

PATTERNS IN EARLY GREEK COLONISATION

THE centuries before the Greeks began to write history are of the greatest interest and significance, but they are also for the historian full of uncertainty, obscurity and dispute.¹ The reason is mainly the simple inadequacy of the information with which the historian has to work, and it is partly because of that inadequacy that the colonising movement² is uniquely valuable. Part of this value lies in the revealing nature of colonial activity in itself. Think what it tells us about geographical knowledge, seafaring, if not seapower, military achievements, state organisation, economic conditions—to mention only a few broad and obvious categories. But in a period so inadequately known the colonising movement is also extremely important to the historian as a source of a relatively large amount of clear and unequivocal facts. In the context of the eighth and seventh centuries B.C. the fact that such and such a city sent a colony to such and such a place constitutes a rare piece of definite and valuable knowledge. Since it is also possible to assign dates to large numbers of colonial expeditions, we can say that the colonising movement provides a large amount of extremely significant historical information, which is in general terms clear and definite and relatively well dated.

There is still a further reason for the general importance of the colonial movement. This is a field in which we can look for continuing improvement in our knowledge. Apart from new fragments of the early lyric poets on papyrus the only likely source of new information on the history of these centuries is archaeology, and the history of the colonising movement is especially well suited to benefit from archaeological discoveries. It would be fair to say that much of the most important new material on early Greek history has come from archaeological discoveries on Greek colonial sites. The epoch-making excavation of Old Smyrna not only transformed our knowledge of the Greek settlement of the coast of Asia Minor, but also contributed most significantly and valuably to the question of the nature and rise of the Greek city-state.³ The discoveries at Al Mina in Syria have not only thrown light on Greek trade and colonisation in very early times, but have also effectively determined our interpretation of the relations between the Greeks and the East and the oriental influences on early Greek civilisation.⁴ On the island of Ischia the excavations of Pithecusa have provided on the one hand invaluable information about the earliest Greek ventures in the West, but on the other the site is one of the most informative of all Greek settlements of the

¹ This is substantially the text of a lecture delivered to the Hellenic Society on March 18, 1971. I am most grateful for helpful suggestions made by some of my auditors on that occasion.

In this paper I refer to the following works by the author's name alone (or as indicated):

J. Bérard, *L'expansion et la colonisation grecques jusqu'aux guerres médiques* (Paris 1960).

J. Boardman, *The Greeks Overseas* (London 1964).

G. Buchner in *Metropoli e colonie di Magna Grecia (Atti III Convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Naples 1964)* 263–74 (Buchner, *Convegno*).

G. Buchner, 'Pithekoussai, oldest Greek colony in the West' in *Expedition* viii no. 4 (1966) 4–12 (Buchner, *Expedition*).

J. N. Coldstream, *Greek geometric pottery* (London 1968).

R. M. Cook, 'Ionia and Greece in the eighth and seventh centuries B.C.' in *JHS* lxvi (1946) 67–98.

T. J. Dunbabin, *The western Greeks* (Oxford 1948).

M. J. Mellink (ed.), *Dark ages and nomads* (Istanbul 1964) (*Dark ages and nomads*).

E. Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums* (2nd ed. Stuttgart 1937) iii 388–438.

C. Roebuck, *Ionian trade and colonization* (New York 1959).

² There are no recent, complete and fully documented histories of the great Greek colonising movement of the archaic period. The nearest approach to such a work is Bérard's, but it is most unfortunately incomplete (see my review, *JHS* lxxxi [1961] 201). Boardman's book is extremely useful as a comprehensive account of the archaeological evidence.

³ J. M. Cook, *BSA* liii–liv (1958–9) 1–34; *The Greeks in Ionia and the East* (London 1962) chs. 2 and 3; *CAH* ii² ch. 38.

⁴ T. J. Dunbabin, *The Greeks and their eastern neighbours* (London 1957) chs. 2–5, especially 25–9; Boardman ch. 3, especially 61–74; Coldstream 310–16, 345, 384–5, 423.

eighth century.⁵ At Metapontum it is possible to see in air photographs how the city's land was divided. This division can be shown to belong to archaic times, even if it does not represent the original division made at the establishment of the colony at latest in the early seventh century.⁶ We thus have a most significant addition to our knowledge about land division in Greek settlements, which is also evidence which throws light on Greek society at the time, and even on such important themes in Greek history well known from later times, like redistribution of land and equal rights.⁷

Not that I want to fall into the common error of overestimating what archaeological evidence can tell us. The literary sources on Greek colonisation may be small in bulk, but they will always remain the most important. Archaeology cannot provide us with the precise and detailed knowledge we often obtain from a literary account. Cyrene will, I imagine, always be the best known of early Greek colonial enterprises—because of Herodotus not the spade.⁸ But even when we ask the archaeological record the relatively simple questions which it is capable of answering there are still dangers in the use and interpretation of archaeological evidence about Greek colonies. Even the establishment of the fact of settlement at a certain date is not entirely straightforward. How much material proves a settlement? At Acragas, where we have good literary evidence, the finds include a little material of earlier date than 580. Yet it seems wrong to reject the literary foundation date, since the bulk of the material comes from after that time.⁹ A clear example, it appears, that the earliest material on a site may not date the settlement. At Thasos, on the other hand, no archaeological finds are earlier than about 650. Yet I doubt if many would care to put the foundation of the colony so late.¹⁰ This illustrates a major difficulty which is always present: can one be sure that the earliest material has come to light? In addition to these fundamental problems, we have the uncertainties of interpretation which always arise when the main evidence—as is normally the case—is painted pottery. Once pottery is an object of trade, and not simply a personal chattel locally produced, its presence on a site need not tell us anything about the movements of the people who made it.¹¹ To illustrate the point by absurdity: it has been pointed out that if we had no literary evidence for the origin of the settlers of Pithecusa, and if we had no records of their writing, we should be tempted by looking at the eighth-century pottery to call it a Corinthian colony.¹²

When we consider all these difficulties we must concede that the archaeological evidence cannot totally change the nature of our knowledge of Greek colonisation. That knowledge will always remain on the whole skeletal, a framework of simple facts about origins and dates only rarely enriched by detail. The picture of Greek colonisation that we can achieve will, therefore, always be drawn in rather broad lines, and the task of the historian is continually to try to improve the quality and validity of these rather general reconstructions. In that task he inevitably works not just with the direct source material but also with the background or the context within which colonial expeditions were made. In simple terms this activity is looking at patterns on a map; hence the justification for my title. If we look at the pattern of Greek colonies on a map, we find, for instance, that Egypt is virtually free of Greek colonies, and it is a commonplace to conclude that the Greeks were not able to

⁵ See the valuable general accounts of his excavations by Buchner cited in n. 1 above.

⁶ Adamesteanu, *Rev. Arch.* 1967 3–38, especially 25–7. Cf. A. Giuliano, *Urbanistica delle città greche* (Milan 1966) 44–5, 48, whose arguments for the highest possible date are not completely convincing.

⁷ On this topic see D. Asheri, *Distribuzioni di terre nell' antica Grecia* (*Mem. Accad. Sci. Torino, Classe Sci. Mor. Stor. Fil.*, ser. 4a no. 10, Turin 1966) chs. 1 and 5.

⁸ F. Chamoux, *Cyrène sous la monarchie des Battiades* (Paris 1953) ch. 3; Boardman 169–73.

⁹ Boardman 198–9; Dunbabin 305–12.

¹⁰ Boardman 238; cf. J. Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos* (Paris 1954) 22–3.

¹¹ Cf. my remarks and references in *Colony and mother city in ancient Greece* (Manchester 1964) 13–14.

¹² Buchner, *Convegno* 267.

establish settlements in the territory of an advanced and organised state. As it happens, even here the pattern is not so simple. The colony at Naucratis, a trading post established by permission of the Pharaoh, and existing under precise Egyptian regulations,¹³ might seem merely to emphasise that Egypt as a whole was not Greek colonial territory. But the very large-scale permanent settlements of Greek mercenary soldiers in Egypt, as has been well observed recently,¹⁴ can be seen as a kind of colonisation, in which the need of the Greeks to settle abroad was specially adapted to the opportunities available in an advanced host country.

It is not surprising that the interpretation of the patterns of Greek colonisation generally becomes more satisfactory as we descend in date. It is, for example, clear that we can combine what we learn from literary sources, especially Herodotus, with archaeological evidence, to obtain a generally valid picture of the Phocaeen colonisation in the Western Mediterranean from the end of the seventh century.¹⁵ The chronology, causation and character of this colonisation emerge clearly enough; we have the attractions of the riches of Spain, good relations with native peoples both in Spain and Gaul, the ability of the Phocaeans to compete with hostile rivals, especially the Carthaginians, the pressure of oriental powers on the mother city. This relatively rich and secure evidence of all kinds is not fully matched for the Black Sea colonies, but even so the pattern of settlement there, from the latter part of the seventh century onwards, is also reasonably clear.¹⁶

In both these areas and periods archaeological evidence is now available to supplement or to test the literary information. That is not yet true of all areas and periods of Greek colonisation. The absence of archaeological evidence does not prevent pattern-making, as can easily be seen by consulting any pre-archaeological account of Greek colonisation. There is a good account of this nature in Meyer's *Geschichte des Altertums*.¹⁷ A combination of literary evidence, geography, knowledge of the history of non-Greek peoples and shrewd estimates of probability yields patterns which are not by any means totally different from those we should draw today. But one notes above all the way in which an author without archaeological evidence has no way of checking or confirming his literary evidence. He is also forced to turn frequently to the very dubious evidence of myths in order to enrich his picture.

When one turns from such pre-archaeological accounts to R. M. Cook's very useful discussion of Greek colonisation in his paper of 1946,¹⁸ it is easy to see the great improvement in the strength and quality of the historical reconstruction which the archaeological evidence has allowed. This was a very well-informed and well-balanced critical account of what was known of the Greek colonising movement at that time, and it makes a good base from which to estimate the improvements which have accrued in the last quarter of a century. In addition Cook's remarks about the ways in which reconstructions of the history of Greek colonisation have been made provide an enlightening text for what I am attempting in this paper. He notes that people have tended to use—to a greater or lesser degree—a simple geographical determinism (leading in its most extreme form to the thesis that the nearer the colony to the founding state the earlier the date of foundation), and have ignored such factors as 'the comparative attractiveness of sites, the attitude and strength of the native inhabitants, and chance: but these are factors of which we know little'.¹⁹ We may admit

¹³ See the very good discussion by M. M. Austin, *Greece and Egypt in the archaic age* (*Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. Suppl.* 2, 1970) 22–33.

¹⁴ Austin *op. cit.* 15–22, especially 18.

¹⁵ Cf. Boardman 223–30; Bérard 129–33.

¹⁶ Boardman 255–67; Bérard 100–7; Roebuck ch. 8. The active archaeological work on the Greek colonies in the Pontus is mostly published in Slavonic languages. There are useful accounts of that work

by Boardman, *AR for 1962–3*, in English, and E. Belin de Ballu, *L'histoire des colonies grecques du littoral nord de la Mer Noire* (Leiden 1965), in French. It is to be hoped that the results of the recent work on the archaeological evidence for Greeks in the Pontus by Dr J. G. F. Hind of the University of Otago will become generally available through publication.

¹⁷ See n. 1 above. ¹⁸ Pp. 70–80 (see n. 1 above).

¹⁹ 70 with n. 28.

the truth of the last comment, but since the factors mentioned may well have been decisive in most, if not all, colonial enterprises, no reconstruction which ignores such aspects can be called satisfactory.

One of the results of the possession of the new evidence from archaeology has been a tendency to be unwilling to trust the literary evidence when it stands unconfirmed by archaeological discoveries, a tendency which we can also see in Cook's paper. Such an attitude is no doubt from an ideal point of view perfectly correct. We must all look forward to the day when the literary evidence can all be evaluated against a background of adequate archaeological exploration. But it seems to me that the outstanding general result from all the archaeological discoveries about Greek colonisation has been that the literary record is on the whole thoroughly trustworthy. This conclusion has, it is true, been more solidly established by evidence unearthed since Cook's paper was written. At that time there was a disturbing element of circularity in the argument. The painted pottery had been given absolute dates from the literary foundation dates of the colonies in the West. It was not, therefore, entirely satisfactory to go on to conclude that the pottery confirmed those literary dates. But the excavations on Ischia have provided external dating evidence—notably the Bocchoris scarab—so that the chronology of the painted pottery can now be regarded as independently established.²⁰ As a result we now have in Italy and Sicily enough good archaeological evidence even for the colonies of the eighth century to be able to assess the quality of the literary sources. The result is highly encouraging, perhaps even a little surprising. Was it entirely to be expected that a sentence of Livy²¹ standing alone and referring to events of the eighth century B.C. would be so triumphantly justified as it has been by the excavation of Pithecusa? It is important to note here that the modern arguments about the chronology of the early colonies in Sicily do not seriously shake the general reliability of the literary dates. However one may believe the authors of the fifth century and later obtained the foundation dates which they transmitted—whether or not they were artificially computing by generations—the fact is that those dates have been proved to be in general terms reliable.²²

This is a result of major importance for early Greek history in general, but for my present purpose I would emphasise its implications for the history of Greek colonisation. It shows that when the Greeks came to write history they were able to discover the fundamental facts about many colonies established in the eighth century, not just the origin of the colony but also its date. It seems therefore that it is not good method to ignore or disbelieve information about early colonial foundations in our literary sources merely because that information is without archaeological confirmation. Thus, if we venture to look at patterns in early Greek colonisation in areas where the archaeological evidence is still very slight, we have at least this advantage over our pre-archaeological forerunners: we know that the literary evidence on which we mainly depend, and in particular the literary foundation dates, have been proved in other areas to be in general reliable.

In the light of these introductory remarks it seems worthwhile to reconsider certain aspects and areas of Greek colonisation in the eighth and early seventh centuries, where there is manifestly still room for improvement in our understanding of the general pattern. (Thus I exclude Sicily, where a relatively satisfactory picture, even of the earliest colonisation, can be said to have been achieved.)²³ In some of these areas new archaeological evidence acquired over the last two decades has made such a reassessment necessary. In others, although there is no such direct new evidence, the implications of the new evidence from elsewhere affect our interpretation of the existing historical sources. In attempting

²⁰ Coldstream 316–17, 322–7. ²¹ viii 22.5–6.

²² Coldstream *ibid.*; Dunbabin Appendix I; my *Colony and Mother City* 221 n. 2.

²³ See, for instance, the good accounts of Bérard,

La colonisation grecque de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'antiquité (2nd edition Paris 1957) chs. 2, 3, 6; Dunbabin chs. 1, 3; A. G. Woodhead, *The Greeks in the West* (London 1962) ch. 3.

this reconsideration I also hope to give due weight to those factors, which Cook recognised to be important, but then dismissed because they were so little known.²⁴

The little eighth-century colonisation in the Black Sea which is attested by literary sources has still neither been confirmed nor disproved by archaeological evidence, so I have nothing to add to what I wrote about this subject some years ago.²⁵

The colonisation of the Propontis²⁶ offers a promising field for speculation in the attempt to make sense of the pattern of settlement. It has long been held, for instance, I am sure correctly, that the absence of Greek colonies from the north shore in early times is to be attributed to the warlike strength of the local Thracian tribes.²⁷ There are several examples in the history of Greek colonisation of expeditions which fell foul of these dangerous opponents.²⁸ They may also be called in to explain the paradox, which has troubled interpreters since ancient times,²⁹ that Chalcedon was settled before the magnificent site of Byzantium. We need an explanation, for the splendid headland of Byzantium is an example of a type of site particularly favoured by Greek colonists.³⁰ They would not have rejected it in favour of Chalcedon without some very strong reason.

However, if the north side of the Propontis was largely forbidden territory for the earliest Greek colonists, we find a number of colonies on the south side with early foundation dates in the literary sources. Eusebius gives the following foundation dates: for Cyzicus 756 and 679; for Astacus 711; for Parium 709; for Chalcedon 685 (and Byzantium 659).³¹ Herodotus' story (iv 14–15) of Aristaeas of Proconnesus implies that Cyzicus and Proconnesus were already in existence as Greek cities more than 240 years before Herodotus' own time, say *c.* 690.³²

There is a great dearth of archaeological material from this area, and the only site which has been excavated and yields material of a relevant date is the modern Hisartepe, a place some 20 miles south of Cyzicus. Here part of an entirely Greek city with pottery as early as the first half of the seventh century was unearthed.³³ The site was with great probability identified by its excavator as Dascylium, capital of the third Persian satrapy.

In attempting to reconstruct the pattern of early Greek colonisation in this region we need first of all to set this small quantity of direct evidence in its geographical context. The Propontis has been well called 'a little Aegean'.³⁴ Other things being equal we should expect it to be a very attractive area for Greek colonists. Fortunately we can make estimates as to how far other things were equal by using our knowledge of non-Greek peoples, whose activities can be shown or assumed to have influenced the colonising movement. The three peoples who come into the picture are the Cimmerians,³⁵ the Phrygians and the Lydians.

R. M. Cook made himself merry about those who used the Cimmerians—'these dim but useful barbarians'—in order to explain problems in the record of Greek colonisation.³⁶ And it is still true that archaeologically speaking the Cimmerians remain very fugitive. There

²⁴ See above p. 37. ²⁵ *BICS* v (1958) 25–42.

²⁶ For recent useful accounts and discussions see Bérard 95–100; Boardman 245–55; Coldstream 376–80; Roebuck 110–15.

²⁷ See, for instance, already Meyer 418.

²⁸ As Thasos, see Pouilloux, *Recherches sur l'histoire et les cultes de Thasos* 22–3; Abdera, see Hdt. i 168; and, later, Amphipolis, see Thuc. iv 102.2–3.

²⁹ Hdt. iv 144.1–2.

³⁰ Examples of such sites: Croton, see Dunbabin 85 opp.; Bérard, *Colonisation . . . l'Italie . . . et . . . Sicile* 157; Elea, see Bérard *op. cit.* 270–1; W. Hermann, *AA* 1966, 360–4; Istrus, see *BCH* lxxxii (1958) 337–8 figs. 2 and 3.

³¹ R. M. Cook usefully set out the literary dates of colonial foundations (77).

³² As Cook 77; *cf.* 71 n. 42.

³³ Akurgal, *Anatolia* i (1956) 15 ff.; *cf.* Coldstream 377; Boardman 249, 254.

³⁴ *CAH* iii 658.

³⁵ The Cimmerians were not the only nomadic people in the regions under discussion at this time; see *CAH* iii 187–9, 511; but since we cannot distinguish them convincingly I shall use the term Cimmerians to embrace all the nomads active in Asia Minor in the eighth and seventh centuries.

³⁶ 73.

is no occupation level at any site which can be securely identified as theirs.³⁷ But a people who are firmly attested in contemporary oriental and Greek records³⁸ cannot be simply ignored, so that we are required to take account of their possible activities and the effects which these may have had on colonial enterprises in the regions under discussion. Such theories are not, after all, pure modern speculation. Of two Greek sites—Sinope in the Black Sea and Antandrus in the Troad—our literary sources actually state that there was Cimmerian occupation,³⁹ and the widespread destruction by Cimmerians in Asia Minor is indisputable.

We know that Cimmerian and possibly other nomadic raiders were active in Asia Minor over a period of some fifty years from about 700. Their most famous destructions, of Gordium, for instance, or Sardis, show their strength. There is nothing in the least improbable in the theories that certain Greek colonies, founded before their incursions, were destroyed by them and then subsequently re-established when the raiders had been defeated and disappeared. This is what we are expressly told happened at Sinope (in the long account of Ps-Scymnus), and it seems to me a perfectly acceptable way of explaining the two dates for Sinope's foundation, one in the eighth century, by implication, and one in the seventh, which we have in our literary sources.⁴⁰ So I also see no theoretical objection to the similar explanation which has been offered for the two foundation dates of Cyzicus in the literary record.⁴¹ The Cimmerians destroyed Gordium and the Phrygian Empire early in the seventh century.⁴² Cyzicus could well have suffered a similar fate, possibly even at the same time.

It also seems an acceptable notion to me that the dangerous if sporadic appearances of the nomadic raiders made the whole area of Pontus and Propontis relatively unattractive to Greek colonists in the first half of the seventh century.⁴³ When the people of Colophon decided to settle elsewhere under pressure of the Lydians, probably early in Gyges' reign, they chose to colonise Siris in southern Italy, the only early colony in the West founded from Ionia.⁴⁴ Their choice certainly suggests that all the geographically more accessible Pontic and Propontid region was unattractive to them for one reason or another, and the Cimmerians may well have furnished one of those reasons.

The great period of Phrygian domination was the second half of the eighth century, and it came to an abrupt end with the Cimmerian destruction of Gordium at the beginning of the seventh.⁴⁵ It is virtually certain that the territory on the south side of the Propontis will have been under Phrygian rule at this time.⁴⁶ There were three Greek colonies on this territory in the period in question according to our literary sources: Cyzicus (756), Astacus (711) and Parium (709). The high date for Astacus, a Megarian colony, has long been doubted.⁴⁷ Our earliest authority on the colonisation of the area, Charon of Lamprus, calls Astacus a colony of Chalcedon.⁴⁸ It should therefore apparently be dated after 685, the foundation date of Chalcedon. Possibly the higher date of Eusebius is to be explained as a result of calculations designed to glorify the antiquity of the predecessor of Lysimachus' new foundation of Nicomedia.⁴⁹ If we leave Astacus on one side, we have one colony,

³⁷ Cf. *Dark ages and nomads* 63.

³⁸ See *CAH* *ibid.*; Barnett, *CAH* ii² ch. 30, 11–12; U. Cozzoli, *I Cimmeri* (Rome 1968) ch. 8.

³⁹ Sinope: Hdt. iv 12.2, Ps-Scymnus 941–53; Antandrus: Aristotle, see Steph. Byz. s.v.

⁴⁰ *BICS* v (1958) 33–4 with n. 15, where I discussed modern rejections of Ps-Scymnus' information, 941–53.

⁴¹ E.g. N. G. L. Hammond, *History of Greece to 322 B.C.* 115.

⁴² Young, *Proc. Amer. Philos. Assoc.* cvii (1963) 351.

⁴³ Cf. Cook 79 n. 108: 'possibly that field was not then ripe for colonisation'.

⁴⁴ For references and discussion see Dunbabin 34–5; Bérard, *Colonisation . . . l'Italie . . . et . . . Sicile* 187–98; cf. Boardman 195; Cook *ibid.*

⁴⁵ Cf. Young, *Dark Ages and Nomads* 55.

⁴⁶ See *RE* s.v. 'Phrygia' 787–8.

⁴⁷ It is rejected by Meyer 419 n. Cf. Bérard 96–7; K. Hanell, *Megarische Studien* (Lund 1934) 119–22.

⁴⁸ *FGH* 262 fr. 6.

⁴⁹ Cf. Hanell's views about the various foundation legends, *op. cit.* 120.

Cyzicus, allegedly settled about the beginning of the high Phrygian period, and another, Parium, near its end. In view of the intrinsic attractions of the Propontis for colonists, we might be justified in supposing that Phrygian rule on the whole excluded Greek colonisation.

From such a conclusion it is a short step to doubting the literary sources and denying the high dates for Cyzicus and Parium. Perhaps we need not press the matter in the case of Parium. Its origins are somewhat confused in our sources,⁵⁰ and its traditional date is near enough to the destruction of the Phrygian Empire for it to be easy to accept the possibility of a small overestimate and assume that it was in fact founded after the fall of that power. But the first foundation date for Cyzicus must either be rejected outright, or taken to show that a Greek colony could exist on that site in the high Phrygian period.

Earlier writers did not find the latter assumption difficult. Meyer thought the Phrygians might have taken their alphabet from the Greek colonies in the Hellespontine area.⁵¹ The discovery that the Phrygians were using the adapted Phoenician alphabet by c. 725 has led to the suggestion that they may not have received it through Greek intermediaries at all.⁵² But the argument from chronology is not compelling,⁵³ and since we have good evidence for contacts between Greeks and Phrygians⁵⁴ it seems an unnecessary extra hypothesis to suggest that the Phrygians also obtained their alphabet by contacts in the Phoenician area.

However, evidence for peaceful intercourse between Greeks and Phrygians does not prove that the Phrygians would have allowed Greek colonists to settle on territory that they controlled. To my mind the general absence of colonisation in both Pontus and Propontis in the second half of the eighth century most probably implies that they did not. But this conclusion does not necessarily carry with it the rejection of the first foundation date of Cyzicus. It is possible to envisage the foundation of Cyzicus as preceding the full power of Phrygia. It is worth emphasising that similar early dates are attested for the first colonies in the Pontus.⁵⁵ We should also remember that Cyzicus was almost certainly then an offshore island.⁵⁶ It seems possible to retain confidence in the first foundation date for Cyzicus while at the same time accepting the view that at its height the Phrygian Empire effectively prevented new colonial settlements on the south shore of the Propontis.

We may begin our examination of Lydian influence on the Greek colonisation of the Propontis with the very interesting piece of information that Milesian Abydus was founded with Gyges' permission.⁵⁷ The credibility of this statement has been impugned,⁵⁸ but we must surely concede that the specially good relations we know to have existed between Miletus and the Lydian kings could well have led to privileges in the field of colonisation.⁵⁹ Recently, however, a much more extreme interpretation of the information about Abydus has been offered. It has been suggested that it was in fact a settlement of Greek mercenaries in Lydian service, and that the Greek settlement which has been discovered south of Cyzicus, and identified as Dascylium, should be interpreted in a similar way, because Dascylium was called after Dascylus, Gyges' father.⁶⁰

Boardman puts forward this view in explicit opposition to the conclusion which I drew from the discoveries inland from Cyzicus—namely that a Greek settlement twenty miles

⁵⁰ Bérard 97; F. Bilabel, *Die ionische Kolonisation* (*Philologus* Suppl. xiv) 49.

⁵¹ 423.

⁵² Young, *Proc. Amer. Philos. Assoc.* cvii (1963) 362–4; cf. *Dark ages and nomads* 55.

⁵³ Cf. the useful discussion by Coldstream 379–80.

⁵⁴ Roebuck 43–7; cf. Boardman 104–9.

⁵⁵ See *BICS* v (1958) 25–6.

⁵⁶ F. W. Hasluck, *Cyzicus* (Cambridge 1910) 2–5.

I now regard his arguments as convincing; contrast my statement on p. 39 of the article cited in the

previous note, though the main argument is not affected.

⁵⁷ Strabo xiii 590.

⁵⁸ Cook thought (71 n. 41) that the connection with Gyges might have been invented at a later date because a promontory near Abydus was called Gygas (Strabo *ibid.*), but it seems just as easy to accept the more straightforward interpretation implied by Strabo.

⁵⁹ Cf. *CAH* iii 508.

⁶⁰ See Roebuck 112 for the original suggestion, accepted and developed by Boardman 249, 254.

inland from Cyzicus implies that the Greeks had already established themselves on the south shore of the Propontis. Boardman's line is that if the settlement identified as Dascylium is a settlement of Greek mercenaries in Lydian service it need not imply anything about Greek colonisation in the Propontis. I would only reply, firstly, that I do not know of any clear evidence that the Lydians did establish such settlements of Greek mercenaries, and, secondly, the argument from the fact that the site was called Dascylium is open to the objection that there were several places of that name in the Asia Minor region, and the name has been thought by linguistic experts to be a local formation, i.e. not commemorative of an individual.⁶¹ It still seems best to me, therefore, to conclude that on the basis of what we know about Greek colonisation in general a settlement inland most probably implies previous settlement on the coast,⁶² and to see the Greek city identified as Dascylium as evidence that it was possible for Greeks to penetrate inland in this area after the fall of the Phrygian Empire.

It follows that I should also prefer simply to accept what we are told about Abydus as it stands, and to adhere to the view that one may infer from it that colonising activity in the region went on with the blessing of the Lydian king. Such a hypothesis makes it easier to understand the dominating position of Miletus in the colonisation of the Propontis (as also in the Pontus), and the extreme paucity of colonies founded by other Greek cities in this readily accessible and attractive area. The first Megarian colony, if we may follow Charon of Lampsacus,⁶³ is right at the far end of the Propontis at the not outstandingly inviting site of Chalcedon, and one recalls again the Colophonian colony at Siris in southern Italy. We have suggested that these colonists went to the West as the East was generally unattractive at that time because of the Cimmerian danger. I believe that to be true, but there may also have been a special reason. Impelled to colonise by pressure from Gyges, they might well seek to avoid an area in which he had influence.

To sum up on the early Greek colonisation of the Propontis. Apart from Cyzicus, and perhaps Proconnesus and Parium, the first major effort was by the Megarians at the further end. So in addition to the long-lived difficulties of the north shore the southern shore too was not readily available. This is most easily explained by, first, Phrygian power, then the danger of the nomad invaders, and, finally, some Lydian control. In such a picture I have suggested that the first foundation date of Cyzicus need not be rejected. This is clearly the most hazardous part of the proposed pattern. But it does not seem to me difficult in principle to envisage Greek colonisation of Cyzicus about the middle of the eighth century. Shortly before this Greeks began to settle in the Troad, if we may judge from the beginning of Greek Troy,⁶⁴ and this is a time of increased seafaring and trade in general,⁶⁵ as well as being the time of the first colonisation in the West. But such questions will inevitably remain to some extent at the mercy of subjective judgment as long as the Propontis is virtually unexplored archaeologically. It is worth pointing out that the sort of things we badly need to know about colonisation in the Propontis, such points as chronology in general, or whether there are any violent destructions, are the kinds of questions to which archaeology is well-equipped to provide answers. I have tried to show that one can profitably look for patterns here in spite of the shortage of direct archaeological evidence, but it is also clear that even a small increase in such archaeological evidence could greatly improve our knowledge of Greek colonisation in the Propontis.

In the West, as we have seen, the situation is entirely different, mainly because archaeological evidence is abundant. As a result, I shall confine my attention to one old problem in

⁶¹ *RE* s.v. 'Daskyleion' 2219 (Ruge); Sundwall, *Klio* Beiheft xi (1913) 63, 194; Bilabel, *Die ionische Kolonisation* 45.

⁶² As J. M. Cook, *The Greeks in Ionia and the East* 51; also Coldstream 377.

⁶³ See above p. 40.

⁶⁴ Cf. Boardman 101-2, 248; Coldstream 376-7.

⁶⁵ Well emphasised and illustrated by Coldstream

the pattern of the early Greek colonisation in Italy and Sicily: why is it that the earliest Greek colonies, Pithecusa and Cumae, are also the most distant from Greece? There could be no clearer warning that in the interpretation of the pattern of Greek colonisation geographical determinism is not enough. At first sight it seems to offend against commonsense that the earliest colonists should have rejected and sailed past all the sites which later supported flourishing Greek cities. However, not all ancient historians have thought that any special explanation was required. Meyer thought that it was merely that the Bay of Naples was the most attractive place of all, and the first colonists had first choice,⁶⁶ an explanation which seems to be too simple to be convincing. A more recent suggestion, though still before the excavations on Ischia, was Dunbabin's: that it was trade with Etruria, and especially the lure of metals, which drew the first colonists so far from home.⁶⁷

The discussion has certainly been put on an entirely different plane by Buchner's invaluable excavations of Pithecusa.⁶⁸ In the first place they have made it quite certain that this is indeed the earliest Greek colony in the West. The foundation date is put in the second quarter of the eighth century. But in addition they have also thrown interesting light on the character of the settlement. It is clear on the one hand that in the eighth century objects from Greece, the eastern Mediterranean and Egypt, not to mention the Italian regions nearer at hand, found their way to the colony in large quantities. We thus have a picture of a community settled far away from its original home which maintained widespread commercial contacts.

In addition the excavator has found unequivocal evidence for the smelting of iron at Pithecusa—namely quantities of iron slag, terra-cotta bellows-mouthpieces, and two bottoms of coarse pots which are encrusted with iron slag, i.e. they had served as crucibles. This evidence for iron-smelting comes unfortunately from an unstratified context, a dump consisting of material extending in date from the Bronze Age to the second century B.C., but the fortunate appearance of a similar piece of iron slag in a purely eighth-century level in the cemetery has justified the assumption that iron-smelting was practised in eighth-century Pithecusa. The origin of the iron-bearing rock that the Pithecusans were smelting is thought to be Elba, so that the colonists of Pithecusa are envisaged as bringing the stone in ships from Elba in order to smelt it at home.⁶⁹

On the basis of these discoveries it has been claimed that Dunbabin's view about the motives for the foundation of Pithecusa has been triumphantly vindicated. The settlers at Pithecusa are seen as living by trade and industry. They obtain iron-bearing stone and perhaps other metals from the Etruscan region and pay for it with manufactured products and luxuries from the civilised peoples of the eastern Mediterranean. The commercial connections in the eighth century between the Euboean cities and the East are attested by evidence from Al Mina and elsewhere. The Euboean colony at Pithecusa is therefore to be seen as an emporion, settled in order to facilitate and exploit a trade between the eastern and western Mediterranean which, it is suggested, was at that time in the hands of the Euboeans. In support of this interpretation it is pointed out that Ischia is not good terrain for grain production—even if its soil is rich and suitable for olives and vines—so that one would not expect the site to be chosen for an agricultural settlement.⁷⁰

Have we an example here of the way in which an old problem can be solved by new evidence from archaeology? If I would answer, perhaps not yet, or not completely, it is because I see a number of difficulties in the way of accepting the interpretation I have just outlined.

⁶⁶ 439.

⁶⁷ Dunbabin 3, 7–8; for a different view, see R. M. Cook, *Historia* ix (1962) 113–14.

⁶⁸ For Buchner's general accounts of his results see n. 1 above.

⁶⁹ Buchner, *Expedition* 12; *AR for 1966–7* 30;

Ridgway, *Studi Etruschi* xxxv (1968) 318–19. I am also indebted to Dr Ridgway for valuable verbal information on this topic.

⁷⁰ See the discussions by Buchner and Ridgway cited above (nn. 1 and 69).

The first of these difficulties concerns iron and iron-working, and it is therefore necessary to have a clear picture of the general situation with regard to iron resources and iron-working in the Greek world of the eighth century.⁷¹ This is all the more necessary since there are some strange but widespread misconceptions about such matters which frequently disfigure the works of archaeologists and ancient historians.

Iron-bearing rock is one of the commonest formations.⁷² In the Greek world such iron-bearing rocks are found in a large number of places.⁷³ The islands of the Cyclades are particularly rich in iron resources, but so is the mainland. Euboea itself had plentiful deposits.⁷⁴ As a result iron was widely manufactured locally in historical times and no one centre predominated.⁷⁵

The ancient method of smelting iron requires merely three things: the iron-bearing rock, a supply of fuel, i.e. wood for charcoal, and the necessary metallurgical skill. Once they had the last, there were numerous Greek communities which could manufacture their own iron. Although there may be room for argument as to the precise date when the Greeks entered into the full Iron Age, i.e. the time when iron was regularly used for all the tools and weapons for which it is best suited, there is no doubt that that date precedes the eighth century. Iron was certainly widely used by the tenth century.⁷⁶ It is true that widespread use does not necessarily prove that they were producing it locally, and there is, to my knowledge, no definite evidence to prove that the Greeks were smelting iron as early as this.⁷⁷ It is *a priori* probable since the knowledge of smelting was already centuries old in Asia Minor, and it has therefore been assumed that there was local production in Greece from the end of the second millennium.⁷⁸ But for our purposes it is not necessary to make any assumptions. If the people at Pithecusa were smelting iron in the eighth century, then the Euboeans and, no doubt, other Greeks had the required metallurgical skill by that date.

It follows that there was no need for eighth-century Euboeans to go and settle in the far West simply to obtain iron; there was plenty at home. The presence of iron in Tuscany does not, therefore, *in itself* explain why the colony was established.

There is also some inherent improbability in the notion that people used to working locally available iron sources should have welcomed the idea of bringing ironstone by ship from a place some considerable distance away, in order to smelt it at home.⁷⁹ We are assured that the iron smelted on Ischia did indeed come from Elba and that there is definitely no workable iron ore on Ischia.⁸⁰ It is necessary to remember, however, that quite a small

⁷¹ On the subject in general see R. Pleiner, *Iron-working in ancient Greece* (Prague 1969); R. J. Forbes, *Metallurgy in Antiquity* (Leiden 1950) ch. 11; H. H. Coghlan, *Notes on prehistoric and early iron in the old world* (Oxford 1956). I would express here my gratitude to Professor F. C. Thompson, Emeritus Professor of Metallurgy, University of Manchester, for his kindness in discussing this topic with me and for valuable advice.

⁷² Forbes 380; Coghlan 13. Forbes' map, fig. 80, showing only the most important deposits of the Near East, illustrates the point graphically.

⁷³ For deposits in Greece see Pleiner 23-4; *RE* Suppl. iv 117-18; C. Neumann and J. Partsch, *Physikalische Geographie von Griechenland* (1885) 229-35.

⁷⁴ In addition to the works in the preceding note see *BSA* lxi (1966) 109-10.

⁷⁵ Pleiner 11-12, 19-20, 23-4; Forbes 457-8; Neumann and Partsch 236. It is not always easy to tell whether Greeks smelted their own iron or imported iron in semi-finished condition; so much so that Forbes actually states that they mostly imported

it and on the same page (458) discusses local smelting in Greece. No doubt economic considerations decided the matter differently in different times and different places.

⁷⁶ Pleiner 11-12; Snodgrass, *AJA* lxvi (1962) 408-10.

⁷⁷ See Pleiner *ibid.*

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

⁷⁹ Some have thought that Strabo in the passage v 223 states that in his day the ore was shipped from Elba to the adjacent mainland for smelting, but that does not seem to be the right interpretation; see the Loeb edition p. 354 n. 3. It was already smelted iron from Elba which was shipped at about the same period to the famous iron workings at Puteoli; see *Diod.* v 13.1-2. But I doubt if these references to the practices of a far later age are really significant for the period that we are discussing.

⁸⁰ See n. 69 above. I am grateful to Professor W. S. MacKenzie, Professor of Petrology, University of Manchester, for kindly discussing these geological questions with me and giving me the benefit of his personal knowledge of Ischia.

isolated seam (as of pyrite) would be sufficient for the requirements of the small-scale local iron industry of an ancient city, and such a seam could have been entirely worked out long ago. I mention this possibility only because there seem to me inherent general objections to the notion that the iron industry of eighth-century Pithecusa depended on sources of iron as distant as Elba.

There are also difficulties regarding the suggestion that Pithecusa was an emporion which lived by passing on the products of the East to Italian and particularly Etruscan peoples. It has been acutely pointed out that the abundance and diversity of products of eastern origin which we find at eighth-century Pithecusa is not in fact paralleled on any known contemporary site in Etruria.⁸¹ The picture seems to be that Pithecusa itself must often have been the end of the trade route from the East, and the Pithecusans were largely acquiring these products for themselves. It has been suggested, therefore, that the trade between the Greeks and Etruscans at this time was mainly in primary products, and does not leave, in consequence, traces in the archaeological record.⁸² But one is bound to ask, what primary products were the Greeks offering the Etruscans?⁸³

These considerations suggest that it is still a complicated and difficult question why the first Greek colony in the West was the most distant. We can be sure that the people who settled there did so because they were better able to win a livelihood on Ischia than at home. But the way they won that livelihood is still not entirely clear. They had products to give in return for their imports from the East, and one of those products was probably iron, iron which could no doubt be traded at a profit in the West among people less skilled (or totally unskilled) in metallurgy.⁸⁴ The choice of an island seems to suggest they had security in mind, though Ischia is rather too big to be seen as the typical offshore island site. The fertility of the soil was doubtless attractive to a people used to a predominantly agricultural economy. If that were all, however, there must have been powerful reasons to deter them from settling elsewhere in southern Italy or Sicily. Such powerful reasons might have been furnished by the strength and hostility of the existing inhabitants. That would be a perfectly legitimate hypothesis.⁸⁵ We may yet find evidence for extensive trade between the Pithecusans and peoples in Italy in the eighth century. As the evidence at present stands, however, it would, curiously enough, be much easier to understand their choice if there was iron as well as fertile soil on Ischia itself.

The discoveries on Ischia have also great significance for our understanding of early Euboean colonisation as a whole. In the first place we now know definitely that there were Euboean colonies in the West for some fifty years before the first colonies in Sicily. During those years ships were regularly plying the coast route from Greece to southern Italy. Recent discoveries at an important site at the modern Francavilla, near ancient Sybaris, show the sort of goods those ships may have brought. Of the four levels which have been distinguished the two earliest antedate the establishment of Greek colonies in the area. Corinthian Geometric pottery was found in a tomb of the earliest period, which has been dated *c.* 800–750; and in the second phase, built directly on top of the first, there are imports from the East, scarabs, glass and amber.⁸⁶

⁸¹ Ridgway, *Dialoghi di Archeologia* i–ii (1969) 27–30.

⁸² *Ibid.*

⁸³ It has been suggested to me that the Greeks at Pithecusa might have had the metallurgical skill to manufacture iron when it was still unknown to the Etruscans. This seems to be just conceivably possible, since it is thought that the knowledge how to produce iron reached Tuscany 'possibly by 800 B.C.' (Coghlan 71), but I should be hesitant to advance the paradoxical hypothesis that the Greek colonists brought their knowledge of iron-working

to the West in order to sell iron to the peoples who were later so famous for their riches in metals.

⁸⁴ As, for example, at the recently discovered site of Francavilla; see *AR for 1969–70* 45 and below, next paragraph. Trading in iron is attested by Homer; see, e.g., *Od.* i 184.

⁸⁵ *Cf.* Dunbabin 43–7 on the use of force by Greek colonists against Sicels in Sicily and southern Italy.

⁸⁶ *AR for 1969–70* 45. The site is discussed by P. Bicknell, *Klearchos* xxxv (1967) 131–43, where an interesting argument is put forward in favour of its identification as Aminaia.

There is also no doubt that the Ionian islands will have been essential ports of call for those ships. Traces of early Euboean activity in this area were seen long ago in some dubious mythological evidence, and, more recently, signs of contact with Euboea have been recognised in the eighth-century pottery from Ithaca,⁸⁷ but the only explicit evidence that we have relates to Corcyra. Plutarch states, in a most suggestive passage,⁸⁸ that the Corinthian colonists expelled Eretrian settlers from Corcyra. The Corinthian colony at Corcyra was established either in 733 or 709,⁸⁹ so an Eretrian colony had been established there before one of those dates, if Plutarch may be trusted. Not everyone has been inclined to trust Plutarch on this matter,⁹⁰ but it is obvious that in general terms the results of the excavations on Ischia make it very probable that his information is reliable. In the light of what we now know of the Euboean colonisation in the West eighth-century Euboean settlements in the Ionian islands make very good sense.

Plutarch's statement does not only concern Eretrian colonisation in the West. He relates that the ejected Eretrian colonists tried to return to the mother city, were refused permission to land, and so sailed away to found a new colony at Methone. If we accept his information about Corcyra, we should also reconsider the implications of his statement regarding Eretrian colonisation in the Chalcidice region.

This is an area of colonial settlement where there are no literary foundation dates before the mid-seventh century, and also an area where none of the colonial sites has been excavated.⁹¹ Arguments about the date of the colonisation of the region are, therefore, inevitably inconclusive. It is possible to interpret Plutarch's information about Methone as implying that Chalcidice was an area of extensive colonial settlement in the eighth century. Since Methone is not so attractive a site as Mende, the main Eretrian colony in Chalcidice (not to mention Torone, the greatest of the Chalcidian colonies), it seems likely that the best sites in the region had already been occupied when Methone was colonised. Such an interpretation would harmonise well with Aristotle's implication that there were Chalcidian colonies in 'Thrace' before the Lelantine War,⁹² for the date of that war, in spite of its notorious uncertainty, seems best situated about the end of the eighth century.⁹³ In addition to these rather slender arguments we now have not only our improved knowledge of Euboean colonisation in the West but also the recent interesting discoveries about Eretria itself.⁹⁴ New Eretria is now known to have been laid out at about the same period as Pithecusa was established. It is suggested that it was created by the synoecism of several previous settlements, and it has been acutely called the first Eretrian colony.⁹⁵ The excavators have drawn attention to the grand scale of the new city, with its large space between the acropolis and the sea.⁹⁶ Thus we can now say that before the middle of the eighth century the Eretrians were trading widely in the Mediterranean; they had successfully settled colonies in the West; and they had synoecised at home, laying out a new city on a large scale. It is not difficult to imagine that these people were capable of colonisation in more than one area at that time.

In collecting arguments in favour of the idea that Chalcidice was colonised in the

⁸⁷ Wilamowitz, *Phil. Untersuch.* vii (1884) 171-2; on Ithaca see Coldstream 366-7.

⁸⁸ *QG* xi.

⁸⁹ Cf. my discussion, *Colony and mother city* 219-20; Coldstream 367.

⁹⁰ See Cook 71.

⁹¹ For accounts of the colonisation of this area see Bérard 66-8, 92-5; Boardman 236-40. There is also a useful discussion in Bradeen's paper, *AJP* lxxiii (1952) 356-80.

⁹² *Erotikos fr.* 3 (*OCT*, Ross = *fr.* 98 Teubner, Rose).

⁹³ For my views on this matter see *Colony and mother city* 222 n. 3.

⁹⁴ For brief accounts of the recent excavations at Eretria see *AR for 1966-7* 12-13; *1968-9* 8; *1969-70* 7-8. Apart from the preliminary reports in *Antike Kunst*, some volumes of the final publication have already appeared (most recently *Eretria* iii. *L'heroon à la porte de l'ouest*, by C. Bérard [Berne 1970]).

⁹⁵ Schefold, *ADelt* xxii (1967) *Chr.* i, 271; cf. *AR for 1968-9* 8.

⁹⁶ Schefold, *Antike Kunst* ix (1966) 106 ff., especially 108; xii (1969) 72-4; C. Bérard, *Eretria* iii 68.

eighth century we should also not forget that it has the great advantage of proximity and it is geographically a natural Greek colonial area.

However, it is also possible in the present state of our knowledge to mount quite a strong counter-argument. When R. M. Cook discussed the matter,⁹⁷ he argued that since Thasos is a particularly attractive site and since we know that Thasos was not colonised till the first half of the seventh century, it may be assumed that the other colonies are later in date. Thus he rejected Plutarch's evidence about Methone, and, incidentally, ignored the passage Arist. *Erotikos* fr. 3. But it is not necessary to treat the evidence so cavalierly. It is possible to accept what Plutarch says and still maintain that Chalcidice was at least largely uncolonised in the eighth century. The choice of Methone could be explained by the hostility of native peoples further east rather than by the assumption that the best sites in Chalcidice were already occupied. We know that Thasos was only settled in face of the warlike hostility of the local Thracian tribes.⁹⁸ If we envisage that the whole north Aegean area was in the eighth century made unattractive to Greek colonists by native opposition, we could see Methone as an isolated eighth-century venture, and follow Cook in taking Thasos for the first major Greek colony in the area. Aristotle's statement is too undefined to provide by itself a major obstacle to such an interpretation.

It will be seen that we are still in the position of being unable to answer definitely very simple questions about the early colonisation of Chalcidice. We cannot estimate the extent of the area denied to Greek colonists by Thracian tribes, and hence we cannot tell how much colonisation was achieved before the middle of the seventh century. Of the two views outlined above I prefer the former. It seems to me most probable that Chalcidice was an important area of Greek colonisation in the eighth century. But I am also well aware that the argument will remain inconclusive until we are provided with some new and definite evidence by the spade.

Many of the individual points and suggestions made here may be open to disagreement, but they should serve to illustrate some important conclusions. In the first place it is clear that geographical factors do not in themselves determine the pattern of Greek colonisation, even in the eighth century. So far as it depended on seafaring skill or geographical knowledge, the Greeks were able to colonise anywhere between the Bay of Naples and the Bosphorus, if not beyond. The determining factors were political and economic. We are thus bound to try—difficult though it may be—to make reasonable estimates of the power and attitudes of existing inhabitants of colonial areas, and of the economic possibilities for the colonists, if we are to understand the pattern of colonisation. These factors have normally been given less attention in discussions of Greek colonisation than the economic and political conditions of the founding states.⁹⁹ But while these conditions undoubtedly produced the need for colonisation, the pattern which the colonisation took was largely determined by local factors in the colonial areas.

It is also to be hoped that this paper will have drawn attention to the ways in which our knowledge of Greek history in the early period is enriched and improved by the study of the colonising movement; to the advances that have been made in the study of that movement owing to recent archaeological discoveries; and, finally, to the very great scope that exists to make further improvements in our knowledge of early Greek colonisation by suitably directed archaeological exploration.

A. J. GRAHAM

The University of Manchester

⁹⁷ 71.

⁹⁸ See above n. 28.

⁹⁹ As, for example, in the fundamental paper of A. Gwynn, *JHS* xxxviii (1918) 88–123.