Since my views on colonisation differ in detail, some preliminary remarks are needed before specific discussion. Rather than seeking causes for the onset of the colonial movement in over-population or the impetus of trade opportunities, I prefer to consider colonisation an exploitation of the institutional order of the *polis* itself. The nature of the *polis* (and concomitantly the psychology of its *politai*) entailed that basic relations, such as between *asty* and *chora*, be susceptible to articulation. Moreover, socio-political evolution must be a public process involving conscious conceptual manipulation. Hence, *nomothesia* could transcend the institutional drift and privileged restatement of divine law characteristic of more traditional societies, with their cyclical initiatives toward restoring a timeless sanctioned order. Once norms could be abstracted and manipulated, *poleis* could expand through self-replication on new sites in a manner going beyond both state formation through amalgamation, as seen in the Ionian migration, and growth through accretion at the margins and insettling, typical of most agrarian communities during the Dark Age and even the Archaic period. When conceptual sophistication could be married to practical advantages like superior military technology and tactics and the possession of sea-going ships, colonisers were able to reshape the human geography of the Mediterranean and Black Sea basins to their advantage.

Colonisers did not return settlers to a populist, egalitarian state from which a hierarchy of statuses re-evolved gradually, but recreated the aristocratic orders of their mother-cities. That recreation seems to have included unequal distribution of assets or access to assets even in the formative stage that engendered fundamental economic inequili-
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1 In my discussion of Attic colonisation, I have been economical with citation and refer the reader to the fuller citation in Figueira 1991, although I have highlighted more recent scholarship. For non-Athenian colonisation, I have been necessarily most selective, weighting citation toward current works.

ties in the new community.\textsuperscript{3} The existence of early status hierarchies is striking when juxtaposed with uneven distribution of colonisation and establishment of colonial networks. These factors in combination suggest why it was intrinsically advantageous to found a sequence of colonies—or the model of a single, large foundation reinforced by waves of colonists would have prevailed everywhere—especially when institutional replication involved oblique movement in status. For example, through providing the largest share of Syracusan colonists, the Teneates progressed from an inland, marginal Corinthian village (Strabo 8. 6. 22), to become the Gamoroi, a wealthy agrarian élite caste that monopolised political privilege.\textsuperscript{3} Metropolitan settlers rose in rank during colonisation, while lower status ranks were filled by less favoured recruits like fugitives or suppliants, poorer neighbours, losers in factional strife or inter-communal warfare and natives. The under-appreciated phenomenon of composite colonies has its place in this hypothesis, because composite colonies need not have been constituted from contingents of colonists of equal status.

Therefore, colonisation could preserve the metropolitan dispensation by alleviating inter-class tensions and deflecting pressure for upward mobility. Under this hypothesis, over-population does not drive colonisation, but rising numbers are a demographic precondition exploited by colonisers. A corollary is that colonisation may be classed among early élite strategies to preserve aristocratic social orders. Not only did it transform claimants to higher status at home into colonial aristocrats, but it also reduced exploitation of new pools of resources (such as supplies of raw materials or populations ready to purchase Greek goods) to short-distant interactions. Just as aristocratic régimes faced challenges from non-élite groups, they faced a hybrid external/internal challenge through differentiation of the élite into segments (including newcomers) specialising in different economic activities. With colonisation, aristocrats, who embodied an Odyssean versatility in social comportment, need not differentiate their lifestyles and risk alienating themselves from prized aspects of their ethos (like excellence in single combat). Euboean aristocrats practised regional trade both in the Aegean and the Tyrrhenian Seas without needing to transform themselves into specialists


\textsuperscript{4} Note Herodotus 7. 155. 2; Timaeus FGrHist 566 F8; Diodorus 8. 11. 2; Aristotle fr. 603 Gigon; cf. Aristotle Politeia 1303b19–26; Plutarch Moralia 825C.