

5-18-2014

Ethnicity, Nomima, and Identity: A Study of the Multi-Ethnic Cities of Himera and Gela

Daniel Plekhov
Dickinson College

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholar.dickinson.edu/student_honors



Part of the [Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Plekhov, Daniel, "Ethnicity, Nomima, and Identity: A Study of the Multi-Ethnic Cities of Himera and Gela" (2014). *Dickinson College Honors Theses*. Paper 159.

This Honors Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by Dickinson Scholar. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized administrator. For more information, please contact scholar@dickinson.edu.

ETHNICITY, *NOMIMA*, AND IDENTITY:
A STUDY OF THE MULTI-ETHNIC CITIES OF HIMERA AND GELA

DAN PLEKHOV
DICKINSON COLLEGE
2013-2014

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| <u>Introduction</u> | 3 |
| <u>Ethnicity</u> | 5 |
| <u>Overseas Expansion and Settlement</u> | 12 |
| <i>Foundation Stories</i> | 14 |
| <i>Oikists</i> | 17 |
| <i>Nomima</i> | 18 |
| <u>Material and Literary Indicators of Ethnic Identity</u> | 23 |
| <i>Ceramic Record</i> | 24 |
| <i>Mortuary Record</i> | 25 |
| <i>Dialects</i> | 27 |
| <i>Epigraphy</i> | 29 |
| <u>Gela</u> | 31 |
| <i>Foundation Stories</i> | 31 |
| <i>Oikists</i> | 36 |
| <i>Archaeological Evidence</i> | 38 |
| <i>Coinage</i> | 44 |
| <i>Epigraphy</i> | 45 |
| <i>Conclusion</i> | 46 |
| <u>Himera</u> | 52 |
| <i>Foundation Stories</i> | 52 |
| <i>Archaeological Evidence</i> | 55 |
| <i>Coinage</i> | 58 |
| <i>Epigraphy</i> | 60 |
| <i>Stesichorus: A proxy for mixed-dialect?</i> | 62 |
| <i>Conclusion</i> | 67 |
| <u>Comparison and Conclusion</u> | 71 |
| <u>Acknowledgements</u> | 74 |
| <u>Bibliography</u> | 75 |

INTRODUCTION

This study has its origins in an account by Thucydides (6.3-5), in which he provides a brief historical overview of Hellenic Sicily and the settlements established there. This account offers invaluable details regarding the beginnings of the cities, such as the (relative) date of foundation, the origin of the settlers, and often the circumstances under which these cities were settled. Neither consistent nor exhaustive in the details he provides for each city, Thucydides nevertheless supplies important information for understanding how these cities began. From the list of cities he discusses, three share an interesting characteristic. For these, and only these three cases, those of Gela (6.4.3), its colony of Acragas (6.4.4), and Himera (6.5.1), Thucydides additionally clarifies the institutions (νόμματα) that were implemented at the city, labeling them by ethnic designations such as Dorian or Chalcidian. It is no doubt significant that each of these cities was founded by multiple groups of settlers from various regions of the Hellenic world, and we must presume that it is on account of the multi-ethnic nature of the settlements that the ethnic affiliation of the institutions present in the city are clarified. Such clarification suggests that differences in ethnicity among Hellenic peoples were important and salient elements of their identities. It furthermore implies that ethnic identity in the Hellenic world extended to the political level as well, such that it was necessary for a city as a whole to project one of those identities. That a city could utilize its institutions to align itself with a certain ethnic affiliation is not itself surprising, yet the motives and requirements for such a practice are unclear.

Unfortunately, Thucydides is brief and does not elaborate on his comments. As a result, I take this account as my focus, and derive from it several topics of inquiry. First, I address broadly the discourse on the study of ethnicity in the ancient Greek world, and the challenges it presents. We are comfortable using broad ethnic tribal appellations such as “Dorians” and

“Ionians,” yet the reality was no doubt far more complex for ancient Hellenes, and likely changed through time. Second, because Thucydides is discussing settlements established outside the periphery of what we consider mainland Greece, it is necessary to discuss the nature of overseas settlement and the conditions under which these settlements were established. This discussion includes an overview of what *nomima* may have been in Hellenic cities, and what role they played in the foundation of new settlements. Third, because I draw on both material and literary evidence in this paper, it is important to acknowledge the limitations and biases of these various indicators of ethnic influence, or indeed whether they can even be viewed as indicative of ethnic influence. Dialect specifically is often viewed as being synonymous with ethnicity, such that Dorians speak the Doric dialect etc., however, the relationship between the two is not so simple.

Finally, I present a comprehensive analysis of the material and literary evidence from the cities of Gela and Himera. I leave out Acragas from this discussion for the sake of temporal consistency, as Acragas was founded about a century after both Himera and Gela. While ethnic identity was no doubt important in all Hellenic cities, the multi-ethnic designation Thucydides gives for these two cities makes it likely that issues of ethnicity will be more visible here and thus easier to extricate from the historical record. I address the role ethnicity played in the foundation and development of these two cities, specifically with respect to the institutions of the city. Taken together, however, a comparison of these two cities will show that ethnic identity was by no means formulaic or consistently implemented, but rather strategically deployed by both individuals and communities to navigate the complex series of relationships and networks that defined their daily lives. The cities of Gela and Himera played important parts in the events of the eighth through fifth centuries BC. By presenting the results of this study on ethnic identity at

these two cities, I hope a clearer understanding of their inner-workings may be achieved so as to better understand their roles in the history of Sicily and the broader Hellenic world.

ETHNICITY

Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, in the introduction to their edited volume *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture*, begin by laying out an important analytical framework that I believe has profitable parallels for the study of Hellenic ethnicity.¹ They state that “culture” is a theoretical category that is understood as “a system of shared beliefs and practices by means of which Greeks (like all groups of human beings) structured, regulated, and comprehended their collective lives.” It is the means by which we can comprehend the significance of idiosyncratic archaeological remains or practices, and from them draw meaning and cohesion. Yet while utilizing the framework provided by this understanding of Greek culture, the authors acknowledge “its lack of coherence and unity, its multiplicity, and its grounding in individual practices.” These two contradictory viewpoints mirror the difficulties of studying ethnicity in the ancient world. Ethnicity, much like culture, exists at multiple levels and is never static, but rather is constantly negotiated and readapted to suit specific needs for specific groups of people. Thus, while we may speak in terms of a Greek culture and ethnicity, we are also keenly aware of the significant variation and change that occurs within it.

If we are then to study the “sub-Hellenic” or “intra-Greek” ethnic identities that Thucydides deals with, that is the Dorians and Ionians, a clearer understanding of “Hellenicity” is necessary. This concept, namely a collective Hellenic identity, is one that should not be taken as established and unchanged through all periods of Greek history, but must instead be evaluated to understand the connotation of its use at various points in time as well as the significance of its development.

¹ Dougherty and Kurke 2003: 1-2

² Dewey and Bentley 1949: 146, Ardener 1989: 68, Eriksen 1993: 90; Hall 2002: 125.

Many have argued that the act of naming, or developing an ethnonym, in this case “Hellenes,” effectively creates a space for “self-identification and external classification” through which a group is formed and defined.² As such, the very existence of the term “Hellenes” indicates that an understanding of ethnic identity existed among the politically divided and fragmented Hellenic peoples, who nevertheless understood themselves as a part of a larger identity.

While it is important to make a distinction between the use of a term and the reality of its meaning, the assumption is that by tracing the use and frequency of the term “Hellenes” in the literary record we can also trace the development and acceptance of the idea of Hellenic identity itself. Because of the fragmentary nature of the literary record as we have it, as well as the possibility of our misinterpretation of it, a definitive correlation between the use of the term and the reality of its meaning may perhaps always be out of reach. Even so, following the development of the term “Hellenes” through the literary record is certainly productive and provides much evidence of the nature of Hellenic identity through antiquity.

Beginning with Homer, our earliest literary source, we find that the term “Hellenes” is almost entirely absent from his works.³ Some may explain the Homeric absence of “Hellenes” by arguing that Homer is intentionally hearkening back to an earlier period (perhaps the Mycenaean) in which there was no such Hellenic identity, and therefore uses such archaic appellations as Achaeans, Argives, or Danaans when discussing the coalition against Troy.⁴ This argument posits that there was another term instead of Hellenes, used in a similarly collective sense (e.g. Achaeans) by which prehistoric Greece can be understood as having ethnic unity. There is, however, little evidence to support this in Late Bronze Age Greece.⁵

² Dewey and Bentley 1949: 146, Ardener 1989: 68, Eriksen 1993: 90; Hall 2002: 125.

³ The term “Hellenes” is used once in *Iliad* 2.684, but refers to a group from a specific region of Greece.

⁴ Hall 2002: 127.

⁵ For a discussion of collective identity during Mycenaean times, see Hall 2002: 47-55, 126.

Instead, present in Homer as well as some of his contemporaries such as Hesiod (*Works and Days* 526-28) and Archilochus (fr. 102 West), is the term Panhellenes (Πανέλληνες), or literally “all the Hellenes.” By its use and context Panhellenes is shown to be a regional rather than ethnic term, indicating a “pluralistic aggregate” of peoples as opposed to a monolithic and homogenous people.⁶ Literally it referred to all the people in Hellas, depending on the geographic definition of Hellas at that time,⁷ and indeed seems to imply a diverse collection of groups. Linguistic analysis of the term Ἕλληνες (Hellenes) shows that because the accent falls on the initial rather than penultimate syllable, Ἕλληνες must have at one time had a prefix and quite clearly derives from Πανέλληνες.⁸ Yet Ἕλληνες does not appear in the literary record until Hecataeus of Miletus (mid sixth century), around 200 years after the time of Homer.⁹ By its use, the meaning of “Hellenes” appears to have moved away from a regional designation and by the sixth century is used as an ethnonym. Because the use of an ethnonym logically implies the existence of an ethnic identity, in this case a Hellenic one, the sixth century may be designated as a *terminus ante quem* of its introduction. But to understand what it means to be a Hellene, we must understand the parameters of inclusion in this Hellenic identity, based primarily on the evidence available to us from the period in question.

The focus on the term Hellenes is largely the work of Jonathan Hall, who argues that Hellenic identity, beginning in the sixth century, was originally dependent upon inclusion within mythological genealogies of descent which correspond to the major sub-Hellenic ethnic groups such as the Dorians and Ionians.¹⁰ The genealogical tradition is described in the works of many authors but is based largely on the *Catalogue of Women*, of uncertain authorship but likely

⁶ Hall 2002: 132; Hall 2004: 38; Morgan 1993: 18-44.

⁷ For geographic extent of Hellas, see Hall 2002: 127-129.

⁸ Stier 1970: 22-23; Hall 2003: 28.

⁹ Hall 2002: 133.

¹⁰ Hall 2002: 25-29.

written around the sixth century, in which there are described “the sons of the war-loving king Hellen, Doros, Xouthos and Ailos” and later “Akhaois and Ion...”¹¹ Interestingly these figures are otherwise unknown and have few if any stories associated with them. Instead they appear to exist only in order to provide an origin for the various ethnonyms, legitimating and organizing the various ethnic groups which hold their names.¹² Inclusion within this genealogy constituted inclusion within the Hellenic identity, through subscription to these various eponymous ethnic groups. Without going too far into Hall’s arguments concerning Hellenic ethnogenesis,¹³ evidence for the importance of these ethnic groups as a means of Hellenic inclusion comes from religious and political institutions, such as the Hellanodikai (Ἑλλανοδίκαι) of the Olympic Games, established no earlier than 680 BC. The responsibilities of the Hellanodikai were to determine if participants were eligible for competition based on their “Hellenic credentials,” which meant proving descent from one of the eponymous Greek “forefathers.” It is necessary to note here that descent from ethnic genealogies was not understood literally but rather metaphorically. Herodotus (5.22) gives an example of this when he discusses Alexander I, king of Macedon in the early fifth century, having to “prove” his Hellenism in order to be permitted to compete in the Olympic games. He does this by claiming Argive descent, at which point he was permitted to compete.¹⁴ From this example we can conclude both that a sense of Hellenic identity was in existence at this time and that sub-Hellenic ethnic identity was important for inclusion within the broader Hellenic identity.

A change in the parameters of Hellenic identity seems to occur around the middle of the fifth century. At this time Herodotus (8.144.2) describes Hellenism as, “common bloodlines,

¹¹ Fr. 9 Merkelbach-West.

¹² Hall 2002: 27.

¹³ See Hall 2002: 134-171, especially for discussion of the Delphic Amphictyony.

¹⁴ For more on Olympia and the importance of the Olympic games for Hellenic identity, see Hall 2002: 154-168.

common language, altars to the gods and sacrifices shared in common, and a common way of life.”¹⁵ Much scholarship has been written analyzing this quote, yet suffice it to say here that this description of Hellenic identity hardly seems like an ethnic description based on descent, and even mention of “common bloodlines” is ambiguous and unclear. No longer does there seem to be a genealogical basis of Hellenic identity, but rather the emergence of cultural criteria. Jonathan Hall identifies this split, which he places at the time of the Persian War, as being the transition from an aggregative to an oppositional form of identity. Through an aggregative identity, Hellenic peoples emphasized the similarities they saw between themselves, focusing on the mythic genealogy describe above, but also *polis* identity, religion, and language. The advent of the Persian Wars served to create an “oppositional identity” in which Hellenic identity was formed against that of the well-known “Barbarian.”¹⁶ To quote Irad Malkin, “the Persians were the whetstone against which a common Greekness was sharpened.”¹⁷ What made Hellenes Hellenes was no longer the similarities they had between themselves, but rather their differences from external cultures. This contrast served to emphasize homogeneity rather than variety within the Hellenic ethnicity, thus leading to cultural elements becoming more heavily emphasized.

This cultural sense of identity is certainly evident by the time of Isocrates (early fourth century BC), who advocated Hellenism as being based not on genealogical or sub-ethnic characteristics but rather on a manner of thought and learning.¹⁸ Thus, Hellenic culture had become sufficiently defined and homogenized by this point so that people of non-Hellenic descent could subscribe to it by their acceptance of its cultural practices. In this manner,

¹⁵ τὸ Ἑλληνικὸν ἐὸν ὁμαιμὸν τε καὶ ὁμόγλωσσον καὶ θεῶν ἰδρύματα τε κοινὰ καὶ θυσίαι ἡθεῖα τε ὁμότροπα, τῶν προδότασ γενέσθαι Ἀθηναίους οὐκ ἂν εὖ ἔχοι. For more analysis of this quote, see Zacharia 2008: 21-36

¹⁶ Hall 1997.

¹⁷ Malkin 2001: 7

¹⁸ Isocrates *Panegyricus* 50.

deemphasizing the sub-ethnic parameters of inclusivity in Hellenic identity made the overarching identity stronger and more meaningful.

Yet because we are concerned with ethnic identity at the time of the foundation of the Sicilian settlements, we must focus on the Archaic period more closely. Jonathan Hall's view that Hellenic identity at this time was dependent on inclusion in mythicized genealogical traditions is of course not the only theory in existence, nor is genealogy the only parameter by which Hellenic identity may have been defined.¹⁹ Irad Malkin makes the point that ethnic identity is really a form of "collective identity," under which *polis* identity, religious identity, linguistic identity, and others are subsumed.²⁰ Malkin argues from a network theory perspective in which he identifies "fractal" areas throughout the distant Greek settlements and territories. Fractals are political communities, either city-states or regional/ethnic groups, which themselves are increasingly subdivided by region, kinship model,²¹ or religious and ethnic affiliations. It is precisely the ever-expanding connections between these fractals, which occurred with the increase in colonization, that Malkin identifies as strengthening Hellenic identity. He echoes Hall's arguments about perceived similarities between Greeks forging a pan-Hellenic identity as they confronted increasingly varied and different populations. But rather than identifying shared mytho-historical genealogies as being fundamental to the emergence of a Hellenic identity, Malkin argues that it was specifically colonialism and the multiplicity of identities it permitted, and often created, that led to the growing awareness of Hellenicity.²²

This interpretation has value for our study because it emphasizes the variety within Hellenic identity and the interplay between regional identities and ethnic identities. Malkin focuses much

¹⁹ See Osborne 2012 who argues that ethnic identity had a negligible effect on the formation of cultural divisions.

²⁰ Malkin 2001: 3-4, Hall 2002: 17. For a discussion on *polis* identity, see Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 12-14.

²¹ Fragoulaki 2013.

²² Malkin 2003.

of his analysis on the Altar of Apollo Archegetes at Sicilian Naxos, which unlike other religious institutions, was not restrictive based on sub-Hellenic ethnic identities. Rather it served all *Sicilian* Greeks, an important and novel development. Ethnic parameters for religious institutions in other cases show that they support the importance of sub-Hellenic ethnic groups, even if not the overall Hellenic identity. For example, while participation in the Olympic games was restricted to Hellenes only, other religious festivals or sanctuaries were not so exclusive. Herodotus provides ample evidence that non-Hellenes had access to the Delphic Oracle, while coastal sanctuaries such as those dedicated to Hera at Samos and Perachora functioned also as meeting places of cultural exchange with non-Hellenic groups.²³ Along with such evidence of inclusion of non-Hellenes in religious activities, there is also evidence of exclusion of Hellenes from certain religious rites. Again Herodotus provides examples of this, such as when the Spartan general Cleomenes is barred from the Athenian acropolis because he is a Dorian, despite fulfilling all other criteria of what would constitute a Hellene.²⁴ Robert Parker observes that it was not gods but cults that defined religious identity. He further argues that religious practices and festivals would be shared among Hellenes with shared blood/kinship, which would usually be synonymous with ethnic grouping.²⁵ The lack of an institutionalized and codified Greek religion makes religious identity difficult to use as a basis for Hellenic identity, but perhaps sufficient for highlighting the divisions along sub-Hellenic ethnic divides. However, this is not the case with the Altar of Apollo Archegetes at Sicilian Naxos, which suggests that regional identities could supersede ethnic divisions, an important fact to keep in mind in our study of ethnic identity at Gela and Himera.

²³ Hall in Dougherty and Kurke 2003: 24

²⁴ Hall in Dougherty and Kurke 2003: 32

²⁵ Parker 1998: 12

OVERSEAS EXPANSION AND SETTLEMENT

Terminology is the first order of business when discussing what is often called Greek colonialism. It has long been the practice of distinguishing the “Greek” world, centered on the Aegean, from some conception of an external world of colonies and isolated settlements. The result of this differentiation is a diminished appreciation for the culture and history of these colonial regions in relation to the history of mainland Greece. They are conceptualized as being secondary or “peripheral,” as marginal in importance as they are geographically. As Irad Malkin notes in his critique of this “centre-and-periphery” model, a Sicilian Greek fighting the Carthaginian invasion of 480 BC “must have felt no less at the centre of things ‘Greek’ than his counterpart in Athens who, in the same year, was facing the Persians.”²⁶ Such a “centre-and-periphery” perspective furthermore ignores the long history of colonization that was already well established in the Aegean by the time the first colonies in the West and East were settled. Rather than interpreting the “overseas” (another term based in “centre-and-periphery” thought) settlements as being a sudden and unprecedented phenomenon of the eighth century, they must be understood in the context of migration and settlement movements that had already long been occurring in western Anatolia and the northern Aegean.

Awareness of these problems has led to broader questions of whether we can even term these population movements as being “colonization.” Robin Osborne’s critique of this term is perhaps the most well known. Viewing the term as a product of European imperialism in the modern era, he argues that “colonialism” evokes “statist” overtones that cause us to contemplate Greek colonies as “instruments of political and cultural control” rather than an end themselves. He argues that the commonly held assumption of state-organized colonization, while appropriate for the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods, is anachronistic and misleading regarding

²⁶ Malkin 2003: 60.

eighth and seventh century foundations. Rather, Osborne holds that “private-enterprise” and more organic population movements were responsible for the majority of western settlements established during the Archaic period. The foundation accounts that have passed down to us discussing specific state actions are therefore later creations, composed to suit specific political or cultural needs. Likewise, modern scholarship based on ancient accounts differentiates between *apoikiai* and *emporía*, the former being understood as evidence of state action while the latter is merely commercial activity not necessarily endorsed by the state. Osborne argues that there is in fact little archaeological evidence to support this distinction in the Archaic period, at which time such an understanding would be anachronistic.²⁷

Peter van Dommelen, on the other hand, provides a more measured definition of colonialism that takes into consideration some of these critiques, calling it:

The presence of one or more groups of foreign people in a region at some distance from their place of origin (the “colonizers”), and the existence of asymmetrical socioeconomic relationships of dominance or exploitation between the colonizing groups and the inhabitants of the colonized regions.²⁸

While this definition allows us to reclaim “colonialism,” no matter what terminology is used, we cannot ignore that there was a process of settlement in regions not traditionally associated with Greece. As such, though “there must be a limit to the preoccupation with semantic quibbling and word-chopping,” the more important issue is the move away from the model by which we understand settlements in Sicily, and indeed everywhere, as being in some way peripheral to mainland Greece and the Aegean.²⁹

If we are to acknowledge that the history of colonial settlements are a part of Greek history, the reasons for colonization become all the more necessary to study. While

²⁷ Osborne 1998. For critiques see Domínguez 2011.

²⁸ van Dommelen 1997: 306.

²⁹ For more on terminology of Greek colonies, see Tsetskhladze 2006: xxxviii-xlii.

overpopulation, or conversely deficiency of resources adequate to support populations, is the most often cited reason for colonization, there is little evidence to support either interpretation in the Archaic.³⁰ Indeed Anthony Snodgrass has argued that Greek cities of the eighth and seventh centuries did not have populations large enough to single-handedly support an overseas venture without severely depleting their populations at home. Useful parallels with North American colonization of the seventeenth century have been offered by Gillian Shepherd, where successful colonies such as Plymouth Bay were settled by only sixty-five adults, half of which died in the first winter.³¹ These numbers are mostly consistent with what few sources we have that speak of early colonial populations, such as 200 individuals at Apollonia in Illyria as well as Cyrene.³²

A possible cause of colonization may have been forced migration, either because of external forces or intra-city politics.³³ Though there are historical accounts that support this cause for some colonies, it nevertheless cannot have been the prime motivator in all cases, and unfortunately the rest remains speculation. Disappointing as the conclusion may be, it is hardly surprising that Greek colonization was not dependent on a specific or singular reason, but rather was a result of localized factors. It underlines the importance of studying settlements individually and resisting the urge to generalize.

FOUNDATION STORIES

Much of what we know about the origins of Hellenic settlements abroad comes from foundation stories that have been passed down through the literary record. As with all things literary, there is a spectrum of historical truth and mythical fiction along which each foundation

³⁰ Tsetskhladze 2006: xxviii-xxix.

³¹ Shepherd 2005: 129-130.

³² Graham 1982: 146.

³³ Tsetskhladze 2006: xxix-xxx.

account must be considered. The accounts of Greek migrations that occurred prior to the beginning of the “historical” period, considered to begin with the foundation of the Olympic Games in 776 BC, are often labeled as legends and myths. Those accounts of foundations occurring within the historical period are given far greater credibility even though similar terminology is used in both. Despite acknowledging that these “historical” foundation stories almost all date to the fifth century or later, these “historical-positivists,” as Jonathan Hall labels them, refute the possibility that these stories might be entirely fabricated. Furthermore, they prefer literary evidence over archaeological evidence, except when they cite relevant material evidence to affirm the validity of these accounts. Likewise, even those scholars who prefer archaeological evidence over literary evidence often find their interpretations guided by literary accounts.³⁴

However, there are certainly reasons to be cautious with these foundation stories. Carol Dougherty has noted the formulaic nature of many of these stories, speculating on the existence of a *ktisis* genre of Greek literature specifically focused on the creation and development of foundation accounts.³⁵ For example, in many foundation stories the Delphic Oracle is consulted to resolve some kind of civil strife and directs the settlers towards the location of the city-to-be, thereby resolving the initial problem.³⁶ Other patterns such as prophecies based on word play also exist for certain cities, as well as the theme of the polluted founder. On the other hand, these themes are by no means consistent across all accounts, sometimes being represented in only one or two sources. For example, of the twenty-seven accounts Jonathan Hall analyzes in his

³⁴ Hall 2008: 383-385. As Thucydides is the main source when it comes to chronology for Sicilian cities, the veracity of his dates are often called into question. For the most part, however, his dates are consistent with archaeological findings and are generally believed to be correct (Tsetskhladze 2006: xxxi-xxxviii; Hall 2008: 398-402).

³⁵ Dougherty 1994: 35-46.

³⁶ Dougherty 1993: 15-27

systematic analysis of foundation stories, only five make mention of the Delphic Oracle. The question of a *ktisis* genre underscores the existence of similarities between accounts, indicating that historical truth was not always the only purpose of foundation stories.³⁷

In utilizing these foundation accounts as part of my analysis, I echo the cautions laid out by Jonathan Hall. He cautions against using quantitative measurements when presented with a high number of accounts, as it is difficult to know the sources utilized by authors. Thus while it may seem significant that both Thucydides and Diodorus Siculus name the same founders for Gela, the perceived validity this adds to that account is mitigated by considering that Diodorus was likely working from Thucydides' work, who himself was likely working from the now mostly lost writings of Antiochus of Syracuse. Secondly, the absence of certain details in various historical accounts does not mean that authors were unaware of them, just that it was not immediately relevant.³⁸

While historical-positivists may view patterns in foundation stories as evidence for an institutionalized and ritualistic process by which cities were settled, others argue that foundation accounts must be studied as elements of hindsight-historicizing on the part of cities as they invent historical narratives that suit specific political or cultural needs, rather than as historical truth.³⁹ Much can be said regarding the difficulties of preserving historical memory in semi-literate societies, especially concerning events that occurred centuries before they were recorded in writing. The differences that occur among the wide variety of foundation accounts must confirm that they are all representations of the local factors and practical needs of the times they were written in. They certainly cannot all be true, and it would be difficult to adequately prove why one was more trust-worthy than another. For our purposes, it is especially interesting to note

³⁷ Hall 2008: 400-402.

³⁸ Hall 2008: 388.

³⁹ Hall 2008: 387; 394

that of the foundation accounts for the twenty-seven cities of southern Italy and Sicily that Jonathan Hall examines, he specifically identifies three as showing considerable disagreement regarding the provenance of the initial settlers. Two of these cities are Gela and Himera.⁴⁰

OIKISTS

A critically important element of the foundation of a settlement abroad, based on historical accounts, is the role of the *oikist*. This figure was both the leader of the expedition that set out as well as the individual responsible for handling the practicalities of establishing a city. Osborne's arguments for private enterprise certainly emphasize the role of the *oikist*, but the distinction between private and public spheres is not so clear in the Archaic. Even if these individuals acted without the implicit support of an established polity, assuming the concept of a *polis* was already sufficiently developed, many of these *oikists* must have been aristocrats or community leaders of some kind.⁴¹ Thus while Osborne may be right in saying that it is anachronistic to speak of commercial interests of polities driving colonialism, there is no reason to doubt that individuals did not possess commercial interests or motives.⁴²

Whoever they were, once in their colonial context their responsibilities became more governmental, organizing the development of the city and leading the military forces of the city in conflicts. After their deaths, they often took on religious and cultic functions and are believed to have been worshipped as heroes.⁴³ In this way the city not only gained a focalization of religious identity, but also a means by which the historical facts of a city's foundation could be

⁴⁰ Hall 2008: 391. The other city is Mylae, which was perhaps also a colony of Zancle.

⁴¹ Domínguez 2011: 198-199.

⁴² Domínguez 2011: 204.

⁴³ Graham 1983: 29.

reiterated in annual rites.⁴⁴ While there is some evidence of these practices at a few cities, the actual mechanics of an *oikist* cult are unknown. Equally unclear is the result of having multiple *oikists*, such as at Gela and Himera.⁴⁵ Generally each *oikist* would be associated with a specific group of settlers, though it is extremely difficult to identify which *oikist* led which contingent of colonists. Thus while the mechanics of their roles remains unclear, evidence of them in the archaeological record in their colonial cities is highly valuable and may provide important clues regarding the foundation of the city.

NOMIMA

The relations between communities and states was certainly based in part on ties of kinship associated with mytho-historical genealogies, creating a sense of racial affiliation based on sub-Hellenic ethnic groups. However, Thucydides also provides evidence of kinship based not on descent, but rather on cultural and political institutions.⁴⁶ In discussing the topic of *nomima*, it is worthwhile to examine the accounts by Thucydides in which he references it.

Γέλαν δὲ Ἀντίφημος ἐκ Ῥόδου καὶ Ἐντιμος ἐκ Κρήτης ἐποίκουσ ἀγαγόντες κοινῇ ἔκτισαν, ἔπει πέμπτω καὶ τεσσαρακοστῶ μετὰ Συρακουσῶν οἴκισιν. καὶ τῇ μὲν πόλει ἀπὸ τοῦ Γέλα ποταμοῦ τοῦνομα ἐγένετο, τὸ δὲ χωρίον οὗ νῦν ἡ πόλις ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πρῶτον ἐτειχίσθη Λίνδιοι καλεῖται· νόμιμα δὲ Δωρικὰ ἐτέθη αὐτοῖς. ἔτεσι δὲ ἐγγύτατα ὀκτώ καὶ ἑκατὸν μετὰ τὴν σφετέραν οἴκισιν Γελῶσι Ἀκράγαντα ὄκισαν, τὴν μὲν πόλιν ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκράγαντος ποταμοῦ ὀνομάσαντες, οἴκιστὰς δὲ ποιήσαντες Ἀριστόνουν καὶ Πυστίλον, νόμιμα δὲ τὰ Γελῶων δόντες.

καὶ ἡμέρα ἀπὸ Ζάγκλης ὄκισθη ὑπὸ Εὐκλείδου καὶ Σίμου καὶ Σάκωνος, καὶ Χαλκιδῆς μὲν οἱ πλεῖστοι ἦλθον ἐς τὴν ἀποικίαν, ξυνόκισαν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκ Συρακουσῶν φηγάδες στάσει νικηθέντες, οἱ Μυλητίδαι καλούμενοι· καὶ φωνὴ μὲν μετὰ τῆς τε Χαλκιδέων καὶ Δωρίδος ἐκράθη, νόμιμα δὲ τὰ Χαλκιδικὰ ἐκράτησεν.

Antiphemus of Rhodes and Entimus of Crete, leading together an expedition, established Gela in the forty-fifth year after the foundation of Syracuse. The town got its name from

⁴⁴ Malkin 1987: 189.

⁴⁵ Malkin 1987: 254.

⁴⁶ Fragoulaki 2013: 3-10.

the river Gelas, and the place where the city now is, and was first fortified, is called Lindii. Dorian institutions were established for them. Almost one hundred and eight years after the foundation of Gela, the Geloans established Acragas, being named for the river Acragas, making Aristonous and Pystilus the founders and giving the city the institutions of the Geloans. (6.4.3-4; author's translation)

Himera was founded from Zancle by Euclides, Simus, and Sacon. The greater portion were Chalcidians who went to the colony, but they were accompanied by those exiles from Syracuse who had been defeated in civil war, called the Myletidae. The language became a mix of Chalcidian and Doric, but the institutions that prevailed were the Chalcidian. (6.5.1; author's translation)

Simon Hornblower presents several observations concerning the meaning of *nomima*, which Liddell and Scott translate as “usages or customs,” but is often summed up as “institutions.” He states that these institutions could be religious calendars and festivals, the language of official use, coin and/or weight standards, or laws. However, in the case of Himera and Gela, at the time of their foundation coinage had not yet been instituted, and there was no such concept as Dorian or Ionian standards of coin and weight, nor any of Dorian or Ionian law.⁴⁷ The institution of language is a tempting option, especially as both Rhodes and Crete were regions where the Dorian dialect would have been in use, yet Thucydides' description of Himera seems to treat language (φωνή) as being distinct from institutions (νόμιμα).⁴⁸ The answer is not clear from the text alone, and Hornblower ends his commentary on these passages with a recommendation that they deserve more attention than they have had.⁴⁹

John Boardman lists the institutions of a colony as the cults, calendar, dialect, script, state offices, and citizen divisions, which are reproduced from those of the mother city.⁵⁰ However, A. J. Graham argues that when Thucydides says that most of the settlers were Chalcidians, rather

⁴⁷ Hornblower 2010: 291; For coinage, see Kraay 1983.

⁴⁸ Thucydides (7.57.2) later makes a similar dichotomy between language and institutions, when he describes people who “speak Attic and use Athenian laws.”

⁴⁹ Hornblower 2010: 291, 297. Gomme (1970) is notably silent on the issue entirely, making only a small note referring the reader to a series of inscriptions in *SGDI* 3247-51 that preserve the $\bar{\alpha}$.

⁵⁰ Boardman and Hammond 1982: 153-55.

than saying they were Zancaean, it is because he is preparing himself for his comment about the *nomima* of Himera. In this way the institutions of the mother-city are not as important as the more general institutions and ethnicity of Chalcidian, which Himera would adopt and project.⁵¹ This interpretation is difficult to reconcile with Strabo's account (6.2.6) of Himera in which he says "the Zancaeans in Mylai founded Himera," thus using the Zancaean ethnic name rather than the Chalcidian.⁵² On the other hand, Strabo makes no mention of a mixed population or dialect, nor is he concerned with the institutions of the city.

Irad Malkin presents a more detailed interpretation of *nomima*. He describes the *nomima* of a city as the rituals and institutions set out when a city is first founded, and argues that the "foundation" of a city is the period between the arrival of the founder and his death. In the case of Himera, where there are three *oikists*, this period of time would not have been definitive. Malkin further argues that the means through which settlers integrated and took on their new identities was that of the *nomima*, which involved social divisions, sacred calendars, and various legal institutions which altogether defined the social and religious nature of the community. Malkin states that "*nomima* served to assimilate all individual migrants into the new social order so that after one generation all would become 'Chalkidians' or 'Phokaians.'"⁵³ In doing so, he argues that *nomima* reveals connections that are not based on foundation myths or "quasi-historical" accounts. In this sense Malkin identifies the institutions of a city as being objective and "innocent of the suspicion of manipulation."⁵⁴ In a brief aside in which he discusses Himera specifically, Malkin argues that the language became mixed there because it was "neutral, not an object of symbolic and formal decision." Yet because the city required common *nomima* from

⁵¹ Graham 1983: 104-105. See Malkin 2011: 73-74 as well.

⁵² ὅν τὴν μὲν Ἰμέραν οἱ ἐν Μυλαῖς ἔκτισαν Ζαγκλαῖοι

⁵³ Malkin 2011: 23, 55. Malkin's view is supported by Pindar *Pyth.* 1.64 where he equates Dorian laws with the retention of Dorian ethnic identity (Nisetich 1980:153-159). See also Brugnone 1997: 77.

⁵⁴ Malkin 2003: 68.

the beginning and could not wait for an “evolutionist mixture to emerge” as happened with the language, the Chalcidian *nomima* were deliberately chosen.⁵⁵ Therefore, Malkin views language as being a “neutral” element of a city’s character, and does not include it among the possible *nomima* of a city. Hornblower, Boardman, and Graham do include language as an element of a city’s *nomima*, though Hornblower admits that in the case of Himera Thucydides seems to make a distinction. The role of language in the institutions of the city will be elaborated on more in the section on Himera.

Further analysis of Thucydides’ account shows that, whatever role language played in the institutions of Himera, the foundation might not have begun smoothly. Thucydides uses different verbs to describe the way the institutions were implemented at the various cities. For Gela and Acragas, the verbs are ἐτέθη (was established) and δόντες (having given) respectively, while for Himera the verb is ἐκράτησεν (they prevailed). The sense between the two cases is markedly different. Simon Hornblower’s commentary on these sections suggests that the implications of the verbs used for Gela and Himera indicate a “definite and single-moment imposition of institutions,” which is what one may perhaps suspect from a city founded by two groups of colonists who shared the same ethnic identity.⁵⁶ But regarding Himera, Hornblower suggests that the sense of Himera’s establishment according to the verb choice implies “something less than imposition,” as compared to that of Gela and Acragas. In other words, perhaps because of the mixed origins of Himera, the establishment of institutions there had a different nature than at Gela where both founding parties were Dorian.⁵⁷ The sense of “prevailed” implies some kind of conflict or struggle, of which we have no evidence, but it certainly indicates that the foundation

⁵⁵ Malkin 2011: 192.

⁵⁶ Hornblower 2010: 290.

⁵⁷ Hornblower 2010: 297.

of Himera was not as straightforward as at Gela, and we are left to suspect that ethnic differences may have been the cause.

Finally, it is important to note that Thucydides has a particular agenda and bias in composing his *History of the Peloponnesian War*. He goes to great lengths to portray the conflict largely as an ethnic confrontation between Dorians and Ionians,⁵⁸ and though his subject of the foundation of Sicilian settlements predates the conflict, his account must nevertheless be seen as influenced by his overall theme. How conscious the average Hellene was of the ethnic nature of this conflict is unclear, and Thucydides does in fact hint at ulterior factors beyond ethnic divisions in shaping the war. For example, Thucydides (6.6) identifies the Egestaeans as being especially influential in persuading the Athenians to invade Sicily, claiming that if the power of Syracuse was not checked there would be a great risk of a unified Dorian force coming to the aid of the Peloponnesians in their war against Athens. Thucydides does not ignore, however, that the Egestaeans were also at that time wrapped up in their own conflict with Syracuse, and it is made clear that they have other motives besides a concern for the well being of Athens.

The argument of the Egestaeans is also worth addressing because of an important distinction Thucydides makes. The Egestaeans argue that:

κίνδυνον εἶναι μή ποτε μεγάλη παρασκευῆ Δωριῆς τε Δωριεῦσι κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενές καὶ ἅμα ἄποικοι τοῖς ἐκπέμψασι Πελοποννησίοις βοηθήσαντες καὶ τὴν ἐκείνων δύναμιν ξυγκαθέλωσιν

There is danger lest one day, by a large expedition, [the Syracusans] join together their power and come as fellow Dorians to the aid of the Dorians and, as colonists, to those Peloponnesians who had sent them out. (6.6; author's translation.)

By juxtaposing the connection the Sicilian Dorians would have with their mainland Dorian brethren, alongside the connection between a colony and mother-city, Thucydides makes it clear

⁵⁸ This is best demonstrated by the speech Thucydides provides for Hermocrates (6.80) when addressing the neutral Camarinaeans during the Athenian invasion of Sicily, as well as later when he distinguishes combatants who fought for Athens or Sparta by ethnic group (7.57).

that ethnic identification can be used to magnify and parallel the more concrete ties of kinship that would already exist between a colony and its mother-city. For Thucydides, who is concerned with the systems of alliances that shaped the Peloponnesian War, ethnicity is then an important topic worth addressing. Yet while he clearly has this subject of ethnic divisions in mind, it is not surprising that later historical accounts make no mention of *nomima* or ethnic affiliations, since they are not concerned with the same narrative as Thucydides.

In summary, we lack any definitive clarification by ancient sources on what *nomima* were and we are therefore left to speculate. Though our intuition that the *nomima* were the religious, social, and political institutions of a city that altogether defined its character and operation is likely correct, the specifics perhaps will always elude us. What is clear is that every city had *nomima*, and there is evidence of cities adopting the *nomima* of other cities.⁵⁹ Though Malkin argues that the adoption of the institutions of another city “was perhaps ideological to the extent that it declared a focus of identity,” he continues that its primary purpose was most likely practical.⁶⁰ However, in the multi-ethnic cases of Gela and Himera, there is little doubt that the *nomima* served a greater purpose than practical needs, and will therefore be explored in detail.

MATERIAL AND LITERARY INDICATORS OF ETHNIC IDENTITY

The previous discussions have demonstrated that ethnicity is extremely difficult to define and defies any attempts at generalization. Identifying ethnicity in the archaeological record thus presents significant challenges. Pottery and burials are generally the most common lines of evidence, but unsurprisingly also do not provide definitive answers.⁶¹ Nevertheless, taking into consideration as many lines of evidence as possible is unlikely to be harmful in forming

⁵⁹ Malkin 2003: 69.

⁶⁰ Malkin 2003: 70.

⁶¹ Tsetskhladze 2006: lxi.

interpretations, for which reason I also discuss dialect and epigraphy here. Still, caution must be exercised in order to avoid the trap of circular arguments, by which cultural boundaries defined by literary sources are used to name dialects or ceramic styles, which are themselves then used to prove the validity of literary sources.⁶² In articulating this warning, I offer a brief discussion on several lines of evidence used in this paper. While I also take into consideration evidence of religious practices and institutions at Gela and Himera, the evidence is very site specific and will be discussed in those sections rather than here.

CERAMIC RECORD

As early as 1971, A. J. Graham already voiced many cautions regarding the use of archaeological material in the context of colonial settlements. Because we have relatively extensive literary sources that provide us with the dates of settlement for many colonial cities, it is generally quite simple to test the validity of these chronologies. An excavation of the site will show a stratigraphy of cultural deposits, most of which can be dated based on ceramic sequences and relative dates. Yet in many cases, such as Gela and Himera, cultural deposits indicating a Greek presence predate the traditional foundation dates provided for cities by historical accounts. It would be irresponsible, however, to completely reject the historical accounts based on the presence of earlier cultural deposits, especially when they are often scant. There is little reason to doubt the existence of trade or temporary habitation before the establishment of the actual city, and in any case the presence of ceramics does not confirm the presence of people.⁶³ Corinthian wares, for example, are found in extremely high frequency at almost every colonial site in the western Mediterranean. To assume based on these ceramics that Corinth single-handedly settled

⁶² Antonaccio 2001: 124-125.

⁶³ Graham 1971: 3.

every colony in the West would be absurd.⁶⁴ Euboean wares, on the other hand, are found among the earliest layers at many Chalcidian sites, thereby seemingly supporting the connection between the material and literary accounts for these sites. However, as Jonathan Hall cautions, “what is at stake is a point of method: the archaeological evidence is seldom conclusive, so the decision to either invoke or to refute the equation of ‘pots and people’ is all too often guided by literary evidence which has itself already been selected and filtered by modern assumptions.”⁶⁵

Above all else, consistency is ultimately necessary for a synchronic study of ceramic assemblages from these overseas settlements. A far safer paradigm is to accept that ceramics should not be taken as representative of identity, even in cases when they are locally produced.⁶⁶ The consequences this has for studies of identity are that ceramics should generally be used with great caution in analysis. Yet their connection to the institutions of a city are less clear. The considerable variety of ceramic types that exists at most cities suggests that trade and commerce were not dependent on institutions, but rather external to their ethnic affiliations. The significance of this is difficult to specify, but at the very least it shows that some elements of the population and daily life of a city were independent of the *nomima* of a city.

MORTUARY RECORD

A prime example of the value of regional comparison is the mortuary record in colonial Sicily. While much has been written on the burial customs of ancient Greeks and the grouping of practices according to regional or ethnic groups,⁶⁷ colonial practices are not so easily defined. When discussing burial practices, the discussion is basically about inhumations and cremations.

⁶⁴ Boardman 1999: 163.

⁶⁵ Hall 2008: 395.

⁶⁶ Antonaccio 2004: 64-65.

⁶⁷ Kurtz and Boardman 1971.

There is greater variety within these two types, as well as specifics relative to age and sex, and certain practices have been associated with Dorian while others with Ionian peoples. Gillian Shepherd has written much on the subject of colonial burial practices in Sicily, and notes there is rarely a case when the burials of a city indicate a specific origin. She argues that “perhaps, however, our inability to recognize specific origins within the burial record of any one settlement is one of the desired effects of funerary practices in the West.”⁶⁸ The assumption that the burial practices of a mother-city or region will transmit entirely to the colony is challenged by the data, which shows that new burial practices emerged very soon after the establishment of colonial cities. Especially in multi-ethnic cases such as Gela and Himera, there is great difficulty in attempting to derive an over-arching burial practice that can be connected to an ethnic affiliation.

While the presence of indigenous peoples is largely ignored in this paper, differentiating Greek burials from indigenous burials is often difficult and many necropoleis make no spatial distinction. The adoption and reuse of specific cultural elements further hinders definitive identification, with the result that “Greek” names often appear on tombs that show evidence of non-Greek burial practices. Since neither onomastics nor burial rites are especially indicative of ethnic identification, oftentimes each burial and necropolis must be taken on a case-by-case basis.⁶⁹ Thus the mortuary record largely reflects the conclusions reached in the discussion about the ceramic record. We can conclude that burial practices as well were not tied to the ethnic affiliation of a city’s institutions. Rather, they developed freely in such a way as to reflect multiple and varied identities.

⁶⁸ Shepherd 2005: 131-132.

⁶⁹ Tsetskhladze 2006: lxii.

DIALECTS

The equivalency between ethnic groups and dialectic groups, by which, for example, Dorians speak the Dorian dialect, is problematic. The geographic overlap between dialectic groups and ethnic groups is far from complete, as is the correlation between eponymous genealogical figures, upon which the ethnic groups are based, and actual dialectic groups.⁷⁰ Furthermore, the study of Greek dialects today is one very much molded by evidence and scholarship from the Hellenistic period and onward, leaving the Archaic and Classical periods unclear and difficult to interpret. This is due in large part to the scarcity of evidence from before the Hellenistic period concerning what Greeks actually thought about the variety of Greek dialects spoken throughout the Hellenic world. While the information from the Hellenistic period is certainly valuable, at that time *koine* Greek, a dialect based on Attic Greek, had emerged as the standardized and universally adopted form of Greek, whereas before a multiplicity of regional and local dialects existed. What scholarship exists from the Hellenistic period is therefore several centuries removed from the periods in question, and may in fact be influenced by more contemporary theories on language and dialect. Of the writing that survives prior to the Hellenistic period, many regions of Greece are underrepresented and their writing dates to a fairly late period, at which time *koine* Greek was already beginning to be adopted. In those areas where writing exists from earlier periods, the dialect is a standardized and conservative form rather than an accurate representation of what was being spoken. A further complication arises

⁷⁰ There is no Xouthian dialect, nor is there a figure for the Arcado-Cypriot dialect group (Hall 1995: 85). For Hellenic genealogy, see Hall 2002: 56-89.

from problems of transmission, by which ancient editors emended texts to better reflect contemporary theories on dialect and the origin of the poet.⁷¹

What is certain, however, is that there was dialectic variability, and that before the adoption of *koine* in the fourth century BC it is inaccurate to say that there existed a common Greek language, as it was not standardized and instead highly diverse.⁷² Even so, Greeks of the Archaic and Classical periods seemed to believe that they possessed a common language, even if one did not quite exist yet. Historical sources rarely discuss dialects, indicating perhaps that dialect was not a concern or an integral part of identity.⁷³ As such, there is no evidence that dialectic differences hindered communication,⁷⁴ and the degree to which two people of different dialects or languages may have understood each other could have more to do with their frequency of contact rather than how their languages are grouped. It is also unlikely that ancient Hellenes would have had as developed a taxonomy of dialects as we have today, and therefore would be less likely to distinguish one another based on linguistic cues and isoglosses. Furthermore, simply learning to speak Greek as a non-Hellene would not make the speaker identifiable as a Hellene to other Hellenes, unless he could further demonstrate other parameters of inclusivity, such as kinship with a group from the aforementioned mythic genealogy.

At the same time, one cannot ignore that the three major dialectic groups (Ionic, Doric, Aeolic) were derived from the eponymous sons of Hellen, in reference to whom these ethnic

⁷¹ There is much debate concerning some of the Doric forms in the works of Alcman, such as the use of <σ> for <θ>, a replacement that has no representation in archaic Laconian inscriptions and did not emerge until several centuries after the time of Alcman (Tribulato in Bakker 2010: 389; 396).

⁷² Morpurgo Davies 2002: 156.

⁷³ Hdt. 8. 144. For Greek dialects see Colvin in Bakker 2010: 200-212; Morpurgo Davies 2002: 153-171; Hall 1995: 83-100. An instance where dialect is mentioned is in Thucydides (4.3), where the Athenians use Messenians, who speak the same dialect as the Spartans, to cause confusion in the imminent battle.

⁷⁴ Thucydides' comment (3.94.5) about the unintelligibility of the Eurytians can be resolved as an extrapolation based on cultural perceptions, thus his comment that they "eat their meat raw" (Strassler 2008: 614).

groups were also defined.⁷⁵ The use of language to emphasize ethnic differences, such as the use of archaisms in Laconian to portray pure Dorianism, further suggests a more tangible connection between dialect and ethnicity.⁷⁶

Regarding poetry, the Greeks made a strong distinction between literary dialect and oral dialect.⁷⁷ These literary dialects (Ionic for epic poetry and monodic lyric, Doric for choral lyric, Attic for tragedy and oratory) rarely matched the local dialect of the author, and often contained elements of other dialects.⁷⁸ What this means is that writers could use a dialect more appropriate to their content rather than their geographic origin, such as Pindar who freely and uncontroversially used the Doric dialect for his choral lyric, rather than his native Boeotian dialect.⁷⁹ To reiterate, there is simply not enough evidence from the Archaic and Classical periods to get a complete picture of the role dialects played in Hellenic ethnic identity, but even so, it is still possible to make observations based on linguistic evidence that can contribute to broader discussions.

EPIGRAPHY

In epigraphy we find similar problems to those posed by literary texts. First and foremost is the paucity of what survives, especially from the Archaic period, and the lack of representation for some dialects before the fourth century BC.⁸⁰ What does survive over-represents Athenian inscriptions, and the study of inscriptions must take into consideration that not all parts of Greece

⁷⁵ Colvin in Bakker 2010: 202.

⁷⁶ Hall 1995: 90

⁷⁷ Colvin in Bakker 2010:202.

⁷⁸ See Tribulato in Bakker 2010: 388-389 for discussion of *Kunstsprache*.

⁷⁹ A notable exception is the poet Corinna, also from Boeotia, who wrote in the Boeotian dialect. Unfortunately not enough of her work survives to explain this distinction. Note also Tyrtaeus, a Spartan poet somewhat contemporary with Alcman who wrote exhortations for Spartan soldiers, yet composed mostly in the Ionic dialect. Like Corinna, not enough is known about his life and work to examine further this peculiarity.

⁸⁰ Bodet 2001: 59. See as well Mickey 1981.

felt the need to have numerous inscriptions, nor had easily accessible stone suitable for carving.⁸¹ The dialectic choices made by epigraphers often reflect an artificial and purified form of the local dialect rather than the vernacular, yet epigraphy is unique in preserving the diversity of local alphabets in early inscriptions.⁸² Features such as the alphabet,⁸³ as well as the dialect, are often used to date inscriptions based on when these features are expected to be present at whatever location the inscription is found. It is clear, however, why this could be problematic, as in the case of Himera where the presence of dialectic features would be based primarily on the chronology of Thucydides, and could therefore only validate his account in a circular manner. This is a problem that can only be solved through the introduction of more lines of evidence, yet for the inscriptions discussed here I follow the interpretations of my sources.

⁸¹ Bodel 2001: 13.

⁸² Morpurgo Davies 2002: 158; Bodel 2001: 59.

⁸³ Brugnone (1995) has shown, through a study of a wide variety of Sicilian cities, including Himera (cf. *SEG* 45.1341), that the Ionian alphabet was not fully implemented in Sicily until c. 450 BC. For more on the Euboean alphabet present in Sicily, see Arena 1994: 9-10. For the Euboean script, see Jeffery 1990: 79.

GELA

FOUNDATION STORIES

Accounts of Gela's foundation can generally be divided into two categories: those that describe a mixed group of colonists and those that describe only Rhodian colonists. As discussed previously, the extent to which later historians used earlier sources is difficult to determine, and quantity alone does not support one historical interpretation over another. Therefore, while more sources do indeed describe Gela as being founded by only Rhodians, it does not necessarily make that account more valid.⁸⁴

Of those that describe a mixed foundation, we begin with Thucydides. His account for Gela states (6.4.3):

Γέλαν δὲ Ἀντίφημος ἐκ Ῥόδου καὶ Ἔντιμος ἐκ Κρήτης ἐποίκουσ ἀγαγόντες κοινῇ ἔκτισαν, ἔτει πέμπτῳ καὶ τεσσαρακοστῷ μετὰ Συρακουσῶν οἴκισιν. καὶ τῇ μὲν πόλει ἀπὸ τοῦ Γέλα ποταμοῦ τοῦνομα ἐγένετο, τὸ δὲ χωρίον οὗ νῦν ἡ πόλις ἐστὶ καὶ ὁ πρῶτον ἐτειχίσθη Λίνδιοι καλεῖται· νόμιμα δὲ Δωρικὰ ἐτέθη αὐτοῖς.

Antiphemus of Rhodes and Entimus of Crete, leading together an expedition, established Gela in the forty-fifth year after the foundation of Syracuse. The town got its name from the river Gelas, and the place where the city now is, and was first fortified, is called Lindii. Dorian institutions were established for them. (author's translation)

Diodorus (8.23) includes the *oikists* Antiphemus and Entimus as well, and furthermore provides the response of the Delphic Oracle:

Ὅτι Ἀντίφημος καὶ Ἔντιμος οἱ Γέλαν κτίσαντες ἠρώτησαν τὴν Πυθίαν, καὶ ἔχρησε ταῦτα:

Ἔντιμ' ἠδὲ Κράτωνος ἀγακλέος υἱὲ δαΐφρον,
ἐλθόντες Σικελὴν καλὴν χθόνα ναίετον ἄμφω,
δειμάμενοι πτολίεθρον ὁμοῦ Κρητῶν Ῥοδίων τε
πὰρ προχοᾶς ποταμοῖο Γέλα συνομώνυμον ἄγνοῦ.

Antiphemus and Entimus, the founders of Gela, asked the Pythia, and she prophesized thus:

Entimus and you, wise son of famous Craton,

⁸⁴ Hall 2008: 388

go you two to the fair Sicilian lands and live there,
building a city of both Cretans and Rhodians,
at the mouth of the holy river, Gela, with the same name.
(author's translation)

Artemon of Pergamon, in his commentary on Pindar's description of the "toil" of Theron of Akragas' ancestors (*Olympian Odes* 2.16), elaborates on the beginnings of the expedition to Gela (569 *FGrHist* 1):

Ἀντίφημος γὰρ ὁ Ῥόδιος καὶ Ἔντιμος ὁ Κρήης οἱ τὴν εἰς Γέλλαν στείλαντες ἀποικίαν
πρῶτον μὲν περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν ἔκαμον οὐ μετρίως, συναθροίζοντες τοὺς ἐκ
Πελοποννήσου καὶ Ῥόδου καὶ Κρήτης, εἶτα περὶ τὸν διάπλουν, εἶτα περὶ τὸν
κατοικισμὸν, καὶ πάλιν διαγωνισάμενοι πρὸς τοὺς Σικανούς.

Antiphemus the Rhodian and Entimus the Cretan, the leaders of the expedition to Gela, toiled much at first in gathering settlers from the Peloponnesus, Rhodes, and Crete. Then during the sailing across, the foundation, and again in dealing with the Sicans.⁸⁵
(author's translation)

Based on these accounts, Gela would have been founded in 688 BC.⁸⁶ The descriptions of Thucydides and Diodorus clearly specify a mixed Rhodian-Cretan expedition, while the commentary of Artemon furthermore claims that colonists were gathered from other regions as well.

These three sources are, however, the only to mention Cretan participation in the settlement of Gela. The inclusion of other regions besides Rhodes is present in various other sources, yet even then mentions of Crete are excluded. Thus Herodotus' account (7.153.1) states:

τοῦ δὲ Γέλωνος τούτου πρόγονος, οἰκίτωρ ὁ ἐν Γέλλῃ, ἦν ἐκ νήσου Τήλου τῆς ἐπὶ
Τριοπίῳ κειμένης: ὃς κτιζομένης Γέλλης ὑπὸ Λινδίων τε τῶν ἐκ Ῥόδου καὶ Ἀντιφήμου
οὐκ ἐλείφθη.

⁸⁵ This interpretation is argued against by Menecrates (Schol. ad Pi. *O.* 2.16 c), who understands the "toil of the ancestors" as referring to the foundation of Thebes rather than Gela (Palladini 2013: 55).

⁸⁶ Syracuse's dating can comfortably be set at 733 BC based on strong archaeological evidence, which is indeed supported by literary sources (Dominguez 2006: 272).

The ancestor of this Gelon, who settled at Gela, was from the island of Telos which lies off Triopium. When the founding of Gela by Antiphemus and the Lindians of Rhodes was happening, he would not be left behind.

(translation by A.D. Godley)

How “non-Rhodian” such an origin may be is unclear, since the island of Telos is small and proximate enough to Rhodes that it may have been considered “Rhodian,” or at least part of its political sphere, as it was during the Hellenistic period.⁸⁷ Other sources focus entirely on Rhodes.

Callimachus (Pf. 43.46-47) writes:

οἶδα Γέλα ποταμοῦ κεφαλῇ ἔπι κείμενον ἄστν
Λίνδοθεν ἀρχαίη [σ]κιμπ[τόμενο]ν γενε[ῆ]

I know the city which sits at the mouth of the river Gelas
And claims to be from Lindos through ancient birth. (author’s translation)

Stephanus of Byzantium (s.v. Γέλα) provides an account of Antiphemus at Delphi, laughing when told the Oracle, but fails to mention Entimus. From this story comes another piece of scholia, by Tzetzes, who attributes the name of Gela not to the river, but to Antiphemus laughing (γελάω) at the Delphic Oracle (Schol. ad. Th. 6.4.3). In both cases Antiphemus is described as the founder of Gela, and no mention is made of Entimus. Pausanias writes (8.46.2):

καὶ ἔτεσιν ὕστερον πολλοῖς Δωριέων ἐς Σικελίαν ἐσοικιζομένων, Ἀντίφημος ὁ Γέλας οἰκιστῆς πόλισμα Σικανῶν Ὀμφάκην πορθήσας μετεκόμισεν ἐς Γέλαν ἄγαλμα ὑπὸ Δαιδάλου πεποιημένον.

And many years later, when the Dorians were settling Sicily, Antiphemus, the founder of Gela, sacked the Sican town Omphace, and returned to Gela a statue made by Daedalus. (author’s translation)

This account, though leaving out any explicit mention of Entimus or the Cretans, nevertheless hints at a Cretan influence as Daedalus was mythologically connected to Crete. Such an interpretation is compelling, but only seems evident because we have other accounts that mention Crete. A Cretan connection based on this account is thus tenuous at best.

⁸⁷ Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 776

It must be stressed again, however, that the exclusion of references to Entimus or Cretans does not preclude the possibility that historians simply did not feel it relevant or important to mention others besides Antiphemus and the Rhodians. If this is true, it begs the question of what gave the Rhodians such primacy. Certainly it is more likely that the Rhodians were joined by others in their expedition, and because we do have some sources that explicitly state that Cretans joined the Rhodians, a multi-ethnic expedition seems plausible. The exclusion of any references to Cretans in many sources suggests that those colonists from Rhodes were in some way dominant or more influential than the non-Rhodian colonists. The ambiguity of the literary sources on this topic requires an examination of archaeological evidence, presented below.

Finally, a few remarks on the significance of the name Lindioi in Thucydides' account is warranted. We are to assume that the name is derived from the city of Lindos on Rhodes, a city which indeed other accounts refer to explicitly. There is therefore little reason to doubt the connection between the name Lindioi and the city of Lindos on Rhodes. Nevertheless, it is worth cautioning that names alone can be misleading. A prime example is the Sicilian city of Naxos, whose name suggests that its colonists came from the Cycladic island of Naxos, though Thucydides' account (6.3.1) mentions only Chalcidians from Euboea. Archaeological evidence has, however, shown similarities in coin types, religious institutions, and inscriptions between Sicilian Naxos and Cycladic Naxos, suggesting a population of Cycladic Naxians.⁸⁸ Because no historical accounts mention these colonists, we are forced to weigh archaeological data against literary data, or arrive at some compromise between the two. This example illustrates that Thucydides may not include all relevant information in his accounts, or may even be misinformed. While the case of Lindioi seems far more straightforward, we must nevertheless be careful in attributing too great a significance to a name, as clear cut as it may seem.

⁸⁸ Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 218; Hornblower 2008: 45.

A more troublesome problem is the inconsistency in the historical accounts between the city-ethnic of Lindos and the region-ethnic of Rhodes. The degree to which they are interchangeable is unclear, such that Lindos may act as metonymy for Rhodes, and we cannot say for sure whether colonists were drawn from all of Rhodes, or just Lindos.⁸⁹ Rhodes was not unified into a single political entity until the end of the fifth century, at which time the ancient city of Rhodes was also established at the northern tip of the island.⁹⁰ Before then, the island had been divided into three regional states: Lindos, Kameiros, and Ialysos. We must, therefore, be careful in not conflating the ethnic designations of “Lindian” and “Rhodian,” as being a Rhodian did not imply one was from Lindos, or that a citizen of Lindos would be indistinguishable from a citizen of Kameiros or Ialysos.⁹¹ Indeed Herodotus (1.144) writes that the Dorian Hexapolis, later Pentapolis, included these three cities of Rhodes. If each city is to be understood as an independent political entity, then the use of the Lindian ethnic must have a different connotation than the Rhodian ethnic.

The question then arises of what circumstances permit the use of the city-ethnic over the regional ethnic, and vice versa. Pausanias (6.7.1), for example, writes about statues of Rhodian athletes with inscriptions, presumably dedicated by the athletes themselves, who refer to themselves as “Rhodian” as opposed to “Lindian.”⁹² The inconsistency with which our historical sources use “Rhodian” and “Lindian” makes it difficult to infer whether the authors are stating that the colonists came *only* from Lindos, or if Lindos was merely the leader of a pan-Rhodian

⁸⁹ See Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 1196-1997 for an overview of evidence for pan-Rhodian unity prior to the *synoikism* of the late fifth century.

⁹⁰ Diod. 13.75.1. Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 1205-1208.

⁹¹ Homer writes that Tlepolemos led nine ships to Troy of Rhodians from Rhodes, “which was divided into three areas, Lindos, Kameiros, and Ialysos” (*Il.* 2.653; my translation). Here Homer affirms the triple division of Rhodes, but also is the first to use the ethnic designation of “Rhodian.” By doing so he indicates that a regional ethnicity existed, but that city-ethnicities were also salient. Malkin 2011: 66.

⁹² *IvO* 151,152,153. Pindar’s *Olympian Ode* 7, extolling Diagoras, was supposedly dedicated at the temple of Athena at Lindos, though Diagoras was himself from Ialysos (Malkin 2011: 70).

contingent.⁹³ The mention of individuals coming from Telos may also indicate that the Rhodian contingent drew on colonists from the more general Dorian Hexapolis of Asia Minor, of which Lindos was a part, and would therefore support a pan-Rhodian collection of colonists that may have simply outnumbered the colonists from Crete.

As discussed, the size of colonizing expeditions need not have been large. Based on comparison to the few cases where population size is specified for ancient Greek colonies, as well as parallels in seventeenth century North American colonization, the contingent that went to Gela need not have been greater than 200. Though it is impossible to estimate relative populations that each region contributed, nor the actual size of the expedition, a pan-Rhodian coalition would allow for a far greater number of colonists from Rhodes than the population of just Lindos may have allowed.

Nevertheless, there is no indication in any sources that the expedition included non-Dorians. On this the sources are in agreement. Why Thucydides felt it was necessary to specify that the *nomima* of the city was Dorian is therefore unclear. His inclusion of Cretans among the founders of Gela, whom Herodotus had left out, suggests that their presence in the city was relevant in some way to the implementation of the Dorian *nomima*. Evidence of ethnic tensions may not be possible to find, but the overall nature of the institutions of Gela must be evaluated to better understand the significance of Thucydides' account.

OIKISTS

In light of the strong historical emphasis on Antiphemus and the Rhodian/Lindian colonists, it is not surprising to see evidence of a founder's cult to Antiphemus at Gela. Evidence

⁹³ Thucydides, Diodorus, and Artemon of Pergamon use "Rhodian." Herodotus and Callimachus use "Lindian." Pausanias, Stephanus of Byzantium, and Tzetzes do not specify at all.

for this cult is a votive inscription on the foot of an Attic kylix, dated to the sixth or early fifth century, found at Gela.⁹⁴ This find was discovered among the remains of what can possibly be interpreted as a *heroon* to Antiphemus, therefore confirming a hero/founder's cult centered around him. Though Paulo Orsi, the original excavator at Gela, does not rule out the possibility that this *heroon* may have been dedicated to Entimus as well, no similar evidence of a cult to Entimus has been found.⁹⁵ Irad Malkin has argued that the Cretan population of Gela was likely aware of and uncomfortable with the emphasis the Rhodians were receiving for founding Gela. Malkin suggests the oracle preserved by Diodorus (8.23.1), quoted above, is inauthentic, and moreover a reflection of Cretan attempts to preserve the record of their contribution to the foundation of Gela. The unusual emphasis in the oracle on the dual contribution to the foundation and the explicit mention of Entimus, otherwise absent from many historical accounts, would support such an interpretation.⁹⁶

Another explanation for the primacy of Rhodes at Gela advanced by Malkin is that the Deinomenids - the powerful family of priests that became tyrants of Acragas, Gela, and Syracuse - traced their descent from a colonist of Telos that settled Gela with Antiphemus.⁹⁷ It would be in their interest therefore to promote historical traditions that emphasized Antiphemus, even if at the expense of Entimus.⁹⁸ Support for this theory may come from an inscription (XXVIII) in the Lindian Chronicle, in which a Deinomenes, described unusually as “father of Gelon and Hieron and Thrasyboulos and Polyazalos, being a Lindian, and having colonized Gela together with

⁹⁴ Dubois: 1989: 160.

⁹⁵ Orsi 1906: 559. An undated inscription on gold leaf (*SEG* 50, 987) has been found at Gela bearing four names, one of which can potentially be read as Entimus. Even so, the three other names appear to be Sicel in origin and are otherwise unknown (Dubois 2008: 142).

⁹⁶ Malkin 1987: 52-54.

⁹⁷ Herodotus 7.153.1.

⁹⁸ Malkin 1987: 259.

Antiphemus” dedicates to Athena the Lindian spoils from Sicily.⁹⁹ The actual Deinomenes, from whom the Deinomenid rulers took their name, could not possibly have been one of the colonists that came with Antiphemus. The inscription preserved in the Lindian Chronicle is therefore an example of the kind of historical-legitimizing tyrants would be interested in, and supports Malkin’s theory.¹⁰⁰

Regardless of the reasons for Antiphemus’ primacy, Malkin argues that the cult of the *oikist* was a defining feature of a city’s identity, and an “answer to a primary historical need: the need to have a history.” Multiple foundation cults would distort a city’s identity, especially one with multiple ethnic groups. For whatever reason the cult of Antiphemus was chosen, this very act would have solidified the connection between Gela and Lindos/Rhodes, and explain the emphasis it receives in historical accounts.¹⁰¹

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

Archaeological excavation of the long hill upon which modern Gela sits has found evidence of Archaic occupation concentrated at the far eastern end, directly above the river Gelas. The earliest Greek finds from this area date to the eighth century, and therefore predate the traditional seventh century date provided by Thucydides for Gela’s foundation.¹⁰² This discrepancy has incited further discussion concerning the meaning of Thucydides’ Lindioi, discussed above. Hermann Wentker has argued that Gela was colonized in two phases, the first being the Lindioi-phase described by Thucydides, which was more of a preliminary and

⁹⁹ The replacement of the typical patronymic for the names of his sons, who would all become tyrants of various Sicilian cities, further supports the political motivations behind this inscription.

¹⁰⁰ Higbie 2003: 35; 111-113

¹⁰¹ Malkin 1987: 260

¹⁰² Holloway 1991: 63

unfortified settlement. The eighth century finds would date to this phase, which would reconcile their presence before the later urbanized settlement, the Gela of Antiphemus and Entimus.¹⁰³

Other arguments suggest that the dual use of *polis* in Thucydides' account refers to both "the city which was named for the river Gelas" as well as to "the place where the city, which is called Lindioi, is and was first fortified." This reading suggests that Lindioi was the name of the acropolis around which Gela was established. Tobias Fischer-Hansen offers an alternate reading, in which the first sense of *polis* refers to the political community that collectively took its name from the river Gelas, whereas the actual *polis* was built in a place called Lindioi. The sense of "where the *polis* now is" also suggests that the city was in a different place in Thucydides' time than it was before. This reading can be explained by Herodotus (7.156.2), who writes that in 485 BC Gelon moved more than half the population of Gela to Syracuse. By the time of Thucydides the population of Gela may not have recovered and therefore have occupied only the main part of the city, the so-called Lindioi.¹⁰⁴

In any case, this eighth century occupation of the acropolis indicates prior investment in this area, likely by Rhodians if we are to attribute significance to the name Lindioi described by Thucydides.¹⁰⁵ If the expedition that founded Gela was actually settling, or rather expanding, upon a previous Rhodian settlement, it would undoubtedly already have a strong Rhodian cultural bias.

The acropolis was one of the first areas to see major construction and indeed appears to have been the religious center of Gela. From the seventh century there is evidence of only small rectangular buildings, likely shrines (Temple A), which were razed in the sixth century to

¹⁰³ Wentker 1956: 129-139. This argument is largely based on the perceived difference in use of ἄποικοι and οἰκίζειν by Thucydides, which later studies have shown not to be significant (Fischer-Hansen 1996: 333).

¹⁰⁴ Fischer-Hansen 1996: 322, 358-359. For a more detailed discussion see Fischer-Hansen 1996: 332-334.

¹⁰⁵ Archaeologically the evidence does not identify the eighth century deposits as specifically Rhodian (Fischer-Hansen 1996: 334).

accommodate the much larger Temple of Athena (Temple B). This temple is associated with Athena due to the high frequency of Athena-type terracotta figurines discovered nearby. Of these, one figurine was decorated with necklaces and a *polos*, an imitation of the statue of Athena Lindia at Rhodes.¹⁰⁶ This is likely evidence that the cult of Athena Lindia, a major religious institution at Lindos and Rhodes, was instated at Gela as well.¹⁰⁷ Though it is difficult to evaluate how closely connected the cult of Athena Lindia at Gela was to Lindos, as the earliest structural remains for the temple of Athena at Lindos are roughly contemporary to the temple of Athena at Gela, the presence of the cult itself is significant.¹⁰⁸

Other sanctuaries on the acropolis include a small shrine of Hera identified nearby to the temple of Athena.¹⁰⁹ Another sanctuary, the Predio Sola, is believed to have been dedicated to Demeter and was located on the seaward side of the acropolis. Discovered there was a group of forty-one votive masks of Demeter, which are believed to have been locally made but based on a well-known type common throughout the Greek world. Rhodes is known to have been a center of production and distribution of these types.¹¹⁰ Herodotus (7.153) confirms the presence of religious institutions dedicated to Demeter when he writes that the descendants of Telines became ἱεροφάνται τῶν χθονίων θεῶν (priests of the chthonic gods), i.e. Demeter and Persephone. Several other small sanctuaries have been identified as based on Cretan styles, and are further attested in hinterland sites.¹¹¹

Regarding burials, cremations account for about half of the burials at the archaic necropolis west of Gela. This rate must be compared to the almost universal practice of

¹⁰⁶ Holloway 1991: 85; Dominguez 2006: 281

¹⁰⁷ Higbie 2003: 1-15

¹⁰⁸ Fischer-Hansen 1996: 323

¹⁰⁹ Holloway 1991: 56

¹¹⁰ Holloway 1991: 57

¹¹¹ De Miro 1974: 202-207

cremation at Rhodes and Crete.¹¹² The burial practice at Rhodes both before and after the colonization of Gela was generally cremation in pits for adults and inhumation of children in storage vessels. There is no evidence from Crete predating the seventh century, but those that date to Gela's colonization are for the most part secondary cremations in urns, deposited either individually or in communal tombs. Gillian Shepherd has identified a pattern by which western colonies significantly depart from the burial practices of their home regions at a fairly early stage, and the adoption of inhumation is shown to be very common in western colonies. The high frequency of inhumation at Gela therefore falls into a broader pattern that may not necessarily relate to local factors at the city, though it is significant nonetheless.¹¹³

Yet the cremations themselves differ from practices at Rhodes and Crete. Those cremations that exist at Gela are primary, thereby differing from Cretan practices, and are in shallow pyres rather than pits as at Rhodes. It appears therefore that Gela adopted burial practices more closely connected with its neighbors than with practices at home. Stone monolithic sarcophagi appear at Gela at approximately the same time as they do at Megara Hyblaea and Syracuse, around the seventh and sixth century. The origin of sarcophagi burial is believed to be Syracuse, brought over from Corinth, where it is used very early on and remains very popular for much of its history, at least among the elite.¹¹⁴ This practice is especially surprising at Gela, which lacked an accessible supply of stone, and would therefore have been an extremely expensive preference. Even though monolithic sarcophagi are phased out during the late sixth century, no doubt because of the obvious expense, they were replaced with terracotta sarcophagi, *baule*, which continued as the dominant burial practice into the fifth century. Even when the cheaper *baule* became common, some still showed elaborate ornamentation and

¹¹² Holloway 1991: 64; Shepherd 1995: 60

¹¹³ Shepherd 1995: 60-61

¹¹⁴ Shepherd 1995: 52-55

interior decoration. Shepherd argues that these practices indicate a portion of Gela's population that was considerably wealthy and went to great pains to demonstrate it, as well as an eagerness to compete with neighboring cities such as Megara Hyblaea and Syracuse. The disappearance of the monolithic sarcophagi at Gela coincides with a period of great prosperity, around which time Gela actually is able to conquer Syracuse. It is doubtful that at this time Gela felt any need to compete with Syracuse, and the timing of the disappearance of the monolithic sarcophagi fits in well with Shepherd's arguments for competition being a prime motivator during Gela's early history.¹¹⁵

Based on Shepherd's analysis, the burials at Gela indicate a general lack of commitment to the burial practices of Rhodes and Crete. Rather, the burials at Gela must be understood in the context of inter-city competition in Sicily and displays of prosperity. Other excavators have argued for more concrete connections between the burials of Gela and its home regions. The site of Butera, approximately nine miles inland of Gela, shows definite indigenous burial practices in the strata dated to the eighth century.¹¹⁶ In the seventh century, around the time of Gela's foundation, a markedly different stratum appears in which there are secondary cremations with elements of *akephalia* as well. Acephalic burials are those where the skull is treated differently from the rest of the body, as at Butera where some of the cremation urns contained a complete skull among the cremated ashes of the individual. This unusual practice has been connected to a similar style of burial at the Siderospilia necropolis at Priniàs on Crete, leading the Butera burials to generally be considered Cretan.¹¹⁷ A rather more compelling piece of evidence for this identification is a story told by Herodotus (8.153), in which a group of Geloans had left the city,

¹¹⁵ Shepherd 1995: 60-63

¹¹⁶ The site of Butera is commonly identified with the Sican settlement of Ὀμφάκη, which according to Pausanias (8.46.2) was conquered by Antiphemus (Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 179; Palladini 2013: 59).

¹¹⁷ Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 179. This interpretation is tenuous at best, however, and does not explain the presence of acephalic burials elsewhere in Sicily. See Shepherd (2005: 124-125) for further discussion.

as a result of some kind of *stasis*, to a place called Mactorion. If this Mactorion is Butera, as it is commonly identified, we can infer that Mactorion/Butera was associated with the Cretans, as seen by the burial data. This would also in turn suggest that the group of Geloans who were forced to leave the city were themselves Cretans and therefore provide evidence of civil strife based on ethnic differences at Gela.¹¹⁸ Even if true, the identification of burials at Butera with Cretans would be the only instance of burial practices that can be associated with one of Gela's home regions. For the rest of the burials we must accept Shepherd's analysis that they show no clear influence from either Rhodes or Crete.

Regarding ceramics, Dinu Adamesteanu, the excavator of the necropolis at Butera, argues that some of the initial colonists that came to Gela were from the island Nisiros, northwest of Rhodes, based on the similarities in vase types.¹¹⁹ As with the presence of colonists from Telos described by Herodotus (7.153.1), it may have ultimately made little difference culturally whether they were from Rhodes proper or any of the small islands that surround it. Indeed the ceramic record at Gela contains many plain or simply decorated Rhodian pottery, which Dunabin postulates came to Gela by means other than commercial channels. He believes that these wares, which are numerous in the first half of the sixth century, may have been brought by immigrants from Rhodes and then continued to be made from local clay.¹²⁰

Cretan wares are also noticeably present at Gela. These ceramics come from the oldest deposits from the acropolis and date mostly to the first half of the seventh century. They become more difficult to recognize as local-made imitations become more common in the second half of the seventh century.¹²¹ Dunabin further notes a trend in which Cretan-type *pithoi* decrease in

¹¹⁸ Wentker 1956

¹¹⁹ Shepherd 2005: 128

¹²⁰ Dunabin 1948: 236

¹²¹ Fiorentini 1983: 67-68, 80-82

frequency from the early seventh century to the late seventh century, at which time the Rhodian-type *pithoi* become ubiquitous. He takes this as evidence of a weakening of the Cretan influence, perhaps by a reinforcement of Rhodian colonists that arrived near the end of the seventh century.¹²²

While much of the archaeological material unearthed at Gela is of a definitively Rhodian type, there have also been found many Cretan products, which due to their rarity in Sicily, may be a clear indicator of a Cretan population living at Gela. Yet as we have already discussed, ceramics cannot be taken as indicative of settled populations. As usual there is a high frequency of Corinthian types found at Gela as well, though we have no reason to suspect Corinthians living at Gela, at least not in its early history.¹²³ Nevertheless, it is likely that these ceramics do in fact indicate settled populations of Rhodian and Cretan origin. However, whether they continued to identify as such in later generations cannot be based on the ceramics, which after all could be a result of trade and other contacts.

COINAGE

Geloan currency did not begin to be struck until relatively late. This means that the oldest coinage from Gela dates from no earlier than the first quarter of the fifth century, about 200 years after its foundation. The first series, Group 1, was minted during the tyranny of Gelon and Hieron, and is therefore dated to about 490-475 BC. The obverse of this series is consistently an armed horseman, a clear marker of a city with a strong aristocracy concerned with horse rearing.¹²⁴ The presence of this symbol can be as easily dated to the reign of Hippocrates, whose

¹²² Dunabin 1948: 236-237

¹²³ Boardman 1999: 178.

¹²⁴ Jenkins 1970: 33-34

name would reference the symbol, as it could to the reign of Gelon, who began his political career as commander of Hippocrates' cavalry.

The majority view is that Group 1 coins began to be minted under Gelon, as there is evidence of a strong Syracusan influence, which at this time had come under the control of Gelon. Indeed the only obverse inscription from Group 1 is ΦΙ, likely the name of a mint-official, with the *phi* being typical of the Syracusan alphabet.¹²⁵ Group 2 follows immediately after and is dated to the reigns of Hieron and Polyzalos, about 480-470 BC. As we have seen earlier, the Deinomenids participated in an intensive program of historical legitimization. While it is unfortunate that there is no currency that dates to an earlier period of Gela's history, even from these two groups we can see further evidence that the Deinomenids had a political agenda that would have implications for the ethnic identity of Gela.

EPIGRAPHY

Analysis of inscriptions based on letterforms is not very compelling. While the scripts of both Rhodes and Crete are fairly well known for this time period, the script at Gela does not seem to conform to either. Jeffery notes this pattern in the other Doric cities of Sicily as well, such as at Megara Hyblaea and Syracuse, and struggles to definitively connect the local scripts to a specific home region. Indeed Jeffery sees more similarities between the Doric colonies of Sicily in their alphabets than she does between a specific colony and its home region.¹²⁶ For Gela, Jeffery believes the alphabet was for the most part derived from that of Rhodes, based on the “red” *xi* and *chi*, and shows little to no influence from Crete.¹²⁷

¹²⁵ Jenkins 1970: 35; Jeffery 1990: 262

¹²⁶ Jeffery 1990: 272-274

¹²⁷ Jeffery 1990: 263, 273. The designation of “blue” and “red” is based on Kirchhoff's color chart to denote the difference between: blue - *chi* X and *psi* Ψ, red - *xi* X and *chi* Ψ. The “blue” and “red” alphabets correspond to

Many inscriptions are short and often display the name of the owner or dedicator. These names can be useful markers of geographic origin, as some names are more attested in certain regions than others. At the same time, the correlation between a name and a geographic region is heavily dependent on the number of inscriptions we have from those regions, creating a preservation bias in interpreting names. Thus graffiti on a ceramic dated to the early sixth century (*SEG* 16, 562; Dubois 142c) bears the name Πόλυς, which Dubois comments is rather uncommon and attested at Smyrna.¹²⁸ Another graffito (Dubois 136), from the early fifth century, reads Θίασος ἀνέθ[εκε]. Dubois comments that the name Θίασος is rare and may be attested in eastern Lydia.¹²⁹ The name Σαῖνις is inscribed on a ceramic dated to the fifth century (Dubois 143), and is attested at Thera.¹³⁰ The variety of regional affiliations these inscriptions suggests indicates that Gela's settlers may have been drawn from a quite diverse range of origins, as Artemon of Pergamon claims. Unfortunately we have no evidence of legal or official inscriptions from which we can study the institutions of the city.

CONCLUSION

The first thing that can be said about identity at Gela is that it hardly seems concerned with sub-Hellenic ethnicities. There is so little evidence of non-Dorians at the city that the question really becomes more one of regional identities. This is nevertheless interesting as it shows that these regional identities could function very similarly to ethnic identities, and were likely constructed and managed for similar reasons. Irad Malkin argues that the expedition to Gela was an effort by the Lindians to make a “New Lindos,” the Lindioi of Thucydides' account.

regions of the Hellenic world in which they are found (A. Kirchoff, *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabets*, ed. 4, 1887; Jeffery 1990: x).

¹²⁸ Dubois 1989: 163-164

¹²⁹ Dubois 1989: 160

¹³⁰ Dubois 1989: 164

He views this attempt as a failure, by which the *nomima* given to the city was not that of Lindos, nor even of Rhodes, but the least specific Dorian *nomima* that would accommodate the Cretan and other Dorian colonists. In this way, Lindians became “Rhodian” and Rhodians and Cretans became “Dorian.” Such ethnic generalizing would also allow non-Lindian colonists, like the ancestor of Gelon from Telos, to associate themselves more closely with Antiphemus and the foundation of Gela. As for Crete, even in those accounts which do mention Entimus and the Cretans, we are not told from what *poleis* these colonists came. The absence of a specific *polis* in historical accounts for the origin of the Cretans could be taken as evidence that those colonists were not associated with a singular *polis*, or that it was not an integral part of their identity. The lack of such an identity may have caused Cretans to latch onto the Rhodian identity, and therefore decrease their prominence in later historical accounts.¹³¹

Malkin echoes in many ways the views of David Asheri who argues that the “list of founders” which every settlement kept was in no way static, and often changed in response to specific purposes. Certain historical or mythical founders could be elevated in importance, thereby emphasizing their role in the foundation of a city in order to stress the connection of the city to a certain region. Conversely, a founder can be demoted to simply a “co-founder,” or in some cases even erased from records, in order to downplay the role a certain region may have had in founding the city.¹³² As such, Asheri acknowledges that Antiphemus was likely always at the top of Gela’s “list of founders,” while Entimus fell in importance as ties with Crete weakened. Asheri also focuses on the Deinomenid attempts to elevate their ancestor from Telos to an equal footing with Antiphemus, as evidenced by the entry in the Lindian Chronicle (XXVIII). This Deinomenes would likely then have been high on Gela’s “list of founders”

¹³¹ Malkin 2011: 114

¹³² Asheri 1970: 621.

during the period of the Deinomenid tyrants (491-465 BC), until falling again in importance with the decline of the tyrants.¹³³

As we have seen, Robin Osborne has argued that the commonly held assumption of state-organized colonization, while appropriate for the Classical, Hellenistic, and Roman periods, is anachronistic and misleading regarding eighth and seventh century foundations. In other words, the question of whether we should seek firm archaeological evidence of Rhodian, Lindian, or Cretan influence at Gela presupposes that the expedition to settle Gela was directly financed and supported by these regions. Because Osborne holds that “private-enterprise” and more organic population movements were responsible for the majority of western settlements during the Archaic period, he argues, along with Malkin and Asheri, that these foundation stories are a result of historical legitimizing that serves specific political or cultural motives, rather than historical facts.¹³⁴

Settlements that are founded to satisfy specific military or agricultural objectives of a mother-city can be expected to have consistent and high-level contact with it, evidence of which can certainly be anticipated in the archaeological record. If we consider the possibility that Gela was not such a settlement, which indeed only became common in the fifth century,¹³⁵ we should consequently allow for a less definitive association in the archaeological record with its supposed home regions and refrain from attempting to connect each artifact with Rhodes or Crete. While it is natural for people to continue the practices of their homelands, there is no reason to believe that these practices remained unchanged or uninfluenced by local sources, nor that they continued to be a part of their identity.

¹³³ Asheri 1970: 262-263

¹³⁴ Osborne 1998: 251-269

¹³⁵ Osborne 1998: 252-255

The archaeological record of Gela indicates that Gela was indeed a city that from the beginning strove to form its own identity. Though the evidence supports a connection with Lindos through the presence of religious structures believed to be associated with Athena Lindia, this connection must be tempered by the presence of other religious structures, specifically that of Demeter (and perhaps Persephone?) which seems to have been equally important at Gela and not associated with Lindos or Rhodes. The burials at Gela also show possible Rhodian influences, but none specific or significant enough to stand out. The fact that only half the burials at Gela are cremations, compared to the universal practice of cremation at Rhodes, is itself a strong indicator that the citizens of Gela did not feel compelled to emulate the practices of their home regions. Gillian Shepherd's analysis of the monolithic sarcophagi at Gela is compelling and supports the idea that Gela was more concerned with competing with its immediate neighbors than maintaining cultural ties with home regions.

The inscriptions from Gela are noteworthy in that they can hardly be called Rhodian or Cretan. Though it is necessary to acknowledge that a few dozen inscriptions are not adequately representative of the entire population of Gela through time, it is nevertheless indicative that names present at Gela are attested all over the Aegean. This serves to confirm the multi-ethnic composition of Gela, and suggest that its residents came from a wide-range of places rather than just Rhodes or Crete. The coins, though only beginning to be minted during the fifth century, also reinforce the notion that Gela was a major player in the political sphere of Sicily. The coins bear no markers that tie the city to Rhodes or Crete, but rather bear the identifiers of the tyrants of Gela.

In reexamining Thucydides' account of the foundation of Gela, we can reevaluate the sense of his claim that the city adopted Dorian *nomima*. First, we must acknowledge that

Thucydides is correct in stating that Cretans accompanied Rhodians in settling Gela, despite this version being the minority among historical accounts. Secondly, we must admit that the archaeological evidence shows a far stronger connection between Gela and Rhodes than it does with Crete, though we can only theorize about the reasons for this. Whether it was a result of a continued influx of Rhodian colonists to Gela or because the Cretans simply assimilated to Rhodian practices requires further evidence to explain. However, we must also acknowledge that the evidence tying Gela to Rhodes, while stronger than to Crete, is still not exceptionally strong or decisive. Malkin would be correct then in his view that the Rhodians failed to institute Rhodian *nomima*, if that was ever really their goal. It is noteworthy after all that Thucydides describes the *nomima* as Dorian rather than Rhodian. Yet while Malkin views this as a failure on the part of the Rhodians to effectively implement their cultural institutions, another possibility, advocated by Osborne, would be that this was not indeed their goal at all.

Whether Gela developed as a result of private-enterprise, mostly composed of Rhodians though with participation of Cretans and peoples of other regions, is as difficult to prove as the opposite. What is clear is that from the beginning Gela developed on its own terms. Since the colonists were, as far as we can tell, all from Dorian regions of the Hellenic world, they very easily implemented Dorian institutions at the city. Asheri and Osborne would argue that it was only later, during a period of increased competition with neighboring *poleis*, and with a growing need to historicize origins, that the Rhodian connection became emphasized.

The Rhodian connection may have been chosen as a result of Deinomenid attempts at legitimization, or because of the primacy of the cult to Antiphemus, or simply because the Rhodians were by then a majority demographic in the city. Regardless, if we accept this interpretation, it requires that the Rhodians were still a distinct element of the society rather than

being homogenized by the Dorian *nomima*. This would also permit the Cretans to be a distinct demographic within the city, who may well have been angered by the growing influence the Rhodians were achieving by imposing a specific set of historical origins for the city. Malkin's interpretation of the account recorded by Pausanias would then more easily fall into place, as a Cretan attempt to preserve their role in the foundation of Gela.

It is this latter interpretation I argue for. Thucydides' comment concerning the Dorian *nomima* of Gela preserves the nature of its foundation as being perhaps one closer to private-enterprise rather than state-action. Such a foundation allowed for the implementation of non-specific Dorian *nomima* that accommodated the likely wide range of settlers at the city. It is thus less shocking to find that Rhodians and Cretans fought on the side of Athens against Gela during the Sicilian expedition of the Peloponnesian War, as the cultural connections between the regions were not in fact that strong.¹³⁶ While the foundation stories that emerged later emphasized different groups in the establishment of Gela, the institutions themselves remained the same. Perhaps in the face of such strong attempts to identify a single party as being responsible for the foundation of Gela, Thucydides felt it necessary to provide both parties, the Rhodians and Cretans, and specify that regardless of origins, the city was Dorian.

¹³⁶ Hdt. 7.57.6, 9.

HIMERA

FOUNDATION STORIES

Four historical sources discuss the foundation of Himera, a relatively small number compared to other Sicilian settlements.¹³⁷ Yet even among these four sources there is considerable disagreement regarding the origins of the initial settlers, and only Thucydides provides details about the institutions. He writes:

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

Himera was founded from Zancle by Euclides, Simus, and Sacon. The greater portion were Chalcidians who went to the colony, but they were accompanied by those exiles from Syracuse who had been defeated in civil war, called the Myletidae. The language became a mix of Chalcidian and Doric, but the institutions that prevailed were the Chalcidian. (6.5.1; author's translation)

Pseudo-Scymnos, working sometime in the second century BC, writes:

Ζάγκλη, Κατάνη, Καλλίπολις ἔσχ' ἀποικίαν.
Πάλιν δ' ἀπὸ τούτων δύο πόλεις, Εὐβοία καὶ
Μύλαι κατωκίσθησαν ἐπικαλούμεναι,
εἴθ' Ἴμερα καὶ Ταυρομένιον ἔχομένη·
εἰσὶν δὲ πᾶσαι Χαλκιδέων αὐταὶ πόλεις.

Zancle, Catane, Callipolis had colonies.
And again from these were two cities, Euboia and
Mylai, as they are called, were settled,
As also Himera and Tauromenion were settled
And these were all the cities of the Chalcidians (285-290; author's translation)

Strabo, working in the early first century AD, writes:

ὧν τὴν μὲν Ἴμεραν οἱ ἐν Μυλαῖς ἔκτισαν Ζαγκλαῖοι

Of these cities, the Zancaeans of Mylai founded Himera (6.2.6; author's translation)

¹³⁷ Hall 2008: 393

In none of these accounts do we get any information regarding the date of Himera's foundation. For that we must turn to Diodorus Siculus, working in the first century BC, who discusses the destruction of Himera by Hannibal. Diodorus writes:

καὶ τὴν πόλιν εἰς ἔδαφος κατέσκαψεν, οἰκισθεῖσαν ἔτη διακόσια τεσσαράκοντα

And he razed the city to the ground, two hundred forty years after it had been founded.
(13.62.4; author's translation)

Because we know that Himera was destroyed by the Carthaginians in 409 BC, we can calculate the date of Himera's foundation to be 648 BC, around forty years after the foundation of Gela. It is worth noting here that because Himera was utterly destroyed at the end of the fifth century, only Thucydides' account comes from a time when the city was actually in existence. The other accounts all date centuries after the destruction of Himera, though that does not necessarily make them less reliable. However, even Thucydides is writing at a point when Himera had already undergone radical demographic change. Diodorus Siculus (11.48.6-8) tells us that in 476 BC Theron massacred a significant portion of Himera's population who were unhappy with his son's rule. So many were killed that the city had to be repopulated with new colonists, many of whom were Dorian. The second-hand nature of all these accounts must therefore be kept in mind.

A comparison of the sources reveals disagreement primarily about the parties involved in the foundation of Himera. Thucydides names Chalcidians of Zancle¹³⁸ and a contingent of Syracusans, whom he refers to as the Myletidae. Pseudo-Scymnos mentions only that Himera was founded by Catane and Callipolis and makes no mention of the Syracusans. Strabo also makes no mention of the Syracusans, but states that the Zancleaeans who founded Himera were themselves from Mylai, an earlier colony of Zancle. It is tempting to view the Myletidae as connected with Mylai, which would reconcile Strabo's and Thucydides' accounts, but it is not

¹³⁸ Zancle was one of the early Chalcidian settlements in Sicily. While these settlements are known as Chalcidian, or Euboean, they are considered to be ethnically Ionian.

clear if they are in fact related.¹³⁹ Indeed, the accounts of Strabo and Pseudo-Scymnos are rather limited in their descriptions, and Pausanias provides us only with a date for Himera's foundation. We are then left to work primarily with Thucydides' account.

The first point of information he provides is that Himera was founded by Zancle. Thucydides then provides us with the names of three *oikists* who were responsible for leading the expedition to settle the city. Each *oikist* likely represented a group of settlers of a specific origin or circumstance.¹⁴⁰ While Thucydides does not tell us the origin of the three *oikists* of Himera, we can presume that one represents the Chalcidians from Zancle and one represents the exiled Syracusans. Clearly this leaves the last *oikist* with an unaccounted-for contingent. It has been suggested that the name Sacon, the third of the *oikists* listed by Thucydides, is indigenous in origin and therefore indicates a group of native Sicels who joined the foundation of Himera.¹⁴¹ Though Thucydides provides no information regarding the population size of each group, we know at least that the population of Dorian Syracusans was sizeable enough to influence the dialect spoken at the city.

We are fortunate in this account to have another piece of information that is lacking from Gela, as Thucydides also claims that the language of Himera was a mix of Doric and Chalcidian. His comment about the language of the city must have some nucleus of truth, as the first century BC Alexandrian grammarian Tryphon is known to have written a treatise on dialect called *On the Dialect of Greeks and of Argos, Himera, Rhegium, the Dorians and Syracuse* (Περὶ τῆς Ἑλλήνων διαλέκτου καὶ Ἀργείων καὶ Ἱμεραίων καὶ Ῥηγίων καὶ Δωριέων καὶ Συρακουσίων),

¹³⁹ J. Bérard (1957:241) has argued for the connection between the Myletidae and Mylai, though see Asheri (1980: 132) for opposing views. See also Arena 1994: 55; Hansen and Nielsen 2004: 217.

¹⁴⁰ Domínguez 2006, 292

¹⁴¹ Castellana 1980: 71-78. On the other hand, Knoepfler (2000:95) argues that Sacon, whose name is attested at Selinous and Gela, was one of the Myletidae.

which unfortunately does not survive. Nevertheless, his inclusion of Himera in a study of Greek dialect suggests that its dialect was in some way truly noteworthy.

The previous discussions have shown that it is not clear what role language played in the institutions of a city. Thucydides does indeed seem to treat them as separate, such that we should not expect the institutions of Himera to bear evidence of the mixed dialect. Nevertheless, language is consistently included by scholars in what constitutes the *nomima* of a city. Rather than choose one option or the other, such that language either is an institution and therefore must be Chalcidian, or language is not and therefore free to develop as it pleases, I argue that there was a vernacular dialect as well as an official dialect spoken at Himera. The connection this argument has to the broader questions of ethnic identity and institutions at Himera will be explored below.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL EVIDENCE

The site of Himera is in fact two sites: the upper city, which occupies what may be called the acropolis of Himera, and the lower city, which spanned out below the acropolis bound by the sea and the river to the east.¹⁴² The lower city appears to have been occupied first as the earliest archaeological remains from Himera are found there. While Euboean wares are certainly present, there is also a high frequency of proto-Corinthian and Corinthian type amphorae that indicate an immediate connection with wider Mediterranean trade networks.¹⁴³ Though the presence of Euboean ceramics is indicative of Chalcidian influences, to date the ceramic assemblage does not show any clear archaeological evidence of a connection to Zancle specifically. At best, among the ceramics first produced at Himera there are potential similarities to Zanclean-types, which

¹⁴² Vassallo 2009: 196-200

¹⁴³ Vassallo 1997: 89-90.

could suggest that the first generation retained the styles of the mother-city.¹⁴⁴ Overall, however, the city shows a wide variety of ceramic types, both Greek and non-Greek, that indicates strong commercial activity at Himera.

Regarding religious institutions, Diodorus (5.3) writes that the city of Himera was sacred to Athena. Archaeological excavation has uncovered evidence of such a connection in the northeastern section of the upper city where there was a large temple complex, the so-called *temenos* of Athena. The discovery of a bronze statue of Athena and a dedicatory inscription is compelling evidence that temples A and B were in fact dedicated to Athena. The Temple of Victory, constructed after the Battle of Himera in 480, may also have been dedicated to Athena, though this has not been confirmed.¹⁴⁵ Diodorus (5.3) also writes that there was a cult of Heracles at Himera. In support of this connection, the metopes of Temple B show the various labors of Heracles. Various clay figurines of Heracles have also been found in domestic contexts, and a relief of Heracles bathing at a fountain (a reference to the thermal waters of Himera) is also attested from Himera's hinterland. These lines of evidence offer strong support for the presence of a cult of Heracles at Himera.¹⁴⁶ Other archaeological remains hint at the presence of a cult to Demeter, though this is speculative.¹⁴⁷

Regarding burials, three necropoleis are known for the city of Himera: the east necropolis, west necropolis, and south necropolis. From the western necropolis, more than 9000 burials have been excavated dating throughout the 240 years of Himera's existence. *Enchytrismos* child burials, those of children or infants buried within storage vessels, are highly attested, though often within Corinthian amphorae. Adult inhumations are extremely common

¹⁴⁴ Vassallo 2012: 2.

¹⁴⁵ Vassallo 2005:67.

¹⁴⁶ Vassallo 2005: 68; 2012: 3.

¹⁴⁷ Fischer-Hansen 1996: 341; Vassallo 2005: 70.

(88% of total burials), varying in form as simple pit graves (40% of inhumations), *a cappuccino* (19% of inhumation), or *enchytrismos* (41% of burials). Cremations are also present at Himera, though they only comprise about 12% of the total burials. These burial practices and percentages are consistent with what is found at other Sicilian Greek settlements, regardless of Dorian or Chalcidian ethnic affiliation.¹⁴⁸

The city plan has also been extensively studied. The initial layout of buildings and streets was on a NE-SW axis, which is still visible in the orientation of the buildings in the *temenos*. At this stage the upper city shows scattered and clustered settlement, while the lower city appears to be more developed. No more than fifty years after the establishment of Himera, the city is again radically rebuilt so that the buildings and streets become oriented East-West. The upper city becomes heavily urbanized, though interestingly the orientation of the upper city differs from that of the lower city. This may have more to do with topography than an intentional differentiation, but it nevertheless reinforces a distinction between the lower city and upper city that has still not been sufficiently explained. It is also unclear what prompted this change in orientation, but it clearly shows that the city was effectively organized and governed enough to exact such a large-scale change.¹⁴⁹

Overall the archaeological record for the city shows intensive trade contacts with other Greek parts of the Mediterranean, as well as substantial trade with Phoenician, Etruscan, and indigenous centers. Himera's unique position as one of two Greek settlements on the north coast of Sicily, the other being Mylai, ensured that it would grow prosperous in trade. However, there is no evidence of specifically Chalcidian influences in the religious institutions of the city or the burials. The material remains are also diverse and varied enough so as to imply wide-spread

¹⁴⁸ Vassallo and Valentino 2012.

¹⁴⁹ Vassallo 2005: 28-30.

contacts rather than specific Zanclean or Chalcidian ones. The city ultimately shows a strong commercial nature from the archaeological record, and indeed Himera would become one of the first cities in the Greek world to begin minting its own currency.

COINAGE

The coinage of Himera is notable if for no other reason than that the amount that was produced by the city greatly exceeded that of other minting cities in Sicily. The preserved volume exceeds even that of Zancle, the mother-colony of Himera, and Naxos, the oldest Ionian city in Sicily. At Zancle sixty-one drachmae obverse dies are known, while at Naxos there are nineteen drachmae obverse dies. From Himera, by contrast, 149 drachmae obverse dies have been identified, indicating not only a significantly greater production output but also greater diversity.¹⁵⁰ Himera's unique position in northern Sicily was a contributing factor to why it began minting currency so early, likely drawing in Spanish silver from its trade connections.¹⁵¹

The collection is divided into two major phases, based on the presence or absence of a hen on the reverse. The hen, and rooster which is on the obverse, may have symbolized "hemera," as the rooster would announce the new day and the Greek word (ἡμέρα) was close to the city name.¹⁵² These phases are further divided into eight groups based on die sequences (the pairing of obverse to reverse dies). Kraay infers from the complex die sequences in many of the groups that there were short periods of intense production rather than a consistent rate of

¹⁵⁰ Kraay postulates further that the access to Spanish silver would have been necessary in order for Himera to produce the quantity of coin it did, and as one of the closest cities to Carthaginian territory, Himera likely would have had close relations with the Carthaginians to access the silver they controlled in Spain (Kraay 1983: 11-14).

¹⁵¹ Boardman and Hammond 1982: 431; Holloway 1991:122.

¹⁵² Holloway 1991: 123.

production.¹⁵³ The chronology for the archaic coinage of Himera begins around 550 BC with Group I and ends with the political takeover of Theron in 484 BC with Group VIII.

A notable occurrence is the presence of an open *heta* in the full ethnic (HIMERAION) of some coins in Group I, which if truly dated to the mid-sixth century would be one of the earliest attestations of this form, especially in the West.¹⁵⁴ Later ethnics in Group III and IV are abbreviated (e.g. H ι) before the hen is added on the reverse to balance the rooster on the obverse. The script throughout these groups is entirely Chalcidian, and there is no trace of Doric features in the script or language.

Aside from the script, the weight of the coins falls within the range of weights of coins from Zancle and Naxos, suggesting that the Chalcidian cities had similar standards for minting.¹⁵⁵ It is therefore all the more striking when, after Himera was conquered by Theron of Acragas and much of the population massacred and replaced with Dorians in 476 BC, the ethnics on the coins immediately changed (e.g. HIMERA) to reflect Doric forms and a different weight standard.¹⁵⁶ Such a systematic and profound change to Dorian standards serves to emphasize how non-Doric the coinage of Himera was prior to 476 BC, and we can thus conclude that the coinage of Archaic Himera indicates a strong Chalcidian influence, both in language and in weight standard.

¹⁵³ For example, in sequence IVb ten obverse dies are paired with seven reverse dies, of which five obverse dies are paired with only two of the seven reverse dies. Altogether there are 154 reverse dies and 151 obverse dies present in the archaic coinage of Himera (Kraay 1983: 13).

¹⁵⁴ Kraay 1983: 16; Jeffery 1990: 245-246.

¹⁵⁵ Kraay 1983: 19.

¹⁵⁶ Jeffery 1990: 246.

EPIGRAPHY

Some of the most extensive surviving inscriptions from Himera are in bronze. This is convenient as many of these are official inscriptions that provide hints as to the institutions of the city. Thus we examine a rectangular bronze tablet found at Himera (*SEG* 53.1002/*SEG* 45.1364), which bears a *boustrophedon*¹⁵⁷ inscription written in the Chalcidian alphabet and dated to the mid-sixth century. Antonietta Brugnone compares the inscription present here to that on a Chalcidian homicide law found at Monte San Mauro (*SEG* 4.64, *SEG* 36.824), positing a possible connection between the two Chalcidian sites.¹⁵⁸ Another bronze tablet (*SEG* 47.1427; cf. *SEG* 53.983), dating to the early fifth century, concerns the redistribution of land and is also written in the Chalcidian alphabet:

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>[-4-5 -]εντῶν ἡ ἐμίσχοι[νον] [. . .]εδε τῶν [οἰ]οπέδων [.1-2.]- λα δανκλαῖα ποιέσαι ἀ[.]- 4 ἀρε· ἡαὶ φρατρίαὶ ἀ[ν]έδειξα- ν τὰ καταγεγραμ(μ)ένα · ἰ- ἀν [δέ τι]ς παρ τὸ χάλρομα ἐργάσδεταί ἔ τὸ [χ]ά[λρ]- 8 [ῶμ]α [ἀφ]ανὲς ποιέσει ἔ θ[έλ]- [εἰ λ]αθ[έν τ]ὶ περὶ τῷ χα[λρ]-</p> | <p>[ῶ]ματο[ς] ε[.]ε[.1-2.]ειε μ(ο)ῖρ- [α . .]ιε κακε[. .] ἀγαθε[. ἐ]- 12 ν τοῖ αὐτό(ι) αὐτὸν ἔχε[σ]- θαι ἐν ἡοῖπερ ἡ[ο μ]εῖ λ- [αχῶ]ν γέεξ ἀναδαιθμοῖ μνέσεται περὶ δ[ἐ] τ- 16 ὅ [ν] δεχο[μέν]ῶν κατὰ τ- ὀ χά[λ]ρομα καρτ- ερο[.]εντα [- - - - - - - - - -]</p> |
|--|---|

Antonietta Brugnone has also extensively studied this inscription. She cites φρατρίαὶ (4) as referring to the basis for civic divisions at Himera, a traditionally Chalcidian institution.¹⁵⁹ In regards to the alphabet and dialect, the text is almost entirely Chalcidian, especially with the presence of *koppas*. Notable forms here are ἐργάσδεταί (7), which is a *hapax*, and γέεξ ἀναδαιθμός (14), instead of γῆς ἀναδασμός. An inscription on a stone base found in the *temenos*

¹⁵⁷ The practice of alternating the direction of writing between lines.

¹⁵⁸ Brugnone 1997: 84. A worthwhile parallel may be a bronze plaque from Naupaktos, also believed to be from a colonial context and concerned with land distribution and homicide. Though the alphabet is Locrian, the dialect allows Attic elements (Jeffery 1990: 108).

¹⁵⁹ Brugnone 2003; Vysokii 2013: 43

of Athena, dated to the fifth century reads: ΕΥΚΛΕΙ. As such, it is tentatively offered as evidence of a founder's cult to Euclides still in practice by the fifth century.¹⁶⁰ If Euclides was the leader of the Chalcidian contingent, the presence of a founder's cult dedicated to him would be clear evidence of a Chalcidian institution.

Recorded as well are a series of smaller private inscriptions. One such inscription (*CEG* 392) was found in the area of Temple D at Himera, on the foot of an Attic black-glazed vessel, dated to the sixth century. The inscription reads:

Ζῆνος ἐριγδούποιο κόρεϊ γλαυκόπι Ἀθῆνῃ
Θρίπυλος εὐξάμενος τένδ' ἀνέθεκε θεᾶι.

The text is notable because the first hemistich matches that of *Homeric Hymn 12* to Hera, which reads Ζηνὸς ἐριγδούποιο κασιγνήτην ἄλογόν τε. Though it is unlikely that the *Homeric Hymns* were actually written by Homer, their classification as such speaks to the epic style of their meter and phrasing.¹⁶¹ In this inscription however, κόρεϊ is a non-Ionic form, but is rather attested in Euboea. Furthermore, the Homeric/epic dative should be γλαυκώπιδι, but instead is here γλαυκόπι.¹⁶² The poetic adjective ἐριγδούποιο also has only two epigraphic testimonies, both from Italy. This inscription thus indicates that epic and Homer were known at Himera, while also providing a clear connection to the city's Chalcidian roots.¹⁶³ Another inscription on the foot of an Attic *kylix* dated to the end of the sixth century reads: Κριμνο καλε Τεισικλε[λ]ι δοκει. The script is Chalcidian.¹⁶⁴

Important observations can be made from these inscriptions. First, those inscriptions related to legal institutions at the city, those inscribed on the bronze tablets, reveal institutions

¹⁶⁰ Vassallo 2005:20. See parallels in the case of Antiphemus of Rhodes above.

¹⁶¹ See Thuc. 3.104

¹⁶² Dubois 1989: 12; Arena 1994: 56

¹⁶³ Compare here as well Nestor's Cup, found at Pithekoussai, another early colonial instance of Homeric allusion.

¹⁶⁴ Vassallo and Brugnone 1998: 323-326.

present at the city that have strong connections to Chalcidian influences. Furthermore, the language these laws were written in is wholly Chalcidian, both in dialect and script. The private inscriptions also show little Doric influence, but instead contain elements that can be related specifically to Euboea. Based on these inscriptions, not only are there clear Chalcidian influences in the legal code and system of Himera, but the language used to record them is also Chalcidian. The private inscriptions also show Chalcidian influences, while Doric influences are noticeably absent.

STESICHORUS: A PROXY FOR MIXED-DIALECT?

The Doric dialect first emerges in the literary record in the choral odes of Alcman. Hailing from the Peloponnese, or perhaps from Sardis in Asia Minor, Alcman's poetry not only introduces Doric as a poetic dialect, but also shows the most characteristic Doric traits of all choral lyricists.¹⁶⁵ Choral lyric in all cases has an epic nature, essentially an Ionic-Aeolic dialect present in the epic works of Homer, but is colored heavily by Doric to a lesser or greater extent according to the author. It is thus misleading to say that the language of choral lyric was wholly Doric, as it was always a blend of epic elements and other non-Doric features.¹⁶⁶ Therefore while Alcman uses Doric very heavily, later lyric authors such as Ibycus and Simonides (from Rhegium and Ceos respectively) employ a wider variety of Ionic forms, while Sappho and Alcaeus (from Lesbos) show a heavy Lesbian Aeolic influence. In all these cases, their particular dialectic features are likely due to their areas of geographic origin. Furthermore, while Alcman is

¹⁶⁵ Tribulato 2010: 396. See Colvin 2010: 203-212 for an overview of characteristic traits of each dialect, as well as Buck 1955.

¹⁶⁶ Silk 2010: 426

thought to have written specifically for a Spartan audience, and about Spartan religious festivals, other poets were known to perform at panhellenic festivals.¹⁶⁷

While there is some disagreement in the literary record regarding his city of origin, most authors treat Stesichorus as being from Himera.¹⁶⁸ The time period in which he lived is also uncertain, though what evidence we have suggests he lived c. 640-550 BC, in the time after Alcman but before Simonides.¹⁶⁹ Assuming Stesichorus lived and worked in Himera during the period he is attested to have done so, he would be a valuable resource to draw on for the study of dialect and ethnicity at Himera.¹⁷⁰ As mentioned previously, poetic dialect and spoken dialect are not the same, and any analysis of Stesichorus' dialect must proceed with literary factors in mind.

The *Suda* explicitly describes Stesichorus' poems as being Doric, as one would expect from a choral lyric, and indeed that seems to be the case.¹⁷¹ His work is characterized by many Doric elements present in the work of Alcman, the first and most conservative of the poets to use Doric. Similarities with Alcman are demonstrated by the Doric retention of $-\bar{\alpha}-$, such as in $\nu\bar{\alpha}\sigma\omicron\nu$ (Ion. $\nu\eta\sigma\omicron\nu$; S8.2), $\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$ (Ion. $\mu\eta\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\alpha$; S17.6), and $\Lambda\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\varsigma$ (Ion. $\Lambda\theta\eta\eta\nu\varsigma$; 209.9). Another Doric feature is the replacement of $-\alpha-$ with $-\epsilon-$ in the words $\dot{\iota}\alpha\rho\omicron\varsigma$ (attested S17.4, S105b12, 222.ii.6) and $\dot{\iota}\alpha\rho\tau\alpha\mu\iota\varsigma$ (attested S105b12), as well as Doric prepositions such as $\pi\omicron\tau\acute{\iota}$ (Ion. $\pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$;

¹⁶⁷ Tribulato 2010: 396

¹⁶⁸ As Silvia Barbantani demonstrates, Stephanus of Byzantium claims Stesichorus is from Metauros (Steph. Byz. s.v. Μάταυρος). Stephanus' account is however incorrect in placing Metauros in Sicily, when it is actually in southern Italy, thus indicating a possible contamination of sources. The most tantalizing line of evidence is a herm from Tivoli that bears an inscription (*I.G.* xiv 1213) naming Stesichorus of Himera, son of Euclides. Though many sources give varied names for Stesichorus' father, in this case it must be remembered that Euclides was the name of one of the founders of Himera, thus potentially establishing a very strong connection to Himera (Thuc. 6.5.1). For a more detailed analysis, see Barbantani 2010: 23- 24.

¹⁶⁹ E.g. *Sud.* Σ 1095, Cic. *De Rep.* 2. 20, Tzetz. *Vit. Hes.* 18; Campbell 1991: 29-35.

¹⁷⁰ *Suda* s.v. Τρύφων. It should be noted that Tryphon also wrote a treatise called *On the dialects in Homer, Simonides, Pindar, Alcman and the other lyric poets* (Περὶ τῶν παρ' Ὀμήρῳ διαλέκτων καὶ Σιμωνίδῃ καὶ Πινδάρῳ καὶ Ἀλκμᾶνι καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις λυρικοῖς). That Stesichorus is not included in the title does not prevent him from being discussed as one of the "other lyric poets," but it may imply that his dialect was not considered especially worthy of study in Tryphon's time.

¹⁷¹ καὶ ἔστιν αὐτοῦ τὰ ποιήματα Δωρίδι διαλέκτῳ (*Sud.* Σ 1095)

S14.4).¹⁷² We also find such forms as γωνάζομαι (S13.4) and ὠρανόθεν (209.i.3), which are changed in their root syllables (ὠ for οὐ) rather than in endings. The first is a form (originally γουφάζομαι) that is appropriate for Ionic dialects, and is possible in a few Doric dialects,¹⁷³ but is otherwise generally not appropriate in West Greek dialects. Stesichorus' use of it with –ω- is therefore artificial. The second case, ὠρανόθεν, has as its ending (-θεν), a form that belongs only to epic while the stem is applicable for Doric dialects. Richard Felsenthal argues that in these two cases of “hyperdoricism” there is evidence that Stesichorus has borrowed epic forms, which could not have existed in actual Doric dialects, and given them a Doric “flavor” rather than replicated actual Doric speech.¹⁷⁴

This observation introduces the most well-known aspect of Stesichorus' language, which is his strong connections to the genre of epic. Stesichorus is cited as being the “most Homeric of poets” due to the epic nature and style of his poems, and according to some traditions he was even considered the son of Hesiod, though this is impossible.¹⁷⁵ Examples of epic elements in his work are the contraction -εε- for which Stesichorus uses the epic –ει- instead of the Doric –η-, as in κείνα (Dor. τῆνος; 223.3). His use of verbs is also very epic in that he often employs augmentless aorists and imperfects, such as νικάσεν (79b2), for metric flexibility. Infinitives are also unique in their use, such as εἶμεν (Dor. ἦμεν; S102.5) and εἶν (S15.i.7), the latter only known in inscriptions from Euboea. This last form, εἶν, seems the strongest connection between the language of Stesichorus and what we can expect to be at Himera based on its Chalcidian roots.¹⁷⁶

¹⁷² ποτί is however found also in Homer and Hesiod

¹⁷³ Those of Argos, Crete, Thera, Cos, and Rhodes.

¹⁷⁴ Felsenthal 1980: 55-56, 73.

¹⁷⁵ Longinus *Subl.* 13.3. See Barbantani 2010: 23-41 for a lengthy discussion of the parallels later authors made between Homer and Stesichorus, as well as possible Pythagorean connections.

¹⁷⁶ Felsenthal 1970: 56-62.

Unfortunately this is one of the few cases where the language of Stesichorus can be localized. Whereas the other choral poets are localized through dialectic features in their poetry, as Alcman's Laconian elements place him in the Peloponnesus, Alcaeus' and Sappho's Lesbian elements place them in Lesbos, and Ibycus' and Simonides' Ionic elements place them in Magna Graecia, Stesichorus does not lend himself to such localization.¹⁷⁷ His heavy use of Epic forms and relatively lax commitment to Doric forms is interesting but not especially indicative of origin.¹⁷⁸ Gregory Hutchinson further points out that even the use of Doric in the work of Stesichorus is not itself indicative of any local factors, as Doric lyric was in use all over the Greek world and his form of Doric does not demonstrate the mixture of Ionic and Doric that Thucydides describes as being present at Himera. Therefore, it may be the case that the dialect alone cannot provide much insight into the language at Himera, but a more nuanced approach might.

As such, while analysis of Stesichorus' language reveals a strong influence from Homer and the epic genre, their influence is not limited only to dialectic forms. First there is the vocabulary of Stesichorus, as from the entire corpus of words used in his poems, only thirty-five out of the 900 words are not attested in extant epic.¹⁷⁹ Then there is the problem of how his work was performed, as it is difficult to imagine a chorus singing the poetry of Stesichorus such as the *Geryoneis* which is more than 1000 lines long. Such length is more familiar in the genre of epic, and it is not entirely clear if Stesichorus' poems can definitively be called choral lyric, or if they border more on actual epic.¹⁸⁰ The meter of Stesichorus' poems is also heavily influenced by

¹⁷⁷ Felsenthal 1980: iii; Hutchinson 2003: 115.

¹⁷⁸ Even so, note above the presence of the inscribed vase (*CEG* 392) that bears a Homeric Hymn to Hera at Himera as being affirmation that Homer was known among locals.

¹⁷⁹ Felsenthal 1980: 73. I have been unable to find similar statistics for other Archaic poets, but it stands to reason that this statistic is nevertheless remarkable.

¹⁸⁰ Hutchinson 2003: 116.

epic as he uses dactylic hexameter, the meter of epic, to create a notably Homeric feel to his poetry. This metrical effect is aided by the distinguishable epic practice of treating the syllables before a mute consonant followed by a liquid as short, rather than long as in all other dialects except Attic. Examples of this can be seen in μέλι_χλωρόν (179a2) and τοιάδε_χρή (212.1), where the underlined is treated as short. Another metrical practice used is correption, by which a long final syllable could be shortened if the following word began with a vowel.¹⁸¹

Beyond even the language, the themes of many of Stesichorus' poems are taken from Homer and epic. Thus several of his poems, such as the *Helen*, *Iliou Persis*, and *Nostoi* are Homeric in their theme.¹⁸² The variety of his themes and the lack of connection to a specific occasion stand out in contrast to the specificity of Alcman's work, which on the contrary is focused on just one place (Laconia). Though it is said that Stesichorus wrote twenty-six books, of which very little survives, one of the most substantial works we have is the *Geryoneis*, written about Heracles' tenth labor in which he must steal the cattle of Geryon. Various traditions place this labor in the western Mediterranean,¹⁸³ yet Stesichorus specifically, and perhaps for the first time, places it in western Sicily. This placement has been suggested as possibly reflecting contemporary Greek designs to control the region,¹⁸⁴ supported further by the poem's interest in Spanish silver for which control of western Sicily would have been important.¹⁸⁵ Heracles is, however, the quintessential Doric hero, and it may be noteworthy that Stesichorus should employ such a figure in a narrative aimed at affirming ownership of a region.

¹⁸¹ Felsenthal 1980: 69-70. See Ibid. 70-72 for a full list of features found in Stesichorus and their association with various dialects.

¹⁸² Felsenthal 1980: 53; Hutchinson 2003: 117.

¹⁸³ e.g. Hdt. 5.43, Apollodorus, *Bibl.* 2.5.10.

¹⁸⁴ Boardman and Hammond 1982: 187.

¹⁸⁵ Stes. fr. 184 *PMG*. Dunabin 1968: 329; Kraay 1983: 14. Note previous discussion about the use of Spanish silver in the coinage of Himera.

Altogether this discussion demonstrates that Stesichorus was very powerfully influenced by epic, and specifically by the work of Homer.¹⁸⁶ While the extent to which the epic influence pervades the work of this choral lyricist is remarkable, who must after all remain classified as a choral poet, Stesichorus was likely not the first to be so influenced by Homer, and was certainly not the last. Yet it is significant that his work deviates from epic primarily in his use of Doric elements, and one must wonder why he used them at all. It is not after all surprising that he should feel the influence of the epic genre, which likely went with Hellenes wherever they went and was felt across all aspects of their culture. Yet the Doric elements suggest either that he was aware of the work of Alcman, and perhaps earlier choral poets who may have worked in Doric, or that he himself, independent of Alcman, infused his poetry with Doric features. Though the latter seems far less likely, both scenarios require that Stesichorus be in close contact with some form of Doric influence, perhaps a local population or patrons. To be clear, however, equating poetic dialect with vernacular dialect is essentially breaking one of the most important rules of studying dialects. The interpretation I offer here acknowledges that rule, but in light of the analysis undertaken here and the goals of this paper, it would be irresponsible to completely ignore Stesichorus as a potential line of evidence for a vernacular dialect at Himera. While the dialect used by Stesichorus is not the mixed-dialect we would expect, what Doric he does use in his poetry implies that there may in fact have been more Doric in the dialect of Himera than the inscriptions and coinage would suggest.

CONCLUSION

The first question to be addressed here is whether the institutions of Himera can truly be said to be Chalcidian. The mortuary record is highly varied and there is no burial practice that

¹⁸⁶ See further Felsenthal 1980: 80-88.

can definitively be shown to be indicative of Chalcidian influences. Furthermore, the ratio of inhumations to cremations is consistent with that at other Sicilian sites, and not even burial goods provide any useful links. Though funerary practices are not generally considered to be institutions of a city, we can nevertheless say that the burials at Himera show no sign of an overarching Chalcidian influence. The same can be said of the ceramic record, which again is highly varied and reflects more the mercantile nature of Himera than a specific cultural link to Zancle or other Chalcidian sites. The religious institutions of Himera also bear no clear Chalcidian influences. Though there may have been a specific cult of Athena worshipped at Himera, we are not aware of one and Athena alone does not connect Himera to Chalcidian institutions.¹⁸⁷ While I believe most scholars would agree that religious institutions are included in *nomima*, there does not appear to be compelling evidence of specifically Chalcidian religious institutions at Himera.

Coinage, on the other hand, is an institution that we can very comfortably describe as Chalcidian. Not only do the weight standards of the currency conform with coinage at other Chalcidian cities in Sicily, but the script and dialect on the coins themselves is clearly Chalcidian. The inscriptions presented here also bear evidence of pronounced Chalcidian influences in the legal and governing system of Himera, which again is paralleled by the clearly Chalcidian script and dialect in which they are written. In this regard, language is in fact an integral part of the institutions of the city, much in the same way that modern nations have an official language. Though the city may not have thought of it in these modern terms, the “official” dialect of Himera, based on the coins and inscriptions from legal codes, was no doubt Chalcidian.

¹⁸⁷ The cult of Athena Lindia was well established at Gela, a Dorian city, and was a clear reflection of Gela’s Lindian roots (Fischer-Hansen 1996: 321-323).

There is no reason, however, to doubt the presence of a mixed dialect at Himera, even if the official dialect was Chalcidian. In support, I offer Stesichorus here as tentative evidence of Doric influences in the “vernacular” dialect of Himera, though as always there is danger in drawing conclusions from poetic dialects. Nevertheless, Thucydides wrote that there was a mixed-dialect at Himera while maintaining that the institutions of the city were Chalcidian.

It is then significant that the inscriptions and coinage are primarily institutional media and reflect the Chalcidian *nomima* as we would expect, while the works of Stesichorus, a more private and personal medium, reflect far more what can be interpreted as the presence of a mixed dialect at Himera. The mortuary record as well reflects this vagueness, such that personal manifestations of identity do not have to conform to the overarching identity projected by the *nomima*. In that regard, language in its official capacity is an integral part of the institutions of a city, but at the same time is separate and distinct from them among the population.

While the dual presence of a vernacular dialect and official dialect was likely quite common in the ancient Greek world, at Himera it is all the more profound because of its clear attempts to take part in a wider Chalcidian ethnic identity. The presence of non-Chalcidians at the city, especially Dorians, must have caused tensions, and yet we see no evidence for it. Neither in the historical record nor in the archaeology do ethnic tensions appear, despite the emphasis on a Chalcidian identity at the institutional level. Rather than arguing, as Malkin does, that the *nomima* would have assimilated all non-Chalcidians, I argue instead that the vernacular dialect and the mortuary record show that *nomima* had clear and defined boundaries within which Chalcidian identity served a very specific purpose. The proximity of Himera to its mother-city of Zancle, as well as other Chalcidian establishments such as Mylai, makes it extremely likely that it maintained frequent and friendly relations with these cities. In maintaining and

reinforcing these ties, Chalcidian identity was critically important for the city to project. Yet as a *polis* in its own right, Himera naturally developed its own identity relative to the cultural influences present in the city. The place for this identity was external to the *nomima* of the city, and as a result we see it in burials and vernacular dialect. The case of Himera therefore stresses the multiplicity of identities that may co-exist for communities, and the necessity of understanding the spaces for which they were constructed.

COMPARISON AND CONCLUSION

Though I initially chose the cities of Gela and Himera for their similarities, in an attempt to introduce a measure of consistency and “scientific rigor” to this examination of ethnic identity, the truth is that there can almost never be consistency when it comes to ethnic identity. The definition provided at the beginning of this paper holds, that ethnic identity was an actively and socially constructed identity dependent on a wide range of cultural, political, and geographical factors, any combination of which can contribute to the development of certain identities at certain times. It furthermore could exist in multiple forms at the same time, and at different levels and scales. Thus while both cities developed *nomima*, as all Greek cities must, we must understand the development of each city’s institutions relative to the circumstances of its foundation and development. Thucydides is correct in implying that *nomima* had ethnic affiliations, but the connection between them may not have always been as conscious as he implies.

Gela was part of the first wave of colonies set up in Sicily and was certainly the first to explicitly be settled by Rhodians or Cretans. This, in combination with its, at the time, unique position on the south coast of Sicily, ensured that it was significantly more free to develop its own identity. Even if we accept that Gela always maintained close and frequent ties with Rhodes, the considerable distance between these two regions would nevertheless cause Gela to look inwards towards Sicily rather than out. At Gela there was no need to create institutions more specific than general Dorian ones, yet Dorian ones emerged likely more as a result of the lack of non-Dorians than because of a desire to be inclusive. That we do not see the institutions become more Rhodian as the Deinomenids intensified their emphasis on Rhodian identity is indicative that that there was no practical need to develop such *nomima*. The emphasis on

Rhodian identity in the foundation accounts would have been sufficient to legitimize the authority of the tyrants, while there were no other Rhodian colonies in Sicily that the tyrants could have developed closer ties with through Rhodian institutions. In any case, Gela strove to be the dominant Dorian city in Sicily, a purpose for which its Dorian institutions were more than suitable.

Himera, on the other hand, though founded no more than forty years after Gela, was nevertheless already considered to be part of the second wave of settlements. It was a colony of Zancle, itself a colony of Cumae and with colonists from Euboea. As such, Himera was geographically much closer to its origins, and though the evidence indicates that it became an independent and self-sufficient city almost from the beginning of its foundation, it nevertheless could not help but tap into the larger Chalcidian regional sphere. The presence of non-Chalcidians at the city creates a different situation at Himera than at Gela, which perhaps explain the differentiation in verb choices that Thucydides makes between the two foundations. Though there may have been tensions at the beginning of the city, such as one would expect with any union of different groups, the clear demarcation of institutions from private life would not have been oppressive to the Dorians in the city, who would be free to maintain their personal ethnic identities even while the city adopted the regional/ethnic identity of Chalcidian.

Altogether this paper emphasizes the flexibility and mutability of ethnicity and identity in the ancient Greek world. Rather than generalizing ethnic perceptions from localized indicia, we must be aware that often times ethnic identities are in fact limited to localized conditions. We must accept that a wide variety of identities can exist, even when they seem to contradict each other. Thus while foundation accounts from Gela stress a primarily Rhodian character, there is

no need for us to exclude other accounts that disagree, nor to actively seek for elements of Rhodian identity in all aspects of the city's archaeological record.

By way of closing remarks, I would like to emphasize that much remains unanalyzed in this discussion. The relationship of Acragas to Gela certainly requires further inquiry to better understand the development of ethnic identities at Gela and their transmission to a secondary colony. In that sense Acragas may have more in common with Himera than Himera has with Gela, though Acragas also shows evidence of completely different formations of identity independent of both. Another major element noticeably excluded from my discussions is the presence of indigenous peoples at these cities. While it is extremely likely that some element of the urban population was indigenous or mixed, it is undoubtedly true that the hinterland of these cities contained many indigenous centers.¹⁸⁸ The relationships these cities had to these populations, as well as the mechanisms of trade, assimilation, and intermarriage all must be explored in understanding ethnic identities at these colonial cities.

Nevertheless, I hope by this study I have added my voice to the growing awareness that the old model of understanding Hellenic identity as simply Dorians and Ionians is extremely problematic and leaves out the incredible variety of ethnic, linguistic, regional, religious, and political identities that at any given time can express a multitude of local influences and situations. In truth, Gela and Himera are no more multi-ethnic than any other city, but simply register more visibly on our modern understanding of ethnic identity. Each city contains a wide spectrum of identities, from the elite to the lowest classes, all of which offer valuable evidence for the study of the ancient world.

¹⁸⁸ See especially Domínguez 1989.

Acknowledgements

I am extremely grateful for all the help I have received in writing this senior honors thesis. Thanks go to Olga Faccani and Margot Cardomone for help in translating some of the many Italian articles necessary for this research. I would like to also thank Elena Martin Gonzalez for her suggestions and feedback and for agreeing to sit on my review panel. I am also grateful to Tessa Cicak for proofreading help and feedback throughout the year. Special thanks go to Meghan Reedy, Chris Francese, and Meagan Ayer of the Dickinson College Classical Studies Department, who have been endlessly supportive and helpful throughout this process. Also of the Dickinson College Classical Studies Department, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Marc Mastrangelo who has advised and mentored me throughout my time at Dickinson College, and continued to do so as my primary advisor on this thesis.

Bibliography

- Ardener, E. *The voice of prophecy and other essays*. Oxford: Berghahn Books, 1989.
- Antonaccio, Carla. "Etnicity and Colonization." In *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*, edited by Irad Malkin, 113-158. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- . "Siculo-geometric and the Sikels: Ceramics and identity in eastern Sicily." In *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean, Identity in the Western Mediterranean: Papers in honour of Brian Shefton*, edited by Kathryn Lomas, 55-82. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- Arena, Renato. *Iscrizioni Greche Arcaiche di Sicilia e Magna Graecia: Iscrizioni delle Colonie Euboiche*. Pisa: Nistri Lischi, 1994.
- Asheri, David. "Note on the resettlement of Gela under Timoleon." *Historia: Zeitschrift für Alte Geschichte* 19(1970): 618-623.
- Barbantani, Silvia. *Three Burials (Ibycus, Stesichorus, Simonides): Facts and fiction about lyric poets in Magna Graecia in the epigrams of the Greek Anthology*. Alessandria : Edizioni dell'Orso, 2010.
- Boardman, John. *The Greeks Overseas*. London: Thames & Hudson, 1999.
- Boardman, John, and Hammond, N. G. L., *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 3, Part 3: The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries BC*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- Bodel, John, ed. *Epigraphic Evidence: Ancient History from Inscriptions*. New York: Routledge, 2001.
- Brugnone, Antonietta. "Gli alfabeti arcaici delle poleis siceliote e l'introduzione dell'alfabeto milesio," *ASNP*, s. III, XXV (1995): 1297-1327.
- . "Legge di Himera sulla redistribuzione della terra," *PP* 52 (1997): 262-305.
- . "Nomima chalkidika. Una laminetta iscritta da Himera," *Atti delle Quarte Giornate Internazionali di Studi sull'area elima* (2003): 77-89.
- Buck, Carl Darling. *The Greek Dialects: Grammar, Selected Inscriptions, Glossary*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1955.
- Campbell, David A, trans. *Greek Lyric: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonies, and Others*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.
- Castellana, G. "Indigeni ad Himera." *Sicilia Archeologica* 13(1980): 71-76.

- Colvin, Stephen. "Greek Dialects in the Archaic and Classical Ages." In *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, edited by Egbert Bakker, 200-212. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2010.
- Davies, Anna Morpurgo. "The Greek Notion of Dialect." In *Greeks and Barbarians*, edited by Thomas Harrison, 153-171. New York: Routledge, 2002.
- Dewey, J., and A. F. Bentley. *Knowing and the known*. Boston: Beacon Press, 1949.
- De Miro, Ernesto. "Influenze cretesi nei santuari ctoni dell'area geloo-agrentina." *Cronache di archeologia* 13(1974): 202-207
- Domínguez, Adolfo J. "Greeks in Sicily." In *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas Volume 1*, edited by Gocha R. Tsetschladdze, 253-357. Leiden: Brill, 2006.
- . "The Origins of Greek Colonization and the Greek *Polis*: Some Observations," *Ancient West and East* 10 (2011), 195-207.
- Dougherty, Carol. *The Poetics of Colonization*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993.
- . "Archaic Greek Foundation Poetry: Questions of Genre and Occasion." *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 114 (1994), 35-46.
- Dougherty, Carol, and Leslie Kurke. eds. *The Cultures Within Greek Cultures: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- Dubois, Laurent. *Inscriptions Grecques Dialectales de Sicile: Contribution a l'etude du vocabulaire grec colonial*. Rome: Ecole Francaise de Rome, 1989.
- . *Inscriptions Grecques Dialectales de Sicile II*. Geneva: Librairie Droz, 2008.
- Dunabin, T. J. *The Western Greeks*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968.
- Eriksen, T. H. *Ethnicity and nationalism: anthropological perspectives*. London: Pluto Press, 1993.
- Felsenthal, Richard Albert. "The Language of Greek choral lyric: Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus and Simonides." PhD diss., University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1980.
- Fischer-Hansen, Tobias. "The Earliest Town-Planning of the Western Greek Colonies, with special regard to Sicily." In *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis*, edited by Mogens Herman Hansen, 317-373. Copenhagen: The Royal Danish Academy of Science and Letters, 1996.

- Fiorentini, Graziella. "Gela protoarcaica: dati topografici, archeologici e cronologici." *Annuario della Scuola archeologica di Atene e delle missioni italiane in oriente* 61(1983): 53-106.
- Fragoulaki, Maria. *Kinship in Thucydides: Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.
- Gomme, A. W. *An Historical Commentary on Thucydides: Books V(25)-VII*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1970.
- Graham, A. J. "The colonial expansion of Greece." In *The Cambridge Ancient History Volume 3*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- . *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*. Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1983.
- Hansen, Mogens Herman, and Thomas Heine Nielsen. eds. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Hall, Jonathan. "The Role of Language in Greek Ethnicities," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 41 (1995), 83-100.
- . *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997.
- . *Hellenicity: Between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2002.
- . "'Culture' or 'Cultures'? Hellenism in the late sixth century." In *The Cultures Within Greek Cultures: Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*, edited by Carol Dougherty and Leslie Kurke, 23-34. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- . "How 'Greek' were the Early Western Greeks?" In *Greek Identity in the Western Mediterranean, Identity in the Western Mediterranean: Papers in honour of Brian Shefton*, edited by Kathryn Lomas, 35-54. Leiden: Brill, 2004.
- . "Foundation Stories." In *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas Volume 2*, edited by Gocha R. Tsetskhladze, 383-426. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- Hansen, Mogens Herman, and Thomas Heine Nielsen. eds. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- Higbie, Carolyn. *The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of Their Past*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Holloway, R. Ross, *The Archaeology of Ancient Sicily*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

- Hornblower, Simon. "Greek Identity in the Archaic and Classical Periods." In *Hellenisms: Culture, Identity, and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity*, edited by Katerina Zacharia, 21-36. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008.
- . *A Commentary on Thucydides: Volume III: Books 5.25-8.109*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2010.
- Hutchinson, G. O. *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Commentary on Selected Larger Pieces*, New York: Oxford University Press, 2003.
- Jeffery, L. H. *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Greek Alphabet and its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth centuries B.C.* Revised by A. W. Johnston. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1990.
- Jenkins, G. Kenneth. *The Coinage of Gela*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1970.
- Kirchoff, Adolf. *Studien zur Geschichte des griechischen Alphabets*, Berlin: F. Dümmler, 1887.
- Knoepfler, Denis. "Oropodoros: Anthroponomy, Geography, History." In *Greek Personal Names: Their Value as Evidence*, edited by Simon Hornblower and Elaine Matthews, 81-98. New York: Oxford University Press for the British Academy, 2000.
- Kraay, Colin M. *The Archaic Coinage of Himera*. Naples: Arte Tipographica, 1983.
- Kurtz, Donna C. and John Boardman. *Greek Burial Customs*. New York: Cornell University Press, 1971.
- Malkin, Irad. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden: Brill, 1987.
- . "Networks and the Emergence of Greek Identity," *Mediterranean Historical Review* 18 (2003), 56-74.
- . *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.
- Malkin, Irad, ed. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2001.
- Mickey, K. 'Dialect Consciousness and Literay Language: An Example from Ancient Greek.' In *Transactions of the Philological Society* (1981), 35-66.
- Morgan, Catherine. "The Origins of pan-Hellenism." In *Greek Sanctuaries: New Approaches*, edited by Nanno Marinatos and Robin Hagg, 18-44. London: Routledge, 1993.
- Morpurgo Davies, Anna. "The Greek Notion of Dialect." In *Greeks and Barbarians*, edited by Thomas Harrison, 153-171. New York: Routledge, 2002.

- Nisetich, Frank, *Pindar's Victory Songs*. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press, 1980.
- Orsi, Paolo. *Gela: Scavi del 1900-1905*. Rome: Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei, 1906.
- Osborne, Robin. "Early Greek Colonization? The nature of Greek settlement in the West." In *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, edited by Nick Fisher and Hans van Wees, 251-269. London: Duckworth, 1998.
- . "Landscape, ethnicity and the polis." In Cifani, Gabriele, and Simon Stoddart. eds. *Landscape, Ethnicity and Identity in the Archaic Mediterranean Area*. Oxford: Oxbow Books, 2012.
- Palladini, Letizia Poli. *Aeschylus at Gela: An Integrated Approach*. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2013.
- Parker, Robert. *Cleomenes on the Acropolis: An Inaugural Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford on 12 May 1997*. Oxford: 1998.
- Silk, Michael. "The Language of Greek Lyric Poetry." In *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, edited by Egbert Bakker, 424-440. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2010.
- Shepherd, Gillian. "The pride of most colonials: burial and religion in the Sicilian colonies." In *Ancient Sicily*, edited by Tobias Fischer-Hansen, 51-82. Copenhagen: Museum Tusulanum Press, 1995.
- . "Dead Men Tell No Lies: Ethnic Diversity in Sicilian Colonies and the Evidence of the Cemeteries." *Oxford Journal of Archaeology* 24(2005): 115-136.
- Snodgrass, Anthony M. "The Growth and Standing of the Early Western Colonies." In *The Archaeology of Greek Colonisation: Essays dedicated to Sir John Boardman*, edited by Gocha R. Tsetschladdze and Franco De Angelis, 1-10. Exeter: Short Run Press, 1994.
- Stier, H. E. *Die geschichtliche Bedeutung des Hellenennamens*. Cologne: VS, 1970.
- Strassler, Robert B, ed. *The Landmark Thucydides: A Comprehensive Guide to The Peloponnesian War*. New York: Free Press, 2008.
- Tribulato, Olga. "Literary Dialects." In *A Companion to the Ancient Greek Language*, edited by Egbert Bakker, 388-400. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2010.
- Tsetschladdze, Gocha R. ed. *Greek Colonisation: An account of Greek colonies and other settlements overseas – Volume 1*. Leiden: Brill 2006.
- van Dommelen, Peter. "Colonial Constructs: Colonialism and Archaeology in the Mediterranean." *World Archaeology* 28 (1997), 305-323.

- Vassallo, Stefano. "Indagini in un quartiere della città bassa di Himera." In *Wohnbauforschung in Zentral- und Westsizilien. Sicilia Occidentale e Centro-Meridionale: Ricerche archeologiche nell'abitato*, edited by H.P. Isler et al, 81-90. Zurich: Archäologisches Institut der Universität, 1997.
- . *Himera città Greca: Guida alla storia e ai monumenti*. Palermo: Regione siciliana, Assessorato dei beni culturali e ambientali e della pubblica istruzione, 2005.
- . "Himera: Ricerche sull'urbanistica arcaica della città bassa." In *La Sicilia in età arcaica : dalle apoikiai al 480 a.C.*, edited by Rosalba Panvini and Lavinia Sole, 196-200. Palermo : Centro regionale per l'inventario, la catalogazione e la documentazione, 2009.
- . "La colonia dorico-calcedese di Himera. Dai dati storici di Tucididee di Diodoro Siculo all'archeologia," *Atti del VII convegno di Studi – Sicilia Antica* (2012): 1-10.
- Vassallo, Stefano and Antonietta Brugnone. "Il ricordo della 'bella' Himera in un'iscrizione di Himera." *Annali della Scuola Normale Superiore di Pisa* (1998): 323-326.
- Vassallo, Stefano and Matteo Valentino. "Scavi nella necropoli occidentale di Himera, il paesaggio e le tipologie funerarie." In *Sicilia occidentale. Studi, rassegne, ricerche*, edited by Carmine Ampolo, 49-71. Pisa : Edizioni della Normale, 2012.
- Vysokii, Mikhail F. "Ancient Greek Legislation on Sicily: The Laws of Charondas." In *Ruthenia Classica Aetatis Novae: A Collection of Works by Russian Scholars in Ancient Greek and Roman History* edited by Andreas Mehl, Alexander Makhlayuk, and Oleg Gabelko, 31-43. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2013.
- Wentker, Hermann. "Die Ktisis von Gela bei Thukydides." *Mitteilungen des Deutschen Archaeologischen Instituts, Roemische Abteilung* 63(1956): 129-139.
- Zacharia, Katerina. ed. *Hellenisms: Culture, Identity, and Ethnicity from Antiquity to Modernity*. Hampshire: Ashgate, 2008.