COLONIZING WOMEN: A CASE STUDY ON MISCEGENATION AND SYNCRETISM IN

ARCHAIC GREECE

by

EMILY ANN SHARP

(Under the Direction of Naomi Norman and Laurie Reitsema)

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the processes by which colonization occurred in the Archaic period (800-600 BCE), focusing on the Greeks' preconceived notions of the Other through myth and history, and how those notions clashed against lived experience in the colonies. It does so especially by examining the role of indigenous women, providing the opportunity to analyze not only how and why the Greek colonization event of the Archaic period differs from other major colonial movements, but also why in particular it provides a novel opportunity to question the broad assumptions we make about colonization in general and the formation of ethnic identity in particular.

INDEX WORDS: Archaic Greece; colonization; the Black Sea; Sicily; women; indigenous; intermarriage; syncretism; hybridity

COLONIZING WOMEN: A CASE STUDY ON MISCEGENATION AND SYNCRETISM IN

ARCHAIC GREECE

by

EMILY ANN SHARP

BA, Vanderbilt University, 2013

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2016

COLONIZING WOMEN: A CASE STUDY ON MISCEGENATION AND SYNCRETISM IN

ARCHAIC GREECE

by

EMILY ANN SHARP

Major Professors:	Naomi Norman
	Laurie Reitsema
Committee:	Christine Albright

Electronic Version Approved:

Suzanne Barbour
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2016

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis came together at the end of three long years, which included a transcontinental move and five classrooms of teenagers. I laughed and I cried (a lot), but most importantly, I leaned on many, many others. To my parents, thank you for understanding when I disappeared for days at a time, and for not calling me overmuch when I did so, despite the panic that must have ensued. To my partner, thank you for the endless stream of support, whether that came in the form of listening to me wax poetic over how exciting Persephone's rape really is, or bringing me lavender tea and chocolate, and sometimes both. To my committee, thank you for the ceaseless time, energy, and understanding that helped me get here, and especially to Dr Naomi Norman, without whose kind ear and sharper mind I would not have succeeded. You are the yardstick by which I measure myself, and if I am one day half the mentor and scholar you are, I will count myself most fortunate.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

"The evolving, eclectic generation
Who never purposely left behind an identity
Who never purposely decided to plow forward and
Who never purposely stopped reflecting back"
--Adeline Nieto, "A Pure Medley"

"Do you know what a foreign accent is? It's a sign of bravery."
--Amy Chua, *Battle Hymn of the Tiger Mother*

From the time of Edward Said's publication of *Orientalism* in 1978, the topic of West versus

East has never been far from the academic's mind. Possibly more importantly, from the time of

the Ionian revolts in 499 BCE, the topic of Greek versus Other was never far from the ancient's

mind. If Greeks were hard, Persians and other ethnic groups were soft.[1] Where Greeks were a

small loyal group, the Other was legion. Indeed, the very term for foreigners in Greek was

barbaroi, those who speak any tongue not Greek, which apparently sounded simply like

muttering nonsense (bar-bar-bar, onomatopoetically). And yet the Greeks were also known for

their sea faring, trade, and colonization of lands stretching from Spain all the way to India, in the

times of Alexander. So we must reconcile these images somehow. On the one hand, we have the

hermetically sealed off, xenophobic commentary of several ancient authors, and on the other, the

material record that Greeks frequently interacted with and even lived amongst foreign

populations. Were Greek identities further firmed up by interaction with the Other, or did the two

intermingle?

---

[1] Herodotus' infamous passage at 9.122 ("soft lands breed soft men"), as well as comments throughout his
history, provides a good base for understanding the contrast Greeks used to help create their own identity

An excellent place to begin resolving the tension between these extremes is the evidence

for major movements of Greek speakers primarily taking place in the 8th-6th centuries BCE.

During this time, many Greek *poleis,* such as Corinth, grew from small-scale agricultural units to

trade empires and centers of industry, and the Greek world expanded dramatically.[2] But what

happened at the colonized sites, and to the people indigenous to them, remains more of a

mystery. Health status, political rights, and tension with the colonists are all frequently discussed

for more modern colonial events—as scholars, we seem to have assumed that the diaspora of the

early Greeks followed similar patterns.[3] Yet that line of reasoning does not *have* to follow, and

so this thesis intends to address how and for what reasons the Greek colonies may have differed

from what we know of watershed moments in colonialism and imperialism, especially as regards

the interactions between colonizer and colonized. I make particular note of if and how ethnic

identity is formed in the process of Greek colonization, and the factors underlying such form the

bases for my chapters. Within this thesis, I review literature both ancient and modern, with an

eye towards the utility of bioarchaeological research for parsing out the same issues and

providing a different view towards them. The two methods reveal wildly different results on the

same topic and an analysis of why they differ will be discussed in future research and theories.[4]

I specifically focus on Sicily and the Black Sea as two areas with high concentrations of Greek

colonies, albeit with very different indigenous groups.

---

[2] White 1961, 451-2.

[3] See, for example, Scramuzza 1939, whose introductory sentence claims that "the student of colonial America acquainted with Greek history cannot fail to be impressed by certain analogies between the Greek colonization of Sicily and the English colonization of America" (303). I intend to note how these trends in scholarship have affected the research being done on colonialism, from the models of imperialism to resistance and finally to hybridity.

[4] This second concern will be of great importance for research being carried out by Dr. Laurie Reitsema of the Anthropology department at the University of Georgia, along with a team of colleagues, which will investigate the status of "locals" versus "non-locals" at nine different sites.

The very next chapter considers the composition of the sites being surveyed. According to my findings, Greek colonies were founded primarily for one of two reasons. Either the site was being used as an *emporion*, "trade outpost," such as Apollonia Pontica and Catalan Emporion, to get at exotic goods and provide a resting point for Greek merchant vessels or it was an *apoikia,* "far from home," to serve as a permanent residence for its founders. The Ionian cities of Asia Minor were *apoikiai*.[5] Those living in an *emporion* were almost an economic garrison, separating themselves from native peoples and retaining their political rights back home. Members of an *apoikia,* on the other hand, gave up their political rights and formed fully-fledged city-states of their own. This second chapter explores the advantages and downfalls of these two situations, and what motivations a mother-city would have to create each. Oracular responses may reveal underlying reasons for founding a site as either an emporion or apoikia, and for choice of location and founding members. If religious reasons seem to be at play in a colony's foundation, interactions with the locals may have a different focus than if not. In the same vein, if political malcontents and the rapidly growing lower classes comprised the majority of colonists, that would have a major effect on the founding years of the colony, as opposed to an upper class of merchants. Soldiers with land grants, who were known as *kleruchoi,* would possibly be more likely to intermarry, for example, but their law enforcement would probably be stricter than that of the merchants. Elite men could be less willing to interact with the local population: the list goes on. The tone of interactions between colonizers and colonized could easily change depending on the perceived class and status of the colonizers, as Greek society was within its own bounds highly stratified.

The following, third chapter explores the underlying attitudes of the Greeks towards the pre-existing populations at the sites they colonized. I keep in mind the various regions being

---

[5] Noonan 1973, for the origins and process of creating an *emporion.*

surveyed by Dr. Reitsema and her team, and focus in on colonies ranging from eastern locations

all around the Black Sea to western sites in Sicily and Magna Graecia.[6] Since the Greeks would

have had varying opinions on the wide range of indigenous populations under consideration, it is

necessary to examine each site individually, and to note both similarities and differences.

Herodotus and Thucydides both provide good background information on the Greek

conceptualization of the Other and of self, as the presence of foreigners may have crystalized

Greek identity in and of itself. This formation of identity in turn leads into a discussion of

inequality as perceived and perpetuated by the Greeks, as they wielded their own identity in

response to others. Also, Xenophon's *Anabasis* discusses the Euxenos (Black) Sea and the

surprise he felt when the local population recognized some of the Greek words being spoken

around them.[7]   Common myths of the peoples under question may prove to be of use as well: the

tale of Jason and the Argonauts, for example, reveals some fairly negative assumptions about the

people of the Black Sea as savage and bloodthirsty.[8] Herakles' travels take him into Magna

Graecia. From ancient mythologies and histories, as well as modern scholarship, I gather as

much as possible about Greek attitudes towards foreign peoples.

 The fourth chapter narrows its scope down to the topic of intermarriage between the

Greek colonists and indigenous populations. The information from the earlier chapters, on the

nature of the sites and their colonists, as well as the attitudes towards these native peoples,

informs this discussion of intermarriage. In theory, the Greek population would be significantly

---

[6] Magna Graecia, or "Great Greece," is a region west of mainland Greece, encompassing much of Italy, including the south and Sicily, and is named for Greece's colonial expansion there.

[7] Negotiations between the Cyreians of Xenophon and local tribes seems to have aimed primarily for diplomacy, although occasional skirmishes broke out, 6.2.1.

[8] Of course, the question of how much Greeks knew about the extent of the world is also up for debate. Bacon 1932 covers a basic concept of geography as a field of study, as well as the concept of a travelogue, which he contends begins as early as the *Odyssey,* though he acknowledges that the divide between mythology and scientific inquiry is often fuzzy in the ancient world.

smaller than the native one, and would have to intermix with them in order for the colony to continue, especially if few women colonized the sites. This would be the case, most likely, if non-heirs and political malcontents comprised the *apoikia* founders, and if soldiers were rewarded for their service with a grant of the colony's land. In *emporia,* on the other hand, we should expect to see the direct opposite: since merchants would retain their political rights in their home cities, they would most likely wish to marry women from those cities, so that their children would have citizenship as well. The Jason and Medea myth particularly resonates with this hypothesis, since once Jason returns to Greece, he marries a Corinthian princess with whom he can have legitimate children, and puts Medea, the foreign princess, to the side. Initial attitudes would obviously have an effect as well, though I have some doubts whether it would be particularly strong. Cultures of bride-theft and woman-raiding are also investigated, since the question of willingness comes into play with any intermarriage between a colonizer and colonized. The acceptability of woman-raiding seems to be high for both Greeks and non-Greeks, if Herodotus' account of the bride snatching between Greeks and easterners is to be believed (1.1-5). This chapter synthesizes literary research with bioarchaeology, since osteological evidence for inter-breeding, which may indicate marriage, and geographical origin, which may indicate both woman-stealing and colonization, can be found in cemeteries. Despite my hypotheses above, researchers may find evidence of gene flow whether the colonizers and colonized actually married or not—relations may have taken place in either case.

My conclusions sum up the research and consider bioarchaeological directions for further study, from analyses of health status for effect of colonization on both colonizer and colonized to burial location and strontium isotope analysis of remains as indication of attitudes towards and

presence of intermarriage.[9] Evidence of indigenous agency and a hybridity of culture are

promoted as an alternate view of colonization events, while not ignoring both marginalization

and resistance due to imperialism. Finally, I return to the question posed at the beginning of my

thesis: not only how and why does the Greek colonization event of the Archaic period differ

from other major colonial movements, but also why in particular it provides a novel opportunity

to question the broad assumptions we make about colonization in general and the formation of

ethnic inequality in particular.

---

[9] Evidence of health status can be explored through separating individuals into colonizer and colonized on basis of inherited non-metric traits and mtDNA, and then looking for lower and higher rates, respectively, of dental caries, cribra orbitalia, other disease indicators, growth patterns, and trauma, both before and after the colonization event.

CHAPTER 2

LAYING THE GROUNDWORK: WHAT CONSTITUTES A GREEK COLONY

In discussions of the archaic Greek colonization period, the question inevitably brought up first is whether colonization is even the proper term—the underlying implications being that this Greek migration may vary wildly in form and function from our most frequent touchstone for colonization, that of Europe and America, and that ethnic inequalities and issues of the latter do not necessarily apply to the former. Leaving aside issues of comparison to places thousands of miles and years separate from Greek colonization, it is still valuable to explore why a colony was founded and to what extent the Greeks doing the founding thought it necessary or useful to assert total control over land, people, and customs. This chapter intends to analyze for what reasons a colony may be founded, and by whom.

The debates over reasons for foundation have raged throughout the past several centuries, beginning with C.D. Morris' claim that there were four classes of colonies: those established because their mother city was ruined by foreign conquerors, such as Rhegium, founded after their metropolis Messenia was destroyed by Sparta; those founded due to internal dissensions within the home city, resulting in the withdrawal of the defeated party, such as Syracuse, after Archias was thrown out of Corinth; those sent out by the oligarchy in the home city as a means of getting rid of some of the lower class, claiming oracular command, like the other founding Greeks of Rhegium, the Chalcidians, or finally, those founded due to the commercial interests of the parent state.[10] With all these types, Morris and other early scholars see a certain amount of intentionality; indeed, a mere 35 years later, Gwynn claims that "what is certain is that a Greek

---

[10] Morris 1884, 485-7.

colony was never a motley gathering of adventurers, grouping themselves together under no definite leadership."[11] Yet there is little written evidence for colony formation, other than mythological foundation legends. Most information is from the 5th and 4th centuries, notably from Thucydides and Herodotus, and since Athenian imperialism and antagonism inspired a cultural and literary milieu of their own, conversations about older colonization events may have spillover from later policies, causing them to be understood in ways completely different than an 8th century colonist would have conceived of them.

We therefore must work from the archaeological record and supplement with the literature where possible, while keeping a critical eye. Most scholars seem to believe that the two main reasons for colonization were either trade or settlement, or both.[12] Motivations for colonization that should be explored include whether trade was a factor, whether overpopulation and a need for more land came into play, whether the colonists were political or social fugitives, and whether the impetus was the private venture of an entrepreneur or fugitive, or publicly funded and endorsed by the state. Each of these factors will have affected how the colonists viewed themselves and therefore also how they viewed others, whether those others be indigenous populations, fellow colonists from other cities, or other visitors in their new home.

This chapter discusses first the most popular motivations proposed for colonies, and then what other elements of a colony's foundation lore may tell us about motivation, as well as the subsequent relationships between mother-city and colony, colonists and others. Trade as a motivation appears first, with the snappy tagline of "trade before the flag"—in which case, we ought to see settlements held independent from the indigenous sites nearby, but close enough for trade, and the archaeology should reflect that colonists kept themselves apart, maintaining

---

[11] Gwynn 1918, 100.
[12] Drews 1976, for example, claims that "it is inconceivable….for reasons of uninterested exploration" (22).

entirely Greek traditions and their political rights at home.[13] This chapter considers not only the evidence for such trade sites, or *emporia,* but also the possibility that most sites were *apoikia,* full cities in their own rights, founded with other goals in mind, such as dispersing excess population to a new site. Colonies, in this model, were state enterprises organized by aristocratically governed city-states, in search of arable land as a result of overpopulation. If this is the case, we should find that the main colonizing *metropoleis*—Corinth, Miletus, Chalcis— were growing too large for their physical boundaries by the beginnings of the 8th century BCE. The physical evidence for such would come from population estimates based on number of houses and burials versus land production capabilities for each city's *chora,* or surrounding countryside. Still other reasons, including political dissension, could lead to the foundation of a colony and determine if it was founded through public or private mechanisms. In particular, the myths of founders often retain some fragments of historical truth, if held under close scrutiny and taken with a grain of salt, and as such can say much about why the colony originally was founded.[14]

These varying reasons for colonization also cause certain rituals about a city's foundation to change, which may also in turn mark a difference in how colonists interacted with those ethnically different from themselves.[15] A city was founded by the process of a religious ritual, involving oracular questioning and response as well as a traditional setting up of a founder's cult and sacred flame from the mother-city—the degree to which a new colony upheld these traditions or subverted them for their own purposes may show their willingness to change their

---

[13] Al Mina, in modern Syria, and Naucratis, in Egypt, certainly functioned in this way, but they seem to be the exceptions rather than the rule.

[14] These myths were frequently written hundreds of years later, with records coming from the 5th century BCE authors Herodotus and Thucydides, hence the grain of salt.

[15] This may include locals, of course, but also other traders and colonists who are not from the same mother-city.

own ethnic identity, or tenacity in keeping to old Greek traditions. Methods of dividing up space also may show whether the colonists were minded towards equality, and for whom.[16] Finally, the reasons for colonization may affect the obligations of the colony to the metropoleis and vice-versa: if a colony is only a trading-site, it may have more reciprocal obligations, which may in turn make it more likely for the colonists to adhere to their own ethnic identity and less likely to intermingle with indigenous populations, other colonizing groups, or traders.

Empirical Evidence for Emporia

One potential and very reasonable explanation for Greek colonization is trade. Geographical determinists argue that Greece's small size, along with its relative dearth of natural resources, spurred the Greeks to look seaward for economic growth early on, especially when considered in conjunction with the relative ease with which they could access the sea—most Greek cities fall on the coastline.[17] Even Gwynn, who argues that land was the primary reason motivating colonization, admits that by the 6th century, trade had become the primary cause. His assertion, however, that the small size of industry and inadequacy of shipping capacity in the preceding centuries make trade unlikely as a main cause ought to be investigated. Naucratis in Egypt and Al Mina in Syria (established circa 800 BCE) already have been identified as emporia, with large buildings serving as storehouse and home alike to the traders who were strangers living amongst foreign peoples, rather than citizens in a new home. Emporia would have served as trading posts and not much more. A strong Greek presence, either physically with the number of individuals or culturally in the presence of Geometric art, language, and institutions, would have been unlikely and unnecessary. These types of settlements would have existed as privileged economic garrisons in already developed states, with no sense of political institution or true

---

[16] Carter 1990, Danner 1997, Fitzjohn 2007.

[17] Many introductory Greek culture textbooks follow this trend of determinism, though I am loathe to point fingers at any in particular.

metropolis, as traders from different areas would probably combine resources and stay in the same area near the harbor, rather than spread out.[18] These colonists would be less likely to interact with indigenous populations outside of purely mercantile transactions, as they would be more transient visitors than permanent settlers. But did many of these separatist trade colonies exist, and are they even archaeologically identifiable today? Can we claim any colonies that we have found in the modern age were, at one point, emporia? We may simply be "misapplying the analogy of modern colonization," making more of an exchange of raw materials on the one end and finished crafts on the other than we should because of our more recent cultural memories.[19]

In the so-called Dark Ages of Greece, circa 1100-750 BCE, less people would have had incentive to settle or develop regular trade, at least not in a way that would go beyond a few exotic items given as luxury gifts for foreign dignitaries and elites, or that would require full-scale establishments. In the 8th century, the population began to rise at a faster rate than previous generations, and by the 9th, the Greeks were looking east to Syria and elsewhere, as Euboean pottery there shows us. Exotica brought back from the area may be in part responsible for the Orientalizing revolution in Greek art and for serving as incentive to further trade. Since the Phoenicians concentrated on the far west, the eastern half of Sicily and the entirety of the Black Sea were open for business, so to speak. There was no trade competition as a barrier, nor such a thing as a national merchant navy, nor a language barrier, since a simple game of show and tell would serve.[20] Naucratis serves as not quite a model for western emporia, but it comes close. It was a merchant town set up by perhaps Miletus, but joined by others, and may have included

---

[18] The ancient Etruscan cities Spina and Adria, near modern Venice, are described by Strabo in ways similar to this, but as they were not founded until at least the end of the 6th century BCE, they fall outside the range of this study (V.214; IX.421).

[19] Graham 1983, 5.

[20] See Boardman 2001, who argues that it is "only the literate who find difficulty with foreign languages" (35).

some mercenaries seeking hire.[21] This type of establishment would have had fewer direct conflicts with native cultures, since trade was mutually beneficial, rather than the zero-sum game of land and exploitation of populations that John Boardman points out come as a result of a fully independent colony foundation, like apoikia. In Sicily specifically, this indigenous-colonist relationship has been blurred by 19th century scholars who note that "in the West the peoples with whom the Greeks came into contact were at a more primitive stage of development than they themselves."[22] It does not help Magna Graecia's case that even ancient historians seemed to have held the same belief; Livy, for example, paints the native populations as wide-eyed, naïve children, excited beyond measure at their first vision of a ship (8.22.5-6).[23] In reality, these relationships may have been more nuanced, less obviously master-and-pupil: though the indigenous peoples encountered by Greeks may not have developed in the precise same fashion, it is clear from the *impasto* pottery and burial styles of the Villanovans (to name only a few examples) that a complex and multilayered society already existed before men sailed from mainland Greece.

Nevertheless, Euboea may have formed trade colonies along the western coast of Campania and elsewhere. As an island a mere 50 km wide at its largest point and only 176 km long, Euboea could not long support its main cities, Chalcis, Lefkandi, and Eretria, founded circa 1300, 1100, and 800 BCE respectively. They may have formed a loose and informal trade confederation, as Euboea's epithet, ναυσικλειτῆς Εὐβοίης, shows ("Homeric Hymn to Apollo" 219).[24] The Euboeans were broadly based, well connected, and economically prosperous, as shown by their ability to bring in outside clout for the Lelantine Wars (710-650 BCE), and their

---

[21] Moller 2001.

[22] Sir John Beazley, as quoted in Ridgway 1993, 12.

[23] "The fleet that had brought [the Chalcidians] from their homeland made them much respected along the [Campanian] coast."

[24] "Euboea, famous for its ships."

distinctive skyphoi decorated with pendant semicircles show up on the eastern coast of Asia

Minor and in Cyprus before the 10th century.[25] Once Phoenicians appear in Cyprus, having

settled Citium in the 9th century, their gold and ivory begin to show up in the corresponding

layers of Euboean stratigraphy. Certainly, there is a plethora of evidence indicating that Greek

trade, especially Euboean, was popular by the beginning of the colonization movement in the 8th

century BCE. In Italy in particular, Phoenicians and Euboeans existed in a state of symbiosis,

with securely datable trade at each site arriving in 800 and 750, respectively.[26] Yet the

archaeological evidence at places such as Veii and Villasmundo, major Etruscan sites that fit the

requirements outlined above for emporia, does not support Greek residence until the 500s for the

burials and homes do not reflect any change or move towards Greek practices until then. The

only possible indicator of a Greek resident is the presence of a Greek word, transcribed as

"eulin," found at Gabii, on a pot in a cremation grave between 830 and 770.[27] Unfortunately, the

presence of the Greek language and alphabet on a single piece of pottery, even if in a grave,

which is a place traditionally rife with symbolism, cannot prove residency. Greek architecture

does not appear on the Tyrrhenian coast until the 6th century, and then the shift is massive and

immediate, more indicative of an apoikia than emporion. The appearance of monumental Greek

buildings indicates a long-lasting desire to stay and claim land for oneself—a trader passing

through, even annually, would have no reason to undertake a task so cost- and labor-intensive. A

temple appears at Cumae on Italy's mainland in the early 6th century and is accompanied by a

metalworkers quarter, preceded by pottery in the late 8th century. The site is not near an Etruscan

---

[25] As Thucydides comments at 1.15.3, μάλιστα δὲ ἐς τὸν πάλαι ποτὲ γενόμενον πόλεμον Χαλκιδέων καὶ Ἐρετριῶν καὶ τὸ ἄλλο Ἑλληνικὸν ἐς ξυμμαχίαν ἑκατέρων διέστη. ("The long-ago war which happened between the Chalcideans and the Eretrians was the one in which the rest of the Hellenic name was most divided into allies of one or the other.")

[26] Ridgeway 2004, 37-8, for Phoenician wares; Snodgrass 2004, 20, for Euboean type 6 pendant circle skyphoi and potsherds.

[27] Ridgeway 2004, 38.

one, but established wholly new, in a defensible area with a valley for burials, and trade is

mainly in exotica, marking it as a fully intentional and independent city, rather than a trading

post.[28] The sites in Sicily follow the pattern of the rest of Magna Graecia, and so emporia for

now must be abandoned as the primary usage of colonies in Italy.

To turn our eyes eastward, we should also look to the early Euboeans as settlers. On the

Black Sea, the Scythians had already settled several areas, and were too nomadic for Greek art

and culture to make a serious impact, so the Greeks instead made Scythian luxury items in a

Greek style; as Boardman would say,

> the acculturation took many different forms, all of it affecting the colonized, not the
> colonizers, who behaved almost as though they had never left home in terms of their way
> of life, art, religion, language, and beliefs (2001, 322).

This type of comment certainly implies that the Greeks in the Black Sea held themselves aloof

from indigenous populations, but modern scholarly opinion should not be allowed to confound

the archaeological evidence, which we ought to take piece by piece. It is true, first, that the

majority of trade in the Dark Ages and the early archaic period comes from the East. In an

analysis of which early city-states were known for their rule of the sea, the first book of

Eusebius' *Chronicon* notably lists kingdoms catapulted into success by economic prosperity and

sea-trade:

> *...iam inde ex Diodori scripotis, breviter, de temporibus Thalassocratorum qui mare*
> *tenebant. Post bellum Troianum mare obtinuerunt Cares, Lydi, Pelasgi, Thraces, Rhodii,*
> *Phryges, Cyprii, Phoenices, Aegyptii, Milesii, Cares, Lesbii, Phocaeenses, Samii,*
> *Lacedaemonii, Naxii, Eretrienses, Aeginetae...*

> …now then from the writings of Diodorus, briefly, about the times of the thalassocracies,
> who were holding the sea. After the Trojan war, these held the sea: the Carians, Lydians,
> Pelasgians, Thracians, Rhodians, Phrygians, Cyprians, Phoenicians, Egyptians,

---

[28] See Coldstream 2004, 49-54, for details on the wares found at both Pithekoussai and Cumae. I will
return to these sites in the following chapters, to discuss their relationship with indigenous populations in
more detail.

Milesians, Carians, Lesbians, Phocaeans, Samians, Spartans, Naxians, Eretrians, and Aeginetans… [29]

Appearing from his list, and from the appropriate time periods, are the Lydians, Thracians, Rhodians, Phrygians, Phoenicians, Egyptians, and Milesians, all of whom could be big players in trade. The establishment of Al Mina in Syria by the 8th century shows that the Euboeans were perhaps interested in having emporia there. Other colonizers from Asia Minor founded agriculturally-based towns, which rapidly outgrew their own resources, and so by the end of the 8th century, emporia may have been founded for trade of grain, fish, cattle hides, honey, wax, and other raw materials., rather than simple subsistence farming[30] A good example of this trend seems to be of the two cities on the Black Sea founded by Megara: Chalcedon was founded for agriculture and a mere 17 years later was called the "city of the blind," since Byzantium was founded across the straits for trade. White takes this nomenclature as evidence that motives change quickly and that Byzantium was founded for trade only, but as it formed immediately into a full city with political rights of its own, it cannot count as a trading post alone.

The presence of Greek pottery sherds in Scythian sites from the early 7th century BCE onward may indicate the presence of Greek emporia, but as Gocha Tsetskhladze points out, the fact that those sherds number only 55 despite intensive excavation indicates the use of Greek pottery as luxury good more than as evidence for established trade.[31] Mycenaean weapons appear similarly rarely, with no pottery and no colonies dating from the Bronze Age.[32] Tsetskhladze argues instead that we should see the "Pontic Greek cities as indigenous bodies with their own diminutive economies, not depending much initially on overseas trade or trading links with local

---

[29] All translations, unless otherwise noted, are my own.
[30] White 1961.
[31] Tsetskhladze 1998, 10-12.
[32] Tsetskhladze 2004, 48.

populations."[33] Though the emporia thesis was predominant in prerevolutionary and Soviet

scholarship on the origins of Black Sea colonies, trade is more a consequence of colonization

rather than its raison d'etre. It is possible that there were Greek trade settlements at later colony

sites, since a few fragments of early 7th century pottery appear in the Archaic houses at

Panticapaeum and in nearby native burials, but the majority of over 250 fragments are from 650-

550 BCE, and the earlier ones may represent family heirlooms brought over with the colonists,

rather than an earlier presence of Greek settlers.[34] It seems therefore more likely that new

colonies on the Black Sea were founded as independent settlements rather than as trading posts;

preexisting desire for Greek goods would have been a main motivator for traders to settle, and

native trade seems to have been fairly limited, as the Black Sea peoples seemed less interested in

such goods. These colonists were thus emigrants starting a new life rather than merchants;

commercial centers would come later, as Byzantium became larger in the 6th and 5th centuries

and developed from a colony to a full bustling hub in its own right. Trade cannot function as the

primary cause of colonization for the archaic Greeks, in either the East or the West.

Bursting at the Seams: Population Overgrowth

The other most popular explanation put forth for colonization is population overgrowth.

Proponents of this theory argue that the growth rate had rocketed up as high as 4%, in contrast to

the more general 0.2-1% growth rate of the Dark Ages, and claim that such a rate resulted in a

rapid expansion and competition for a dwindling supply of land. Thucydides himself believed

---

[33] Ibid, 10.

[34] Noonan 1973; see Tsetskhladze 2004 for examples at Hestia (a mere 36 pieces of Middle Wild Goat Class pottery dating from the last third of the 7th century at a site founded in the mid-7th century according to Eusebius and Pseudo-Scymnus) and Berezan (a few pieces from the second quarter of the 7th century and more from the second half, although the site was founded in the mid-7th, also according to Eusebius and Pseudo-Scymnus).

that the Greek thalassocracies developed to counterbalance the surfeit of people and deficit of land:

> ἐπιπλέοντες γὰρ τὰς νήσους κατεστρέφοντο, καὶ μάλιστα ὅσοι μὴ διαρκῆ εἶχον χώραν. κατὰ γῆν δὲ πόλεμος, ὅθεν τις καὶ δύναμις παρεγένετο, οὐδεὶς ξυνέστη: πάντες δὲ ἦσαν, ὅσοι καὶ ἐγένοντο, πρὸς ὁμόρους τοὺς σφετέρους ἑκάστοις
>
> Those sailing out conquered the islands, and especially those who did not have their own land. Concerning war by land, where some power could be gained, there was none: for all contests, as much as they existed, were against their own neighbors (1.15.1-2)

The scholars of the 19th century generally followed this view, holding that Corinth, Megara, and Miletus, all major metropoleis, also all sea-ports, with territories of limited cultivable land confined by nature and their neighboring states, were able, with the regulation of piracy, to travel freely by sea and settle abroad.[35] Later the limited resources of Greece and the rise of the polis in the 8th century led first to acute land problems in Euboea, as evidenced by the wars over the Lelantine Plain, and then at Corinth and Megara, both restricted by the isthmus. Additionally, the lack of primogeniture meant that inheritance would have been divided between all heirs—although wealthy families could still preserve their estates in tenable sections, lower classes sat on shrinking parcels, as each son divided the land up farther. Hesiod provides evidence of this problem, at least for the 8th century, with his comments on bribe-swallowing elites oppressing their fellows (*Erga* 37-9, 248-52). But we should be cautious of taking a handful of mentions from a notoriously misanthropic and churlish source as proof of overpopulation and discontent with land and the elite.

The question thus remains: was Greece becoming overpopulated towards the end of the Dark Ages, or do the ancient sources exaggerate? Scholars have argued that the preconditions for overpopulation all existed in ancient Greece. First, international trade and cross-cultural contacts

---

[35] See for example Gwynn 1918 and Scramuzza 1939.

facilitated an exchange of knowledge, which generally allows for better medical practice and improved health status for the population, in turn reducing the mortality rate. Second, trade clustered in large cities, allowing the cities to recover from the collapse into the Dark Ages to rise to economic power and activity—Ian Morris argued that the per capita consumption of the Greeks rose between 50 and 100 percent from the beginning of the Archaic to the end of the Classical age (800-300 BCE or thereabouts).[36] Yet Walter Scheidel's analysis of demographic growth rates for Archaic Greece serves as a rebuttal to these proposals of explosive growth rates.[37] In basic population growth theory, geographical expansion goes hand in hand with population growth and demographic change, and economic output and social complexity are followed by contraction—the Dark Ages of Greece, with the nadir occurring in the 10th century BCE—and a subsequent recovery—in the 9th and 8th centuries, which then peters out and retracts, in a cyclical pattern of growth and development. Scheidel warns against taking a number of sites and intensity of surface scatter as reflective of absolute population size, considering shifts in cultural practices and structures as Greek tribes moved from a more nomadic and spread-out existence to one clustered in cities, but nevertheless he uses archaeological data as a broad index. The rise in agrarian production from technological advances would have resulted in a larger population, yes, but at a rate closer to 0.4% than 4%.[38] A rise in population density and intensifying urbanization and trade—elements common to many Archaic Greek cities at the dawn of the 8th century—would, however, also have facilitated the spread of infection, counteracting the benefits of growing economic output on population numbers.

---

[36] Morris 2004.
[37] Scheidel 2003 and 2004, where he rebukes the notion that Greece was undergoing such an efflorescence.
[38] Scheidel 2003, 134.

To use an example closer to our investigations in Sicily and the Black Sea, Francis De Angelo examined the foundation of Selinous, a colony of Megara Hyblaea and part of the second great wave of colonization in Sicily, to see whether population overgrowth could have precipitated the transfer of excess population to the western half of the island in 628. Dunbabin held that Selinous was founded because Megara Hyblaea which was located between the strongholds of Syracuse and Leontinoi was unimportant and unable to battle for land. But Megara Hyblaea's triangular chora of 400km, as De Angelis points out, is of flat limestone terraces and is 60% arable, meaning its agricultural capacity would have supported 15,000 to 22,000 people.[39] Based on the homes and graves found in the excavations of Megara Hyblaea, there were a mere 240-320 settlers at its foundation in the last quarter of the 8th century, a number which had grown to between 1,710-2,280 inhabitants around the time that Selinous was settled, in the third quarter of the 7th century. There was, therefore, plenty of land for everyone— unless land tenure belonged to an elite minority, in which case lower classes could claim discontent and a need for land of their own. Again, however, the archaeological record contradicts this possibility. Excavations show that the allotment of domestic, public, and religious space was all relatively equal in the 8th century, and only a little less so in the 7th century.[40] De Angelis comes to the conclusion that, instead of overpopulation, Megara Hyblaea must have had another reason for choosing to participate in the colonization movement. At around the same time, the town underwent a massive construction project; two temples, a *stoa*, a *heroon* (hero shrine), and *bouleuterion* (council house) were built, with another two temples, another stoa, and street curbs in the following centuries. As Megara Hyblaea became a full-

---

[39] De Angelis 2004, 94.
[40] See Carter 1990 for Metapontian land division, which shows that in the cases that land division was not wholly equal in size, it was justified by the quality of land per plot.

fledged polis, perhaps its population became interested in participating in the same sorts of

rituals as its parent city, seeking its own place at the table.

Founding Mythologies and Justifications

Given the equivocal evidence that trade and/or population pressure alone inspired the

Greeks to colonize new land, other factors may be considered. These other factors likely vary

vary between founding cities and which may be more difficult to get at in the archaeological

record. By turning to the mythos of a place's foundation, we may be able to understand how the

colonists and their descendants conceived of their own beginnings. The legends of *oikists,* or

founders, can be telling in particular: in the traditional pattern, as demonstrated early on by

Cumae, a site was selected in advance and two oikists organized the settlement and assigned

lots.[41] We have information about these founders through a variety of sources, including

etiologies for names as presented in Herodotus and Thucydides, and backstories to the subjects

of victory odes.

The name of a colony itself can be very telling about its foundation; one has only to count

the number of Alexandria's still extant today to see the extent to which a single young man

conquered the known world. But we must investigate how places were named before the

Macedonians, who practiced auto-eponymy to an unprecedented degree. While *nomos*, most

easily translated as a strong sense of custom, dictated that the oikist was to be given a hero's cult

after death, a burial in the city center, and annual public commemoration (Herodotus 6.38.1), to

name a city after someone, during his lifetime, would require exceptional circumstances.[42] But

before we examine for what reasons a city could be named after an oikist, we should turn to

---

[41] White 1961, 447, mentions that the oikists themselves were remembered in a later hero-cult. These oikists are recorded in Strabo (5.4) as being Megasthenes of Chalcis and Hippocles of Euboean Cyme.
[42] On nomos and oikists, see Malkin 2004, who states that the *heroikai timae*, or heroic honors, accorded the dead oikist "constituted a political act through which the community focused on its dead founder as the symbol of its genesis and hence of its identity" (114).

philosophers and statesmen to see how a place traditionally was named. According to Plato, a city may be named for one of several reasons:

> φέρε δή, τίνα δεῖ διανοηθῆναί ποτε τὴν πόλιν ἔσεσθαι; λέγω δὲ οὔτι τοὔνομα αὐτῆς ἐρωτῶν ὅτι ποτ᾽ ἔστι τὰ νῦν, οὐδὲ εἰς τὸν ἔπειτα χρόνον ὅτι δεήσει καλεῖν αὐτήν— τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ τάχ᾽ ἂν ἴσως καὶ ὁ κατοικισμὸς αὐτῆς ἤ τις τόπος, ἢ ποταμοῦ τινος ἢ κρήνης ἢ θεῶν ἐπωνυμία τῶν ἐν τῷ τόπῳ

> Come now, what ought this city to be called? I am not saying what its name now is or what it should be called in the future—for this may be equally from its foundation or its place, or some river or spring or gods may give a name to the place. (*Laws* 4.704a)

For the most part, Plato advocates naming a city for its geography or some sacredness inherent to its geography. Its foundation myth, however, also has some stake in its naming —so if it is not objectionable to name a place for its founding, why does it not happen more frequently? Irad Malkin believes that cities were occasionally named for their founders, but only when the oikist's personal position was enhanced in some way, by war or tyranny. Thera, for example, was named for its oikist, Theras, a Spartan who led the Minyans out as outcasts to a new town (Herodotus 4.147-149). In this situation of political discontent, the fugitives were completely reliant on their oikist, being without a parent city, and so chose to name their land after him.[43] Plato himself recommended colonization as a method to get rid of either a surplus population or political malcontents, so this foundation lore is also in accordance with the *Laws* (4.735-6). Eponymous founders tended to be heroes, but the cause of their naming seems to have been more sociopolitical than religious: a city could be named after a living man, but not always, as that sort of excessive personal preeminence did not fit the standards of the polis community, in which there was more frequently a sense of equality. Earlier, fugitive colonies, therefore, were more

---

[43] Other examples of fugitive apoikiai include Illyrian Apollonia, a Corinthian colony founded by Gylax, which was originally called Gylakeia. This particular city was renamed for Phoebus Apollo due to uncertainty over the identity of the actual oikist, as colonies could turn to Delphi for arbitration (Thucydides 1.26.2; Pausanias 6.22.3-4; Diodorus 12.35).

likely to be named for their founders, as they had no metropolis and indeed no polis to which to they must answer.

Greek foundation poetry backs up these assertions made from prose sources. In Archaic poetry, *ktisis*, or founding, poetry became a literary topos across a variety of contexts, as part of a geographic catalogue or beginning of a local history, either as spoof in satire or praise in victory ode. Humorously, Pisthetairos, in Aristophanes' *Birds,* discovers a poet praising a city foundation, with some Pindaric elements in a cyclic poem and a chorus of young girls (917-919). In epic, quarrels between fathers and sons form the basis for the foundation of many cities, from the account of Tlepolemos to Doulichion (*Iliad* 2.661-669; 2.625-630).[44] Narrative elegy and iambic satire would have been performed at public festivals as a civic celebration as well, displaying a colony's history to many with pride—these performances would have been too long for symposia, and too politically advantageous to waste. Among Kallinos, Mimnermus, and Xenophanes, Archilochus also wrote foundation tales. In one Archilochean fragment, Aithiops trades the land he was supposed to receive (his *lakon* or portion) for a honey-bun belonging to Archias, known early on as the oikist of Syracuse (293W). Finally, epinician, or victory, odes and tragedies also made use of the colonial tradition, as Pindar ascribes the success of Battos, founder of Cyrene, to Delphic Apollo (*Pythian* 5.57-62) and Apollodorus relates the foundation of Thebes by the Phoenician Cadmus as he was searching after his abducted sister Europa (*Bibliotheca* 3.4-5).

In the tradition about Syracuse, we have a good example of how a Sicilian colony was founded, not because of trade or overpopulation pressures, but as a result of civic pollution and religious cleansing. As the story goes according to Plutarch, the Corinthian Archias desired

---

[44] See Dougherty 1993, who lists as other examples of familial strife leading to colonization. Ozolian Lokris in Plutarch *Mor.* 294e, Tiryns in Pausanias 7 2.1, and Dorieus in Herodotus 5.42.

Actaeon, son of Melissos, but when he tried to steal him away, he and Actaeon's friends became

involved in a tug-of-war over the boy and accidentally killed him. Melissos then committed

suicide after begging Poseidon to deliver drought and plague upon the Corinthians. Delphi

eventually tells the Corinthians they will have no relief until vengeance has been meted out, so

Archias leaves to found a new settlement, where he is killed by his lover Telephos, leaving

behind his daughters Syracuse and Ortygia (*Mor* 772e-773b). According to the narrative, a

murder leads to civic pollution which is relieved by an expulsion and, eventually, to a new

foundation.[45] Yet in Thucydides' version of events, Archias merely founds Syracuse and expels

the Sicels: no mention is made of bloodshed back home (6.3.2). We are left to wonder why

Thucydides suppressed the narrative of murder, or why Plutarch fabricated it. Dougherty argues

that colonial representation omits bloodshed "inherent in colonizing foreign lands," substituting

colonists for murderers, as a way to displace the violence and "relocate it within a religious

system that can address and expiate that violence" (179, 188). It is noteworthy that the god most

frequently associated with colonization, Phoebus Apollo, is a murderer himself; in the Hesiodic

Catalogue of Women, Zeus kills Asclepius so Apollo kills the Cyclopes. Pausanias also notes

that Apollo required purification after killing the Python, the world snake (1.43.7). As oikist,

Archias would have stood in metonymically for Apollo, sharing more traits than we might

initially think. Thucydides' history of Syracuse simply includes Archias as another political

malcontent, which should not surprise us; as Plato would have it, the leader of a political

insurrection committed a crime against the state and so was the moral equivalent of a murderer.

In this case, a mythological murderer equated to a political malcontent equated to a founder is

not so shocking after all (*Laws* 856b). In any case, Archias had the door to Corinth shut to him

---

[45] Dougherty importantly notes that "the concept of pollution is not so much a system of rationalization as a vehicle for the expression of social disruption" (180). See Mary Douglas' *Purity and Danger* for more details on the concept of pollution, which is a crossing of boundaries between the pure and profane.

and could not return; if we assume his colonists were treated in the same manner, Syracuse's particular strategy in dealing with indigenous populations begins to make more sense, as the Corinthians must have been desperate for land and willing to fight for it no matter what. But we'll return to that in the second chapter.

As far as the Black Sea is concerned, our information regarding oikists is a little more tenuous. No oikists were contemporary with their foundation, and the most frequent attribution of an oikist has the Argonaut Autolycus as founder, giving us very little historical evidence from which to work. Apollonia Pontica, according to Pseudo-Scymnus, was founded by Autolycus, who was from Thessaly himself (Apollonius 2.955), and Strabo reports that a statue by Sthenis was set up to him in the 4th century BCE (*Periegesis* 986-997, 12.3.11). These two authors were both working in the first century BCE, however, so we are at a minimum several centuries removed from concrete evidence.[46] In any case, it is difficult to ascertain whether this Autolycan myth reflects that some mainland (perhaps even Thessalian) Greeks may have founded Apollonia Pontica or not, rather than Miletus, but we have some other evidence to go on. The only Milesian foundations on the Black Sea in the 8th century BCE were Cyzicus, Sinope, and Trapezus, but these attributions are all modern, and so the initial settlement may have been by the historical versions of the Argonauts, some Thessalians and even Corinthians. The Argonauts were supposed to have killed king Cyzicus by mistake after all, and so it is entirely possible that Milesian fugitives simply joined the colony in 631 BCE or so. Thucydides does claim that the Corinthians were the first to have a modern navy and in 704 had already built ships (1.13.2-3), and their pottery can be found in the lowest archaeological levels of Pithecusae, as well as at

---

[46] According to the dedication of Pseudo-Scymnus' *periegesis* to a king Nicomedes of Bithynia, the author was most likely referring to either Nicomedes the II or his son the III, who reigned roughly from 149 BCE for an unknown number of years, which would place Pseudo-Scymnus himself writing sometime after 100 BCE. Strabo's dates are clearer, thanks to the Roman consular system of dating years, and he wrote his *Geography* between the 20s BCE and 20s CE.

Cyzicus and Syracuse. Finally, Sinope has another founder listed, Habron, who coincidentally shares a name with the grandfather of Actaeon, the boy whose death forced Archias to leave Corinth (Plutarch *Am. Narr.* 772E-773A). These individual echoes of Corinthian foundation myths may be small, but it does not seem by happenstance that they continue to show up in the foundation stories of Black Sea colonies over and over. If the "Argonauts" did indeed have a hand in the foundation of cities around the Pontus, that would have affected colonial relationships. The associations of Heracles as a mythic founder in Sicily and the Argonauts in the Black Sea could be used to "justify or validate a claim over a particular site…as a point of cohesion and social identification."[47]

Rites of Passage: the Role of Religion in Colonization

From what we have seen so far, colonies tended to be founded not because of trade or overpopulation alone, but a combination of factors, some of which lead to a state-sponsored foundation, but more of which result in private individuals taking their leave due to some political mishap or religious crime. In the case of the former, religious ritual could serve as continued sanction of behavior during colonization, whereas in the latter, it serves as both stimulus, through desire for expiation, and legitimization, as an entirely new venture. It is important, perhaps, to note at the beginning that religious conversion was not a factor, unlike in modern colonization stories.[48]

Greek colonies seem always to have been sent out with an oracle, a fact of which later classical authors were cognizant (Cicero *De div.* 1.3). Plutarch comments that one needed to consult an oracle to recognize the appropriate place and time, to set up temples of gods across the sea, and to set up tombs of heroes (*De Pythiae oraculis* 407f-408a). Some oracles seem to have

---

[47] Malkin 1987, 2.
[48] Scholars as early as Gwynn in 1918 have stressed this fact, though in the 19th century this view seems to have been more popular.

been made up later, and their motives and influences are unclear, probably serving as

justification after the fact, but the more vague and ambiguous ones can be believed at least some

of the time to have been real. The gods by whom an oracle was given, the type of question

(whether it be "should we settle at all," or "is this location acceptable"), and the answer type

(direct, conditional, or ambiguous) should all be taken into consideration when ascertaining the

possible veracity of the oracle. Primarily, Delphi and Apollo were involved, and the inquirers

were either the oikists themselves or an entire city, depending on whether the enterprise was

private or public.[49] The more specific the answer, whether that meant including a puzzle with the

only possible answer being a very particular location, or actual explicit directions, the less likely

it seems to have been authentic.[50] Both the place to be founded and person to found were

conventionally asked, and the oracle served not simply as ritual, but also confirmatory and

legitimizing, in a way not wholly dissimilar to a Papal bull's effect for Catholic colonists of the

new world. Diodorus of Halicarnassus records, for example, that the indigenous population did

not allow a Pelasgian settlement on their land until they had heard an oracle decreeing it (1.20).

Moral justification is thus provided for claim and possession, though not until asked. Though this

report may be exaggerated, it shows the importance of oracular confirmation to the Greek

settlers, at a minimum.[51] Showing its prominence even further is the fact that Socrates was told

by Hippias that he was popular for his ability to talk about foundations and genealogies, pointing

to the significance even later Greeks attributed to these early Archaic oracles (Plato *Hipp. Maior*

285d).

---

[49] Even Asia Minor was believed to have consulted Delphi, despite the distance (Herodotus claimed Phocaea checked in with the oracles, 1.163).
[50] Pease 1917, 12-13.
[51] Though religious ritual varies across Greek city-states as independently formed entities, they shared some things in common, including Delphi: see Herodotus 7.144, who claims religion as a common element to all Greeks.

In addition to ascertaining whether a colony had the go-ahead from Delphi, state-sponsored colonists would have had a *mantis*, or seer, accompanying them on their journey. Traditionally, *manteis* accompanied military expeditions, and since an oikist served as a military leader as well as a lawgiver, these seers fulfilled the legalistic prescriptions of ritual.[52] They also provided corroboration to the oikist in allaying the fears of colonists, which must have been many upon emigration to new and uncharted waters. These colonist-seers were also more accessible on a daily basis than distant Delphi, creating an informal sense of place and belonging affirmed by religious rite. The state-sponsored colonists would, in an ideal situation, also have fire from their sacred hearth, watched over by Hestia, back home, stressing both the importance of their link to the founding city and also their existence as a new, separate, and religiously certified polis. The fire would be placed in their new prytaneion, carried over by the oikist, as Pamillos from Nisaia went to Selinous, and serving as a great comfort (Thucydides 1.24.2). This tradition seems impractical at best, since the fire would have to survive a several-month long sea voyage, but its ideological importance cannot be ignored. These religious rituals would have distinguished colonists from natives, giving them their own concrete sense of identity, while maintaining some link with their mother-city.

For both public and private colonies alike, however, sacred spaces needed to be set up. The Greeks here were dealing with an entirely unprecedented scenario, in which they had to think out in advance and conceptualize their social units as a whole, choosing sites for sacred precincts, whereas older cities had existed for long stretches of times and did not need to justify their sacred spaces.[53] Oikists seem to have used rational and functional criteria rather than indications of native cults or inherent sacredness (such as caves, hollows, rivers), just as

---

[52] Malkin 1987, 8-10.
[53] Malkin 1987, 136-137, of the uniqueness of this particular event.

Nausithoos in the *Odyssey* founded Scheria, drawing out the wall, making homes for the colonists and for the gods, and dividing the plow land (6.7-10). Battos according to Pindar did much the same thing at Cyrene, creating the *temenos*, or sacred precinct, the sacred road, and festivals all on his own (*Pythians* 5.89ff). All these oikists once more followed the example of Apollo, who after being born in Delos, went about creating territories in his guise as Apollo Aguieus, or "Guardian of the Streets and Pathways."[54] Marcel Detienne argues that the verb used to describe Apollo's path on the way to Delphi, ἐπιβαίνειν, going from Euboea to Thebes, to Onchestos, to Telphusa, to Phlegyae, and finally to Parnassus, is not simply wandering or aimless, but instead specifically cultivating.[55] In the same way, when oikists founded colonies, whether they were private or public, outcast or sponsored, they were not lawless nomads, but thoughtful cultivators, choosing religious sites carefully and forming their own identity in the process.

The Sicilian colonists had their own specific rituals, which identified them as separate from the mainland Greek cities they all originated from. The altar of Apollo Archegetes at Naxos served as a pan-Siceliote religious space, which makes sense, considering the role of Apollo as founder and as mediator between gods and men (Thucydides 6.3.1). [56]The Sicilian colonists chose a specific aspect of the god that reflected their origins and their appreciation for his patronage—after all, he could easily have chosen not to have granted it, if they had behaved improperly. Doreius, for example, was censured by Apollo for not consulting Delphi where he should go originally, and he failed twice to found colonies, once in North Africa and once on

---

[54] Ἀγυιεύς, prayed to formally in Aristophanes' *Wasps* (875) by Bdelycleon, for his father to return to the right path, and in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (1081, 1086) by Cassandra, for having been brought to as horrible a place as Mycenae, as well as in speeches of Demosthenes (22 and 43) as he cites messages from the Delphic oracle.
[55] 1997, 11-12
[56] I here use Siceliote to mean the identity created by the colonists and natives living in the new colonies in Sicily, distinct from both Sicel, which refers to the eastern indigenous people, and Greek mainlanders.

Sicily (Herodotus 5.42.2). In the colonies, specific space was also always set aside for the gods, as exemplified below.

Megara Hyblaea founded its colony in accordance with the religious rituals Plutarch describes (above), with temples to the gods and tombs of heroes. The city is methodically planned, with extreme regularity on a flat coastal plain, and even the earliest houses are in line with the later streets and blocks.[57] The very early temenos is in line with the rest of the orthogonal planning, and the excavators have identified one particular house, 23.5, on Block 6 between C1 and C2, along with the building next to it, as a possible *heroon,* or hero tomb, perhaps for the oikist. Its identification is on the basis of pits in the entrance, similar to those at Cyrene and Thasos, and at the crossroads of two major roads, several other temples date to the 7th century. The identification of the heroon in particular shows the early importance of the oikist cult to the people of Megara Hyblaea, who would have viewed their founder as a symbol of unity and self-identity, distinct from their parent city. Notably, this heroon may have been not for Lamis, their original oikist who died on their journey, but for Hyblon, a Sicel king for whom the colony ended up being named, after his gracious help in showing them a site. If truly his heroon, Megara Hyblaea is claiming a very particular and novel status, as a mixed colony willing to integrate with their indigenous population.

Around the Pontus, less is known, due to the continued occupation of most colony sites from foundation to present day. Oracles of the area also do not hold up, as the oracle regarding Chalcedon and Byzantium shows; it reports that Byzantium would be founded "opposite the blind," a detail that seems concocted as etiological explanation by the authors who wrote armed with hindsight centuries later, since Chalcedon would have been a good colony for agriculture, if

---

[57] Excavations carried out of agora and 26 street blocks by George Vallet, Francois Villard, and Paul Auberson, 1976-1981.

not for the bustling trade Byzantium was later known for (Strabo 8.320, Tacitus 12.63, Herodotus 4.144). These folkloristic elements and etiologies make it hard to understand what the original foundation motives were, as well as what role religion truly played during a colony's early days.

Paying Dues: Obligations of Colony and Metropolis

Finally, we turn to the effect that the cause of colonization may have on the reciprocal relationship between colony and original city. In the case of a colony founded by political malcontents or religious polluters, such as Syracuse, there would theoretically be no relationship or obligations. But for state-sponsored colonies, some sort of policies must have been in place to help negotiate the interactions between the two. White claims that "once the new city was founded the ties which bound it to the mother-city were those of religion and sentiment only. Colonies were in no sense a colonial empire of the mother-city," but I am not quite so certain.[58] The two constitutions we have preserved, for Cyrene and Naupactis, record that later Theraeans and Locrians, respectively, may come and become citizens of their colonies at any point in the future and hold political rights, including the right to run for office, and that within a certain space of years, if the colony is not successful, the colonists may return home and take up rights in their old city again.[59] These details speak to a continuing relationship between the metropolis and colony, especially in state-sponsored or –funded expeditions. For Corinthian foundations, "colonists" also had the right to return to Corinth for court, though the exigencies of long sea travel meant this right was most likely rarely exercised. In later times, Corcyra commented that Corinth founded their colonies not to be slaves to but equals with those left behind at Corinth, and although of course Corcyra is trying to force its own political agenda through, it wouldn't

---

[58] 1961, 449.
[59] See Graham 1983, 224-228, for translations of these decrees, along with the facing Greek.

have made a claim entirely insupportable (Thucydides 1.34). Aegina also listened to its parent

city, Epidaurus, when it had court cases to discuss, and the implications are wide and far

reaching; for example, if the new settlers went back to Epidaurus for justice, the conquered

indigenous peoples may have been compelled to do so as well, forcing Greek interactions upon

them (Herodotus 5.83, 8.46). The place required by court for native representation implies a sort

of equality we look toward in future chapters. A final way to see whether colonies relied on their

mother–cities and vice versa would be to look at warfare and whether each fought on behalf of

the other. Our data, unfortunately, come from Athens rather than an early parent city, so we must

examine it with due scholarly suspicion, as the imperialism of the 5th and 4th centuries will

undoubtedly have clouded evidence from earlier and different cities. In Athenian casualty lists,

allies and cleruchs, or ex-Athenian soldiers who were given a land grant in a colony, were called

to service, but had separate casualty lists, showing they were thought of as separate cities

entirely, though ones with obligations to Athens.[60] They were mobilized as separate tactical

units, though named by the Athenian tribes of which they were originally members as well as by

the name of the people among whom they settled, conceived of as uniquely separate from yet

indebted to their founding city. Through constitutions, court cases, and casualty lists, we can see

that state-sponsored colonies sat in an interstitial space in relation to their founding cities, neither

wholly similar in identity nor totally separate, and obligated to provide some benefits to them,

even if they did not receive the same in return.

Greek colonies seem to have been founded not for trade alone, nor because of

overpopulation, though trade interests may play a factor and occasionally land held by a minority

at home may cause malcontents to leave. Each colony must thus be examined in its own context

---

[60] See Smith 1919 and his examination of CIA 1.432-62 from the 5th century BCE, as well as CIA 1.443, now known as the *Inscriptiones Graecae.*

to see whether it was state-sponsored, as a way of gaining more prestige for the parent city, or private, as a way of gaining more prestige for the individual. Religious rituals and reciprocal obligations would change based on the nature of the colony, which would in turn affect the colonists' relationships with the indigenous populations. The one thing that is certain is that colonies were their own unique political institutions, separate from though occasionally indebted to their mother-cities, competing to make a name for themselves in the larger Greek world. How they chose to do so and how they incorporated or ignored native strategies for success remains to be seen in the following chapters.

CHAPTER 3

HERE THERE BE MONSTERS: PRECONCEIVED NOTIONS OF FOREIGNERS

Having discussed some of the reasons why the Greeks set their sights on new horizons, we

should now turn to what, or rather who, they expected to find there. Unlike colonizers of the

New World, for whom the natural resources of their new home were essentially unknown and for

whom the leap would have necessarily been blind, the Greeks already had participated in trade

with some of the cultures they would settle amongst, or at least had heard of many of them

through other traders and general word of mouth. We have evidence that Egyptian and

Phoenician groups, at a minimum, were interacting with Greece even before colonists set out for

new places.[61] By the time of Homer and Hesiod, in fact, audiences were accustomed to hearing

about the backgrounds and places of origin of various heroes and gods. During this time and

even before, colonization was occurring, and the Greeks became more and more interested in

exploring the boundaries of their world. According to Corinna Riva, by the 7th century BCE,

"intercommunity contacts were likely to happen at all levels of the social scale on both sides, and

aristocratic elites entertained personal relationships including guest-friendship or *xenia* relations

among one another."[62] This interest in geography and peoples grew to such a degree that

Herodotus wrote what has been referred to as the first ethnography. Though some of his tales are

incredible, they may reflect truths: centaurs, for example, could be men so skilled with a horse it

---

[61] Waldbaum 1994 and Markoe 1996 for the physical evidence, McGready 1968 for linguistic, and Ilsley
Hicks 1962 for mythological, among many others.
[62] Riva 2010, 80.

was easier to believe them one beast rather than two, or a one-legged philosopher in India could actually be a yogi.[63]

Yet what, amidst all these details, ought we to believe was representative of early Greek views, rather than later interpolations? There are several questions relevant to our topic that help with this study of colonization and ethnic inequality. The foremost question is whether the presence of foreigners in Greek colonies crystalized Greek and indigenous identities, and led to segregation of ethnic groups. Within that overarching question are several elements to be unpacked, including whether the Greeks think of people elsewhere as belonging to one large umbrella group known as "barbarian," or as separate groups, or as individuals they encountered. We should also question whether it was specifically the development of critical scientific thought and geography as a branch of study that led to these identifications, or whether the impetus was colonization itself. Did Greeks respect foreign practices as separate from their own and equally worthy? And if so, did respect equate with integration of said practices into their own traditions?

To answer these questions, we will look at the ways that Greeks depicted foreigners and the terms they used, beginning with the oral and lyric poetic traditions extant prior to and contemporary with colonization itself, and then inspect later sources of philosophy and history from the 5th century BCE. If Greeks simply placed barbarians under an umbrella as a single group, or as single individuals, we should expect no differentiation in treatment of characters from myth and history; further we might expect that they would depict the barbaric individual as wholly incomprehensible and perhaps even evil, amoral, or monstrous. These groupings would showcase individuals to point out flaws of the whole, separating the ideal Greek hero from the

---

[63] Curtis Runnels even suggests that "myth contains a folk memory of encounters between Greeks and an earlier, more primitive race," when Neanderthals and modern homo sapiens roamed the same territory, and while that predated the writing of Homer and Hesiod by over 27,000 years, his point is not entirely invalid (1989, 43). Racial biases against foreigners as "stupid" or "less advanced" may, in this view, have some biological root, though it does not seem wholly likely.

barbarian antagonist. If, on the other hand, Greeks understood the peoples whose lands they were colonizing as distinct groups, and held them in some respect, we should expect to see regional myths reflecting such. The prominence of a sun god on the Black Sea, for example, should result in more emphasis on Apollo and Helios as deities in Pontic colonies than elsewhere, so long as that respect translated to incorporation of local belief. While respect of foreign belief does not necessitate integration into one's own system, it would certainly smooth over the process of colonization, by appeasing and cultivating good faith with native groups. Such conflations of originally distinct religious and sociocultural traditions would show a complex negotiation of identity, as well as a recognition of others, and would acknowledge the validity of both

Travelling Heroes—Claim-Staking and Syncretism in Myth

Before the popularization of geography and cartography as branches of study, Greeks primarily learned of other places through the performance of poems about mythological characters. Especially popular were the tales of the wandering heroes, Heracles and Odysseus. These *periplus* tales of sailing various seas served as travelogues, evidence for the world as a place of wonders. In the late 8th and early 7th centuries, Homer and Hesiod each make reference to various elements of both heroes' adventures, and various lyric poets such as Stesichorus and Pindar in the 7th and 6th centuries also made use of them. I chose these heroes in particular for our study because they travel either to Sicily, the Black Sea, or both, and their visits seem to have had lasting impacts on the stories these colonies told about themselves.

As Heracles travelled most broadly, to both Sicily and the Black Sea, it seems most appropriate to treat his narrative first. Heracles seems to have started as an early honorific title for the husband of Hera, in her guise as a chthonic mother-goddess, even before the Indo-European Zeus came into the picture. With the appearance of the Olympians, Heracles' godhood

was eradicated and replaced by folktale, for a while.[64] His history as the demigod grandson of Alcaeus originates from tales in both the Peloponnese and Thebes, and his prominence on the mainland of Greece is undisputed. Elements of his sack of Troy and of his appearance in the underworld crop up as early on as Homer (*Iliad* 19.95-133; *Odyssey* 11.601-26) and various monsters from his twelve labors are represented in Hesiod's catalogue of gods and monsters (*Theogony* 292, 314-5, 329-30, 530). Yet this information only explains in part how and why Heracles came to be such an important figure in colonial narrative.

Heracles was particularly popular in the colonies of the 8th to 6th centuries BCE. His presence is felt in towns named "Heraclea" for him, stretching from modern Turkey to Macedonia, from Sicily to France, and totaling at least ten in number. As discussed in the previous chapter, if towns were not named for their actual historical founder, they were frequently named for a god or hero associated with the place, which must have made Heracles, the doomed travelling hero, a particularly apt pseudo-oikist. Indeed, when the Cnidian Pentathlos attempted to settle in western Sicily and when the Spartan Dorieus did the same, both in the 6th century, their commonality was seen in their descent from Heracles—which they conveniently presented as justification for their claims over the land (Diodorus 5.9; Pindar *Pythian* 1.70-80). Pentathlos and Doreius both argued that since Heracles stopped in western Sicily and conquered the city Eryx on his way back with the cattle of Geryon, he was leaving the territory for them, his descendants. An additional sign of Heracles' cultural coinage among the Greeks is the frequency with which he appears in the poems of Pindar, which were contracted most often by Sicilian townspeople and individuals to commemorate local athletic victors. In *Olympian 10*, for example, Pindar calls his tale of Heracles founding the Olympic games a *koinos logos,* a common tale or Panhellenic narrative (11). As Eckerman argues, Heracles and the Olympic

---

[64] Philips 1978, 432-4.

games were important to all Greeks, and especially to new colonists, who must have felt that competing well helped define them in the Mediterranean world as an independent power.[65] On the part of the original Greek colonists, at least, it is clear how they felt a strong connection to Heracles, and why they would make claims of descent from him, or of foundation by him.

Yet the explanation thus far is strictly unilateral, a handing down of Greek culture to the people under their power—and it does not present the full picture. For Heracles to be as successful as he was in the colonies, there must have been some connection to him that the indigenous and other foreign peoples could feel. Careful examination of myth reveals that a much more complex cultural negotiation was taking place, as Greeks, Phoenicians, Sicels, and Thracians found ways to innovate novel versions of the tale to suit their own needs, forging new and unique colonial identities in the process. Heracles and the Phoenician god Melqart, popular in Tyre, were often seen as one and the same. This conflation helps to explain why the Phoenicians took the claims of both Dorieus and Pentathlos seriously enough to battle with them and make proclamations about them, when each oikist landed on the traditionally Punic western half of Sicily. Phoenician control and cultural dissemination near the Black Sea would also give the Greeks good reason to utilize Heracles-as-Melqart there. The Greeks must have been concerned that the Phoenicians, their competitors in both trade and colonization, recognize their stakes throughout the Mediterranean. I will return to the conflation of god-heroes later in this chapter, in a more archaeological context.

In Sicily, Stesichorus' retelling of the monster Geryon's battle with Heracles gives us some insight into the way the people of Himera conceived of themselves. The poet himself, born in southern Italy around 640 BCE, moved to Himera within a generation or two of its foundation

---

[65] Eckerman 2008. For other examples of Heracles and Olympia being referenced in Pindar, see *Olympian* 1, 3, and 7, *Isthmian* 7.

circa 650. His viewpoint accordingly represents a rare opportunity to "listen in on" cultural

dialogue as it occurred. In the fragments of the *Geryoneis* which remain to us, Geryon first

speaks to his friend Menoitus, who entreats him not to fight, while Geryon himself argues that it

is much nobler to die defending his land and family than to shame his descendants (Fr. 11.20-4).

This argument might remind the classical reader of Hector speaking with his family, in the

manner reminiscent of many Homeric heroes. Then Callirhoe, Geryon's mother, joins the

conversation, baring her breast in a display of maternal concern similar to that of Hecuba asking

Hector not to fight Achilles (Fr. 13.1-4; *Iliad* 22.79-92). In both cases, mother and son each

know that his destiny is to be destroyed by a stronger foe, but in each case, the son feels he must

protect his own honor and that of future generations (Fr. 11.20-4; *Iliad* 6.440-65). While Hector

and Geryon are both adversaries to Greek forces, they are nevertheless painted in a sympathetic

light by Greek authors intent apparently on acknowledging their nobility. Christina Franzen has

argued that by building up sympathy for this foreign monster while at the same time showing

him through an entirely Greek lens, with Homeric similes and Greek language, the poet is

encouraging his audience in Himera to identify with Geryon as much as if not more than with

Heracles. As she says, Geryon the hero "embodies the alterity of a colonized people, a

localization of the fears of the other to Greek primacy."[66] We can even extend this argument, by

noting that monsters, for the Greeks, represented the transgression of a variety of boundaries,

including but not limited to political, social, and sexual transgressions.[67] Certainly, the

intermingling of Chalcidians and Myletidai, exiles from Syracuse, along with Sicel natives,

would include all of these transgressions in some way, as these exiles have, by nature, already

committed some political transgression, and the continuance of the colony past a generation

---

[66] Franzen 2009, 63.
[67] For more on this theory, see Olmsted 1996.

would require transgressing Greek norms to mingle with the native population. Geryon, as a three-headed blood-red monster, is an emblem of the various cultures blended together in the west, as the three native cultures (Sicel, Elymian, Sican) intermixed with Greek, and the west was commonly associated with the red tones of the setting sun. The myth of Heracles has thus been subverted for a colony's own purposes, neither wholly Greek nor native.

On the Thracian coastlines near the Black Sea, Heracles would have also been particularly resonant. Heracles' adventures here included both stealing the horses of Diomedes and voyaging with Jason and the rest of the Argonauts. The Thracian king Diomedes, son of Ares and Cyrene, had four man-eating horses, which Heracles was tasked to steal as another of his labors. In both Euripides' *Alcestis* and *Heracles,* the hero succeeds in doing so, but in the *Heracles,* his steersman, Abderus, is killed in the process, leading the hero to murder Diomedes and found a town in Abderus' honor.[68] While it is unclear whether the Thracian and the Homeric Diomedes were related (which would make these horses twice stolen, first by Diomedes from the Trojan ally Rhesus, in the *Iliad*), it is evident that this Diomedes had several cult sites around Thrace.[69] During colonization, cults of Heracles became popular as well, especially at Thasos, which had amongst its temples a Heracleion, containing several pieces of art associating Heracles with horses.[70] These depictions showed Heracles as an archer, often standing next to a horse, sometimes winged (connecting him further to another mythic equine, the Pegasus). This association was not unique, but it also did not feature among Heracles' most identifiable stylistic attributes from mainland Greece, which typically included the club and the lion skin. The Greek colonies on the Black Sea seemed to be going out of their way to associate Heracles with the

---

[68] For a similar version of the story, see Apollodorus.

[69] As W.H. Porter believed to be the case, although he also held the unsubstantiated belief that human sacrifice was part of the rites associated with this shrine (1922, 230-2).

[70] Jesi and Egli 1964.

local Diomedes, emphasizing the horse-stealing myth at every turn. At Abdera itself, the annual celebration of their oikist involved a procession celebrating him as the son of either Hermes or Poseidon, and as the favorite of Heracles.[71] Here, Pindar's *Paean 2* may help us understand this particular focus on the stealing of the horses, as his poem emphasizes the cavalry of Abdera as a particular strength (37-50). Between the preexistence of shrines to the Thracian hero-king Diomedes and the preeminence of horsemanship among the Thracians, the siting of Heracles' labor here and the popularity of his cult shows how the general myth of Heracles as traveller and founder is adapted for the local culture, showing a subtlety of understanding of the indigenous people by the Greeks and vice versa. Each culture retained elements of their own stories, mingling them with others' stories to explain each people's claim on the land, and the new culture created upon foundation.

Odysseus is as world-weary a traveller as Heracles with an equally long journey to complete; however he is a much less successful oikist, even if he too resonates with local peoples. Odysseus famously encountered the island of the Cyclopes, a place that is commonly associated with Sicily (9.105-566).[72] Homer's narrative presents Odysseus as very like an oikist, albeit an ineffective one: he leaves behind the civilized and world-famous city of Troy, confronts different values during his travels, and broadens his horizons, figuratively and literally, but he struggles to understand all that he encounters. From the beginning of the episode with the Cyclopes, Odysseus fails to recognize that he is in a place where his own laws do not apply. His view of the "goat island" next to the island of the Cyclopes is cast in colonial terms: the place is fertile and lacks men: ἀνδρῶν χηρεύει (9.124). This verb χηρεύει is also resonant of sacking cities and taking them over, as it can specifically mean "to be widowed," with the genitive of

---

[71] Dougherty 1994, 208.

[72] Bradford 1963, though Bérard 1933 places it at Posillipo in the Bay of Naples. At any rate, the island is frequently linked with colonies in Magna Graecia.

separation, "of men/husbands." Jenny Strauss Clay points out that the same verb is used of Heracles sacking Troy itself, and that the amount of time devoted to this otherwise inconsequential place may indicate a "newly awakened spirit of Ionian colonization which looks upon an uninhabited site with a view to its practical potential as a new settlement."[73] In particular, the view of uncolonized land as a virgin, to be possessed and married, is intriguing in light of captive-taking in new lands.

Yet Odysseus ultimately fails, as did many colonists who attempted to settle in difficult areas of Sicily. Before seeing the goat island, Odysseus and his men had destroyed the Ciconian city Ismaros, but were soon ousted by an army of neighbors (9.39-42). With his colonizing desires having been roused again by the goat island, Odysseus waited in Polyphemus' home expecting *xenia,* the normal guest-host relationship that dictated an exchange of gifts including but not limited to shelter and food for a stranger (9.228-32). When the Cyclopes did not proffer xenia but imprisoned them instead, Odysseus and his crew suffered casualties and fled. Afterward, Odysseus related that the Cyclopes had no councils, but simply ruled their own families, and did not care for one another. It is significant that Odysseus had no way of knowing this information and that it stands in direct contradiction to his own narrative, since the other Cyclopes come to Polyphemus' aid when Odysseus blinded him. Scholars have seen this episode as reflecting the failure of human knowledge in general and of a colonist in particular, as indigenous residents were not always inclined to be enthusiastic about visitors and therefore less than willing to share information about themselves.[74] Later accounts of the encounter of Odysseus and Polyphemus reflect similar themes. In Euripides' satyr play *Cyclops,* the overly civilized and rational Odysseus comes across as being just as brutal and bloodthirsty as the

---

[73] Strauss Clay 1980, 261ff.
[74] Rinon 2007.

savage Polyphemus and the satyrs. The tragedian may be asking us to struggle with our implicit assumptions of who the protagonist is, and whether his morals are any better than the enemies he faces down. Carol Dougherty believes that this comic play's settings and distance from the actual time and place of Athens in the 5th century BCE allowed Euripides and his audience to question the meaning and ethics of Athenian identity and empire.[75] The inheritance of Odysseus in this context is one with moral ambiguity, the beginnings of which we can see even in Homer's version, perhaps reflecting the early tensions and misgivings colonists may have felt upon encountering a people different from themselves. By the classical age at least, Euripides' play reflects the problematic nature of imperialism, as projected onto Odysseus.

Odysseus' travels on the Black Sea are far less detailed, but the account of his crew's passage between Scylla and Charybdis is sometimes taken as indicative of sailing up the Bosporus (*Iliad* 2.851-7). On his way to the underworld, he may have also encountered the Cimmerians, a people who theoretically lived at its entrance and could not see sunlight (*Odyssey* 11.14-9). These people represented the limit between the known and the unknown, forming the boundary of the world, and thus seemingly fascinating. But Odysseus is strangely silent on more details here, perhaps because neither poet nor audience would have known more about this area nor would have cared to learn more. Other 8th century accounts of the Black Sea area give little detail beyond its geography: the Corinthian poet Eumelus mentions Borysthenis, the name both for the Dneiper River and a daughter of Apollo, while Hesiod lists the rivers of Scythia and Thrace in his Catalogue of Rivers (fr. 17; *Theogony* 337-45). The Hyperboreans, another people dwelling interstitially, were associated with both Thrace and the river Istros, as worshippers of Apollo, according to Pindar (*Olympian* 3.11-34).[76] Thematically, early Greek authors seem to

---

[75] Dougherty 1999, 314.
[76] See Vassileva, in Tsetskhladze 1998, for more on the varying peoples of the Black Sea.

share a conception of Apollo and the sun in general as being of extreme importance to people living on the Black Sea; Medea of Colchis, after all, was the granddaughter of Helios, and the priestess of Hecate, a goddess who may have originated as an aspect of Apollo.[77] While the Greeks, as far as our literary knowledge allows us to go, did not engage with the Thracians and other peoples of the Black Sea on the same level as they did the Sicels, their assimilation of local sun cults into those of Apollo show that they were trying to understand and make sense of a people they did not wholly comprehend, by placing them in more familiar, Greek categories.

Critical Thinkers and Later Views of the Other

As we have been looking at sources, we have gradually moved later in time—and while we can claim that Pindar wrote in the times of the second waves of colonization, towards the end of the 6th century and the Archaic age, there was a marked change in new colonies and in literature. With the Persian Wars beginning in 499 BCE came a need to differentiate good from bad, friend from foe, and Greek from non, in order to justify their battles. Before these wars, the Greeks had no reason to unite, but with the threat of an outside foe, they banded together. This war helped to bring about the development of history as a genre, as writers like Herodotus and Thucydides wished to record the momentous events of their times in prose. The post-war proliferation of critical thought led to the rise of not only history, but also of geography and philosophy. Mythology was contrasted with scientific inquiry and natural history, and although fictitious boundary peoples continued to appear in each, by the end of the 6th century, poetry was reserved for mythological geography, while prose was considered to be scientific.[78] Authors began to question more explicitly how to deal with foreign peoples, and to outline what qualities

---

[77] Hecate's name, ἑκάτη, is the feminine form of the common epithet for Apollo, the Far-Shooter, ἕκατος. It should be noted that this theory, while popular, does not stand alone, and Hecate's origin is far from certain.

[78] Bacon 1932, Graff 2005.

made someone Greek or not. In short, ethnicity was categorized in much clearer terms than ever before. Herodotus, for example, made use of the terms *ethnos* and *genos* to distinguish between groups of people, and used the two terms interchangeably to outline what was Greek. According to Jones, Herodotus defines *ethnos* as a people or nation, sometimes as small as the population of Attica, or as large as the nation of the Medes, and most frequently as a people ruled by a specific person, from a particular moment in the narrative (*Histories* 1.57.3, 1.101).[79] Herodotus uses *genos,* on the other hand, usually to refer to a descent-group into which one enters by fact of birth. Both, however, are used to define Greeks as opposed to Other, implying that Greekness is in part an inherited trait (though the presence of *ethnos* as well suggests this implication is not black and white).

As far as they delineated their respect for these other cultures, both Plato and Thucydides suggested that each place be allowed to preserve its own rites. In his *Laws,* Plato wrote, through the mouthpiece of an Athenian stranger giving advice to Clinias on founding a new Cretan colony:

> εἴτε τινὲς ἔντοποι Μαγνήτων εἴτ᾽ ἄλλων ἱδρύματα παλαιῶν μνήμῃ διασεσωμένων εἰσίν, τούτοις ἀποδιδόντας τὰς τῶν πάλαι τιμὰς ἀνθρώπων

> and if there exist any local deities of the Magnetes or any shrines of other ancient gods whose memory is still preserved, we shall pay to them the same worship as did the men of old (848d). [80]

The philosopher states that in particular the Greeks themselves participate in these rituals, rather than just respecting them. For a slightly different take, Thucydides commented:

> τὸν δὲ νόμον τοῖς Ἕλλησιν εἶναι, ὧν ἂν ᾖ τὸ κράτος τῆς γῆς ἑκάστης ἥν τε πλέονος ἥν τε βραχυτέρας, τούτων καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ αἰεὶ γίγνεσθαι, τρόποις θεραπευόμενα οἷς ἂν πρὸς τοῖς εἰωθόσι καὶ δύνωνται.

---

[79] Jones 1996, 315-7.
[80] The Magnetes were the original inhabitants of the land Clinias was going to settle.

> The law to the Hellenes was that, whoever had power over any land, whether larger
> or smaller, also the sanctuaries should always be theirs, to be served in all ways by
> the rites to which they were accustomed before that time (4.98.2).

While Greeks were not required to practice every religious rite encountered, they must respect

them, and preserve them to a reasonable extent. Irad Malkin has argued that these two comments

both refer to other Greek city-states' sanctuaries rather than foreign people's rites, but evidence

one way or the other is not particularly compelling, and so we must take it at face value. In either

case, it seems that respect—if not conservation—for other cults was preferred by at least the

Athenians of the 5th century BCE.

The Sicilian expedition of the Peloponnesian War in particular provided an opportunity

for Thucydides to reflect on what it was to be Sicilian by recounting a brief history of the island

up to contemporary times (6.1-6). At the outset, ethnically Dorian cities like Syracuse fought

against Chalcidian/Ionian cities like Leontinoi and ethnicity justified and structured the actions

of the colonies, in accordance with kinship ties with their mother cities. But the Syracusan

Hermocrates addressed an audience of Sicilian city representatives as *Siceliotai,* an identity

unique to colonials, all part of one *chora* or land (4.61.3, 4.64.3).[81] According to Jonathan Hall,

this "aggregative ethnicity" crystallizes specifically colonial identity during periods of great

stress, resulting in ethnogenesis.[82] To support his hypothesis, Hall notes that Siceliotai first

appears in Thucydides and is used afterwards as a specific name of this group. Hermocrates'

argument used habitation, residence, and kinship as key markers of a person's *ethnos,* and so

while there would be small distinctions between different cities in Sicily, there was an overall

---

[81] From this label, I've drawn my distinctions of Greek (mainland or first generation colonist), Sicel
(native prior to colonization), and Siceliote (the term colonists used of themselves once settled and
mingled with the native population).
[82] Hall 1997, 115.

pan-Sicilian identity among the Greek cities to be had.[83] Undoubtedly, the mainland Greeks felt

this distinction as well, since Nicias later expressed a fear of Sicilian Greek unity. In fact he

called the Athenians' expedition a new city foundation among a hostile tribe, which would

otherwise be shocking, considering that Ionic Greeks lived in Sicily and were hardly hostile

foreigners (6.21.1). Yet how did the Siceliotes stake these claims of identity for themselves,

other than by a simple appellation? What could have spurred Nicias to mark them as being so

different from the Athenians themselves?

The background of Sicily's contact with Greeks may provide some insight into how

Siceliotes could claim their own identity and territory. According to legend, not only did

Heracles come and defeat the Elymians on the west coast of Sicily, those western peoples were

also descended from both Trojan refugees and Greek heroes (Thucydides 6.2.3; Diodorus 4.22-

4). In the middle of the island, the Sican king Cocalos was said to have received Daedalus, the

famous craftsman, as he fled Minos (Diodorus 4.76-80; Strabo 6.26, 7.2.6-7). The story goes that

Minos then attacked Sicily in an attempt to regain Daedalus, but died in the attempt and was

buried in Acragas, where his bones remained until the tyrant Theron had them repatriated in the

480's BCE. Though no Minoan artifacts have been found in Sicily, this pseudo-historic traffic in

heroic relics was meant to legitimize the colonists and natives alike, making the former the true

heirs to the place and the latter worthy and noble enemies turned neighbors.[84] Some Cretans were

even rumored to have stayed in Sicily, making the Sicans, Elymians, and Sicels perhaps even

more Greek, and and helping to rationalize the relative equality they seem to have been given in

many colonies.[85] By establishing the precedent of Greek presence in the mythic past, Sicily

---

[83] Antonaccio 2001, 118-9.

[84] Sjogvist 1973, 6, for details on the dating of gold objects found at Heraclea-Minoa, and on the other
dearth of evidence for Minoan works in Sicily.

[85] Fitzjohn 2007, with the key exception of Syracuse, which rounded up native peoples as slaves.

placed itself on the map—dealing with its native inhabitants neither under the model of total imperialism, controlling them with no regard, nor resistance, with Sicels fighting colonists left and right.

Turning to the Black Sea, we can explore how Thucydides' and Plato's religious prescriptions came into play as well, as Greeks struggled to make sense of local Thracian ritual. First off, it is important to note that it's unlikely that our key narrator, Herodotus, ever visited the Black Sea—he exaggerates its size and seems misinformed on several of its geographical features (4.85-6).[86] Our other literary sources are even farther removed in time and space from proto-colonial Thrace, so we should be careful of what we believe to be actual practice on the part of the Thracians. Fortunately, however, this affords us the chance to see Thracians through an average Greek colonist's eyes: this colonist would not know much more than hearsay from his neighbors, until he himself landed, and so his notions about religion in Thrace may have been as muddled as our own.

In legend, Dionysus was crossing over from Asia to Europe when Lycurgus attempted to kill him and his settlers. Dionysus found out and killed Lycurgus, giving his land to Charops, grandfather of Orpheus, the earliest Thracian king. The myths surrounding that grandson Orpheus are varied and many, but certainly Thracians considered him a high priest and reformer of religion, who charmed beasts and deities alike with his musical skills—his best-known adventure, a voyage to the Underworld to save his one true love, seems to have been a Greek interpolation.[87] However, his survival of death despite the odds must have had ethnic resonance for the Thracians, as many of their tribes believed in a god Zalmoxis, who told them men lived eternally after death. This led to them rejoicing at death and lamenting birth, as Herodotus

---

[86] See Hind, in Tsetskhladze and Snodgrass 2002, for more details on Herodotus' sources and knowledge about the Black Sea.
[87] Venedikon 1977.

reports of the Trausoi, a particular tribe west of Apollonia Pontica. The popularity of Dionysus and Orpheus both among Greek colonists in Thrace shows that they were paying careful attention to local myth, seeming to follow Plato and Thucydides in respecting indigenous rites, if subtly changing them for their own purposes. Indeed, this incorporation and continuity of old tales permitted some Thracian practices to survive to this day: on St Athanasius' Day, January 18, the people of Etropole, Bulgaria, travel up the nearest mountain, shouting the theonym *Sabo Sabo*, calling up a god of the mountain to marry a dying virgin. Though this ritual sounds very similar to Dionysiac rites, it has Thraco-Phrygian origins. An uncolonized area of Thrace retains an inscription dating to the 6th century BCE naming the god Sabazios and his mother, the great goddess, much earlier than any referents to Dionysus in the region.[88] The dualistic nature of Thracian religion allowed this god to be associated with Apollo during the day and Dionysus at night, and hence for the Greeks to Hellenize on a small scale what was a strong Thracian cult-rite, incredibly maintaining it to this day in a successful example of syncretism (Macrobius *Saturnalia* 1.18.1-10).[89]

On a final note regarding the fifth century Greek view of indigenous peoples, Thucydides and the tragedians may have had some sense of how dangerous disease transference between new cultural contacts could be, which would in turn influence the Greeks negatively towards them. The plague passage in Thucydides' account of the Peloponnesian War is infamous: the sick suffered boils and a burning sensation so strong that they could not stand to wear clothes and wished to be in cold water, even if by jumping into a well (2.47-55)! The description is

---

[88] Fol, in Tsetskhladze 1998, 79-80.

[89] Macrobius' text takes the form of dialogues between learned individuals, like many symposiastic works, and the first book is devoted to how all worship is derived from worship of the sun, which allows individuals in the text to discourse on various cultures' religious beliefs, including the Thracians. Though Macrobius is writing at a late date (the 5th century CE), the supposed endurance of practice there allows us a decent understanding of the rituals.

lengthy and detailed, leading many to believe that the Athenian plague of 430 BCE was, variously, typhus, measles, or smallpox.[90] This last should resonate with any reader thinking of colonization, as the "smallpox blanket" has become a notorious symbol both of biological warfare and New World colonization efforts.

Leaving Thucydides for the time being, when we do a little digging into Greek-foreigner interactions, we find that in several famous examples, a gift of clothing from a foreigner results in the Greek victim developing disease-like symptoms. The centaur Nessus attempts to steal Heracles' wife Deianeira, but is shot down with an arrow poisoned by Hydra blood. Deianeira later uses Nessus' blood as a love charm, rubbing it into Heracles' clothes to keep her husband from straying to a younger concubine, and Heracles develops boils and burns up, vainly attempting to cool himself in a nearby spring. The word the tragedian Sophocles uses to describe Heracles' pain, *anthos,* or pustule*,* is typically only used in clinical diagnoses, as well as in Thucydides' account of the Athenian plague (*Trachinian Women* 999, 1089). It is worth noting that the lair of the Hydra was often also associated with malaria in antiquity, and that Nessus is also the name of a river in Thrace (*Theogony* 338-45). Sophocles' version of this well-known myth seems to include some understanding that disease can come from wet climates and from foreign peoples, though where we today would speak of immune systems, he aggrandizes into tragedy on a supernatural level. A fearful or antagonistic position towards indigenous peoples could result from this misapplication of medical knowledge.

A similar thing happens with Glauce, the new Corinthian bride of Jason, when he abandons the princess of Colchis, Medea, in favor of a younger, more Greek model. The scorned woman gives her rival a robe, which burns her and then engulfs her father and all the guests, in the Euripidean account (*Medea).* Again, I should point out that Medea's hometown, Colchis, is

---

[90] Littman 2009, for a summary of diseases to which the plague has been attributed.

on the Black Sea, just as the river Nessus. Intriguingly, both Medea and Deianeira destroy those around them with woven garments—the threat is not just in the foreigner, but in the garment so carefully made by each hero's spouse. The idea of foreign marriage is even more dangerous than interacting with a foreigner in other ways. While these tales are mythological, the narrative itself could be historical—the *Medea* was performed in 431, and the *Trachinian Women* sometime between 440 and 420 BCE, so both tales may reflect an understanding of the Athenian plague. The morality of the myths are clear, since the foreigner in each case (Nessus and Medea) intended harm, though the blame is shifted to a single renegade rather than a whole indigenous population. Contamination starts with the one given the "smallpox blanket," and then spreads to the rest of the population. It is unclear whether the tragedians intended their tales to be reflecting a real, deliberate transmission, but Thucydides himself mentions speculation that the Peloponnesians intentionally infected Athenian reservoirs (2.48). In either case, the Greeks had a clear experience of contagious disease coming from foreign contact, and developed legends of the biological weapon in both history and myth.[91] These legends could be used for fear-mongering against otherness, thus contributing to an overall Greek view of indigenous peoples.

Archaeological Evidence and Conclusion

Having looked at the literary evidence for Greek notions of preexisting populations extensively, we shall examine the archaeological material briefly. As Phoenicians seem to have been present in both Thrace and Sicily, let us first look for substantiation of the Heracles/Melqart conflation. Melqart, as one of the two main gods of Tyre, was already a good oikist or *archegetes* for settlement: the etymology of his name suggests it, as QRT may mean "city," and MLK may

---

[91] Adrienne Meyer takes this theme of the "Nessus shirt" and extends it all the way down to today's time, providing examples throughout (1995).

be "god" or "king."[92] Some oscillation between those two terms and roles would make sense to the Greeks, for whom Heracles had the same sort of ambiguity as a demigod (Herodotus 2.43.44). In fact, a bilingual Greek-Phoenician inscription dating to the 2nd century BCE has been reconstructed and translated by Corinne Bonnet:

> To our lord, to Melqart, Baal of Tyre: this is what vowed your servant bd sr and his brother srsmr the two sons of srsmr son of bd sr, because he heard their voice! Let him bless them!
> Dionysios and Serapeion, the sons of Serapeion, Tyrians; to Heracles Archegetes.[93]

Rather than simply transliterating one god-hero's name into the other language, the inscription changes the name entirely, substituting one for the other. The syncretism of Melqart and Heracles worked for these dedicants because as archegetes, each was a founder, progenitor, and king. Each was called upon to justify violent conflict, as Tyre used the cult of Melqart to legitimate their claims in commercial and colonial policy in a similar manner to the Greeks' utilization of Heracles. The two did not have the same rituals and cults necessarily, but their associations with city founding and land possessing, along with their dual mortal-immortal nature, allowed slippage between the two, which helped to validate their claims and make them recognizable to the other.

In Sicily specifically, the presence of chevron skyphoi and other goods in the early 8th century shows that even before colonization, Greeks had contact with the indigenous peoples of both Italy and Sicily. In order to reach more distant sites like Pithecusae, Euboean and Phoenician traders passed through the Straits of Messina. The city of Villasmundo attests to such, as imported Corinthian pottery and Egyptian steatite scarabs dating to that time were found

---

[92] See Malkin 2011, 126, on the meaning of the name.
[93] Bonnet 1988, 245.

there.[94] Thinking along the lines of this trade route, the Thapsos peninsula where Megara

Hyblaea would later be founded was one of the most important sites in the west during the

Middle Bronze Age. Excavations in this southeastern corner of Sicily reveal that from the 15th to

the 9th centuries, Thapsos was a bustling center of commerce and industry. The nearby site of

Pantalica was also busy. Both sites have thousands of chamber tombs, as well as large

rectangular buildings of Cyclopean masonry and paved streets on a grid system, reflecting

massive construction projects. Early Mycenaean trade with these centers reveals that Greeks had

knowledge of and some sort of commercial relationship with them, if nothing else. By the time

Greece reemerged at the end of the so-called Dark Ages (1100-800 BCE), these Sicilian cities

were thriving, with populations nearing a thousand.[95] Greeks seem to have recognized this

society as centrally organized and respected it, on the basis of religious structures and rituals that

continued in usage down through the fifth century. In particular, goddess worship at Lake

Pergusa, possibly dating as far back as 4000 BCE, became associated with Demeter and

Persephone as well as a local goddess, and cult dedications in the form of statuettes increased

during the colonization process, rather than the decrease one would expect if Greeks were

unilaterally imposing their own value system.[96] Later, the Sicel hegemon Ducetius even built a

new sanctuary nearby to the divine Palicoi, twin Sicel brothers, with an admixture of Greek and

Sicel cult practices and building styles.[97] Notably, the chthonic nature of these two sites was

preserved; although the chthonic nature was a uniquely Sicel element, the rites and architecture

reveal that the Greek colonists found ways to incorporate local practices with their own to create

new hybrid colonial rites. Their practices were shared, but not identically replicated,

---

[94] De Angelis 2003, 10-11.
[95] ibid, 5-6
[96] Rigoglioso 2005, 8-10.
[97] Hodos 2008, 20.

reinterpreting ideas to continue indigenous tradition while welcoming new thoughts.

On the shores of the Black Sea, similar processes were at work. Ever since the times of Homer, the area was rumored to have pygmies, small men who dwelt in caves and fought off cranes annually (*Iliad* 3.3-6). Down into the times of Pliny the Elder and Stephanus of Byzantium, this myth continued, though Strabo was skeptical of their existence (17.2.1). Pygmies were originally believed to live in Africa and on the borders of Oceanus. Since the crane is a migrating bird, the Greeks assumed its natural enemy, the pygmy, must also dwell in both the extreme south and north, which explains the African and Pontic locations. In the Black Sea environment, their origin story is slightly different: they were men who fought the cranes and when not entirely successful, moved to caves, where they became smaller in successive generations in order to better fit their environment. The explanation of this myth seems to be in the indigenous underground houses of Dobrodgea and other sites on the western shore of the Black Sea; the diminutive size of these houses led the Greeks to believe their occupants must be equally tiny (Aristotle *HA* 8.12; Pliny *NH* 4.44).[98] The local populations, called Kattouzoi, may come from the Greek *katoudei,* underground, being transliterated into a Thracian tribe name. These Kattouzoi were thought to live underground in pit-houses, which continue to exist in Bulgaria and Romania as *bordei,* dug into the soil and covered with straw roofs to protect against both the freezing winds of winter and the dry heat of summer. Despite the monstrous rumors about these peoples, it seems that the earliest Greek immigrants to the Thracian settlement at Apollonia Pontica and elsewhere built similar structures to survive in this harsh environment.[99] The Thracian "pygmies," leading by example, were actively involved in the survival of the first colonists and the Greeks adapted their myth in order to endure in a new land. They invented an

[98] Dan 2014.
[99] Grammenos and Petropulos 2003.

ethnicity based on an old legend to explain the presence of these tiny underground houses.

In the colonization movements to both Sicily and the Thracian shores of the Black Sea, Greek myths and legends changed to reflect the views of the people they were settling amongst. In the process, they solidified what it meant to be Greek, while also reordering and synthesizing this identity with those of their fellow settlers and their neighbors. Whether an audience member identified with Heracles or Geryon, Odysseus or Polyphemus, Jason or Medea, these ancient tales were used to clarify ethnic identity, while showing a subtlety of expression and not particularly devaluing one culture in favor of the other. Regional myths, from the early poets to the later historians and tragedians, express the tension and moral ambiguity of colonization, and show the negotiation of culture as it was taking place and as the peoples involved chose to view it in the aftermath.

CHAPTER 4

INTERMARRIAGE: A MORE PERFECT COLONY

Thus far in my exploration of Greek colonies, I've discussed reasons for colonization as they

affect interactions with the indigenous peoples, as well as general Greek conceptions of

foreigners, with a specific focus on interactions around the Black Sea and Sicily. Thus I have set

up a framework through which to understand the particular relationship between Greek colonists

and foreign women. The nature of this relationship, as previously noted, seems likely to have

been affected by both the reasons for the colonization and the pre-existing views held by the

Greeks on these places and people. If Greek overpopulation had been the main impetus for

colonization, we probably could expect that men, women, and children would all be settling new

colonies, rendering a need to intermarry with other groups less critical (depending of course on

the numbers involved on both sides). If, on the other hand, trade drove colonization, it seems

reasonable that merchant men would have maintained citizenship rights and families in their

metropoleis; although they may have engaged in relations with native women and so produced

mixed children, they would not have had such a compelling need to form permanent and binding

connections with these local women. However; if, as proposed in chapter one, the colonists

comprised mainly political malcontents, exiles, and others seeking to make a name for

themselves, the majority of the colony would be male, requiring intermarriage in order to survive

in the foreign location to a second generation of legitimate heirs.

Furthermore, the recognition of cultures other than their own as similar and worthy of

respect in some way, as evidenced in the syncretism of Hercules and Melqart in Sicily and of

Apollo and related deities in the Black Sea, may indicate that colonial marriages and identities were layered with meanings and a power dynamic that did not lay clearly with either the conquered or conquerors. Whether or not this holds true remains to be seen, as this chapter explores how the Greeks may have created a discrete ethnic identity and inequality, or otherwise, through interbreeding with the people whose land they colonized. Before moving further, I must define the terms intermarriage and interbreeding, which I sometimes use interchangeably. I accept that intermarriage is difficult to prove, rather than simply interbreeding, but there are a few ways to do so, and to see how the difference may have affected the lived experience of colonists and natives alike. In *emporia,* interbreeding seems much more likely than intermarriage, since as covered in chapter two, those merchants held themselves apart, and retained political rights back home. Their legitimate spouses and children would have also been at home, but the likely reality is that these merchants took up with indigenous women as well, albeit in a temporary fashion. These children would not have necessarily taken on any of their foreign father's cultural customs, however, and as they were illegitimate, could potentially have been treated poorly. Grave goods for children at sites identified as *emporia* would prove interesting here, as would a bioarchaeological examination of their remains for traumas and for diet as compared to wholly native children. On the other hand, at *apoikia* where male exiles and malcontents came over, a successful second generation would more likely require the socially-condoned construct of a marriage. These hybrid children could be contrasted with those at emporia, to see if their lives were affected positively by the constant presence of a colonist father in addition to a native mother. However, without further bioarchaeological research it is difficult to prove interbreeding versus intermarriage in either case, and so I leave the ambiguity for now.

In either case, these close interpersonal contacts had a dramatic effect on the survival of the colonies, and on the formation of ethnic identity in particular.

Intermarriage provides a particularly apt stage upon which to act out cultural exchange—the participation of indigenous women, living in such close quarters with colonists, would have an undeniable effect on the changing sociopolitical landscape, especially as compared to the effect of Greek women, married endogamously.[100] Women traditionally have control of the domestic space, and of daily life—at least in Greek society, so the male colonists would not necessarily have any particular know-how in this realm, and could leave it to their foreign wives on the whole, negotiating on the most important elements occasionally. As Peter van Dommelen comments, "cultures do not just blend;" rather people from a variety of backgrounds "actively construct their identities and invent new practices," in a variety of ways. He concludes that no social unit is better able to do so than a hybrid family.[101] The daily interactions that would best aid our understanding, of both Greek and native inclusion in and exclusion from each other's cultures, either isolating or commingling the two, are unfortunately difficult to get at. Unlike later colonial events, like those of the Americas, we do not have personal letters or diaries recording the words and actions of contemporary individuals affected by colonization. Instead, we must turn to mythological and historical evidence for the treatment of captive and foreign brides by Greek colonists, conquerors and traders. Legal records are often cited as evidence to support or negate the other sources, but it is unclear how pertinent they are since most date to the Classical Athenian empire (480-330 BCE). The participation of women, especially in commodity culture and exchange in the home, means that continuity or change in pottery styles and shapes, in food production, and in daily clothing, from indigenous to Greek and vice versa, can reflect

---

[100] Ghosh 2004 on the formation of new masculine and feminine ideals in the tension of cultural contact, and on the effect of the participation of women on the nature of colonial rule itself (740).
[101] Van Dommelen 2012, 403.

the agency of both groups. Burial practices will also prove useful in such a study of intermarriage and ethnic formation or hybridity, as these rites are highly symbolic and of grave importance to most societies. By deploying both literary and archaeological evidence alike, this chapter aims to discover how intermarriage functioned as a particularly adept relationship in which to navigate cultural exchanges and even to form identity.

The Women Behind the Myth: Warriors, Conquests, and Daughters

Myth is a fluid thing, highly important to a culture's self-identity and highly susceptible to change based on a number of various societal factors, providing etiologies of specific places and events, as well as more general explanations for life as needed. Because of its mutability, myth is not a completely trustworthy source for information about ancient times—specifically here for evidence on the treatment of foreign women—and yet despite this, it is profoundly important to examine. While we must be cautious of the data it provides, myth also represents what a culture values most, even if that changes. The changes, of course, that we must be most concerned about are those after the Persian invasion of the 490s BCE. This war helped lead to a switch from independent, separately defined poleis to a Greek league, overseen by Athenian imperialism and subsequently by Macedonian. As noted in previous chapters, these events brought about mass change for the Greek world, and we cannot take contemporary sources, even when speaking of centuries before their time, at face value. Nevertheless, the attitudes of Greek tales towards foreign women, from Hecuba to Helen, Medea to Medusa, can reveal both exempla *par excellence* of intermarriage, as well as cautionary tales of vicious barbarian women who undermine the Greek men who come into contact with them. What will prove most telling about ethnic identity, and about the role of women in its formation, is whether their actions, praise- and

blame-worthy alike, are attributed to their status as women, as captives, as barbarians, or as some combination of the three.[102]

Captive and foreign women in Greek myth may be divided into a few main groups—the Amazons of the Black Sea region, other Eastern women, and Persephone, whose tale is thought to have taken place in Sicily. The Amazons are a particularly symbolic group, as a warlike group comprised exclusively of women, whose virginity and mannish nature were thought to threaten men, almost goading Greek men into attempting to capture and dominate them. One of our earliest mentions of them comes from Priam, who, having encountered them in a battle at the Sangarios River, calls them "man-like" and says they comprised the largest army he had ever seen (*Iliad* 3.171-189).[103] The terms used of Amazons in general seem to imply respect for them as a noble adversary. In Pindar, they are a worthy enemy of Bellerophon (*Olympian* 13), an exile of Corinth who fought against not only the Amazons, but also the Solymoi and the chimera.[104] In other sources, however, the Amazons are a clear threat; Aeschylus, for example, names them "an army, haters of men" (*Prometheus Bound* 724) and "man-less" (*Supplicants* 287).[105] They are man-less, perhaps, because they are man-like—the need for the opposite sex has been erased from their narrative. Andrew Stewart argues that the Greeks needed the Amazons to speak to a particular element of capturing foreign women: they could be hyper-sexualized and their abduction myths dealt with the violence inherent in sexuality and marriage, especially between

---

[102] David Castriota would argue that the woman barbarian is used to depict the effeminate and intemperate nature of the foreigner, at least in the accounts of Herodotus, and has nothing specifically to do with the actual fact of her gender or marital status (1992, 32).

[103] ἀντιάνειραι. This term is only used of either the Amazons or Athena—and the inclusion of that goddess in particular points to it being a positive, as Athena is revered rather than reviled (see in particular Colluthus 170).

[104] Oddly enough, these people are also located to the East—in Caria and Lycia, more southern regions of modern-day Turkey, but still nearly adjacent to the Black Sea. This supports locating the Amazons somewhere in that general vicinity.

[105] στυγάνορ᾽ στρατόν, ἄνανδροι.

cultural groups.[106] In fact, many Greek heroes were supposed to have attacked and taken

Amazon women; Heracles attacked them for Hippolyta's girdle; Theseus raped either Antiope or

Hippolyta, depending on the version of myth; Achilles fell in love with Penthesilea as he

penetrated her with his spear, killing her, and Bellerophon's third task involved attacking

them.[107] These violent attacks indicate a degree of uncooperativeness on the part of the women,

who often flee or aggressively defend themselves. According to Herodotus, the Amazons who

originally lived in Thermodon, were captured by Greek sailors and then turned on them, killed

them all and drifted to shore at Lake Maiotis (the modern Sea of Azov), where they married

Scythian men and became the Sarmatai tribe (4.16-36, 4.110-6). Herodotus in his mytho-

historical narrative connects the Amazons to a real tribe, as does Arctinos of Miletus, who tells

us that "the Amazon Penthesilea, daughter of Ares and a Thracian by birth, arrives to aid the

Trojans in war" (*Aithiopis,* quoted in Byzantine Proclus' *Chrestomathia* 105.20-8).

   Ancient authors clearly thought of the Amazons as being located primarily on the western

and southern coasts on the Black Sea. The Greeks used the heroic Amazons to explain the

existence of tribes that were matriarchal, or at least allowed women to participate fully in

society, in a dissent from the conventions of the life meant for Greek women.[108] Mound graves

of the Sarmatian tribe in Pokrovka, Russia reflect a physical reality to this myth—graves of

---

[106]Stewart 1995, 574-575.

[107] Heracles: Pindar fr. 172, Eur. *HF* 408-418, *Ion* 1144-1145, and Attic vases dating from 570. Theseus: Plutarch *Theseus* 26-8, Pindar fr. 175, Panathenaicus of Isocrates, and Attic vases dating from 520, including a red figure from Sicily circa 450-50 by Polygnotes and a red figure kylix from 510 featuring the abduction of Antiope by both Theseus and Heracles (both at the Ashmolean). Achilles: Arctinos of Miletus' *Aithiopis* (In Byzantine Proclus' *Chrestomathia* 20-8), Attic black figure amphora by Exekias 540-30, a Trojan Amazonomachy (British Museum). Bellerophon: *Iliad* 6.186, Apollonius 2.3.2, Pindar *Olympian 13*.

[108] Hardwick 1990 on the connection between myth and history more fully.

women dating to the 6th-4th centuries BCE contain arrows in many burials.[109] The mythological Amazons relate something about the sexual status of women; in Ken Dowden's opinion, "being an Amazon is only an interim status: it has no future….the Amazon can only pass on to the next stage—marriage—or die."[110] Such warrior behavior could not be tolerated for long, nor could their man-lessness. The void must be filled, for Greek women and foreigners alike. This myth, at least, bears more important information about Amazons as defiant women than as barbarians or captives in particular—after all, Hippolyta is eventually tamed, and Penthesilea is not an enemy merely because she is a barbarian, but because she is fighting on the side of the Trojans. When linked to historical groups, however, the myth of the Amazons takes on new meaning—it reflects a resistance to captivity and intermarriage, as well as a fundamental cultural opposition in terms of lifeways for women. Whether or not this resistance is reflected in the archaeological record is discussed later this chapter.

Other captives in Asia Minor and more specifically the Black Sea may give us some differing information, in order to create a more nuanced picture of women in the Pontic area who are captured in the Greek myths. Captive-taking is hardly an uncommon practice in ancient myth, and the most famous story of such takes place during the Trojan War. Helen's story can be read as a narrative of captivity—although in the opposite direction for she is a Greek captured by a Trojan. Her recapture and the subsequent captivity of other women in Asia Minor due to the Greek invasion reveals the sexual interactions of at least two major cultures, possibly more, as many women were taken from neighboring territories. In Euripides' *Hecuba,* for example, the distinction between immoral rape and culturally-acceptable concubinage is blurred to the advantage of the Greek troops, as Hecuba and her daughter are taken by Agamemnon (825-35).

---

[109] Stewart 1995, 576. Note that this is one of several Pokrovkas in Russia—this particular locale is in the Urals.
[110] Dowden 1997, 112.

The status of a forcibly taken woman would be lower than that of a legitimate concubine or second wife, and Nestor and Hector both make these distinctions explicit (*Iliad* 2.355; 6.465). Of course, it is possible for captive women to have a reasonably high status and position, although the victim will need the possibility of protection and a return home for this circumstance to occur. According to Ruth Scodel, Agamemnon prefers Chryseis to his wife and treats her well, this high status having been given because she is not a guaranteed permanent possession—her father may reclaim her (*Iliad* 1.111-5).[111] By contrast, the Trojan women from *Hecuba* do not share the same luck; because their men have already been killed, they must forge a new path and barter for their rights separately.

In these tales and others from later tragedies by Sophocles and Euripides, the women exploit their sexual *charis,* or grace in order to get their way, whether that meant better accommodations for themselves or leniency for their families and friends.[112] This exploitation is useful in part because the Greeks seem to have believed full sexual pleasure for men was unattainable without cooperative women (Aristophanes *Lysistrata* 162-3), and that women also needed sexual pleasure to conceive (Soranus *Gynaikon* 1.12-50). If the captors did not yield some power to their taken concubines, they would thus have a hard time of it themselves. Though these myths deal specifically with war captives rather than a more peaceful interaction, they still work towards an understanding of what colonial ethnic relations were like, as not all colonial ventures are guaranteed to have been nonviolent. These Trojan women (as they are

---

[111] Scodel 1998. Chryseis is not alone in occupying such a place: Achilles swears to love Briseis as a wife (9.337-43) and Briseis herself believes she will become a legitimate wife in the eyes of the Greeks (19.295-300). Lyons 2003 in particular argues "women whose mobility causes trouble, like Briseis and Chryseis, are treated with respect and compassion" (100). They cause trouble in large part because of the possibility that they can be returned home.

[112] See also Sophocles' *Ajax* and the eponymous hero's relationship with Tecmessa, as well as Euripides' *Trojan Women,* for the devastating consequences of wartime captivity and the negotiations to lessen it on both sides.

described in the Trojan cycle) may have been manipulated in many ways by their captors, but they provide mythic evidence that intermarriage and sexual relations between culture groups was a two-way exchange, involving difficult life choices on the parts of both the survivors and the captors.

A particularly resonant tale across the Mediterranean for captive-taking was that of Persephone's rape by Hades. As the tale goes, Persephone was the daughter of both Zeus and Demeter, and went out picking flowers one day. At that point, Hades stole her, and Demeter began to search for her. The sun god Helios saw everything and informed Demeter, who went to Zeus to petition for their daughter's release. Zeus at first refused, since he had given Hades permission to take his daughter, but at last relented. But Hades tricked Persephone, also known as Kore, into consuming a pomegranate, and thus forced her to return to the underworld for a third of each year. This tale is popular for its explanation of the seasons (Demeter, goddess of harvest, grieves her daughter's loss each fall and winter, and rejoices at her return in the spring), but I would like to point up a few other details relevant for our purposes, beginning with Persephone's other name, Kore. In Greek, this is more than a name; it is also a common word for maiden. A kouros is a young man at the threshold of adulthood, and kore has the same sense for a girl; she is someone at the threshold of womanhood. The word indicates a sort of ripeness, a fruit ready to be picked, as Hades does to Persephone.[113] The Thesmophoria was a women-only ritual in honor of Persephone and Demeter that seemed to be widespread throughout Greek cities, which celebrated this taking at the cusp of adulthood and may have functioned as an

---

[113] Quite literally. The word used of her taking is most often ἁρπάζω, "to seize or snatch up." (Diodorus Siculus *Bibliotheca Historia* 5.5.1, *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* 3 and 19, Hesiod *Theogony* 914, etc.)

initiation into womanhood.[114] One of the many purposes of myth is to explain basic truths of life, and while the Persephone story does explain the seasons, it may also serve as an explanation to young girls that they will one day be taken by their husbands, and while their mothers will grieve, they can never entirely return to their childhood lives and homes. These women-only, goddess-celebrating festivals may have functioned as preparation for that fact. The story does have a happy ending of sorts as Persephone does become the queen of the underworld. At any rate, it rationalizes captive-stealing to a certain degree, and seems to emphasize that it is not necessarily a shameful and degrading treatment.

The Greek city-states then have rationalized captive-taking. The indigenous populations may have done so as well. It seems likely that the colonists would have carried over at least some of their metropoleis' religious views and customs, and the Persephone myth, or a version of it, was popular with the pre-existing indigenous population as well. A.J Graham goes even further and asserts that "we may take it as certain that the religion of the colonies was the same as that of the cities of old Greece and just as important to them."[115] This proclamation comes on a little strong, but such pan-Hellenic myths as the one of Persephone do appear unlikely to have been forgotten or ignored. In Sicily particularly, the story held particular resonance, as many ancient authors placed her abduction there.[116] They believed the region known as Enna in particular was Persephone's sacred land, for there was a lake named Pergusa there, which turned dark as blood at various times.[117] The nearby archaeological site Cozzo Matrice has ceramic material dating

---

[114] Lincoln 1979 argues that the Arrephoria, Brauronia, and Haloa were also initiation festivals for women, as these rites were in honor of, respectively, Athena, Artemis, and Persephone again. The commonality between these was that these three goddesses were the three virgins of the Greek pantheon.

[115] Graham 1980, 311.

[116] See Diodorus Siculus again, as well as Ovid *Metamorphoses* 5.365-678

[117] As it turns out, that lake contains a bacterium that oxidizes sulfur, which turns red due to the chemical reaction. Rigoglioso 2005 goes into detail on the biological processes involved with the fluorescence at

back as early as 4000 BCE, and by the 6th century, the joint influence of local Sicels and

colonizing Greeks can be seen, through statuettes and a sanctuary to Demeter.[118] It is clear that

Demeter and Persephone were important to the peoples, both native and foreign, who inhabited

this land. They may have synchronized their various rituals under the umbrella of the familiar

Greek story, in a manner similar to the stories discussed in the previous chapter. Certainly

several elements were particular to the Siceliote culture that emerged there—the earlier

necropolis in particular held bodies covered in red ocher, and the later burials also contained

bowls with red pigment painted on.[119] This red color could be representative of a number of

things, from menarche rites of festivals like the Thesmophoria to the pomegranate associated

with the cults of Persephone and Demeter to a return to the Lake Pergusa, the bloody womb of

Sicily. This sacred site, no matter which option you choose, was of obvious import to the

Siceliote colony there, as it allowed the Sicels and Greeks to meld their myths into one hybrid,

which emphasized Persephone's capture and marriage. This myth had particular implications for

such a colony, as the men and women there intermarried, possibly after the captive-taking that

the myth legitimizes.[120]

"Legitimate Rape" and Marriage by the Books: Laws and Histories

Having taken a look at the mythological evidence for the acceptability of bride-stealing, it

is time to turn to what legislative and historical evidence we have for the status of captive-

---

Lake Pergusa, and makes several more connections about rites of womanhood than strictly necessary for
us to discuss here.
[118] Rigoglioso 2005, 8.
[119] Ibid, 14-15.
[120] Demeter and Persephone were popular in more areas than just Pergusa, but I highlighted it for the
particularly interesting elements of the lake in connotation with women's rites. Another popular
archaeological reference is on the walls of Selinus: the archaic metopes there show three female figures in
profile, carrying torches and grain stalks (Demeter, Hecate, and Kore) and a quadriga with two divinities
(Demeter and Kore). The town Himera also had a small 6th century BCE sanctuary to chthonian deities,
perhaps including Hades and Persephone (Holloway 1971, 81).

stealing and intermarriage. Marriage by capture was an ancient practice. Indeed, Dionysius of Halicarnassus records that when the Romans were taking the Sabine girls captive, Romulus reminded them that taking girls from their parents was common and respected from the time of the Greeks (*Antiquitates Romanae* 2.30.5). In fact, Romulus is quoted as calling it the "most distinguished" of all ways for a marriage to be contracted.[121] Dionysius in an aside from the same passage remarks that intermarriage is the best way to seal friendship between cultural groups. His comment has some validity, as captive women were potent agents of cultural change, especially considering the prevalence and the antiquity of the practice.[122] Really, slavery and captive-taking were ubiquitous until about 200 years ago. According to Catherine Cameron, between 10 and 70 percent of any given historical population could be captives.[123] While this quantity seems shockingly high, they begin to make sense when you consider that a mostly-male group of Greek colonists would need an equal number of women for the colony to continue past a generation, and probably double that number given the high degree of infant mortality in antiquity. Indeed, there is archaeological evidence of the practice that goes back much further than the Greeks; for example, a shackled pregnant female in a 20,000 year old site, and evidence of slave-raiding and -trading in late Hallstatt Iron Age.[124]

Captive-taking was therefore at the very least an accepted fact of life, and perhaps even a popular and respected one. Many Greek marriage ceremonies, as it turns out, included elements of bride-theft, even when there was no actual theft and both sides of the union had agreed to it. Although data for this post-dates the Archaic colonizing period of the 8th to 6th centuries BCE, it may suggest that the practice went back to the Archaic period or even earlier. For example, in

---

[121] τὸ ἔθος ἐπιφανέστατον
[122] Golitko and Keeley 2007, 339, and Keeley 1996, 86, considered it to be a constant characteristic of prestate warfare.
[123] Cameron 2011, 179.
[124] Taylor 2005, Arnold 1988.

Athens, the groom and bride would stop in front of the main entrance to the groom's house and engage in a mock fight.[125] This symbolic resistance was the last step before the two merged households and began their marriage. In Classical Sparta, the echoes of bride-theft were even clearer. According to Plutarch, a Greek writing in the Roman period, the Spartans during the time of their famous law-maker Lycurgus:

> ἐγάμουν δὲ δι᾽ ἁρπαγῆς, οὐ μικρὰς Οὐδὲ ἀώρους πρὸς γάμον, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀκμαζούσας καὶ πεπείρους. τὴν δὲ ἁρπασθεῖσαν ἡ νυμφεύτρια καλουμένη παραλαβοῦσα, τὴν μὲν κεφαλὴν ἐν χρῷ περιέκειρεν, ἱματίῳ δὲ ἀνδρείῳ καὶ ὑποδήμασιν ἐνσκευάσασα κατέκλινεν ἐπὶ στιβάδα μόνην ἄνευ φωτός. ὁ δὲ νυμφίος οὐ μεθύων Οὐδὲ θρυπτόμενος, ἀλλὰ νήφων, ὥσπερ ἀεί, δεδειπνηκὼς ἐν τοῖς φιδιτίοις, παρεισελθὼν ἔλυε τὴν ζώνην καὶ μετήνεγκεν ἀράμενος ἐπὶ τὴν κλίνην.

> They married through seizure, not when the women were small and unprepared for marriage, but when both fully in bloom and ripe. After this carrying-off the so-called bridesmaid having received the woman cut her hair close to the skin, preparing her in a man's cloak and sandals, and laid her on a pallet, on the ground, without light. The groom then, not being sotted with wine or unmanned by debauchery, but sober, having eaten at the common mess as always, snuck into the room, loosened her girdle, and carried her to the marriage bed. (15.3)

This whole passage is quoted because it highlights several elements of captive-taking and marriage that we have already discussed in some detail, and further shores them up. The first thing to point out is the use of the verb ἁρπάζω and the metaphors of ripeness and being on the cusp of adulthood. These korai are at the same stage of life as Persephone when she was raped by Hades, as discussed above. Then the groom sneaks into the "captive's" room and performs a second theft. This treatment, although brutal to modern eyes, seems to have been common practice, and may reflect an earlier custom of actual capture. Athenian and Spartan marriage rites tacitly nod in approval at the concept of bride-theft.

Our strongest evidence for captive-taking from and subsequent intermarriage with indigenous populations comes, however, in the form of laws repudiating it, rather than

---

[125] Bardis 1964, 159, summarizing several snippets of Aristophanes.

encouraging it. The theory here is that there is no need to issue an edict against something that is not happening in the first place, or that is only happening rarely—bride-theft must have been a widespread cultural practice by the time of these laws, albeit not a unanimously condoned one. It is notable that these prohibitions don't appear until the 4th century BCE in Athens, but then continue to be made all the way through the time of Constantine in the 4th century CE. Prior to that, the law is silent, perhaps because outright woman-stealing occurred with impunity in the Archaic period and was only later deemed inappropriate and illegal.

The first real edict against marriage to foreign captives comes in the time of Classical Athens. Specifically, sanctions were put in place against sexual assault, and against foreign marriage. These sanctions were separate declarations, but combined can show us what the Athenians thought of sexual interactions with foreign women, whether that was with marriage or not. The sexual laws included seduction of a woman away from her husband as well as sex by assault. The term, βιασμός, is "violation," but is used usually of sexual violation in particular, and is often accompanied by an objective genitive, such as παρθένου, "of a maiden."[126] The verbs ὑβρίζειν "to outrage" and αἰσχύνειν "to shame" also make appearances in lawsuits and the histories, along with the verbal form βιᾶσθαι "to violate."[127] There are a few particular elements of these laws and how they were enacted that we should consider. First, Susan Cole asserts that the seducers were punished more harshly than rapists, because in ancient authors' eyes, seduction was a destruction and betrayal of the family by luring the woman's heart away as well as her body.[128] The famous Athenian orator Lysias makes this argument for his client Euphiletus,

---

[126] Dion. Hal. 1.77, Men. Epit. 453
[127] Plat. Leg. 874C, Xen. Hell. 6.4.7, Plut. Sol. 23, Paus. 4.4.2, Plat. Leg. 874C, Xen. Hell. 6.4.7, Plut. Sol. 23, Paus. 4.4.2, Hdt 3.80, 4.43, 6.137
[128] Cole 1984, 100-102.

claiming that the husband cannot be sure of the paternity of his wife's children any more, and that the woman is never to be believed again.

Further evidence that the Greeks thought of adultery as worse than rape comes in the form of punishment. For example, adultery could result in one's eyes being cut out, or even death, whereas rape required only that a monetary fine be paid.[129] For rape in particular, it is also worth noting that in the Gortyn law code, the penalties varied depending on the classes of both the offender and victim, and the lower class the victim the less the payout necessary. A free foreigner ranked lower than a citizen, and a slave even lower than that. Legal treatment of foreign-born wives and concubines was harsh; although there were laws against assault, their protection was minimal, and the likelihood was that male citizens could continue to violate them. Their legal status was so little thought-of, that they could not even defend themselves in court. Greek women on the verge of being captured frequently chose to kill themselves rather than be taken, knowing what harsh realities were likely in store.[130] On the other hand, many ancient Greek thinkers clearly believed that in an ideal government, the assault of women would be non-existent; even Herodotus considers the rape of women the result of the vice of an uncontrolled monarch, and excessive violence the mark of a tyrant. Notably, rape is included along with indiscriminate murder as a violation of the most ancient customs, so not just a bad thing in his view, but the worst thing.[131] Plutarch and Polybius share some of these same opinions.[132]

---

[129] For adultery, see Heraclid. Pont. 30.2, FHG 2:221, and for rape, see Lysias 1.32, Plutarch *Solon* 23, Leg. Gort. 2.3

[130] Polyb. 16.30-34, Paus 10.1.6-10, Plut. Mor. 244A-D, Livy 31.16-8

[131] νόμαιά πάτρια

[132] Herodotus 3.80, Plut. De mul. Vir. 253C-E, Mar. 19, Alex. 12, Polyb. 6.8.5. Kathy Gaca (2008, 2010) makes note of other fleeing women who know their fate throughout ancient history: Diodorus Siculus on Darius' defeat (17.35.6-7, 333 BCE) Procopius on Picenum (*De bellis* 4.8.22, 7.4.32, 538 CE) Ammianus on Nisibis (18.6.10, 359 CE) Eustathius on Thessalonica (*De capta Thessalonica* 474B, 1185 CE)

Moving on from the edicts regarding assault to those addressing foreign women's rights

and naturalization more generally, the picture is a little more complicated. Exogamy became a

public concern in Athens in the 400s BCE, as marriage would lead to an expanding citizen body.

Double endogamy was eventually prescribed by a Periclean law in 451 BCE. This law meant a

citizen was born only if both parents were also Athenians. The law was reenacted in 403,

implying that at some time—quite probably as a result of the plague that decimated the

population of Athens—the law was rescinded in practice, if not in law. By the time of the orator

Demosthenes in the late fourth century, the marriage itself was also illegal, rather than simply

discouraged by the illegitimacy of any children from the union. David Whitehead's research has

also found that fines were instituted for anyone found in violation of this law, up to a thousand

drachmae.[133] So metics, free foreigners without citizenship rites, were generally not accepted by

the community at this point as grooms and brides. Non-citizen grooms could not contribute

financially, as their children could not legally inherit and they themselves could not hold

property, and non-citizen brides were even less appealing.[134] The tragedian Euripides wrote a

line in his *Medea* that seemed meant as support for these laws:

> οὐκ ἔστιν ἥτις τοῦτ᾽ ἂν Ἑλληνὶς γυνὴ
> ἔτλη ποθ᾽, ὧν γε πρόσθεν ἠξίουν ἐγὼ
> γῆμαι σέ, κῆδος ἐχθρὸν ὀλέθριόν τ᾽ ἐμοί
>
> There is no Greek woman who would dare this,
> Instead of whom I desired to marry you,
> A union both hateful and destructive to me. (1339-1341)[135]

---

[133] Whitehead 1986, 109. To understand how exorbitant a fine this was, a skilled worker or hoplite could expect to make about a drachma a day (Thucydides 3.17.4), and a jurist would be paid between 1/6 and ½ a drachma per diem as compensation for their loss of work (Aristophanes *Knights* 255, *Wasps* 609, 684).

[134] Bakewell 2008/9, 100-104.

[135] Strangely enough, the word κῆδος can be used to mean either a union or connection by marriage as one definition, or an anxiety or grief as the second. This duality of the term may reflect the same about the institution, continuing all the way down to modern jokes such as "marriage is the only war where you sleep with the enemy."

Of course, just because Euripides wrote these lines does not mean there was universal agreement with them. In fact, his play took last place in the festival that year.

In addition, Thucydides, one of the most famous Athenian historians, was himself the product of an exogamous marriage. Though this is a lesser-known element of Thucydides' life, his Athenian grandfather had married the daughter of an Athenian man and Thracian woman. His father, Oloros, was named for this Thracian woman's father, who was a Thracian ruler.[136] True, this marriage occurred prior to the enactment of these laws, but Thucydides continues to mention his father's foreign name with pride, not bothering to conceal it. In other famous examples, the general Alcibiades had a Spartan name and Themistocles' mother was a Thracian named Abrotonon, from the Abkhaz abra, "sky" (Plut. *Them.* 1.102). Gabriel Herman argues that these names represent the bindings of *xenia,* a pact made between different families, sometimes of different city-states, and that there was far greater potential for alliance building in these relationships than anywhere else.

None of these Athenian laws seem to have served as a strong enough deterrent, however, perhaps because it was too difficult to enforce them. More prominent politicians probably avoided it, but the common classes, and colonists in particular, probably cared less and got away with more, being less in the public eye. It is clear that the laws against sexual relations, especially with foreigners, did not work permanently, as even the late Roman emperor Constantine had to make laws against it (CTh. IX.24.I). His edict of 326 CE is notable here for a particular element of who it punished—not only the groom/kidnapper himself, but "even the girl herself and her parents, if they had later agreed to the marriage of their daughter with her

---

[136] See Davies 1971, 234-5, for the detailed family tree. This name, in Proto-Indo-European*oel-r or *Ol-ro, most likely meant glorious, an honorific that may have contributed to Thucydides' desire to keep it.

abductor."[137] The emperor clearly considered it a heinous offense—going so far as to reward a slave for reporting on his master, an unusual practice at the time. Nonetheless, bride-theft may have functioned for centuries as an alternative to arranged marriage, a socially approved norm. For one, it saved the cost of wedding and kept the bride's family from needing to provide dowry, as well as serving to preserve the bride's chastity. She could protest and then later agree to marriage, all the while having intended it.

In short, bride-theft and exogamy were widely known and not uncommon practices, since laws were continually having to be made to reprimand them, and their popularity was also reflected in epic and history. Our look at written records of intermarriage paints a grim picture as to the political and legal rights of these women, although cultural pride does seem to have been sustained at least in naming customs. Yet written records tend to reflect only the views of the upper-class citizen male in the ancient world, and in particular our sources were the later Athenians, rarely colonists themselves, so they must be taken with a grain of salt.

The Proof in the Pottery: Archaeological Evidence for Intermarriage and Syncretism

Material evidence provides yet another way for us to understand how intermarriage actually functioned in the colonies, rather than relying on the theoretical assumptions of Classical authors about Archaic events. Pottery and other household goods in particular prove to be of use, as women were of course very involved in the daily running of the home. In the ancient world specifically, women's own acquisitions say much about their claim to status in a home, as objects can be used to represent identity.[138] We must, however, also be cautious not to link "pots with people" as an absolute 1:1 correlation, since commodity consumption involves factors other

---

[137] Evans-Grubb 1989, 59. Her article dives much more into the implications of the law than I intend to, since it is so far from the scope of this paper.
[138] Roberts 1998, 817, 826; Lyons 2003

than ethnic identity.[139] The social stratification we may observe in land distribution and usage is also helpful, although once more we should treat this data with care. This section considers pottery, land usage, and burial practices as a way of getting at equality and identity formation through the lens of intermarriage, in particular looking at the "intersections in lived relations of class, gender, and ethnicity."[140] In particular, the material evidence points to the increasing presence of Greek elements in the material record not as evidence of domination alone, but of a hybridization of cultures, with variable levels of success at different sites.

As usual, let us start with Italy and then move eastwards to the Black Sea. In Sicily and Magna Graecia more broadly, scholars have found that examining the material record with the polarities of Greek versus barbarian is usually unfruitful at best. Carla Antonaccio argues for an examination of how ancient authors' discourse, as discussed above, differed from praxis, and how the processes of acculturation and assimilation affected what has previously been assumed to be a unilateral development of Hellenization.[141] It is from her research on ceramics in Sicily that we will pull, but first, a note on why pottery in particular is useful for examining indigenous women's incorporation into a Greek colony. There may be some exceptions to the rule, but in ancient societies, and in Greece more specifically, women were more frequently involved in household chores than men, who engaged in politics and warfare instead.[142] This meant women went to the well or other water-sources for water, bought food, cooked the meals, and prepared various social events. Various types of pottery were used for these activities, from the *hydria* for carrying water and *kraters* for serving wine, to *amphorae* for storing many kinds of foodstuffs, to

---

[139] T.M. Weik 2014 in particular cautions against this, arguing that the permeability and efficacy of ethnic boundaries prevent us from taking too reductionist an approach to material culture and identity formation.
[140] Anthias 2001, 375.
[141] Antonaccio 2005, 100-101.
[142] Exceptions would have included, for example, upper-class women who had slaves to do their bidding. Yet even here there's room for interpretation—those slave women may themselves be indigenous women.

lekythoi for storing performed oil for anointing the dead. Since women had daily use of these objects, it would make sense for them to reflect their own culture and identity, rather than someone else's.

Across Sicily, the ceramic record reflects a "middle ground," a space neither wholly Greek nor Sicel, but the combination of the two, which may be deemed Siceliote.[143] Antonaccio, as mentioned, chose several different complete pieces and examined them in detail as anthemic of the general pot-sherd assemblage. Shapes tend to be local and adaptive, as of the Attic red-figure *nestorides* pieces now in the Getty Museum, which are painted in a traditionally Greek style of the mid-400s BCE, but are reminiscent in shape of South Italian *olla* or *trozzella,* local cooking dishes. Sometimes the opposite occurs—a Protocorinthian krater from Morgantina, made in the 600s BCE, has the traditionally Greek stirrup handles and light coloration, but it is decorated with a wavy line motif.[144] Of course, pieces that were more traditionally Greek or Sicel, rather than a mix, have also been found throughout the settlements of Sicily. These combinations reflect a complex negotiation of identity, but the presence of hybrid pieces, which Antonaccio calls Siculogeometric, indicates a desire for both practicality and a sense of joined cultures and homes. This local artistic *koine* or "commonality" would have some regional variance, of course. It is worth noting that interior settlements contained less of a mix of Greek elements, as they would have been in less contact with the colonists generally. For example, the settlement of Himera, founded around 648 BCE, had a particularly high proportion of indigenous material throughout the city in domestic contexts.[145] This proportion was determined by archaeologists' visual determination of shape and decoration, but is confirmed to some degree by

---

[143] Van Dommelen 2012 discusses this concept of "middle ground," and references sites not only in Sicily, but across the Mediterranean, and includes Greek works also mingling with Phoenician.
[144] Necropolis 2, Tomb 32.
[145] Antonaccio 2005, 98, 111.

chemical composition. Maria Mannino and Santine Orecchio took 38 pottery samples from the

necropoleis of Himera and positively identified that over half were of local make, with only one

certainly originating in Corinth.[146] So, the eclectic mingling of cultures and households would

vary by the settlement's location and other factors, but even in more remote colonies like

Himera, it is clear that there was some give and take, as there would be in any good marriage.[147]

Apart from pottery, the very shape of domestic spaces was affected by the intermarriage

of colonists and locals. Excavations at Metapontum, Leontini, and Monte San Mauro reveal that

local inhabitants were incorporated into the rural network (*chora* and *proschoros*) at the very

least, and frequently made their way into the actual town center as well.[148] The Greeks clearly

had a concept of equality, or at least fairness, within town planning, as in the regularity of blocks

in Megara Hyblaea discussed in the first chapter. These urban plans physically established, by

their delineation, a commitment to *isonomia,* equality in law and custom. And this *isonomia*

could not have applied only to the Greek colonists themselves, not if they lived side by side with

indigenous peoples, as the evidence above already points to.

The buildings themselves also indicate that indigenous people were living with the

colonists. In Colle San Mauro, a satellite hill-town of Leontini, indigenous long houses and

ceramics prevailed up to the Chalcidian settlement in the late 8th or early 7th century BCE.[149]

Both Thucydides and the military historian Polyaenus indicate that there was conflict, both

between local Sicels and Megarians, and then between the Megarians and Chalcidians already at

---

[146] Mannino and Orecchio 2011, 172 for conclusions on their results.

[147] For this commingling assemblage of Greek, Sicel, and Siceliote goods, see also Holloway 1971, who mentions this occurring at Potenza (Serra di Vaglio) and Monte Adranone, amongst others.

[148] Van Dommelen 2012, Carter 2006, Fitzjohn 2007.

[149] Rizza 1978, 33.

Leontini, and but not complete destruction (6.3 and 5.5, respectively).[150] After these skirmishes,

a new fortification wall was built around the town, and houses begin to be rock-cut out of the

hillside. In an odd twist, this was a new method not only to the Greeks, who traditionally built

homes with stone foundations and brick walls, but also to the local population, whose earlier

homes seem to have been wattle and daub longhouses. The newly commingled community did

have the techniques and skills to do this, as local tombs were cut from rock frequently, but

otherwise, the change is mystifying. Matthew Fitzjohn points out that "people do not modify

their domestic space and their method of construction without reason…the creation…represents

an intentional process that created a new form of dwelling at the site, resulting in the creation of

a new form of cultural space."[151] If the Greek colonists had come over with Greek women, there

would be no reason to establish a new type of house for an old type of household. Perhaps the

colonists at Leontini and Colle San Mauro, along with their indigenous spouses and neighbors,

chose to express their novel union by utilizing local skills and the Greek concept of stone homes,

but they did so in an entirely new fashion. Similarly selective adaptation took places in towns all

around Sicily in the 8th to 6th centuries BCE.[152] While some scholars call using "aboriginal"

methods "backwardness," it seems more likely that the retention of indigenous elements mixed

with Greek traditions was born out of self-preservation and a longing to express a new identity

than some sense of devolving to the primitive.[153]

---

[150] Strangely enough, these Megarians are the same group led by Lamis, the oikist who will die and leave his people at the mercy of the Sicel king Hyblon, who will go on to help them find Megara Hyblaea.

[151] Fitzjohn 2007, 223.

[152] Hodos 2006 chronicles the changes, as the circular structures popular in sites such as Monte Adranone, Polizzelo, Butera, Castiglione, and Morgantina gradually gave way to the *pastas*-style rectangular homes more characteristic of the Greeks, and yet also retained traditional elements, like a stone bench towards the back and cooking installations used since the earliest indigenous settlements. Notably, many communal and religious buildings kept traces of their original circular shape.

[153] Mertens 375, in Descoeudres 1990.

Pottery and domestic spaces in Sicily seem to indicate close connections with and respect for indigenous practice in Greek colonies, and especially indicate the integration of the native women for whom these household objects and spaces would have been so important. In the Black Sea, there is just as much evidence that indigenous women had some hand in the creation and use of pottery in colonial domestic spaces, although there is less data on the homes themselves (partially because many modern cities now rest on top of the old colonies).[154] Just as in Sicily, the development of pottery in the Black Sea reflects that indigenous peoples brought their own innovations to the table, both in form and in style.

Sarah Morris has studied one such original product worth reviewing, the λάσανα. This clay artifact is a standing cylinder, between 10 and 25 cm in height, with a broad base and flaring crown, curving about midway through, with a single ring attached to the outside. Based on its location in dig sites (usually the kitchen), Morris assumed it was a cooking implement of some kind. A hydria in the Villa Giulia, which depicts a sacrifice with a cauldron propped on two lateral supports, suggests that this item is the λάσανα, a prop to hold pots over the fire that is mentioned by Aristophanes (*Peace* 890-3).[155] What is so fascinating about Morris' discovery is that this product is found throughout Greece, but she has also tracked when it appeared in each area. The pattern of diffusion begins around the Black Sea in the 6th century, spread to Miletus between the 6th and 3rd centuries, to Corinth in the 5th century, Athens in the 4th, and Magna Graecia between the 5th and 3rd centuries BCE. The connection to be made and emphasized here is that this pottery seems to be an innovation of Black Sea colonies within the first century of their existence, as indigenous women merged their cooking styles and implements with Greek

---

[154] What data we do have on homes was already covered in chapter two, as we dealt with the legend of the subterranean pygmies (Grammenos and Petropulos 2003).

[155] The joke in Aristophanes is that Theoria's space between her legs was blackened with smoke, as she roasted meat there—although lewd, the imagery helps to imagine the λάσανα as small legs, bent at the knee, for the pot.

ones, and then it spread first to the two cities known best for early colonization efforts to the east, before dispersing to the rest of the Greek world. For an archaeologist, the popularity of this item seems odd at first—the Greeks already had tripods that served the same purpose, so the adaptation of the two individual ceramic props would be capricious, to say the least, if Greek women had come over with the colonists and not used the cookware they already had. However, if the colonists were male political exiles and younger individuals looking to make a name for themselves, as proposed in chapter one, they would be more likely to take native wives and concubines, and allow them to continue using their own kitchen implements, or to develop a new form as an adaptation to the regional pottery and cooking styles. The subsequent popularity of the item throughout the Greek world shows the success of hybridity as a cultural adaptation.

Apart from form, pottery reflects the attempts of colonists and merchants to overcome the language barrier between themselves and the peoples inhabiting the area originally. On ancient Athenian vases, there are over 1500 "nonsense" inscriptions, words whose Greek letters do not form any words known by modern classicists. Yet when a linguist knowledgeable in the languages spoken around the Black Sea, including Iranian, Abkhazian, and Circassian, examines these inscriptions as words transliterated with Greek letters, the "nonsense" begins to make sense.[156] The Greek colonists were from a polyglot, language-conscious society—their names for the tribes of the Black Sea reflect that, from the Arimaspi, which is Iranian for "owners of wild horses," to the Sarmatae, Ossetian for "free men."[157] The classical archaeologists Adrienne Mayor and David Saunders recently tested whether scholars were trying to stretch these glottographic nonsense inscriptions and make them "work"—they chose twenty vases, provided

---

[156] Mayor, Colarusso, and Saunders 2014.

[157] Other examples include the places Maeotis (Circassian for "not able to be dammed up") and Colchis (proto-Circassian "mountains"), and the people the Massagetae (Iranian "they of the great clan"). It is remarkable that these examples seem to follow Plato's guidelines for place names and extend it to people as well (*Laws* 848d, discussed in detail in chapter two).

only the inscriptions to the historical linguist John Colarusso, and asked him if the sound patterns

matched any known language forms. Of the twenty inscriptions, twelve ended up being

meaningful in connection to the images on the vases, which is striking as Colarusso was not

shown photos of the pottery until the end of the project. These pieces were all from the Late

Archaic and Early Classical, so within the first century or two of colony foundations. They

reflect not only an attempt to overcome language barriers, but also a sharing of collective myths

between the colonists and natives. Many of the vases depict Heracles and/or Amazons, two

stories that have resonance for both groups of people, as discussed in chapter two.[158] These

vases, items of daily use in a household, show that the Greek colonists were interacting on a very

personal level with the indigenous population, most likely living with them in close contact, and

synthesizing their knowledge and culture.

These pieces of pottery discussed above for both Sicily and the Black Sea were

frequently found in burials as well, indicating their extreme importance to the peoples

involved—no one puts items they do not care about in their final resting places, after all. Tamar

Hodos goes a step further, saying these items do not just signify importance to the deceased and

their family, but serve as signs of inter-colony competitive emulation. [159] In Morgantina, for

example, tomb pottery was of local manufacture, with local shapes and Geometric designs.

While Corinthian goods were found commonly in domestic spaces for symposia and banquets,

the private funerary context reflects more of a melding of local production with Greek styles.[160]

The tombs themselves were rock-cut quadrangular chambers with benches, and contained

---

[158] Cases 2, 3, and 5 of this study are particularly relevant, as 2 shows Heracles on one side and Amazons labeled *pkpupes* "worth of armor" on the othe, 3 shows three Amazons (Andromache, Antiope, and Hyphopyle) who in addition to their Greek names have the label *kheukhe* "one of the heroes," and 5 shows Heracles fighting an Amazon named *barkida* "princess/noble kinswoman." These phrases are all in Circassian.
[159] Hodos 2006.
[160] Ibid, 130.

between one and three bodies—practices unusual for mainland Greeks, but common in Sicily. The presence of hybrid pottery and the monumental size of these graves communicate a desire for status, but not purely Greek status. This would be more of a correspondence between equals than pure Hellenization, and the members of the colony at Morgantina were claiming their own place in the world.[161] Something similar was happening at Megara Hyblaea's necropoleis, although I intend to narrow down to one individual's commemoration. Sombrotidas, a doctor in the 6th century BCE, is most famous in archaeology for the *kouros,* or Archaic nude statue, that stood atop his grave and named him both a doctor and the son of Mandrocles; amongst the other items found in his grave was a sandstone goddess figure nursing two infants.[162] This figure was squat, with long toes and individualized breasts, wearing a non-Greek garment. In chapter two, we discussed twins popular in Sicily, the divine Palicoi, to whom Ducetius had built a new sanctuary that mixed Greek and Sicel building styles. Perhaps these Palicoi were being referenced again; they were, after all, supposed to be the children of the local mountain goddess Aetna and the Greek god Zeus. The hero-children of a divine intermarriage speak to the new Siceliote identity being forged in Megara Hyblaea, and represented by Sombrotidas' funeral decorations, a combination of the purely Greek *kouros* and the local goddess-figure.

The styles of the burials themselves also suggest the fusion of Sicel and Greek beliefs into one new Siceliote practice. Prior to the arrival of Greeks, Sicel practice included multiple and contracted burials, often accompanied by many bronze fibulae, in rock-cut chambers. Mainland Greek inhumations of the Archaic period were more often single burials of skeletal remains post-cremation, with the individual lying supine. Practices at Megara Hyblaea in its first century of existence trace the series of compromises the two must have made, as bodies

---

[161] Fitzjohn 2007 for hybridity, though Shepherd 2005, 117, claimed the mixture of Sicel and Greek was "Hellenization."

[162] "Paolo Orsi" Regional Archaeological Museum, Syracuse

continued to be placed together, though in fewer groups. Shepherd suggests this was a

manifestation of the new colonists' social aspirations responding to the demands of a new

economy, and that it fizzled out due to their growing wealth, but it could just as easily be because

the colonists were buried with their native spouses in a practice common to Sicily at the time.[163]

Of the sixty or so inhumations dating to the earliest settlement (640-500 BCE) that have been

recovered so far, six bodies were placed in a contracted position.[164] Clearly the Greek habit of

supine body positioning prevailed, but some capitulations were made to the local style. The same

can be said of the continuation of local fibulae in the graves, and of the use of slab-topped

sarcophagi for the burials, a style similar to the native rock-cut tombs. All this data, of course,

doesn't necessarily mean that Greek colonists were marrying native women, but it does suggest

the possibility, as it seems illogical for the Greeks to change all their own practices to reflect

native ones without these close familial ties. De Angelis points out that there were only around

225 people by 700 BCE, and by the period of 675 to 650 BCE, the population had grown to

nearly 1125, that explosion most likely represent the incorporation of and reproduction with

natives.[165] The same patterning of burials and of population growth occurred at Metapontum,

according to both the archaeology and the literary sources.[166] The combination of burial rites

makes more sense in the context of hybrid families, although while adult graves synthesized into

a new Siceliote practice, the *enchytrismos,* or inhumation in an amphora, of children was a

purely Greek innovation. De Angelis makes the passing suggestion that it may have been cultural

convention that a hybrid child was buried by the heritage and customs of the father. At any rate,

---

[163] Shepherd 2005, 120.

[164] Shepherd 2005 and De Angelis 2003.

[165] De Angelis 2003, 52. This data is based on the number of graves found, and their dating, as best as possible. Morel 84, 134-5, Coldstream 1993, and Braund 1994:,81-3, back up this hypothesis of population growth and miscegenation.

[166] Coleman Carter 1993 and Diodorus Siculus 12.9.2, who claims the colony grew because citizenship was shared with the many.

the burial customs of Siceliote colonies reflect a complex negotiation of cultural symbols, rather than the exclusive use of one group's customs, most likely reflective of intermarriage.

In the lands surrounding the Black Sea, the picture is a little more complicated. At Histria, founded sometime around 657 BCE, there was no pre-colonial settlement, and yet in the necropolis, there are over one thousand tumuli, a practice uncommon on the Greek mainland.[167]By the time of Roman occupation, tumuli had faded away in favor of flat graves. Regardless of inhumation style, cremation prior to burial was very popular in the early days of Histria. Gifts were also given to the deceased during the burning, including the common Greek grave goods of clothes, jewels, and ceramics. A slightly more unusual "peripheral" gift showed up in four of the oldest graves—human and animal sacrifices.[168] These bones were deposited in pits near the tumuli proper, and seem to be a Thracian tradition, as peripheral ditches with similar gifts have been found in Thracian *necropoleis* at Duvanli and Rosova.[169] The horses frequently found in these graves reflect the mythology of the Thracians and Scythians discussed in chapter two, and in combination with the more traditional Greek gifts and burial styles, led Donnellan to proclaim that "'mixed marriages' may be taken for granted."[170]

In Apollonia Pontica, founded about fifty years after Histria, tumuli and flat graves were both popular as well, but the earliest excavated cremation was not until the second half of the 4th century.[171] Children were found *enchytrismos* here as well, and gifts were mostly imported Attic ceramics until the 4th century, when Thracian fibulae began to appear.[172] Contemporaneously,

---

[167] Condurachi excavations of 1955-1961, reviewed in Donnellan 2005.
[168] Donnellan 2005, 209-210.
[169] Cholakov and Chukalev 2008 and Coja, in Descouedres 1990.
[170] 2005, 216. I have some reservations about such a definitive statement, but generally agree.
[171] Petersen 2004.
[172] Donnellan 2005, 231.

fire places with fish-baking grills made of rough clay appeared, perhaps for funerary rituals.[173] Everywhere else that we have looked, local customs have been present from the beginning, mingling with Greek, but here it seems to have taken two centuries. It is possible that at this colony in particular, Greek men and women colonized the space, and a Thracian group was integrated later. Another option would be that the Greek male colonists imposed their own value system and funerary practices wholesale for some time, but that the hybrid character of the colony became stronger as the integration became more complete.

The lesson to be learned from Apollonia Pontica and the other sites discussed in this chapter is that while colonies generally commingled traditions, each site had its own ethnic identity, distinct as a political framework incorporating the vicissitudes of its territory and common myths. Aggregative "mainland" Greek identity was non-existent in Black Sea as well as Sicily, as each area veered off to form a more specific local identity out of pan-Hellenic customs, and each site within the area did the same. Myths with common elements from the various intermingling cultures were used as cultural *koine,* creating an atmosphere of mutual respect and allowing the "Other" to seem more familiar. This "Other" went from a noble enemy to a worthy neighbor, and possibly even to a spouse.

---

[173] Cholakov and Chukalev 2008, 167-168. These hearths also contained sheep/goat remains, pig, and deer, along with burnt hazelnuts and almonds, perhaps indicating a feast for the deceased.

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND FURTHER DIRECTIONS

This thesis started with the simple idea to explore ethnic inequality in the Greek colonies of the

Archaic period. But the more research and time put into it, the more it became clear that my

assumptions were wrong. I assumed that, like other colonization movements, the Greek conquest

was a conquest, and that natives would be enslaved or otherwise demoted. Yet there are major

differences between the Greek city-states of the 8th-6th centuries BCE and the European countries

of the 17th-19th CE, which led to vastly dissimilar colonization movements in motive, size, and

dealings with local populations. Instead of a question of domination and resistance, we are left to

ask how exactly the Greeks intended to fuse their populations. For when Chalcidians, Euboeans,

and Corinthians sometimes lived side by side, as bands of political exiles and misfits joined

together to survive in a new world, it cannot have seemed that odd to include the local culture as

well.

The discussion in chapter one of motivations led us to believe that colonies were founded

due not to overpopulation, or trade, or religion, but for political exiles, malcontents, and others

seeking to make a new name for themselves. As this group would rarely have included women,

colonists must have "set out to new lands with a predetermined plan to marry local non-Greek

women," which in turn says something about their understanding of cultural identity.[174] Their

picture of what these local women would be like was nuanced, as per chapter two, neither wholly

good nor bad. Their hybrid offspring had a cultural identity all their own. The Greeks may have

underestimated the extent to which this would occur, but it occurred nonetheless, as our

---

[174] Ziskowski 2007, 141.

archaeological evidence shows in chapter four. Occasional attempts were made to corral the

effects of non-Greek women, as Athenian citizenship laws controlled the legality of inheritance

with a metic spouse, and yet the cultural transfusion continued.

There are more ways to explore the extent to which this cultural and biological

syncretism took place, ways that this thesis unfortunately cannot explore. My original intent was

to look at the bioarchaeological research that has been done on human skeletal remains in

Archaic Greek colony sites, but that evidence is not abundant nor well published to date.

Osteological study has been slow to catch on in a field with such a wealth of other resources, but

it should prove fruitful in helping support or fail to support my research here. We could, for

example, look into whether trauma incidents were lower at sites like Naucratis, as *emporia*

would theoretically have less initial combat either with natives or between colonists. As

mentioned in chapter one, trade is not a zero-sum game fighting for land like full colonization of

an *apoikia.*[175] On the other hand, a trade site may have fewer laws governing their behavior,

since there would not necessarily be the need to set up a foundational charter. Thus higher

incidents of non-lethal antemortem trauma may occur, whereas perimortem injuries would be

lower. Another element of foundation that would be a good avenue for future research deals with

the *oikist,* or colony founder. Respect for the oikist meant they were usually buried in the city

center. Any skeletal remains found in such a city center could have their teeth isotopically

analyzed and non-metric traits measured to see if the data corresponded with a foreign, Greek

individual, as our sources would have us believe, or if occasionally local leaders were given this

sort of honor.[176] In Megara Hyblaea this examination may prove particularly fruitful, since the

---

[175] p. 6.

[176] Different regional soils have varying isotopes of the same elements, which humans ingest via plants and other animals, and this data remains present in permanent teeth, which are grown with the nutrients from this soil and absorb the isotopes. Using soil and skeletal samples, bioarchaeologists can compare

city itself was named not for the original oikist, Lamis, but the Sicel king Hyblon, who helped the colonists find the location after their first effort failed. That sort of honorific treatment may extend to burial practice as well, and would reflect in general on a positive incorporation of the indigenous population with the Greek colonists.

For intermarriage specifically, a study of gene flow and female-linked migrant traits would prove useful. From the research cited in chapter four on the legal standing of non-Greek wives, we know that these captives and metics had very little protection against assault, and even if someone were prosecuted, they were unlikely to receive much punishment—so long as colonies followed similar rules, there should be a fairly high rate of gene flow, regardless of marriage itself. A group of researchers has looked at the genetic history of Sicily's population today, taking over two thousand individuals and looking for 24 independent markers on the gene sequence. In theory, the eastern and western subpopulations should be representative of early colonization, as Punic settlements dominated west and Greeks the east, but the researchers only found one real panmictic unit, with geographic clustering probably erased by successive Roman, Byzantine, and Arab occupations.[177] However, a study of skeletal remains found in various archaeological sites across Sicily and the Black Sea could still use the same principles. Short range migration is often associated with marriage, and leads to gene flow between local populations. We should expect to see homogenization between geographically closer units and isolation at farther distance, so long as the Greeks and local populations were intermarrying and creating hybrid families.

It is not always desirable to destructively analyze human remains for DNA, however, and so non-metric traits should be examined as well. Non-metric traits are exactly what they sound

isotopic levels of nitrogen, oxygen, and carbon, among others, to determine whether the deceased is local to their burial space, or from another region entirely.
[177] Rickards et al 1998.

like, in that they are non-measurable morphological traits, usually marked as present or absent, that are frequently linked to genetics.[178] Some research has already been done in Sicily on this as well, although it could stand to be expanded. In Pithekoussai on the Bay of Naples, for example, the presence of tooth bifurcation on the maxillary (upper) first premolars was common for the local population from around 900 to 600 BCE, whereas the earliest Greek burials did not have any skeletal remains displaying this trait. Later populations at the same colony site show a low incidence of the morphological trait, indicating its assimilation into the gene pool.[179] Tooth morphology is therefore suggestive of intermarriage at Pithekoussai, as it is at Metapontum, another colony located in Magna Graecia. At this site, a mesio-lingual concavity on the crown of the upper lateral incisor is commonly known as the "Etruscan incisor," since 30% of the Etruscan population from the 7th to 1st centuries BCE have this trait. It is not present on any modern Greeks, so it is probably not a Greek genetic trait—but it is present at Metapontum, at about 18%, showing that intermarriage may have diminished the occurrence.[180] Interestingly, this "Etruscan incisor" may be a bit of a misnomer, as Britney McIlvaine and her fellow researchers at Apollonia Pontica have also found cases of it on the local populations, so it may be a common non-metric trait that simply is not in the genetic code for Greeks, and may thus be an excellent marker for interbreeding at the very least.[181]

Finally, the incidence of particular diseases on the skeleton may indicate sexual transmission, and while that does not equate to intermarriage, it does at least bring up the possibility of contacts and relationships between Greeks and indigenous peoples. Also at

---

[178] A quick example would be the presence of Wormian bones on the skull—while all skulls have suture lines from the gradual fusion of the seven bones which originally make up the skull cap, Wormian bones are extra, smaller bones created when those suture lines go around each other.

[179] Becker 1999, summarized in Ziskowski 2007.

[180] Pinto-Cesternas et al. 1995

[181] McIlvaine et al 2014.

Metapontum, three separate skeletons have been found with treponematosis, a bacterial disease which tends to manifest in caries and lesions, frequently compared in appearance to either cauliflower or moth-eaten items.[182] This bacteria, *Treponema p.*, is responsible for modern syphilis, among other diseases, and while it does not always necessitate venereal transmission, it does require close contact. An isotopic analysis of the three skeletons here, two of which were found in the contracted burial position common to local and Siceliote groups, could prove Greek and native miscegenation once and for all. In fact, an analysis of the various contracted and multiple burials, such as mentioned in chapter three at Megara Hyblaea, would do similar things for proving a hybrid ethnic identity and intermarriage particularly.[183] The Greeks came to Sicily and the Black Sea, and various other lands, and it seems were never wholly "Greek" again, but instead something new, a mixture of indigenous and foreign, claiming their own identity in the ancient world. Myth and ideology were used—not as commonly thought of in the Age of Exploration—to subjugate, but to forge connections. Indigenous women were considered suitable wives in *apoikia,* an idea wholly foreign to the European colonists of the New World. In joining together lives, the Greek colonization movement defies all expectations of what colonization should be—it is not a conquest, but a negotiation, and a compromise, a creation of a new world entirely for both colonist and colonized.

---

[182] Ziskowski 2007, 147-148. Per Reitsema, personal comment, there is also a likely case at Himera.
[183] Per Reitsema, personal comment, contracted and supine burials at Himera were equally likely to be local and non-local, but this evidence of cultural commingling is extremely preliminary.

REFERENCES

Anson, E. 2009. "Greek Ethnicity and the Greek Language." *Glotta* 85: 5-30.

Anthias, F. 2001. "The material and the symbolic in theorizing social stratification: issues of
gender, ethnicity and class." *British Journal of Sociology* 52.3: 367-390.

Antonaccio, C. 2001. "Ethnicity and Colonization." In *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity,*
Ed. By I. Malkin, 113-157. Boston: Harvard.

---- 2005. "Excavating Colonization." In *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity, and
Difference,* 97-113. London: Duckworth.

---- 2009. "(Re)defining Ethnicity: Culture, Material Culture, and Identity." In *Visual
Culture and Social Identity in the Ancient Mediterranean,* Ed. By T. Hodos and S. Hales,
32-53. Cambridge: Cambridge.

---- 2010. "Origins, Culture, and Identity in Classical Antiquity." In *Worlds Elide,* Ed. By
P. Euben and K. Bassi, 4-17. Lexington: Lexington.

Athanassaki, L. 2003. "Transformations of Colonial Disruption into Narrative Continuity in
Pindar's Epinician Odes." *HSCP* 101: 93-128.

Ayres, B. 1974. "Bride Theft and Raiding for Wives in Cross-Cultural Perspective."
Anthropological Quarterly 47.3: 238-52.

Bacon, J.R. 1932. "Terra Incognita." *G&R* 1.2: 79-86.

Bakewell, G. 2008/9. "Forbidding Marriage: 'Neiara' 16 and Metic Spouses at Athens."
Classical Journal 104.2: 97-109.

Bardis, P.D. 1964. "The Ancient Greek Family." *Social Science* 39.3, 156-75.

History of Religions 10:3, 228-33.

Benjamin, S. 2006. *Sicily: Three Thousand Years of Human History.* Hanover: Steerforth.

Bérard, Victor. 1933. *Dans le sillage d'Ulysse*. Paris.

Bianchi, U., R. Horewitz, and K.S. Girardot. 1971. "Dualistic Aspects of Thracian Religion."

Boardman, J. 1999. *The Greeks Overseas: Their Early Colonies and Trade.* London: Thames &
Hudson.

---- 2001. "Aspects of 'Colonization.'" *BASOR* 322: 33-42.

Bonnet, Corinne. 1988. *Melqart: Cultes et Mythes de l'Héraclès Tyrien en Méditerranée.* Namur:
Presses Universitaires; Leuven: Peeters.

Bradford, E. 1963. *Ulysses Found.* Hodder and Stoughton: London.

Calame, C. 2003. *Myth and History in Ancient Greece: The Symbolic Creation of a Colony.* New
York: Princeton.

Cameron, C.M. 2011. "Captives and Culture Change." *Current Anthropology* 52:2, 169-209.

Caplan, H. and M. Ostwald. "Pindar, Nomos, and Heracles." *Harvard Studies in Classical
Philology* 69, 109-38.

Carter, J.C. 1990. *The Chora of Croton 1983-1989.* Austin: Texas.

----1993. "Taking Possession of the Land: Early Greek Colonization in Southern Italy."
Studies in the History of Art 43: 342-67.

----2006. *Discovering the Greek Countryside at Metaponto.* Ann Arbor: Michigan.

Castriota, D. 1992. "Barbarian and Female: the Other on the West Front of the Parthenon."
Source: Notes in the History of Art 15.1, 32-8.

Cerchiai, L., Jannelli, L., and F. Longo. 2004. *The Greek Cities of Magna Graecia and Sicily.*
Los Angeles: Getty Trust.

Coldstream, J.N. 1993. "Mixed Marriages at the Frontiers of the Greek World." *OJA* 12: 89-107.

Cholakov, I.D. and K. Chukalev. 2008. "Archaeology in Bulgaria, 2006 Season." *AJA* 112:1,

    143-70.

Cole, S.G. 1984. "Greek Sanctions against Sexual Assault." *Classical Philology* 79.2: 97-113.

Dan, A. 2014. "Mythic Geography, Barbarian Identities: Pygmies in Thrace." *ACSS* 20.1: 39-66.

Danner, P. 1997. "Megara, Megara Hyblaea, and Selinous: the Relationship Between the Town

    Planning of a Mother City, Colony, and a Sub-colony in the Archaic Period." In

    Urbanization in the Mediterranean in the Ninth to Sixth Centuries B.C. Ed. Damgaard

    Andersen, H., Horsenaes, H., Houby-Nielsen, S., and A. Rathje: 143-165. Denmark:

    Museum Tusculanum.

Davies, J.K. 1971. *Athenian Propertied Families.* Oxford: Oxford.

de Angelis, F. 2003. *Megara Hyblaia and Selinous. The Development of Two Greek City-States

    in Archaic Sicily.* Oxford University School of Archaeology: Monograph 55.

    ----2003. "Equations of Culture: the Meeting of Natives and Greeks in Sicily (CA. 750-

    450 BC)." In Tsetskhladze, GR, ed. *Ancient West and East: Volume 2:* 19-50.

    ----2004. "Foundation of Selinous." in Tsetskhladze GR. and De Angelis, F. *The

    Archaeology of Greek Colonization.* Oxford: Oxford.

Descoeudres, J.P. 1990. *Greek Colonists and Native Populations: Proceedings of the First

    Australian Congress of Classical Archaeology held in honour of Emeritus Professor A.

    D. Trendall.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Detienne, M. and J. Lloyd. 1997. "This Is Where I Intend to Build a Glorious Temple." *Arion*

    4.3: 1-27.

Dietler, M. 2005. "The Archaeology of Colonization and the Colonization of Archaeology: Theoretical Challenges from an Ancient Mediterranean Colonial Encounter." In *The Archaeology of Colonial Encounters: Comparative Perspectives.* Ed. Stein, G.J, 33-68. Santa Fe: School of American Research.

Donnellan, L. 2005. "Ethnic Identity in the Western Black Sea Area: the Cases of Histria, Kallatis and Apollonia Pontika (7th-4/3rd centuries BC)." *Talanta* 36-38: 187-268.

Dougherty, C. 1994. "Archaic Greek Foundation Poetry: Questions of Genre and Occasion." *JHS* 114: 35-46.

---- 1999. The Double Vision of Euripides' "Cyclops": An Ethnographic "Odyssey" on the Satyr Stage. Comparative Drama 33:3, 313-38.

---- and L. Kurke. 2003. "The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture." *Contact, Conflict, Collaboration.* Cambridge.

Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger: An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo.* New York: Routledge.

Dowden, K. 1997. "The Amazons: Development and Functions." *Rheinesches Museum fur Philologie* 140.2:97-128.

Drews, R. 1976. "The Earliest Greek Settlements on the Black Sea." *JHS* 96: 18-31.

Dunbabin, T.J. 1948. *The Western Greeks: the History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 BC.* Oxford: Oxford.

Eckerman, C. 2008. "Pindar's ΚΟΙΝΟΣΛΟΓΟΣ and Panhellenism in Olympian 10." Rheinsches Museum fur Philologie 151.1:37-48.

Evans-Grubbs, J. 1989. "Abduction Marriage in Antiquity: A Law of Constantine (CTh IX.24.I) and Its Social Context." Journal of Roman Studies 79, 59-83.

Farkas, A.E. 1981. "Style and Subject Matter in Native Thracian Art." *Metropolitan Museum Journal* 16, 33-48.

Fitzjohn, M. 2007. "Equality in the Colonies: Concepts of Equality in Sicily during the Eighth to Six Centuries BC." World Archaeology 39.2: 215-28.

Franzen, C. 2009. "Sympathizing with the Monster: Making Sense of Colonization in Stesichorus' Geryoneis." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* 92:2, 55-72.

Gaca, K.L. 2008. "Reinterpreting the Homeric Simile of Iliad 16.7-11: the Girl and Her Mother in Ancient Greek Warfare." *American Journal of Philology* 129:2, 145-171.

----2010. "The Andrapodizing of War Captives in Greek Historical Memory." *Transactions of the APA* 140:1, 117-61.

Ghosh, D. 2004. "Gender and Colonialism: Expansion or Marginalization?" The Historical Journal 47.3: 737-55.

Golitko, M. and L.H. Keeley. 2007. "Beating Ploughshares Back into Swords: Warfare in the Linearbandkeramik." *Antiquity* 81, 332-342.

Graff, R. 2005. "Prose versus Poetry in Early Greek Theories of Style." *Rhetorica* 28.4: 303-35.

Graham, A.J. 1980. "Religion, Women, and Greek Colonisation." *CRDAC* 11: 293-314.

----1983. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece.* Chicago: Ares. 2nd Ed.

Grammenos, D.V. and E.K. Petropoulos. 2007. *Ancient Greek Colonies in the Black Sea.* New York: Archaeopress.

Gray, V. 1995. "Herodotus and the Rhetoric of Otherness." *AJP* 116.2: 185-211.

Greaves, A.M. 1998. "Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Antiquitates Romanae 2.30, and Herodotus 1.146." *ClasQ* 48.2, 572-4.

Gwynn, A. 1918. "The Character of Greek Colonisation." *JHS* 38: 88-123.

Hall, J. 1997. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity.* Cambridge: Cambridge.

---- 2002. *Hellenicity. Between Ethnicity and Culture.* Chicago: Chicago.

Hardwick, L. 1990. "Ancient Amazons—Heroes, Outsiders, or Women?" *Greece and Rome* 37.1, 14-36.

Herman, G. 1990. "Patterns of Name Diffusion within the Greek World and Beyond." *Classical Quarterly* 40.2, 349-63.

Hodos , T. 2006. *Local Responses to Colonization in the Iron Age Mediterranean.* New York: Routledge.

----2008. "Ritual Communities and Local Identities in Iron Age Sicily." *Bollettino di Archeologia Volume Speciale A:* 15-24.

---- 2009. "Colonial Engagements in the Global Mediterranean Iron Age." *CamArch* 19: 221-241.

Holloway, R.R. 1971. "Archaeological News from South Italy and Sicily." *AJA* 75.1, 75-81.

Hurst, H. and S. Owen. 2005. *Ancient Colonizations: Analogy, Similarity, and Difference.* London: Duckworth.

Ilsley Hicks, R. 1962. "Egyptian Elements in Greek Mythology." *Transactions and Proceedings of the APA* 93: 90-108.

Izzet, V.E. 2005. "The Mirror of Theopompus: Etruscan Identity and Greek Myth." *Papers of the British School at Rome* 73: 1-22.

Jannelli, L. and F. Longo. 2004. *The Greeks in Sicily*. Arsenale Editrice: Verona. 44-57.

Jesi, F. and B. Egli. 1964. "Thracian Herakles." *History of Religions* 3:2, 261-77.

Jones, C.P. 1996. "ἔθνος and γένος in Herodotus." *ClasQ* 46.2: 315-20.

Jones, D.W. 1999. "The Conundrum of Greek Population Growth in the 8th Century B,C,;

    Burials, Settlements, and Wells." *Oath* 24: 25-50.

Keeley, L.H. 1996. *War Before Civilization: the Myth of the Peaceful Savage.* Oxford: Oxford.

Knappett, C. 2011. *An Archaeology of Interaction: Network Perspectives on Material Culture*

    and Society. New York: Oxford.

Kuleshnyk, I. 1984. "The Stockholm Syndrome: Toward an Understanding." *Social Action and*

    the Law 10: 37-42.

Lincoln, B. 1979. "The Rape of Persephone: a Greek Scenario of Women's Initiation." *Harvard*

    Theological Review 72.3/4: 223-35.

Littman, R.J. 2009. "The Plague of Athens: Epidemiology and Paleopathology." *Mt Sinai*

    Journal of Medicine 76.5: 456-67.

Lyons, C.L. and J.K. Papadopoulos. 2002. *The Archaeology of Colonialism.* Getty Research

    Institute: Los Angeles.

Lyons, D. 2003. "Dangerous Gifts: Ideologies of Marriage and Exchange in Ancient Greece."

    Classical Antiquity 22.1: 93-134.

Malkin, I. 1985. "What's In a Name? The Eponymous Founders of Greek Colonies." *Athenaeum*

    63: 115-30.

    ----1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece.* Brill: London.

    ----1998. *The Return of Odysseus.* Berkeley: University of California.

    ---- 2011. *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean. Greeks*

    Overseas.   Oxford: Oxford.

Mannino, M.R. and S. Orecchio. 2011. "Chemical Characterizations of Ancient Potteries from

        Himera and Pestavecchia Necropolis (Sicily, Italy) by Inductively Coupled Plasma-

        Optical Emission Spectrometry (ICP—OES)." *Microchemical Journal* 97: 165-72.

Markoe, G. 1996. "The Emergence of Orientalizing in Greek Art: Some Observations on the

        Interchange between Greeks and Phoenicians in the Eighth and Seventh Centuries B.C."

        BASOR 301: 47-67.

Mayor, A., J. Colarusso, and D. Saunders. 2014. "Making Sense of Nonsense Inscriptions

        Associated with Amazons and Scythians on Athenian Vases." *Hesperia* 83.3: 447-93.

McGready, A.G. 1968. "Egyptian Words in the Greek Vocabulary." *Glotta* 46.3/4: 247-54.

McIlvaine, B.K., L.A. Schepartz, C.S. Larsen, and P.W. Sciulli. 2014. "Evidence for Long-Term

        Migration on the Balkan Peninsula Using Dental and Cranial Nonmetric Data: Early

        Interaction Between Corinth (Greece) and its Colony at Apollonia (Albania.)." *AJPA*

        153: 236-248.

Meyer, A. 1995. "The Nessus Shirt in the New World: Smallpox Blankets in History and

        Legend." *Journal of American Folklore* 108: 427, 54-77.

Moller, A. 2001. "Naukratis, or How to Identify a Port of Trade." In *Prehistory and History:*

        Ethnicity, Class and Political Economy. Ed. Tandy, D.W. New York: Black Rose: 145-

        58.

Morakis, A. 2011. "Thucydides and the Character of Greek Colonisation in Sicily." *ClasQ* 61.2:

        460-92.

Morris, C.D. 1884. "The Relation of a Greek Colony to Its Mother City." *AJP* 5.4: 479-87.

        ---- "The Jurisdiction of the Athenians over Their Allies." *AJP* 5.3: 298-317.

Morris, I. 2004. "Economic Growth in Ancient Greece." *JITE* 160.4: 709-742.

Morris, S.P. 1985. "ΛΑΣΑΝΑ: A Contribution to the Ancient Greek Kitchen." *Hesperia* 54.4: 393-409.

Myres, J.L. 1906. "On the 'List of Thalassocracies' in Eusebius." *JHS* 26: 84-130.

Noonan, T. 1973. "The Origins of the Greek Colony at Panticapaeum." *AJA* 77.1: 77-81.

Olmsted, W. 1996. "On the Margins of Otherness: Metamorphosis and Identity in Homer, Ovid, Sidney, and Milton." *New Literary History* 27:2, 167-84.

Osborne, R. 1998. "Early Greek Colonization? The Nature of Greek Settlement in the West." In *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence.* Ed. Fisher, N., and Van Wees: 251-269.

Pease, A. 1917. "Notes on the Delphic Oracle and Greek Colonization." *CP* 12.1: 1-20.

Petersen, J.H. 2004. "Greek or Native? A Case Study of Burial Customs in the Northern and Western Black Sea Region- Olbia and Apollonia Pontike." Paper delivered at the international conference "The golden treasures of the Dacians. Rumania through 7000 years," Stockholm, Sweden.

Petropoulos, E.K. 2005. *Hellenic Colonization in Euxenios Pontos: Penetration, Early Establishment, and the Problem of the "Emporion" Revisited.* New York: Archaeopress.

Philips, C.F. 1978. "Heracles." *Classical World* 71:7, 431-40.

Pinto-Cisternas, J., J. Pinto-Cisternas, J. Moggi-Cecchi, E. Pacciani, "A Morphological Variant of the Permanent Upper Lateral Incisor in Two Tuscan Samples from Different Periods," in *Aspects of Dental Biology: Palaeontology, Anthropology and Evolution* (Florence, 1995) 333-339.

Porter, W.H. 1922. "The Myths of the Thracian Diomedes and Rhesus." *Hermathena* 19:43, 223-34.

Pugliese Carratelli, G., ed. 1996. *The Greek World: Art and Civilization in Magna Graecia and Sicily.* New York: Rizzoli.

Rickards, O., Martinez-Labarga, C., Scano, G., De Stefano, G.F., Biondi, G., M. Pacaci, and H. Walter. 1998. "Genetic History of the Population of Sicily." *Human Biology* 70.4, 699-714.

Ridgeway, D. 1993. *The First Western Greeks.* Cambridge: Cambridge.

----2004. "Phoenicians and Greeks in the West: the View from Pithekoussai." in Tsetskhladze GR. and De Angelis, F. *The Archaeology of Greek Colonization.* Oxford: Oxford.

Rigoglioso, M. 2005. "Persephone's Sacred Lake and the Ancient Female Mystery Religion in the Womb of Sicily." *Journal of Feminist Studies in Religion* 21:2, 5-29.

Rinon, Y. 2007. "The Pivotal Scene: Narration, Colonial Focalization, and Transition in Odyssey 9." *AJP* 128:3, 301-34.

Riva, C. 2010. "Ingenious Inventions: Welding Ethnicities East and West" In: *Material Culture and Social Identities in the Ancient World*., eds. Hales, S. and T. Hodos. 79-107.

Rizza, G. 1978. "Ceramiche Figurate di Priniàs." In *Antichità Cretesi. Studi in Onore di Doro Levi*, *Vol. II.* Catane, 153-160.

Roberts, M.L. 1998. "Gender, Consumption, and Commodity Culture." *American Historical Review* 103.3: 817-44.

Rose, P. 2003. "'The Conquest Continues': Towards Denaturalizing Greek and Roman Imperialisms." *CW* 96.4: 409-15.

Rowlands, M. 2006. "The Politics of Identity in Archaeology." In *The Archaeology of Identities, a Reader.* Ed. By T. Insoll, 59-71. London: Routledge.

Runnels, C. 1989. "Greece Before the Greeks: the Neanderthals and Their Fate." *Archaeology*
42:2. 42-7.

Schaps, D. 1982. "The Women of Greece in Wartime." *Classical Philology* 77.3, 193-213.

Scheidel, W. 2003. "The Greek Demographic Expansion: Models and Comparisons." *JHS* 123:
120-40.

---- 2004. "Demographic and Economic Development in the Ancient Mediterranean
World." *JITE* 160.4: 743-57.

Scodel, R. 1998. "The Captive's Dilemma: Sexual Acquiescence in Euripides' Hecuba and
Troades." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 98, 137-54.

Scramuzza, V. 1939. "Greek and English Colonization." *American Historical Review* 44.2: 303-
15.

Shepherd, G. 2005. "Dead Men Tell No Tales: Ethnic Diversity in Sicilian Colonies and the
Evidence of the Cemeteries." *OJA* 24: 115-136.

Siapkas, J. 2003. "Conceptualizing Identities in Ancient Greece." *Heretological Ethnicity
Uppsala.*

Sjogvist, E.. 1973. *Sicily and the Greeks: Studies in the Interrelationship between the Indigenous
Populations and the Greek Colonists.* Michigan. Ann Arbor.

Smith, G. 1919. "Athenian Casualty Lists." *CP* 14.4: 351-364.

Snodgrass, A.M. 1971. *The Dark Age of Greece: An Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to
the Eighth Centuries BC.* Edinburgh: Edinburgh.

Spanson, W.V. 1996. "Culture and Colonization: The Imperial Imperatives of the Centered
Circle." *Boundary 2* 23.1: 135-75.

Srejovic, D. 1998. *The Illyrians and the Thracians.* Malta: Midsea Books.

Stewart, A. 1995. "Imag(in)ing the Other: Amazons and Ethnicity in Fifth-Century Athens."
Poetics Today 16.4: 571-97.

Stocker, S.R. and J. Davis. 2006. "The Earliest History of Apollonia: Heroic Reflections from
Beyond the Acropolis." In *New Directions in Albanian Archaeology: Studies Presented
to Muzafer Korkuti.* Ed. Bejko, L. and R. Hodges. Tirana: International Centre for
Albanian Archaeology: 85-93.

Strauss Clay, J. 1980. "Goat Island: Od. 9.116-141." *Classical Quarterly* 30:2, 261-4.

Topper, K. 2007. "Perseus, the Maiden Medusa, and the Imagery of Abduction." *Hesperia* 76.1:
73-105.

Tsetskhladze, G.R. 1998. *Greek Colonization in the Black Sea Area.*

----and A.M. Snodgrass. 2002. *Greeks Settlements in the Eastern Mediterranean and the
Black Sea.* Oxford: Oxford.

----2004. "Greek Penetration of the Black Sea." in Tsetskhladze GR. and De Angelis, F.
The Archaeology of Greek Colonization. Oxford: Oxford

----2008. Ed. *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements
Overseas.* Boston: Brill.

----2012. *Ancient Greeks West and East.* Boston: Leiden.

van Dommelen, P. 1997. "Colonial Constructs: Colonialism and Archaeology in the
Mediterranean." *WA* 28: 305-323.

----2012. "Colonialism and Migration in the Ancient Mediterranean." *Annual Review of
Anthropology* 41: 393-409.

Venedikov. 1977. "Thrace." *Metropolitan Museum of Art.*

Vlassopoulos, K. 2011. "Greek Slavery: From Domination to Property and Back Again." *Journal of Hellenistic Studies* 131: 115-30.

----2013. *Greeks and Barbarians.* Cambridge.

Waldbaum, J.C. 1994. "Early Greek Contacts with the Southern Lavant, ca. 1000-600 BC: The Eastern Perspective." *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 293: 53-66.

Weik, T.M. 2014. "The Archaeology of Ethnogenesis." *Annual Review of Anthropology* 43: 291-305.

White, M. 1961. "Greek Colonization." *Journal of Economic History* 21.4: 443-54.

Whitehead, D. 1986. "Women and Naturalization in Fourth-Century Athens: the Case of Archippe." *Classical Quarterly* 36.1: 109-14.

Woodhead, A.G. 1962. *The Greeks in the West.*

Ziskowski, A. 2007. "Debating the Origins of Colonial Women in Sicily and South Italy." *Electronic Antiquity* 11:139-157.