

# INTERTEMPORAL MEMORIES OF A SHIFTING UNITY: POLITICAL, ECO- NOMIC, CULTURAL AND KINSHIP BONDS BETWEEN CORINTH AND CORINTHIAN APOIKIAI AROUND THE AMBRACIAN GULF

*By Antonios S. Kaponis*

**Summary:** In ancient Greece, a *metropolis* and its *apoikiai* constituted a form of kinship unity. In Thucydides' view, at least in his era, particular bonds of kinship connected the Corinthian *apoikiai* on, or in the vicinity of, the Ambracian Gulf with Corinth itself, and literary tradition endowed Ambracia, Leucas and Anactorion with a special cultural unity. Modern research ranging over political institutions, foreign policy, ideology, economic factors, cults, myths, calendar and burial customs has shown that these *poleis* regarded themselves as members of a Corinthian colonial family. Initially highly dependent on Corinthian policy during the archaic period, by the end of this period the western *apoikiai* had admittedly begun to diverge from a Corinthian-centred economy and to move away from Corinthian traditions. Internal social diversification also caused these *poleis* to move away from Corinthian institutions and habits. Nevertheless, despite various political fluctuations, western Corinthian *apoikiai* remained within the Corinthian sphere of influence and after Timoleon's campaign they revived old Corinthian traditions and institutions. Indeed, other Greeks of late classical times regarded the citizens of these *poleis* as if they were indeed Corinthians. The area remained under Corinthian economic influence throughout Hellenistic times and memories of affinities with and ties to Corinth survived in her *apoikiai*. Lastly, Hellenistic monarchs and even Augustus himself took advantage of the peculiar Corinthian identity of these *apoikiai* for their own ends.

## Metropoleis and apoikiai

Scholars have long been interested in the subject of political unity and diversity in ancient Greece.<sup>1</sup> *Metropoleis* and their *apoikiai*<sup>2</sup> were mainly groups of states connected by economic and cultural bonds that rested on kinship.<sup>3</sup> The present paper uses evidence concerning foreign policy, political institutions, tribal organization, ideology, coin types, cults, myths, calendar and burial customs in order to present the evolution of these bonds among Corinthians and Corinthian *apoikiai* around the Ambracian Gulf.<sup>4</sup> The unusual feature of this unity lies in how it was maintained, as we will show, even after the destruction of the *metropolis* itself. I therefore hope to shed some light on various shifting aspects of the subject and to illuminate intertemporal common memories that point to an intertemporal political and cultural unity.<sup>5</sup> In order to put these features in their historical context and to present their multifaceted function, I present them in chronological order.

- 1 I am grateful to all reviewers for the helpful advice and insightful critique. The following is a selective bibliography on matters such as Greek ethnicity: Hall 1997; Malkin 2001; Luce 2007; Müller & Veisse 2014; federalism: Dobesch 1968; Payrau 1971; Flower 2000; Mitchell 2007; Birgalias et al. 2013; panhellenism: Beck, Buraselis & McAuley 2019; political unification: Buraselis & Zoumboulakis 2003. On cultural unity: Burckhardt 1963: 104-23; Greek nationality: Walbank 2002; Osborne 2004: 102-18; cultural affinity: Dougherty & Kurke 2003 (see also Hall 2002; Jost 2006); several unifying/diversifying features: Cassola 1996: 5-23; Settis 1996: 847-1207.
- 2 The terms *apoikiai* and *metropolis* express the meaning of the respective ancient words better than the terms *colonies* and *mother-city* used extensively in the Anglo-Saxon bibliography, *colony* in particular evoking anachronistic parallels: see also Tsatskhladze 2006; Osborne 2016.
- 3 The relationship between *metropolis* and *apoikia* was first analysed by Seibert (1963) and Graham (1964). For the term συγγένεια in Thucydides, see Fragoulaki 2013: 32-57. For colonial networks in Italy and Sicily, see Vlassopoulos 2013: 78-128. Πόλις and ἔθνος were also political organizations based on kinship: Morgan 2003: 4-16.
- 4 For the exception offered by Corcyra to the unwritten rule of colonial piety: Thuc. 1.25.3-26.1, 1.38.1-4. See also Williams 1985; Rhodes 1987; Morrison 1999; Kaponis 2020: 94-115; Psoma 2022: 55-63, 134-62.
- 5 Mazarino 1964; Reboton 2008. The most typical parallel are found in the Megarian *apoikiai*: Robu 2012; 2013; 2014; 2015; 2018; 2019; 2020a; 2020b. See also Costanzi & Dana 2020; Morakis' contribution in the present volume.

### Political and cultural unity through dependence

Ambracia, Leucas and Anactorion were founded on, or in the vicinity of, the Ambracian Gulf by the Corinthian tyrant Cypselus.<sup>6</sup> He probably regarded this area as a geographical and economic unity since he intended, among other things, to control land and sea routes to northwestern Greece and the West.<sup>7</sup> At this first stage, these three *apoikiai* were dependent on Corinthian trade<sup>8</sup> and therefore necessarily formed a political and economic unity. They also formed a cultural and a consciously maintained kinship entity linked to Corinth, given that many Corinthian burial customs appear and evolve in these *apoikiai* along the same lines as they do in Corinth. They consist of the extensive use of interment in all of *apoikiai* and, in Ambracia, a large number of grave offerings in the first half of the sixth century, the use of cist tombs for adults and vases for infants and conscious orientation of the corpse.<sup>9</sup>

- 6 Athanadas (*FGrHist* 303) fr. 1 (= *Ant. Lib. Met.* 4); *Ps.-Scylax* 34; *Ps.-Scymn.* 465; Strabo 10.2.7-8 (C452), 10.2.8-9 (C451). Strabo describes the Corinthian campaign as a unique operation, scheduled and executed by Cypselus and his son, Gorgus, the oecist (a term I prefer to 'founder') of Ambracia. See Fantasia 2017: 19-23, who restores the corrupt text with the phrase Γόργου ἡγησαμένου. If the colonial expedition was simultaneous, Pylades and Echiades, oecists of Leucas and Anactorion respectively, will have participated in this joint foundation: see *Nic. Dam. (FGrHist 90) fr. 58.44-46*, reading Ephorus (see Jacoby 1926: 248).
- 7 Kaponis 2020: 97 with nn. 563-65. This interpretation is corroborated by the pre-colonial contacts between Corinthians and local Illyrian, Epirotic, or Akarnanian tribes: Athanadas (*FGrHist* 303) fr. 1; *Ps.-Scylax* 34; *Ps.-Scymn.* 465; Strabo 10.2.7-8 (C452), 10.2.8-9 (C451); see also Vokotopoulou 1982: 79 with fig. 4, 82 with fig. 5-6. On the issue of the pre-colonial settlement of natives in Ambracia and the origin of the 'Thapsos workshop', see Gadolou 2008: 287-88; Gadolou 2011: 38-45. See *contra* Douzougli & Papadopoulos 2010: 49. See also Kaponis 2020: 43, 100-8, 115, 126-28, 131 with n. 762, 125-37, 138-41. For the planning of the foundation of *apoikiai* by Euboean Chalcidians, see Frisone 2016.
- 8 Kaponis 2020: 146-47 with n. 858, 173-74 with n. 1024, 198-202 with nn. 1184-85, 1199, 1206; Aggeli 2021: 262. For the respective Megarian network, see Robu 2012: 183-89.
- 9 Staikou 2016: 174-80; Stavropoulou-Gatsi & Alexopoulou 2002: 83-85; Aggeli 2021: 282-84. On the tombs as a sign of kinship between *apoikia* and *metropolis*, see Thuc. 1.26.3.

During the tyranny of Periander in Corinth, all three *apoikiai*<sup>10</sup> seem to have been ruled by Cypselids.<sup>11</sup> The Corinthian tyrants seem to have intervened militarily in the region. An epigram in honour of Arniadas from Corcyra indicates that in late sixth century Ambracia was probably attacked by Corcyra, or a Corcyrean squadron, perhaps made up of pirates.<sup>12</sup> The event was probably connected in some way to the old enmity between Corinth and Corcyra referred to by Thucydides and implied by Herodotus.<sup>13</sup> Periander also defended Leucas, Anactorion, and Apollonia from an external threat, and punished Corcyreans for having killed his son in the last few years before his death.<sup>14</sup>

The existence of hero cults of their oecists in archaic times is implied by dubious Hellenistic versions of foundation myths, which however seem to retain the memory of an older diachronic cult.<sup>15</sup> The authenticity of these foundation stories and the historicity of the oecists and their cults in Greek *apoikiai* in the West have been challenged by Hall, who points out that they involved variant oecists and mythical heroes.<sup>16</sup> Indeed, Helios or his daughter Ambracia, Hercules, and Ambrax are also

- 10 Together with Apollonia in Illyria: Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀπολλωνία. See Reboton 2008: 9.
- 11 On Periander the Ambraciot and Archinos: Arist. *Pol.* 1304a31-33; Neanthes of Cyzicus (*FGrHist* 84) fr. 19 (= Diog. Laert. 1.99); Maximus of Tyrus, 18.1a-f (= Plut. *Mor. Am. narr.* 768 E.10-F.5); Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 17.4. See Kaponis 2020: 277-82. Periander tried to establish his son Nicolaos/Lycophron at Corcyra as tyrant: Hdt. 3.53.4; Nic. Dam. (*FGrHist* 90) fr. 60.
- 12 *IG IX* 1<sup>2</sup> 4 880. See Kaponis 2020: 185-86, 406-7; Psoma 2022: 13, 77 n. 20, 118, 122 (pirate?), 408, 444, 461, 475, 487, 503. The phrase ἐπὶ Ἀράθθοιο ῥοφαῖσι refers to the river Arachthos which runs through Ambracia: Camerotto 2015.
- 13 Hdt. 3.48.6-49.9, 3.52.23-53.30 (especially the subjugation and the consequent revolt of Corcyra against Periander's son); Thuc. 1.13.4, 1.38.1-4. See Psoma 2022: 63-73.
- 14 Hdt. 3.53.30; Nic. Dam. (*FGrHist* 90) fr. 60; Plut. *Mor. De sera* 557A-B.
- 15 Ambracian foundation legend: Athanadas (*FGrHist* 303) fr. 1. The hero cult of Gorgus is confirmed through numismatic testimony dated to the fourth century: see Calciati 1990: II.461 no. 82; Mortensen 2015: 224-27; Kaponis 2020: 125-27, 130-31, 368-69. The foundation legends of Leucas and Anactorion are implicitly attested: Ps.-Scymn. 460-465; Nic. Dam. (*FGrHist* 90) fr. 58.44-46. The existence of the *patra Chersikratidai* in honour of the oecist of Corcyra also indicates the existence of an official cult of the oecist there: *IG IX* 1<sup>2</sup> 4 1140. See Psoma 2022: 51-52, 316, 346, 377, in particular 393.
- 16 Hall 2008: 399, 402-11.

mentioned as possible founders of Ambracia.<sup>17</sup> However, the Corinthian *apoikiai* in western Greece seem to have preserved the memory of the oecists against the need to ‘justify circumstances’ in later times, because they tended to perpetuate the names of three Cypselid oecists, although this family had been considered unholy and sinful from classical times onward.<sup>18</sup> The presence of Gorgus on classical Ambracian *pegasoi* and the antityrannical Hellenistic version of the foundation legend of Ambracia tend to suggest that this name and the respective oecist’s cult were historical in this sense.<sup>19</sup> At this early stage such cults also created religious and emotional bonds with Corinth through the acknowledgement of Corinthian origin and the memory of the common past.

During this phase, Corinthian political institutions and cult practices, the νόμιμα, were adopted by the new *poleis*, as late sources suggest, so ensuring further communication between *metropolis* and *apoikia*.<sup>20</sup> More precisely, the tribal organization of the *apoikiai* was Doric/Corinthian. The Bacchiads had probably added a fourth tribe to the initial tripartite system in order to integrate the pre-Doric population into the community.<sup>21</sup> Cypselus preserved this system in Corinth and this was probably

17 Arist. fr. 474 (= Steph. Byz. s.v. Δεξαμεναί); Philistus *FHG* 52 (p. 191) (= Steph. Byz. s.v. Ἀμβρακία); Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.50.4.1-51.1; Athanadas (*FGrHist* 303) fr. 1.

18 Thgn. 1.891-894; Hdt. 5.92α.-92ζ; Pl. *Phdr.* 236b; Suda, s.v. Κυψελιδῶν ἀνάθημα.

19 See above n. 15. For the cult of oecists or founders of a *polis*: Hdt. 6.38.1; Pind. *Pyth.* 5.93-95; Paus. 3.1.8; Callim. *Aet.* 2.43; Schol. Pind. *Ol.* 1.149b (Drachmann). See also Malkin 1987: 11, 263; Dougherty 1993: 24-25; Musti 2005: 308 with n. 21; Cordano 2009; Lane 2009: 246; Mortensen 2015: 224-27; Golding 2017: 7-8; Castiglioni et al. 2018; Kaponis 2020: 88 with n. 508, 368. Besides, the foundation myth of Miletus suggests that the mythical mortal oecists were also heroized: Polito 2011; 2018.

20 Kaponis 2020: 292-94, with bibliography. Robu (2014: 325-406) has examined similar common political institutions between Megara and its *apoikiai*. For *nomima* in Greek colonization, see Martin 1987; Malkin 2011: 189-97.

21 IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4 798 ll. 3, 5; 866 A l. 1; 869 l. 2; 872 A ll. 1-2; SEG 30.990; Calligas 1971: l. 25. See Robert 1948: 5-15; Daux 1953-54: 250 n. 5; Robert 1960: 562-69; Jones 1980: 167-72; 1987: 189-93; Antonetti 1999: 367-70; Crema 2010: 213; Stickler 2010: 26-27; Del Monaco 2011: 307; Psoma 2022: 314.

also implemented in the *apoikiai*.<sup>22</sup> The system was probably subsequently reformed by the Corinthian oligarchy, who added four more tribes.<sup>23</sup> The *apoikiai* certainly shared tribal divisions and subdivisions with Corinth. Mention of the tribe Ἄ(Φ)ορεῖς is found in the archaic lead tablets from Corcyra and in a Hellenistic honorific decree that comes either from Corinth, Apollonia or Ambracia, while the tribe *Hylleis* occurs in a second century honorific decree from Corcyra.<sup>24</sup>

Other political institutions were adopted by these *apoikiai*, either from the start or as an *a posteriori* link to the *metropolis*. The assembly in most of the *apoikiai* was called either *halia* or *ekklesia*.<sup>25</sup> The re-use of the term *halia* after Timoleon's campaign of 344<sup>26</sup> implies that the term was used at least initially after the foundation of the *apoikiai*.<sup>27</sup> The presence of *prytaneis* in both Ambracia, Leucas, and Anactorion, and in several Corin-

22 Kaponis 2020: 291-96, especially for the tripartite Doric system at Syracuse, 292 (see also n. 1670). See also the respective *phylai* in Megarian *apoikiai*: Robu 2014: 326-60. On Ionian *phylai* at Milesian *apoikiai*: Ehrhardt 1983: 98-112. On the incorporation of the Dryopian population into the tribes of Ambracia: Athanadas (*FGrHist* 303) fr. 1. Similar hybrid cultural and anthropological characteristics are found in Apollonia and in Euboean *apoikiai*: McIlvain *et al.* 2014; Charalambidou 2017: 110. For contacts between the Corinthians and local tribes: see above n. 7.

23 Nic. Dam. (*FGrHist* 90) fr. 60.38. The reform was later attributed to Aletes: Suda, s.v. πάντα ὀκτώ. It is highly likely that the oligarchic government of Corinth renamed some of the previous tribes and turned other tribes into subdivisions: *SEG* 30.990, l. 25. See Antonetti 1999b; Kaponis 2020: 291-99; Psoma 2022: 314.

24 On a possible tripartite tribal system in Corcyra: Thuc. 1.47.1; *IG* 1<sup>2</sup> 4 798 ll. 9-10, 37-38, 49. See Psoma 2022: 309-16. On the strong similarity of the tribal system of Apollonia with that in Corcyra: Kaponis 2020: 298; Psoma 2022: 316 with n. 69. On the joint Corinthian and Corcyrean colonization of Apollonia: Ps.-Scymn. 439-446; Strabo 7.5.8 (C316). See also Reboton 2008: 11; Kaponis 2020: 89-90, 415-17.

25 Leucas: *IG* IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4 1475 ll. 16-17 (= *SEG* 51.466, 53.388, 58.388) – for the restoration ἀ[λίαι], see Thonemann 2003: 116; Anactorion: *IG* IX 1<sup>2</sup> 2 212 l. 3; Corcyra: *IG* IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4 786 l. 5; 789 l. 1; 790 l. 1; 791 l. 1; 792 l. 1; 798 ll. 18, 49, 72, 83, 140; Epidamnus: Arist. *Pol.* 1301b21-26. See also Psoma 2022: 316-18.

26 All dates from this point onwards are BCE.

27 Kaponis 2020: 300-4. Cf. Psoma 2022: 316-18.

thian or Corinthian-Corcyrean *apoikiai*, shows that there were close political connections between Corinth and northwestern Greece.<sup>28</sup> The *pol-emarchos* was of great political significance in Leucas as we can deduce from a Hellenistic inscription, but probably originated from a military office that initially existed in archaic Corinth.<sup>29</sup> The *probouloi* was also possibly of Corinthian origin.<sup>30</sup> Other *poleis* in this region later imitated these institutions.<sup>31</sup> All these similarities in political organization show clearly that northwestern Greece was an area of Corinthian political and ideological influence and that its political and economic development was due to the Corinthian *apoikiai*.

The Corinthian calendar was also adopted by several northwestern *apoikiai* and *poleis*, Corinthian and otherwise.<sup>32</sup> The epigraphic evidence is scarce and comes mainly from Ambracia.<sup>33</sup> Yet Iversen has proved that all northwestern Corinthian *apoikiai* used the same model from the very beginning, implicitly acknowledging the economic primacy of Corinth.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, the Epeirotan sub-group of Corinthian calendars suggests

28 The material is mainly Hellenistic, but the offices discussed were certainly founded in previous periods: SEG 24.421 l. 1; 26.694 l. 2 (see also 24.412 l. 2); 42.543bis l. 3; 42.543ter l. 1; IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> 2 212 l. 3; IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4 786 l. 1; 798 l. 1; 1196 l. 2; 1475 l. 26; McCabe 1991: 45 l. 2; 46 ll. 2, 39-40; Cabanes & Ceka 1997: 5b l.1; 6 l. 1; 7 l. 2; 21 l. 1; 187 l. 2; 189 ll. 3-4; 193, F a l.15, F b ll. 10-12; 369 l.1; 385 l. 1; 387 l. 1; 390 l. 1; 391 l. 1; Cabanes & Drini 2007: 394 l. 1; 396 l. 1; 397 l. 1; 398 l. 1. For analysis: Kaponis 2020: 305-9, based mainly on Crema 2010. See Psoma 2022: 322-24. For the office of *prytanis* in Apollonia, see Reboton 2008: 11-12. For the office of *basileus* in Megara and its *apoikiai*, see Robu 2014: 367-75.

29 IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4 1231 ll. 8-9. On the archaic origin: Nic. Dam. (*FGrHist* 90) fr. 58.1-43. See also Matijašić 2010: 232-35; Kaponis 2020: 314-15.

30 IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4.1231 ll. 8-9; IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4 1475 l. 30 (ἀ[λίαι]); IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4 786 l. 12; 787 l. 11; 789 ll. 16-17. For a comparison with Corinthian *probouloi*, see Tréheux 1989; Psoma 2022: 325-27. For *probouloi* in Megara and its *apoikiai*, see Robu 2014: 387-89; 2018: 280-81. For the transplantation of *probouloi* to Milesian *apoikiai*, see Nawotka 2014: 121.

31 De Vido 2010; Matijašić 2010.

32 Cabanes 2003. On calendar in the Megarian *apoikiai*: Avram *et al.* 1999; Robu 2019. In Milesian *apoikiai*: Ehrhardt 1983: 113-26; Feraru 2015.

33 SEG 30.990 l. 3, if the inscription, as Crema (2010: 213) and Del Monaco (2011: 307) believe, is Ambracian; and see also SEG 56.948 (Γαμίλιος); 35.665 l. 2 (Φοινικαῖος). See also Cabanes & Andreou 1985: 499-544, 753-57, part B, 23 (Ἀρτεμίσιος), 25 (Ψυδρεῦς).

34 Iversen 2017; 2020: 27-30; Kaponis 2020: 318-23, 395-96, 404, 440-41. See also Psoma 2022: 395-400. For the Megarian calendar: Robu 2019.

that Ambracia, Leucas, Anactorion and other *poleis* enjoyed a special economic and cultural unity in northwestern Greece. The Corinthian calendar was so widespread that it even ended up on the Antikythera mechanism, which was manufactured after the destruction of Corinth itself.<sup>35</sup> The calendar played a perennial role in relations between Corinth and her *apoikiai*, in that the common festivals referred to by Thucydides are probably those celebrated in the respective months involved.<sup>36</sup>

Corinth also played a crucial role in the religious life of the *apoikiai* from the beginning. Cults and deities connected with the Doric-Corinthian foundation of the *apoikia* concerned were established from this time, although local variations were to appear later.<sup>37</sup> Religious bonds were made even closer through Corinthian epic poems and *Nostoi*, which connected Corinth with northwestern Greece and the West. Most of the available information comes from literary sources and inscriptions dated between the fifth century and Roman times. However, legends of traveling or returning heroes were certainly widespread from classical, and probably even archaic times onwards in Corinth, Corcyra, and throughout Epirus, Illyria, and Akarnania.<sup>38</sup>

35 The division into an Epeirotan and a Corcyrean subgroup denotes that Corcyra and other Corinthian *apoikiai* were commercial rivals from early on; see Kaponis 2020: 404.

36 Thuc. 1.25.4: during these festivals, the *apoikiai* showed particular honour to Corinthian citizens who happened to be present.

37 Tzouvara-Souli 1993; Kaponis 2020: 326-31, 333-49, 353-62, 378-84, 386-87, 391, 403-5, with extensive bibliography. See also Psoma 2022: 372-76, 376-79, 382-83, 383-84, 387-88. Cults of deities connected with colonization were also founded in Megarian *apoikiai*: Antonetti 1999a: 21-22; Robu 2013: 75-76; 2018: 276-78. On Aphrodite in Milesian *apoikiai*: Greaves 2004: 30-31. For transplanting of cults from Paros to Thasos, see Papadopoulou 2018; Trippé 2018; from Miletus to her *apoikiai*, see Ehrhardt 1983: 127-223; from Phocaea to her *apoikiai*, see Sachs 2014: 78-84, 122-27, 158-61.

38 Pind. *Nem.* 7.35-37 (Neoptolemus); Eur. *Andr.* 1243-1252 (Andromache, Helenus); Schol. Eur. *Andr.* 13-14.4 (Neoptolemus); Simias fr. 6 (Andromache, Aeneas); Strabo 10.2.9 (C452) (Leucadius); Eur. fr. 65.73a; Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.94.1 (Amphilochus); Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.50.4.1-51.1.5 (Aeneas); Ptolemaeus Chennus, *Novae Historiae* 7 (Westermann 1843: 198); Ath. 13.56.32-36 (589D) (Helenus); Paus. 1.11.1-2 (Neoptolemus, Helenus, and Andromache), 5.22.2-4 (Trojan and Achaean heroes); IG IX I<sup>2</sup> 2 583 l. 38 (Helenus); IG IX I<sup>2</sup> 4 866 B ll. 5-6; 871 ll. 1-2 (Amphineis), Cabanes & Ceka 1997:



### Moulding a multifaceted unity

After the overthrow of the tyrants, oligarchic constitutions were established in both the *metropolis* and in the northwestern *apoikiai*.<sup>39</sup> The Corinthians seem to have willingly supported their *apoikiai* and defended them against enemies, as is implied by the existence of the *polyandrion* at Ambracia, erected after the defeat of the *Perrhaiboi*, and in all likelihood commemorating assistance offered by the Corinthians,<sup>40</sup> and the existence of the late archaic tomb stele of the Corinthian Aristion who was either a representative of Corinth, a hoplite or even a mercenary.<sup>41</sup> The fact that a baetyl, the symbol of Ambracia itself, is inscribed on this stele probably indicates that the Ambraciots deeply appreciated Aristion's action on behalf of their *polis*.<sup>42</sup>

By the early decades of the fifth century, Ambracia, Leucas and Anactorion had become more independent in terms of commercial activity

78, T 303, 14-15 n. 4 (Trojan heroes); Tzouvara-Souli 1979: 46 with fig. 18b (Aeneas). See further Castiglioni 2003: 877-79; Stocker 2009: 288-94; Antonetti 2010; Morgan 2018: 32; Malkin 2018; Kaponis 2020: 138, 345, 355-57, 379-80, 391, 396-97, 405; Psoma 2022: 309, 311 n. 22, 355-63.

39 Ambracia: Arist. *Pol.* 1304a29-33; see also Gehrke & Wirbelauer 2004: 354-56; Birgalias 2009: 126 with n. 387. Leucas: Arist. *Pol.* 1266b15-25; see also De Vido 2010: 258-59. Epidamnus and Apollonia: Thuc. 1.26.3, Arist. *Pol.* 1290a40-b20, 1301b21-26, 1304a13-17; Diod. Sic. 12.30.2. See also Reboton 2008: 10-11; Kaponis 2020: 133-34, 282-91.

40 *Polyandrion*: SEG 41.540A l. 1; 44.463 l. 1; 44.1697. For the restoration of εὐρυχώροι[ο πορίνθο]: *Anth. Pal.* 6.135. See further Kaponis 2020: 51 with n. 274. The Thessalian/Epirotic *ethnos* of Perrhaeboi (Περραιβοί in the inscription) was a nomadic mountain people of the Pindos: Hom. *Il.* 2.749-54; Soph. fr. 271; Ps-Scymn. 614-617; Strabo 9.5.12 (C434), 9.5.19-20 (C439); Cl. App. *Ill.* 3-5; Plut. *Mor.* 293A-B (*Quaest. Grec.* 13); Hdn. 3.1.399; Plin. *HN* 4.1-2. See further Kaponis 2020: 58-63. Corinthians also saved (ἔρρυσάντο) Syracusans in the late sixth century when they, along with Corcyreans, reconciled them with Hippocrates of Gela: Hdt. 7.154.16.

41 SEG 41.540B ll. 1-2; see Andreou 1986.

42 The baetyl as a symbol of Ambracia: Kaponis 2020: 104 with n. 612, 132, 162 with n. 944, 328-30 with bibliography.

and internal political relations. Initially firmly dependent on Corinth, these *poleis* developed independently as is indicated above all by the appearance of Attic artifacts, although this may be simply due to the general trend of the time.<sup>43</sup> The economic development of Ambracia, Leucas and Anactorion led to further social stratification and political diversification stimulated by the emergence of political groupings. This could also be connected with the evolution that occurs in burial customs. In some respects, such as the construction of the Ambracian *polyandrion*, numerical predominance of cist tombs and the numerous cremations in Anactorion, they diverge from those in Corinth and, in other cases, the burial customs of the *apoikiai* resemble Corinthian habits. For example, the citizens of these *apoikiai* use sarcophagi, stop making funerary offerings and the main type of burial is interment.<sup>44</sup> However, this resemblance could be due not to the imitation of the *metropolis* but rather to social factors.<sup>45</sup>

In this context, a pro-Corcyrean faction seems to have arisen on Leucas,<sup>46</sup> as can be deduced from the arbitration of Themistocles in 483/2 between the Corcyreans and the Corinthians for the colonial rights over Leucas. Themistocles favoured the Corcyreans and acknowledged that they were mutual founders of the *apoikia*.<sup>47</sup> However, the pro-Corinthian grouping soon prevailed and convinced the Leucadians to strike coins

43 Aggeli 2004: 555-56; Aggeli 2014: 63-67. See also Kaponis 2020: 161, 200-1.

44 Dickey 1992: 20, 24-32; Stavropoulou-Gatsi & Alexopoulou 2002: 83; Slane 2017; Aggeli 2021: 284-87. On similarities and divergences between Corinthian and Syracusan burial customs: Shepherd 2002; 2015; Germanà Bozza 2011: 694; Morakis 2019: 191-92 with nn. 800, 805; between Corinthian and Corcyrean burial customs: Spanodimos 2014.

45 Other, non-Corinthian, *apoikiai* seem to have used the sarcophagi simply as a sign of social differentiation: Shepherd 2014: 120-23; 2015: 357-66.

46 Kaponis 2020: 203-11.

47 Thuc. 1.136.1; Theophr. fr. 9 ll. II.23-34 (*POxy*, 7.1012C); Plut. *Them.* 24.1; see also Psoma 2022: 134-38. These claims probably arose from the fact that Corcyreans had a powerful navy at the time: Hdt. 6.168; Thuc. 1.14.2, 25.4; see also Psoma 2022: 118-26.

employing Corinthian types.<sup>48</sup> The prevalence of this oligarchic grouping may be related to the institution of the habit of burying the dead in sarcophagi which survived in Leucas until the second century.<sup>49</sup> Themistocles' involvement in commerce in northwestern Greece also confirms the point that Corinth and its *apoikiai* in northwestern Greece had long collaborated over corn trade from Sicily.<sup>50</sup>

In the early fifth century, Leucas and Ambracia minted *pegasoi* in large quantities in an attempt to prepare their military forces in the face of Xerxes' invasion.<sup>51</sup> Ambracian staters were struck in the mint at Corinth: Ambracia and Corinth were on very friendly terms and had even aligned their economic institutions with each other.<sup>52</sup> The economic support of *metropolis* towards the *apoikiai* inaugurated close economic cooperation between them. So important were the kinship bonds between Ambracia and Leucas and Corinth that they decided to participate in the naval battle of Salamis, in Herodotus' view, "because they were Dorian Corinthians".<sup>53</sup> All three *apoikiai* amassed a considerable number of hoplites for the battle of Plataea.<sup>54</sup> Herodotus' unusual statement, in which he gives

48 This conscious choice is resonant, because at the same time or a little earlier the Corcyreans minted their own coins on a variation of the Corinthian weight standard and with different types, although they also were included in the sphere of Corinthian economic influence: Calciati 1990: II.385; Psoma 2015: 141-46; Kaponis 2020: 203-11; Psoma 2022: 89-93, who emphasizes the fact that this numismatic differentiation was caused by the Corcyreans' desire to ensure their own 'loneliness' and to protect its own economic benefits denying another *polis*' currency such as the Corinthian one.

49 Douzougli 2001: 51-52, 55-57; Staikou 2016: 176-79; Aggeli 2021: 293.

50 *Themistocles' Letters* (6.8-30, 7.4-6). The letters are Hellenistic in date but draw on classical authors: see Cortassa & Culasso Gastaldi 1990: I.39. Kometopoulou (2012: 205 with n. 998) depicts Themistocles' commercial activities in the West in which he collaborates with Corinthian corn traders.

51 For the integration of these *apoikiai* into the Hellenic Alliance: Hdt. 8.45; Paus. 5.23.2; Syll.<sup>3</sup> 30 ll. 29-30 (X), 33 (XI). See also Fantasia 2017: 45 with n. 131.

52 This conclusion is mainly based on the use of common dies for Ambracian and Corinthian coins: Kraay 1977: 42-44; Carter 1993: 35, 39; Mercuri 2006: 243; Kaponis 2020: 210-12.

53 Hdt. 7.45.

54 Hdt. 9.28: the Ambraciots gathered 500 and the Leucadians and Anactorians together 800. This is a significant number of hoplites, given the small populations of these *poleis*: see also Kaponis 2020: 142-44.

one figure for both Leucadians and Anactorians, can only be explained, if the Leucadians and Anactorians were regarded as a joint force. These ethnonyms also appear together on the bronze serpent column erected at Delphi.<sup>55</sup> This joint deployment implies tactical collaboration during the battle, which means that they clearly considered themselves Corinthian sister *apoikiai*.<sup>56</sup>

### Colonial and kinship piety: a rule with exceptions

During the first half of the fifth century, Corinthian oligarchic institutions and values deeply influenced the political life of Ambracia. Both the foundation myth of Ambracia and the 13<sup>th</sup> *Olympian* of Pindar in honour of the wealthy Corinthian Xenophon show that Corinth and Ambracia shared common political values (*themis*, *eunomia* and *dike*), which, also unsurprisingly, happened to possess oligarchic connotations.<sup>57</sup> Thucydides' own comments on the filial piety of the Corinthian *apoikiai* and Aristotle's few passages on their polities suggest that both Ambracia and Leucas were governed by pro-Corinthian oligarchies.<sup>58</sup> On the other hand, the contemporary change that we have observed concerning the burial customs of all three *apoikiai*, in particular the adoption of built cist tombs or pit burials, the prevalence of cremations, the use of tombstones and the abandonment in Ambracia (albeit not in Leucas) of limestone sarcophagi, a burial form predominant in Corinth, implies that there was some divergence from Corinthian culture.<sup>59</sup>

55 Hdt. 9.28; Paus. 5.23.2; Syll.<sup>3</sup> 30 ll. 29-30 (X), 33 (XI).

56 Cf. the similar troop deployment implemented in the battle outside Stratos: Thuc. 2.81.3. On the colonial identity of Euboean colonies, see Mermati 2012.

57 Pind. *Ol.* 13.4-8; Athanadas (*FGrHist* 303) fr. 1. For parallels, see Hes. *Theog.* 85, 396, 902; *Op.* 9, 137, 221; Hdt. 1.65.10; Dem. *Aristog.* 11.1-3, 35.1. See also Stickler 2010: 35-57.

58 Thuc. 1.38.1-4, Arist. *Pol.* 1266b15-25 (Leucas), 1303a20-25, 1304a17-20, 1304a31-33, 1311a28-36, 1311a40- b1 (Ambracia).

59 Stavropoulou-Gatsi & Alexopoulou 2002: 82-84; Staikou 2016: 180-81; Stavropoulou-Gatsi 2019; Aggeli 2021: 98, 287-88, 294-95. This divergence was either due to local conditions, such as a lack of limestone, or due to constitutional change: see Aggeli

By 460 the Athenians had started to dispute Corinthian political control of northwestern Greece. The settlement of Messenian refugees in Naupaktos and Athenian military campaigns dissolved this strategic unity between Corinth and her northwestern *apoikiai*. Almost all the Akarnanian *poleis* became Athenian allies.<sup>60</sup> After Phormio's victory in defence of the Amphilochians, the powers of Ambracia no longer extended to the southeastern shore of the Ambracian Gulf, so that pro-Corinthian unity in northwestern Greece was ruptured by the subsequent alliance between Athenians and Akarnanians.<sup>61</sup> The hatred between Ambraciots and Amphilochians probably created anti-Corinthian sentiment in Amphilochikon Argos during this period, traces of which may perhaps appear in the version of the foundation legend of Amphilochikon Argos given by Euripides, in which the eponymous hero Amphilochus denies its Corinthian origin.<sup>62</sup>

Besides, a pro-Corcyrean political grouping may also have sprung up in Anactorion before 435, although before the Peloponnesian War Leucas and Anactorion functioned as important stopping-off points for Corinthian vessels travelling in the Ionian Sea and/or in the Ambracian Gulf.<sup>63</sup> Both Corcyra and Corinth had already been recognized as the co-founders of Anactorion<sup>64</sup> and it is very suspicious that Anactorion failed to send any triremes to assist Corinth during the first Corinthian campaign to help Epidamnus.<sup>65</sup> Thus, the campaigns against Corcyra seem to have provoked a reaction on the part of pro-Corcyrean or pro-Athenian

2021: 284-87. A similar independent evolution in the burial customs is seen at Syracuse: Shepherd 2005.

60 Thuc. 1.103, 108, 111, 2.30.1, 2.33.1, 2.82.1, 3.94.1. See also the effort of the Corinthians to supervise colonial loyalty in Potidaea by means of a special office, the *epidamiourgos*, who was sent every year from the *metropolis*: Thuc. 1.56.2. See Kaponis 2020: 311-14.

61 Thuc. 2.68.7-8. For the date of Phormio's campaign in Akarnania: Kagan 1969: 385; Krentz & Sullivan 1987; Kagan 1998: 169-70; Stickler 2010: 132-40 (before the Thirty Years' Peace); Fantasia 2017: 47-48 (beginning of 430s).

62 Eur. fr. 65.73a; Ps.-Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.94.1. See also Jouan 1990.

63 Thuc. 1.29.1-4, 30.3, 46.3, 55.1.

64 Thuc. 1.55.1-2.

65 Thuc. 1.27.2. The Corinthians took Anactorion by treachery before the Peloponnesian War and during the Archidamian War the Athenians expelled Corinthian *apoikoi* also by treachery in order to establish Akarnanians in the city: Thuc. 1.55.1, 4.49.

groups in Anactorion.<sup>66</sup> As part of the same dynamic, Ambraciots and Leucadians sent considerable assistance to Corinth during the second campaign which resulted in the battle of Sybota, while the Anactorians sent almost none.<sup>67</sup>

By the 430s, the Ambraciots had become, thanks to their superior military abilities, the leaders of a regional alliance that comprised several *ethne* of Epirus and Illyria.<sup>68</sup> On the other hand, in previous decades the Corinthians had controlled the land route from Aetolia to Illyria<sup>69</sup> and maintained friendly relations with the local *ethne*, as can be deduced both from Corinthian *nostoi* dealing with returning heroes who travelled through Epirus and Illyria and from the foundation of small *poleis*, *apoikiai/polismata* in northwestern Greece.<sup>70</sup> This overlapping of Corinthian and Ambracian political and strategical interests created a tangible, concrete Corinthian/Ambracian sphere of influence.

The Corinthians continued to regard these *poleis* as indispensable components of their sphere of influence. Leucadian *pegasoi* were minted in large quantities and on a great variety of dies at this time.<sup>71</sup> Corinth also minted Ambracian *pegasoi* to fund the building of triremes for Ambracia. She also probably ordered Leucas, Potidaea, Epidamnus, and Anactorion to mint their own *pegasoi* in preparation for the colonial and naval campaigns in defence of Epidamnus.<sup>72</sup> The Corinthians could now require military and political aid from these *poleis* on grounds of

66 Kaponis 2020: 143, 207-8. On *oligoi* and *demos* supporting different hegemonical powers at Megara, Epidamnus and Corcyra: Thuc. 1.24-27, 1.103-5, 3.70-81. For Corcyreans' claims over Apollonia: Strabo 7.5.8 (C 316); Paus. 5.22.4.

67 Thuc. 1.27.2, 46.1. See also De Ste. Croix 1972: 68.

68 Thuc. 2.80.

69 Thuc. 1.26.2; Paus. 5.22.2-4; Cabanes & Ceka 1997: T 303, 78.

70 Thuc. 1.47.3. The Corinthians followed this route in the early 460s, in order to subjugate Thronion, a *polis* hostile to Apollonia: Paus. 5.22.2-4; Cabanes & Ceka 1997: T 303, 78. According to Thucydides (1.26.2), they later used this route to lead new colonists to Epidamnus. On Corinthian *apoikiai/polismata*: Thuc. 1.108.5, 2.30.1, 3.102.2.

71 Carter 1993: 35, 39. See also Kaponis 2020: 214-15.

72 Thuc. 1.27.1. The *pegasoi* from each of these *poleis* were engraved with the initial letter of its respective ethnonym: Kraay 1976: 123-24, 1979: 38, 42, 54, 58; Kagan 1998: 164-66, 168; Kaponis 2020: 216-20.

συγγένεια and was obliged to reciprocate with offers of military protection and financial support. The Corinthians even declared that they enjoyed more affection and respect from northwestern *apoikiai* than did any other *metropolis* in Greece. With the exception of the Corcyreans, during joint sacrifices the Corinthians were first to be honoured by them.<sup>73</sup>

Corinth continued to support her *apoikiai* and allies during the Peloponnesian War.<sup>74</sup> Ambracia did not mint any coinage in this period in contrast to Leucas.<sup>75</sup> *Pegasoi* from both Corinth and her *apoikiai* became the dominant coinage in neighbouring areas, while Akarnanian *poleis*, although hostile to Corinth and her *apoikiai*, also minted coins on a reduced Corinthian weight standard.<sup>76</sup> Thus *pegasoi* came to symbolize a peripheral economic unity despite any political diversity. Corinth also insisted on exercising particular political and military control over Anactorion.<sup>77</sup>

During the Archidamian War, the Corinthians were very willing to promote Ambracian interests.<sup>78</sup> After the battles of Stratos, Olpae and Idomenae the Ambraciots lost their supremacy.<sup>79</sup> On the other hand, Corinth sent 500 hoplites to protect Ambracia and Leucas to demonstrate her willingness to protect her *apoikiai* should the Athenians attack.<sup>80</sup> Anactorians had sent hoplites for the first Peloponnesian expedition in 429, but in 425 the anti-Corinthian party facilitated the Athenian conquest and Anactorion was refounded by new settlers from all over Akarnania.<sup>81</sup>

73 Thuc. 1.25.4, 38.3. For an interpretation of this passage, see Suk Fong Jim 2013. Thucydides emphasizes the paradoxical fact that Corcyreans plundered Leucas, although it was a Corinthian *apoikia*: Thuc. 1.30.2. It is in this context that we must regard the Corinthian claim that the Corcyreans were their own allies who had rebelled against them: Thuc. 1.40.4. See also Stickler 2010: 248–50; Fragoulaki 2013: 66, 73, 84.

74 Thuc. 2.9.3.

75 Carter 1993: 35. See also Kaponis 2020: 223–25.

76 Carter 1993: 35; SNG (1943/Copenhagen) n. 340; Calciati 1990: II.404–5 nos. 54, 55, 57, 58, 392–476 nos. 17–129; Psoma 2007a: 10–11, 17, 18.

77 Thuc. 1.55.1–2, 4.49. Graham 1962; Fragoulaki 2013: 40.

78 Thuc. 2.80–82 (Cnemus), 3.102.6–7, 3.105–14 (Eurylochus).

79 Thuc. 2.81.6–7, 3.114.3.

80 Thuc. 4.42.3.

81 Thuc. 4.49.

Leucas was then the only place to provide secure docking facilities for triremes and commercial vessels and so became the centre of naval operations of Corinth in the region.<sup>82</sup>

In Thucydides' narrative, Ambracia and Leucas and (until 425) Anactorion are constantly mentioned together, which implies that this was how they were grouped in battle. This is how they appear in the catalogue of Sparta's allies, in the battle of Stratos, in the Corcyrean civil war and in the Sicilian Campaign.<sup>83</sup> In various passages in Thucydides, Corinth willingly supports her *apoikiai*, being motivated above all by colonial and kinship bonds.<sup>84</sup> Thucydides thus regarded the *apoikiai* around the Ambracian Gulf as a form of an entity united by *συγγένεια*.<sup>85</sup>

### Revival of a mocked Corinthian unity

The economic development of the *poleis* around the Ambracian Gulf and the consequences of the Corinthian War gave the *poleis* another chance to diverge from the policy of Corinth. At the beginning of the fourth century, the Leucadians struck new issues on Corinthian types, albeit with new legends (Λ or ΛΕΥ), which proudly advertised the economic independence of Leucas.<sup>86</sup>

82 Thuc. 2.80.2-5, 81.3, 84.5, 91-92.3, 3.7.4-5, 69.1, 80.2, 81.1, 94.1-2, 95.1-2, 102.3, 4.8.2, 4.42.3, 6.104.1, 7.2.1, 7.1, 8.13.1; Xen. *Hell.* 6.2.26; Paus. 10.9.10.

83 For similar grouping before the Peloponnesian War, cf. above n. 55-56.

84 Thuc. 1.29.1-4, 1.30.1-3, 2.9.2-3, 2.80, 2.91.1-4, 3.69.1, 3.76.1, 7.58.3 (κατὰ τὸ ξυγγενές); Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.64.2-4.66.10, 6.2.2.1-2.2.5. Cf. Thuc. 1.26.3 (Epidamnus), 7.57.7 (Corcyra). On kinship in Thucydides: Curty 1994; Fragoulaki 2013, especially concerning Corinth and *apoikiai*, 58-99.

85 Corinth preserved the same warm relationship with other Corinthian *apoikiai*, such as Potidaea and Syracuse: Hdt. 7.154.16; Thuc. 1.29.6, 56.2, 60.1-3, 4.72.1, 6.34.3-4, 73.2, 88.7, 104.1, 7.2.1-3, 4.7, 7.3, 17.3-4, 18.1, 19.5, 24.3, 39.2. The Syracusans later in fourth century asked Corinth to become their *metropolis* again, showing their loyalty over time: Plut. *Tim.* 23.1-2. See also Fragoulaki 2013: 81, 88-96. Cf. the violation of this Corinthian *συγγένεια* when the Corcyreans participated in the Sicilian Expedition: Thuc. 7.57.7. See also Fragoulaki 2013: 34.

86 Kraay 1976: 125 n. 3; Calciati 1990: II.392, 400 no. 45, 404 no. 54-55, 405 no. 57; Carter 1993: 35. See also Kaponis 2020: 223-25, 231-33. Over 400-350 there was a significant



Although Ephorus states that Ambracia and Leucas were members of the anti-Spartan coalition during the Corinthian War, they did not send troops or triremes in support of Corinth, whose territory was ravaged.<sup>87</sup> At the time, Anactorion was still considered Akarnanian.<sup>88</sup> Consequently, both Leucas and Ambracia reorganized their army and navy and, when they became Peloponnesian allies soon after, they again funded naval campaigns in the Ionian Sea and supported Peloponnesian triremes in the conflict over Corcyra. Ambracia and Leucas are again mentioned together by Xenophon as members of the naval force under Mnasippus, although this time they appear in the text after Corinthians.<sup>89</sup>

By the fourth century, probably after the Corinthian War,<sup>90</sup> the polities of Ambracia and Leucas had been reformed and the *poleis* gradually adopted democratic institutions that diverged from the oligarchical model employed in Corinth.<sup>91</sup> Furthermore, political offices which in archaic times had enjoyed great prestige started to acquire features in the *apoikia* that differed from those possessed by such magistracies in Corinth.<sup>92</sup>

Moreover, the Leucadians in 361 joined the Second Athenian Alliance, albeit for only a short period.<sup>93</sup> In 350s they minted staters depicting the

increase in foreign coins circulating in the *agora* at Leucas: Bonelou 2005: 49-53; Gatzolis 2012: 386-90; Bonelou 2016: 121, 124-25; Kaponis 2020: 269-71.

87 Diod. Sic. 14.82.1.5-5.1. However, Ephorus in his list of the states in this alliance mentions Leucadians along with Akarnanians and Ambraciots. Cf. Xen. *Ages.* 1.5.1-7.1; *Hell.* 4.2.17, 3.15.

88 After Agesilaus' expedition in 388 against Akarnania, Anactorion became an ally of Sparta: Xen. *Hell.* 4.7.1.

89 Xen. *Hell.* 5.4.64-66.10, 6.2.2-2.5, although he never mentions any bonds of kinship.

90 Kaponis 2020: 286, 288. During this war, Corinth also experienced a political revolt, possibly organized by a recently formed democratic party in collaboration with disenfranchised wealthy citizens: Diod. Sic. 14.86.1; *POxy* 7.2; Xen. *Hell.* 4.4. See also Hamilton 1972: 21-24.

91 Arist. *Pol.* 1266b15-25 (Leucas), 1303a20-25 (Ambracia).

92 On the office of *polemarchos*: *IG IX* 1<sup>2</sup> 4 1231 ll. 8-9; Nic. Dam. (*FGrHist* 90) fr. 58.1-43; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 14.1, 17.2, 22.2; on that of *basileus*: Hdt. 5.92δ; Nic. Dam. (*FGrHist* 90) fr. 58.1, 59.1-13; Apollodorus (*FGrHist* 244) fr. 331 (= Diod. Sic. 7.9.1-9.6); Euseb. *Chron.* I, 88 (Schöene); Arist. fr. 611.19-20 (Rose). See also Matijašić 2010: 232-37; Kōiv 2016: 26-27, 58, 60; Kaponis 2020: 314-15.

93 *IG II*<sup>2</sup> 104. See also Kaponis 2020: 230, 239.

Boeotian shield, possibly as a sign of some economic or political cooperation with Thebes, which at the time was on bad terms with Corinth.<sup>94</sup> Anactorion had also cooperated with Thebes at about that time: it was asked to fund Theban troops during the Third Sacred War.<sup>95</sup> However, it minted a large amount of *pegasoi*, a symbol of Corinthian economic supremacy in the region before 350.<sup>96</sup>

The most important factor that deepened and expanded unity within northwestern Greece was the campaign in support of Syracuse organized by the Corinthian *strategos* Timoleon in 344. An inscription from Corinth commemorating his victory mentions Corcyreans, Apolloniates and possibly Ambraciots, while literary sources confirm that the Leucadians also took part.<sup>97</sup> This campaign led to the political rediscovery of Corinth as the *metropolis* of all the Corinthian *apoikiai* in the north-west and to the reestablishment of previous colonial loyalty.<sup>98</sup> Anactorion re-entered the Corinthian sphere of economic and political influence, and the idea of kinship was promoted once more and this time incorporated even the previously hostile Corcyra.<sup>99</sup> The reunification of the Corinthian colonial family was also expressed by the settlement of citizens from one *apoikia* in another, as is shown by the presence of tombs of Corcyreans at Leucas and Anactorion and of Ambraciots at Leucas.<sup>100</sup> The memory of the com-

94 Kraay 1976: 125 with n. 3; Calciati 1990: II.392, 400 no. 45, 404 nos. 54-55, 405 no. 57; Kaponis 2020: 237-42. Likewise, the Akarnanians were briefly members of the Second Athenian Alliance and subsequently fell within in the sphere of influence of Thebes: Diod. Sic. 15.36.5-6 (Second Athenian Alliance); Xen. *Hell.* 6.5.23; Diod. Sic. 15.57.2-4 (Theban sphere of influence).

95 *IG VII* 2418 ll. 5-7. See also Psoma 2016: 102; Kaponis 2020: 261, 266-69.

96 Kaponis 2020: 261.

97 Kent 1966: no. 23; Cabanes & Ceka 1997: T 307. For the possible reconstruction [Ἀμβρακ]ιωτῶν, see Fantasia 2017: 99-105. For the participation of Leucas and Corcyra: Diod. Sic. 16.66.2; Plut. *Tim.* 8.4; [*Rh. Al.*] 1429b.18-22. For the encapsulation of Corcyra in the Corinthian sphere of influence, see Intrieri 2015: 107-9.

98 Antonetti 2011.

99 Forasté 1993: 47. On Corcyra regarded as ἄποικοις of the Corinthians and συγγενής of the other Corinthian *apoikiai*: Thuc. 7.57.7. See also Fragoulaki 2013: 34.

100 Stavropoulou-Gatsi & Alexopoulou 2002: 84; Staikou 2016: 180-81. For the right of reestablishment in old *apoikiai*, see Malkin 2018; Kaponis 2020, 90 with n. 516.

mon past was expressed on Ambracian coins, where the figure of the Corinthian oecist Gorgus was depicted.<sup>101</sup> The reconnection of *metropolis* and northwestern *apoikiai* was so strong in fourth century that Demosthenes tried to warn the Corinthians of Philip's aggression, since (he states that) Ambracia and Leucas were *poleis* under Corinthian control.<sup>102</sup> Once more in the literary tradition the *poleis* around the Ambracian Gulf form a multifaceted unity.<sup>103</sup>

A few years later, the Ambraciots formed a similar political and economic entity, albeit smaller. A treaty of friendship and alliance with the Akarnanians and the Amphilocheians, probably agreed in 342 but in fact a renewal of the treaty signed in 426, confirms that the Ambracian Gulf is to be exploited freely and in common by all parties.<sup>104</sup> Ambracia managed also to reaffirm her bonds with Akarnania, point commemorated on her coins that depict the Akarnanian god Achelous.<sup>105</sup>

During this period, the Leucadians considered themselves the closest relatives of the Corinthians, as did also other Greeks. A Late classical mirror advertises its Corinthian origin and hints at economic cooperation between Leucas and Corinth: it depicts Corinth as a seated male deity and Leucas as a nymph serving him, while two irises, a flower closely connected with Corinthian and Leucadian trade in perfumes in Epirus and Illyria, appear in the background.<sup>106</sup> These close kinship bonds are found

101 Cf. above n. 15.

102 Dem. *Phil.* 3, 34.1-35.2.

103 Kaponis 2020: 140, 434-35.

104 SEG 63.391, especially on the common exploitation of the Ambracian Gulf: ll. 8-9. See also Funke & Hallof 2013: 56-62; Fantasia 2018: 503-5; Kaponis 2020: 158, 245. Ambraciots exported great quantities of fish throughout the classical period: Hsch. s.v. ἀκεῖνες; Anonymus, *Exegesis totius mundi e nationum*, 30; Arcestratus, fr. 7 Brandt (= Ath. 3.44-92D), fr. 26 Brandt (= Ath. 3.66-105E), fr. 15 Brandt (Ath. 7.72-305E-F), fr. 30 Brandt (Ath. 7-328A), fr. 45.1-10 Brandt (Ath. 7.86-311A): fr. 54 (Ath. 7-326D), fr. 156 Brandt (Ath. 3-105E); Philemon, fr. 82 (Kassel). See also Dakaris 1976: 19; Tzouvara-Souli 1992: 206-7; Zoumbaki 2012: 85-86; Dalby 2013: 7 (Ambracia); Kaponis 2020: 149-57.

105 Calciati 1990: II.463, nos. 88-90. Achelous was the most important deity of the Akarnanians: Corsten 2006: 163-65. See also Kaponis 2020: 244-45.

106 IG IV 360; IG IX 1<sup>2</sup> 4 1477 (Louvre no. 1699). For the ideological relation with Corinth: Ostrowski 1996: 266; Zachos & Douzougli 2003: 45; Antonetti 2011: 58-59 with nn.

to an exceptional degree in pseudo-Aristotle's implication that Leucadians and Corinthians resemble each other.<sup>107</sup> Most peculiar and amusing of all, Callisthenes made fun of the obvious and mutual affection between the Corinthians and the supposedly conservative Leucadians, presenting the Leucadians as "a fogeyish version of the Corinthians".<sup>108</sup>

### Intertemporal Corinthian memories

During the period of Macedonian and/or Molossian supremacy, pro-Macedonian parties in northwestern *poleis* respected their Corinthian past, although in an effort to legitimize the claims of the Macedonian sovereign, they created new versions of foundation legends and placed deities with Macedonian/Molossian affinities at the centre of local cult.<sup>109</sup> The later version of the Ambracian foundation legend commemorates the Corinthian oecist Gorgus, thus revealing the diachronic cult that lay at the heart of Ambracian religious life.<sup>110</sup> Furthermore, the economic bonds that had connected the members of the Corinthian family of *apoikiai* could not be annulled. Numismatists have concluded that Am-

31-32. Iris flowers: Theophr. *Hist. Pl.* 9.7.3-4; Plin. *HN* 13.5, 21.42. See also Roebuck 1972: 118; Lambrugo 2008; Castel *et al.* 2009: 326-27; Zoumbaki 2012: 84. For depictions of iris on Leucadian coins: Calciati 1990: II.392-476 nos. 17-129.

107 Arist. [*Phgn.*] 808a31 (Bekker). Unlike Leucadians, the inhabitants of Apollonia in Illyria had probably little in common in their appearance with the Corinthians: McIlvain *et al.* 2014.

108 Callisthenes (*FGrHist* 124) fr. 5.32-33 = Ath. 8.44.7-11 (347C).

109 Kaponis 2020: 133-37, 341-46. For re-elaborated and amended foundation legends in Miletus: Polito 2011: 97-98.

110 Athanadas (*FGrHist* 303) fr. 1. Cf. the cult of the oecist in Megarian *apoikiai*: Robu 2014: 159, 248, 412-13.

bracia continued to use *pegasoi* for several decades after Pyrrhus' arrival,<sup>111</sup> and Corinthian *pegasoi* circulated extensively in northwestern Greece and the west.<sup>112</sup>

In spite of the political integration of these *poleis* in the territory of Hellenistic hegemonic or peripheral powers, there were still strong memories of Corinthian culture. The most eloquent symbol of the Corinthian origin of its *apoikiai* and of cooperation over time between *metropolis* and *apoikia* was Pegasus. He was still engraved on Hellenistic *danakes* (coin-shaped burial offerings) in Ambracia and Leucas.<sup>113</sup> Moreover, political cults connected with the Corinthian *nostoi* or linked to Doric cult practices kept Corinthian culture and ideology alive.<sup>114</sup>

Most strikingly, however, these memories were propagated by authors and poets of Augustan times. Antipater of Thessalonica represents the three *apoikiai*, along with Argos Amphilochikon and Thyrrheion, as the predecessors of Nicopolis. Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Ovid represent their conquest by the Romans as a result of Roman aggression against Corinth.<sup>115</sup> Lastly, the survival of so many deeply-rooted Corinthian memories is attested in the cults of Nicopolis. The population of Augustus' city was drawn from neighbouring areas, and they brought with them their own deities and cult practices, along with their material culture,<sup>116</sup> and sanctuaries were dedicated to Asclepius, Leucadian Apollo

111 Oikonomidou-Karamessini 1994: 172-74; Preka-Alexandri & Stoyas 2009; Bonelou 2013: 389. Corinthian staters were also used for paying the wages of Akarnanian soldiers: *IG IX I*<sup>2</sup> 1 3 l. 39. Bronze Ambracian *pegasoi* were dominant in the Ionian Sea and Epirus during the third and early second centuries: see Oeconomides 1990: 267-69 with n. 4; Tsangari 2007: 26; Kaponis 2020: 251-52.

112 *CID* 2 12, col. II ll. 20-25; Bousquet 1942: 102, 20-25; *CID* 2 4, col. III; *IG IX I*<sup>2</sup> 4 32; *IG IX I*<sup>2</sup> 4 798 ll. 4, 7, 19, 41, 69, 102, 112; *IG IX I*<sup>2</sup> 4 1196 l. 32; Cabanes & Drini 1995: 514 n. 46 l. 41. See also Psoma 2007b: 238-40; 2018: 128-33.

113 Zachos 1997: 282; Vassios 2017.

114 *IG IX I*<sup>2</sup> 2 583 l. 38; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.50.4.1-51.1.5; Strabo 10.2.9 (C 452). On the exploitation of traditional Doric cults in Hellenistic times: Kaponis 2020: 322, 396-97.

115 *Anth. Pal.* 9.553; Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.50.4.1-51.1.5; Ov. *Her.* 155-172. See also Fantasia 2017: 200.

116 Fantasia 2017: 190-95.

or Apollo Actios.<sup>117</sup> The temple of Apollo Actios in Akarnania was also restored by Augustus.<sup>118</sup> The ‘Leucadian Leap’ on the promontory of Leucas as a purificatory ceremony was adopted, while Leucadian Apollo was also depicted on coins of Nicopolis.<sup>119</sup> A baetyl, the Ambracian symbol, was erected in the centre of Nicopolis to indicate the identity of the new city. During the same period, burials of wealthy citizens from Nicopolis contained golden *danakes* depicting Pegasus, just like in Hellenistic Ambracia.<sup>120</sup> Finally, both the political institutions of these *poleis*, especially the *boule* and *demos* of Ambracia, and in general the *nomima*, including cults and calendar, remained to a remarkable degree unchanged throughout the Hellenistic and Roman periods.<sup>121</sup>

### Intertemporal memories of a shifting unity

To conclude: ancient literary tradition always regarded Ambracian Gulf as an area of Corinthian economic, cultural and political interest from the archaic period onwards. Corinth’s relationship with her western *apoikiai* gradually led to a notable degree of unity, derived from colonial kinship and otherwise rare in the divided world of Greek *poleis*. Other examples of such unity are exceptional in the ancient Greek world and are

117 Polyb. 21.27.2; Livy 38.5.2. See also Strauch 1996: 172.

118 Verg. *Aen.* 8.704-706; Prop. 4.6.27-68; Strabo 7.7.5-6 (C325); Suet. *Aug.* 18.2; Dio Cas. 51.1.1-3.

119 Prop. 3.11.69; Ov. *Her.* 155-172; *Tr.* 3.1.35-40. For coins, see Franke 1976; Tzouvara-Souli 2001: 242-44.

120 Tzouvara-Souli 1984; 1987: 177; 1993: 65-69; Fehrentz 1993: 156; Strauch 1996: 171-72; Tzouvara-Souli 2001: 243-44; Katsadima 2007: 96. For the baetyl in Ambracia and Apollonia, see SEG 45.659; 59.614-15; Quantin 2011: 229 with n. 44. For artifacts from Ambracia adorning the monuments of Actium, see Hoepfner 1983; Tzouvara-Souli 1987: 181; Strauch 1996: 170-71; Fantasia 2017: 193.

121 Most of the sources are Hellenistic: see above nn. 25-31. For βουλή and δῆμος in possibly Trajanic Greek inscriptions: CIG 2.1801; SEG 39.527; 1868. Fantasia 2017: 196 thinks that βουλή and δῆμος were revived after the site had been abandoned in Augustan times.

perhaps due to initial strong political and economic affinities.<sup>122</sup> Political unity was to a certain degree ruptured by Athenian policy in the region and was challenged by political developments and constitutional changes in the *apoikiai*. Yet this unity survived via political ideology and institutions and until the absorption of the *poleis* by Hellenistic powers was revived several times thus strengthening the kinship bonds among these states. Economic unity was maintained through Corinthian trade and through a common calendar and numismatic policy and managed to survive until the end of the Hellenistic era. Cultural diversities that arose from local needs and particularities did not prevent these *poleis* over time from remaining conscious of their common Corinthian culture, expressed mainly through cults, myth, burial customs and artefacts.

Although they had their own institutions and followed their own policies, these *apoikiai* seem initially to have depended on Corinth because of the blood relationship between Corinthian and their own tyrants. The Corinthian legends created a common mythological tradition, retained the memory of Corinthian origin and therefore shaped strong kinship and cultural bonds. *Metropolis* and *apoikiai* shared a common ideology and war experience that reinforced bonds of sentiment between them. At the end of the archaic period, they formed a political and economic unity, which motivated the *apoikiai* to support each other. However, from time to time political bonds among these Corinthian *apoikiai* and between them and the *metropolis* were either strengthened or partially dismantled. Despite the divergence from Corinth caused by the economic development of its *apoikiai*, by internal social diversification and by the corrosive effects of war over the fifth and early fourth centuries, Corinthians, Ambraciots, and Leucadians continued to enjoy the economic and political unity they had established previously.

122 For the similar relations of Sicilian *apoikiai* with their *metropolis*, see Morakis in this volume (throughout). The *apoikiai* of the Syracusans and Sinopeis maintained exceptional bonds with or even dependence on their *metropolis*: Hdt. 7.154.18; Thuc. 6.5.2-3 (Syracusans); Xen. An. 4.8.22, 5.3.2, 5.5.7, 5.5.10-11 (*Sinopeis*): for Syracusan *apoikiai*, see Dunbabin 1948: 16-18; Graham 1964: 92-93; Morakis 2019: 177-80; for Sinopean *apoikiai*, see Manoledakis 2015: 86. Sparta also had a similar relationship to her *apoikiai*: Fragoulaki 2013: 140-208 with references to Thucydides. For Miletus and her *apoikiai*, see Ehrhardt 1983: 229-54.

In late classical times, Corinthian *apoikiai* diverged from Corinth and created new economic relations, albeit still respecting Corinthian economic supremacy. They gladly participated in the revival of old traditions and in establishing a new and long-lasting period of unity as a result of Timoleon's campaign. So firm at that time were their bonds of sentiment, that other Greeks regarded the citizens of the *apoikiai* almost as if they were Corinthians. The *apoikiai* were thought to be so respectful of their *metropolis*, that they surpassed the normal limits of colonial loyalty and indeed became something of a caricature of Corinthians. The renewal of economic interconnections with Corinth and the West created a perennial memory of the political, economic and cultural unity of the past for a greater group of *poleis* in the north-west, which now included old enemies or *apoikiai*.<sup>123</sup> Although these ties underwent various fluctuations over the course of history, they remained important channels for the transmission of ideologies and they sometimes even engendered important cultural revivals in successive periods. The citizens of Nicopolis acknowledged the cultural bonds with the Corinthian *apoikiai* on and around the Ambracian Gulf, both through Corinthian cults and via the dominant ideology of Augustus himself, who employed Corinthian saga and myth in order to legitimize the political unification and synoecism of the ancient *poleis*, namely the foundation of Nicopolis. Such was the powerful impression made by these bonds between *metropolis* and *apoikiai* upon Augustus himself, that he, too, respected this tradition and even promoted it through his own propaganda.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aggeli, A. 2004. 'Μελαμβαφείς αμφορείς και πελίκες από τα νεκροταφεία της Αμβρακίας' in *Στ' Επιστημονική Συνάντηση για την Ελληνιστική Κεραμική, προβλήματα χρονολόγησης, κλειστά σύνολα-εργαστήρια*. Athens, 549-56.

123 Such colonial memories were exploited over time in Megarian *apoikiai* as well: Robu 2014: 411-12.



- Aggeli, A. 2014. 'Red-figure Pottery of Ambracia in North-western Greece' in S. Schierup & V. Sabetai (eds.) *The Regional Production of Red-figure Pottery: Greece, Magna Graecia and Etruria*. Aarhus, 158-75.
- Aggeli, A. 2021. *Τα νεκροταφεία της Αμβρακίας κατά τους αρχαϊκούς και τους κλασικούς χρόνους* Diss. National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.
- Andreou, I. 1986. 'Τα επιγράμματα του πολυανδρίου της Αμβρακίας' *AD* 41 [1991] *Α Μελέτες*, 425-46.
- Antonetti, C. 1999a. 'Le culte d'Apollon entre Mégare et ses colonies du Pont' in O. Lordkipanidzé & P. Lévêque (eds.) *Religions du Pont-Euxin*. Paris, 17-24.
- Antonetti, C. 1999b. 'Les Ἄ(F)ορεῖς: groupes civiques et *syggéneiai* de la tradition dorienne' in P. Cabanes (ed.) *L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Épire dans l'Antiquité*. Paris, 367-72.
- Antonetti, C. 2010. 'Tra storia ed epos. Il donario degli Apolloniati a Olimpia (Paus. 5.22.2-4)' in E. Cingano (ed.) *Tra Panellenismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia*. Alessandria, 433-50.
- Antonetti, C. 2011. 'La madrepatria ritrovata. Corinto e le poleis della Grecia nordoccidentale' in L. Breglia et al. (eds.) *Ethne, Identità e Tradizioni: La "terza" Grecia e l'Occidente*. Pisa, 53-71.
- Avram, A., A. Fraysse & É. Geny 1999. 'Les calendriers de Mégare et de ses colonies pontiques' in O. Lordkipanidzé & P. Lévêque (eds.) *Religions du Pont-Euxin, Actes du VIII<sup>e</sup> Symposium de Vani (Colchide) - 1997*. Paris, 25-32.
- Beck, H., K. Buraselis & A. McAuley (eds.) 2019. *Ethnos and Koinon. Studies in Ancient Geek Ethnicity and Federalism*. Stuttgart.
- Birgalias, N. 2009. *Από την κοινωνική στην πολιτική πλειονοψηφία: το στάδιο της ισονομίας, πολιτειακές μεταβολές στον αρχαίο ελληνικό κόσμο (550-479 π.Χ.)*. Athens.
- Birgalias, N. et al. (eds.) 2013. *War-Peace and Panhellenic Games: In memory of Pierre Carlier / Πόλεμος-ειρήνη και πανελλήνιοι αγώνες*. Athens.
- Bonelou, E. 2005. 'The Numismatic Circulation from the Private and Public Buildings of the Capital and Port of Leucas' in *Proceedings of the 4th International Numismatic Congress in Croatia, September 20-25, 2004, Star Grad (Pharos), the island of Hvar and M/S Marko Polo, Croatia*. Rijeka & Zagreb, 45-61.

- Bonelou, E. 2016. 'Το νομισματοκοπείο της Λευκάδος. Σχέσεις και επαφές εντός και εκτός Ελλάδος' in X. Papadatou-Giannopoulou (ed.) *Πρακτικά Συνεδρίου, Νήρικος-Λευκάς-Κάστρο, Ή μακροβιώτερη πρωτεύουσα τής Λευκάδας*. Lefkada, 119-44.
- Bousquet, J. 1942. 'Delphes. Comptes du IV<sup>e</sup> siècle' *BCH* 66-67, 84-123.
- Buraselis, K. & K. Zoumboulakis (eds.) 2003. *The Idea of European Community in History. Conference Proceedings*, v. II. Athens.
- Burckhardt, J. 1963. *History of Greek Culture* (trans. Palmer Hilty). London (*Griechische Kultur*, Berlin 1958).
- Cabanes, P. (ed.) 1999. *L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Épire dans l'Antiquité*. Paris.
- Cabanes, P. 2003. 'Recherches sur le calendrier corinthien en Épire et dans les régions voisines' *REA* 105, 83-102.
- Cabanes, P. & J. Andreou 1985. 'Le règlement frontalier entre les cites d'Ambracie et de Charadros' *BCH* 109 (I), 499-544 and 753-57.
- Cabanes, P. & N. Ceka 1997. *Inscriptions d'Apollonia d'Illyrie* in P. Cabanes (ed.) *Corpus des inscriptions grecques d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Épire*. Athens.
- Cabanes, P. & F. Drini 1995. *Corpus des inscriptions grecques d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Épire*, 1. *Inscriptions d'Epidamne-Dyrrhachion et d'Apollonia*. Athens.
- Cabanes, P. & F. Drini 2007. *Corpus des inscriptions grecques d'Illyrie méridionale et d'Épire*, v. 2.2: *Inscriptions de Bouthrôtos*. Athens.
- Calciati, R. 1990. *Pegasi*, v. I-II. Mortara.
- Calligas, P. 1971. 'An Inscribed Lead Plaque from Korkyra' *ABSA* 66, 79-94.
- Camerotto, A. 2015. 'Alle correnti del fiume Arachthos. Il sema di Arniadas e la tradizione orale del canto epico' in C. Antonetti & E. Cavalli (eds.) *Prospettive Corciresi*. Pisa, 33-52.
- Carter, C. 1993. 'The stater of Leucas: A numismatic and historical study' in E. Stazio (ed.) *La monetazione corinzia in occidente*. Rome, 35-42.
- Cassola, F. 1996. 'Chi erano i Greci?' in S. Settis (ed.) *I Greci, Storia Cultura Arte Società*, vol. 2, *Una storia greca, I. Formazione*. Turin, 5-23.
- Castel, C., X. Fernandez, J.-J. Filippi & J.-P. Brun 2009. 'Perfumes in Mediterranean antiquity' *Flavour and Fragrance Journal* 24, 326-34.
- Castiglioni, M.-P. 2003. 'Il monumento degli Apolloniati a Olimpia' *MEFRA* 115(2), 867-80.

- Castiglioni, M.-P. et al. (eds.) 2018. *Héros fondateurs et identités communautaires dans l'Antiquité entre mythe, rite et politique*. Perugia.
- Charalambidou, X. 2017. 'Viewing Euboea in relation to its colonies and relevant sites in Northern Greece and South Italy-Sicily' in A. Mazarakis Ainian et al. (eds.) *Regional Stories Towards a New Perception of the Early Greek world*. Volos, 85-126.
- Cordano, F. 2009. 'I luoghi di culto per i fondatori' in M. Bonhgi Jovino & F. Chiesa (eds.) *L' Ara della Regina di Tarquinia, Aree Sacri, Santuari Mediterranei*. Milan, 199-207.
- Corsten, T. 2006. 'Stammes- und Bundeskulte in Akarnanien' in K. Freitag et al. (eds.) *Kult - Politik - Ethnos, Überregionale Heiligtümer im Spannungsfeld von Kult und Politik*. Stuttgart, 157-67.
- Cortassa, G. & E. Culasso Gastaldi 1990. *Le lettere di Temistocle*, v. I: Edizione critica, traduzione, note testuali e indici), v. II: Il problema storico: il testimone e il tradizione. Padua.
- Costanzi, M. & M. Dana (eds.) 2020. *Another way of being Greek. Interactions and Cultural Innovations of the Greeks in a Colonial Milieu*. Leuven, Paris & Bristol.
- Crema, F. 2010. 'Pritania e spazio civico' in C. Antonetti (ed.) *Lo spazio ionico e le comunità della Grecia nordoccidentale, Territorio, società, istituzioni*. Pisa, 201-23.
- Curty, O. 1994. 'La notion de la parenté entre cités chez Thucydide' *MH* 51(4), 193-97.
- Dakaris. S.I. 1976. *Ἡ Κτηνοτροφία στὴν ἀρχαία Ἑπειρο*. Ioannina.
- Dalby, A. 2013. *Food in the Ancient World from A to Z*. London & New York.
- Daux, G. 1953-1954. 'Adeimantos de Lampsaque et le renouvellement de la ligue de Corinthe par Demetrios Poliorcète (302 avant J.-C.)' *AEPH* 92-93, 245-54.
- Del Monaco, L. 2011. 'Da Corcira a Siracusa: criteri di registrazione anagrafica di matrice corinzia' in G. De Sensi Sestito & M. Intrieri (eds.) *Sulla rotta per la Sicilia: l'Epiro, Corcira e l'Occidente*. Pisa, 301-13.
- De Ste. Croix, G.E.M. 1972. *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War*. London.
- De Vido, S. 2010. 'Istituzioni, magistrature, politeiai: frammenti di documentazione e spunti di ricerca' in C. Antonetti (ed.) *Lo spazio ionico e le comunità della Grecia nordoccidentale, Territorio, società, istituzioni*. Pisa, 257-71.

- Dickey, K. 1992. *Corinthian burial customs*. Diss. Bryn Mawr College. Ann Arbor.
- Dobesch, G. 1968. *Der Panhellenische Gedanke im 4. Jh. v. Chr. und der 'Philippos' des Isokrates*. Vienna.
- Dougherty, C. 1993. *The Poetics of Colonization*. Oxford.
- Dougherty, C. & L. Kurke (eds.) 2003. *The Cultures within Ancient Greek Culture. Contact, Conflict, Collaboration*. Cambridge.
- Douzougli, A. 2001. 'Παρατηρήσεις στα νεκροταφεία της αρχαίας Λευκάδας' in *Πρακτικά Δ' Συμποσίου, Οι πρωτεύουσες της Λευκάδας, Αρχαία Λευκάδα-Νήρικος, Κάστρο Αγίας Μαύρας, Αμαξική*. Athens, 45-84.
- Douzougli, A. & J.K. Papadopoulos 2010. 'Liatovouni: A Molossian Cemetery and Settlement in Epirus' *JDAI* 125, 1-87.
- Dunbabin, T.J. 1948. *The Western Greeks: The History of Sicily and South Italy from the Foundation of the Greek Colonies to 480 B.C.* Oxford.
- Ehrhardt, N. 1983. *Milet und seine Kolonien: Vergleichende Untersuchung der kultischen und politischen Einrichtungen*. Frankfurt.
- Fantasia, U. 2017. *Ambracia dai Cipselidi ad Augusto. Contributo alla storia della Grecia nord-occidentale fino alla prima età imperiale*. Pisa.
- Fantasia, U. 2018. 'Ambracia e l'Acarnania nel IV secolo A.C. (a proposito di un nuovo document epigrafico)' in M. Intrieri et al. (eds.) *KOINONIA, Studi di storia antica offerti a Giovanna di Sensi Sestito*. Rome, 497-511.
- Fehrentz, V. 1993. 'Der Antike Agyieus' *JDAI* 108, 123-96.
- Feraru, R.M. 2015. 'Fêtes civiques et calendriers dans les colonies milésiennes du Pont-Euxin' *DHA* 41 (1), 13-46.
- Flower, M.A. 2000. 'From Simonides to Isocrates: The Fifth-Century Origins of Fourth-Century Panhellenism' *ClAnt* 19, 65-101.
- Fragoulaki, M. 2013. *Kinship in Thucydides. Intercommunal Ties and Historical Narrative*. Oxford.
- Franke, P. 1976. 'Apollo Leucadius und Octavianus' *Chiron* 6, 159-63.
- Frisone, F. 2016. "'Sistemi" coloniali e definizioni identitarie: le "colonie sorelle" della Sicilia orientale e della Calabria meridionale' in L. Donnellan et al. (eds.) *Conceptualising early Colonisation*. Brussels & Rome, 179-96.
- Funke, P. & K. Hallof 2013. 'Zwei neue Staatsverträge aus Akarnanien' in F. Lang et al. (eds.) *Interdisziplinäre Forschungen in Akarnanien, Διεπιστημονικές έρευνες στην Ακαρνανία*. Bonn, 55-64.

- Gadoulou, E. 2008. *Η Αχαιΐα στους πρώιμους ιστορικούς χρόνους. Κεραμική παραγωγή και έθιμα ταφής*. Athens.
- Gadoulou, E. 2011. *Thapsos-Class Ware Reconsidered: The Case of Achaea in the Northern Peloponnese. Pottery workshop or pottery style?* Oxford.
- Gatzolis, C. 2012. 'A re-examination of the bronze coinage of Alexander III and Cassander in the light of new excavation and hoard evidence' in M. Tiverios et al. (eds.) *THREPTERIA. Studies on Ancient Macedonia*. Thessaloniki, 380-97.
- Gehrke, H.-J. & E. Wirbelauer 2004. 'Akarnania and adjacent areas' in M.H. Hansen & T.H. Nielsen (eds.) *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Greek Poleis*. Oxford, 368-95.
- Germanà Bozza, G. 2011. 'Necropoli e società aristocratica a Siracusa durante l'età arcaica' in *Dalla nascita alla morte: antropologia e archeologia a confronto. Atti dell'incontro internazionale di studi in onore di Claude Lévi-Strauss*. Rome.
- Golding, C. 2017. 'The Oikist Cycle: Oikists, Tyrants, and the Political Development of Magna Graecia' [http://www.academia.edu/43064215/The\\_Oikist\\_Cycle\\_Oikists\\_Tyrants\\_and\\_the\\_Political\\_Development\\_of\\_Magna\\_Graecia](http://www.academia.edu/43064215/The_Oikist_Cycle_Oikists_Tyrants_and_the_Political_Development_of_Magna_Graecia) (consulted 5.1.2023).
- Graham, A.J. 1962, 'Corinthian Colonies and Thucydides' Terminology' *Historia* 11(2), 246-52.
- Graham, A.J. 1964. *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece*. New York.
- Greaves, A.M. 2004. 'The cult of Aphrodite in Miletos and its colonies' *AS* 54, 27-33.
- Hall, J.M. 1997. *Ethnic identity in Greek antiquity*. Cambridge.
- Hall, J.M. 2002. *Hellenicity, between Ethnicity and Culture*. Chicago.
- Hall, J.M. 2008. 'Foundation stories' in G.R. Tsetschladze (ed.) *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas*, 2. Leiden, 383-426.
- Hamilton, C.D. 1972. 'The Politics of Revolution in Corinth, 395-386 B.C.' *Historia* 21(1), 21-37.
- Hoepfner, W. 1983. 'Ein frühes korinthisches Kapitell bei Aktion' in A. Di Vita & N. Bonacasa (eds.) *Alessandria e il mondo ellenistico-romano. Studi in onore di Achille Adriani*, I. Rome, 74-77.
- Intrieri, M. 2015. 'Atene, Corcira e le isole dello Ionio (415-344 a.C.)' in C. Antonetti & E. Cavalli (eds.) *Prospettive Corciresi*. Pisa, 53-117.

- Iversen, P. 2017. 'The Calendar on the Antikythera Mechanism and the Corinthian Family of Calendars' *Hesperia* 86 (1) 129-203.
- Iversen, P. 2020. 'The Antikythera Mechanism, Rhodes, and Epeiros' in A. Jones & C. Carman (eds.) *Instruments - Observations - Theories Studies in the History of Astronomy in Honor of James Evans*, 17-38 <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3928498> (consulted 20.1.2023).
- Jacoby, F. 1926. *Die Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*. II. *Kommentar zu Nn. 64-105*. Berlin.
- Jones, N.F. 1980. 'The Civic Organization of Corinth' *TAPhA* 110, 161-93.
- Jones, N.F. 1987. *Public Organization in Ancient Greece. A Documentary Study*. Philadelphia.
- Jost, M. 2006. 'Unité et diversité: la Grèce de Pausanias' *REG* 119, 568-87.
- Jouan, F. 1990. 'Les Corinthiens en Acarnanie et leurs prédécesseurs mythiques' in F. Jouan & A. Motte (eds.) *Mythe et politique*. Geneva, 155-66.
- Kagan, D. 1969. *The Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War*. Ithaca & London.
- Kagan, J.H. 1998. 'Epidamnus or Ephyre (Elea). A Note on the Coinage of Corinth and her Colonies at the Outbreak of the Peloponnesian War' in R. Ashton & S. Hurter (eds.) *Studies in Greek numismatics in memory of Martin Jessop Price*. London, 163-74.
- Kaponis, A.S. 2020. *Οι κορινθιακές αποικίες περί τον Αμβρακικό κόλπο από την ίδρυσή τους έως και την εποχή του Φιλίππου Β΄*. Diss. National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.
- Katsadima, I. 2007. 'DISJECTA MEMBRA. Δείγματα πήλινων αρχιτεκτονικών μελών από τη Νικόπολη' in K.L. Zachos (ed.) *Νικόπολις Β΄, Πρακτικά τοῦ Δευτέρου Διεθνούς Συμποσίου για τη Νικόπολη, 11-15 Σεπτεμβρίου 2002*. Preveza, I, 87-100 and II, 45-60.
- Kent, J.H. 1966. *Corinth VIII.3. The Inscriptions 1926-1950*. Princeton.
- Kōiv, M. 2016. 'Basileus, tyrannos and polis. The Dynamics of Monarchy in Early Greece' *Klio* 98(1), 1-89.
- Kometoroulou, M. 2012. *Ἀριστείδης Λυσιμάχου Ἄλωπεκῆθεν. Από την Τυραννίδα στη Δημοκρατία*. Diss. National and Kapodistrian University of Athens.
- Kraay, C.M. 1976. *Archaic and Classical Greek Coins*. London.
- Kraay, C.M. 1977. 'The Earliest Issue of Ambracia' *NAC* 6, 35-52.
- Kraay, C.M. 1979. 'The Coinage of Ambracia and the Preliminaries of the Peloponnesian War' *NAC* 8, 37-66.

- Krentz, P. & C. Sullivan 1987. 'The Date of Phormion's First Expedition to Akarnania' *Historia* 36(2), 241-43.
- Lambrugo, C. 2008. 'Les vases à parfum corinthiens en Sicile et en Grande-Grèce' in L. Bodiou et al. (eds.) *Parfums et odeurs dans l'antiquité*. Rennes, 187-96.
- Lane, C.S. 2009. *Archegetes, Oikistes, and New-Oikistes: The Cult Founders in Greek Southern Italy and Sicily*. Diss. University of British Columbia.
- Luce, J.M. (ed.) 2007. *Les identités ethniques dans le monde grec*. Toulouse.
- Malkin, I. 1987. *Religion and Colonization in Ancient Greece*. Leiden.
- Malkin, I. (ed.) 2001. *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity*. Cambridge, Massachusetts & London.
- Malkin, I. 2011. *A Small Greek World. Networks in the Ancient Mediterranean*. Oxford.
- Malkin, I. 2018. 'Returning Heroes and Greek Colonists' in S. Hornblower & G. Biffis (eds.) *The Returning Hero, Nostoi and Traditions of Mediterranean Settlement*. Oxford, 83-104.
- Manoledakis, M. 2015. 'Greek colonies and the southern Black Sea hinterland: looking closer into a long, complex and multidimensional relationship' in G.R. Tsetschladze et al. (eds.) *The Danubian Lands between the Black, Aegean and Adriatic Seas (7th Century BC-10th Century AD)*. Oxford, 81-90.
- Martin, R. 1987. 'Relations entre métropole et colonies: aspects institutionnels' in J. Pouilloux & G. Vallet (eds.) *Architecture et urbanisme*. Rome, 439-48.
- Matijašić, I. 2010. 'Magistrati militari in Grecia nord-occidentale?' in C. Antonetti (ed.) *Lo spazio ionico e le comunità della Grecia nordoccidentale, Territorio, società, istituzioni, Atti del Convegno Internazionale*. Pisa, 225-44.
- Mazzarino, S. 1964. 'Metropoli e Colonie' in P. Romanelli (ed.) *Metropoli e colonie di Magna Grecia*. Naples, 51-84.
- McCabe, D.F. 1991. *Rhodian Peraia Inscriptions. Texts and List*. Princeton.
- McIlvaine, B.K., L.A. Schepartz, C.S. Larsen & P.W. Sciulli 2014. 'Evidence for Long-Term Migration on the Balkan Peninsula Using Dental and Cranial Nonmetric Data: Early Interaction between Corinth (Greece) and Its Colony at Apollonia (Albania)' *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 153(2), 236-48.

- Mercuri, L. 2006. 'Corinto e le sue colonie nel nord-ovest fino al V secolo a.C.' *Annali di Istituto Italiano di Numismatica* 52, 235-55.
- Mermati, F. 2012. 'Osservazioni sulla costruzione dell'identità coloniale tra Pithekoussai e Cuma' in J.-P. Descœudres & S.A. Paspalas (eds.) *Zagora in Context Settlements and Intercommunal Links in the Geometric Period (900-700 BC)*. Sydney, 283-308.
- Mitchell, L. 2007. *Panhellenism and the Barbarian in Archaic and Classical Greece*. Swansea.
- Morakis, A. 2019. *Οι ελληνικές αποικίες της Μεγάλης Ελλάδας κατά την αρχαϊκή εποχή. Πολιτεία, Κοινωνία, Οικονομία*. Athens.
- Morgan, C. 2003. *Early Greek States beyond the Polis*. London & New York.
- Morgan, C. 2018. 'Nostoi and Material Culture in the Area of the Classical-Hellenistic Ionian and Adriatic Seas' in S. Hornblower & G. Biffis (eds.) *The Returning Hero, Nostoi and Traditions of Mediterranean Settlement*. Oxford, 213-44.
- Morrison J.V. 1999. 'Preface to Thucydides: Rereading the Corcyrean Conflict (1.24-55)' *ClAnt* 18, 94-131.
- Mortensen, E. 2015. 'Ktistes: Mythical Founder Hero and Honorary Title for New Heroes' in J. Fejfer et al. (eds.) *Tradition, Transmission of Culture in the Ancient World*. Copenhagen, 213-37.
- Müller, C. & A.-E. Veisse (eds.) 2014. *Identité ethnique et culture matérielle dans le monde grec*. Besançon.
- Musti, D. 2005. *Magna Grecia. Il quadro storico*. Rome & Bari.
- Nawotka, K. 2014. *Boule and Demos in Miletus and its Pontic Colonies*. Wiesbaden.
- Oeconomides, M. 1990. 'Épire: Relations politiques et économiques, au III<sup>e</sup> et au II<sup>e</sup> siècle jusqu'en 146 av. J. C., d'après les monnaies' *RN* 32, 264-72.
- Oikonomidou-Karamessini, M. 1994. 'Die Münzen der Ausgrabung von Kassope' in W. Höpfner & E.-L. Schwandner (eds.) *Haus und Stadt im klassischen Griechenland*. Munich, 172-74.
- Osborne, R. 2004. *Greek History*. London & New York.
- Osborne, R. 2016. 'Greek "colonisation": what was, and what is, at stake?' in L. Donnellan et al. (eds.) *Conceptualising early Colonisation*. Brussels & Rome, 21-26.



- Ostrowski, J. 1996. 'Personifications of Countries and Cities as a Symbol of Victory in Greek and Roman Art' in E.G. Schmidt (ed.) *Griechenland und Rom. Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Entwicklungstendenzen und -höhepunkten der antiken Geschichte, Kunst und Literatur*. Tbilissi, Erlangen & Jena, 264-72.
- Papadopoulou, Z. 2018. 'Η λατρεία του Απόλλωνος και του Ηρακλέους στην Πάρο και οι Δεσμοί με την Θάσο' in D. Kotsanopoulou (ed.) *Η Πάρος και οι αποικίες της/Paros and its colonies*. Athens, 161-78.
- Payrau, S. 1971. 'EIRENIKA. Considérations sur l'échec de quelques tentatives panhelléniques au IV<sup>e</sup> siècle avant Jésus-Christ' *REA* 73, 24-79.
- Polito, M. 2011. 'I racconti di fondazione su Mileto: antichi nomi della città ed eroi fondatori' in A. Mele (ed.) *Incidenza dell'Antico*. Naples, 97-98.
- Polito, M. 2018. 'Nélée héros fondateur et l'identité communautaire: Milet et les Ioniens' in M.-P. Castiglioni et al. (eds.) *Héros fondateurs et identités communautaires dans l'Antiquité entre mythe, rite et politique*. Perugia, 153-67.
- Preka-Alexandri, K. & Y. Stoyas 2009. 'Economic and socio-political glimpses from Gitana in Thesprotia: the testimony of stamped amphora, handles, coins and clay sealings' in J.-L. Lamboley & M.P. Castiglioni (eds.) *L'Illyrie méridionale et l'Épire dans l'Antiquité V*. Paris, 663-83.
- Psoma, S. 2007a. 'Le monnayage fédéral acarnanien de l'époque classique' *Klio* 89.1, 7-23.
- Psoma, S.E. 2007b. 'Profitable Networks: Coinages, Paneguris, and Dionysiac Artists' *MHR* 22/2, 237-55.
- Psoma S.E. 2015. 'Corcyra's Wealth and Power' in C. Antonetti & E. Cavalli (eds.) *Prospettive Corciresi*. Pisa, 145-67.
- Psoma, S.E. 2016. 'Choosing and Changing Monetary Standards in the Greek World during the Archaic and Classical Periods' in E.M. Harris et al. (eds.) *The Ancient Greek Economy, Markets, Households and City-States*. New York, 90-115.
- Psoma, S.E. 2022. *Corcyra, A City at the Edge of two Greek Worlds*. I-II. Athens.

- Quantin, F. 2011. 'Contribution à l'histoire religieuse des colonies corinthiennes occidentales. Le problème du transfert des cultes métropolitaines vers les cités coloniales' in G. de Sensi Sestito & M. Intrieri (eds.) *Sulla rotta per la Sicilia: L'Epiro, Corcira e l'Occidente*. Florence, 209-32.
- Reboton, J. 2008. 'Making "Colonial" Institutions: The example of Corinthian "Apoikiai" in the Adriatic' in G. Lottes et al. (eds.) *Making, using and resisting the law in European history*. Pisa, 1-17.
- Rhodes, P.J. 1987. 'Thucydides on the Causes of the Peloponnesian War' *Hermes* 115, 154-65.
- Robert, L. 1948. 'Un décret dorien trouvé à Délos' *Hellenica* 5, 5-15.
- Robert, L. 1960. 'Décret dorien trouvé à Délos' *Hellenica* 12, 562-69.
- Robu, A. 2012. 'Les établissements mégariens de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin: réseaux, solidarités et liens institutionnels' *Pallas* 89, 181-95.
- Robu, A. 2013. 'Le culte de Poséidon à Mégare et dans ses colonies' *Dacia* n.s. 57, 63-80.
- Robu, A. 2014. *Mégare et les établissements mégariens de Sicile, de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin: histoire et institutions*. Bern & New York.
- Robu, A. 2015. 'Sélinonte et les deux Mégara. Considérations autour de l'héritage de la métropole' in A. Iannucci et al. (eds.) *La Città Inquieta. Selinunte tra lex sacra e defixiones*. Milano & Udine, 79-96.
- Robu, A. 2018. 'What's in a Name? Megarian apoikiai in the Black Sea: Common nomima and Local Traditions' in H. Beck & P.J. Smith (eds.) *Megarian Moments. The Local World of an Ancient Greek City-State*, 273-89. <https://teiresias-supplements.library.mcgill.ca/issue/view/1> (consulted 5.1.2023).
- Robu, A. 2019. 'Coutumes et transferts institutionnels dans l'Antiquité: le calendrier de Mégare et de ses colonies' *RESE* 57, 133-52.
- Robu, A. 2020a. 'Cultes et sanctuaires sur les rives du Bosphore thrace: traditions mégariennes et développements locaux' in M. Costanzi & M. Dana (eds.) *Another way of being Greek. Interactions and Cultural Innovations of the Greeks in a Colonial Milieu*. Leuven, Paris & Bristol, 149-60.
- Robu, A. 2020b. 'Communautés cultuelles et dynamiques religieuses dans le monde grec antique II. Mégare et ses colonies de la Propontide et du Pont-Euxin' in *EPHE, Section des sciences religieuses* 127, 95-99, <http://journals.openedition.org/asr/3268> (consulted 5.1.2023).

- Reobuck, C. 1972. 'Some Aspects of Urbanization in Corinth' *Hesperia* 41(1), 96-127.
- Sachs, G. 2014. *Phokaia und seine Kolonien im Westen: Handelswege in der Antike*. Berlin.
- Seibert, J. 1963. *Metropolis und Apoikie. Historische Beiträge zur Geschichte ihrer gegenseitigen Beziehungen*. Diss. University of Würzburg.
- Settis, S. (ed.) 1996. *I Greci, Storia Cultura Arte Società*, vol. 2: *Una storia greca, I. Formazione*. Turin.
- Shepherd, G. 2002. 'The Pride of Most Colonials: Burial and Religion in the Sicilian Colonies' *ActaHyp* 6, 51-82.
- Shepherd, G. 2005. 'Dead Men tell no Tales: Ethnic Diversity in Sicilian Colonies and the Evidence of the Cemeteries' *OJA* 24.2, 115-36.
- Shepherd, G. 2014. 'Archaeology and Ethnicity: Untangling Identities in Western Greece' in C. Müller & E. Veisse (eds.) *Identité ethnique et culture matérielle dans le monde grec*. Besançon, 115-43.
- Shepherd, G. 2015. 'Display and the emergence of elites in archaic Sicily' in N. Fisher & H. van Wees (eds.) *Aristocracy in Antiquity. Redefining Greek and Roman Elites*. Swansea, 349-79.
- Slane, K.W. 2017. *Tombs, burials, and commemoration in Corinth's northern cemetery*. Princeton & New Jersey.
- Spanodimos, Ch. 2014. 'Κόρινθος-Κέρκυρα. Ανιχνεύοντας τη σχέση δύο πόλεων με οδηγό τους τάφους της Αρχαϊκής περιόδου' in D. Konidaris (ed.) *Πρακτικά Ι΄ Διεθνούς Πανιόνιου Συνεδρίου, Κέρκυρα, 30 Απριλίου - 4 Μαΐου 2014, IV. Φιλοσοφία - Αρχαιολογία - Αρχαιογνωσία - Αρχιτεκτονική - Θέατρο*. Athens, 245-55.
- Staikou, V. 2016. 'Νεώτερες ανασκαφικές έρευνες στα νεκροταφεία της αρχαίας Λευκάδας' in C. Papadatou-Yannopoulou (ed.) *ΝΗΡΙΚΟΣ-ΛΕΥΚΑΣ-ΚΑΣΤΡΟ. Η μακροβιότερη πρωτεύουσα της Λευκάδας, Πρακτικά Συνεδρίου*. Leucas, 169-95.
- Stavropoulou-Gatsi, M. 2019. 'Επιτύμβια σήματα στους τάφους της αρχαίας πόλης της Λευκάδας από τις ανασκαφές των ετών 2004-2010. Η μαρτυρία των επιγραφών' in D.F. Markatou (ed.) *ΙΑ΄ Διεθνές Πανιόνιο Συνέδριο, τ. 5: Αρχαιολογία*. Argostoli, 293-315.
- Stavropoulou-Gatsi, M. & G.Z. Alexopoulou 2002. 'ΑΝΑΚΤΟΠΙΟ - ΑΚΤΙΟ ΑΚΑΡΝΑΝΙΑΣ. Συμβολή στη μελέτη της οχύρωσης της πόλης του

- Ανακτορίου και στην τοπογραφία της ευρύτερης περιοχής' *Eulimene* 3, 25-94.
- Stickler, T. 2010. *Korinth und seine Kolonien, Die Stadt am Isthmus im Mächtegefüge des klassischen Griechenland*. Berlin.
- Stocker, S.R. 2009. *Illyrian Apollonia: Toward a New Ktisis and Developmental History of the Colony*. Diss. University of Cincinnati.
- Strauch, D. 1996. *Römische Politik und griechische Tradition. Die Umgestaltung Nordwest-Griechenlands unter römischer Herrschaft*. Munich.
- Suk Fong Jim, T. 2013. 'The nature of the religious dispute in Thucydides 1.25.4' *CQ* 63(2), 537-42.
- Thonemann, P.J. 2003. 'Inscriptions from Kerkyra and Leukas' *ZPE* 145, 114-16.
- Tréheux, J. 1989. 'Sur les *probouloi* en Grèce' *BCH* 113(1) 241-47.
- Trippé, N. 2018. 'Θεοί και Επικλήσεις στην Αποικιακή Διαδικασία: Θρησκευτικές Μεταφορές μεταξύ Πάρου και Θάσου' in D. Kotsanopoulou, (ed.) *Η Πάρος και οι αποικίες της / Paros and its colonies*. Athens, 321-32.
- Tsangari, D. 2007. *Corpus des monnaies d'or, d'argent et de bronze de la Confédération Étolienne*. Athens.
- Tsetskhladze, G.R. 2006. 'Introduction: revisiting ancient Greek colonization', in G.R. Tsetskhladze (ed.) *Greek Colonisation: An Account of Greek Colonies and Other Settlements Overseas* v. 1. Boston, xxiii-lxxxiii.
- Tzouvara-Souli, C. 1979. 'Η λατρεία τῶν γυναικείων θεοτήτων εἰς τὴν ἀρχαίαν Ἥπειρον'. Diss. University of Ioannina.
- Tzouvara-Souli, C. 1984. 'Η λατρεία τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος Ἀγυῖως στὴν Ἥπειρο' *Dodone (Hist.)* 13, 427-42.
- Tzouvara-Souli, C. 1987. 'Λατρείες στη Νικόπολη' in E. Chryssos (ed.) *Νικόπολις Α΄, Πρακτικά του πρώτου Διεθνούς Συμποσίου για τη Νικόπολη*. Preveza, 169-96.
- Tzouvara-Souli, C. 1992. *Αμβρακία*. Arta.
- Tzouvara-Souli, C. 1993. 'Common Cults in Epirus and Albania' in P. Cabanes (ed.) *L'Illyrie méridionale et Épire dans l'Antiquité II*. Paris, 65-82.
- Tzouvara-Souli, C. 2001. 'The Cults of Apollo in Northwestern Greece' in J. Isager (ed.) *Foundation and Destruction: Nikopolis and Northwest Greece. The Archaeological Evidence for the City Destructions, the Foundation of Nikopolis and the Synoecism*. Aarhus, 233-45.

- Vassios, A. 2017. 'Δανάκες' in V.N. Papadopoulou (ed.) *Αμβρακία. Τα νεώτερα ανασκαφικά ευρήματα (Κατάλογος περιοδικής έκθεσης, Αρχαιολογικό Μουσείο Άρτας)*. Arta, 28-29.
- Vlassopoulos, K. 2013. *Greeks and Barbarians*. Cambridge.
- Vokotopoulou, I. 1982. 'Η Ήπειρος στον 8ο και 7ο αι.' in *Atti del Convegno Internazionale Grecia, Italia e Sicilia nell'VIII et VII sec. A.C.* Rome, 77-98.
- Walbank, F.W. 2002. 'The Problem of Geek Nationality' in T. Harrison (ed.) *Greeks and Barbarians*. New York, 234-56.
- Westermann, A. 1843. *Μυθογράφοι. Scriptores Poeticae Historiae Graeci*. Braunschweig.
- Williams, M.F. 1985. 'Two Traditional Elements in Thucydides' Corcyrean Excursus' *CW* 79, 1-3.
- Zachos, K. 1997. 'Νομός Λευκάδας, Οικόπεδο Σπ. Κουνιάκη' *AD* 47 [1992], B1 *Chronika*, 281-85.
- Zachos, K. & Douzougli, A. 2003. *Λευκάδα. Ιστορική - αρχαιολογική επισκόπηση μέσα από τα εκθέματα του αρχαιολογικού μουσείου*. Athens.
- Zoumbaki, S. 2012. 'The exploitation of local resources of Western Greece by Roman entrepreneurs (3rd-1st c. BC)' *RBPh* 90(1), 77-92.