

“Promiscuous Nations, Easily Shifting, and Easily Admitting New Commers”: πολιτογραφίαι, Manipulation of the Civic Body and Multiple Citizenships in Deinomenid Sicily

*Davide Amendola**

Scuola Superiore Meridionale di Napoli

ORCID: 0000-0003-3316-8371

DOI: 10.54103/milanoup.292.c752

ABSTRACT:

This paper explores the notion of *politographia* and its role in addressing central questions of Greek citizenship. To support Pollux’ claim that *politographein* was originally coined by the historian Philistus of Syracuse, two significant episodes in fifth-century Sicily are examined: the refoundation of Syracuse by Gelon in 485 and the resettlement of Himera by Theron in 476 BCE. Through a close analysis of Diodorus’ account and parallel sources, the discussion focuses on the social and political implications of the restructuring of citizen bodies imposed by tyrants, including the admission of new members or the expulsion of existing ones, as well as the impact of these processes on *polis* membership.

KEYWORDS: *politographia*, naturalisation, Sicily, *misthophoroi*, *tyrannoi*

1. Sicilian instability and the emergence of *politographia*

In his account of the assembly debate between Nicias and Alcibiades in the lead-up to the Athenian expedition to Sicily in the spring of 415, Thucydides has Alcibiades famously commenting on the loose linkage between land, *polis* and people among Western Greeks: “it is only with a mixed rabble [ὄχλοις... ξυμμείκτοις] that the cities there are populous [πολυανδροῦσιν], and changes and accessions in the body of their citizens [πολιτῶν] are easy”.¹ The precise

* This paper develops from work undertaken within the project *Politografie nel mondo greco di età classica ed ellenistica*, conducted by the research unit of the Scuola Normale Superiore of Pisa—directed by Anna Magnetto—as part of the PRIN 2020 “*Sharing in the Community*”: *Citizenship and Society in the Greek World (VII-II century BC)*. I am grateful to the organisers of the final conference “*Sharing in the polis*”: *Citizenship and Forms of Civic Participation in the Greek*

meaning of this passage remains a matter of considerable debate. One perceptive scholiast, for instance, explained it by suggesting that Alcibiades was alluding to the tendency of Sicilian *poleis* to “admit foreigners and exiles into the citizen body with relative ease”—or, at any rate, with greater ease than the proverbial *avarice grecque* regarding citizenship would permit.² Personally, I am inclined to favour the *lectio singularis* πολιτῶν on account of some parallel passages where the phrase occurs, but this textual issue, which, in turn, raises a deeper historical question, is best left open.³

However one chooses to interpret the passage, the broader thrust of Alcibiades’ argument is unmistakable. His speech advocates the invasion of Sicily by drawing attention to large-scale demographic change and political instability as defining features of the western Mediterranean *apoikiai*; yet he does so by articulating concerns rooted in the core regions of the Greek world, above all mainland Greece and the Aegean. Implicitly, Alcibiades was also highlighting that the Sicilian *poleis* may have followed a different trajectory from their mainland counterparts in handling key aspects of *polis* membership as the primary form of social and political organisation—most notably citizenship and landownership.⁴ In other words, the underlying suggestion was that Western Greeks had not developed the strong nexus between population, land, and

World, Michele Faraguna and Donatella Erdas, as well as to the participants on that occasion, for their stimulating comments and suggestions. Unless otherwise indicated, all dates are BCE. The quotation is taken from T. Hobbes, *Eight Bookes of the Peloponnesian Warre Written by Thucydides the Sonne of Olorus Interpreted with Faith and Diligence Immediately out of the Greeke*, London 1629, 360.

- 1 Th. 6.17.2-3 Alberti (καὶ τὸν ἐς τὴν Σικελίαν πλοῦν μὴ μεταγιγνώσκετε ὥς ἐπὶ μεγάλην δύναμιν ἐσόμενον. ὄχλοις τε γὰρ ζυμμείκτοις πολυανδρουσιν αἱ πόλεις καὶ ῥαδίας ἔχουσι τῶν πολιτῶν [E: πολιτειῶν ABCFGM] τὰς μεταβολὰς καὶ ἐπιδοχάς). On this much-discussed passage of Alcibiades’ speech, see, among others, Seibert 1982/83, 34; Berger 1992, 9-10; Vattuone 1994, 84-85; Lomas 2006, 95-96; Dreher 2007, 57; and, more recently, De Angelis 2016, 209, note 431 (with further references); Ampolo 2022, 4-7; Péré-Noguès 2022, 79-80, adducing Diodorus’ (13.84.3) description of Akragas’ population at the end of the fifth century as a parallel; Bettalli 2024; on ζυμμεικτος in Thucydides, see Salati 2014/15, esp. 90-98 (with detailed discussion).
- 2 Sch. Φ(MFφC3Pl) Th. 6.17.2c Kleinlogel (ῥαδίας ἔχουσι τῶν πολιτειῶν τὰς μεταβολὰς καὶ ἐπιδοχάς: τὸ ἐγγράφειν ῥαδίως ταῖς πολιτείαις ξένους τε καὶ φυγάδας). For the quotation, see Gauthier 1974.
- 3 Cf. Hdt. 8.75.1 Wilson (τὸν [i.e. Σίκιννον] δὴ ὕστερον τούτων τῶν πρηγμάτων Θεμιστοκλέης Θεσπιέα τε ἐποίησε, ὥς ἐπεδέκοντο οἱ Θεσπιέες πολήτας); Th. 1.2.3 Alberti (μάλιστα δὲ τῆς γῆς ἡ ἀρίστη αἰεὶ τὰς μεταβολὰς τῶν οἰκητόρων εἶχεν). For further discussion of both aspects, see especially Gomme *et al.* 1970, 249-50; Masaracchia 1977; Tosi 2001; Hornblower 2008, 348-49.
- 4 Th. 6.17.3 Alberti (καὶ οὐδεὶς δι’ αὐτὸ ὥς περὶ οἰκείας πατρίδος οὔτε τὰ περὶ τὸ σῶμα ὅπλοις ἐξήρτυται οὔτε τὰ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ νομίμοις [codd.: μονίμοις Doukas] κατασκευαίς). Dreher (2007, 76) observes that the above-average availability of cultivable land (“die überdurchschnittliche Verfügbarkeit von bebaubarem Land”) for the settlement of new citizens decisively contributed to the unusually intense population movements in Sicily and, in turn,

citizenship that lay at the heart of the notion of “sharing in the *polis*” (μετέχειν τῆς πόλεως).⁵ As has been repeatedly observed, that was not merely a rhetorical strategy. The arguments Alcibiades used to persuade an audience traditionally obsessed with its own autochthony rested on a foundation of historical reality corresponding to the island’s troubled history between the sixth and fifth centuries. These arguments must have resonated all the more strongly in the wake of the dissolution of the Chalcidian *polis* of Leontinoi after the Congress of Gela (424), when the *demos* was forcibly dispersed and the δυνατοί moved to Syracuse to receive citizenship there—a development that Athens itself sought to exploit by invoking, not without opportunism, their shared Ionian kinship.⁶

Within Greek political discourse, processes of enlargement, expansion, and restructuring of the citizen body were commonly viewed with suspicion, as they entailed modifications to its formal composition—whether through the admission of new citizens, the expulsion of existing ones, or a combination of both. These phenomena are generally subsumed under the term πολιτογραφία, which scholars have interpreted in various ways—including, just to name a few, simple naturalisation of individuals, expansion of the citizen body (much like ἀναπλήρωσις), “iscrizione in massa di nuovi cittadini” (Asheri 1980, 145), “schriftliche Eintragung in Bürgerlisten” (Dreher 2007, 66; see also Péré-Noguès 2022, 77), “revision of citizenship lists” (Lomas 2006, 106), “archiviazione in un registro generale di cittadinanza” (Savalli 1985, 408).⁷ As far as can be established from the extant literary and documentary evidence, the term πολιτογραφία first appears in the third century, most notably in the second of the two well-known letters sent by Philip V to Larisa (Thessaly), dated to 217 and 215.⁸ Among surviving Greek authors, Diodorus seems to be the earliest

meant that civic status could be acquired or changed more readily than in other regions of the Greek world.

- 5 On this point, see esp. Lomas 2000; Lomas 2006. On issues of citizenship among Western Greeks (both in Sicily and Magna Graecia) in the Archaic and Classical periods, see further Cordano 1992b (civic groups in Greek Sicily); Lazzarini 1995 (*instrumentum publicum*); Ghinatti 2000; Cordano 2001; Lombardo 2004; Cordano 2018; Lazzarini 2018 (Achaean colonies); Lombardo 2018 (Greek cities on the Gulf of Taranto); Erdas 2024 (Magna Graecia).
- 6 On the *stasis* that broke out at Leontinoi after 424, see e.g. Moggi 1976, no. 32, 206-10; Dreher 1986; Berger 1991; Vattuone 1994, 85-89; Vanotti 1995; Frasca 2020b, 279; Intrieri 2020, 68-72.
- 7 On the connection between πολιτογραφία and ἀναπλήρωσις, see esp. Asheri 1966, 25-27, whose remarks on the link between land allotment and the conferral of citizenship in the ancient Greek world (“[l]’aspetto agrario della πολιτογραφία”) are still fundamental; Lonis 1992; see further Mari, Thornton 2016, 149, who understand πολιτογραφία as “la registrazione di nuovi cittadini con la concomitante necessaria, parziale redistribuzione delle terre”. On citizen registers and ancient Greek archives, see Boffo, Faraguna 2021, 151-75.
- 8 *IG IX 2* 517, l. 31: τοὺς λοιποὺς τοὺς ταῖς ὁμοίαις πολιτογραφίας χρωμένους (famously including the Romans); cf. ll. 21, 26, 41-42, 46-47. This crucial epigraphic dossier and its relationship to other Hellenistic *politographiai* have recently been discussed in detail by Mari, Thornton 2016, 149-58, 159-165.

whose text has been transmitted directly and makes use of the term.⁹ The verb *πολιτογραφέω* also occurs once in Polybius' account of the arrival of Athenian and Achaean envoys in Rome to discuss Delos in 159/8, but the passage is only preserved through the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, which necessarily limits its value for terminological inquiry.¹⁰

Although the attestations of *πολιτογραφεῖν* and *πολιτογραφία* are comparatively late, as Ivana Savalli and Martin Dreher have rightly pointed out, the phenomena of expanding and reshaping the citizen body implied by the term are, of course, much older in ancient Greek history.¹¹ Thucydides himself, for instance, in his account of the Leontinian affair of 422, uses the synonym *ἐπιγράφεσθαι* to refer to the enrolment of new *πολίται* at Leontinoi proposed by the *demos* and the connected redistribution of land.¹² In fact, the distinction between natural-born citizens and those admitted to citizenship (*δημοποίητοι*)—in other words, between *politeia* by birth (*γένει* or *φύσει*) and *politeia* by acquisition (*κατὰ ψήφισμα δήμου*)—is clearly attested in a number of literary and documentary sources. Notable examples include Aristotle's *Politics*, with its treatment of the notion of *πολίτης sensu stricto* (*ἀπλῶς*) and the prerogatives attached to that status;¹³ the first speech *Against Stephanus* in the *Corpus Demosthenicum*, where the opposition between *οἱ γένει πολῖται* and *οἱ ποιητοὶ πολῖται* is given particular prominence;¹⁴ and, most significantly, Demosthenes' *Against Aristocrates*, written for an Athenian named Euthycles in 352, in which the discourse of the grant of citizenship plays a central role.¹⁵ The significance of this distinction may be illustrated by recalling that citizenship was not always granted on equal terms (*ἐφ' ἴση καὶ ὁμοίᾳ*), and that citizens admitted by decree could be subject to partial or temporary restrictions—such as limitations, exclusions, or similar

9 On Diodorus' use of *πολιτογραφέω*, see below. For a full discussion, see Appendix, *s.v. politographēō*.

10 Polyb. 32.7.3, with Walbank 1979, 525–26; Savalli 1985, 419–20.

11 Savalli 1985, 396–97; see further Dreher 2007, 66, 75, who notes that the terminology of citizenship commonly used in the Classical and Hellenistic periods is anachronistically applied to earlier historical phases.

12 Th. 5.4.2 Alberti (*ἀπελθόντων Ἀθηναίων ἐκ Σικελίας μετὰ τὴν ξύμβασιν πολίτας τε ἐπεγράψαντο πολλοὺς [scil. the Leontinians] καὶ ὁ δῆμος τὴν γῆν ἐπένει ἀναδάσασθαι*), with Hornblower 1996, 430–31. On the phrase *πολίτας ἐπιγράφεσθαι*, cf. Dreher 2007, 75. On the land redistribution contemplated on that occasion, see D. Erdas' chapter in this volume and Appendix, *s.v. ges anadasmus*.

13 Arist. *Pol.* 3.1.1275a 6–7 Ross (τοὺς μὲν οὖν ἄλλως πῶς τυγχάνοντας ταύτης τῆς προσηγορίας, οἷον τοὺς ποιητοὺς πολίτας, ἀφετέον). Cf. Fröhlich 2016, esp. 105.

14 [Demosth.] 45.78 Dilts (οὐ γὰρ ἄγνωθ' τοῦθ' ὅτι τοῖς μὲν γένει πολίταις ὑμῖν ἰκανόν ἐστι λειτουργεῖν ὡς οἱ νόμοι προστάττουσι, τοὺς δὲ ποιητοὺς ἡμᾶς ὡς ἀποδιδόντας χάριν, οὕτω προσήκει φαίνεσθαι λειτουργοῦντας).

15 Demosth. 23.65, 126, with Zajonz 2022, 267, 456. See further Blok 2017, 50–53; for the rhetorical reconstruction of civic identity in Demosthenes' forensic oratory, see recently Giannadaki 2018.

measures—when compared with citizens of longer standing.¹⁶ For this reason, modern scholarship has often assumed that νεοπολῖται tended to occupy a subordinate position within the civic body, a pattern further attested by numerous accounts in the ancient sources of tensions—if not outright civil strife (*stasis*)—between established citizens (ἀρχαῖοι πολῖται) and the newly enfranchised.¹⁷

In a section of *Onomasticon* Book 3 devoted to citizenship and to such aspects of interstate relations as the reception of foreigners, Pollux associates the verb πολιτογραφεῖν with the terms δημοποίητος and νεοπολίτης, while also explaining that δημοποίητος means “to be awarded citizenship by public decree” (ἐκ δόγματος κοινού πολιτείας τυγχάνειν).¹⁸ According to Pollux, the original use of the term should be traced back to Philistus of Syracuse (*FGrHist* / *BNJ* 556), friend, adviser, officer, and historian of both Dionysius I and Dionysius II.¹⁹ Indirect support for Philistus’ role in introducing the verb may be found in the passages where Diodorus employs πολιτογραφέω: there are seven attestations in total, most of which concern Sicilian affairs—a strikingly high number, considering the verb’s otherwise limited occurrence in the literary sources.²⁰ The view that Diodorus made direct or indirect use of Philistus had already been advanced by Hejnic, who noted that in Books 11–15 the narrative of events in Sicily displays a chronological articulation by summers and winters—a feature widely recognised as distinctive of Philistus’ Σικελικά, and all the more striking in light of his reputation in antiquity as an imitator of Thucydides.²¹ The occurrences of πολιτογραφεῖν in the *Historical Library* may thus serve as an index fossil indicating the occasional dependence of Diodorus on this source in his account of Sicilian affairs down to the death of Dionysius I in 367.²²

It is not my intention to delve here into long-standing—and by now somewhat outdated—*vexatae quaestiones* of *Quellenkritik*, yet I believe that the testimony offered by Pollux concerning Philistus’ coinage of πολιτογραφεῖν must be taken fully seriously. This becomes particularly clear when one considers that,

16 On this point, see e.g. Savalli 1985, 423–27.

17 Cases of civil strife in Magna Graecia and Sicily are collected by Berger 1992; cf. Lintott 1982.

18 Poll. 3.56 Bethe (οἱ δὲ δημοποίητοι, ὅποσοι ἐκ δόγματος κοινού πολιτείας τύχοιεν· τοῦτο δὲ πολιτογραφεῖν Φίλιστος [φύλισκος II] καλεῖ [= *FGrHist* / *BNJ* 556 F 74]· τάχα δ’ ἂν οἱ τοιοῦτοι ὀνομάζοντο νεοπολῖται ὑπὸ τοῦ Πλάτωνος). On the macro-structure of *Onomasticon* Book 3, see König 2016, 305–306. Compare Harp. Δ 29, s.n. δημοποίητος Keaney (ὁ ξένος μὲν ὦν τῇ φύσει, ὑπὸ δὲ τοῦ δήμου πόλιτης γεγενημένος); Hsch. Δ 873, s.n. δημοποίητον Cunningham (ὁ κατὰ ψήφισμα δήμου γεγονὼς πολίτης, ξένος ὦν φύσει).

19 On this point, see also Raffone 2004, 66, note 5; for quotations from Classical authors in Pollux, see e.g. Stroebel 2005. On Philistus, see recently, among others, Bearzot 2002; Pownall 2013.

20 D.S. 11.49.4, 72.3, 86.3; 13.29.2, 97.1; 14.78.6; 19.2.8.

21 Hejnic 1955.

22 On Diodorus and Philistus, see esp. Sanders 1987, 43–71; the use of Philistus in the *Historical Library*, albeit mediated through Timaeus, is also acknowledged by Pearson 1987, 167–91.

in Greek Sicily, the correlation between demographic movement and autocracy was much stronger than in many other parts of the Greek world. Even a brief survey of the ancient evidence reveals that episodes of large-scale forced migration and manipulation of the citizen body in Sicily between the late sixth and third centuries took place largely, albeit not exclusively, as a result of direct political and/or military interventions by *tyrannoi*. Considerable debate persists regarding the relationship between inward and outward population movements and autocratic regimes, as well as the causes and effects of such movements in both Magna Graecia and Sicily.²³ In particular, in a 2007 study on *Bürgerschaft* in Sicily, Martin Dreher has usefully proposed grouping under the general heading of *Bevölkerungsbewegung* at least four different phenomena, not always clearly distinguished in earlier scholarship, which usually occurred under compulsion but could also take place voluntarily: *Ansiedlung*, the settlement of people in a given location; *Aussiedlung*, the displacement of people from their place of residence; *Umsiedlung*, the transfer and resettlement of the same population in a different location; and finally, *Umbesiedlung*, the removal of a population and its replacement by others.²⁴ This picture should be complemented by David Asheri's tripartite categorisation of the ways in which pre-existing arrangements were restored and these movements reversed, which distinguishes between the mass return of displaced populations and the subsequent recolonisation or radical refoundation of cities; the reassertion of the old citizen body at the expense of the newcomers, often accompanied by the return of political exiles; and the reintegration of former citizens and exiles on an equal footing with the new settlers.²⁵

Our understanding of these phenomena largely, though not exclusively, depends on Diodorus' narrative and his underlying sources. However, as Kathryn Lomas has noted in her analysis of migration, identity and urban development in Sicily, "it is necessary to move away from the analysis of the historical sources and political motivations in isolation and to attempt to place the actions of tyrants in their material contexts".²⁶ This paper seeks to contribute to the recon-

23 Cf. Th. 1.17 Alberti (οἱ γὰρ ἐν Συκελίᾳ [*scil.* τύραννοι] ἐπὶ πλείστον ἐχώρησαν δυνάμεως), with Hornblower 1991, 51. A number of scholars have addressed such questions in recent years: the main references include Seibert 1979; Seibert 1982/83; Demand 1990; Vattuone 1994; Lomas 2006; and, more recently, Jacquemin 2019; Zizza 2019.

24 Dreher 2007, 57: "Erstens gehört dazu die *Ansiedlung* von Menschen an einem bestimmten Ort. Zweitens haben wir den umgekehrten Vorgang einer *Aussiedlung* vor uns, wenn Menschen ihren Wohnort verlassen. Eine *Aussiedlung* mit einer gezielten *Ansiedlung* derselben Bevölkerung an einem anderen Ort ist als *Umsiedlung* zu bezeichnen. Davon läßt sich wiederum die *Umbesiedlung* unterscheiden als eine Entfernung von Bevölkerung von einem Ort und dessen Wiederbesiedlung mit anderen Menschen. Diese Bevölkerungsbewegungen erfolgen teils freiwillig, teils unter Zwang".

25 Asheri 1980, 154.

26 Lomas 2006, 116; see also, along similar lines, Vattuone 1994, 83-84.

struction of such contexts by examining the social and political implications of population change enforced by tyrants in Greek Sicily during the early Classical period, with particular attention to the enrolment and promotion of immigrant groups such as mercenaries or individuals from displaced populations. Special emphasis will be placed on the question of how this type of “demographic engineering” (as Lomas has termed it) affected notions of citizenship and reshaped civic structures and patterns of *polis* development.

2. Gelon’s manipulation of the Syracusan citizen body (ca. 485 BCE)

Interest in large-scale forced migration arguably began with Hippocrates of Gela (498-91), whose expansion of power in north-eastern Sicily (Zancle, Callipolis, Naxos, Leontinoi) established his city as a hegemonic force, as evidenced by his involvement in Zanclean affairs during the Samian occupation in 494, in the refoundation of Camarina around 490 after its passing under Geloan control—a transfer formalised through the mediation of the Corinthians and the Corcyraeans in the aftermath of Syracuse’s defeat at the battle of Heloros—and in the conquest of the indigenous centre of Ergetion, probably located in the Sicel area around the Hyblaeon Mountains.²⁷ However, as Herodotus shows in the Sicilian *logos* of Book 7, it was his successor Gelon who implemented a more extensive and systematic programme of resettlement after coming to power in Syracuse in 485, possibly in the capacity of a mediator between the contending parties (διαλλακτής or αἰσυμνήτης).²⁸ This position was secured through assistance against the *dēmos* to the ousted *gamoroi*—the landowning order that had been ruling the city for nearly a century—in their efforts to obtain repatriation from the Syracusan *apoikia* of Kasmenai.²⁹

27 Zancle: Hdt. 6.23-24, 7.154.2-3, with Vannicelli, Corcella 2017, 492-93; Camarina: Th. 6.5.3 Alberti (χρόνῳ Ἱπποκράτης ὕστερον Γέλας τύραννος, λύτρα ἀνδρῶν Συρακοσίων αἰχμαλώτων λαβὼν τὴν γῆν τὴν Καμαριναίων, αὐτὸς οἰκιστὴς γενόμενος κατόκισε Καμάριναν), with Hornblower 2008, 298-99; Pi. N. 9.40-42, with Braswell 1998, 123-29; Timae. *FGrHist* / *BNJ* 566 F 18; D.S. 10.59 Cohen-Skalli; Ergetion: Polyaeon. 5.6. See Piccirilli 1973, 58-60, no. 12; Consolo Langher 1988/89 (= 1996, 211-17); Luraghi 1994, 119-86; Mafodda 1996, 24-38; Braccesi 1998, 22-25; Braccesi, Millino 2000, 58-64, 205-207; Millino 2001, 127-40; Stuppia 2006.

28 The chronological indication given by Paus. 6.9.5 (the second year of the 72nd Olympias: 491) is evidently mistaken: cf. Maddoli *et al.* 1999, 241; see further below. On Gelon’s role in his seizure of power at Syracuse, see Luraghi 1994, 286-87; Mafodda 1996, 67-101, esp. 71; Consolo Langher 1997, 7-9; for the origin of the tradition concerning Gelon’s possible appointment as στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ, see Bearzot 1991.

29 On the early fifth-century *stasis* at Syracuse (possibly around 491), see esp. Berger 1992, 35-36; Bravo 1992; Consolo Langher 1997, 3-7; Giangiulio 1998, 109-10 (“una ‘rottura’ strutturale degli assetti bloccati [...] propri delle comunità aristocratico-oligarchiche”); Erdas 2010a; Erdas 2022, 475-76, with further references; cf. Dreher 2007, 73: “die sizilischen Städte

A crucial element in Gelon's consolidation of control over the *polis* was the implementation of a series of military operations, ranging from the construction of fortifications and arsenals to the enlargement of the citizen body through the incorporation of foreign groups, notably Greeks from other Sicilian *poleis* and mercenaries of unspecified origin.³⁰ As for the population of Gelon's homeland, Herodotus notes that half of it was transferred to Syracuse, but his use of the term *ἄστοί*, rather than *πολιῆται*, precludes certainty as to the criteria of selection or the social profile of those transferred, not least because *ἄστοί* may here be little more than a synonym for *πολιῆται*.³¹ In the case of Camarina, by contrast, the entire population was absorbed into Syracuse following the city's rebellion and the subsequent execution of Glaucos of Carystus, the celebrated wrestler installed by Gelon as local ruler in accordance with Hippocrates' mode of control over conquered cities through trusted intermediaries.³² This outcome appears to have been closely connected with the destruction of Camarina by Gelon, which probably ceased to exist before being repopulated for the third time in 461 by Geloans.³³ Other factors may nonetheless have contributed: despite the

waren ausgesprochen landwirtschaftlich geprägt". The account of this enterprise is generally regarded as modelled on the earlier enterprise of Gelon's ancestor Telines, who restored to Gela the exiled members of the ruling elite by resorting to the sacred objects of Demeter and Kore: see most recently Porciani 2024. An early fifth-century fragmentary terracotta votive plaque found in 1960 in Piazza Archimede on Ortygia and depicting the two goddesses has been connected by Shapiro (2002, 93-95, Fig. 12a-c) with Gelon's patronage of their cults in the 480s. Mignosa 2021 has further suggested that Kasmenai may have served as a place of refuge for the ousted *gamoroi* by virtue of privileges previously granted to them, traces of which may be reflected in a fragmentary late sixth-century decree from Palazzolo Acreide, *I.dial. Sicile* I 219 (Arena, *Iscrizioni* I² 76).

30 Herodotus' possible reference to military operations undertaken by Gelon to strengthen Syracuse's defensive system (7.156.1 Wilson: ὁ δὲ τὰς Συρηκούσας ἐκράτυνε) has recently been discussed by Mignosa 2020, 248-51, with further bibliography; see also De Angelis 2016, 185-86. Cf. Vannicelli, Corcella 2017, 493, *ad locum*.

31 Hdt. 7.156.2 Wilson (αἱ δὲ [*i.e.* Syracusae] παρ' αὐτὰ ἀνά τ' ἔδραμον καὶ ἔβλαστον· τοῦτο μὲν γὰρ Καμαριναίους ἅπαντας ἐς τὰς Συρηκούσας ἀγαγὼν πολίητας ἐποίησε, [...] τοῦτο δὲ Γελάων ὑπερημίσεας τῶν ἀστών τῶντ' οἷσι Καμαριναίοισι ἐποίησε), with Vannicelli, Corcella 2017, 494, *ad locum*. On *ἀστός* and the Greek concept of the citizen, see *e.g.* Lévy 1985; Davies 2004, 27; Blok 2017, 162-72; Falco 2024; on the language of citizenship in Herodotus and Thucydides, see recently Frullini 2023.

32 As illustrated by the parallel cases of Scythes and Kadmos of Cos at Zancle and Ainesidemus of Rhodes at Leontinoi: see esp. Luraghi 1994, 130-45, 148-53. On Glaukos of Carystus (Moretti, *Olympionikai* 134), cf. Sch. Aeschin. 3.189 Dilts; see Dunbabin 1948, 416; Luraghi 1994, 150-51, 275-76; Mann 2001, 245-46, 307-308; Dreher 2007, 67: "Wir dürfen vielleicht annehmen, daß Glaukos sich im Dienste Gelons militärisch bewährt hatte"; Fisher 2018, 216, 218.

33 Cf. Hdt. 7.156.2 Wilson: Καμαρίνης δὲ τὸ ἄστυ κατέσκαψε; Th. 6.5.3 Alberti: καὶ αὐθις ὑπὸ Γέλωνος ἀνάστατος γενομένη τὸ τρίτον κατοικήσθη ὑπὸ Γελάων [Dodwell: Γέλωνος codd.]; Pi. O. 5.19; Philist. *FGrHist* / BNJ 556 F 15; Timae. *FGrHist* / BNJ 566 F 19a-b; D.S. 11.76.5. Asheri 1980, 150 points out that the phrase ἀνάστατος γενομένη does not imply the physical destruction of the city, but only "lo sbandamento della *polis* e l'espulsione dell'intera popolazione". The more than 150 lead *tesserae* dating to the mid-fifth century (OR 124; Arena,

introduction of new settlers from Gela at the time of Hippocrates’ refoundation ἐξ ἀρχῆς in the late 490s, Gelon may have been prompted to transfer the entire population to Syracuse by the close relationship between the sub-colony and its mother-city, since Camarina had originally been founded as a Syracusan *apoikia* in 598 and was first depopulated around 552 following a revolt.³⁴

Gelon appears to have pursued a similarly selective policy in other relocations, granting Syracusan citizenship to members of the landowning class while selling the *demos* into slavery, as occurred at both Megara Hyblaea and Euboea (possibly to be identified with Monte San Mauro), a sub-colony of Leontinoi later converted into a Syracusan *phourion*.³⁵ It thus emerges that, despite the emphasis commonly attributed to the Deinomenids on the ethnic opposition between Dorians and Ionians, Gelon treated the populations of both centres in essentially the same manner, reflecting his anti-democratic inclinations, a view famously encapsulated by Herodotus in the tyrant’s characterisation of the *demos* as an “unpleasant housemate” (συνοίκημα ἀχαριτώτατον).³⁶ A comparable pattern in the treatment of the *demos* can be observed in the context of the Leontinian crisis of 422, when the δυνατοί expelled the people and were granted Syracusan citizenship after abandoning their city.³⁷ This parallel may in turn

Iscrizioni II 124-141), most of which were found rolled or folded near the northern foundations of the temple of Athena at Camarina, belong to the third phase in the life of the *polis* and therefore most likely reflect the radical reorganisation of the citizen body undertaken at the city’s re-establishment in 461: cf. Cordano 1992a; Del Monaco 2025; for a brief overview, see also Cecchet 2017, 69-73. Essential references on the history of Camarina include Mattioli 2002; Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen, Ampolo in Hansen, Nielsen 2004, no. 28, 202-205; Cordano 2011; Uggeri 2015; Uggeri 2016.

34 For the conflict between Camarina and Syracuse around the mid-sixth century, cf. Th. 6.5.3 Alberti (ἀναστάτων δὲ Καμαριναίων γενομένων πολέμῳ ὑπὸ Συρακοσίων δι’ ἀπόστασιν); Philist. *FGrHist* / *BNJ* 556 F 5, with Consolo Langher 1988/89 (= 1996, 217-18); Millino 2001, 137, note 45; De Luna 2009, 80-81; Sudano 2016.

35 Hdt. 7.156.3 Wilson (τοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν [*i.e.* the Megarians] παχέας [...] ἀγαγὼν ἐς τὰς Συρηκούσας πολήτας ἐποίησε· τὸν δὲ δῆμον τῶν Μεγαρέων [...] ἀγαγὼν καὶ τούτους ἐς τὰς Συρηκούσας ἀπέδοτο ἐπ’ ἐξαγωγῇ ἐκ Σικελίης. τὸν δὲ τοῦτο καὶ Εὐβοέας τοὺς ἐν Σικελίᾳ ἐποίησε διακρίνας); cf. Str. 10.1.15 Radt (ἣν δὲ καὶ ἐν Σικελίᾳ Εὐβοία, Χαλκιδέων τῶν ἐκεῖ κτίσμα, ἣν Γέλων ἐξανέστησε καὶ ἐγένετο φρούριον Συρακουσίων). On the destruction of Megara Hyblaea and the absorption of its citizenry by Gelon, see Moggi 1976, 112, note 25, who suggests that the term *παχεῖς* may designate Megara’s agrarian aristocracy; Vattuone 1994, 104-106; De Angelis 2003, 66-67; Moggi 2008, 38. On the identification of Euboea with Monte San Mauro, see Frasca 2020a.

36 Hdt. 7.156.3 Wilson (ἐποίησε δὲ ταῦτα τούτους ἀμφοτέρους νομίσας δῆμον εἶναι συνοίκημα ἀχαριτώτατον): on this point, see especially Bruno Sunseri 1980; Seibert 1982/83, 36-37; Luraghi 1994, 300. It has not, to my knowledge, been observed that a connection may exist between Gelon’s *Witz* and the statement about the *demos* attributed to Korax of Syracuse in *Proleg.Rh.*, *RbG* XIV, p. 270.9-10 Rabe (σκοπήσας ὡς ὁ δῆμος ἀστάθμητον καὶ ἄτακτον πέφυκε πρᾶγμα).

37 Th. 5.4.3 Alberti (ὁμολογήσαντες Συρακοσίοις καὶ τὴν πόλιν ἐκλιπόντες καὶ ἐρημώσαντες Συρακούσας ἐπὶ πολιτείᾳ ὄκησαν), with Hornblower 1996, 431. On this episode, see the

suggest that, already after 485, Megarian and Euboean landowners relocated to Syracuse while retaining their holdings in the adjacent *chōra*, which might have been incorporated into Syracusan territory.

The overall nature of this operation has been the subject of considerable scholarly debate: while some have viewed it as a refoundation *sensu stricto*, others—most notably Mauro Moggi—have argued that it should instead be understood as a *συνοικισμός*, the most common form of aggregation and incorporation between *poleis* or autonomous communities in the Archaic and Classical Greek world.³⁸ It is beyond dispute that the absorption of formerly independent entities into a stronger one could, in principle, be described in such terms. However, the *synoikismos* hypothesis may be more readily applicable to Megara and Euboea—which, as noted above, lay sufficiently close to Syracuse to be incorporated into its *chōra*—than to more distant and not-coterminous *poleis* such as Gela and Camarina, located well beyond the Hyblaean area under the military control of the Syracusan *apoikiai* of Akrai and Kasmenai.³⁹ Accordingly, despite significant disagreement in scholarship over the distinction between *synoikismos* and *sympoliteia*, which is decisive for assessing the status of the absorbed communities, the operation carried out at Syracuse by Gelon seems to align more closely with what recent studies have identified as characteristic of the latter rather than the former.⁴⁰

references quoted above.

38 For an interpretation of Gelon's seizure of power as a refoundation of Syracuse, see Dunbabin 1948, 416; Malkin 1987, 96-97; Luraghi 1994, 288-304; Hofer 2000, 84-89; Morgan 2015b, 54-56; on this point, see also below. For synoecism as an alternative reading, not necessarily incompatible with the refoundation hypothesis, see Moggi 1976, 100-114, no. 17, who points to the incorporation of various settlements in Caria by Mausolus in 370-365 as a possible *comparandum* (Str. 13.1.59: Moggi 1976, no. 42); Asheri 1980, 145-46; Consolo Langher 1988/89 (= 1996, 218-29); Consolo Langher 1997, 9-12. Vannicelli, Corcella 2017, 494-95, *ad locum*, observe that Gelon's *Witz* on the *demoi* as a *συνοίκημα ἀχαριτώτατον* may originally have been a paradoxical sympotic quip, which can nonetheless be read as encapsulating the rationale of his large-scale programme of demographic and social engineering—namely, a vast *synoikismos* aimed at minimising the presence of the popular element within the civic body of the newly founded *polis* of Syracuse.

39 On Syracusan expansion into inland south-eastern Sicily from the seventh century onwards, see e.g. Di Vita 1987; Erdas 2006; for the communication routes linking Syracuse and its *chōra* with Camarina and Gela, see Millino 2001, 135-37, with further references.

40 See Müller 2014b, 756, note 19: “[l]a sympoliteie consiste en la fusion de deux ou plusieurs corps civiques, qui aboutit à la création d’une citoyenneté partagée: elle renvoie donc à la fois au phénomène fédéral et à l’absorption d’une ou plusieurs cités par une autre plus importante”. For a detailed overview, see further Piñol-Villanueva 2017, 26-30, who has proposed understanding *sympoliteia* as “the political merging of two or more *poleis* into a common State or *politeia*” and confining *synoikismos* to “the physical aspect of those *sympoliteiai* which contemplated some sort of urban changes” (cf., along similar lines, Walser 2009 and Schuler, Walser 2015); *contra* Moggi 2008 (= 2017, 430, note 44), who follows Robert, Robert 1976, 189 (on the absorption of Kyrbissos into Teos). On Hellenistic *sympoliteiai*, see also, among others, Reger 2004, esp. 148-49, who suggests that in the Hellenistic period *sympoliteia* covered

In addition to the relocations discussed above, Gelon is said to have settled more than 10,000 *misthophoroi* of unspecified origin in his new capital, granting them Syracusan citizenship.⁴¹ This information is preserved by Diodorus in his account of the events following the Syracusan revolt against Thrasybulus in 466/5 and the subsequent collapse of Deinomenid rule, which ultimately led to the restoration of democracy.⁴² After a decree was enacted in 463 stipulating that only the old citizens were eligible to hold magistracies (τὰς δὲ ἀρχὰς ἀπάσας τοῖς ἀρχαίοις πολίταις ἀπένεμον), the mercenaries enfranchised by Gelon—more than 7,000 of whom remained at Syracuse after the fall of the tyranny—were excluded from office, despite retaining their civic status.⁴³ This situation gave rise to factional conflict, which the *neopolitai* eventually lost. A common agreement (κοινὸν δόγμα), enacted by most Sicilian *poleis* in 461 (Syracuse, Gela, Akragas, Selinous, Himera and probably Zancle-Messana), subsequently reversed the population transfers effected earlier in the fifth century by, among other measures, providing for the return of exiles, compelling accommodation with resident alien groups—probably through the confirmation of citizenship previously granted—and allowing the mercenaries still in service, originally hired by the Deinomenids and the Emmenids, to resettle at Zancle-Messana.⁴⁴

both “the ‘federal state’ with shared citizenship arrangements and super-*polis* political institutions” and “the political union of two coterminous *poleis* which could—but did not necessarily—lead ultimately to the disappearance of one of the partners” (though there are also cases in which the rule of coterminousness is violated), and concludes: “while *synoikismos* might implicitly emphasize the physical joining of separate settlements and *sympoliteia* political and citizenship arrangements, in fact the overlap between the two terms was considerable”; Pascual González 2007; Mack 2013.

41 On *misthophoroi* in fifth-century Sicily, see Sinatra 1992; Tagliamonte 1994, 99–102; Millino 2001; Péré-Noguès 2004; Raffone 2004; Bettalli 2013; Tempio 2016; Harris 2020; Péré-Noguès 2022, who refers to the period between the Deinomenid rule and the fall of Dionysius I as “un âge d’or du mercenariat en Sicile”.

42 D.S. 11.72.3 Haillet (τοῦ γὰρ Γέλωνος πλείονας τῶν μυρίων πολιτογραφῆσαντος ξένους μισθοφόρους, ἐκ τούτων περιελείποντο πλείους τῶν ἑπτακισχιλίων κατὰ τοὺς ὑποκειμένους καιροὺς). On the fall of the Deinomenids, see recently Vinci 2013; Sciacchitano 2016.

43 Bettalli 2013, 328: “Se si tralascia la notazione che il 70% di sopravvissuti dopo tanti anni di guerre sembra una percentuale stranamente assai elevata, il dato ha qualche possibilità di essere frutto di una tradizione conservata su calcoli che potrebbero essere stati fatti quando il problema si presentò in tutta la sua impellenza”. As rightly observed by Raffone 2004, 67, note 16, Diodorus’ specification that all magistracies were assigned to the old citizens—identified by some scholars with the *gamoroi*—suggests that these offices had previously also been open to the *xenoi* naturalised by Gelon. On participation in magistracies (ἀρχαί) as a defining feature of citizenship (πολιτεία), see Arist. *Pol.* 3.1.1275a 22–23 Ross (πολίτης δ’ ἀπλῶς οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὀρίζεται μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ μετέχειν κρίσεως καὶ ἀρχῆς), b 17–21 (ὃ γὰρ ἐξουσία κοινωνεῖν ἀρχῆς βουλευτικῆς καὶ κριτικῆς, πολίτην ἤδη λέγομεν εἶναι ταύτης τῆς πόλεως), with Accattino, Curnis 2013, 149–52; Fröhlich 2016, 107–109, 111–16.

44 D.S. 11.76.4–5. On the *koinon dogma* and its implications, Asheri 1980 remains fundamental, viewing it as the expression of simultaneous tendencies towards the restoration of the status quo ante and a de novo refoundation; for more recent discussions, especially with

The conflict between old and new citizens at Syracuse is also famously recalled among the historical *exempla* cited in a passage of Aristotle's *Politics*, in which ethnic heterogeneity is treated as a source of political imbalance and a prelude to *stasis*.⁴⁵ However, some ambiguity remains in the terminology employed by the ancient sources to designate the actual targets of the measures enacted at Syracuse in the second half of the 460s. Aristotle's phrase τοὺς ξένους καὶ τοὺς μισθοφόρους, as indicated by the use of two articles, appears to clearly distinguish the two categories that together constituted the broad group of foreigners admitted by Gelon—namely, the individuals from Gela, Camarina, Megara, and Euboea involved in large-scale population transplants and the thousands of mercenaries made citizens of Syracuse.⁴⁶ The picture offered by Diodorus, instead, is less straightforward: in the narrative regarding the situation at Syracuse after 466 (11.72.3), reference is made in general terms to “aliens enfranchised in Gelon's time” (τοὺς ... ξένους τοὺς ἐπὶ τοῦ Γέλωνος πολιτευθέντας), immediately followed by mention of the foreign mercenaries enrolled at roughly the same moment (πλείονας τῶν μυρίων ...

reference to the evidence that emerges from comparison between Diodorus and the epitome of Sicilian history preserved in *P.Oxy.* IV 665 (IM 63712; *FGrHist* 577 F 1: second century CE) concerning the fate of the mercenaries in the service of the Deinomenids and the Emmenids after the fall of the tyrannies, see Consolo Langher 1988/89 (= 1996, 236-45); Sinatra 1992; Hofer 2000, 169-75; Raffone 2004; Dreher 2012b; Bettalli 2013, 326-330; Tempio 2016. Teegarden 2018 interprets this general settlement as “a multilateral agreement” whose provisions ultimately implied that full citizenship within the participating *poleis* was reserved only to the old citizens, while the “resident *xenoi*” (see below) were granted some sort of limited citizenship status. On whether Diodorus by ἐν τῇ Μεσσηνίᾳ actually means Messenia in the Peloponnese (as accepted, for example, by Green 2006, 149, note 298) or, as seems far more likely, Zankle-Messana, see De Sensi Sestito 1981 (for a possible connection with the events described by Iust. 4.3.1-3); Luraghi 2008, 155; Péré-Noguès 2022, 79; cf. Asheri 1980, 153, who suggests that the mercenaries were probably assigned the *chōra*, though “in condizione giuridica ignota, ma probabilmente inferiore (forse in condizione di metecia)”.

45 Arist. *Pol.* 5.3.1303a 25-b 2 Ross (στασιωτικὸν δὲ καὶ τὸ μὴ ὁμόφυλον, ἕως ἂν συμπνεύσῃ [...] διὸ ὅσοι ἤδη συνοίκους ἐδέξαντο ἢ ἐποίκους, οἱ πλείστοι διεστασίασαν [...] καὶ Συρακούσιοι μετὰ τὰ τυραννικὰ τοὺς ξένους καὶ τοὺς μισθοφόρους πολίτας ποιησάμενοι ἐστασίασαν καὶ εἰς μάχην ἦλθον). On this passage, see Moggi 2012; cf. Keyt 1999, 91-92; De Luna *et al.* 2016, 306. On the *stasis* that broke out at Syracuse after the expulsion of Thrasybulus, see, among others, Berger 1992, 37-38; Consolo Langher 1997, 51-56; Thatcher 2012; Giangiulio 2015, 80-83; Evans 2016, 57-78; Péré-Noguès 2022, 78-79; for the role played in that conflict by the Syracusan *epilektoi* (a picked force of 600 men: D.S. 11.76.2), see Vinci 2010b. Asheri (1980, 155-57) adduces as a *comparandum* the case of the Sybarites at Thurii, an example likewise cited by Aristotle in his discussion of population heterogeneity as a cause of civil strife (*Pol.* 5.3.1303a 31-33): on this episode, see especially, among others, Moggi 1987; Nafissi 2007; see also De Luna *et al.* 2016, 307-308.

46 Bettalli (2013, 320, note 3) proposes understanding Aristotle's phrase both as “stranieri e (per di più) mercenari” and “stranieri e (tra questi) mercenari”, despite ultimately favouring the latter option. I would suggest construing μετὰ τὰ τυραννικὰ with ἐστασίασαν and taking the participle ποιησάμενοι as expressing anteriority with regard to the two aorist indicatives: on the interpretative issues raised by this passage, see also De Luna *et al.* 2016, 312-14.

ξένους μισθοφόρους), whereas the description of the provisions of the *koionon dogma* (11.76.5) speaks of reconciliation with the resident foreigners (πρὸς τοὺς κατοικοῦντας ξένους διελύθησαν), the mercenaries resettled at Messana being likewise designated as *xenoi* slightly after (τοῖς ... ξένοις τοῖς διὰ τὰς δυναστείας ἀλλοτρίας τὰς πόλεις ἔχουσι).⁴⁷ Against this background, modern scholarship has rightly insisted on the need to draw a clear-cut distinction between the former group, consisting of *misthophoroi* and displaced individuals settled in Syracuse and Aitna during the period of the tyrants, who had already been granted some sort of citizenship status, and the group of active mercenary soldiers recruited ad hoc by Hieron and Thrasybulus for specific military operations, to whom citizenship was never granted: this latter group included, for instance, those employed in the confrontation with the Syracusan civic army that preceded the fall of the tyranny, who were promptly evacuated following Thrasybulus’ capitulation (D.S. 11.68.5).⁴⁸

The long-term settlement of the *misthophoroi* enlisted by the Deinomenids and the Emmenids in various communities may, in certain cases, also be inferred from archaeological evidence: on the basis of a detailed examination of the necropoleis of eastern Sicily—most notably those of Gela, which are better documented than others owing to Orsi’s systematic excavations—and, in particular, of distinctive funerary practices and original patterns in the composition of grave goods, Juliette de La Genière concluded that a significant proportion of fifth-century burials should be attributed to non-Greek residents, very probably of Campanian origin. More specifically, the rich assemblages found in several of these graves attest to a substantial presence of mercenary leaders integrated into Gela during the first half of the fifth century, allowing their identification with some of the ξένοι mentioned by Diodorus in his account of the Sicilian affairs in the late 460s.⁴⁹ According to La Genière, this evidence may

47 Péré-Noguès 2022, 86-88 argues that, although still imperfectly defined, the notion of “resident foreigners” (οἱ κάτοικοι ξένοι), which Aristotle’s approach relegates to a secondary position in this passage, nonetheless encapsulates all issues pertaining to the composition of the civic body and its unity—a conclusion that is not entirely clear to me.

48 On this point, with particular reference to the two groups of *xenoi* mentioned by Diodorus, see esp. Asheri 1980, 146, followed by Giangiulio 1998, 111-12; Raffone 2004, 65-68; Teegarden 2018, 460-61 argues that the “resident *xenoi*” mentioned in the first provision of the *koionon dogma* were most likely the thousands of mercenaries enfranchised by Sicilian tyrants (especially those granted Syracusan citizenship by Gelon and those settled by Hieron at Aitna), while the exiles referred to in the second provision should be identified with the body of individuals displaced during this period.

49 See La Genière 2001, esp. 36, who concludes: “Aucune rupture n’indique, dans la nécropole de Gela, que la fin de la tyrannie ait entraîné le départ des mercenaires qui avaient été les soutiens de l’autorité des Deinoménides”; cf. Millino 2001, 157-160, who entertains a more cautious approach; for a recent reassessment, see Pace 2018. Asheri 1980, 148 rightly points out that at Gela the *archaioi politai* comprised those who had remained in the city throughout the period of Deinomenid rule and those deported by Gelon to Syracuse around 485 and

even suggest that their arrival at Gela dated as early as the period of Cleander and Hippocrates, at the turn of sixth and fifth centuries.⁵⁰

With regard to the number of mercenaries actually admitted to the Syracusan citizen body, Martin Dreher has expressed skepticism, concluding that Diodorus' figures should not be regarded as reliable.⁵¹ However, one possible explanation for the figure of 10,000 may be sought in the notion of the μυρίανδρος πόλις, which, according to Aristotle, represented the ideal size of the civic body in Hippodamus' ἀρίστη πολιτεία.⁵² Indeed, the same number also appears as the total of the settlers sent by the Spartans in 426 to colonise Trachis in response to requests for protection from the Trachinians—one of the three μέρη of the Malians—and from the Dorians of Doris against pressure from the Oetaeans: Diodorus records that the οἰκήτορες were drawn in the number of 4,000 from the Lacedaemonians and Peloponnesians and of 6,000 from other Greeks (παρὰ τε τῶν ἄλλων Ἑλλήνων τοὺς βουλομένους μετέχειν τῆς ἀποικίας προσεδέξαντο), who, according to Thucydides, were selected to the exclusion of certain ἔθνη, such as the Achaeans and the Ionians.⁵³ Nor should it be forgotten that a concrete instance of the application of similar measures is provided by Ptolemy's *diagramma* at Cyrene, which requires the civic body (πολίτευμα) consist of 10,000 members.⁵⁴ Most significantly, 10,000 was also the number of οἰκήτορες settled by Hieron in 476 in his new foundation of Aitna—5,000 drawn from the Peloponnese and 5,000 from Syracuse.⁵⁵ It is therefore unlikely that the recurrence of the same figure in connection with the size of Syracuse itself in Plato's *Seventh Letter* is merely coincidental, since the author there advises Dion's *philoi* not

subsequently repatriated, while there is no evidence for the presence of former mercenaries or other individuals settled and enfranchised by the tyrants.

50 On Hippocrates' use of mercenary troops, see Millino 2001, 127-43; Bettalli 2013, 320-22; Copani 2013; Péré-Noguès 2022, 76.

51 Dreher 2007, 65: "auch die runden Zahlen von meist zehntausend Mann sind ebenso verdächtig wie sie es bei anderen Siedlerzahlen sind; aber daß es sich jeweils nicht nur um mehrere hundert, sondern eher um mehrere tausend Männer handelte, dürfen wir schon annehmen". De Angelis (2016, 184) argues that "[a]t 100-120 hectares in size, Syracuse under Gelon may have had a population on the order of 15,000-24,000".

52 Arist. *Pol.* 2.8.1267b 30-31 Ross (κατεσκεύαζε δὲ τὴν πόλιν τῷ πλήθει μὲν μυρίανδρον, εἰς τρία δὲ μέρη διηρημένην). On this point, see also Bettalli 2013, 324; Jacquemin 2019, 62. For an insightful discussion of Hippodamus' constitution since Schaefer 1961, see Ferrucci 2017.

53 D.S. 12.59.5 Casevitz (διὸ καὶ τὴν Τραχίνα μυρίανδρον ποιήσαντες, καὶ τὴν χώραν κατακληρουχίσαντες, ὀνόμασαν τὴν πόλιν Ἡράκλειαν); cf. Th. 3.92.1-5, with Hornblower 1991, 501-7. On the foundation of Heraclea Trachinia, see, among others, Falkner 1999; Bouyia 2010.

54 *IG Cyrenaica*² 010800 (Rosamilia 2023b, no. 2: 320), l. 5. See also Rosamilia's chapter in this volume.

55 D.S. 11.49.2 Haillet (τοῦτο δ' ἐπραξε σπεύδων ἅμα μὲν ἔχειν βοήθειαν ἐτοίμην ἀξιόλογον πρὸς τὰς ἐπιούσας χρεῖας, ἅμα δὲ καὶ ἐκ τῆς γενομένης μυρίανδρον πόλεως τιμὰς ἔχειν ἡρωικάς). On the foundation of Aitna, see further below.

to admit to the recolonisation of Sicily individuals incapable of living in accordance with the Doric way of life of their ancestors.⁵⁶

Another reason why cases such as those of Aitna and Heraclea in Trachis are relevant to the present discussion is that they may shed light on the mechanisms through which the *misthophoroi* were integrated into the Syracusan citizen body. A passage from Polyaeus concerning the dissolution of Megara by Gelon—one that has received surprisingly little attention in modern scholarship—suggests that the refoundation of Syracuse in 485 may have been carried out through comparable procedures, namely through a proclamation inviting volunteers from a specific ethnic group to serve as additional colonists (ἔποικοι):

Γέλων τὸ Μεγαρικὸν [κράτος add. R] βουλόμενος καταλῦσαι ἐποίκους μὲν ἐκάλει τοὺς ἐθέλοντας Δωριῶν, Διογνήτῳ δὲ, τῷ Μεγαρέων ἄρχοντι, χρήματα παρὰ δύναμιν ἐπέταξεν· οἱ δὲ τοῖς πολίταις, οἱ δὲ τοῖς τέλεσιν ἀπαγορεύοντες ἐς τὴν ἀποικίαν τὴν ἐν Συρακούσαις ὑπέεικον [vulg.: ὑπήκουσαν F, ὑπέεικον Valckenarius] ὑποβαλόντες αὐτοὺς τῇ Γέλωνος δυναστείᾳ.⁵⁷

According to Polyaeus, Gelon compelled the Megarians—it is not entirely clear under what capacity, maybe as a consequence of the *homologia* mentioned by Herodotus—to pay a sum beyond their means, thereby forcing them to respond to the proclamation calling for any Dorian willing to join the new settlement.⁵⁸ In light of this isolated piece of evidence, which nonetheless complements the otherwise one-sided picture provided by Herodotus, one might be tempted to identify the mercenaries enfranchised at Syracuse as belonging to the group of voluntary Dorian ἔποικοι summoned by Gelon for the refoundation of Syracuse (ἐς τὴν ἀποικίαν τὴν ἐν Συρακούσαις).⁵⁹

Scholars are almost unanimous in holding that all the mercenaries were probably granted citizenship on a single occasion, again by analogy with Aitna, where, a few years later in 476, a body of mercenaries was incorporated simultaneously

56 Pl. *Ep.* 7.337b-c Burnet (τοὺς δὴ κρατήσαντας αἰεὶ χρή, ὅτανπερ ἐπιθυμήσωσιν σωτηρίας, αὐτοὺς ἐν αὐτοῖς ἄνδρας προκρίναι τῶν Ἑλλήνων οὓς ἂν πυνθάνωνται ἀρίστους ὄντας, [...] ἀριθμὸν δὲ εἶναι μυριάνδρῳ πόλει πεντήκοντα ἱκανοὶ τοιοῦτοι): cf. Harward 1932, 208-9; Schaefer 1961, 295.

57 Polyaeus. 1.27.3 Woelfflin/Melber. The passage is referred to, but not discussed, by Asheri 1980, 147, 151; for a brief examination, see Bruno Sunseri 1980, 305-306; Luraghi 1994, 289-90; Vattuone 1994, 106; Mafodda 1996, 76; De Angelis 2003, 66-67.

58 Hdt. 7.156.3 Wilson (Μεγαρέας τε τοὺς ἐν Σικελίᾳ, ὡς πολιορκούμενοι ἐς ὁμολογίην προσεχώρησαν). On the possible meaning of ὁμολογία in this context, see Galvagno 2012, 101.

59 Cf. Péré-Noguès 2022, 77, who notes that the integration processes associated with the granting of citizenship to groups of mercenaries “s’inscrivent tous dans un contexte de refondation coloniale, l’objectif étant pour Gélon, comme pour Hiéron, d’obtenir le statut prestigieux d’*oikistès*”. On the provenance of the *misthophoroi* enrolled at Syracuse by Gelon, see the discussion below.

at the city's establishment.⁶⁰ However, debate has arisen regarding the precise point at which the 10,000 *misthophoroi* were enfranchised by Gelon—whether at the refoundation of Syracuse in 485 or after the battle of Himera in 480.⁶¹ The latter option appears less convincing than the former, since it would require assuming that Gelon, only a few years after having radically reorganised the Syracusan citizen body, dismantled his own arrangements by reopening land distributions and reallocating the new citizens among the various civic subdivisions (arguably the three Dorian *phylai*).⁶² A further, albeit more tenuous, indication may be drawn from the fact that, in his narrative of the post-Deinomenid government at Syracuse, Diodorus appears to allude to the enfranchisement of the mercenaries by Gelon as having already been mentioned, although no such notice survives in Book 11. This could suggest that the measure was originally reported in the now-lost Book 10 of the *Historical Library* and should therefore predate 480.⁶³ Additional support for this hypothesis could be provided by Diodorus' account of the immediate aftermath of the battle, when, as he notes, Gelon dismissed his allies and brought back to Syracuse the citizens who had fought alongside him, with no mention of *misthophoroi* specifically recruited for the engagement.⁶⁴

In light of the foregoing considerations, it seems reasonable to surmise that the introduction by Gelon of so substantial a body of *neopolitai* must have entailed considerable effort in the provision of housing for them. Uncertainty remains, however, as to which area of the city is most likely to have formed the core of this urban expansion: whereas Nancy H. Demand and Valentina Mignosa have pointed to Neapolis, Hans-Peter Drögemüller, followed by David Asheri, instead favoured Ortygia and Achradina.⁶⁵ In particular, on the basis of Diodorus' account of the conflict between old and new citizens at Syracuse after the Deinomenids' fall (11.73.1-3)—at a time when the rebels seized the

60 On this point, see below.

61 The former is accepted by Moggi 1976, 106; Luraghi 1994, 290; Mafodda 1996, 78-80; Consolo Langher 1997, 12-13; Raffone 2004, 66; Bettalli 2013, 322; Péré-Noguès 2022, 77. For the latter, see e.g. Berve 1967, 143; Sinatra 1992, 356-57.

62 For Syracusan civic sub-units in the fifth century, see e.g. Consolo Langher 1969/70 (= 1996, 280-82); Jones 1987, 173-76; Del Monaco 2011.

63 On Sicilian affairs in Diodorus Book 10, see Cohen-Skalli 2012, 168-70, 176-77.

64 D.S. 11.25.5 Haillet (τοὺς συμμαχοὺς ἀπολύσας τοὺς πολίτας ἀπήγαγεν εἰς τὰς Συρακούσας). On this point, see also Mafodda 1996, 80. On the enfranchisement of mercenaries both as an alternative mode of remuneration and as a means of establishing citizen militias for the maintenance of power, see Millino 2001, 131-32, 142-43; on the power base of Sicilian tyrants, see esp. Krasilnikoff 1995.

65 Cf. Drögemüller 1969, 54-62; Demand 1990, 49, with note 24; Mignosa 2020, 250, note 45, who places one of the new residential districts created by Gelon to accommodate the newly enfranchised citizens in the area west of Via Piave, extending towards the Parco archeologico della Neapolis. For a detailed overview of archaeological research in Syracusan urban areas, see Ampolo 2011, 155-69 (Ortygia), 169-74 (Achradina), 174-81 (Neapolis), 182-85 (Tyche).

urban quarters within the walls (Ortygia and Achradina), previously occupied by Thrasybulus himself in 466/5—Asheri suggested that after 485 the ἀρχαῖοι πολῖται were probably cleared from the intra-mural areas in order to make room for the *misthophoroi* and other individuals drawn from displaced populations enfranchised by Gelon.⁶⁶ This suggestion, in turn, rests on the assumption that, just as parity of political status between old and new citizens was called into question in the aftermath of Thrasybulus’ expulsion, so too a form of land redistribution other than general allotment on an equal basis among all citizens took place at Syracuse following the *stasis* brought about by the collapse of tyranny. Otherwise, it would be hard to explain the account preserved in a passage of Cicero, ultimately derived from Aristotle, concerning trials over the rightful ownership of property in post-Deinomenid Syracuse, through which the old citizens sought to reclaim in court assets confiscated and reassigned to others under the Deinomenids.⁶⁷ As a result, Asheri concludes that the land re-allotment (ἀναδασμὸς τῆς χώρας) mentioned by Diodorus in connection with the implementation of the *koinon dogma* at Syracuse may have consisted in a reshuffling of urban quarters, whereby the ἀρχαῖοι πολῖται were restored to their former holdings in Ortygia and Achradina as a result of such ownership disputes, while the *neopolitai* were relocated to more recent extra-mural quarters, such as Tyche and Neapolis.⁶⁸

In his discussion of the manipulation of the Syracusan citizen body undertaken by Gelon, Martin Dreher has adopted what may be termed an “informelle Einbürgerung” perspective, arguing that at that stage the *polis* had not reached a sufficiently advanced level of institutional development or formalisation and

66 For a recent reassessment of the main topographical issues connected with the Syracusan walls, see Beste, Mertens 2015, esp. 241–47 (Archaic and Classical periods). This process of demographic and urban expansion also seems to find an echo in Thucydides’ remark on the expansion of the original settlement within the inner *polis* (ἡ πόλις ἡ ἐντός), on Ortygia, to the outer *polis* on the mainland, namely Achradina (6.3.2: ὕστερον δὲ χρόνῳ καὶ ἡ ἔξω προστετριχθεῖσα πολυάνθρωπος ἐγένετο). Compare Diodorus’ account (12.9.2) of Sybaris’ πολυανθρωπία—the figure of 300,000 citizens being certainly exaggerated, though—as resulting from its practice of granting citizenship to large numbers of foreigners (πολλοῖς ... μεταδιδόντες τῆς πολιτείας): on the tradition portraying Sybaris as a city of excess, see, among others, Ampolo 1993; Bugno 1999.

67 Cic. *Brut.* 46 Malcovati (*ait Aristoteles, cum sublati in Sicilia tyrannis res privatae longo intervallo iudiciis repeterentur, tum primum [...] artem et praecepta Siculos Coracem et Tisiam conscripsisse*). According to this tradition—convincingly traced by Luzzatto 2008 to Aristotle’s Συναγωγὴ τεχνῶν (see also Asheri 1980, 155)—forensic oratory originated at Syracuse from the legal disputes arising out of the full reintegration of the ἀρχαῖοι πολῖται through the activity of Corax, a former partisan of Hieron and a leading figure in the events of 466, before being subsequently “exported” to Athens by Tysias.

68 Asheri 1980, 156–57. See D.S. 11.86.3 Haillet (μετὰ δὲ τὴν πολιτογραφίαν τὴν ἐν ταῖς πόλεσι γενομένην καὶ τὸν ἀναδασμὸν τῆς χώρας, πολλῶν εἰκῇ καὶ ὡς ἔτυχε πεπολιτογραφημένων, ἐνόσουν αἱ πόλεις καὶ πάλιν εἰς πολιτικὰς στάσεις καὶ ταραχὰς ἐνέπιπτον), from a context regarding the situation at Syracuse in 454, immediately preceding the rise of Tyndarides.

that political procedures therefore did not rely to any significant extent on written documentation.⁶⁹ In other words, those settled by the tyrants and provided with land for their livelihood would automatically be regarded as citizens of the *polis*: “Politen, Bürger wurden die Angesiedelten”.⁷⁰ Dreher has further observed that the circumstances brought about by the fall of the tyrannies in 466 and the promulgation of the *koinon dogma* in 461/0 marked the very first moment in the history of Greek Sicily in which “standardised” criteria for civic membership were introduced and subjected to formal legal procedures (“in rechtsförmigen Verfahren”).⁷¹ Against this thesis, however, it is worth recalling that the late-Archaic law from Himera on land distribution—an epigraphic document probably slightly earlier than Gelon’s arrival at Syracuse—already featured a provision explicitly referring to written registers of citizenship, including a list of those who had been granted building plots.⁷²

Additionally, a group of individuals plausibly enfranchised by Gelon—often identified in scholarship as mercenaries—can be recognised on the basis of inscriptions from Panhellenic sanctuaries, which appear to indicate that most of them migrated from Arcadia to Syracuse in the early fifth century. As for the concrete dynamics of this Arcadian migration to Sicily, Millino, followed by Bettalli, has suggested that the Panhellenic sanctuary of Olympia played a prominent role as a hub of information and recruitment.⁷³ For example, Praxiteles of Mantinea left a dedication on a statue base at Olympia in which he styles himself

69 Dreher 2007, 62; see also 71, where he reiterates the conclusion that in the Archaic period the integration of new citizens into the *polis* was carried out “ohne formalisiertes Beschlußverfahren und ohne schriftliche Eintragungen”, on the basis of five individual cases—Glaukos, Astylos, Ergoteles, Phormis, and Praxiteles (see below).

70 Dreher 2007, 66, adding that this would be the meaning of the phrase *πολίτης ἐποίησε* employed by Herodotus in that context. Cf. Millino 2001, 126: “L’introduzione massiccia di mercenari [...] modifica il rapporto classico fra *pólis* e *polites*”; Bettalli 2013, 329, who characterises the naturalisation of mercenaries by the Sicilian tyrants as a “rottura della sacralità del diritto di cittadinanza”.

71 Dreher 2007, 72–73, 75–76.

72 *L.dial. Sicile* II 15, ll. 3–5 (ἄ[φ]αρ ἔχει φρενίαι ἀ[ν]έδειξαν τὰ καταγεγραμ(μ)ένα). Dreher (2007, 73) also cites the document, though in connection with “Landverteilung”. Cf. Faraguna 2015a, 656–57; Brugnone 2022, 276–77, who argues against Dreher’s thesis on the basis of this passage: “Il caso di Himera—dove [...] le fratrie potrebbero essere coinvolte nell’assegnazione dei lotti in virtù della loro funzione di garanti dell’aggiornamento delle liste dei cittadini—suggerisce che il processo di formalizzazione dell’appartenenza alla *polis* sia stato avviato prima dell’instaurazione nella città dell’egemonia agrigentina”. I return to this issue in a forthcoming study, where the argument is developed further in light of new textual supplements.

73 Millino 2001, 146; Bettalli 2013, 323; this point is further developed by Forsén 2013, who concludes that “the games in Olympia may have been of importance for Arcadians wanting to enlist as mercenaries”. New insights into the connections between various Arcadian communities and Olympia are provided by a recently published bronze tablet containing lists of festivals from the region (CGRN 223: c. 450). On the Arcadian mercenaries across the Greek world, see also Nielsen 2002, 79–83; Bettalli 2013, 406–409.

as both of Syracuse and Camarina: Πραξιτέλῃς ἀνέθηκε Συρακόσιος τόδ’ ἄγαλμα / καὶ Καμαριναῖος· πρόσθα <δ> [προσθαρε lapis] Μαντινέαι / Κρίνιος ἠνιὸς ἔναιεν ἐν Ἀρκαδίᾳ πολυμέλῳ(ι) / ἡεσλὸς ἔόν, καί φοι μνᾶμα τόδ’ ἐστ’ ἀρετᾶς.⁷⁴ The date of the dedication and the details of Praxiteles’ movements remain uncertain, but the word order Συρακόσιος [...] καὶ Καμαριναῖος might at first sight indicate that he settled in Syracuse before Camarina. It cannot, however, be determined with certainty whether he was first enfranchised at Camarina—at the time of its refoundation by Hippocrates—and subsequently transferred to Syracuse together with the rest of the population after Gelon razed the city, or whether he moved from Syracuse to Camarina at its re-establishment in 461.⁷⁵ Either way, the presence of a dual ethnic in Praxiteles’ dedication strongly suggests that he held citizenship in both Camarina and Syracuse.⁷⁶

A comparable pair of cases is provided by the rich dedications of charioteers and horses recorded by Pausanias among the offerings located near that part of the precinct sacred to Pelops, which reflected the wealth and achievements of Phormis of Mainalos and his associate Lycortas of Syracuse (probably an Arcadian himself, as suggested by Hornblower).⁷⁷ Pausanias explicitly reports that Phormis went from Mainalos to Syracuse to fight for Gelon and Hieron, thereby implying that his equestrian victories stemmed from lucrative military campaigns.⁷⁸ Significantly, the inscription on the flank of the first horse seen by Pausanias presents Phormis as Ἀρκὰς Μαινάλιος, νῦν δὲ Συρακόσιος, whereas that accompanying the figure of Phormis fighting enemies—dedicated by

74 CEG I 380 (*I. Olympia* 266; Jeffery, *LSAG*² 211, 215, no. 20; van Effenterre, Ruzé, *Nomima* I 20). Cf. Dunbabin 1948, 416; Luraghi 1994, 161–63; Dreher 2007, 69–70; Fisher 2018, 218.

75 The former option is accepted by Manganaro 1999, 118, who also suggests that he may have preserved the land plot received from Hippocrates in the *chora* of Camarina; Millino 2001, 141–43; Bettalli 2013, 322 (“al soldo prima di Ippocrate, poi di Gelone”); Péré-Noguès 2022, 76; *contra* Dreher 2007, 70, note 53; for the latter, see e.g. Asheri 1980, 150: “Il caso di Praxiteles potrebbe quindi testimoniare la partecipazione alla rifondazione di Camarina di altri elementi naturalizzati a Siracusa a fianco dei Camarinesi deportati”.

76 As already noted, for instance, by van Effenterre, Ruzé, *Nomima* I 20, *ad locum*, who speak of “double citoyenneté”. Cf. Dreher 2007, 70, who prefers to interpret the phrase as meaning “eine gleichzeitige Zugehörigkeit” rather than “eine nacheinander erfolgte Ansiedlung”, thus implying the subordination of Camarina to Syracuse following the transfer of its inhabitants around 485.

77 Hornblower 2004, 186.

78 Paus. 5.27.1–2 Rocha-Pereira (ἐκ Μαινάλου διαβάς ἐς Σικελίαν παρὰ Γέλωνα τὸν Δεινομένους καὶ ἐκείνῳ τε αὐτῷ καὶ Ἰέρωνι ὕστερον ἀδελφῷ τοῦ Γέλωνος ἐς τὰς στρατείας ἀποδεικνύμενος), also referring to other dedications by Phormis at Delphi (ἀναθεῖναι μὲν ταῦτα ἐς Ὀλυμπίαν, ἀναθεῖναι δὲ καὶ τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι ἄλλα {δὲ} ἐς Δελφούς), which, however, have not survived. On Phormis, see Luraghi 1994, 295–96; Hornblower 2004, 186; Dreher 2007, 69; Bettalli 2013, 322; Fisher 2018, 218–19; Péré-Noguès 2022, 78. As Millino (2001, 145–46) has rightly noted, the dedications of *anathemata* in Panhellenic sanctuaries mark these individuals as members of a privileged elite, yet such prominent figures should be understood as the visible tip of a much larger process of mass migration.

Lycortas—refers to him simply as a Mainalian. On this basis, Dreher has suggested that, much like Micythos, Phormis may at some stage have returned to his homeland, a move that would have rendered his affiliation as a Syracusan πολίτης obsolete.⁷⁹ In this case as well, however, it is not strictly necessary to construe νῦν δὲ as a rigidly adversative expression implying the rejection of Phormis' former civic status; rather, it may be posited that Phormis and Lycortas were enrolled as πολῖται at Syracuse following Gelon's refoundation, thereby retaining a form of dual citizenship.⁸⁰

The picture may be further enriched by the case of the Iamid *mantis* Hagesias of Stymphalos, the honorand of Pindar's *Olympian* 6, who, according to the relevant scholia, served as seer to Hieron on military campaigns and at city foundations, before being executed after the fall of the Deinomenids in 466.⁸¹ Remarkably, in the epinician ode celebrating his victory in the mule-cart race at Olympia (472 or 468), he is hailed as a co-founder of Syracuse (συνοικιστήρ): Luraghi has interpreted this title as an exaggeration, suggesting either that he was simply granted Syracusan citizenship in 485 or that he assisted Gelon in the process of *synoikismos*, whereas Malkin has pointed to his possible involvement, in his capacity as a *mantis*, in the refoundation of the *polis*—thus a case analogous to that of Lampon at Thurii.⁸² At a deeper level, Pindar's association of Hagesias' ancestor Iamos with the river Alpheios provides further support for the antiquity of the connection between Syracuse and Olympia, as reflected in the mythic link between the river and Arethusa, the spring-nymph of Ortygia, within the city's foundation narrative—a connection already attested by Ibycus and by the oracle delivered to Archias according to Pausanias.⁸³ In the same vein, the imagery on Syracusan coinage—including the Alpheios tetradrachm and the

79 See Zizza 2006, 247-56, no. 26; on Phormis and Mainalia, see also Forsén 2022, 106-117.

80 Cf. Hornblower 2004, 140, who understands the phrase as “an Arkadian from Mainalos but (or ‘and’?) now a Syracusan”.

81 Moretti, *Olympionikai* 248. Cf. Sch. Pi. O. 6.30c (φησὶ γὰρ καὶ τὸν Ἀγησίαν μεθ' Ἰέρωνος στρατευσάμενον πολλοὺς πολέμους κατωρθωκέναι μαντεία καὶ ἀρετῇ), 6.165 Drachmann (δὲ ἀνηρήθη Ἰέρωνος καταλυθέντος). On Pindar's *Olympian* 6, see Gentili *et al.* 2013, 137-43; Morgan 2015b, 361; Nicholson 2016.

82 On Hagesias as συνοικιστήρ of Syracuse, see Malkin 1987, 93-97; Luraghi 1997, esp. 76-77; Bettalli 2013, 322; Foster 2017, 108-35; Fisher 2018, 219-20. The scholiasts on Pindar's *Olympian* 6 attest that the Iamidai themselves took part in the foundation of Syracuse together with Archias (σὺν Ἀρχίᾳ παρεγένοντο ἐν Συρακούσαις οἱ Ἰαμίδαι): see *e.g.* Hornblower 2004, 185, who accepts the story as a genuine colonial tradition. To this Elean-Arcadian priestly γένος also belonged Callias, the seer who fled Sybaris because of the tyrant Telys and was received by the Crotoniates shortly before 510: cf. Hdt. 5.44.1-45.2, with Nenci 1994, 216-19; see also Flower 2008, 156.

83 Cf. Pi. O. 6.57-58, with Gentili *et al.* 2013, 460-61; Ibyc. *PMG* 323, perhaps from an epinician for a Syracusan victor (see Wilkinson 2013, 287); Paus. 5.7.3, with Giangiulio 2014, 217-19, and, more recently, Rosamilia 2023a. Based on this background, Arnold-Biucchi, Weiss 2007 (see also the discussion of Lewis 2019a, esp. 186-88) have identified the river god on the obverse of Gelon's Syracusan silver tetradrachm as the Olympic Alpheios. On Arethusa and

familiar quadriga/Arethusa series, featuring a flying Nike crowning the *beniochos* with a wreath—is best understood against the background of Deinomenid ideology, celebrating both Gelon’s chariot victory at Olympia in 488 (Moretti, *Olympionikai* 185) and his rise to power in the *polis* in 485.⁸⁴ As Virginia Lewis has argued, in the context of Gelon’s programme of demographic engineering, “the myth of Alpheios and Arethusa continued to offer the Syracusans a model for peaceful negotiations and relations between the members of its mixed citizenry”.⁸⁵ This point becomes all the more significant if one accepts Freeman’s view that a substantial proportion of Gelon’s mercenary forces may have included not only Greeks, but also Sicels.⁸⁶

The last case to be considered in this context is that of Astylos of Kroton, the celebrated runner who won three times at Olympia (488, 484 and 480) in various events—the *stadion*, the *diaulos* and the race in armour: as Pausanias relates, on the occasions of his victories in 484 and 480, in order to secure Hieron’s favour (though in all likelihood Gelon should be understood), he proclaimed himself a Syracusan rather than a Crotoniate, thereby provoking the anger of his fellow citizens, who eventually pulled down his statue in the sanctuary of Hera Lacinia.⁸⁷ Leaving aside the possibility—occasionally entertained in the scholarship by reference to alleged later parallels, such as that of Antipatros of Miletus—that Astylos transferred his civic allegiance in return for a series of rewards from the Deinomenids (if not through outright bribery), the episode might more plausibly be understood as a further instance of double citizenship, possibly connected with his emigration from Croton and

Syracusan civic identity, see recently Lewis 2020, 30–72. On Olympia and Western Greeks, see e.g. Philipp 1994; Dreher 2013.

84 Morgan 2015b, 62–63; Lewis 2019a, 188–90. The quadriga already appeared on the obverse of the city’s earliest tetradrachm displaying Arethusa on the reverse inside an incuse square (end of the sixth century) as a representation of the elite competition and—as suggested by Rutter 1997, 115—of the interests of the *gamoroi*.

85 Lewis 2019a, 191–192. Drawing on the imagery of Ortygia singing in honour of Zeus Aitnaïos in Pindar’s *Nemean* 1 (in celebration of the chariot victory of Chromios—regent for Hieron’s son Deinomenes in Aitna—in 469 or 467: see Braswell 1992; Cannatà Fera 2020, 9–20), Foster 2017, 132–34 argues that the motif of the mingling waters of Alpheios and Arethusa may also have been relevant to Hieron’s colonial programme, in that it “symbolically captures the synoikism of Peloponnesians and Syracusans that Hieron hoped to engineer at Aitna”. On the foundation of Aitna, see further below.

86 Freeman 1891–1894, II, 132–33. For the problem of mercenaries of indigenous origin in late Archaic Greek Sicily, see esp. Millino 2001, 132–40. De Angelis 2016, 183 supposes that the *misthophoroi* enrolled by Gelon “must have also come from other parts of Greece, and possibly too from the Italian mainland”. On this point, see also above.

87 Moretti, *Olympionikai* 178–179, 186–187, 196–198. Napoleone 2023 argues that *P.Oxy.* XXV 2430 (TM 62725), fr. 131 (= Simon. F 15 Poltera) may be a fragment of Simonides’ epinician ode for Astylos.

subsequent participation in the refoundation of Syracuse.⁸⁸ A comparable situation can be observed during the Peloponnesian War with the pancratiast and boxer Dorieus of Ialysos and his nephew Peisirhodos—another example cited by Pausanias—who competed at Olympia for Thurii while in exile from Rhodes, even though scholars such as Hornblower have denied that this designation implies full Thurian citizenship.⁸⁹

The patterns that emerge from the examples discussed above invite comparison with the modes of self-representation adopted by the Deinomenids themselves in the same contexts. Whereas in the inscribed dedication on the Olympian quadriga monument commemorating his chariot-race victory of 488—no longer *in situ*, but described by Pausanias (6.9.4–5, cf. *I. Olympia* 143)—Gelon presents himself explicitly as a Geloan, the inscription on the plinth of the bell-shaped base supporting the golden tripod in the sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, *I.dial. Sicile* I 93 (ML 28; Arena, *Iscrizioni* V 66; *Choix Delphes* 18), proclaims him simply as a Syracusan (Συραφόςσιος).⁹⁰ This has led Gianfranco Adornato to interpret the dedication as a thank-offering to Apollo for the refoundation of Syracuse rather than for his victory at the battle of Himera, as traditionally maintained on the basis of Theopompus (*FGrHist* / *BNJ* 115 F 193), Phaenias of Eresos (F 16 Engels)—both quoted by Athenaeus (6.20–21 Olson)—and Diodorus (11.26.7).⁹¹ Interestingly, Pausanias—who mistakenly dates Gelon's seizure of power at Syracuse to 491 rather than 485—relies precisely on the ethnic Γελῶς to identify the statue of the Olympian group not

88 Paus. 6.13.1 Rocha-Pereira (ἐν δύο ταῖς ὑστέραις [scil. νίκαις] ἐς χάριν τὴν Ἰέρωνος τοῦ Δεινομένου ἀνηγόρευσεν ἑαυτὸν Συρακόσιον), with Maddoli *et al.* 1999, 263; Plin. *NH* 34.59; see further Luraghi 1994, 293–95; Mann 2001, 188–89, 246–48; Punzo 2007; Cuniberti 2011, 278–79; Fisher 2018, 221. Dreher 2007, 67–68, who proposes that Astylos joined Gelon at Gela before 485 and subsequently relocated with the tyrant's court to Syracuse, suggests that the measures taken against him by the Crotoniates should be understood as formally adjudicated sanctions, possibly on grounds of treason.

89 Paus. 6.7.4 Rocha-Pereira (ἀνηγορεύοντο δὲ οὐτός τε καὶ ὁ Πεισίροδος Θούριοι, διωχθέντες ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιστασιωτῶν ἐκ τῆς Ῥόδου καὶ ἐς Ἰταλίαν παρὰ Θουρίους ἀπελθόντες), with Maddoli *et al.* 1999, 227–28, suggesting that Dorieus moved to Thurii between 434/3 and the summer of 424; cf. Th. 3.8.1, with Hornblower 1991, 389–91; 8.35.1; Xen. *HG* 1.5.19, with Kelly 2019, *ad locum*. Cf. Hornblower 2004, 140; Dreher 2007, 72, note 57; Fisher 2018, 221.

90 On this point, see also Adornato 2005, 412–13; cf. Zizza 2006, 418–22. For the Deinomenids' participation in the Panhellenic games, see the useful synoptic overview provided by Bonanno (2010, 185–86). Privitera 2003, 425 stresses that in their dedications at Delphi and Olympia Gelon and Hieron present themselves as private dedicants, devoid of any explicit institutional link with their civic community; see also A. Jacquemin, D. Mulliez and G. Rougemont at *Choix Delphes*, 45. For a recent overview of the historical problems connected with *I.dial. Sicile* I 93, see further Palazzo 2017.

91 Adornato 2005, 415: “Nel santuario delfico Gelone, ecista e tiranno di Siracusa, offre un tripode e una Nike ad Apollo *Archegetes*, chiedendo la protezione per il reggente e per la città, secondo un protocollo tipico dei movimenti coloniali di età arcaica”. On Phaenias' work *On the Tyrants of Sicily*, see recently Schütrumpf 2015.

as belonging to Gelon, but to a private individual of the same name, thereby implicitly ruling out the possibility of a double ethnic.⁹²

Taken together, the evidence examined so far—centred on individuals who appear to have enjoyed multiple citizenships, at least for a time (notably Praxiteles and possibly Phormis and Astylos)—points to a broader framework that should be understood in light of the Deinomenids’ deliberate policy of enfranchising athletes, soldiers, poets, seers, and other experts, with a view to encouraging their attachment—whether temporary or permanent—to the *poleis* under their control. Further confirmation of this dynamic may be drawn from parallel contexts, not least the case of Micythus, former liegeman of Anaxilas and later regent of Rhegion and Zancle-Messana, who identified himself as Ῥηγῖνος καὶ Μεσσηνίος in his dedications at Olympia, set up after his retirement to Tegea (Arcadia), in fulfilment of a vow made during his son’s illness.⁹³ The phrase has sometimes been taken to mean “a Rhegian of Messenian origin”, but it more plausibly indicates—as Luraghi has argued—that, much like Praxiteles, Micythos was first a citizen of Rhegion and subsequently of Messana, having taken part in the group of settlers involved in Anaxilas’ refoundation of the city around 488/7.⁹⁴ Nick Fisher has observed that “[i]n such cases, we should not insist that individuals must have changed citizenship in order to be declared at (for example) Olympia a Syracusan, an Aetnaean, a Crotoniate, or a Thurian”, since *de facto* dual citizenship may have been rather frequent—or at least more frequent than might otherwise be expected.⁹⁵ However, the significance of such instances lies, in my view, not only in their capacity to illuminate mechanisms of civic expansion

92 For the idea that the ruler of Gela (Γέλας ἀνάσσειν) that is mentioned as a dedicant in the erased inscription on the statue base traditionally associated with the Charioteer, Arena, *Iscrizioni* V 68 (CEG I 397; *Ldial. Sicile* I 133; *Choix Delphes* 19), might originally have been either Gelon or Hieron, see Adornato 2008, 40–41.

93 *I.Olympia* 267–269; cf. Hdt. 7.170.4, with Vannicelli, Corcella 2017, 513–14; D.S. 11.48.2, 66.1–3; Paus. 5.26.2–5, with Zizza 2006, 413–17; Iust. 4.2.5. See Luraghi 1994, 224–29.

94 Luraghi 1994, 226 does not rule out the hypothesis, first advanced by Freeman (1891, 546), that Micythos may have been an Arcadian mercenary who came to the court of Anaxilas, much as his compatriots had arrived at those of Hippocrates and Gelon, and was subsequently settled in the newly founded *polis* of Messene; see further Philipp 1994, 88; Bettalli 2013, 323; *contra* Dreher 2007, 70–71, note 54. Cf. Th. 6.4.6 (καὶ τὴν πόλιν αὐτὸς ξυμμείκτων ἀνθρώπων οἰκίσας), with Salati 2014/15, 86–90; D.S. 15.66.5; Str. 6.2.3; Paus. 4.23.6–10, with Musti, Torelli 1991, 239: “se Tucidide parla di ξύμμεικτοι ἄνθρωποι portati da Anassila in Sicilia, può trattarsi di discendenti dei profughi messenii e insieme di gente del luogo di rifugio—che sia l’Arcadia o l’Elide—, oltre che di eventuali nuovi fuggiaschi dalla regione oppressa”. For a recent analysis of developments in the Strait of Messina under Anaxilas, see Bianchi 2020.

95 Fisher 2018, 223, drawing on Hornblower 2004, 140, who, however, concludes along different lines: “We might sometimes want to call this lapsed, sometimes lost, sometimes double, sometimes renewed, citizenship, but the main message is that with some of the big names in Pindar and Thucydides it does not do to be too formal and legalistic, particularly when the West is concerned”. Cf. Dreher 2007, 70: “Eine formalisierte Verleihung des Bürgerrechts für

and integration in the Greek West, but also in the contribution they can make to the wider discussion of multiple citizenship in the ancient Greek world, long assumed to be a phenomenon emerging only from the late Hellenistic period onwards. In this respect, following the suggestions made by Christel Müller in a 2015 article devoted to the “question de l'appartenance multiple”, it seems necessary to bring cases such as these back to the centre of the debate, in order to gain a better understanding of long-term dynamics in the history of Greek citizenship and to give proper attention, as she puts it, “à la fois aux éléments de continuité et au foisonnement des pratiques dès l'époque classique”.⁹⁶

3. Theron's Dorian resettlement of Himera (476 BCE)

A particularly complex example of the impact of demographic change and tyrant-instigated mass migrations in Sicily is the situation at Himera under Emmenid rule, known primarily through the account of Diodorus.⁹⁷ Following the removal of the tyrant Terillos in the late 480s and the subsequent victory of Gelon and Theron in the celebrated battle of 480 against the Carthaginians and their Greek allies, the city entered a phase of pronounced political instability.⁹⁸ In this context, Theron installed his son Thrasydaeus as tyrant; his rule, however, was challenged at an early stage by an insurrection in 476/5—exacerbated by the conflict with Hieron concerning his brother Polyzelus—and was ultimately maintained through violent repression by Theron himself.⁹⁹ Against this background, the severe losses sustained by the civic body, resulting both from the heavy casualties of the battle of 480 and from the ensuing massacre of dissidents, prompted the replenishment of the population of Himera through the admission of Dorians and other settlers to citizenship.¹⁰⁰ Thrasydaeus' domina-

zwei verschiedene Städte durch einen Tyrannen wäre jedenfalls weder als gleichzeitiger noch als ungleichzeitiger Akt leicht vorstellbar”.

96 Müller 2015, 359. For multiple citizenship in the Greek world during the late Hellenistic and Roman periods, cf. Heller, Pont 2012; Cecchet 2023; Cecchet 2025a.

97 On Theron's repopulation of Himera in 476, in the aftermath of his conquest of Heraclea Minoa from the Selinuntines, and the *polis*' subsequent incorporation into the Akragantine sphere of control, see Consolo Langher 1988/89 (= 1996, 209-11); Bonacasa 1992; Luraghi 1994, 244-50; Allegro 2022; Brugnone 2022, 277-79. On the history of the *polis* more in general, see Belvedere *et al.* 1990; Allegro 1999; Anello 2017.

98 On the battle of Himera and its implications, cf. Hdt. 7.165-167.2, with Vannicelli, Corcella 2017, 503-9; D.S. 11.20.1-26.8; Polyae. 1.28.1. See *e.g.* Meier-Welcker 1980 and, more recently, Sammartano 2022; on Gelon's allies on that occasion, see esp. Palazzo 2009.

99 D.S. 11.48.6-8. Asheri 1980, 148 suggests that the faction opposed to Theron was perhaps predominantly composed of Chalcidians, including former supporters of Terillos and individuals who favoured the alliance with the Carthaginians and Anaxilas over Emmenid domination.

100 D.S. 11.49.3 Haillet (Θήρων δὲ μετὰ τὴν Ἰμεραίων σφαγὴν ὄρων τὴν πόλιν οἰκητόρων δεομένην, συνώκισεν εἰς ταύτην τοὺς τε Δωριεῖς καὶ τῶν ἄλλων τοὺς βουλομένους

tion lasted until 472/1, when his defeat at the hands of Hieron paved the way for Himera’s definitive incorporation into the Deinomenid sphere of control.¹⁰¹

According to a persuasive hypothesis put forward by Spencer Barrett, the group of Dorians enfranchised by Theron at Himera likely included the Cnossian runner Ergoteles, the honorand of Pindar’s *Olympian* 12 and victor in the *dolichos* at Olympia in 472 and 464.¹⁰² This identification is supported by the testimony of both Pindar himself and Pausanias, who attest that he was exiled from Cnossos because of *stasis* and subsequently welcomed, granted citizenship, and honoured at Himera.¹⁰³ Beyond this individual case, modern scholarship has further suggested that the Δωριεῖς settled at Himera by Theron may also have included the Lacedaemonians who survived the expedition of Dorieus and, under the leadership of Euryleon, captured Heraclea Minoa shortly before 500.¹⁰⁴ Another possible member of the group, according to Asheri, was the obscure Pythagorean Petron, a figure of largely uncertain chronology, described by Plutarch (*Mor.* 422d-e)—on the authority of Phaenias (F 56B Engels), himself drawing on Hippys of Rhegium (*FGrHist* / *BNJ* 554 F 5)—as a Δωριεὺς ἐκ Σικελίας.¹⁰⁵

Within this broader context, it has plausibly been suggested that Theron was responding to, and competing with, the mass deportations carried out by

ἐπολιτογράφῃεν). The impact of the battle on the population is clearly attested in the burial evidence from the western necropolis: see Vassallo 2022b.

101 On Theron’s *philoi*, who—dissatisfied with the rule of Thrasydaeus—are said to have betrayed him in favour of Hieron, cf. Sch. Pi. O. 2.29c, 173f Drachmann. On this point, see esp. Asheri 1980, 148-49; Luraghi 1994, 245-46; Millino 2000, 248-49.

102 Moretti, *Olympionikai* 224, 251: cf. *I.Olympia Suppl.* 23 (CEG I 393; Arena, *Iscrizioni* III 54: 464-450); Paus. 6.4.11 (οὗχ Ἱμεραῖος εἶναι τὸ ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καθάπερ γε τὸ ἐπίγραμμα τὸ ἐπ’ αὐτῷ φησι, Κρής δὲ εἶναι λέγεται Κνώσσιος· ἐκπεσὼν δὲ ὑπὸ στασιωτῶν ἐκ Κνωσσοῦ καὶ ἐς Ἱμέραν ἀφικόμενος πολιτείας τετύχηκεν {δς} καὶ πολλὰ εὗρετο ἄλλα ἐς τιμὴν), with Maddoli *et al.* 1999, 207; Zizza 2006, 411-13. See Barrett 1973, 24. On Pindar’s *Olympian* 12 and its date (arguably 466), see Hamilton 1984; Catenacci 2005; Catenacci 2011; Gentili *et al.* 2013, 287-291; Lewis 2020, 227-33.

103 Pi. O. 12.13-16 Snell-Machler (οὐδὲ Φιλάνορος, ἦτοι καὶ τεά κεν / ἐνδομάχας ἅτ’ ἀλέκτωρ συγγόνῳ παρ’ ἐστίῃ / ἀκλεῆς τιμὰ κατεφυλλορόησε(ν) ποδῶν, / εἰ μὴ στάσις ἀντιάνειρα Κνωσίας σ’ ἄμερσε πάτρας). On Ergoteles, see Millino 2000, 253-54; Mann 2001, 245; Dreher 2007, 68-69; Fisher 2018, 220; cf. Hornblower 2004, 192-96, who suggests that “Ergoteles came to Himera via Akragas, which would for a Kretan have been an initial and logical refuge, a greater and perhaps more attractive city than its metropolis Gela in this period”. This hypothesis, however, cannot be substantiated.

104 For this hypothesis, see esp. Consolo Langher 1961 (= 1996, 507-13); see also Consolo Langher 1988/89 (= 1996, 209-11, esp. note 12), suggesting that the phrase employed by Diodorus “accomuna insieme elementi che dovettero affluire sia da Agrigento sia dalle città vicine”. On the seizure of Heraclea Minoa by the remnants of Dorieus’ expedition, cf. Hdt. 5.46.2 Wilson (συλλαβὸν δὲ οὗτος [*i.e.* Euryleon] τῆς στρατιῆς τοὺς περιγενομένους ἔσχε Μινώην τὴν Σελινουσίων ἀποικίην), with Nenci 1994, 219-20; see further Braccisi 1999.

105 Asheri 1980, 149, note 8; on Petron of Himera, cf. the recent reappraisal of Visconti 2014, 142-54; Zhmud 2015.

Hieron in connection with the creation of Aitna (a clear case of *Umbesiedlung* in Dreher's terms), generally dated between the autumn of 476 and the spring of 475.¹⁰⁶ As part of this strategy, Hieron pursued a policy of forced relocation, transferring the populations of Naxos and Catane to Leontinoi, with the explicit aim of concentrating the Chalcidian element in a strategically crucial area and, in so doing, weakening the Ionian presence on the island.¹⁰⁷ The former inhabitants of Catane were replaced by 10,000 new settlers drawn from both Syracuse and the Peloponnese (ἐκ μὲν Πελοποννήσου πεντακισχιλίους ἀθροίσας, ἐκ δὲ Συρακουσῶν ἄλλους τοσούτους προσθείς), plausibly including a substantial number of mercenaries, but also—according to a scholion on Pindar—some of the Geloans and the Megarians previously enfranchised at Syracuse.¹⁰⁸ The new foundation, however, proved short-lived. Following the death of Hieron in 467, the people of Katane—encouraged by the resurgence of the Sicels under the leadership of Ducetius and by the military support provided by Syracuse—returned to their city and expelled Hieron's settlers (ἐξνοικοι) around 461, who subsequently refounded Aitna at Inessa, an inland site plausibly located in the area of modern Santa Maria di Licodia.¹⁰⁹

Himera possessed a multi-layered identity from a very early stage in its history. Established as an Euboean *apoikia* by Zancleans and other Chalcidians around the mid-seventh century, the city soon received a group of Syracusan exiles known as οἱ Μυλητίδαι, as attested by Thucydides.¹¹⁰ Among the three

106 For the connection between the two episodes, cf. *e.g.* Péré-Noguès 2022, 77. On the foundation of Aitna, see further Asheri 1980, 147; Consolo Langher 1980 (= 1996, 437-42); Consolo Langher 1988/89 (= 1996, 233-36); Demand 1990, 50-52; Dougherty 1993, 83-102; Luraghi 1994, 337-38; Bonanno 2010, 127-57; Vinci 2010a; De Angelis 2016, 187.

107 Cf. D.S. 11.49.1-2 Hailet (τοὺς τε Ναξίους καὶ τοὺς Καταναίους ἐκ τῶν πόλεων ἀναστήσας [*scil.* Hieron], ἰδίους οἰκήτορας ἀπέστειλεν [...]. τοὺς δὲ Ναξίους καὶ τοὺς Καταναίους ἐκ τῶν πατρίδων ἀνασταθέντας μετόκισεν εἰς τοὺς Λεοντίνους, καὶ μετὰ τῶν ἐγγχωρίων προσέταξε κατοικεῖν τὴν πόλιν); Str. 6.2.3 Radt (ἀπέβαλε δὲ τοὺς οἰκήτορας τοὺς ἐξ ἄρχης ἢ Κατάνη κατοικήσαντος [ηϛ : κατοικήσαντος ABC] ἑτέρους Ἰέρωνος τοῦ Συρακουσίων τυράννου). On this point, see also above. For an overview of the history of Naxos of Sicily, Consolo Langher 1980 (= 1996, 417-56) remains a useful point of reference.

108 Sch. Pi. P. 1.120b Drachmann (ὁ οὖν Ἰέρων Γελῶν καὶ Μεγαρεῖς καὶ Συρακουσίους ὄντας τῶν Δωριέων ἀποίκους ἐνόκησε [ἐνόκησε CP] τῇ Αἴτνῃ). Bettalli 2013, 326 casts doubt on Diodorus' figures and assumes that the 5,000 Peloponnesian mercenaries were likewise part of the group from Syracuse.

109 Str. 6.2.3; D.S. 11.76.3. On the problem of the identification of Inessa, see Massa, Bombaci 1990. For the provisions of the *koimon dogma*, see above.

110 Th. 6.5.1 Alberti (καὶ ἡμέρα ἀπὸ Ζάγκλης ᾠκίσθη ὑπὸ Εὐκλείδου καὶ Σίμου καὶ Σάκωνος, καὶ Χαλκιδῆς μὲν οἱ πλεῖστοι ἦλθον ἐς τὴν ἀποικίαν, ξυνώκησαν δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ ἐκ Συρακουσῶν φυγάδες στάσει νικηθέντες, οἱ Μυλητίδαι καλούμενοι). On the foundation of Himera and the problem of reconciling the archaeological evidence with the literary sources, cf. Belvedere *et al.* 1990, 248; Allegro 1999, 271-73; Vassallo 2012; Anello 2017; see further Fischer-Hansen, Nielsen, Ampolo 2004, no. 24, 198-201. The so-called Syracusan Myletidai were probably "either a family group [...] or a class name or gentile name [...] of unknown etymology", as pointed out by Gomme *et al.* 1970, 219, who, however, refer to

oikists named by the historian, Eukleides and Simos may be taken to represent the Chalcidian element, while Sakon most likely reflects the Syracusan one, since individuals bearing this name are attested in inscriptions from Doric Sicily.¹¹¹ Thucydides (6.5.1) further notes that, owing to the Syracusan component, the local dialect was a mixture of Ionic and Doric (καὶ φωνὴ μὲν μεταξὺ τῆς τε Χαλκιδέων καὶ Δωρίδος ἐκράθη), a circumstance partly corroborated by sixth-century epigraphic evidence, even though Chalcidian *nomima* ultimately prevailed (νόμιμα δὲ τὰ Χαλκιδικὰ ἐκράτησεν).¹¹² Further support for this remark comes from a very fragmentary bronze plaque from Himera, inscribed *boustrophedon* on both sides, *SEG* 53.1002 (Brugnone 2022, no. 1: 550–500), pointing to contacts among Euboean communities in Sicily in matters of codification.¹¹³ The text—arguably a law—shows close similarities in lettering, physical appearance and content to the bronze tablets preserving fragments of Chalcidian laws from Monte San Mauro, *SEG* 4.64.¹¹⁴

A complex interplay may thus be discerned between Himera’s original identity and its later reconfiguration after Theron’s takeover, a process nonetheless partly grounded in the city’s mixed foundations. In this connection, as Asheri rightly notes, the peaceful coexistence of such a heterogeneous population—highlighted by Diodorus—is striking in a Sicilian context marked by ethnic antagonism and by the assertive construction of Dorian identity vis-à-vis neighbouring Chalcidian communities.¹¹⁵ On closer inspection, however, this representation of internal stability at Himera between its refoundation in 476 and its destruction by the Carthaginians in 406 appears to sit uneasily with the subsequent narrative of Diodorus himself, pointing instead to a series of episodes suggestive of internal tension, ranging from the expulsion of Thrasydaeus in 472/1—probably followed by the establishment at Himera of an autonomous government under Hieron’s aegis, arguably oligarchic in character—to the support offered in 466/5 by the Himeraeans, the Geloans and the Acragantines to the Syracusans in their struggle against Thrasybulus, as well

the name of the Laconian hero Μύλης (stem: Μυλητ-), son of Lelex and father of Eurotas (Paus. 3.1.1), as a possible *comparandum*; on the historical context in which to locate the expulsion of the Myletidai, see e.g. Dunbabin 1948, 56–57; Guzzo 2011, 207–8.

111 As Cordano 1984 has demonstrated. On Eukleides, cf. Arena, *Iscrizioni* III 44.

112 For a recent reassessment of the evidence relating to the mixed nature of the dialect of Himera, see Tribulato 2018. On the issues raised by Thucydides’ notion of *nomima Chalkidika*, see Bianchi 2021.

113 Brugnone 2003; further fragments of sixth-century bronze plaques from the poliad sanctuary of Athena in the Upper City were published by Brugnone 2017.

114 *LSAG*² 247, no. 2; *I.dial. Sicile* I 15; Arena, *Iscrizioni* III 84; Koerner, *Gesetzestexte* 86*. On the Chalcidian laws from Monte San Mauro, see also Cordano 1978; Cordano 1986; Pepe 2007.

115 D.S. 11.49.4 Haillet (οὗτοι μὲν οὖν μετ’ ἀλλήλων καλῶς πολιτευόμενοι διετέλεσαν ἔτη πεντήκοντα καὶ ὀκτώ).

as the return of exiles to the city in the late 460s under the provisions of the *koinon dogma*.¹¹⁶

Demographic change brought about by the incorporation of a substantial number of new settlers into the citizen body had a profound impact not only on the social sphere—most clearly reflected in the almost exclusive use of Doric in fifth-century inscriptions from Himera—but also on the *polis*’ institutional structures.¹¹⁷ The late-Archaic law commonly interpreted as recording the allocation of building plots and land to a newly arrived group of settlers from Zancle, *I.dial. Sicile* II 15, suggests that phratries (φρατρίαι) formed the structural basis of the civic organisation at Himera prior to Theron’s intervention, thereby also providing the earliest attestation for these sub-units among the Western *apoikiai*.¹¹⁸ The document further indicates that such subdivisions played a crucial role both in the publication of written records and in their preservation, probably in the form of registers or lists of enfranchised *politai*—a pattern readily explained by the close association between phratry membership and citizenship in the Greek world.¹¹⁹ The picture outlined so far may be further refined by reference to a slightly later lead tablet that records a *lochagos*, potentially pointing to a further articulation of the civic body into *lochoi*.¹²⁰ While a *lochos* was originally a military unit, in this context—as elsewhere—it likely functioned as a civil administrative subdivision of the city.¹²¹ Notwithstanding the interpretative problems posed by the inscription, the appearance of *lochoi* cannot be excluded as an outcome of the (partial?) adoption of νόμιμα Δωρικά in the context of Theron’s refoundation.¹²²

116 D.S. 11.53.3-5 (referring to Himeraeans recruited by Thrasydaeus for the conflict with Hieron); 68.1-2; 76.4. On the events following the expulsion of Thrasydaeus, see esp. Asheri 1980, 148-50; Millino 2000, 248-56, who also discusses the problematic passage in Justin (4.3.1) attesting to the presence of Himeraean mercenaries (*veterani ab Himera*) at Rhegium during a *stasis*, possibly connected with the aftermath of the overthrow of the sons of Anaxilas (see also De Sensi Sestito 1981). Cf. Robinson 2011, 248-49, who lists Himera in the period between 466 and 409 under the category “democracy attested with a high degree of certainty”.

117 Cf. e.g. Arena, *Iscrizioni* III 52. See recently Tribulato 2018, 167-68; Brugnone 2022.

118 Following Dubois, Brugnone’s reconstruction of ll. 2-3 as evidence for tribes ([φῦ] | λα) at Himera cannot be accepted, as it presents serious material difficulties; the reading [ἄ(λ)]λα Δανκλαῖα ποιῆσαι is therefore to be preferred.

119 On this point, see also above.

120 Grotta 2008, no. 2 (*I.dial. Sicile* I 11; Arena, *Iscrizioni* III 51: 475-450), Α (Εὐδῶπιδας ἡιάλῃ | Διεύχῃς : λοχᾶγος | Δαίτις). See further Brugnone 2022, 277, 284, no. 3.

121 Cf. e.g. Xen. *Hier.* 9.5 Marchant (διήρηνται μὲν γὰρ ἅπασαι αἱ πόλεις αἱ μὲν κατὰ φυλάς, αἱ δὲ κατὰ μόρας, αἱ δὲ κατὰ λόχους, καὶ ἄρχοντες ἐφ’ ἐκάστῳ μέρει ἐφεστήκασιν); Arist. *Pol.* 5.8.1309a 10-12 Ross (τοῦ μὲν οὖν μὴ κλέπτεσθαι τὰ κοινὰ ἢ παραδόσις γιγνέσθω τῶν χρημάτων παρόντων πάντων τῶν πολιτῶν, καὶ ἀντίγραφα κατὰ φατρίας καὶ λόχους καὶ φυλάς τιθέσθωσαν), with De Luna *et al.* 2016, 410-11.

122 On Thucydides’ conception of Dorian customs, see esp. Raccuia 2007. According to a convincing hypothesis put forward by Stefania De Vido (2023, 39), the period after 480 saw the

The processes connected with the manipulation of the civic body can also be traced in the archaeological record, particularly in the urban fabric of the *polis*. Recent investigations undertaken by the Universities of Palermo and Bern have shown that the city’s topography underwent major changes in the fifth century, reflecting the presence of new population groups. The issue had, in fact, already been raised by Luigi Mauceri and Giulio Schmiedt, who questioned whether, after 476, the perimeter of the Upper City—which in the Archaic period must have included the Piano di Imera to the east and the Piano del Tamburino to the west—was further extended westwards and southwards, reaching the limestone spur of Rocca del Drago. Archaeological evidence points, among other changes, to modifications affecting the settlement on the Piano di Himera during Phase IIB, consisting primarily in the raising of floor levels in houses and streets and in the reorganisation of the grid of *oikopeda*.¹²³ Scholarly debate persists as to whether such modifications in the topography of Himera and in the use of urban space should be attributed specifically to Theron’s intervention, or rather to the subsequent demographic and political developments following the removal of Thrasydaeus at the end of the 470s. The most plausible scenario is that, on the one hand, the settlers installed by the Emmenids occupied part of the housing stock formerly belonging to Himeraean citizens killed or exiled in the period between the battle of 480 and the unrest of the 470s; on the other hand, those able to return between the fall of the tyranny in 472 and the promulgation of the *koinon dogma* likely repaired or rebuilt their earlier, damaged dwellings.¹²⁴ Whichever interpretation one adopts, the changes reflected in the archaeological record offer a vivid illustration of the effects that population movements associated with tyranny and its overthrow could exert on a community.

Among the radical transformations experienced by Himera in various spheres after Theron’s refoundation were the abandonment of the harbour quarter on the right bank of the Himera river and the concomitant cessation of local wine-amphora production, which had flourished in the final decades of the sixth century—a development that, as Babette Bechtold suggests, may reflect the impact of Emmenid tyrannical policies on the colony’s Mediterranean connections.¹²⁵ These changes also included the issue of didrachms on the Attic standard (rather than the Euboean-Chalcidian one), bearing the Acragantine

abrogation of the late-Archaic law from Himera, as suggested by the condition of the bronze plaque at the time of its discovery, with its four corners folded over—a practice conventionally understood as indicating the annulment of the inscribed provisions.

123 For a recent reassessment of the archaeological evidence and the settlement phases at Himera, see Allegro 2022, 51–53; Vassallo 2022a; cf. further Allegro 1999.

124 On the return of citizens exiled under Emmenid domination, see Asheri 1980, 148–150, 158, who argues that the regime established after the expulsion of Thrasydaeus may have rested on a general redistribution of land.

125 Allegro 2014; cf. Bechtold, Vassallo 2025.

crab on the reverse.¹²⁶ The most consequential transformation, however, was Gelon's construction of the so-called Temple of Victory in the eastern sector of the Lower City, one of the two buildings intended both to celebrate the victory and to house the peace treaties with the Carthaginians (D.S. 11.26.2): this shift entailed the relocation of the city's principal cultic activities away from the older sanctuary of Athena on the northern outskirts of the Upper City, on the Piano di Himera.¹²⁷ The iconographic programme of the temple may likewise reflect the concerns of the settlers installed by Theron, being interpreted—following a proposal by Valentina Consoli—as centring on Heracles in a tutelary role rather than on Zeus Eleutherios, as traditionally assumed.¹²⁸

4. Western Greek citizenship through the lens of the *longue durée*

The recurring episodes in Sicilian history of large-scale forced population movements—ranging from expulsions and enslavements to the mass importations of new groups—the selective removal of elites or lower socio-economic groups, and the use of mercenaries to replace displaced populations all resulted in repeated reorganisations of the citizen bodies. This process is well illustrated, for example, by the numerical phratry system introduced at Camarina, as well as by invitations extended to large numbers of new citizens, often drawn from mainland Greece. At the same time, there are numerous instances, particularly in the fifth century, where parts—though not all—of the exiled populations returned once the regime responsible for their expulsion had been overthrown, and were encouraged to do so as a means of marking a symbolic rupture with the previous authority. On such occasions, return formed part of a complex and highly structured process, often involving the formal redistribution of land and the revision of citizenship registers, aimed at reintegrating former exiles into their original *polis* and severing their ties with the community of adoption. Thus, even in matters of citizenship, Sicily may be seen as a remarkable laboratory in which many of the political and institutional dynamics that would later come to characterise the wider Greek world—particularly in the Hellenistic period—first began to take shape. One need only think, for example, of phenomena

126 On Himeraean issues of Acragantine type, see Westermark 1999; Consoli 2009; Cutroni Tusa 2017.

127 Cf. Gras 1990; Amara 2020; Allegro 2022, 53–56; for similarities between the Himeraean Temple of Victory, the Doric Athenaion at Syracuse, and Temple C on the acropolis of Gela, see Van Compernelle 1992, 58.

128 Consoli 2008. For the traditional interpretation, see *e.g.* Dunbabin 1948, 429.

such as the emergence of personality cults (Gelon, Hieron, Timoleon) or the formation of the territorial state.¹²⁹

As shown at the outset of this paper, in Alcibiades’ speech Thucydides presents demographic mobility and a different conception of sharing in the *polis* as distinctive features of the western *poleis*. Centuries later, the same phenomenon was remarked upon by Cicero in his speech *Pro Archia*, where the poet is recalled to have received citizenship from several Greek cities of Southern Italy, and observes—not without a pejorative undertone—that the Greek cities of Italy were notably generous in conferring citizenship, and less scrupulous as to the character of those who received it. Once again, the key to understanding historical dynamics of this kind lies in the Braudelian *longue durée*.¹³⁰

129 On the former aspect, see esp. Trifirò 2014, 141 (Gelon); Muccioli 2011 (Hieron at Aitna); Luraghi 1994, 271 (Theron at Himera: D.S. 11.53.2); Muccioli 2014 (Timoleon). On the impact of the concept of the territorial state on questions of citizenship in Greek Sicily, see recently Péré-Noguès 2022, 87–88; cf. further De Vido 2013, 152–56.

130 For a similar *longue durée* perspective, see Prestianni Giallombardo 2006, 108, who argues that the large-scale incorporation of mercenaries into the *poleis* of Greek Sicily from the late fifth century onwards, and the ensuing tensions between citizens and mercenaries—arising from repeated episodes of enfranchisement involving more or less substantial groups—played a significant role in the political transformations that marked the island’s history up to the mid-third century.

