

Massalia (no. 3) itself, a foundation of c.600. However, archaeological evidence suggests the possibility of pre-colonial contacts between Greeks and indigenous populations, e.g. the three cups and the oenochoe of C7l from the indigenous cemetery of Le Peyrou, near the place where Agathe (*infra*) was later founded (Nickels *et al.* (1981); Nickels (1989)), and the sporadic finds of C7l Greek pottery at Maillhac (Gaillardat (1997) 69–70).

However, the foundation of Massalia marked the real beginning of Greek presence and expansion in the region, an expansion that was basically a coastal phenomenon; besides, the expansion of Massalia was a long-term process running from C6 to the beginnings of the Roman occupation of the region. Massaliote activity, moreover, varied from period to period: during C6 and C5e it was directed towards the development of commercial interests (Bats (1988)), whereas from C5l/C4e it aimed primarily at establishing greater territorial control through the foundation of colonies and fortified centres. Such settlements are, obviously, of greater interest to our sources and are described below. Whether any of the settlements founded by Massalia in this period, and presumably dependent on it, can be considered *poleis* (albeit dependent *poleis*; cf. Hansen (1997b)) is uncertain: some may have been *poleis*, but in no case does the evidence warrant inclusion in the Inventory, which includes only two possible Massaliote foundations: Emporion (no. 2) and Rhode (no. 4). Of these, Emporion certainly and Rhode possibly were founded prior to C4. According to ancient writers, Massalia's reason for founding these settlements was the need for defence against the barbarians living in the direction of Iberia as well as towards Liguria (Strabo 4.1.5); trade interests or the wish to control the coastline may have provided an additional reason (as implied by Strabo 4.1.9, 10 and 4.6.3).

The following Greek settlements on the Mediterranean coast of France are mentioned by our sources.

**Agathe** (Ἀγάθη) Ps.-Skymnos 202–8 seems to include Agathe in the πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες founded by the Phokaian Massaliotes (Μασσαλιῶται Φωκαεῖς), although in this passage, strictly speaking, *polis* is not used about Agathe. Strabo 4.1.5–6 calls it a *polis* and an *epiteichisma* founded by Massalia (κτίσμα Μασσαλιωτῶν; cf. Plin. HN 3.33: *Agatha quondam Massiliensium*) for protection against the barbarians living in the direction of Iberia. It may have been a “*polis* founded as a fortress” (12) in the typology of Hansen (1997b). Archaeology has revealed two phases of occupation; in the earlier phase Agathe was probably only an *emporion*,

and remains of C6–C5f houses of mudbrick seem to belong to it; to the later “Massaliote” phase from C5l belong houses with stone basements and mudbrick walls. It seems that the city had a grid plan in this phase. The C5l city covered 4.25 ha (Nickels (1983) 421–22, (1995)). At least two phases of the circuit wall have been established, the oldest dating to C6, and showing repairs during C5 (Nickels and Marchand (1976); Nickels (1982) 273–74). The territory of Agathe was divided into plots from at least C4e; its area has been estimated at c.20,000 ha, partly devoted to agriculture, and containing at least 1,500 *kleroi* (Clavel-Lévêque (1982); García (1995)). *Barr.* 15, AC.

**Antipolis** (Ἀντίπολις) Ps.-Skymnos 216 seems to consider Antipolis the most remote of the cities founded by Massalia (αὐτῶν [*sc.* πόλεων] ἐσχάτη). Strabo 4.1.5 includes it among the *epiteichismata* set up for defence against the barbarians and describes it as one of the *poleis* of the Massaliotes (4.1.9). In 155/4 Antipolis certainly belonged to Massalia (Polyb. 33.8.1), and it still belonged to Massalia prior to 49 (Strabo 4.1.9; Gschnitzer (1958) 24), but its status in the Archaic or Classical period is unknown. The ancient city of Antipolis must be somewhere below modern Antibes; however, the relatively abundant Archaic finds (Clergues (1969); Ducat (1982) 89–90) must belong to the native village; the remains of the supposed Archaic Greek city are, consequently, unlocated so far (Bats (1990)). A Greek presence in Classical times can be proved only by Greek inscriptions, especially the verse dedication set up by one Therpon to Aphrodite in C5s (IG xiv 2424; LSAG 288 no. 3; cf., however, the doubts expressed by Clerc (1927) 257 on the circumstances of its discovery). *Barr.* 16, AC.

**\*Athenopolis** (Athenopolis) This place, qualified by Plin. HN 3.35 as *Massiliensium*, must be sought on the coast between the *Citharista portus* (La Ciotat or, better, Olbia) and Forum Iuli (Fréjus) (Pompon. 2.77). *Barr.* 16 (St-Tropez?), HR.

**Avenion** (Ἀβενιών) Steph. Byz. 146.16 calls it a πόλις Μασσαλίας; he does not give any indication of his source, but it may be Artemidoros, as in the entry on Καβελλίων (Cavellio; see *infra*; cf. Brunel (1945) 130). It is undoubtedly to be identified with modern Avignon, assigned by Strabo 4.1.11 and Plin. HN 3.36 (*Avennio*) to the Cavares. The reason for its designation as a “city of Massalia” must be sought in the close links that the Gauls of this region maintained with Massalia (Clerc (1927) 242–43; Barruol (1975) 233–44). Massalia presumably never included this area within its

territory (Arcelin (1986)), though some scholars have maintained this (Barruol (1975) 224–25). *Barr.* 15, AC.

**Azania** (Ἀζανία) Steph. Byz. 31.1–2 states that, in addition to the region in Arkadia (cf. Nielsen and Roy (1998)), there was a city called Azania which belonged to Massalia (he cites Philon of Byblos: ἔστι καὶ Μασσαλίας ἄλλη, ὡς Φίλων). The city has not been identified and although it might well be a site controlled by Massalia (Brunel (1945)), we cannot entirely rule out the possibility that Stephanos or Philon made a mistake (e.g. by confusing Massalia with Mainalia, *vel sim.*?). *Barr.* 15, unlocated, H.

**Kabellion** (Καβελλίων) Steph. Byz. 345.17 calls it a πόλις Μασσαλίας; his source is Artemidoros' *Geography*. Strabo calls it Καβαλλίων (4.1.3, 11) and assigns the city to the Cavares, as does Plin. *HN* 3.36 (*Cabellio*). It is to be equated with modern Cavaillon, and its relationship to the Massaliote dominion must be similar to that of Avenion (cf. *supra*). *Barr.* 15, HRL.

**Kyrene** (Κυρήνη) Among the *poleis* of that name mentioned by Steph. Byz. 396.18–19, one is assigned to Massalia. It is otherwise unknown, but Barruol (1975) 224 has suggested identifying it with the site of La Couronne, where the quarries exploited by Massalia were located (Strabo 4.1.6). *Barr.* 15, unlocated (La Couronne?), H.

**Monoikos** (Μόνοικος) Strabo 4.6.3 describes it merely as a harbour (λιμὴν), although in Steph. Byz. 456.7 it appears as a *polis* in Liguria, accompanied by a reference to Hekataios (fr. 57). Not in *Barr.*; Hecat. fr. 57 indicates A.

**Nikaia** (Νίκαια) This is one of the *poleis* founded by Massalia as a fortress (*epiteichisma*) for protection against the barbarians according to Strabo 4.1.5, who includes it among the πόλεις τῶν Μασσαλιωτῶν situated between Massalia and the river Var (Strabo 4.1.9; cf. Steph. Byz. 474.22; Plin. *HN* 3.47). The city existed in 154 (Polyb. 33.8.2), but is absent from Ps.-Skymnos 216; if we accept that Timaios is the main source for that passage in Ps.-Skymnos, Nikaia probably had not yet been founded by 260 (the date of Timaios' death; Bats (1986) 29, 40, n. 57; Bats and Mouchot (1990) 223; Bats (1992) 273). It provides the most interesting evidence as to the kind of control exercised by Massalia over its dependencies (Strabo 4.1.8; *CIL* V 7914). It corresponds to modern Nice. *Barr.* 16, AC.

**Olbia** (Ὀλβία) Ps.-Skymnos 216 mentions Olbia as a *polis* within the series of cities founded by Massalia to the east, and Strabo 4.1.5 adds that Olbia was one of the

*epiteichismata* founded by Massalia for protection against the barbarians. The archaeological evidence suggests that Olbia was a “*polis* founded as a fortress” (cf. Hansen (1997b) 36). The earliest city wall is dated to c.340–330 (Coupry (1986) 391–96; Bats *et al.* (1995) 372–76) and the city was laid out on a grid plan; it seems that Olbia was a square of 165 m × 165 m (Coupry (1986) 397–99; Bats and Brenot (1990) 208–9). The size of the city suggests that its population cannot have exceeded c.1,000 persons (Coupry (1974) 196), i.e. between 200 and 240 citizens of military age, which would amount to an infantry battalion or σύνταγμα (Coupry (1986) 397–99). Olbia had an agrarian territory of 305 ha, distributed in lots already from C4m (Benoit (1985) 45–47). Several cult places and other public works have been excavated at the site. *Barr.* 16, HRL.

**Rhodanousia** (Ῥοδανουσία) This is described as a *polis* founded by Massalia by Ps.-Skymnos 208 and perhaps by Strabo 4.1.5, who also includes it among the *epiteichismata* designed to protect Massalia from the barbarians living around the river Rhône. Steph. Byz. calls it both πόλις Μασσαλίας (542.15) and πόλις ἐν Μασσαλίᾳ (546.1). The foundation date of the city is unknown, and its identification is likewise uncertain: some scholars have suggested identifying it with the site known as Espeyran (Saint-Gilles-du-Gard) (Barruol and Py (1978) 94–100), though recently doubts have been expressed (Bats (1986) 41, n. 63; Py (1990) 112–13, 284–85). *Barr.* 15 (Espeyran?), CHR.

**Sekoanos** (Σηκοανός) Leaning on the authority of Artemidoros, Steph. Byz. 562.7 describes Sekoanos as a πόλις Μασσαλιωτῶν; however, we may be dealing here with a mistake by Stephanos (πόλις instead of ποταμός?; so *Barr.* 15, unlocated, H). It must be one of the rivers between the Rhône and Massalia, or even a waterway, perhaps the *fossa Mariana* (Barruol (1975) 199–200).

**Stoichades Islands** (Στοιχάδες) Strabo 4.1.10 mentions these five islands and says that they were tilled by the Massaliotes, who in ancient times (τὸ παλαιόν) had built a fort (φρουρά) there to prevent piracy. Steph. Byz. 585.19 merely says πρὸς Μασσαλίᾳ. The modern name is Îles d'Hyères. *Barr.* 16, CHRL.

**Tauroeis** (Ταυρόεις) Tauroeis was one of the fortress-cities (*epiteichismata*) founded by Massalia to protect the coast against inland barbarians (Strabo 4.1.5, 9); the defensive character of the site is stressed by Caesar (*B Civ.* 2.4.5), who calls Tauroentum *castellum Massiliensium* (r49). Artemidoros (*apud* Steph. Byz. 608.6) places the foundation

in the time of the fall of Phokaia (i.e. c.540). It is located at the modern town of Le Brusc, and it is generally accepted that the foundation of the city must be placed in C3l or C2e (Arcelin (1986) 65; Bats (1986) 29, 40 n. 57; Brien-Poitevin (1990); Bats (1992) 273). *Barr.* 16, HR.

\***Theline** (*Theline*) Avienus (*Ora maritima* 690–91) says that the city of Arelate (Arles), by the river Rhone, was formerly called Theline, “when it was inhabited by Greeks” (*Arelatus illic ciuitas attollitur, Theline uocata sub priore saeculo, graio incolente*). Strabo 4.1.6 is silent about the Greek identity of Arelate but describes it as a πόλις καὶ ἐμπόριον οὐ μικρόν. Archaeology suggests the existence of a Greek *emporion* from c.540, which lost its Greek character from—perhaps—C4f (Arcelin (1995)). *Barr.* 15, ACH.

**Troizen** (*Τροιζήν*) The last of the cities called Troizen and mentioned by Steph. Byz. 639.9, it is in Italy, but belongs to Massalia (ἐν Μασσαλίᾳ τῆς Ἰταλίας). In addition, Eust. *Il.* 1.442 mentions a Massaliote city called Troizen and placed in Italy (καὶ ἑτέρα ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ Μασσαλιωτικῇ). Some scholars suggest that this Troizen must be a fortress located in southern France, but situated east of the river Var and so, formally, beyond the frontier between the *prouincia* and Italia, but subject to Massalia, as was Nikaia (Strabo 4.1.9) and the other Massaliote *poleis* in Italy listed by Ptol. *Geog.* 3.1.2 (cf. Barruol (1975) 223); others emend the text of Stephanos and suppose the existence of two cities called Troizen, one in the territory of Massalia and another in Italy (cf. Brunel (1974)) or suggest a mistake in Stephanos’ and Ptolemaios’ reading of their sources (cf. Clerc (1927) 247–49); finally, it has been suggested that Massaliote Troizen in Italy cannot be other than the city of Poseidonia (cf. Morel (1992) 20–21), neighbouring on and supposedly closely related to Phokaian Hyele (no. 54), in its turn apparently closely related to Massalia (Ps.-Skymnos 250: καὶ Μασσαλιωτῶν Φωκαέων τ’ Ἑλέα πόλις). Not in *Barr.*

### 3. The Mediterranean Coast of Spain

The Greeks referred to the coast of the Iberian peninsula by the generic name Ἰβηρία, a term which, as time went on, ended up as the name of the whole peninsula (Strabo 3.4.19). The name *Iberia* seems to have been coined by the Greeks to designate the westernmost places in the Mediterranean visited by them since C7l; it presumably derives from the name of the river Hiberos; however, the name *Hiberos* was applied to several rivers of the Iberian peninsula in antiquity (Domínguez (1983); Jacob (1988); Gailledrat (1997) 35–36,

and this fact may explain the different and sometimes contradictory views which ancient writers hold on the extent of Iberia (cf. Strabo 3.4.19). However, even if Herodotos (1.163) still distinguishes between Tartessos and Iberia, the C5l historian Herodoros of Herakleia (*FGH Hist* 31 fr. 2a) includes within Iberia all of the coast between the western end of the peninsula and the river Rhône, and so Strabo’s definition of Iberia may be valid from C5l onwards: οἱ δὲ νῦν ὄριον αὐτῆς τίθενται τὴν Πυρρήνην (3.4.19).

If the late and hardly reliable references to Rhodian colonisation in Iberia (see Rhode (no. 4) with Domínguez (1990) and Santiago (1994b)) are disregarded, the only Greeks to frequent Iberia seem to have been the Samians and, above all, the Phokaians (Hdt. 4.152, 1.163.164; Domínguez (1991a), (1996) 26–31). Archaeological evidence for the earliest contacts, of C7l/C6e, is found at e.g. the Tartessian town of Onoba (modern Huelva; Cabrera (1988–89)), at the Phoenician city at Cerro del Villar (Cabrera (1994)) and at the Iberian village at the location where Emporion was eventually founded (Aquilué *et al.* (1998) 24–25). However, these early contacts did not lead to the foundation of Greek *poleis*: only Emporion developed the structures of a *polis* and then only several decades after the initial contacts between Greeks and natives. The Greek settlements in Iberia were foundations of the Phokaians (no. 859) or, perhaps, of the Phokaians from Massalia (no. 3); at least, it seems that Massalia ended up controlling, probably both economically and politically, a major part of the coastal regions of Iberia.

The Greek settlements in Iberia mentioned by our sources are the following.

**Alonis** (*Ἀλωνίς*) Artemidoros (*apud* Steph. Byz. 80.7) describes Alonis as a νῆσος καὶ πόλις Μασσαλίας. It is not completely certain that Alonis was located in Iberia, although it may be the place called *Allone* by Pompon. 2.93, and situated in the *Sinus Illicitanus*; it could also be the *Ἀλωναί* of Ptol. *Geog.* 2.6.14. It remains unlocated, although many suggestions have been advanced for its site (García y Bellido (1948) 58–59); recently, Rouillard (1991) 303–6 has suggested that it may be on modern Santa Pola, where excavations have revealed a (native) fortified settlement of C5s and finds show strong Greek influences (Moret *et al.* (1995); Badié and Moret (1997)). *Barr.* 27 (S. Pola?), CHRL.

**Hemeroskopieion** (*Ἡμεροσκοπεῖον*) Hemeroskopeion was the most famous (γνωριμώτατον) of the three πολίχνια Μασσαλιωτῶν between the river Jucar and New Carthage (Strabo 3.4.6: μεταξὺ [...] τοῦ Σούκρωνος καὶ