THUCYDIDES AND THE CHARACTER OF GREEK COLONISATION IN SICILY

INTRODUCTION

The nature of the Greek colonisation[1] of the Archaic period has been much debated for over a century.[2] During the twentieth century, the Greek colonisation movement was viewed for the most part as a state enterprise organised by the aristocratically governed city-states,[3] and the focus was mainly on whether cities founded colonies for commercial reasons – that is, in the search for new resources and markets[4] – or in the search for arable land.[5] The need for arable land created as the result of overpopulation has gained favour among modern scholars as the primary explanation for the colonising movement.[6] Other scholars see climate changes behind the

[1] The words 'colony' and 'colonisation', which derive from Roman vocabulary have rightly been considered as inappropriate to depict the Greek overseas settlements. It is worth mentioning that the same word (ἀποικία) is still used to describe 'colony' in modern Greek as in ancient Greek and a modern derivative of it (ἀποικισμός) to render the word 'colonisation'.

[2] Perhaps too much, according to F. De Angelis, *Megara Hyblaia and Selinous* (Oxford, 2003), 11, but not without reason in my opinion, since colonialism and colonisation are features of societies from antiquity until the present day.

[3] 'What is certain is that a Greek colony was never a motley gathering of adventurers, grouping themselves together under no definite leadership. It was essentially a state enterprise organized for the public good and placed under the leadership of a competent oikistes' (A. Gwynn, 'The character of Greek colonization', *JHS* 38 [1918], 88–123, at 100).

[4] The commercial reasons were mainly promoted by A. Blakeway, 'Prolegomena to the study of Greek commerce with Italy, Sicily and France in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.', *BSA* 33 (1933), 170–208, with his famous expression 'the flag followed trade' (202), and was followed by others scholars, predominantly J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas* (London, 1999⁴). For a fuller bibliography of the scholars who supported the opinion that trade was the main reason behind overseas settlements, see F. Bernstein, *Konflikt und Migration* (Mainz, 2004), 17, n. 17.

[5] The need for land as the main impetus for the colonial enterprises was most famously expressed by Gwynn (n. 3), esp. 90, 92–3, 121–2, and before him by K.J. Beloch, *Griechische Geschichte, Band I: Die Zeit vor den Persekriegen* (Strassburg, 1913²), 229–30.

[6] The idea that Greece faced an enormous population augmentation during the eighth century was put forward by A. Snodgrass, *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment* (London, 1980), 19 ff., 23, who based his argumentation on the increase in the number of burials in Attica and Argos. Snodgrass' estimates are now considered too high. It is worth mentioning that, in a later paper, A. Snodgrass, 'The nature and standings of the early western colonies', in G. R. Tsetskhladze and F. De Angelis (edd.), *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation: Essays Dedicated to Sir John Boardman* (Oxford, 1994) 1–10, at 2, he added that the 'the injustices, perceived or real, personal or collective, in the distribution of land and the access to power' contributed to colonisation movements. For the demographic expansion of Greece, see W. Scheidel, 'The Greek demographic expansion: models and comparisons', *JHS* 123 (2003), 120–40. For a fuller bibliography on overpopulation/need for arable land as the primary motiva-

colonisation movement,[7] while others see political motives.[8] Finally, there has been much discussion about the relation between colony and mother city and the degree of dependence of the latter on the former.[9] A recent article by R. Osborne has shifted the debate.[10] Considering mainly colonial activity in the West, Osborne challenged the traditional model of Greek colonisation as a state-guided enterprise. He considered it, on the contrary, as merely a process, and not an instant event, better described as the private ventures of individuals or dissatisfied groups.[11] Moreover, he rejected later sources referring to the colonisation process as anachronistic and very much echoing the realities of their own era. His view has gained support by scholars,[12] but his total rejection of sources as related to colonisation[13] has met

tion for archaic colonisation, see Bernstein (n. 4), 18, n. 21. See also C.G. Starr, *The Economic and Social Growth of Early Greece, 800–500 B.C.* (New York and Oxford, 1977), 62, n. 63; S. Calderone, 'Problemi storici relativi alle "apoikiai" siceliote in età protoarcaica', in L. Rizza (ed.), *Insediamenti coloniali greci in Sicilia nell VIII e VII secolo a.C.* (Catania, 1978), 11–20, at 16, neither of whom are not mentioned by Bernstein. On overpopulation, seel also F. De Angelis, 'The foundation of Selinous: overpopulation or opportunities?', in Tsetskhladze and De Angelis (this note), 87–110, at 106, n. 1. The overpopulation theory has been much criticised: see e.g. G.R. Tsetskhladze, 'Revisiting ancient Greek colonization', in G.R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas* (Boston, MA, and Leiden, 2006), xxiii–lxxxiii, at xxviii–xxx; J.M. Hall, *A History of the Archaic Greek World* (Oxford, 2007), 115.

   [7] J.McK. Camp II, 'A drought in the late eighth century B.C.', *Hesperia* 48 (1979), 397–411, esp. at 405–11; G.L. Cawkwell, 'Early colonisation', *CQ* 86 n.s. 42 (1993), 289–303.

   [8] Bernstein (n. 4); B. D'Agostino, 'The first Greeks in Italy', in Tsetskhladze (n. 6), 201–37, at 218–19.

   [9] J. Seibert, *Metropolis und Apoikie: Historische Beiträge zur Geschichte ihrer gegenseitigen Beziehungen* (Würzburg, 1963); A.J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece* (Chicago, IL, 1983²); R. Werner, 'Probleme der Rechtsbeziehungen zwischen Metropolis und Apoikie', *Chiron* 1 (1971), 19–73. For additional bibliography, see Bernstein (n. 4), 15, n. 13. Scholars universally agree now that colonies were independent communities.

   [10] R. Osborne, 'Early Greek colonization? The nature of Greek settlements in the West', in N. Fisher and H. van Wees (edd.), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence* (London, 1998), 251–70.

   [11] Other scholars have also expressed doubts about the absolute state sponsorship of colonisation. P. Giraud, *La propriété foncière en Grèce jusqu'à la conquète Romaine* (Paris, 1890), 86–6 clearly referred to private ventures (however, he relates the Greek colonisation of Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands to the colonisation of the 8th century). Osborne himself mentions Graham (n. 9), 7–8 (but Graham, when referring to private enterprise, mentions the expedition of Dorieus, the private character of whose project is crystal clear, and not the colonisation of the eighth and early seventh centuries). See also J.L. Lamboley, *Les grecs d'occident: la période archaïque* (Paris, 1996), 64, 'la puissance politique ne doit pas être considérée comme une cité grecque (polis) mais comme une communauté de Grecs pouvant provenir d'horizons différents'.

   [12] On the character of the colonisation as merely a process and not an event, see S. Owen, 'Analogy, archaeology and Archaic Greek colonization', in H. Hurst and S. Owen (edd.), *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity and Difference* (London, 2005), 5–22, at 6–8; A. Snodgrass, 'Lesser breeds: the history of a false analogy', in Hurst and Owen, 45–58, at 48–9; C.M. Antonaccio, 'The western Mediterranean', in K.A. Raaflaub and H. Van Wees (edd.), *A Companion to Archaic Greece* (London, 2009), 314–29, at 321; P.W. Rose 'Class', in Raaflaub and Van Wees, 468–82, at 473, but none of these authors are so critical towards the sources. On the other hand, J.P. Wilson, 'Ideologies of Greek colonization', in G. Bradley and J.P. Wilson (edd.), *Greek and Roman Colonization: Origins, Ideologies and Interactions* (Swansea, 2006), 25–57; Hall (n. 6), 110–17, 172; idem, 'Foundation stories', in G.R. Tsetskhladze (ed.), *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, vol. 2 (Boston, MA, and Leiden, 2008), 383–426, also support Osborne's view regarding the poor reliability of the sources.

   [13] Osborne (n. 10), 269, at the very end of his article says that 'a proper understanding of archaic history can only come when chapters on Colonization are eradicated from books on early Greece'.

strong criticism.[14] In addition, Osborne's article has detached the core of the debate from the motives for the colonial enterprises (agrarian, overpopulation, commercial, political), turning it instead to the character, namely state-sponsored or the result of private initiatives.[15]

   This investigation will focus on the Greek colonisation of Sicily as described by Thucydides. First, I will argue that the vague manner in which Thucydides describes (in Book 6, chapters 3–5) the foundation of the first-generation colonies indicates 'private' colonisation, while his description of the second-generation colonies points mainly to state-guided character. The close reading of Thucydides 6.3–5 will be supplemented with other literary and archaeological evidence, as well as comparison with Thucydides' other descriptions of colonising actions.

   At this point I should make clear that the use of the word 'state' in the expression 'state-guided' is arbitrarily used to imply that the foundation of a colony or the launching of a colonising undertaking is the result of the decision and organisation of the authorities of a specific political entity, namely a certain *polis*.[16] Private colonisation refers to colonies or enterprises in which such authorities are not dominant. I do not intend to enter the debate as to whether the ancient Greek cities were states or stateless communities, and when they might have managed to become states. As far as this subject is concerned, I will assume that the Greek cities, even if considered to be stateless communities, had many of the characteristics of the state as we conceive it.[17]

---

[14] For example, I. Malkin, 'Exploring the validity of the concept of "foundation": a visit to Megara Hyblaia', in V.B. Gorman and E.W. Robinson (edd.), *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies, and Military Power in the Ancient World. Offered in Honor of A.J. Graham* (Leiden, 2002), 195–224; A. Mele, 'La colonizzazione greca arcaica: modi e forme', in *Passato e futuro dei convegni di Taranto: Atti del convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia* (Taranto, 2006), 39–60.

[15] C.M. Antonaccio, 'Colonization: Greece on the move, 900–480', in H.A. Shapiro (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Archaic Greece* (Cambridge, 2007), 201–24, at 201, puts it in a more sophisticated manner, borrowing a vocabulary that derives from later historical experiences: 'Colonization, on the one hand, is viewed as a kind of protocapitalist enterprise of self-starting, pioneering risk-takers and entrepreneurs as well as the castoffs of society (and an individual affair). Alternatively, colonization is seen as a protoimperialist movement that established Hellenism in foreign territory, secured trade for the mother city, and inscribed the *polis* by means of the spatial allocations of city and country that some of the earliest colonies created.' It is indeed true that many opinions concerning Greek colonisation are inspired by later periods, modern conceptions and the political and social environment of the writers: see M. Dietler, 1995, 'The cup of Gyptis: rethinking the colonial encounter in early-Iron-Age western Europe and the relevance of word system models', *JEurArch* 3.2 (1995), 89–111; F. De Angelis, 'Ancient past, imperial present: the British empire in T.J. Dunbabin's *The Western Greeks*', *Antiquity* 72 (1998), 539–49; Malkin (n. 14), 204–5; G. Sheperd, 'The advance of the Greek', in Hurst and Owen (n. 12), 23–44; Snodgrass (n. 12); also Owen (n. 12), 6 for some additional bibliography and 10–12. Undoubtedly there must be similarities between different colonial enterprises in time and place, but, as C.L. Lyons and J.K. Papadopoulos, 'Archaeology and colonialism', in C.L. Lyons and J.K. Papadopoulos (edd.), *The Archaeology of Colonialism* (Los Angeles, CA, 2002), 1–23, at 9–11, remark, 'Any such model [of colonisation] is bound to carry the cultural baggage of its own time. As it soon becomes clear, no single theoretical position can encompass the multiple instances of historical colonization and the practices that shaped them. The founding of colonies is a world phenomenon that is out locally. It is grounded on attitudes and accidents as much as institutional policies'.

[16] For the relation between colonisation and the rise of the *polis*, see below pp. 488–90.

[17] For this subject, see A. Snodgrass, 'Archaeology and the study of the Greek city', in J. Rich and A. Wallace-Hadrill (edd.), *City and Country in the Ancient World* (New York, 1991), 1–23, at 4, n. 1; K.A. Raaflaub, 'Homer to Solon: the rise of the polis', in H. Hansen (ed.), *The*

THUCYDIDES' CREDIBILITY

First I will examine to what extent Thucydides is a reliable source for the events that he describes and for the chronology he gives, particularly when he is writing of events that occurred three hundred years before. Nowadays there seems to be a general agreement among scholars that the source for Thucydides' description of the foundation of the Greek colonies of Sicily, as also for his other references to Sicilian history in Books 3 and 4, derives from Antiochus of Syracuse.[18] So we should keep in mind that the way that Thucydides describes the foundation of the Sicilian colonies quite probably follows Antiochus.

As for the chronological issue regarding the foundation of the Sicilian colonies, some scholars have argued that Thucydides/Antiochus determined his chronologies by counting generations.[19] This view was revived more recently[20] by R. van Compernolle, who proposed (based on the major events of the leading Sicilian families in the early fifth century) that Antiochus used a system of counting generations of 35 years.[21] A similar system, again developed by Antiochus, but even more complicated, was proposed by Miller some years later (based on 36-year generations, fractions of generations and more initial starting points to count back than van Compernolle used).[22] In general, these views have not gained favour,[23] and

---

ancient Greek City-state (Copenhagen, 1993), 41–105, at 87, n. 2, for previous bibliography; and more recently M. Berent, 'The stateless polis: towards a re-evaluation of Greek political community' (Diss., University of Cambridge, 1994); idem, 'In search of the Greek state: a rejoinder to M.H. Hansen', *Polis* 21 (2004), 107–46; P. Cartledge, 'The peculiar position of Sparta in the development of the Greek city-state', in idem, *Spartan Reflections* (London, 2001), 21–38, at 21; M.H. Hansen, 'Was the polis a state or a stateless society?', in T.H. Nielsen (ed.), *Even More Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (Stuttgart, 2002), 9–47.

[18] This thesis goes back to B.G. Niebuhr, *Römische Geschichte* (Berlin, 1811), 27, 41, 131, and E. Wölfflin, *Antiochos von Syracus und Coelius Antipater* (Winterthur, 1876), 1–21. K.J. Dover, in *HCT* 4.195 ff., 216, argued persuasively in favour of this view. For a full bibliography of earlier discussion, see R. van Compernolle, *Étude de chronologie et d'historiographie siciliote* (Brussels, 1960), 461–7, esp. 465–6; also R. Sammartano, *Origines Gentium Siciliae, Elanico, Antioco, Tucidide* (Roma, 1998), 212–16; S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides, Volume III: Books 5.25–8.109* (Oxford, 2008), 272–4. For Antiochus and his work see L. Pearson, *The Greek Historians of the West: Timaeus and His Predecessors* (Atlanta, GA, 1987), 11–18; N. Luraghi, 'Antioco di Siracusa', in *Storici greci d'occidente, a cura di R. Vattuone* (Bologna, 2002), 55–89; C. Cuscunà, *I framenti di Antioco di Siracusa* (Alessandria, 2003), 2–21; also Sammartano (this note), 129 ff.

[19] S. Bianchetti, *Falaride e Pseudofalaride: Storia e legenda* (Rome, 1987), 8, n. 3, with previous bibliography for the pre-1960 scholarship.

[20] T.J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks* (Oxford, 1948), 435–71, had argued at length in favour of Thucydides' credibility for the dates of the Sicilian colonies foundations and against the view that Thucydides was counting based on generations.

[21] Van Compernolle (n. 18), esp. 261 ff.

[22] M. Miller, *The Sicilian Colony Dates* (Albany, NY, 1970), esp. 77–85.

[23] See initially the very interesting remarks of Dover (n. 18), 204–5, who rightly questions van Compernolle's view and chronological system (the most striking problem is the chronological relation of Gelon's Olympic victory in 488/487 as a ruler of Gela with the chronology of the foundation of Syracuse and Selinus' foundation based on the chronology of Syracuse's foundation). See also L. Pearson, 'review of van Compernolle, R. (1960), *Étude de chronologie et d'historiographie siciliote*, Bruxelles', *Gnomon* 84 (1962), 579–83; A.J. Graham, 'The expansion of the Greek world, eighth to sixth centuries B.C.', in N.G.L. Hammond and J. Boardman (edd.), *CAH*2, vol. III.3 (Cambridge, 1982), 83–162, at 89–90. Similar remarks could be made about Miller's calculations (for example, the dating of Syracuse's foundation from the destruction of Megara). Other scholars favour a chronology based on the generations view, e.g. Hall

most scholars still accept Thucydides' dates, even if he seems to be contradicted by Eusebius or pottery.[24]

The most important issue is what the basis of Antiochus' excursus on the foundation of the Greek colonies was.[25] The first possibility is that his narrative is entirely contrived, without the use of any evidence. He may have relied instead on contemporary oral traditions, traditions that would have reflected the specific cultural and political environment (mainly Osborne's opinion). If this was his source, his testimony is unreliable. The oral tradition might also date from the foundations, augmented in the intervening years but basically preserved. In that case it would be very difficult to distinguish older stories, closer to the actual facts and probably more reliable, from newer stories. Antiochus may also have relied on previous writers who had described these events. These sources would probably have been poetic rather than historical. This is Mele's view.[26] Poetic sources would have been close to real events, even if they were coloured by prejudices. He may also have relied on local chronicles.[27] Finally it is possible that the Greek colonies kept full official archives of major events in the city's history or lists of annual magistracies and priests, as Dunbabin and others claim,[28] where Antiochus could easily look up information. If this was the case he must be considered very reliable.

Fortunately, despite the fact that we possess only a few fragments of Antiochus' work, in one of them the Syracusan historian gives us some indication of how he composed his work. This fragment, which seems to be the introductory sentence of his work concerning Italy,[29] comes from Dionysius of Halicarnassus[30] and says the following: Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίας, ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα.[31] The ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων could be

---

(n. 12), 411, though he himself admits that the mathematical procedure for such calculations cannot be recovered.

[24] For example Graham (n. 23), 91, 103–9; also N. Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery: A Survey of Ten Local Styles and Their Chronology* (London, 2008²), 322–7; idem, *Geometric Greece* (London and New York, 2003²), 233–7; D.A. Amyx, *Corinthian Vase-painting of the Archaic Period* (Berkeley, CA, 1988), 430; Boardman (n. 4), 161 and subsequently 165–85 (wherever there is reference to the Sicilian cities); I. Morris 'The absolute chronology of the Greek colonies in Sicily', *AArch* 67 (1996), 51–9; T. Fischer-Hansen, T. H. Nielsen and C. Ampolo 'Sikelia', in M.H Hansen and T.H. Nielsen (edd.), *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis* (Oxford, 2004), 172–248, at 173–4; A.J. Nijboer, 'The Iron Age Mediterranean: a chronology mess or "trade before the flag", part II', *Ancient West and East* 4 (2005), 255–77, at 259–61, the latter by connection with the Phoenician colonisation.

[25] For the chronology of the Sicilian colonies, Graham (n. 23), 90, considers it the product of Thucydides' own research.

[26] Mele (n. 14).

[27] Murray, forthcoming article cited by Hornblower (n. 18), 273.

[28] Dunbabin (n. 20), 450–1; G. De Sanctis, *Ricerche sulla storiografia siceliota: Sikelika I* (Palermo 1957), 13; also Murray (n. 27).

[29] Something like a programmatic announcement or statement, as Cuscunà (n. 18), 7, rightly remarks.

[30] Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.12.3 = *FGrH* 555 F2. Most scholars accept that Dionysius was aware of Antiochus' work without the mediation of other authors: see the bibliography in Sammartano (n. 18), 130, n. 3.

[31] Cuscunà (n. 18), 7, nn. 44–5, relates the first adjective (πιστός) to Herodotus' phraseology, and the second (σαφής) to Thucydides'. He presents (8–9) Antiochus' method of writing history as something intermediate between Herodotus and Hellanicus on the one hand and Thucydides on the other. He concludes that Antiochus' attempt to find the πιστότατα caught the interest of Thucydides. Additionally, Pearson (n. 18), 11–12, compares Antiochus with Hecataeus, who presented λόγοι ὥς μοι δοκεῖ ἀληθέα εἶναι.

interpreted in two ways. It could refer either to the oral tradition or, as Meister mentions (citing Jacoby), 'shift through oral accounts selecting those to be recorded *in writing* by applying the criterion of credibility'.[32] Besides that, we must also remark that, immediately after πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα, the passage continues: Τὴν γῆν ταύτην, ἥτις νῦν Ἰταλία καλεῖται, τὸ παλαιὸν εἶχον Οἰνωτροί, which means that ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα could have applied to the events concerning the history of Italy before the foundation of the colonies,[33] that this may not have been the only method for his work, and that some other method or sources could have been used for the description of the foundation of the Greek colonies.[34] After all, Thucydides neither used the same method nor the same kind of sources to describe, for example, the migration of the Greek tribes after the fall of Troy or the fall of the Peisistratids, the First Peloponnesian War, and the capture of the Spartans at Spachteria. To conclude, this phrase describing Antiochus' method of composing his work could be interpreted as follows: a) he based his writing on oral tradition, b) he used written material, c) his writing on the history of Italy before the arrival of the Greeks was based on oral tradition.

Bearing all this in mind, I will try to respond to the possibilities regarding sources mentioned above. The first must be excluded. If Antiochus was depicting a fully fictional narration for the foundation of the Greek colonies this would have been easily detected by Thucydides, who would not have used such material.[35] Moreover, his aforementioned programmatic phrase shows that he did not intend to write fairy tales. The possibility of using full records and archives, where some very important events, such as foundational dates, were inscribed, cannot be totally excluded. Such a place, where some kind of date archive could have been kept, might be the altar of Apollo Archegetes, where the religious envoys from mainland Greece made sacrifices when they first arrived in Sicily.[36] However, this possibility seems unlikely, since, as Dover notes 'the hypothesis that the colonies maintained from the beginning lists of annual magistrates or priests is very anachronistic in attributing to the 8th and 7th century a historical curiosity which even in the 5th century was only imperfectly developed'.[37]

Oral traditions would be the best possibility, if the Greeks did not use writing at that point, in which case the ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων would refer to those oral

---

[32] K. Meister, in Brill's *Der Neue Pauly*, 1.498.

[33] Luraghi (n. 18), 72, analysing the same phrase, mentions that Antiochus used Herodotus' and probably also Hecataeus' habit of retaining the wording of the locals as a source for things that had occurred in their land in very ancient times, before the foundation of the Greek colonies. This view largely coincides with ours, namely that the passage could indicate that the method used was applicable mainly for the history of people of the region before the arrival of the Greeks.

[34] A completely different approach to this passage is provided by F. Cantarelli, 'Latinion o Lametinion in Arist. Fr. 700 ed. Gigon (apud Dionys. Hal., A.R., I 72, 3–4)? Nuove proposte storiografiche', in G. De Sensi Stestito (ed.), *Tra l'Amato e il Savuto II: Studi sul Lametino antico e tardo-antico* (Soveria Mannelli, 2001), 17–84, at 38, n. 56. She considers the whole passage as part of an epitome of Antiochus περί Ἰταλίης. She considers the Ἀντίοχος Ξενοφάνεος τάδε συνέγραψε περὶ Ἰταλίας to be the title of the epitome, with the ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα as the subtitle and the rest of the passage as the beginning of the epitome.

[35] At least this is implied in Thuc. 1.21.1.

[36] Thuc. 6.3.1. This was suggested to me by P. Cartledge and O. Murray.

[37] Dover (n. 18), 203.

traditions. But the Greeks did know how to write.[38] Thus we should suspect the existence of written material that described the foundations of the Greek colonies. In that case, Antiochus' phrase, ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα, is easily applicable, as Jacoby and Meister think, to written material. Since we have references in the poetry of mainland Greece to the colonisation, we must consider it as highly possible, as Mele points out, that similar references also existed in the West.[39] For the case of Syracuse, he proposed the poet Eumelus, a contemporary to the founder, Archias, as the ultimate source for Syracuse's foundation. This is a very fair and reasonable assumption.[40] Similarly, works now lost to us must have existed for the other Sicilian colonies, from which Callimachus also drew for his work. Besides that, Thucydides – although he criticises the reliability of the events described in the work of poets and *logografoi*[41] – also used poetic material.[42] Moreover, we must keep in mind that Thucydides describes events much older than the foundation of the Greek colonies in the West, which are closer to myth than history, older than the introduction of the alphabet, while Antiochus deals with proper historical events as the foundation of the Greek colonies. And of course it is more probable that the kind of poetry that deals with such events would provide more facts than the poetry that deals with Minos, Pelopas, Heracles, Agamemnon and Troy, to which Thucydides refers.

Furthermore, as Pearson mentions, some prominent Sicilian families could offer important evidence of family history and genealogical details that might go back as far as the foundation of the colonies.[43] Finally, we must not exclude the possibility of local chronicles: little of the cultural production of the western Greeks is preserved, even from later periods; what we know is mainly the names of historians, philosophers, lawgivers, poets, speechwriters, and so forth. Of course, we can imagine that some details in the poetry of the early Archaic period for the foundation of the Greek cities or in the local chronicles could have been exaggerated. But again Thucydides does not give any suspicious details for the foundation of the Sicilian colonies. He only provides a chronology and, not in every case, the name of the *oikist*(s), the place(s) from which the colonists originated and, in a few cases, some further details about how the colony was founded (Megara, Zancle, Himera).

It is quite probable, that, as Antiochus made a selection for his writing (ἐκ τῶν ἀρχαίων λόγων τὰ πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα), so Thucydides, in his brief excursus on the foundation of the Greek colonies of Sicily, also preferred to quote from Antiochus' narration only the details that seemed most secure or important to him.[44] As Hornblower puts it, in relation to Kamarina's foundation, 'If, as likely, Th. used Antiochos' material, he used it in very much his own way, and subordinated it to his own architectural scheme.'[45] So what remains in Thucydides' narration

---

[38] As Pearson (n. 18), 16, remarks, the start of the colonial activity coincides with the usually accepted date for the introduction of the alphabet in Greece.

[39] For the lost poetry of the West, see A. Debiasi, *L'epica perduta: Eumelo, il Ciclo, l'occidente*, *Hesperìa* 20 (Rome, 2004), esp.19–69 for Eumelus and 48–54 for his participation in the foundation of Syracuse.

[40] Mele (n. 14), esp. 40–2, 46–51.

[41] Thuc. 1.21.1.

[42] Thuc. 1.8–12, 13.5.

[43] Pearson (n. 18), 16.

[44] This seems to be supported also by Thuc. 1.1.3.

[45] Hornblower (n. 18), 298.

for the foundation of the Greek colonies is what was left, after what Antiochus considered πιστότατα καὶ σαφέστατα from the written material to which he had access, and then what Thucydides considered reliable or important from Antiochus' work.[46] To conclude, what we possess in Thucydides' narration, is the result of the critical thought of two historians concerning the stories recorded in writing about the foundation of the colonies. Even though these stories were probably enlarged with some details that are not true, they must have had an initial core of truth, or at least generally accepted events, which I believe are reflected in the few details mentioned by Thucydides.[47]

THE FIRST-GENERATION COLONIES

Let us proceed to our main focus, the text of Thucydides. At 6.3.1, where Thucydides says Ἑλλήνων δὲ πρῶτοι Χαλκιδῆς ἐξ Εὐβοίας πλεύσαντες μετὰ Θουκλέους οἰκιστοῦ Νάξον[48] ᾤκισαν, the subjects of the colonising movement are Thoucles the *oikist* and Χαλκιδῆς but not the state/*polis* of Chalcis. The ethnic of the colonists (Chalcidians) is used in an indefinite context alongside Thoucles' name and only to denote the geographical origin of the colonists (that is the reason for the ἐξ). It should not be taken as analogous to the ethnic names that the historian uses to define a city as a whole (the Spartans, the Athenians). The vagueness of the

---

[46] It is very significant to this that Thucydides omits mentioning that, before the foundation of Syracuse, Archias contributed to the foundation of Croton also, which is stated by Antiochus (Strab. 6.1.12 = *FGrH* 555 F10). According to Luraghi (n. 18), 68, this last tradition reflects the good political relations between Croton and Syracuse in the fifth century, but see Cuscunà (n. 18), 83–4, who emphasises the coincidental nature of this cooperation as occurs in Antiochus. For Strabo's sources for the part of his work concerning Italy and Sicily, see Pearson (n. 18), 18, n. 55, for previous bibliography; N. Biffi, *Strabone di Amasea: Magna Grecia e dintorni (Geografia, 5,4,3–6,3,11)* (Bari, 2006), 7–21. For Strabo's use of Antiochus see, among others, L. Moscati-Castelnuovo, 'Sul rapporto storiografico tra Antioco di Siracusa e Strabone (nota a Strab. VI 1, 6, C257)', in *Studi di Antichità in memoria di Clementina Gatti* (Milan, 1987), 237–246; Luraghi (n. 18), 82–3; Cuscunà (n. 18), 7; Biffi (n. 46), 16–17 and n. 56 for previous bibliography. It is difficult to say whether Strabo used Antiochus' work directly or through one or more intermediaries. For example, Cuscunà and Moscati–Castelnuovo prefer the intermediary possibility, Luraghi mentions that Strabo used Antiochus initially through an intermediate, but later directly, while many scholars (see Biffi [n. 46], 17, n. 56) follow the theory that Antiochus was directly used by Strabo.

[47] As Hornblower (n. 18), 274, very accurately remarks, 'Th. is the least likely of writers to take over dates or anything else slavishly and without scrutiny.'

[48] For the foundation of Naxos, see J. Bérard, *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'antiquité: L'histoire et la légende* (Paris, 1957), 75–9; D. Asheri, 'La colonizzazione greca', in E. Gabba and G. Vallet (edd.), *La Sicilia antica*, vol. 1.2 (Naples, 1980), 89–142, at 105–8; W. Leschhorn, *Gründer der Stadt* (Stuttgart, 1984), 8–11(with n. 4 for previous bibliography); A.J. Domínguez, 'Greeks in Sicily', in Tsetskhladze (n. 6), 253–357, at 256–8. The date provided by Thucydides for its foundation (734) seems to be confirmed by archaeological data (P. Pelagatti, 'I più antichi materiali d'importazione a Siracusa, a Naxos e in altri citi della Sicilia orientale', in G. Vallet (ed.), *La céramique grecque ou de tradition grecque au VIIIe siècle en Italie centrale et méridionale* (Naples, 1982), 113–80, at 141–63; M. Lentini, 'Nuovi rinvenimenti di ceramica euboica a Naxos di Sicilia', in M. Bats and B. D'Agostino (edd.), *Euboica: l'Eubea e la presenza euboica in Calcidica e in Occidente: Atti del convegno internazionale di Napoli, 13–16 novembre 1996* (Naples, 1998), 377–86; idem, 'Naxos di Sicilia', in R. Panvini and L. Sole (edd.), *La Sicilia in età arcaica: Dalle apoikiai al 480 a.C.* (Palermo, 2009), 61–3, at 62.

meaning that Thucydides gives to the expression is clear to modern translators: for instance, Forster-Smith (Loeb) translates 'some Chalkidians' and de Romilly (Budé) 'des Chalcidiens'. Indeed, it looks as if an understood τινές accompanies Χαλκιδῆς. The notion of a private enterprise is supported by other literary sources that refer to colonists from various areas of Greece, and it is very much implied also by the name itself of the first Greek colony of Sicily (Naxos, the Aegean island).[49]

In 6.3.2, Thucydides says: Συρακούσας δὲ τοῦ ἐχομένου ἔτους Ἀρχίας τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν ἐκ Κορίνθου ᾤκισε. We see that the subject of the phrase who founds Syracuse[50] is not Corinth but Archias who came from Corinth (ἐκ is used again to denote origin). On the basis of this passage, Graham suggested that we should consider that Syracuse was founded mainly as a result of Archias' initiative[51] but his view has been criticised.[52] Besides, Archias is considered by most scholars to be a Bacchiad and his expedition has been treated as state-sponsored, initiated by the Bacchiadic oligarchy of Corinth. In neither source, however, is Archias called a Bacchiad: he is called either a Heraclid or a descendant of Temenus, or he is mentioned only with his proper name. In my opinion, the references of the sources indicate more that he was not a Bacchiad than the opposite. Moreover, the stories that Archias left Corinth on account of the murder of Actaeon[53] also suggest discontent and point to private motives and character for Archias' expedition. The private character of Syracuse's foundation is not refuted by either Strabo or Ps.-Scymnus, who both emphasise Archias' role.[54] Bérard remarks that Strabo found it unnecessary to mention his source as he had done for the foundation of Naxos and Megara, where he cited Ephorus.[55]

In this passage, Strabo relates the expedition of Archias to that of Myscellus, which resulted in the foundation of Croton. The two ventures are related also in the fragment of Antiochus preserved by Strabo that was mentioned previously.[56]

---

[49] Strab. 6.2.2; Ps.-Scymnus 270–8. See below on the foundation of Syracuse and Megara. Hellanicus, *FGrH* 1 F 82, clearly states that Naxians also took part in the foundation of Naxos; see also Leschhorn (n .48), 9, n. 7. An Aegean presence is also implied by archaeological findings (see Domínguez [n. 48], 258, n. 5).

[50] For the foundation of Syracuse, see Bérard (n. 48), 116–30; Asheri (n. 48), 116–18; Leschhorn (n. 48), 13–16 (with 13, n. 3, for previous bibliography); P. Reichert-Südbeck, *Kulte von Korinth und Syrakus: Vergleich zwischen einer Metropolis und ihrer Apoikia* (Dettelbach, 2000), 5–9; Bernstein (n. 4), 45 ff. (with 46, n. 3, for an extensive older bibliography); Domínguez (n. 48), 269–75.

[51] Graham (n. 9), 220.

[52] C. Roebuck, 'Some aspects of urbanization in Corinth', *Hesperia* 41 (1972), 96–127, at 112–13. Domínguez (n. 48), 271–2, though he seems to characterise the Euboian and Megarian ventures as non-state guided, stresses the opposite for Syracuse.

[53] Diod. Sic. 8.10; Plut. *Am. Narr.* 772e–773b. See also A. Andrewes, 'The Corinthian Actaeon and Pheidon of Argos', *CQ* 45 (1949), 46–58; E. Will, *Korinthiaka: Recherches sur l'histoire et la civilisation de Corinthe des origines aux guerres médiques* (Paris, 1955), 180–7; Bérard (n. 48), 117–18; Leschhorn (n. 48), 13–16; M. Kõiv, *Ancient Tradition and Early Greek History: The Origins of States in Early Archaic Sparta, Argos and Corinth* (Tallinn, 2003), 249–53; Bernstein (n. 4), 47–52, 72–7; Mele (n. 14), 46–50; Hornblower (n. 18), 282–3; G. De Luca, 'Ecisti Esiliati?', *Hesperìa* 22 (2008), 9–32, mainly 9–18, 23–5, 26–32. I do not agree with the 'poeticist' (borrowing an expression from Hall [n. 12], 385) interpretation of C. Dougherty, *The Poetics of Colonization: From City to Text in Archaic Greece* (Oxford, 1993), 8, 37–8, 43, n. 29, that the murder in the motherland symbolically denotes the conflict with the natives and the taking of their lands.

[54] Strab. 6.2.4; Ps.-Scymnus 279–82.

[55] Bérard (n. 48), 116. See also below.

[56] See n. 46.

So it is quite probable that Strabo's 6.2.4 also comes from Antiochus directly or through an intermediate source as did 6.1.12. But Thucydides, who also used Antiochus, does not mention Myscellus, although the latter is directly connected to Archias' expedition by Antiochus. From what has been said before, our view of Thucydides' selection from Antiochus of the most important and/or trustworthy details seems to be confirmed, and his omission of Archias' relation to Myscellus and his role in Croton's foundation is thus explained.

Likewise, at 6.4.1, where Thucydides mentions that κατὰ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον καὶ Λάμις ἐκ Μεγάρων ἀποικίαν ἄγων ἐς Σικελίαν ἀφίκετο, καὶ ὑπὲρ Παντακύου τε ποταμοῦ Τρώτιλόν τι ὄνομα χωρίον οἰκίσας, the subject of the Megarians' first establishment, Trotilon, is not the city of Megara but the leader Lamis, who 'guided' a colony from Megara (ἐκ again, to denote origin). The dates proposed by Thucydides for the foundation of Syracuse and Megara – 734/733 and 729/728 respectively – are generally accepted by scholars.[57] At this point we must also add that, in the case of both Syracuse and Megara, the tradition (deriving from Ephorus and preserved in Strabo and Ps.-Scymnus, admittedly enlarged with details that do not seem true) gives no hint of a state-guided enterprise. Rather, the colonising expeditions are presented as private ventures, whereas, in Thucydides, the *oikist* plays a prominent role. Contrary to Thucydides, the Ephoran tradition describes expeditions composed of settlers of different origin,[58] reinforcing the

---

[57] The old view of G. Vallet and F. Villard, 'Les dates de fondation de Mégara Hyblaea et de Syracuse', *BCH* 76 (1952), 289–346, for a higher chronology for Megara's foundation, no longer has supporters.

[58] Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 137, preserved in Strabo 6.2.2 and Ps.-Scymnus 270–8 (for other possible sources of Ps.-Scymnus' narration, see M. Gras, H. Tréziny and H. Broise, *Megara Hyblaea V: La ville archaique* [Rome, 2004], 548, no. 3); Polyaenus 5.5; Hellanicus *FGrH* 1 F 82). It is worth mentioning at this point that, in my view, it is not absolutely clear whether the whole of 6.2.2 of Strabo derives from Ephorus or only the passage that refers solely to the date of the foundation of the Greek colonies, namely, φησὶ δὲ ταύτας Ἔφορος πρώτας κτισθῆναι πόλεις Ἑλληνίδας ἐν Σικελίᾳ δεκάτῃ γενεᾷ μετὰ τὰ Τρωικά. Nevertheless, I will follow the traditional view and consider the whole narration in Strabo's passage as deriving from Ephorus. For Strabo's use of Ephorus, see Biffi (n. 46), 14, n. 46. Thucydides' version is usually preferred to that of Ephorus. Among modern scholars, see E.A. Freeman, *The History of Sicily from the Earliest Times* (Oxford, 1891), 1.381–90; Dunbabin (n. 20), 18–20; Bérard (n. 48), 83–4, 110–16; L. Bernabò Brea, 'Il crepuscolo del re Hyblon: consid-erazioni sulla cronologia delle fondazioni di Leontinoi, Megara e Siracusa e sulla topografia della Megaride di Sicilia', *PP* 23 (1968), 161–86; R.P. Legon, *Megara: The Political History of a Greek City-state* (Ithaca, NY, 1981), 71–6 (who prefers Ephorus' version and seems to place the expedition during the subordination of Megara to Corinth); Graham (n. 23), 106–7, and idem, 'Megara Hyblaea and the Sicels', in O. Lordkipanidze (ed.), *Local Ethnopolitical Entities of the Black Sea Area in the 7th–4th Centuries BC: Materials of the 4th All-Union Symposium Dedicated to the Problems of the Ancient History of the Black Sea Littoral Tsqualtobo-Vani-1985* (Tbilisi, 1988), 304–21, at 311–17 (who dismisses the Ephoran tradition); T.J. Figueira, 'Chronological table, Archaic Megara, 800–500 B.C.', in T.J. Figueira and G. Nagy (edd.), *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and Polis* (Baltimore, MD, 1985), 261–303, at 269–71, who makes (in my view) a very improbable reconstruction of the events; M. Manfredi and L. Braccesi, *I greci d'occidente* (Milan, 1996), 101, who follow some of Figueira's arguments; Asheri (n. 48), 108; and Malkin (n. 14), 210–16, 220–2, who tried to conciliate the two ver-sions. See also De Angelis (n. 2), 13–14 with notes; Gras, Tréziny and Broise (n. 58), 550–1.

For Syracuse the non-exclusively Corinthian character of its foundation is implied by Pindar (*Ol.* 6.4 and Scholia, for the forefathers of Agesias and their Arcadian origin) with Bérard (n. 48), 126–7; but see I. Malkin, *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece* (New York, 1987), 93–7, and the reference to the legendary king Pollis of Argive origin (Hippys *FGrH* 554 F 7; Poll. 6.16; Ael. *VH* 12.31; *Etym. Magn.* s.v. Βίβλινος οἶνος). J.B. Salmon, *Wealthy*

private character. In Megara's case, we possess part of the initial layout of the city, and the ruins of the houses dating from the foundation of the city.[59] The layout reveals an initial plan, which presupposes some kind of organisation and supports the notion of the single foundation described in literary sources.

In the case of Gela,[60] at 6.4.3 Thucydides writes: Γέλαν δὲ Ἀντίφημος ἐκ Ῥόδου καὶ Ἔντιμος ἐκ Κρήτης ἐποίκους ἀγαγόντες κοινῇ ἔκτισαν, καὶ τῇ μὲν πόλει ἀπὸ τοῦ Γέλα ποταμοῦ τοὔνομα ἐγένετο, τὸ δὲ χωρίον οὗ νῦν ἡ πόλις ἐστὶ καὶ ὃ πρῶτον ἐτειχίσθη Λίνδιοι καλεῖται. The subjects of the phrase that depicts the foundation of the city are Antiphemus and Entimus, who originated from Rhodes and Crete respectively, and it was they who guided the colonists. Again ἐκ denotes only the origin of the settlers, while there is no specific city behind the colonial enterprise.

The vocabulary of Thucydides in this particular phrase has caused debate among modern scholars. Wentker thought that the verb κτίζω in this sentence has a different meaning from the οἰκίζω used in most of the other cases, and that each verb describes a different process of foundation. According to him, οἰκίζω refers to occupying territory and installing colonists while κτίζω describes all the activity that follows the installation (construction of the walls, introduction of cult and political institutions, urbanisation, etc.). In other words, the *oikisis* of the settlement came first, and after some interval of time – which could be substantial – the *ktisis* took place. Moreover, Wentker argued that Thucydides' use of ἐποίκους denotes the arrival of additional colonists. He concluded that a first installation of colonists of Lindian origin arrived in the territory of Gela, an *oikisis* that occupied

---

Corinth: A History of the City to 338 B.C. (Oxford, 1984), 66–7, sees the Argive presence in archaeological data.

[59] The initial layout of Megara Hyblaea has attracted the attention of many scholars. I mention some of them: first, the results of the excavators: G. Vallet, F. Villard and P. Auberson, *Mégara Hyblaea 1: Le quartier de l'agora archaïque* (Rome, 1976); eidem, *Mégara Hyblaea 3: Guide des fouilles: introduction à l'histoire d'une cité coloniale d'Occident* (Rome, 1983); Gras, Tréziny and Broise (n. 58). See also the remarks of A. Di Vita, 'Town planning in the Greek colonies of Sicily from the time of their foundation to the Punic wars', in J.P. Descoeudres (ed.), *Greek Colonists and Native Populations* (Oxford, 1990), 343–63, at 348–9; idem, 'Urban planning in ancient Sicily', in G. Pugliese Carratelli (ed.), *The Western Greeks: Classical Civilization in the Western Mediterranean* (London, 1996), 263–308, at 264–8; R. Osborne, Η γέννηση της Ελλάδας (Athens, 1996), 352; Lamboley (n. 11), 166–8; P. Danner, 'Megara, Megara Hyblaea and Selinous: the relationship between the town planning of a mother city, a colony and a subcolony in the Archaic period', *Acta Hyperborea* 7 (1997), 143–65, at 145–9; H. Tréziny, 'On equality of lot division at Megara Hyblaia in the eighth century B.C.', *AJA* 101 (1997), 381; idem, 'Lots et îlots à Mégara Hyblaia: questions de métrologie', in *La colonisation grecque en Méditerranée occidentale: Actes de la rencontre scientifique en hommage à Georges Vallet organisée par le Centre Jean-Bérard, l'École française de Rome, l'Istituto universitario orientale et l'Universita degli studi di Napoli Federico II, Rome, Naples, 15–18 novembre 1995* (Rome, 1999), 141–83; De Angelis (n. 2), 17–39; F. De Polignac, 'Forms and processes: some thoughts on the meaning of urbanization in early Archaic Greece', in R. Osborne and B. Cunliffe (edd.), *Mediterranean Urbanization 800–600 B.C.* (Oxford, 2005), 45–69, at 51–4; Domínguez (n. 48), 275–6; Hall (n. 6), 107–8.

[60] For the foundation of Gela see Bérard (n. 48), 225–31; Asheri (n. 48), 124–6; Leschhorn (n. 48), 43 (with n. 1 for previous bibliography); C. Raccuia, *Gela antica*, Biblioteca dell'Archivio storico messinese 29 (Messina, 2000), 99–130 (with 99, n. 1 for previous bibliography); S.N. Consolo Langher, *Siracusa e la Sicilia Greca, tra età arcaica ed alto ellenismo* (Messina, 1996), 5, n. 1; P. Anello, 'La storia di Gela antica', *Kokalos* 45 (1999), 385–408, at 385–96; R. Sammartano, 'Le tradizioni letterarie sulla fondazione di Gela e il problema di Lindioi', *Kokalos* 45 (1999), 471–99; Domínguez (n. 48), 279–83.

the area called Lindioi, and that additional colonists who came with Antiphemus and Entimus occasioned the settlement's more intensive organisation.[61] In opposition to Wentker, Nicosia argued that the verb κτίζω in Thucydides has the meaning of occupying the territory, while οἰκίζω has mainly, but not exclusively, the meaning of founding a colony.[62]

In addition to disagreements about the meaning of the verbs, scholars have diverged in their identifications of the 'Lindioi' mentioned by Thucydides. Some have thought that Lindioi was the place fortified by the first colonists and the original name of Gela. Others, following Wentker's suggestions, have viewed Lindioi as the first stage of the city's foundation, carried out exclusively by Rhodians. Still others have believed that the word reflects a secondary wave of colonists of Lindian origin, who came to Gela at the beginning of the sixth century. Some have even argued, based on the use of νῦν and πρῶτον, that Thucydides had in mind the *polis* of Gela after the Carthaginian occupation of 405 and the destruction of her walls.[63] Wentker's hypothesis is very important to any analysis of Gela's foundation, since, if accepted, it seems to contradict any claim of singular foundation and to bolster the view that the foundation of colonies should be considered as a process rather than an event.

A thorough consideration of Thucydides' vocabulary and phraseology has shown that Wentker's definitions are not apt. Dover very rightly remarked that the term ἔποικοι does not always refer to supplementary colonists,[64] while de Wever and van Compernolle showed that Thucydides does not differentiate between κτίζω and οἰκίζω.[65] Nevertheless, archaeological findings from Gela seem to show a Greek presence prior to the Thucydidean date of 689. They have encouraged scholars (mostly archaeologists) to accept Wentker's view of the two stages of foundation, despite the fact that it is not supported by his literary analysis.[66] These findings include a fragment of a cup found in the lowest layer of the acropolis of Gela similar to pottery found in Syracuse, Megara Hyblaea, Leontini and Perachora (CLG,[67] 730–720), another cup fragment from the acropolis beneath the lowest level of the foundation of the Dorian temple of the acropolis (CLG, before 710), a fragment of

[61] H. Wentker, 'Die Ktisis von Gela bei Thucydides', *MDAI(R)* 63 (1956), 129–39.

[62] F. Nicosia (1963), 'Fonti relative alla data della fondazione di Megara Hyblaea', *Siculorum Gymnasium* 16 (1963), 154–82, at 164.

[63] For a fuller analysis of the 'Lindioi' problem, with complete bibliography, see Anello (n. 60), 386–96; Sammartano (n. 60); Raccuia (n. 60), 118–20; T. Fischer-Hansen, 'The earliest town-planning of the western Greek colonies with special regard to Sicily', in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis* (Copenhagen, 1996), 317–73, at 332–3.

[64] Dover (n. 18), 217; M. Casevitz, *Le vocabulaire de la colonisation en grec ancien: étude lexicologique: les familles de κτίζω et de οἰκέω-οἰκίζω* (Paris, 1985), 157–8.

[65] J. de Wever and R. van Compernolle 'La valeur des termes de "colonisation" chez Thucydide', *AC* 36 (1967), 461–523, at 479–82; Casevitz (n. 64), 101; Fischer-Hansen (n. 63), 333–4.

[66] De Angelis (n. 2), 126, n. 179, remarks in a very designative way that 'the comments of Gomme and al. [namely Dover's] and Casevitz need to be modified in light of these archaeological discoveries'. See P. Orlandini, 'La più antica ceramica greca di Gela e il problema di Lindioi', *Cronache di Archeologia e di Storia dell'Arte* 2 (1963), 50–6, at 55–6; E. de Miro and G. Fiorentini, 'Gela nell'VIII e VII secolo a.C.', in G. Rizza (ed.), *Insediamenti coloniali greci in Sicilia nell'VIII e VII secolo a.C* (Catania, 1978), 90–9, at 90; E. de Miro, in E. de Miro and G. Fiorentini 'Gela protoarcaica', *ASAA* 45 (1983), 53–106, at 77; R. Panvini, *Γέλας: Storia e archeologia dell'antica Gela* (Turin, 1996), 25; Domínguez (n. 48), 279–80.

[67] Scholars agree on the chronological limits of LG 750–720 and EPC 720–690: Coldstream 2008 (n. 24), 327; Amyx (n. 24), 428; Morris (n. 24), 57.

a *skyphos* from the acropolis similar to pots from Corinth and Perachora, Syracuse and Helorus, Megara Hyblaea (CLG, before 710), and a substantial fragment of a large LG amphora found in the area of the archaic necropolis, which could come from a number of different sources (Cycladic, Argive, Attic), similar to an amphora from the Fusco cemetery in Syracuse.[68] More recent excavations have brought to light fragments of a *kotyle* from areas separate from the acropolis and the necropolis, dated by the excavator to the last decades of the eighth century.[69]

In the case of Gela, since the pots found there are considered to be 20–30 years older than the chronology of Thucydides for the foundation of the city, a Greek presence in the area could be considered very likely. Moreover, the fact that these findings do not originate from a single area but were scattered in different areas, including the acropolis and the necropolis, suggests that we are dealing with a more permanent presence, namely the establishment of a settlement. On the other hand, the archaeological evidence, taken with the analysis of the vocabulary of Thucydides, cannot be fully supportive of Wentker's view of a first-stage Lindian occupation and a second by the colonists brought by Antiphemus and Entimus. In addition, none of the pottery mentioned can be considered of Rhodian origin[70] and, as Fischer-Hansen remarks, it cannot tell us what kind of presence this might have been,[71] since the pots are Corinthian, which was a popular style at this period both in the newly founded colonies and in Aegean Greece. As Mannack puts it, as a general principle, we cannot know whether the pots found belong to the colonists themselves, were brought by traders or belonged to precolonial inhabitants.[72]

The users of these pots in Gela could either have been of the same origin as those that arrived later under Antiphemus and Entimus, or from anywhere in the Aegean Greece except Rhodes or Crete, or even from pre-existing Greek settlements in Sicily. Moreover, as Orlandini himself admits,[73] there is always the possibility that the colonists who came in 689 brought with them and used pottery older than the types that were in circulation at this period. The surviving material is, in any case, scarce.

In conclusion, the hypothesis of two stages of Rhodian colonisation is neither supported by Thucydides nor fully confirmed by the archaeological evidence. On the other hand, the archaeological evidence could support the presence of people of indefinite Greek origin in the area of Gela, prior to 689. Such a precolonial stage makes sense in areas of south-east Sicily during the period immediately after the foundation of the first colonies, namely after 710, when the Greeks were acquainting themselves with the area. As for the character of Gela's foundation, which is also the core of our research, we have said previously that the text of Thucydides points to private enterprise. Archaeology cannot help us in this case. It cannot tell us anything about the origin of these first settlers, under what circumstances or in what manner they established themselves in this area. Finally, as in the case

[68] Orlandini (n. 66), 50–2; de Miro and Fiorentini (n. 66), 90–1, 94–5; de Miro (n. 66), 74–5. The dates are from de Miro (n. 66).

[69] M. Pizzo, 'Sulla ceramica più antica di Gela e la topografia della città', in M. Castoldi (ed.), *KOINA: Miscellanea di studi archeologici in onore di Piero Orlandini* (Milan, 1999), 157–68, at 165.

[70] All the findings, as mentioned above, are of Corinthian origin except for one that has multiple possible derivations.

[71] Fischer-Hansen (n. 63), 334.

[72] T. Mannack, *Griechische Vasenmalerei: Eine Einführung* (Darmstadt, 2002), 55.

[73] Orlandini (n. 66), 55.

of Megara and Syracuse, other literary sources refer to colonists originating from various parts of Greece,[74] which is a further indication of the private character of Gela's foundation.

The looseness with which Thucydides depicts the foundation of the first-generation colonies is clearest in the case of Zancle.[75] At 6.4.5 he writes:

Ζάγκλη δὲ τὴν μὲν ἀρχὴν ἀπὸ Κύμης τῆς ἐν Ὀπικίᾳ Χαλκιδικῆς πόλεως λῃστῶν ἀφικομένων ᾠκίσθη, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ Χαλκίδος καὶ τῆς ἄλλης Εὐβοίας πλῆθος ἐλθὸν ξυγκατενείμαντο τὴν γῆν· καὶ οἰκισταὶ Περιήρης καὶ Κραταιμένης ἐγένοντο αὐτῆς, ὁ μὲν ἀπὸ Κύμης, ὁ δὲ ἀπὸ Χαλκίδος.

According to Thucydides, Zancle was colonised in two stages. It is very interesting that Zancle is the only city for which Thucydides clearly states that it was founded in such a way.[76] In the phrase that denotes the first stage of the colonising movement, it seems that the primary force behind the colonising action was a group of pirates (*λῃστῶν*)[77] and that the city Cyme refers only to the origin of the pirates (*ἀπὸ* + genitive). It is true, of course, that *ἀπὸ* + genitive can also denote the agent but this is not the case here. Thucydides clearly prefers the more common *ὑπὸ* + genitive to express agent. Here, the agent is not expressed but assumed, as happens often in Greek. Modern translators agree on this point (de Romilly-Budé, Forster-Smith-Loeb). Of course this reading of Thucydides makes it clear that we are not dealing with some state-guided enterprise since a 'pirate' establishment could not be considered state-sponsored.

In the second stage of Zancle's colonisation, Thucydides mentions that many people who originated from Chalcis and the rest of Euboea came and shared the land with the previous settlers and that its founders were Perieres and Crataemenes, who originated from Cyme and Chalcis respectively. Again, there is no city behind the colonial enterprise and Chalcis and the rest of Euboea are mentioned only to denote the settlers' origin, with *ἀπὸ* + genitive. The vagueness of Thucydides' narration and the private character of the undertaking are especially evident in the indefinite reference of *πλῆθος*. In addition, the moving force of the foundation is once again, as in all the previously mentioned foundations, the *oikists* (*οἰκισταὶ Περιήρης καὶ Κραταιμένης ἐγένοντο αὐτῆς*). Likewise the two cities (Chalcis

---

[74] Artemon *FGrH* 569 F 1 = Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 2.16b, who mentions that the *oikists* searched for additional colonists in the Peloponnese; Hdt. 7.153 and Schol. Pind. *Pyth.* 2.27, mention that Deinomenes, Gelon's ancestor, originated from the small island of Telos.

[75] For the foundation of Zancle, see Bérard (n. 48), 92–6; G. Vallet, *Rhégion et Zancle: Histoire, commerce et civilisation des cités chalcidiennes du détroit de Messine* (Paris, 1958), 59–66; Leschhorn (n. 48), 16–23 (with 16, n. 4, for previous bibliography); L. Antonelli, 'La falce di Crono: considerazioni sulla prima fondazione di Zancle', *Kokalos* 42 (1996), 315–25; Consolo Langher (n. 60), 380–84; Domínguez (n. 48), 263–9.

[76] The same could be said for Selinus and has been argued for Gela, but in both cases the settlers are considered to be of the same origin, while in Zancle's this is not, at least directly, stated since the Cymeans were also of Chalcidian origin.

[77] These *λῃσταί* should not necessary be considered as pirates or bandits with a twenty-first century connotation (Vallet [n. 75], 61, 65; Leschhorn [n. 48], 16, n. 5; B. D'Agostino, 'Pitecusa – Una apoikía di tipo particolare', *AION* n.s. 1 (1994), 19–28, at 21–2; Antonelli [n. 75], 315). Antonelli explains this reference in Thucydides as due to his pro-Syracusan source (Antiochus). Moreover she considers (320 ff.) that they did not originate from Cyme, but from Pithecusae and that the latter's omission is due to pro-Cymean sources.

and Cyme) are mentioned only to denote the founders' origin with ἀπὸ + genitive, as previously,

   Other sources give conflicting information about Zancle's foundation. Strabo mentions that Zancle was a Naxian foundation; and the same story is found in Ps.-Scymnus.[78] On the other hand, Callimachus seems to follow Thucydides.[79] Pausanias provides another interesting version of Zancle's foundation, one that is very close to Thucydides'. He says that, initially, Zancle was occupied by pirates who fortified the harbour and used it as a base for raids. Their leaders were Perieres and Crataemenes, but, according to him, the first did not originate from Cyme but from Samos. And it was they who decided to bring new Greek colonists.[80]

   Pausanias agrees with Thucydides' two-stage foundation of Zancle, with the preliminary foundation carried out by pirates, and he also depicts the second stage of the city's foundation as merely the result of the *oikists*. It is very important to remark that his narration is not as divergent from Thucydides as it seems at first. Thucydides does not clearly state that the *oikists* came together with the colonists from Euboea. It could be reasonably inferred, but it is not stated. Thucydides only says that the place of their origin was Cyme (whether Italian or Euboean he does not say) and Chalcis. Keeping this in mind, the version of Pausanias should not be dismissed *a priori*. Either way, the private character of Zancle's foundation is clear. The tradition preserved in Strabo and Ps.-Scymnus seems a little more problematic, since Naxos is here considered the mother city of Zancle. Unfortunately, neither Strabo nor Ps.-Scymnus provide any details as to how the foundation took place, especially whether Ephorus supported the two-stage foundation. If accepted, however,[81] Zancle's colonisation should be considered identical to that of Catane

---

   [78] Strab. 6.2.3; Ps.-Scymnus 283–6. They both seem to follow a different tradition, probably Ephorus (Bérard [n. 48], 93; Vallet [n. 75], 60); see also n. 58 on the foundation of Syracuse and Megara.
   [79] Callim. *Aet.* fr. 43, lines 58–83: λαὸς ὁ μὲν Κύμης ὁ δὲ Χαλκίδος, ὃν Περιήρης ἤγαγε καὶ μεγάλου λῆμα Κραταιμένεος, Τρινακρ[ί]ης ἐπέβησα[ν] (lines 58–60). Callimachus also uses the very vague λαὸς when he refers to the colonising enterprise, which is very similar to the πλῆθος that Thucydides uses, and says that the colonists came from Cyme and Chalcis. The origin of the *oikists* is not clearly stated but it could be inferred from the μὲν and δὲ if also connected with the two *oikists*. It would be fair to conclude from this, as Antonelli (n. 75), 319, did, that both Thucydides and Callimachus drew on the same source, but it is also possible that the latter may have used the former. Callimachus, as Vallet (n. 75), 63, also remarks, does not provide any other evidence about the conditions and circumstances in which Zancle was founded. However, his point that, in order to avoid dispute over who among the two was the proper founder of the city during the public ceremonies, the *oikist* was honoured without his name being mentioned (lines 74–83), provides evidence for the important role of the *oikist*'s cult for the community. From Callimachus' initial verses, which seem to follow Thucydides, a private enterprise is suggested, since the *oikists* appear to be the primary force of the colonising venture (ἤγαγε) and there is no city that sends colonists, just a λαὸς that originated from Cyme and Chalcis. Nevertheless, although Callimachus' phraseology confirms our argument about the nature of Zancle's foundation, we should avoid relying too much on him, since we are dealing with ambiguous poetry that must be treated with great caution. For a full analysis of Callimachus' verses, see Leschhorn (n. 48), 17–23; Malkin (n. 58), 197–200.
   [80] Paus. 4.23.7: Ζάγκλην δὲ τὸ μὲν ἐξ ἀρχῆς κατέλαβον λῃσταί, καὶ ἐν ἐρήμῳ τῇ γῇ τειχίσαντες ὅσον περὶ τὸν λιμένα ὁρμητηρίῳ πρὸς τὰς καταδρομὰς καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἐπίπλους ἐχρῶντο· ἡγεμόνες δὲ ἦσαν αὐτῶν Κραταιμένης Σάμιος καὶ Περιήρης ἐκ Χαλκίδος. Περιήρει δὲ ὕστερον καὶ Κραταιμένει καὶ ἄλλους ἐπαγαγέσθαι τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἔδοξεν οἰκήτορας.
   [81] Bérard (n. 48), 93. Vallet (n. 75), 64, in an effort to reconcile the two traditions, said that Naxos could have taken some part in the foundation of Zancle.

and Leontini.[82] It is probable that Ephorus assumed that, since Catane and Leontini were founded by Naxos, and since Zancle was also a Chalcidian colony founded at approximately the same time, Naxos also founded the latter. In the end, it seems preferable to stick with the far more reliable Thucydides.

This last remark brings us to the issue of the date of Zancle's foundation and thus to the examination of the archaeological data. Thucydides does not give a foundation date for Zancle, probably because his source did not provide one.[83] In the Armenian translation of Eusebius' *Chronicle*, however, the foundation of Zancle is placed under the year 757/756. This date seems to contradict Thucydides, who mentions Naxos as the first Greek colony in Sicily. Moreover, the foundation of Selinus is also placed under the same date, making the whole reference of the *Chronicle* very untrustworthy.[84] Nevertheless, some limits for the foundation of Zancle can be drawn. One could be considered the foundation of Mylae, a sub-colony of Zancle, if we follow the view that Eusebius' reference to the foundation of Chersonesus in 717/716 is actually made for Mylae. A foundation date close to Eusebius' date for Mylae/Chersonesus seems to be confirmed by the archaeological evidence.[85] Another is Cyme's foundation, if Thucydides and his reference to the Cymean pirates are to be followed. Cyme is dated, based on archaeological data, to around 740.[86] So we arrive at a date around 730, but later than Naxos (734), which was the first Greek colony in Sicily. The oldest pottery remains in Zancle are some fragments from two or three LG cups of the 'chevron' type, but they are thought to be from before the period of the foundation of the Greek colonies: similar fragments are present in other settlements (Greek and non-Greek) of Italy,

---

[82] See below, p. 485–6.

[83] According to N. Luraghi, 'Fonti e tradizione nell'Archaiologia Siciliana (per una rilettura di Thuc. 6.2–5)', *Hesperìa* 2 (1991), 41–62, at 56, Zancle's foundation date is missing from Thucydides because it is related to the foundation date of Cyme, and thus to the Italian colonies in general, while Thucydides prefers to stay only with Sicilian affairs. In contrast, van Compernolle (n. 18), 429, takes the view that this omission is due to the general tendency of Antiochus to neglect the colonies of Chalcidian origin.

[84] A. Schöne, *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer bearbeitung durch Heironymus*, vol. 2 (Berlin, 1900), 80: *In Sicilia Silinus et Gangle conditae sunt*. It is worth mentioning that in St Jerome's translation in Schöne's edition this reference is absent, while in Helm's edition, which is based mainly on St Jerome's translation (R. Helm, *Eusebius Werke. 7, 2: Die Chronik des Hieronymus* [Leipzig, 1926], 243), the text appears corrupt: *In Sicilia urbes Selinus et S... a conditae sunt*. That is why many modern scholars who treat the foundation of Zancle do not even mention Eusebius' reference (for example, Freeman [n. 58], 393–4, 584–7; Dunbabin [n. 20], 11; Vallet [n. 75], 59–64; Graham [n. 23], 108–9; Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo [n. 24], 234; Domínguez [n. 48], 263–5).

[85] *In Sicilia Chersonessus condita est* (Schöne [n. 84], 82–3; Helm [n. 84], 257). For the identification of Chersonesus with Mylae, see Freeman (n. 58), 587; Bérard (n. 48), 98, 114; for a different view, see Vallet (n. 75), 83–4. For the archaeological evidence deriving from the necropolis of Istmo, see L. Bernabò Brea and M. Cavalier, *Mylai* (Novara, 1959), 116–17. The excavators refer to Cycladic geometric cups similar to the oldest found in the Greek West and also cups of the 'Thapsos' type that could not be dated later than the last quarter of the eighth century, namely a little older than Eusebius' foundation date. Nevertheless, they follow Eusebius' chronology. For Mylae's foundation date, see also C. Sabbione, 'La colonizzazione Greca: Metauros e Mylai', in *Lo Stretto Crocevia di Culture: Atti del XXVI convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto 1986* (Taranto, 1987), 221–36, at 224, 229, and G. Tigano, 'Mylai', in Panvini and Sole (n. 48), 159–67, at 164.

[86] N. Coldstream, 'Prospectors and pioneers: Pithekoussai, Kyme and central Italy', in Tsetskhladze and De Angelis (n. 6), 47–59, at 53–4.

such as Cyme, Capua, Veii and Pithecusae.[87] Considering the presence of this
kind of pottery, three possibilities arise: the fragments could be from an earlier
period, given their small numbers, in contrast to the more numerous fragments of
the 'Thapsos' type,[88] which probably date around 730; they could originate from
a pre-urban settlement;[89] or this pottery reflects the establishment of the pirates
mentioned by Thucydides and Pausanias.[90] It seems to me that the first and third
are the most probable. Either way, the non-state-guided character of Zancle's foun-
dation, as expressed in Thucydides and Pausanias, is not refuted.

   Similar remarks about Thucydides' language, though only for the Euboean ven-
ture, the subsequent foundation of Naxos and the Megarian undertaking, have also
been made by Malkin. He does not stress, however, the language used for the
foundation of the rest of the first-generation colonies (Syracuse, Gela, Zancle), and
he makes these remarks mainly in order to argue that the foundation stories should
be considered reliable to some extent, in contrast to Osborne's argumentation on
this subject. Moreover, Malkin does not proceed further to the examination of the
Thucydidean text for the second-generation colonies.[91]

   To summarise, in all the cases mentioned here, we have seen that neither the
city with its proper name (Megara, Corinth, Chalcis) nor the ethnic name that
Thucydides usually uses to refer to the whole city (the Megarians, the Corinthians,
the Chalcidians) is used to denote the primary impetus for the foundation of the
Greek colonies. Instead, either the ethnic is used together with the founder's name
(one case) or the name of the founder(s) is used alone (four cases). Thucydides
depicts the first-generation colonies as ventures of private character ultimately
originating in the actions of the *oikist(s)*. This last notion seems to be supported
by other sources, or at least is not refuted. In some cases, such as Gela, the
archaeological data point to a precolonial stage or seem to support the view of
the colonising expedition as a process. But the limited amount of pottery and the
numerous possible explanations for its existence make arguments based on this
pottery weak.

   The private nature of these expeditions does not exclude the existence of special
bonds between the colonists and their places of origin. The fact that it was their
choice to leave their homelands and not an official decision of their city does not
mean that they forgot where they came from or did not recognise a mother city.
A stronger relationship between colony and mother city is more likely to have
existed in the colonies where the majority of the settlers originated from one
specific area, as in Megara's and Corinth's case, and probably less so in colonies
where the settlers came from more than one place, as Naxos, which was mainly

   [87] G. Bacci, 'Zancle: un aggiornamento', in M. Bats and B. d'Agostino (edd.), *Euboica:
L'Eubea e la presenza euboica in Calcidica e in Occidente: Atti del convegno internazionale di
Napoli, 13–16 novembre 1998* (Naples, 1998), 387–92, at 387; idem, 'Zancle-Messana: alcune
considerazioni sulla topografia e sulla cultura materiale', in B. Gentili and A. Pinzone, *Messina
e Reggio nell'antichità: Storia, società, cultura: Atti del Convegno della S.I.S.A.C. (Messina-
Reggio Calabria 24–26 maggio 1999)* (Messina, 2002), 25–46, at 35; also Domínguez (n. 48),
266.
   [88] Bacci 1998 (n. 87), 387–8; M. Gras, 'L'urbanisme de Zancle', in Gentili and Pinzone
(n. 87), 13–24, at 16–17.
   [89] Domínguez (n. 48), 266, suggests, in this case, that the Cymean pirates should be placed
even earlier chronologically.
   [90] Bacci 2002 (n. 87), 33.
   [91] Malkin (n. 14), 213–15.

a Chalcidian colony but with many Naxians, as her name indicates; Gela, which was a Rhodian and Cretan foundation according to Thucydides;[92] or Zancle, where the colonists came from the whole of Euboea.

Of course, generalisations should be avoided and each city should be dealt with separately; but again we possess little evidence to allow us to follow this relationship and its evolution for every case. Particularly in the case of the Euboean colonies almost nothing can be said, since we know next to nothing of Chalcis' archaic history,[93] the place of origin of most of the Euboean colonists. For the other first-generation colonies it is difficult to find evidence for the relations between colony and mother city in the eighth and early seventh centuries, although these are traceable for later periods. For example, in Megara's case, when the Megarians of Sicily decided to found Selinus they turned to Megara Nisaea;[94] in Gela's, when the Geloans founded Acragas (580), it seems that they asked for colonists from Rhodes;[95] while Syracuse, when it was threatened by Hippocrates after the defeat at the Helorus river early in the fifth century, was saved after the mediation of her mother city (Corinth) and sister city (Corcyra).[96] It is certain that Megara Hyblaea, by the date of Selinus' foundation in the second half of the seventh century, Syracuse by the early fifth century, and quite probably Gela by 580 recognised Megara Nisaea, Corinth and Rhodes respectively as their mother city and had some kind of relations with them. The question is whether this occurred at some later stage than the foundation of the colonies[97] or whether it stood from the beginning. I support the second possibility. The Megarian, Corinthian and Rhodian identity and the origin of at least the majority of the first settlers prevailed already from the foundation of the colony, or at least from a very early stage. This identity was bequeathed to later generations in such a way that the Megarians of Sicily, the Syracusans and the Geloans of Rhodian origin knew the city from which their forefathers departed and recognised it as their mother city, as presumably their forefathers did. The same could also be true of other Sicilian first-generation colonies for which we have no evidence. This awareness of identity and consciousness of place of origin, which is reflected in the names that the colonists gave to their new homes, was borrowed directly from their mother cities – for example, Megara from Megara Nisaea; Lindioi (in Gela's case), from the city of the island of Rhodes; as also in cult practices common both to the new foundations and places of origin[98] – is a good indication for the existence of relations between colony and mother city.

---

[92] See p. 470 for Gela's case, and pp. 480–2 on Acragas' foundation also.

[93] Except, of course, for the aristocracy of the Hippobotae (Strabo 10.1.8, quoting Aristotle) and the Lelantine War fought between Chalcis and Eretria, which is dated somewhere in the eighth or seventh century. For this war, see V. Parke, *Untersuchungen zum Lelantischen Krieg und verwandten Problemen der frügriechischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart, 1997).

[94] See below pp. 477–8, 480.

[95] See below pp. 480–1.

[96] Hdt. 7.154.

[97] Hall (n. 12), 412–21, contends that it occurred between Taras and Sparta.

[98] For the cult similarities between Corinth and Syracuse, see Reichert-Südbeck (n. 50). In Gela, the cult of Athena Lindia existed as early as the seventh century and was introduced from Lindos on Rhodes.

THE SECOND-GENERATION COLONIES

At 6.4.2–3, where Thucydides writes: Πάμιλλον πέμψαντες Σελινοῦντα κτίζουσι, καὶ ἐκ Μεγάρων τῆς μητροπόλεως οὔσης αὐτοῖς ἐπελθὼν ξυγκατῴκισεν, it is the Megarians, namely the city of Megara, that send the *oikist* and found Selinus. The present passage has two possible interpretations depending on whether there is considered to be a lacuna in the text between οὔσης and αὐτοῖς. If there is no lacuna, it follows that the *oikist* Pamillus came from Megara Nisaea at the request of the Sicilian Megarians. If there is a lacuna between οὔσης and αὐτοῖς, then Pamillus originated from Megara Hyblaea and another *oikist*, whose name is missing from the manuscript, was sent from Megara Nisaea on the request of the Sicilian Megarians.[99] Forster-Smith for example, in the Loeb, prefers the first reading, while de Romilly, in the Budé, follows the second.

The subject becomes even more complicated, since other sources provide a different, earlier date (651/650) from Thucydides (628/627).[100] Wentker tried to reconcile the two dates for Selinus' foundation. He argued that κατοικίζειν refers to the installation of Greek people in a place previously inhabited by Greeks that had since been abandoned, and that there was indeed a first establishment of Megarians in the area under the guidance of Megara Hyblaea, which corresponds to the earlier date, and a later re-foundation, at the date provided by Thucydides, under the leadership of Pamillus, who came from Aegean Megara.[101] Wentker's interpretation is appealing but de Wever and van Compernolle have provided solid argumentation against Wentker's definition of κατοικίζειν.[102]

The case for an earlier date for the foundation of Selinus was revived owing to new archaeological material, namely Corinthian pottery. At this point, it is important to notice that there is a strong relation between the chronological classification of the Corinthian pottery and the chronological references in Thucydides. As Dunbabin very clearly stated 60 years ago, 'the chronology of Protocorinthian vase-painting is established absolutely by reference to two historical events, the foundation of Syracuse and the foundation of Selinus'.[103] This classification was initially made by Payne, who relied on the work of Johansen.[104] Though there has been much discussion of Payne's classification, it still stands firm, with only minor alterations.[105] Payne considered that, since the earliest pottery found in Selinus was EC, this style must have begun a little later than the foundation date that is given

[99] See also the remarks of Dover (n. 18), 217.

[100] Diod. Sic. 13.59.4 and Euseb. Schöne (n. 84), 88–9; Helm (n. 84), 273. For a bibliography concerning the foundation date of Selinus, see R.J.A. Wilson, 'Archaeology in Sicily, 1977–1981', *AR* 28 (1981–2), 84–105, at 101; A.J. Domínguez, *La colonización griega en Sicilia: Griegos, indígenos y Púnicos en la Sicilia arcaica: Interación y aculturación* (Oxford, 1989), 361–2; idem (n. 48), 302; C. Dehl-von Kaenel, *Die archaische Keramik aus dem Malophoros-Heiligtum in Selinunt* (Berlin, 1995), 33, n. 112; P. Anello, 'L'ambiente greco', in *Il Guerriero di Castiglione di Ragusa*, *Hesperìa* 16 (2002), 59–76, at 59, n. 1; De Angelis (n. 2), 123–4, with n. 183.

[101] Wentker (n. 61), 137.

[102] De Wever and van Compernolle (n. 65), 510–17.

[103] Dunbabin (n. 20), 452.

[104] H.G.G. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* (Oxford, 1931); K.F. Johansen, *Les Vases Sicyoniens: Étude archéologique* (Copenhagen, 1923).

[105] For a full analysis of the views concerning the chronology of the Corinthian pottery, see Amyx (n. 24), 397–434.

by Thucydides for Selinus (628/627).[106] In the 1950s, however, previously unpublished pottery locked in the basements of the Palermo Museum during the Second World War and probably deriving from graves revealed the existence of much LPC and Transitional material.[107] This evidence was later supplemented with additional material of Megarian origin of the same period from the Buffa cemetery[108] and the Manuzza cemetery[109] of Selinus.

The problem created by these findings was apparent to many scholars: either the date of Thucydides is to be kept and Payne's chronology for the Corinthian pottery lowered or Payne's chronology kept and the date for the foundation of Selinus raised, given the existence of an alternative chronology.[110] Many scholars preferred the latter solution and attributed a higher chronology for Selinus' foundation, following Eusebius and Diodorus.[111] Others, however, considered that the material dated before the EC was insufficient reason to disregard Thucydides and thus opt for a higher date of Selinus' foundation.[112]

A slightly different explanation from Wentker's for κατοικίζειν was given by Braccesi.[113] Braccesi argued that this verb, when it is coupled in the text of Thucydides with an object in the accusative that denotes location, means in all cases 're-found'.[114] By applying his conclusion to Selinus, he suggested that there was a first foundation of the city by Pamillus, which corresponds to the earlier date, and a later re-foundation by the Megarians in which Megara Nisaea participated, corresponding to the later Thucydidean date.[115] His view has been followed by other scholars, who have added the archaeological evidence of Greek pottery dated from around 650.[116]

In sum, the case of Selinus, in the ambiguity of Thucydides' language and the reliability of his dates in spite of apparently contradictory archaeological evidence, has many similarities with the case of Gela. In contrast to Gela, however, the case for an earlier date is supported by the existence of an independent literary tradition. This information when combined with the archaeological findings and the ambiguity of Thucydides makes some difference. Moreover, we must keep in mind

[106] Payne (n. 104), 21 ff., 55 ff.

[107] G. Vallet and F. Villard, 'Les dates de fondation de Selinonte: les données archéologiques', *BCH* 82 (1958), 16–26, at 17–22.

[108] V. Tusa, 'Richerche e scavi nelle necropolis selinuntine', *ASAA* 60 (1982), 189–202, at 194–202; also Dehl-von Kaenel (n. 100), 33–4.

[109] A. Rallo, 'Selinunte: le ceramiche di VII secolo a.C. della necropoli meridionale di Manuzza dopo gli scavi 1978', *ASAA* 60 (1982), 203–18; also Dehl-von Kaenel (n. 100), 34–5.

[110] For this dilemma see also Tusa (n. 108), 190–1; A. Snodgrass, *An Archaeology of Greece: The Present State and Future Scope of a Discipline* (Berkeley, CA, 1987), 54–7; De Angelis (n. 2), 126, n. 183; Hall (n. 6), 38–9, 106; idem (n. 12), 407–8.

[111] Vallet and Villard (n. 107), 25–6; Tusa (n. 108), 192; Rallo (n. 109), 217; R. van Compernolle, 'Lo stanziamento di apoikoi greci presso Capo Zefirio (capo Bruzzano) nell'ultimo terzo dell'VIII secolo a.C.', *ASNP* 22 (1992), 761–80, at 777–8.

[112] Dehl-von Kaenel (n. 100), 36–7; also Snodgrass (n. 110), 56.

[113] L. Braccesi, 'Appunti su katoikizein in Tucidide VI 3, 5', *Kokalos* 41 (1995), 339–44.

[114] Ibid., 340–1: 6.5.3 (refoundation of Camarina by Hermocrates), 1.8.2 (repopulation of the Aegean islands by the legendary king Minos), 2.70.4 (dispatch of colonists to recently conquered Potidaia), 3.34.4 (sending of colonists to Notion, previously colony of Colophon), 6.76.2 (the Syracusan Hermocrates refers to the possibility that the Athenians might want to repopulate the deserted Leontini). Nicosia (n. 62), 164–5, also gave three definitions for the specific verb, one of them close to Wentker's and another similar to Braccesi's.

[115] Braccesi (n. 113), 341–2.

[116] De Angelis (n. 2), 124 and n. 183; Domínguez (n. 48), 302.

that this alternative date is the only one of Eusebius' dates for the foundation of
Sicilian colonies that is totally inconsistent with Thucydides'. As for the analysis
and argumentation of Braccesi, they seem persuasive. On the other hand, a sceptic
could argue that it is implausible that Thucydides preserves so delicate and specific
a distinction as between 're-found' when κατοικίζειν has a place as an object and
other meanings when such an object is absent.[117] As for the archaeological data
and the value of archaeology in the chronology of Selinus and the character of its
colonisation, the findings from Selinus are more extensive than those from Gela,
making the argument stronger for an initial foundation for Selinus around 650.
Nevertheless, even this amount of evidence is not considered enough by some
scholars, when compared with the amount of material from later periods, to discredit
Thucydides' date.[118] There is a strong possibility of a two-stage foundation for
Selinus: the relation of the two different dates of foundation to the archaeological
data seems to have some significance. Gras's warning should be kept in mind:
we should not relate archaeology immediately to dates given by literary sources
since we cannot know to which stage of a colony's foundation the latter refer.[119]

Nevertheless, whichever reading of Thucydides, or modern view about the foun-
dation date of Selinus, is chosen, we arrive at the same result for Thucydides'
characterisation of the city's foundation as a state-organised enterprise. Whether we
consider that Selinus was established in two phases – a first stage with Pamillus
in 651/650, and a second in 628/627 with the aid of Megara Nisaea – or we
dismiss the Diodorean/Eusebean date and consider that there was only one stage
of foundation in 628/627, it seems very clear from the participle πέμψαντες that
there was a specific impetus for the foundation, namely the Megarians (i.e. the
city of Megara, which sent the *oikist*). It is clear that the Megarians of Sicily
requested the supply of an *oikist* from their home city, whichever of the readings
we choose. This makes the state-sponsored character of Selinus' foundation even
more apparent. Again, as in Gela's case, the archaeological data cannot help us with
more than dates. They support an establishment prior to 628/627 but they cannot
tell us anything about the character of this establishment, namely state-guided or
private undertaking. The fact that the Megarians of Sicily asked Megara Nisaea for
aid, or at least an *oikist* for the foundation of Selinus proves that at least by this
period, and quite probably from the foundation of Megara Hyblaea, the Megarians
of Sicily recognised Megara Nisaea as their mother city.[120]

Turning to Acragas,[121] at 6.4.4–5 Thucydides writes: Γελῷοι Ἀκράγαντα
ᾤκισαν, τὴν μὲν πόλιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκράγαντος ποταμοῦ ὀνομάσαντες, οἰκιστὰς δὲ

---

[117] In other cases where there is no object that denotes location, κατοικίζειν could mean 're-
found' – 6.48, 6.50.4, 6.63.3, 6.84.2 (though they all refer to one case, that of Leontini) and
probably in 1.103.3 (Naupactus) – but in most cases it does not: 1.12, 1.38.2, 2.102.5–6, 2.17.2
(in this passage the words ἐνοίκησιν, τῆς οἰκήσεως, κατοικισθησόμενον are used all together
in the same context), 4.102.2, 5.35.7, 6.7, 8.62.2).

[118] Dehl-von Kaenel (n. 100), 37.

[119] M. Gras, 'Aspects de la recherche sur la colonisation grecque: à propos du Congrès
d'Athènes: note de lecture', *RBPh* 64 (1986), 5–21, at 13. Of course the acceptance of this
argument points to foundations as processes rather than instant events.

[120] See also above, p. 477.

[121] For the foundation of Acragas, see Bérard (n. 48), 235–9; J.A. de Waele, *Acragas Graeca:
Die historische Topographie des griechischen Akragas auf Sizilien* (Rome, 1971), 81–97;
Leschhorn (n. 48), 52, n. 5; Bianchetti (n. 19), 7–27; L. Braccesi, *Agrigento greca nel suo
divenire storico*, in 'Veder greco. Le necropoli di Agrigento': *Mostra Internazionale Agrigento,
2 maggio–31 luglio 1988* (Rome, 1988), 3–22, at 4–6; G. Baghin, 'Falaride, Pentalo e la fon-

ποιήσαντες Ἀριστόνουν καὶ Πυστίλον, νόμιμα δὲ τὰ Γελῴων δόντες. Although
the phrase Γελῷοι Ἀκράγαντα ᾤκισαν seems as indefinite as in the cases of the
first-generation colonies, it subsequently becomes clear that Γελῷοι is the ethnic
name denoting the city. They appoint the *oikist* (the participle ποιήσαντες) and
also give (the participle δόντες) the same institutions (νόμιμα)[122] as theirs to the
new city. It is very clear that this is a state-guided operation.[123] In Acragas' case,
other sources mention that it was a colony of Rhodes or emphasise the Rhodian
element of the city.[124] Moreover, modern scholars have thought the foundation
of Acragas related to the expedition of Pentathlus, which occurred, according to
Diodorus, in 580–576 (κατὰ τὴν ὀλυμπιάδα τὴν πεντηκοστήν 5.9.2.), roughly
the same period in which Acragas was founded.[125] Likewise, the two *oikists* men-
tioned by Thucydides were considered to be of Geloan and Rhodian origin.[126]
Other scholars thought, considering the proximity of the colony to the home city,
that the foundation of Acragas resulted from the Geloan need to expand, similar
to Syracuse's need that was manifest in the foundation of Acrae and Casmenae.[127]

dazione di Agrigento', *Hesperìa* 2 (1991), 7–17; D. Musti, 'Le tradizioni ecistiche di Agrigento',
in *Agrigento e la Sicilia Greca* (Rome, 1992), 27–45; Consolo Langher (n. 60), 19, n. 26;
Domínguez (n. 48), 306–10. Thucydides mentions that Acragas was founded in 580. His chronol-
ogy seems to be confirmed by other sources: Pind. *Ol*. 2.93–96, 100 years before the Olympic
victory of Theron (476); Schol. Pind. *Ol*. 2.166, 168, which is of course only an approximate
indication; also Bianchetti (n. 19), 11 and archaeological data (de Waele [n. 121], 88–97, esp.
96; E. de Miro, 'Akragas, città e necropoli nei recenti scavi' in *Veder Greco: Le necropoli di
Agrigento* [Rome, 1988], 235–52, at 240–4, esp. 244; A. de Miro, 'Akragas in età arcaica', in
Panvini and Sole [n. 48], 245–9, at 245–6; also Bianchetti [n. 19], 14).
   [122] For the meaning and significance of the *nomima*, see I. Malkin, '"Tradition" in Herodotus:
the foundation of Cyrene', in P. Derow and R. Parker (edd.), *Herodotus and his World* (Oxford,
2003), 153–70, at 164–5; idem, 'Foundations', in Raaflaub and Van Wees (n. 12), 373–94, at
386 ff.
   [123] Domínguez (n. 48), 307 remarks that, as in Gela's case, when Thucydides refers to the
nomima he wants to underline the difference in the origin of the settlers. This seems a reasonable
statement. But when Thucydides refers to the Athenian colonisation of Notion (3.34.4) he says
that the Athenians πέμψαντες κατὰ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νόμους κατῴκισαν τὸ Νότιον, a wording
not identical but very close to the νόμιμα δόντες. And, of course, in Notion's case the phrase
is not used because of the difference of origin of the settlers, since they were all Athenians. I
think that in both cases the state-guided character of the colonisation is apparent. Both phrase-
ologies indicate that the colonising actions are due to specific cities.
   [124] These sources are: Polyb. 9.27.8 (colony of Rhodes; he also mentions the cult of Zeus
Artabyrios, which is of Rhodian origin, though not attested by others); Schol. Pind. *Ol*. 2.15a, 16
= Timaius *FGrH* 566 F 92 (who admit the Rhodian origin but add that some individuals such as
the forefathers of the tyrant Theron came directly from Rhodes); also Artemon *FGrH* 569 F 1.
For an analysis of these sources, see Bérard (n. 48), 236–8; Bianchetti (n. 19), 15–16; Bracessi
(n. 121), 4–6; Musti (n. 121), 31 ff.
   [125] V. Merante, 'Pentatlo e la fondazione di Lipari', *Kokalos* 13 (1967), 88–104, esp.
99–102; Bianchetti (n. 19), 17–27; Baghin (n. 121), 12–17. For Pentathlus' expedition, see also
G. Maddoli, 'La Sicilia greca dal VI secolo alle guerre puniche', in E. Gabba and G. Vallet
(edd.), *La Sicilia*, vol. 2.1 (Naples, 1980), 1–102, at 7–8; T.J. Figueira, 'The Lipari islanders
and their system of communal property', *ClAnt* 3 (1984), 179–206, at 186–7; Domínguez (n.
100), 477–8; Consolo Langher (n. 60), 454, n. 6; S. De Vido, *Gli Elimi: storie di contatti e di
rappresentazioni* (Pisa, 1997), 194–201; V. Krings, *Carthage et les Grecs, c. 580–480 av. J.-C.:
Textes et histoire* (Leiden, 1998), 82–5, 202–4.
   [126] Dunbabin (n. 20), 310; Graham (n. 23), 167; Leschhorn (n. 48), 53; Braccesi (n. 121),
5.
   [127] E. de Miro, 'La fondazione di Agrigento e l'ellenizzazione del territorio fra il Salso e il
Platani', *Kokalos* 8 (1962), 122–52; Leschhorn (n. 48), 52; Domínguez (n. 100), 427–8; idem
(n. 48), 308.

The possibility of a mixed colony of both Geloan and Rhodian origin should not be excluded but equally should not be assumed. It is possible that the Geloans asked for some help from Rhodes, since some came from there,[128] just as Megara Hyblaea asked for help from Megara Nisaea when they founded Selinus. But we must admit that some of the sources who record Rhodian origin are of suspiciously pro-Emmenid (the family of Theron the later tyrant of Acragas) origin,[129] while the archaeological evidence is far less persuasive for Rhodian origin than others have thought.[130] In either case, the state-guided character of Acragas' foundation is secure. It does not change, in my opinion, even if we consider that these Rhodians were the remaining colonists who came to Sicily under Pentathlus.[131]

In Himera's case things seem a little more complicated. At 6.5.1 Thucydides writes:

καὶ Ἱμέρα ἀπὸ Ζάγκλης ᾠκίσθη ὑπὸ Εὐκλείδου καὶ Σίμου καὶ Σάκωνος, καὶ Χαλκιδῆς μὲν οἱ πλεῖστοι ἦλθον ἐς τὴν ἀποικίαν, ξυνῴκισαν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκ Συρακουσῶν φυγάδες στάσει νικηθέντες, οἱ Μυλητίδαι καλούμενοι· καὶ φωνὴ μὲν μεταξὺ τῆς τε Χαλκιδέων καὶ Δωρίδος ἐκράθη, νόμιμα δὲ τὰ Χαλκιδικὰ ἐκράτησεν.[132]

In general he gives a notion of a private enterprise, but there are also hints of a state-guided enterprise.

First of all, the impetus of the colonising expedition is the three *oikists* who founded Zancle, a point made clear by their role as the agent of the phrase.

---

[128] Probably the majority or the prevailing group, since Herodotus (7.153) mentions that Gela was the colony only of Rhodes and not of both Rhodes and Crete, meaning that at some time the element of Rhodian origin had prevailed.

[129] Above all, see A.M. Buongiovanni 'Una tradizione filo-emmenide sulla fondazione di Acragas', *ASNP* 15 (1985), 493–9; but also Bianchetti (n. 19), 16; Baghin (n. 121), 11–12; Domínguez (n. 48), 307; and the analysis of Musti (n. 121), 33 ff.

[130] Baghin (n. 121), 12, and Domínguez (n. 48), 307, hold this view, based on the findings of De Miro (n. 121), 243–4. De Miro mentions the existence of pottery of Rhodian origin in the necropolis of Contrada Montelusa, the oldest of Acragas' cemeteries, dating from the period of the city's foundation. This pottery is only two plates (one of them is also mentioned by de Waele [n. 121], 96 n. 77/s. 2258), while all the other material is of Corinthian origin. The sample is not large enough for safe conclusions to be made. Moreover we cannot be sure who brought this material to Acragas. It could either originate from Rhodes or have been brought from Gela by Geloans. After all, many of the Geloans were of Rhodian origin. We should also not entirely exclude the possibility that they could have been manufactured in Gela in imitation of pottery of their home city.

[131] These people would have incorporated themselves into the Geloan expenditure. They must have been very few. Depending on how many left Rhodes (probably not many), and keeping into consideration that some must have died in fighting Carthaginians, and that some must have taken part in the foundation of Lipara, we are left with only a small portion of the original population. It is worth mentioning that Diod. Sic. 5.9.1 mentions that both Rhodians and Cnidians took part in the foundation of Lipara, while Paus. 10.11.3 quoting Antiochus, refers only to Cnidians.

[132] Thucydides does not give a foundation date. For this omission of his see above, n. 83. Diodorus mentions that Himera was founded in 648/647 (Diod. Sic. 13.62.4), a date that seems to be confirmed by archaeological findings (J. Allegro, 'Le fasi dell'abitato di Himera', in H.P. Isler et al., *Wohnbauforschung in Zentral und Westsizilien: Sicilia Occidentale e Centro-Meridionale: Ricerche archeologiche nell'abitato* [Zürich, 1997], 65–80, at 70–1; S. Vassallo 'Indagini in un quartiere della città bassa di Himera', in Isler et al., 81–90, at 85–8; P. F. Fabri, R. Schettino and S. Vassallo, 'Lo scavo delle sepulture della necropoli di Himera Pestavecchia (Palermo)', in *Guerra e pace in Sicilia e nel Mediterraneo antico (VIII–III sec. a.C.* [Pisa, 2006], 613–20, at 613). For the foundation of Himera, see Bérard (n. 48), 240–2; Asheri (n. 48), 131–2; Leschhorn (n. 48), 48–51, with 48, n. 8; Domínguez (n. 100), 333–5; idem (n. 48), 292–7.

Moreover, in the following phrase, which explicitly says that 'most of those who came in the colony were Chalcidians', there is no city as an agent of Himera's foundation. Furthermore, Thucydides does not refer to Zancleans, as we would expect, but to Chalcidians in general. Finally, from the verb that he uses to refer to the institutions of Himera (ἐκράτησεν), it is not clear that they were imposed by Zancle, in antithesis to the participle δόντες, which is used in the case of Gela to Acragas.[133] This all points clearly to private colonisation.

On the other hand, there are some elements that seem unclear and could have multiple interpretations. One of them is the ἀπὸ Ζάγκλης. De Romilly translates as thought it goes with the *oikists*: 'De Zankle partirent les fondateurs d'Himere', while Foster-Smith gives it as 'Himera colonized from Zankle', associating it with the verb. In the second version, the meaning is that Zancle as a city had some role in the foundation of Himera, but the agent in the phrase is the *oikists*. Moreover, as in the previously mentioned cases, this ἀπὸ plus genitive indicates derivation from a specific place and it is used in this case only to describe, if not the origin of the founders, as de Romilly translates, at least the origin of the settlers.

There is also the ξυνῴκισαν or ξυνῴκησαν (Forster-Smith in the Loeb uses the first, while de Romilly in the Budé prefers the second). If the first is preferred, it follows that the Myletidae[134] co-founded Himera with the colonists from Zancle, while, if the second is preferred, then the Myletidae simply followed the Zancleans and were established there. In the first case, the notion of a foundation with private initiative is reinforced, since it seems that we are dealing with groups of people of different origin who collaborate between themselves in order to found a colony.

Finally Himera is exceptional in the colonisation of Sicily in that Thucydides refers to three *oikists*.[135] It has been assumed that the three *oikists* represent different ethnographic elements, one of them originating from Zancle, one from the Syracusan Myletidae, and the third from the mother city of Zancle, Chalcis.[136] It seems that at least one of the *oikists* came from Zancle and, if the ξυνῴκισαν is to be followed, one also must be from the Myletidae. If we believe that the third one originated from Chalcis, then we could speak of a state-guided colonising enterprise, since the appointment of an *oikist* from the mother city presupposes an official act organised by the authorities of the *polis*. Moreover, elsewhere Thucydides mentions that it was an old custom when a colony intended to found a new colony to ask its mother city to provide an *oikist*.[137] On the other hand, he does not mention an *oikist* from the mother city in the present passage or make any allusion to one. Besides, he mentions that when the Spartans founded Heracleia Trachinia they

[133] Of course it could be argued that the phrase means that Zancle gave the Chalcidian institutions to Himera and that these institutions managed to prevail despite the mixed origin of the settlers.

[134] Strabo (6.2.6) says that Himera was founded by the Zancleans from Mylae. Bérard (n. 48), 241, combined the two references and argued that the Myletidae were initially installed by the Zancleans in Mylae. For the Myletidae and the reference of Strabo, see also Asheri (n. 48), 132; F. Cordano, *Antiche fondazioni greche: Sicilia e Italia meridionale* (Palermo, 1986), 46; and, above all, Leschhorn (n. 48), 49.

[135] For a fuller analysis of what these three *oikists* mentioned by Thucydides might represent, see Leschhorn (n. 48), 48–51; Domínguez (n. 100), 333–4.

[136] This view was initially expressed by Bérard (n. 48), 241–2. See also Domínguez (n. 48), 292–3, who refers to a possible third group in addition to the Syracusan Myletidae and the Chalcidians. For a fuller analysis and for the identification of specific *oikists* with specific colonial groups based on indications of the former's names, see Leschhorn (n. 48), 50–1.

[137] Thuc. 1.24.2.

also appointed three *oikists*.[138] In conclusion, Thucydides description of Himera's foundation points to private initiative,[139] unless we believe that the third *oikist* came from Zancle's mother city.

Finally, in the case of Acrae, Casmenae and Camarina, at 6.5.2–3 Thucydides writes:

Ἄκραι δὲ καὶ Κασμέναι ὑπὸ Συρακοσίων ᾠκίσθησαν, Ἄκραι μὲν ἑβδομήκοντα ἔτεσι μετὰ Συρακούσας, Κασμέναι δ' ἐγγὺς εἴκοσι μετὰ Ἄκρας. καὶ Καμάρινα τὸ πρῶτον ὑπὸ Συρακοσίων ᾠκίσθη, ἔτεσιν ἐγγύτατα πέντε καὶ τριάκοντα καὶ ἑκατὸν μετὰ Συρακουσῶν κτίσιν· οἰκισταὶ δὲ ἐγένοντο αὐτῆς Δάσκων καὶ Μενέκωλος. ἀναστάτων δὲ Καμαριναίων γενομένων πολέμῳ ὑπὸ Συρακοσίων δι' ἀπόστασιν.

The three cities were founded, according to Thucydides, by the Syracusans (ὑπὸ Συρακοσίων), which should be regarded as the ethnic name denoting Syracuse itself. The fact that Thucydides does not mention the name of the *oikist* for the cities, as Asheri also remarks, indicates that they had a special relation with their mother city and were not fully autonomous,[140] thus making the state-guided character of their foundation even clearer. In Casmenae, excavations have discovered the initial layout of the city, revealing a well-planned foundation that supports the notion of a single foundation and suggests the state-guided character of Casmenae's foundation even more clearly.[141] Both Acrai and Casmenae were of military character and were intended to expand the Syracusan control in the hinterland of south-east Sicily.[142] Their dependence on Syracuse and subsequently the state-guided character of their foundation is also indicated by the lack of independent coinage. The same holds for Camarina. Thucydides mentions that the war that broke out later between Syracuse and Camarina was δι' ἀπόστασιν, making it even clearer that there was some kind of dependency of Camarina on Syracuse, or at least a

---

[138] Ibid. 3.92.6.

[139] Following this view, Tusa (n. 108), 194, and Cordano (n. 134), 12, were wrong to assert that Himera was founded in order to check the Carthaginian expansion. It is unlikely that Greek cities made plans to expand against Carthage as early as the mid-seventh century.

[140] Graham (n. 9), 92–4; idem (n. 23), 176; Asheri (n. 48), 122.

[141] For Casmenae's layout, see A. Di Vita, 'Un contributo all'urbanistica greca di Sicilia: Casmene', in *Atti 7° Congresso Internazionale di Archeologia Classica 1958* (Rome, 1961), 69–77; idem 1996 (n. 59), 276–9; G. Voza, 'Akrai', in *Archeologia nelle Sicilia Sud-Orientale* (Napoli, 1973), 127–8; idem, 'Akrai, Camarina, Casmene', in E. Gabba and G. Vallet (edd.), *La Sicilia Antica I*3*: Città greche e indigene di Sicilia: Documenti e storia* (Naples, 1980), 497–536, at 529–36; G.P.R. Métraux, *Western Greek Land-use and City Planning in the Archaic Period* (New York, 1978), 129–36; Domínguez (n. 100), 215–16; Fischer-Hansen (n. 63), 336; D. Mertens, *Città e monumenti dei greci d'Occidente: dalla colonizzazione alla crisi di fine V secolo a.C.* (Rome, 2006), 77–9.

[142] A. Di Vita, 'La penetrazione siracusana nella Sicilia sud-orientale alla luce delle piu recenti scoperte arceologiche', *Kokalos* 2 (1956), 177–205; also idem, 'Tucidide VI.5 e l'epicrazia siracusana: Acre, Casmene, Camarina', *Kokalos* 33 (1987), 77–87, at 79–80; idem 1961 (n. 141), 350; idem 1996 (n. 59), 276. In general, Di Vita's reconstruction of the character of the Syracusan expansion is accepted by most scholars; Anello (n. 100), 67, n. 48. Some exceptions are E. Greco, in E. Greco and M. Torelli, *Storia dell'urbanistica: Il mondo greco* (Rome, 1983), 180–4; M. Melfi, 'Alcune osservazioni sul cosiddetto tempio di Ares a Monte Casale-Casmenai', *Geoarcheologia* 2 (2000), 39–48, at 45. The latter suggested that Casmenae was founded for mediation with the locals, a theory that appealed to E. Greco, 'Note di topografia e di urbanistica IV', *AION* 7 (2003), 223–33, at 229, but see A. Di Vita, 'Ancora Casmene: una nota', *PP* 58 (2003), 66–70.

special bond between the two cities.[143] This special bond probably resulted from the state-guided character of Camarina's foundation.

LEONTINI AND CATANE

The state of affairs of the two other Euboean colonies, Leontini and Catane, is somewhere between the first- and second-generation colonies.[144] On the one hand, they were not second-generation colonies but were founded only six years after Naxos. On the other hand, they were founded by the colonists of Naxos only after the establishment of Naxos. The special character of Leontini and Catane is also illustrated by the Thucydidean narration at 6.3.3: Θουκλῆς δὲ καὶ οἱ Χαλκιδῆς ἐκ Νάξου ὁρμηθέντες ἔτει πέμπτῳ μετὰ Συρακούσας οἰκισθείσας Λεοντίνους τε πολέμῳ τοὺς Σικελοὺς ἐξελάσαντες οἰκίζουσι, καὶ μετ' αὐτοὺς Κατάνην· οἰκιστὴν δὲ αὐτοὶ Καταναῖοι ἐποιήσαντο Εὔαρχον. The subject of the foundation of Leontini and Catane is again Thoucles; however, alongside Thoucles, Thucydides does not refer to Naxians as we would expect, given that Naxos had already been established, but to Chalcidians again, this time with an article before the word making his sense clearer. The article is used, however, not to denote the city of Chalcis but rather to connect the two expeditions (Naxos/Leontini–Catane), and the previously mentioned Chalcidians with the one in this passage. The mention of the Chalcidians instead of Naxians, along with the explicit mention of Thoucles as the driving force, points to a non-state-guided operation. It is reasonable to assume that the six years that elapsed between the foundation of Naxos and the subsequent foundation of Leontini and Catane were a very short period of time for the Chalcidians to construct a Naxian identity and a more established form of political organisation. Therefore, there is insufficient reason to consider the two later Chalcidian colonies as state-guided. The fact that these Chalcidians managed to found three cities in a very short period of time could be explained by large numbers at their time of departure or the arrival of additional colonists.[145]

However, as Leschhorn remarks, though the driving force behind the foundation of Catane was the same as behind Leontini – namely the Chalcidians, along with Thoucles – immediately after, Thucydides mentions that the Catanians chose (literally 'made') their own *oikist*, Euarchus.[146] In no first- or second-generation colony does he mention this happening. The *oikist(s)* are either referred to as in charge of the colonising movement or they seem to have been appointed by the mother city. This could further indicate the peculiar character of Catane. Bérard considered that the Catanians chose another *oikist* because Thoucles remained in Leontini,[147] while Leschhorn argued that Thoucles was just the leader of the expedition, and

---

[143] Maddoli (n. 125), 20–1; G. Manganaro, 'La Syrakosion dekate', *ZPE* 128 (1999), 115–23, at 116; Anello (n. 100), 71–2. For a different opinion, see Greco (n. 142), 181. For the relation between the two cities see also Seibert (n. 9), 122–7.

[144] For the foundation of Leontini and Catane, see Bérard (n. 48), 83–5; Asheri (n. 48), 108–11; Leschhorn (n. 48), 11–13 with 12, n. 1 and no 4. For earlier bibliography for Leontini and Catane, see Domínguez (n. 48), 259–63.

[145] Dunbabin (n. 20), 10, supports the first option, considering that there is no mention in Thucydides of later arrivals; while Domínguez (n. 48), 262, prefers the second possibility.

[146] Leschhorn (n. 48), 12.

[147] Bérard (n. 48), 85.

that, since Thoucles was already recognised as *oikist* of Naxos, they should have
another *oikist* and so chose Euarchus,[148] which implied that Catane had autonomy
from the beginning.[149] In roughly the same context, Casevitz[150] says that Euarchus
was chosen so that the Catanians would differentiate themselves from Naxos, and
Malkin mentions that this choice 'was an assertion by the new foundation of its
own identity'[151] and elsewhere that the Catanians revolted against Theocles and
chose Euarchus.[152] Domínguez seems to agree with the first characterisation of
Malkin, but he also mentions that 'we don't know why Catana chose (or perhaps
better "created") Euarchus as founder'.[153] At this point we must remark that it
is of primary importance to specify when the Catanians chose Euarchus as their
oikist. If this choice was made in some later period, then we return to Osborne's
model, according to which the events of Greek colonisation described in the literary
sources are merely inventions of later periods. Malkin implies that Euarchus was
named immediately after the foundation of the city; Casevitz is not sure; while
Domínguez's 'created' is close to invented. I follow Malkin's view, or at least
consider that Euarchus was not named many years after the city's foundation. The
reading of Thucydides' text seems to be closer to this view; otherwise we would
expect some temporal adverb, such as the very common ὕστερον, to have been
added in the phrase.

COLONISING ACTIONS IN OTHER PASSAGES
OF THUCYDIDES

I will now compare the aforementioned passages with other passages that describe
colonising actions and see what expressions Thucydides uses for colonising move-
ments in different periods. I will first present the colonisation of his age, which
is universally considered to have been state-guided. The examples are many. At
3.92.1, Thucydides tells how Λακεδαιμόνιοι Ἡράκλειαν τὴν ἐν Τραχινίᾳ ἀποικίαν
καθίσταντο, and by the Lacedaemonians Thucydides clearly refers to Sparta. At
3.92.4, the Lacedaemonians literally 'send' the colony (οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι γνώμην
εἶχον τὴν ἀποικίαν ἐκπέμπειν). The verb ἐκπέμπειν is the same as the one used
in the case of Selinus, and the same verb appears again a little further on in the
phrase, ἐξέπεμψαν τοὺς οἰκήτορας, namely they sent out the colonists (3.92.5).
At 4.102.3, he writes: οἱ Ἀθηναῖοι, Ἄγνωνος τοῦ Νικίου οἰκιστοῦ ἐκπεμφθέντος,
Ἠδῶνας ἐξελάσαντες ἔκτισαν τὸ χωρίον τοῦτο. It is clear that the Athenians
founded the colony (Amphipolis), and it is they who sent the *oikist* – again the
same verb in participle form (ἐκπεμφθέντος). At 1.100.3 Thucydides writes οἱ
Ἀθηναῖοι … ἐπὶ δὲ Στρυμόνα πέμψαντες μυρίους οἰκήτορας αὐτῶν καὶ τῶν
ξυμμάχων. It is Athens that sent 10,000 colonists to Strymon; again the city is
designated by the ethnic and the participle denotes who was the driving force

[148] Leschhorn (n. 48), 13.
[149] Hansen, Nielsen and Ampolo (n. 24), 206.
[150] Casevitz (n. 64), 106. He also says, mentioning Brasidas, that the *oikist* might be named,
even if he was not the originator of the colonising expedition.
[151] Malkin (n. 58), 57 and n. 100, where he also compares Catane with Amphipolis and
Euarchus with Brasidas; see also Hornblower (n. 18), 285.
[152] Malkin 2009 (n. 122), 377.
[153] Domínguez (n. 48), 262.

of the colonisation. Similarly at 5.116.4, in the case of Melos (τὸ δὲ χωρίον αὐτοὶ ᾤκισαν, ἀποίκους ὕστερον πεντακοσίους πέμψαντες), the Athenians – meaning Athens again – sent the colonists, where the participial phrase ἀποίκους πέμψαντες is used. The same phrase is used at 2.27.1, where Thucydides writes: καὶ τὴν Αἴγιναν ἀσφαλέστερον ἐφαίνετο τῇ Πελοποννήσῳ ἐπικειμένην αὐτῶν πέμψαντας ἐποίκους ἔχειν. καὶ ἐξέπεμψαν ὕστερον οὐ πολλῷ ἐς αὐτὴν τοὺς οἰκήτορας. In the case of Aegina, the participle πέμψαντας ἐποίκους and then a verb, ἐξέπεμψαν … τοὺς οἰκήτορας, are used. Both make clear that Athens is the specific initiator of the colonising action. The same construction is used at 3.34.4, where he says: καὶ ὕστερον Ἀθηναῖοι οἰκιστὰς πέμψαντες κατὰ τοὺς ἑαυτῶν νόμους κατῴκισαν τὸ Νότιον, ξυναγαγόντες πάντας ἐκ τῶν πόλεων, εἴ πού τις ἦν Κολοφωνίων. Again the Athenians (without the article) sent colonists οἰκιστὰς πέμψαντες (the same participle), adding that they colonised Notion according to their laws, a statement that, as with Gela and Acragas, makes the state-guided character of the expedition even more explicit. From all the above, it seems clear that Thucydides uses specific expressions to describe colonisation. Behind every colonising movement there is always a specific city, which is referred to by the usual ethnic name that Thucydides uses when referring to a city as a political entity. Moreover, it is explicitly mentioned that this city sends both the *oikist* and the colonists (the verb ἐκπέμπω in different forms), which makes even clearer the state-guided character of each expedition. In no case is the *oikist* presented as the initiating force of the expedition, and the colonists do not just arrive vaguely from a specific place as in the description of the foundation of the first-generation colonies. Instead they are sent by a specific city.

Unfortunately, we do not possess such parallel evidence in Thucydides' text for non-state-guided colonising enterprises, since, except for the colonisation of the West, he refers mainly to colonisation in his own time, which is purely state-guided. There are a few exceptions, however. In 1.2.6, Thucydides mentions that Athens (we may very plausibly infer that the subject is the Athenians) ἐς Ἰωνίαν ὕστερον ὡς οὐχ ἱκανῆς οὔσης τῆς Ἀττικῆς ἀποικίας ἐξέπεμψαν. Here he follows the Athenian tradition and propaganda, with which he was brought up, that considers the colonisation of Ionia as organised by Athens.[154] His phraseology indicates that the colonisation of Ionia was made by a single city, namely Athens. This is of course Athenian fiction. The same also applies to 3.61.2, where the Thebans, in order to legitimate their claims on Plataea and their hegemonic position in the rest of Boeotia, argue that they, meaning the city of Thebes, founded Plataea (ἡμῶν κτισάντων Πλάταιαν). In both cases, Thucydides relates propaganda about sup-posedly state-guided operations.

Finally Thucydides makes references to colonising activity at 1.12. In this chap-ter, he refers to all the major movements of the Greek people from the Trojan War down to the eighth century. He seems to differentiate the emigration of the Greek tribes immediately after the Trojan War from the colonisation of Ionia, Sicily and Italy, and the rest of Greece.[155] This differentiation is more apparent if ᾤκισαν is preferred to ᾤκησαν in reference to the emigration immediately after the Trojan War.[156] Thucydides groups together the colonisation of Ionia and the West because

[154] The same view is also expressed in Herodotus (1.146.2).
[155] Wilson (n. 12), 32–3, makes a hypothesis for this differentiation.
[156] But, again, de Wever and van Compernolle (n. 65), 474–5, do not consider this necessary, since they remark that the verb οἰκίζω does not solely denote the foundation of an *apoikia*.

he considers that they were both carried out in an organised manner, unlike the movements after the Trojan War. But his language does not indicate any state-sponsored act. Though he uses the phrase ἀποικίας ἐξέπεμψε, the subject is the very vague ἡ Ἑλλὰς, which is similar to the Ἑλλήνων δὲ πρῶτοι in 6.3.1.

COLONISATION AND THE RISE OF THE *POLIS*

The nature of the Greek colonies, namely state-sponsored or result of private initiative, is also directly related to the rise and the stabilisation of the *polis* as an organised political entity. Scholars have formerly expressed the view that, since the Greek colonies of the West were proper *poleis*, then their mother cities must have been also.[157] However, this seems a very generalised and oversimplified view, since, for example, the Acheans in mainland Greece were not organised in *poleis* when their first colonies were founded in Italy in the end of the eighth century, but only in a much later period.[158] Other scholars have argued that the formation of the *polis* in mainland Greece was very much influenced by the colonial experience.[159] The view that sending out an *apoikia* was a formative process that led to the integration and stabilisation of the *polis* in a simultaneous and reciprocal manner both in the new foundation and the place from which the colonists had departed has also gained favour.[160] I am in full agreement with scholars who say that we should not assume that the Greek political communities of mainland Greece had already been incorporated as *poleis*-states by the period in question.[161] The first steps towards *polis* formation – which must have been initiated around 750 in some parts of mainland Greece[162] – should not be identified with the consolidation of the basic

[157] V. Ehrenberg, 'When did the polis rise?', *JHS* 57 (1937), 147–59, at 155; M.M Austin and P. Vidal-Naquet, *Economic and Social History of Ancient Greece: An Introduction Translated [from the French] and Revised by M.M. Austin* (London, 1977), 49–50; Graham (n. 23), 159.

[158] M.B. Sakellariou, *The Polis-state: Definition and Origin* (Athens, 1989), 315; C. Morgan and H. Hall, 'Achaian poleis and Achaian colonization', in M.H. Hansen (ed.), *Introduction to an Inventory of Polis* (Copenhagen, 1996), 164–262, at 199–200.

[159] Snodgrass (n. 6), 41 (who adds, however, that, except Lokris and Achaea, all the other places that sent colonists were city-states); Malkin (n. 58), 12 (but see the next note); Di Vita 1996 (n. 59), 263.

[160] I Malkin, 'Inside and outside: colonisation and the formation of the mother city', *AION* n.s. 1 (1994), esp. 1–2, 9; idem 2009 (n. 122), 377–8, 382. O. Murray, *Early Greece* (London 1993²), 103, found it very difficult to determine whether the formulation of the *polis* started earlier in the colonies or in the home cities.

[161] Among others, Malkin (n. 160); I. Morris (1991), 'The early polis as a city state', in Rich and Wallace-Hadrill (n. 17), 24–57; Di Vita 1990 (n. 59) 346–7; Snodgrass (n. 6), mainly at 40, 43; E. Greco, *Η αρχαιολογία της Μεγάλης Ελλάδας* (Thessaloniki, 2001), 179; Wilson (n. 12), 33–4.

[162] For example, at Megara the first sign of a recognised community identity could be considered to be the Megarian synoecism (Plut.*Quaest Graec.* 17) which is dated to roughly the same period: M. Moggi, *I sinecismi interstatali greci* (Pisa, 1976), 29–34; Legon (n. 58), 46–55; also N.G.L. Hammond, 'The Peloponnese', in N.G.L. Hammond, J. Boardman, I.E.S. Edwards and E. Sollberger (edd.), *CAH²*, *3.1* (Cambridge 1982), 696–744, at 724; Figueira (n. 58), 265–9; De Angelis (n. 2), 47; Gras, Tréziny and Broise (n. 58), 557. At Corinth, the fall of the kingship and the beginning of the Bacchiadic rule of two hundred persons could be considered as the significant steps for the *polis*' formation. For these events, see mainly Diod. Sic. 7.9, from Georg. Syncell. Chron. 179; Schöne (n. 84), 1.220, but also Paus. 2.4.4; Nic. Dam. *FGrH* 90 F 57.6; Hdt. 5.92. According to Diodorus, the fall of the kingship occurred in 747. Further, it is clearly stated in the sources that when Archias left Corinth the Bacchiadae where already in

principles of the *polis* as a political entity but should be thought of rather as a process and not an instantaneous development. It is hard to believe that the cities of mainland Greece in the mid-eighth century had already managed to develop the necessary political structure and organisation and the appropriate mechanisms to organise colonial undertakings. This evolution occurred both in mainland Greece and the colonies of the West mainly during the seventh century, and it is mostly related to the encoding of laws[163] and the development of ideas of citizenship,[164] but also to the establishment of sanctuaries.[165]

On the other hand, based also on the model of mainland Greece, since we possess little information about the internal affairs of the Sicilian cities, we should consider that by the middle of the seventh century the Greek *poleis* of Sicily had developed a more centralised political organisation, which allowed the official sending of colonists and the foundation of new cities. Thus the character of Greek colonisation should be considered in tandem with the general conditions in any given period; these of course were not the same in the eighth and early seventh centuries as they were 50 to 100 years later. Nevertheless generalisations must be avoided, and each colonising venture should be dealt with separately.[166] The stabilisation of the *polis* in any given area does not necessarily imply that any colonising movement originating from there must be considered as state-guided. The most striking example is the expedition of the Spartan prince Dorieus. If we simply possessed a testimony that Dorieus, the son of the king of Sparta, sailed to found a colony, without knowing the reasons for this action, it is almost certain that it would be considered a state-guided operation organised by the authorities of Sparta, who put a prominent member of the community in charge. We are lucky, however, to have the more detailed narrative of Herodotus.[167] But it must

---

power there: see mainly Plut. *Amat. Narrat.* 772e; Ap. Rhod. 4.1212 with Scholia; along with n. 53 above.

[163] For early Greek law enactment see, among others, M.Gagarin, *Early Greek Law* (Berkeley, CA, 1986); K.J. Hölkeskamp, *Schiedsrichter, Gesetzgebung im Archaischen Griechenland* (Stuttgart, 1999); Z. Papadopoulos, *Lawmaking and Adjudication in Archaic Greece* (London, 2008). It is worth mentioning that the first written legislation in the Greek world is attributed to Zaleucus, who acted in the West at the city of Lokroi: Strab. 6.1.8 = Ephorus *FGrH* 70 F 139; Ps.-Scymnus 312.

[164] Scholars have expressed various opinions on the rise of citizenship in the Greek cities. For instance, some, such as Snodgrass (n. 6), 39–40, and Hölkeskamp (n. 163), 155–7, have identified the origin of citizenship with land-owning; others with the participation in battles and more precisely through the ranks of the phalanx: see P.B. Manville, *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens* (Princeton, NJ, 1990), 85, n. 53. See also K.A. Raaflaub, 'Soldiers, citizens and the evolution of the early Greek polis', in L.G. Mitchell and P.J. Rhodes (edd.), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* (London 1997), 26–33, for a combination of the two previous views, while J.K. Davies, 'The concept of the "citizen"', in S. Cataldi (ed.), *Poleis e politeiai: Esperienze politiche, tradizioni letterarie, progetti costituzionali: Atti del convegno internazionale di storia greca, Torino, 29–31 maggio 2002* (Alessandria, 2004), 19–30, identified it with the rise of elites such as the Bacchiadae.

[165] F. De Polignac, *La naissance de la cité grecque: Cultes, espace et société VIIIe–VIIe siècles avant J.-C.* (Paris, 1984).

[166] See also the remark of Lyons and Papadopoulos given in n. 15 above.

[167] For the ventures of the Spartan prince Dorieus, see Hdt. 5.42–48, with I. Malkin, *Myth and Territory in the Spartan Mediterranean* (Cambridge 1994), 192–218; G. Nenci, *Le storie / Erodoto. Vol. 5: La rivolta della Ionia* (Milan, 1994), 212–22; De Vido (n. 125), 172–194 (171, n. 121, for a full bibliography); Krings (n. 125), 161–215 (161 n. 1, for bibliography); C. Caserta, 'Erodoto, i Battiadi e Sparta', in *Erodoto e l'Occidente*, *Kokalos* Suppl. 15 (Rome, 1999), 67–109, at 99–108.

be considered more probable that an organised political community would be more able to organise colonial expeditions than a still unformed one.[168]

CONCLUSIONS

To sum up, I think that Thucydides presents the foundation of the first-generation Greek colonies as a series of private enterprises, in which the *oikist* or *oikists* play the primary role. For the second-generation colonies, however, with the exception probably of Himera, Thucydides suggests that the colonies were state-guided, founded thanks to the initiative of specific *poleis*. As for the first-generation colonies, other literary sources (Strabo and Ps.-Scymnus) agree with Thucydides. An important difference between Thucydides and these sources is that the former gives the notion of homogenised groups of people, whereas the latter speak of colonists from different regions of Greece.

The divergence can be explained by a difference in sources,[169] or by Thucydides' preference for brief descriptions of the foundations of the Greek colonies in Sicily, mentioning only the primary origin of the colonists, the place from which each colonial expedition sailed, or, even more probably, the *polis* from which the *oikist(s)* originated.[170] The variety of the colonists' origins should be believed despite Thucydides' silence.[171] These various origins of the first settlers support

---

[168] The colonies that were founded by Corinth and Megara Nisaea in the seventh century and later, for example, were surely state-guided. For Corinth, a strong indication for this is the fact that they were founded by the tyrants and had some kind of dependency or at least a close relation with Corinth even in the fifth century (see mainly Graham [n. 9], 118 ff.; Legon [n. 58], 209–17), while for Megara the similarities with its colonies in the East in matters of political organisation, calendar and alphabet, which are not found in Megara Hyblaea, are a strong indicator. For these similarities see mainly K. Hanell, *Megarische Studien* (Lund, 1924), 115–218; L.D. Loukopoulou, *Contribution à l'étude de la Thrace Propontique* (Athens, 1989), 120–2, 143–5, 158–60; C. Antonietti, 'Megara e le sue colonie: un' unità storico-culturale?', in C. Antonietti (ed.), *Il dinamismo della colonizzazione greca: Atti della tavola rotonda 'Espansione e colonizzazione greca di età arcaica: metodologie e problemi a confronto', Venezia 10–11/11/1195* (Naples, 1997), 83–94, at 83–5. Similarities do exist in Selinus' case if we follow the majority of scholars who consider an inscription in Olympia to originate from Selinus. For this inscription, see W. Dittenberger and K. Purgold, *Die Inschriften von Olympia, Olympia V* (Berlin, 1896), no. 22; R. Arena, *Iscrizioni greche arcaiche di Sicilia e Magna Grecia, I: Inscrizioni di Megara Iblea e Selinunte* (Milan, 1989), n. 52; L. Dubois, *Inscriptions grecques dialectales de Sicile* (Rome, 1989), n. 28, with bibliography. Dunbabin (n. 20), 417; Graham (n. 9), 112–13; J. Seibert, *Die politischen Flüchtlinge und Verbannten in der griechischen Geschichte* (Darmstadt, 1979), 550; D. Asheri, 'Rimpartio di esuli a Selinunte: Inschriften von Olympia V, nr. 22', *ASNP* 9 (1979), 479–97, esp. at 484–5; *SEG* 29 (1979), no. 403; N. Luraghi, *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia: Da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi* (Florence, 1994), 55–6; Antonietti (n. 168), 87; De Angelis (n. 2), 160–1, all believe that the inscription originates from Selinus.

[169] We have mentioned previously that Thucydides' source is universally considered to be Antiochus of Syracuse. Gras, Tréziny and Broise (n. 58), 550, mention that two different historiographical traditions existed, one pro-Syracusan and one pro-Chalcidian (and we should remember that Ephorus came from Cyme). The former wanted to degrade the Chalcidian participation in the colonisation, and insisted that each *polis* had its own *oikist* and consisted of a group of people of specific origin. The latter did not elide the different origin of the settlers and emphasised the prevalence of Chalcis.

[170] See also above, pp. 466–7.

[171] This variety of the settlers' origin is also apparent from burial customs, according to T. Jackman, 'Political communities in the Greek colonies of Archaic and Classical Sicily and southern Italy' (Diss., Stanford University, 2005), 17–94.

the private character of the first-generation colonies. As for the second-generation colonies, literary sources beyond Thucydides are less numerous than for the first generation, with the exception of Acragas, and they do not provide a clearer picture, or point in a different direction.

As for the archaeological data, in some cases pottery found in specific colonial sites (Gela, Selinus) is of earlier date than the Thucydidean foundation dates, creating doubts not only about the accuracy of Thucydides' chronology but also about his credibility concerning the conditions in which each colony was founded. On the other hand, a single foundation, as expressed by the sources, is very clearly confirmed in the cases of Megara and Casmenae, and in the initial layout of the two cities. As discussed above, the archaeological data should be treated with the same caution as literary sources if not with even more caution. Moreover we must also keep in mind that the archaeological evidence used to discredit or support Thucydides, namely the Corinthian pottery, has been interpreted chronologically based on him, creating a vicious circle. If archaeology could provide independent evidence the situation might be different.[172] Moreover, as Hornblower remarks, Greek presence prior to a formal settlement also has to do with how good relations were with the natives.[173] Finally, as Morley puts it, archaeology shows that goods are being moved, but rarely by whom, or in what context.[174]

Nevertheless we should not exclude the possibility that formal foundations were predated by another informal settlement (Gela and Selinus could offer two examples). This is especially likely in the period after 710–700 when the Greeks became better acquainted with Sicily. This in turn implies that, in some cases of colonisation, Greek colonial cities were the result of a process. This does not necessarily contradict Thucydides' descriptions. As Gras pointed out, it is quite probable that the sources present a specific moment in a city's foundation.[175] Finally, we must always keep in mind the political and social environment from which the colonists departed. This will lead to safer conclusions about the character of their venture, although even in this case generalisations should be avoided.

In conclusion, the initial colonisation of Sicily should be regarded not as the result of a state-guided policy by the cities of mainland Greece but merely as private enterprises of groups of people of different origins. Nevertheless, there was some sort of organisation even for these enterprises, organisation that is reflected in the role of the *oikist*.[176] The *oikists*, along with other nobles not necessarily of the same origin, as the cases of Syracuse and Gela very clearly illustrate, possibly dissatisfied with the economic and political conditions in the homeland, decided to leave their places of origin, probably 'in search of the political role denied them back home', as d'Agostino puts it.[177] The role of the *oikist* is very clear in Thucydides' narration but also in other literary sources. These sources, though they

---

[172] See also the exhortation of H. Bowden, 'The chronology of Greek painted pottery: some observations', *Hephaistos* 10 (1991), 49–59, at 52.

[173] Hornblower (n. 18), 274–5.

[174] N. Morley, *Trade in Classical Antiquity* (Cambridge, 2007), 6.

[175] See above, n. 119.

[176] For the *oikist*'s role in the colony's foundation and as a point of reference for the whole colonial community and its cohesiveness, see Malkin (n. 58), 190 ff. For an opposing view see Hall (n. 12), 410–11.

[177] D'Agostino (n. 8), 219. We should note that the Syracusan Myletidae were obliged to take part in the foundation of Himera, στάσει νικηθέντες (Thuc. 6.5.1), that is, after failing to gain the desirable role in the political affairs of their own city.

must be treated with caution, should not be dismissed wholesale. On the other hand, the second-generation colonies in Sicily should not be considered of the same character. They were mostly planned settlements, overseen by the authorities of fully formed city-states, as were the colonies of Corinth in western Greece and Megara in northern Greece.

University of Athens   ANDREAS MORAKIS
andmorakis@gmail.com