

Manolis Manoledakis*

Ancient sites on Righa's *Charta*. Some remarks based on the case of central Macedonia

Keywords: Rigas Velestinlis; Rigas *Charta*; Greek enlightenment; Eighteenth century cartography; Ancient sources; site placemnt.

Summary

Righas' *Charta*, a very important product of Modern Greek Enlightenment and cartography, follows the tradition of the western European "post-ptolemaic" maps, but with the innovative element of the deliberate projection – in many ways – of Greek antiquity. It would be very interesting to know if *Charta*, which contains a lot of ancient Greek sites, could possibly constitute an important aid for the researcher of ancient topography, for example in the identification of ancient cities whose positions remain until nowadays unknown. In this paper a short factual approach to this question is tried, based on the case of central Macedonia. For this particular area Righas followed strictly the map of G. Delisle, based mainly on Herodotus, Ptolemy and Strabo, but on other ancient sources as well. After the examination of the positions of the known sites of *Charta* and a comparison with the relevant archaeological data, it turns out that unfortunately Righas' map is not especially reliable for someone who would try to seek the areas of *Charta*'s unidentified sites on the actual map.

Introduction

Righas' *Charta* (1791-1797) is undoubtedly a unique of its kind product of Modern Greek Enlightenment (fig. 1). From a pure cartographic point of view *Charta* belongs to the so-called "post-ptolemaic" cartography, which is characterized inter alia by the addition in the maps of place-names that were not mentioned in Ptolemy's record. The ancient ones of these place-names were obviously derived from other ancient sources, but without ever being reported by which one.



Fig. 1. The title (cartouche) of Righas' *Charta*.

* Guest Lecturer of Archaeology, University of Thrace [manol@vivodinet.gr]

The important thing about *Charta* is that it presents an innovative element, absent from all Western European maps, and this is the emphasis on Greek antiquity (as well as on Byzantium), in some unprecedented in cartography ways: by the note of important events of antiquity or other information in the form of messages near the places with which these were connected (fig. 2), by the presence of names of Greek history's important persons on the margin of the map, as well as by the depiction of ancient Greek coins – always both obverse and reverse – in several places of the *Charta*¹. Finally, by Righas' habit of marking, where it is possible, the ancient name of a place together with its modern one (e.g. “Pydna Citron”).



Fig. 2. Notes written by Righas, referring to the historical events in Thermopylai (480 BC).

All these would legitimately make one conclude that Righas, having a stronger interest than the European cartographers in the projection of Greek antiquity, tried to be as precise as possible in the relative information and that consequently *Charta* could possibly constitute an important aid for the researcher of ancient topography, for example in the identification of ancient sites whose places remain until nowadays unknown. In the pages that follow we will try a short factual approach to this issue, which of course also concerns all the European maps with ancient place-names. For this special aim it is certainly impossible to examine the entire region depicted on *Charta* in the space given, but neither is it essential.

An indicative but at the same time also reliable conclusion could be also drawn from the examination of a concrete region. Here I have selected the region of central Macedonia (fig. 3), which occupies parts of two leaves of *Charta*. This region presents particular interest, as it includes enough ancient places known from the written sources (as compared with regions as e.g. the northern Balkans), from which however only few are today with certainty identified, as opposed to other regions, as for example Sterea Hellas or Peloponnesus. The region under review has been deliberately selected so that it includes hundred cities, in order to be easy to make some practical statistical observations.

¹ For the coins see above M. Pazarli, *A note on the coins represented on Righas Charta*.



Fig. 3. The part of *Charta* that is under examination (region of central Macedonia).

Quantitative observations

The first such observation that can be made concerns the cartographic source of Righas, which, for the particular region, must have been the map of G. Delisle, *Graecia Pars Septentrionalis*, 1700 (fig. 4). It is characteristic that from the 100 cities marked, 93 exist on Delisle's map too, while also the names of ancient regions (e.g. Mygdonia, Vottiaia, Amfaxis etc.) are marked in exactly the same areas on both of the maps. From the remaining seven cities of *Charta* that are absent from the map of Delisle only one is ancient (Olophyxos, in the SW Athos peninsula) and the rest of them modern (e.g. Koziani, Vladova², Provlakas etc.), or even unknown (e.g. Niagos and Ramba in Sithonia).



Fig. 4. The map of G. Delisle, *Graecia Pars Septentrionalis*, 1700.

Looking at Righas' hundred cities we also find out that only twenty of them existed in his times, mainly medieval or newer ones (e.g. Kozani), or even ancient ones, which continued existing up to then (e.g. Beroea), while all the others, namely eighty, are ancient cities, which had been de-

² They are actually Kozani and Vladovo, as they are marked by Righas.

stroyed up to Righas' years and much earlier (Apollonia, Dion, Aenea, Moryllos, Smila, Kampsa etc.). From these eighty cities only twenty, that is to say the 25%, are identified – with absolute or relative certainty – with archaeological sites (e.g. Dion, Olynthos, Aenea), while the place of the sixty cities (75%) remains unknown (Smila, Kampsa, Gigonos etc.). This means that the 60% of the cities marked on this particular region of the map are still unidentified.

Ancient sources used by Righas and the European cartographers

Before we examine the reliability of the placement of these sixty cities on the map, it is useful to seek the sources from which all the (eighty) ancient cities were derived by Righas (or Delisle, since 79 of them are also marked on the map of the French cartographer and almost always in the same points). Although one would expect that the majority of these cities were taken from the geographic record of Ptolemy, as the European maps of the 16th-18th centuries followed generally the tradition of the so-called “ptolemaic maps”, this is not confirmed. In Ptolemy's *Geography* we find less than the half of Righas' ancient cities (about 40%), indeed in Chalkidiki this percentage is impressively smaller (almost 20%).

More analytically, we notice that the basic, if not the exclusive source as far as the peninsulas of Chalkidiki and the western coastline of its northern part (ancient Crousis) is concerned, is Herodotus (fig. 5). The historian of the 5th century BC from Halicarnassus of Asia Minor, whom we owe a lot of historical and geographic information, in the seventh book of his *Histories* describes the route of the Persian army and fleet under Xerxes in 480 BC, from Hellespont to Attica, via southern Macedonia, Chalkidiki and Pieria.

Describing the route of the Persian fleet Herodotus mentions (7.22-23, 7.122-124) all the cities of Athos, Sithonia, Pallene (Kassandra) and the Thermaic gulf (up to the city of Ichnai) that are marked on the particular part of *Charta*, with the geographic order that we see. Of course, many of these cities are not mentioned only by Herodotus, but also by other ancient writers, as mainly by Strabo (*Geographica*) and Pseudo-Skylax (*Periplous*) and less by Thucydides (*Histories*) and Ptolemy (*Geography*). However, it is obvious that the cartographers whom Righas (and Delisle) copied followed the text of Herodotus, which includes all these cities and in clear geographic order too, something particularly useful for them, so that they did not need to search in other texts in order to find only few cities in each one, in various regions and without any important clue for their geographic relation to each other. This, of course, does not exclude the probability that they were also consulted other writers.

Contrary to the coastal regions of our map, in the inland ones the influence of Herodotus' text is minimal. Here dominate the geographers – always regarding the ancient cities. In the northern as well as in the western part of our 100-cities map, up to the region of Thessaloniki, the big majority of cities are derived from Ptolemy's record (fig. 5, 6). Indeed, some cities are to be found only in his text in all the known ancient Greek literature (such as Kyrros, Vairo, Ossa, Kalliterai etc.). The record of the geographer of the 2nd century AD seems to have constituted an important source also for the interior regions and the northeastern coasts of Chalkidiki. Finally, there is no doubt that for the region round Thessaloniki the cartographers were based, as we will see, on the text of Strabo (VII, fig. 20, 21 and 24) (fig. 5).



Fig. 5. The eastern half of our *Charta*'s part, showing the regions of Herodotus', Ptolemy's and Strabo's influence.



Fig. 6. The western half of our *Charta*'s part.

The works of these three writers constituted the main sources for the placement of ancient sites by Righas and the earlier European cartographers in the region of central Macedonia, which we examine. However, it is worth stressing that in the above-mentioned “herodotian” or “ptolemaic” regions sometimes appear individual ancient cities that are not mentioned in the works of the above writers, but in other texts of Greek or Latin literature. So we see, for example, the cities of Vormiskos (Vromiskos on *Charta*) and Aulon near Lake Volvi (fig. 7), which are reported by Thucydides (4.103), Spartolos (fig. 6), mentioned by Thucydides (2.79), but also by lexicogra-

phers of later antiquity³, as also Anthemous (fig. 7) (Harpocration, Stephanos Byzantios, Hesychios, *s.v. Spartolos, Anthemous*), the city of Volvi (fig. 7), that is reported by Aelius Herodianus (*De prosodia catholica* 3.1.107) and Stephanos Byzantios, the city of Cassera in northern Athos (fig. 7), that is known only from Pliny's text (*N.H.* 4.38), as well as Tauriana, Acerdus and Melis-sourgis (fig. 3), which are mentioned in the roman itineraries of the 4th century.



Fig. 7. The eastern half of our *Charta*'s part.

Regarding the names of ancient regions, which are marked with bigger, capital letters, a clear confidence in Herodotus is noticeable. Many regions are, of course, mentioned by Ptolemy as well, but the placement of most of them follows the text of Herodotus. Some regions are not reported by Ptolemy at all, as Crestonia, Vottiaia and Crousis, while the “Sileon Pedion” (fig. 7), which Righas places on the west of Lake Volvi (Syleus Field), is known only by Herodotus (7.115). The names of the remainder geographic points – mountains, lakes, rivers, capes etc. – seem to emanate from a composition of ancient and newer sources. As long as the route of Via Egnatia is concerned, it is obvious that Righas has copied it with absolute precision from the map of Delisle⁴. From this it results that European cartographers, whose tradition is also followed in *Charta*, were based, at least regarding the region of central Macedonia, mainly on Herodotus and Ptolemy, but more on the former. Apart from this, it turns up that European cartographers as well as Righas, with his own additions, did not content themselves only in one or two ancient texts for the creation of their maps, but studied the ancient Greek and Latin literature more extensively and drew place-names from various sources. It should be noticed here that, as far as the ancient cities is concerned, we are unable to know with certainty if Righas just copied Delisle or also studied himself the ancient sources or the modern gazetteers (which, of course, are also based on the ancient texts) and to what extent. The fact that 79 of his 80 ancient cities in central Macedonia come from Delisle could lead to the former possibility, but the case of Olophyxos, even a unique one, is capable of making one suspect that Righas may have worked more thoroughly and concerned

³ Even if not in the right place. Cf. relatively below.

⁴ Via Egnatia is clearly distinguished as a line connecting the cities that were situated on it and is called “Ἰγνατία Οδός” (fig. 7). The same on Delisle's map.

himself about not leaving out any site (with Olophyxos he includes all the cities mentioned by Herodotus and looking at Chalkidiki on *Charta* it is as if we read the historian's passages, especially *Hist.* 7.122-123). Besides, the frequent notes on historical events of antiquity written on *Charta* confirm Righas' real interest in ancient Greece and the addition of many modern place-names and monasteries shows that he intended to do much more than simply copying other maps. That is the reason for which the remarks made in this paper are referred directly to Righas, although most of them concern also other European maps.

How "reliable" are the placements of the sites on *Charta*?

The question that emerges now has to do with the reliability of the placement of the cities on *Charta*, so that we could hope for a help in the search of unidentified cities on the real map, for example after the process of a similarity transformation best fitting of the *Charta* onto the actual map⁵. A way to answer this question is to examine how exact are the known cities placed by Righas. The result of such an examination is not particularly encouraging. Even if most of these cities appear to be placed correctly, many of them are not. We notice that Righas, who often mentions the ancient name of a city with its new one, identifies, for example, Giannitsa with ancient Spartolos (fig. 6), although Spartolos (Thuc. 2.79) was situated in Chalkidiki (perhaps near Nea Syllata. See Hansen – Nielsen 2004: 843-844-P. Flensted-Jensen), while the older name of Giannitsa was Vardari. Also, Ouranoupolis (fig. 7) is marked in the southern instead of the northern Athos, Anthemous (fig. 7) to the north of Thessaloniki and not to its south, while even Naoussa (fig. 6) that existed in Righas' times, is marked to the south of Beroea, although, of course, it is situated to its north.

In any case, it should be said that Righas is not the only one responsible for all these errors. Some of them are exclusively his, but he inherited many others, as also Delisle, from the previous cartographers. For example, the city of Moryllos, which today is identified thanks to an inscription with the ancient site near Ano Apostoli in Kilkis (e.g. Hatzopoulos – Loukopoulou 1989), is placed on all the maps in Chalkidiki (fig. 7), because there results its place from the text and the coordinates of Ptolemy, the only writer referring to it. We have very probably to do with erroneous information that reached the geographer, because there would rather not have been existed two cities with this name.

These errors create intense scepticism as far as the reliability of the placements of all sites on *Charta* is concerned, a scepticism that is strengthened by the big disadvantage of all the maps of this era, namely that they belong to the period of cartography before the systematic drawing of coastlines (based on measurements), which thus are presented strongly disfigured. If we focus on the western coast of northern Chalkidiki, from Aenea to Potidea, we will notice an absolute resemblance between the map of Righas and that of Delisle (fig. 8-9), both in the coastline and in the placements of the seaside cities. This however does not mean that these cities have been placed according to a criterion other than the geographic order in that Herodotus (7.123) mentions them, which is indeed kept faithfully. Whether these cities were indeed situated at gulfs or capes, as shown on the maps, as well as the distances between them, these are elements that are not given by Herodotus⁶ or any other source and in those issues it is also the imagination of cartographers that had worked. These particular cities, apart from Aenea and Potidea, remain until nowadays unidentified (see more recently Hansen – Nielsen 2004, with ancient sources and modern bibliography).

⁵ For the methods of such transformations see Boutoura – Livieratos 2006: 60-70.

⁶ For the geographic data that result from the text of Herodotus cf. Müller 1987, with all the previous relative bibliography.



Fig. 8. The western coast of northern Chalkidiki on Charta.



Fig. 9. The western coast of northern Chalkidiki on Delisle's map.

The same applies to the cities in the inland regions as well. The city of Kissos in the region of Thessaloniki (fig. 7) constitutes a characteristic example. The only known written source that mentions this city is a fragment of Strabo, known to us from two Byzantine epitomes (Strabo VII, frg. 21-Epitome Vaticana and frg. 24-Epitome Edita). The geographer mentions that Cassander founded Thessaloniki (in 316/5 BC.) by taking population from twenty-six townships that existed in its region and reports the names of six of them. In the order mentioned by Strabo they are Apollonia, Chalastra, Therme, Gareskos, Aenea and Kissos. Apart from this he doesn't give any other information about the towns and their place. As far as Kissos is concerned, which has not been identified yet, its place should very probably be sought, based on the few existing data, on the NW slopes of Mount Kissos, which is now called Hortiatiss⁷.

This town did certainly not exist in the years of Righas (or the previous European cartographers). So what data did he have in order to place it on the particular point of his map, apart from the reasonable conjecture that it was situated near Thessaloniki? We saw that the coastal cities of northern Chalkidiki follow the precise order in which Herodotus mentions them. If the same stood also in the case of Kissos, then this town should have been placed (according to Strabo's order) to the south of Aenea, something that does not happen. Moreover, if Kissos was marked more southwards than Aenea, it would rather be a coastal town, and then Herodotus would have mentioned it, as he mentioned Aenea. Besides, the ancient name of Mount Hortiatiss (Kissos) was always known and the homonym town would very reasonably be situated on its slopes, but also near Thessaloniki (Strabo). These are already enough for the localisation of the wider region of Kissos by the cartographers, but of course not for its exact placement. If there also existed a more concrete tradition for the position of the town in the period of the Ottoman domination we do not know.

It was mentioned above that the main source of Righas for the region of Thessaloniki appears to be the text of Strabo. This is also proved by the fact that Therme and Thessaloniki are presented as the same city (fig. 7), according to the words of the geographer (according to the author of Epitome Edita): "Thessaloniki is a city that was formerly called Therme" (VII frg. 24)⁸. However, Pliny (*N.H.* 4.36) mentions Therme and Thessaloniki as two separate cities. About the issue of ancient Therme's place and its relation with Thessaloniki much has been written in the modern research (Tiverios 1995-2000: 314 ff., with bibliography), while all the located ancient settlements in the region of Thessaloniki remain unidentified. Probably ancient Therme was a city that was constituted by small separate settlements, which were situated near but not inside the limits of later Thessaloniki, as the archaeological data imply.

⁷ For the ancient town of Kissos and all the elements regarding it (name, mythology, placement, history), for which we have relative data from the sources or the archaeological research, see Manoledakis 2007, with all the relative sources and bibliography. For the discussion regarding its area cf. p. 43-64 (very probably between the modern settlements of Hortiatiss, Panorama and Therme).

⁸ Indeed on the map of Delisle it is marked "Therma postea Thessalonica".

The cases of discrepancy, either ostensible or real, between two or more ancient texts constitute useful chances to control the way in which Righas evaluates the sources and consecutively the way in which we can evaluate Righas' work. Two characteristic examples concern the place-names *Aegae* and *Apollonia*. Regarding *Aegae*, the first capital and later on royal necropolis of ancient Macedonia, for its identification with Edessa speaks the text of Justin (7.1.7 ff.), while its placement to the south of Beroea results mainly from Ptolemy (III.12.36). It is particularly interesting that Righas doesn't seem to see a disagreement of these two sources, but their mention of two separate homonym cities (fig. 6). Thus he marks Edessa with the double name "Aegaeas. Edessa", according to the text of Justin, but also "Aegae Sariggiol" to the south of Beroea, according to Ptolemy's coordinates (Manoledakis 2005: 483-494; Manoledakis – Livieratos 2006: 262-270, fig. 3). However, he considers that the royal necropolis of ancient Macedonia is the former, pointing out that "here the kings of the Macedonians were buried". As Ptolemy mentions only one city with this name, distinguishing it evidently from Edessa, it is interesting the fact that Righas appears to show the same confidence in Justin as in Ptolemy, if not more in the former. The information that the Macedonian kings were buried in the city of *Aegae* is derived from Pliny (*N.H.* 4.33), who however does not determine the precise position of the city. How likely it would be to have existed two cities with the same name we cannot know with certainty. However, the erroneous place of Naoussa, but also the second name of *Aegae* to its south (the only known place-name Sari Giol is the before 1928 name of Crestonis in Kilkis) do not provide for us the essential pledge in order to be based on the *Charta* for this issue. Besides, the archaeological data that we have today speak for the probability that the royal necropolis of *Aegae* was situated near modern Vergina, close to Ptolemy's place of the city.

As far as the name *Apollonia* is concerned, we notice that two cities with this name are marked. "Apollonia Mygdonia" to the NW of Thessaloniki (fig. 6) and "Apollonia Ierissos" in NE Chalkidiki (fig. 7). Although several opinions have been expressed up to now as for how many cities with this name existed in central Macedonia (all in Hatzopoulos 1994: 163-177), today only one Apollonia is archaeologically identified, to the south of Lake Volvi. To its NE a homonym station was founded in the roman period, on Via Egnatia, marked in the roman itineraries (more recently Adam-Veleni 2000: 273-290). However, both Strabo's reference to Apollonia (VII, frg. 21), one of the twenty six townships that were situated in Crousis or at Thermaic gulf, and the coordinates given by Ptolemy for "Apollonia of Mygdonia" (III.12.33) imply that there existed also a second Apollonia, to the NNW of Thessaloniki, which is the only one known in the sources as the "Mygdonian" one, even if the first was also situated in Mygdonia⁹. This Mygdonian Apollonia of the two ancient geographers is marked by almost all the European cartographers and Righas in the same region.

Things regarding Apollonia of Lake Volvi are less clear. And this because there are certain texts mentioning an Apollonia in Chalkidiki, but not in Volvi's region. In the "Lists of *cities that have changed their names* (A. Burckhardt (ed.), *Hieroclis Synecdemus*, Lipsiae 1893, Appendix I-III), of the 7th or 8th cent., we read of an Apollonia that was later called Ierissos, while an Apollonia in the region of Ierissos is also mentioned by Pliny (*N.H.* IV.37) (2nd cent.). According to an interesting, but pure hypothetical and sure unproved opinion, this is Apollonia of Volvi, whose Episcopal see was transferred to Ierissos (Papazoglou 1988: 221; Hatzopoulos 1994: 163), which is actually no other than ancient Akanthus. It should be noticed that these two texts, which draw information from earlier sources, are not from the most reliable and auxiliary ones in a topographic study and are more capable to create confusion. This confusion is also impressed on *Charta*, where Apollonia that is marked on Via Egnatia, namely that of Lake Volvi, is situated far to the south of the

⁹ For the region in which this Apollonia must have been situated, according to Ptolemy and Strabo, cf. shortly M. Manoledakis, *Απολλωνία Μυγδονίας, Εγνατία* 11 (2007).

lake, is near Akanthus (namely Ierissos), but not Akanthus and is named by Righas “Apollonia Ierissos”. In this way Righas may show that he knows both the two above-mentioned sources (the *Lists* and Pliny) and the roman itineraries and that he identifies their particular Apollonia with that of Volvi, but this results in a strong distortion of Egnatia’s course (exactly the same occurs on Delisle’s map), which actually passed directly to the south of the lake. An error that is avoided by other cartographers, as, for example, N. Sanson, *Graecia Antiqua*, 1636 (fig. 10), who correctly ignores both Pliny and the *Lists* of the renamed cities.



Fig. 10. The map of N. Sanson, *Graecia Antiqua*, 1636.

From these cases it results that Righas was not capable of evaluating the ancient sources, distinguishing which offered reliable information and which should be ignored, or investigating when two texts that mention two cities with the same name in different regions are referring to two different cities or eventually to the same one. Besides, the frequent coexistence of the older and the newer name of a city is not always correct, as shown by the examples of “Spartolos Giannitsa”, “Aegae Sariggiol” etc. Moreover, there are many errors in the spelling of names transferred from the European maps. Thus Augaia (Ptol. III.12.34), to the west of Olynthos, is written “Aggaia” (fig. 7), Piloros (Herod. 7.122), more to the east, “Palaros”, and Verga (Ptol. III.12.28) “Verta” (fig. 7); at the western coast of N Chalkidiki (fig. 7) the cities Gigonos, Lissai and Combrea (Herod. 7.123) are transported as “Gygaios, Lassai and Konivrea”, Neapolis in Pallene (Herod. 7.123) becomes “Medopolis”, Thyssos (Herod. 7.123) in Athos “Chryssos” (Gold), Karravia (Ptol. III.12.33) in the western part of the map (fig. 6) is written “Kanavia” etc. Indeed in some cases, through the transference from an ancient text to a map and then from one map to another, a completely different name comes up, which is of course non-existent in the sources. Thus, “Pyclata” in Pieria (fig. 6) should probably be Phylacae (Ptol. III.12.37), while “Moros”, more to the north, corresponds with “Morus” of Delisle (fig. 4) and “Alorus” of Sanson’s (fig. 10) and other cartographers’ maps (which is the right name, copied wrongly by Delisle, who was copied by

Righas). Delisle read wrongly the *Al* as *M* and Righas wrote the Greek ending *-oς*, which corresponds to the Latin ending *-us*. We have to do with a series of erroneous transferences, as also Alorus of Ptolemy (III.12.25) and Strabo (VII, frg. 20) is indeed situated more to NW.

Finally, it should be noticed that also the names of ancient regions don't lead to correct conclusions regarding the areas that they occupied. A characteristic example is Mygdonia, which is placed excessively westwards (fig. 6), while we know from the sources that it generally occupied the region round the lakes Koroneia and Volvi, from the Thermaic up to the Strymonic gulf (Hansen – Nielsen 2004: 810 - P. Flensted-Jensen).

However, among the interesting elements of *Charta*, which however does not concern ancient sites, is the appearance of newer names, that are absent from the European maps – as, for example, Lake Ostrovo (Vegoritis) and Vladovo (Agras) in its region (even with an erroneous relation to Edessa) (fig. 6), Paliouri in Pallene, Sykia in Sithonia (Loggos) or Provlakas at the gulf of Athos – as well as the monasteries of the Holy Mountain (fig. 7). Particularly interesting is the fact that in some cases we see names of cities that prevailed after 1928, especially in the wider region of Thessaloniki (fig. 6): Gallikos was called Salamanli before 1928; Gefyra was called Topsin and Phyliro Gialitzik. We would expect Righas to know the names existing before 1928, as happens e.g. with the name “Aivati”, which however is the older name of Lete and not of Sindos (which was called Tekeli). It seems therefore that in a lot of cases the names of cities that prevailed after 1928 simply came back, obviously after their replacement in the period of Ottoman domination.

Final remarks

After the observations made above, we can draw the conclusion that Righas' *Charta* does not constitute a reliable aid for the researcher of ancient Greek topography, at least as far as a region like this of central Macedonia is concerned, which is still in an important degree archaeologically unknown and not much investigated. It is consequently obvious, but also reasonable, that Righas and all the cartographers of ancient Greece did not have at their disposal more sources regarding the places of ancient sites than those that we know of today, neither of course written, but probably nor oral, and so there is no new or more concrete relative information that we could draw from *Charta*. What we should not ignore is the fact that these cartographers were the first who tried to assemble and transform the geographic information of the ancient literature into maps, and especially regarding Ptolemy, by using his coordinates, something in which the historical and archaeological research didn't appear to give particular gravity for a very big time interval, even if this would have been particularly useful to it, as sometimes is proved (for example, in the case of Aegae; cf. Manoledakis 2005).

Besides, we should point out that the main aim of Righas was not to create a historical atlas of ancient Greece and obviously he didn't even have the future archaeologist in mind. His target was other: the uprising of the enslaved Greek nation. Righas wasn't interested in locating the one or the other unidentified ancient place, but to show his compatriots that in such a region there was an ancient city with such a name and that the whole Greece was in antiquity full of important sites, where important events had happened. Righas believed that through historical education he could manage to wake the patriotic feeling of the non-educated Greeks, leading them to the fight for liberation. Judging from the result that followed only two decades after the publishing of *Charta*, Righas' efforts seem to have been particularly fruitful (fig. 11).



Fig. 11. Rigas sows the seed of freedom. Detail from the picture of P. Zografos – I. Makrygiannis, “The fall of Constantinople”, 1836.

References

- Adam-Veleni P. (2000). Απολλωνία η Μυγδονική, *AEMΘ* 14: 273-290.
- Boutoura Chr. – Livieratos E. (2006). Some fundamentals for the study of the geometry of early maps by comparative methods, *e-Perimtron* 1.1: 60-70 (www.e-perimtron.org)
- Hansen M.H. – Nielsen T.H. (eds.) (2004). *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, Oxford.
- Hatzopoulos M.B. (1994). «Apollonia Hellenis», in: I. Worthington (ed.), *Ventures into Greek History*, Oxford: 163-177.
- Hatzopoulos M.B. – Loukopoulou L.D. (1989). Moryllos. Cite de la Crestonie, *Μελετήματα* 7, Athens.
- Manoledakis M. (2005). Η θέση των Αιγών στη Γεωγραφία του Κλαύδιου Πτολεμαίου, *AEMΘ* 19: 483-494.
- Manoledakis M. (2007). *Από τον Κισσό στον Χορτιάτη*. Thessaloniki.
- Manoledakis M. – Livieratos L. (2006). On the digital placement of Aegae, the first capital of ancient Macedonia, according to Ptolemy’s *Geographia*, *Proceedings of the First International Workshop “Digital Approaches to Cartographic Heritage”*, Thessaloniki: 262-270 (also in *e-Perimtron* 2007).
- Müller D. (1987). *Topographischer Bildkommentar zu den Historien Herodots*, Tübingen.
- Papazoglou F. (1988). Les villes de Macedoine a l’epoque romaine, *BCH Suppl.* XVI.
- Tiverios M. (1995-2000). Έξι χρόνια πανεπιστημιακών ανασκαφών στο Καραμπουρνάκι Θεσσαλονίκης, *Εγνατία* 5: 314-321.