

5-3-2010

Reforming "Hellenization" into a Two-Way Street: the dialectic of colonization between Greeks and Sikels in eastern Sicily

Dirk Petersen

Macalester College, dpetersen3339@gmail.com

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/classics_honors



Part of the [Other Classics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Petersen, Dirk, "Reforming "Hellenization" into a Two-Way Street: the dialectic of colonization between Greeks and Sikels in eastern Sicily" (2010). *Classics Honors Projects*. Paper 10.

http://digitalcommons.macalester.edu/classics_honors/10

This Honors Project is brought to you for free and open access by the Classics Department at DigitalCommons@Macalester College. It has been accepted for inclusion in Classics Honors Projects by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@Macalester College. For more information, please contact scholarpub@macalester.edu.

**Reforming “Hellenization” into a Two-Way Street:
the dialectic of colonization between Greeks and Sikels in eastern Sicily**

By

Dirk Petersen

Submitted in Fulfillment of
Departmental Honors, Classics
Macalester College

3 May 2010

Advised By Professor Andrew Overman
Completed Under Professor Beth Severy-Hoven, Chair

Abstract:

Extensive colonization was a key feature of Greek-speaking societies of the ancient Mediterranean. Diffusion of colonizers likewise led to a diffusion of the colonized, ramifications of which pepper extant literature. Rather than acknowledging these groups' multi-vocality, Classical scholarship traditionally discusses their relationship employing the one-sided term, "Hellenization." Even those interested in the experiences of the colonized often employ concepts such as appropriation and assimilation in their discussions. Rejecting these approaches, this paper employs a case study of Greek colonization in eastern Sicily to seek, instead, a dialectic, a lens to account for the nuances of pluralism inherent in these interactions.

Like ants making a new home in a vacant, dirt lot, any act of colonization involves a great transformation of space, leaving an indelible and enduring mark upon the colonized landscape. Among the many places where this transformation is strikingly evident, the Mediterranean basin within the bounds of what has traditionally been understood as the Hellenic world provides a ready case in point, being marked by a commerce of goods, words, customs, gods, and architecture over which has often been draped the moniker, "Hellenization." This term, which ultimately takes into consideration the culture of only one of the involved parties, namely the Hellenes, is rather in keeping with the anthill imagery, i.e. that, at least to those unindoctrinated in the finer points of ant colony construction (like me), all ant colonies in empty lots appear more or less the same. Irrespective of what the surrounding environs may contain, the ants pile up their tell-tale mound of dirt and go about their antish lives, providing great amusement to bystanding children with their prowess at porting potato chips or other proportionately enormous objects. Unfortunately for the simplicity of study, but fortunately for the diversity of it, no Greek colony ever sprang up in a vacant, dirt lot. Rather, every instance of new, colonial settlement occurred in its own dynamic context, peopled with its own dynamic inhabitants. The Greek colonization of Sicily is certainly no

exception to this trend. The island was inhabited by distinct peoples and cultures prior to Hellenic colonial contact, peoples and cultures which it seems impossible to dismiss within the univocal scheme of “Hellenization.” Rather, I propose that a more profitable approach is to examine the possibility for broader interaction in light of a dialectic of colonization. While this paper will only seek to define and explore such a dialectic in the specific context of the Greek colonization of eastern Sicily, it is my hope that such a method could come to be generally employed in favor of the traditional lens of Hellenization.

“Hellenization:” Usage and Definitions

Before embarking on an investigation, deconstruction, and—hopefully—reorientation of the lens of Hellenization, the term itself and the concept it embodies must first be defined. Being a term of such semantic breadth, “Hellenization” has experienced diverse usage, and thus diverse definition. These usages range from those which are entirely ethnocentric to those which tentatively acknowledge the possibility of a hybrid culture resulting from Greek-Sikel admixture, even while still couching this admixture in language which identifies and therefore privileges only one of the involved parties.

To take “Hellenization” at its most basic, the term describes an active process, that of Hellenizing, acted out by a dominant, Hellenic entity and resulting in an object which is Hellenized. This position is exemplified by Alan Blakeway’s work of the 1930’s.¹ While his contributions to the understanding of the terrific importance of archaeology in reconstructing the past are to be lauded,

¹ In Ridgeway 1990.

his posture regarding the definition of “Hellenization” falls down hard on the side of pro-Greek prejudice. As Ridgway sums up, “Hellenization” was, for Blakeway, “the nature of the effect the Greeks had on the ‘barbarians,’” objectified individuals whose identity and culture were irrelevant since “the proper business of ‘barbarians’ was to be Hellenized.”²

T. J. Dunbabin’s exhaustive *The Western Greeks* elaborates at length upon this view. To offer an example on the more pleasant side, he presents the reader with a couple of idyllic and deeply romanticized passages in which he opines about the many virtues of Syracuse, the city he calls “marked out by Nature for rule” over the adjacent territories.³ One passage in particular is worth quoting in its entirety:

The land of Syracuse, with its bare limestone hills and steep scarps, recalls in its purity of line and clarity of atmosphere the landscapes of Greece more than do the luxuriant countryside common elsewhere in Sicily and Italy. Looking eastward from the rocks by the Little Harbour, one feels that the sea is a path, not a barrier, and that this land is indeed Greek.⁴

While the description is aesthetically pleasing, it contains several thorns imbedded in the language. His use of the words “purity” and “clarity” for the environs of Syracuse in contrast to “luxuriant” for those of other parts of Sicily

² Ridgway 1990, 62-63.

³ Dunbabin 1948, 95.

⁴ Ibid. 49-50.

suggest that the superiority he attributes to the Syracusan location transcends the physical and enters the realm of the moral. Thus, he pursues a claim for Syracusan overlordship that is nearly biologically determinant in its rationale. Furthermore, to claim the land as “indeed Greek” sets up a legitimization of its seizure from native hands, casting the Greeks as holding some inherent right of possession that the Sikels were apparently lacking.

Dunbabin’s ethnocentrism gets much more explicit. This tendency is perhaps most pronounced when he is analyzing Sikel art. In his estimation, Sikel art generally runs the gamut from being “very provincial” to “thoroughly barbarian” and “grossly incompetent,” a material culture that is “completely without style and untouched by the canons of any art.”⁵ To be fair to Dunbabin, though, he did acknowledge the possibility of “a genuine Greco-Siculan culture” if both Greeks and Sikels were to “contribute” in creating one.⁶ However, this position, even were it not overshadowed by his obvious proclivity for viewing the Greeks as the pinnacle of human culture in the Archaic-era Mediterranean, fails to take two points into account. First, Dunbabin neglects to offer what such a system might be called wherein Greeks live in intertwined proximity, both physical and cultural, to the Sikels, instead adhering to his narrative of the unidirectionality of Hellenization. The second and far more important shortcoming is that, while he touches on the very question of hybridity in the colonial environment, Dunbabin fails to acknowledge the implications of these

⁵ Ibid. 124, 173, 174.

⁶ Ibid. 133-134.

Greek-Sikel interactions for the meaning of Greek culture. He chooses to see hybridity as only an unfulfilled hypothetical, neglecting the role of even an extremely marginalized Sikel population in exerting a reciprocal influence in shaping the identity of the colonizers. This omission is exactly that which I hope to rectify in the upcoming theory section.

Though of their same era, Biagio Pace deviates from the discourses Blakeway and Dunbabin pursue regarding the cultural ascendancy of Greeks over Sikels. His position is one from which considerations for a more complex interchange *between* Greek and Sikel, rather than *from* Greek *to* Sikel, are brought to much of the same evidence considered by Dunbabin. For example, like Dunbabin, Pace becomes concerned with the spatial organization and artifactual remains of the sites of ancient Sicilian cities and what these elements describe about their Sikel or Greek characters. Considering the archaeological records at many sites, he notes that lines of distinction blur over time to the point that one cannot clearly differentiate between a Sikel and a Greek city on the basis of material remains alone.⁷ Unlike Dunbabin, though, Pace sees these blurred lines not as demonstrating complete Greek cultural domination, but rather as indicators of a culture unique to the Sicilian situation, one which is perhaps no longer strictly Greek.

Erik Sjöqvist, head of the Princeton University team which first identified and conducted excavations on the site of Morgantina, offers another, slightly different usage of “Hellenization,” one in which the considerations for reciprocity

⁷ Pace 1935, 192.

begin to be more evident as they course just beneath the surface. In his examination of the process whereby the native Sicilians became “completely Hellenized,” Sjöqvist also wants to ask “whether and to what degree the Greek civilization of Sicily was conditioned or modified by the indigenous element.”⁸ This acknowledgement of the potential for cultural kickback onto the colonizers marks an important broadening of the perspective on the intertwining of Sikel and Greek cultural assignments. However, Sjöqvist’s musings in this area are curtailed by the privilege he assigns to the colonizing group, discussing them in terms of “their cultural superiority.”⁹

Another author seems to follow these same lines of assigning superiority to Greek culture. Though speaking of Southern Italy rather than Sicily, Dinu Adamesteanu applies this definition of “Hellenization” to two archaeological instances that I believe involve more nuanced cultural interactions. This particular discussion of Southern Italy, while physically slightly removed from Sicily, is especially relevant to this paper’s critique not only because the Greek colonial movement there was contemporaneous with that in Sicily, but also because Adamesteanu wrote about “Hellenization” in Sicily as well.¹⁰ In the first of the article’s two examples, walls in which some elements of Greek typology can be read are said to be the handiwork of “Greek-trained gangs of natives” on account of the excellence of their construction.¹¹ In the second example, vases which

⁸ Sjöqvist 1973, 1.

⁹ Ibid. 35.

¹⁰ I was unable to get ahold of this article, but the interested reader could search for “L’ellenizzazione della Sicilia ed il momento di Ducezio” in *Kokalos* 8.

¹¹ Adamesteanu, 1990, 147.

preserve “unparalleled, somewhat confused interpretations of Greek myths” are seen as the work of natives who just didn’t get their Greek quite right.¹² Both of these archaeological instances are given as proof of the identity of their creators as “fully Hellenized natives.”¹³ Two points can be made regarding the limitation Adamesteanu’s privileging of Greekness places upon his interpretation. First, while his assessment of the native artistic capacity is more charitable than that put forth by Dunbabin, the artifacts are described as still not quite up to snuff with the Greek models they are said to be copying. This attribution of a hierarchy of quality as well as the allegation of imitation creates a cultural model in which natives are viewed as striving—and, in this instance, failing—to achieve a paradigm of copied Greekness. This model results in an assignment of privilege that, in turn, gives rise to the second shortcoming: referring to either one of these instances as an act of imperfect derivation wrought by individuals whose goal is assumed to be exact replication fails to take into account the role that the native culture plays. Ignoring that culture’s agency in creation does not seem to offer an adequate explanation for the artifacts’ unique forms, neither one of which is truly “Greek.”

Carla Antonaccio is among the first to employ a critique of Hellenization that works toward a more complete recognition of the intercultural dynamics inherent in colonization. She calls the concept of a unified Hellenic culture into question by exploring the multiplicity of articulated micro cultures within the

¹² Ibid. 149.

¹³ Ibid. 146.

macro of “Greek” in “Hybridity and the Cultures Within Greek Culture”¹⁴ and explores some of the possibilities for native influence on shaping Greek colonial identity in “Ethnicity and Colonization.”¹⁵ In the latter article, she expresses that “the problem with the concept of Hellenization is its omnidirectionality and lack of native agency.”¹⁶ Moreover, she notes that “the permeability and impermanence of ethnicity” make defining groups in terms of such rigid binaries inaccurate.¹⁷ Having acknowledged this shortcoming of the model, though, she does identify the acculturation process as one founded primarily upon native “assimilation” and “appropriation” of the culture of the colonized.¹⁸ Nonetheless, the spirit of her critique is the one upon which I hope to build throughout this paper.

Theory and Method

Having elucidated the paradigm in place of which I hope to offer a more inclusive alternative, my foundation is only half complete: establishing the context for my discussion would only go so far were I offering my critique from a vacuum. On the contrary, attendant in my critical retinue are four theories that inform my interpretations and arguments throughout this paper and with which I endeavor to bolster the validity of my claims. The first two are drawn from 20th-century colonial and post-colonial theory and address the construction of identity in a colonial environment. The latter two are taken from the field of human

¹⁴ Antonaccio 2003.

¹⁵ Antonaccio 2001.

¹⁶ Ibid. 127.

¹⁷ Ibid. 126.

¹⁸ “assimilation” ibid.126; “appropriation” ibid. note 82.

geography and address the role of humans in shaping the built form of their environment, as well as that environment's role, in turn, on shaping their identities.

The first of these theories considers the effect of colonialism on the identity of the colonized. In his 1967 book, *Wretched of the Earth*, Frantz Fanon presents a grim view of the deleterious effects of such population shifts. While written from a 20th-century position, and cited in a discussion about the crisis of identity inflicted upon Australian Aboriginal people by 18th- and 19th-century European colonialism, the fundamental mechanisms involved in Greek colonial activity are hardly different, irrespective of their motives. Fanon states:

Because it is a systematic negation of the other person and a furious determination to deny the other person all attributes of humanity, colonialism forces the people it dominates to ask themselves the question constantly: 'In reality, who am I?'¹⁹

While the extent to which the instances of Greek colonization that this paper addresses could be characterized by this "systematic negation" and "furious determination" to dehumanize inhabitants of the colonized land could be freely debated, I argue that this crisis of identity is just as fundamental and intrinsic to this ancient colonialism. Furthermore, in some cases, like slave-holding,²⁰ the interest in dehumanization is just as explicit. The significance of this framework of consideration for the argument of this paper is its illumination of the

¹⁹ Qtd. in Williams 1990, 182.

²⁰ As at Syracuse, for instance; see Dunbabin 1948, 111 for discussion of the *Killyrioi*.

destabilization of identity that comes as a direct result of colonialism. In this light, a Sikel whose identity has been destabilized and placed into crisis by the arrival of Greek colonial forces is hardly a candidate for being summed up as “Hellenized.” Privileging the ascendancy of the colonizing culture within the colonial subject’s identity—which, all other considerations aside, the term “Hellenized” certainly does semantically—does not adequately account for the complexity of issues of identity in this turbulent environment and simultaneously threatens to further disenfranchise a colonized group whose experience is already marginalized by the univocality of extant ancient literature.

While Fanon’s assertion of the deletion and active abnegation of identity highlight the destructive social potential of colonization, his concept does not offer a framework through which the creation and negotiation of identity might be mediated in these circumstances. The second post-colonial theory employed in grinding the lens through which this paper gazes accounts for this colonial hybridity, and is one which has already been employed to great effect in a brief study by Matthew Fitzjohn. In this work, Fitzjohn makes use of the concept of “third-space” in colonial contexts, a theory advanced by H.K. Bhabha in his 1994 book, *The Location of Culture*.²¹ As he elucidates, crucial for Bhabha’s theory is the understanding that “colonizer and colonized redefine their social positions and express themselves *in response to others*.” Out of this reciprocally bound relationship of response, “a ‘third space’ [is] created that characterize[s] the

²¹ Fitzjohn 2007, 219; Bhabha’s title from Fitzjohn’s references.

hybrid cultural practices of displaced persons.”²² In this framework, the culture of the colonizers meets the culture of the colonized and, rather than one subsuming and/or negating the other, they come together to form a hybrid culture which occupies this “third space” between the two pre-existing cultures. Fitzjohn employs this concept with compelling results when discussing the case presented by certain houses at Leontini. These house forms are neither Sikel nor Greek, but combine elements from each, resulting in a new culture of architectural forms.²³ Interestingly, a passage from Polyainos relates that, at least for a short time, Sikels and Greek colonists coexisted peacefully at the site.²⁴ Fitzjohn’s analysis of the built form suggests not only a confirmation of Polyainos’ account, but also a deeper indication of synthesis arising as a result of this coexistence.

Implicit in Fitzjohn's structural argument for "third space" in the colonial built environment, and, indeed, constituting its success, is one of the theories most important to human geography: the “socio-spatial dialectic.” First conclusively developed by Edward Soja in his eponymous 1980 journal publication, the theory, while profound, can be summarized in fairly simple terms: society creates and shapes the spaces it inhabits, and those spaces, in turn, shape and create the society which inhabits them. These two processes are synthesized through the dialectic and thereby mediate the social interactions they circumscribe.²⁵ This theoretical framework has immense applicability and significance to contemporary society in terms of the organization of social space, from elements

²² Ibid. 219; emphasis mine.

²³ Fitzjohn 223; See Wilson 1982, 90.

²⁴ Polyainos in Sjöqvist 1973, 23.

²⁵ Soja 1980.

as seemingly mundane as the accessibility of sidewalks influencing the number of pedestrians in the built environment, to the insidious and systemic structural problems of disenfranchisement reproduced by the production of segregated spaces.²⁶ To illustrate the socio-spatial dialectic in practice through expanding upon the sidewalk example, imagine two idealized urban areas. One is constructed with a proliferation of sidewalks, sidewalks that are separated from the street by a buffer and well served with metered crosswalks to increase pedestrian safety. The other urban area has very few sidewalks, and those that do exist directly abut the street, leaving minimal space between vehicular and foot traffic. As a result of these built forms, the first area sees a proliferation of people walking and thus a lively street life. In contrast, the second area sees hardly anybody out and about afoot, and the street life is reduced to that arising from primarily automotive traffic. These socially created spaces each have a distinct character due to their distinct societal origins.

Dennis Cosgrove, another human geographer, has employed the term "landscape" to describe this produced environment. This terminology takes into account the human agency inherent in the process of structuring inhabited space by drawing an analogy to the manner in which a painter composes a landscape painting, presenting to viewers a space that is very much conceptualized and then created.²⁷ Thus, the socio-spatial dialectic represents the nexus between this societal conceptualization and creation of landscape and the reciprocal effect that

²⁶ As we are briefly touching on this topic, I cannot help but direct the interested reader to Massey and Denton's *American Apartheid*.

²⁷ Cosgrove 1989.

landscape has upon the individuals who inhabit it.

While Fitzjohn's example of the built form at Leontinoi stands at great temporal distance from the analyses carried out by contemporary human geographers on contemporary urban environments, the theory carries no less relevance. The societal production of landscape is already well-accounted for in his analysis: persons from two different groups, colonizer and colonized, come into contact. This interaction gives rise to a blending of elements from each, which constitutes Bhabha's "third space." The effect of this creation of hybrid social space is reflected in the built environment in the form of houses that synthesize elements from both cultures to form a new physical landscape. The significance for hybridity does not stop with the fact of the creation of this hybrid physical space, however--here the reciprocity of the socio-spatial dialectic steps into the picture. While the blending of elements from two discrete groups results in the formation of hybrid space, this hybrid space in turn shapes the society which inhabits it, causing this hybridity to become part of the social consciousness. Thus, as I hope to demonstrate through specific examples below, even a conquered, expelled group can still have a socio-spatial role in influencing the identity of their conquerors through the geography of conquest and colonization. This influence manifests itself in the hybridity of "third-space:" even if the city of the expelled is razed, the settling conquerors are still in a position to be affected by the socio-spatial reciprocity of landscape, for they are still inhabiting the fundamental landscape created and inhabited by their expelled predecessors; even if the only element of the old that remains for the new is the

physical location of a city, this still affects the new inhabitants' social identity through the role of space in reproducing society. Thus, highly disproportionate though the interchange may be, a city on a former Sikel site which is typologically Greek in terms of its artifacts is still influenced by the originally Sikel nature of its location.

A Brief History of Habitation in Pre-Greek Sicily

Having laid out the problem and its undergirding theoretical considerations, the scene and players in this investigation must now be set. Who was living in Sicily at the time of Greek colonial activity? To get to this point, a rapid overview of the history of Sicilian habitators—mythic and otherwise—will be of moment, both to demonstrate the island's long history of settlement and diversity, as well as to illustrate the account's relation to colonists of Greek origin. The history of the inhabitants of the largest island in the Mediterranean, if taken in the sense of events recorded in extant writing, is a colorful tapestry woven of the myth and imagination of the broadly construed ancient Greek culture, whose authors offer our earliest extant literature on the subject. The fruits of their labors bear seed for these dialectic considerations, even taking into account all the attendant challenges ancient historians' methodology may toss in the face of empiricism. Chief among these surviving passages in both its antiquity and frequency of citation by later writers is one offered by Thucydides.²⁸ In his account, he mentions that the earliest inhabitants of the island are said to be the Cyclopes and Laestrygones, quasi-inhuman and

²⁸ Thuc. 6.2.1.

fabulously savage peoples whose literary life dates back at least as far as Homer, if not further in non-extant pieces. In Homer's tale, they were wild cannibals who lived in flagrant violation of the carefully structured guest-host etiquette expectations and surely served, if nothing else, as reminders to the prodigal among the audience of just how sweet a good Greek home really was.²⁹ The mantle of traditional homeland for these peoples was eventually awarded to the island of Sicily and has been such a pervasive element of the popular imagination that, even today, one can photograph and, if intrepid enough, clamber upon *le isole dei ciclopi*. Lying just off shore between the little fishing villages of Acitrezza and Acicastello and immediately to the north of Catania, these jutting, igneous formations are cast as the rocks which Polyphemos hurled at the departing wanderers (Fig. 1). Writing a fair bit more recently than Homer, Thucydides remarks only that, concerning these semi-humans, he can say neither where they came from, nor where they went, and he leaves the postulation off there, having thoroughly branded such hypotheses with skepticism.

²⁹ Hom. *Od.* 9.1.; *Od.* 10.1-2.



Fig. 1: Le Isole dei Ciclopi, Acitrezza. Photo: Dirk Petersen

Following this lead, Holm, speaking of the Cyclopes and Laestrygones, states that their existence, “che non ha nessun fondamento” (“that has no basis”), was entertained with such gravity that the discovery of megafaunal remains was billed even among some scientific literature as proof of the existence of these ancient semi-humans. He, in turn, dismisses such practices as nothing but the manifestation of a “pregiudizio popolare” (“common prejudice”), by which he means that “[i]n tutti i paesi si e’ creduto popularmente che ne fossero stati primi abitatori uomini giganteschi e di selvaggi costumi” (“in all countries, it is popularly believed that the first inhabitants had been men giant and of savage

customs”), a death knell for that belief, if ever one were sounded.³⁰

The earliest inhabitants of whom Thucydides feels he can speak definitively are the Sikans, Sikels, and Elymians.³¹ The Sikels are likewise mentioned in Homer, though their role is as commodities in the slave trade, rather than consumers of mankind like their Sicilian predecessors.³² These three groups come to constitute the peoples who are traditionally thought of as existing on the island prior to the arrival of the Greeks, though they are certainly not thought of as indigenous by any account. Instead, Thucydides’ passage sees them as the immigrants most recently preceding the Greeks, coming from Iberia, the Italian peninsula, and Troy, respectively. This appraisal of origins, irrespective of what the facts may be, could also certainly be interpreted as a device by which to ease the colonizing mind, absolving it of any concern about disenfranchising autochthonous peoples.

Scholars more recent than Thucydides have also taken up the quest to identify Sicily’s succession of prehistoric populations. In what continues to be a definitive, single-volume work on the ancient history of Sicily, and founding his observations upon extensive archaeological data in collaboration with written traditions, Moses Finley states that the earliest peoples to inhabit Sicily arrived during the “Advanced Palaeolithic period,” approximately 10,000 BCE. The island has extensive evidence of “Old Stone Age habitation in caves and rock shelters” and these inhabitants’ “stone tools link them with the cultures of central

³⁰ Holm 1896, 128.

³¹ Thuc. 6.2.2-6.

³² Hom.*Od.*24.3; a Sikel slavewoman tends to Laertes.

and western Europe, . . . [as] does their art . . . [which is] in the same tradition as the cave and paintings of the Rhone valley and of central and southern Spain.”³³ Moving forward in history, he speaks of a great population disturbance through Europe and Asia, during which “[o]n the western flank there was a complicated series of migrations, absorption and re-migration, originating in the Iberian peninsula, of people skilled in working copper and gold and identifiable by a characteristic kind of pottery known as ‘bell beakers.’ Their impact led to various hybrid cultures as they merged with local populations.” These people appeared in Sicily in a “later, ‘reflux’ stage”, and whence exactly they arrived is unclear, but this evidence could support the hypothesis for an ancient Iberian link.³⁴ Nonetheless, despite mentioning the cultural hybridity which these (at least culturally) Iberian immigrants fostered, Finley subsequently chooses to speak of the mode of acculturation in Sicily between Greeks as pre-existing peoples as “more or less complete Hellenization.”³⁵

In his three-volume work on the history of ancient Sicily, Holm speaks of the early scholarly considerations of an Iberian origin for some of the immediately-pre-Greek Sicilians.³⁶ In this discussion, he is speaking specifically of the Sikans, whose association with an Iberian origin comes initially from the ancient historians. These ancient writers, like their modern followers, base their hypothesis on similarities between place names across the two regions. This postulate of Iberian origin seems to be corroborated by the later evidence offered

³³ Finley 1961, 5, 6.

³⁴ Ibid. 7.

³⁵ Ibid. 8.

³⁶ Humboldt, Guglielmo; cited in Holm 1896, 130.

by Finley regarding the bell beakers, but Holm does proceed to draw attention to the possibility that, while Iberians may indeed have inhabited Sicily, they are not necessarily the same people as the Sikans. Having acknowledged this difficulty, Holm then goes on to speak of the Sikans as the earliest people who can be definitively identified and gives an account of the sites and situations of the Sikan cities.³⁷ This clear-cut distinction between Sikan and Sikel has been called into question in more recent works by authors who can discover no appreciable difference in the archaeological record between the Sikans and the Sikels,³⁸ though the latter are traditionally said to have come across from the Italian peninsula in contrast to the former's Iberian roots. Ultimately, the distinction can currently be made on no grounds other than geographic, with Sikans holding the west-middle of the island and Sikels the eastern half. The distinction will be observed strictly on the basis of geography in order to build a case study upon a manageable amount of material, and will focus on the activities occurring within this bounded, physical space. In light of the uncertainty—epistemological, let alone practical—current archaeological finds offer regarding the distinction between Sikan and Sikel, examining a dialectic between colonizer and colonized in terms of “Greek and Sikel” may come across as a difficult and even questionable approach. However, explication of the rationale behind this choice will hopefully justify such an approach.

By this point, even the reader unfamiliar with ancient Sicily will perhaps

³⁷ Holm 1896, 131.

³⁸ e.g. Antonaccio 2001, 129.

have noticed something catching about the name, “Sikel.” This very word is contained within the name for the island itself—Σικέλια. Whatever its empirical value, Thucydides 6.2 preserves a history which is notable in its representation of the life of Sicily’s nomenclature in the Greek imagination. During the era of the Cyclopes and Laestrygonians, he reports that the island was called “Trinacria,” a name that reflects its roughly three-pointed shape (and which has bearing on Sicily’s modern logo). Following this phase, the island bore the moniker, “Sikania,” after the next wave of inhabitations catalogued under the Sikans. The third name he records is that borne only slightly altered from the hazy vales of prehistory into the present day, the name “Sikelia.” That this name survived through all the years of Greek presence, the years of Roman presence,³⁹ the Byzantine era, the Arab era, the Norman epoch, the Swabian epoch, on through the march of Garibaldi, and into these early years of the European Union, bespeaks a tenacity which resists the subsumation beneath the blanket of Hellenism implied by the conventional model. Furthermore, even while they acknowledge the haziness of Sikan/Sikel distinction, many scholars carry forth with its use. This decision, given the definitive posture taken by extant ancient literature, is perhaps only justifiable, if for no sake other than that of continuity. Lastly, the “Greek” identities of the authors of our received histories leave us little choice but to adhere at least in part to these exigencies when reconstructing the social past, even while simultaneously recognizing the challenges presented by the one-sided vocalicity of the literature. Thus, while perhaps the field is ripe for

³⁹ See Latin “siculus”, for example

the sowing of a reconsideration of the slippery verity of the distant past as it filters down to us, I, with attendant caveats laid out, continue in a similar vein as those before, defining Sikels as those groups inhabiting the eastern and central parts of the island as far West as Enna and Butera, especially in the degree to which they can be said to have united under Douketios.

In service to the investigation of this dialectic, I will consolidate and reproduce the key events of fifth-century BCE Sikel history as narrated by Diodoros Sikelos. This author's work forms by far the bulk of what we have received in writing regarding these people and their interactions with the colonizing groups originating in the Greek-speaking Eastern Mediterranean. These passages will be corroborated at appropriate points by other ancient authors, as well as by supporting conclusions reached by modern scholarship. Attention will be paid throughout to their implications for hybridity between colonizer and colonized. Following this narrative, I will present a survey of some archaeological sites relevant to the culture attributed herein as "Sikel" in order to establish the geographic area of interest and identify a body of loosely "Sikel" settlement traits. Stemming from this discussion will be one focused on linguistics, particularly in light of the question of linguistic attribution in epigraphy recovered in archaeological contexts. Finally, I will attempt a synthesis to offer at least a thorough examination and problematization of the process of acculturation between colonizer and colonized, if not a framework for considering the dialectic itself.

An Abridged Sikel History

The written history of the Sikels, as least inasmuch as it survives to the present day, begins with Thucydides' account of their origins in 6.2. He says them to be of Italic origin, having migrated to Sicily at some prehistoric point of uncertain antiquity. They are clearly demarcated from the Iberian-originating Sikans, whose Sicilian presence he claims to predate that of the Sikels. According to Thucydides, the latter's significance for Italy itself is tremendous—he states that the very name, “Italy,” comes from a Sikel king on the continent named Italos.⁴⁰ While this last point remains of inscrutable verity, the theory for the Italic origin of the Sikels is now widely accepted, confirmed on such grounds as pottery style and—especially—linguistics: in addition to being a confirmed constituent of the Indo-European family, the language of the Sikels bears strong affinities to other languages of the Italian peninsula, a milieu out of which Latin itself arises.⁴¹ This narrative from Thucydides forms part of a larger body of ancient history that sees the native elements of the Italian peninsula originally springing forth from a generalized proto-Greek stock. Pliny offers a summary of this history in which he states that the Oinotrians, at some point in the mythic past, came from Arcadia and mark the tree trunk from which several other groups diverged. He claims that, during the reign of Italos, the Oinotrians were differentiated into the “Itali, Morgeti, and Siculi,” or Sikels.⁴² After this divergence, the Morgetes—under their leader, Morges—went across the strait and into inland Sicily, where they founded Morgantina. At approximately the same

⁴⁰ Thuc. 6.2.4.

⁴¹ Zamboni 1978; Dunbabin 1948, 42.

⁴² Pliny in Guzzo 1990, 138.

time, some of the Sikels also came across to inhabit the eastern parts of the island.

Besides offering an origin for the Sikels, Thucydides also presents an account of the major events, persons, and places of their time on the island prior to the arrival of the Greek colonists. However, partially because these events are transmitted across time, space, and culture to their much later Greek purporters and thus have less of a chance of being truly historical, and partially because this material is not immediately of moment for the events of empirically historical colonization, I elide the Greek mythology concerning the Sikel past and move on to an overview of Diodoros' presentation of the Sikels and their interactions with the Greeks in the period after colonization. For the reader's reference, relevant passages of Diodoros in both Greek and English can be found as an appendix to this document.

II.68.1

The first significant mention in Diodoros of Sikels in the colonial period comes with his account of how the citizens of Syracuse sent envoys to implore those residents of Sikel cities to assist them in overthrowing the Syracusan tyrant, Thrasybulos. Even leaving aside all of its implications for the state and history of political affairs in the Sicilian colonies, the account has considerable bearing for examining the nature of Sikel-Greek relations in this period. Most striking, of course, is the fact that the Syracusans sent an envoy to beg Sikel help at all. This indicates that, though the Sikels may have been an Other, they were nonetheless not so far removed from the Greeks' view of themselves as to be unreasonable allies. Moreover, the circumstances of the Syracusan citizens' plea demonstrate

the fragmentalized nature of the Sicilian colonial community at large. Rather than constitute a united, Hellenic whole, the Greek-speaking, colonizing community consisted of factions—factions which, at least in this example, are as likely to be composed of a mixed force of Sikels and Greeks as they are to be exclusively Greek. The third important point to derive from this passage is that the Sikels dwell in cities in the interior, suggesting that they maintain both complex social structure and a degree of autonomy within the bounds of a clearly differentiated cultural identity.

Works and Days of Douketios

The Sikels next come to the forefront of a Diodoran passage in connection to Douketios, the Sikel leader of the fifth century BCE who is undoubtedly the single most important Sikel in the histories. The events concerning Douketios are narrated in several short, scattered passages. Diodoros' chronology seems somewhat confused because he describes Douketios as "leader" and "king" of the Sikels prior to his passage describing how Douketios established himself as the head of the Sikel federation. Restructuring chronology is never a sure business, but, on the basis that Douketios could not be leader of all the Sikels without having first consolidated them into his civic company, I have arranged the events as follows:

11.88.6

Sometime in the middle of the fifth century BCE, a man named Douketios, who was in some capacity "the one leading the Sikels," formed a Sikel league by joining together all of the Sikel cities, with the notable exception of Hybla.

Henceforth he is referred to not as “one leading,” but as “the leader” and “the king” of the Sikels. Following this leadership designation, he founded the city of Palike at the site of a pre-existing Sikel sanctuary. He enclosed the city with walls and brought the neighboring area under his jurisdiction, and the settlement grew rapidly on account of “the excellence of the land and the multitude of inhabitants.” This Sikel sanctuary, scene of powerful, twin geysers and venue for oath-taking as well as for amnesty for mistreated slaves,⁴³ is even mentioned in *Aeneid* 9.585, attesting to its importance in the wider imagination of the region.⁴⁴ Such an important location is a propitious and powerful position from which to extend an assertion of Sikel autonomy.

11.78.5

In addition to establishing this city at a major cult center, Douketios founded another settlement, Menainon, where he once again apportioned land to his settlers. Sometime in the temporal vicinity of these foundations, he also spearheaded two sieges, one against the inland city of Morgantina and another against coastal Katane.

The first of these sieges is notable in light of who was besieged. The original inhabitants of Morgantina are said to be the Morgetes, a group who came over from the Italian peninsula and are thus identified with the Sikels. Taking that story at face value, why would Douketios besiege an essentially Sikel city, and, through so doing, win fame among his Sikel federation? This question is

⁴³ See Diod. 11.89.1-8 for full description of the geologic phenomenon.

⁴⁴ Oldfather 1946, Vol. IV, 353.

particularly justified in light of the maneuver's singularity—Douketios is never said to have attacked another native city. Diodoros offers nothing further about either this action's motivations or its outcomes, but archaeology may offer some explanation. Excavations have revealed that Morgantina was at this time the scene of a sizable Greek population. Were this the case, Douketios could have been motivated by a desire to reclaim Sikel territory for Sikel leaders. He did not stop with destruction, though—there is evidence for continuity at the site following a refoundation, likely accomplished by Douketios himself. The further implications of this settlement are addressed in the archaeology section below.

11.76.3

The second of these sieges is notable in light of who was besieging. Douketios and the Sikels were not alone in this endeavor, but rather were joined by the Syracusans. This event echoes the earlier plea of the Syracusans for Sikel help, and suggests that the plea was likely honored. Moreover, this joint effort illustrates the Greek-Sikel cooperation that archaeology at Morgantina seems to support. Interestingly, Diodoros' text seems to suggest that Douketios maneuvered against Katane in order to regain territory that had originally been Sikel. The role of Syracuse, then, in supporting this action becomes a matter for great interest. Ultimately, though, given the paucity of information, I can note only that much.

11.91.1-4

Despite Douketios' streak of victories and the cooperation he seems to enjoy with the Syracusans, his fortune soon turns sour. He seizes the Greek

foundation, Aitna, as part of his program. Though this itself does not seem to excite much resistance, Diodoros nonetheless elects to brand Douketios as having accomplished this task through “having treacherously slain [Aitna’s] leader.” After this, though, he moves against the westernmost territory of the Akragantines. This attack brings his erstwhile allies, the Syracusans, to the aid of the citizens of Akragas. Incredibly, Douketios and his Sikels manage to beat the combined forces of the colonies and seize the Akragantine outpost of Motyon. This success is short-lived, though, as the allied colonies forces, after wintering back in their homes, proceed to badly defeat the Sikels in battle. Douketios’ forces are scattered, and he cedes himself to despair.

11.92.1-4

After being deserted by nearly all his troops, Douketios manages to sneak into Syracuse by night and become a suppliant of the city. After some debate amongst the Syracusans, he is spared and gives his territory over to Syracuse. They, in turn, exile him to Corinth, providing him with enough money to be comfortable for the rest of his life.

12.8.1-3.

Douketios does not disappear from the record after his exile, though. Making the claim that he has received an oracle, he convinces Syracuse to allow him to come back to found another city, Kale Akte. During this process, he again attempts to lay claim to the leadership of the Sikels, but dies of an illness in the midst of his plans.

All of these instances from Douketios’ life, even taking into account his

ultimate failure, offer us a figure who is more than comfortable engaging in discourse with the Greek colonists in Sicily. He is both willing to ally with them to achieve his goals, and daring enough to put up a fight in an effort to win self-determination for “those of his same tribe.” He also demonstrates a clear knowledge of the systems of suppliance and of the importance of oracles in securing permission for founding cities. Some authors have taken this familiarity to be an indicator of the intense “Hellenization” Douketios evinces.⁴⁵ However, I believe that Douketios’ willingness to manipulate these systems in order to achieve his own ends demonstrates not an imitation of the Greek, but rather the synthesis of a hybrid identity which arise out of Douketios’ quest for self-definition. I hope that the following sections provide further evidence to suggest a confirmation of this model, and not just for Douketios, but for the populations as a whole, both colonizing and colonized.

From the Archaeological Record

To take Diodoros Sikelos at his word would be a convenient maneuver and would give us a history from which any relevant dialectic could be teased via a conclusive and definitive literary analysis. However, though the allure of so mercifully bounded an approach may be great, “reality” is ever a fickle word and “what really happened” as subjective as beauty, and we are ultimately left with no choice but to take even the choicest of historians with a grain of salt. Fortunately for the one seeking, ancient words are not the only remaining record of these ancient events, and both corroboration and new vistas may be found through other

⁴⁵ See Dominguez 1989, Luraghi 1977, and Rizzo 1970.

means, namely those of archaeology. Archaeological surveys over the past century-plus have illuminated much about the ways in which the Sikels lived, particularly their settlement tendencies and burial practices, traits which have been further illuminated in the thorough studies conducted over the last fifty-plus years at the site of Morgantina. Giving a full account of the situation of every identified Sikel site, while offering “empiricism” the stoutest legs on which to stand, would drag on for more pages than this paper can cover, but a smattered handful will serve to demonstrate both the geographic spread of the culture in question and the consistency of its settlement forms. Although pre-dating many more recent excavations, T.J. Dunbabin’s book, *The Western Greeks*, offers a useful survey of many major native population sites. As noted above, Dunbabin is invested in the primacy of Greek culture and its ascendancy over that of the Sikels, and his interpretations in turn reflect this ethnocentric bias. Nonetheless, he was an impressive assembler of information, and much good can be gleaned from his thorough work, even if strikingly different interpretations are drawn from the same raw data. In forming his survey of pre-Greek and non-Greek archaeological sites, Dunbabin makes wide recourse to the massive corpus of work carried out by Paolo Orsi. Though Orsi’s work is, on the whole, more than a century old, his careful and exhaustive surveys have in many instances not been bettered, with advances in excavation and archaeology often contributing little to his original raw data.⁴⁶ Instead, the primary objective of later scholars has often been interpretation, a task which Dunbabin undertakes with brio.

⁴⁶ See Wilson 1988, 114, for example.

The territory of the Sikels is defined most clearly in the instances where colonial expansion has come into contact—and often, as can be seen above, conflict—with established Sikel populations. Main areas of Sikel influence have been identified as the Heraian and Hyblaian hill regions, as well as the rugged foothills surrounding Etna.⁴⁷ Inspired by this information, archaeological research has in turn established the location of many Sikel centers throughout these regions.

Perhaps chief among the southeastern sites is that of Pantalica, a site whose heyday stretched between the tenth and eighth centuries BCE.⁴⁸ Like the vast majority of Sikel communities, the site occupies a hill-top. Located in only some fifteen miles from Syracuse, the ancient settlement was first unearthed by Orsi at the end of the 19th century.⁴⁹ The main feature of Pantalica is a large structure, called by Orsi an *anaktoron* and by Dunbabin the “best-built” of Sikel structures unearthed to date.⁵⁰ Unlike many of its contemporaries, the “palace” is built with a stone floor. The size of the building is also notable, covering some 120 by 35 feet in dimension. Its function is a subject for conjecture, particularly in light of the paucity of material excavated from within, but Dunbabin makes note of the remains of bronze-casting devices which constitute the majority of what survives inside the building itself. On the basis of the size and fineness of the building, Dunbabin finds it “reasonable to see the influence of Greek models and

⁴⁷ Sjöqvist 1973, 23.

⁴⁸ Ibid. 95.

⁴⁹ See Orsi 1912.

⁵⁰ Dunbabin 1948, 95.

perhaps the hand of Greek workmen.”⁵¹ However, both in light of the absence of any contemporary comparanda of definitive Greek origin as well as Dunbabin’s apparent tendency to correlate Sikel with shoddy and Greek with grand—attested by his aforementioned use of descriptors such as “very provincial” and “barbarous” for work he represents as unequivocally Sikel—I see little to recommend such an interpretation. This postulate is made especially tenuous by the lack of any Greek material at the site.⁵²

Examining the site more generally, Dunbabin notes its great defensibility as well as its size, which he conjectures would have allowed the hill-top to serve as a refuge for all the outlying inhabitants in a time of crisis. The substantial population is also attested by the “thousands of graves” present in the immediate vicinity.⁵³ In addition to its natural defensibility, the value of the location as a look-out point is also great. From Pantalica, one could command a view of the entire Anapos valley. Despite the site’s size and significance, it appears to have fallen into disuse shortly after the onset of the colonial era.

Another of the great sites in this immediate region of Sicily was Finocchito. Like Pantalica, Finocchito was located on a hill-top and commanded an impressive view of the Heloros river gorge. The site was smaller in size than Pantalica and less naturally defensible as the sides of the hill were less steep, but nevertheless in a powerful position given its sight-lines and height.

In addition to security provided by location on hill-tops, many Sikel cities

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid. 97, Albanese-Procelli 1996, 168.

⁵³ Dunbabin 1948, 95.

also had their own walls. Two such walled sites are found at Monte Rossomanno and Cozzo Matrice.⁵⁴ The former is located near Valguarnera Caropepe and the latter in the vicinity of Lago Pergusa, both a few kilometers southeast of Enna. The density of settlement in this area indicates the importance and vitality of this inland region for the Sikels, attested also by the nearby presence of Enna and Morgantina, two other important, hill-top sites. This correlates also with the reference in Diodoros 11.68.1 regarding the Sikel cities of the interior to whom the Syracusans appealed for help. While walled cities do suggest the presence of strife and a perceived need for defense against armed attackers, they also are a testament to a location's economic vitality and its ability to undertake major public works as a civic entity, suggesting stability and organization. Unlike some of the southeastern sites, these inland sites demonstrate substantial continuity during the colonial period.

From these central sites, we move south to Butera, the modern town which marks the westernmost point at which the territory of the Sikels is identified for this study. Located just northwest of Gela, Butera was identified by Van Buren as the scene in antiquity of "one of the most powerful Siculan communities, perhaps Maktorion."⁵⁵ Also a walled, hill-top site, this location attests to the significance of the Sikel population dwelling in this area. The area of definite Sikel influence up to—and, to a large extent, during—the colonial era can thus be identified as extending from the foothills around Etna to the southernmost point of the island

⁵⁴ Wilson 1982, 99.

⁵⁵ Van Buren 1953, 59.

and west as far Fiume Salso and Butera, an area covering over half of the island's total.

In addition to the aforementioned Sikel centers, the colonies themselves bear revisiting in terms of their history prior to colonial arrivals. At Catania, erstwhile site of Katana, Aitna, and Inessa, a Sikel community had existed up until the epoch "immediately prior to the foundation of the colony," as represented by the recovered Pantalica Sud-Finocchito pottery.⁵⁶ Due to the massive beds of igneous rock associated with the 1669 eruption of Etna, however, any further evidence for interaction and settlement patterns at the advent of colonization cannot be recovered. The record from other colonies provides a more complete picture. Naxos, for instance, oldest of the Sicilian colonies, is one such location. Like Catania, Naxos occupied the site of a Sikel city which immediately pre-existed the foundation. After colonization, the Sikels who had been living there are thought to have fled to Taormina, whence they were "apparently living at peace" with the seaside colony at the foot of the mountain.⁵⁷ This situation would seem to have a parallel in Dunbabin's account of the small Greek community living on the Contrada above the Sikel town of Ragusa.⁵⁸ However, the latter instance represents Greek colonists coming into a settled Sikel area and establishing their own immigrant enclave, circumstances which seem to provide a readier opportunity for peaceable interaction than that presupposed by the former instance, wherein the outside group is said to have forced a relocation

⁵⁶ Wilson 1982, 92.

⁵⁷ Ibid. 94.

⁵⁸ Dunbabin 1948, 107-108.

upon the earlier settlement. Such circumstances might instead make a case for arguing that the peaceable nature of Naxos-Taormina relations is dubious. However, a passage from Diodoros claims that, during an attack on Naxos by Dionysius, the Naxians sought refuge with the Sikels on Taormina, and evidence of Greek artifacts from the necropolis not only bolsters this story but, as these artifacts' presence extends back into the fifth and sixth centuries BCE at the site of the agora, suggests that this peaceable relation was ongoing. Most compelling of all, perhaps, should be the evidence from Syracuse, consistently the most influential and bully-like of the colonies.⁵⁹ Even here, at the colony often claimed to have exerted aggressive, militaristic dominion over all the area Sikels⁶⁰—not to mention other Greek colonies—the record seems to illustrate greater continuity than a model of all-out Hellenic domination would allow. Excavations on the island of Ortygia, site of the earliest Syracusan settlement, have unearthed remains of Sikel houses which, rather than forming part of a destruction layer, instead continued to be used into the early years of the colony. Rather than being destroyed by Syracusan military action, these structures appear to have been “quietly abandoned,” and, in one instance thus discovered, Greek construction continued on the exact same spot as the Sikel habitation, even building off of pre-existing walls; as Wilson points out, “the notion that Corinthian émigrés firebranded everything in sight stands in need of revision.”⁶¹ While the presence of a recycled Sikel house is by no means an indication that Sikels were peacefully

⁵⁹ Diod. , for example.

⁶⁰ See Dunbabin 1948, 95, for example.

⁶¹ Wilson 1988, 111.

coexisting with the new colonists—indeed, the paucity of Siculan wares during the colonial period⁶² makes a theory of expulsion⁶³ tenable—the act of recycling contributes to an urban environment composed of at least remnants of Sikel cultural products. Following Fitzjohn’s implementation of Bhabha’s “third-space,” this created space is of a hybrid form neither purely Greek nor purely Sikel. Following Soja, this created space in turn shaped the peoples inhabiting it, influencing in some measure their culture and contributing to the production and reproduction of a hybrid form of identity which was likewise neither purely Greek nor purely Sikel.

Having provided a requisite sample of Sikel hotspots, I will now move into more detailed case studies of two sites in particular. Coincidentally, or perhaps not, these sites are the scenes of some of Douketios’ most important moments as a leader and a founder in Diodoros’ history and have produced some of the most intriguing finds to date. In accordance with both their apparent chronological relation to Douketios (earlier to later) and the volume of material thus far garnered from each (lesser to greater), these case studies focus on Palike and Morgantina, respectively.

Palike

The potential significance of Palike as an example of a center of Sikel cult and religiosity needs little reiteration; one need only think of Angkor Wat, Stonehenge, or the remains of massive, colonial-era, Greek temples scattered

⁶² See Dunbabin 1948, 50-51.

⁶³ Thuc. 6.3.2.

across Sicily to see the enduring importance cult centers play in defining the culture of which they were a part, an importance which was surely no less great in their heyday. Though devoid of monumental remains, archaeological research at the site of Palike and the sanctuary of the Palikoi has provided some provocative information with which to consider both the nature of the site as a true *center* for Sikel culture, as well as its potential significance for cross-cultural interaction and hybridity.

Maniscalco and McConnell provide a history of archaeological activity at the site and a summary and their analysis of the most recent fieldwork conducted there, work which has generated the majority of what is known. The modern town of Rocchicella di Mineo roughly occupies the area described by the ancient site, “located in the Caltagirone river valley south of the plain of Catania in eastern Sicily.”⁶⁴ As related in Diodoros Sikelos, the area was once the scene of an impressive hydrologic spectacle. Rocchicella di Mineo’s identification as the scene of city and sanctuary and nearby Naftia Lake’s identification as the scene of the boiling *kraters* can be traced back to the 1500s when Tommaso Fazello, a Dominican monk, made the denominative call. Unfortunately for current observation, modernity bore far less reverence for the scene than had cultures of yore, and “land reclamation and industrial projects began to tame . . . [the *kraters*] characteristic jets of carbon dioxide,” resulting in the lake’s drainage and its eventual transformation into the scene of a plant for harnessing gas for

⁶⁴ Maniscalco and McConnell 2003, 145

carbonated beverages.⁶⁵ Despite these obstructions, the sanctuary and city are shown to have a long and complex history of inhabitation and use, “from the Paleolithic period through late antiquity.”⁶⁶ In addition to the distinctive geologic markers for the site, Maniscalco and McConnell remark that Paolo Orsi claimed to have found a Sikel inscription at the site. Though this inscription was lost—an admittedly suspicious circumstance, even taking Orsi’s credibility into account—I choose to take its presence as further proof of the Sikel character of the site, a character which becomes increasingly important over the history of the site.⁶⁷

The earliest traces of human activity consist of layers of ash, animal remains, and tools, which are dated “between the 11th and 10th millennia B.C.[E.],” with strata immediately above these containing an infant burial accompanied by a simple collection of stone tools.⁶⁸ Activity began to be continuous in the Neolithic period, marked by some pavement remains, transitioning into those of a hut in the Early Bronze Age, with Sicilian Late Bronze Age activity marked by extensive remains of rock-cut tombs, tombs which are consistent with the Sikel typology recorded at various sites across the eastern half of the island. Occupation continued in the Archaic period, represented by elaboration of buildings and terraces, but without any significant remains to indicate a dramatic change as the result of contact with the colonies. The authors note that, though the exact date of the emergence of the cult itself is unknown and

⁶⁵ Ibid. 147; footnote 16.

⁶⁶ Ibid. 145.

⁶⁷ Ibid. 145.

⁶⁸ Ibid. 145.

unknowable, “[c]ults connected with geological phenomena in Sicily are well attested not only in historic times, but also at many prehistoric sites.”⁶⁹ All of these observations point to a site with continuing significance as a Sikel center of some sort, an identity consistent with Diodoros’ history. Deviating from his narrative, however, archaeology unveiled remains of an urban layout “dated to the seventh century [BCE] on the basis of associated pottery fragments.”⁷⁰ While dating on the basis of pottery alone can be problematic, and therefore a rejection of the date in favor of collation with Diodoros tempting, my reliance on this method at other points demands consistency in accepting Maniscalco and McConnell’s proposed date. Even with this date intact as indicating the existence of city prior to the alleged Douketian foundation, the possibility of his role as oikist in this situation is not precluded. Rather than a foundation *de novo*, the Diodoran foundation could represent rather a reconsolidation or rejuvenation of an existing city and its subsequent designation as a seat of centralized Sikel government under their new leader.

The evidence from the site grows both more complicated and more compelling within the layers chronologically approximating the era of Douketios. A building identified by the authors as a *hestiaterion*, a communal dining facility with parallels not only at the Sicilian colony of Megara Hyblaea, but also in Athens and mainland Greece itself, as well as southern Italy, emerges in the archaeological record sometime around this period.⁷¹

⁶⁹ Ibid. 148-150; ref. Dunbabin 1948, Wilson 1982, for example

⁷⁰ Ibid. 153

⁷¹ Ibid. 153.

Despite Diodoros' assertion that Palike was razed and fell into disuse after only a short heyday, activity at the site continues essentially uninterrupted. A destruction layer is present which correlates approximately with the chronology of the destruction mentioned by Diodoros, but this destruction was followed by "reconstruction in the woven masonry technique, which is the easiest way to build using debris, at the beginning of the fourth century B.C.[E.]"⁷² This suggests that rather than being wiped out, the site continued to serve in its capacity as a cult center and that it "never lost its image as a political point of reference."⁷³

Further evidence of two dedications at the site bolsters this assertion. In the immediate vicinity of Rocchicella di Mineo, a bronze belt was discovered, upon which is an inscription in Greek. The inscription, dated to the fourth century BCE, is in the manner of a dedication of spoils of war. Though only one instance, the find could suggest that "Palike was a cult center where war-spoils could be dedicated in a matter similar to the pan-Hellenic sanctuaries of Greece."⁷⁴ In this interpretation, not only was the sanctuary vital to Sikel identity and enduring, but it also represented a location which became important to the Greek-speaking population, a situation which provides a ready example of pluralism and the creation of hybrid space, both literal and ideological. This assessment is given further weight if one accepts the proposed identification of the sanctuary as the location where Salvius, leader of a third-century BCE slave

⁷² Ibid. 153.

⁷³ Ibid. 166.

⁷⁴ Ibid. 147.

revolt, made a dedication of war-spoils.⁷⁵ In this context, the sanctuary continues to exist not only as a location for pan-Sicilian dedications, but also a created space for the representation of marginalized groups. Taking the lens offered both by Bhabha and by Soja's socio-spatial dialectic, this "third space" mediates these social interactions that go on within it as per its status as a landscape created by diverse groups.

Morgantina

The site of Morgantina is situated in the province of Enna, deep in the mountainous interior of Sicily, roughly equidistant as the crow flies from each of the island's three coastlines and just down the SS228 from the modern town of Aidone. The excavations at the site first began in 1955 under the direction of Erik Sjøvquist, who subsequently identified it as being Morgantina. While his identification was initially met with some degree of skepticism and other speculations persisted for a time, Sjøvquist's identification has been borne out by the ongoing exploration. According to Thucydides, the city was founded by Morges, leader of the Morgetes, and his followers after they had crossed over to Sicily from the Italian peninsula.⁷⁶ Nothing more is to be found regarding this group of people in the extant literature aside from identifying them as part of the Sikel whole (as above). Ceramic evidence from the archaeological record as well as the events involving Morgantina in Diodoros Sikelos both seem to confirm this association.⁷⁷ Keeping with the precedents of Sikel practice, the site is located on a

⁷⁵ Diod. 36.7.1; Maniscalco and McConnell 2003, 169, n. 129.

⁷⁶ Strabo,

⁷⁷ Sjøqvist 1973, 3.

system of beetling ridges, overlooking the flat valleys and lakes of Sicily's interior spread out far below. The remains of the city have attracted the attention of countless individuals through the agency of both American universities and Sicilian authorities, and through these individuals' toil and passion, Morgantina has emerged as one of the richest, most complex, and—surely for anyone wandering the forlorn, windswept heights—most compelling sites for the exploration and reconstruction of the tapestry of ancient Sicilian history (Fig. 2).



Fig. 2: Students traipsing the Cittadella of Morgantina

Malcolm Bell's most recent preliminary report on the excavations at Morgantina contains important information on archaeological finds relevant not only to Douketios' presence in the city but to the population composition of the city as a whole, archaeological finds that support the existence of an admixture of

Greek and Sikel within the same streets. From excavated material, Bell is able to conclude that “the Archaic city was abandoned toward the middle of the fifth century, and it seems probable that this happened as a consequence of the capture of the site by Douketios.”⁷⁸ This conclusion corroborates the statement in Diodorus Siculus 11.78.5 concerning Douketios’ seizing of the site. Bell expands this history a step further and hypothesizes that, given that its inhabitation began immediately after the desertion of the Archaic hill-top site, or Cittadella, the “second city was founded . . . perhaps also as result of Douketios’ political authority over the site.”⁷⁹ This hypothesis is hardly unfounded, given not only that the area was under the jurisdiction of Douketios and his *synteleia* at the time, but also that Douketios’ capacity as an oikist is well attested within Diodorus.⁸⁰

Bell’s conjecture in this instance is particularly augmented by pottery finds. Excavations uncovered the remains of two kilns, both of which contained remnants of “local Sikel ware of the late Archaic period.”⁸¹ These kilns occur in a provenience that also contains many potsherds of Attic type, and their deposition marks the earliest evidence for the inhabitation of the second city. Since one of the kilns, kiln B, contained the remains of only local, Sikel-type wares, this would seem to suggest the vitality of the Sikel tradition continuing into the establishment of the new city. As Bell notes—using the excavated information to suggest a confirmation of this Diodorus-based hypothesis—Douketios “appears to have

⁷⁸ Bell, 1988, 316; Trendall 1961, 47.

⁷⁹ Ibid. 316.

⁸⁰ See Diod. 11.78.5, 11.90.1-2, 12.29.1.

⁸¹ Ibid. 319.

avored cooperation between Sikels and Greeks.”⁸² Moreover, if this Sikel vitality is taken as indicative of Douketios’ presence at the site, this association of these kiln materials means that “the new city may have been founded by Douketios, to whom would then be owed the orthogonal plan.”⁸³

This suggestion would be given weight by evidence supporting the presence of Greeks at the site. In service to this question, it is tempting to see the presence of significant amounts of Attic ware as indication of just such a mixed population. Moreover, the mixture of the different forms of pottery within the same context, rather than in discrete deposits, could be an indication of direct comingling between Greeks and Sikels, rather than their separation into distinct quarters of the urban area. This would be a new organization of social space in light of Antonaccio and Neils’ later observation that “Sikel huts were occupied on the *margins*” of the first settlement on the Cittadella.⁸⁴ However, classification of a population on the basis of pottery wares alone is a far from certain methodology. Trade could have brought Greek wares to this second phase of Morgantina, a process which, while demonstrating the diverse aesthetic tastes of the population—and indicating some degree of openness and communication, at least in the form of economic exchange between independent entities—does not necessarily imply anything about the non-Greek entity engaged in the exchange. Indeed, the seizing of the original city by Douketios, its abandonment, and his refoundation on the Serra Orlando might make it seem most probable that those

⁸² Ibid. 321.

⁸³ Ibid. 320.

⁸⁴ Antonaccio and Neils 1995, 263.

Greek inhabitants who had been present were driven out in light of the hostile action carried forth against the city. However, an examination of funerary contexts provides evidence to support a more nuanced view of population dynamics at Morgantina.

The *necropoleis* of Morgantina demonstrate the continuity of habitation experienced by the site. Two *necropoleis* have been identified at Morgantina, predictably designated Necropolis I and Necropolis II. Necropolis I represents funereal contexts from the earliest moments of the settlement on the Cittadella, with the formation and expansion of Necropolis II correlating with expansion of the city during the Archaic period.⁸⁵ The earliest extant tombs are Iron Age burials from the era immediately prior to the establishment of the coastal colonies. Though the graves are badly damaged and only three survive intact, they can in their consistency still give us a likely representation of the Iron Age burial tendencies of Morgantina's pre-Hellenic-contact population. This assumption is justified in that the typology of these three burials, especially in that of multiple inhumations, is readily correlated to a broader funereal typology identified with the Sikels.⁸⁶ One to six individuals are interred in each tomb, and the tombs are all the same elliptical, chamber design. The grave goods are few in number and fairly simple—"bowls and jugs, iron serpentine fibula, and glass beads."⁸⁷ Though some variation in exact arrangement and contents is (predictably) present, the number of grave goods is similar and the deposited forms consistent. In the

⁸⁵ Lyons 1996a, 179.

⁸⁶ See Leighton 1996a, Albanese-Procelli 1996.

⁸⁷ Lyons 1996, 178.

period of first colonial contact, that associated with the Finocchito culture of 730-650 BCE, funereal evidence is scarce, with only two burials surviving. However, as both occur in the same tomb, what scanty evidence they do provide seems to give a portrait of consistency represented by the continuation of multiple inhumation.

The Archaic-era Necropolis II is the first indicator of transformation, providing evidence for the proliferation of diverse burial types and the results of contact with groups from the Greek, coastal foundations. The appearance of a greater variety of grave goods, both local and colonial imports, in concert with a diversification of burial types identified as diffusing from the young, coastal colonies coincides with what in the archaeological record seems to be an increase in the solidification of social strata and a hierarchy within the Archaic community. This theory is based upon the disparity which emerges in the number and fineness of grave goods as well as in the elaboration of the tomb structures themselves.⁸⁸ In this period of contact, the burial forms range from soil burials to cremations to monumentalized chamber tombs with tiled roofs and other architectural elaborations such as *klinai*. However, even though the burial forms began to be diversified in terms of their apparent fineness, the diverse forms were integrated with one another in the necropolis, with the only apparent segregation being the isolated "south slope nucleus of tile, *enchytrismos*, and soil burials consisting exclusively of child and infant [graves]."⁸⁹

⁸⁸ Ibid. 178-179; see Leighton 1996a.

⁸⁹ Ibid. 179.

Sjöqvist⁹⁰ notes two graves which can serve as exemplary of the diversity of form at Morgantina as well as the extent to which the strict cultural lines demarcated by artifact association are crossed. The first of these burials follows the Sikel typology of multiple inhumations in a single chamber tomb. The burial “contained the remains of at least seven skeletons and over two hundred grave gifts,” deposited between “about 520 and 480 B.C.[E.]” The second burial, preserved in the same necropoleic context, is of iconic Greek typology. The cremated remains are placed in an urn and inhumed with accompanying grave goods in a shaft which is then sealed with a rock. However, the urn is not Greek at all, but rather a local product of Sikel typology. On the basis of the richness of the former burial and the typology of the latter, Sjöqvist argues that both represent the burials of a Greek person, but I believe that the cultural attribution could be just as easily argued to the contrary on the basis of the typology of the former and the urn style of the latter. What becomes important in the examples of these two burials is not their specific cultural assignments, but the fact that such assignments can no longer conclusively be made for either group.

In addition to the evidence offered from funerary contexts, epigraphy from Morgantina provides a crucial lens through which to examine the articulation of a hybrid identity. Three instances of recovered epigraphy in particular provide suggestive ground upon which to develop this conceptualization, two from the Archaic context of the Cittadella and one from the Douketian second settlement on the Serra Orlando. The first of these is also perhaps the most significant. At

⁹⁰ Sjöqvist 1973, 35.

the very close of the 1990 season of excavations at Morgantina, a fragment of a “black-slipped krater of Laconian type, typical of the sixth and fifth centuries B.C.[E.]”⁹¹ was recovered from a previously uncatalogued area of the settlement on the Cittadella. Inscribed upon the potsherd in apparently complete form is the phrase,

κυπαρας εμι

The original letter forms are somewhat strange, a trait which, as Antonaccio and Neils remark, contributed to initial doubts about the authenticity of the find, but they remark that such “letter forms . . . are shared both by Greek inscriptions from the mainland and western colonies, and by known Sikel inscriptions.”⁹² These parallels, along with the krater’s provenience, confirm the authenticity of the artifact and its subsequent merit for investigation.

With the alphabet accounted for, addressing the content of the inscription is the next order. To one familiar with graffiti occurring on vessel-shapes associated with symposiastic settings, this graffito appears to adhere to a typical style, that being a genitive form of a name and then a verb “to be,” such that the phrase reads, “I am of _____,” i.e. “I am _____’s.”⁹³ This formula itself, as well as its presence on a symposiastic vessel, occasions no particular comment due to its frequency and familiarity, but the words themselves which constitute the inscription bear further investigation.

As Antonaccio and Neils note, the verb form, εμι, is “obviously paralleled

⁹¹ Antonaccio and Neils 1995, 261.

⁹² Ibid. 268.

⁹³ See ibid 268.

in Greek,” being another version of the common εἶμι. In light of the Sicilian context of the find, though, the lack of the initial ι becomes significant, as the form found on the graffito is also used in Elymian inscriptions in the northwest of the island.⁹⁴ Furthermore, the linguistic history of the Sikels also opens the possibility that the verb is actually Sikel for “to be” and appears so similar to the Greek due to the close relation of the two languages.⁹⁵ As the authors of the graffito’s report aptly note, this context opens three possibilities: the verb is “Greek *per se*, borrowed from Greek into Sikel, or Sikel by way of Indoeuropean.”⁹⁶ In light of the affinity between the two languages and the mixed Sikel and Greek history of the site, I believe the last of the three to be perhaps the most probable, although, given the current impossibility of proof to any effect, I elect to keep the question open for consideration.

The name in the inscription provides further ground fertile for consideration in the light of pluralism. The above authors find two parallels in Sicilian archaeological contexts whose value is given further weight due to the regional proximity of the finds. These names have been published as *Κύπρα* and *Κυπόρα*—or possibly *Κυάρα*—respectively.⁹⁷ While the former, as the authors note, is not a direct parallel, and the first reading of the latter, while close, is not, either, both examples still “supplant a more ready parallel with Aphrodite’s epithet, *Κυπρία*,”⁹⁸ suggesting that the name on the *krater* inscription is local.

⁹⁴ Agostiniani, 1977.

⁹⁵ See Zamboni 1979.

⁹⁶ Antonaccio and Neils, 268.

⁹⁷ Ibid. 269.

⁹⁸ Ibid. 269.

The second reading of the second inscription above is obviously a direct parallel and, given both the potential similarity between *Y* and *A* in an epigraphic setting, especially in light of weathering, as well as the discovery of the graffito from Morgantina, *Κυπάρρα* is perhaps the more likely of the two proposed readings. This direct parallel would lend even more weight to the hypothesis that the *Κυπάρρα* on the *krater* is a local name. Were this to be the case, the inscription would carry significant implications about the potential hybridity of an ancient settlement wherein an inscription were written in the Greek alphabet using a Sikel verb form and name on a Greek-produced vessel associated with the *symposion*.

However, building such an argument for the Sikel identity of the name solely upon three archaeological finds, regardless of their homoregionality and similar appearance, would be a tenuous endeavor at best, and ultimately provide little more substantial than grounds for pondering and speculation. Fortunately for this example, statements from ancient authors allow for corroboration of the suggested reading. The authors of the report note three instances, two of which I believe are particularly significant in exploring the possibility of a distinct Sicilian identity for the name. The first of these is a passage from Hesychius, κ4636, which reads, “Kupara: the fountain Arethousa in Sicily.”⁹⁹ Not only does this entry associate the name, *Κυπάρρα*, with Sicily, but it also offers this name as an alternative toponym for an important Sicilian location in the Greek imagination, namely the Fountain of Arethousa in Syracuse. This mention of an alternative name is suggestive of the possibility that *Κυπάρρα* represents an older, non-

⁹⁹ Cited in *ibid.* 269; translation from the Greek is my own.

Greek—i.e. Sikel—name for the site. The second of these passages is found in Stephanos Byzantios, *Ethn.* 116, and reads, “Arethousa, city of Syria and Thrace and Euboia and fountain of Sicily. This itself [the fountain] is called Kupara.”¹⁰⁰ This second example compliments the first’s attribution of *Κυπάρρα* as distinctly Sicilian, as well as highlighting its deviation from the standard Greek nomenclature and thereby strengthening the possible attribution of the name to Sikel.

If *Κυπάρρα* is indeed a Sikel name, who, then, is *Κυπάρρα*? Functioning on the linguistic premise common to the related languages of Sikel and Greek, the –α termination of the name would suggest that it be attributed to a female (though see Antonaccio and Neils for discussion of remote but discounted possibility of male attribution). In light of the relation Hesychius and Stephanos Byzantios offer between the name and the natural fountain in what became Syracuse, the attribution of the inscription to a dedicatory function honoring some female divinity becomes a definite possibility, perhaps especially in light of the inscription’s location on a krater, which would serve a more communal function in convivial drinking situations than would an individual *kylix*. Were this the case, could the inscription provide evidence for a Sikel cult? While currently unknowable due to paucity of evidence, the possibility is nonetheless a thought-provoking one not only for its suggestion of the ongoing worship of a non-Greek deity, but also for its suggestion of the female identity of that deity.

Considering the spotty evidence for identifying a new cult, looking for

¹⁰⁰ Ibid. 269; translation from the Greek is my own.

Κυπώρα in a more mundane context, as it were, becomes an equally distinct possibility. Despite the prosaity of mere mortals, attribution of the name to a female human rather than to a divinity provides a no less compelling reading of the find's implications. The traditional, Greek *symposion* constituted a rigidly male space, one in which women, if they were allowed at all, were only of the *hetairai* persuasion; certainly women of a high enough status to be owning fine pottery vessels were prohibited. Consequently, visiting any museum with a substantial collection of *symposion* shapes is enough to demonstrate the not uncommon tendency of male owners of pottery vessels to commemorate that ownership with epigraphy. In light of this practice of the exclusion of "honorable women," seeing a woman's name not only show up in a symposiastic context, but do so as the owner of a fine vessel bespeaks a decidedly non-Greek attitude toward designated "female" roles and involvement in convivial drinking. On this note, the Sikels are known to have had some sort of tradition of drinking prior to the arrival of the Greeks, but the social composition of the drinkers in the native tradition with respect to their gender and status assignments are unknown at present, as is whether drinking was a social institution on anything like the same level as the *symposion*.¹⁰¹ In light of both the dearth of information regarding pre-existing convivial drinking practices among Sikels and the use of Greek symposiastic wares at Morgantina, the case could convincingly be made that the institution of convivial drinking was introduced by the Greek colonists. If these convivial drinking settings are attributed to direct transmission from the Greek

¹⁰¹ Antonaccio 2001, 132.

colonists, female participation at Morgantina would present a markedly different interpretation and implementation of this iconic Greek institution. On the other hand, even if the Sikels did have an established practice of convivial drinking wherein female participation was common, their use of Greek vessels would mark an instance of the formation of “third-space.”

The second inscription notable for this discussion also comes from the context of the Archaic settlement on the Cittadella. Like the inscription concerning *Κυπάρρα*, this inscription is likewise found upon a vessel associated with the *symposion*, this time a *kylix*. Written inside on the bottom of the bowl of the cup, the inscription reads, “ΙΙΒΕ.” Through relying on correlation via “the secure equation of Latin *bibe*, Old Irish *ib*, and Sanskrit *píba*,” Calvert is able to conclude that this inscription represents nothing other than “the second singular imperative 'drink!' in Sikel.”¹⁰² Thus we have in this inscription attestation of the presence of the Sikel language at Morgantina. The certainty of this attribution to Sikel has ramifications for the earlier-mentioned inscription as it could lend extra credence to the interpretation of the *Κυπάρρα* inscription as likewise representing Sikel. These bolster the viability of Sikel cultural continuity since we can now establish that the Sikel language was extant in Archaic Morgantina. In his note, Calvert imagines the reason behind the inscription being something so mundane as impressing drinking buddies or a dead father, also indicating that a Sikel inscription does not necessarily predicate a Sikel inscriber. His observations are well-taken as a precaution against reading too heavily into a single archaeological

¹⁰² Calvert 1995, 40.

instance as a representative of demography writ large, but the find does have great significance, even taken at its least adventurous interpretation. Sikel inscriber or no, a Sikel inscription is a sure indication of the persistence of elements of Sikel culture at the site and in the minds of residents. Even if Morgantina were populated exclusively by Greeks, and a Greek person were therefore responsible for the inscription, the occurrence of such an inscription attests to the pervasiveness of Sikel culture in the Greek popular imagination, a pervasiveness which surely would have extended into sectors other than that of epigraphy in symposiastic contexts. However, in light of the other evidence, the ΠΙΒΕ inscription seems best taken as indicative of a continued presence of not only a Sikel cultural identity, but of persons who might identify themselves by that marker.

Returning to Bell's work, he reports the finding of an inscription, which is the third in this brief survey of epigraphy from Morgantina. This time, the inscription is unambiguously identified as Greek, found on an "Attic stemless kylix of ca. 460 B.C.[E.]"¹⁰³ This inscription, in the Doric dialect, records two names, Pyrrhias and Samōnides. The former is "known at Selinous" and the latter unknown in Sicily, though the similarity to the name of the epinician poet, Simonides, is readily apparent. As Bell notes, this inscription, "if incised locally, offers evidence for the presence of Greeks at Morgantina" at the same time as the evidence for Sikel inhabitation of the fifth century BCE. He continues with the assertion that this Greek presence "would not be surprising in a Douketian

¹⁰³ Bell 1988, 319-320.

foundation, for the Sikel leader had a good knowledge of Greek culture and customs, and he appears to have favored cooperation between Sikels and Greeks.”¹⁰⁴ In light of these observations, I, in turn, assert that, taken in concert, these three inscriptions provide for a portrait of Morgantina that represents a far more nuanced experience of Sikel-Greek interaction than can possibly be encompassed by the term “Hellenization.”

Conclusions for Hybridity: The Case Of Douketios

Douketios is easily one of the most complicated pieces of this study, and, as a figure, offers one of the most compelling examples for the creation of “third-space” in the Sicilian experience. In his review of Dominguez 1989, Alan Johnston effectively sums up the position taken by many scholars, which is that “Douketios is no ‘nationalist’ but an emulator of the Deinomenids.”¹⁰⁵ This posture is based primarily on his role in consolidating the Sikel cities and his actions as a founder. In particular, the claim is based on the manner in which he distributed land to settlers of his new foundations. However, given that essentially all we know of Douketios comes from the narrative of Diodoros, with archaeology corroborating but contributing almost no additional information, I believe that labelling him as an “emulator” stands with little to support it.

The first point to address is that of the Sikel *synteleia*. Liddell and Scott’s *Intermediate Greek-English Lexicon* defines *συντέλεια* as:

“*a joint payment, joint contribution for public*”

¹⁰⁴ Ibid. 321. See Rizzo 1970, Dominguez 1988.

¹⁰⁵ Johnston 1992, 357. See also Dominguez 1989, Luraghi 1977, and Rizzo 1970.

burdens [. . .] **II.** At Athens, *a partnership for bearing public burdens* [. . .] 2. generally, *a company*, of the gods [. . . or] **III.** *combination of efforts, the consummation of a scheme.*"¹⁰⁶

In every one of these definitions, the connotation of commonality is clear. At no point is *synteleia* offered as a term for an overlordship of the sort practiced by the Deinomenids. Rather, the specificity of term makes it likely that Diodoros Sikelos was using the *synteleia* with the deliberate intention of communicating the commonality that its specialized context describes. The possibility does exist that Diodoros was not so meticulous in his selection of the term, and therefore even that “tyranny” could have been a better choice, but, because he is our only source on the events, such extrapolation that *synteleia* somehow here and only here more appropriately meant “governmental form undertaken in emulation of tyrannical overlordship” seems unwise.

Even were one to concede that Douketios could have been in a more totalitarian position of leadership than that implied by his designation as head of a *synteleia*, casting him as a simple emulator—and therefore prime example of Hellenization—does not adequately account for his achievements. The first point to be made is that Diodoros’ use of a Greek technical term when speaking about Douketios’ federation does not mean that Douketios was necessarily borrowing this Greek form, or any other specifically Greek form. While he was a centralized leader described by a Greek author using common Greek terms such as *basileus*,

¹⁰⁶ Liddell and Scott, “συντέλεια”, 780.

hegemon, and *dynastos*, nothing about centralized leadership itself is specifically Greek. This is especially apparent in light of Thucydides' extensive accounts of Sikeli kings and leaders of old—this model of leadership is just as inherently Sikeli as it is inherently Greek.

Moreover, with respect to the charge of emulating the Deinomenids in particular, a claim made on the basis of Douketian foundations, how many non-Deinomenids founded cities? While Douketios' actions as a founder do have parallels to those of Hieron, for example,¹⁰⁷ these parallels are not exclusive. A person from a group that was established before the colonial presence who makes use of some of the colonizers' social forms for her/his own purposes is not an appropriate candidate for the label, "Hellenized," especially when those adapted forms are used to establish independence or at least self-representation. In the instance of Douketios, this case is even stronger because the form he is alleged to have borrowed, that of a *synteleia*, is a type of collective identity which the colonizers never succeeded in adopting for themselves; even despite Hermocrates' best efforts to unify all the Greek-speaking islanders under the banner of *Sikeliotas* in the face of the Athenian attack, their communities ultimately remained fragmented.¹⁰⁸ Thus, rather than defining him by the cultural ascendancy implicit in Hellenic emulation, it is more productive and accurate to view Douketios as inhabiting a social world defined by this synthesized "third-space" and mediated by that space's reciprocal influence on

¹⁰⁷ See Pind. *Pythian III* or *Olympian I* for a variety of examples.

¹⁰⁸ Antonaccio 2001, 114; Thuc. 4.61.3, 4.64.3

society.

Toward a Dialectic

All of this paper has not been intended to somehow make a claim that all veneration of the Greek achievements in Sicily is rubbish and that the celebration has in fact been displaced from the Sikels all along. For certainly Greek goods made their way to and through Sicily via trade, and certainly Greek colonists came and settled, diffusing their language, burial customs, religions, material culture; certainly the Roman siege of Syracuse was against an iconically Greek entity, and certainly the remnants of massive temples, most imposing of Sicily's ancient ruins, are of Greek style and dedicated to Grecian gods. The markers of Greek culture lie heavy upon the pages of Sicilian history, and they offer a rich and engaging field for study and discourse. Rather, this paper is meant to make a claim that, even if a people are killed off, enslaved, subsumed, until for many they're all but forgotten, and even if the only definite trace that remains in popular knowledge is that they were the founders of the first cities on the sites of which many modern ones now stand and that their name is indivisible from that of the island itself, these relics of memory fused into modern identity are enough to constitute grounds for a reciprocity of influence and the subsequent formation of distinct, hybrid identity. This creative act in the Sicilian colonies can be seen through the model of the production of "third-space" in colonial contexts and through the way in which this social space is built into the reciprocity of the socio-spatial dialectic.

While we are revisiting Bhabha, one last point must be made about this

system of hybrid identity production. Fitzjohn relates that “third-space” is defined as being occupied on the “*edges*” of the two traditions of which it is composed.¹⁰⁹ I, however, would challenge this notion that the created space is occupied on the margins of the colonial process. On the contrary, in its immediacy in architectural forms, in funerary contexts, in place names and locations, and in its influence on the wider, mythic self-imagination, this place of creation is very much in the midst of things. As a result, a culture arises that contains all the complexities of what it means to be Sicilian and that goes beyond either Sikel or Greek identity. To close with a Plautus quote that perhaps sums this creation of a hybrid identity up best,

“Hoc argumentum graecissat, tamen non atticissat, verum sicilissat.”¹¹⁰

“That argument is Greek, though it is not Attic, but truly Sicilian.”

While Plautus’ statement is couched in terms of Greekness, he captures the sense that something different was going on in Sicily, that being “Sicilian” was an identity that couldn’t be accounted for by simply checking the box marked “Greek.” I hope that, with this paper, I have at least begun to present a looking glass through which the colonial past of Sicily—and, indeed, any colonized place—may be reconsidered. I believe that the material culture has a great deal more left to tell us about the intricacies of the past, and I hope that we may be always willing to listen with minds fully open.

Epilogue

¹⁰⁹ Fitzjohn 2007, 219; emphasis mine.

¹¹⁰ Plautus, *Menaechmi*, prologue 11-12; qtd. in Antonaccio 2001, translation mine.

Having spent so much time poring over volumes old and new in several languages and so many hours scribbling notes, writing, unwriting, rewriting, and editing, not to mention wearing tracks in the creaky floor of my long-suffering room-mates' and my old flat with all my pacing, I would like to offer some explanation for how I came to this topic. As my two in-text pictures and some of my descriptions suggest, I have spent some time in Sicily, both in classrooms and out in the field, experiencing the lingering effects of the ancient Greek presence firsthand. That junior semester abroad at Duke's Intercollegiate Center for Classical Studies in Catania was my first serious engagement with Greek colonization and with ancient Sicily in general, and is the undeniable catalyst for what became this thesis. As I was wandering those sites of ancient stonework overgrown with brambles, taking notes for tests and analyses of the Doric order and the alignment of *agorai*, I began to be nagged by a familiar curiosity. Maybe this tendency arises from my upbringing in the United States' Southwest where countless canyons hide crumbling cliff dwellings and exposed rock art and where arrowheads and potsherds litter the lonely tops of arid plateaus; whatever the case, I found myself wondering about the people who lived in the area before the Greek colonists arrived. This curiosity was cemented by my class' fieldtrip to the site of Morgantina, a place that captivated me beyond any other Greek settlement I had visited. The beauty and melancholy, the mystery and mystique drifting through those ridgetops on that late autumn day invited a deeper seeking of those questions about the past. I hope that I have begun to do justice to that inspiration.

If asked what I would like to see happen with future research on the

history of ancient Sicily, my first answer would be that I would like to see new work conducted on old information. I believe that a reevaluation of much of the previously published material in the light of a more reciprocal view of the mutability of cultural assignments and the power of this reciprocity to create hybridity would have a tremendous potential impact on the understanding of the island's social history. I acknowledge that the state of our knowledge is, and will forever remain, incomplete, and that this incompleteness gives rise to great challenges in reconstructing the full story of the past, but I believe this goal of fullness is one toward which we must tend. Until we do our best to account for all the voices involved in the shaping of reality, "history" will be only a husk where there once lay a field.

Acknowledgements

My deepest thanks go always to my parents for their incredible and unflinching love and support in everything I do. I could never have completed this project, or much of anything else in my life, without both their guidance and their willingness to listen. In the instance of this paper, special thanks go to my mom for answering random Italian grammar questions and particularly for helping me slog through Zamboni's heroic defiance of punctuation.

In broad academic paeon, Macalester College has been a tremendous influence, shaping the outcome of this paper before I even realized I would be writing it. Every experience I've had here, from my time in the Pluralism and Unity program to hours pondering peyotism as hybridity for Psychological Anthropology to sorting through the socio-spatial dialectic in Urban Social Geography this spring, have had a larger role than I often realized in forming who I now am at the end of my senior year, and that's not even taking a single Classics experience into account. Of course, all of that bookwork and all of those lectures aren't worth much of anything if one doesn't have brilliant and engaging peers to foster the enriching dialogue that is so crucial to a complete learning experience. I owe them all a debt of gratitude.

Narrowing the aperture of my gaze, I can say for certain that this paper would never have been even a twinkle in my mind's eye without all of the incredible Classics professors I've had the opportunity to work with. Going back to the beginning, I have great gratitude and affection for Joe Rife for getting me hooked on Classics and proving to me that I was a major before I had even

realized it myself. Even if I was the only person who didn't get to pick my own Greek name in Elementary Greek. I guess being called Πάυ all that time grew on me, after all. To Nanette Goldman I owe far more than a heightened appreciation of Aesop. Her kindness and warmth were always comforting and enlivening, and her passion for and excellence in the study of language is an inspiration. My thanks go as well to Mireille Lee for introducing me to the practice of iconographic analysis of material goods, lessons that I have been able to carry into visual analysis in other disciplines. Corby Kelly gave me a new appreciation of the art of translation, making me see the benefit in slackening my white-knuckled grip on literalism. Plus, knowing Lucan gives me extra social capital.

My experience with excellent Classics professors isn't limited to time spent on Macalester's turf. I also had the great privilege of being a student of the totally excellent team of Matt Panciera and Nigel Nicholson during a junior semester abroad at Duke's ICCS program in Catania, Sicily. It is this duo to whom I undeniably owe my love of Sicilian Classics and to whom this paper owes its first inspirations. I am particularly grateful to Nigel for invaluable secondary source suggestions when I was beginning this thesis. I just hope Pindar likes it. I have a funny feeling he wouldn't.

Completing my Classics roll call are the two professors who have devoted hours of their time overseeing this thesis and whipping it into shape. I've been fortunate to have had many conversations with my adviser, Andy Overman, in his office, ruminating over old ideas, philosophizing, opining, improvising new ideas, and generally brainstorming this thesis into being. These conversations helped

inform much of this paper's course, and I am deeply thankful for the inspiration. Beth Severy-Hoven, Classics chair and my de facto second adviser, has been an incredible help throughout the entirety of the process, from encouraging me to propose an Honors Project in the spring of my junior year to returning a heavily annotated copy of my penultimate draft almost immediately upon receipt of it. I am also profoundly grateful to Beth for refusing to settle for anything less than my best effort on this project. Her involvement and dedication consistently exceeded my expectations. Without either one of these mentors, this paper could never have been what it is. The faults that remain are entirely my own.

Moving out of the Classics department, I have two final professors to thank for their immediate importance to the formation of this paper. The first is Brett Wilson. His perspectives on my paper at my defense gave me a lens through which to see how this thesis might be perceived outside the field of Classics, as well as insightful suggestions for improvement. Outside of this official panel duty, his willingness to always make time to chat with me when I would drop by his office, whether about grad school, thesis-writing, or the elusive cornerstone of the cosmos, was a tremendous support throughout the school year. I also want to thank Dan Trudeau of Geography. Without the inspiration of his lessons about the importance and relevance of geography in everyday life and human societies at large—an inspiration reinforced by his incredible passion for teaching his subject—I would have been at a much greater loss for how to structure and frame my arguments.

Lastly, my thanks go to my roommate, Ethan Forsgren, for tolerating

months of musty books and scattered articles clogging the arteries of our postage-stamp apartment and always managing to still be up for making some late-night music; and to Yui Hashimoto for her absolutely boundless love and support in everything from long walks in the evenings to proof-reading all the many incarnations of this paper. I don't know where I'd be right now without them. Probably running half-feral through the stacks.

APPENDIX:

Diodoros Sikelos on the Sikels During and Near the Time of Douketios

11.68.1

Sikel allies called to help the Syracusans oust Thrasybylos . . .

οἱ δὲ Συρακόσιοι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον μέρος τῆς πόλεως κατέλαβον τὴν ὀνομαζομένην Τύχην, ἐκ ταύτης δὲ ὀρμώμενοι πρεσβευτὰς ἀπέστειλαν εἰς Γέλαν καὶ Ἀκράγαντα καὶ Σελινοῦντα, πρὸς δὲ τούτοις εἰς Ἴμέραν καὶ πρὸς τὰς τῶν Σικελῶν πόλεις τὰς ἐν τῇ μεσογείῳ κειμένας, ἀξιοῦντες κατὰ τάχος συνελθεῖν καὶ συνελευθερῶσαι τὰς Συρακούσας.

And the Syracusans seized the first part of the city, the so-called Tuche, and, hastening from this place, they sent off ambassadors into Gela, Akragas, and Selinunte, and, in addition these, into Himera and to the cities of the Sikels lying in the inland, expecting them to quickly come together and help liberate Syracuse.

11.76.3

Douketios moves against Katane

ἄμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις Δουκέτιος μὲν ὁ τῶν Σικελῶν ἡγεμὼν, χαλεπῶς ἔχων τοῖς τὴν Κατάνην οἰκοῦσι διὰ τὴν ἀφαίρεσιν τῆς τῶν Σικελῶν χώρας, ἐστράτευσεν ἐπ' αὐτούς. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ τῶν Συρακοσίων στρατευσάντων ἐπὶ τὴν Κατάνην, οὗτοι μὲν κοινῇ κατεκληρούχησαν τὴν χώραν καὶ τοὺς κατοικισθέντας ὑφ' Ἰέρωνος τοῦ δυνάστου ἐπολέμουν: ἀντιταχθέντων δὲ τῶν ἐν τῇ Κατάνη καὶ λειφθέντων πλείοσι μάχαις, οὗτοι μὲν ἐξέπεσον ἐκ τῆς Κατάνης, καὶ τὴν νῦν οὔσαν Αἴτην ἐκτήσαντο, πρὸ τούτου καλουμένην Ἴνησαν, οἱ δ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐκ τῆς Κατάνης ὄντες ἐκομίσαντο πολλῶ χρόνῳ τὴν πατρίδα.

At the same time as these happenings, Douketios, leader of the Sikels, angry with those dwelling in Katane because of their seizure of the territory of the Sikels, marched upon them. The Syracusans were likewise marching upon Katane, and together they took the territory for themselves and made war upon the settlers established under the dynast, Hieron. Those in Katane opposed them in arms, but were destroyed in the majority of the battles, and thus they were driven out of Katane. They [the conquerors] then acquired that which is now Aitna, and before had been called Inessa, and they, being originally from Katane, recovered after a long time their native land.

11.78.5

Douketios as oikist, Douketios as conqueror—the founding of Menainon and the seizure of Morgantina

ἄμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις κατὰ τὴν Σικελίαν Δουκέτιος ὁ τῶν Σικελῶν βασιλεὺς, ὠνομασμένος τὸ γένος, ἰσχύων δὲ κατ' ἐκείνους τοὺς χρόνους, Μέναινον μὲν πόλιν ἔκτισε καὶ τὴν σύνεγγυς χώραν τοῖς κατοικισθεῖσι διεμέρισε, στρατευσάμενος δ' ἐπὶ πόλιν ἀξιόλογον Μοργαντῖναν, καὶ χειρωσάμενος αὐτήν, δόξαν ἀπηνέγκατο παρὰ τοῖς ὁμοεθνεῖσι.

At the same time as these happenings, in Sicily, Douketios, the king of the Sikels, notable with respect to his family and strong in those times, founded the city of Menainon and apportioned the surrounding territory to the settlers and, having marched upon the important city of Morgantina and subdued it, took fame for himself among those of his same tribe.

11.88.6

Douketios, man of action: birth of the Sikel synteleia and the founding of Palike

μετὰ δὲ ταῦτα Δουκέτιος ὁ τῶν Σικελῶν ἀφηγούμενος τὰς πόλεις ἀπάσας τὰς ὁμοεθνεῖς πλὴν τῆς Ὑβλας εἰς μίαν καὶ κοινὴν ἤγαγε συντέλειαν, δραστικὸς δ' ὢν νεωτέρων ὠρέγετο πραγμάτων, καὶ παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Σικελῶν ἀθροίσας δύναμιν ἀξιόλογον τὰς Μένας, ἣτις ἦν αὐτοῦ πατρίς, μετόπισεν εἰς τὸ πεδῖον, καὶ πλησίον τοῦ τεμένους τῶν ὀνομαζομένων Παλικῶν ἔκτισε πόλιν ἀξιόλογον, ἣν ἀπὸ τῶν προειρημένων θεῶν ὠνόμαζε Παλικήν.

During these events, Douketios, the commander of the Sikels, lead all the cities of the same tribe except Hybla into one and a common civic company. Being energetic, he was reaching for new deeds and, having mustered from the confederacy of Sikels a notable army, he resettled Menai, which was his native land, on the plain; neighboring the precinct, he founded the notable city of the so-called Palikoi, which because of the aforementioned gods he named Palike.

11.90.1-2

Palike prospers, Palike perishes

ὁ γὰρ Δουκέτιος τὴν Παλικὴν κτίσας καὶ περιλαβὼν αὐτὴν ἀξιολόγῳ τείχει, κατεκληρούχησε τὴν ὁμορὸν χώραν. συνέβη δὲ τὴν πόλιν ταύτην διὰ τὴν τῆς χώρας ἀρετὴν καὶ διὰ τὸ πλῆθος τῶν οἰκητόρων ταχεῖαν λαβεῖν αὔξησιν.

Douketios, having founded Palike and laid it round with a notable wall, seized the bordering territory. It came to this city, through the excellence of the land and the multitude of the inhabitants, to have rapid growth.

2] οὐ πολὺν δὲ χρόνον εὐδαιμονήσασα κατεσκάφη, καὶ διέμεινεν ἀοίκητος μέχρι τῶν καθ' ἡμᾶς χρόνων: περὶ ὧν τὰ κατὰ μέρος ἀναγράφομεν ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις

χρόνοις.

2] Having prospered no long time, it was razed, remaining uninhabited even unto our own times. Concerning these things, we shall write them in turn with their proper times.

11.91.1-4

ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων Δουκέτιος [μὲν] ὁ τῶν Σικελῶν ἔχων τὴν ἡγεμονίαν Αἴτην μὲν κατελάβετο, τὸν ἡγούμενον αὐτῆς δολοφονήσας, εἰς δὲ τὴν Ἀκραγαντίνων χώραν ἀναζεύξας μετὰ δυνάμεως Μότυον φρουρούμενον ὑπὸ τῶν Ἀκραγαντίνων ἐπολιόρησε: τῶν δὲ Ἀκραγαντίνων καὶ Συρακοσίων ἐπιβοηθησάντων, συνάψας μάχην καὶ προτερήσας ἐξήλασεν ἀμφοτέρους ἐκ τῶν στρατοπέδων.

Douketios, holding the leadership of the Sikels, seized Aitna, having treacherously slain its leader, and, having moved into the land of the Akragantines with his army, besieged Motyon, which was being held as outpost by the Akragantines. Having joined battle and been proven stronger, he drove both out from their camps.

2] καὶ τότε μὲν τοῦ χειμῶνος ἐνισταμένου διεχωρίσθησαν εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν, οἱ δὲ Συρακόσιοι τὸν στρατηγὸν Βόλκωνα, τῆς ἥττης αἴτιον ὄντα καὶ δόξαντα λάθρα συμπράττειν τῷ Δουκετίῳ, καταδικάσαντες ὡς προδότην ἀπέκτειναν. τοῦ θέρους δὲ ἀρχομένου στρατηγὸν ἕτερον κατέστησαν, ᾧ δύναμιν ἀξιόλογον δόντες προσέταξαν καταπολεμῆσαι Δουκέτιον.

2] Then, with winter setting in, they dispersed to their homes, and the Syracusans, having judged the general Bolkon as being at fault for the defeat and for having planned secretly to collaborate with Douketios, executed him as a traitor. When

the warm season was beginning, they each established their own general, to whom, giving a notable army, they gave the enjoiner to subdue Douketios.

3] οὗτος δὲ πορευθεὶς μετὰ τῆς δυνάμεως κατέλαβε τὸν Δουκέτιον στρατοπεδεύοντα περὶ τὰς Νομάς: γενομένης δὲ παρατάξεως μεγάλης, καὶ πολλῶν παρ' ἀμφοτέροις πιπτόντων, μόγις Συρακόσιοι βιασάμενοι τοὺς Σικελοὺς ἐτρέψαντο, καὶ κατὰ τὴν φυγὴν πολλοὺς ἀνεΐλον. τῶν δὲ διαφυγόντων οἱ πλείους μὲν εἰς τὰ φρούρια τῶν Σικελῶν διεσώθησαν, ὀλίγοι δὲ μετὰ Δουκετίου τῶν αὐτῶν ἐλπίδων μετέχειν προείλοντο.

3] Thus having been provided with an army, he caught Douketios marching near Nomae. With a great battle line arranged, and many falling on both sides, the Syracusans routed the Sikels, and took many in flight. Of those fleeing, the majority were preserved in the strongholds of the Sikels, and few chose to share their hopes with Douketios.

4] ἅμα δὲ τούτοις πραπτομένοις Ἀκραγαντῖνοι τὸ Μότυον φρούριον κατεχόμενον ὑπὸ τῶν μετὰ Δουκετίου Σικελῶν ἐξεπολιόρκησαν, καὶ τὴν δύναμιν ἀπαγαγόντες πρὸς τοὺς Συρακοσίους νενικηκότας ἤδη κοινῇ κατεστρατοπέδευσαν. Δουκέτιος δὲ διὰ τὴν ἦτταν τοῖς ὅλοις συντριβεῖς, καὶ τῶν στρατιωτῶν αὐτὸν τῶν μὲν καταλειπόντων, τῶν δ' ἐπιβουλευόντων, εἰς τὴν ἐσχάτην ἦλθεν ἀπόγνωσιν.

Together with these actions, the Akragantines besieged Motyon which was being held down as fort by the Sikels under Douketios leading off an army to the already-victorious Syracusans, they marched upon it in common. Douketios, having been obliterated through the loss of the whole, and with many soldiers leaving him, and many planning to, came to the farthest edge of despair.

11.92.1-4 *Douketios sneaks into Syracuse as a suppliant—and is spared! He gets shipped off to Corinth and told to stay there until he dies, an effort to keep his hands out of the Sicilian cookie jar.*

τέλος δὲ θεωρῶν τοὺς ὑπολοίπους φίλους μέλλοντας αὐτῷ τὰς χεῖρας προσφέρειν, φθάσας αὐτοὺς καὶ νυκτὸς διαδράς ἀφίππευσεν εἰς τὰς Συρακούσας. ἔτι δὲ νυκτὸς οὕσης παρῆλθεν εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν τῶν Συρακοσίων, καὶ καθίσας ἐπὶ τῶν βωμῶν ἰκέτης ἐγένετο τῆς πόλεως, καὶ ἑαυτὸν τε καὶ τὴν χώραν ἧς ἦν κύριος παρέδωκε τοῖς Συρακοσίοις.

Finally seeing his remaining supporters intending to bear their hands on him, having evaded them and run through the night, he snuck into Syracuse. It still being night, he went into the agora of the Syracusans. Having sat upon the altars, he became a suppliant of the city, and both himself and the territory over which he was lord he gave to the Syracusans.

2] τοῦ δὲ πλήθους διὰ τὸ παράδοξον συρρέοντος εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν, οἱ μὲν ἄρχοντες συνήγαγον ἐκκλησίαν καὶ προέθηκαν βουλὴν περὶ τοῦ Δουκετίου τί χρὴ πράττειν.

With the masses flowing into the agora on account of the spectacle, the leaders called together an assembly and established a council concerning Douketios and what it was necessary to do.

3] ἔνιοι μὲν οὖν τῶν δημηγορεῖν εἰωθότων συνεβούλευον κολάζειν ὡς πολέμιον καὶ περὶ τῶν ἡμαρτημένων τὴν προσήκουσαν ἐπιθεῖναι τιμωρίαν: οἱ δὲ χαριέστατοι τῶν πρεσβυτέρων παριόντες ἀπεφαίνοντο σώζειν τὸν ἰκέτην, καὶ τὴν τύχην καὶ τὴν νέμεσιν τῶν θεῶν ἐντρέπεσθαι: δεῖν γὰρ σκοπεῖν οὐ τί παθεῖν ἄξιός ἐστι Δουκέτιος, ἀλλὰ τί πρέπει πράξαι Συρακοσίοις: ἀποκτεῖναι γὰρ τὸν πεπτωκότα τῆ

τύχη μὴ προσήκον, σώζειν δ' ἄμα τὴν πρὸς τοὺς θεοὺς εὐσέβειαν καὶ τὸν ἰκέτην ἄξιον εἶναι τῆς τοῦ δήμου μεγαλοψυχίας.

Some of those went to blow hot air in assembly advised he be punished as an enemy and the fitting retribution for his transgressions be delivered. The more gracious of the council members present desired to save the suppliant, and to preserve reverence for Fortune and the retribution of the gods. For it was fitting to seek not what Douketios was deserving to suffer, but what was best to do for the Syracusans. To slay the fallen one of Fortune was not suitable, but to preserve just reverence toward the gods and to spare the suppliant was worthy of the great-heartedness of the deme.

4] ὁ δὲ δῆμος ὥσπερ τινὶ μιᾷ φωνῇ σώζειν πάντοθεν ἔβόα τὸν ἰκέτην. Συρακόσιοι μὲν οὖν ἀπολύσαντες τῆς τιμωρίας τὸν Δουκέτιον ἐξέπεμψαν εἰς τὴν Κόρινθον, καὶ ἐνταῦθα προστάξαντες καταβιοῦν τὴν ἱκανὴν αὐτῷ χορηγίαν συναπέστειλαν.

The deme, just as in one voice from all side, shouted to save the suppliant. The Syracusans thus having absolved punishment sent Douketios away to Corinth and, having enjoined him to end his days there, dispatched an adequate allowance with him.

12.8.1-3

κατὰ δὲ τὴν Σικελίαν Συρακοσίοις πρὸς Ἀκραγαντίνους συνέστη πόλεμος διὰ τοιαύτας αἰτίας. Συρακόσιοι καταπολεμήσαντες Δουκέτιον δυνάστην τῶν Σικελῶν, καὶ γενόμενον ἰκέτην ἀπολύσαντες τῶν ἐγκλημάτων, ἀπέδειξαν αὐτῷ τὴν τῶν Κορινθίων πόλιν οἰκητήριον.

In Sicily, there was war with the Syracusans toward the Akragantines because of

these very causes. The Syracusans, having beaten in war Douketios, dynast of the Sikels, and freed him from punishments when he had become a suppliant, gave to him the city of Corinth as home.

2] οὗτος δὲ ὀλίγον χρόνον μείνας ἐν τῇ Κορίνθῳ τὰς ὁμολογίας ἔλυσε, καὶ προσποιησάμενος χρησμὸν ὑπὸ θεῶν αὐτῷ δεδόσθαι κτίσαι τὴν Καλὴν Ἀκτὴν ἐν τῇ Σικελίᾳ, κατέπλευσεν εἰς τὴν νῆσον μετὰ τινῶν οἰκητόρων: συνεπελάβοντο δὲ καὶ τῶν Σικελῶν τινες, ἐν οἷς ἦν καὶ Ἀρχωνίδης ὁ τῶν Ἑρβιταίων δυναστεύων. οὗτος μὲν οὖν περὶ τὸν οἰκισμὸν τῆς Καλῆς Ἀκτῆς ἐγίνετο.

Thus having remained a small while in Corinth, he [Douketios] broke the former agreement, and, claiming an oracle had been given him to found Kale Akte in Sicily, he sailed into the island with some settlers. Some from the Sikels joined them, among whom was Archonides, the one holding power in Herbite. Thus came about the foundation of Kale Akte.

3] Ἀκραγαντῖνοι δὲ ἅμα μὲν φθοноοῦντες τοῖς Συρακοσίοις, ἅμα δ' ἐγκαλοῦντες αὐτοῖς ὅτι Δουκέτιον ὄντα κοινὸν πολέμιον διέσωσαν ἄνευ τῆς Ἀκραγαντίνων γνώμης, πόλεμον ἐξήνεγκαν τοῖς Συρακοσίοις.

The Akragantines, being angry with the Syracusans and calling them out because they spared Douketios, their common enemy, without the knowledge of the Akragantines, brought war unto the Syracusans.

12.29.1

ἐπὶ δὲ τούτων κατὰ τὴν Σικελίαν Δουκέτιος μὲν ὁ γεγονώς τῶν Σικελικῶν πόλεων ἡγεμὼν τὴν τῶν Καλακτίνων πατρίδα κατέστησε, καὶ πολλοὺς εἰς αὐτὴν οἰκίζων οἰκῆτορας ἀντεποιήσατο μὲν τῆς τῶν Σικελῶν ἡγεμονίας, μεσολαβηθεὶς δὲ νόσῳ

τὸν βίον κατέστρεψε.

During these events, in Sicily, Douketios, again leader of the Sikel cities, established the native land of the Kalaktians, and settling many inhabitants in it, he again lay claim to the leadership of the Sikels. Having being seized in the midst by illness, he plowed his life under.

Greek Sourced From:

Diodorus Siculus. *History*. In *Perseus Digital Library*. Gregory R. Crane, Editor-in-Chief. Tufts University. 5 Feb 2010. < <http://www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/text?doc=Perseus%3atext%3a1999.01.0083>>. Accessed 3 May 2010.

Bibliography

- Adamesteanu, Dinu. "Greeks and Natives in Basilicata." *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*. ed. J.-P. Descoedres. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Agostiniani, Luciano. *Iscrizioni Anelleniche di Sicilia: le iscrizioni elime*. Firenze: L.S. Olschki, 1977.
- Albanese-Procelli, Rosa Maria. "Greeks and indigenous people in eastern Sicily: forms of interaction and acculturation." *Early Societies in Sicily: new developments in archaeological research*. Robert Leighton, ed. London: Acadia, 1996.
- Antonaccio, Carla. "Ethnicity and Colonization." *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Irad Malkin, ed. Center for Hellenic Studies: Cambridge, 2001.
- Antonaccio, Carla M. "Hybridity and the Cultures within Greek Culture". *The Cultures within Greek Culture*. Carol Dougherty & Leslie Kurke, eds. Cambridge, 2003. pp. 57-74.
- Antonaccio, Carla M., and Neils, Jenifer. "A New Graffito from Archaic Morgantina." *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*. Bd. 105. 1995. pp. 261-277.
- Bell, Malcom III; Holloway, R. Ross. "Excavations at Morgantina, 1980-1985: Preliminary Report XII." *American Journal of Archaeology*. Vol. 92, No. 3. Jul, 1988. pp. 313-342.
- Cosgrove, Denis. "Geography is Everywhere: culture and symbolism in human landscapes." *Horizons in Human Geography*. eds. D. Gregory and Walford. pp. 118-135. Totowa, NJ: Barnes and Noble Books, 1989.
- Diodoros Sikelos. *Library*. Vol. IV. C.H. Oldfather, ed. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, Ltd, 1946. Reprint, 1961.

- Domínguez, Adolfo. *La Colonización Griega en Sicilia: Griegos, Idígenas, y Púnicos en la Sicilia Arcaica: interacción y aculturación*. Oxford: British Archaeological Reports, 1989.
- Dunbabin, T.J. *The Western Greeks*. Oxford University Press: Oxford, 1948. Reprint, 1968.
- Finley, Moses I. *A History of Sicily, Vol 1: Ancient Sicily to the Arab Conquest*. Viking Press: New York, 1961.
- Fitzjohn, Matthew. "Equality in the Colonies." *World Archaeology*. Vol. 39, No. 2. 2007. pp. 215–228.
- Guzzo, P. "Myths and archaeology in South Italy." *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*. J.-P. Descoeudres, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990. pp. 131-41.
- Holm, Adolf. *Storia della Sicilia nell'Antichità*. Vol. 1. trans. G. B. dal Lago and Vitt. Graziadei. Torino: C. Clausen, 1896.
- Johnston, Alan. "Greek Colonists in Sicily," review of Dominguez 1989. *The Classical Review*. New Series, Vol. 42, No. 2. 1992. pp. 357-358.
- Luraghi, Nino. *Tirannidi arcaiche in Sicilia e Magna Grecia : da Panezio di Leontini alla caduta dei Dinomenidi*. Firenze: L.S. Olschki, 1977.
- Lyons, C.L. "Sikel Burials at Morgantina: Defining Social and Ethnic Identity in Early Societies." *Sicily: New Developments in Archaeological Research*. Robert Leighton, ed. London: Acadia, 1996. pp. 177-188.
- Maniscalco, Laura, and Brian E. McConnell. "The Sanctuary of the Divine Palikoi (Rochella di Mineo, Sicily): Fieldwork from 1995 to 2001." *American Journal of*

- Archaeology*. Vol. 107, No. 2. Apr, 2003. pp. 145-180.
- Orsi, Paolo. "Il necropoli siculo di Pantalica." *Monumenti Antichi*. Roma: 1912.
- Pace, Biaggio. *Arte e Civiltà Della Sicilia Antica*. Roma: 1935.
- Ridgway, David. "The First Western Greeks and Their Neighbours." *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*. ed. J.-P. Descoedres. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.
- Rizzo, Francesco. *La Repubblica di Siracusa nel Momento di Ducezio*. Palermo: 1970.
- Soja, Edward W. "The Socio-Spatial Dialectic." *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*. Vol. 70, No. 2. (Jun., 1980). pp. 207-225. JSTOR. DeWitt Wallace Library, Macalester College, Saint Paul, MN.
<<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0004-5608%28198006%2970%3A2%3C207%3ATSD%3E2.0.CO%3B2-Y>>.
- Sjöqvist, Erik. *Sicily and the Greeks: studies in the interrelationship between the indigenous populations and the Greek colonists*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1973.
- Thucydides. *History of the Peloponnesian War*. Vol. III. Charles Forster Smith, ed. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann, Ltd, 1921. Reprint, 1966.
- Trendall, A.D. "Archaeology in Sicily and South Italy: 1958-1960". *Archaeological Reports*. No. 7. 1960 - 1961. pp. 36-53.
- Van Buren, A.W. "Newsletter From Rome." *American Journal of Archaeology*. Vol. 57, No. 3. Jul, 1953. pp. 211-218.
- Watkins, Calvert. "Greece In Italy Outside Rome." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*. Vol. 97: Greece in Rome: Influence, Intergration, Resistance. 1995. pp.

35-50.

Williams, Michael. "The Colonization of Australia—An Aboriginal Perspective." *Greek Colonists and Native Populations*. J.-P. Descoedres, ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1990.

Wilson, R.J.A. "Archaeology in Sicily, 1977-1981." *Archaeological Reports*. No. 28. 1981 – 1982. pp. 84-105.

Wilson, R.J.A. "Archaeology in Sicily, 1982-87." *Archaeological Reports*. No. 34. 1987 – 1988. pp. 105-150.

Zamboni. "Il Siculo." *Popoli e Civiltà dell'Italia Antica: vol VI, Lingue e Dialetti*. ed. Aldo Prodocimi. Roma: 1978.