Preliminaries

Unlike many of the other regions covered in this volume, the western Mediterranean is neither an ancient political territory nor topographically distinct and self-contained. Nor does it constitute a region, like that of the Black Sea, which is defined by the complete shoreline of a bounded body of water and the interior behind that shore, or like the Aegean, a conventionally accepted sub-region of the Mediterranean and conceptualized as such in antiquity (Margomenou et al. 2005). Instead, “the western Mediterranean” is a term used in a way similar to “the west” in the modern world. Indeed, a shorthand reference that echoes a contemporary usage of “the west” has been extended into antiquity, where “the west” sometimes refers to the Greek colonial world, and also to the far reaches of the western Mediterranean basin frequented and settled by Greeks. This notion of the ancient west is paralleled by “the East,” “the Near (or Middle) East,” and further refined by “the far west” (like the modern “Far East”) to indicate an even greater degree of remove, unfamiliarity, and exoticism. Yet it can be argued that already in Greek antiquity there was a concept of “the west” or the western Mediterranean, and even notions of a near and far west.1 The far western Mediterranean – west of Sardinia and Corsica, including modern Spain and coastal France – was certainly not as thickly settled by Greeks as the middle west, i.e. Italy and Sicily.

The western Mediterranean is, from the point of view of Greek history, simply the sea and landscapes west of the conventional Greek homeland of the Balkan peninsula, and for the Greeks it was a prime space of travel, trade, and colonization – not the only such space, but the scene of some of the earliest voyages, exchanges, and permanent settlements. One could make a case that parts of the central Mediterranean, or “midwest” (including part of coastal north Africa), should not be considered anything other than part of what we conventionally call “Greece” in the archaic period.2 The Greek communities of Sicily and southern Italy, for example, were established
at the same time as the *polis* coalesced in “Greece” – indeed, the colonies may have led the way toward the integration and urbanization of the metropolitan communities (e.g. Morris 2006b). It is an old habit to see the Mediterranean midwest as fundamentally different from, say, Crete or Rhodes, a reflex grounded in modern national boundaries and old notions of cultural territories, as well as the sense that the territory once home to the Mycenaeans in particular is the original homeland of the Greeks. The notion of the mobility of early Greeks, a theme of this chapter, is predicated on this idea of a homeland; the traditional founders of western colonies, who for the early colonies were all held to come from the old country, followed in the mythic footsteps of heroic predecessors. But neither the Balkan peninsula nor the Aegean alone comprise “Greece” in the first millennium.

Looked at from the Phoenician (or Carthaginian) point of view, the central Mediterranean, and the Tyrrenian littoral in particular, including the north and west coasts of Sicily as well as the islands of Corsica and Sardinia, forms the eastern “shore” of the western Mediterranean. From this point of view even Gibraltar – the traditional boundary of the Mediterranean, and of the known world – formed no real obstacle to trade or settlement. The western Mediterranean may be a bounded inland sea, but the silver riches of Iberian Tartessos and the markets and resources of the Atlantic were an incentive to found Gades (Cadiz), Huelva, Lixus and Mogador, all on the Lusitanian and African coasts (see below). Even the Greeks knew of Tartessos. The regionality of this part of the Mediterranean is, therefore, not entirely fixed nor strictly bounded.

This chapter will survey developments in a part of the Mediterranean that today comprises Italy, Sicily, Sardinia, Spain, and France but focus on relatively few sites, given the space constraints here. While the subject is the region’s particular “Greek” history, informed by the distance of this space and its shores and islands from the Greek homelands, it will not simply recapitulate the story of Greek colonization. Indeed, to tell the story of colonization in the western Mediterranean would be to give an account not only of the Greek, but also of the Phoenician and Carthaginian settlements in the west, which were many and began earlier than the Greeks’. Rather, the theme will be the conceptualization of the western Mediterranean as a “region” in which interconnected diversity reigns. The variety found in the west is predicated not only on the different origins and fortunes of the Greeks who frequented these waters, but also the presence of Levantines in the same seas: Phoenicians and perhaps North Syrians early; later the Carthaginians – in north Africa to the west of the main area of Greek colonization in Libya (i.e. Cyrene and its territory) – and the Etruscans. The archaic period in this region, as will be seen, is complex and heterogeneous, the groups sometimes in cooperation, at other times in conflict, in cohabitation, and in permanent settlements under the political authority of one group or another.

**Connectivity, Networks, and the Middle Ground**

The archaic period per se is grounded in connections, networks, and movements that, in fact, stretch back to the Bronze Age and often originate, or at least implicate, the
Carla M. Antonaccio

eastern Mediterranean and its hinterlands as well as the west.\textsuperscript{5} Rather than to see it simply as a vague geographical location, or some nebulous space into which the Greeks ventured and settled rather less than elsewhere, the western Mediterranean’s regionality can be predicated on its status as a field of interactivity – what Malkin, borrowing a phrase used of space and modes of interactions of Europeans and native Americans in the upper midwest of North America, has termed a “Middle Ground.”\textsuperscript{6} As Michel Gras remarks, the context for the archaic history of the Greeks of the west, the Greeks of the homeland, and of the Carthaginians, is founded in a Mediterranean that is “characterized by great demographic dynamism and, partly in consequence, great geographic mobility of people and goods.”\textsuperscript{7} This quality does not map solely onto this part of this body of water, of course – indeed, the eastern Mediterranean saw many and similar interactions unfold, some between the same actors. (The western Mediterranean is conceived as including the coast of north-west Africa, whereas the eastern Mediterranean includes Egypt.) Yet, there is a different quality to the eastern and western Mediterraneans; the early and numerous cities of the eastern Aegean littoral anchor the Greek presence in the east to a degree that is not the case in the far west. The Levantine eastern Mediterranean is not a region of settlement for the Greeks either (never mind the somewhat ambiguous status of Cyprus).\textsuperscript{8} The Greeks’ eastern limits, pushed much farther by Alexander, in the archaic period were on the coast of Asia Minor and the Black Sea. The movement in the west noted by Gras has its particular causes and conditions. These conditions, which implicated the Greeks in webs of relations that included other groups, inform the region and its history as a whole, while they also make comprehensible the Greeks’ particularity.

What was referred to above as interactivity, has also been termed connectivity, or sometimes described as the operation of networks. So too the study of particular cultures or groups in and around the Mediterranean has recently emphasized their connections, mutual intelligibility and temporal continuities.\textsuperscript{9} Within Mediterranean connectivity there was (and is) distinctiveness, predicated on ever deeper pasts in which connectivity was, at times, not very pronounced and, without arguing for any original, indigenous purity of particular groups, what we can call “identities” were formed (Hall 2002). In these various places different languages were spoken, distinctive forms of material culture used, and particular ritual practices employed, by inhabitants that constitute what are often called ethnic groups or cultures – Phoenicians, Greeks, and so on, living in settlements of various types and purposes with their own histories. All this diversity might be considered variations on a theme in a broad sense. There are obvious commonalities across the Mediterranean with reference to ritual, elite practices, and so on. Indeed, the emphasis on mutual intelligibility rather than difference has led to the introduction of another metaphor: that of a decentered rhizome, an “endless, interconnected root system (a network with no center) giving rise to leafy plants above the surface.”\textsuperscript{10}

This metaphor may indeed describe some aspects of the high archaic period from a Mediterranean-wide perspective. Even a rhizome, however, spreads by runners from established points that give rise to the abundant and varied life “above ground” (to carry through with the metaphor). The chief factor in difference may be social stratification and the degree of urbanization in a given community, more than ethnic or
cultural difference; indeed, the latter may also articulate the former. To comprehend the Greek experience in the west – to understand how the Greeks caught a wave, so to speak – is to start in the east in the late Bronze Age and the early Iron Age. The end of the Bronze Age around 1200 BC seems to have been a turning point for the entire central and eastern Mediterranean basin. In the case of the Phoenicians, a combination of environmental degradation (desertification) and population growth created conditions that both restricted their territory and encouraged their expansion westwards. This is of some interest because famine and overpopulation have been conventional reasons for Greek colonization, but trade has always been the standard explanation for Phoenician settlements abroad (Aubet 2001: 70ff). Tyre became the dominant city of Phoenicia, and its craft industries supplied luxury goods especially to Assyria, but from the ninth century in a trade that also ultimately encompassed Anatolia and the Aegean. Assyrian conquests in the eighth century cut the Phoenicians off from their markets in Asia, but by then the Phoenicians had already gone west, to North Africa and Iberia, and established permanent presences – settlements. They had access to the supply of silver, the dominant standard of value in the early first millennium, in the area of Huelva (Tartessos) beginning in the late eighth century. Large amounts of silver were coming into the Assyrian sphere from the late eighth century. The western expansion also brought access to supplies of foodstuffs, but especially to raw materials (including gold, tin, and copper in addition to silver; Aubet 2001: 70–96; cf. Aubet Semmler 2002).

Phoenicians were out in front in the far west (Sardinia, Iberia and beyond). Among the Greeks it is the Euboeans who seem to be pre-eminent participants in mobility from at least the middle of the Iron Age (i.e. the tenth century), creating outposts in the North Aegean (e.g. Mende and Torone). They operated in tandem with Phoenicians and with inhabitants of north Syria (speakers of Aramaic) at Pithekoussai on the island of Ischia, and were prominent in the establishment of the first colonies of Sicily. The Euboeans were also well ahead of the curve in the east, as the cemeteries of Lefkandi have shown, with clear ties to Cyprus, Syria, and the Levantine coast, Egypt, and even Mesopotamia. Euboeans were also clearly involved in the activities at the site of Al Mina on the Orontes River in Syria, long recognized as an early example of long-distance overseas trade and exchange – though they may not have been the prime movers in this region. Indeed, Gras has gone so far as to suggest it is as a consequence of the long Euboean experience in the east that they arrive in the west, “in conditions which remain far from clear but appear to be closely linked to Phoenician sea travel.”

The Phoenicians struck out into the far west and to North Africa at nearly the same time, creating a large zone of influence along the Atlantic coast of Iberia and the western African coast (including settlements at the sites of Lixus and Mogador). There was also a series of Phoenician settlements on the Mediterranean coast of Iberia. On the Mediterranean coast, the most important site was arguably Toscanos, founded in the middle of the eighth century. The presence of a large market building has led to the site’s characterization as a “commercial enclave” (Aubet 2001: 317) with connections to Pithekoussai, Cyprus, and the eastern Mediterranean, and the cemeteries include rich graves with Phoenician imports that testify to the high
status of local individuals (see also Niemeyer 2002). A transition from this early Phoenician phase to a Punic, or “Carthaginian” phase when the balance of power shifted to the north African colony, came in the middle of the sixth century. The silver mines of Tartessos were no longer as profitable then, and Tyre had fallen to the Assyrians in the first quarter of the sixth century. Although Tyre recovered by the mid-sixth century, the Phoenician west saw profound changes as a result of these developments, and Carthage ascended at the expense of the Phoenician homeland.

This history, though not centrally Greek, had several effects of interest to Greek history per se: after an initial, cooperative period a more confrontational mode of operation resulted in conflicts between Carthage and western Greek communities, as well as with an ascendant Rome; the abandonment of Phoenician settlements on the Mediterranean coast of Iberia; and the cessation of Phoenician activity in the area of Gadir – a hiatus which may coincide with the Phocaean expansion described below.

Nostoi
Parallel to this archaeologically derived narrative is that of the proto-historical Greek tradition, epic poetry, the poetry of Homer. To some ways of thinking, Homer marks the beginning of a specifically Greek colonialist consciousness at least of horizons beyond the Aegean, and many of these seem to lie to the west. Colonization, too, that permanent settling down that both the Phoenicians and the early Greeks engaged in, has been a kind of summary term for a turn, or a return, a turning again, perhaps: to voyaging, trade, and settlement that slowed dramatically, but did not end, with the end of the Bronze Age as just discussed, and to contacts with overseas regions and their inhabitants who practiced different cultures. Non-Greeks appear as early as Homeric poetry itself, as do far-off lands. But their representation in Greek and Roman sources is just that, and representation has its own purposes.

It is the Odyssey that contains the references most usually associated with knowledge of the west and an awareness of colonization. In recounting the stories of the nostoi, the returns of the Greek heroes from Troy (of which Odysseus is only one), the poem describes several locations that Odysseus encounters which lie in the western Mediterranean, the most obvious being the Straits of Messina (the location of Scylla and Charybdis; Od. 12.253ff), the island of Aeolus (10.1ff), the island Thrinacria (Sicily, 12.285ff), and of course Scheria (Corfu), which is on the westward path towards Sicily and the Tyrrenian Sea. But more interesting is the reflection of a colonizing consciousness detected especially in two episodes. In Book 6 the story is told of how the king of the Phaeacians, Nausithoos, resettled his people from Hyperia to Scheria, as a colonial founder might; and similarly, how he divided up the land, built a city wall and houses, and precincts for the gods (6.4–10). Equally intriguing, in 9.130–42, Odysseus describes an island neighboring the Cyclopes’ territory, uninhabited except for goats, in terms that identify it as a likely place for human habituation – for colonization, since the soil would yield grain and grapes, staples that would sustain a permanent settlement. Just as striking, though, the poet has Odysseus describe the beach, which provides a perfect place to draw up ships on the sand without need for anchorage. And most telling of all, it is said at the start of the passage
that the Cyclopes lack ships and shipwrights to make vessels, so that they do not go
out to sea to trade with other men. The episode is permeated with an awareness of
mobility as much as colonization.

Of course, the Phaeacians are fantastic sailors; the other major epic poet we have,
Hesiod, tells of sea voyages and trade, and describes how his father because of the
difficulty of life in seventh-century Asia Minor, sought a better life abroad in Boeotia
(\textit{W&D} 630–40). Thus, farming and seafaring are not mutually exclusive, so that
voyaging for trade and permanent settlement need not be either. At the same time,
Homer neither uses the word \textit{apoikia} nor names or describes an actual colony, or
an \textit{emporion}. Whether this knowledge is suppressed for the purposes of the epic tradi-
tion is impossible to say for certain. Relations with strangers in Homer are governed
by the norms of \textit{xenia} – as on Scheria – unless the hosts are monstrous barbarians
– like the Cyclopes or Laestrygonians. In these cases the exceptions prove the rule.

This is the early poetic backdrop again which we investigate the early first mil-
lennium from a specifically Greek point of view. These investigations necessarily entail
reconstructing the movements of goods and persons. Of course, the relationship of
material culture, traces of some of the goods and the persons who set them in motion,
indeed of all cultural \textit{indicia}, to cultural identity or ethnicity is highly contested
(see ch. 31, below). It is therefore very uncertain whether archaeological cultures
correspond to literary accounts of ethnic groups, and dangerously circular to argue
from one side or the other of this question. Nevertheless, archaeology is what we have
to write the history of the late Iron Age and early archaic west in particular (from
roughly 1000 BC). The movements of individuals into and out of different regions are
traceable above all by changing artifactual assemblages and their contexts. (Whether
these index the physical presence of individuals who also made the objects is open
to question.) Archaeology is the only way to investigate directly settlement patterns,
ritual landscapes and practices, and interactions with indigenes. Excavation and
survey provide not only data on sites and regions not well documented in written
sources, but also challenge written texts with discourses of things and histories other
than those written about in antiquity (and/or preserved to us). Finally, archaeology
documents pre- and proto-historical experience, which sometimes meshes with the
written accounts available to us, and sometimes does not.

An archaic example of a written account is the story of the Corinthian Demaratus,
who conducted trade with the Etruscans and settled at Tarquinia, eventually becom-
ing the ancestor of the Tarquinii, or Roman kings. We also have the story of the
Samian Kolaios’s voyage to Tartessus, beyond the Straits of Gibraltar (see below),
and the trading ventures of the Aeginetan Sostratos have a tantalizing reflection,
perhaps, in the dedication of an anchor to Aeginetan Apollo by a person of the
same name at Gravisca.\textsuperscript{16} Such encounters, however, occurred probably much earlier
than the sixth century. Both Phoenicians and Greeks used the conventions of gift
exchange to pave the way for trade with indigenous groups – witness the presence
of ostentatious prestige objects such as the Praeneste silver in Italy, on the Phoenician side, and the Vix krater in France, on the Greek side, in the seventh and sixth century respectively. It seems safe to say that while some of those encountered by Greeks came to be represented as barbaroi, in the earliest period they were perhaps more like xenoi, strangers (and, under some conditions, guest-friends). In any case, and in contradistinction to older views, mutual intelligibility seems to have played a large role in the Greek experience in the west, even if hostility, warfare, and cultural assimilation were also present. There is ample evidence for interaction in the form of transfers of artistic styles, mythological narratives (Heracles and Odysseus have already been mentioned), elite ideologies (like sympotic practices and burial customs), to say nothing of commodities and finished goods in trade and exchange. While some of these interactions had been occurring for centuries before the eighth and indeed might be either continuations or revivals of Bronze Age contacts, they intensified with the establishment of permanent settlements.17

Thus, the oft-stressed importance of the colonization movement of the eighth century, frequently supported by reference to Homeric geography and the apparent reflection of colonial features in the Odyssey as sketched above, should not obscure pre-existing geographical, historical, and cultural connections, nor substitute for archaeological evidence of movement and exchange.18

The Western Greeks

The space of return: enoikismos and colonization

In the shared space of the western Mediterranean – a “Middle Ground” – in which actors of various origins interacted, competed, struggled, settled, and continually created new forms of identities, cultures, and symbolic and political systems, the Greeks produced several of each. The western Mediterranean was not mare incognitum for the Greeks of the eighth century who were the first to establish apoikiai (see ch. 19). Nor was it empty: the western Mediterranean was already populated by indigenes whose presence stretches far into prehistory, and provided encounters not with strange flora and fauna, such as have characterized other colonial episodes in human history, but with human strangers. It was also shared space, both with the Phoenicians, who seem to have been first off the mark in the west as we have seen, and with the Etruscans, vying for territory and markets on the islands and coasts of the west Mediterranean in particular. The presence of other groups not indigenous to the western Mediterranean, who also left their homelands to travel, trade, and settle abroad, means that the Greeks were not alone in their expansion. The movements of people from one place to a permanent settling down elsewhere, bringing with them distinctive forms of material culture, social structures, languages, political organization, and so on, is one way to define colonization, however inapt this term is to describe, much less explain, anything in this period of antiquity. Often such communities, like their metropoleis, had an admixture of non-citizens from the same cultural and geographical origin, and from other cultures.
It is important to note that the “colony,” or *apoikia*, is only one of the possible forms settling took; in addition to the *emporion*, or trading station, we may note the model of *enoikismos*, “cohabitation,” proposed by H. G. Niemeyer (1990a), according to which Greeks and others lived, intermarried, traded, manufactured, and farmed together without the settlement being either a colony or a trading post. Pithekoussai is the single best-known example, but others might be found in the far west. Ancient sources speak of famine, civil disturbances and exile, or personal tragedy as reasons for groups of Greeks to leave home to settle permanently elsewhere. Famine came to be generalized as “land-hunger” in modern scholarship, and colonization came to be viewed as a kind of safety valve for societies under social or economic pressure. Alternatively, colonization was viewed as a state-sponsored enterprise aimed at securing lucrative resources (grain, metals, timber, fish) or trade with native populations (as seen especially in ceramic exports, which include transport amphorae and so indicate the trade of commodities and possibly cultural practices that come with these). Colonization, however, is a concept that must be qualified when speaking of the Greeks. It is more a process than an event, and less a manifestation or effect of imperialism than a settling down of a group of individuals, not always from the same original community, who might otherwise only trade or raid. They form a new, independent, permanent community in new territory (Jeffery 1976: 54; Osborne 1998b).

It was long the perception that “trade before the flag” was somehow transformed into settlement, colonization *per se*, and the reasons for this were endlessly debated. The very concept of “pre-colonial,” however, is no longer favored in archaeological discourse (see Ridgway 2000b). It seems certain that voyaging for exchange and trade, and the contacts and human relationships, as well as the knowledge of winds, currents, places that it is based on, never wholly died out after the end of the Bronze Age, and these factors contributed to the conditions that led to permanent settlements that constitute colonization. Yet, despite the presence of *bona fide* Greek colonies in this midwest, the colonization model adumbrated above is not entirely sufficient or appropriate. Certainly *emporia*, or ports of trade, were more than just trading posts that received goods from elsewhere and facilitated their distribution. Their scope of activity included the fabrication of finished goods from local raw materials – and might involve cooperation and/or cohabitation of different groups of individuals from different cultures and origins.

**The Mediterranean midwest**

Sicily and Italy were the middle west, or “the intermediate stages,” to the far western Mediterranean. The Phoenicians are clearly present in this region at a very early stage. This is documented not only by artifacts, but epigraphically. One of the most important written documents is the Nora Stele from near Cagliari in Sardinia. Discovered in 1773, published in 1835, this inscription probably dates to the late ninth century, early in the period under discussion here. It commemorates the founding of a temple to the god Pumay or Pumai (*Pmy*) by an arriving contingent of Phoenicians. This coincides with the Phoenicians’ dispersal to Libya and Cyprus and, at the end of the eighth century, with the foundation of Carthage – as well as
the early Greek colonies on Sicily. The late ninth century also saw the expansion of
the Iberian demand for metal, both raw and finished products, as already noted. From
Iberia, it was a short hop to Sardinia – and to Sicily. But despite these early activities,
a firmly established Phoenician presence in permanent settlements in the west seems
to belong mostly to the eighth century and later, as does the Greek.21

In this midwest, Pithekoussai is among the most celebrated early sites for Greek
history – and for Phoenician history, as it turns out. Though incompletely excavated
and only partially published, it is also one of the best documented. Parts of the
acropolis, necropolis, and town including an area used for the smelting of iron, have
been explored. Most scholars agree that the community, established in the ninth cen-
tury, was of mixed origins, including Greeks from more than a single community,
but certainly Euboeans among them. This fact makes the site important to under-
standing the phenomenon of Greek and Phoenician settlement, for Phoenicians were
also present – if artifact types and origins, and the evidence of inscriptions in Greek
and Phoenician, are anything to go on at all. Indeed, it appears that the community
may have been a very diverse mix of individuals: “families whose original individual
members came from Campania, Etruria, Latium vetus, North Africa, Sardinia, and
doubtless more besides as well as from Euboea, Corinth, North Syria, and Phoenicia.”22

Pithekoussai is therefore not only early, but a hinge in the history of the western
Mediterranean, where three of the main protagonists of the archaic period (and others)
actually came face to face and cooperated in the same place. Indeed, Pithekoussai,
Carthage, and Phoenician settlement in Sardinia are all contemporary; Phoenician
settlements in western Sicily (Motya in particular) are somewhat later but more or
less contemporary with Greek settlements in eastern Sicily (see below). Moreover,
late Geometric style pottery from Carthage seems Pithecussan in origin.

There is general agreement that Pithekoussai was not a colony, Greek or otherwise.
For one thing, there is not enough arable land to support the population extrapolated
from the cemeteries at some thousands of inhabitants (men, women, children). It is
also interesting to note that the cemetery, so far as it is known, seems to have had
a mixture of grave goods from the beginning, with some female burials featuring
indigenous Italian types of metalwork. This may indicate that the community was
socially and ritually integrated, with possible intermarriage and a basic agreement on
burial customs. Inhumations were sometimes placed in Levantine amphorae recycled
to this purpose; the grave goods included ornaments with “oriental” origins (seals of
the “Lyre-Player Group” from North Syria, scarabs, and other “orientalia.”) Indeed,
enoiikismos, “cohabitation,” better describes the situation at Pithekoussai than does
emporion. The co-existence of Greeks and the heavily hellenizing Etruscans here and
at Cumae would have had a strong influence on the Phoenicians of the west from
the beginning (i.e. the eighth century).

The Greek midwest

After the establishment of this cooperative, productive, influential outpost in the
Tyrrhenian Sea a major movement unfolds. Indeed, Pithekoussai for all its import-
ance was not the wave of the future beyond the eighth century.
As already noted, the perspective imposed by modern political maps conditions how we frame the boundaries of Greece, sometimes taking into account the “Ionian Islands” and, less often, the Adriatic coasts as far as the limits of archaic Greek colonization (present-day Albania and Croatia). Yet it is a short coasting voyage from Corcyra to Otranto in the far south of peninsular Italy, shorter than many routes between neighboring islands in the Aegean, and shorter, in fact, than that from Ithaca to Corcyra. The sea path along the south coast of Italy to Sicily is easy to trace, and indeed there is good evidence for contact between the Mycenaeans and southern Italy, and early (if not continuous) contacts from the earliest Iron Age as well (Holloway 1981; d’Andria 1995; see ch. 31, below). It should be noted that some Greek colonies, in actuality, were founded in what we might regard as home territory, because of the locations in the Aegean or Adriatic Seas: Corcyra, Leucas, Ambracia, Naupactos in the north-west; Thasos, the Chalcidice, and Thrace in the north Aegean, Thera in the central Aegean. In some ways, then, colonization can be considered an infilling of space, which occurred even within the territory (chora) of poleis like Athens in the course of the eighth and especially the seventh centuries, and proceeding with secondary colonizations in the sixth and fifth. A distinguishing feature of the western “colonial” movement is its concentration in time, the richness and success of many of the foundations, their impact on developments in the homeland, and their prominence and importance in ensuing Greek history – at least, as long as they lasted, which in some cases was not very long.24

The earliest apoikiai in the Mediterranean midwest were founded in the space of about a generation throughout the Mediterranean, and beyond. Italy and Sicily, situated in the middle west or central Mediterranean, saw some of the first. The very first were in Sicily, and founded by Euboeans: Naxos and Leontinoi, only a few years apart, reportedly by the same oecist (founder), Thucles of Chalcis. A Corinthian named Archias, meanwhile, founded Syracuse within a year of Naxos; an intended co-founder, Chersicrates, stopped instead at Corcyra. Catane was founded by another Chalcidian, Evarchus. Within the decade, Megarians had settled at Megara Hyblaea, after a number of failures, including a joint venture with the Euboeans at Leontini. By the end of the eighth century, Zancle and the dependent Mylai were founded at the straits of Messina, probably by Chalcidians and other Euboeans, with an admixture of individuals, reputedly pirates, from Cumae – itself established in the wake of the Pithecussan period (according to Thucydidces 6.4 a foundation of Chalchis).

Thus, once again, the Euboeans were out in front, continuing into south Italy by founding Rhegium (together with Messenians). But in southern Italy it was the Achaeans who were pre-eminent; they established Sybaris (possibly with colonists from Troizene), and Croton. The Achaean initiative in south Italy presents a different path to establishing homes away from home – it was not driven by trade and exchange, and it happened somewhat after the Sicilian foundations, despite the knowledge of this coast which early contact suggests. Meanwhile, Taras was reputedly settled by Spartans under the authority of Phalanthus. Sparta colonized very little, though; aside from Thera in the south central Aegean, its only colony was Taras. Among pre-eminent homeland communities, Athens is an anomaly, completely uninvolved in early colonial activity, although Athenian transport amphorae are found throughout...
the west Mediterranean, and Athens was in contact with the east from at least the
ninth century.
All of these new communities were in existence before the end of the eighth cen-
tury. These permanent settlements in the midwest, at least in south Italy, would seem
to follow earlier trading contacts; the purpose of settlement in the eighth century,
however, is primarily to create a new, independent, and largely self-sustaining com-
munity, which meant having access to arable land and other resources. Indeed, the
proverbial wealth of many of the western Greek colonies was predicated on their
territory and its productivity. The early foundations were located on the east cost of
Sicily, accompanied at nearly the same moment by colonies in coastal southern Italy.
If viewed from a western perspective, they seem to be a natural part of the central
Mediterranean that includes the west coast of Greece and the Ionian islands, and face
the Greek homeland. Indeed, the sanctuary at Olympia, in the western Peloponnese,
is in many respects a western Greek sanctuary as much as a Panhellenic one, with
early material from Italy and Sicily and a number of later treasuries dedicated by
communities (and not only Greek ones) in the west (Antonaccio 2007, with refer-
cences to earlier work).
The following century saw new colonies in both Sicily and south Italy, still with
the participation of Achaeans at Metapontum, probably early in the century. The
eastern Greeks joined in during this second phase: Siris was founded, reputedly by
Ionians from Colophon, ca. 700, and Locri founded Locri Epizephyri in the early
seventh century. Similarly, Rhodians from Lindus and Cretans founded Gela on
Sicily’s southern coast during the first quarter of the century. Thus, not only were
the original colonies of Sicily and south Italy joined by others sent from homeland
metropoleis; the original colonies themselves became metropoleis, establishing secondary
colonies that extended Greek settlement well into the south and west of Sicily and
the south and west Italian coasts. This phenomenon was led by Syracuse, which founded
Helorus and Acrae early in the seventh century, and Camarina around 600. Megara
Hyblaea founded Selinus in the second quarter of the seventh century, and Selinus
turned around and founded Heraclea Minoa about a century later. Gela founded
Acragas early in the sixth century in the face of Megara’s extension of settlement;
Zancle founded Himera in the last quarter of the seventh century. Colonists could
come from different Greek communities and different regions; and it is not unlikely
that once established, local women and perhaps men may have resided among the
Greeks and intermarried with them. (That indigenous individuals also lived in Greek
communities as slaves or in some other subordinated status is also likely.) Certainly,
Greeks from the homelands moved to the colonies, and vice versa (see further below
on sanctuaries and festivals).
And east met west again, several hundred years after the earlier movements dis-
cussed above. In this context, the Phoenicians were founding their great second city,
Qart Hadashh, “new city” or Carthage, in Tunisia, by the end of the ninth century
according to literary tradition but not until the late eighth century judging by the
archaeological evidence (Hodos 2006: 3, 159), and trade with Iberia was develop-
ing as well. In Sicily the Phoenicians founded cities at Panormus (modern Palermo),
Motya off the west coast, and Soloeis (Solunto), as well as Mazara. The latter was
relinquished when Selinus was founded. The foundations of Himera, on the north coast facing Phoenician colonies just mentioned, and Selinus, in the sphere of Motya, set the stage for confrontation. This came in the early sixth century, with the foundation of Acragas. Meanwhile, a group of east Greeks from Cnidus and Rhodes under the leadership of Pentathlus, attempted to found a colony at Lilybaeum. Siding with the Selinuntines in a conflict with Segesta, Pentathlus was killed. In this episode, according to Thucydides, the Elymian (indigenous western Sicilian) inhabitants of Segesta and the Phoenicians were allied. The foundation of Lilybaeum, had it succeeded, would have put a community of Greeks in a good strategic position to participate in the trade with Iberia, but geographical placement is not the only factor in the pursuit of trade or settlement – witness the Euboeans.  

The far west

Despite earlier contacts, it was only at the end of the seventh century that trade was a regular activity between the Greeks of the eastern Mediterranean and the far west. As the Euboeans dominated early midwestern colonization and pre-colonial trade, it was the Phocaeans, Greeks of Ionia, the eastern Aegean, who founded colonies in modern France and Spain (Lombardo 2002) – another east-west encounter. This westward movement was prefigured by earlier settlements and trading ventures: having founded Lampsacus at the end of the seventh century, they headed west, founding Alalia on Corsica in the process, in ca. 565 – just the moment of the Phoenician “crisis” in the mid-sixth century. The Phoenicians had come under increasing pressure in the eighth and seventh century from the Assyrians. By the middle of the seventh century, Tyre’s coastal territory was in Assyrian hands and cities in the north were destroyed. It was the neo-Babylonian empire, however, in the third quarter of the sixth century that dealt the decisive blow. After taking Nineveh and Jerusalem, as well as Damascus, Nebuchadnezzar’s long siege effectively ended the Tyrian kingship. Sidon, in southern Phoenicia, benefited from the eclipse of Tyre, but Phoenician cedar trade was now in the hands of the Babylonians, and access to southern and eastern trade routes was hampered (Markoe 2000: 47–8; Aubet 2001: 59–60).

The most important of the Phocaean western colonies included Massalia (modern Marseilles, founded ca. 600), and Phocaea the metropolis together with Massalia her colony reportedly founded Emporion (modern Ampurias). Yet, the Phocaeans seem to have been more concerned with trade than with permanent settlement until the Ionian Revolt: the cities lay along the trade routes.  

The status of many archaic sites in the far west, including Rhode (modern Rosas) and the most western, Mainace, are disputed: whether they were apoikiai or emporia, whether Greek, Punic, or mixed, and the dates of their establishment and the role of the preexisting local populations in any of these endeavors. Imports to the far west, however, indicate much earlier contacts than these with indigenous groups, and perhaps not by Ionian Greeks (i.e. Phocaeans): at Huelva on the Atlantic coast beyond Gibraltar (belonging to the Iberian kingdom of Tartessus, ruled by the famous Arganthonius: Herodotus 1.163), the first known imported Greek object is an Attic Middle Geometric II pyxis krater – which may not have been carried by Athenians,
of course, since the Athenians were not part of the early westward movements.\textsuperscript{29} Indeed, recent work has suggested that the Phoenicians carried early Greek imports, including Attic SOS transport amphorae and Corinthian Subgeometric and Protocorinthian kotylai.\textsuperscript{30} Phoenician pottery (Red Slip and Polychrome wares, late seventh/early sixth century) was actually more widely distributed than Greek wares, and occurs further west though not so early. In the early seventh century, Greek material drops off. In the late seventh century, however, imports increase in variety and number, including much from east Greece and Etruscan bucchero, and following this material from Athens, Corinth, Sparta, and Ionia, including metalwork and terracottas, and faience. The story of the voyage of Kolaios of Samos beyond the Straits of Gibraltar, to Tartessus (Herodotus 4.152), is to be placed in this period.

The notion of Phocaean presence and influence is so prevalent and well attested in written sources that every Greek or hellenizing object in the far west can be (and has been) attributed to them. Our impression of the importance of Phocaean activities is due in part to Herodotus, who says they were the first Greeks to undertake lengthy voyages and to establish extremely friendly relations with king Arganthonios of Tartessus (1.163). In recent years, however, with more excavation and publication it has become clear that the majority of the pottery imports in Iberia are Attic, and a very wide variety characterizes the rest. There is no particular link to Ionia in this material. The celebrated “Tartessian” stone sculptures, which have been seen as proof of Phocaean influence because of their East Greek style, have been redefined as products of Iberian workshops influenced probably not by major sculpture or Greek sculptors but by terracottas in wide circulation throughout the Mediterranean (Rouillard 2001).

Nevertheless, the establishment of Massalia by ca. 600 seems to have changed the balance of trade, so to speak, in this region, shifting it from imports of Etruscan pottery and comestibles (wine and oil) in the late seventh century to Greek goods by mid-sixth century, including much Massaliot Greek pottery. The west then offered a refuge for those in the Phocaean metropolis who fled the Persians in 546, settling in the previously founded Alalia on the east coast of Corsica facing Etruria (and who, according to Herodotus, sailed in pentekonters, engaging in piracy). This presented a challenge to both the Etruscans and the Carthaginians, who joined forces to face it at the Battle of Alalia, fought between 540 and 535. Though the Phocaeans drove off this allied navy, they still retreated from Corsica, scattering to Rhegium and ultimately to Elea (Velia) north of Poseidonia (Paestum) on the Italian mainland.\textsuperscript{31}

This row is emblematic of the complex reconfiguration of relations: fluid, but more confrontational in the mid-archaic period than they were earlier. The story of the Spartan Dorieus exemplifies it further. In the late sixth century, Dorieus, the younger brother of King Cleomenes, left Sparta to found a colony, making attempts first on the north coast of Africa (at a site between the related city of Cyrene, and Carthage itself, and possibly aided by Therans) but was forced to leave. His next destination was western Sicily, already staked by the Phoenicians and various Greeks, but mythically traversed by the Dorian Heracles. The region of Eryx was already in the orbit of native Elymians, Phoenicians who had arrived two centuries earlier, and Carthaginians – who therefore combined forces to kill Dorieus. Ostensibly to avenge Dorieus, Gelon
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(of Gela and later of Syracuse) fought a war to free what are referred to as the *emporia* in either north Africa or perhaps in western Sicily. Thus, an early cooperation and mutual intelligibility, articulated by interactivity and permeability, was transformed to confrontation and hostility later in the archaic period. The transition to permanent settlement and the second or third generation colonies, and the accompanying need for territory, created conflicts with both the local populations and among the colonizing Greeks, Etruscans, and Phoenicians/Carthaginians. The battles of Himera (480, Greeks under Gelon of Syracuse defeating the Carthaginians) and Cumae (Cumaeans again with Syracusan help in 474, defeating the Etruscans) mark the end of the archaic period – events providing not only convenient, conventional dates for the end of an historical era. They also exemplify a conflictive, territorial mode, leading to mutual exclusion, and mutual hostility. Conflict, the destruction of Greek cities by other Greeks, and the removal and resettlement of populations also marked the sixth and fifth centuries in the mid and far west Mediterranean. The astonishingly brief *floruits* of rich cities such as Sybaris (founded in the late eighth century, destroyed in a war with Croton ca. 510) are an indication of the fluidity, or instability, of the networks with which we began. Yet, despite the “decolonization” of the west Mediterranean, the archaic Greek expansion was an important element of the mixing that characterizes the Mediterranean throughout history.

As David Abulafia suggests (in Harris 2005: 68), both Braudel, who argued for the unity of the Mediterranean, and Horden and Purcell, who insist on its regional variation (as well as its connectivity), are right: “the Mediterranean had possessed such a high measure of unity . . . ever since long-distance trade linked the shores of Lebanon to the Qart Hadash or ‘New City’ known now as Carthage, and then moved further west to reach the Mediterranean shores of Spain and even Cádiz beyond the Straits of Gibraltar.” These unifying activities began even before the eighth century, as we have seen, and perhaps extended far back into prehistory. In this frame of reference, the archaic western Mediterranean is one of several Mediterraneans, and one with particular importance for the history of the Greeks.

**NOTES**

2 See Bowersock 2005. Acknowledging the imprecision of the term, Fernand Braudel suggests that “pre-em” encompasses “central Europe, from the Alps to the Baltic and the North Sea, the Italian peninsula (rather than the surrounding islands), the territory that would become Gaul, the Iberian peninsula, and North Africa . . . from the Gulf of Gabès to the Atlantic” (2001: 165). It is interesting to note that in this context he identifies the Greeks together with Phoenicians and Etruscans as “peoples from the east” (177). He is not alone; cf. Malkin 2004, Rouillard in Settis 2001.
3 For another perspective on the western Mediterranean and the Atlantic, see Cunliffe 2001.
4 See Aubet 2001: ch. 1 on the terminological confusion between Canaanites, Phoenicians, Carthaginians, and the term “Punic.” Adapting the approach of Aubet (2001: 13), in what follows the term “Phoenicians” will be used of the inhabitants of the coastal plain.
of Lebanon up until the sixth century, “Carthaginians” will apply to inhabitants of Carthage, founded in the eighth century, and “western Phoenicians” will be preferred for those voyaging and settling in the west.

5 Aubet 2001: 52: “Thus the ultimate causes of the [Phoenician] expansion westwards must be sought fundamentally in the internal dynamics of Phoenician society in the east.”


7 “Caractérisé par un grand dynamisme démographique et, en partie par voie de conséquence, par une grande mobilité géographique des personnes et des biens”: Gras 2002: 183; see also Ridgway 2000b.

8 On Cyprus in the archaic period, see for example Reyes 1994.


11 As Aubet comments, “Classical historiography is unanimous in recognizing the silver trade as the objective of Phoenician expansion into the far west . . . the procurement and production of silver on a large scale means Gadir [Cadiz] and its immediate hinterland, Tartessos. For once the archaeological record provides an abundance of elements corroborating this historical fact” (2001: 257). On the settlements in the area, see Ruiz Mata 2002a; 2002b; cf. Aubet Semmler 2002; Jurado 2002.

12 Gras 2002: 189 (“dans des conditions qui demeurent encore peu claires mais qui apparaissent comme très liées aux navigations phéniciennes”); see also Fletcher 2006. As will be noted further below, the presence of a particular style of pottery or other artifact is no necessary index of the presence of a particular group, and Euboean pottery at Al Mina does not prove Euboeans were in charge. See ch. 19, below, on the debate over “phantom Euboeans,” and J. Papadopoulos’s skepticism in particular. This extreme skepticism is not very widely shared, however, and what seems clear is that Euboeans were part of the picture as much as Phoenicians were.

13 The cult of Melqart, whom the Greeks called Heracles, figured in founding Gadir, and a major temple to this divinity was located there. Melqart may have been a mediating figure in the same way that Odysseus was for the Greeks and Etruscans. See Aubet 2001: 194–211, 260–2, 273–9; Malkin 2004. For the Atlantic settlements, see Bierling 2002: part II.


17 See Ridgway 2000b summarizing much other work.


19 His model seems preferable to earlier views (summarized in Hodos 2006: 19–24) because, unlike a colony, an enoikismos does not imply political control by one group or another, and unlike a trading post, it is both durable and exploits the territory for its subsistence.

20 “Le tappe intermedie”: Pugliese Caratelli 1990, speaking of Sicily and Sardinia.

21 Aubet 2001 is the best account so far of the Phoenician expansion into the western Mediterranean; on the Nora stele, 206–9. See also Markoe 2000 (Nora inscription, 176–8).


23 Horden and Purcell 2000: 127, map 9, shows what parts of the Mediterranean were out of sight to sailors at sea; cf. fig. 35 in Aubet 2001: 169.
24 The scholarly literature on colonization is very extensive; see ch. 19, below.
25 Keeping in mind Braudel’s definition of the west, we should remember that this fissioning occurred elsewhere in the Greek ambit; Thera, an early colony of Sparta, founded Cyrene in Libya, which in turn spread other foundations throughout the Cyrenaica.
26 The unsuccessful Knidians went on to found a colony at Lipari and to fight the Etruscans who were active in these waters, and who may have been trading partners with the Greek cities on the Tyrrhenian coast (e.g. Laos). Cf. Thuc. 6.2.6.
28 Niemeyer 1990a: 47. Indeed, it is for the case of Emporion that Niemeyer has suggested the model of *enoikosmos* rather than *apoikia* for the Greek presence in the far west.
29 Niemeyer 1990a: 39; cf. Ruiz and Molinos 1998: 51; Dominguez and Sánchez 2001: 10 and fig. 4 no. 1, with additional references. As Aubet points out, Arganthonius’ name is rooted in the Greek word for silver, directly reflecting the commodity that was the object of the Phoenician and also Greek interest in the area.
32 Hdt. 5.42ff; 7.158; see Dunbabin 1948: ch. XI, 410–14; Malkin 1994b.
33 On the notion of decolonization in the ancient Greek case, see Asheri 1996 (on the rise of indigenous Italian groups such as the Lucanians, Bruttians, Oenotrians, etc. and the decline of the Greek communities in their areas).