INTRODUCTION. The Salento, a country in southern Italy, that the Greeks called Messapia, presented in pre-Roman period a complex system of settlements. The space occupied by each these settlements was circumscribed by walls constructed of blocks of local stone. For many of the thirty known Messapian centres, the walls are the only archeological remains visible above ground. Only some Messapian centres are mentioned in Greek or Roman literary sources, among these is Egnazia, which was the object of the hypothetical Archeological Superintendancy, and of data obtained through on-site observation. Before examining the documentary evidence that forms the basis of the 3D reconstruction, we will remind ourselves briefly that the northernmost stretch of the fortification still visible on site seems to be made up as follows. Starting from the outside of the city, there seems to have been a wide ditch A, then a first curtain of blocks B, then an infill C, then a second curtain wall D, and finally a rubble 'aggere' E held in place by two parallel walls F1 – F2 (Figs. 1, 2, 3). The outer curtain B is executed in double-headed isodomic format and is laid out on footings of cut rock sloping down towards the sea. In 1978 the Archeological Superintendancy conducted a stratigraphical excavation on a spot located some 37 metres from the northern edge of the Great Wall, a trial trench (A-78) drawing at right angles to the defensive structure. On the basis of excavations results, archaeologists have hypothesised two distinct phases of construction for the defensive structure. In the first phase, which can be placed in the IVth century BC, the fortification was simpler. It consisted of the ditch C, the curtain D, and the rubble 'aggere' E sustained by the two parallel walls (F1 – F2). In the second phase, to be dated above all, on account of the infill of earth and stone which would threaten its structural stability. Furthermore, in a more northerly stretch, these walls appear to reach a height of approximately 1.30 metres, thereby presenting an obstacle to anyone wishing to reach the top of the 'aggere'. These considerations have brought us to formulate the hypothesis that wall F1 was in fact the inner curtain of the rubble 'aggere' and not just a retaining wall. The elevation of the outer curtain should have consisted of at least two more courses for the battlements set immediately above the cornice. This suggested arrangement raises an important question with regard to the system of access to the sentry platform. In this regard, it is important to take into account the fact that the defensive structure, in its final stages, incorporated the previous fortifications which, according to the current interpretation, was simply made up of the external curtain with its ditch and the rubble 'aggere' supported at its two parallel walls. This interpretation poses considerable problems with regard to the functionality of the structure. The rubble 'aggere' should have had such a steep slope as to deny easy access to its top; if we consider that the outer curtain must have been higher than it is at the moment, the original angle of slope must have been even steeper. It is equally difficult to come up with an adequate interpretation of the roles of the two parallel walls (F1 – F2) all the more so as they appear to reach a height of approximately 1.30 metres, thereby presenting an obstacle to anyone wishing to reach the top of the 'aggere'. These considerations have brought us to formulate the hypothesis that wall F1 was in fact the inner curtain of the rubble 'aggere' and not just a retaining wall. The outer wall F2 would seem to be the underpinning for an access ramp to the top of the fortifications; in other words, the remains that we see today could have, in reality, been the support for the staircase or ramp. The fact that items D, E and F1 – F2 all date from the same period allows us to place this ramp in the context of the first phase of construction and therefore deduce that it must have been part of the first defensive system. This fortifications therefore consisted of - a ditch (C2) an outer curtain about 6 metres high including battlements (D), the rubble infill or 'emplekton' (E) serving as a sentry platform, an inner curtain (F1) and a ramp to the sentry platform (F2) (Fig. 3). Understood in this way, the entire structure in its final version appears to be made up of a system of 'terraces', where the first defensive structure, already equipped with access ramps, is used as a support system for the defences of the second phase, which are similar to those of the first phase with a similar function, more impressive (Fig. 3). These two terraces could have then been connected by a simple ladder (Fig. 4).