SOME ASPECTS OF URBANIZATION IN CORINTH [1]

" CORINTH was now (c. 750-700 B.C., in the Late Geometric Period) a thriving commercial *polis,* rapidly increasing in size. The nucleus of the Geometric town seems to have been in the neighborhood of the future Agora, where a sequence of pottery from graves and wells covers the whole Geometric Period . . . The wide circulation of Corinthian wares is a symptom of the rapid expansion of Corinthian trade . . . this was a natural consequence of the decline of Attic exports, and the seizure of the commercial initiative by Corinth." Coldstream.[2]

" Jusqu' à la fin du viiie s., Corinthe ne semble donc avoir différé en rien des autres cités du point de vue de l'organisation sociale et de l'activité économique " . . . And of Corinth in the seventh century: " Ne parlons pas d'organisation rationelle: on n'en est encore qu' au stade où l'état de fait économique commence à se dégager de la confusion des improvisations collectives . . . Cette évolution dans la sens d'une production artisanale accrue et d'un négoce naissant et sans doute anarchique n'affecte pas les fondements agricoles primitifs de la cité, si elle affecte certes son équilibre général. On n'a en particulier aucune raison de penser que les oligarchiques Bacchiades se détournèrent de leur existence de grandes propriétaires fonciers pour se consacrer aux " affaires " et transformer consciemment leur cité en un centre industriel et commerçant." Will.[3]

" The fact that both Archias (oekist of Syracuse) and Chersicrates (oekist of Corcyra) were probably Bacchiads was taken to suggest the state organization which the theory (commercial motivation in the Corinthian colonization of the eighth century) requires . . . a member of the ruling clan could clearly be required as oikist without the expedition necessarily being a planned act of state . . ." Graham.[4]

[2] J. N. Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery*, London, 1968, pp. 365-366.

[3] Édouard Will, *Korinthiaka,* Paris, 1955, pp. 337-338. Will, while denying any commercial motivation to the Corinthian colonization of the eighth century and any commercial policy to the Bacchiads, does stress the opportunities for trade opened up by colonization and sets the beginning of the process of urbanization in Corinth in the seventh century.

[4] A. J. Graham, *Colony and Mother City in Ancient Greece,* Manchester, 1964, p. 220. Graham is arguing against the theory of pre-colonization trade in the West and against commercial motivation in eighth-century colonization, as developed a generation ago by Blakeway and Dunbabin.

These three quotations from recent, and excellent, books reveal some of the difficulties which beset the historian of Dark Age and Archaic Greece. Coldstream characterizes Corinth in the latter part of the eighth century as " commercial," " seizing commercial initiative," while Will describes it as agricultural and envisages the economic factor as beginning to emerge only in the following (seventh) century. Coldstream calls Corinth a polis, Graham, by implication, a clan community. For the latter regards the colonization of Syracuse in 733 B.C. and of Corcyra in the same year (or in 709 B.C.) as carried out without state planning; that is, the community did not officially designate an oekist, determine which citizens were to migrate and arrange for the distribution of lots to them in the new colony.

Perhaps these characterizations of Corinthian society are not to be pressed too far as reflecting the respective frames of reference of their authors. For example, Coldstream, on the basis of the excavational evidence at Corinth, conceives of the community physically as a city in embryo, its nucleus near the future Agora, with clusters of villages forming on the plateau near by; perhaps, when considering the wide distribution of pottery in the late eighth century, he means by " Corinth " not so much the deliberate action of the state as certain Corinthian potters and traders acting on private initiative. But the " seizure of . . . initiative," striking in a hitherto rural state, remains. Corinth rapidly did become the chief trading city of Greece, notorious at a later date for holding its artisans in some regard: " Least of all do Corinthians scorn artisans " (Herodotos, II, 167).

The important question for Corinth, as for other Greek states in their infinite variety, is when and how we may recognize the appearance of elements which are characteristic of Greek urbanization; of urbanization in the sense of a complex division of labor by function and the resultant development of a class structure; Greek, in the sense of the integration of the social, political and moral community. Obviously the question cannot be answered from the scanty evidence available for any one city state, nor can the experience of one Greek city be extended to the whole of Aegean Greece, let alone to the colonial areas. Corinth, however, provides a generally useful example in the sphere of economic development. Apparently it was rural, relatively poor, obscure and even isolated in the Dark Age, but very rapidly became the most prominent state of Aegean Greece from the late eighth to the early sixth century.

What particular aspects of urbanization may be discussed from the evidence available for early Corinth? First, there is the physical growth of the city into a community. How early was there an urban center? When did governmental direction and organization of the resources of the community become apparent—for building monumental temples, fortifications, provision of a water supply, in the allocation of land for public uses, as for an agora, or by the relegation of cemeteries to the outskirts of the city. Second, there is the political aspect—when did Corinth

begin to act as a community in foreign affairs, not through the personal diplomacy of its leaders' guest friendships and gift-giving and by raids for personal gain, but by deliberate policy to acquire and to organize territory or to colonize, be it for commercial reasons or to send some of its excess population abroad? Internally, when was the older kinship structure of society replaced by a territorial structure to integrate the individual into the community on a new basis? Third, there is the economic aspect—when, for example, did the pottery industry begin to specialize its production for a home market or for export? When did the city begin to regulate trade and take a fiscal interest in commerce? a political interest? All these aspects are, of course, interrelated, and we can hardly expect that the early Greeks separated them out as sharply as do modern historians. There is good evidence for discussion of some of these questions, little or none for others; all aspects do not appear at the same time, for some are cause and others effect, but all are involved in the formation of Corinth as a city state, of its synoecism in the broad sense of that term.

CORINTH IN THE DARK AGE

Today the most conspicuous landmarks of ancient Corinth are the cluster of Doric columns standing in the archaic " Temple of Apollo," to use its conventional name, and, rising above them to the south, the sheer mass of the city's acropolis, Acrocorinth. Below Acrocorinth stretch two broad terraces, well-watered and fertile in themselves, overlooking the rich coastal plain bordering the Gulf of Corinth. Ultimately classical Corinth, enclosed by its lengthy fortification wall, spread over much of the terraces from its center in the area of the Temple Hill. But both in the Bronze and Early Iron Ages the pattern of settlement seems to have been that of scattered villages, widely separated and presumably linked to one another by a network of paths. Their inhabitants were attracted to the site both by its strategic position at one of the crossroads of Greek communication and by the tempting natural advantages of cultivable land and an ample water supply.[5] The pattern of settlement was dictated by the terrain. From the upper to the lower terraces and from the latter to the coastal plain, ravines break through the shelves of conglomerate which form the floors of the terraces. The course of the ravines provided natural paths, and their sides and the edges of the terraces gave access to the water held by the beds of clay underlying the conglomerate. At the edges of the terraces beside the ravines were desirable sites for settlement—high ground with commanding views, copious water supplies and access to the fields. In time of dire need, though the climb was long and steep, Acrocorinth offered refuge.

It seems probable that from the outset the area around the Temple Hill, now the site of the modern village of Ancient Corinth, was the most advantageous place for settlement and exerted the attraction of a nodal point for a community of Corin-

[5] H. S. Robinson, *The Urban Development of Ancient Corinth*, Athens, 1965, pp. 1-6.

thians. Here the hill, commanding the adjacent region, offered a focal point. Its top has been cut level to bed the temple, and rock has been quarried from the west end, with the exception of the cube left for the Fountain of Glauke. These alterations and the Greek and Roman building, particularly the monumental layout of the Roman Forum, make it difficult to envisage the original form of the region. Apparently the Temple Hill was the highest point of a rim of high ground extending in an arc to enclose a hollow from the modern museum on the west to the Fountain of Peirene and the Lechaion Road on the east. The hollow is now covered with the paving of the Roman Forum and bounded on the south by the South Stoa of the late fourth century B.C. At the foot of the south slope of the Temple Hill was the natural source of water which became the Sacred Spring and at the east end of the hollow the more copious supply of Peirene. The Sacred Spring drained eastward to join the stream flowing north from Peirene near what is now the course of the Lechaion Road. The site, then, offered both high, healthy ground for residence on the west, the natural protection of the hollow, a lookout at the edge of the upper terrace and abundant water.

Presumably the paths, which ultimately became roads, followed the natural lines of communication offered by the terrain. The earliest road discovered, closed *ca.* 575 B.C., when the first monumental temple on Temple Hill was destroyed, ran along the north side of the Temple Hill from east to west, roughly parallel to the modern road leading westward from Ancient Corinth.[6] Apparently it linked the predecessor of the Lechaion Road, giving access to the hollow from the northeast, to the later road to Sikyon, leading into the hollow from the northwest. Presumably, too, this early road continued along the upper terrace to the west, as does the modern road, and from it paths led up to Acrocorinth. Thus the high ground of the Temple Hill and the modern museum served by these routes was an important focal point.

While Mycenean Corinth is known only by some fragmentary pottery[7] and by slight reference in Homer's *Iliad* (II, 570), the pottery finds at least indicate that the Mycenaean town was situated in the same general area as the historical city. At the

[6] We do not know when the road came into use, but perhaps its conversion from a path to a more regular roadway is to be associated with the building of the earliest monumental temple on the hill, the predecessor of the so-called " Temple of Apollo." Professor Henry Robinson, who is currently investigating the archaic temples, has generously informed me of new evidence for their dating: the earliest building was constructed *ca.* 700 B.C. and was destroyed about the end of the first quarter of the sixth century; the temple, some of whose columns are presently standing, seems to have been built *ca.* 560-540 B.C. The roadway, then, was evidently an important thoroughfare from *ca.* 700 to 575 B.C. For the traces of the road see R. L. Scranton, *Corinth*, I, iii, pp. 156-157; Mary C. Roebuck, *Hesperia*, XXIV, 1955, pp. 148-150; for the early roads in the hollow to the south of Temple Hill see C. K. Williams, *Hesperia*, XXXIX, 1970, pp. 37-38 and for a contour plan of the area, p. 32, fig. 10.

[7] S. Weinberg, *Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, pp. 156-157; R. Hope Simpson, " A Gazetteer and Atlas of Mycenaean Sites," *Bulletin Supplement of the Institute of Classical Studies, Univ. of London*, No. 16, 1955, p. 30.

east end of the Roman Forum, behind the Julian Basilica, a deposit of Late Mycenean vases, LH III b, c (one, a large krater with a chariot scene) was found. Some Mycenean sherds were discovered also on the Temple Hill and a few at Mylos Cheliotou to the northwest of the Temple Hill at the edge of the lower terrace. But survivals and the literary tradition offer some hints of the transformation from Bronze-Age to Iron-Age Corinth. The name itself, Korinthos, survived. Religious traditions, apparently predating Dorian Corinth, persisted and, indeed, the lack of impact made on Corinth by specifically Dorian cults and institutions may indicate continuity of habitation by a larger pre-Dorian population than previously suggested.[8]

However that may be, historical Corinth was traditionally a Dorian city. Its " foundation " was connected with the return of the Herakleidai or set a generation later than that event. In tradition the Dorian take-over is represented as violent and abrupt. Thucydides recalled the coming of the Dorians in his statement about the fighting between the first Dorian settlers at Solygeia (Galataki) and the Aeolians at the city of Corinth (IV, 42).[9] The Dorian seizure of the town perhaps provided the historical incident from which the myth of Hellotis sets out. This daughter of Timandros of Corinth, identified as a pre-Dorian goddess whose name appears later as an epithet of Athena, is said to have thrown herself and her sister (there are some variations) into the flaming ruins of the temple of Athena. The Dorian leader, Aletes, made expiation for her death by establishing the festival of the Hellotia.[10] Lists of the Dorian kings after Aletes were worked out which traced the descent of the royal family to the oligarchy of the Bacchiads who ruled Corinth throughout the eighth and much of the seventh century B.C.[11] No archaeological traces of this violent occupation by the Dorians have been discovered, however, so that probably we should

[8] T. J. Dunbabin, *J.H.S.*, LXVIII, 1948, p. 62; Will, *op. cit.*, pp. 288-289, 293. Although Will noticed the implications of cult survival, he followed the archaeological evidence then available that the region of Corinth was virtually deserted. Perhaps it is useful to recall the analogy offered by Roman Corinth. The Hellenistic city was destroyed in 146 B.C., but, when the Roman colony was founded a century later, the tradition of the sanctuaries and cults of the time before the destruction was potent, so that many sanctuaries were repaired or rebuilt to honor the same deity as previously. Presumably the ruined shrines had been used by the rural population living in the region.

[9] Solygeia is identified with Galataki, to the southeast of Corinth, where a Late Geometric and Archaic sanctuary (of Hera ?) has been excavated. While tombs of the Bronze Age were found there, Submycenean and Protogeometric pottery are not reported (N. M. Verdelis, *Archaeology*, XV, 1962, pp. 184-192).

[10] For the myth see the scholia to Pindar, *Olymp.*, XIII, 56 and *Etym. Mag.*, *s.v.* Hellotis. The myth and the historical cult are discussed by O. Broneer, *Hesperia*, XI, 1942, pp. 140 ff. and Will, *op. cit.*, pp. 130 ff.

[11] For a very thorough study of the king lists, *ibid.*, pp. 259-295. Despite the obscurity of the kings in tradition and some disagreement on the beginning of the Dorian epoch in Corinth, the genealogies give a tradition of a continuous hereditary kingship in a single ruling family, that of the Bacchiads.

think in terms of gradual, but substantial, infiltration of migrants, who formed a stable community in which they predominated by *ca.* 900 B.C.[12] There seems now to be enough excavational evidence to identify a Protogeometric settlement in the western part of the original hollow and the high ground above it, and the continuous series of Geometric pottery from graves and wells enables at least a ceramic tradition to be worked out.[13]

It is tempting to see the nucleus of historical, Dorian, Corinth in this settlement. The earliest and most numerous traces of habitation in the region have been found here: remains of a Submycenean hut and pottery from burials west of the modern museum; in 1969 more Submycenean and Protogeometric graves were excavated at the west end of the Roman Forum, and in 1970 Protogeometric sherds were found in the filling dumped over the bedrock floor of the hollow at the end of that period.[14] A series of graves and wells on the high ground at the west extending from the Early Geometric period into the sixth century B.C. indicate that residence was continuous there.[15] In the west end of the hollow the excavation of 1970 south of the Sacred Spring revealed Geometric terrace walls and remains of two Protocorinthian houses—the latter used for smelting as well as residence. Early in the Protocorinthian Period, too, the Sacred Spring itself was improved by tunneling out a supply chamber into the clay and sealing its walls and floor. As the excavator has concluded,[16] the whole west end of the hollow was evidently a growing village in the Archaic Period, at first squeezing out the Geometric burial area at the extreme west end by the road entering the hollow, then, in turn, itself being curtailed by the growth of sanctuaries. It is pertinent to note also that the cults of this western area were early and important: the sanctuary of Medea has been localized on the top of the cube of rock which forms Glauke;[17] the earliest monumental temple in Corinth was built

---

[12] T. J. Dunbabin, *op. cit.,* p. 62; Will, *op. cit.,* pp. 288-289. Presumably the incoming settlers from the Argolid (or more directly from the northwest?) were a mixture of newcomers and the surviving Bronze Age population (V. Desborough, *The Last Mycenaeans and Their Successors,* pp. 231-232, 251-252, 259).

[13] The main studies of Corinthian Geometric pottery are: S. Weinberg, *Corinth,* VII, i, pp. 9-32 (pottery from the main excavations through 1939); R. Young, *Corinth,* XIII, pp. 13-49 (from the North Cemetery); J. N. Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery,* pp. 91-111 (a general study of Corinthian Geometric in the context of Greek Geometric production). Notice of the finds since Weinberg's publication may be found in the excavation reports in *Hesperia.*

[14] Weinberg, *op. cit.,* p. 3 (also, G. G. Styrenius, *Submycenean Studies,* p. 138); Williams, *Hesperia,* XXXIX, 1970, pp. 12-20; XL, 1971, p. 3.

[15] Geometric: Weinberg, *Corinth,* VII, i, Nos. 103-115; *Hesperia,* XVII, 1948, pp. 204-208; Williams, *Hesperia,* XXXIX, 1970, pp. 12, 20.

EPC Linear: *Hesperia,* XVII, 1948, pp. 208-214 (Well C).

EC: *Hesperia,* XVII, 1948, pp. 214-229 (Well D); C. Boulter, *A.J.A.,* XLI, 1937, pp. 217-236; Weinberg, *Corinth,* VII, i, pp. 60 ff. (Well north of Temple E).

[16] C. K. Williams, *Hesperia,* XL, 1971, pp. 23-24.

[17] R. L. Scranton, *Corinth,* I, ii, pp. 149 ff.

on the Temple Hill early in the seventh century,[18] while to the north, at the foot of the hill, apparently lay the sanctuary of Athena Chalinitis.[19]

Presumably the settlement of the Geometric Period spread across the hollow from the Sacred Spring to the southern side. The thorough preparation of the ground on the south for the construction of the South Stoa in the late fourth century has removed much of the evidence, but traces of residential occupation from Protogeometric sherds, Geometric graves and wells to house remains of the fifth century B.C. were discovered.[20]

Another cluster of Geometric habitation was along the stream bed north of Peirene. There an Early Geometric retaining wall has been found, and occupational debris, graves and wells attest continuous residence to the early sixth century B.C. Apparently at that time the area became industrial, for remains of a dyeworks have been excavated.[21]

The hollow and its entrances along the roads from the northeast and the northwest, then, were the site of a continuously growing settlement from the traditional epoch of Dorian settlement in Corinth. The earliest and most significant remains, so far discovered, were towards the west end, but nowhere in the region does there seem to be any indication of utilization of the ground for an early agora. As suggested by the excavator, perhaps the early agora of Corinth is to be sought to the north of the Temple Hill, near the main east-west road and the important early sanctuaries.[22]

While population was concentrating in the hollow and near the Temple Hill other clusters of habitation were springing up on the terraces and at their edges. Again, there seems to have been a favoring of the western part of the region, probably the result of the gravitational pull of the nucleus near Temple Hill. Along the north edge of the lower terrace below the modern village of Ancient Corinth, several graves of the Early Geometric Period, containing a large amount of pottery, were found near the descent of the Lechaion Road to the coastal plain. But to the west burials

[18] See note 6.

[19] T. L. Shear, *A.J.A.*, XXXII, 1928, pp. 489-490; for the cult see note 10.

[20] Submycenean and Protogeometric sherds: *Hesperia*, XX, 1951, p. 293. Geometric: *Corinth*, VII, i, Nos. 73-77 (MG graves); *Hesperia*, XVIII, 1949, pp. 153-154 (LG well); *Hesperia*, XX, 1951, pp. 293-294 (MG II well); *A.J.A.*, XLI, 1937, pp. 544-545 (LG graves).

EPC Linear: *Corinth*, VII, i, Nos. 116-134 (well).

See also Williams, *Hesperia*, XXXIX, 1970, pp. 33 ff.

[21] Protogeometric: unpublished sherds from the fill in which the Early Geometric wall was set.

Geometric: *Corinth*, I, ii, p. 4; *Corinth*, VII, i, No. 68 (EG, near the Baths of Aphrodite), Nos. 54-66 (MG I, Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery*, p. 94); habitational debris from the late eighth century onwards (Weinberg, *Hesperia*, XXIX, 1960, pp. 245-246, 252).

Archaic dyeworks (under the Peribolos of Apollo): *Archaeological Reports*, 1966-67, p. 7; 1967-68, p. 7; Δελτ., XXIII, 1968, pp. 134-135.

[22] Williams, *Hesperia*, XXXIX, 1970, p. 35.

were more numerous: an Early Geometric grave near the later Asklepieion, the large group in the North Cemetery (Middle and Late Geometric), a small group in the Potters' Quarter (Late Geometric) and an Early Geometric burial at Mavrospelaies, near the Roman Villa.[23] A Geometric settlement west of the Temple Hill, near the modern village of Anaploga, is marked by the discovery of a cemetery and a house well (Middle and Late Geometric).[24] Each of these groups of graves is near a good water supply and each of those at the edge of the terrace near a path which led up from the coastal plain. Although remains of houses have not been found near the graves, it seems reasonable to see the burials as evidence of family groups or small villages forming by the paths and water supplies. The fact that burials were made in the central settlement throughout the Geometric Period, just as outside it, precludes the view that the latter were the result of the establishment of a recognized urban center from which it seemed desirable to exclude burials.[25]

The picture of Corinth in the Geometric Period, drawn from this brief review, is remarkably similar to that of the settlement of the present day: a large village at Ancient Corinth, a smaller one at Anaploga, groups of houses, family clusters, near the edge of the lower terrace. Probably other clusters of Geometric habitation will emerge at scattered points near the water supplies and roads as chance finds and excavation continue. The earliest and most intensive settlement does seem to have been near the Temple Hill, revealed by the Submycenean and Protogeometric pottery finds. Continuous growth made it in effect an urban center for the whole region, but recognition of it as such would have been continuous and automatic, marked, in particular, by the development of sanctuaries and shrines, rather than by deliberate planning and organization of its space. Perhaps it is fair to say that the earliest landmark of monumentalization was the construction of the big temple on Temple Hill in the early seventh century B.C.[26]

Presumably the growing community at Corinth drew some of its population from the Corinthians living in the hills and the remoter parts of the Corinthia, as well as by natural increase of its original settlers. There has been little investigation of Geometric habitation in the region, but, even so, some pattern is discernible. Most of the graves known are in the hilly region to the southeast, on the way to the Argolid. While some Early Geometric burials have been found at Zygouries and habitation

[23] Graves east of the Lechaion Road: *Corinth*, VII, i, Nos. 22-53.
Asklepieion: *Corinth*, VII, i, Nos. 20-21.
Potters' Quarter: *Corinth*, XV, i, pp. 7-9(LG).
North Cemetery: *Corinth*, XIII, pp. 13-49 (MG II and LG).
Mavrospelaies: *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 89-91 (EG).
[24] Robinson, *Hesperia*, XXXVIII, 1969, p. 35; *B.C.H.*, LXXXVIII, 1964, p. 705.
[25] R. Young, *Corinth*, XIII, pp. 13-14.
[26] For the archaic city see Robinson, *The Urban Development of Ancient Corinth*, pp. 7-12; Williams, *Hesperia*, XXXIX, 1970, pp. 33-35, 38; also note 6 above.

debris in the later sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia,[27] there are three graves of the Middle Geometric Period at Tenea (Athikia), one at Clenia, and a Late Geometric sanctuary at Solygeia (Galataki).[28] Perhaps these indicate a concentration of population at an early date in this neighborhood resulting from the Dorian spread northwards from the Argolid. Such a concentration, too, is indicated by the tradition that the settlers for the colony at Syracuse were drawn from Tenea.[29] Perhaps, as Will has suggested,[30] there is a hint here that the hill country of the Corinthia was overpopulated by *ca.* 733 B.C. The terraces and coastal plain of Corinth, too, may have been overpopulated, not in the sense that available land was overbuilt, but by the system of land tenure. Large-scale holdings by the great families—we are told that there were over two hundred Bacchiads in that group (see below, p. 106)—and the smaller holdings of the peasants living in the villages may have blocked further agricultural exploitation. Such a condition could have led to political discontent at home and colonization abroad for relief. Also, of course, it might have stimulated urbanization by increasing craft production for the Corinthian community and for export. There is, in fact, some indication in the pottery production of Corinth in the Middle Geometric II phase (*ca.* 800-750 B.C.) that such was the case.

At Corinth the ceramic tradition of the Geometric Period was continuous and individual. Coldstream has characterized it succinctly: " Fine, pale clay; plump, rotund vase-forms; austerely simple ornament, painted with fastidious neatness. . . . Its internal development . . . is logical and consistent." [31] This Geometric production seems to have developed naturally from Corinthian Protogeometric and upon it, *ca.* 725 B.C., came the impact of the Orientalizing influences from which developed the Early Protocorinthian style. There was influence on the shapes and decoration of Corinthian Geometric from Athens, the major center of pottery production through the Protogeometric and Geometric Periods, but Corinthian potters were selective, and the Athenian influence is by no means so pronounced as in the Argolid. In fact, the Athenian influences were discarded in the Middle Geometric II phase. As Coldstream has suggested, trade, if that was the source of the Athenian influence, was stronger across the Saronic Gulf by sea to the Argolid than by the land route through the Isthmus and the Corinthia.[32] Evidently, then, Corinth was relatively isolated in a

---

[27] Zygouries: *Zygouries*, pp. 174-176 (EG).
Isthmia: habitation debris, O. Broneer, *Hesperia*, XXVII, 1958, p. 27.
[28] Athikia: *Corinth*, VII, i, Nos. 69-72; *A.J.A.*, LXI, 1957, pp. 169-71; *Hesperia*, XXXIII, 1964, pp. 91-93. All the pottery is Middle Geometric.
Clenia: *A.J.A.*, LIX, 1955, pp. 125-128 (MG I).
Solygeia: see note 9 above.
[29] Strabo 380 (VI, 6, 22).
[30] Will, *op. cit.*, pp. 319-321.
[31] Coldstream, *op. cit.*, p. 91.
[32] Coldstream, *op. cit.*, pp. 91, 95-97, 341, 352.

cultural sense and rural in character. The region received no large influx of foreign population and did not attract foreign craftsmen to settle. Its population was poor, or conservative in taste, for throughout the Geometric Period the graves did not contain exotic articles. In most cases, too, they contained little metalware or jewelry of local origin.[33]

The types of pottery found in the graves of the North Cemetery, in particular, may reflect the rural character of Corinth before 800 B.C. The dead were buried with the same types of pottery used in their households during life, often coarse and handmade, seldom a speciality; popular shapes were oinochoai, pitchers for pouring, and skyphoi, small cups for drinking. There were a few aryballoi and pyxides for cosmetics, a few small kraters and hydriai, but very few amphoras. However, some change is apparent in the Middle Geometric II pottery after 800 B.C. Coldstream has noted the rejection of Athenian influences and the emergence of a purely Corinthian style in that period.[34] While handmade vessels of a traditional type were still used, large kraters for libation to the dead were placed near the graves, and a few specialties set in them. Local marketing conditions, then, seem to have been more favorable for the potter, stimulating to his interest and his inventiveness. In this period, also, pottery was exported beyond the Corinthia and the Megarid, to which exports had been largely confined in the ninth century. In the first half of the eighth trade was evidently developing in the Gulf of Corinth. The people of Delphi bought Corinthian pottery for use, as well as dedication, and a Corinthian trading post was established on Ithaka ca. 780 B.C.[35] There the colonists preferred to import Corinthian pottery for dedication in the local shrine at Aetos and presumably, too, for their own use. Thus archaeological evidence indicates a change in Corinth on the eve of the traditional date usually accepted for the establishment of the Bacchiad oligarchy, ca. 750 B.C., and the planting of colonies in Syracuse and Corcyra. Is there any hint of this in the historical traditions?

THE POLITICAL COMMUNITY

To judge from tradition, Dorian Corinth was united from the outset into a political and social community of the Corinthians under a single ruling dynasty. The only notice of internal conflict between different communities in the Corinthia is

---

[33] On the pottery from the North Cemetery, R. Young, *Corinth*, XIII, pp. 14, 40-49. It might, of course, be argued that the North Cemetery contains only the burials of poor peasants from near-by villages, not a cross-section of the whole population which would include the wealthy; the latter, of course, may well have been buried in family plots on their own estates, as yet undiscovered or plundered long ago. It is true, however, that while some Geometric burials found elsewhere contained much pottery, few were "rich" in the sense of having exotics and costly jewelry (cf. C. H. Morgan, *A.J.A.*, XLI, 1937, p. 545—a "rich" grave).

[34] See notes 31 and 32 above.

[35] Coldstream, *op. cit.*, pp. 352-353.

Thucydides' reminiscence of the Dorian settlers at Solygeia warring against Aeolians at Corinth. That implies a successful conclusion to these hostilities by the establishment of a Dorian regime over the Corinthia at the former Mycenean town. Evidently a cultural community, at least in the ceramic sense, existed throughout the Corinthia, for the Geometric pottery from the whole region is homogeneous in style; presumably the fine ware was made at Corinth itself. While we should be chary of equating ceramic community with political community, for Megara, too, seems to have used fine Corinthian pottery and did not develop an individual local style,[36] no evidence points to the existence of several small independent kingships in the Corinthia. The Bacchiads, as kings and then as ruling aristocrats, have almost completely obscured other noble families.[37]

While the image of the early Corinthian kings is shadowy,[38] the genealogies picture the kingship descending in a hereditary line through the Bacchiad family, descended from the Heraklids. Bacchis was not the first name on the lists, but there seems no reason to suppose that its appearance marks a change in dynasty. Apparently, too, the change from monarchy to family oligarchy in 777 or 747 B.C. was in the framework of dynastic continuity.[39] The change from hereditary to elective office in the whole genos was presumably a concession to the continuous extension of the clan both by descent and probably, too, by intermarriage with other noble families of the Corinthia. For example, the mother of Kypselos, herself a Bacchiad, was married to Aetion, a non-Bacchiad (Herodotos, V, 92, 2), but Kypselos is said to have become polemarch and then to have used that office as a springboard to tyranny (Nikolaos Dam., frag. 57, 5). While factional strife among the Bacchiad families was not removed, enlargement of the circle of office was significant of a feeling for the need of greater political unity and strength within the community. Three elected officials—prytanis, basileus and polemarch—replaced the single basileus; a large council, for there are said to have been over two hundred Bacchiads (Diodorus, VII, frag. 9), was constituted, in which elective power was vested, and an assembly of the Corinthian demos continued to exist.[40] It is likely that general concern for a stronger state, expressed in the form of aristocratic cohesion, was felt in Corinth at the time of the establishment of the Bacchiad aristocracy. The half-century between 750 and 700 B.C. seems to mark the appearance of Corinth as a polis. Its government

---

[36] Coldstream, op. cit., p. 353, note 3. See also, Hammond, B.S.A., XLIX, 1954, pp. 99-100.

[37] The Corinthian oekist of Epidamnos, Phaleas, is identified by Thucydides as a descendant of Herakles (I, 24), but not as a Bacchiad or a Kypselid. While Kypselos' mother was a Bacchiad, his father was from a different family group (Herodotos, V, 92, 2).

[38] Dunbabin, op. cit., pp. 62-63.

[39] The establishment of the Bacchiad oligarchy is set in 777 B.C. by the Eusebian tradition, but in 747 by the Apollodoran. For the chronology see note 11 above.

[40] I have followed the reconstruction of Will, op. cit., pp. 298-306. See, most recently, S. I. Oost, " Cypselus, the Bacchiad," Cl. Phil., LXVII, 1972, pp. 10-30.

was broadly based, at least for the period; its rulers' aims were expansive in an effort to better the condition of the whole community, and Corinth began to experience the changes symptomatic of urbanization.

By 750 B.C., as noticed above, regular navigation was starting on the Gulf of Corinth; the pottery industry had begun to expand its production, and a trading post had been established on Ithaka. Presumably none of these was the result of deliberate political action by the rulers of Corinth, but all were signs of change and expansion. Overpopulation evidently was pressing, for in 733 B.C. Syracuse was colonized. This venture, organized under a Bacchiad oekist, indicates that the government both was concerned about the problem and had the power to direct the people of the Corinthia. That concern and power seem apparent in other actions of Corinth in this same period: the Perachora peninsula and land north of the Isthmus seem to have been seized and a successful stand made against Pheidon of Argos.

FOREIGN RELATIONS

The territories bordering on the Corinthia were Sikyonia to the west along the coastal plain, the Argolid to the south beyond the hills, and the Megarid to the north across the Isthmus. Relations with the Sicyonians in this early period are completely obscure; perhaps we should assume that they were in the nature of neighborly squabbles over sheep and cattle. In any case there is no hint of a Corinthian attempt to expand to the west. The Argives are usually recognized as the early " great power " of the northeastern Peloponnesus, exercising cultural suzerainty and perhaps a form of control through filial relations over the Corinthia and the Megarid. As discussed below, there is some reason to doubt this state of affairs, but perhaps personal relations among the great families of the northeastern Peloponnesus were generally harmonious, cemented by guest-friendships and intermarriage before their communities developed into city states. In any case relations between Corinthians and Argives seem to have been cordial until the ambition of Pheidon provoked a rift.

With Megara relations were apparently different. From the Corinthia relatively level and cultivable land stretched to Geraneia and the promontory of Perachora.[41] On Perachora were not only the lookout and cove at the tip of the promontory but cultivable land east of Lake Vouliagmeni and in the area of the modern village of Perachora. While the lookout and harborage would not have been of interest until navigation became regular on the Gulf of Corinth, the cultivable land of the Isthmus and of Perachora would have seemed desirable to both Corinthians and Megarians.

---

[41] For a recent sketch map of the Corinthia see P. Wallace, *Hesperia*, XXXVIII, 1969, p. 497. Evidence of Bronze Age and Geometric habitation in the area of the later (early seventh century B.C.) sanctuary of Poseidon at Isthmia is reported by O. Broneer, *Hesperia*, XXVII, 1958, pp. 27-28. Late Geometric and EPC pottery has been found in graves in the Isthmus and the region to the north, *Ath. Mitt.*, LXXI, 1956, pp. 51 ff.

It was accessible to both and a bone of contention. A tradition reported by Plutarch (*Quaest. Gr.*, 17) recalls the conflict, and excavational evidence of the sanctuary at Perachora perhaps enables us to see its culmination in the take-over of the territory by the Corinthians about the mid-eighth century.

The earlier phases of this fighting, conducted in a quaintly chivalrous fashion, were marked by forays of small groups from either side, raids between Corinthian and Megarian villagers and their leaders. Hammond has interpreted the continuous pressure as resulting both in the Corinthian conquest of the territory and in the synoecism of the five original *komai* of Megara.[42] Perhaps, too, stress in the Megarid, resulting from harrassment and loss of territory, prompted the colonization of Megara Hyblaea in Sicily, dated in the mid-eighth century, prior to Syracuse, by its excavators.[43] Should we not also connect the Corinthian take-over with the indications of overpopulation in the Corinthia, with the beginnings of regular Corinthian use of the Gulf for navigation and trade (the colony on Ithaka and the trade to Delphi) and ascribe the Corinthian victory to the greater unity and centralized direction which the Bacchiad reorganization had given to Corinth? The evidence from the sanctuary of Hera at Perachora provides some basis for these suggestions.

Establishment of a sanctuary at the tip of the Perachora promontory was marked by the construction of the little temple of Hera Akraia, currently dated *ca.* 800 B.C. While this temple went out of use toward the end of the eighth century, *ca.* 750-720 B.C., in the meantime, *ca.* 750 B.C., the temple of Hera Limenaia had been built and continued to be the chief shrine of the sanctuary throughout the Archaic Period.[44] There is a marked difference in the type of votive offerings made to Hera Limenaia from those in the earlier shrine. The latter are simple, local in origin and relatively few in number, but from Hera Limenaia came the mass of exotic and unusual offerings which are associated with Perachora: fine pottery, ivories, small bronzes, objects from the east, from as far afield as Luristan. These were evidently a product of the Greek, or more specifically Corinthian, trade with the Levant which began *ca.* 725 B.C.

[42] N. Hammond, *B.S.A.*, XLIX, 1954, pp. 93-102 and *A History of Greece to 322 B.C.*, 2d ed., p. 107. Hammond dates the Corinthian take-over to 750-700 B.C. and sets the synoecism of both Megara and Corinth earlier. As discussed below, pp. 114-116, the synoecism of Corinth seems to have had a different form and to have followed the absorption of the territory. Will (*op. cit.*, pp. 358-359) characterizes the Corinthia as organized, like the Megarid, κατὰ κώμας, at the time of this sporadic fighting. He notes the tradition of a temporary domination of the Megarid by Bacchiad Corinth (pp. 359-360); this might, of course, refer to a Corinthian victory and the subsequent organization of the Geraneia and of Perachora.

[43] G. Vallet and F. Villard, *B.C.H.*, LXXVI, 1952, pp. 343 ff.; the archaic pottery from Megara Hyblaea is published in *Mégara Hyblaea, 2, La céramique archaïque,* Paris, 1964. Coldstream argues against the early dates for Naxos (757) and Megara Hyblaea (750) in *Greek Geometric Pottery*, pp. 324-325. The traditional date for Megara Hyblaea is 728 B.C.

[44] Hera Akraia: *Perachora*, I, pp. 30 ff.; the dating is revised downward by Coldstream, *op. cit.*, pp. 352-353, 404.

Hera Limenaia: *Perachora*, I, pp. 113; Coldstream, *op. cit.*, pp. 353, 404.

and was reinvigorated from *ca.* 625 B.C. The earliest pottery from the sanctuary of Hera Akraia has been classified most recently as Corinthian, rather than Argive.[45] Thus, the view of the excavators, which had considered the pottery indicative of an Argive foundation of the sanctuary and, by extension, of an early Argive " domination " of the Corinthia and of the Megarid, should be revised. Argive pottery there was at Perachora, but apparently it is to be placed after 750 B.C. and thus its presence need indicate no more than the interest of a wealthy, neighboring state in a growing sanctuary of the goddess Hera. She was common to all the Dorians of the northeast Peloponnesus, even if originally at home in the Argolid. To bring this archaeological evidence into connection with the historical event of a Corinthian take-over of the sanctuary is a delicate matter.

Hammond, in his study of early Megara,[46] noted that among the five *komai* which synoecised to form the city state of Megara were two districts named Heraia and Piraia. Presumably these were situated on the promontory of Perachora. He suggested that the Corinthian occupation of the promontory was marked by the establishment of the cult of Hera Limenaia and so dated the occupation about the middle of the eighth century. In effect, Hera Limenaia replaced Hera Akraia. At the same time, it is suggested, Corinth also took over Krommyon along the shore of the Saronic Gulf, thus establishing its control north of the Isthmus in the Geraneia. Coldstream finds some support for Hammond's view in the distinctive character of the votive offerings from the shrine of Limenaia [47] and in the identification of the earliest pottery from the Akraia shrine as Corinthian. While on the evidence of the pottery the sanctuary of Akraia might have been either a Megarian or a Corinthian foundation, for Megarians too used fine Corinthian pottery, it seems preferable to regard it as Megarian. It is difficult to see why Corinthians would found a new cult to Hera Limenaia little more than a generation after establishing that to Akraia. It is preferable to regard the founding of the cult of Limenaia as marking the Corinthian seizure of the sanctuary from the Megarians at a time when the former wished to emphasize that aspect of Hera's worship which accorded with Perachora's function as a lookout for Gulf navigation. If we may take the trade to Delphi as indicative of the inception of regular Corinthian use of the Gulf in the first part of the eighth century, this well explains Corinthian interest in seeking to acquire the rocky promontory tip as well as cultivable land. There was evidently concern both to improve the safety of navigation in the Gulf and to relieve the pressure of population in Corinth. Both actions accord with the vigorous colonizing action of Corinth in the last half of the eighth century as the new polis developed. Before discussing that, however, it would be useful to

[45] Coldstream, *op. cit.*, p. 353, note 2; Hammond (*B.S.A.*, XLIX, 1954, p. 101) had suggested that the early pottery of the Akraia shrine was local Megarian, imitative of Argive.

[46] See note 42 above.

[47] See notes 36, 45 above.

review Corinth's relations with Argos, the great power of the eighth century in the northeastern Peloponnesus.

The Argives, to judge from their place in tradition and from the evidence of excavation in Argos, were the most important people in the northeastern Peloponnesus during the first part of the Early Iron Age.[48] They attained their acme of prosperity in the last half of the eighth century, but, before that, Dorians of the Argolid are considered to have spread northward across the Isthmus to the border of Attica. While the Corinthia and the Megarid were scarcely members of an Argive " empire " in a political sense, historians have assumed that the Argives exerted cultural domination of the region and that close ties existed between the Argives and their " colonies " to the north. Will, for example, pictures a small group of Dorian kingdoms, gravitating around Argos, the kings of which were in more or less close personal dependency on the Temenids.[49]

That picture was based partly on the presumed control of Perachora by Argos, an assumption which seems no longer tenable, and partly on the view that the ceramic region of the northeastern Peloponnesus was dominated by Argos. But, as noticed above, Corinthian Geometric pottery followed its own course of development, although at times reflecting strong Athenian influence. There is no reason to assume that this influence was exercised through the medium of Argive imports. In fact, there seems to be no imported Argive ware in Corinth until after 750 B.C. Then Corinthian, in its turn, was imported into the Argolid.[50]

By the late eighth century Bacchiad Corinth seems to have been independent of Argos and, indeed, was moved to open hostility by the ambitions of Pheidon. The relationship is revealed by Plutarch (Am. Narr. 2) in the story of the dismemberment of Actaeon and by a scholiast on Apollonius of Rhodes (IV, 1212). However difficult of interpretation the story may be, both Will and Huxley accept its picture of Argive-Corinthian relations in the time of Pheidon.[51] Leaving aside discussion of his date,[52] we may use the setting of the story as a source of information about Corinth's early years as a polis.

---

[48] G. Huxley, B.C.H., LXXXII, 1958, pp. 588-601; Coldstream, op. cit., pp. 362-363.

[49] Will, op. cit., pp. 36-37, 289-291, 339-341. Will considered the presumed Argive control of Perachora as indicative of Argive suzerainty over the Corinthia.

[50] Coldstream, op. cit., pp. 91-104. Coldstream recognizes one LG Argive krater among the pottery from the North Cemetery in Corinth (p. 140).

[51] See note 48 above and Will, op. cit., pp. 344-357.

[52] The dating of Pheidon's regime is one of the most difficult chronological problems of early Greek history, and the traditions of his relations with Corinth indicate only that it coincided with the general period of the Bacchiad aristocracy. Huxley and Coldstream (note 48 above) regard Pheidon as a mid-eighth century figure, while Will (op. cit., pp. 352-357) argues for the mid-seventh century in accordance with his lowering of the inception of the Kypselid tyranny to ca. 620 B.C. Others prefer to place Pheidon in the early seventh century; for bibliography see H. Berve, Die Tyrannis bei den Griechen, II, pp. 518-519; Berve prefers a mid-eighth century date.

Throughout the story Corinth is presented as a unified state under a centralized Bacchiad government, although some opposition to the Bacchiads is apparent. When Pheidon, with intent to weaken Corinth, asked the Corinthians for a contingent of 1,000 men to aid him, the force was dispatched by Corinth as an equal and trusting ally. When an Argive noble, Actaeon's father (or grandfather), revealed that Corinth's trust was misplaced, Corinth offered him political asylum and the privilege of residing in Melissos, a Corinthian village. When a Bacchiad, Archias, made the attempt to kidnap Actaeon, the latter's father appealed in the market-place of Corinth to the Corinthians for help. He received only an expression of sympathy (like Telamachos in Ithaka), as might have been expected in a city ruled by the Bacchiads. Therefore he had recourse to Poseidon at the Isthmian sanctuary, where he made a sacrifice of his own life. In reprisal Poseidon brought famine to Corinth, until, to expiate the curse, Archias went off to colonize Syracuse (or the Bacchiad, Chersikrates, was expelled to colonize Corcyra). Nikolaos of Damascus (frag. 35) adds a sequel: Pheidon found a pretext for attacking Corinth by coming to the aid of an anti-Bacchiad faction, failed and was killed in fighting near Corinth. Without pressing into the difficulties of historicity and chronology, it is apparent that throughout the episode Corinth is represented as a state which has drawn the Corinthia into a unity and whose government controls the villages and the people. It is hardly surprising to discover some faction among the two hundred odd members of the family of the Bacchiads. It is tempting to set the situation, and Pheidon, in the third quarter of the eighth century and to bring the notice of famine into connection with the colonization of Syracuse. If so, Corinth's ability to defeat Pheidon falls into the pattern of vigorous activity displayed by its take-over of Perachora and the land north of the Isthmus.

EARLY COLONIZATION

During the eighth century B.C. the Corinthians founded three overseas colonies: on Ithaka, at Syracuse and on Corcyra. To understand the motivation and organization of these ventures would be highly important for our knowledge of the community of eighth-century Corinth, but the foundations lie before or at the beginning of recorded history in Greece. For Ithaka there is no literary tradition, but the evidence from the sanctuary of Aetos indicates that a small group of Corinthians settled on the island and began to use the shrine, already in existence, ca. 780 B.C.[53] The traditional date of Syracuse, 733 B.C., is usually accepted.[54] The synchronization of Corcyra, however, with Syracuse is perhaps incorrect, for the present archaeological evidence points rather to the alternative date of 709 B.C.[55] In any case Ithaka was colonized well before the earliest colonies in Italy and Sicily, although perhaps not

---

[53] Coldstream, *op. cit.,* pp. 353, 409.
[54] For a recent discussion of the dating of the western colonies see *ibid.,* pp. 322-327.
[55] Graham, *op. cit.,* pp. 218-220.

before some voyaging to the region had started, while Syracuse and Corcyra were settled after Greeks were sailing westwards with some regularity. Ithaka hardly falls into the pattern of western colonization and trade but rather into that of use of the Corinthian Gulf.

Corinthian interest in the Gulf, however, seems to have been confined largely to its east end—pottery and bronzes were traded to Delphi [56] and the safety of navigation facilitated by the occupation of Perachora. We can only conjecture about the attraction of Ithaka, outside the Gulf, for a group of Corinthian traders. The settlement seems plausibly identified as a trading post, for Ithaka, already peopled, hardly provided land for agricultural settlement. Also, Coldstream has noted that the Corinthian pottery from its shrine was too great in quantity to be the product of exchange with Ithakans or a testimony to the piety of passing Corinthian traders. Even if one of these explanations should be correct, it is still necessary to account for the trade. Evidently there was profit and/or strategic advantage in settling on the island. While Ithaka could control entrance to the Gulf of Corinth, such a strategic motive at this early date is surely anachronistic—it implies regular navigation in and out of the Gulf, a developed political interest by Corinth and the stationing of warships at Ithaka. Perhaps the settlers were concerned only to provide safe harborage for their own and occasional other craft, not only from weather, but from pirates, whose activity remained endemic in Western Greek waters and presumably was as early as trade itself.[57] Trade, then, there seems to have been, and if it was not to Italy, ships were making their way among the islands and up the coast into the Adriatic.[58] At least the identification of the post as Corinthian indicates that for some Corinthians trading was a means of livelihood in the early eighth century. We need not ascribe a commercial motive for the foundation to Corinth as a state, but regard the settlement as the venture of a few private individuals. Corinthian interest in Ithaka remained strong as navigation to the west developed. Imports to Ithaka from Corinth were numerous and Corinthian pottery began to exert a strong influence on the local production.

With the colonization of Syracuse we are on firmer ground than in the case of Ithaka, although the traditions raise some difficulties. The motive was apparently to ease overpopulation in the Corinthia,[59] for the settlers are said to have come from the hill country of Tenea and there is mention of famine in Corinth about the time of the venture. Despite Graham's argument to the contrary,[60] the whole enterprise has

[56]Coldstream, *op. cit.*, pp. 353, 366, 411. On the relations between Bacchiad Corinth and Delphi, see Forrest, *Historia*, VI, 1957, pp. 172-175.

[57] See the treaty between Oianthea and Chaleion (M. N. Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, I, No. 34; *I.G.*, IX², 1, 717).

[58] Will, *op. cit.*, pp. 38 ff., 321-322.

[59] *Ibid.*, pp. 319 ff.; notes 29 and 30 above.

[60] Graham, *op. cit.*, p. 220. I do not understand the objection of Graham to the colonization

the character of a regularly organized action by the Corinthian state. There was an oekist, Archias the Bacchiad, and the settlers had been assured of grants of land to be given them on arrival in Syracuse; if some desire to get rid of political malcontents by the Bacchiad government was present at the start, feelings of hostility were speedily lost, for relations between Corinth and Syracuse remained cordial throughout their history. To judge from the rapid and successful growth of the colony the vanguard of settlers was followed by other colonists from Corinth.

The founding of a colony on Corcyra, however, seems to reveal a conscious recognition of the island's importance as a port of call on the route to Italy, as well as of its capacity to offer a livelihood for settlers from its soil. The port could provide harborage and exact tolls from visiting ships. Presumably Corinthian realization of the latter is shown by the tradition that Eretrians were ejected to make way for the Corinthian settlers.[61] Even if the foundations of Naxos and of Megara Hyblaea about the middle of the eighth century, prior to that of Syracuse, not be accepted, there was evidently by 733, and certainly by 709 B.C., regular voyaging to Italy. Fiscal and possibly strategic motives seem to be present in the colonizing of Corcyra, which foreshadow the colonial policy of the Kypselids in the following century. Perhaps from the outset the Corcyreans showed a disposition to collect tolls from Corinthian ships. At least by 664 B.C. Corcyra challenged Corinth at sea (Thuc., I, 13) and began to establish its traditional isolation.

It is hardly necessary for our purposes to discuss the colonial policy of the tyrants. Will has characterized it as systematic, motivated in some cases (Leukas, Ambrakia, Anaktorion) to relieve overpopulation in the Corinthia, in others, as strategic, to police the entrances to the Gulf of Corinth and to the Adriatic.[62] Policing, no doubt, was against piracy, but it should be observed that the effect of the effort was to ensure the safety of navigation; that is, a commercial motive is apparent. While the precise relationship between Corinth and these later colonies is not clear, the oekists were usually members of the Kypselid family and the colonies dependent

as a planned act of state. How could a member of the *ruling* clan (Bacchiads) be *required* as oekist without the process being an act of state? Also, while Graham argues that Corinth was not sufficiently organized as a state to have a planned mercantile colony (i.e. to have a commercial policy?)— which is probably true—did not agricultural colonies need to be planned? In this case the colonists knew where they were going, to the east coast of Sicily, if not precisely to the site of Syracuse; they were led by an oekist, a government official, who had consulted Delphi; they took men from the hills, farmers not sailors, and arranged to allocate lots to them. The whole process seems to have been a calculated and organized venture by the state. Will (*op. cit.*, p. 320) considers that the Corinthian land-tenure system of large holdings was transferred to Syracuse and that the lots were not alienable, despite Archilochos' reference (frag. 145b) to one of the settlers selling his land for a cake on the way out. Be the size of the lots as it may, the hungry colonist had something to sell before he got there (cf. M. I. Finley, *Eirene*, VII, 1968, pp. 29, 32).

[61] Strabo, 269 (VI, 2, 4); Plutarch, *Quaest. Gr.*, 11.

[62] Will, *op. cit.*, pp. 517 ff.; Graham, *op. cit.*, chapters III and VII, particularly p. 151, " founded with imperial intentions and remained in close connection with Corinth and under her domination."

on Corinth in some fashion, remaining under Corinthian control. By the latter part of the seventh century, then, Corinth had evidently developed deliberate policies and intentions for trade as well as for the relief of population pressure. The state was using colonization as a deliberate instrument of policy in both respects. How important the trade might be is indicated by the construction of the *diolkos* across the Isthmus *ca.* 600 B.C.[63] and by the establishment of a developed system of tolls by the Kypselids.[64] There seems to be a mixture of political, commercial and fiscal purposes in the Kypselid attitude to trade and colonization. The Bacchiads, who also used members of their own family as oekists, had set a model—by taking land north of the Isthmus and by colonizing Syracuse for the relief of the overpopulation at home, and by seizing the lookout at Perachora and colonizing Corcyra to facilitate trade and the collection of tolls.

SYNOECISM

An obscure definition in Suidas refers to a synoecism of Corinth (*s.v. πάντα ὀκτώ*): "Aletes (the first Dorian king of Corinth), according to an oracle, synoecizing the Corinthians, made eight tribes of the citizens and divided the city into eight parts." Historians are unanimous in dissociating Aletes from any such reform, but, as a result of the obscurity which veils Corinthian tribal organization, there is little agreement as to when the reorganization was made. What evidence there is points to the time between the foundation of Syracuse in 733 B.C. and the establishment of the oligarchy after the fall of the Kypselid tyranny *ca.* 580 B.C. (or *ca.* 550 B.C.?). The upper limit may be set by tenuous inference. The three ethnic Doric tribes, which we would expect to find at Corinth, are attested for Corcyra Nigra (*S.I.G.*,[3] I, 141), a secondary colony by way of Issa, itself a colony of Syracuse. Presumably, then, they existed in Syracuse, where they would have been established at the time of the colonization by Corinthians. A statement by Nikolaos of Damascus (frag. 60, 2) refers to an ὀκτὰς προβούλων, set up after the fall of the tyranny. While interpretation of the passage is difficult,[65] the statement seems to indicate that some organization of the Corinthians into eight parts already existed *at that time*. Presumably the older tripartite tribal division had been replaced by an eight-part division—recognized in tradition as the synoecism of Corinth—by the Bacchiads, by the Kypselids or, with less probability in view of the wording of Nikolaos' statement, at the time of the establishment of the classical oligarchy. Most historians have preferred the Kypselids as the agents,[66] for under the tyranny, particularly at its inception or in the reign of

[63] O. Broneer, *Antiquity*, XXXII, 1958, p. 80.
[64] Herakleides Pont., V, 2 (Müller).
[65] Will, *op. cit.*, pp. 609 ff.
[66] Will, *op. cit.*, p. 612, note 2; T. J. Dunbabin, *The Western Greeks*, p. 55; Busolt-Swoboda, *Gr. St.*, I, p. 363 (at the fall of the tyranny).

Periander, there would have been exilings, confiscation and presumably redistribution of land. At Corinth, as in other Greek states, a reorganization of the citizen body might well have accompanied such political and social turmoil.

But an equally good case might be made for the Bacchiads as the authors of the reorganization. First, such a new organization would have included the whole of the Corinthia, not merely the terraces and region adjacent to the " city." [67] As discussed above (pp. 101-103), Corinth of the Geometric Period was a group of villages and there is no evidence that a coalescence was obtained, either in Geometric or Archaic times, other than by a natural process of growth and filling up around the node of the Temple Hill and adjacent hollow. We need not associate synoecism in the physical sense of creation of an urban center with synoecism in the sense of political and social organization. It seems clear that the Bacchiads controlled the whole of the Corinthia, for colonists were sent to Syracuse from Tenea. If our argument about the occupation of land north of the Isthmus and of the Perachora peninsula is correct, we might say that the Bacchiads created the Corinthia as a territorial and political entity about the middle of the eighth century. The take-over of land north of the Isthmus would have involved a distribution of lots for settlers and the incorporation of the region into the existing state of Corinth. Perhaps, too, the success against Pheidon was followed by a redrawing of the Corinthia's borders to the south. The occasion seems proper for a reorganization of the citizen body at some time in the latter part of the eighth century—in effect, a founding, a synoecism, of the polis of Corinth. [68] Such an enlargement and constituting of the state fits into the picture of

[67] On the constitution of the Classical Period, for which some epigraphical evidence exists, see R. Stroud, *Cal. Studies Cl. Ant.*, I, 1968, pp. 233-242. We know the abbreviated titles of four of the Corinthian tribes: ΣΙ, ΛΕ, ΚΥ, ΣΥ, and Hesychius names one as the Κυνόφαλοι (*s.v.*). There were at least three groups in each tribe, so that Stroud suggests that a trittys organization on a regional basis, somewhat in the manner of Kleisthenean Athens, existed. While it is scarcely possible to identify any of the subdivisions, his regional areas for the trittyes seem reasonable: the city, north of Isthmus, and south of Isthmus. If the Bacchiads did take over the land north of the Isthmus, it is reasonable to ascribe this basic regional division to them, although, of course, modifications would have been elaborated at various periods after that time. Hammond identifies the Kynophaloi as a tribe of non-Dorians established alongside the original Dorian three (*A History of Greece to 322 B.C.*, p. 107); he interprets the synoecism as pre-Bacchiad and a union of eight villages in the region of the later city. See also S. Dow, *H.S.C.P.*, LIII, 1942, pp. 98 ff. Dow reconstructs the tribal development from the original Dorian ethnic tribes in successive stages: 1) creation of a fourth tribe from non-Dorians with perhaps changes of name for all four by the tyrants; 2) a change from kinship to territorial tribes in the post-tyrannical period; 3) division of each of the four tribes into two parts to make eight as a result of population growth, probably in the fifth century B.C. However, the lack of tradition for the three Dorian tribes in Corinth, along with the relative weakness of Dorian traditions there, indicates that their dissolution was very early. The occasion for the fundamental change to a territorial basis would be most appropriate in a period when the basis of government (the 200 Bacchiads) was substantially enlarged and new territory was taken over.

[68] A certain Pheidon (not the Argive king) is mentioned by Aristotle (*Politics*, 1265b) as a

growth and change in eighth-century Corinth suggested by the archaeological evidence, by the colonizing activity and by the advent of the new aristocratic regime itself. We should not, of course, think of the development of a tribal community and of village settlements into a polis, as ancient Greek theorists did, all accomplished at one time by a single person. Rather it was a process, the stages of which may be identified by symptoms of change and the appearance of new activities. The only continuous record of Corinthian activity throughout this early period is provided by the pottery production. Can we use it as an index of the growth of the community?

POTTERY PRODUCTION AND THE GROWTH OF CORINTH

Among the various craft industries which made Corinth a center of production and trade in the Archaic Period—bronze-working, the manufacture of architectural terracottas, of textiles, of cosmetics and pottery, the latter is the most useful for the purpose of studying economic growth in the community. The amount of pottery discovered in Corinth and throughout the Mediterranean area is large and extensively published.[69] While problems of chronology and classification in detail remain controversial, there is enough general agreement for the historian, at least, to use the material as an index of industrialization. Already in the Geometric Period, pottery making was largely an independent not a household craft, serving the needs of the community and, to a small degree, exported as a commodity, or a package for other commodities, of trade. For our purposes it will be significant to note the points in time and the manner in which the production was expanded. For example, when special types were developed for export; to what degree these also served a local market, and when the local market was enlarged by the production of special types of vases for purely funerary use or for dedication in sanctuaries. This internal market is perhaps a better index of urbanization than production for export. Purchase of pottery for his household needs was within the reach of the ordinary Corinthian and enlargement of that market would indicate a growing margin of wealth. The wealthy, of course, at any period might acquire fine and exotic articles by some means, but their presence is scarcely an index for the whole community.

lawgiver in Corinth. His legislation was directed to keep the number of *kleroi* the same, apparently to prevent their alienation and to restrict the extension of citizenship. It seems proper to connect this freezing of the system of land-tenure with the synoecism. Usually such a measure is cited as made to bolster the position of the aristocracy, but, of course, it would guarantee possession to any landholder, thus bolstering the substantial " middle class " farmers also. Perhaps the growth of Corinthian crafts and continued colonization were fostered by the creation of a pool of landless and poor landholders as population increased. I plan to discuss this at length, however, in a study of early Greek land tenure now in preparation.

    [69] One important group of material, the pottery from the Potters' Quarter in Corinth, is being prepared for publication at the present time. Production in that workshop, however, seems to have been in great volume only after 650 B.C., so that its evidence applies only in part to the period discussed below.

While the distribution of pottery abroad is not our main concern, it would be useful to sketch the expansion of export before considering the production in more detail. Before 800 B.C. Corinthian production served only local needs: the villages of the Corinthia, the region of the Isthmus and Megara. By 750 B.C. this area was broadened to include Delphi and Ithaka and the general region of the Corinthian Gulf. Such a distribution implies carriage by sea, so that we may conclude that Corinthian seafaring, at least in the Gulf of Corinth, began with some regularity in this period. Between 750 and 700 B.C. the circle of export widened greatly: to Messenia in the Peloponnesus, to Old Smyrna across the Aegean, to Dodona in Northwestern Greece, to the new colonies in South Italy and Sicily. This great spurt, as usually pointed out, coincided with the colonization of Syracuse and Corcyra and with the emergence of the Linear and Orientalizing style of decoration in Early Protocorinthian production. Thereafter, almost wherever Greek colonists and traders went in the Mediterranean and Black Seas, Corinthian pottery followed them. In the last quarter of the seventh century, three generations after the first major widening, another spurt became apparent. Technically this was marked by the appearance of the Corinthian style of decoration; historically, it seems to have been spurred by renewed contacts with the Near East and by the penetration of the Black Sea. Until *ca.* 575 B.C. Corinth remained the chief exporter of pottery in the Greek world, but then eclipse was rapid and within a generation the foreign markets were largely lost to Athenian wares. In Corinth itself Athenian pottery began to take over the local market, to judge from the contents of the house wells. Explanation for the Corinthian decline is usually found in the better quality of Athenian pottery and the inventiveness of Athenian potters. How are we to explain the rise and expansion of Corinthian production?

To judge from the types of Corinthian pottery found in Corinth in contrast to those exported abroad, the stimulation to greater production was provided largely by the export market. The earliest example is the group of pottery known as the Thapsos group, if we may follow Coldstream in his attribution of it to a Corinthian workshop.[70] The vases assigned to this group, while distinctive in shapes and decoration from other Late Geometric pottery made in Corinth, are homogeneous within themselves, thus produced apparently in a single workshop. None have been found as yet in Corinth, but some were dedicated at Perachora and the rest widely distributed: to Delphi and Thebes in Central Greece, to Ithaka, Naxos, Syracuse, Leontini, Megara Hyblaea, Thapsos (in Lamis' grave) and Pithekoussai in the west and to Thera in the Aegean. In short, the vases were distributed for the new western trade and to an entrepôt for the new eastern trade. Their manufacture seems to have been a deliberate response by one particular shop to an opportunity for export. It seems to have been the vases themselves, new and pleasing in shapes and decoration, which were desirable.

[70] Coldstream, *op. cit.,* pp. 102-104.

The next Corinthian innovation for the export trade, however, coupled a particular vase shape with a special product, the globular aryballos containing perfume or scented oil. The popularity of the latter is usually considered a result of the trade with the Near East, but whether the scent exported from Corinth was made there from local herbs or imported in bulk to be repackaged in Corinth we do not know.[71] If the latter, it demonstrates specialization in the organization of trade as well as in the pottery industry. In any case, some Corinthians again saw an opportunity for an export product and refined an old vase shape, out of use for a generation, to package it. Small aryballoi, globular, ovoid and pointed, in their turn, rapidly became almost a hallmark of Corinthian export. Refinement of other shapes and the invention of new styles of decoration characterized the expanded production: the Linear Style, which surpasses anything Corinth had yet produced,[72] and *ca.* 725 B.C. the first Orientalizing experiments.

The degree to which this innovation was for export is striking. For example, in the graves of the Geometric Period in the North Cemetery at Corinth (800-700 B.C.) there were only one globular aryballos, in a child's grave, and one pomegranate vase, a special shape.[73] There were no Early Protocorinthian vases at all in the graves. Should we conclude that Corinthian potters could not find a local market for their specialties? that this cemetery was only a peasants' burial ground and so is not generally representative? or that Corinthians were very conservative in their burial practices? Similarly the graves lacked imports, jewelry and metal objects. Instead they held ordinary household pottery—skyphoi for drinking, coarse, handmade hydriai for storing water, oinochoai for pouring (MG only), kraters for mixing (they replace the oinochoai in LG). These, of course, in some cases had ritual uses in the cemetery, but they were not special funerary types. On the available evidence no special " burial market " existed in Corinth and the stimulation to expand production came from the developing market abroad.

This initial stimulation resulted in the establishment of new workshops in Corinth in the early part of the seventh century, to judge from the excavation of the Potters' Quarter, as it is called. This is the earliest pottery factory of which we know, but presumably it was only one among others which developed with the growing market. In the Late Geometric Period there was apparently a family group, known from their burials,[74] on the projecting tongue of land about one mile west of the Temple Hill, which was to be the site of the pottery's development. Perhaps the inhabitants made pottery in the Geometric Period, as the excavator suggests, but the evidence of the

[71] H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, p. 5, note 3; Coldstream, *op. cit.*, pp. 104, 346, 347.

[72] Coldstream, *op. cit.*, p. 105.

[73] R. Young, *Corinth,* XIII, pp. 13-14; aryballos, 40-1, pp. 33, 48; pomegranate vase, 21-2, pp. 28, 47-48.

[74] A. Stillwell, *Corinth*, XV, i, pp. 7-11.

conversion of the site to a pottery factory dates from *ca.* 700-650 B.C.[75] The area was admirably adapted for this purpose: clay beds on the sides of the ravines bordering the promontory, a water supply, stone for building, and paths leading up from the lower terrace and to the central village by the Temple Hill. The remains of this first period of activity are very scanty, some traces of walls under a later Terracotta Factory and over the graves of the Geometric cemetery, but sherds of Late Geometric and Early Protocorinthian were found in considerable quantity. They were interpreted as indicating the manufacture of pottery, rather than as habitational debris. A few were inscribed, our earliest examples of the Corinthian alphabet and a testimony to the literacy of some Corinthian workmen.[76]

A very puzzling feature of this early establishment is the remnant of a heavy wall of a defensive type.[77] Its substantial construction (2.40 m. in thickness, preserved for *ca.* 70 m.) of rubble with large stones and compartmented structure between two faces, as well as its position at the west edge of the promontory, seems to identify it as a fortification wall. The pottery found in the earth filling indicates construction before 650 B.C. and a partial rebuilding, at least, in the late seventh century. The wall apparently remained standing until the early fifth century. While it has been identified as part of an enceinte for the city of the early seventh century, there is considerable question that Corinth had such elaborate fortification until the fifth century when the Persian attack on Greece and the Peloponnesian War drove home the need for great enceinte walls. Other remains of such an early wall have not been found and it seems preferable, certainly more complimentary, to think that Corinth, like Sparta, relied on the valor of her citizens. In any case Acrocorinth may well have seemed sufficient refuge for the population scattered in small villages on the terraces. Perhaps we should consider that the wall was designed to protect only the village in which the Potters' Quarter was situated, although no other traces have been found on the promontory.

In small establishments of the type exemplified by the Potters' Quarter the pottery industry of Corinth grew throughout the seventh century. Innovation and invention, some from foreign influences, some of local origin, continued to maintain and to advance the craft. While Geometric traditions continued well into the seventh century, Orientalizing motifs and figured decoration had started *ca.* 725 B.C., and by 700 B.C. the black-figured technique with incised detail became regular, the latter perhaps, as Payne suggested,[78] through imitation of metalwork. From the east came new, exotic shapes: the ring vase, pomegranate vases and tall pyxis, and towards the close of this Protocorinthian phase, from *ca.* 650 B.C., an important new shape, the

[75] Stillwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 11-14.

[76] *A.J.A.*, XXXVII, 1933, pp. 605-610; L. H. Jeffrey, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece*, pp. 120-121.

[77] Stillwell, *op. cit.*, pp. 14-15; R. Carpenter, *Corinth*, III, ii, pp. 82-83; R. Scranton, *Greek Walls*, pp. 56-57, 85-88, 132-133.

[78] Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, p. 7.

alabastron.[79] Its adoption probably represents an addition to the list of Corinthian exports, olive oil, for the shape is proper for holding oil rather than for costly scent, as that of the tiny aryballoi. Perhaps we should infer that need of grain in Corinth was now being supplied in part from Sicily and that Corinthian landowners were able to specialize their agriculture more to olive oil. Wine production, to judge from the lack of amphoras, was minimal and not for export.

Of the indigenous Corinthian shapes, the kotyle, oinochoe and skyphos underwent refinement. These vessels, essentially for ordinary household use, formed a very large part of the export ware—for themselves rather than for contents, as in the case of the aryballoi and alabastra. For example, the pottery found at Megara Hyblaea, to mention only one foreign market,[80] indicates the popularity abroad of the good household pottery and the scent: there are many pouring vessels, oinochoai, with a few olpai (just becoming popular ca. 650 B.C.), thousands of cups, mainly small skyphoi, many pyxides and aryballoi.

At home in Corinth, however, the specialized vases, holding scent and high-grade oil, do not seem to have found a ready market, either for funerary dedication or in ordinary use. Perhaps the North Cemetery is not typical, but the lack of Protocorinthian pottery in its graves is surprising. As noticed above, no Early Protocorinthian at all was found. The graves of the seventh century were very scantily and poorly furnished,[81] for only eight of sixty-five contained any offerings and among them were few of the specialized export types: seven aryballoi, one alabastron, no pyxides, and one pomegranate vase. As in the previous century most of the pottery was of ordinary types and decoration and some of it handmade. Yet, the excavation of Protocorinthian houses near the Sacred Spring reveals that by the mid-seventh century ordinary households in Corinth were well stocked with household pottery.[82] Even so, to judge by the published pottery from the central excavation,[83] specialized and fine pottery was not in general use. While no sanctuary of this early period in the central region has yet been excavated, the material from the shrine of Demeter and Kore on the slope of Acrocorinth points in the same direction. It, too, is of local rather than export type.[84] Perhaps we should conclude that in the early seventh century the ordinary Corinthian was able to provide well for his household needs, make

[79] Payne, op. cit., pp. 269-270.

[80] Vallet and Villard, Mégara Hyblaea, 2; the excavators have made careful statistical records of the pottery discovered (pp. 9-10). Working from these and using their chronology I calculate that between 750 and 710 B.C., 10 hydriai, 86 kraters, 66 oinochoai, 431 cups, 4 plates, 7 pyxides and 24 aryballoi of Corinthian origin were found at Megara Hyblaea. Between 710 and 625 B.C. there are no hydriai, 47 kraters (a falling off of these shapes), but 318 oinochoai, 15 olpai, 6275 cups, 11 plates, 242 pyxides, 650 aryballoi, 772 conical oinochoai (also for scent). The significance lies, of course, not so much in the absolute numbers as in the ratios between types and periods.

[81] R. Young, Corinth, XIII, pp. 50-52.

[82] I am indebted to Mr. C. K. Williams for this information.

[83] Weinberg, Corinth, VII, i, pp. 51-54.

[84] Stroud, Hesperia, XXXVII, 1968, p. 300.

humble dedications in the new sanctuaries which were being established, but as yet did not have the means to purchase many small luxuries. Yet this same period must have seen a marked increase in the diversification of labor and craftwork.

About 700 B.C., as noticed above, the early archaic temple on Temple Hill was constructed.[85] About the same time a great temple was built for Poseidon in his sanctuary on the Isthmus.[86] The building of these large temples, of course, was the work of an organized community whose leaders could command resources of material and labor. The work itself would provide employment and raise the level of living for Corinthian workmen. Some, no doubt, worked on the new buildings in their off-season of agriculture, but others would have begun to specialize in the new activities, not only construction itself, but the building crafts of stone-cutting and carpentry and the making of architectural terracottas.[87] We may assume that the metal-working crafts received the same stimulation—bronze-working to make the new hoplite armor, to provide more costly dedications for the great temples, even bronze for architectural uses.[88] Shipbuilding, too, would have been stimulated. In addition to Thucydides' often-quoted remark about the shipbuilder, Ameinokles (I, 13), it is obvious that already in the eighth century Corinth had the capital and skill to build ships for colonization and its extending trade. The farmers and workers had their new sanctuaries, too, for the shrine of Demeter is characterized by its excavator as popular, the recipient of small and inexpensive votive offerings.[89] In short, urbanization began to work rapidly in Corinth in the first half of the seventh century, and a local market of some size was coming into existence. We can see the results after the middle of the century in the Potters' Quarter and, finally, as the process worked out, in the graves of the North Cemetery.

In the Potters' Quarter, between 650 and 600 B.C., an interesting building, the South Long Building, as it is called, was constructed.[90] Apparently the structure was used for the sale of the Quarter's products. It was long and narrow, compartmented into small rooms and faced on a roadway running between itself and the " fortification " wall. Thus, it provided a row of shops and booths where pottery could be sold, presumably both to traders for export and to local residents for use. The construction of such a building indicates the growth of the local market to which we have pointed. To judge from the large quantity of broken pottery dumped on the roadway, by no means all wasters from the kilns, either production was too great for the market or

[85] See note 6 above.

[86] O. Broneer, *Isthmia*, I, Princeton, 1971, pp. 1, 3, 55.

[87] A considerable number of very heavy, large roof tiles from the temples at Corinth (*Hesperia*, XXIV, 1955, pp. 156-157) and at Isthmia (*Isthmia*, I, pp. 40, 45-53, 55) have been found. Fragments of the same type have been discovered also at Perachora.

[88] For example, bronze was used to seal the joints of the floor in the first storage chamber of the Sacred Spring (Williams, *Hesperia*, XL, 1971, p. 3).

[89] Stroud, *Hesperia*, XXXVII, 1968, p. 300.

[90] Stillwell, *Corinth*, XV, i, pp. 15, 18.

the shopkeepers and buyers were excessively heavy-handed. Such sale at the works may be construed also as indicating that the growth of an agora for specialized marketing purposes was tardy.

There are other hints to the same effect. Corinth was still a group of scattered villages, essentially rural in character, so produce would have been individually raised or consumers could go directly and easily to the producers. If craft establishments were being built where most suitable for their activity rather than in some existing center, each, like the Potters' Quarter, could most conveniently sell its products on the spot. Probably there was some peddling of wares, but that would have been transitional to the establishment of retail shops in a more fully built up community. Then, too, the development of an agora for political purposes would hardly have been of concern to either an aristocracy or a tyranny. Neither would have desired frequent assemblies or need a variety of offices and special buildings for its political activity and administration.[91] On the whole the growth of industrial Corinth seems to have been much like that of residential Corinth—piecemeal, scattered, and using convenient natural facilities. The Potters' Quarter was one mile from the central settlement, another potters' establishment of the sixth century has been found at Anaploga,[92] a Tile Works of the same period was built to the northeast where the modern road winds up from the coastal plain; a fulling establishment has been identified at Anaploga.[93] Even in the central settlement itself there was evidently no aversion to craft workshops. Some were set up in houses, as the smelting operation in the newly discovered Protocorinthian houses near the Sacred Spring indicates.[94] Slag from smelting operations has been found in the classical levels to the east of the Sacred Spring, and a dyeworks was established in the early sixth century along the stream to the north of Peirene.[95] Apparently as Corinthian crafts developed, the new crafts-men, situated in advantageous locations, simply undertook new or complementary avocations. Herodotos' comment on the tolerance displayed by Corinthians to crafts-men seems to have a foundation in the physical appearance of the community. The urban monumentalization of the heart of the growing " city " was long delayed.[96]

[91] For what it is worth in this connection, Periander is said to have prohibited loitering in the agora (Nikolaos Dam., frag. 58, 1) and not to have allowed all those wishing to live in the town to do so (Diogenes Laertius, I, 98; Herakleides Pont., V, 2). Perhaps too much significance should not be given these notices, for they fit into the pattern of sumptuary legislation ascribed traditionally to tyrants and into the moralizing vein of thought characteristic of sixth-century Greece. However, in the case of Corinth Periander's prohibition on residence in the town may be a reference to an attempt to enforce the freezing of the *kleroi* (see note 68 above). Perhaps, too, the notice may be an attempt to account for the sprawling, village-like, appearance of Corinth, despite the luster of its tyrants.

[92] *B.C.H.,* LXXXVII, 1963, p. 726.

[93] *Ibid.*

[94] See note 16 above.

[95] See note 21 above.

[96] A reflection of this vigorous craft activity appears in the clay tablets from Penteskouphia.

The enlargement of the local market is reflected also in the furnishings of the graves in the North Cemetery from *ca.* 600 B.C., where the presence of certain specialized types of pottery indicates that a funerary market was being established.[97] In contrast to the scantiness of offerings in the graves of the seventh century, offerings of pottery became normal, averaging 3.6 vases per grave. The pottery itself, although seldom exceptional in quality, was evidently deliberately selected and grouped for burials. For example, in about fifty per cent of the graves trefoil oinochoai of globular shape, not found among export pottery or in the central settlement, were buried with the dead, evidently made for that purpose. Pyxides and miniature vases were used specifically for childrens' graves, while for some adults imported kylikes were deemed appropriate. A grave excavated at Examilia in the Corinthia[98] reveals another aspect of this funerary market; in it twenty-six vases were found, all, except for one cup, from a single shop, bought for the funeral. But, to judge from the North Cemetery graves, traditional burial practices remained strong in Corinth. Ordinary skyphoi of the type used in households remained a standard offering and, along with some aryballoi and alabastra, a few burials still contained handmade pottery as in previous centuries. Certain new shapes, kothons, large column-kraters and round-mouthed olpai, developed mainly for export, were lacking.

The appearance of the Corinthian Style, marked by new shapes, new types of decoration, and a mode of manufacture which, in an antique sense, might be called " mass production," reveals another step in urbanization. Weinberg, in his publication of the Corinthian pottery from the central excavation,[99] notes that production was substantially greater than previously and catalogues 125 pieces of Early Corinthian, 625-600 B.C., in contrast to the 90 of the preceding century. Among the pottery were some fine pieces with figured decoration, but it is interesting that aryballoi and alabastra were still few in number and the new kothons rare. In the sanctuary of Demeter a very considerable amount of pottery was dedicated in the late seventh and sixth centuries. Again, there were some fine pieces, but much of it consists of small and miniature vases,[100] of types which were turned out in great quantity at the Potters' Quarter and the other works in Corinth. Some, of course, were exported, but Corinthians bought thousands of these cheap vases for dedication in graves and sanctuaries and for the household. The inventiveness of the Corinthian potter was still applied for the export market, as well as his industry for the " mass production."

Potters are represented digging clay, stoking kilns, and shipping pottery. It is of some interest in this connection that scarcely a representation of the traditional round of agricultural work appears in the whole repertoire of Corinthian vase painting (Payne, *Necrocorinthia,* pp. 116-117).

[97] H. Palmer, *Corinth,* XIII, pp. 78-81.
[98] P. Lawrence, *Hesperia,* XXXIII, 1964, pp. 93 ff.
[99] Weinberg, *Corinth,* VII, i, pp. 55, 72-73.
[100] Stroud, *Hesperia,* XXXVII, 1968, p. 320.

The production of pottery in the Early and, to some degree, in the Middle Corinthian phases, from *ca.* 625 to 575 B.C., was characterized by its quantity, by the adoption of new shapes and by a new method of decoration. It was still a vigorous expanding craft. The alabastron, which had appeared *ca.* 650 B.C., remained popular to the end of the century, but then it gradually gave way to a new type of large aryballos, globular in shape. This aryballos is regarded as an eastern form, indicative of renewed direct influence from the Near East. From that quarter, too, came a new repertoire of decoration, probably through the importation of textiles. From them Corinthian potters selected congenial designs: an Assyrian-type lion, solid rosettes, palm trees and floral complexes, as well as figured motifs of marching warriors, banqueting scenes and various eastern monstrosities.[101]

But however healthy sale was on the now large local market in Corinth the renewed effort to hold the export markets was short-lived. The record of Megara Hyblaea is again revealing. Between 625 and 575 B.C., while Corinthian import was still large, the market was held by old products in new shapes, the scent and fine-grade olive oil in aryballoi, alabastra and kothons, and by innovations: amphoras, round-mouthed olpai instead of oinochoai, convex-sided pyxides instead of concave-sided. But the cups fell off markedly in popularity. This ominous note is confirmed by a consideration of the imports for the period from 575 to 550 B.C. A new shape had been developed in Corinth, which met with some reception, the column-krater, but all the rest is trivial. The market for drinking and pouring vessels, the oil and the scent had virtually disappeared.[102] The overseas trade had fallen to Athenian wares.

A variety of causes are advanced for this sudden collapse of much of the Corinthian pottery export. In the colonial regions local production had grown from the early days of the new settlements to respectable proportions and could supply ordinary and some fine pottery. The Corinthian potters could not maintain the momentum of the Early Corinthian period and for the products of the following generation archaeologists begin to use the terms " shoddy," " stereotyped," " hasty," and " mass production." There was, of course, no technical change in production but a careless manner of decoration was practiced, and there was a tendency to concentrate on a few shapes with the result that a larger number of more distasteful products were turned out. Some potters did make an effort, as previously, to innovate, but oddities like mastoi, amphoriskoi, bottles and flasks belong to the category of bric à brac and mantle ornaments rather than to functional pottery. The Athenian potters were working to improve the latter by refining their own shapes and developing new

[101] Payne, *Necrocorinthia*, pp. 53, 67, 118, 147.
[102] See note 80 above. A similar calculation for the period from 625 to 575 B.C. shows: 101 amphoras (an innovation), 21 dinoi (an innovation), 832 pitchers of various types, mainly olpai, 652 cups (about one-tenth of the import for the preceding period), 18 plates, 231 pyxides, 674 aryballoi, 910 alabastra (a new shape), 162 kothons (a new shape). For the period from 575 to 550 B.C.: no amphoras, 56 kraters (a new shape), 21 pitchers, 240 cups, no plates, 16 pyxides, 3 aryballoi, no alabastra, 28 kothons; the market had collapsed.

motifs and styles of decoration. After 550 B.C. Corinthian production was characterized by mechanical reproduction of old types, by the making of miniature vases, and by the substitution of easy linear and floral decoration for more elaborate figured scenes. The production was for a few markets in the Corinthian colonial area in the Ionian Sea and for Corinth itself.

But in Corinth the local market was invaded after 575 B.C. by Athenian pottery, both by fine ware, as might be expected, but also by ordinary household ware. The excavation of four household wells in the central region tells the story. One was filled with household debris of the period 600-540 B.C.; about fifty per cent of the pottery was Athenian.[103] A second well, filled in the second quarter of the sixth century, provoked the comment " a surprisingly large " amount of Attic.[104] A third well seems to have been filled with the remains of a burned-out potter's shop; again, among the Corinthian pottery was a surprisingly large amount of Attic.[105] The fourth well, filled *ca.* 500-480 B.C., also contained much Attic pottery.[106] While the local market for pottery was declining to a considerable degree, fortunately Corinthian crafts had long been diversified, so that the decline of one industry could be compensated for by others. Evidently Corinthians could afford the new Attic imports.

CONCLUSION

At the outset of this study we proposed to discuss the urbanization of Corinth under the aspects of its physical growth, its political organization and foreign policy, and, finally, its economic growth, using pottery production as an index. It remains to draw the threads together.

While excavational evidence is still scanty, it seems clear that Corinth, the " city," was a sprawling community of scattered villages throughout the Geometric and much of the Archaic Periods. The largest and most important village was in the region of Temple Hill, but that was only one of a number situated on the terraces where water supply and paths made settlement desirable. As craft industries developed, their establishments followed the same pattern; for potteries, in particular, a conjunction of the material needs of clay, water and communication was necessary. In their case it is likely that families in possession of such advantageous locations capitalized on the situation to develop the craft. Other families seem to have set up smelting operations and shops in their residences. Between the clusters of houses and workshops were open fields, tilled by the villagers and gradually filled in, presumably by attraction to the central settlement. Presumably, too, the wide extent of the area covered by these scattered villages was a factor in the slowness shown in the construction of an enceinte wall, which could have given form and a definite boundary

---

[103] E. Brann, *Hesperia,* XXV, 1956, pp. 350-374.
[104] O. Broneer, *Hesperia,* XX, 1951, p. 294.
[105] O. Broneer, *Hesperia,* XVI, 1947, pp. 237-238.
[106] M. Campbell, *Hesperia,* VII, 1938, pp. 557-611.

to the city. Perhaps the wall's great circumference, when ultimately built, resulted in part from the still sprawling nature of the city. In its growth as a complex of villages Corinth was following the pattern of other city states in the Peloponnesus, where creation of an urban center was very slow, as the examples of Sparta, Elis and Arcadia indicate.

Despite the obvious advantages of Acrocorinth as a refuge acropolis, its distance and the difficulty of ascent from the scattered villages precluded its early and steady development as the main religious center of the growing community, unlike the Acropolis at Athens. Instead, Temple Hill served that function and provided a visible center for urban growth. It is perhaps significant in this connection that most of the architectural terracottas of the archaic period were found in the region of the hill, by no means all to be connected with the successive phases or roof repairs of the temple itself.[107] On Temple Hill the primary stage in monumentalization was the construction of the large temple at the start of the seventh century. Other evidence of archaic construction in the area indicates the founding and embellishment of sanctuaries, provision for water supply, extension of residential areas and the establishment of some craft shops but hardly the organization of an agora. As discussed above, neither the political needs of archaic Corinth nor its pattern of growth would tend to stimulate the formal organization of space for that purpose.

Throughout their early history as a community the Corinthians seem to have been a unified political and social group. But it is important to differentiate the nature of the political cohesion between that of the Bacchiad kingship and that of the Bacchiad aristocracy. In the time of the kingship presumably the unity was furnished by ties of an Homeric nature—acknowledgment, sometimes grudging, sometimes enthusiastic, but always essentially personal, of the single leadership of an hereditary king seated at Corinth. But under the aristocracy effective ties of an institutional nature which could operate the state continuously as a political unity began to work. The basis of government, despite its family character, was considerably broadened. Offices of state were defined, selective, and limited in tenure, while officials, if not elected by, were presumably recognized by an assembly of the people. It is noteworthy in this connection that the " tyrant " Kypselos obtained a popular mandate by election to the kingship, *basileia*. His office was in name a revival of kingship and held in his family (itself a Bacchiad cadet branch) for three generations, although Greek historical tradition labeled him a tyrant. We have suggested that this new unity of the aristocracy was expressed also, at the community level, by a political synoecism. Membership in the state was transformed from the former ethnic basis of the Dorian tribes into a new territorial basis of eight units. This was presumably to take into account population shifts in an enlarged Corinthia, not to enable greater political participation of the citizens *per se*.

[107] I owe this observation to my wife, Mary Campbell Roebuck, who is studying the architectural terracottas from Corinth.

In foreign affairs the Bacchiads were concerned for the welfare of the state as a whole and able to utilize its resources for that purpose. Some of their actions, the organization of the aristocracy, the take-over of land north of the Isthmus, lie at the beginning of recorded history. But the traditions of the colonization of Syracuse and of Corcyra indicate that these were planned acts of state. The Bacchiads, too, were able to control internal dissension and to defend Corinth from Pheidon of Argos. Bacchiad purposes in foreign policy must remain conjectural, but there seems to have been concern not only about overpopulation and the means to remedy it, but also for Corinthian power abroad. The take-over of Perachora and the colonization of Corcyra reflect concern for sea traffic in the Gulf of Corinth and on the route to the west. Presumably this was no more at the outset than the transference of the concept of Corinthian control of its land to control of its " sea." But from this developed the fiscal concern of collecting tolls at the points where the sea traffic touched and ulti- mately the commercial, and fiscal, idea of putting a *diolkos* across the Isthmus. In- volved with these considerations, of course, was that of keeping the sea clear of pirates. As Thucydides observed (I, 13, 2), " The Corinthians are said to have been the first to handle maritime matters in a manner closest to the present." In short we should credit the Bacchiad aristocracy with the political synoecism of Corinth, that is, with the creation of an effective state, in the latter half of the eighth century B.C.

This creation of a political community in the Corinthia provided the basis for the economic organization and urbanization of the community. Not only was the agrarian sector strengthened by the addition of territory and relief of overpopulation, but the crafts responded. Pottery production showed the first stimulation by develop- ing special types primarily for export, to be shipped along the regular sea route through the Gulf of Corinth and to the west. Early in the seventh century Corinth was ready to diversify and enlarge its craft production as the stimulus provided by the construction of great new temples was felt. Sanctuary markets were added to the household and export markets. By the end of the seventh century a funerary market in pottery was added to the enlarged local and export markets. It is tempting to equate this rise in material prosperity and the appearance of new groups of workers among the population with the repudiation of the Bacchiad control *ca.* 650 or 620 B.C.; further, to associate the downfall of the tyranny with the economic pinch of decline in pottery export *ca.* 575 or 550 B.C. Be that as it may, Corinth did not become a city state in a phoenix-like birth nor can the community be characterized simply as " rural " or " commercial." The process was long-drawn-out from the time some Corinthians began to navigate the Gulf regularly in the early eighth century until the people elected Kypselos to a new type of kingship and then repudiated it in the sixth century.

<div align="right">CARL ROEBUCK</div>

NORTHWESTERN UNIVERSITY