the southwest. The line of its city walls, marked in places now by rows of cypress trees, and its acropolis are clearly visible from many places along the Acrocorinth walls. From Acrocorinth, Kleonai appears to crouch directly on the main route south, and one can easily imagine that it was something of an eyesore to the Corinthians, much as Aigina was to the Athenians. The line of the Longopotamos road leading out through the Longopotamos passes and up to the city would have been as dominant in the ancient view as the modern roads from Spathovouni toward Kondostavlo (the modern village closest to ancient Kleonai) are in the modern view. Looking out from Acrocorinth, it is instantly clear why Strabo would have chosen to give details about Kleonai, and particularly about the road south, from that particular vantage point.

Similarly, Pausanias's description of Kleonai (2.15.1) emphasizes its location on the Corinth–Argos road, and it is best interpreted to suggest a route via the Longopotamos:

Among the Phliasians, then, these are the things that I found most worthy of mention. To one coming from Corinth to Argos there is a not large city Kleonai (ἐκ Κορινθίου δ' ἐς Ἀργος ἐμφανισθεὶς Ἀκροκόρινθα πάλις ἀνάμεσα οὐ μεγάλη). . . . In Kleonai there is this shrine [of Athena] and a memorial (μνήμα) of Eurytos and Creatos. For as they were going as sacred ambassadors (θεοφόροι) from Elis to the Isthmus, Herakles shot them down in that spot, committing this crime because they had fought against him during his war against Augeias.\textsuperscript{13}

Although Roux, followed by others, argued that Pausanias visited Kleonai from Phlius, it appears rather that he first returned from Phlius via Sikyon all the way to Corinth. From Corinth he began again, and headed for Argos via Kleonai.\textsuperscript{14} The route taken by Pausanias from Corinth appears to visit Nemea after visiting Kleonai, which would be the reverse if he were coming from Phlius, and the very wording of this passage indicates the direction in which he is traveling: he is "one coming from Corinth to Argos," and thus this is a natural way for him to describe the city site. Miller (1982, p. 107, n. 53) stresses that even though Phlius and Kleonai are equidistant from Nemea, Pausanias visits Nemea via the latter city, indicating the closer connection between that city and the Nemean sanctuary.


\textsuperscript{13} Translation based on the Greek text of H. S. Jones, Pausanias: Description of Greece 1, Cambridge, Mass., 1964, p. 322.

\textsuperscript{14} Roux 1958, p. 171; recently also Gregory 1994, p. 352: "It is clear that he [Pausanias] approached the city from Phlius and the west." Bynum (1995, p. 30) strongly disagrees with Roux, and emphasizes that the μεν . . . δε construction between the mention of Phlius and then of Corinth and Kleonai indicates that Pausanias had returned from Phlius to Corinth, and then began a new line of description. This is also the opinion of Papachatzis (1972, p. 121). Lolos (1998, pp. 149–158) has recently shown that Pausanias returns to the city of Sikyon from Titane before visiting Phlius, which is in keeping with the penegete's habit of making excursions from a central location. Additionally, Pausanias
to Kleonai and here described cannot be the Xerias valley route, since “one coming from Corinth to Argos” in all probability refers to Pausanias himself, and he appears not to have visited Tenea at all, a major stop on the Xerias route. Thus, the route that both Strabo and Pausanias are describing must be the Longopotamos route. This also appears to be the route illustrated on the Peutinger Table 7.5, a Late Roman map showing major roads and stations used by the Imperial post; it depicts a route to Kleonai and Argos leaving from the west side of Corinth, although the distances given are incorrect.

The Longopotamos route clearly carried the main Corinth–Argos road as early as the Roman period of Strabo. It is difficult to prove that this route is specifically referenced earlier than this, but two literary sources heretofore neglected in studies of this region should suffice to demonstrate the expediency of the Longopotamos route in the Hellenistic period. The first involves events in the mid-3rd century B.C.: Plutarch in his Life of Aratos (29.1–4) describes activities in the area of Kleonai when Aratos held Corinth and the tyrant Aristippos held Argos:

A little while after this, Aratos heard that Aristippos was plotting against Kleonai, but feared to attack it while his enemy was posted at Corinth. Aratos therefore assembled an army by public proclamation. And after ordering his troops to carry provisions for several days, he marched down to Kenchreai, by this stratagem inviting Aristippos to attack Kleonai in the belief that his enemy was not at hand; and this was actually what happened. For the tyrant set out at once from Argos with his forces. But Aratos, returning from Kenchreai to Corinth as soon as it was dark, and posting guards along all the roads, led his Achaian toward Kleonai, and they followed him in such good order and with such speed and alacrity that not only while they were on the march, but also when they had entered Kleonai, before the night was over, and had arrayed themselves for battle, Aristippos knew nothing about it. Then, at daybreak, the gates were thrown open, the trumpet gave its loud signal, and dashing at a run and with shouts upon the enemy Aratos routed them at once, and kept on pursuing where he most suspected that Aristippos was in flight, the country having many diverging routes.

16. Bolte notes that the distance for the stretch between Corinth and Kleonai given on the map is too small even for the shorter Longopotamos route, not too large (RE XI.1, 1921, cols. 721–728, s.v. Kleonai [F. Bolte]). This seems to exclude that a different, longer route like that via the Xerias was meant. The table uses Roman miles of approximately 1,462 m and gives six miles as the distance between Corinth and Kleonai; Strabo’s distance of 80 stades is roughly equivalent to between nine and ten Roman miles, which corresponds to the Longopotamus route. Pritchett 1980, pp. 203, 244; Pikoulas 1995, pp. 33, 321, n. 149 (on the length of the stadium in Strabo). The Tabula Peutingeriana is preserved on an early-13th-century parchment roll and thought ultimately to derive from a map prepared under Augustus by Marcus Agrippa. The existing copy is thought to have formed part of a work of the late 4th century A.D. Some scholars believe that parts of the resulting map belong to the epoch of Augustus, and others to later periods, while Hammond suggests that the entire tabula is based on a Roman map of the Antonine period. For a discussion of the Peutinger Table for this region and bibliography, see Weber 1976; Pritchett 1980, pp. 197–206.
Aratos's men are clearly entering Kleonai from the north, via the Longopotamos. It is evident that they did not come from the direction of Tenea, since there would have been no reason to return to Corinth from Kenchreae in that case. From the north they would escape the notice of observers south of Kleonai, since the hills around and on which the city of Kleonai is situated would effectively mask movement along the Longopotamos road. The treacherous nature of the eroding marl slopes in the Longopotamos pass led scholars such as Salmon to assume that the route was too difficult to have carried a major ancient road, and this, coupled with the apparent ease of the Xerias route, enforced the idea that the route via Tenea must have been the main ancient road. This passage from Plutarch, however, underscores the ease of travel along the Longopotamos River. The Longopotamos route was more than able to accommodate an entire army on the march. Plutarch also emphasizes the close intervisibility between Corinth and Kleonai, and the ease of approach from one place to the other via this road: Aristippos was afraid to advance on Kleonai with Aratos at Corinth, that is, at hand. The passage also points up the strategic value of Kleonai in struggles between Corinth and Argos, which resulted from its position on this direct road between the two cities.

The context of the second passage is the battle of the Nemea River, fought between the forces of the Achaian League and those of Philip V of Macedon in 197 B.C. During the Second Macedonian War, the Achaeans had switched their allegiance to the Roman side and besieged the Macedonians holding Acrocorinth. The following year, Philip's general Androsthenes retaliated by attacking the general of the Achaian League stationed at Sikyon:

Nikostratos, the general of the Achaeans, was at Sikyon with 2,000 infantry and 100 cavalry, but, seeing himself inferior [to Androsthenes] both in numbers and in the quality of his troops, he would not leave his fortifications. The king's infantry and cavalry were roaming about and ravaging the lands of Pellene, Phlious, and Kleonai, and finally crossed into the territory of Sikyon, taunting the enemy with cowardice... [Hard pressed by these troops and the enemy fleet, Nikostratos plots a surprise counterattack with the neighboring states.] When all was ready on the appointed day, he at once set out by night through the country of the Phliasii and arrived at Kleonai, no one knowing what he was planning... Androsthenes, in ignorance of all this, had left Corinth and encamped on the Nemea, which is a stream separating the lands of Corinth and Sikyon. There he ordered half of his army, divided into three columns, and all of his cavalry to lay waste at the same time the country of Pellene, Sikyon, and Phlious. The three separate columns marched out. When this was reported to Nikostratos at Kleonai, he immediately sent out a strong force of mercenaries to close the pass that gives access to Corinthian territory, and posting the cavalry ahead of the infantry to lead the way, himself followed rapidly in two columns... The infantry and the cavalry were now not far from the camp [of Androsthenes on the Nemea River] and

some of the Thracians had made an attack upon the enemy, foraging and scattered through the fields, when sudden panic gripped the camp. The commander was afraid, inasmuch as he had nowhere seen the enemy except in small detachments in the hills in front of Sikyon, not daring to march their column down into the plains, and had never believed that they would attack from Kleonai. . . . [Androstenes recalls the foragers, but ultimately, before they all return, his routed army flees for Corinth.] Part of the troops, too, who had ravaged Pellene and Phlious, returning in disorder and ignorant of what had transpired, when near the camp, drifted into the enemy’s outguards in the belief that they were their own.20


The first point to be made is that this passage describes a pass that provided transition and access between Kleoaian and Corinthian territory; the Latin reads: *occupandum saltum, per quem transitus in Corinthium est agrum*. The wider context of the passage allows us to place the pass along Kleonai’s northern border, since Nikostratos’s troops used it to descend upon Androstenes’ camp along the Nemea River. This must be a reference to the ravine of the Longopotamos River at the northeastern corner of the Kleonai valley, the only egress from the north that could possibly be described by the word *saltus* (Figs. 2, 3). It is hardly likely that Nikostratos would have marched his troops out of Kleonai via the Xerias River far to the southeast; this opening is wide and much less of a pass than the southern end of the Longopotamos River valley, and it leads in the wrong direction for a surprise attack on a camp on the Nemea River. It is inconceivable that Nikostratos would have planned a long, circuitous route that would have ultimately involved circling around to march directly past the city of Corinth from east to west in order to reach the enemy.

The only other possible interpretation is also made unlikely by the context, namely, that Nikostratos led his troops from Kleonai first to Nemea,

Figure 3. View to the north from a point near the base of Kleonai’s walls straight to the southern entrance of the Longopotamos pass along the route of an old footpath, *or monopati*. 
and thence out along the Nemea River itself (Fig. 1). The lower portions of this river valley are narrow enough to justify the description "pass," but Livy indicates specifically that Nikostratos attacked directly from Kleonai, a direction from which Androstenes did not expect danger. Had the attack come via Nemea, Livy presumably would have said so. Furthermore, it is probable that Androstenes' camp was near the Nemea River but in the coastal plain on the Corinthian side, and thus between Sikyon, where he believed Nikostratos to be, and his own headquarters at Acrocorinth. The troops sent by Androstenes to ravage Phlius were presumably sent via the Nemea River route; Nikostratos would not have escaped notice taking this route, and indeed the Macedonian troops returning from the direction of Phlius only encounter the enemy once they return to camp. The most natural interpretation of the passage is that Nikostratos and his troops went out via the Longopotamos pass, which carried the main road between Kleonai and Corinth, and surprised Androstenes from behind his own lines. Androstenes did not expect this turn of events, not only because he was unaware of Nikostratos's departure from Sikyon, but also because the enemy troops came from the opposite direction entirely, in a sense "turning" his position and cutting him off from Acrocorinth.

It is thus possible to argue persuasively that the Longopotamos route was the main Corinth–Argos route at least as far back as the 3rd century B.C. Literary references detailed enough to argue for a specific route in any period prior to the Hellenistic age are scarce, but there is little reason to think that the basic route between Corinth and Argos via Kleonai changed in antiquity, or to doubt that the fragment of Stesichoros quoted above refers to the Longopotamos route. In sum, without dismissing the potential existence of local and branch roads, it is important to stress that the Longopotamos provided the easiest and most direct natural route connecting three important poleis of the region, cities whose locations had not changed from Classical and Archaic times (when the city of Kleonai was at its most prosperous).

This contrasts starkly with the situation in the modern era, when the Xerias/Leukon route gained prominence precisely because it was designed to serve the needs of a shifted populace: the more casterly located modern city of Corinth, and the relatively new towns of Solomos and Chilionios. By then, the major population of the Kleonai valley had also shifted south to the village of Ayios Vasilios. It is not surprising, then, that the modern railroad and road via the Xerias traversed the Kleonai plain far south of the old polis site, serve these new population centers. The Xerias route thus makes perfect sense as a modern highway, but it makes no sense as the ancient interstate route.

21. Moreover, there is not one instance in which it can be demonstrated that the region of Nemea was ever referred to as Kleonai or Kleonaian. Even if one assumes that the ancient Nemea valley was at one time part of Kleonai territory, by the 4th century B.C. and probably earlier, the region was certainly Argive.

22. The passage from Livy may also indicate that it was possible in antiquity, once one had entered the Longopotamos pass via the Corinth–Argos road, to turn off the main road and to continue straight out along the Longopotamos River into the Corinthian plain. Indeed, the pass itself continues to provide easy access straight out to the plain to the north; there may not have been a maintained road along the route, adding to the surprise of the attack.

23. Papathezios (1972, p. 121) makes a similar observation.
TRACING THE LONGOPOTAMOS ROUTE

A number of topographical studies, most notably those of Wiseman, Pikoulas, and Bynum, have documented physical evidence for the ancient Corinth–Argos road via the Longopotamos, including a now-lost ancient bridge and three sections of wheel ruts. The documented evidence for the road is restricted to the sections north and south of Kleonaian territory proper, either within the Longopotamos pass or within the Tretos pass, where exposed bedrock preserves the sections of wheel ruts. In the open plain of the Kleonai valley, there is no direct physical evidence. I will argue, however, that near the city of Kleonai, the ancient Corinth–Argos road can be identified precisely; it was preserved as an old footpath, or monopati, that remained in use up until the early modern period and was followed by early travelers to Greece in the 18th and 19th centuries, many of whom cite Strabo and Pausanias as guides.

To build this argument, it will be necessary to compare the landmarks of the ancient Corinth–Argos road north of the Kleonai valley, as identified

24. A route did exist which bypassed Kleonai entirely by continuing over the mountains from Tenea, via modern Ayionorion (via the pass labeled Kleisonata on Fig. 1): Xen. Hell. 4.4.19, Ages. 2.17. This has often been identified as the “Kontoporia” or staff road mentioned by Polybios (16.1.4–6) and Athenaios (2.19.43e, citing the seventh book of the memoirs of Ptolemy VIII = PGrHist 2R 234 Fb); see Pikoulas 1995, pp. 280–281 (contra Adshhead 1986, p. 3; Gauvin 1992, p. 135; Bynum 1995, pp. 101–109). Note also Plutarch’s observation (Aret. 29.4) that there were many diverging routes from Kleonai to Mycenae (e.g., the Kleisoura route, a route over the Psili Rachii to Mycenae via Ayios Vasilios, and the shortcut route of Pausanias 2.15.2 via Ayios Sostis, discussed below). These were all steep roads more suitable for foot travel or pack animals; only the Kleisoura route bypasses Kleonaian territory entirely.

25. If this basic, natural route was in use in prehistoric times, it may have followed the Longopotamou riverbed directly out to the Corinthian plain rather than taking the exact route of the road outlined here, which leads specifically to the polis of Corinth; however, the site of Aetopetra may have been an important destination for a Bronze Age version of the route.

26. Wiseman 1978; Pikoulas 1995, 1999, Bynum 1995. It is difficult to date wheel ruts, particularly if they are entirely the result of wear. Pikoulas has argued generally that roads represented only by smoothed bedrock and cut wheel ruts in Greece represent pre-Roman roads: unlike the Greeks, the Romans engineered and prepared roadbeds across open ground, and in general they had little interest in major road construction in the Peloponnes. Roads originally constructed in the Byzantine and Tourkokratia periods were not planned for wheeled traffic, unlike hum transport at that time was done with pack animals. Indeed, the majority of them were kalderimia, or cobble-paved roads, which often used steps to ascend steeper slopes. Pikoulas outlines the basic differences between Greek, Roman, and Turkish roads in the general introduction to his 1999 study (pp. 249–255). In his 1995 book he dates the entire road network in the northeastern Peloponnes to the Classical period, including the ruts in the Longopotamos and Tretos passes.

27. On the convergence of ancient and premodern road systems in Greece and the efforts of early travelers to follow the routes of Pausanias and Strabo as closely as possible, see Sanders and Whitbread 1990, p. 333.
in earlier studies, with the accounts of the early travelers; by comparing their itineraries to evidence for the ancient road, it will become clear that they are following the basic route so far identified as that of the ancient road. On this basis alone, in the absence of other evidence, the continuation of the early modern route beyond the Longopotamos pass and into the Kleonai valley would be a good candidate for the route of the ancient road, but it will also be shown that this route taken by the early travelers past Kleonai is the most direct route across the plain, and accords best with the ancient literary sources for the road as discussed above. Moreover, there are ancient landmarks along this portion of the route that are best explained in connection with a major road.

That the early modern road from Kleonai to Corinth via the Longopotamos pass is likely to have taken roughly the same route as the ancient road is not a new idea; previous commentators on the region have associated the ancient road with the main Tourkokratia or apbentiko road between Corinth and Argos.28 As Papachatzis noted, the early modern route between Argos and Corinth via Kleonai only began to fall out of use when the modern Corinth–Argos highway was constructed to serve the new needs of modern Corinth and the shifted populations in the region.29 The Longopotamos route did not go completely out of use, however, even after the highway was built. Konstantinos Charitos, a longtime resident of Kondostavlo, noted in 1968 that "this road [from Corinth to Argos via the Longopotamos] is still used today along its entire length, and I think it necessary to mention that it is still used by all of the residents of the former deme of Kleonai who still use pack animals to go to Ancient Corinth, Perigiali, [and] Lechion, ."30 In general, ancient roads tend to take the most direct route allowed with any ease by the topography, and thus they have tended to remain in use up until very recently, with the advent of modern machines.31 Even now, as Charitos noted, the old routes tend to remain in use as monopatia.

Unfortunately, none of the commentators on the region specify which monopatia in the region of Kleonai corresponds to this early modern road via the Longopotamos River. Therefore, in the next section I attempt to correlate the accounts of those travelers to Greece in the 18th and 19th centuries whose descriptions of their itineraries from Corinth to Kleonai are sufficiently detailed, or who give time estimates for features on their route, with physical evidence for the ancient and Turkish-period roads.32

30. Charitos 1968, p. 10 (trans. from the modern Greek). It should be noted here that erosion in ravines feeding the lower Longopotamos region has washed out the ancient bridges and most of the Turkish ones, so that it is now impossible to continuously follow the exact ancient road.
31. Pritchett 1980, p. 195. It is interesting that local residents have also noticed and mention that ancient roads took the most direct path possible.
32. The reports of the early travelers must be used with extreme caution, but their observations were made at a time when more from antiquity was preserved, and when greater grazing meant that any visible remains were less overgrown and more likely to be observed than they are now. It is often not possible to reconcile their accounts with each other, or with the ancient remains, and it is often difficult even to decipher their vague descriptions and to relate them to the landscape. In the case of timed itineraries, there is the added complication that they are not all traveling at the same rate of speed or heading in the same direction, and so a comparison of their observations is difficult. It is worth considering their evidence here, however, since although others have commented on the early modern route, no one has demonstrated its exact course or noted the observations made by the travelers en route.
This compilation of evidence for the ancient road and the Tourkokratia road shows that the two routes were essentially the same, although no doubt with minor divergences and alternative sections at some points, and that particularly in the Kleonai valley proper, the ancient and the early modern roads are identical. A portion of this ancient and early modern road is extant, and it passes directly below the walls of the ancient city of Kleonai.

THE NORTHERN SECTOR

Physical Evidence and the Early Travelers

The first fixed point on the ancient Longopotamos route is the "Phliasian gate" of Corinth (Fig. 4.1).33 Wiseman notes that "the main road to Cleonae from the city... extended through a gate whose remains are preserved some distance to the north of the saddle [between Acrocorinth and Kastraki/Penteskouphi hill]. The city route to the gate lay through the present Anaploga at the western edge of ancient Corinth. Here is the only easy crossing of a deep ravine beyond which is the ridge with the west city wall that is near the gate. This must be the Phliasian gate referred to by Xenophon in the Hellenica VII.1.18 because the road leads to Cleonae and Phlius and because there can be no other gate further south and to the north other roads would lead to the coastal plain."34 This description corresponds with the accounts of early travelers, who mention leaving Corinth on horseback and heading west, and soon crossing a ravine, although Edward Dodwell appears to be the only one who noticed the walls:

I left Corinth and took the road for Sparta. On leaving Corinth, we left the fortress of that city on our left.
—M. Le Roy, 1758, traveling from Corinth to Argos

At 8:30 in the morning I quit Corinth: At 8:40 [10 min] leave the road to Vasilika [Sicyon] on the right, and take that of Argos, which passes through the white clayey hills on the southern side of the plain of Corinth: here the road is very slippery, in consequence of the late rains, and our pace is slow, though our horses good.
—W. M. Leake, 1805, traveling from Corinth to Nemea

33. Tzonou Herbst and Herbst (forthcoming) have recently reexamined the evidence for the northernmest section of this route in relationship to the findspot of the Penteskouphia plaques. They correlate notes from Corinth notebooks with the topography of the area, correct some of Wiseman's (1978) observations, and present new evidence for an additional branch of the road. Upon publication, this work will provide invaluable additional information on the northernmest section of the road.
34. Wiseman 1978, p. 93, n. 4. The gate was excavated by Oscar Broneer and described by Carpenter, Corinth III.1, pp. 74-76, figs. 51, 53, pl. IV. Presumably this gate was called "Phliasian" because the main road to Phlius and the central western Peloponnese was a branch off the Corinth-Argos road at Kleonai. Considering the frequent political tensions between Corinth and Argos, it is not surprising that the gate was not called "Argive" or even "Kleonaian." It is possible that this name implies that there was a branch of the road that diverged before Kleonaian territory, thus providing access to the Corinthian gate at Phlius without any intermediary stops, but there are numerous topo

graphical difficulties in reconstructing any satisfactory route for such a road.

35. Le Roy 1758, p. 42 (trans. from the French). I have translated in English the accounts of travelers who wrote in a foreign language. The dates given with the text are the dates of travel, when different from the date of publication; the travel date is given at the first mention of each traveler.
36. Leake 1830, p. 324. Note that the travelers are for the most part on horseback. When a time estimate is
At the distance of 10 minutes from Corinth, the road crosses a ravine and stream.

—W. Gell, 1801–1806, traveling from Corinth to Nemea

We passed over a deep ravine: It appears that the walls of Corinth were intersected by this ravine, and extended only to the edge of the opposite banks.

—E. Dodwell, 1801–1806, traveling from Corinth to Argos

The early travelers clearly leave Corinth on the west and take a road south across the ravine near the Phliasian gate described by Wiseman; Leake even comments on the slippery, whitish clay of the hills in the Longopotamos pass, which Salmon argued made a road through these hills south of Corinth an impossibility. Next Wiseman observes that the "ancient road to Phlius must have followed closely the line of the present road that leads from Anaploga along the northern slope of Penteskouphia hill [Kastraki] to the village of Penteskouphia and on to the Longopotamos valley. Large poros blocks of the ancient road terrace are still in place in the second ravine west of Anaploga.” Further west, at a spot called Bayevi (Fig. 4), about 45 minutes by foot from Ancient Corinth, Wiseman then observed an underground water tunnel. He noted Roman sherds from this area, and in 1960 he observed the ruins of a large Roman structure that he thought was probably a villa. The early modern road followed this same basic route. It is possible that Dodwell was referring to this Bayevi area when he noted that "we passed by a fountain, and some remains of Roman brickwork, and crossed some small streams." From the neighborhood of Penteskouphi village, the early modern route descended southwest along an old monopati into a large ravine formed by the Smyrtorema, a stream running down from the east and emptying into

given by a traveler, I have given the relative time in minutes from Corinth in brackets, in order to provide a loose basis for comparing the accounts. The relative speeds of the travelers must still be taken into account: note, for instance, the large discrepancies between the time estimates given by Aldenhouven and the other travelers. Many give no time estimates at all.

38. Dodwell 1819, p. 205 (italics added).
39. Wiseman 1978, p. 82, fig. 104.
40. Wiseman 1978, pp. 82–83, fig. 105. He reports that the water tunnel was explored in February 1937 over a distance of 27.75 m. He supposed that this was part of the Hadri-anic aqueduct, but Lolos has shown that Hadrian's aqueduct followed a different route: Lolos 1997, pls. 66–76, map, p. 275. Wiseman also notes that a group of five 5th-century B.C. terracotta vessels that were brought to the Corinth museum and said to have been found on the southwest slope of Penteskouphi in 1939 were probably also from the same area of Bayevi. He suggests that the famous Archaic painted terracotta plaques found on the west slope of Penteskouphi indicate that the sanctuary of Poseidon in which they were dedicated must have been somewhere in the area, presumably also accessible from this road. For the findspot of these plaques and its relationship to the ancient road, see Tzonou-Herbst and Herbst, forthcoming.
41. Dodwell 1819, p. 205. Wiseman, however, noted a water tunnel, not a fountain, which may have been Turkish, and the descriptions "Roman brickwork" and "villa" do not match up; it is possible that Dodwell is following a branch of the road identified by Tzonou-Herbst and Herbst that led below the findspot of the Penteskouphia plaques and joined the road again before passing over the Smyrtorema, the next obstacle on the route; I thank James Herbst for this suggestion. Tzonou-Herbst and Herbst also point out that the distance between Bayevi and Corinth given by Wiseman is problematic. Dodwell does not give time estimates, and none of the other travelers mention comparable features that allow us to pinpoint the observation of Roman remains. Only Aldenhoven (1841, p. 399), traveling from Mycenae to Corinth via Kleonai, mentions a fountain "close to Corinth, but he may be even closer to the city, since he says "at 38 minutes [i.e., 9 min from the last houses of Corinth], traces of construction, to the right a fountain." One cannot tell where he considered the "last houses of Corinth" to be located.
the Longopotamos near the central of the three groups of houses known today as Veliniatika (Fig. 4:6). It appears that the ancient road also headed southwest, since the next fixed point that has been identified on the ancient route is an arched bridge of stone masonry located somewhere in this ravine, about 45 minutes by foot to the southwest of Pentakouphi village. This bridge was first noted by Bronner; Wiseman, apparently having visited it himself, described it in some detail. This is very fortunate, since recent attempts to relocate the bridge and to verify its exact location have failed. Based on his observations, Wiseman dated the bridge as early as the 4th or the 3rd century B.C., and at the latest of Hellenistic rather than Roman construction (see Fig. 4, near no. 2).

The only bridge over the Smyrtorema today is part of a modern pipeline taking water from Stymphalos to Corinth (Fig. 4:2). The ancient bridge must have been somewhere in the vicinity of the modern bridge and to the east of it. Stroud recorded the bridge’s existence east of the modern bridge in notes documenting frequent trips from Corinth to Kleonai and Nemea on foot in the 1960s and 1970s. His notes are on deposit in the library of Hill House at Corinth, and many of his photographs of the bridge survive (e.g., Fig. 5). None of the travelers mention seeing or crossing an ancient bridge, and there is no reason to believe that it survived in usable condition into the early modern period. However, both Leake and Gell mention bridges at approximately the same point in their progress; Leake even specifies that the stream being crossed is a tributary of the Longopotamos River (which he calls the Cleone):

at 8.57 [27 min from Corinth] cross on a bridge a small stream which joins that of Cleone.

—W. M. Leake

At 36 minutes [from Corinth] quit the plain crossing a bridge over a deep ravine, on the left see another bridge and a house.

—W. Gell

Today this ravine is virtually impassable. Few residents have any recollection of an ancient bridge in the area, and those who do claim to remember it can do so only vaguely, but residents remember the early modern route clearly. They claim that the dirt path, now widened, leading down to the

42. On the Greek Army survey (hereafter, ΓΥΣ) 1:50,000 map, the stream crossed is designated Σμυρτόρμα. It is a branch of the Ρέμα τῆς Κοκοθήκας, which carves the large ravine: this name is provided by Pikoulas (1995, p. 33).
43. Wiseman 1978, pp. 82–84, fig. 106.
44. Unfortunately, Stroud has not been able to locate the bridge in the last decade. See also Pikoulas 1995, pp. 32, 33, 301, figs. 1–4; he argues that the bridge must have been located just south of the modern pipeline bridge, and gives the toponym Τησαμιζέρα.
45. Leake 1830, p. 324.
modern pipeline bridge from the north, and then continuing south of the bridge, corresponds roughly to an old monopati. On this monopati locals traveled on horse or donkey to Corinth, crossing the ravine at approximately the same point that the modern pipeline bridge now crosses, and this corresponds to the route recorded in Stroud’s notes. Residents recall, however, that there was also an alternate early modern route to the Longopotamos River. This turned west rather than south at Pentekouphi village, and skirted the entire ravine by entering the Longopotamos River pass near the northern group of houses known as Veliniatika (Fig. 4:6). This route still carries at least one dirt road that is still in use, and it is possible that it came into greater use when the bridges over the ravine washed away or were obscured. It cannot be the route taken by the early travelers, however, since it does not cross a ravine at all.48

Although both the ancient and the early modern bridge over the ravine are now lost, it seems reasonable to assume that the monopati north and south of the modern pipeline bridge corresponds to the line of both the Tourkokratia-period and ancient roads. This is particularly likely since this monopati, after crossing the ravine, passes directly between the two hills Patima (Πάτμια) to the east (Fig. 4:4) and Kibouria (Κιβούρια) on the west (Fig. 4:3), just north of the southernmost collection of houses known as Veliniatika.49 On the hill of Patima, Stroud and Bynum located the remains of a rural shrine of the Classical period, and on the Kibouria hill opposite, a Classical cemetery.50 As Pikoulas observed, this shrine and cemetery must have lain along the road, which must have been located in the narrow space between the two hills where the monopati, widened into a dirt road, still runs (Figs. 4, 6). On Patima, Stroud and Bynum found a number of squared poros blocks with plaster still adhering to them, along with large Classical Corinthian roof tiles. They also found part of a votive column and the base of a terracotta perirrhanterion, and copious fragments of pithoi, amphora handles, and smaller fragments of fine and coarseware pottery. The view from this spot both down to the Gulf of Corinth to the

47. Various dirt roads in existence today on this route are shown on the ΓΥΣ 1:50,000 map as thin black lines between Πατέντα and Νικόλέτο, north of Pentekouphi village.
48. This route makes more sense as a way for residents of Pentekouphi village to reach the Longopotamos River in order to head out into the Corinthian plain in the direction of Assos, and as a way for residents of the northernmost village of Veliniatika (Rachani) to travel to Pentekouphi.
49. Pikoulas (1995, p. 35) provides the modern names of the hills.
north and toward the southern end of the Longopotamos pass is splendid, and they proposed that this was the site of a rural sanctuary.

In July 1994, Stroud and Pikoulas made another discovery at Patima: a funerary inscription on a sarcophagus lid that in all probability came from the cemetery on the hill opposite and had subsequently been brought to the sanctuary to be reused. The funerary nature of the original use of the stone was clear from the inscription, reading τὸ δεῖπνον σῶμα. Stroud dated the inscription to the Late Archaic or Early Classical period based on letter forms.\textsuperscript{51} I myself have visited the site of the shrine and the cemetery on a number of occasions. The inscription is still there, but I have been unable to locate the perirrhanterion or the base of the votive column. At the cemetery site, a lovely fragment of Corinthian black-figure pottery depicting the feet of a number of horses (Fig. 7), likely brought to the surface during the looting of one of the tombs, helps confirm the Late Archaic/Early Classical date for the cemetery. Moreover, Bynum rightly saw that this roadside cemetery lent support to the interpretation of the Stesichoros passage quoted above (p. 109) as a reference to this road via the Longopotamos.\textsuperscript{52}

The early travelers also appear to have proceeded from the ravine with the Hellenistic bridge to the area of Patima and Kibouria. Shortly after crossing the stream and bridge mentioned above, Gell observes:

\begin{quote}
Hence ascend by a steep winding path until 40 minutes where on the top of the hill are 2 tumuli on the right, and a stone quarry on the left.\textsuperscript{53}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{52} Bynum 1995, pp. 40–41.  
\textsuperscript{53} Gell 1810, pp. 19–20.
This observation corresponds directly with the accounts of Dodwell and Leake:54

At the foot of the hills which enclose the plain are two tumuli, some ancient quarries of stone, and some traces of buildings.
—E. Dodwell55

at 9.5 [35 min from Corinth] pass a quarry and the marks of chariot wheels in the rocks. A little further some Hellenic foundations.
—W. M. Leake56

These observations are significant in their own right, because they suggest that the Turkish/early modern road at one point coincided with an ancient road, since the quarries, the tumuli, and the “foundations” were no doubt alongside the ancient road, and Leake specifically mentions seeing wheel ruts. Even though it sounds as though the “marks of chariot wheels in the rocks” probably belonged to an access road for the quarry that he and the other travelers mention, such access is likely to have led to the main cart road.

It is possible to see the tumuli mentioned by the travelers as having some connection with the cemetery on Kibouria hill, which would have been on their right, and the “Hellenic foundations” as forming part of the Patima sanctuary. Unfortunately, it is impossible to place the accounts that precisely, but both Gell and Leake mention seeing the quarries, tumuli, and foundations soon after crossing the stream; the early travelers’ observation of a quarry here is particularly intriguing, since there does not now appear to be a suitable source of stone anywhere in the area.57 The settlement associated with the Kibouria cemetery has never been located: perhaps it should be sought between the stream and the cemetery.

Just west of the monopati, where it ascends from the stream, I located the remains of a late farmhouse (Fig. 4:5). Its remains had been recently removed from a field in order to plant a new vineyard, and the area was still full of finger-grooved tiles, rough mortar cement, and coarseware pottery, including a number of large pithos rims. Large pieces of two conglomerate trapaeta (olive mills) were also lying nearby (Fig. 8a). Of particular interest were a significant number of large, well-cut but broken poros blocks tossed down toward the ravine (Fig. 8b). Some still had traces of a fine plaster coating. These appear to have been taken from an ancient structure somewhere nearby for reuse in the farmhouse. One Corinthian roof tile was also

54. The correlation is particularly clear between the accounts of Gell and Leake, who both give time indications. They are going at different rates of speed, but the difference between the intervals at which they observe these features is only four minutes. Although it is clear that all of the travelers are describing the same features, Gell describes the tumuli as being at the top of the hill, whereas Dodwell places them at the foot of the hills: Gell must mean at the top of one of the foothills, and Dodwell must mean on the foothills at the base of the mountains. Pouqueville’s itinerary (1826, p. 187) places a “butte” and a quarry before a ravine and bridge. It appears that with “ravine and bridge” Pouqueville is referring not to the ravine with the ancient bridge, but to a subsequent crossing of the Longopotamos River itself, since the other travelers also cross this river next. Thus Pouqueville appears to be describing the same location. This sort of difference in perspective and method of description is illustrative of the problems faced in using the early travelers as topographic sources.
55. Dodwell 1819, p. 205.
56. Leake 1830, pp. 324–325.
57. The most logical place to look for these quarries is on the eastern slopes of the hill marked at 306 m elevation on the I YL 1:50,000 map just west of the Smytorrema and Mt. Gerothanes, near the reconstructed location of the Hellenistic bridge.
Figure 8. (a) Late Roman orbis of an olive mill from a farmhouse near the Smyrtorrema; (b) large poros blocks cleared from a field near the farmhouse.

among the debris. In the vineyards and olive groves further south, but still north of the Kibouria cemetery, coarse pottery and roof tiles appear in some quantity, and a number of pieces of poros, some clearly from sarcophagi and similar to those still visible scattered over the Kibouria hill (Fig. 9), have been recently removed from fields. This material, in conjunction with the early travelers’ reports, indicates that further investigation north and west of Kibouria would be particularly fruitful.

From Kibouria and Patima, there is clear evidence that the ancient road descended toward the Longopotamos River bed, and from there exited the Longopotamos pass proper. South of Kibouria and Patima, where the river bends around the foot of Kotroni, the western spur of Mt. Spathovouni, Pikoulas found parallel wheel ruts of the ancient road on the eastern side of the river, visible for a total distance of about 16 m (see Figs. 2 and 4 [near no. 7]). The bedrock has been shaved back in order to allow carts to pass around the bend on a narrow ledge, and it is at the base of the Kotroni hill that the Longopotamos pass is narrowest. These ruts provide irrefutable proof that an ancient road did run through the Longopotamos pass just above the riverbed and on its eastern side.

58. Pikoulas 1995, pp. 33–35, figs. 5–7, and map, p. 32. He notes that this spot, known locally as Karavouli, is the only one with exposed limestone on the entire route from Corinth to Kleonai. These do not appear to be the same ruts as those mentioned by Leake, since his were associated with the quarry. On a visit to the site in August 2006, I noted that the area of bedrock carrying Pikoulas’s ruts had been damaged. Although the ruts were still there, the bedrock just below has been gouged out, no doubt by farming equipment maneuvering on the narrow dirt roads; it may be only a matter of time before the rest of the rock above crumbles.
Figure 9. Fragments of poros sarcophagi at the Kibouria cemetery

Just south of these ruts, Bynum noted a shaved-back area of bedrock that suggested to her that the road descended at that point to the bed of the river. After passing the tumuli, quarries, and foundations, here presumed to be roughly the location of Kiboura and Patima, the early travelers indicate that they also descended to and crossed the Longopotamos:

Another steep descent succeeds, till at 45 minutes the road crosses a bridge over a great ravine and torrent.

—W. Gell

Gell here seems to mean the Longopotamos River itself: he never gives it a name.

Having entered the valley of the river of Cleonae, we cross the stream three times, generally proceeding along its right bank, between rugged hills, which connect the Acrocorinthus on the left with the Apesas on the right.

—W. M. Leake

Leake's description makes it clear that he is only now firmly in the Longopotamos pass, and also probably very near the spot where the ruts noted by Pikoulas are located.

Gell and Dodwell next observe the following:

At 50 the village of Rachani is seen right.

—W. Gell

To our right was the village of Rakani, and further on to our left that of Omer Tschaousch, with a few cypresses about it.

—E. Dodwell

The village of Rachani (the spelling varies) is roughly equivalent to the northernmost cluster of houses of modern Veliniatika (Fig. 4:6). The significant fact is that the travelers do not go through or past Rachani, they merely "see" it off to the right (north). They are clearly following the

60. Gell 1810, p. 20.
63. Dodwell 1819, p. 206.
64. Kordosis 1981, p. 326 and final map; Peppas 1993, p. 50. Rachani is also an early modern name for the Longopotamos River; its ancient name is unknown. Pouqueville (1826, p. 187) also mentions seeing the village of Rachani and then mounting and descending to the river, which he crosses twice; he appears to be referring to crossing the Longopotamos.
monopati leading to the pipeline bridge, past Kibouria and Patima and from there down to the riverbed, and not the alternate route north of and through Veliniatika mentioned above (p. 124).

The early travelers continue following the Longopotamos River, crossing it several times, or riding directly in its bed. Near the end of the pass (mill of Bujukli), as they approach Omer Tschaousch, they cross again to pass that village (roughly modern Spathovouni; Figs. 2, 10) on the west:

At one hour recross the river by the mill of Bujukli, which is on the right at the foot of the mountain. Hence continuing near the river, with high hills on the left, pass a fountain on the right, and at 1 hour 25 minutes cross again the same river, leaving a mill on the left. Ascending through cultivated grounds by the bed of the torrent, arrive at the village of Omer Tschaousch in 1 hr 55 minutes. . . . The road lies often in the bed of the torrent.

—W. Gell

At 10.35 [2 hr 5 min], at the opening of the narrow valley into the plain of Cleonae, Omer Tjaus, a small village, adorned with gardens and cypresses, stands on the opposite or right bank of the river.

—W. M. Leake

From the northern half of their itineraries, it should be clear that the route taken by the early travelers corresponds closely to the ancient road utilizing the Longopotamos route: they leave Corinth on the southwest in the vicinity of the Phliasian gate (Fig. 4:1); they cross over upland regions significantly east of the Longopotamos to pass Penteskouphi hill on the north and west, and cross a tributary of the Longopotamos near the location of a now-lost Hellenistic bridge (Fig. 4, near no. 2). They continue to cross farmland in rolling hills on the east side of the river and they appear to pass between Kibouria and Patima (Fig. 4:3, 4), and only thereafter descend to follow the Longopotamos, as they near the end of the pass in the vicinity of the Kotroni hill they descend to the riverbed (Fig. 4:7), and they exit the pass near the village of Spathovouni, where they ultimately cross to the western side of the Longopotamos River. This route corresponds closely to the old dirt path leading south from the approximate location of the pipeline bridge, between Kibouria and Patima, and thence skirting the foot of Kotroni just below Pikoulas’s wheel ruts. It then descends to the bed of the Longopotamos, crossing it several times, and heads out of Spathovouni after crossing to its western side immediately south of the modern soccer field to the northwest of the village.

65. Peppas (1993, p. 103) includes Omer Tschaousch in a list of Turkish settlements before the second Venetian period; see also Kordosis 1981, final foldout map.

66. Gell 1810, p. 20. I can make little sense of Gell’s subsequent comment that Omer Tschaousch is the most westerly point of the road to Kleonai; it implies that the town originally lay significantly further west than the present-day Spathovouni, and Kleonai itself seems to lie west of any likely location for Omer Tschaousch.

Pouqueville (1826, p. 187) also mentions the mills: “descend to river which we cross 2 times, mill of Boiuouki.”

67. Leake 1830, pp. 324–325.
The Kleonai-Corinth Border and the Pass

Here it is necessary to introduce one further piece of evidence for the road near the southern end of the Longopotamos pass and to consider its implications for an important related issue: the location of the border between Corinth and Kleonai in this area and the ability of both cities to defend access to their respective territories via the Longopotamos road. Fifteen meters from the top of the Kotroni hill, Gauvin located the remains of a watchtower in an extremely poor state of preservation (see Fig. 10; also Figs. 2, 4-7, above). Based on black-glazed sherds found near the remains and on the likely historical period in which such towers were constructed, she dated the watchtower to the 4th century B.C. 68 Gauvin attributed the tower to Kleonai, but Stroud, Pikoulas, and Bynum have all assigned it to the protective system of Corinth. 69 Pottery extending to the base of the Kotroni hill might suggest that Kleonai had a permanent base there to support its watchtower on the heights above. In order to determine the likely builder of this tower and its significance, we must first take a closer look at other evidence for the Corinth-Kleonai border in this region.

No Corinthian boundary markers, or horoi, have been found along the Kleonai frontier, but Xenophon (Hell. 4.4.6) mentions horoi in connection with Argos's encroachment and ultimate absorption of Corinth for a short time following the battle of Koroneia in the early 4th century B.C., and a fragmentary inscription found at Corinth and dated to the Roman period may refer to horoi between Corinth and Sikyon. 70 No doubt there were also boundary markers between Corinthian and Kleonaian territory, and the border must have been well defined. We know that none of the coastal plain belonged to Kleonai, and thus Kleonai did not control any direct access to the gulf; its territory was entirely landlocked and had no ports. 71

Logic thus dictates that the border between Corinth and Kleonai be placed along the high ground between the western half of the Corinthian plain bordering the gulf and the Kleonaian valley—in other words, somewhere in the coastal hills at the northern end of the Kleonai valley through terrain, but given the close relationship between Kleonai and Argos already in place at this time, it is much more likely that the events recounted by Xenophon relate to the entire southern border of Corinth in the direction of Kleonai and Argos, and the passage suggests that Corinth had boundary stones along this border. Lolos (1998, p. 34 and n. 94) discusses the inscription found east of Temple Hill (Corinth VIII.3, pp. 36-37, no. 65, lines 6-7) in relation to the Sikyonian and Corinthian border.

71. Strabo (8.6.25) and Livy (33.14) indicate that at least in their day the Nemea River formed the border between Corinth and Sikyon. This boundary leaves no portion of the plain available for Kleonai, and numerous sources extolling the bounty of the coastal regions of Corinth and Sikyon confirm that these states had exclusive ownership of the plain; see Lolos 1998, pp. 20-21. Lolos (1998, p. 30) notes that Kleonai and Sikyon did apparently share a common border in this area for a short period: between the end of the Achaian war in 146 B.C. and the foundation of the Roman colony of Corinth in 44 B.C., the eastern Sikyonian border extended to include "most of the Corinthian countryside," and Sikyon controlled the Isthmian games during this period (Strabo 8.6.23, Eust. II. 1.448 and Paus. 2.2.2). There is no indication that this affected Kleonai territory; presumably Kleonai simply exchanged one northern neighbor for another.
Figure 10. View from Kleonai past its northern border with Corinth (delineated by the hills Kotroni, Patima 2, and Lioufti, out of view to the left) toward the ancient cemetery (Kibouria) and shrine (Patima 1) that flank the route of the ancient Corinth–Argos road

72. These hills are demarcated to the west by the ridge of foothills descending from Mt. Apesas, and to the east by the foothills and saddle between Acrocorinth and the mountains of Skiona; see Fig. 1.

73. E.g., Wiseman 1978, p. 110: “But since Kleonai was merely a polisma, a ‘little city,’ its territory probably did not exceed a minimal walking distance (perhaps about an hour); such a walk north from Cleonae would not extend far into the valley of the Longopotamos.”

74. Wiseman (1978, p. 110) suggested that there may have been a branch of the main Corinth–Argos road that turned off within the Longopotamos pass and headed south for ancient Tenea. He proposed that the junction between this hypothetical road to Tenea and the main Corinth–Argos road might have marked the border between Kleonaian and Corinthian territory. He did not offer a precise location for this junction, but he did place the border “not far into the Longopotamos valley.” Bynum (1995, p. 46) accepted the possibility that the border was related to these roads, and placed the junction between them south of the Kotroni hill. She appears to consider the entire area east of the hypothetical road to Tenea all the way south across the valley as Corinthian territory. This is extremely unlikely, since it would deny Kleonai any sort of natural boundary or defense from Corinth and would place the boundary directly in the cultivation plain, which would be very unusual in any event. The Corinth–Kleonai border must have been marked by natural features and must have been defensible from Kleonai, and therefore should be placed north of the Kotroni hill regardless of whether a branch road to Tenea existed or not.
possibilities are highly unlikely. Livy's passage makes one more fact clear: the pass in question could be defended from the Kleoanai side, and Nikostratos sends troops from Kleoai to "close" the pass. Furthermore, this was a very important border. The two acropoleis of Kleoai and Acrocorinth were close enough to be clearly visible across it. The ancient sources imply that there were confrontations between the Kleoanaians and Corinthians during the Classical period, and the two cities can be considered long-time enemies.75

Secondly, Kleoai was a firm ally of Argos, Corinth's traditional enemy, from at least the 5th century B.C. The watershed of the Psili Rachi mountains on the southern border of the Kleoai plain is constantly stressed as the dividing line between the Corinthia and the Argolid, but from the perspective of political boundaries and not geography, the real border between these two regions for most of the Classical period was the northern Kleoai-Corinth border, and thus this very pass. Although Argos did have a common border with Corinthian territory in the mountains south of Tenea, it is rough terrain far from the actual city centers of both territories. As allies of Kleoai, troops from Argos could have advanced unhindered up to the southern end of the Longopotamos pass and the hill of Kotorion, and thus within close range of the city of Corinth.

Salmon perhaps overstates the situation when he says that the plethora of routes from Argos into Kleoai territory made it hardly worth the effort for Corinth even to defend the Kleisoura route past Tenea on the Corinth-Argos border, but his comment hints at an important truth: the Psili Rachi range was not the main point of contact between these enemy states.76 Rather, the northern border of Kleoai was the "front" between the Corinthians and the territory of Argos by the Classical period. This was the practical border between the Corinthia and the Argolid even before it was the official border, as was certainly the case by the late 4th century, since Kleoai had been absorbed politically by Argos, and Skylax describes Kleoai as part of the Argolid (Periplous 49).77 It would have been imperative for both the Kleoanaians and the Corinthians to have a border that was clearly defined and could be defended.78

75. Plut. Cim. 17.1 (Corinthian aggression against Kleoai in the early 5th century B.C.); see n. 138, below. Plutarch (Tim. 4) refers to a battle of the Corinthians against the Kleoanaians and the Argives. To these must be added all conflicts between Corinth and Argos during the long period in which Kleoai was a close ally or subordinate of Argos.

76. Salmon 1984, p. 5. The route was probably used by Agesilaos to invade the Corinthia from the Argolid in 391 B.C. (Xen. Hell. 4.4.19, Ages. 2.17); see n. 24, above.

77. This passage should not be given too much weight, since it is not clear that Skylax means that Kleoai is politically part of the Argolid. However, firm evidence that Kleoai was politically absorbed into Argos by the late 4th century exists in the form of two Argive inscriptions that include Kleoai as an Argive home; see IG IV 616 and SEG XXX 355. For the dates of these inscriptions, see Pittarr and Thalman 1980, Miller 1982, and Perlman 2000, pp. 145-149. The political position of Kleoai vis-à-vis Argos can be more accurately defined upon full publication of the recently discovered Argive archive of bronze inscriptions noted in SEG LI 410 and briefly introduced in Kritzas 2005. More recently, Kritzas (2006) has pushed back the date of Kleoai's integration to the early 4th century B.C. (I saw this article too late to fully incorporate it into my text.) Elsewhere I have argued (Marchand 2005, 1992) that the close alliance between Kleoai and Argos began as early as the Archaic period. Kleoai regained nominal independence upon its induction into the Achaian League in 253 B.C.

78. Pikoulas (1995, p. 35) notes that the presence of remains of a Late Byzantine watchtower (still visible) on the opposite side of the river at a location called Kazarma underscores the diachronic significance of movement along the Longopotamos River pass.
The passage of Plutarch’s *Life of Aratos* discussed in some detail above (pp. 114–115) also stresses the importance of securing this pass; I argued that Aratos brought his men from Corinth to Kleonai via the road in the Longopotamos pass for his sneak attack on Aristippos, who was encamped in the Kleonai plain south of the city. As in the passage of Livy, the pass is secured before the troops are sent out. In this case, the control of the pass is exerted from Corinth, and surely the defense of this pass was as significant for the Corinthians as it was for the Kleonaḯans. The topography of the pass must be emphasized: on the west, the sides of the pass remain relatively steep throughout, and at the base of the Kotroni hill, the pass is very narrow. However, to the north of the Kotroni hill, on the cast the pass opens up and is bordered by relatively gentle hills with good farmland up to and surrounding Penteskouphi hill and the base of Acrocorinth, marred only by the numerous small tributaries to the Longopotamos River proper. This is why the Corinth–Argos road as described above was able to leave the bed of the Longopotamos north of the Kotroni hill to cut directly over these gentle hills and straight to the city of Ancient Corinth, which is located east of the northern exit of the Longopotamos pass; the road is in fact only within the bed of the pass proper for a short distance at its narrow, southern end.

From Acrocorinth, although the entrance at the southern end of the Longopotamos pass was not visible, the approach to the city along the Corinth–Argos road in the pass was visible, and movement along the northern portion of the road could be monitored from Acrocorinth and other heights within Corinthian territory. The Kleonaḯan side must also have had heights within its territory from which to view an approach from Corinth along the road, and it is of some significance that in the passage from Plutarch, Aratos’s forces also hold the city of Kleonai. Therefore, it may not have been possible for the Corinthians to place guards along the entire route of the road and pass when Kleonai was opposed to Corinth, as was usually the case. The passage highlights the significance of controlling the pass even when the political alliances had altered and Kleonai was, in name at least, separate from Argos, since topographically it still provided the easiest point of conflict between forces at Corinth and forces from Argos.

Thus, the Corinth–Kleonai border must have been located somewhere within the Longopotamos pass, and it is at the base of the Kotroni hill that one can recognize the real beginning of the pass. This hill is a prominent visual feature of the southern mouth of the pass from both directions, but particularly so from the vantage point of the city of Kleonai (see Figs. 2, 3). Not only is Kotroni the most distinctive feature of the northern skyline from Kleonai (with the exception of Acrocorinth), its base can be easily and swiftly reached from Kleonai by cutting directly across the plain. Between Kotroni and the city of Kleonai only very gentle foothills dot the Kleonaḯan plain, and from none of these hills is any portion of the Longopotamos valley within the pass visible.

Given the importance of the Corinth–Kleonai border and the evidence of the literary sources, Kleonaḯan territory must have extended far enough into the pass to have allowed it to control the heights on either side of
its southern end, on which it could have had lookout posts. Therefore, Kleonaian territory must have included at least Mt. Spathovouni and its western foothill Kotroni, which delineate the southeastern end of the Longopotamis pass. These are the first real heights on the eastern side in the direction of the Kleonai valley. The Kotroni hill is not only a prominent landmark on the horizon that indicates the location of the pass when viewed from the direction of Kleonai, it is the first and only readily accessible height from the direction of Kleonai that provides a view into the pass, and it is likely that the top of this hill and the ridge connecting it with Mt. Spathovouni formed the official line of the border on the Kleonaian side.

Although Kleonaian territory must have included these peaks, it also must have soon come to an end: I concur with the conclusions of Stroud, Pikoulas, and Bynum concerning the sanctuary and cemetery on the twin hills of Kibouria and Patima (not much further north within the pass), namely, that these were likely to have belonged to Corinthian territory. As noted above, the view to the north from these hills is splendid, but to the south one cannot actually see the acropolis and city of Kleonai, since the ridge and hill of Kotroni block the view.\(^79\) The specific location of the shrine of Patima vis-à-vis the probable border also strengthens the argument above that it was a boundary sanctuary of the type that François de Polignac believes was used to help mark and establish a polity's claim to its territory, since it is inside Corinthian territory but overlooks the probable boundary with Kleonai.\(^80\) Moreover, it lies on the highest ground directly before the point at which the road coming from Corinth through Corinthian territory descended to the bed of the Longopotamis River. It is therefore likely that the sanctuary marks the approximate point of the official border in the Corinthian direction.\(^81\) I would argue, then, that the northern border of Kleonai was marked by the following points from cast to west: Mt. Skiona, Mt. Spathovouni, Kotroni, another peak along the western side of the Longopotamis pass on the Kalentzi plateau also confusingly called Patima (Patima 2), and Lioufti; the southern border of Corinth was located at the hills of Patima (1) and Kibouria within the pass (Fig. 10).\(^82\)

\(^79\) I was interested to learn that the farmland now surrounding these hills is predominantly owned by residents of Assos in the Corinthian plain. This situation resulted from the former residents of Veliniastika (Rachani, see below), the closest modern town, having all moved north down and out of the Longopotamis pass (toward clearly Corinthian territory), rather than inland to the much closer Spathovouni (toward Kleonaian territory).

\(^80\) See Polignac 1995, p. 33, and passim; also Bynum 1995, p. 42.

\(^81\) The small region between the sanctuary and the Kotroni hill was probably considered eschatia, or borderlands belonging officially to neither state. Stroud (1992, p. 243) expresses the opinion that the two hills are at the edge of, but still within, Corinthian territory.

\(^82\) Sakellariou and Pharaklas (1971, p. 47) placed the border in virtually the same location along a line drawn between Lioufti and Mt. Spathovouni (note that they refer to Lioufti as Lioukti); they present no supporting argument, but appear here, as elsewhere, to depend on identifying likely heights along probable border lines.
The Kotroni Tower

I have purposely delayed discussing the watchtower found by Gauvin on the Kotroni hill in order to emphasize that my arguments concerning Kleonai’s borders are not based on the existence of this structure. The two published descriptions from autopsy of the site, those of Gauvin and of Pikoulas, are not entirely compatible, nor does either conform on all points to my own observations. In 1992, Gauvin published her discovery of the watchtower on this hill as part of an article concerning what she called the defensive system of Kleonai.83 Her comments about the tower itself are very brief: she notes only a few courses of “good rectangular” masonry in a slightly trapezoidal style located in the small saddle between the Kotroni peak and the bulk of Mt. Spathovouni (Figs. 2, 4-7, 10). She attributes the tower to a 4th-century defensive system of Kleonai and assigns it a function of guarding the Longopotamos road.

Gauvin’s work has been harshly criticized, and in general her reliability as an observer in the field has been questioned by Pikoulas, Bynum, and Lolos.84 Pikoulas reports that, at least by the time he visited the site in 1994, the remains of the structure had been churned up and moved to the side of the field. Although he was only able to confirm the presence of orthogonal blocks at the site and “a very few” unglazed and black-glazed sherds, he accepted Gauvin’s identification of a 4th-century watchtower. Unlike Gauvin, Pikoulas assigned the tower to Corinth, arguing that it is intervisible with Acrocorinth.85 Gauvin likewise stressed the site’s intervisibility with the acropolis of Kleonai, and thus this issue cannot be decisive: Kleonai and Acrocorinth are themselves intervisible, and Acrocorinth is visible from most points in Kleonai territory.86 Stroud and Bynum also comment on the tower, although neither appears to have visited it, and they also both assign it to Corinth.87

On my most recent visit to the site, in July 2006, in the saddle between Kotroni and the peak of Spathovounion there were still a number of rectangular poros blocks that were no longer in situ. The blocks were large and nicely cut (most of the blocks are damaged and obscured, but they appear to be in the range of 0.50 x 0.30 x 1.00 m or larger). From the state of these blocks it is impossible to identify the nature of the structure to which they originally belonged: the identification of it as a watchtower must rest on Gauvin’s observations and on the strong likelihood of such a structure at this location, not on the actual remains. If this was a watchtower, it was a significant structure and not a simple lookout post. The view from this spot over the route of the Longopotamos road to the north is indeed impressive, as previous observers pointed out, but the section of the road represented by the wheel ruts that Pikoulas located at the southern base of the hill is not visible from here or from the actual peak. Pikoulas noted that the range of vision is increased considerably if one climbs to the top of the Kotroni hill approximately 15 m west of and higher than the location of the tower. This, he says, is an excellent location for a lookout, and it could have been used without modification in conjunction with the tower.

The only access to the saddle is from the south. Even this approach is steep, but on the north the drop is at first sheer and thereafter extremely

86. E.g., Salmon (1984, p. 4) assigned the southern portion of the Longopotamos valley just north of Kotroni to Kleonai based on the fact that Acrocorinth is not visible from many points within it—but neither is the acropolis of Kleonai.
rugged. I have argued that the crest of Kotroni and of Mt. Spathovouni represent the southernmost line possible for the Corinth-Kleonaia border, since Kleonai must have controlled some heights at the entrance to the pass. To reach the saddle and watchtower from the direction of Corinth, one would first have to pass Kotroni and circle to its south, into what must have been Kleonaia territory. For this reason I must concur with Gauvin, against all others, that the tower was in Kleonaia territory. Furthermore, from the location of the tower, the only impressive view of the road is toward the north. It allows one to observe travelers coming from Corinth who would not have been visible from any point further south in the Kleonai plain; therefore, this location would have been necessary for Kleonaia defense (see Fig. 6).

If the Kotroni hill were in Corinthian territory, it would have been possible for the Corinthians to enter the Kleonai valley undetected at any time, since the next significant height to the south is the acropolis of Kleonai itself (see Figs. 2, 3). On the contrary, the hill was not crucial for Corinthian defense, since much of the approach along the Longopotamos road is visible from other points within Corinthian territory, including the Patima hill, Penteskouphi, and Acrocorinth. The top of the Kotroni hill is not only an ideal location for a lookout post, as Pikoulas noted, but also one necessary for Kleonai, and the passages from both Plutarch and Livy cited above (pp. 114–116) suggest that there were other such lookout points controlled by Kleonai along the pass and Longopotamos road. I therefore argue that this hill was indeed the site of an important Kleonaia lookout post, but I retain some reservations as to the exact nature of the structure on its lower saddle, represented by the poros blocks reported by Gauvin.88

Recognizing that the main road in antiquity between Corinth and Argos utilized the Longopotamos pass—and that the border between Kleonai/Argos and Corinth was located so close to Corinth within this pass and along this road—brings the political geography of the area in antiquity into sharp focus. That this border was on the northern side of Kleonaia territory and strongly defendable by Kleonai via the Kotroni tower underscores both the value of the polis to Argos throughout the Classical period and the threat its close relationship with Argos posed to Corinth (and, to a lesser extent, Sikyon).

88. In a later article, Gauvin and Morin (1997, pp. 8–9, fig. 1:4) also identify a prehistoric site on the lower western and southern slopes of the Kotroni hill. They report several walls constructed of fieldstones and arranged in concentric circles on the western slopes, and identify this as the site of a possibly fortified Bronze Age settlement. There is a quantity of loose rubble on these slopes, most of it now residing in what appear to be modern constructions made by farmers.

I observed a number of Geometric sherds near the tower; pockets of pottery continuing down the slope from the saddle and into the fields below (see Fig. 10), including roof tiles, pithoi rims, battered coarseware, and some sherds identifiable as Geometric, Archaic, and Classical; and one prehistoric kylix stem.

The nature of the activity here in any period is unclear and would require systematic study, and I was unable to confirm sufficient evidence for a fortified Bronze Age settlement, but there does appear to have been a small settlement at the southern base of Kotroni and on its lower southern slopes that may represent a permanent support base for the lookout post above. Given the significance of this border, a long-lasting and permanently settled military presence here makes good defensive sense. Some of the rubble on the upper slopes may derive from earlier versions of the watchtower or related fortifications.
IN KLEONAIAN TERRITORY: A NEW IDENTIFICATION FOR THE ROAD

In passing the Kotroni hill, the Corinth–Argos road entered Kleonai territory. South of the ruts observed by Pikoulas and the Kotroni watchtower, there is no direct evidence for the ancient road through the valley. A vague observation by Dodwell of “some ancient vestiges” is the only mention by the travelers of antiquities in this area.\(^9\) As noted above, it is clear that the road had to descend into the bed of the Longopotamos River as it passed by the foot of the Kotroni hill, and previous commentators have argued either that the ancient road then continued to follow the bed of the Longopotamos across the entire Kleonai valley, or that it crossed the eastern edge of the plain. Pikoulas cites remains of a Late Roman villa of the 3rd to 4th centuries A.D. at the southern end of modern Spathovouni at the location \(\text{Κόλασες}\) as another indicator of the course of the ancient road.\(^9\)

I do not believe that the ancient road for Kleonai passed through or east of modern Spathovouni; instead, I think that it continued along the bed of the river for some distance, like the early modern road followed by the early travelers, not entering but keeping west of the modern village.

Bynum argued that south of Spathovouni, the ancient road probably continued and crossed the entire Kleonai plain in the bed of the Longopotamos and that of its main southern tributary, the Varuko \(\text{rema}\) (Fig. 11).\(^9\)

However, the route taken by the early travelers soon left the bed of the river to cut across the plain in a westerly direction straight to the ancient city of Kleonai, and I argue that their early modern route continues to follow that of the ancient Corinth–Argos road. It is clear that the early modern route went southwest, not due south, from Spathovouni to cut more quickly across the plain: the next identifiable feature of that road is a stone bridge (Fig. 11:9). Aldenhoven, who was traveling in the opposite direction, that is, from Kleonai to Corinth, says that after leaving Kleonai:

One next reaches an elevated plateau where Acrocyrinth is once again visible, then crossing a small bridge bordered by red laurels and many torrents, one sees the remains of a paved road, in the

---

89. “A short way further [from where he saw Rachani] two small streams from the right cross the road, and join a larger stream which is on the left, flowing towards Corinth. Near the junction of the latter are some ancient vestiges” (Dodwell 1819, p. 206).

90. Pikoulas 1995, p. 35. He notes blocks, unpainted tiles, wheel-ridged sherds, and glass dating to the 3rd–5th centuries A.D. Presumably this is where Wiseman (1978, pp. 107, 110, figs. 147, 148) locates the “large Roman villa” 1 km east of Spathovouni on a (then) dirt road leading from there to Chilimodi; he also mentions a number of poros blocks, including an unfluted column fragment and a considerable amount of pottery, which he dates to the 2nd–3rd century A.D. Other column fragments at Chilimodi are said to come from near Spathovouni, and he also notes a very large and curiously shaped conglomerate block rolled to the edge of a field. This block is still along the road leading from Spathovouni to the toll post on the new Corinth–Tripolis highway at Koutalas. It appears to me to be an upside-down mortarium. Wiseman does not put these remains on the road from Corinth to Kleonai; on the contrary, he associates them with his hypothetical road to Tence (sec. n. 74, above). It seems likely that this is what Pouqueville (1826, p. 185) means when at Omer Tschaousch he says, “I no longer saw the columns of the house with the gardens which M. Fauvel indicated to me.” Pouqueville appears to be heading east at this point, since his next references are to Examilia and Tence. Pikoulas (1995, p. 35) also noted a small Late Antique settlement \textit{west} of Spathovouni, at the location \textit{Κοτερή η Δίκυλος, Βάλαπως}. This seems more in line with the course of the Kleonai road.

neighborhood of which there is a fountain: the mountain Phoukas raises to the left.\textsuperscript{92}

He goes on to elaborate on his description of the bridge:

7 minutes: hill where Cleonae was [2 hr 48 min from Corinth].
3 minutes: elevation and view of Acrocorinth. 17 minutes: one traverses a small river on a stone bridge with an arch [2 hr 28 min from Corinth].\textsuperscript{93}

This bridge can be firmly identified. A little over a kilometer northeast of the walls of ancient Kleonai is a well-preserved Tourkokratia-period bridge (Fig. 12) over the seasonal stream Kakorcma that collects runoff from the foothills of Apselas and feeds into the Longopotamos from the west. This bridge consists of one large arch of well-cut poros stones, the rest of the construction consisting of rubble and mortar. Today a paved road from Spathovouni to Ayios Vasilios still uses this bridge.\textsuperscript{94}

As Aldenhoven’s itinerary indicates, the next stop on the early modern route for all the travelers was the acropolis of Kleonai:

In two hours and thirty-three minutes from Corinth, we arrived at the ruins of Kleonai, at present named Kourtse, and situated upon a circular and isolated hill, which seems to have been completely covered with buildings.

—E. Dodwell\textsuperscript{95}

leaving the river and plain on our left, we cross some uncultivated hills, the roots of Mt. Fuka [Apselas], and at 11.13 [2 hr 43 min] halt for a few minutes at the site of Cleonae.

—W. M. Leake\textsuperscript{96}

The acropolis of Kleonai occupies the top of the hill that is directly under the toponym Βορθακχός on the ΓΥΣ 1:50,000 map and is known to the locals as Τούρλα (meaning “mound” or “heaped up”, Fig. 11:8). The city itself extended over this hill and onto the flanking hills to the southeast and the west, and over the plain thus encircled (the rough line of the city walls is marked on Fig. 11).\textsuperscript{97} On its eastern side, the ancient city

\textsuperscript{92} Aldenhoven 1841, p. 399. He does not give a direction for the paved road that he sees: perhaps it is a \textit{kalderimi}, or cobbled medieval road, possibly heading along the Varuko rema for the now-ruined medieval Moni Stephanii (in the plain east of Kondostavlo and north of Ayios Vasilios, Fig. 11:18). It would make sense for a \textit{kalderimi} to have given access to it, and perhaps to have continued to Aysios Vasilios and the medieval kastro beyond, where a portion of a \textit{kalderimi} along the mountain road to Mycenae for pack animals (see n. 24, above) is still preserved.

There is no particular reason, however, to believe that Aldenhoven was referring to a road running in this direction.

\textsuperscript{93} Aldenhoven 1841, p. 399. His observation can be placed by comparing it with those of the other travelers. From west to east, he notes a mill, then a fountain, then the bridge, then Kleonai. Gell also notes a mill, settlements, a stream, and then Kleonai. Pouqueville also gives the order of landmarks on the road in this area as follows: mill, 25 minutes torrent, 5 minutes khan (i.e., of Kurtessa, near Kleonai; see below).

\textsuperscript{94} Both Charitos (1968, p. 10) and Pikoulas (1995, p. 35) give the “Turkish bridge” as a fixed point on the Corinth–Argos road, but neither of them gives its precise location.

\textsuperscript{95} Dodwell 1819, p. 206.

\textsuperscript{96} Leake 1830, pp. 324–325.

\textsuperscript{97} Marked roughly on the ΓΥΣ 1:50,000 map as Βαλιματή. The toponym Βορθακχός actually refers to the area north of the acropolis. Locals refer to the area encircled by the acropolis and the hills to the southeast and west as Βαλιματή Γούβα, γούβα meaning “pit” or depression; this is the likely area of the agora. The elevation of Βαλιματή on the map is 276 msl; this is actually not the highest elevation of the acropolis. The hill of the army survey marker, which is located east of the top of the acropolis. The elevation at the top, where there are remains of a structure of some sort, is given as 279.80 msl on the ΓΥΣ 1:5,000 map.
Figure 11. The Corinth–Argos road through the Kleonai valley (from the Longopotamos pass to the entrance to the Tretos pass proper); (7) watchtower on the Kotroni hill; (8) acropolis of Kleonai; (9) Tourkotratia bridge over the Longopotamos; (10) sarcophagi; (11) hill 228; (12) Varela; (13) Ayios Nikolaos/khan of Kurtessa; (14) easternmost foothills of the Drymoni ridge with ancient quarries; (15) bridge(?); (16) edge of the Rachi Mantzorou and location of church of Ayia Triada; (17) Ayia Triada hill; (18) Moni Stephani; (19) Nemea/Dervenakia railway station; (20) Anemomylos tower; (21) Chani Anesti/khan of Dervenakia; (22) two villages of Papoutseika; (23) sanctuary of Zeus at Nemea. B. Stiver
spread down from its acropolis onto a portion of a lower but connected hill (Fig. 13). The city did not extend all the way to the base of this hill, as is clear from extant portions of the city wall in this area. At the base of the hill, another hill rises immediately to the east (Fig. 11:11), marked at 228 masl on the ΓΥΣ 1:50,000 map. The area between the lower, easternmost hill carrying the city wall and “hill 228” further east is very narrow and forms a sort of miniature pass (Figs. 13–17).

Just south of the Turkish bridge, an old monopati turns off the paved Spathovouni–Ayios Vasilios road and heads southwest toward Kleonai (see Fig. 3, above). This path runs directly from the bridge through the small pass between the city and hill 228 (Figs. 11, 14). I believe that this monopati represents the exact course of both the ancient road and the early modern road used by the travelers as they passed the city of Kleonai. Sakellariou and Pharaklas, in their survey for the Ancient Greek Cities series, have already argued that all the old monopatia in the area of Kleonai represent ancient roads, and this may be true. 98 They make no arguments for any of the specific monopatia, however, and even if one accepts the premise, their observation does not provide evidence that this particular path represents the main Corinth–Argos road, and not one merely giving local access. Nevertheless, locals of Kondostavlo confirm that the path, now widened enough for vehicles, was indeed an old monopati. 99

More significantly, as one nears the ancient city site, evidence for burials on either side of the path appears. In the 1980s, an inscribed gravestone of the Late Classical or Hellenistic period was removed from a field just west of the path and taken to the Archaeological Museum in Archaia Nemea. 100 On the east of the path, the fields just north of

98. Sakellariou and Pharaklas 1971, p. 131, fig. 72.
99. Some claim that this path is particularly hard-packed (as shown by the difficulty in plowing over it when turning tractors in the neighboring fields), and that successive layers of pebbles have been noted in its composition, unlike that of some of the other dirt paths.
100. Nemea, Archaeological Museum, inv. I 119; S. G. Miller and E. Skazas (pers. comm.). Elias Skazas showed me the approximate location of the field: of course, the stone was not in situ when “found.” The pedimental funerary stele, of reddish Kleonai limestone, is unpublished except for notice in Marchand 2002, appendix A, no. 282. It was found in a field northeast of the acropolis of Kleonai, where it had been churned up in cultivation, and reported by Spiros Tarnaras of Kleonai: Nemea Archives KTA notebook II (Findcs), pp. 246–247, entry for June 23, 1998, supplemented by autopsy of the stone.
hill 228 contain a large number of stone fragments that appear to have come from simple burials. These have generally been removed from fields and piled along the edges: in one location, where there was a pile of poros stones, some with traces of plaster, it was possible to still see the outline of the rectangular pit from which the slabs were removed. Of particular note is a large pile of poros sarcophagus fragments recently removed from a nearby field in January 2000; these included at least seven pieces of the bottom parts of sarcophagi with sections of the side walls preserved (Fig. 11:10). Without disassembling the pile, it was impossible to tell exactly how many sarcophagi were represented by the pieces, but the variations in the thickness of the side walls (0.09-0.13 m) and the size of the pieces indicate that there were clearly more than two or three (Figs. 18, 19).101

101. The sarcophagi have subsequently disappeared.
Figure 15. View to the northwest from the kastro of Ayios Vasilios, with the *monopati* representing the ancient Corinth–Argos road in white (hidden in places by low hills). The arrow points toward Corinth and to the Tourkokratia bridge.

Figure 16. View to the north from Ayios Nikolaos/Kurtessa along the *monopati* south of Kleonai.
There were also numerous large, flat slabs of harder limestone that may have formed the lids. All of the sarcophagi were of very soft, yellow poros limestone and roughly worked. Chisel marks in large herringbone patterns were clearly visible on the exterior side walls (Fig. 18:b). In general, the sarcophagi resemble those at the Kibouria cemetery, north of Spathovouni, illustrated above (Fig. 9).

The practice of locating burials along major routes into and out of cities is well known. Since the bulk of this material is located to the east of the path, and over a wide area, it is possible to argue that this evidence for burials could also relate to a road running along the Varuko rema, passing just east of hill 228, as Bynum originally argued. My greatest objection to locating the ancient road to the east of hill 228 is the fact that this hill, though of no great height, is very wide. It was clearly outside the city of Kleonai, and there do not appear to be any remains from the Classical period on it at all.102 A road running to the east of hill 228 would be far

---

102. There is virtually no pottery on this hill, as opposed to the copious pottery at the city site. The entire hill is under cultivation, and it is possible that traces of any structure that may have been there have now disappeared, but the hill was certainly outside the city walls, and the dearth of pottery indicates that it was not populated as an extramural sector. There are a few blocks, not in situ, at the foot of the far (eastern) side of the hill near the Spathovouni–Ayios Vasilios paved road. Further north, still near the road but just beyond the hill in the plain, is a fair amount of late material of an agricultural nature, including a large conglomerate mortarium, part of a trapetum, blocks, pottery, tiles, and loom weights. To the south of the hill is a Late Roman agricultural villa partially excavated in the 1980s, which like the Moni Stephani is constructed in large part from remnants of the ancient city. The spot, known locally as Varela, consisted of an agricultural villa of the 3rd–6th centuries A.D. with a small bath complex and a surrounding settlement (Fig. 11:12). Use of the site continued into the medieval period. Given the size and appearance of many of the blocks, it is tempting to argue that the choice of this site was dictated by the presence of a preexisting extramural structure or structures. The location is not directly on the line of the monopati here presented as the Corinth–Argos road, but it is perhaps close enough to be considered a roadside feature. See Moutzali 1989; Gregory 1994; Marchand 2002, p. 131, n. 219.
from the city, and the hill itself would completely block the view of Kleonai to one traveling past it.

As an experiment, I walked the route proposed by Bynum along this section, and found that the acropolis of Kleonai is hidden from view until one is virtually at the abandoned church once belonging to Moni Stephani east of the city (Fig. 11:18). This does not accord well with Strabo’s comment that Kleonai was directly on the road: he uses the preposition ἐκι. Indeed, Bynum also stressed this point: however, she was misled by the labeling of the army maps, which place the name Kleonai to the east of the actual city site, and so misidentified hill 228 as the acropolis of Kleonai. Thus, she claimed that her version of the road passed within 100 m of the Kleonai acropolis, according well with Strabo’s account.103 It is actually the version of the road proposed here, however, that passes close to Kleonai’s walls, and thus corresponds to Strabo’s description; after passing the sarcophagus burials and entering the small pass between the hills of Kleonai and hill 228, the old monopati leading from the Tourkokratia bridge (Fig. 3) passes approximately 200 m below an extant portion of

Figure 19. Sarcophagi with the acropolis of Kleonai in the background. The line of cypress trees to the right is on the scarp that preserves sections of Kleonai’s city wall. The monopati is located just beyond the vineyard in middle view; the cypress trees to the left are adjacent to the path.

Kleonai’s city wall. The monopati is also the most direct route across the plain allowed by the topography. The scenes described in Plutarch’s Life of Aratos quoted above can be imagined much more vividly with the main road coming into Kleonai along the course of this monopati, where the acropolis, the eastern city hill, and hill 228 would effectively block movement along the road from the view of anyone encamped south in the plain (Figs. 13, 15).

Additionally, this monopati continues straight in a southwesterly direction to the little modern church of Ayios Nikolaos of Kondostavlo (Fig. 20). Around this church is the location of the khan, or inn, of Kurtesa (spelling varies) where some of the early modern travelers stopped for the night (Fig. 11:13). It is clear from their descriptions that after passing the acropolis of Kleonai on their right, they continued straight to the khan, on their left. This accords with the route of the monopati, and it thus seems clear that the Tourkokratia and early modern road went from the Turkish

104. Wall sections S and T on final oversized plan Kleonai 1500-1, in Marchand 2002. The view of the monopati shown in Fig. 3 (above) is from a point immediately north of the small pass between the hills on which Kleonai stands and the low hill 228 to its east. The Turkish bridge (Fig. 12, above) is only a short distance beyond and slightly to the left of the point at which the path goes out of view.

105. A number of sources give the khan of Kurtesa as a marker of both the Tourkokratia road and of the ancient road: see Miliarakis 1836, pp. 169–170; Charitos 1968, pp. 10, 13; and Papachatzis 1972, p. 121. None of them specify the location, however; Wiseman photographed the remains, and he located them on the Corinth–Argos road, but he did not associate them with the khan of Kurtesa (see n. 112, below). Only Pikoulas (1995, p. 35) clearly equates Kurtesa with Ayios Nikolaos (Charitos is aware of the connection, but does not make it explicit). Muddled references abound. Lolling states (in Frick’s 1990 translation of Steffen’s 1884 Karten von Mykenai [Steffen 1990, p. 128]): “If we follow the mountain road further, we find ourselves in 20–25 minutes opposite the site of the ruins of an ancient kome below Lower Clenia which the inhabitants of the small region ordinarily designated as the remains of Cleonai the name of which is certainly preserved in the village name of Clenia. It is clear that Tenea must rather be put here while Cleonai lay as far as Chani from Kurtesa.” Frick attempts to elucidate (in Steffen 1990, n. 24), without much success: “This Chani identified in Lolling’s time the junction of the present Corinth–Argos highway and the side road to Haghiou Vasilios; Kurtesa remains a mystery to me.” Frick appears to have confused Lolling’s reference to Kurtesa with another, later khan located closer to Ayios Vasilios.
bridge to the church of Ayios Nikolaos on the path I have identified with the ancient road, passing just below the then-old walls of Kleonai (Fig. 11:9, 13; see also Figs. 15, 16). A few excerpts from the travelers’ accounts suffice to locate the khan just south of the acropolis of Kleonai, and to identify its salient features. 106 It consisted of an inn, a small settlement including a “police station,” and a church of Ayios Nikolaos made of ancient debris, under which a natural spring bubbled up forming a fountain and providing water for animals and shade trees:

At fifteen minutes from Cleonae is a Khan, called Kortesa, with a chapel and a fountain.

—W. Gell 107

at 11.13 halt for a few minutes at the site of Cleonae: only remains are some Hellenic features. Around a small height, upon which are the supporting walls of several terraces. A hamlet of four or five houses on the slope towards the plain is still called Klenes (Klenais), not far from which is a larger village named Kurtesi.

—W. M. Leake 108

In a few hours we reach a small plain, strewed with the ruins of ancient Cleonae. The citadel, where some courses of Cyclopian wall are still visible, occupies an eminence to the right. Beyond is a Khan, comprising also a station of gendarmes, where we halted to refresh.

—W. Mure, Earl of Caldwell, 1838 109

Near these are the ruins of many modern monuments which were built out of ancient fragments; there is a Roman architrave. The Khan of Kortesa where there is a police station is only a little ways away; the hamlet contains a church which is made of ancient debris.

—F. Aldenhoven, 1841 110

106. There are too many references to Kurtesa to quote them all here. The most colorful is that of Pouqueville (1826, p. 187): “Courtesa, triste auberge, où nous ne trouvâmes ni une chambre logeable, ni le moindre gîte à l’abri du vent, et dont les puces ne tardèrent pas à nous chasser. Nous demandâmes du pain et du vin au cabaretier, il n’y en avait pas. On nous procura en rechignant une salade d’olives, et, avec le surplus de nos provisions, nous nous étalions sous un arbre, afin de préder notre repas, qui ne fut pas de longue durée.” See also Conze and Michaelis 1861, p. 15; Puillon Boblaye 1835, p. 41: “All these circumstances (of Kleonai) fit perfectly with the Cylopean ruins which crown a hill near the khan of Kurtesa.” Welcker [1842] 1865, p. 172: “the khan of Kuresa [sic] by Kleonai.” Kordosis (1981, pp. 225–226, 304, 343), discussing Kurtesa, south of Kondostavlo, “famous from the Revolution of 1821,” says: “Τὸ δωρίτι τῆς προστάσεως τὴν οὐσίαν τῆς παρανομίας.” He notes that others thought the name was Albanian or Frankish (p. 304, n. 866: Φωρίης, Τοπογ. Αττικής, p. 125, n. 8: Albanian; Ηλιόπουλος, Τοπον. Ηλείας, p. 173: Frankish). Peppas (1993, pp. 88, 117, nn. 237–240) mentions a reference to Kurtesa in the second Venetian period. He proposes that the toponym was brought with settlers from Epirus via Elis into the Corinthian area, based on the locations of similar toponyms; he associates the names Kortesa and Kurtesi with Kurtaj, a toponym found in Albania. (I am not sure such an etymology by sound is justifiable.) On the formation of the demos of Kleonai in 1834, the khan of Kurtesa was listed as having five inhabitants (Skiadas 1994, p. 285: Δήμος Κλεοναίον).


108. Leake 1830, pp. 324–325 (italics added). Leake clearly identifies a small habitation at the site of ancient Kleonai still called Klenes or Kleonai at the time of his visit; this should not be confused with the modern village of Clenia near ancient Tenea, but perhaps some confusion of this sort can help account for Frick’s jumbled discussion of Kurtesa (n. 105, above).


110. Aldenhoven 1841, p. 397 (italics added). He is traveling in the opposite direction: the “ruins” he mentions are not Kleonai, but some houses built into quarries (see below).
I changed my plan and struck off [from Sikyon] on the way to Kleonai, to visit Nemea on the same day and to spend the night in the Khan of Kurtesa by Kleonai. . . . It was nearly four o’clock when we got to the Khan of Kurtesa, a few hundred feet south of the ruins of the ancient city. . . . It was too late to visit Nemea, until men and animals had rested, and it was too early to stay in the Khan of Kurtesa, which otherwise would have pleased me. The small place consists now of only the Khan, a police station, a pair of other houses and a church of St. Nikolaos, but it is situated amiably with trees around it and a clear spring bubbling up from under the church. The main place of the valley, the village of Aghios Vasilios, one can see further to the SE lying on the mountain. Since I for now left Nemea to the side, I now directed my journey towards Argos in order to reach the next khan [of Dervenakia] by evening.

—W. Vischer, 1853

The church of Ayios Nikolaos of Kondostavlo stands 700 m south of the ancient city of Kleonai, directly on the monopati described above (Fig. 20). It is surrounded by very old plane trees, and although it has been whitewashed, large ancient blocks are still visible both in its structure and lying nearby (Fig. 21); recently some of this material has been obscured by the creation of a cemented pavement surrounding the entrance to the church. At the back of the church is a channel, also built of ancient debris, which used to allow the water “bubbling up from under the church” to run off (Fig. 22); the natural spring has now been tapped by other nearby agricultural wells. The area around the church is still known to locals by the toponym Kourtesa, though most locals have forgotten why. One resident of Ayios Vasilios whose vineyards stood nearby remembered the khan, and told me specifically that it stood just south of the present church of Ayios Nikolaos of Kondostavlo, from the south. The monopati passes in front of the church; the hill in the background is ancient Kleonai. The khan of Kurtessa stood in the empty field in the foreground, now filled with cement blocks and debris.

Nikolaos. Wiseman first published photographs taken in the 1960s of the antiquities built into Ayios Nikolaos of Kondostavlo in his Land of the Ancient Corinthians, and indeed, in one of these photographs, large amounts of dilapidated rubble construction mixed with ancient reused material can be seen immediately south of the church: these must be the remains of the khan, of which there is no trace today.\footnote{112} Wiseman already recognized that these ancient remains must be related to the route of the ancient road:

Some previously unreported antiquities near the church of Ayios Nikolaos, ca. 2 km south of [the modern town of] Cleonae, should be mentioned since they are substantial and suggest the existence of some large buildings near the main road to Argos. A number of large poros blocks are actually built into the walls of the church on all sides and others lie scattered about nearby. There is a spring beneath the church and ancient blocks line the channel where the water gushes from below the apse. The blocks continue to be

\footnote{112. Wiseman 1978, p. 109, fig. 151 (front view of the church of Ayios Nikolaos, from the west; note that the front porch to the church had not yet been built); fig. 152 (view of the church from the south; the ruins in the foreground must be the remains of the khan of Kurtessa); fig. 153 (the channel behind the church).}
numerous for some hundred meters south of the church, especially at the edges of the fields near the road, to which area they had been removed by farmers clearing their fields for planting. Among the more important architectural pieces are two Doric column fragments. . . . Little datable pottery was observed, but since the main road to Argos passed nearby and a good spring lay at hand, it is likely that a fountain house, at least, stood here both in Greek and Roman times. To judge from the number of blocks and their wide scatter, there were also other buildings or monuments along this part of the ancient way. 113

It is clear that Wiseman is talking about Ayios Nikolaos of Kondostavlo (he refers to the modern village of Kondostavlo as Cleonae). He also does not connect the scattered ruins with the khan of Kurtessa; it seems quite clear that many of the ancient blocks were actually originally from the city of Kleonai and had been brought to be reused in the structures of the later inn and settlement. In particular, one of the column fragments he mentions is still nearby, just south of the paved road connecting Kondostavlo and Ayios Vasilios. 114 This fragment is identical to others found scattered over the site of the ancient city of Kleonai: there is no reason to think that it was from a building originally this far south.

In the photograph mentioned above, one can see ancient blocks in and among the rubble of what must have been the khan itself. However,

---

Wiseman’s conclusion that there was probably a fountain or other roadside structures of some significance here in antiquity is well founded. The spring cannot have moved, and the likelihood that a fountain adorned this spring in antiquity, perhaps with an accompanying shrine or sanctuary, is increased by the likelihood that some of the ancient blocks in the church of Ayios Nikolaos were reused in situ. Although Wiseman does not mention it, the church was probably built in part on ancient limestone foundations.115 Also, some of the blocks nearby are marble, and indeed at a farmhouse just 50 m to the north, there is a lovely Roman marble architrave. This may even be the architrave mentioned by Aldenhoven as being just south of the khan, since the owners of the farm apparently dragged the architrave to their driveway from nearby.116

It must be reiterated here that it is extremely difficult to prove that a particular road was in use at any given time. However, the Turkish bridge, the travelers’ descriptions of passing the acropolis of Kleonai on their right, and the location on their left of the khan of Kurtessa, their next stop, all indicate that the monopati discussed here represents the early modern road. The directness of the route, Strabo’s placement of Kleonai directly on the road, the evidence for a natural spring, and the probability that the church of Ayios Nikolaos is built in part of remains of an ancient roadside structure—along with the known tendency for ancient routes to remain in use into early modern times—combine to form a strong argument that this monopati was also the route of the Roman Corinth–Argos road as it passed Kleonai.117

Furthermore, it is difficult to find an argument against the idea that this monopati from the Turkish bridge to the khan of Kurtessa represents the route of the main road as it passed Kleonai throughout antiquity. The now-lost bridge in the Longopotamos pass indicates that this basic route was in use in the Hellenistic period; the account of Aratos’s surprise attack on Aristippus makes the best sense if the “Hellenistic” road continued straight toward Kleonai to pass between the hills of Kleonai and hill 228, Kakorema where it is shallower and can be forded. This could also explain why, when he continues to Nemea, he is the only traveler to describe leaving the ruins of Kleonai on his left (east). A portion of Gell’s route is visible and marked on Fig. 14, where the path can be seen branching to the west north of the bridge. Part of this route was recently paved and is used by residents of Kondostavlo to reach Spathovouni (see Fig. 11); elsewhere I have argued (Marchand 2002, p. 58, n. 83, and p. 82) that this was also an ancient route, but not one used to travel from Corinth to Argos; it was one of the roads branching off the Corinth–Argos road at Kleonai to head west to Nemea and Phliaus.

---

115. This could be confirmed only by excavation, but before the porch of Ayios Nikolaos was constructed, large blocks were visible in the lowest foundations of the structure.
116. Local residents (pers. comm.).
117. At first glance, Gell’s account of the road after passing Omer Tshaousy appears to contradict this interpretation and to support Rynum’s argument. After passing Omer Tshaousy, Gell continues (1810, p. 20): “At the distance of 2 hours from Corinth pass a mill, and continue in the plain in which are several villages, till at 2 hrs 35 minutes the road crosses a torrent, and in a few minutes after, arrives at the hill on which are the ruins of the city of Cleonea. The direct road to Argos turns off before this place to the left, in the plain, at 2 hrs 12 minutes, leaving the hill of Cleonea to the right, and a Kalbea or temporary village to the left.” The explanation of this passage (and other peculiarities of Gell’s account) is rather surprising: though many of the other travelers claim to follow Gell, he apparently took a slightly different route. He clearly states that he does not take the direct road to Argos, which should be associated with the monopati from the Turkish bridge as described here. Indeed, his comments about the direct road fit the monopati well. Instead, he apparently turns off the direct road before reaching the Turkish bridge, and indeed there is a path branching off of the early modern road and heading west north of the bridge, to cross the...
since advance along the road would thus be effectively hidden from the southern portion of the plain. The passage of Stesichoros quoted above (p. 109) indicates that the city of Kleonai was already on the Corinth–Argos road in the Archaic period, when Kleonai was a flourishing polis; the roadside cemetery at Kibouria suggests that the basic Longopotamos route was already in use in the Archaic period, and very similar sarcophagi have been found along the old monopati in question just before it passes below the walls of Kleonai and through the miniature pass between the hills of Kleonai and hill 228. This evidence, combined with the longevity of direct, easy routes through the Greek countryside, suggests that the monopati discussed here provides the best basis for the reconstruction of the ancient Corinth–Argos road in the vicinity of the city of Kleonai.

FROM KLEONAI TO ARGOS

The next marker of the probable route of the main ancient Corinth–Argos road beyond Ayios Nikolaos/Kurtessa is the hill of Ayia Triada (Fig. 11:17). On this small, round hill Bynum and Stroud found evidence of a possible rural shrine of the Classical period.118 There is no direct evidence for the ancient road at this point, but I would argue that it followed a route roughly similar to and possibly even west of that of the dirt path that continues southwest of Ayios Nikolaos.119 This path runs parallel to the low foothills of the eastern tip of the Drymoni ridge, crosses the Longopotamos tributary marked Ayia Triada rema on the ΓΥΣ map, and then turns west, north of the Ayia Triada hill. Here I imagine that the ancient road did not follow exactly any of the modern paths (many of which have been disrupted by the construction of the new Corinth–Tripolis freeway), but went more directly south, passing just north and west of the Ayia Triada hill, and passing between the narrow opening between it and the base of the Rachi Mantzorou hill to the west (Fig. 11:16).120

This route is the easiest and most direct from Ayios Nikolaos to the beginning of the Tretos/Dervenakia pass, and such a route would also have expedited the transport of blocks from the huge limestone quarry operations of Kleonai, which cover the entirety of the Drymoni ridge (the eastern edge of the rocky Mantzorou plateau that separates the Kleonai and Nemea

118. Bynum 1995, p. 65: “In addition to a large number of coarseware fragments, R. S. Stroud and I in October 1993 found a small piece of the foot of a ray-based Corinthian kotyle and several other fragments of fine black-glaze pottery of the Classical period. From the presence of the fine ware, and the type and size of vases in evidence, we can reasonably infer that there was some sort of shrine on top of Ag. Triada in the Classical period.” Pikoulas (1995, pp. 5, 274) was more hesitant in his identification of the site: he noted only a few black-glazed sherds and deemed the nature of the site uncertain.

119. Bynum (1995, pp. 64–65) argued that the road passed just east and south of the Ayia Triada hill, following the bed of the stream marked Ayios Sostis (Fig. 11). Her placement of the road here follows from her placement of the road further north in the streambeds of tributaries of the Longopotamos, she came up with a satisfactory route that led past Ayia Triada and its possible roadside shrine. I disagree with her reconstruction primarily because I place the beginning of this stretch of the ancient road at Ayios Nikolaos/Kurtessa, and therefore believe that the ancient road ran further to the west. The road may have eventually run east and south of Ayia Triada in the Ayios Sostis stream, as Bynum suggests, but in that case I would argue that it entered that streambed from the north (near Fig. 11:15).

120. Pikoulas (1995, pp. 57, 274, n. 74) also argued that the road ran north of Ayia Triada.
valleys and borders the Tretos on the north; Figs. 1, 11).\textsuperscript{121} Research for the current project has shown that the quarry operations covered an area of over a square kilometer, consisting of more than 200 individual quarry areas, most with preserved wheel ruts of associated access roads (Fig. 23).\textsuperscript{122} Many of these quarry roads run down from the spurs of Drymoni toward the plain, particularly along its low eastern and southeastern foothills, the areas that would be closest to the main Corinth–Argos road in this reconstruction (one major quarry road into which others funneled runs directly past the point labeled Fig. 11:14). The sheer quantity of stone removed from the quarries indicates that it may have been intended at least in part for export; it could have undergone initial preparation on site and then been sent directly toward Argos, Corinth, Nemea, Phlius, or Sikyon from the quarries.

\textsuperscript{121} In the late 1980s the Fourth Ephoria of Prehistoric and Classical Antiquities in Nauplion stopped construction on the new Corinth–Tripolis highway to conduct the rescue excavation of a 3,085 m\textsuperscript{2} area of ancient limestone quarries at the southern tip of the Drymoni ridge (modern toponym Patima); this area represents only a tiny fraction of the quarries on Drymoni, and only a brief mention of this excavation was ever published (Pachyianni-Kaloudi 1991). The remaining unexcavated quarries are documented in Marchand 2002, chap. 4.

\textsuperscript{122} Ninety-nine areas preserving wheel ruts of quarry access roads and over 250 of the individual rut segments are documented in Marchand 2002, chap. 4.
There is also some evidence that the route taken by the early travelers passed close to the eastern tip of Drymoni and the quarries then visible therein. William Mure, the Earl of Caldwell, makes it particularly clear that the Argos road passed close to the eastern tip of Drymoni:

About a half mile further on [from the khan of Kurtessa] there is a division of the road, at the extreme point of a low hill, which here juts forward toward the Khan from the great Nemea range, now rising in heavy dark masses in front of the traveller. The track to the right of this eminence leads direct to the ruins of the Nemea temple, that to the left is the high road to Argos, from which, however, there is also a branch to the plain of Nemea, a few miles further on.

—W. Mure

The “extreme point of a low hill” must be a reference to the easternmost tip of Drymoni, with its quarries and access roads (Fig. 11:14). Mure even describes it as jutting toward Ayios Nikolaos/Kurtessa (Fig. 17). What Mure calls the Nemea range must be the entirety of the Drymoni ridge and the Mantzoraita plateau separating the Kleonai and the ancient Nemea valleys. Mure does not mention the quarries cut into this hill, but other travelers do:

At 15 stades below the Khan of Kourtesa, one sees on the flank of the mountain the ancient quarries which served the inhabitants.

—M. E. Puillon Boblaye, 1835

At 15 stades further from the Khan there exist on the flank of the mountain the ancient quarries which served as habitations.

—F. Aldenhoven

Aldenhoven describes in greater detail the “quarries which served as habitations” when he is describing the route that he took from Nemea to Kleonai; his route took him along the northern side of Drymoni's eastern spur to reach Ayios Nikolaos/Kurtessa:

Leaving the route and going to the left at the foot of a mountain, there are ancient houses cut into the mass (of the mountain): some of them are covered by rubble, others have wooden roofs, today they are not all abandoned, in some one sees notches cut right into the rock to receive pieces of framework.

Indeed, at the eastern tip of Drymoni, where it extends into the plain and toward Kurtessa (Figs. 11:14, 17), there are quarries that have been clearly modified into what could have served as cave-like dwellings (Fig. 24). The possible quarry dwellings continue to the west, along the trajectory described by the travelers as heading for Nemea; many of these are still “modified” by the additions of poles, planks, and brickwork to serve as agricultural sheds and animal pens. The evidence of the early travelers indicates that the early modern road passed close to the eastern tip of Drymoni; the ancient quarry operations covering this ridge and the numerous quarry access roads that descend the ridge toward the route strongly suggest that the ancient road followed the same route.
Figure 24. Quarries on the eastern spur of Drymoni south of Kleonai. Two views of a quarry (top, center) modified into a cave dwelling; and an adjacent quarry (bottom) lacking only a roof to make a suitable shelter.
South of Drymoni, the modern dirt path crosses a torrent marked Ayia Triada rema on the ΓΥΣ 1:50,000 map. Residents of Ayios Vasilios told me that at this point there used to be a small early modern bridge (Fig. 11:15), which was removed when the road was widened (and now paved) because it did not seem sturdy enough to carry motor vehicles. From this point there is no evidence for the early modern road, but the location of the chapel of Ayia Triada to the west, on the southeastern side of Rachi Mantzorou (Fig. 11:16), may indicate that the road at one time ran in this direction, particularly if the architectural elements still located in the courtyard do belong to an earlier version of the church, as Pikoulas suggested.128

After passing between Rachi Mantzorou and the Ayia Triada hill, both the ancient and the early modern traveler were confronted with a choice of routes to Argos. Pausanias writes:

From Kleonai to Argos there are two roads, one is for active men and is shorter, but the other via the so-called Tretos, also narrow and going through mountains, is however more suited for wheeled traffic. In these mountains the cave of the lion is still pointed out, and the place Nemea is about 15 stades away.129

Pausanias’s route via Tretos is generally accepted as corresponding to a route via the Nemea/Dervenakia railroad station (Fig. 11:19) through the modern Tretos valley and thence south, through the narrowest part of the only natural low-elevation pass in the mountains that separate the Argolid from the plain of Kleonai (marked on the ΓΥΣ map as “ΣΕΣΕΝΑ ΑΡΠΒΕΝΑΚΩΝ,” between Chani Anesti [Fig. 11:21] and the villages of Papoutsika [Fig. 11:22]); Chani Anesti is the location of the khan of Dervenakia, another roadside Tourkokratia inn where some of the early travelers report spending the night. Pausanias does not explain what he means by Tretos: he could be referring to a town, a region, a mountain, or to the pass itself. Although it is clear that the earliest authors to mention Tretos, Hesiod and Diodorus, are referring to a mountain, Pausanias’s wording seems to indicate that he uses the term to refer to the entire pass or valley.130 This is clearly how Leake, the first to connect the area of modern Tretos and Dervenakia with Pausanias’s passage, interpreted it.131

Although the narrowest part of the pass is the north–south section that runs between the Agriolovouni and Panagorrrachi mountains near Papoutsika (Fig. 11:22), the pass actually begins just beyond and to the southwest of the church and hill of Ayia Triada (near the Nemea/Dervenakia railroad station, Fig. 11:19). Here the Kleonai valley proper ends and the Tretos valley opens up, running east–west beyond a narrow opening between Rachi Mantzorou to the north and Panagorrrachi to the south. This short, narrow opening is the highest point and the true beginning of the pass. Thus, when Pausanias says “from Kleonai to Argos there are two roads,” he means from the Kleonai valley, not from the city. He has just passed between Rachi Mantzorou and Ayia Triada (Fig. 11:16, 17), the point to which we have so far traced the ancient and early modern road, and has perhaps even seen the remains of the shrine on that hill, which may have been a border shrine of Kleonai not unlike that for Corinth at Patima mentioned above. Here he mentions the two roads, because this is the point at which the two routes diverge.
The main road, via Tretos, turns west and heads through the Tretos valley; the shortcut, or epitomes, route continues due south and follows a mountain pass between Panagourachi on the west and Trikorphion on the east, along the rema of Ayios Sostis.\(^{132}\) After passing the chapel of Ayios Sostis, this route follows a high, natural mountain pass. At the watershed are the remains of a watchtower first published by Lord and known locally from its circular shape as Anemomylos, or “windmill” (Fig. 11.20).\(^{131}\) Wiseman dated the ceramics he found around the tower to the 4th century B.C., but Louis Lord proposed that the foundations of the tower were Mycenaean.\(^{134}\) The route then continues south (past the area labeled Ντάρες on the ΓΥΣ 1:50,000 map), and descends to regain the main road to Argos beyond the narrowest part of the Tretos pass; thus, the road truly represents a shortcut for the main route. By keeping to the slopes of Mt. Trikorphion, one can also use this route to descend closer to Mycenae.

Thus, Pausanias’s comments about the two roads to Argos appear to refer specifically to the point at which the main road turns west to skirt the Rachis Mantzourou and to enter the east–west section of the Tretos valley; this is the point at which the two routes he mentions diverge, and this is the point at which one can recognize the true beginning of the Tretos pass, even though it is still some distance to the east of its narrowest portion. At

\(^{132}\) This route first appears to have been identified by Roux (he incorrectly describes it as via Ayios Vasilios, but the reference to the monument of Kolokotronis places his route at Ayios Sostis), and has been followed by virtually all scholars since: “The route over the mountains to Argos via Aghios Vasilios, east of Zygouries, going past a cypress tree defile and monument of Kolokotronis, corresponds to Pausanias’s δῆλον Ἀγίου Βασίλειου” (trans. from Roux 1958, p. 172). (Note that Ayios Vasilios is east of Zygouries, but the Ayios Sostis route is west of it.) It is worth observing that the brunt of the slaughter of the Turkish forces during the Greek War of Independence at Dervenakia occurred in the Ayios Sostis pass. I thank Y. Pikoulas for bringing the history of one of Kolokotronis’s officers, Photakos, to my attention. Particularly instructive is Gritzopoulos 1973, pp. 351–368: Kolokotronis cut off the main road via Tretos, arranging his men as if based on the west side of the pass, thus luring the Turks to attempt to circumvent their enemy and to gain their goal of Kurtesa by taking the more archons Ayios Sostis road to the east. The episode highlights the parallel between the early modern situation of Kurtesa in relationship to the two roads into the Argolid, and Pausanias’s description of Kleonai and the two Roman roads to Argos. It is impossible to determine the exact route taken by Pausanias solely on the basis of his account, but the situation that he describes in 2.15.2 accords with the area just south of the Ayia Triada hill. He then describes the two roads, and himself takes the Tretos. While describing this road, he says that “Nemea is approximately 15 stades away.” I believe that he means away from the Tretos road, not specifically from the cave of the Nemean lion, which he merely indicates is “somewhere in the hills” surrounding the route.

\(^{133}\) Lord 1939, pp. 80–81, 83; Wiseman 1978, pp. 115–116, figs. 157–159; Pikoulas 1995, p. 175, fig. 69. Pikoulas mentions a scatter of roof tiles and sherds 300 m south of the tower, which, in addition to the pottery fragments noted by Wiseman, may indicate that there was also a small settlement by the tower. Pikoulas 1995, pp. 55, 175, IIB; Bynum 1995, pp. 95–96. Gauvin (1992, pp. 136–138) includes this tower in her network of Kleonaiain watchtowers, but offers no supporting discussion.

\(^{134}\) Wiseman 1978, p. 116, n. 15: “There seems to be little reason to ac-
this juncture, where the road leaves the Kleonai valley proper to enter the Tretos valley, I would argue that the road also leaves Kleonai territory, as Pausanias’s comments imply. It is worth noting, then, that (1) the Tretos valley represents a large buffer area between Kleonai territory proper and Argive territory south of the narrow portion of the pass; (2) Argive territory is not directly visible from the southern edge of Kleonai territory along the main road; and (3) the narrow portion of the pass beginning south of Chani Anesti/khan of Dervenakia (Fig. 11:21) is much longer and narrower than the Longopotamos pass, which is only narrow immediately adjacent to the Kotroni hill. Thus, Kleonai was not only closer to Corinth than to Argos in terms of total miles, it also had easier access.

The remainder of the main Corinth–Argos road through the Tretos pass has been so thoroughly studied and discussed by both Pikoulas and Bynum that no detailed discussion is required here, except to note that Pikoulas specifically records wheel ruts preserved within the narrowest portion of the pass south of Chani Anesti, just east of the modern road and at a point where it makes a large curve to the south to enter the first center of the small village of Papoutseika (Fig. 11:22). The early travelers whose itineraries took them from Kleonai to Argos also continued along the route via Tretos. Many of them stopped at the khan of Dervenakia located at the modern roadside stop Chani Anesti (Fig. 11:21), and they themselves already noted stretches of wheel ruts from the ancient road near the narrowest portion of the pass. Thus, there is no question that the early modern route and the ancient route continue to coincide south of Kleonai territory.

135. The Tretos valley in antiquity was closely associated with the region of Nemea, as is the area today. Elsewhere I have argued (Marchand 2002, esp. pp. 175–176, 191, 221–236) that this valley was not part of Kleonai territory proper, but part of Nemea, which I attribute either directly to Argive territory, or to an area under the protection of both Kleonai and Argos, but belonging to neither.

136. Pikoulas 1995, pp. 56–58; he also illustrates some of the ruts in figs. 13 and 14, and records that more ruts were at one time preserved further south, along the eastern bank of the watercourse that carved the pass.

137. Among the most colorful accounts of the road via Tretos is that of Clarke (1818, p. 521; italics added): “As we entered this defile, we travelled by the side of a rivulet of very clear water, through woods which were once the haunts of the famous Nemean Lion. The only animals we saw were some very fine tortoises. We passed one or two huts inhabited by wild-looking fellows, who told us they were the guards of the pass. They offered us water, and we gave them a few paras. Near this place, we observed the remains of the old road alluded to by Pausanias in his account of this defile. The marks of the wheels were yet visible: the surface of the stone being furrowed into ruts, which must have been worn by the wheels of ancient carriages.” See also Vischer 1857, p. 286 (italics added): “This is the Tretos pass, the main connection between Corinth and the southern Peloponnes, a highway in antiquity [i.e., carriage road], in which are many places still recognizable in the bed-rock the known wheel-ruts. How a wagon could still come through, I can hardly understand, yet Ross relates in the king’s travels that the notorious Kalergis of King Ludwig von Bayern went through here from Argos to Corinth in a light carriage and this clever feat I have also managed to perform several times” Gell (1810, p. 27) also specifically mentions seeing wheel ruts of the ancient road in the Tretos, as does Clark (1858, pp. 64–65), though he expresses some curious and quite extraordinary doubts: “This is the road known by the name of Tretos, or the perforated, not, I conceive, because of the caverns in the neighbouring rocks, which are not more numerous hereabouts than elsewhere, but because the glen itself is, as it were, drilled through the rock. And drilled it has been by the stream which flows at the bottom. We saw, or fancied we saw, frequent wheel-marks in the rocks, and we know that this was the direction of a carriage road. But from my subsequent observations I learnt to distrust these marks. The ordinary mode of carrying wood in Greece is to tie the heavier ends of the poles on each side to the back of the horse or donkey, and suffer the other ends to trail along the ground, thus making two parallel ruts which in course of time may attain the depth and be mistaken for wheel-tracks. When a depression is once made, it becomes a channel for the winter rains, and so is smoothed and deepened.”
CONCLUSIONS: THE POLITICS OF ACCESS

The main goal of this article was to document the route of the direct Corinth–Argos road in antiquity, with a particular emphasis on presenting a new identification of its course through Kleonaiant territory, and to stress Kleonai’s topographical position vis-à-vis the road and the access it provided between Corinth and Argos. The route of the road from the Longopotamos pass in the northeast to the Tretos pass in the southwest is now clear. The most important landmarks of the road as it passes through Kleonaiant territory should be reemphasized: they consist of the base of the Kotroni hill; the Tourkokratia period bridge north of the ancient city; the old monopati heading from this bridge and through the small pass between the eastern hill of the city and hill 228, and thus just below extant remains of the city’s walls; the roadside structure under the church of Ayios Nikolaos and the location of the khan of Kurtessa; and the easternmost tip of the Drymoni ridge on which Kleonai’s quarries are located. In the course of tracing the route of this important road, the intervisibility of Corinth and Kleonai and the closeness and ease of access between the two cities via the Longopotamos road have become clear. It is of the greatest importance to recognize that the boundary between Corinth and its allies and Argos and its allies throughout the Classical period was located in the Longopotamos pass.

Some further conclusions can also be proffered, since it is possible to argue that the topographical relationship between these states and the road played an important role in shaping alliances in the wider region. Kleonai was located between Corinth and Argos, but Argos was further away, across the formidable barrier of the Psili Rachi mountains, and through the large buffer area of the Tretos pass and valley. By the Archaic period, although Kleonai was flourishing, it was landlocked and surrounded by powerful states looking to expand. We know that at least by the Early Classical period, Kleonai had entered into a close and long-lasting alliance with Argos. This alliance has usually been portrayed as an aggressive move by Argos forced onto a weak Kleonai. However, given the proximity of Corinth via the Longopotamos (and the view of its acropolis looming on Kleonai’s horizon), it is easy to see why Kleonai itself might have chosen alliance with Argos as a means of protecting itself against aggressive neighbors to the north. Indeed, although our sources for the early history of the states in the northeastern Peloponnese are scant, there are indications of aggression against Kleonai from both Sikyon and Corinth in the Archaic and Early Classical periods.\textsuperscript{138} The visible threat of Corinth to Kleonai would

\textsuperscript{138} Plutarch (\textit{Cim.} 17.1) implies Corinthian aggression against Kleonai at an unspecified time prior to Kimon’s expedition to Sparta in the 460s; Meyer (1939, p. 485) associated this report with the battle between Argos and Corinth attested by a bronze helmet dedicated at Olympia by the Argives for a victory over the Corinthians (\textit{SEG} IX 1203; scc \textit{RE} XI.1, 1921, col. 726, s.v. Kleonai [F. Bolte]). Adshead (1986, pp. 72–76) argued that the attack on Kleonai was followed by a period of Corinthian control of the Nemean Games, followed by the ejection of Corinth with the assistance of Argos. She dates to this period the change in the Isthmian crown to dry celery in imitation of the Nemean Games (Kallim. \textit{Art} fr. 265; Plut. \textit{Quart. conv.} 5.3). There are two references in Pindar scholia (\textit{Nem. Hyp. C} and D) to the Corinthians as presidents of the Nemean Games, but there is nothing to date the references; they are identical, and may simply be a mistake. Miller has found no evidence...
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have been a strong motivation for Kleonai to maintain its relationship with Argos throughout the 5th century.

Perlman has rightly pointed out the significance of geography in Kleonai's political motivations, and Kleonai also could have used its proximity to Corinth as a bargaining chip in its relationship with Argos; by threatening to switch its allegiance and go over to Corinth, Kleonai would have been able to keep its alliance with Argos on favorable terms. Likewise, its alliance with Kleonai provided Argos with a guardian for one of the major passages into the Argolid, the Tretos pass, and assured it of easy exit from its own mountain-ringed territory to the north. The foothold beyond the Argolid proper provided by Kleonai—one that allowed quick access to the southern borders of its neighbors while at the same time denying them similar access to its own borders—was surely a significant motivation for expansionist Argos to form the alliance. Thus, Kleonai's location on this major, easy route helps explain not only why the city needed a strong ally throughout the 5th century, but also how the city was able to use its position as leverage to allow it to maintain a unique relationship with Argos for most of its history.

The strategic possibilities of Kleonai's position along the Longopotamos road have also become apparent; we have seen that the city could function as a fort right on this main road, and the passages of Plutarch and Livy discussed in detail above point up the usefulness of Kleonai as a base of military operations in conflicts involving Argos, Sikyon, and Corinth. Since these passages relate to events in the Hellenistic period, when Kleonai was part of the Achaean League and thus in the hands of military leaders stationed either at Sikyon or Corinth, the accounts demonstrate exactly how Kleonai could have been used to good military advantage by its northern neighbors in earlier periods, had the city not been under Argive protection.

This point leads to an important observation: although the Corinth-Argos road via the Longopotamos was the most expedient route for traffic heading both south and west of the Isthmus, it was not used for many of the major military expeditions through the region in the Classical period,
precisely because of Kleonai's close association with Argos. The Corinth–Argos road provided more than just direct access between these two cities; once beyond the barrier of the Psili Rachi mountains, the traveler had a number of options. He could continue to Argos itself, passing Mycenae, and thence to Epidauros and Hermione, or he could proceed to Arkadia via Mantinea, or south past Tegea and on to Sparta; this road would have been the most direct route for the Spartans and their allies to take to the Isthmus when Argos and Kleonai were neutral.

There was also another western route that branched off the Corinth–Argos road at Kleonai and led first to Nemea and then to Phlius. From Phlius, one could head south, past Mantinea and Asea to Sparta, or continue west to Arkadia and Elis via Stymphalos and Orchomenos; Pausanias 2.15.1 (quoted above), which places Kleonai on the route of theoriai from Elis to the Isthmus, is only one of many references to the importance of access through Kleonai for east–west travel.\textsuperscript{141} These routes had the advantage of avoiding the Tretos pass, which was easily controlled by Argos, but it is crucial to remember that Kleonai was a close ally of Argos by at least the early 5th century B.C., and that crossing through Kleonaian territory was therefore essentially the same as crossing through Argive territory.\textsuperscript{142} Thus, two of the most expedient routes to the Isthmus from Sparta both funneled into the Corinth–Argos road in Kleonaian territory.

Kleonai was not just on one major interstate route, it was located at a major crossroads of travel through the northeastern Peloponnese, and any road leading through this crossroads in the Classical period was indirectly under Argive control. Argos and Sparta were long–time enemies, however, and whenever Argive territory was off limits to Sparta, so was Kleonaian territory. As Pritchett has pointed out, in order to avoid territory influenced by Argos entirely, one would have to turn north at Phlius and head for Sikyon.\textsuperscript{143} Pritchett and Lolos have shown that Sparta made much use of a longer route via Phlius to Sikyon, and from there along the coast to the Isthmus (for instance, for its annual invasions of Attica), precisely because the routes through Kleonaian territory were often not open to it due to

\textsuperscript{141} Pritchett 1969, p. 77: "in antiquity a major way from Corinth to Sparta ran through Nemea, Phlius, Asea, and Mantineian territory. Indeed, when I questioned two experienced Corinthian archaeologists, Professor O. Brunner and H. Robinson, as to how they would go to Sparta on foot, both replied that they would probably go by way of Asea."

\textsuperscript{142} Proussas (1995, pp. 75–91) has identified a large number of cart roads near the modern villages of Kandia and Platani, between Stymphalos and Orchomenos. He identifies the route between Stymphalos/Alea and Orchomenos (and via Galata to Phlius) as the northern of the four main axial routes leading east–west (in addition to three mentioned by Pausanias: the 

\textsuperscript{143} Pritchett 1989, p. 3.

probably already formed their alliance in the Archaic period (see Marchand 2002, chap. 3, and pp. 471–474); the alliance remained intact throughout the Classical period, and at least by the 4th century B.C., Kleonai was politically integrated into the Argive state (see n. 77, above). The major shift in this block came only after the induction of Kleonai into the Archaic League (see Marchand 2002, chap. 6).

There is physical evidence for roads on this east–west axis beginning at Kleonai from the Corinth–Argos road and heading toward Nemea, the subject of an article now in preparation.
political enmity.\textsuperscript{144} Phlious was an important ally of Sparta, as Xenophon
tells us in \textit{Hellenika} 7 (devoting the entire chapter to praising its loyalty),
and access to its territory allowed Sparta to avoid, in part, its enemies at
Argos and Kleonai.

The exact date of the formation of an association between Kleonai and
Argos and the circumstances of the founding of the Nemean Games are
subjects too large to examine in detail here, but elsewhere I have argued that
the alliance between these two states was already in place in the Archaic
period, and that the Games as a panhellenic institution represent both
Argos's proclamation of its foothold outside the Argolid and celebration of
its alliance with Kleonai, and a venue to rival Sparta's association with
the Olympic Games.\textsuperscript{145} It is therefore possible that the formation of an
alliance with Kleonai represents an aggressive move on the part of Argos
not only against its northern neighbors, but also against Sparta from the
outset, and that Sparta's formation of alliances with Phlious and Sikyon
was in part necessitated by Kleonai's close alliance with Argos. Even if
such an early alliance between Kleonai and Argos is not accepted, it should
be clear that control of land routes was a major consideration behind the
alliances formed in the northeastern Peloponnesian by the Classical period,
and that the Kleonai-Argos alliance required Sparta's continuous efforts to
maintain strong alliances with Kleonai's neighbors to the north and west.
Thus, Kleonai's location on the "axis of history" played an important role
in shaping and even dictating the political alliances of its neighbors.

\textsuperscript{144} Pritchett (1989, p. 3) notes that in wars with Argos, Sparta and
the Peloponnesian League used
Phlious rather than Nemea or Kleonai as a point of assembly. He draws
attention to a passage in Herodotos
that indicates both that the route via
Tretos was used by the allies before
the battle of Plataia, and that they
subsequently used an alternative route
when that route was blocked by the
Argives: "Before the five thousand
Spartans prior to the battle of Plataia
marched to Oresthasion and on to
the Isthmus (Herodotos 9.10–11),
the Argives had promised Mardonios
that they would stop the Spartans
from crossing their borders (9.12).

The Spartan route, therefore, was not
through the Argolid. The logical way
would seem to have been from Orest-
thesion to Orchomenos, over the Kan-
dila pass, to Phlius or Sicyon."

Lolos (1998, p. 145) has shown that
the Spartans made extensive use of this
alternate route through the Phliasian
plain and thence to Sikyon. He draws
attention to a passage in Pausanias
(4.11.8) referring to the aftermath of
the First Messenian war in ca. 735–
715 B.C., which indicates that there
were only two passes from the southern
Peloponnes to Corinth, one through
Argive and one through Sikyonian
territory: the first is via the Tretos pass,
and the second is via Phlious. By con-
tinuing to Sikyon, Sparta could also
avoid Argos's ally Kleonai. Lolos (1998,
p. 146) uses the events of the battle of
Nemea in the first year of the Corin-
thian war as an example: the Spartans
travel from Tegea and Mantinea to
Sikyon, while the Confederates (includ-
ing in this case Argos, Kleonai, and
Corinth) travel from Corinth to Nemea
to attempt to head them off. Thus, the
Spartans use a route through Phlious in
order to bypass the Tretos pass, Nemea,
and Kleonai, all under Argive influence
(one of the few times that Corinth was
allied with Argos).

\textsuperscript{145} Marchand 2002, pp. 164–165,
172–182.
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