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It is traditional to begin the history of Greek colonisation in Sicily by mentioning a well-known passage of Thucydides in the opening chapters of his sixth book because, despite the problems that this text continues to arouse, it is one of the most interesting general overviews left by an ancient author about this historical process, both in respect of Sicily and for continental Greece. I shall, therefore, follow tradition:

Of the Hellenes, the first to arrive were Chalcidians from Euboea with Thueles, their founder. They founded Naxos and built the altar to Apollo Archegetes, which now stands outside the town, and upon which the deputies for the games sacrifice before sailing from Sicily. Syracuse was founded the year afterwards by Archias, one of the Heraclids from Corinth, who began by driving out the Sicels from the island upon which the inner city now stands, though it is no longer surrounded by water: in process of time the outer town also was taken within the walls and became populous. Meanwhile Thueles and the Chalcidians set out from Naxos in the fifth year after the foundation of Syracuse, and drove out the Sicels by arms and founded Leontini and afterwards Catane; the Catanians themselves choosing Evarchus as their founder.

About the same time Lamis arrived in Sicily with a colony from Megara, and after founding a place called Troilus beyond the river Pantacyas, and afterwards leaving it and for a short while joining the Chalcidians at Leontini, was driven out by them and founded Thapsus. After his death his companions were driven out of Thapsus, and founded a place called the Hyblaean Megara; Hyblon, a Sicel king, having given up the place and inviting them thither. Here they lived

* I would like to thank G.R. Tsetskhladze for entrusting me with this chapter, which has let me revisit a subject I dealt with several years ago (Domínguez 1989). In this chapter I have been able to take into account recent scholarship and new approaches to the issue of the Greek colonisation of Sicily and relationships with the non-Greek world. I should also like to express my gratitude to F. De Angelis, who kindly gave me details of the most recent literature about ancient Sicily.
two hundred and forty-five years; after which the Syracusan tyrant Gelon expelled them from the city and the country. Before their expulsion, however, a hundred years after they had settled there, they sent out Pamillus and founded Selinus; he having come from their mother country Megara to join them in its foundation. Antiphemus from Rhodes and Entimus from Crete, who joined in leading a colony thither, in the forty-fifth year after the foundation of Syracuse, founded Gela. The town took its name from the river Gelas, the place where the citadel now stands, and which was first fortified, being called Lindii. The institutions that they adopted were Dorian. Near one hundred and eight years after the foundation of Gela, the Geloans founded Acragas (Agrigentum), so called from the river of that name, and made Aristonous and Pystritus their founders; giving their own institutions to the colony. Zancle was originally founded by pirates from Cumae, the Chalcidian town in the country of the Opicans: afterwards, however, large numbers came from Chalcis and the rest of Euboea, and helped to people the place; the founders being Perieres and Crataemenes from Cumae and Chalcis respectively. It first had the name of Zancle given it by the Sicels, because the place is shaped like a sickle, which the Sicels call zanclon; but upon the original settlers being afterwards expelled by some Samians and other Ionians who landed in Sicily fleeing from the Medes, and the Samians in their turn not long afterwards by Anaxilas, tyrant of Rhegium, the town was by him colonized with a mixed population, and its name changed to Messina, after his old country.

Himera was founded from Zancle by Euclides, Simus, and Saco, most of those who went to the colony being Chalcidians; though they were joined by some exiles from Syracuse, defeated in a civil war, called the Myleitidae. The language was a mixture of Chalcidian and Doric, but the institutions that prevailed were the Chalcidian. Acrae and Casmenae were founded by the Syracusans; Acrae seventy years after Syracuse, Casmenae nearly twenty after Acrae. Camarina was first founded by the Syracusans, close upon a hundred and thirty-five years after the building of Syracuse; its founders being Dascon and Menecolus. But the Camarinaeans being expelled by arms by the Syracusans for having revolted, Hippocrates, tyrant of Gela, some time later receiving their land in ransom for some Syracusan prisoners, resettled Camarina, himself acting as its founder. Lastly, it was again depopulated by Gelon, and settled once more for the third time by the Geloans.

In this passage, the principal cities founded by the Greeks in Sicily (Fig. 1) during the 8th and 7th centuries appear, ordered according to their different dates of foundation and also according to the different ethnic origins of their founders and colonists. In general, it
seems that Thucydides’ chronological outline is correct, so it can be used to organise our discussion, taking into account the different origins of those colonial foundations. However, I shall distinguish between the first generation colonies and the colonies they founded in turn (secondary colonisation).

The First Generation Colonies

Euboean Colonies

In Thucydides’ text, Naxos, sited at Punta Schisò, 50 km south of the Straits of Messina, appears as the first Greek colony in Sicily (Fig. 2). It does not seem, however, that it was the first place in Sicily to have been visited by the Euboeans (as we shall see later). The relationship of Naxos with the navigation routes seems clear if we consider that the altar of Apollo Archegetes became the point of departure and arrival of the sacred ambassadors (theoroi) leaving Sicily for the sanctuaries and festivals of Greece. It is quite probable that Naxos arose as a mere point within a network of establishments created by the Euboeans during the second half of the 8th century, in order to secure for themselves trading routes in the direction of Tyrrhenian Italy. Of course, within the later historiographical scheme, Naxos appeared as the pioneer of Euboean colonisation in Sicily and around it new foundation stories arose, which added more details to the brief mention in Thucydides. For instance, Strabo (6. 2. 2) says that the founder, Thucles, called by him Theocles, arrived at the future site of Naxos, ‘borne out of his course by the winds’ and there ‘perceived both the weakness of the peoples and the excellence of the soil’; consequently, he led an expedition composed of Chalcidians from Euboea, as well as of some Ionians and Dorians. These latter would bring about the foundation of Megara Hyblaea, to be dealt with later.

Naxos never possessed much territory, which again suggests that the main aim for its establishment was control of a key point in the maritime communications of eastern Sicily, at a time when the Euboeans were pursuing a similar strategy in other parts of the

---

Fig. 2. Naxos. Layout of the city during the 6th century B.C., with references to Archaic layout (after Pelagatti 1981, fig. 3).
Mediterranean. The relationship of Naxos to control of the approaches to the Straits of Messina seems quite certain: the relationship of Cape Schisò with navigation to and from Italy is attested during the Bronze and Iron Ages. Some scholars even insist that first establishment at Naxos has the character of an emporion, although others continue to doubt this. For a while Naxos could have acted as the main point of arrival for other Greeks who were beginning their own process of emigration which, within a few years, would lead to the rise of new colonies. The reference in Strabo (6. 2. 2) to the Ionians and the Doriens, who, presumably, arrived together with the Euboeans, could be the proof of this.

The date usually given for the foundation of Naxos is 734 B.C. and archaeological finds made there do not challenge this. The archaeological evidence seems to corroborate the reference in Strabo (6. 2. 2) to the weakness of the natives. The name of the city, which is that of a well-known Aegean island, implies the presence of people originating there, otherwise reported by Hellanicus of Lesbos (FGHist 1 F 82); there is also archaeological evidence for this Aegean presence. We know some of the houses of the earliest Naxos: they are quadrangular (4 × 4m), single-room constructions, concentrated in the north-eastern part of the plateau, where the harbour seems to have been. The extent of the first settlement has been calculated at about 10ha. The habitat grew notably during the 7th century and it is possible that, although showing a regular layout, it was organized around several axes, perhaps recalling the existence of colonists of different origins. During this period (7th century) the city’s increasing economic prosperity is reflected in the size of its houses. It is possible that recent excavation has located the place of the agora. As for the Archaic necropolis, very few tombs are datable to the

---

6 Pelagatti 1982b, 141–63.
7 Procelli 1983, 63–6, 80–1.
first generation of the colony; however, the presence of native women has been confirmed among them. The most recent excavations have detected several rural sacred areas around the city.

Naxos' rôle as a bridgehead seems clear when we note Thucydides' information, that in the sixth year after founding it Thucles/Theocles departed to found Leontini and, soon afterwards, Catane. However the people of Catane chose as founder one Evarchus.

Leontini, the older of the two cities mentioned by Thucydides, is also that furthest from Naxos, and one of the few Greek colonies not on the coast (Fig. 3), although it enjoyed good communications via the navigable River Terias (Ps.-Skylax 13). The foundation within a few years of Leontini and Catane, which took place after the Corinthians had founded Syracuse, inaugurates a new page in the history of the Greek presence in Sicily. Until then, the main type of settlement seems to have had a basically commercial function, controlling key points along navigation routes. The places selected, both on the Sicilian and Italian coasts, clearly betray that function; the most significant example, even within the Euboean world, is Pithekoussai. But even on the island of Ischia, whose main function was trade and the transformation of raw materials, part of the population was devoted to agriculture and cattle-raising, as the recent finds at Punta Chiarito, in the southern part of the island, show. Furthermore, calculations suggest a population for Pithekoussai in the second half of the 8th century of between 4,000 and 5,000.

The foundation of Leontini, however, demonstrated a different type of establishment, as with Cumae in Italy. Cumae implied an increase in the size and strength of the Greek presence in Tyrrhenian Italy, although the Greeks had previously frequented the place. It is difficult to know why the Euboeans (mainly Chalcidians, it seems) modified the previous model of establishing a presence in Sicily, which had required neither large physical investment nor great numbers of persons. If we did, we should know the causes of the true

17 Morris 1996, 57. On Greeks in Italy, see the chapters by E. Greco and B. d’Agostino in the present volume.
Fig. 3. Leontini. Topography of the site of the Greek city (after Gabba and Vallet 1980, pl. 9).
Greek colonisation, but this is a subject I shall not deal with here. However, we must not forget that, at least according to the course of events presented by Thucydides, the foundation of Syracuse may have had strong consequences on the general development of Greek involvement in Sicily during the second half of the 8th century.

Be that as it may, the foundation of Leontini was not free of difficulties, although the brief summary by Thucydides does not reveal them in detail. In fact, he says only that the Chalcidians expelled the Sicels who lived thereabouts after a war (Thucydides 6. 3. 3); however, when he turns to the foundation of Megara, he mentions the period of joint residence of Chalcidians and Megarians at Leontini, before the latter were expelled by the former (Thucydides 6. 4. 1). Strabo (6. 2. 2) also attests the relationship between Chalcidians and Megarians in Sicily in that period (as we have already seen). Polyaeus gives a more complete picture: he states that Theocles and the Chalcidians lived in Leontini together with the native Sicels, although they used the Megarians, led by Lamis, to expel the natives; later on, and after living together in the city for six months, the Chalcidians expelled the Megarians, allowing them to live for one winter in Trotilon (Polyaeus Strat. 5. 5). The existence of a pact between the Chalcidians and Sicels is quite likely. 19

The city of Leontini controlled the southern edge of the plain of Catane, which constituted, furthermore, the most important portion of its territory—the Leontina pedia mentioned by Polybius (7. 6. 4). This suggests that the Chalcidians were seeking either to control the whole of that wide plain or, at least, to establish their presence in it, just as Syracuse had been settled and (perhaps) its Corinthian colonists had begun to show an interest in the region. The rivalries, in those years, between Corinthians and Euboeans can also be observed in the expulsion of the Eretrian colonists of the island of Corcyra; indeed Strabo (6. 2. 4) says that both Syracuse and Corcyra were founded at more or less the same time and that both Archias, the founder of Syracuse, and Chersicrates, the founder of Corcyra, had left Corinth to take part of the same expedition. Although Strabo does not mention it, we know thanks to Plutarch that the host of Chersicrates (called by the author Charicrates) was responsible of the

---

expulsion of the Eretrians from Corcyra (Plutarch Mor. 293 a8–b7). However, we have no data until several centuries after their foundation, about rivalries between the Euboean foundation, Leontini, and the Corinthian foundation, Syracuse.

From an archaeological point of view we know little about the earliest city at Leontini, although the evidence seems to confirm a period of cohabitation, or at least coexistence, between Greeks and natives, of perhaps a greater duration than the written sources suggest. The Greek city may have been sited at Colle San Mauro (mainly in its southern part) and the native settlement, probably on the adjacent Metapicola hill. As time passed, the city came to include both hills and eventually, in the valley between, the agora and the main political buildings of the Greek city would be placed (Polybius 7. 6). The date of foundation traditionally assigned to Leontini is 729 B.C.; the same also to Catane. The archaeological evidence is compatible with this chronology.

With the foundation of Catane, seemingly very near in date to that Leontini, the Chalcidians established a dominant position in the plain of Catane, one of the most fertile areas of all Sicily. Once the southern edge of the plain had been secured with the foundation of Leontini, it is reasonable to suppose that Catane was established to reinforce that control. From Thucydides’ account we must assume that the foundation of Leontini and Catane, both of them arising from Naxos, was carried out within a single movement, perhaps to make way for new immigrants arriving in Sicily, among them people from diverse origins, as the traditions related to the foundations of Naxos and Leontini suggest. We do not know why Catane chose (or perhaps better ‘created’) Evarchus as founder; however it is not difficult to suggest that, as Theocles perhaps remained at Leontini, the Chalcidians established at Catane needed a different leader, one personally involved in the organisation of the new city.

---

24 Rizza 1981, 313. On the territories of Leontini and Catane, see De Angelis 2000b, 128–30; on the control carried out by the Greeks of the plain, in which Catane was to be settled, see Branciforti 1999, 243.
Catane occupies a coastal site adjoining an ancient gulf, which today has almost vanished (Fig. 4). The city had an important harbour (Thucydides 6. 71. 2). From this position, it controlled the northern part of the plain of Catane, bounded on the north by Mount Etna and on the south by the River Symaethus, which, at least during the 5th century, was the border between this city and Leontini (Thucydides 6. 65. 2). This river was one of the main routes penetrating the Sicilian interior, perhaps used by the two neighbouring poleis in their important expansion inland. The early interest of Catane in its immediate territory is suggested by some recent finds in Valverde, on the southern approaches to Mount Etna, and contemporary with the foundation of Catane. The topography of the ancient city has been almost totally lost through the destruction caused by the various eruptions of Etna and by the development of the modern city; the oldest necropoleis are not known. Some excavations carried out in the city have detected levels of the second half of the 8th century, which would confirm the foundation date suggested by Thucydides (about 729 B.C.).

The first-generation Euboean colonies should be completed with Zancle and, probably, Mylae. Thucydides (6. 4. 5) gives some important information about the origin of the first, but no precise date. According to him, the first Greek establishment was by a group of pirates coming from Cumae. The importance of the Straits of Messina in the routes which carried the Euboeans from the Aegean to the Tyrrhenian is obvious; the Euboean presence at Zancle and in its Italian neighbour Rhegion is closely related to the trade (and pirate) routes leading to the Bay of Naples, perhaps in the same way as Naxos. In this scheme, the main beneficiaries of the existence of a friendly, fraternal establishment on the Straits were, of course, the Euboeans settled in Pithekoussai and Cumae; consequently, the tradition present in Thucydides shows the originary dependency of the Euboean establishment at Zancle on the needs of Cumae. The depiction of these first settlers as pirates may be the result of the philo-Syracusan tradition that Thucydides seems to use, if it is true that

---

26 Procelli 1989, 679–89.
27 Wilson 1996, 75.
Fig. 4. Catane. The location in the modern city of the main remains of the Greek city. Author’s elaboration after several sources. A–A’. Ancient coastline; 1. Castello Ursino, sited in ancient times by the coast; 2. Former Benedictine monastery (acropolis?); 3. Votive steps in San Francesco square (7th–5th centuries B.C.); 4. Hellenistic (and older?) necropolis.
his source for this part of his work is, as seems likely, Antiochus of Syracuse. The pioneer character of this first Euboean (Eretrian?) settlement in Zancle seems also to have left traces in the different traditions.\(^\text{30}\)

The so-called ‘second foundation’ of Zancle must definitely be related to contemporary developments at Naxos. Both centres had acted for a time as single points of coastal control for Euboean navigation but, from a certain date, more people began to arrive in Sicily, both at Naxos, whence new expeditions leading to the foundations of Leontini and Catane would depart, and Zancle, where they would increase the population and also contribute to the foundation of neighbouring Mylae. Furthermore, the relationship between Naxos and Zancle is stressed by Strabo (6. 2. 3) and Ps.-Skymnos (283–286), especially the latter, who includes Zancle (together with Leontini and Catane) within the Naxian colonies. The new (‘second’) (re-)foundation of Zancle was of a more solid nature because Thucydides insists that those just arrived, coming from Chalcis and other parts of Euboea, ‘divided jointly among them’ the land. Certainly, the leader of the people from Cumae who settled there was Perieres, one of the two oikists mentioned by Thucydides: the other, Crataemenes was the leader of the people just arrived from Euboea. However, neither of them would be considered as the oikist of the city, according to Callimachus (\textit{Aet.} frag. 43, ll. 58–83); he says that in public ceremonies the founder of the city was invoked without his name being pronounced. Pausanias (4. 23. 7), although with some mistakes, reconstructs the foundation of Zancle in a clearer way:

\begin{quote}
Zancle was originally occupied by pirates, who fortified nothing but their harbour, as a base for brigandage and sea-raiding. Their captains (hegemones) were Crataemenes of Samos and Perieres of Chalcis. Later Perieres and Crataemenes decided to bring other Greeks as settlers.
\end{quote}

(Penguin translation)

The difference, with respect to Thucydides’ story, is that Perieres had not arrived directly from Chalcis but represented the Chalcidian element already established, together with the Cumaeans, in the strategic site of Zancle. Of additional interest is the view of Zancle

\(^{30}\) Antonelli 1996, 315–25.
as a ‘pirates’ nest’, in which only the area of the harbour would be fortified, thus stressing the interest that this place had for Euboean trading enterprise. The name itself, perhaps deriving from that given by the natives to the harbour area, with a characteristic shape of a sickle (zanklon, it seems, in the Sicel language), suggests the close relationship between the pre-urban establishment and the harbour area.

Investigation of the site of Zancle show that the city, at least until 5th century, occupied a narrow extension, to the south of the peninsula (Fig. 5). Pottery finds show that Greek presence there began in the second half of the 8th century. The types of pottery present are similar to those known in neighbouring centres, especially Rhegion, Mylae, Metaurus and Naxos, which suggests common economic and trade interests.

There is not much agreement about the chronology of the foundations of Zancle. However, there is evidence (Euboean cups) to suggest a Greek presence in Zancle before the foundation of most of the colonies we are discussing. Similar pottery, so far considered as the oldest Greek imports in Sicily, does not usually appear in colonial cities, but, for the most part in native sites (such as the necropolis at Villasmundo). That would indicate, perhaps, the existence of a pre-urban settlement there. We would not be far wrong to fix the foundation of Zancle at about the same time as that of Naxos; in consequence, the establishment of the Cumaean ‘pirates’ would, of necessity, be earlier.

Also related to Zancle are the foundations of such cities as Rhegion, Metaurus and Mylae. I shall deal here only with the last, which is on Sicily. As we have seen, Greek imports at Zancle show great similarities with those known in the other places mentioned so far, although in the case of Mylae the finds come from the necropolis. The relationship of Mylae to Euboean designs for control of the Straits of Messina has been mentioned many times, as has the possible function of this dependent centre (Diodorus 12. 54 considers it just a phrourion in the 5th century) as supplier of corn and food to Zancle, whose territory was always small.

---

31 Scibona 1986, 433–58.
34 Sabbione 1986, 221–36.
35 Dunbabin 1948a, 211–2; Vallet 1988, 166–7. See, however, De Angelis 2000b, 131.
Fig. 5. Zancle. General topography (after Bacci 1998, fig. 1).
relates Mylae and the yet unidentified Euboea\textsuperscript{36} to Chalcidian colonisation, and Strabo, when referring to the establishment of Himera, says that it was founded by the Zanclaeans at Mylae (Strabo 6. 2. 6). The foundation had to take place very soon after that of Zancle itself, as Greek pottery found in the necropolis and the traditions summarised by Eusebius (\textit{Chron. Sub Ol.} 16. 1) suggest. According to him, it could be dated to about 716 B.C., if we accept that this Christian author is using the name Chersonesus for Mylae.\textsuperscript{37} The city was placed on the Milazzo promontory, but it commanded a very rich and fertile plain, crossed by several rivers.\textsuperscript{38}

The Euboean cities so far considered were established in Sicily during the last third of the 8th century. However, we have seen that in some cases (Naxos, Zancle), the rise of the \textit{poleis} was the result of a period, of varying duration, of what are usually called ‘pre-colonial’ contacts; sometimes, the term ‘precolonisation’ has been also used. Regardless of the inadequacy of such a term,\textsuperscript{39} we have, indeed, some archaeological evidence (in addition to the references in written sources) which suggests the existence of contacts between Greeks and the coast of Sicily before the establishment of the first \textit{poleis}. It is quite possible that Greeks from Euboea (or from their Tyrrhenian establishments) explored the coasts of eastern Sicily during the second half of the 8th century, during their travels of prospecting, exploration and trade.

Apart from some pottery discovered at Zancle (chevron skyphoi and Euboean cups in general), the main place where this process has been analysed is in the native necropolis of Villasmundo, in the valley of the River Marcellino (only some 8km from where Megara Hyblaea would be founded), where several tombs contain Greek pottery (skyphoi decorated with pendant semicircles, skyphoi of Euboean-Cycladic type with chevron decoration), which may be dated in the first half of the 8th century, while other pottery (Aetos 666 kotyle or Thapsos cups) may be contemporary with the foundation of the

\textsuperscript{36} Camassa 1989, 391–7. On the possibility of its identification as Licodia Euboea, as has been traditionally thought, see, most recently, Wilson 1996, 75. However, Frasca (1997, 407–17) suggests identifying it with Monte San Mauro di Catagirone.


\textsuperscript{39} Domínguez 1994, 19–48; Alvar 1997, 19–33.
The presence, in a place which is not on the coast, of a series of Greek imports of the 8th century, from both before and after the foundation of the colonies, must be interpreted as the result of travels of exploration with basically commercial ends. Similar finds in other places (such as Castello San Filippo, near Catane) may suggest that the process is more widespread than a first view might suggest.

The information acquired by these different agents (Euboean, Megarian, Corinthian) was used wisely when it became necessary to establish cities that needed to make a profit from the agricultural resources of those regions with which previously they had maintained only commercial relationships. Strabo's account (6. 2. 2) of the travels of Theocles to Sicily, shows clearly the transition from the first phase to the second.

Corinthian Colonisation: Syracuse

The foundation of Syracuse, the year after the foundation of Naxos (733 B.C.), meant the presence of a new ethnic component in Sicily. Although we must not ignore Corinthian interest in the South Italian and Tyrrhenian markets, Greeks from Euboea had, in general, led the process until then; however, when the Euboeans began establishing durable settlements in Sicily, so too did the Corinthians. In spite of the succession established by Thucydides in the dates of the Sicilian foundations, other authors, such as Strabo are slightly less precise; for him, the foundation of Syracuse had taken place 'about the same time that Naxos and Megara were colonised' (Strabo 6. 2. 4). Strabo also introduces a tradition which considers as contemporary the Delphic consultation and the foundation of Syracuse and Croton, although this is most probably a later forgery. Perhaps more reasonable is the relationship established by some authors, among them also Strabo (6. 2. 4), between the foundation of Syracuse and the Corinthian establishment in Corcyra, after the expulsion of its previous colonists, the Eretrians.

---

41 Wilson 1996, 75.
Fig. 6. The oldest Greek imports in Sicily (after Albanese Procelli 1997b, pl. II).
1. Messina (LGc: Thapsos cup; LGe: chevron skyphos); 2. Naxos (LGe: Thapsos cup; LGe);
3. Catania (LGc: Thapsos cup); 4. Leontinoi (LGc: Thapsos cup; LGe);
5. Mégara Hyblaea (MG?; LGc: Aetos 666 kotylai; Thapsos cup); 6. Siracusa, city (LGc: Aetos 666 kotyle; Thapsos cup; LGr) and territory (?) (LGc: Thapsos cup);
7. Gela (LGc: Thapsos cup; LGr); 8. Villasmundo (MGe II: chevron skyphos; LGe: pendent semicircle skyphos; kyathos; LGe: Aetos 666 kotyle; Thapsos cup); 9. Thapsos (LGe: Thapsos cup); 10. Modica (LGc: Aetos 666 kotyle; Thapsos cup; LGe: Cycladic cup); 11. Avola (LGc: Thapsos cup); 12. Cocolonazzo di Mola (LGc: kotyle); 13. Centuripe (LGe: kotyle); 14. Monte Castellazzo-Pietralunga (LGc: Aetos 666 kotyle; LGr: cup?); 15. Valverde (LGc: Thapsos cup; LGe?: kyathos); 16. Castelluccio (LGe: cup).
Plutarch (Mor. 772e–773b) mentions a story according to which Archias had left Corinth as the result of the murder of a youth who was his lover. Recently, this has been interpreted from the point of view of the tensions which would affect the community, forced to send some of its members on an uncertain overseas enterprise; these tensions would be expressed in the form of a metaphor. 42

As well as the name of the oikistes, Archias, whose name is also mentioned by Thucydides, Strabo gives some additional detail about the group who founded Syracuse; in fact, besides the people from Corinth, Archias would have added to his expedition a group of Dorians he met at Cape Zephyrion (capo Bruzzano). These Dorians were on the way back to their country after his participation in the foundation of Megara (Strabo 6. 2. 4; Ps.-Skymnos 278–280). We are not informed about who these Dorians were or why they had left Sicily; they returned eagerly to Sicily after Archias asked them to take part in his new foundation. In spite of the suspicious reference to Zephyrion, perhaps originating in the interest that Syracuse would have in Classical times in that part of Italy, we must not reject the tradition entirely and we may think that there is some element of truth in it. Anyway (as we have already mentioned and to which we shall return), the foundation of Megara was very troublesome, perhaps precisely because the objectives were not very clearly defined.

According to Thucydides, the first gesture of the colonists of Syracuse was to expel the natives who occupied the island of Ortygia (the island city); afterwards, they spread themselves along the mainland (the outer city), occupying and enclosing within walls that part of the city (Thucydides 6. 3. 2). The city became very prosperous because it had both excellent natural harbourage and an extraordinarily fertile territory (Strabo 6. 2. 4).

The foundation of Syracuse seems to have been a perfectly planned enterprise, led by the leading family of the city of the Isthmus, the Bacchiad aristocracy which, if we accept Strabo’s reconstruction, had held power for 200 years, until overturned by Cypselus (ca. 657 B.C.) (Strabo 8. 6. 20). Thucydides calls Archias a Heraclid and Strabo also so describes Chersocrates, the person who would leave the joint expedition to found Corcyra. Here, perhaps, is one of the main

differences with the contemporary activities of the Euboeans and the Megarians in Sicily: Corinthian colonisation seems to be the result of a perfectly planned action, while the Euboean action is more hesitant, with a gap of several years from the creation of the first bridgehead, Naxos, until the rise of the main foundations, Leontini and Catane. The action of the Megarians, in turn, is thoroughly timid, always dependent on partners who are more powerful and, lastly, on the protection of a lesser native ruler. Nothing of this kind is perceived in the Corinthian action.

Archaeology has confirmed that the first Corinthian settlement took place on the island of Ortygia and the first levels of the Greek city are immediately above the destruction levels of the previous native settlement, although probably not in all places (Fig. 7). The chronology suggested for the Corinthian settlement by Greek pottery (mainly Thapsos cups) is between the third and fourth quarters of the 8th century, which fits well with the date suggested by Thucydides. The native settlement of huts occupied all the highest part of Ortygia and although it seems to have been destroyed by the establishment of the Greek polis, probably the ‘expulsion’ of the natives may have not been as complete as Thucydides suggests.

We know several houses of the earliest Greek city, for the most part little quadrangular structures (3.5 × 3.5m), ordered around small courts and arranged along narrow straight streets (2.5–3m). The date of the oldest houses is the last quarter of the 8th century, while the street seems to have been built in the early 7th century. However, the first houses are disposed according to some axis that has survived in certain areas of Ortygia until today. The island was crossed north to south, by a street, perhaps of pre-Greek origin, which linked Ortygia with the mainland and whose outline has been revealed by excavation. The type of house is very similar to that known in other contemporary Sicilian cities, such as Megara Hyblaea, although there seems to have existed in Syracuse a higher population, because the houses seem to have been built closer together.
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43 Pelagatti 1982a, 125–40.
Fig. 7. General topography of Syracuse (after Voza 1982a, pl. 1).
A. Fusco necropolis; B. Giardino Spagna; C. Agora.
It is also possible that the houses were concentrated around wells or springs and several empty areas may have existed between the various clusters; it has even been suggested that the city was organised kata komas in its first decades. During the 7th century the city began its expansion on the mainland and a street seems to have linked Ortigia with the oldest necropolis of the city, Fusco, 1km westward of Aceradina. This street may be that identified as the ‘broad continuous street’ (via lata perpetua) mentioned by Cicero in his description of Syracuse (Verr. 2. 4. 119).

The Archaic necropoleis of Syracuse form a semicircle around the inhabited area; the oldest of them is Fusco, which was excavated by Orsi between 1892 and 1915. Recent analysis carried out on the material coming from that necropolis suggests that during the last quarter of the 8th century the economic level of the inhabitants of Syracuse was not very high, although from the beginning of and throughout the 7th century, it increased dramatically—we know of several tombs which show an important level of wealth, a consequence of the increasing general level of prosperity caused by the city’s inclusion within wide commercial networks. Parts of the necropolis recently excavated, also dated to the 7th century, suggest the same.

Syracuse would become, in time, one of the most important cities not only of Sicily, but of the whole Greek world; this was the consequence, mainly, of the expansive politics marked by the foundation of new second-generation (secondary) colonies (sub-colonies), which I shall deal with later. However, as well as penetration inland to territories held by the natives and to the southern coast of Sicily during the 7th century, it seems that the city showed very soon a clear interest in the control of the entire coastal strip from the city southwards to Helorus, 30km distant. Helorus seems to have been founded in the later 8th century, but Thucydides does not mention it among the Syracusan sub-colonies; however, this must be
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interpreted as a result of the close relationship that Helorus always maintained with Syracuse, because of its proximity.

Communication between Syracuse and its first sub-colony was secured through the Helorine way, mentioned several times by Thucydides (6. 66. 3; 6. 70. 4), which was used by the Athenians during their tragic retreat in 413 B.C. (Thucydides 7. 80. 5). The antiquity of the Syracusan establishment at Helorus suggests that the main area of expansion of the city would be southwards; in fact, Syracusan expansion to the north would be hindered by the presence of Megara and, further away, by Leontini.55 At the same time, this early foundation attests to the quick growth of the city during its first decades.56 I shall return later to Syracusan sub-colonies.

Megarian Colonisation: Megara Hyblaea

As we have seen, the foundation of Megara Hyblaea appears to have been one of the most complex of all the first wave of Sicilian colonies. Furthermore, the different sources do not agree on all the details, which complicates the issue further.57 It seems, however, beyond all doubt, that a host coming from Megara and led by Lamis, left the city more or less ‘about the same time’ that the Chalcidians were founding Naxos and the Corinthians Syracuse (Thucydides 6. 4. 1; Strabo 6. 4. 2). It also seems certain that Megarians and Chalcidians lived together for a time in Leontini (Thucydides 6. 4. 1; Polyaeus Strat. 5. 5), and some authors even thought that Chalcidians and Megarians left Greece together (Strabo 6. 2. 2; Ps.-Skynnos 274–277 = Ephorus FGrHist 70 F 137). It is possible that before or after their cohabitation with the Chalcidians at Leontini, the Megarians settled for a time at Trotilon, by the River Pantacias (before: Thucydides 6. 4. 1; after: Polyaeus Strat. 5. 5). Anyway, after the unsuccessful joint experience with the Chalcidians of Leontini (Ps.-Skynnos 276 talks about a stasis), the Megarians settled in Thapsos, where Lamis died (Thucydides 6. 4. 1). They were eventually expelled from Thapsos, although we do not know who was responsible (the recently arrived

56 Di Vita 1996, 272.
Corinthians?); this would have forced some individuals to join the Corinthians who were founding Syracuse (Strabo 6. 2. 4). It is now that the native king, Hyblon, gave part of his territory for the settlement (Thucydides 6. 4. 1).

As Thucydides gives very precise information, saying that the Megarians lived in that place for 245 years before the tyrant Gelon occupied and destroyed the city (483 B.C.), the foundation of Megara Hyblaea must have taken place in 728 B.C. If anything is relatively clear amidst the very complex stories relating to the foundation of Megara, it is the lack of a clear political design among the Megarians, which provoked several years of hesitation before finding a definite place to settle. The outcome was influenced by the attitude of a philhellenic local ruler. There have been numerous attempts to identify where he might have resided and what his interest in helping the Megarians was; it is usually thought that his initiative may ultimately have failed, because it seems beyond doubt that Syracuse came to occupy the lands previously in the hands of the Sicels. Megara was always a small city, placed between two more powerful neighbours, Leontini to the north and Syracuse to the south. Even when the Megarian colonists had not yet found a definite place of settlement, those from Leontini let them occupy Trotilon for one winter, deprived of their weapons. This suggests that Trotilon was within Leontini’s sphere of influence. At the same time, the expulsion from Thapsos, 12 km north of Syracuse, perhaps implies an early interest by the Corinthian colonists in that coastal area. Some Greek objects dated to the late 8th century found within a native tomb at Thapsos are usually interpreted as proof of the short stay of the Greeks in the Magnisi peninsula, but there is no evidence to consider it the ‘grave of Lamis’.

Finally, the Megarians established themselves on a calcareous plateau by the sea, only 20 km to the north of Syracuse, where there are no remains of previous native settlement. The oldest Greek pottery found there attests the date given by Thucydides.

Megara Hyblaea is one the best-known Sicilian colonies from an archaeological point of view, thanks to the excavation carried out

there, especially in the area of the Archaic agora (Fig. 8). This revealed that during the installation of the colonists in the 8th century, several straight streets 3m wide were laid out in a north-south direction, intersected by transverse streets to create *insulae* 25m long. Near the agora, the streets are aligned at an angle of 21° to the previous pattern, thus creating a triangular area that would become the Archaic agora. At least three more orientations have been identified in the Archaic layout; these are usually interpreted as corresponding to the five villages or *komai* which had formed the *polis* of Megara in Greece (usually known as Megara Nisaea).  

The street pattern created urban plots (about 121–135m²), which at first appear very sparsely occupied, with square houses of 4 × 4m. During the 7th century the houses were enlarged up to three rooms, leading to a small court, but always respecting the general layout created in the later 8th century. During the 7th century, especially its second half, the city began a programme of construction of large buildings, taking particular care to ensure that the size of plots was similar (although this was not always achieved). The town-planning of Megara Hyblaea is strong evidence for the egalitarian spirit which infused the first Greek colonies, and applied also to the strict differentiation between public and private space. It seems as if a good part of the surface enclosed within the 6th-century city-wall was already included in the first settlement.

As usual, the necropoleis surround the city and are placed beyond the urban limits, arranged, it would seem, around the axes of the main routes leaving the city. Few tombs are known from the earliest phase of the city (late 8th-early 7th century); those of later periods are more abundant. They show different rituals and different levels of wealth. The southern necropolis seems to have been the earliest.
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Fig. 8. General plan of Megara Hyblea, showing the main cultic areas (after de Polignac 1999, fig. 1).
Megara Hyblaea possessed a larger territory than its population warranted, and they never made extensive use of it.\textsuperscript{67} It has also been suggested that it might have served as a ‘buffer-state’ between Leontini and Syracuse.\textsuperscript{68}

\textit{The Colonisation of the Dorians: Gela}

Gela was the last of the first generation colonies to be founded in Sicily, in 688 B.C., 45 years after Syracuse (Thucydides 6. 4. 3). Thus, we move to a different time from that considered so far. Furthermore, the area chosen by its colonists, the southern coast of Sicily, and their origin in the insular Dorian world, make Gela a somewhat peculiar case.

Thucydides (6. 4. 3) informs us that before the proper foundation of Gela, a fortified precint called Lindioi existed, which would become the \textit{acropolis} of the city. This strongly suggests that a small Rhodian settlement (more precisely of Rhodians from Lindus?) existed, hard by Cape Soprano and controlling the mouth of the River Gela (‘Cold’ river?).\textsuperscript{69} Some ancient authors such as Callimachus (\textit{Aet.} frag. 43. 46–47) ascribe the foundation of Gela directly to the Lindians, and although the Cretan component is not forgotten, the most authors insist on the principal rôle of the Rhodians in the colonisation of Gela (Herodotus 7. 153).

Archaeological excavation has shown, both in the eastern part of the hill, where later would arise the \textit{acropolis} of the city of Gela, and in other points of the future Greek city, a period of apparent occupation between the second half-late 8th and the beginnings of the 7th century.\textsuperscript{70} After a fashion this confirms the traditions transmitted by Thucydides. It shows that a group of Rhodians (and people of other origins?) had established a base of operations at that point of the Sicilian southern coast. Perhaps the motive was trade or control of an important watering point for ships following the coast \textit{en route} to the western tip of the island. This is, anyway, the first presence of East Greeks in the central Mediterranean and we surely

\textsuperscript{67} De Angelis 1994, 95–100.
\textsuperscript{68} Berger 1991, 129–42.
\textsuperscript{69} Wentker 1956, 129–39.
must look for an important economic development in Lindus at this
time to be able to explain these new interests.

The change of status to a full-blown colony may have been a con-
sequence of some kind of problem at Lindus: certainly some tradi-
tions suggest that the Lindians were also founding Phaselis, on the
coast of Asia Minor, at the same time as Gela (Philostephanus apud
Athen., Deipn. 7. 297 f). A scholium to Pindar (Ad Ol. 2. 15) affirms
that, as result of a stasis, some Rhodians had to leave their country
and, after fighting the barbarians living thereabouts, founded Gela.
It is possible that this information does not really clarify the facts
but there is an additional element. The historian Artemon of Pergamum
(FGrHist 569 F 1, apud Schol. Pind. Ol. 2. 16) mentions the difficulties
faced by the colonists during the different phases of the foundation,
but says also that both oikists had to look for new participants in the
Peloponnese. We know also that, besides Rhodians, Cretans and
Peloponnesians(?), there was at least one individual from Telos,
Deinomenes(?), the ancestor of the tyrant Gelon (Herodotus 7. 153;
Schol. Pind. Pyth. 2. 27), and he might not have been the only indi-
vidual from there.71

From the foregoing, we may conclude that the Lindians estab-
lished a trading post in southern Sicily in the late 8th century; a
generation later, and consequent upon some difficulties in their city
(a civil conflict or whatever), some of the Lindians had to leave their
home. To increase their opportunities, they had to join people com-
ing from elsewhere in Rhodes and a small group of Cretans, per-
haps with a leader of their own. They might also have accepted
others from the regions surrounding Rhodes (among them some indi-
vidual from Telos) who wished to join them, and perhaps picked up
others in the Peloponnese. This great diversity of origins perhaps
justifies the explanation given by Thucydides (6. 4. 4), when he
assures us that the nomisma of the new city would be Dorian. He only
gives this information when he is dealing with mixed foundations,
such as Himera (6. 5. 1) or Acragas (6. 4. 5).

The place chosen for the establishment was (naturally) the mouth
of the River Gela where there was already one (or several) small
nucleus of Rhodians. The name of one of the oikists, Antiphemus of
Rhodes, as well as the cult devoted to him after his death, is attested

71 On this individual and his descendant, Telines, see Harrell 1998, 28–74.
both by a great number of sources and by a votive inscription found on the foot of an Attic kylix dated to the 6th or 5th centuries, with a dedication to Antiphemus (SGDI 32 5215). The first years of the city were very hard, at least to judge from the campaigns that the oikist himself had to lead against the neighbouring native Sicans, placed in the polisma of Omphake, which would eventually be destroyed and plundered (Pausanias 8. 46. 2).

The city of Gela occupied a long hill (Fig. 9), parallel to the coast, whose eastern part, where one of the tiny Lindian settlements had been, acted as the acropolis. There had existed, since 7th century, the sanctuary of Athena Lindia, as well as two other temples and a large number of tiny cult places or naiskoi, spread across the whole eastern part of the hill and perhaps related to the act of foundation. It has been also suggested that they were part of a preconceived urban structure. The 7th-century pottery is, for the most part, of Corinthian manufacture, as is usual in the rest of Sicily, which would show that Gela entered immediately into the distribution networks of this pottery, but among the oldest material are some Late Geometric North Ionian cups. This shows the double commercial orientation of the Archaic city, linked to the Corinthian-Syracusan trade but also with a Rhodian connexion. At the same time, typical Cretan products, quite scarce in the rest of Sicily, have been identified at Gela, and Cretan influences have also been observed quite frequently in other spheres of the culture (including religion).

The Archaic necropolis was located to the west of the city and some tombs with material dating to the late 8th century are known. Around the city, an important set of extra-urban sanctuaries is known; among them, the most remarkable is the Thesmophorion at Bitalemi, by the mouth of the River Gela.

---
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Recent excavation has discovered the harbour area of Gela, to the south of the acropolis, as well as an area of housing (late 7th–early 6th century) to the north of it. The orientation of the streets in both areas seems to have been the same. These new finds show that the Archaic city was larger than previously thought.  

Thus, the foundation of Gela, preceded by a previous period of occupation by peoples coming from Lindus, introduces a new component in Sicily. This, essentially East Greek, would not lose contacts with its area of origin and, later on, would be responsible for an increase of this East Greek presence, but of Dorian origin, in other parts of Sicily.

The Second-Generation Colonies

Gela brings to an end the first series of Greek colonies founded in Sicily. During the last third of the 8th century and the first quarter of the 7th century, colonies of Chalcis, Corinth, Megara, Rhodes and Crete were established. Each, according to the opportunities, developed its urban area, with public spaces and sanctuaries and, at the same time, began a process of expansion toward the lands previously held by the natives. The pattern of the relationships between these cities and the native world was extremely varied, however, a common feature was that all cities created an agricultural territory as well as an area of influence, of greater or lesser importance, which ended up affecting the native environment. The development of trade in Greek products, which had already begun to arrive in native centres in the 7th century (sometimes earlier), is a clear mark of that interaction inaugurated by the foundation of the Greek cities.

This economic activity brought rapid advances to the conditions of life in the colonies, many of which had begun, from the 7th century, the development of an urbanism, which continued during the 6th century. Their public and religious buildings, city-walls, paved streets, etc. show the levels of wealth reached.

However, from the 7th century, in a process that continued to the late 6th century, the first generation colonies usually became
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82 Domínguez 1989, passim.
mother cities of other new colonies in turn. But they had no need

to seek distant countries to take their surplus population; Sicily itself

was the destination. This did not always encourage the widening of

the mother city’s horizons beyond its own borders; indeed, some-
times there was to be strife between the new colony and its far from

remote mother city.

The main difference between this new process and that which had

led to the foundation of the first generation colonies is that the

Greeks established in Sicily ended up knowing the island extraordi-
narily well, both its economic capacities and the eventual difficulties

which the creation of sub-colonies might bring about. Undoubtedly,

all Greek cities were always needing to increase their territories, but

in Greece itself this implied fighting Greek neighbours; in the colo-
nial world, the expansion was at the expense of the natives, who,
in the Greek view, were inferiors. This circumstance justified (a pos-
teriori) conquest and expulsion.84 Even civilising and conquering heroes

such as Heracles sometimes removed impediments to legitimate the

appropriation of territory.85

Consequently, the process begun in the 7th century involved all

those cities founded during the 8th century. Furthermore, there would

be two colonial enterprises introducing new elements into Sicily—

Cnidians and Spartans; although with unequal success.

Syracusan Colonisation: Acrae, Casmenae and Camarina

Syracuse founded three colonies in Sicily (besides Helorus): Acrae,

Casmenae and Camarina. According to Thucydides (6. 5. 2), Acrae

had been founded about 663 B.C. (70 years after Syracuse), Casmenae

about 643 B.C. (20 years after Acrae) and Camarina about 598 B.C.

(135 years after Syracuse).

Undoubtedly, each of them reflected different interests of their

mother city, but essentially within the same politics, especially in the

case of the first two (which I shall deal with first). We have the name

of an oikist for neither, which has usually been considered as proof

of their close relationship to their mother city. Perhaps they were
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Contrary to the general practice for Sicily (the exception is Leontini), and unlike the remaining sub-colonies analysed here (including the third Syracusan foundation, Camarina), they were established inland, not on the coast. Thus, we are probably contemplating centres whose main function was to secure efficient control of the territory, not for their own benefit but for that of their mother city, Syracuse. The two cities were established on the upper reaches of the main rivers which bordered Syracusan territory, the Anapo to the north and the Helorus (modern Tellaro) to the south. It is quite probable, therefore, that Acrae and Casmenae served as frontier posts, reinforcing the Syracusan presence in an area that was very important to its interests.

The foundation, in the first place, of Acrae (Fig. 10), which commands the course of the Anapo, suggests that this river acted as the main route of penetration. The establishment of Casmenae was probably effected through the valley of the Tellaro river, at whose mouth Helorus lay. This could explain the long time (20 years) between the foundations, despite their relative proximity (12km). We must not forget that the area of influence of Casmenae also included the River Irminio, which perhaps marked one of the borders of the territory of the future city of Camarina.

Acrae (on the site of modern Palazzolo Acreide) occupied a plateau that commanded the valleys of the Anapo and the Tellaro. The entire region was occupied by natives. We know very little about the structure of the city during the Archaic period—most known buildings (bouleuterion, temple of Aphrodite) are of later date; however, it is possible that the town planning corresponded to that of the Archaic period. Some tombs dated to the 7th century and later have been excavated in the necropolis at Pinita, which seems to have been used previously by the natives.

Slightly better known is the situation in Casmenae (modern Monte Casale) (Fig. 11). The city was sited on a wide plateau which

---
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Fig. 10. The expansion and the territory of Syracuse. A. Directions of the expansion of Syracuse towards the interior (after Domínguez 1989, fig. 68). B. The three phases in the growth of Archaic Syracuse’s territory (after De Angelis 2000a, fig. 55).
commands the sources of the Anapo and Irminio rivers, and very near to the source of the Tellaro. Excavation has revealed an urban layout comprising a series of parallel streets running from north-west to south-east (this is to say across the narrow part of the plateau). No street crossing the settlement from east to west has been found. This planning is considered as proper for the 7th century, but it was maintained during the 6th century. T.J. Dunbabin considered that the oldest material, found in the houses, could be dated to the late 7th century and that the Archaic temple might be even earlier. It was placed in the western part part of the city, which perhaps acted as acropolis. In the temple a votive stips with hundreds of weapons was found, which has been explained as the result of a strong military component in the city. The impregnability of Casmenae, thanks mainly to its situation, is confirmed by Herodotus (7. 155) when he records that the Syracusan gamoroi took refuge there after their expulsion from Syracuse. From Casmenae, Gelon would reintroduce them to Syracuse in 485 B.C. The regularity of the layout has enabled the number of houses in the city to be calculated, as well as the number of inhabitants (about 7,528) and some authors have seen it as a rigid ‘military’ planning by Syracuse. We know some tombs in the Casmenae necropolis, south-west of the city, that date to the first half of the 6th century.

The third Syracusan colony, Camarina, was founded in about 598 B.C. In this case we do know the names of the two oikists: Dasco and Menecolus. This most probably suggests that we are dealing with a true ktisis of a true Greek polis, although it is doubtful, judging from the war against Syracuse (see below) that it was completely independent. On the other hand, the existence of two oikists may point to the existence of two main groups of colonists one of them, at least, or Syracusan origin. We do not know if the other could be Corinthian, as Dunbabin has suggested. Camarina was founded on

94 Dunbabin 1948a, 101.
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98 On the dependence of Camarina with respect to Syracuse, see most recently Manganaro 1999, 116–7.
99 Dunbabin 1948a, 105.
Fig. 11. Plan of Casmenae (after Gabba and Vallet 1980, pl. 4).
the southern coast of Sicily, whereas the other two colonies and the first Syracusan foundation, Helorus, were directed to the eastern coast. The actual motives for this foundation are not well known but we must not forget two very important facts. On the one hand, the new city very quickly developed a political orientation absolutely opposite to that of its mother city. This brought about severe retaliation in ca. 553 B.C., when it revolted against Syracuse and allied itself with the Sicels (Ps.-Skymnos 295–296; Thucydides 6. 5. 3; Philistus FGrHist 556 F 5).100 On the other hand, in the years before the foundation of Camarina, there were political troubles within Syracuse; thus, for instance, we know of the exile of a part of its citizenry (the so-called Myletidae), who would take part in the foundation of Himera, as Thucydides (6. 5. 1) stresses. The foundation of Himera must be placed in about 649/48 B.C. (Diodorus 13. 62. 4). Thus, it is possible that the foundation of Camarina, as well as reflecting the increased interest of Syracuse in the southern coast of the island, might also have solved some internal political troubles. In fact, Camarina was to be a neighbour of the powerful Gela, which eventually would also cause it some problems (Thucydides 6. 5. 3).101 It is not improbable that the foundation of Camarina was designed to prevent Geloan expansion both along the coast and in the interior of Sicily; expansion dangerous for Syracuse and its outposts Acrae and Casmenae.102

The interests of Camarina (and perhaps of Syracuse) in the maritime trade along the southern coast of Sicily, may be observed in several places: on the one hand, in a series of harbour structures found in near the mouth of the River Hipparis, at least in part datable to Archaic period,103 on the other, in what seems to be an emporion, placed in the mouth of the River Irminio, at the site called Maestro. There, structures dated to the early 6th century have been discovered, and show the strong commercial interest represented by this territory.104 In addition, epigraphic evidence of the second half
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104 Di Stefano 1987a, 129–40; 1987b, 188–96; Some scholars, however, suggest that it must have been an emporion not of Camarina but of Syracuse: Gras 1993, 107.
of the 6th century, in which the purchase of a certain quantity of corn is mentioned, helps confirm the commercial character of the place. Some shipwrecks and other structures found in the surrounding area (Punta Bracceto) point to the same conclusion.

On the other hand, the River Irminio, linked the coast with the interior where Acrae was situated, and we know from Philistus (FGrHist 556 F 5) that the casus belli in the war between Syracuse and Camarina, in which the latter was supported by other Greeks and Sicels, was the crossing by the Camaritans of the River Irminio. Although we still lack sufficient evidence to understand fully what lay behind the foundation of Camarina, there are numerous and very diverse strands, such as the territorial expansion of Syracuse, the control of coastal points of trade interest but also of key importance in the protection of the territory, the creation of centres to reinforce Syracusan control over the southern coast of Sicily, etc.

Camarina was founded at the mouth of the River Hyparis (today Ippari), commanding one of the most important plains in southern Sicily, which would constitute the backbone of its territory, in spite of the dense occupation by the natives (Fig. 12). However, Camarina maintained very close and intense relations with the Sicels during the Archaic period. The archaeological evidence so far found in the city and in the necropolis, dated to the late 7th and the early 6th century, seems to confirm Thucydides’ observations. The high percentage of Corinthian transport amphorae found may reinforce the old hypothesis of a Corinthian provenance for some of the founding colonists, but it is difficult to relate the commonest types of amphora in a city to the origin(s) of its inhabitants. From the first, Camarina enjoyed a regular layout, which remained stable through the different phases of the life of the city. During the first half of the 6th century, a city wall was constructed, enclosing 150ha.
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Fig. 12. Plan of Camarina (after Pelagatti 1976a).
The *agora* of the city is also known: it occupied a space kept free from buildings from the beginning of the Greek establishment.\(^{112}\) Some sacred areas are also known, such as the temple of Athena, where an important collection of more of 150 lead letters datable to *ca.* 561 B.C. has been discovered.\(^ {113}\)

The Archaic necropolis is placed to the east, just outside the city-walls, adjoining the route to the interior of the island (Rifriscolaro-Dieci Salme). Some tombs dated to about 600 B.C. are known, perhaps corresponding to the first generation of colonists.\(^ {114}\) Overall, several thousands tombs pertaining to the Camarinian necropolis are known, a good part (more than 2,000) of the Archaic period.\(^ {115}\)

**Chalcidian Colonisation: Himera**

Himera, except for Mylae the only Archaic Greek colony on the northern coast of Sicily, shows, in Thucydides’ account (6. 5. 1), a number of features of interest. In the first place, the existence of three *oikists*, which is quite uncommon. This is usually interpreted as the result of there being different groups of colonists, also mentioned by Thucydides.\(^ {116}\) A greater problem is to try to link a particular group to a particular *oikist*, a matter which has received different interpretations,\(^ {117}\) although I shall not enter in them.

The second element of interest, related to the previous one, is the presence of at least two, and perhaps three, different groups of colonists in this foundation. On the one hand, the Chalcidians from Zancle, the founders of the colony; on the other, the so-called Myletidae, coming from Syracuse and expelled from that city as the consequence of a *stasis*, in which they had been the losing party. Undoubtedly, these Syracusans joined the colony at the very outset: they might even have arrived in territory controlled by the Chalcidians before the foundation itself. J. Bérard had already suggested that

\(^ {113}\) Cordano 1992.
these refugees had originally been settled in Mylae, whence their name.\textsuperscript{118} In addition, the relationship between Mylae and Himera was reported by Strabo (6. 2. 6), who considered Himera to be a colony of the Zancleans at Mylae. However, not all authors agree with this interpretation.\textsuperscript{119} The existence of a third group, perhaps neither Chalcidian nor Syracusan, is suggested by the existence of the third oikist and by Thucydides' information.

As for the observations in Thucydides about the dialect spoken in Himera and its nomima, they are different in character. Certainly, the election of the nomima, which Thucydides mentions when he refers to mixed communities (see Gela above), is part of the characterisation, even of the ethnicity, which the colony wants to assume: it is a consequence of the consideration of the city as Chalcidian and which is related to the mention of Zancle as its mother city or to the inclusion of Himera in the catalogue of Chalcidian cities (for instance, Ps.-Skymnos 289–290). Consequently, this option corresponds to the very moment of the creation of the colony. However, the reference to the dialect is something that arose with time and through groups with diverse linguistic origins living together. Of course, this was not a deliberate act but the outcome of the usual mechanisms of linguistic contact and change. This mixing of dialects would not have been perceived during the first generation but it was something to be developed during the following centuries in the life of the city.

Thus, Himera would show a somewhat particular character: its double heritage, Dorian and Chalcidian, making it a privileged onlooker to the different conflicts of interests present in Sicily during the late 6th and the early 5th century.

Thucydides does not mention the date of foundation of Himera. This resembles the case of Selinus, where his information is also very vague and, in both instances, it is Diodorus who gives us the information. Diodorus says, in the account of his campaigns, that Hannibal son of Gisco destroyed Himera in 408 B.C., 240 years after its foundation (Diodorus 13. 62. 4), which gives us a date of foundation of 648 B.C. (and that Selinus was captured by Hannibal after 242 years of existence—Diodorus 13. 59. 4).

\textsuperscript{118} Bérard 1957, 241.
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On some occasions, certain parallels between Himera and Selinus have been pointed to: both were founded at about the same time and both were placed at the island’s most westerly extremity, on its northern and southern coasts respectively. Some scholars have suggested, because of those circumstances, that the cities were part of a joint plan to limit and fight Punic expansionism.¹²⁰ I shall return later to the causes of the foundation of Selinus; I shall deal here with Himera.

The interest of the Chalcidians and, more precisely of Zancle, in the northern coast of Sicily is shown by the early foundation of Mylae. This city soon participated in the interests of the Chalcidians in the Straits of Messina, perhaps in the Aeolian Islands and in the Tyrrhenian Sea. The rest of the northern coast does not seem to have been especially suited to the establishment of Greek cities, judging by their absence. In addition to Himera, there were only two satisfactory points anywhere along that coast: Cale Acte (modern Caronia), midway between Himera and Mylae, where the Zancleans tried to found a colony of Ionians in about 494 B.C. (Herodotus 6. 22) and where, ca. 446 B.C., a mixed Greek-Sicel colony would be established (Diodorus 12. 8; 12. 29); and, Tyndari, where a Greek city was not founded until the early 4th century.

Perhaps the Zancleans attempted to found a colony at Cale Acte during the mid-7th century. If they did not, it might have been because their interests in the 7th century were not the same as the Syracusans, who were creating a network of establishments not far distant from Syracuse itself on the opposite side of the island. In my opinion, Zancle had different goals: it was interested both in giving lands to a series of heterogeneous populations concentrated in the city and at Mylae, and to form a good foundation for trade with the Tyrrhenian and, perhaps, the western Mediterranean, in the main by making contact with trading networks controlled by the Phoenicians in the western tip of the island. Thus, whilst agrarian considerations were undoubtedly important when deciding where to place a colony,¹²¹ so were commercial ones (both maritime and terrestrial), and relations with the Phoenician-Punic world had also to be taken into account: we must not forget that Himera was founded
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30km to the east of the Phoenician city of Soloeis, located in the area of San Flavia, by the promontory of Sólanto.

The oldest remains so far found at Himera come from the coastal area, a zone undoubtedly more exposed and less defensible than the hill, which would be occupied only 20 or 25 years later. It is also possible that the pattern of occupation of Himera is similar to that attested at Selinus. This early trade orientation (which I suggested some years ago) seems to have been confirmed by recent finds, such as an important quantity of transport amphorae, which show the insertion of Himera within the wide network of commercial interchanges existing in the Tyrrhenian between the later 7th and the first half of the 6th century.

Himera was founded in the central part of the Gulf of Termini Imerese, at the mouth of the River Northern Himera. Its site first comprised the coastal plain, and afterwards included the plateau to the south (Piano di Imera). Several kilometres to the west flows the River Torto, and the two rivers defined a rich coastal plain, bordered by hills, which provided an ideal terrain for establishing an agrarian territory, well suited to a variety of crops. It seems that the first establishment took place around the harbour, in the lower part of the city (which would corroborate the date given by Diodorus), where some pottery has been found, partly manufactured at Himera itself and dated to the third quarter of the 7th century. The oldest archaeological remains on the hill has been found in the sacred area established in the first years of the colony on the north-eastern part of the hill. They are dated to the last quarter of the 7th century (ca. 625 B.C.) and show, in spite of the hesitations of their excavators, some characteristics of an emporion: some objects (a bronze statuette depicting Athena or Aphrodite Promachos, a faience figurine with an obscene subject) show very close parallels to similar objects found in the Greek emporion at Gravisca.
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It seems that the city, once it had occupied the hill, comprised the whole plateau (Piano di Imera) from the beginning (Fig. 13). It also enjoyed an ordered and regular planning from the start, based on a series of streets running from north-east to south-west, intersected by a wide street running from north-west to south-east. Only some temples built in the north-eastern sacred area preserved the orientation of the Archaic city when, afterwards, the city modified completely its urban face. It has been suggested that the occupation of the urban area was not very extensive, on the basis of the pattern already observed in other cities, such as Megara Hyblaea. The lower city would have been developed in relation to the harbour. The substitution of the second layout for the first has usually been placed between the end of the 6th century and the beginning of the 5th century, although some scholars suggest that the change could have taken place between 580 and 560 B.C.

Material of native origin, although not very abundant, is known at several points of the Archaic city, which has led some scholars to suggest that there was an indigenous presence within the Greek city and to return to an old theory that one of the oikists of Himera, Saco, could have represented the native element in the foundation.

As for the Archaic necropoleis, we know just some hundreds of tombs, mainly from the eastern cemetery (Pestavecchia), dated to the 6th century. Some material dated to the mid-7th century has appeared which would indicate a Greek presence in the area at that time. The material found in the Archaic necropoleis includes large pithoi and native amphorae used as funerary containers; they have usually been interpreted as witness to trade exchange between Greeks and natives living around the city.

Already in the Archaic period Himera had created an important agricultural territory, the lands suited to cultivation delimited by the valleys of the Himera and Torto to the east and the west, and by
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Fig. 13. Plan of Himera (after Gabba and Vallet 1980, pl. 8). A. Temple of the Victory; B. Houses; C. Houses in the Eastern quarter; D. Houses in the Southern quarter; E. Sacred area; F. Houses in the Northern quarter; G. City-wall.
a range of hills (400–500m high) to the south. This territory, 1260km² in extent, constituted the *chora* proper of Himera. Surveys carried out in it, show the great interest of the city in controlling bordering regions: it is the most distant sites that are the first show remains of a Greek occupation during the 6th century, some clearly of a defensive character, others sacred. Furthermore, Himera's interests in inland territories are perfectly attested; they were encouraged by the course of the River Himera, at whose mouth the city had been founded, but also by those of several other rivers in the region (San Leonardo, Torto). This broad territory was populated by important native settlements, still not very well known, which correspond to the area occupied by the Sican people. It is possible that Himerean expansion involved armed conflict with the natives, as an inscription dated to the first half of the 6th century, found in Samos, would suggest. In it a group of individuals (Samian mercenaries?) make an offering to the divinity (Leukaspis?, Hera Thespis?) in fulfilment of a vow 'when the Himereans suffered the assault of the Sicans'.

The Acragantines would take advantage at different times (Phalaris, Theron) of the routes which led from the Tyrrhenian Sea to the southern coast of Sicily, to mark their power over the Chalcidian colony.

**Megarian Colonisation: Selinus**

A ‘traditional’ reading of Thucydides (6. 4. 2) is that Megarians founded Selinus about 100 years after Megara (in about 628 B.C.), having obliged Pamillus, the *oikist*, to come from the mother city, Megara Nisaea. We have here, as perhaps in other cases (Zancle, Camarina?, Acragas?) an *oikist* arrived directly from the mother city to help its colony in the foundation of a new colony. Nevertheless,
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in the case of Selinus we are told the name of only one oikist, which suggests that there was only one contingent, namely that coming from Megara Nisaea. However, some scholars have suggested that the name of the other (eventual) founder could be found in the great bronze inscription from Selinus, dated to the mid-5th century, and containing a sacred law (Fig. 14).\textsuperscript{144} Of course, we do not know if Megara Nisaea was forced to send overseas a part of its population in the last years of the 7th century, but this appears unlikely: we must not forget that this was the time when the city was governed by the tyrant Theagenes, whose policy seems to have been clearly expansive—witness the numerous conflicts with Athens in those years.\textsuperscript{145} The weight given to to these circumstances varies according to the date we ascribe to the foundation of Selinus, a matter with which I shall deal later.

It is quite reasonable to think that the foundation of Selinus was a result of the interests of Megara Hyblaea itself and that, as a gesture of deference, the latter looked to her mother city for an oikist. Selinus, founded on the southern coast, was the westernmost Greek city in Sicily. Why it was founded and where raise several questions. In the first place, it seems clear that one of the main reasons forcing some of the inhabitants of Megara Hyblaea to leave their country was the scarcity of Megarian territory, severely constricted by Leontini to the north and by Syracuse to the south, although it had a theoretical size of about 400km\textsuperscript{2}.\textsuperscript{146} We must understand the scarcity largely in terms of unequal access to to land of the Megarian population. As time passed, the distribution of land on (perhaps) an equal basis in the city’s earliest years, gave way to the rise of a powerful landed aristocracy who prevented or obstructed access to it by later arrivals or dispossessed individuals. The search for the land was, of course, a decisive reason.\textsuperscript{147} The people most disposed to leave their city were likely to be the ones experiencing the most difficulty obtaining access to land there, but it is difficult to think of the

\textsuperscript{144} Jameson \textit{et al.} 1993, 121, who suggest that the other founder could have been either Myskos or Euthydamus, both of whom seem to have been important individuals in the 5th-century city; see, however, an opposite opinion in Brugnone 1997a, 130, note 34.
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Fig. 14. A sacred law from Selinus; mid-5th century B.C. after Jameson, Jordan, and Kotansky 1993, Folding pls. 1 and 2.
voluntary departure of those affected by the situation. In my opinion, this could suggest the existence of some political tensions linked to the land question. The foundation of Selinus could have been an attempt to avoid these tensions through calling in a neutral element, a mediator, fresh from the mother city, Megara Nisaea. Political tensions did not diminish in Megara Hyblaea and at the time of its destruction by Gelon in 483 B.C., there continued to be tensions between aristocracy (the so-called pachestes) and the Megarian demos (Herodotus 7. 156).

In the second place, it is necessary to explain the foundation of Selinus so far from the mother city when other cities (such as Syracuse, even Zancle, and later Gela) were trying to use sub-colonies to create and reinforce their areas of strategic interest. I think that the site of Selinus was, by the later 7th century, the only one possible for a relatively small city, such as Megara Hyblaea. In fact, the south-eastern corner of Sicily was out of play because the Syracusans had already shown their interest in it, with foundations such as Helorus on the coast and Acrae and Casmenae inland, concluding, slightly after the foundation of Selinus, with that of Camarina. To the west of Camarina, Gela controlled an important part of the coast and had extended its interests not only towards the interior of the island but also to the coast to the west, where later on Acragas would be founded.148 The northern coast would have been more troublesome for a Megarian establishment because of the strength of the Chalcidian rule around the Straits, and the scarcity of suitable sites. Thus, if the Megarian colonists who founded Selinus wanted to remain in Sicily, the place they chose was, in practice, the only one possible.

It has sometimes been suggested that the foundation of Selinus should be related to the eventual threat posed by the Phoenician-Punic world to the Greek world of Sicily, and it has even been said that Selinus and Himera would be part of the same buffer against the Punic.149 This interpretation is not wholly satisfactory and we must consider several kinds of interests at work in the foundation of Selinus: trade, in relation both to the Phoenician world of Sicily and, mainly, to the natives of that region (Elymians);150 a clear philo-Punic
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attitude, which would make Selinus take part in the traffic carried out by the Phoenicians in the Far West. Finally, some scholars have suggested that Selinus could represent a similar model to its mother city, with the territory for the colony provided by the natives. It is probable that all the previous interpretations have some truth to them, some others too. Indeed, what seems quite probable is the weight of Selinus as the last point of the Greek trade in southern Sicily; at the same time, we must not forget its important agrarian territory and the great extent of its _chora_. Nevertheless, it was not until later, during the 6th century, that the city would exhibit fully its rôle as a great cultural crossroads.

Another matter still the subject of debate is the foundation date. According to the tradition represented by Thucydides (see above) the foundation of Selinus had to be placed at about 628 B.C., but Diodorus (13. 59), mentioning the city’s conquest and destruction by Hannibal (son of Gisco) in 409 B.C., states that it had been inhabited for the previous 242 years. This gives a foundation date of 650 B.C. One scholar has suggested that Thucydides’ text mentions two moments, the first represented by Pamillus, which would have come from Megara Hyblaea, and which would correspond to 650 B.C., and the second, in which the (anonymous) _oikist_ coming from Megara Nisaea had taken part, which would correspond to 628 B.C. This hypothesis, which substantially modifies the traditional vision, resolves the problems posed by the traditional reading of Thucydides, in which the initiative for the whole process seems to have been in the hands of Megara Nisaea.

Excavation has shown the actuality of Greek presence in the area from the middle of the 7th century, at least. Certainly, excavations of the necropoleis (Bufia and, above all, Manuzza) and some in the inhabited area seem to confirm the presence of the nucleus of a Greek population already settled in Selinus by the mid-7th century. The earliest remains of houses, apparently close to those of the native inhabitants, can be dated to the last quarter of the 7th century.
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Occupation was, perhaps, sparse until the beginnings of the 6th century, when the whole urban area was organised on a regular layout, which would endure until the destruction of 409 B.C.\textsuperscript{157}

The city was founded on a hill by the sea (Manuzza to the north, and the area usually known as the ‘acropolis’ to the south), bordered by the Rivers Cottone and Modione (ancient Selinus), whose mouths also served as the city’s harbours (Fig. 15).\textsuperscript{158} Important sanctuaries rose beyond both rivers, the so-called ‘sacred area of the eastern hill’, to the east of the city, and the sanctuary of Malophoros to the west. Furthermore, some sacred and civic areas were laid out in the acropolis hill. In the acropolis the cults of the city gods had their site; the heavenly gods were worshipped on the eastern hill, while the earthly gods were honoured in the western area.\textsuperscript{159} The development of these sacred areas took place very early on: the sanctuary of Malophoros was already active during the last quarter of the 7th century.\textsuperscript{160}

The regular layout of the city was initiated in the early 6th century, undoubtedly in accordance with an already defined or implicit axis, in existence since the beginning of the Greek presence there. In addition, the development of the south-eastern area of the acropolis began, as the seat of a series of important city sanctuaries, especially the so-called temple C. To this temple an important collection of metopes belong, which depict an iconographical programme related to the pretensions and aspirations of the Selinuntine aristocracy, who were responsible for the organisation of the city.\textsuperscript{161} In fact, during the 6th century the city experienced an important process of monumentalisation, especially visible in the sacred area of the acropolis as well as on the eastern hill, which also implied the building of the city-wall and, perhaps, a trapezoidal agora in the area between the hills of the acropolis and Manuzza.\textsuperscript{162}

The oldest necropolis of Selinus seems to have been that at Manuzza, to the north-east of the future acropolis: pottery of clearly
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Fig. 15. Plan of Selinus (after Mertens 1999, fig. 1).
Megarian origin, dated to before the mid-7th century has been found in this necropolis, which suggests that here are the tombs of the first colonists. From the 6th century, the necropolis at Buffa, to the north-east of the Archaic city, was used and, finally, the area of Galera-Bagliazzo, to the north of the city. The western necropolis, Manicalunga, may have belonged to the city, although some scholars suggest that it might belong to some neighbouring settlement of rural character. Some attempts have been made to establish differences in the economic circumstances of those buried from the study of the Attic pottery deposited in their tombs of the second half of the 6th and the 5th century.

The relationships between Selinus and her mother city and Megara Nisaea, the mother of both, have been analysed on several occasions. It has been revealed how there are some elements that show a clear relationship, such as religion, and others, of a topographical or urban character seemingly common to all three. However, it is difficult to know whether this is specific to Megara and its colonies or part of a wider phenomenon. The territory of Selinus is not well known, but it is possible that its area of influence was wide. We know this mainly from Thucydides, who remarks that there were conflicts between Selinus and the Elymian city of Segesta over lands shared between them (Thucydides 6. 6. 2). Furthermore, the discovery of an inscription devoted to Heracles (ca. 580 B.C.) written in the Selinuntine alphabet, at Monte Castellazzo di Poggioreale, 25km distant from Selinus, suggests that the city had interests over a very wide area. The existence of farms or dispersed villages across the territory seems certain for the later 6th century, as the find of a tiny rural necropolis in Erbe Bianche (Campobello di Mazara) suggests. And within the territory of Selinus, several kilometres from the city, there were quarries from which the city procured stone—mainly the Cave di Cusa, already being worked during the 6th century.
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The oldest reference to Heracleia Minoa as a Selinuntine colony appears in Herodotus (5. 46. 2); when describing the retreat of Dorieus’ companions after their defeat before the Phoenicians and Segestans, he says that the only of the surviving chief, Euryleon, ‘took Minoa, colony of the Selinuntines’. As this episode took place in the late 6th–early 5th century, the city must have been founded by Selinus before then. Archaeological remains also suggest a foundation date in the middle of first half of the 6th century, perhaps to prevent the expansion of Acragas to the west; certainly, Minoa was midway between Acragas and Selinus, which were linked through the Selinuntia hodos. Sited at the mouth of the River Platani (ancient Halykos), Heracleia Minoa controlled an important route penetrating inland. From an archaeological perspective, the best-known period is the 4th century. It is only recently that remains have been found of an Archaic necropolis, which seems to have begun in the mid-6th century. Soon after the episode involving the Spartan Euryleon, Acragas occupied Heracleia Minoa and incorporated it into its territory, as the Lindian Chronicle (FGrHist 532 F 1 no. 30) suggests. At the beginning of the 5th century, the tyrant Theron of Acragas ‘discovers’ the bones of Minos there and returned them to Crete (Diodorus 4. 79). The name of Heracleia could correspond either to this time or to that when the city was under the control of Euryleon. The name Minoa, which seems to have been the original, always evokes in the sources very strong memories related to the myth of Minos.

The oldest reference to Heracleia Minoa as a Selinuntine colony appears in Herodotus (5. 46. 2); when describing the retreat of Dorieus’ companions after their defeat before the Phoenicians and Segestans, he says that the only of the surviving chief, Euryleon, ‘took Minoa, colony of the Selinuntines’. As this episode took place in the late 6th–early 5th century, the city must have been founded by Selinus before then. Archaeological remains also suggest a foundation date in the middle of first half of the 6th century, perhaps to prevent the expansion of Acragas to the west; certainly, Minoa was midway between Acragas and Selinus, which were linked through the Selinuntia hodos. Sited at the mouth of the River Platani (ancient Halykos), Heracleia Minoa controlled an important route penetrating inland. From an archaeological perspective, the best-known period is the 4th century. It is only recently that remains have been found of an Archaic necropolis, which seems to have begun in the mid-6th century. Soon after the episode involving the Spartan Euryleon, Acragas occupied Heracleia Minoa and incorporated it into its territory, as the Lindian Chronicle (FGrHist 532 F 1 no. 30) suggests. At the beginning of the 5th century, the tyrant Theron of Acragas ‘discovers’ the bones of Minos there and returned them to Crete (Diodorus 4. 79). The name of Heracleia could correspond either to this time or to that when the city was under the control of Euryleon. The name Minoa, which seems to have been the original, always evokes in the sources very strong memories related to the myth of Minos.

Thucydides (6. 4. 5) places the foundation of Acragas about 108 years after that of Gela, which would be about 580 B.C. A very
similar date (ca. 576 B.C.), although coming from a different tradition, is suggested by Pindar (Ol. 2. 93–96), as well as by archaeological evidence. As is usual in other colonial foundations, the existence of two oikists must be interpreted as a consequence of the existence of, at least, two groups of colonists of different origin. The Geloi origin of one seems clear, that being the city which took the initiative in colonising Acragas. On the origin of the other group, several possibilities have been advanced: Cretans, Rhodians from Camirus, Rhodians integrated within Gela, Rhodians arrived directly from Rhodes, etc. On the basis of our present knowledge, I think that we may confidently accept a Rhodian origin: even the archaeological evidence confirms the presence of Rhodians in the first phase of the city’s existence.

However, some ancient authors insisted upon an exclusively Rhodian origin of Acragas (Polybius 9. 27. 8). A middle course is that of Timaeus (FGrHist 566 F 92), who recognised a Geloi origin, but pointed out that some individuals, such as the ancestor of the 5th century tyrant Theron, had arrived directly from Rhodes, without passing through Gela. This has been correctly interpreted as an element of propaganda developed by that tyrant to break any relationship between Acragas and its mother city, Gela. However, both traditions show the presence, from the very beginning, of people coming directly from Rhodes. Some scholars have suggested, perhaps rightly, that the occasion for the arrival of those Rhodians to Sicily could be related to the joint Cnidian-Rhodian enterprise led by Pentathlos, which sought to found a Greek city in western Sicily, but ended in complete failure.

The existence of a mixed groups among the Acragantine colonists, as well as the Geloi character of the foundation, is stressed by the reference in Thucydides to the nomima received by the new city which were those from Gela. As we have seen in other cases, Thucydides always referred to this important fact when underlining the ethno-
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cultural affiliation assumed by a city of mixed origin. The weight of the Rhodian element had to be important, as the presence of certain cults in Acragas which were absent in Gela shows, for instance that of Zeus Atabyrius.\footnote{Baghin 1991, 11.} Nor should we ignore the presence at the outset of people of other origins, but related to the Dorian world. One of the traditions, which refers to Phalaris, undoubtedly one of the first colonists, makes him come from Astypalaea (Ps.-Phalaris Ep. 4. 35).

Acragas was founded on land bordered by the Rivers Acragas (modern San Biagio), which gave the city its name, and Hypsas (modern Drago), 3km from the sea (Polybius 9. 27. 2–7) and 65km to the east of Gela. There are many reasons why Gela founded this colony, among them to reinforce the area to its west, a region where the city seems to have had important interests from the beginning. The geographical proximity suggests that Gela wanted to create an area firmly under its control, probably in the same way as Syracuse.\footnote{De Miro 1962, 122–52; Domínguez 1989, 427–8.} However, the immediate development of Acragas, perhaps influenced by its Rhodian element, which more preoccupied by other interests, very soon changed the new city’s orientation.\footnote{Baghin 1991, 15–6.} Some finds of possible Geloan origin in the area of Sant’Angelo Muxaro, 19km to the north-west of Acragas, have been interpreted as linked to the policy Gela pursued towards the natives or that region before the foundation of its sub-colony.\footnote{Leighton 1999, 260.}

The site chosen for the foundation of the city, as Polybius (9. 27. 7) describes it, was a wide and high plateau, bordered by cliffs and, for a good part of its perimeter, by the Rivers Acragas and Hypsas (Fig. 16).\footnote{De Waele 1971, 5–7.} To the north, separated by a valley, another summit existed, the Athena hill (Diodorus 13. 85), acting as the acropolis and housing temples dedicated to Athena and Zeus Atabyrius (Polybius 9. 27. 7). To the south, over the edge of the plateau, most of the temples were built.\footnote{T. Van Compernolle 1989, 44–70.} It seems that this entire large area was included within the urban precinct from the beginning, when also the first regular layout can be traced. In the mid-6th century this planning
Fig. 16. Plan of Acragas (after Gabba and Vallet 1980, pl. 1).
received more consistent development. Although the details of buildings in Archaic Acragas are not very well known, a number of late-6th-century houses have been excavated, some of the pastas type.

The very rich necropoleis of Acragas were plundered long ago. As usual, they were placed around the city, along the main routes of communication linking Acragas to the rest of Sicily. Another necropolis (Montelusa) was placed very near the sea, at the mouth of the River Acragas, and clearly related to the city’s emporion (Strabo 6. 2. 1; 6. 2. 5). Its origins are dated to the first quarter of the 6th century, which makes it contemporaneous with the foundation of the city. Some vases manufactured in Rhodes have been found in it. The necropoleis underwent important development from the second half of the 6th century and many were used without interruption until the destruction of the city by the Carthaginians in 408 B.C.

The city was greatly renowned for its prosperity (eudaimonia) (Diodorus 13. 81) as well as for its high population (Diodorus 13. 84; Diogenes Laertius 8. 63).

The rise of a tyranny, that of Phalaris (572–566 B.C.), is very closely related to the foundation of the city itself. The traditions about all aspects of the history of Phalaris are quite abundant, although they are strongly biased against him, in good part by the adverse propaganda generated by the circle of the 5th-century tyrant, Theron. Beyond the means used by Phalaris to obtain power (Polyaenus Strat. 5. 1), the main issue is why the tyranny arose only ten years after the foundation of Acragas. While some scholars place the emphasis on internal strife, originating in the city’s ethnic diversity, for others the cause was external factors, mainly Phoenician and native pressures on the new city. Finally, others try to connect Acragantine expansionism, certainly damaging to the interests of Gela, with tensions within Acragas between colonists of Geloan
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origin and those of Rhodian stock. Therefore, in this context, perhaps it is not wrong to think of Phalaris as a sort of middleman, an aiýmnetes. Be that as it may, Phalaris was responsible for the first great expansion of Acragas into the Sicilian interior, occupying part of the area which was previously Geloan, and even showing an Acragantine interest in the Tyrrhenian coast, thereby threatening the independence of Himera.

Through this expansionist policy, Acragas came to control the mouths of rivers which penetrate inland, but it seems to have had only a slight interest in the coastal areas to the west of the city, as recent surveys carried out in that territory have shown.

The Last Colonial Foundations: Failures and Successes

In this section, I shall deal with two attempts to found Greek colonies in western Sicily that resulted in complete failure, although with different consequences. I shall deal first with the attempt by Pentathlus of Cnidus and, in second place, with that of Dorieus of Sparta.

Pentathlos, the Cnidians and the Foundation of Lipara

About Pentathlos' activities, which would conclude with the foundation of the Greek city of Lipara, our main sources are Diodorus (5. 9), who perhaps bases himself upon Timaeus and Pausanias, who follows Antiochus of Syracuse, as he admits. According to Diodorus, a host of Cnidians and Rhodians decided to found a colony in the Aeolian Islands, tired of the increasing pressure of the 'king of Asia'. Furthermore, they made their decision when they noticed that the islands, inhabited by descendants of Aeolus, were becoming gradually depopulated. The leader of the expedition was Pentathlos, a Heraclid; the time of the expedition is fixed in the
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50th Olympiad (580–576 B.C.). When they arrived at Lilybaeum, they intervened in a war between Selinus and Segesta, to help the Greek city. However, once defeated and after Pentathlos’ death, the survivors named three of his kinsmen as their chiefs and headed towards the Aeolian Islands where, with the support of the natives, they founded the city of Lipara.

Pausanias, in turn, claims that the Cnidians (in his story the Rhodians do not appear) founded a city on Cape Pachinus (in the south-eastern corner of Sicily); the defeat was caused by the Elymians and Phoenicians, and that when they retreated, the Cnidians occupied the islands and, after expelling their inhabitants, founded the city.

The two stories show interesting departures, which it is necessary to explain. In the first place, on the issue of the Rhodians, a joint Rhodian-Cnidian expedition is not improbable: both shared the same geographical space and relationships of every kind. However, those from Lipara always saw themselves as colonists from Cnidus, as Thucydides (3. 88. 2), Pausanias and epigraphic evidence show.²⁰² It is not improbable that either before or after the defeat by the Elymians (and the Phoenicians), the Rhodians (part, if not all) would choose a different destiny from the Cnidians. In this sense, it has been suggested on several occasions that these Rhodians joined at the outset the people from Gela who were then founding Acragas.²⁰³

In the second place, the reference to Cape Pachynus and the foundation there of a city does not appear in Diodorus’ story but it is not improbable that both the Rhodians and Cnidians may have disembarked there at first and even that they might have tried to settle there. However, the likely pressure of Syracuse and Camarina (then just founded) could have forced the new arrivals to leave a region which Syracuse reserved for herself. Perhaps at this moment the separation of the Rhodians and Cnidians took place.²⁰⁴

The divergences between the accounts of the conflict given by Diodorus and Pausanias are not absolutely incompatible. Indeed, both traditions can easily be combined if we think that the help given by the Cnidians to the Selinuntines in their fight against the
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Elymians from Segesta could have had a counterpart in help from Selinus to the Cnidians to establish themselves at Lilybaem. However, a Greek colony in Lilybaem directly threatened Motya. In consequence, the Phoenicians were forced to support Segesta against the Cnidian-Selinuntine coalition. It seems that both authors, Diodorus and Pausanias, selected those parts of the conflict they wished to stress.\textsuperscript{205}

While in Diodorus’ account the foundation of Lipara took place with the collaboration of the natives, in that of Pausanias (Antiochus of Syracuse), we may observe a curious fact: the author has not clearly decided whether the islands were uninhabited or whether the Cnidians had expelled the natives before founding their city. In this case, the explanation may be revealed by a general analysis of Antiochus’ view on the Greek colonisation in Sicily. Clearly, he preferred a view according to which a necessary prerequisite to the founding of a colony is the expulsion of the previous inhabitants. On several occasions, this view contrasts with other traditions that refer to varying periods of coexistence between Greeks and natives. Thus, I suggest that Antiochus’ account is absolutely appropriate to a time, such as that in which he wrote, when his city, Syracuse, was subject to strong pan-Siceliot propaganda (for instance, Thucydides 4. 59–64).\textsuperscript{206} Archaeology, helps us little to identify those eventual natives living in Lipara before the arrival of the Cnidians.\textsuperscript{207} Furthermore, there is no archaeological evidence for a supposed Cnidian presence on the largest island before the foundation of the colony in the 50th Olympiad.\textsuperscript{208}

In my opinion, Cnidian objectives must be set against the general background of the East Greek world during the last years of the 7th century and the beginning of the 6th century. Oriental pressure (Lydia) and aristocratic political regimes favour the departure of peoples in search of better ways of life. Undoubtedly, the search for new lands was an important objective, but in cities with a strong commercial tradition, such as Cnidus, trade factors could also have played an important rôle. Cnidus had been involved in long-distance
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trade since the later 7th century at least, as the Cnidian foundation of Black Corcyra shows (Ps.-Skymnos 428; Strabo 7. 5. 5; Pliny NH 3. 152). This foundation took place three generations before Polycrates (Plutarch Mor. 860 B.C.). In addition, we can mention the participation of Cnidus (as well as Rhodes) in the emporion at Naukratis (Herodotus 2. 178). It is possible that Cnidus was seeking a base in the central Mediterranean as a political priority. Fifteen years later (ca. 565 B.C.), other East Greeks, such as the Phocaeans, would found another city in the central Mediterranean, Alalia, although on this occasion on the island of Corsica.

The foundation of Lipara was not to be an easy adventure. Diodorus (5. 9) mentions that Etruscan resistance to the Greek establishment in the archipelago was immediate, provoking rapid Cnidian organisation to secure their position on the islands whilst they established a means of getting food. From Diodorus’ text, we may trace the stages of this process:

- Division of the population in two groups: one devoted to the naval defence and the other to tilling the soil. In order for the system to function, it was necessary to make the land and remaining goods common property, as well as to develop a system of the communal eating (syssitia).
- Secondly, distribute the lands in Lipara by lot, but retain common property elsewhere.
- Finally, all land is distributed for periods of 20 years; after which it had again to be distributed by lot.

The views on the ‘communist’ system established in Lipara have been many and various, both in general interpretation and in the different phases that this process experienced. I have analysed these opinions elsewhere.

From my point of view, the true foundation of the city could have taken place only in the mid-6th century, when the Cnidians had secured their stay in the islands after defeating the Etruscans in some naval battle, and after the allotment of lands on the main island—certainly the decisive fact from the point of view of the creation of a political community. It is possible that this event
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had been ratified through the creation of political cults in the acropolis of Lipara. We know that Hephaistus and Aeolus were especially honoured in this polis (Diodorus 20. 101).

The victories of the Liparians over the Etruscans became very well known (Diodorus 5. 9; Strabo 6. 2. 10), and Pausanias (10. 16. 7) relates some of the circumstances. The sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi received offerings from the Cnidians at Lipara as thanksgivings for their victories. Abundance and wealth of offerings speak about the important rôle played by the city in the control of the routes leading to the Straits of Messina.

The city of Lipara was founded on a promontory on the eastern coast of the main island (Lipari), which continues to be occupied today; consequently, it has revealed very little archaeological evidence for the Archaic period, mainly some architectural terracottas and, especially, the bothros on the acropolis, 7m deep and full of votive offerings, pottery, terracottas and animal bones (cows, pigs, sheep, goats and molluscs). The material is dated from the mid-6th century to the first quarter of the 5th century and the entire ensemble was dedicated to Aeolus. The bothros was closed by a lid on which a lion was represented. Some of the pottery, although perhaps of local manufacture, shows very clear similarities with Cnidian pottery. In a votive pit near the bothros some pottery has been found which may be dated to the first half of the 6th century. A city wall encircling the city was built about 500 B.C.

The necropolis was to the west of the city, occupying a very wide area. More than 2,000 tombs of Greek and Roman times have been so far excavated. The oldest are not very plentiful; they dated from the mid-6th century, although there is some sparse older material. The tombs with terracotta sarcophagi, of clear East Greek origin, are especially remarkable. The presence of objects of Egyptian origin, such as a faience aryballos with the cartouche of Pharaoh Apries (585–570 B.C.), as well as some other material, show the relationship
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which Cnidians at Lipara had maintained with Egypt. Regrettably, all these objects come from old collections and lack archaeological context.\textsuperscript{215}

Diodorus (5. 9. 5) informs us that, in the final phase of their installation, the Liparians distributed the lands of the lesser islands, repeating the distribution by lot every 20 years. In turn, Thucydides (3. 88. 2–3) assures us that in the 5th century, although the population lived in Lipara, they cultivated the islands of Didyme (Salina), Strongyle (Stromboli) and Hieria (Vulcano); similar information is given by Pausanias (10. 11. 3). From an archaeological point of view, it seems that the occupation of the minor islands was not very intensive and, on some of them, there is no evidence of a Greek presence before the end of the 6th century or the beginning of the 5th century; it seems to have been more intense during the 5th and 4th centuries.\textsuperscript{216}

\textit{Dorieus and his failed Heracleia}

The adventure of Dorieus is narrated in considerable detail by Herodotus (5. 42–47), who tells of his various incidents in Libya and Italy before his arrival in Sicily. Diodorus (4. 23) gives some complementary detail of great interest and, in another context, Herodotus has some information pertinent to the final failure of Dorieus’ enterprise (7. 158). I shall deal here only with the stay of Anaxandridas’ son in Sicily and the task carried out there. Dorieus’ interest in Sicily was the result of advice given him by Anticares of Eleon according to which he would have to found a city called Heracleia in Sicily, in the region of Eryx (Herodotus 5. 43). However, after seeking the advice of the Delphic Oracle (Herodotus 5. 43) and making offerings in other sanctuaries of Apollo,\textsuperscript{217} and before arriving in Sicily, he was involved in the fight between Sybaris and Croton, which led to the former’s destruction (Herodotus 5. 44–45). Although I shall not enter into detail, the Spartan intervention may be considered either as the outcome of a deliberate Spartan policy with respect to the
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western Mediterranean or as a result of Spartan desire to solve tensions within its society through colonisation of a ‘traditional’ kind.

Herodotus’ account of the activities of Dorieus in Sicily is, however, rather sketchy; he informs us that other Spartans joined Dorieus as co-founders (*synoikistai*), Thessalus, Paraebates, Celeas and Euryleon (5. 46). They were joined by one Philip of Croton, with a trireme and a group of men paid for by himself (5. 47).

Herodotus (5. 46) states that the entire expedition died in a battle, after being defeated by the Phoenicians and Segestans, but he gives no further detail because he is more interested in the moral of the story. In a different context, Diodorus includes the expedition of Dorieus within the results of the conquering activity of Heracles. Dorieus, a descendant of Heracles, would have occupied a land of his own, because Heracles had already conquered it during his travels, and he founded the city of Heracleia. It is clear that both in this enterprise and perhaps also in that of Pentathlos, there is implicit an important vein of the Heracleian tradition, widely analysed by many scholars, which seeks to justify Greek aspirations to occupy territories previously held by the natives. Once founded, Heracleia grew quickly until the Carthaginians, fearing that it could bring about a Heracleian hegemony, attacked it with a great army and destroyed it (Diodorus 4. 23). In the prophecy of Anticares of Eleon given to Dorieus (Herodotus 5. 43) this result is also implicit. Thus, although Herodotus’ story does not mention directly the foundation of a city, Diodorus’ report considers it a true fact, but he ascribes its destruction to Carthage some time after its foundation, while Herodotus mentions only that the Segestans and Phoenicians defeated the Greeks in battle. However, in a different context, Gelon of Syracuse affirms that he carried out a war against the Carthaginians and Segestans to revenge Dorieus, as well as to free some *emporia*, which perhaps had fallen into their hands (Herodotus 7. 158. 2). In this entire episode there are some facts that remain
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obscure: in the first place, the Spartan expedition goes to the region of Eryx, which in Diodorus’ story would be well disposed toward the Spartans and where perhaps Dorieus would defend the interests of the Greeks of Sicily. However, the adverse reaction is led by Segesta, helped by the Phoenicians. The intervention of Carthage seems to have taken place later, as Herodotus seems to suggest (7. 158. 2), but Carthage is not the only party responsible for the destruction of Heracleia, as Diodorus relates. Certainly, the great Carthaginian intervention in Sicily took place in 480 B.C. (Herodotus 7. 165–166), after three years of preparation (Diodorus 11. 1. 4–5), but we have no real evidence of conflicts between Greeks and Carthaginians in Sicily before that time.

Furthermore, there is the problem of the chronology of Dorieus, still debated. It seems certain that the city of Heracleia was founded in the territory of Eryx, which perhaps Segesta considered to be a threat, as did the Phoenicians of Sicily. Their actions convinced the Carthaginians to intervene, helping Segesta against the Greeks, whose city would be destroyed. Some years later, perhaps when Gelon began his rise to the power, he could have used the affair of Dorieus to intervene in western Sicily. The Carthaginian reaction, encouraged by internal strife in Himera, led to the invasion of 480, concluding in the Battle of Himera (cf. Justinus 4. 2. 6–7; 19. 1. 9–12).

In any case, the failure of Dorieus implied also the failure of the last Greek attempt in the Archaic period to establish a Greek city in the most westerly tip of Sicily. The use of the legend of Heracles as coloniser of Sicily was severely diminished by Dorieus’ failure. However, others such as Gelon would continue using Heracles to justify new expansive desires, although now directed from Sicily itself.

The Political, Economic and Cultural Development of the Greek Cities of Sicily

During the last third of the 8th century, when most of the first-generation Greek colonies were founded, but especially during the 7th century, the Greek cities of Sicily began to interact among them-

selves and with the indigenous world. Each city had as a priority the creation of its own political and economic territory, its chora, but also the creation of an area of influence, varying in size according to the city’s interests and capabilities. These dynamics may have caused conflicts between Greek cities and with the native world, but also brought about non-violent forms of contact which would create a political and cultural space highly innovative in many respects.

The Political Structures of the Greek Cities of Sicily

The foundation of the Greek colonies in Sicily produced new political entities in which the first colonists formed the inner circle, regardless of whether we accept the existence of an organised movement or think that early colonisation was predominantly a ‘private enterprise’ in which a leading rôle was accorded to the oikist. Perhaps for a while, later arrivals may have been integrated into the narrow circle, who had a share in the plots of land initially laid out, both in the city and in its rural territory. It is not easy, however, to know whether the initial distribution benefited only those present at the moment of the foundation or if there were more plots of land available to those who would arrive in the next few years. In my opinion, the latter possibility might be true on account of the slow increase in the population of many cities, although the occupation and planning of the urban centre and the territory took place at the foundation.

The scarce data available on the way of life during the first years of many first-generation colonies suggest a situation of a certain modesty: houses of small size, an urban panorama quite sparse, levels of comfort certainly low, etc. However, in the cities, sanctuaries and necropoleis we can see how early contacts with the rest of the Greek world commence, which points to the existence of commodities to trade and the ensuing development of commercial traffic, undoubtedly advantageous for the Sicilian cities. The beginning of construction of large monuments in the cities of Sicily from the 7th
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century is a sign of the accumulation of wealth: the surplus was invested in the embellishment of the city with monuments and public buildings, as well as the development of the private house and the acquisition of higher levels of comfort. With respect to the dwellings, it has recently been suggested that a certain type of house, called *pastas*, may have represented the prototype house for people of a certain level within the Archaic city.\(^{233}\)

In recent times, the extra-urban sanctuaries have been used to investigate the mechanisms deployed by *poleis* to assert their control over territory, within the process of elaboration of their own political identity.\(^{234}\) The number known is slowly increasing, although for Sicily the recent overviews such as we have for Magna Graecia are lacking,\(^{235}\) with the information dispersed through many publications.\(^{236}\) Although issues about their origin (Greek or local) have long been discussed, especially for the extra-urban sanctuaries of Magna Graecia and Sicily,\(^{237}\) current opinion considers them, at least the oldest, to have resulted from the conscious act by the *oikist* himself, who would have had control of this aspect of the distribution of the space of the future *polis*.\(^{238}\) As F. de Polignac has put it, the articulation of a path between mediation and sovereignty, between border contacts and manifestations of authority, which is an essential feature of the genesis of extra-urban sanctuaries in the Greek world, retains a fundamental place in colonial cities.\(^{239}\)

However, in the colonial world, sanctuaries accompanied and, sometimes, prefigured the claims of the city over the territory\(^{240}\) but they could also be used (if we follow well known examples in Magna Graecia) to integrate the ‘Hellenised’ local élites.\(^{241}\)

Another consequence of the politics of appropriation and maintenance of political territory, is the creation of areas of privileged
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rule carried out by some of the cities of Sicily, both of Chalcidian stock (Leontini) and of Dorian origin (Syracuse, Gela).\textsuperscript{242} Perhaps the city of Syracuse exhibited the most complex system because the foundation of sub-colonies (Helorus, Acrae, Casmenae, Camarina) secured for the Corinthian colony control and dominion over the entire southeastern corner of island. However, other cities, such as Gela, also took important steps in the creation of a wide territory, with interests in different areas of Sicily. In fact, both control of the best maritime approaches and rule over the lands of the interior would become the main keys to the political and economic growth of the Siceliot cities.

The cities of Sicily accepted the model current in the rest of Greece, that of an aristocratic regime, where a select group of families (varying in size from case to case) shared political and judicial powers, which gave them social and economic pre-eminence in their respective cities. It is known that, even in the 5th century, the aristocratic groups of some Sicilian cities continued using names which mentioned the characteristics of their power, such as the \textit{gamoroi} of Syracuse, who held the land,\textsuperscript{243} or the \textit{pacheis} of Megara Hyblaea, a term which refered to the personal welfare of members of that group.

Beyond this information, we know little of the internal affairs of Sicilian cities in the Archaic period, although we can suppose that there was rivalry between different families to acquire a greater share of power within the system. This is shown, for instance, by Herodotus’ account of Telines (one of the ancestors of the tyrant Gelon) who convinced a part of the population, exiled in nearby Maktorion after their defeat in a \textit{stasis}, to return to Gela (Herodotus 7. 153). This procured him an honour, a privilege (\textit{geras}) undoubtedly important, of becoming the hierophant of Demeter and Core (Herodotus 7. 153–154).

During the Archaic period, these conflicts between aristocratic families were quite frequent, as the existence of other such groups, the Myletidae of Syracuse, shows. The Myletidae, as we have previously seen, took part in the foundation of Himera in the mid-7th century (Thucydides 6. 5. 1), having been defeated in a \textit{stasis} and expelled
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from Syracuse. These internal troubles in the Sicilian poleis can be related to the tensions caused by their markedly expansionist policies. Certainly, the acquisition of new territories, the establishment of new alliances with the natives, the increase in the wealth of a group of the inhabitants of the Greek cities, benefited only a part of society, perhaps even only a part of the aristocracy. The outcome was to increase stasis that, in some cases, led to the expulsion of the defeated, and in time to the rise of tyrannies. Although it is difficult to know for certain, it is possible that in the beginning of some of the second-generation colonies’ internal conflicts may have existed between the inhabitants of the mother cities that, occasionally, could even transform the old aristocracies into oligarchic regimes.

The existence of oligarchic regimes in Sicily was certainly well known in Greek tradition: Aristotle considered that many of the ancient tyrannies in Sicily originated in oligarchies, although he only mentions those of Panaetius of Leontini and Cleandrus of Gela (Aristotle Pol. 1316 a 36–37). Certainly, the existence of those oligarchic groups could favour the emergence of regimes of a personal type. Panaetius of Leontini seems to have inaugurated the list of Archaic Sicilian tyrants in the late 7th century, followed by Theron of Selinus and, afterwards, Pythagoras by Phalaris of Acragas, Cleandrus, Hippocrates and Gelon of Gela, Terillus of Himera and Theron of Acragas. All that, of course, before the Classical type of tyranny in Sicily, represented by Gelon and Hieron of Syracuse. It was in the final years of the 6th century and the first half of the 5th century that the political relationships between the cities of Sicily arrived at their first great development and when all the Greek cities of the island perhaps began to develop that idea of a Sicilian identity which, in 424 B.C. the Syracusan Hermocrates would proclaim in the Congress of Gela (Thucydides 4. 64). It is precisely the abundance of coin hoards dated to the first half of the 5th century, especially that found at Randazzo, which show the
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important monetary circulation existing then between the Greek cities of the island. In my opinion, it is a proof not only of the economic, but also of the political and ideological integration, which I have previously mentioned.

It would seem that, although the oldest tyrannies are perhaps similar to those arising in the same period in Greece proper, some scholars agree in stressing the specifically Sicilian features exhibited by the tyrannical regimes from the late 6th century, either from the ascent of Gelon or, even, from the time of his predecessor, Hippocrates. These features undoubtedly result from the substantially different conditions in which the Sicilian cities had to exist, with mutual relations usually more fractious and a background of a non-Greek world which was simultaneously suffering the process of Hellenisation and developing its own identity, usually in contrast to the Greeks themselves. It is also necessary to add the Carthaginian threat, already present in a certain way during the 6th century, but clearly shown from the beginning of the 5th century. One consequence of these tyrannies was a very significant change in the composition of the population of the cities, on account of the abundant movements and transfers of population undertaken by the tyrants.

The political troubles of the Sicilian cities in the Classical period, after the overthrow of the tyrannies, are usually complex, with resettlement of populations, return of exiles and new political structures. Sometimes, the sources give information about these changes; occasionally, there is epigraphical evidence about the transformations experienced by some cities, such as Camarina or Selinus after periods of tyrannical rule.
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The Greek Cities of Sicily and the Natives

The issue of the expansion of the Greek cities of Sicily has been dealt with extensively in the study of these cities. Back in the 1950s and 1960s, the journal *Kokalos* published a series of articles which continue to be the starting point for all study of the Greek penetration of the native territory of the interior.

As we have seen, a native involvement, greater or lesser according to the circumstance, may be traced in almost all the Sicilian foundations. In some, the written sources tell of the basic rôle played by the natives in the foundation of the colony (e.g. Megara Hyblaea); in others the traditions are contradictory, some asserting that rôle and others denying it (e.g. Leontini and Lipara). In yet others, the predominant tradition of the expulsion of the natives (Syracuse) may be coloured by the light of the archaeological evidence. Be that as it may, it seems undeniable that the native question had to be considered when establishing colonies. Furthermore, the creation by the *polis* of an area of political and economic dominance necessarily took place to the detriment of the territory’s previous owners, irrespective of any agreements for appropriation of such land by the Greeks. The Greek literary tradition interprets the implicit violence in this in several ways: developing the theory of empty territories before the Greek arrival, of legitimate occupation (in this case given ideological support by myths), or resorting to the single justification of military victory.

It is undeniable that Greek cities exerted strong economic pressure over areas beyond the confines of their *chorai*. This derived, in part, from sheer economic weight. In fact, the very efficient mechanisms of international trade, which, as the archaeological evidence shows, maintained all the Greek cities of Sicily from the moment of their foundation, caused every kind of manufactured goods from every part of the Mediterranean to flow through them (Fig. 17).
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Fig. 17. Attic pottery of the 6th century in Sicily (after Giudice 1991, figs. 1, 3, 5, 7 and 8. The figures for Catane come from Giudice 1996).
Besides their use in the daily life of Greek cities and in the funerary rituals of their citizens, such goods were also used as an economic inducement to the populations living in the vicinity of the cities. The native élites, as well as other non-Greek societies, claimed these goods, together with the products manufactured in the Greek cities themselves, in circumstances of social and economic competition in which ownership of Greek products became a matter of prestige. The distribution of Greek pottery through the interior of Sicily lets us trace these economic relationships and observe the important rôle played in this traffic by products such as wine and the vessels suitable for its consumption.

Greek cities required a wide range of goods (Fig. 18) which they did not (could not?) produce, or produced only in small quantities, such as honey, textiles, animal products, wood, minerals, herbs, and medicinal and edible plants, even slaves. Thus, we are faced with a group of places which demanded a great quantity of products and had at their disposal the means to pay for them, including products such as wine and olive-oil (which were traded with the native interior of Sicily from the later 7th century, as finds of Greek amphorae show). Who carried out this trade with the interior? For many scholars the answer is Greeks, although latterly the possible intervention of the natives has also been discussed.

Non-Greek areas in the environs of Greek cities became their true economic satellites. This may even have extended to the introduction of new ways of production and new agricultural techniques in order to satisfy the cities’ needs. At the same time, such new ways of production could encourage the development of new productive strategies by the natives—as suggested, for instance, by the existence of new pottery shapes of non-Greek manufacture. Thus, in central and eastern Sicily (later 7th-early 6th century), the existence of native storage vessels, as well as the manufacture of a type of native amphora, although with Greek influence, supposedly devoted to the storage
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and transport of some liquid, perhaps hydromel. This type of amphora does not appear in the Greek cities.274 Sometimes the Greek cities took on an aggressive posture, which was mirrored in the native world by the rise of defence works.275

At the same time, the Greeks sought control of those areas of production basic to their economic development, to secure them against eventual threats from the non-Greek world and the pressure exerted by other (usually adjacent) Greek cities. How they did this varied: on the one hand, establishment of sub-colonies and military outposts to secure the main routes of communication; on the other, by inclusion of important native territories within a sphere of mutual interest, grounded on establishing agreements, alliances and (sometimes) pacts of mutual security, among which we could include matrimonial agreements of the type of the epigamia, and even the inclusion of native territories in spaces of shared rights and laws. Perhaps the legal texts found at Monte San Mauro di Caltagirone (Fig. 19) may suggest the inclusion of this centre within the area of interest of the Chalcidian cities,276 as opposed to the influence exerted previously by Gela. In fact, Monte San Mauro was at the limit of the Geloan area of influence, but the legal texts found there, which relate to homicide and date to the later 6th century, show a clear Chalcidian imprint, including the type of alphabet and the Ionian dialect in which they are written.277 Even the interpretation of it as a status symbol278 does not conflict with its use as evidence that Monte San Mauro had entered the orbit of the Chalcidian cities, acting as their true south-western border.279 Recently, the possible rôle of Monte San Mauro as a distribution centre for Greek products, which were previously stored there, has been discussed,280 and it has even been suggested that it could have been a true Greek foundation, the unknown Chalcidian colony of Euboea.281
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Fig. 19. Fragments 1 and 5 of the Archaic laws of Monte San Mauro (after Dubois 1989, no. 15).
The various Greek cities, with their different methods and traditions, created different native ‘cultural provinces’. This helps to explain the opposed interests among the different native regions in later times,282 and provides a coherent means for understanding better how each city constructed its own area of dominance, allowing sketchy interpretations, which supposed that Chalcidian colonists pursued peaceful means whilst the Dorian used violence, to be abandoned.283

A phenomenon observable at Monte San Mauro but also known in a good part of native Sicily during the 6th century (earlier in some places), is the progressive appearance of a certain urbanism, as well as prestige (religious or political) buildings, even dwellings, which assume a Greek aspect (Fig. 20). This is the case, for instance, with a group of pastas houses discovered in Monte San Mauro during the 1980s, perhaps having a special significance within this important centre.284 In other places, dwellings of Greek type, single or in groups, are also accompanied by the rise of a regular urbanism, which seems to copy or adapt Greek models. This influence may also be observed in the development of funerary rituals, although the implications there are deeper. A list of these centres is long and they are known, to a greater or lesser degree, in all the regions of Sicily exposed to the influence of Greek cities, irrespective of ethnic affiliation: such centres are present both in the part of Sicily inhabited by the Sicels and in those in which dwelt Sicans and Elymians.285

The best known are Serra Orlando (Morgantina),286 Monte Bubbonia,287 Monte Saraceno,288 Monte Sabucina,289 Segesta290 and Vassallaggi.291

Perhaps the important feature is the transformation from village-type (komai) to urban structures (poleis), as a text of Diodorus (5. 6) referring to the Sicans suggests.292 In it Diodorus perhaps does not preclude the existence of a political organisation among the Sicans,

282 La Rosa 1989, 54; 1996, 524.
283 See, for instance, Sjoqvist 1973, 36–7; against, Domínguez 1989, 177, 248.
292 Testa 1983, 1005–6. The existence of processes of centralisation is shown by Leighton (2000, 21–2) in other parts of Sicily.
Fig. 20. Houses of Greek type ("pasta houses") from Monte San Mauro, 6th century B.C. A. Plan of House 1; B. Reconstruction of House 2 (after Cordsen 1995, figs. 6–7).
but only mentions the dispersed and slightly organised character of their ancient way of settlement.\textsuperscript{293} The complexity of the territorial organisation of the native settlements, at least from the 6th century onwards, with an evident hierarchy among them, has been revealed recently through a survey carried out in the surroundings of Morgantina.\textsuperscript{294}

An old debate about the ‘Hellenisation’ of these centres had as its main question the possibility that Greeks could have lived there, thus being responsible, in a certain way, for the various developments.\textsuperscript{295} A typical case of the change in interpretation is represented by Serra Orlando (Morgantina) (Fig. 21), where the strong Hellenisation of the settlement and the necropoleis from the second quarter of the 6th century had been considered as a consequence of the arrival and establishment of Greeks in the region\textsuperscript{296} living with the natives.\textsuperscript{297} However, more recent studies prefer to emphasise the creation of a more complex and multicultural local society, where the stimuli brought by the Greeks had been adapted and reinterpreted within that non-Greek society.\textsuperscript{298}

In any case, and although we accept that ‘Hellenisation’ as a term and concept usually applied to the transformation of the way of life of non-Greek residents in the Greek colonial sphere of influence, does not adequately account for the reciprocities of intercultural contact,\textsuperscript{299} we must certainly accept that Greek modes of expression, the formal and ideological language, the mixed concepts of religion and politics were responsible for the rise of a new ethnic consciousness among the non-Greek peoples of Sicily,\textsuperscript{300} perhaps related to the rise

\textsuperscript{293} On the concept of \textit{kome}, see Hansen 1995, 45–81; on the use of \textit{polis} as a generic word for state, see Hansen 1997, 9–15.
\textsuperscript{295} For instance, La Rosa 1989, 54.
\textsuperscript{296} Sjoqvist 1962, 52–68; 1973, 68.
\textsuperscript{297} Domínguez 1989, 151–2; Procelli 1989, 685.
\textsuperscript{299} Lyons 1996a, 132.
\textsuperscript{300} This was already observed by Finley (1979, 20) when he wrote: ‘It is certain that Hellenization did not immediately destroy their self-consciousness as Sikels or their desire to remain free from overlordship from original Greek settlements.’ Thompson (1999, 463) has also observed how ‘Hellenization was not simply a process of becoming Greek but was, just as importantly, a process of becoming Sikel.’ For a review of recent scholarship, see La Rosa 1999, 159–85.
Fig. 21. Morgantina. Area III; plan of the upper plateau (after Antonaccio 1997, figs. 2–3).
or development of political structures of monarchical type. This perspective is, perhaps, better than the one which tries to quantify mechanically how many Greek and native elements appear in a certain place in order to detect the identity of their bearers: that has been adequately criticised. As R.R. Holloway has summarised it, one may say that between the extremes of Greek and Sicel there seems to have existed a middle ground of cities where both elements merged, but merged in different ways in different places.

In the case of Morgantina, the presence of Greek speakers seems attested for the 6th century by the presence of graffiti written in Greek, both in the Archaic settlement and in the necropolis, and we cannot discard the possibility of mixed marriages. That does not imply a hegemonic position for the Greeks but it can suggest, at least in this instance, Greek intervention in the creation of a new ethnic identity. If we widen the panorama to embrace the rest of Sicily, I think that the rise of different non-Greek ethnicities was perceived, and even used, by the Greeks, as a mean of apprehending and controlling these native territories for their own benefit. A different matter is that this process, as time went on, could act against the Greeks themselves, as the episode of the Sicel revolt led by Ducetius in the mid-5th century might suggest.

Consequently, the Greek penetration of the interior of Sicily has to be considered as a long process with several stages, each very different from the other from a qualitative and quantitative point of view. In it, we find actions of very different kinds taken in response to different needs. Thus, for instance, the need to consolidate an initial area of political and economic domination of a newly founded city explains the actions carried out by the oikistes Antiphemus of Gela against the native centre of Omphake (Pausanias 8. 46. 2; 9. 40. 4), or those carried out by Phalaris against the indigenous surroundings of Acragas (Polyaenus 5. 1). In addition, the end of some native settlements neighbouring Greek cities, as may be the case with Pantalica,
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301 La Rosa 1996, 532.
303 Holloway 1991, 93.
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has usually been interpreted from that perspective.\textsuperscript{306} At the same time, the increase of population in other centres (\textit{e.g.} Morgantina) seems to have been the result of the displacement of native populations from areas of Sicily already occupied by Greeks.\textsuperscript{307}

The creation of the economic and political territories of Greek cities introduced a certain transitory stability to the non-Greek world. The beginnings of the exploitation of these territories by Greeks meant the rise of an intensive agrarian economy, and the generally coastal location of the cities, meant their rapid absorption into the pattern of circulation of goods through the Mediterranean. Although perhaps not the consequence of predetermined action, it is true, as Strabo (6. 2. 4) observes, that

the Greeks would permit none of them [the barbarians] to lay hold of the seaboard, but were not strong enough to keep them altogether away from the interior.

\textit{(Loeb translation)}

Undoubtedly, this fact made the Greek cities economic centres with a wide hinterland and reach, supplying the native interior with prestige goods and consumer items. In turn, the interior came to supply raw materials and, especially, services. We find in the written sources information about the basic agrarian character of the island’s interior. Strabo mentions that although Hybla did not exist in his time, its name had been preserved thanks to the excellence of Hyblaean honey (6. 2. 2); he also praises the quality of the lands covered by volcanic ash for producing excellent wine and cattle, both in the territory of Catane and, in general, all the lands affected by the eruptions of Mount Etna (6. 2. 3), as well as the general wealth of the island (Strabo 6. 2. 7).

It is possible that the early interest of Catane in the far interior may explain the arrival in some native centres of great quantities of Greek prestige goods, such as the bronze tripods at Mendolito, amongst a great hoard of bronze (more than 900kg) dated to the 8th and 7th centuries.\textsuperscript{308} Of course, the native response is also interesting because hoards such as those of Mendolito and Giarratana,
may imply processes of accumulation of wealth, perhaps related to civil or religious powers. 309

A further step would imply Greek desire to establish a more direct control over these territories, partly to obtain the profits from their natural resources, partly to get a higher revenue by forcing the natives to pay tribute. Syracuse seems to have been the most efficient city in establishing such control, as the foundation of sub-colonies on the borders of the territory subject to its control indicates. However, such a policy does not seem to have been pursued widely elsewhere on the island and other cities may have used different tactics.

In addition to the trade existing between native centres and Greek cities, undeniable from an archaeological point of view, we may think of the presence of Greeks in the native centres. The existence of Greek graffiti in different places of Sicily, 310 as well as the development, from the mid-6th century, of indigenous writing clearly based on Greek alphabets, 311 may indicate the penetration of native territories by individual Greeks.

We have previously discussed, with respect to Morgantina, different interpretations of that eventual Greek presence. In most instances it was not hegemonical; consequently, we cannot consider these Greeks as spearheads of an imperialist policy directed from the Greek cities. However, it seems beyond doubt that the increased political and economic activity of the Greek cities in their hinterland may be explained with reference to the changes affecting the non-Greek world. 312 In fact, there was a clear desire by the native élites to adopt aspects of the economic model represented by the Greek cities, whilst many non-Greek communities were developing an intense multi-cultural character. The 6th century was the great period of Greek action in the native world of Sicily and it is then that we can seek, for the first time, the earliest manifestations of native cultures that were beginning to express their own political and ideological identity using mechanisms adapted from the Greeks. Thus, the non-Greek epigraphy of Sicily was used for the same purposes as Greeks deployed their own writing (Fig. 22). It gives us an interesting means to perceive how native uses and customs were adopting a Greek mode of

309 Albanese Procelli 1995, 41.
310 Dubois 1989, passim.
312 Boardman 1999, 190.
Fig. 22. Distribution of the non-Greek inscriptions from Sicily (after Agostiniani 1997, fig. 1, with additions). 1. Aetean area; 2. Area of the Iblei; 3. Geloan area; 4. Elymian area.
expression, while Greek concepts were beginning to penetrate to the native world. Examples as interesting as the public inscription of Mendolito,\(^3\) where terms referring to the community (touto) or others perhaps mentioning armed youth (verega),\(^4\) show the use of Greek-inspired writing with a public projection to proclaim socio-political structures of a clearly non-Greek nature. Also inscriptions of probably private use, such as that on an askos of Centuripe,\(^5\) or the painted text added before firing on a local amphora from Montagna di Marzo, show customs probably Greek but seen through native eyes. In fact, the inscription on the amphora seems to mention individuals with Greek names, but is written according to the rules of Sicel phonetics (tamura or eurumakes),\(^6\) and the use to which it was put was drinking.\(^7\) We might add some other epigraphical evidence showing possible bilingualism, with texts written in native tongues but with words of possible Greek type (emi, tode),\(^8\) or the interesting case of the funerary epigraph of Comiso (6th century), written in Greek, where an individual relates how he has buried his parents, at least one of whom (the father) carries a Sicel name.\(^9\)

Similar development perhaps took place also in native religion, a subject not very well known, although some of their gods, such as the Palici or Adrano,\(^1\) whilst preserving features of their own, also suffer a process of Hellenisation, even of appropriation by the Greeks to integrate them into their own mythical universe.\(^2\) This is especially evident in the case of the Palici, whose use by Aeschylus in the Aetnaeans (ca. 472 B.C.) may be interpreted either as a fusion of the Greek and the native\(^3\) or, perhaps more correctly, as an expropriation by the Greeks of native traditions in order to justify
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\(^{3}\) Albanese Procelli 1991b, 546.


\(^{7}\) Prosdocimi 1995, 68–73.


\(^{9}\) Pugliese Carratelli 1942, 321–34; Dubois 1989, 140–1 (no. 127).


\(^{3}\) Corbato 1996, 67.
Greek political domination in general and, more concretely, the dispossessing of native lands carried out by Hieron during the foundation of his city Aetna in the territory of ancient Catane. 323

As for the manifestations of the indigenous religion, these vary in the differing parts of Sicily; thus, in eastern Sicily (the area traditionally assigned to the Sicels) the native cult places are not very well known, although some votive deposits and some possible sacred building inspired by Greek models are certainly mentioned. 324 As for central/southern Sicily (the Sicak area), some sacred buildings of great interest are known in places such as Sabucina and Polizzello. Those buildings reproduce the model of native huts (the so-called hut-shrines), although introducing architectural elements (and perhaps ritual practices) of Greek type. 325 Lastly, in the Elymian area (western Sicily) the case of Segesta is outstanding. Here, as well as the well-known unfinished Doric temple, dated to the later 5th century, 326 an Archaic sanctuary (contrada Mango) dated to the beginnings of the 6th century and apparently of purely Greek type is also known. 327 Recently, a series of bronze artefacts from that sanctuary, perhaps corresponding to a native votive deposit, has been published. 328

The panorama outlined so far is proof of the increasing complexity of the Archaic world of Sicily, where new ideas arriving in the non-Greek world from Greek cities were immediately echoed by the natives. This shows how the non-Greek world of Sicily had come within the area of economic interest of the Greek cities, perhaps even that of political interest. The inscription at Monte San Mauro (mentioned above), perhaps placed in a sacred or prestigious building, 329 could talk about the juridical aspect of the relationships between Greek cities and natives. The well-known cause of the disputes between the Greek city of Selinus and the Elymian city of Segesta, matters relating to marriage laws between the two (implying certainly the epigamia) (Thucydides 6. 6. 2) undoubtedly point in the

324 La Rosa 1989, 57–9.
329 Spigo 1986, 1–32.
same direction. Furthermore, the shelter given by the natives of Maktorion to the Greeks of Gela who fled their city in consequence of a *stasis* (Herodotus 7. 153) may reflect close relationships between both communities. Finally, the help given by the Sicels of southeastern Sicily to Camarina in its fight against its mother city Syracuse (Philistus *FGHist* 556 F 5) is remarkable when we consider that this part of Sicily had remained quite hostile to Greek influence for a good part of the 7th century.

A final phase in the relationships between Greek cities and non-Greek communities during the Archaic period is that begun during the tyranny of Hippocrates of Gela. He directed his actions against Chalcidian territory, attacking Callipolis, Naxos, Zancle and Leontini, as well as ‘numerous barbarian cities’ (Herodotus 7. 154). One of the Sicel cities he conquered was Ergetion (Polyaenus 5. 6) and Hippocrates would die during the siege of the Sicel city of Hybla (Herodotus 7. 155), perhaps Hybla Heraea (Ragusa). The location of his campaigns would suggest that Hippocrates was interested in conquering the area surrounding the territories of Camarina and Syracuse. The difference between the policies initiated by Hippocrates and those carried out previously by the Greek cities is great: Greek cities had carried out a process of control and influence over their environs within a dynamic of expanding frontiers. However, the new policies of Hippocrates forced Gela to intervene in areas in which it had never before shown the slightest interest. Clearly, this was an imperialist policy in which the tyrant even seems to have included the Sicels, using them as mercenaries and establishing alliances with them to obtain troops (cf. Polyaeus, who mentions mercenaries, *mistophoroi* and allies, *symmachoi*, among the Ergetians). According to another scholar, the rise of Sicel mercenaries might have been the result of the evolution of the warrior aristocracies pre-

---

330 We have known for a long time that the relationship between Segesta and Selinus was very close between the later 7th century and the later 5th century, notwithstanding the political conflicts attested between them; see de la Genière 1978, 33–49; 1997, 1029–38.


 Previously existing in Sicily, who had modified their way of life because of the action of the Greek cities. At the same time, the usual changes of population carried out by the tyrants must have affected the native world.

Henceforth, the deep interaction between natives and Greek cities, especially those which carried out an imperialist policy, such as Syracuse after its conquest by Gelon (Herodotus 7. 156), would be very intense. There were, however, to be moments of special tension such as the refoundation of Catane as Aetna by Hieron (476/5 B.C.) and the transfer there of 10,000 new colonists, 5,000 from the Peloponnese and the other 5,000 from Syracuse, as well as the enlargement of the territory of the new city compared with that held by Catane (Diodorus 11. 49). This seizure of territory from many native communities led, after the fall of the tyranny, to a fight by the Sicels, under Ducetius, to restore the old balance (Diodorus 11. 76), although this became subsumed in a campaign, perhaps the most interesting of whose objectives was the creation of a *synteleia* or political and military alliance which, in Diodorus’ words (11. 8) included all the Sicel poleis which were of the same race (*homoethneis*) except Hybla.

Related to this last, it is also probable that we must ascribe to Hellenic influence the creation of ethnic identities among the non-Greek peoples of Sicily, mainly Sicels, Sicans and Elymians, already perfectly delineated in Thucydides (6. 2. 2–5), who would have taken such data from the Syracusan historian Antiochus. It is difficult, of course, to know how far Greek views on the formation of ethnic identities among the pre-Greek inhabitants of Sicily were accepted by these groups, if at all. At the same time, it is usually futile to seek to establish relationships between Greek myths and legends and archaeological evidence. However, in some instances we can see...
how some native groups, for instance the Elymians, may have used their identity, in this case insistence on their Trojan origin (Thucydides 6. 2. 3), as a means of stressing their rivalries with the Greeks. 341

What remains undisputed is the weight of the Greek influence on the elaboration of native material culture from the 8th and 7th centuries onwards, 342 and in some cases (for instance the Elymians) the inaccuracy of the views of ancient authors about their origins can be proved. 343 On Greek perceptions of the natives, I shall mention only one example. It seems that Ducetius, in his revolt, behaved almost as a Greek hero, 344 or perhaps in the way that a Greek would expect a Sicel to behave: imperfectly imitating a Greek, but not achieving final success.

In the last years of the 5th century, and during Athenian intervention in Sicily, the prominence of non-Greeks in the tactics of both fighting powers was, in my opinion, decisive, although some ancient authors seem to hide or diminish it. 345 It would imply the definitive integration of the native world of the island into the circle of interests of the Greek cities of Sicily. The military conflicts of the 4th century, with the complex involvement of many different components (Punic, Italic) 346 and the ensuing policy of Greek re-colonisation, especially after Timoleon’s time, 347 would dilute the non-Greek world of Sicily within a context which, from Agathocles onward, began to show its similarity to the new Hellenistic world which embraced the whole Mediterranean. 348

345 Domínguez 1989, 569–82.
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