Archias, the Heracleids, the Bakhiads and the Foundation of Syracuse.
Andreas Morakis

Abstract: This paper tries to explore the origin of Archias, the founder of Syracuse. Archias according to the *communis opinio*, which was formulated already from the end of the 19th century (by Freeman) descended from the aristocratic family/clan of the Bakhiads who ruled the city during the early Archaic period. Moreover, another view based on a reference of the Parian Marble supports the Argive origin of the *oikistes* of Syracuse. Both views are challenged. In particular, the first opinion is considered as the outcome of the false perception of the character of Syracuse's foundation, as state guided, namely organized by the authorities of the city, the Bakhiads who chose one of their members (Archias) and put him in charge of the colonial expedition. As for the Argive origin, this is also rejected and is claimed to have been formulated during the early 4th century when Argos and Corinth were briefly united under a single state. In the end, it is supported that Archias was a Corinthian of noble origin (a Heracleid) who left Corinth in order to find the political role denied in his country by the ruling family of the Bakhiads, and founded a colony (jointly probably with other nobles) mainly on his own initiative.

Key words: Archias, Syracuse, Bakhiads, Heracleids, Greek colonization

Introduction

This paper explores the origins of Archias, the *oikistes* of Syracuse, which is to say it investigates whether he belonged to the family/clan of the Bakhiads or not. The issue of whether Archias was a Bakhiad is significant, because it also helps us better define the character of the colonial expedition that led to the foundation of Syracuse.[1] Concerning the character of the Greek colonization I would note that in the past it was viewed mostly as a state enterprise organized by aristocratically governed city-states, and the debate was limited mainly to the reasons for founding new settlements (commerce, arable land, political motives). However, one very influential article by Robin Osborne challenged this traditional model of Greek colonization as a state-guided enterprise. Osborne considered the foundation of the Greek colonies as merely a process, and not an instant event, better described as the private ventures of individuals or dissatisfied groups.[2] Therefore a Bakhiadic origin for Archias could better resemble the old model of state-guided colonization for Syracuse's foundation, while if Archias was not a Bahkiad the state guided-character of Syracuse's establishment becomes less probable. It is not my goal to fully

---

[1] Archias was not in fact a Bakhiad as already mentioned in Morakis, 2011, 468, but without further analysis, which is attempted to be clarified here.

[2] Osborne, 1998, see also more briefly Morakis, 2011, 460-462.

investigate the foundation of Syracuse,[3] or examine the character of Greek colonization;[4] instead I will limit myself to Archias' origins and examine how that relates to how Syracuse was founded.

The Sources

Numerous traditions relating to Archias and subsequently his role in the foundation of Syracuse were preserved, both in antiquity and in the Byzantine era.[5] The first of these references dates from Thucydides in the fifth century[6] and reach as far as the Byzantine era and beyond (Anthologia Graeca). We can categorize these references in two major groups. In the first one there are only references to Archias as the founder of Syracuse. These testimonials are not necessarily, of course, interrelated, and only preserve the basic fact, namely the foundation of Syracuse, with minor or without any details. In the second group of literary sources several details are presented about why Archias left Corinth, but also regarding the colonial expedition itself until the final establishment of the colonists in Syracuse.

Beginning with the first group I should remark that to this belong the oldest preserved references (Thucydides and Theocritus). The first one in his much discussed narration on the foundation of the Greek cities of Sicily mentions: 6.3.2:

> Συρακούσας δὲ τοῦ ἐχομένου ἔτους **Ἀρχίας τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν ἐκ Κορίνθου** ᾤκισε, Σικελοὺς ἐξελάσας πρῶτον ἐκ τῆς νήσου ἐν ᾗ νῦν οὐκέτι περικλυζομένῃ ἡ πόλις ἡ ἐντός ἐστιν·

> In the following year Archias, one of the Heraclidae, came from Corinth and founded Syracuse, first driving the Sicels out of the island of Ortygia; in which, though it is no longer surrounded by the sea, the inner city now stands (transl. B. Jowett).

Theocritus mentions (*Bucol. Idyl.* 28.17-18):

> καὶ γάρ τοι **πάτρις ἂν ὡξ Ἐφύρας** κτίσσε ποτ' **Ἀρχίας**, νάσω Τρινακρίας μύελον, ἄνδρων δοκίμων πόλιν.

> For my own country thou comest and thy native town is that which Archias of Ephyra founded of old, the very marrow of the Trinacria isle, whose citizens are of high renown (transl. A.S.F. Gow).

To these we will add Pseudo-Scymnus (279-282):

> **Ἀρχίας δὲ** τούτους προσλαβὼν **ὁ Κορίνθιος** μετὰ Δωριέων κατῴκισεν ἀπὸ τῆς ὁμόρου λίμνης λαβούσας τοὔνομα τὰς νῦν Συρακούσας παρ' αὐτοῖς λεγομένας.

---

[3] For the foundation of Syracuse see the bibliography in Morakis, 2019, 177, n. 732.

[4] This has been done in Morakis, 2011.

[5] Bérard, 1957, 118, n. 3 mentions a small part of these references. Just recently, technology (TLG) has simplified this (otherwise very painful) kind of research.

[6] All dates/chronological references are before the birth of Christ, unless otherwise stated.

Archias, the Corinthian after taking these, founded along with the Dorians the city, which was called by them Syracuse, the city taken the name from the neighboring lake (transl. by Author).

Thucydides has nothing to say about the circumstances under which Archias left Corinth and his only references concern the establishment of a city in Sicily (that is, the expulsion of the natives and the fact that the first establishment took place in Ortygia, namely ἐκ τῆς νήσου), while Pseudo-Scymnus only adds that the new city was named after a neighboring lake.[7] All these references to the origins of Archias mention that he came from Corinth (Ephyra in Theocritus, the oldest name of the area), but Thucydides also adds that Archias was a Heracleid.

There are also other references of a much later date, namely those of Aelius Herodianus in the 2nd century A.D. (*De prosodia catholica*, 3.1, p. 271), <Συράκουσσαι> πόλις μεγίστη, ὡς Ἑκαταῖος Εὐρώπῃ, κτίσμα μὲν Ἀρχίου, Κορίνθου δ' ἄποικος, τοῖς ἐν Σικελίᾳ Μεγάροις καὶ Νάξῳ ὁμόχρονος. "Syracuse, a great city, as Hecataeus mentions in Europe, a foundation of Archias a colonist of Corinth, founded at the same year as Megara and Naxos of Sicily" (transl. Author). and Stephanus Byzantius (<Συράκουσαι,> πόλις Σικελίας μεγίστη, ὡς Ἑκαταῖος Εὐρώπῃ, κτίσμα μὲν **Ἀρχίου, Κορίνθου δ' ἄποικος,** τοῖς ἐν Σικελίᾳ [Μεγάροις] καὶ Νάξῳ ὁμόχρονος) in the 5th-6th century A.D. that apparently derive from the same source,[8] whose ultimate source was Hecateus of Miletus, which preserve the additional fact the Archias founded Syracuse in the same year as the establishment of the Sicilian Megara and Naxos. Once again, as for Archias' origins, these sources only note that he was a colonist from Corinth. It is worth mentioning that Hecataeus is the oldest writer, from among those whose material has come down to us, mentioning Archias directly, or (as in this case) indirectly.

Finally I should note an important reference from the Parian Marble where Archias is referred to as originating from Corinth, but he is called a descendent of Temenus (IG XII 5, 444, l. 47-48 = Marm. Par. *FGrHist* 239 A 31:

ἀφ' οὗ Ἀρχίας Εὐαγήτου δέκατος ὢν ἀπὸ Τημένου ἐκ Κορίνθου ἤγαγε τὴν ἀποικίαν [καὶ ἔκτισε] Συρακού [σσας, ἔτη – – – ,] [.. βασι]λεύ[ον]τος Ἀθηνῶν Αἰσχύλου, ἔτους εἰκοστοῦ καὶ ἑνός.

From the time Archias, son of Euagetes being tenth from Temenus, led the settlement from Corinth [and founded] Syracu[se ... years], when Aeschylus w[a]s [k]ing of Athens in his twenty-first year (transl. A. Rotstein).

Other sources present several details about why Archias left Corinth, but also about the colonial expedition itself. There are three basic issues, which, in some cases, are interrelated. The first is Archias and his murder of Aktaion, the other is the synchronization of the colonial expeditions that resulted in the foundation of Corcyra under Chersicrates and Syracuse under Archias, and the third is the interconnection between the foundation of Syracuse, Kroton and Megara Hyblaea.

---

[7] See below for another version, according to which the name of Syracuse derived from the daughters or the wife of Archias.

[8] At all probability, Ephorus since he places the foundation of Naxos and Megara the same time (Strab. 6.2.2 = Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 fr. 137). See also Billerbeck, Neumann-Hartmann, 2016, 235, n. 398 and below p. 114, n. 51

Let us begin with the tradition of Aktaion's murder.[9] The first to refer to this tradition is Diodorus (8.10). Diodorus mentions that Archias was in love with Aktaion, but he was not able to persuade the latter to return this love. He then got drunk with his friends and they all went to the house of Melissus, the father of Aktaion, in order to kidnap the young Aktaion, but in the struggle between them the latter died.

The first, more detailed elaboration of the same incident can be found in Plutarch (*Mor.* 772c-773b). In Plutarch, the story begins with Pheidon of Argos asking for a thousand Corinthians to join him, whom Pheidon intended to eliminate in order to weaken Corinth and easily conquer it, with the ultimate aim of dominating the whole of the Peloponnese. But Habron, a commander of Pheidon, warned the Corinthians who managed to escape Pheidon's trap. Habron also found refuge in Corinth to avoid the wrath of Pheidon and dwelled in Melissus, a village in Corinth. There, he fathered Melissus (named after the village) and the latter fathered Aktaion with whom Archias fell in love. Aktaion was eventually killed in the way that Diodorus describes.

Then, Melissus asked for justice on behalf of the Corinthians, but he was not vindicated. Accordingly, he committed suicide during the Isthmian Games cursing the Bakhiads and reminding the Corinthians of his father's good deeds. Thereafter, drought and pestilence plagued Corinth and the Corinthians sent a delegate (to Delphi presumably) and the god replied to them that this was due to the wrath of Poseidon, because the Corinthians had not avenged the death of Aktaion. Upon hearing this news, Archias, who was part of this sacred delegation, did not return to Corinth, fleeing to Sicily instead, where he founded Syracuse. There, he gave birth to two daughters and he was finally killed by his lover Telephus. Archias' love for Aktaion is referred also by Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus (*Imperator Hist., De virtutibus et vitiis* 8. 10. 1), in the 10th century A.D.

The incident of Aktaion's murder is also elaborated in the Scholia in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius, written in the 3rd century (1212 – 1214a), but more briefly and with some significant differences. At the core of the narration are the Bakhiads, while Archias is not mentioned at all. The Bakhiads are characterized as Corinthians of noble origin; the famous founder of the dynasty, Bakhis, being a son of Dionysus. The Bakhiads were expelled from Corinth because of the death of Aktaion. The work goes on to mention that Melissus, (instead of Habron, as in Plutarch) was honored by the Corinthians, because he had helped them when Pheidon, king of Argos, tried to conquer Corinth. Subsequently, there is a gap in the text and the incident of Aktaion's death is briefly described as in Plutarch, but here the protagonist is not Archias, but the Bakhiads in general. Accordingly, the death of Melissus during the Isthmian Games is briefly mentioned, along with the curse he put on the Corinthians to avenge his son's death. Ultimately, the Corinthians obeying the will of the god, avenged Aktaion by expelling the Bakhiads. As a result of that, Chersicrates, a Bakhiad, founded Corcyra after he expelled its previous inhabitants, the Colchoi, who took refuge in Epirus.

The foundation of Corcyra by the Bakhiad Chersicrates is also referred in another Scholion in the Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius (1216: Τίμαιος δέ φησι μετὰ ἔτη ἑξακόσια τῶν Τρωικῶν Χερσικράτη......ἀπόγονον τῶν Βακχιαδῶν κατῳκηκέναι τὴν νῆσον ἀγαγὼν τῶν Βακχιαδῶν Χερσικράτης, ἀποστερούμενος τῶν τιμῶν ὑπὸ Κορινθίων.), where Timaeus is mentioned as the source of it.[10] This reference is also considered as evidence for the

---

[9] For a detailed overview of the sources related to the incident of Aktaion, Ragone, 2006, 45-50.

[10] Timaeus *FrGrHist* 566 fr. 80.

synchronization of the foundation of Syracuse and Corcyra, since the date of 734/3 (the date that Thucydides provides for the foundation of Syracuse is estimated if Douris' (*FGrHist* 76 fr. 41) dating for the fall of Troy is followed (1334/3);[11] nevertheless, we do not know the Timaean date for the foundation of Syracuse.

The story of Aktaion is also recounted by Maximus of Tyrus (18.1). There, it is mentioned that Aktaion's father was named Aeschylus and that a young Corinthian (unnamed) "γένους τῶν Βακχιάδων", who at the time ruled Corinth, was in love with Aktaion. The latter did not return this love and this Bakhiad along with other members of his family came to the house of Aktaion and he died in the manner that all sources describe. Moreover, Maximus noted the resemblances to the Boeotian Aktaion. Finally, regarding the Aktaion issue, there is a passage by Alexander Aetolus (Alex. Aetol. fr. 3 Powell / fr. 3 Magnelli, vv. 7-10 (from Parthen. XIV 5), a 3rd century poet, in which the Bakhiads are blamed for the death of Aktaion, the son of Melissus.

The second event related to Archias (and the subsequent foundation of Syracuse) is the foundation of Corcyra by Chersicrates. Strabo, in a passage we will examine below, describes the foundation of both Corcyra and Syracuse as part of the same expedition (6.2.4):

> πλέοντα δὲ τὸν Ἀρχίαν εἰς τὴν Σικελίαν καταλιπεῖν μετὰ μέρους τῆς στρατιᾶς τοῦ τῶν Ἡρακλειδῶν γένους Χερσικράτη συνοικιοῦντα τὴν νῦν Κέρκυραν καλουμένην, πρότερον δὲ Σχερίαν.

> And when Archias, the story continues, was on his voyage to Sicily, he left Chersicrates, of the race of the Heracleidae, with a part of the expedition to help colonize what is now called Corcyra, but was formerly called Scheria (Transl. H. L. Jones).

There are also two passages dating from the Byzantine era which seem to echo the same tradition. In these passages both Archias and Chersicrates are mentioned together as having been expelled from Corinth with the first founding Syracuse, and the second founding Corcyra (κατῴκησεν ἐν τῇ Φαιακίᾳ). The first comes from Georgius Choeroboscus (*Prolegomena et scholia in Theodosii Alexandrini canones isagogicos de flexione verborum.* 242.2-7, ed. Hilgrad, Teubner) in the early 9th century A.D., a Byzantine priest and writer, while the second from Sophronius (*Excerpta ex Joannis Characis commentariis in Theodosii Alexandrini canones* p. 431, l. 36-38, ed. Hilgrad, Teubner). They both seem to follow a common source (they both note that Syracuse was named after the two daughters of Archias). However, it is not clearly stated in these two passages that the two expeditions are interconnected.

Strabo also relates the expedition of Archias and the foundation of Syracuse to the corresponding foundation of Kroton and Megara Hyblaea. The first association with Kroton is initially made with the oracle given by the god to both Archias, the *oikistes* of Syracuse and Myscellus, the *oikistes* of Kroton (Strab. 6.2.4). This tradition was also preserved by later writers, such as Aelianus (*Soph.* fr. 346) in the 3rd century A.D., Suida: <Ἀρχίας> in the 10th century A.D., Eustathius (*Comm. Dion. Per.* 369) in the 12th century A.D., and the Anthologia Graeca (Epigram 37, edit. Cougny) in the 16th century A.D.

---

[11] This has been proposed by Jacoby, see in Antonelli, 2000, 60 with n. 5; De Luca, 2008, 19, but there is also the view that the fall of Troy according to Timaeus took place in 1194/3, Champion, 2016, see also Lachenaud, 2017, 191, 205.

The oracle given to Archias is also mentioned by Pausanias (5.7.3-4) and in another passage of the Anthologia Graeca (Epigram 35, edit. Cougny), but without relating it to Myscellus and the foundation of Kroton. Moreover, in 6.2.4, Strabo also relates (part of) the expedition that led to the foundation of Megara Hyblaea with Archias and the foundation of Syracuse:

> τὸν δ' Ἀρχίαν κατασχόντα πρὸς τὸ Ζεφύριον τῶν Δωριέων εὑρόντα τινὰς δεῦρο ἀφιγμένους ἐκ τῆς Σικελίας παρὰ τῶν τὰ Μέγαρα κτισάντων ἀναλαβεῖν αὐτούς, καὶ κοινῇ μετ' αὐτῶν κτίσαι τὰς Συρακούσσας.

> Whereas Archias landed at Zephyrium, found that some Dorians who had quit the company of the founders of Megara and were on their way back home had arrived there from Sicily, took them up and in common with them founded Syracuse (transl. H. L. Jones).

While in another passage of his quoting from Antiochus (6.1.12=Antiochus *FGrHist* 555 fr. 10) Archias also took part in the foundation of Kroton:

> ἐπανελθόντα δὲ κτίσαι τὸν Κρότωνα συμπράξαντος **καὶ Ἀρχίου τοῦ τὰς Συρακούσσας οἰκίσαντος**, προσπλεύσαντος κατὰ τύχην ἡνίκα ὥρμητο ἐπὶ τὸν τῶν Συρακουσσῶν οἰκισμόν.

> And Myscellus came back and founded Croton, having as an associate Archias, the founder of Syracuse, who happened to sail up while on his way to found Syracuse (transl. H. L. Jones).

Lastly, there is also a passage of Aristotle (Arist. fr. 611.19, from Heraclides Lembus' *epitome* of Aristotle's *Constitutions*) that refers to the origin of the Bakhiads and the homonymous founder of their clan/family, Bakhis or Bakhaios.[12] The text is the following:

> Κόρινθος Ἐφύρα πρότερον ἐκαλεῖτο μέχρι Κορίνθου, ἀφ' οὗ τὸ ὄνομα ἔσχεν. ἐβασίλευσε δὲ καὶ Βακαῖος τρίτος χωλὸς καὶ εὐτελὴς τὴν ὄψιν, καλῶς δὲ ἄρχων καὶ πολιτικῶς. ᾧ θυγατέρες μὲν τρεῖς, υἱοὶ δὲ ἑπτά, οἳ τὸ γένος οὕτως ηὔξησαν ὥστε Βακχίδας ἀντὶ Ἡρακλειδῶν καλεῖσθαι τοὺς ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

> Formerly Corinth was known as Ephyra until the time of Corinthos, from whom it derives its name. Also, Bacchis was the third king. Although he was lame and shabby in appearance, he ruled well and like a statesman. He had three daughters and seven sons, who so strengthened their family that those descended from them were called 'Bacchiadae' instead of Heraclidae (Transl. M. Dilts).

The text of Aristotle was wrongly used by Graham as evidence that the Heracleids and the Bakhiads are one and the same, since instead of ὥστε Βακχίδας ἀντὶ Ἡρακλειδῶν Graham adopted ὥστε Βακχίδας **καὶ** Ἡρακλειδῶν,[13] which is surely wrong (we would expect ὥστε Βακχίδας καὶ Ἡρακλείδας). Aristotle's reference is also echoed in Diodorus and Georgius Syncellus.[14]

---

[12] For the Bakhiad genealogy see Kõiv, 2019, 95-96 with n. 12, 108-109 who considered that Bakhis was fictional.

[13] Graham, 1964, 220 with n. 3, also Malkin, 1998, 90; 2011, 79.

[14] Diod. 7.9; Georgius Syncellus, *Ecloga chronographica*, 209, l. 29, ed. Mosshammer: καὶ Βάκχις ὁμοίως τὸν ἴσον χρόνον, γενόμενος ἐπιφανέστατος τῶν πρὸ αὐτοῦ· διὸ καὶ συνέβη τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα βασιλεύσαντας οὐκέτι Ἡρακλείδας, ἀλλὰ Βακχίδας προσαγορεύεσθαι. And Bacchis, who ruled for an equal number of years,

Finally, it is worth indicating that Archias is mentioned by Athenaeus (following Archilochus, West fr. 293), in relation to Aethiops, who bartered his plot for a honey cake, on his journey to Sicily,[15] by Clemens of Alexandria who stated that the poet Eumelus travelled along with Archias to Syracuse,[16] and by the Scholiast of Pindar who, while referring to Hagesias from the priestly family of the Iamidae, mentioned that his forefathers travelled along with Archias to Syracuse.[17] Of course, our goal is not to fully investigate all these traditions and try to explain their character and origins, but above all to explore that part related to the origins of Archias. Nevertheless, inevitably some remarks concerning these traditions do need to be made.

Modern Writers on Archias' Origins

Archias is not explicitly mentioned as a Bakhiad in either source, and this point had been noticed already by Holm.[18] On the other side, the view that he was a Bakhiad was first formulated (in some considerable detail) by Freeman.[19] According to Freeman, Archias' Bakhiadic origin seems certain since he is found as a chief man in Corinth at the time when the Bakhiads ruled the city.

Freeman's argumentation is based: a) on Plutarch, (*Mor.* 773e) where it is noted that Habron, the father of Aktaion, cried out against the Bakhiads, because the murderer of his son, namely Archias, was one of the Bakhiads, which explained why they did nothing to punish him, b) on the Scholia in Apollonius Rhodius 4.1212 where the Bakhiads are mentioned as acting collectively (and Archias is totally missing!) in what ended with the murder of Aktaion, c) on Strabo (6.2.4) where Archias' expedition to Sicily is linked and synchronized with the one of Chersicrates who founded Corcyra, along with Scholia in Apollonius Rhodius 4.1212-1214a, 1216 = Timaeus *FrGrHist*566 fr.80 where Chersicrates is mentioned as a Bakhiad, therefore since the two expeditions were of the same kind (Strabo) and Chersicrates was a Bakhiad (Scholiast and Timaeus) Archias must also be a Bakhiad, d) on Ovid (Met. 5.407-408 *et qua Bacchiadae, bimari gens orta Corintho, inter inaequales posuerunt moenia portus.* "and where the Bacchiadae, a race sprung from Corinth between two seas, had built a city between two harbours of unequal size." Transl. F.J. Miller) where Corinth is mentioned as a Bakhiadic colony, therefore Archias, who was the founder of Syracuse, inevitably must have also been a Bakhiad.

Freeman's view about the Bakhiadic origin of Archias had gained much approval by modern scholars and it is nowadays considered the *communis opinio*, even if scholars have

became a more famous man than any of his predecessors, and this was the reason why the kings who followed him came to be called no longer Heracleidae, but Bacchidae. Transl. C.H. Oldfather.

[15] Athen. *Deipn.* 4.167d. For this incident see Asheri, 1974, 232-326; Bernstein, 2004, 58; Ragone, 2006, 53; Morakis, 2019, 13 with n. 27.

[16] Clem. Alex. *Strom.* 1. 131. 8, also Paus. 2.1.1 for the Bakhiadic origin of Eumelus. For the relation between Archias and Eumelus and the latter's participation in the foundation of Syracuse see West, 2002, 109; Debiasi, 2004, 48-54; Bernstein, 2004, 69, with n. 95; Carfora, 2007, 164-165; De Luca, 2008, 27, n. 79, for another view that rejects this tradition Malkin, 1987, 210; Reichert-Südbeck; 2000, 8, n. 25.

[17] Scholia in Pind. *Ol.* 6.13.

[18] Holm, 1870, 376.

[19] Freeman, 1891-1894, v.1, 336-337, 572-577.

long since stopped citing him.[20] Subsequently, Archias' expedition was considered a state-sanctioned operation,[21] organized by the authorities of Corinth, which at the time were identified with the family/clan of the Bakhiads.[22]

On the contrary relying on the aforementioned reference in the Parian Marble (Ἀρχίας Εὐαγήτου δέκατος ὢν ἀπὸ Τημένου), other scholars have argued for an Argive origin for Archias and saw the expedition of Archias as the outcome of the conflicts of the pro-Argives (like Archias had been) and others who did not favor a rapprochement with Argos and fought for a (somewhat) independent Corinth. In the end, the pro-Argive party was vanquished in the strife and the winners obliged the vanquished to abandon the city.[23] To support this view, they also add a passage of Plutarch where Pheidon is described as plotting against Corinth with an eye on capturing the city,[24] and/or another of Nicolaus of Damascus who mentions that Pheidon died in trying to conquer Corinth.[25] Moreover they consider that Tenea, the village of origin of most colonists that took part in the colonization of Syracuse, according to Strabo, was under the influence/control of Argos.[26]

---

[20] For Archias' Bakhiadic origin, see among many others Jacoby, 1904, 95, 161; Beloch, 1912, 274; Gomme, 1945, 159; Dunbabin, 1948, 14 with n. 5 who noted that he probably belonged to the Bakhiad governors of the city, although he himself indicated that he was not clearly referred as a Bakhiad, he nevertheless followed Freeman as he indicated; Andrewes, 1949, 70; Bérard, 1957, 119 based on Ovid (*Met.* 5.407-408) and Plutarch (*Mor.* 772e-773b); Graham, 1964, 220 with n. 3; 1982, 105; Loicq-Berger, 1967, 31-32; Métraux, 1978, 88; Roebuck, 1972, 111; Asheri, 1980, 116-117; Salmon, 1984, 65, with n. 40 he also recognized that Archias was strictly not mentioned as a Bakhiad but he mentioned that the story of Aktaion, in the degree that it could be considered as reliable, implies that he was; de Fidio, 1995, 90 with n. 152, although she also recognized that only Chersicrates is mentioned as a Bakhiad; Manfredi, Braccesi, 1996, 98; Dougherty, 1993, 5 with n. 6 citing only Thucydides 6.3.2!; Reichert-Südbeck; 2000, 7; Biffi, 2006, 230; Ragone, 2006, 49, n. 72; Mele, 2007, 46 identifying Bakhiads with Heracleids, 50; De Luca, 2008; 18; Malkin, 1998, 90; 2011, 79, also 1987, 41 (probably a Bakhiad); Intrieri, 2011, 185; Debiasi, 2015, 164; Ciaravella, 2016, 51-52; Braccesi, Nocita, 2016, 34-35; Evans, 2016, 6, 8; Sickinger, 2016; Kõiv, 2019, 110 with n. 100, citing the aforementioned reference of Ovid. See also the significant bibliography in Bernstein, 2004, 72, n. 104.

[21] For the state character of Corinth's foundation see for example, Dunbabin, 1948, 15; Will, 1955, 323, but he is very cautious as for the Bakhiadic origin of Archias (297-298); Roebuck, 1972, 112-113; Asheri, 1980, 117-118; Salmon, 1984, 66; Antonelli, 2000, 133-134; Dominguez, 2006, 271-272; Malkin, 2011, 79; Kõiv, 2019, 110 with n. 100.

Among those more skeptical regarding the state character of Syracuse's foundation denoting mainly Archias' personal contribution to it, see for example, Graham, 1964, 220; Manni, 1974, 88, n.61; Hansen, Nielsen, 2004, 19; de Luca 2008, 26-27, see also in the introduction.

[22] For the oligarchy of the Bakhiads and its character see mainly Will, 1955, 298-306; Salmon, 1984, 55-62; Kõiv, 2019, 119-121 who has a very interesting new approach on the Bakhiadic rule.

[23] Vitalis, 1930, 16 cf.; Lenschau, 1936, 388; Huxley, 1958, 596-597, adding that, in the end, the Bakhiads, after Pheidon's death, turned to Sparta; Van Compernolle, 1966, mainly 76-79; Manni, 1974, in particular 85-88; Bernstein, 2004, 74-77, denoting that the Temenids were dissatisfied with the monopolization of power by the Bakhiads; Guzzo, 2011, 194-196.

[24] Plut. *Mor.* 772e: Φείδων τις τῶν Πελοποννησίων ἐπιτιθέμενος ἀρχῇ, τὴν Ἀργείων πόλιν, τὴν πατρίδα τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ἡγεμονεύειν τῶν λοιπῶν βουλόμενος, πρῶτον ἐπεβούλευσε Κορινθίοις. A man named Pheidon, who was striving to make himself ruler of the Peloponnesians and wished his own native city of Argos to be the leader of all the other states, plotted first against the Corinthians. Transl. H.N. Fowler.

[25] Nic. Dam. *FGrHist* 90 fr. 35, usually considered as following Ephorus, Kõiv, 2000, 15 with n. 89; 2019, 93, n. 4; Paradiso, 2018.

[26] Strab. 8.6.22. Manni, 1974, 88, n. 61 considered that Archias left Corinth because of the capture of Tenea by the Corinthians. For Tenea see also the analysis of Bernstein, 2004, 57-58; Ragone, 2006, 53-54, n. 85.

But this reference from the Parian Marble was rejected by Jacoby as a mistake either by the chronographer, or the inscriber of the Chronicle which it contains on stone.[27] Jacoby corrected/changed entries 30 and 31 in the Parian Marble in order to fit with the reference made by Ephorus that Pheidon was the 10th descendant of Temenus[28] and with the rest of the references in the ancient sources which refer to Archias as being a Corinthian. Therefore, he changed the ἐνδέκατος ὢν ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους for Pheidon to δέκατος ὢν ἀπό Τημένου and for Archias he changed δέκατος ὢν ἀπὸ Τημένου to ἐνδέκατος ὢν ἀφ' Ἡρακλέους. His amendments have generally gained much acceptance by modern scholars, especially those who supported the Bakhiadic origin of Archias.[29]

Finally, one should also mention Williams' view, according to which the Heracleids were a separate (aristocratic) clan/family, and Tenea constituted the seat of the family, or that most of its members lived there. Williams does not refer to an Argive origin, so presumably according to him the Heracleid tribe/family was of Corinthian origin.[30]

The Bakhiadic Origin
1. Aktaion

I will begin my examination starting from the sources on which the perception of Archias' Bakhiadic origin is based, and attempt to deconstruct the argumentation contained therein (mostly Freeman's who is after all the founder of this perception, which in our view is false). In this context I will focus initially on the Aktaion incident, since it constitutes the most detailed story we have related to Archias (in some cases, though, Archias is not mentioned at all) and parts of it are used by Freeman (and others) to support the Bakhiadic origin of Archias.

Scholars have approached the Aktaion incident from different perspectives and have interpreted it accordingly. Some have considered this story, although - not without problems - not entirely worthless.[31] Among these scholars, it is worth exploring a little further Kõiv's view, since it is very interesting and extremely detailed. Kõiv has (rightly) remarked that the story is not mentioned by any author from the Classical period, adding that its source is Ephorus. The most difficult element is the association made with Pheidon of Argos, which must have occurred during the Classical era (before the Macedonians created their own genealogy of their kingship in the late 4th century, which placed Pheidon

---

[27] Jacoby, 1904, 94-96, 158-162; 1929, 683-685 and more briefly Van Compernolle, 1966, 76-77; Kõiv, 2003, 251 with n. 64; Bernstein, 2004, 74; Sickinger, 2016.

[28] Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 fr. 115: Φείδωνα δὲ τὸν Ἀργεῖον δέκατον μὲν ὄντα ἀπὸ Τημένου.

[29] See among others, Will, 1955, 296-297; Bérard, 1957, 118-119; Malkin, 1987, 41 with n. 142; Reichert-Südbeck, 2000, 7, n. 12; Kõiv, 2003, 250; 2019, 110; Ragone, 2006, 54. It is worth mentioning that his amendments are not followed by Rotstein, 2016, 26, n. 64, while Sickinger, 2016 notes that Temenus maybe used only as a chronological marker and this does not necessary need to imply Archias' descent from him. But he recognizes that it is an unusual practice and he generally does not seem to refute Jacoby's amendments.

[30] Williams, 1995, 41.

[31] Vitalis, 1930, 17, we should remove first the romantic elements to find the truth; Will, 1955, 182, it should be viewed as the projection in a historical event of a badly defined myth, which was formerly seen by the combination of many myths; Bérard, 1957, 119; Huxley, 1958, 594, a romantic depiction of the conflicts between the Bakhiads and their opponents; Kõiv, 2003, 248-252, 278-287; 2019, 111-118; Bernstein, 2004, 51.

a century earlier). The relation to Pheidon either derived from some oral tradition and/or if constructed, was not done later than Ephorus.

According to Kõiv, the Aktaion story had been extremely important for the Corinthians from the very founding of their state; it derived from oral tradition, and was not only the story that the Corinthians told about the colonization of Syracuse, a long time ago, but also a very important story concerning the way that the Corinthians perceived the emergence of their own statehood. Thus, the story about Aktaion's murder integrally connected the aggression of Pheidon against Corinth, the unavenged crime of Archias which resulted in the Bakhiads being cursed, and the foundation of Syracuse as its principal result. After the fall of the tyranny, the story also became associated with the Isthmian Games and their transformation into Panhellenic Games. The story of Aktaion was able to integrate Pheidon and the alleged Argive component into the foundation of Syracuse (deriving probably from Antiochus), as well as the establishment of the Bakhiadic oligarchy.

Furthermore, according to Kõiv, the fact that this tradition emerged early on does not mean that all the details are early. Also, the fact that we are not dealing with a historically accurate narrative, does not exclude the fact that the memory of it may have been formed immediately after the events occurred, when it was still possible to recall them and that there is some core of reality in all this tradition. In the end, the story of Aktaion depicts the way in which oral traditions shaped and conveyed information, turning it into mythologically patented stories for the people, so that they could be remembered more easily.

Other scholars, though, found no historicity in the story. For example, Andrewes considered that the story developed in all probability in the era of Periandrus. The story preserved in the Scholiast (and Alexander of Aetolia) is the initial one, while those in Plutarch and Diodorus, which derive from the same source (Ephorus or Timaeus) reflect some later tradition, in which Archias, being more prominent, was added instead of some unknown Bakhiad. In the end, according to Andrewes, the inclusion of Pheidon in the scene should be linked with the expulsion of the Bakhiads and placed in the middle of the 7th century.[32]

For his part, Malkin considered the Aktaion episode and the depiction of Archias as the murderer of the former as a late adaptation of the myth[33] (probably dating from the Hellenistic period). Finally, Salmon considered the whole story as a distortion of the myth of the Boeotian Aktaion; he also found suspicious similarities to Timoleon and at the same time noted the false placement with the expulsion of the Bakhiads that took place in the mid-7th century.[34]

Other scholars approached the story mainly from a symbolic perspective. In particular, Broadbent[35] noted the resemblance with the death of the Boeotian Aktaion[36] and also drew similarities to the Cretan customs of ritual pederasty, as described by Ephorus (*FGrHist* 70 fr.

---

[32] Andrewes, 1949, 71, 77-78.

[33] Malkin, 1998, 90.

[34] Salmon, 1984, 65-66.

[35] Broadbent, 1968, mainly, 44, 48-52 and more briefly Kõiv, 2003, 277-279; 2019, 112-115; Ragone, 2006, 50-52.

[36] For the relation between the two Aktaions see also Will, 1955, 182-183; Kõiv, 2003, 277-278 with n. 180 for older bibliography; 2019, 113-114 with n. 111 for older bibliography; Bernstein, 2004, 50-51; Ragone, 2006, 50-51; Carfora, 2007, 160-161.

149)[37] and to the myth of Io and Melikertes,[38] and considered the story of the Corinthian Aktaion as a mythical etiological projection of initiation rituals for the transition from childhood into adulthood, but also into the cult at Isthmia. She considered the source for the story, not to be an historian like Ephorus, but some hymnographer or some writer about fests and games. Dougherty, for her part, saw the murder of Aktaion, as described in Plutarch, as part of a larger pattern of colonial representation: a). which omits any reference to the bloodshed inherent in colonizing foreign lands during the expulsion of the local populations and substitutes it with stories of Greek colonists as murderers in exile, b). through which the murderer/founder is purified by Apollo, who had urged that the colony be founded.[39]

Finally, Mele interpreted the incident as follows: the colonists are paralleled with Aktaion, the victim of Archias and Telephus, the murderer of Archias (as mentioned by Plutarch). They are "killed" by Archias the *oikistes*, as citizens of Corinth, just like Aktaion was murdered by Archias, in order to grow and become the adult citizens of the new city and thus *eromenoi* of the *oikistes*, like Telephus, and finally they kill their old lover and shake off their status of dependency from the *oikistes*.[40]

It is very difficult, in my view, to pinpoint the exact historicity of the Aktaion incident and determine which details may be true and which not. Even if admitting like Kõiv, that Aktaion was a real person,[41] it is very doubtful that his death could be linked with any of the historical events associated directly or indirectly with him. And they are not few in number: in Plutarch, we have Pheidon (indirectly), Archias, the Bakhiads and the foundation of Syracuse; in the Scholiast (1212-1214a), we have Pheidon (indirectly), the Bakhiads and their expulsion, Chersicrates and the foundation of Corcyra; in Diodorus and Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus, we have only Archias, while in Alexander of Aetolia and Maximus of Tyrus we have only the Bakhiads.

A second conclusion to be drawn is that it is very clear that there have been two different traditions, one that related the death of Aktaion to the Bakhiads and another that related the death of Aktaion to Archias. I agree that the first elaborated tradition (the Scholiast, Alexander of Aetolia, Maximus of Tyrus) was the one that considered the Bakhiads responsible for the death of Aktaion, while Archias (Plutarch, Diodorus, Constantinus VII Porphyrogenitus) must have been a later amendment to this event.[42]

A third conclusion to be made is that the reference in the Scholiast seems the most unreliable of all, since it has surely mistaken the fact that the expulsion of the Bakhiads occurred in the mid-7th century (based on Nic. Dam. *FGrHist* 90 fr. 57.7-8, where the expulsion of the Bakhiads is the outcome of their downfall, because of Kypselus rising to

---

[37] For the Cretan connection see also Will, 1955, 183; Kõiv, 2003, 278 with n. 181 for older bibliography; 2019, 114-114 with n. 212 for older bibliography; Mele, 2007, 50; Carfora, 2007, 161-162; De Luca, 2008, 15 with n. 18 for older bibliography; Ciaravella, 2016, 52.

[38] For the resemblances between the death of Melissus and the death of Melikertes see also Will, 1955, 184-185; Kõiv, 2003, 278-279; 113-114 with n. 111 for older bibliography; Ragone, 2006, 51-52; Carfora, 2007, 163-164.

[39] Dougherty, 1993, 31-32, 38-39.

[40] Mele, 2007, 49-50, considers that the story generally reflects the Bakhiadic view of Syracuse's colonization.

[41] Kõiv, 2003, 119.

[42] Andrewes, 1949, 71.

power), with the foundation of Corcyra by Chersicrates that took place either in 734/3 (following Strabo and the synchronization with Syracuse), or near the end of the 8th century (following Eusebius' date).[43]

In my view, it is highly risky to rely on the Aktaion incident in some effort to draw historical conclusions and I have shown that major historical events or personalities, like Pheidon, Archias, the foundation of Syracuse, the exile of the Bakhiads, are later amendments elaborating on some initial significant Corinthian story/myth related to the beginning of the Corinthian state, as the death of Aktaion (perhaps because of the Bakhiads) had been. However, as far as my primary investigation is concerned, which is an exploration of the origin of Archias, in neither part of this tradition that relates Archias to Aktaion's murder, is Archias referred to as a Bakhiad. Even in Plutarch, who preserved the most elaborated version of the story, Archias is referred to as a Heracleid and not as a Bakhiad (*Mor.* 772e), although, later, Plutarch explicitly refers to the Bakhiads (*Mor.* 773a). Moreover, it could be argued that Habron cried out against the Bakhiads, not because they murdered his son, but because they were the rulers of Corinth and therefore it was up to them to do justice, and the fact that they refused to punish Archias does not necessarily make the latter a member of that clan. Therefore, Freeman's assumption that the Bakhiads did not initially condemn Archias, because he was one of them, is not supported at all by Plutarch's narration of the story. It is very clear, in my view, that the Heracleids and the Bakhiads were not the same for Plutarch.

2. Synchronizations

Another important issue to examine is the synchronization of the expeditions of Chersicrates and Archias and, subsequently, the foundation of the two colonies under the same expedition, as noted by Strabo. Regarding this matter there are a number of scholars who have accepted it,[44] while others have refuted it[45] adopting the alternative tradition/date recorded in Eusebius, which placed the foundation of Corcyra a generation later (706).[46] It should be noted that the oldest archaeological evidence found in Corcyra

---

[43] See also Manni, 1974, 88. Others tried to defend in a way the reliability of the Scholiasts' reference. Mele, 2007, 48 referred to a story (the murder of Aktaion) of Bakhiadic origin, well-known already in the end of the 4th century. He further postulated for a crisis in the aristocracy of the Bakhiads, and considering the difficulties in the Scholiast's references, spoke of a typical confusion of the exile of some Bakhiads which took place in 734/3 (Archias and Chersicrates) to the expulsion of the Bakhiads taking place in the mid-7th century, followed by Intrieri, 2011, 185. In the same context, de Luca, 2008, 16-18 tried to reconcile all these apparent contradictions by stating that in 734/3 there was only one minor group of Bakhiads that were prosecuted, Archias being one of them, probably because they claimed a more elevated role inside the Bakhiadic oligarchy.

[44] See for example, Freeman, 1891-1894, v.1, 576; Dunbabin, 1948, 16, 24; Vallet, Villard, 1952, 298, 301; Will, 1955, 297, 319; Nicosia, 1963, 176-179; de Fidio, 1995, 90-92; Malkin, 1998, 77; Antonelli, 2000, 59-61 with n. 6; the bibliography in Bernstein, 2004, 56, n. 43; Mele, 2007, 48-49; De Luca, 2008, 19; Intrieri, 2011, 185; Guzzo, 2011, 194-195, 209-210; Braccesi, Nocita, 2016, 35-36; Evans, 2016, 11cf.

[45] See for example, Graham, 1982, 105, probably not; Salmon, 1984, 62; Καλλιγάς, 1982, 61; Reichert-Südbeck; 2000, 7; Bernstein, 2004, 56, 72; Gerhke, Wirbelauer, 2004, 361 with bibliography; Ragone, 2006, 52; Biffi, 2006, 229; Robu, 2014, 29, n. 49; Champion, 2016; Lachenaud, 2017, 191.

[46] Schöne, 1900, 85; Helm, 1926, 91b.

evidence from the last quarter of the 8th century, which could support both dates and, therefore, cannot be used to clarify the issue of chronology.[47]

Finally, as for the foundation of Kroton and the synchronization of the expeditions of Archias and Myscellus, I should mention that there is an alternative tradition/date for Kroton's foundation, reported by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (710/709) and Eusebius (709/708), and scholars are also (as in Corcyra's case) divided over the choice of a date,[48] since also in the case of Kroton the archaeological evidence is not useful in settling the issue.[49]

Of these two synchronizations, the one of major importance for our research is primarily Strabo's (6.2.4), which depicts the foundation of Syracuse as an expedition led by Archias, who left some of the colonists destined for Sicily in Corcyra, under Chersicrates, who consequently founded Corcyra. That is because, since Chersicrates is referred to by the Scholiast/Timaeus as a Bakhiad (though it is to be noted that Strabo also refers to him as a Heracleid in the same passage) Archias must have also been a Bakhiad.

In my opinion, the Strabo passage cannot be accepted, at least not as a whole. That is because he depicts Archias not only as responsible for the foundation of Syracuse, but also as being involved in the foundation of Corcyra, Kroton and Megara Hyblaea at the same time, which in my view, seems highly improbable. The tradition which connects the foundation of Kroton and Syracuse derives from Antiochus, as is clearly stated in 6.1.12=Antiochus *FrGrHist* 555 fr.10.[50] It seems, though, that the rest of 6.2.4 comes from some other tradition. We can be positive that the part concerning the foundation of Megara Hyblaea comes from Ephorus.[51] As for the part concerning the co-foundation of Corcyra and Syracuse, Intrieri considered that Strabo's source was a pro-Syracusan one, namely

---

[47] Graham, 1982, 105; Καλλιγάς, 1982, 60-61, 63-67, refers to evidence from the second half of the 8th century; Antonelli, 2000, 61 with n. 6; Gerhke, Wirbelauer, 2004, 361; Intrieri, 2011, 184, n. 49; Robu, 2014, 29, n. 49. There is an ongoing new excavation taking place on the acropolis of Corcyra, which eventually could clarify this issue.

[48] For the foundation of Kroton see among others, Bérard, 1957, 151-156; Leschhorn, 1984, 27-31; Mele, 1984, 9 cf.; Malkin, 1987, 43-47; Giangiulio, 1989, 134-148; de Sensi Sestito, Intrieri, 1992, 24-27; Morgan, Hall, 1996, 206-207; Arena, 1996; Bernstein, 2004, 124-170 with 125, n. 8 for an extensive older bibliography; Hall, 2008, 399-401; Guzzo, 2011, 227-235; Intrieri, 2011, 178-180, 183-184; Erdas, 2012, 94-97.

[49] The oldest imported vessels are dated in the last quarter of the 8th century, while the first local-made production is dated in the last years of the 8th century. For this evidence and the different approaches based on them see among others, Sabbione, 1982, 255-256; Spadea, 1984, 125-126; 1992, 96; Giangiulio, 1989, 284-285; Greco, 2001, 77; Verbicaro, 2010, mainly, 227-228, 230-231; Luberto, 2010; 2017, mainly, 194-196; Guzzo, 2011, 235-237; Intrieri, 2011, 184, n. 49.

[50] See also the remarks of Cuscunà, 2003, 82-84; Biffi, 2006, 198; Luraghi, 2013, see also previously n. 48 on the foundation of Kroton.

[51] Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 fr. 137=Strab. 6.2.2 and Pseudo-Scymnus 270-278, along with Morakis, 2011, 469-470, with n. 58 in comparison with Thucydides'/Antiochus' version for the foundations of Syracuse and Megara Hyblaea. See also Parker, 2011. For the foundation of Megara Hyblaea, see the extensive bibliography in Morakis, 2019, 259, n. 1133.

Antiochus, and that Strabo had confused Antiochus and Ephorus,[52] while Antonelli,[53] Kõiv[54], Braccesi and Nocita[55] considered that Ephorus was Strabo's source.

In my view, Strabo's source cannot have been Timaeus (although the latter was famous for his synchronizations),[56] since Chersicrates is mentioned by Timaeus as a Bakhiad, while Strabo refers to him as a Heracleid, and although a Bakhiad was at the same moment also a Heracleid, I very much doubt that Strabo would have changed "Bakhiad" to "Heracleid", if he had followed Timaeus. As for the choice between Ephorus and Antiochus, if Antiochus' approach is preferred,[57] he would have synchronized the foundation of Corcyra, Kroton and Syracuse. Accordingly, if Ephorus was his source he would have synchronized Corcyra, Syracuse, and Megara Hyblaea. It is difficult to decide; nevertheless, I would suggest Ephorus as the most probable candidate. In any case, I cannot support a synchronization of the expeditions that led to the foundation of Corcyra and Syracuse, and therefore the fact that Cheriscrates is referred to as a Bakhiad does not mean that Archias was also a member of the Bakhiadic clan, since their expeditions are unrelated.

Generally, I consider all these synchronizations preserved by the ancient sources as very suspicious and, in this context, I am very reluctant to accept the synchronization of the foundations of Kroton and Syracuse.[58] I think that the alternative tradition/date preserved in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Eusebius mentioned above, regarding the foundation of Kroton, is probably more accurate. Therefore, since the foundation of Corcyra and Syracuse was not the outcome of the same colonial expedition, the fact that Chersicrates was a Bakhiad does not also make Archias a Bakhiad.

3. Ovid

Finally, there is Ovid's reference (*Met.* 5.407-408) in which, since Syracuse is mentioned as a Bakhiadic colony, consequently its *oikistes*, as mentioned in the beginning and according to Freeman, must have also been a Bakhiad.[59] Ovid's reference seems at first sight the most difficult to explain.[60] Nevertheless, there are several possible explanations for it. At first, we might wonder about its accuracy and credibility, especially since elsewhere Ovid refers to

---

[52] Intrieri, 2011, 182.

[53] Antonelli, 2000, 60-61, 133-134, the tradition went back as far as Bakhiadic Corinth.

[54] Kõiv, 2003, 250.

[55] Braccesi, Nocita, 2016, 35.

[56] For Timaeus' synchronizations see Feeney, 2007, 43-52.

[57] For Strabo's use of Antiochus, Morakis, 2011, 467, n. 46, also Evans, 2016, 5-6.

[58] Note that also Thucydides, although following at all probability Antiochus (see Morakis, 2011, 464-467), does not relate the foundation of Kroton to the one of Syracuse (along with Morakis, 2011, 467, n. 46). Recently Evans, 2016, 11-18 drawing also on Strabo's reference on the synchronization of the foundations of Kroton and Syracuse, downdated the whole foundation of the Greek colonies of the West to nearly half a century. For Syracuse (and subsequently Archias) he proposed a date to about 680-675. I fully disagree with Evans' reconstruction (since he fully discredits Thucydides and does not take into consideration any of the archaeological evidence). I cannot expand on his argumentation here, but my viewing on the Greek colonization is Sicily can be found in Morakis, 2011.

[59] See in the introduction, also Bérard, 1957, 119; Kõiv, 2019, 110 with n. 100.

[60] See also Bernstein, 2004, 73, who, although, supports an Argive origin for Archias, remarked that Ovid's passage points strongly to a Bakhiadic origin of the former.

Myskellus, the founder of Kroton, as being of Argive (and not of Achaean) origin.[61] Moreover, we should remark that Archias is not mentioned by Ovid and the reference to the Bakhiads could be only because the latter were the only noble family from the Archaic period of Corinth that Ovid knew,[62] and if he wanted to attach a noble past to Syracuse, mentioning the Bakhiads seems a very reasonable choice. Finally, the name of the Bakhiads could be mentioned by Ovid in relation to the colonization of Rome with which Ovid was familiar. Since Ovid knew that the Bakhiads ruled Corinth at the time Syracuse was founded, he considered that its foundation, was –like the establishment of colonies by Rome– an enterprise with a state character, organized by the authorities of the city, namely the Bakhiads.

The Argive Origin

Having refuted the Bakhiadic origin of Archias, I will now advance my analysis by referring to the Parian Marble and the Temenid/Argive origin of Archias. It is true, on the one hand, that an Argive origin seems to be in contradiction given all other references in the ancient (and Byzantine) authors, in which Archias is mentioned as being a Corinthian. Moreover, the arguments presented by Jacoby about the possible mistake[63] in the Parian Marble and the corrections proposed by him seem at first sight very plausible. But on the other hand, there are some problems, which occur when we follow the reconstruction proposed by Jacoby and consider the tradition of Archias' Temenid origin a simple mistake in the sources.

Firstly, we cannot be sure that the source of the Parian Marble was Ephorus, as Jacoby considered to be the case;[64] on the contrary, there is some evidence that implies the opposite. More particularly, Pseudo-Scymnus and by extension (that is because the text is corrupt), Strabo,[65] who are generally considered to follow Ephorus,[66] attribute the foundation of the Greek colonies of Sicily to the 10th generation after the Trojan War[67] (and thus, to the 7th from Temenus and the Dorian invasion).[68] Therefore, Ephorus could not have been the source for the Parian Marble, where the foundation of the Greek colonies are

---

[61] Ovid. *Met.* 15.19-59.

[62] See also Bernstein, 2004, 72.

[63] This mistake could not have been made on behalf of the engraver as Van Compernolle, 1966, 78-79 very clearly has depicted.

[64] For Ephorus as the source of the Parian Marble, either directly, or through an intermediary, see Jacoby, 1929, 683-684.

[65] Ps. Scymn. 264; Strabo. 6.2.2.

[66] For Strabo's use of Ephorus, Biffi, 2006, 14, n. 46, for other possible sources of Pseudo-Scymnus' narration, see Gras, Treziny, Broise, 2004, 548, n. 3.

[67] Strab. 6.2.2=Ephorus *FGrHist* 70 fr. 137: φησὶ δὲ ταύτας Ἔφορος πρώτας κτισθῆναι πόλεις Ἑλληνίδας ἐν Σικελίαι, δεκάτηι γενεᾶι μετὰ τὰ Τρωικά· "According to Ephorus these were the earliest Greek cities to be founded in Sicily, that is, in the 10th generation after the Trojan war" Transl. H. L. Jones.

[68] Busolt, 1893, 385, n. 2 has explained this as that Pseudo-Scymnus had confused the 10th generation from the return of the Heracleids with the 10th generation from the capture of Troy, but again if this view is accepted, we follow the same path of constant confusions by our sources.

(rightly) placed three generations later, or at least not for these entries.[69] In addition, Bernstein remarked that this passage is the only one where the father of Archias is named; which he rightly considered as a clear indication that it derives from a different source.[70] Bearing in mind that Ephorus was not the source for the Temenid origin of Archias, I should try to explore the (possible) origin of the reference found in the Parian Marble.

In the Aktaion incident, the role of Pheidon is of primary importance, as it was his relation to the events that ultimately led to the exodus of Archias and subsequently to the foundation of Syracuse. Among the sources referring to Aktaion, only Plutarch and the Scholiast of Apollonius of Rhodes seem to (somehow) associate this incident with Pheidon of Argos. This connection between Pheidon and Aktaion is usually used as evidence for the Argive origin of Archias.[71] Nevertheless, there are others who while postulating an Argive origin for Archias, according to the Parian Marble, dismiss the role of Pheidon in the events related to Aktaion and the subsequent foundation of Syracuse[72]; there are also others who support a Bakhiadic origin of Archias, and accept the references that relate Pheidon to Corinthian affairs, but not at the time of the foundation of Syracuse. They place them at the end of the Bakhiadic hegemony in the mid-7th century.[73]

Pheidon is one of the most puzzling and controversial personalities of the Archaic Greek world, since he is dated by ancient writers between the 9th century and the beginning of 6th century. He is related to many well-known events of the Archaic period and many innovations are attributed to him, such as coinage and measurements. There is no space here, of course, for a detailed analysis of these references,[74] and I shall limit myself to merely noting that I prefer for Pheidon a date around 600, following the tradition preserved in Herodotus, according to whom Leocedes, Pheidon's son, was one of the suitors of Agariste, the daughter of the Orthagorid Cleisthenes, the tyrant of Sicyon.[75] Setting him in such a context, of course, Pheidon could not be linked with the events that led to Aktaion's death. Therefore, it is significant to try to explain under which circumstances Pheidon was related to Corinthian affairs and indirectly to Archias.

I would like to remark that, I cannot support the view of Archias' Argive origin, despite the fact that an Argive component in the expedition that resulted in the foundation of

---

[69] See mainly Van Compernolle, 1966, 77, 79, adding that the author of the Chronicle in the Parian Marble did use in general Ephorus, but in the specific passage he deliberately chose to follow another source, and not Ephorus; Kõiv, 2003, 250-251 with n. 64, denoting also that the Parian Marble abandoned at this point the narration of Ephorus for what must have been the *communis opinio* at the time, and adding that the 11th from after Heracles for Pheidon, namely the 7th from Temenus feats with the genealogical position in connection with the pedigree of the Macedonian kings.

[70] Ἀρχίας Εὐαγήτου, Bernstein, 2004, 74.

[71] See especially, Manni, 1974, 85-87.

[72] See for example, Bernstein, 2004, 50.

[73] Will, 1955, 353-355.

[74] For Pheidon and the chronological problems related to him see among others, Huxley, 1958, 588-601; Manni, 1974, 78, n. 6; Kelly, 1976, 94-111; Kõiv, 2000; 2003, 239-297; Ragone, 2006; Hall, 2007, 145-154; Bernstein, 2004, 48, n. 6; Μεϊδάνη, 2010, 84-88.

[75] Herod. 6.127: Ἀπὸ δὲ Πελοποννήσου Φείδωνος τοῦ Ἀργείων τυράννου παῖς Λεωκήδης, Φείδωνος [δὲ] τοῦ τὰ μέτρα ποιήσαντος Πελοποννησίοισι καὶ ὑβρίσαντος μέγιστα δὴ Ἑλλήνων ἁπάντων, ὃς ἐξαναστήσας τοὺς Ἠλείων ἀγωνοθέτας αὐτὸς τὸν ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ ἀγῶνα ἔθηκε, τούτου τε δὴ παῖς. From the Peloponnese came Leocedes, son of Phidon the despot of Argos, that Phidon who made weights and measures for the Peloponnesians, and dealt more high-handedly than any other Greek; for he drove out the Elean stewards of the lists, and ordered the contests at Olympia himself; this man's son.... Transl. A. D. Godley.

Syracuse cannot be excluded, due to the evidence that supports an Argive presence, mostly in the form of Argive ceramics found in Syracuse,[76] and the literary tradition concerning king Pollis of Syracuse,[77] who was of Argive origin, and moreover the fact that generally colonial expeditions consisted of mixed origin populations.

I agree with Kõiv, that the tradition of Aktaion-Pheidon-Bakhiads was elaborated during the Classical period, prior to the end of the 4th century and was also of Corinthian origin, since Pheidon is presented as the aggressor (see p. 109-110). I would also like to add that the Argive origin of Archias sprung up at about the same time, and was based on the general belief that the Argives also took part in the foundation of Syracuse. I think that both these traditions are related to early 4th century events that resulted in the short-lived union between Argos and Corinth, during the Corinthian war.[78] The Argive origins of Archias were elaborated by the Argives and those (in Corinth) who favored the union between the two cities, a union in which Corinth played the subordinate role, since it was somehow incorporated by Argos. By making Archias, a well-known figure of the earliest period of formation of the Corinthian state, an Argive, the Argives (and the pro-Argive Corinthians probably) were able in some way to justify their interference in Corinthian affairs; they legitimated the union between the two cities and justified in some way the subordinate role that Corinth played in it.

On the other hand, the detailed stories regarding Pheidon's interference in Corinthian affairs was the result of the response of the Corinthian oligarchs to the tradition created by the Argives or/and the pro-Argive Corinthians concerning Archias, probably created after 387/6 BC and the King's Peace (though we cannot rule out that it was developed prior to it) that dissolved the union between the two cities. Pheidon was the most prominent figure of the Archaic period in Argos (one might even say the whole Peloponnese) and the Corinthian antidemocrats, who fought against this unification, related him with some of the most well-known periods of Corinthian history (namely the very beginning of the Corinthian state in the early 8th century). In both cases, Pheidon's efforts to subjugate Corinth failed, while in the second case Pheidon died in this effort of his, just as the effort of the 4th century Argives to subordinate Corinth had failed due to the efforts of the pro patria Corinthians (with their oligarchic bias).

Some could find many similarities to the early 4th century events, especially in the incident described in Plutarch. According to Plutarch's narration, it seems that the Corinthians were somehow obliged to provide this military force,[79] as they would have been asked to do by Argos during the Corinthian War. In both cases (8th and 4th century) the subordination of the Peloponnese to Argos manifested through the conquest of Corinth, which in the end did not occur and both Corinth and the whole of Peloponnese were saved from the menace of Argos, since the Corinthian oligarchs, of course, turned towards Sparta. As for the writer that recorded this tradition, Ephorus, as Kõiv indicated, is a very plausible

---

[76] For this evidence see mainly, Van Compernolle, 1966, 90-93; Pelagatti, 1982, 147-162; Guzzo, 2011, 195 with n. 39.

[77] For Pollis see mainly, Freeman, 1891-94, v.2, 431-436; Hüttl, 1929, 44-46; Dunbabin, 1948, 93-94; Van Compernolle, 1966, 80-87; Drews, 1983, 38-40; Ragone, 2006, 55; de Angelis, 2016, 147-149; Morakis, 2019, 180 with n. 742, 182-183.

[78] For the union between Argos and Corinth see among others, Griffith, 1950; Kagan, 1962; Tuplin, 1982; Whitby, 1984; Buckler, 2003, 102-108; Sordi, 2006; Kleinman, 2011; Twele, 2011.

[79] See also Lenschau, 1938, col. 1943, for an opposite view see Will, 1955, 354.

candidate.[80] However, the Argive origin of Archias must have been recorded, as noted above, by someone else.

Conclusions

Reaching the end of this investigation it would be useful to recapitulate the main arguments. Initially, I should remark that Archias is mentioned by no source as a Bakhiad, and as analyzed above, there are no few sources mentioning Archias. He is called either a Heracleid, or a descendent of Temenus, or is mentioned only by his proper name, sometimes along with the place of his origin (Corinth). Regarding his Argive origin, I have argued that it reflects an alternative (false) tradition echoing (the fact or conviction) that there was also an Argive component in the colonial expedition that led to the foundation of Syracuse. This tradition was elaborated in the beginning of the 4th century during the brief period of the unification of Argos and Corinth, by Argive and/or pro-Argive Corinthians and at the same time the stories of Pheidon of Argos were also elaborated (by the Corinthian oligarchs) as someone who had menaced Corinth during the Archaic period.

As for the Bakhiadic origins of Archias I have tried to show that the ancient sources do not support the arguments of modern scholars. More precisely, I have questioned the reliability of the Scholiasts' passage in particular, and I have argued that Archias was added at a later stage to the story of Aktaion; a story in which (regardless of its authenticity, even in its basic core) the Bakhiads alone, and not Archias, were initially considered as responsible for his death. Moreover, I have refuted the possibility that Corcyra and Syracuse were founded as the outcome of a single colonial expedition, which is used as evidence for the Bakhiadic origin of Archias (since Chersicrates, the founder of Corcyra is mentioned as such). In addition, I have also tried to show that Ovid's reference should not be used as evidence of Archias' supposed Bakhiadic origin.

Ultimately, I think that the passage in Aristotle (and Syncellus) somehow clarifies the difference between the Heracleids and the Bakhiads, the origins of Archias as a Heracleid (but not a Bakhiad) and subsequently the character of the colonization of Syracuse (see p. 107). In these references we are told that, at some point, the Bakhiads stopped being called Heracleids. In Aristotle, this is traced back to the period of the children of king Bakaios, who were ten in number, and had numerous offspring, while in Diodorus and Georgius Syncellus this occurred during Bakhis' reign (the 5th king before the fall of the kingship), due to his authority.

Either way, the Bakhiads stopped being called merely Heracleids and adopted the name of Bakaios/Bakhis at some time considerably prior to the sailing of Archias, in order to distinguish themselves from the other aristocratic families of Corinth, who were also descended from Heracles. Therefore, in that case, Archias should have been explicitly called a Bakhiad and not a Heracleid by the sources if he was one of them. Presumably, all the aristocrats of Corinth were descended from Heracles, and therefore were all Heracleids and were referred to in that way. The Bakhiads were also descended from Heracles; they were, of course, also Heracleids, but after choosing to differentiate themselves from the rest of the aristocratic families they stopped being called Heracleids and they were only referred to as Bakhiads.

---

[80] See previously n. 25 for Nicolaus of Damascus and Kõiv, 2003, 283-284 with n. 207, 287 with n. 218.

This distinction became crystal clear when they assumed power in the city, as the only aristocrats that had a share in the government of the city.[81] And the fact that Archias is only called a Heracleid is because he was one, like many others from the various aristocratic families of Corinth. It is worth mentioning also that Phalios the Corinthian who founded Epidamnus (627) is referred to by Thucydides as a Heracleid,[82] implying that he also descended from a family of the Corinthian aristocracy and not, of course, from the Bakhiads.[83]

In concluding, I consider that the Bakhiadic origins of Archias derive exactly from the old, false perception in modern scholarship that the Archaic colonization was guided and executed by the authorities of the Greek *poleis.* In this context, since the foundation of Syracuse was viewed as a Bakhiadic enterprise organized by the city's oligarchic government, it seemed inevitable that the Bakhiads would choose a member of their family and place him in charge of the colonial expedition. But this was not the case. On the contrary, the foundation of Syracuse was not a "state" guided expedition, (as was also the case for the first-generation colonies in Sicily, namely those founded in the 8th-early 7th century)[84] designed and executed by the authorities of the city, namely the Bakhiads. It was the outcome of an expedition organized by a noble/aristocrat, a Heracleid (but not also a Bakhiad), who was probably dissatisfied by the fact that the Bakhiads monopolized the magistratures and the government of the city. Archias, followed probably by other non-Bakhiad nobles, left Corinth in search of the political/leadership role that was denied him in his country,[85] which he eventually found in Sicily.

ANDREAS MORAKIS

ANDMORAKIS@GMAIL.COM

Bibliography

Andrewes, A. (1949) "The Corinthian Actaeon and Pheidon of Argos", *CQ* 43: 70-78.

Antonelli, L. (2000) *Κερκυραϊκά. Ricerche su Corcira alto-arcaica tra Ionio e Adriatico.* Roma.

Arena, E. (1996) "Il responso delfico di fondazione di Crotone P/W nr. 45: per una riconsiderazione cronologica", *SAL* 9: 217-234.

Asheri, D. (1974) "l caso di Aithiops, regola o eccezione ?", *PP* 29: 232-236.

-----. (1980) "La colonizzazione greca", in *La Sicilia antica*, *v. I.2*, edited by E. Gabba, G. Vallet. Napoli: 89-142.

Beloch, K.J. (1912) *Griechische Geschichte. Die Zeit vor den Perserkriegen. v. 1.2.* Strasburg.

Bérard, J.P. (1957) *La colonisation grecque de l'Italie méridionale et de la Sicile dans l'antiquité. L'histoire et la légende.* Paris.

---

[81] Will, 1955, 297-298, although mentioning that there is no reason to differentiate Bakhiads from Heracleids, he indicates immediately after that we should not identify them and consider that all Heracleids were part of the ruling clan.

[82] Thuc. 1.24.1.

[83] As Gomme, 1945, 159 wrongly assumes.

[84] For this viewing of the character of the Greek colonization in Sicily see Morakis, 2011, 467-477.

[85] See Morakis, 2011, 490-491, also in broader terms, D' Agostino, 2006, 219 and for Megara Hyblaea, Robu, 2014, 53-54.

Bernstein, F. (2004) *Konflikt und Migration. Studien zu griechischen Fluchtbewegungen im Zeitalter der sogenannten Grossen Kolonisation.* St. Katharinen.

Biffi, N. (2006) *Strabo. Magna Grecia e dintorni: (Geografia, 5, 4, 3-6, 3, 11). Introduzione, traduzione, testo e comment.* Bari.

Billerbeck, M., Neumann-Hartmann, A. (2016) *Stephani Byzantii Ethnica. v.4.* Berolini et Novi Eboraci.

Braccesi, L, Nocita, M. (2016) *I fondatori delle colonie tra Sicilia e Magna Grecia.* Roma.

Broadbent, M. (1968) *Studies in Greek genealogy.* Leiden.

Buckler, J. (2003) *Aegean Greece in the fourth century BC.* Leiden.

Busolt, G. (1893) *Griechische Geschichte bis zur Schlacht bei Chaeroneia. v.1.* Gotha.

Carfora, A. (2007) "Myth and history in oikist traditions: Archias of Syracuse", *Electronic Antiquity* 11.1: 159-167.

Champion, C.B. (2016) "Timaios", in *BNJ online.*

Ciaravella, P.B. (2016) *Corinto in Occidente* (Tesi di Laurea). Palermo.

Cuscunà, C. (2003) *I frammenti di Antioco di Siracusa. Introduzione, traduzione e commento.* Alessandria.

D'Agostino, B. (2006) "The first Greeks in Italy", in *Greek Colonisation. An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas, v.1*, edited by. G. R. Tsetskhladze. Boston-Leiden: 201-237.

De Angelis, F. (2016) *Archaic and Classical Greek Sicily. A Social and Economic History.* New York.

Debiasi A. (2004) L' epica perduta: Eumelo, il Ciclo, l' occidente. Roma.

-----. (2015) *Eumelo. Un poeta per Corinto. Con ulteriori divagazioni epiche.* Roma.

de Fidio, P. (1995) "Corinto e l'Occidente tra VIII e VI secolo a.C.", in *Corinto e l' Occidente. Atti del XXXIV Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, 7-11 Ottobre 1994*: 47-141.

de Luca, G. (2008) "Ecisti Esilati?", *Hesperìa* 22: 9-32.

de Sensi Sestito, G., Intrieri, M. (1992) "Crotone in età arcaica Greca e romana", in *Crotone. Storia cultura economia*, edited by F. Mazza. Crotone: 23-88.

Domínguez, A.J. (2006) "Greeks in Sicily", in *Greek Colonisation. An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas, v. I,* edited by G. R. Tsetskhladze. Leiden-Boston: *253-357.*

Dougherty, C. (1993) *The Poetics of Colonization. From City to Text in Archaic Greece.* Oxford-New York.

Drews, R. (1983) *Basileus. The Evidence for Kingship in Geometric Greece.* Yale classical monographs 4. New Haven.

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

Erdas, D. (2012) "'Dori d'Italia e di Sicilia" e popolazioni locali nelle "politeiai" aristoteliche di Magna Grecia e Sicilia", in *Convivenze etniche, scontri e contatti di culture in Sicilia e Magna Grecia.* Aristonothos 7. Trento: 91-111.

Evans, R. (2016) *Ancient Syracuse: From Foundation to Fourth Century Collapse.* London.

Feeney, D. (2007) *Caesar's Calendar. Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History.* Berkeley, Los Angeles, London.

Freeman, E. A. (1891-1894) *The History of Sicily from the Earliest Times.* Oxford.

Gerhke, H. J., Wirbelauer, E. (2004) "Akarnania and Adjacent Areas", in *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*, edited by M.H. Hansen, T.H. Nielsen. New York: 351-378.

Giangiulio, M. (1989) *Ricerche su Crotone arcaica.* Pisa.

Gomme, A.W. (1945) *An Historical Commentary on Thucydides. Introduction, and Commentary on Book I.* Oxford.

Graham, A.J. (1964) *Colony and Mother city in Ancient Greece.* Manchester-Chicago.

-----. (1982) "The colonial expansion of Greece», in *CAH², v.III.3. The Expansion of the Greek World, Eighth to Sixth Centuries B.C.*, edited by J. Boardman, N.G.L. Hammond. Cambridge: 83-162.

Gras, M., Tréziny, H., Broise, H. (2004) *Mégara Hyblaea 5. La ville archaïque. L'espace urbain d'une cité grecque de Sicile orientale (Préface de Paola Pelagatti et Giuseppe Voza)*. Rome.

Greco, E. (2001) *Αρχαιολογία της Μεγάλης Ελλάδας*, μτφ. Κ. Σουέρεφ. Θεσσαλονίκη.

Griffith, G.T. (1950) "The Union of Corinth and Argos (392-386 BC)" *Historia* 1.2: 236-256.

Guzzo, P.G. (2011) *Fondazioni greche. L'Italia meridionale e la Sicilia (VIII e VII sec. a.C.)*. Roma.

Hall, J.M. (2007) *A History of the Archaic Greek World. ca. 1200-479 BCE*. Malden.

-----. (2008) "Foundation Stories", in *Greek Colonisation. An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas, v. 2*, edited by. G.R. Tsetskhladze. Boston-Leiden: 383-426.

Hansen, H.M., Nielsen, T.H. (2004) *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis*. Oxford.

Helm, R. (1926) *Die Chronik des Hieronymus. Hieronymi Chronicon (Eusebios)*. Leipzig.

Holm, A. (1870) *Geschichte Siciliens im Alterthum. B.1.* Leipzig.

Hüttl, W. (1929) *Verfassungsgeschichte von Syrakus*. Prague.

Huxley, G. (1958) "Argos et les derniers Tèménides", *BCH* 82.1: 588-601.

Jacoby, F. (1904) *Das Marmor Parium*. Berlin.

-----. (1929) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker, v.1.* Berlin.

Intrieri, M. (2011) "Corcira fra Corinto e l'Occidente: rapporti e sincronismi di colonizzazione", in *Sulla rotta per la Sicilia: l'Epiro, Corcira e l'Occidente*, edited by G. de Sensi Sestito, M. Intrieri. Pisa: 175-208.

Καλλιγάς, Π. (1982) "Κέρκυρα, αποικισμός και έπος", *ASAtene* 60, N.S. 44: 57-68.

Kagan, D. (1962) "Corinthian Politics and the Revolution of 392 B.C.", *Historia* 11: 447-457.

Kelly, T. (1976) *A history of Argos to 500 B.C.* Minneapolis.

Kleinman, B. (2011) "The Union of Corinth and Argos: Foreign Policy, Citizenship and Ethnicity", *Hirundo* 9: 32-55.

Kõiv, M. (2000) "The dating of Pheidon in Antiquity", *Studia Humaniora Tartuensia* 1.1: 1-21.

-----. (2003) *Ancient Tradition and Early Greek History. The Origins of States in Early-Archaic Sparta, Argos and Corinth*. Tallinn.

-----. (2019) "Reading ancient tradition: the rulers of Archaic Corinth", *Chiron* 49: 93-129.

Lachenaud, G. (2017) *Timée de Tauroménion. Fragments*. Paris.

Lenschau, T. (1936) "Forschungen zur griechischen Geschichte im VII. und VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. ", *Philologus* 91: 278-307, 385-411.

-----. (1938) "Pheidon", *RE* 19 col.1939-1943.

Leschhorn, W. (1984) *Gründer der Stadt*. Stuttgart.

Loicq-Berger, M.P. (1967) *Syracuse. Histoire culturelle d'une cité grecque*. Bruxelles.

Luberto, R.M. (2010) "La ceramica arcaica dallo scavo Crugliano 1975 a Krotone", in *Kaulonia tra Krotone e Locri, Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Firenze, 30 maggio - 1 giugno 2007, v. I*, edited by L. Lepore and P. Turi. Firenze: 279-297.

-----. (2017) "Material Koinai in The West: Achaean Colonial Pottery Production Between the 8th and 6th Centuries BC", in *Materail Koinai in the Greek early Iron Age and Archaic period*, edited by S. Handberg and A. Gadolou. Monographs of the Danish Institute at Athens, Volume 22. Aarhus: 191-220.

Luraghi, N. (2013) "Antiochos of Syracuse", in *BNJ online*.

Malkin, I. (1987) *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden.

-----. (1998) *The Returns of Odysseus. Colonization and Ethnicity*. Berkeley-Los Angeles-London.

-----. (2011) *A Small Greek World: Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford.

Manfredi, V.M., Braccesi, L. (1996) *I greci d' Occidente*. Milano.

Manni, E. (1974) "Fidone d'Argo, i Bacchiadi e le fondazioni di Siracusa e Megara Iblea", *Kokalos* 20: 77-91.

Μεϊδάνη, Κ. (2010) *Αρχαϊκή Ελλάδα και πόλεμος*. Αθήνα.

Mele, A. (1984) "Crotone e la sua storia", in *Crotone. Atti del XXIII Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto 7-10 ottobre 1983*. Taranto: 9-87.

-----. (2007) "La colonizzazione greca arcaica: modi e forme", in *Passato e futuro dei convegni di Taranto. Atti del XLVI Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, 29 settembre-1 ottobre 2006*. Taranto: 39-60.

Métraux, G.P.R. (1978) *Western Greek Land-Use and City-Planning in the Archaic Period*. New York.

Morakis, A. (2011) "Thucydides and the character of Greek Colonisation in Sicily", *CQ*: 61.2: 460-492.

-----. (2019) *Οι ελληνικές αποικίες της Μεγάλης Ελλάδας κατά την αρχαϊκή εποχή. Πολιτεία, κοινωνία, οικονομία*. Αθήνα.

Morgan, C. A., Hall, J. (1996) "Achaian poleis and Achaian colonization", in *Introduction to an Inventory of Poleis. Symposium august 23-26, 1995. Acts of the Copenhagen polis centre* 3, edited by. M. H. Hansen. Copenhagen: 164-232.

Nicosia, F. (1963) "Fonti relative alla data della fondazione di Megara Hyblaea", *Sic Gymn* 16:154-182.

Osborne, R. (1998) "Early Greek colonization? The nature of Greek settlements in the West", in *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, edited by N. Fisher and H. van Wees. London: 251-270.

Paradiso, A. (2018) "Nikolaos of Damaskos", in *BNJ online*.

Parker, V. (2011) "Ephoros", in *BNJ online*.

Pelagatti, P. (1982) "I più antichi materiali di importazione a Siracusa, a Naxos e in altri siti della Sicilia Orientale", in *La céramique grecque ou de tradition grecque au VIIIe siècle en Italie centrale et méridionale, Naples 1976 (Cahiers du Centre J. Bèrard, III)*. Napoli: 113-180.

Ragone, G. (2006) "Riflessioni sulla documentazione storica su Fidone di Argo", in *Argo. Una democrazia diversa*, edited by C. Bearzot, C. Landucci. Milano: 27-103.

Reichert-Südbeck, P. (2000) *Kulte von Korinth und Syrakus. Vergleich zwischen einer Metropolis und ihrer Apoikia*. Dettelbach.

Robu, A. (2014) *Mégare et les établissements mégariens de Sicile, de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin. Histoire et institutions*. Bern.

Roebuck, C. (1972) "Some Aspects of Urbanisation in Corinth", *Hesperia* 41: 96-127.

Sabbione, C. (1982) "Le aree di colonizzazione di Crotone e Locri Epizefiri nell' viii e vii sec. a. C.", *ASAA* 44: 251-299.

Rotstein, A. (2016) *Literary History in the Parian Marble*. Cambridge, MA.

Salmon, J.B. (1984) *Wealthy Corinth. A History of the City to 338 BC*. Oxford.

Schöne, A. (1900) *Die Weltchronik des Eusebius in ihrer Bearbeitung durch Hieronymus*. Berlin.

Sickinger, J. P. (2016) "Marmor Parium", in *BNJ online*.

Sordi, M. (2006) "Atene e l'unione fra Argo e Corinto", in *Argo. Una democrazia diversa*, edited by C. Bearzot, C. Landucci. Milano: 299-310.

Spadea, R. (1984) "La topografía", in *Crotone. Atti del XXIII Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, 7-10 ottobre 1983*. Taranto: 119-166.

-----. (1992) "Note topografiche sulla polis", in *Crotone. Storia cultura economía*, edited by F. Mazza: 93-109.

Tuplin, C. (1982) "The Date of the Union of Corinth and Argos", *CQ* 32: 75-83.

Twele, R. (2011) *The So-Called Union of Corinth and Argos and the Nature of the Polis*. Chapel Hill (Unp. Master Thesis).

Vallet, G., Villard, F. (1952) "Les dates de fondation de Mégara Hyblaea et de Syracuse", *BCH* 76: 289-346.

Van Compernolle, R. (1966) "Syracuse, colonie d'Argos ?", *Kokalos* 12: 75-101.

Verbicaro, G. (2010) "Aree produttive a Krotone tra VII e III sec. a.C", in *Kaulonia tra Krotone e Locri, Atti del Convegno Internazionale, Firenze, 30 maggio - 1 giugno 2007, v. I*, edited by L. Lepore and P. Turi. Firenze: 227-242.

Vitalis, G. (1930) *Die Entwicklung der Sage von der Rückkehr der Herakliden, untersucht im Zusammenhang mit der politischen Geschichte des Peloponnes bis den I. Messenischen Krieg.* Greifswald. Unpublished Dissertation.

West, M.L. (2002) "'Eumelos': A Corinthian Epic Cycle?" *JHS* 122: 109-133.

Whitby, M. (1984) "The Union of Corinth and Argos: A Reconsideration", *Historia* 33.3: 295-308.

Will, E. (1955) *Korinthiaka. Recherches sur l'histoire et la civilisation de Corinthe des origines aux guerres médiques.* Paris.

Williams, C.K. (1995) "Archaic and classical Corinth", in *Corinto e l' Occidente. Atti del XXXIV Convegno di Studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, 7-11 Ottobre 1994*: 31-46.